THE STRESS OF CHANGE

THE STRESS OF CHANGE

ESSAYS HISTORICAL AND BIOGRAPHICAL

BY

GEORGE V. JOURDAN, D.D.

Author of " The Movement towards Catholic Reform in the Early Sixteenth Century "

WITH A FOREWORD BY

THE REV. J. P. WHITNEY, D.D., D.C.L.

DIXIE PROFESSOR OF ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE

LONDON: ROBERT SCOTT
ROXBURGHE HOUSE
PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

MADE IN ENGLAND

THE author is greatly indebted to Dr. Whitney of Cambridge, the Very Rev. Dr. Lawlor (Dean of St. Patrick's, Dublin, and Professor of Ecclesiastical History, T.C.D.), Professor W. Alison Phillips, M.A. (Oxon), and Mr. J. E. Healy, M.A., for their kindly criticisms and counsel; to the Rev. George Sidney Baker, B.D., and the late Canon Hugh W. B. Thompson, for reading the book in its rough state and noting some necessary amendments. From the officials of the great public libraries, especially of the Bodleian and the Bodleian Camera; the British Museum; Trinity College, Dublin; Dr. Williams's, London; the National Library of Ireland; the University College, Cork; and some others, he has received invariable courtesy, loans of books, and much patient assistance in tracing rare books and difficult references. The Rev. R. H. Babington, B.A. (Oxon), and Mr. Archibald Orr-Ewing, M.A., M.B. (Camb.), have given him valuable help in the proof-reading.

To these, and many friends unnamed, the author tenders his grateful thanks for their encouragement, advice, and aid.

CONTENTS

FOREWORD

I READ Dr. Jourdan's earlier work on *the Movement towards Catholic Reform in the Early Sixteenth Century* with interest and pleasure. It was a study in a period and movement too much neglected, and it showed knowledge and judgement in tracing currents of thought and literary connections. Many people and writers overlook this continuity which there really was even in an age of change and revolution. If this continuity was too much forgotten in those days as well as in these, and if the forgetfulness was hurtful to coming generations, there is all the more need for us to renew its study. The perception of this, and the excellent spirit and the industry which Dr. Jourdan brought to his task, led me to rate his book highly, both in reviewing it at the time and in recommending it often since.

I am glad, therefore, that he has carried on his work and is now giving the benefit of it to the public. Once again he gives us studies of characters and events, which even if diversified in life and lands have an underlying continuity. English readers will find much that is new to them in the fields where Dr. Jourdan guides them. After having read his earlier book I was glad to meet him at the International Historical Congress in Brussels; and it is doubly pleasant to say a word of introduction for one whom I can now hold as a friend as well as a scholar who loves history and understands it.

I am sure that this new book, which shares the merits of its fore-runner, will, like it, arouse interest in those days of old which largely shaped our world and have moulded us. So I feel safe in recommending it, even if all its views and conclusions may not be accepted always or by all. The study and the presentation of history must always be a process of debate and criticism. But we owe the past our love, whatever our thoughts of it may be. Yet a love which does not understand is not worth much ; and Dr. Jourdan is one of those who can ably and persuasively help us to understand.

J. P. WHITNEY

INTRODUCTION

THE age of the Renaissance and Reformation covered a considerable space of time, at least a century and a half. But, when the number and the variety of the departments of human thought and work, affected by the transitional movements peculiar to that age, are taken into account, it will be easily recognised that the period was by no means too long. For it is an error to imagine that the Renaissance had to do solely with literary matters and the Reformation with ecclesiastical. Any such view of them is altogether too limited. These names should be capable of summoning before our mental sight a wonderful vision of the human intellect, rising with a renascent vitality, becoming conscious of a growing strength, and entering upon a rapid and triumphant progress through an ever-widening dominion.

The vision is, translated into the events of the times, the panorama that depicts for us the general purpose of that era. To such a condition had the medieval order of things come that change had become a vital necessity. Some persons there were, no doubt, especially those interested in the maintenance of that older order, who believed that the world around them was desirous of too rapid amendments. Perhaps it was; but change it would, and change it did. Looking back at all that then happened, we cannot but be convinced that God, the Ruler and Guide of mankind, stood behind the restlessness. It may be, for instance, that

the kings of France and England, when they consolidated their kingdoms and their autocracies, were incited thereto by selfish motives, but their activities constituted an act of God. The reasons that urged the Greek exiles to bring to the West their manuscripts and their ancient culture, may have been food and wealth, but they performed, for all that, an act of God. The exploring sailors who went south to the Indian Ocean, or west beyond the Atlantic, stirred the imaginations of their contemporaries. The imaginings of these men may have run in the direction of conquest and gold; but, nevertheless, by them, and the deeds of those who awakened them, the Great Finger of Omar Khayyám was writing out the will of God in something more durable and more spiritual than letters of blood. Some authors of the age, moreover, were producing books full of the freedom and licence, if also of the art, of the ancients. They sought fame and rank and power—selfish interests, and patently so. We know not the motives that guided the wandering footsteps of such a genius as Bombast von Hohenheim, who called himself Paracelsus, or those that cheered the labours of a Lefèvre, a Colet, a Ficino, a Commynes, a Gaguin, and a Reuchlin. Nor can we quite explain the reason why Pierre Belon and Gilles of Albi, and others like them, risked life and liberty, to help in founding the modern sciences of natural history. But of this we are persuaded, that all these persons, whatever their motives or reasons, were serving a glorious and a mighty purpose, little as they themselves realised it.

It is likewise true that the religious domain was only one of several in which the new life was exhibiting its capability of awakening in the minds of men aspirations and ideas of such a kind as could only be sat-

isfied by something in the nature of a revolution. That revolt, moreover, when it came, proved to be not that of a tribe, a community, or a congregated body of men, but that of the individual, and it breathed more of the spirit of Ionia than of ancient Rome ; as swayed by the Greek mental temperament, it had its constructive as well as its critical side. The individual, in fact, was beginning to be aware of, and to proclaim his right to, a full share in the intellectual, the religious, and the political heritage that had hitherto been denied him. He was, at the same time, beginning to assert his further right to examine and criticise that which came to him by way of authority.

What are termed " Renaissance " and " Reformation " were, accordingly, the temporary outward expressions of a great forward movement of the human intellect, perhaps one ought to say, of the human soul. A movement, be it noted, which is not particular to any age, or race, or clime. During some one or other period it may seem to lie quiescent, to be retarded or repressed, but it is only waiting then for the maturing of the years. That wonderful movement began when man first realised that he could make a cutting weapon out of the stone which he had hitherto used as a missile, and first became aware of an Existence outside himself, even though he located It no higher than in the objects around him. It will end only with the disappearance of man from this planet. And always, at each stage of development, when the latest Renaissance and Reformation arrives, the adherents of the older and passing order find themselves in conflict with the champions of the new, perhaps aggressive, certainly exultant, life that is coming into its full strength—a life which will itself, in the procession of the centuries, prove too old, or too feeble, and must give place to

one stronger, greater, nobler. That this forward progress, with an occasional arrestment, of the intellectual, moral, and spiritual part of man is indispensable to the working out of his destiny can be recognised in Christian teaching, as well as in all philosophical considerations of that destiny. It supplies the most powerful reason for the enunciation of the Christian doctrine of progressive revelation; it explains why theories such as the recurrent advents of the Buddha have been stated. The forms of these theories vary, indeed, with the minds and environment of their promoters, but their fundamental topic will be found to be the same, and to contain somewhat of the truth.

The Renaissance and Reformation, therefore, must not be counted as things that are dead or past, as things that belonged to the fifteenth, the sixteenth, or some other century. Nor can anyone, in strict accuracy, declare them to have failed in the accomplishment of their intended purpose. They are but names for certain manifestations of that active force, or movement, which is inseparable from man's continued existence on this earth and is God's agent for the directing, the quickening, and the elevating of it.

* * * * *

It would be impossible to give an account, with satisfactory fullness, in a small book, of the marvellous process of change that had begun to display its strength before the fifteenth century ended and was bound to enlarge its influences as time went on. For the human intellect itself was on the move; the stress of its motion invaded every department of mental activity. Literature, philosophy, theology, politics, and natural science were all affected and advanced, interacting somewhat upon one another. Such an intellectual field stretches out to an enormous, not to say inde-

finable, extent. One could hardly expect to cope with it adequately save in a number of large volumes. It is, however, possible to describe, within a comparatively small compass, the necessity for change which then existed and the manner in which that necessity expressed itself in the thought of the period. That is all that is attempted here. No biographical sketches of Erasmus, Colet, Luther, Calvin, Montaigne, or similar great men of that age, are here given, for the reason that the reading public is, or can be, familiar with their careers from the works of Dr. P. S. Allen, Mr. F. M. Nichols, Mr. J. H. Lupton, Professor Mackinnon, M. Doumergue, and other erudite scholars. But the Essays of this present book have, nevertheless, been chosen and arranged with deliberation and care. Where the subject is a biographical one, the selection has been made on the ground that the great man was the earliest representative of a particular class, as, for instance, Lefèvre d'Étaples; or that he, by his life and career, marked the operation of a new polity, as More; or that he was the actual pioneer of an advance in knowledge, as Paracelsus. The remaining Essays, except one, are intended to explain some of the movements which, during the age under consideration, began to effect those changes that have made our modern world what it is. One Essay stands alone and needs a separate explanation, viz., that on Prince Djem. It is included here, because it manifests the great want, at that date, of a higher morality in the administration not merely of political affairs but also of ecclesiastical.

Such classifying terms as are employed are fairly obvious in their connotation. One, however, is a little confusing, because it is used in its limited original sense, as well as in the wider sense which has become

somewhat common. That is the term " humanist." Its original meaning is : " a student of the Greek and Latin classics." But, at the time of the Renaissance, those studies of the classics brought into existence a hitherto unknown quality of intellectual independence. Henceforward, a humanist might be either a man deeply versed in the literature of antiquity, or one who, having attained a considerable classical erudition, felt himself freed, by his intellectual exaltation, from the restraints of ecclesiastical conventions or authority. So likewise with regard to the cognate expression " humanism." It may denote the occupation or the mental character of the humanists ; it may also denote that occupation or that character demonstrating itself in full candour. The context will be found to indicate, with sufficient clearness, whether the limited or the extended sense is the one to be assumed, wherever these words occur.

I

What the Renaissance Wrought

LONG ages before the Mohammedan tide of conquest rolled westwards, the Aristotelian and Platonic systems of thought had cast their roots deeply in the Semitic mind. When, therefore, after the victory of 711, the Moors established themselves in the Iberian peninsula, the erudition of the East flowed into their dominions and found new homes in Cordova and Seville. There it became available for the Christian peoples of Western Europe. As the years passed on, the Christians of Spain learned perforce to dwell peaceably with the Moors and the Jews, and even to intermarry with them [1]; whilst, in the eastern lands, the crusades hastened the progress of a similar development by bringing the comparatively barbarous "Frankish" hosts into touch with Saracen civilisation. There, then, in Syria and Spain, Christian and Moslem and Jew—representatives of not only three religions but three diverse types of cultural instincts—met together and began to entertain an appreciative understanding of one another.

It was from the loose coalescence thus formed that there arose in Spain, Italy, France, and England, about three centuries before the advent of the great Revival of Learning, an important renaissance of a

[1] Bernard and Ellen M. Whishaw: *Arabic Spain*, London, 1912, ch. XIII, XIV, and XV.

somewhat different character.[1] This may be described as a partial renaissance, one confined principally to philosophy and to such natural and physical sciences as were matter for speculation. Indeed, it can be safely admitted that, to the Hebraeo-Arabic renaissance of the eleventh and twelfth centuries, as to one of the distant but quite recognisable fountain-heads of learning, we owe our present vast scientific erudition and wide range of thought. And we can the more particularly make this acknowledgment, because, though Albert the Great, Thomas of Aquino, and other eminent Christian teachers, may have decried the Jew and the Mohammedan[2] they based many of their own arguments, and no small part of their theology, on the knowledge they derived from these non-Christian sources.[3]

This earlier renaissance failed, or rather it was checked in its career, through the rise of the scholastic method. Perhaps the Christian world of the West

[1] " In the Middle Ages, in the sphere of philosophy no distinction can be drawn between Christians, Moslems, and Jews, as such. The spirit of Greece enjoyed a threefold revival, leading to a new life in Arabic, Latin, and Hebrew. What is more, the three channels often ran together and intermingled, they did not merely start from the same source. The scholars of the mosque, church, and synagogue worked in the same studies, and some remarkable cases of collaboration might be cited."—*Maimonides*, by D. Yellin and I. Abrahams (Jewish Hist. Socy., London, 1903), p. 155.

[2] *The Reactions between Dogma and Philosophy*, by Philip H. Wicksteed, D.Litt. (Hibbert Lectures), London, 1920, p. 36.

[3] *The Legacy of Israel*, ed. by E. R. Bevan and C. Singer, Oxford Univ. Press, 1927, p. 262 *et seq.* Also *Maimonides*, p. 157 : The dependence of Thomas of Aquino on Maimonides " is not confined to philosophical details, but in a certain sense may be detected in the whole of his theological system."

had not matured sufficiently, in its political constitution, in its civilisation, or in its intellectual outlook, to be able to interpret aright, to extend, to develop and to apply, the learning which was coming to it by way of the Moorish and Saracen states. No doubt, the Christian teachers could not but feel that the new knowledge, at least in some of its forms, was dangerous to Christian truth, as they conceived it.[1] No doubt also, it seemed to them that what they feared most had actually happened, and that too great a freedom of speculation and too marked an inclination to mould Christian dogmas after Oriental patterns had infected some portions of the Christian fold, notably the whole of southern France and parts of northern Italy. The ferocity and cruelty with which the subjects of the Viscount Raymond Roger of Beziers and the Count Raymond of Toulouse were suppressed in the Albigensian war are to be accounted for, on the religious side, by the fear which Western ecclesiastics felt for the mental liberty engendered by these Hebraeo-Arabic theories and opinions. And yet, though they and succeeding generations of Christian teachers, urged by such fears, had stifled this earlier renaissance out of existence by the fourteenth century, it persisted for a considerable time afterwards, under altered conditions, and coloured the thought of the Christian mystics, such as Nicolas of Cusa and Pico della Mirandola, whilst it awakened, in the minds of a different class of scholars the notions peculiar to Averroes. The influence of the Semitic thinkers did not, in fact, end with the schoolmen ; it gave the impetus to the search for the originals of Greek philosophy and science. It ended finally only when, having suggested to the minds of the scholars of the Renaissance the serious

[1] *Legacy of Israel*, pp. 296, 297.

study of the Hebrew language and literature, it merged its remaining forces into the new philological movement.[1]

Undoubtedly, there were great minds in western Europe during the medieval times. Alexander of Hales, Albert the Great, Thomas of Aquino, Roger Bacon, and Duns Scotus, who flourished between 1170 and 1308, were men famous for intellectual grandeur; in addition to them, the general multitude of the schoolmen cannot be forgotten. Their high honour consists in this, that they fostered and stimulated the mental capacities of their contemporaries and of the immediately succeeding generations of thinkers. The men of the Middle Ages were quite well able to think, and sometimes to think profoundly. But the territory over which their thought ranged was narrowed by the limited quality of the literature available. Upon this thought, too, lay heavy constraints which hampered its action;[2] the free exercise of the intellect was not then viewed, in Latin Christendom, either as a right or a privilege.

One turns naturally to the philosophic thought of Abélard for an illustration at once of the spirit of enquiry struggling to express itself, in spite of the limitations imposed upon it, and of its living on to voice itself in the age of the Renaissance and, through the independence of those times, to assert itself more

[1] *Legacy of Israel*, p. 374.

[2] M. Ambroise Firmin-Didot, *Alde Manuce et l'hellénisme à Venise*, Paris, 1875, Intro. XIX *et seq.*, maintains that the schools of Ireland were the last to have a knowledge of the Greek language. This is denied by Mr. J. A. Symonds, *Revival of Learning*, 1877, p. 66. M. Firmin-Didot adds (Intro. XXI–XXIII) that the rivalry between Constantinople and Rome was responsible for the disappearance of Greek studies in Western Christendom.

openly and boldly in the experimental movements of the sixteenth century. For, in truth, from the days of the Carolingians to those of Lorenzo Valla and the Neo-Platonists of Florence, that is, from the ninth to the fifteenth century, no greater work of intellectual value appeared than the *Sic et Non* (Yes and No) of Abélard. The very form of the work shows clearly enough that the philosopher did not feel free to express his own opinion on the important topics which he enumerated. He confined himself simply to a display of the arguments for and against, and left his readers to draw their own conclusions. If only this great Frenchman's lot had been cast in the richness and freedom of the Renaissance, he might have succeeded in making a very real advance towards a certainty of religious conviction. An examination of his extant writings makes one feel that, with absolute freedom to express his thoughts fully, it would never have become possible to hail him, as Strada has done, as the father of modern rationalism, the originator of an agnosticism which seems past healing.[1] There are indications in him of a purer and a larger faith than the narrowed minds of his own age could appreciate or comprehend.

It has been said, and it may be truly correct to say, that Abélard, when he wrote his *Sic et Non*, gave a

[1] Strada (J.), *Abeylar, la France mère de l'esprit de l'Europe* (nouvelle édition, Paris, 1902), pp. vii and ix. A briefer and more valuable estimate of Abélard's opinions and their place in the philosophical thought of his time, is to be found in Bussell (F. W.), D.D.: *Religious Thought and Heresy in the Middle Ages*, London, 1918, pp. 688–94.

The works of Abélard are available in Migne, *Patr. Lat.*, vol. CLXXVIII. For his theological outlook, consult Tournon (Alfred), B.-ès-Lett., *De la Théologie d'Abélard*, Bordeaux, 1861.

powerful impulse to the crystallising movement which was then making of Christian dogmatics a closed system.[1] But if so, that can hardly have been his intention. There is a great dissimilarity between the mental outlook of Abélard and that of Peter the Lombard, even if the *Sentences* of the latter took somewhat of their form from the treatise of the former. The *Sic et Non*, as a matter of fact, manifests the hopelessness of attempting to discuss freely what is already determined. Abélard, indeed, found himself confronted by charges of heresy whenever he endeavoured to conduct an investigation unfettered by the decisions of authority.[2] The effort was too much for him. It is on this ground, indeed, that we must explain the very puzzling contradictions which occasionally occur in his statements.[3] One conclusion alone appears possible : Abélard believed free enquiry to be essential to the discovery of the truth.

Nevertheless, he has not been left entirely without some links of connection with the freer intellectual movements of modern times. Not, indeed, that they issued by way of the schools of Albert or Aquinas, which flourished within the narrowed limits of ecclesiastical authority. To these schoolmen the dogmatical decisions already arrived at were final and afforded no room to other or divergent suppositions.

[1] *Reactions betn. Dogma and Philosophy*, p. 22.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 61 : " Bernard was fully justified in scenting danger and heresy in the teaching of Abélard, but he showed little enough insight or comprehension in the specific form of his charges. He declares that, whenever Abélard speaks of the Trinity, he ' smacks of Arius.' The reproach is a mere commonplace, and has no point at all. Had he said ' smacks of Platonism,' he would have hit the mark."

[3] Migne *Patrol. Lat.*, CLXXVIII, 1223D–1224A ; and other passages.

But, one link [1] exhibited itself in the eclectic spirit of Duns Scotus, who, though be kept within the recognised limits no less strictly (perhaps even more so) than Aquinas,[2] managed to draw through the medium of his own comprehensiveness the philosophic thought of writers anterior to, and even diverse in character from, the scholasticism to which he himself and his system belonged.[3] Such a master was naturally

[1] Pluzanski (E.), *Essai sur la philosophie de Duns Scot*, Paris, 1888, pp. 217–18 : on the question of universals, the thought of Duns Scotus, while not the same in all points as that of Abélard, is closely akin to it.

[2] That there was not that opposition between the teaching of Aquinas and Scotus which is often assumed is the point argued by Longpré (P. Ephrem), O.F.M., *La philosophie de Duns Scot*, Paris, 1924, p. 195. Yet, Longpré notes (p. 160) one remarkable and fundamental difference : " C'est dans l'amour et non dans la vision intellectuelle que consistera formellement la béatitude : *Volitio sive dilectio est simpliciter vita aeterna, beata et perfecta.* Toujours le B. Duns Scot est logique : il n'oublie pas le principe fondamental de ses constructions : *Deus vult alios diligentes.*"

[3] *Duns Scotus*, by C. R. S. Harris, M.A., Ph.D., Clar. Press, 1927, vol. I, pp. 270–2 : " Scotus is, philosophically speaking, a dogmatic realist no less than Thomas ; indeed his realism is more pronounced. . . . There is also another important respect in which Scotism rather than Thomism represents the culmination of medieval philosophy. In Duns Scotus all the conflicting currents of scholastic thought seem to flow together. The Christian mysticism of Augustine and Anselm, and the twelfth-century doctors, with its strongly marked platonizing tendencies ; the mixed Platonism and Aristotelianism of Robert Grosseteste, William of Auvergne, Alexander of Hales, and Saint Bonaventura ; the newer peripateticism of Albertus Magnus and Thomas Aquinas ; the ' new ' logic of William Shyreswood, Petrus Hispanus, and Lambert of Auxerre ; the Arabian and Jewish philosophy of Avicenna, Averroes, and Avicebron ; all these contribute to the development of his thought and the formation of his doctrine, which is thus a unique restatement of the great

followed by such a disciple as William of Ockham.[1] In his company, Duns Scotus has formed affinities with the somewhat sceptical, wholly experimental, intellectual tendencies of the sixteenth century.[2]

From what has been already said, therefore, it will be seen how true it is that great minds existed in mediæval times. Yet, for those great intellects to have proved of incalculable worth to their own and subsequent generations, as they could have been, a widening of the bounds of speculation was required, and, in addition, the power to apply themselves to the life outside the sphere of mere speculation. In other words, whilst the modern world owes a considerable debt to the great ones of the schoolmen, it might well have owed everything to them, if only their field of

problems which confronted the minds of the Christian philosophers of the Middle Ages. And if his thinking is not always completely coherent, nevertheless it is often the richer for its lack of consistence and the more significant for its incongruities. It is true that this eclectic spirit is confined within the limits of the ecclesiastical authority, but these limits are less narrow than they appear to be at first sight, and it is combined with a freedom and a width of range which raise Duns Scotus above the ranks of his contemporaries and make him after Erigena and Abélard perhaps the most interesting thinker of the Middle Ages."

[1] It is not claimed that William of Ockham was, in a full sense, a true disciple of Duns Scotus. He opposed some of the Scotist theories and exaggerated others.—Pluzanski, p. 25.

[2] In regard to Duns Scotus, Pluzanski (p. 33) is able to remark : " Comme Scot manifeste éminemment l'esprit critique, il a paru sceptique " ; whilst, in regard to William of Ockham, Longpré (pp. 163, 164) is equally able to note : " Ces déclarations révèlent nettement l'initiateur indépendant que fut Guillaume d'Ocham ; elles permettent de reconnaître dans le Venerabilis Inceptor, à la suite de Mgr. Grabmann, *ein selbständiger empirisch gerichteter Denker von grosser wissenschaftlicher Initiative*."

thought had been unlimited and if their thought had found its obvious expression in experiment. The limiting of thought and the absence of experiment produced their natural results when the keener minds had long ceased to exist. In the epoch of the Renaissance, Erasmus and others like him, who rebelled against what satisfied their meaner fellows, poured contempt upon scholastic studies; but one needs to observe carefully that upon which they uttered their censures. They deplored the narrowed scope wherein the scholastics of their time were exercising themselves; they despised the purposeless discussions on which these would-be philosophers were spending so much energy; they condemned the frequently absurd and profane arguments to which the Scotists and Thomists were debasing whatever of genius was in them. To the men who had become familiar with the literature, the thought and the empiricism of the ancient civilisations, who had, in fact, sensed the broader atmosphere and life of Greece and Rome, the restraints upon thought and action imposed by medieval canons were bitterly resented and openly derided.

Accordingly, when the bursting of the bounds came, in the fifteenth century, men looked on the new sense of freedom as a rebirth of certain intellectual capacities. As a title descriptive of what had happened to these mental powers, besides being descriptive of the revived interest in literature, "Renaissance" is sufficiently correct. The advent into Western Europe of Greek literature, Greek modes of thought, and Greek civilisation, had brought about a "rebirth." Most certainly, it was not the rebirth of the power to think; but just as certainly it was the rebirth of the power to think critically. Take up any chronicle or so-called history, written in the Middle Ages, and, as you read

it, you will readily find yourself exercising that critical faculty which you have inherited from the age of the Renaissance when it was reborn.

At the opening of the fifteenth century, the countries of Western Europe had begun to enjoy increasingly a settled condition of prosperity and government. They had thus become capable of seeking after, and welcoming, a finer culture and a wider knowledge.[1] Florence, Venice and Naples, suitably enough, had been the first to invite learned Greeks to come and teach in their cities. From 1400 onwards, a succession of Greek scholars had responded largely to the invitations which the misfortunes of their own land rendered acceptable.

The intellectual movement had, therefore, already made its earliest advances in the states and republics of Italy. When, however, in 1453, the capture of Constantinople by the Turks and the fall of the Eastern Empire took place, these events profoundly stirred the imagination of Christian Europe. Thereupon the crowds of Greek exiles themselves, their language and erudition and culture, became exceedingly popular among the wealthy and powerful in Italy, and not in Italy alone. To the new teachers and their Italian disciples flocked students from the surrounding lands, from Germany, France, and England. At the beginning of the sixteenth century no one could call himself an educated man unless he had been to the fatherland of Virgil and Cicero, and had there sat at the feet of one or other of the great Greek scholars.

One of the immediate results of this passion for classical literature was that the learned came to esti-

[1] Consult Burckhardt (Jacob), pt. II, ch. 1, and pt. III, ch. 4–6. See also Reumont (A. von), *Lorenzo the Magnificent*, Eng. trans., London, 1876, vol. I, bk. IV, ch. 1.

mate everything from the standpoint of the new culture and to depreciate whatever was beyond its scope. Within the limits of its sway were contained not only the great Greek masterpieces, but also the Latin literature of both the Augustan age and of those before and after it. To the men who enthusiastically devoted themselves to classical studies these became not a means to an end, but the very end itself. Even the patrons of the new learning shared the same conception of its importance. To have succeeded in producing a Latin poem in imitation of Horace or Virgil, or to have had such a poem dedicated to one, was to have attained a glorious immortality. The story is told that one erudite cardinal advised another not to read the Pauline Epistles lest he should corrupt the style of his Greek compositions. That was very generally the attitude of mind on the subject among the highly learned at that time.[1]

The middle and end of the fifteenth century, and the opening decades of the sixteenth, constituted, therefore, a period of extraordinary literary activity. Treatise followed treatise, poem followed poem—epic and lyric and idyll—in seemingly endless profusion.

[1] An excellent account of the intellectual activities of the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, particularly in Italy, is to be found in Roscoe (Wm.), *Life and Pontificate of Leo the Tenth*, 4 vols., Liverpool, 1805; or, in A. von Reumont's fine two-volume work on Lorenzo de' Medici; Armstrong (E.), M.A., *Lorenzo de' Medici*, Knickerbocker Press, 1900, and Villari (Prof. Pasquale), *Savonarola*, 2 vols., London, 1889, are most helpful. But probably the most complete work on this subject is Burckhardt (Jacob), *The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy*. An English translation of the fifteenth German edition with extra notes and criticisms, and enriched by numerous fine illustrations, has been recently published by Messrs. Harrap (London).

Neither author nor reader appeared to care much what the topics treated of were to be. These might be tediously serious or boisterously gay; they might be fulsome in piety or grossly obscene; they might be of a useful nature or mere exhibitions of verbal ingenuity. Nothing of that mattered.[1] What did very much matter to author, patron and reader was that the compositions were written in the style and language of the ancients.

To this feverish intellectual energy there were several outlets. One was literary composition. Another was the eager search for new manuscripts, whether of authors hitherto unknown or of those already familiar. The discovery of such a manuscript was the occasion of an outburst of joy equal to that of the winning of a great battle. A batch of newly found codices brought their bearer a welcome comparable with that accorded to the greatest of princes. Statues, coins, inscribed tablets and other relics of classical times were assiduously sought, and, when found, became the objects of an unbelievable enthusiasm.

It is true enough that the era of the Renaissance was one in which false estimates, ill-based raptures, foolish conceits and rivalries, were all too common, exhibiting the weakness and pettiness which frequently accompany exalted mental activities. However, all that was ephemeral and worthless about the writings and the characters of such as Filelfo, Poggio, Pulci, Fracastoro [2] and the rest of them, has long since been cast

[1] For reference to the incredible filth which Filelfo and Poggio employed in their Latin polemical writings against their opponents, see Symonds, *op. cit.*, pp. 238–42, 278–9.

[2] See Villari (Prof. Pasquale), *Life and Times of Niccolò Machiavelli*, Introd., ch. III, sections 2 and 4, for Francesco Filelfo (1398–1481) and Poggio Bracciolini (1380–*c.* 1460);

aside upon the dust-heaps of the centuries. To-day few readers, even men of great learning and industry, ever glance at the books of any of these writers, beyond, perhaps, the cursory examination suggested by curiosity!

Yet, to these authors, men who believed that they were rendering themselves immortal by their labours, there must be granted this honour—that it was their genius which gave the Renaissance its abiding power. They wrote as those who felt they had a right to speak the thoughts that lay within their minds, without let or hindrance. No doubt, what their hearts were most usually set on was the dress in which those thoughts were to be clothed. Still, they spoke the thoughts, and, for the first time for centuries in Western Europe, with frank carelessness. Not explicitly, but by implication, a claim had been made that man has a right to think and to speak his thought, with unchecked candour.[1] To maintain such a claim, or to assert its justice, may not have constituted the originating cause of the Renaissance, but it undoubtedly was one of its effects.

If that intellectual era is to be appraised by the worth of its children, as a tree is by its fruit, then its glory stands pre-eminent. No age has produced a more wonderful succession of marvellously talented men and women, in its later periods, than did the Renaissance. In the first period there were, indeed, scholars and writers, but those who came after them

Roscoe, *op. cit.*, III, pp. 282–94, for Girolamo Fracastoro (1483–1553); and for Luigi Pulci, Armstrong, *op. cit.*, pp. 350–5, with Perrens (F. T.), *The History of Florence*, Eng. trans., London, 1892, pp. 451–3.

[1] Burckhardt, pt. VI, ch. 2, "Religion in Daily Life," and especially ch. 3, "Religion and the Spirit of the Renaissance."

—painters, poets, sculptors, teachers, theologians—had not only absorbed their scholarship, but were able to apply it to the creation of works which are now justly regarded as among the most precious heirlooms of our modern world.

II

The Case of Prince Djem : A Curious Episode in European History

ON the death, in 1481, of Mahomet II, the great Sultan who had taken Constantinople, two of his sons came into prominence, Bajazet and Djem. Their characters were very different : the elder, Bajazet, loved ease and pleasure, Djem, on the other hand, enjoyed hunting and led a strenuous life. As neither was in Constantinople when the Sultan Mahomet died, the Vizir Achmed, a man of great military skill and sagacity, proclaimed Bajazet Sultan. Djem, however, had a strong following amongst the Turkish people and the janissaries. Moreover, he considered himself the rightful heir to the Caliphate, because he had been born after his father had ascended the throne. He therefore gathered an army in Bithynia, with the object of asserting his rights. Giving Djem no time to strengthen his cause or reinforce his army, the Vizir threw an army of Thracian soldiers across the Propontis into Asia and scattered the forces of the Prince, who thereupon withdrew for safety, first to Jerusalem, and afterwards to Sultan Kaibai in Egypt.

A little later, Djem, with the assistance of one of the Caramanian princes whom Mahomet II had defrauded of their patrimony, resolved again to try the hazard of a battle. Once more he suffered defeat and was forced to flee. Fearing lest he should fall into the hands of his

brother, with whose cruel, treacherous nature he was well acquainted, he despatched messengers to the Knights of St. John of Jerusalem, whose headquarters were at Rhodes, entreating them to give him a secure refuge from the fury of Bajazet. His envoys found it no easy task to perform their mission, on account of the watch which the Sultan had set to prevent this very enterprise. At length, having discovered a small boat in a hut on the Cilician coast, they sailed to Rhodes, and prevailed on the Grand-Master, Pierre d'Aubusson, and the Council of Knights, to send their fleet to take Djem off the coast. They came at an opportune moment, for Prince Djem, hard pressed by his brother's soldiers, had ridden at full gallop to the shore and embarked on a vessel that he had previously hired as a safeguard against capture.[1]

The Knights received the fugitive prince with royal honours. To them Djem explained that he did not deny Bajazet's right to inheritance, but that that prince had only a right to possess the dominions their father had held before he became Sultan. His appeal for aid against his brother, however, merely elicited the reply that the Knights would have to consult the Pope and Christian Princes on the matter, and that meanwhile Djem would find a safer asylum in France. Accompanied by Pierre d'Aubusson, and some of the Knights, he sailed from Rhodes on 1st September, 1482.

For some time previously, Bajazet had been seeking peace with the Knights. Accordingly, a treaty was now drawn up and agreed to, in which no mention of Prince Djem occurred. It was followed by a private compact in accordance with which the Sultan begged

[1] See the extracts from Caoursin's narrative in *Burchard's Diary*, translated and edited by Dr. A. H. Mathew, vol. I, p. 386.

Pierre d'Aubusson " to keep, care for, and protect him (Prince Djem), beneath your wings, that his passion for war may die away." Bajazet promised that money should be furnished " suitable for the expenses of a prince and royal brother." The amount fixed upon was 45,000 ducats payable yearly on 1st August.[1] From this time to the end of his life, Djem became a captive, valuable as a menace to the aspirations of his brother and source of emolument to those who held him prisoner.

The diplomatic correspondence of this period contains frequent references to the Turkish captive, and from these we learn that eager attempts were made by Venice, the Pope, and the Kings of France, Hungary, and Naples, each in turn, to gain possession of him. Djem, nevertheless, remained an inmate of the Chateau de Bourg Neuf, under the charge of Guy de Blanchefort, a nephew of d'Aubusson, until 1489, when the Knights, with the consent of King Charles VIII, handed him over to Pope Innocent.[2] This important transaction did not take place without an exchange of considerable advantages. On the one side, the terms of the compact were that the Prince should be given " for his personal safety " a bodyguard of Knights of Rhodes, that the Pope should receive in future the annual pension of 45,000 ducats for the Prince's maintenance, and, moreover, that the Pope should undertake to pay a fine of 10,000 ducats if he handed Djem over to any other monarch without the consent of the King of France. On the other side, the Knights were to receive certain

[1] See the extracts from Caoursin's narrative in *Burchard's Diary*, translated and edited by Dr. A. H. Mathew, vol. I. pp. 393–8.

[2] Heidenheimer, in *Zeitschrift für die Kirchengeschichte*, V (1882), p. 513.

rights and immunities; Pierre d'Aubusson was to be elevated to the Cardinalate; and, for the satisfaction of King Charles, Pope Innocent promised to confer another Cardinal's hat on the Archbishop of Bordeaux, and also to put obstacles in the way of the proposed marriage of Alain d'Albret with the heiress of Brittany.[1]

Djem was, at this time, about thirty-five years of age, tall, stoutly built, and healthy. His keen blue eyes were shaded by heavy black brows which almost met above his aquiline nose. He had a small chin, small ears, thick neck, chestnut-brown complexion, and hardly any beard. His manner of speaking was serious and dignified, but when he was angry, his voice became shrill and his eyes flashed. He was always reserved and proud, and never forgot, under any circumstances, that he was a Prince of the House of Othman and a faithful follower of the Prophet Mahomet. An Italian envoy at the Papal Court remarked the resemblance Djem bore to his father, the Sultan Mahomet II.[2]

It was on 13th March, 1489, that Prince Djem entered Rome. Members of the households of the Cardinals, the foreign envoys, the President of the Senate, Franceschetto Cibò (the Pope's son), and a numerous throng of the Roman populace, came to the gates to meet him. A common prophecy of the time had asserted that the Sultan would one day come to Rome and reside in the Vatican. The Romans felt, with a mixture of joy and relief, as they gazed on the procession, that this was evidently the fulfilment of that forecast.

Probably by now Djem entertained little hope that his request for help to obtain what he considered justice

[1] Pastor, *History of the Popes*, trans. by Antrobus, London, 1898, vol. V, p. 298.

[2] Ep. of Matteo Bosso, in *Burchard's Diary*, I, 381, 382.

for himself would have any prosperous issue, for, on the day after that on which he had entered Rome, when he came face to face with the Head of the Christian Church, he bore himself proudly, stalking into the conclave like the Sultan he claimed to be. And, though he had been carefully instructed as to the reverence and humility he should display in the presence of the Pope, Djem, to the amazement of the beholders, and the manifest anger of Innocent, having given a scarcely perceptible inclination of the head, walked up the steps of the papal throne and kissed the Pope's right shoulder. Through an interpreter, he then addressed a few words to Innocent, saying that he thanked God for having been permitted to see him, and that when the Pope should have granted him a private audience he would have things to tell him which would be to the advantage of Christendom. This probably related to an offer made by Djem that, if he obtained the Caliphate by Christian aid, he would withdraw the Turks from Europe and even surrender Constantinople.

Pope Innocent had long entertained the idea of a crusade against the Turkish power, which was always threatening Hungary on the one side, and Italy on the other. Now that he had got into his hands a claimant to the Turkish throne the way seemed clear, and accordingly, in May, 1489, he propounded his scheme. Although the Christian princes and their accredited representatives approved of his suggestions, they made no serious effort to act upon them. The opportunity, therefore, of conducting the crusade advantageously was allowed to pass away.

That Bajazet recognised that the possession of his brother by a Christian power constituted a very grave danger to himself is evident from the efforts made, at his instigation, during 1489–90, to poison or assassinate

Prince Djem.[1] Even when the final blow to Innocent's hopes of a crusade was administered by the reopening of the violent quarrel between the Emperor Maximilian and King Charles VIII, Bajazet felt so little secure that he sent envoys to Rome with presents, and a letter in which he offered to the Pope the same conditions as he had arranged with the Knights of Rhodes. His envoy delivered to Innocent the pension for Djem's safe custody, and promised, on his master's behalf, that Bajazet would refrain from attacking the Adriatic coasts.

The bargain thus entered into by the Pope with the Sultan was not, even in those days when much that was unseemly passed uncensured, regarded as in accordance with the honour of the Holy See. But, it has been pointed out, the Pope may be reasonably justified, in this particular, by the unwillingness of the majority of the Christian princes to assist him in the crusade he had proposed to them, and by the urgent need of guarding Christendom from any further depredations of the Grand Turk. Yet even the ultramontane historian Dr. Ludwig Pastor has to confess frankly that this and subsequent dealings between the Vatican and the Porte introduced an undesirable element into the foreign policy of the Papacy.

For Djem the years of captivity went by not unpleasantly. He had as much hunting as he wished, and peaceful luxury. The Pope maintained him royally at great expense. Still, it was not the kind of life Djem desired ; he had vast ambitions, and had pleaded with the Christians to aid him in fulfilling them : they had replied by keeping him a prisoner for their own ends. Though Innocent's plan for a crusade had fallen through, Djem did not cease to figure in the diplomatic

[1] Creighton, *History of the Papacy*, London, 1901, IV, 154 f.

correspondence of that time.[1] Nor did the death of Pope Innocent in 1492 bring any notable change in the circumstances of the Turkish prince.

Towards the end of 1494, when Charles VIII had reached Florence in the prosecution of his expedition into Italy, the negotiations between Pope Alexander VI and the Sultan took on a most offensive aspect. Alexander, terrified at the prospect of the French invasion, which seemed likely to involve his deposition from the Papacy, had applied to Bajazet, in the month of May, for aid for Naples, and in the month of June for pecuniary assistance for himself, in order to resist the advance of the French forces.

The papal envoy, Giorgio Bocciardo, entrusted with this mission, was intercepted on the return journey by Giovanni della Rovere, near Ancona. Giovanni was the brother of Cardinal Giuliano della Rovere, afterwards Pope Julius II, who had become the political opponent of Alexander, and was now with the French monarch. Accordingly, Giovanni della Rovere detained for his own use the 40,000 ducats which the envoys were carrying to the Pope, but he sent the documents found in their possession to his brother at Florence. Cardinal Giuliano and the Cardinal of Gurk (Raymond Perraud) had them published in Latin.

This famous correspondence consists of (1) a document in Latin which purports to be the Instructions given by Pope Alexander VI in June, 1494, to Giorgio Bocciardo, his envoy to the Sultan Bajazet ; (2) four epistles from Bajazet to Alexander, dated 18th September, originally written in Turkish, but now existing only in a Latin translation, and (3) another epistle from the Sultan to the Pope, of a personal and private character, dated 12th September, originally written

[1] *Burchard's Diary*, App. 37.

in Italian. In the printed copies of these papers, they are prefaced by a statement that the Cardinal of Gurk had made them public, and an attestation of Giorgio Bocciardo at Sinigaglia, countersigned by a notary public at Florence, regarding the authenticity of (1). Concerning (2), the same notary public bears witness that the attestations of the translators, the Greek Lascaris, the Bishop of Famagosta, and one Marcellus of Constantinople, Secretary to the Prince of Salerno, were made in his presence. The notary public also states, in reference to (3), that the copy published was such as he himself had made from the original " which was written in Italian, with Latin letters, on oblong paper after the Turkish fashion, and had affixed to it at the top the golden seal of the Grand Turk, and at the foot the black."

The documents have a peculiar interest of their own, and form a curiosity in diplomatic records, but their historical value depends upon (1) and (3), that is to say, on what appears to be Alexander's Instructions to Bocciardo, and the private reply of Bajazet.

We will take the documents in the order given in the printed copies.

The " Instructiones " bid Bocciardo inform Bajazet that the King of France, assisted by the States of Milan, Burgundy, Brittany, Normandy, and other nations, is about to come to Italy for the purpose of

" tearing out of our hands Djem-Sultan, and obtaining possession of the Kingdom of Naples . . . and not only will he hasten that he may seize the said Djem-Sultan and secure a Kingdom, but also that he may be able to cross over into Greece and wage war against the territories of your Highness, which ought to be known to your Majesty. They even say that a fleet under Djem-Sultan will be sent into Turkey."

Bocciardo is to demand the annual pension of 40,000

ducats due " the last day of November next," inasmuch as Alexander needs money to make preparations to resist the advance of the French.[1]

" If the French should be victorious, your Majesty would suffer great injury, both by their seizing Djem-Sultan, and by the expeditions that would follow, in the which they would have the assistance against your Highness, of the Spanish, English, Hungarians, Poles, Bohemians, and the Emperor Maximilian, who are all powerful princes."

As the forces arrayed against him would be too great for him to hope for victory, it would be prudent if the Sultan could prevail on Venice (at that time the friend of Bajazet, but indifferent to the policy of the other Italian States) to join the side of Naples in opposing the French, thereby helping to destroy the possibility of an invasion of the Turkish dominions.

Alexander furthermore instructs his envoy to secure from Bajazet, in return for the safe custody of Djem and the benefits he would derive from the efforts of the Italian States against the French, an undertaking that he would refrain from attacking Hungary, or any other parts of Christendom, especially Croatia, Ragusa, etc.

Each of the four epistles in (2) bears date, " Given in the Court of Our Sultanic Authority at Constantinople in the 1494 year from the Nativity of the Prophet Jesus, on the 18th day of September."

The greetings are couched in language we should not have expected from the Head of the Moslem world to the Head of the Christian : " The Sultan Bajazet Khan, by the Grace of God, Greatest King and Emperor of both Continents of Asia and Europe, to the Excellent Father and Lord of the Christians Alexander, by

[1] They are given in L. Thuasne, *Johannis Burchardi . . . Diarium*, Paris, 1884, vol. II, pp. 202–10, and in W. Roscoe, *Leo X*, Liverpool, 1805, vol. I, App. XLI.

Divine Providence, Most Worthy Pontiff of the Roman Church."

The first epistle relates that Giorgio Bocciardo had come and faithfully delivered the message committed to him by the Pope; that the Sultan for his part was pleased to send what Alexander desired, and for the execution of this business he was despatching with Bocciardo a trusty servant Cassimen.

The second letter declares that Bajazet had in return confided to Bocciardo certain verbal replies to the Pope and wished "thy Pontiffship" to give credence to the words Bocciardo had to utter.

The third letter sets forth that the Sultan was despatching his faithful servant Cassimen to Alexander with letters, and with instructions to present himself before "thy Gloriosity," whom he requests to send the envoy back again "to my Highness."

The fourth epistle, which exhibits to us a rather startling illustration of the curious commingling of religious interests which then prevailed in Europe, announces that the Sultan had recommended to the consideration of the late Pope Niccolò Cibò, Archbishop of Arles,

"who, from the time of the late Supreme Pontiff up to this present day, has laboured in the cause of peace and friendship, and has always served, and is still serving, both sides with the greatest fidelity." For this reason, "we begged the Supreme Pontiff to make him a Cardinal, and he granted our petition, but the Archbishop could not then take his place, as the custom required. Meanwhile, the Pontiff died, so the matter remains unsettled. Accordingly, we now write and entreat thy Magnitude, on account of the friendship and peace between us, that thy Pontiffship will fulfil what is necessary and make him a Cardinal fully, and we will look on it as a most gracious act towards ourselves."

But the private epistle, that which was written in Italian and was translated into Latin by the notary

public (Philippus de Patriarchis), contains the most amazing statements of all in this strange correspondence:

" The Sultan Bajazet Khan, son of the Sultan Mahomet, by the Grace of God, Emperor of Asia, Europe, and the Maritime Shore, to the Father and Lord of all Christians, by Divine Providence, Pope Alexander the Sixth, Worthy Pontiff of the Roman Church . . . (Bocciardo) has related to me, among other things, that the King of France intends to get possession of Djem our brother, who is in the hands of your Potency. This is greatly against our desire, and from it would come very considerable loss to your Magnitude, and all Christians would suffer injury. Consequently, we have expressed our thoughts to the aforementioned Giorgio,[1] that it might make for the peace, benefit, and honour of your Potency, as well as for my contentment, if you would cause the said Djem, our brother, who is liable to death and is in the hands of your Magnitude, altogether to die.[2] It would be life to him, a serviceable thing to your Potency, most conducive to peacefulness, and most pleasant to me. If your Magnitude were disposed to satisfy me in this particular, as you may, in your discretion, think well of doing, it ought (for your Potency's ease of mind and my satisfaction) to be effected as quickly as possible, and according to the method that your Magnitude thinks best, that the said Djem should be removed from the troubles of this world, and his soul transferred to another life, where it will have more perfect rest. If your Potency will have this accomplished and will consign his body to us at some place on this side of the sea,

[1] " Idcirco una cum praefato Georgio cogitare coepimus."

[2] As to the moral aspect of political assassination then widely accepted in Italy, the following words, quoted from an anonymous contemporary document, are instructive: " In every State political expediency rules absolutely in its own right. . . . I conclude therefore that for reasons of state and reasons of war it is the prince's duty to aim ever at the enfeeblement and annihilation of his foe by stripping him, even treacherously, of his allies, as of those who form an essential part of his forces."—Brown (Horatio F.), *Studies in the History of Venice*, London, 1907, pp. 226–9. His whole chapter on " Political Assassination " is worthy of careful study.

we, the Sultan Bajazet above mentioned, promise, in whatever place your Magnitude may be pleased to appoint, the sum of 300,000 ducats, with which you may buy estates for your children, the which 300,000 ducats we will cause to be delivered to him whom your Magnitude may authorise before the said body shall have been given and delivered by your men to mine."

Bajazet further undertakes to offer no injury to any Christian people or State, either by land or sea except such as do hurt to himself or his subjects. He then proceeds,

"And for the greater satisfaction of your Magnitude, so that you may be in no doubt concerning all those promises I have made above, I have sworn and affirmed, in the presence of the aforementioned Giorgio, by the True God Whom I adore, and upon our Gospels, to keep them all to their completion, without any failure or deficiency. And for the still greater security of your Magnitude, so that there may not remain the slightest doubt in your mind, but that you may be absolutely certain, I, the above mentioned Sultan Bajazet Khan, swear by the True God, who created Heaven and Earth, and all the things therein, in whom we believe and whom we adore, that, for the accomplishment of what I have asked above, I do promise, by the said oath, to observe all the things which are contained above and in no way ever to act against or to oppose your Magnitude. Written at Constantinople in Our Palace, according to the Coming of Christ, the 12th day of September, 1494."

On the publication of this correspondence, Christendom professed to be profoundly shocked. And, indeed, that the Sultan should have imagined the Head of the Christian Church capable of the deliberate assassination of a captive prince was very deplorable. But, in spite of the just horror which such a proposition excites in us to-day, we may, in all fairness, question if a good deal of the pious outcry in the fifteenth century were not a mere political device adopted in order the more surely to effect a political design. If the Borgia Pope

and his family differed in any way from their Italian neighbours and contemporaries, it was rather in the degree and extent than in the character of their shortcomings. Other Italian princes besides the Borgia employed assassination as part of their political methods of administration. Other Italian States besides the Papal States were in sinister communication with the Turkish Porte. Yet, Alexander was not merely an Italian prince, he was the Head of the Christian Church. And, at the very time when devout and thoughtful Christians believed the whole ecclesiastical system badly in need of reform, the spectacle of a Christian Pontiff debasing himself to become the paid tool, for a criminal purpose, of a heathen monarch horrified all Christendom. No more damaging accusation, in truth, could then have been made against Alexander than that of carrying on an abominable correspondence with the arch-enemy of the Christian faith, in order to attain a political end. Later on, the Pope asserted that the entire affair was concocted by Cardinal Giuliano della Rovere through personal enmity. His own actions are against the veracity of such a plea. For, a few years after the disclosure, he became reconciled to Giovanni della Rovere, to whom most of all he owed his defamation, and Bocciardo, whose attestation of the documents persuaded contemporaries regarding the genuineness of these papers, appears to have been early restored to the service of the Pope. These facts are important, for, if there was any forgery at all, those two men must have either performed it, or connived at the performance of it at Sinigaglia. The charge of forgery, it has been conclusively shown,[1] cannot be laid against the Cardinal della Rovere or Cardinal Perraud.

As might easily be imagined, apologists for Alexan-

[1] Creighton, *Hist. of the Papacy*, IV, 348.

der have been at great pains to cast discredit upon this correspondence. Even Ranke long ago used all available proofs to show the spurious nature of its composition: its disagreement with the Turkish authorities as to the name of the Sultan's envoy; the improbability of a Turk dating a letter "from the Nativity of the Prophet Jesus"; and the unusual description of the Koran as "our Gospels."

It is hard to see now what room there can be for doubt. Dr. Heidenheimer in 1882,[1] and Bishop Creighton some years later,[2] brought together an overwhelming sufficiency of evidence in support of the authenticity of the documents, and effectually disposed of the arguments of M. Brosch, as well as those of Ranke and Du Bulais. The only additional item furnished by Dr. Pastor to the information on the subject serves to render this decision more sure,[3] and yet he speaks as if there were grave reasons for doubt remaining. Even if there were, the least that could be said is that which Gregorovius declared, viz., that whatever question might arise regarding the verbal authenticity of the papers, there could be none concerning the substance of them. For such a moderate judgement, and we are convinced it is much less than the evidence warrants, the testimony of the Venetian archives is incontestable.[4]

But there is a further particular which supplies an indirect proof of the authenticity of the correspondence, one which, in our opinion, makes doubt impos-

[1] *Zeitschrift für die Kirchengeschichte*, V (1882), 511–73.

[2] *Hist. of the Papacy*, IV, 345–50.

[3] Ep. of the Marquese F. Gonzaga to the Sultan, referred to by Pastor, *op. cit.*, V, 430.

[4] Consult V. Lamansky, *Secrets d'État de Venise*, S. Petersbourg, 1884.

sible. The death of Prince Djem was strangely in accordance with the wishes of his cruel brother. For a few weeks longer he remained in his honourable captivity at Rome. King Charles, having marched from Florence upon Rome, gained possession of him and withdrew him thence in January, 1495, to take part in the Neapolitan campaign. He did not prove to be of much service to the designs of the French King upon the Turkish empire, for he died three days after the invading army entered Naples. Some have maintained that he was poisoned at the instance of Pope Alexander. Among Turkish writers there seems a general belief that he was poisoned, and one of them asserts that the deed was done by an emissary of Bajazet. Bembo, in his concise way, remarks simply, "Capuam ubi rex venit, Giemes, quem Roma secum abduxerat, in morbum incidit, cujus sustinere vim non potuit." [1]

We do not think it can be satisfactorily proved that Alexander planned the death of Prince Djem by poisoning, although grave suspicions will remain that possibly Caesar Borgia, before his escape from the French camp, had found some means of having a slow poison administered to the Turkish Prince.[2] The death of the Prince following so quickly upon Bajazet's suggestion, the chagrin of the Borgia at losing a valuable captive, the goodly sum of money promised on oath for his dead body, are circumstances which hang very well together and justify the suspicions of foul play. But an

[1] *Rerum Venetarum Historiae* (*Opere*, Venezia, 1729), I, 37.

[2] See A. H. Mathew, *Life and Times of Rodrigo Borgia, Pope Alexander VI*, London, 1912, pp. 401–6.

Burckhardt (Jacob), *Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy*, London (Harrap), 1929, p. 132, asserts that Alexander had Djem poisoned before handing him over to Charles VIII, but Professor Götz marks this as doubtful.

additional circumstance strengthens such a conclusion : Burchard states that Djem died in consequence of something in his food disagreeing with him, and that his dead body was returned to Bajazet, who received it with every mark of respect, and is said to have paid over a large sum of money for obtaining it.[1] Papal representatives accompanied the body to Constantinople. All these facts taken together establish a strong case. There is sufficient ground for suspecting Alexander and his son of being concerned in the death of the Prince. But we are convinced that these later facts put the authenticity of the correspondence captured by Giovanni della Rovere at Ancona beyond question.

Nowhere is there to be found a more complete illustration of the pitiably low level that Christian morals had reached in that age. The treachery of the Christian Knight Pierre d'Aubusson, the callous selfishness of the Christian Princes, the degrading bargain of the Christian Pope with the Sultan, and the deplorable circumstances surrounding the death of Djem and the delivery of his body to the brother who had so often tried to effect his assassination, reveal the incredible baseness of the Christians into whose hands the unfortunate Mohammedan Prince had fallen.

[1] Thuasne, *Joh. Burchardi . . . Diarium*, p. 242 : " Ex esu sive potu nature sue non convenienti ex consueto, vita functus est, cujus cadaver deinde ad instantiam et preces Magni Turci, eidem Magno Turco cum tota defuncti familia missum est, qui propterea magnam pecuniarum summam dicitur persolvisse seu donasse, ac familiam ipsam in gratiam recepisse." The opinion of Bishop Creighton, that the death of Djem was probably the result of the undermining of his constitution by so many years of captivity and his being then suddenly exposed to the rigours of a winter campaign, is not admissible. Djem, in his captivity, had ample opportunity of exercise, and the winter of 1494–5 seems not to have been severe.

III

Lefèvre d'Étaples

THE present Essay is intended to do no more than recall the memory of one whose name has been suffered to fall into undeserved oblivion. In the more recent of histories his influence upon his own time has been recognised by brief notices. Yet his life work might well attract more attention than it has received, and would no doubt have done so, had it not been that the scantiness of the materials offers serious obstacles to the production of a satisfactory biography.

The name of Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples (Jacobus Faber Stapulensis) is familiar to French Protestants, who proudly claim him as their first " Réformateur." The sense in which he may be so described cannot be that in which, for instance, the title is accorded to Calvin. He had no hand, like that great man, in the ordering of events or the attainment of results ; the most that can be claimed in his behalf is that he fostered and tried to guide the tendencies towards reform which had declared themselves in his day. He lived long enough indeed to see " results," but they were not such as he had hoped for or was disposed to welcome.

Lefèvre was born at Étaples, a seaport of north-western France, in 1455. This little town, known as Quantowic in the times of the early Frankish kings, is situated on the right bank of the river Canche. It is

usually described as having been "of Picardy." A learned resident of Étaples, however, who has supplied some of the particulars of this paper, asserts that its proper designation at Lefèvre's birth was "on the confines of the Boulonnais."

The commercial activities of the seaport, which had experienced a long period of neglect, awoke to new life about the middle of the fifteenth century, and once more its markets became thronged with sailors and merchants of many nations. To the cosmopolitan influences exerted on him in his boyhood by so motley a crowd of strangers are, no doubt, due many of the characteristics which displayed themselves in Lefèvre's later life. His faculty of curiosity was, for instance, stimulated by the appearance of so much that was unfamiliar, and his eager desire to arrive at the real grounds on which things rested refused to be satisfied with the usual explanations offered by authority. This insistence on authenticated information naturally developed in him an independence of thought and judgement which could hope for little sympathy or recognition in the opening years of the sixteenth century. But to these early surroundings we must attribute, above all, that deeply rooted conception of the catholicity of the Christian Church which afterwards coloured his teaching so distinctively. When he left Étaples he carried with him a profound and conservative sense of religion which is still a noted trait of the Étaplois. For these people, descended as they are from the diverse races that used to throng the little port, retain in their popular Christian beliefs to-day a strange mixture of pagan notions derived from far-off ancestors.

As the boy showed a capacity for learning, his parents, who appear to have been in comfortable cir-

cumstances, sent him to the University of Paris. Once there he cared so little for anything beyond study that he abandoned to his greedy brothers and nephews his own rights of inheritance.

There is no record of him earlier than 1488–9. We only know that, in due course, he proceeded to his M.A. degree, and soon after entered into Holy Orders. Whether he ever actually exercised the functions of a priest cannot be ascertained. In the year mentioned he went on his first journey to Italy.[1] From this event must be reckoned his interest in Greek literature. He never, indeed, became a Hellenist of note, and it was only the philosophy of Aristotle that had any attraction for him at this time. On his return to his own country he formed the determination to give Aristotle to his countrymen in a purer and more correct form than had hitherto been possible. During the Middle Ages Aristotle was not altogether unknown in Western Europe, but, inasmuch as information concerning him had come through Arabic sources, the works of the Greek philosopher had suffered considerably from the devious routes by which they had reached the medieval student.

The years that followed his return were busy ones for Lefèvre at Paris. He lectured on philosophy and mathematics and published the Logic, Physics and Ethics of Aristotle, which he corrected in accordance with the Greek texts. But if he so delivered himself to the study of teaching of philosophy, he had no idea of permitting abstract speculation to become the goal of his labours. Lefèvre had learnt in his childhood,

[1] Barnaud, *Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples*, Cahors, 1900, p. 12. There appears to be some doubt as to whether this first Italian journey ought not to be dated 1492.—See Delaruelle, *Guillaume Budé*, Paris, 1907, p. 47, note.

as he watched the traders in his native place, the practical lesson of drawing from mental qualities some definite advantage or profit. Hence, all through his life, study, whether of philosophy or literature, or of any other department of learning, subserved one end—the good of Christianity. This attitude of mind marked the wide difference between Lefèvre and the scholastic philosophers of his time.

The search after truth in philosophy led him by slow degrees to deep thoughts of holy things. In 1498 he exchanged the study of heathen philosophy for that of the Christian Mystics. For ten years he was immersed in these works of piety. During that time he was resident in the College of the Cardinal Lemoine, where he delivered lectures and had many famous pupils. Of these two deserve particular mention here, as they represented, later on, two parties, two schools of thought, amongst those who sought to reform the Christian religion in France. One was Guillaume Farel, the fiery apostle of militant Protestantism, the precursor, friend and assistant of John Calvin. The other was Guillaume de Briçonnet, Bishop of Lodève, a cultured nobleman, son of a Minister of the Crown who had taken orders and become Archbishop of Narbonne and Cardinal. In all history there are few more pathetic figures than the younger Briçonnet. He set the high and noble ideal before him of working for the betterment of religion, and of doing this as far as was possible without disturbing the peace of any man. For this he merits the admiration and approval of all good men. But the power to carry out his benevolent designs was wrested from him by the excited zeal of both friend and foe. Moderation and peaceful counsels exposed him to the suspicion of both parties alike. Baffled and disappointed, he retired at last

from his bishopric of Meaux, overborne by the violence of the partisan spirit, and unfitted by the candour of his own judgement to use in his defence the weapons employed against himself.

It was not until 1508 that Lefèvre began to devote himself to the exposition of Holy Scripture. From this time to the end of his long life he consecrated all his powers to this labour.

No one was at that time better qualified by circumstances and training to impress on his generation the value of a knowledge of the Bible. As the restorer of the Aristotelian philosophy,[1] he enjoyed a high reputation in the University of Paris and throughout the learned world. The rôle of a leader was foreign to his cautious and gentle temperament, otherwise he might well have become the centre of the company of brilliant scholars then to be found in Paris, for he exercised over them, undoubtedly, a powerful influence. Moreover, certain advantages accrued to him about 1508 which increased his power and reputation. In the first place, he obtained, though not a monk, a secure residence in the famous monastery of St. Germain-des-Prés. Here he dwelt, not as an inmate subject to rules and restrictions, but as the favoured scholar, the honoured guest of the family that held the Abbacy, the Briçonnets. About the same time also he obtained an introduction to the Court, an event which was to prove of great value to him in later days. That these circumstances combined to impart to Lefèvre's position weight and importance is to be inferred

[1] Reuchlin's letter to Lefèvre, 31st August, 1513, given in Bulaeus, *Hist. Univ. Parisiensis*, VI, 61, and Herminjard, I, 12; Sir Thomas More's lengthy epistle of remonstrance to Martin Dorpius, 21st October, 1515, given in *Eras. Opera*, Leyden, III, 1896, D, E.

less from the actual records of French history or from anything Lefèvre himself has written than from the place assigned him by German and English scholars of his time, themselves of no mean rank in their own countries.

The first result of the new direction of his studies was the Quincuple Psalter (published by H. Estienne in 1509). It is hard to bestow a sufficiently descriptive title upon this work. It was clearly intended to be a kind of study in Textual Criticism, a science indeed not yet born. The first portion of the book is occupied with the three Latin Versions of St. Jerome, called by Lefèvre the "Gallican," that is, the version adopted in Gaul, the "Roman," that adopted at Rome, and the "Hebrew," that which was made direct from the Hebrew for Sophronius. These are printed in parallel columns for the purpose of comparison. The second portion contained the Old Latin Version (that which was in vogue before St. Jerome made his versions) and Lefèvre's own revised, or harmonised (*conciliatum*) version, these two being printed in parallel columns.

It would be of great interest and value now to know what manuscripts he used. We know from the labours of Robert Estienne in 1540 that there were then many precious codices of the Vulgate in the library of St. Germain-des-Prés. In his Preface to this work, Lefèvre mentions having consulted many ancient worm-eaten codices, but that is all he says about them.

However, it is abundantly evident that his mind was not so much concerned about the critical part of his task as about the expositions which he appended to the several Psalms. This portion of his work is indeed the most valuable to those who are interested in determining Lefèvre's place in religious history, since from it may be gathered the reasons which have

led historians to class him as a reformer. As a means to stimulate devotion he knows of no instrument more effective than the Word of God, and, that the knowledge of it should be undiluted and pure, he rejects the prevalent method of exposition by manifold senses, oftentimes artificial and jejune, and the glosses by which tradition had obscured it. He follows simply what he calls the spiritual sense. According to it the practical value of the Psalms lies principally in the application of each of them to Christ, to His Church, or to Christ's dealings with His Church. Therefore Lefèvre's exegetical method resolves itself into an attempt to emphasise the evangelical element in Scripture and thus to exalt its value as the highest accessible source of spiritual comfort and admonition. Indeed, in the Preface addressed to Cardinal Briçonnet, he draws attention to this as the chief purpose of his labours : " I must beseech Christ, who is the beginning and end of all Psalmody, that it may not only be accepted, but that it may be of service to many to attain happiness." A modern French biographer of his [1] has discovered—one can hardly avoid the thought that the discovery was the result of a somewhat laborious search—the doctrine of justification by faith only in the *Expositio Continua* of Psalm vi, where Lefèvre says :—" Da mihi salutem aeternam, non quia dignus sim, non quia meritus sim, sed ob solam miserationem et gratiam tuam." But such expressions of

[1] Barnaud, *Lefèvre*, p. 24. Attention should be drawn to the judicious remark of Mr. A. A. Tilley, *Camb. Mod. Hist.*, II, 283 : " Though the effect of Luther's writings in France was considerable, the French Reformers showed almost from the first a tendency to base their theology rather on the literary interpretation of the Scriptures than on the specially Lutheran doctrine of justification by faith."

dogma, if ever made deliberately by Lefèvre, are only incidental and never constitute his main preoccupation. He was anxious that men should read the Bible and ponder it, and he strove to enable them to do so from the most profitable point of view. He was not directly concerned with the doctrines they might deduce from it.

In pursuance of the great design, Lefèvre published, in 1512, his notable work, the Latin Commentaries on the Pauline Epistles. Dr. Delaruelle [1] has remarked in a recent volume on the great Budaeus, that " by his exegetical works Lefèvre precipitated the Reformation," alluding primarily to these Commentaries. The statement finds its justification in the expressed opinions of some of Lefèvre's contemporaries. Martin Luther [2] (whilst yet the unknown professor at Wittenberg) passed a censure upon the book, because of its intentional deficiency in dogmatical teaching, in a letter of 19th October, 1516, to Spalatin, and in another of 1st March, 1517, to Lange. The censure serves, in Luther's own case, a double purpose. On the one hand it shows the wide diffusion of Lefèvre's influence, and on the other it indicates thus early the attitude he himself was about to assume towards reform. A juster tribute to the value of Lefèvre's book was that implied by Erasmus, when, in defence of his Greek Testament published in 1516, he pointed out that in his edition, so fiercely attacked by hostile critics, he had merely followed in the footsetps not only of Valla but of Lefèvre.[3] The plea was scarcely accurate. There were fundamental differences between the two books.

[1] Delaruelle, *Budé*, p. 54.

[2] De Wette, *Luthers Briefe*, I, 39, 51 ; extracts from these two letters are given in Herminjard, I, 26 f.

[3] Apologia prefixed to *Novum Instrumentum*, *Opera*, Leyden, VI ; Ep. to Card. Grimani, *ibid.*, III, 144 A.

Lefèvre had obeyed very carefully and circumspectly the rule that had become obligatory in practice from the reign of Charlemagne, of correcting the text of the Latin Vulgate from Latin codices alone.[1] So cautious was he that he did not presume even to touch the Vulgate,[2] but altered only that ancient Latin which St. Jerome himself had revised. Erasmus, on the contrary, disregarding a mere conventionalism, altered the Latin Vulgate and that too on the authority of Greek texts, then commonly regarded as heretical.

The divergence between the two books arises in fact from the differences of method pursued by the two authors towards a somewhat similar end. Erasmus aimed at the correction of error, whether in the text of Scripture, or in doctrine, or in the daily lives of Christians. He did not shrink from pointing out the error or from controverting it. Lefèvre's method was more positive : no less sensitive to the prevalence of abuses, he feared to arouse hostility by stigmatising them, and confined himself to an inculcation of what commended itself to him as right. He was a representative of that considerable school which holds that with the restoration of genuine piety errors of discipline and doctrine will disappear automatically and without a struggle.

Ecclesiastical affairs were, however, during these years, taking a course very little likely to respond to Lefèvre's benevolent ideal of peaceful reform. There had been a time when such would have been welcomed ; but reform had been refused when submissively prayed for—it was now to be forcibly demanded.

To a certain extent it is also true that Lefèvre's ideal found itself at issue with the strongest current of the

[1] Scrivener, *Intro. to the Criticism of the N.T.*, Camb., 1883, p. 350 ; Smith's *D.B.*, Art. " Vulgate," sec. iv.

[2] Lefèvre draws attention to this in his Dedicatory Preface.

age. Nationalities, in the modern sense, were springing into existence and trying their strength, and national tendencies in religion were destined to furnish a powerful impetus to the reformation movement. Nationalism was not, however, the highest ideal in religion as Lefèvre discerned it. The Church of Christ was not, for him, a denomination either racial or sectarian, but a realisation of the brotherhood of man. So vividly was he possessed by this vision that in his Quincuple Psalter he professed himself impatient of such titles as "Church of Rome" or "Gallican Church" in that they obscured, as he held, the glorious truth that there is but one Church, the Church of Christ.

It is worth pointing out here that this catholic instinct, so strongly developed in one who was at once a sincere friend of reform and a pioneer in critical studies, as he understood them, brings Lefèvre into a kinship strangely close with those great French scholars and critics of the present day whose general attitude towards Church unity is on the whole so similar. We wonder, sometimes impatiently, why the "Modernists" do not leave the communion of Rome: their steadfastness is attributed sometimes, it is to be feared, to unworthy motives. But the lesson from their life as well as from Lefèvre's is surely that a passion for sincerity and truth in religious teaching and practice does not necessarily involve, and can be maintained quite apart from, that tendency to "split" which has disintegrated and weakened the churches of the Reformation.

There are epochs, however, when counsels of conciliation are not listened to, and Lefèvre's lot was cast in one of them; yet he continued to raise his voice in his own way. In 1522 he published a Latin Com-

mentary on the Gospels, and next year a French translation of the New Testament. Apart from the rough vigour of this work, which appeals still to educated Frenchmen, it presents no notable qualities of style and its importance is mostly due to the fact that it formed part of a noble design whose successful completion could not have been without effect on the course of the Reformation.

For the younger Briçonnet, now Bishop of Meaux, had some time previously invited his old friend and teacher, Lefèvre, to assist him, as Vicar-General, in raising the state of religion in the diocese. Lefèvre had already given his aid in a similar enterprise, but the reformation of a single community, that of St. Germain-des-Prés, was a comparatively simple matter beside the problems furnished by the diocese of Meaux. In this latter undertaking Lefèvre enjoyed, at the Bishop's invitation, the help of several of his most trusted pupils, Gérard Roussel, Guillaume Farel, Michel d'Arande, and this company soon earned the sobriquet of " luthériens de Meaux."

But, in truth, the reforms which Lefèvre projected had nothing to do with Luther. They were simply the logical outcome of the principles he had derived from his Biblical studies. Indeed Briçonnet chose the very time when these measures were being carried out to issue two Synodal decrees dated 15th October, 1523, and a Mandate of 13th December, 1523, against the books and doctrine of Luther, and against any wilful disturbance of received Church doctrine.[1] It is impossible to suppose that the Bishop associated the efforts of his Vicar-General with any tendency towards the Lutheran revolt. Moreover, Lefèvre's own Prefaces are equally emphatic.

[1] Herminjard, I, 153–8, 1–2.

Although the experiment at Meaux was favourably regarded at Court and won the express approbation both of the King, his mother and his sister, it was from the beginning doomed to failure. Since 1512, when his work on the Pauline Epistles appeared, Lefèvre had been earning the growing suspicions of the Theological Faculty at Paris. Recent events in Germany had accentuated their feeling of distrust and the practical reforms initiated at Meaux brought it to a head. But so long as royal favour shielded Briçonnet no step could be taken against one who enjoyed his protection. When however King Francis was made prisoner at Pavia (1525) and led as a captive to Madrid, the opportunity occurred, and Lefèvre's vernacular translations were condemned by the Sorbonne. He was even summoned to answer to a charge of heresy, and would undoubtedly have been condemned had he not, by the advice of his patron, succeeded in making his escape to Strasburg.

The King on hearing, in his Spanish prison, of these proceedings was deeply concerned, and wrote to the Parliament of Paris reserving the case to his own decision until such time as he should be at liberty to deal with it.[1] Being released the following year he recalled Lefèvre from exile and showed his confidence in him by attaching him to the Court and subsequently appointing him tutor to the Royal children.

In this position he remained for a few years unmolested.

His work as a reformer was now at an end—at least its active aspect had no longer scope for exercise, though he carried on the Biblical translations which embodied his ideals. And his enemies were by no

[1] Herminjard, I, pp. 401–3.

means satisfied. The year 1529 brought a warning that he was still in danger. In that year his friend, Louis de Berquin, a favourite at Court and a protégé of Briçonnet, was arraigned for heresy by the watchful foe, condemned and burnt, with scandalous rapidity, in a single day.[1]

Immediately his friend was dead the executioners fixed on Lefèvre as their next victim, and the loss of the King's favour in 1530 would unquestionably have sealed his fate had not the King's sister Marguerite, now Queen of Navarre, carried him off to her Court at Nérac.

Here for the remaining six years of his life he lived in peace, a mere spectator of the ecclesiastical turmoils developing on every side. But his ideals, which for one short period only he had been permitted to put in practice, had failed disastrously to commend themselves to his contemporaries. Henceforth it was his lot to behold his work pass into the less judicious hands of his pupils Farel and Toussaint. These impetuous disciples may have displayed more ardour, more vigour, than he had shown, but, handling doctrine without caution and ceremonies without forbearance, they soon outraged the religious sentiments of many who had not been averse from a temperate reform, and by driving them into the ranks of reaction hardened the opposition between the old and the new.[2]

Lefèvre lived to see the neighbouring Church of England repudiate the papal jurisdiction as a first step towards domestic reformation. The year of his

[1] See Barnaud (Jean), D-ès-L., *Pierre Viret, Sa Vie et Son Œuvre*, Saint-Amans, 1911, pp. 33–4; also, *Cronique du Roy Françoys*, ed. Guiffrey, Paris, 1860, p. 76.

[2] Whitney (J. P.), *The Reformation*, London, 1907, pp. 95–7.

death, 1536, witnessed also the death of Erasmus and the début of Calvin at Geneva. His passing then marks the period at which parties crystallised, and the prospect of conciliation faded so that an overt separation became inevitable.

IV

The Origins of Nationalism

THE ancient Romans established an empire. By means of an authority based on military power they brought the races around them within the scope of a common civilisation and legal system ; but they were no cosmopolites. On the other hand, the Romans had no such words in their language as " national," " nationality," " nationalism." What these words signify to us never entered their minds.

Outside the empire the only bond of association among the Teutonic, Celtic and Scandinavian peoples was kinship. This is to be seen in the Brehon, Salic, Scanian, Saxon and Visigothic laws and usages. It peeps forth from the capitularies of Charlemagne, the regulations of King Alfred, and the eighth-century romance, " Beowulf." [1]

[1] *Tribal Custom in Anglo-Saxon Law*, by F. Seebohm, LL.D., London, 1902, pp. 22 f. : " Among the Cymri, the form of society was patriarchal, in the sense that the common ancestor (generally conceived to be the great-grandfather) during his life, and even after his death, was regarded as the head of the gwely, or group of his descendants for three generations. . . . The unit of society was not simply the family in the modern sense of a parent and his children, but the wider kindred of the gwely or the group of related gwelys headed by the chieftain who provided the da " (i.e. allotment of property). Seebohm, p. 505, shows that there was a general similarity between Welsh, Irish, Norse, Scanian, and Anglo-Saxon systems of Kin-ownership.

" Beowulf " is a story of blood feuds, recited at the court of

When, therefore, the decline of the imperial authority in the West of Europe corresponded with the increase of it in the hands of the invading tribes, there was bound to arise, sooner or later, a new and independent realm in Western and Middle Europe. Not, however, among such races as Charlemagne governed could unity be obtained by a unification of legal codes or an amalgam of social cultures. The Teutonic idea of family possession and liabilities was as far removed as anything could be from the Roman legal conceptions of individual ownership and responsibility. Social assimilations between the Teutons and the Gallo-Romans were hampered by these opposing views of personal status. Accordingly, Charlemagne, in his efforts to weld a State out of such discordant elements, formed his policy on the basis of a common religion, which, in its turn, was to be the means of producing a further basis of unity, a common civilisation.

For his purpose there was no other course which he could have followed. Among the peoples domiciled in Middle, Northern and Western Europe there had been one class of men, the priests of their pagan faith, who had been recognised by long custom as suitable to serve as arbiters and also as executors of the decisions of their laws and usages. Charlemagne's sole method of permanently securing his authority among both the

King Offa, which reveals the conditions of tribal life in Anglia or Northumbria, *ibid.*, pp. 57 and 497.

The Carolingian *Capitularies* of 803 and 825 prove that the Lex Salica was still, to some extent, in force then.

The correct name for the Brehon Laws is Faineachas (= laws of the Feine or Feini, Gaelic free farmers). The largest code of them is the *Senchus Mór* (= Great Law Book), which, in an incomplete condition, has been published by the Royal Commission of 1852. See L. Ginnell's *Brehon Laws* (London, 1894), especially pp. 72 ff., 81 ff., 100 ff., and 114 ff.

Franks and the motley races whom he was gradually subjecting to his rule was to bring them all within the Christian Church and under the sway of its dictates.[1] Such a unifying force would be, and was, understood by them. Baptism, accordingly, became in his hands a political instrument. Opposition to it, or the refusal of a man to allow his children to be baptised, was treated as a State affair. Fines were attached to this and other similar departures from Christian standards —fines, be it noted, payable to the secular authorities. Consequently, when Charlemagne defeated the Saxons, they submitted to baptism. When they revolted they signified their repudiation of baptism by burning the churches and driving out the missionaries. It was their way of asserting their independence of the Frankish rule. In a political sense they perfectly well understood the inculcation of religious authority and sanctions as expressing unity—it was the only thing they so knew, or of which they could form a conception.

[1] Ozanam (A. F.), *La Civilisation chrétienne chez les Francs*, Paris, 1849, p. 336, points out the system of change in the old tribal laws that took place under Childebert II and other kings. Regarding the precarious tenure of the royal authority among the Franks, Ozanam declares (p. 338): "Rien ne peint mieux que ces paroles (those in which King Gontran implored the people not to slay him) la condition de la monarchie germanique; le respect, non de la personne, mais de la race; la précaire destinée de ces princes qu'on abat à coups de hache (if he refused to lead them to fight, when they desired it). . . . Quand les guerriers mirent Pepin le Bref sur le pavois, ce fut la royauté barbare qu'ils relevèrent."

In Charlemagne's *Capitulare de partibus Saxonie*, A.D. 785, the following fines are levied: nobilis 120 solidi, ingenuus 60, and litus 30, for refusing to allow an infant's baptism within a year of birth (s.19); nobilis 60 solidi, ingenuus 30, and litus 15, for taking part in the celebration of pagan rites (s. 21).

The Capitulare Saxonicum (797) of Charlemagne shows that the payment of wergelds was still a general custom.

Yet the reluctance of Charlemagne, on that fateful Christmas Day in the year 800, to wear an imperial crown was, probably enough, genuine. An ancient chronicle [1] tells us that the argument used in his presence to justify his acceptance of the crown was to the effect that the empire had ceased to exist at Constantinople, because the Empress Irene had seized the reins of power, having first blinded her own son, Constantine VI. This argument, however, does not help us to account for his hesitation. It is much more likely that Charlemagne realised that, when his peoples should settle down into an ordered State, they would do so along lines very different from the Roman model, and, therefore, the title of Emperor, as borne by himself and his successors, would be a misapplied one and an anachronism. His subsequent actions in the matter show this, as well as his invariable custom, after 800, of describing himself as Emperor and Augustus, " and also King of the Franks and Lombards." [2]

The ideal, however, of the Holy Roman Empire had been born. For all that, the political development of the peoples who were under the scope of that ideal took the direction of feudalism,[3] a condition of association which owed more to the old tribal " law of kindred " than to any imperial suggestions ; and that came to be their social and political condition. In the religious sphere, indeed, the imperial ideal persisted. It had, in its original, though a moderate,

[1] *Chron. Moissiac.*, apud Bouquet, p. 79 : Delati quidem sunt ad eum dicentes, quod apud Graecos nomen Imperii cessasset, et femina apud eos nomen Imperii teneret, Hirena nomine, quae filium suum Imperatorem fraude captum oculos eruit, et nomen sibi imperii usurpavit.

[2] See his Capitulare of 802 A.D.

[3] Ozanam, pp. 372 ff., makes it clear that Charlemagne's empire led inevitably to feudalism.

form accompanied the Visigoths, Huns, Franks, and the rest of them, from their homes in the northern and central parts of Europe. In a Christian dress it had entered into the political schemes of Charlemagne. Because it had entered into the political sphere, it found itself opposed by the same forces which ultimately wrecked the Caroline plan of a single State under a single ruler. The tribal customs were too strong for the complete realisation of an imperial ideal of this character, either in Church or State.[1] The conception of authority put forth in Dante's famous treatise was a theory, and never could have been anything else. His book presents us with a magnificent vision of earthly rule—a universal empire governed by two heads, a secular and a religious, which yet are not quite two, but operate in such harmony as should make it possible to regard all authority as one, because proceeding from one source. It was very noble and grand in thought, but in reality impossible. Among a feudal aristocracy and a commonalty tenacious of age-old habits of thought and practice it had no chance of acceptance.[2]

Instead, the actual empire gradually lost its power and its dominions, and even the influence it once possessed as an ideal. At the beginning of the six-

[1] Cp. *Germany in the Early Middle Ages* (476–1250), by Wm. Stubbs, D.D., formerly Bishop of Oxford, ed. by A. Hassall, M.A., London, 1908, pp. 28–32. On pp. 54–64, 138–40, Dr. Stubbs explains not only the growth of feudalism, but the differences of its development in England, Germany and France.

[2] For an excellent synopsis of Dante's *De Monarchia*, see Bryce (Lord James), *Holy Roman Empire*, 1904 edition, pp. 276–80.

St. Thomas began a work, *De Regimine principium*, advancing similar views to Dante's. It was finished by his disciple, Ptolemy of Lucca.

teenth century it was a mere shadow of what it had been, and implied little more than a title of honour for the chief prince of a Germanic confederation.[1] The imperial character of the Church had likewise diminished towards the close of the fifteenth and the opening of the sixteenth century. Now the successors of Gregory VII and Innocent III were content to aim at the realities of founding and maintaining an Italian princedom, and of intervening with something like ponderable influence in European politics.[2]

The fact was that the European world had moved on. As the Teutonic people had settled down among the original inhabitants and coalesced with them in blood, laws, habits and language, they formed feudal States or provinces. These feudal units, in their turn, had fallen into groups, and finally these groups had, in the process of time, come under the sway of single overlords or kings. It was in this way that the nations were formed. The old principle of family responsibility, or "law of kindred," was now transferred to the larger unit, and became that sense of loyalty to the nation which is called patriotism.

The first patriot in this modern sense was John Wyclif,[3] and the second was Joan of Arc. The former,

[1] *Germany in the Later Middle Ages* (1200–1500), by Wm. Stubbs, D.D., formerly Bishop of Oxford, ed. by A. Hassall, M.A., London, 1908, pp. 207–30.

[2] Bryce's *Holy Roman Empire*, ch. XXII.

See the excellent ch. X, "The Papacy and its Dangers," in pt. I of Burckhardt's *Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy*.

[3] Workman (H. B.), *John Wyclif*, Clar. Press, 1926, vol. I, pp. 269 ff., and vol. II, pp. 21 ff. (dealing with Wyclif's *De Officio Regis*).

The Anonimalle Chronicle (1333–81), ed. by V. H. Galbraith, M.A., Manch. Univ. Press, 1927, p. 123, is particularly interesting, as it gives the record of Wyclif's speech before the Parliament of 1378, on the royal power.

whatever may be thought of his declarations, at any rate was the first man who stood forth, in a country that had become England, to assert the rights of a people that had become English, in a tongue that had become the English language. The latter addressed her appeal, not merely to the men of her own province, but to the men of all the provinces that owed feudal allegiance to the French Crown. Her call was that of a French woman to French men to save France. It was the first time that such a summons had issued, and it was the first time when it could have issued. France and England had become nations, and, in these nations the individual, with his personal rights of ownership and legal privileges, with his personal duties and responsibilities, had found himself.

Two Powers lagged behind in the advance. Germany remained a mere geographical title for a confederation of States, of a more or less feudal kind, under the incubus of an imperial ideal that had ceased to have any practical value, except as an obstructing force to the evolution of a German nation. The Christian Church of the West, nominally for the most part, continued to maintain her claim to an imperial authority, which included a temporal over-lordship as well as the more real governance of the Churches.

Such imperial ideals, by the sixteenth century, had become quite incompatible with the newer consciousness of nationhood, or nationalism. Imperialism, whether of the Carolingian or Dantesque kind, in both Church and State, was out of date. The peoples who had become nations politically were bound soon to demand Churches that were national. Religious development has invariably either accompanied or followed the political.

It may easily be remarked how, during the first half

of the sixteenth century, the passion for nationalism was absorbing the recently born desire for culture, and applying it, with ever-increasing force, to national ends. Inspiring the humanistic studies of such as Reuchlin were the ambitious longings for the advancement of a civilisation that should be distinctively German. A still more active, yet quite similar, striving after the upthrust of a truly French Renaissance marked the careers of such as Budé. When we arrive at Rabelais we meet the Frenchman who refuses to recognise any authority as of equal eminence with that of France. In England, too, these aspirations added a new power to the life of the people. The literary man, the lawyer, the politician, the ecclesiastic, the artist, the poet—all after their several fashions, and in varying degrees, had become definitely English, long before Henry and his parliament had broken the bounds of an Imperial tradition. Affinities of an international kind, which had been common enough up to the opening years of the sixteenth century, were no longer possible even before the middle of that century had been reached. The characteristics of each race had emphasised themselves by development; and henceforth, in Church and State, in culture and literature, in legal code and moral standard, the nations of Europe tacitly agreed to depart, each on its separate way.

Due allowance, therefore, for the existence, in the heart of every important man of that epoch, of a longing for the betterment of his own nation, is an absolute essential to the understanding of the motives which dictated his public actions.

V

The Later Humanists

I. JOHANN REUCHLIN

JOHANN REUCHLIN was born at Pforzheim in 1455. His parents were worthy persons, though of no remarkable station in life. Nevertheless, they seem to have been able to assist him to visit several renowned Universities in pursuit of general culture and especially of proficiency in legal studies. Later on, when he had adopted the profession of a lawyer, he still continued those literary habits which he had acquired from Greek teachers in Italy and other instructors. In the earlier years of his authorship, he made a number of translations of Greek authors, classical and theological, into Latin, and of Greek and Latin authors into German, besides compiling Greek and Latin dictionaries and grammars.

He had, accordingly, won considerable renown as a scholar, was, indeed, reckoned among the learned ones whose researches and studies were beginning to exert immense influence on the men and women of their age, when an event took place which was destined to leave an enduring impress upon his thought, his fame, and his life, and to constitute, in very truth, " a moment of significance in the history of the world." His prince Eberhard, in 1492, paid a visit to the Imperial Court at Ling, probably for the ratification of a treaty, and took Reuchlin with him as counsellor.

It is not the signal honours which the Emperor Frederick III conferred upon him, the rank of nobility and the office of Imperial Counsellor, that invest this sojourn of Reuchlin's at the Court with paramount interest. That is reserved for the friendship he formed with a Jew, Jacob ben-Jehiel Loans, the medical attendant of the Emperor. Loans must have been a remarkable man, for he was not only a capable physician, but deeply versed in the Hebrew language and literature. He became Reuchlin's teacher.

The German scholar had already made some progress in the Hebrew tongue, his interest in this branch of learning was already awakened. Among the humanists in Italy, eager enquiry was not confined entirely to the Greek and Latin classics. All kinds of knowledge received from them a warm welcome, every department of literature and science attracted their curiosity. And Reuchlin had shared their aspirations, if he did not actually imbibe them from his Italian friends.

Now, however, his attitude towards Hebraic studies ceased to be one of curiosity merely. Loans became his very capable instructor and aroused in his pupil a degree of affection which reflected itself upon that person's estimate of the value of rabbinical literature. At that date, there was neither a dictionary nor a grammar of the Hebrew language of a kind suitable for European use. The strong appreciation of Hebraic literature with which Loans inspired Reuchlin may, therefore, be regarded as the originating force of that vast Semitic erudition which to-day exists in the countries of Western Europe.

Whether he adopted it from his teacher, or, as is quite possibly the case, the ardour of his studies affected

his power of discernment, Reuchlin quite early applied his high value of the literature itself to the ramifications of rabbinical thought contained in it. Like Pico della Mirandola, he became convinced that, in every word, every letter, even every point of the Old Testament lay hidden meanings too deep for apprehension, save by means of the cabalistic art.[1] It is an indication of the experimental character of the thought of that age, that many holy men contemporary (or almost contemporary) with Reuchlin shared his veneration for Mirandola and his passion for the Cabala,[1] among them Sir Thomas More and Bishop Fisher.

Among students, enthusiasm is directly responsible for the defects of their virtues. Marsiglio Ficino was sincerely devoted to the Christian Faith ; he was also an admirer of the Platonic philosophy. Mirandola's piety and orthodoxy were unassailable ; his erudition also, in regard to Greek, Roman and Oriental thought, was profound. These two eminent masters maintained, with a noble insistence, the great worth of every kind of knowledge. But both of them erred gravely when they attempted a harmony of them. Similarly, though possibly not to a like extent, Reuchlin. His championship of Hebraic studies has given him an unique place among the benefactors of European culture ; his adherence to the verities of the Christian faith has retained for him his due rank amongst the pious ones of the times in which he lived. But, through his too zealous affection for Hebrew erudition, he seems

[1] A book on " The Holy Kabbalah, or Secret Traditional Knowledge of the Hebrews," by Mr. A. E. Waite, has recently been published by Messrs. Williams and Norgate, London. Also cp. Dr. Bussell, *Religious Thought and Heresy in the Middle Ages*, pp. 412–23.

to have imparted to that learning an unsuitable perspective towards Christian doctrine.[1]

The first-fruits of the new direction of his industry was his *De Verbo Mirifico* (1494), addressed to his friend Johann von Dalburg, Bishop of Worms and Chancellor of the University of Heidelberg.[2] It consists of three books, in the form of a colloquy between a Jew, a Philosopher, and Reuchlin himself (under his Grecised name of Capnio), upon the " Wonder-working Word," the unpronounceable IHVH of the Hebrews, the Ineffable Name of God (= our *Jehovah*). Around this Name, regarded with such awe by the Jewish scribes and teachers, Reuchlin gathered profoundly mystical conceptions of the Divine Nature. In the first book, he expressed himself thus :

" God is love, man is hope, the bond between them is faith. They can be so joined in an indescribable union that the human God and the divine Man are to be considered as one Being. This union is effected by the Wonderful Word."

---

[1] Barham (F.), *Life and Times of John Reuchlin, or Capnion*, London, 1843, pp. 101 ff. ; Geiger (Dr. Ludwig), *Johann Reuchlin, sein Leben und seine Werke*, Leipzig, 1874, pp. 197–202.

Geiger very pertinently quotes Colet's estimate of Reuchlin's philosophical studies. The Englishman felt it was a waste of time to pursue Pythagorean and Cabbalistic fantasies, when the greater thing was to devote oneself to an ardent love and imitation of Jesus Christ.—Eras., Op. III, 1660 E, F. Cp. also, *The Legacy of Israel*, ed. by Bevan and Singer, Oxford, 1927, p. 328.

[2] See *Ioannis Reuchlin Phorcensis LL. Doctoris Liber de Verbo Mirifico*—Tubingae, Tho. Anshelmi, M.D. XIIII. This edition is prefaced by an epistle entitled : In laudem disertissimi atque trium principalium linguarum peritissimi uiri Ioannis Reuchlin Phorcensis, librorumque quos de Verbo Mirifico nuper edidit, commendaticia Conradi Leontorii Mulbrunnen. Epistola.—The date at the end of the epistle is : Spire, XI, Kal. Maias, M.CCCC.XCIIII.

He arrived at this decision by the most complicated fantasies. The tetragram IHVH, by the addition of another consonant, S, a consonant that betokens the holy Fire (*Esh*), the sacred Name (*Shem*), the consecrated Oil (*Shemen*), becomes pronounceable as the pentagram IHSVH (= Jesus), depending for its existence on the unseen vowels which represent the Deity. In the most ancient times, in various lands, this Name has worked miracles, afforded protection, turned aside evils, the Cross is the symbol of this Wonderful Name. But the word of the Cross is the greatest mystery of all, to be whispered only in the ears of the elect, unheard by others. In a later work of Reuchlin's (his *De Arte Cabalistica*), one of the speakers develops this concept by declaring that the power which once belonged to the tetragram (IHVH) has now passed over to the sacred Name IHSVH (Jesus) and resides in its sign, the Cross. Thereupon another speaker adds the remark that the Hebrew expression for the Cross (*Tselem*), in its numerical value (160), is the same as the word (*'ets*) which is used for the pole on which the Brazen Serpent of the Wilderness hung.

Reuchlin was no philosopher, and his thought is vague and mystical. If we regard these lucubrations of his as worthless and fantastic, as well we may, we possess predecessors for this estimate in the decisions arrived at by Dean Colet, Erasmus, and Luther. Yet, to his credit, we may quote, as Dr. Geiger has done, the just words of Wieland on Reuchlin [1]:

"He spake (to Oriental literature) the word of power, 'Arise, Dead One, and come forth.' And the Dead One came, wrapt in rabbinical graveclothes, his head bound up in the napkin of the Cabala. The second word to be said (and it is

[1] Geiger (Dr. Ludwig), *Johann Reuchlin, sein Leben und seine Werke*, Leipzig, 1874, p. 195.

incomparably an easier one), ' Loose him and let him go,' has been the lauded service of the generations that followed Reuchlin's."

It was, indeed, to assist such studies as we have mentioned that Reuchlin produced, in 1506, the work which constitutes probably his highest merit to fame. This was the Hebrew Grammar and Dictionary (*Rudimenta Hebraica*) which he dedicated to his brother Dionysius, a learned priest, who joined the reformers in later life. The exalted esteem, and even veneration, which Reuchlin had, by this time, attained in the minds of the learned everywhere, lies behind the title which Sebastian Münster in 1537, affixed to his revised edition of this work [1]: " John Reuchlin . . . the principal founder, in Germany, of the Greek and sacred Hebrew tongue and of all the best learning."

We need not wonder if the enthusiasm for Oriental studies which Reuchlin was inculcating attracted not only the interested attention of the erudite but also the suspicions of the opponents of the new learning. The prejudices of these latter he had already encountered, in his Greek studies. It is, however, doubtful if he would ever have been openly attacked merely on the ground of his being a student of the Hebrew language and literature. His great reputation among the *savants* of the age ; the favour he enjoyed among the princes of Germany ; the influence he possessed at the Imperial Court ; combined with the fact that he had been ennobled, would have protected him from

[1] Ioannis Reuchlini Phorcensis primi Graecae et sacrae Hebraicae linguae adeoque meliorum literarum omnium in Germania autoris . . . Lexicon Hebraicum & in Hebraeorum grammaticen commentarij. . . . Basileae, M.D. XXXVII. In this, Sebastian Münster's edition, the Liber Prior, addressed to Dionysius, occupies pp. 1–67, with the date at end : Nonis Martijs, Anno M.D. VI.

serious molestation. Added to these circumstances was that element of caution which good friends took care to enjoin upon him.[1] When, therefore, the dispute with Pfefferkorn came, it did so through none of his seeking or desires; it was, in its origin, thrust upon him. No dispute, indeed, of the period immediately preceding the Reformation manifested so completely as this the need there was then of a revolution which should free the human intellect from a degrading servitude.

This memorable controversy arose through an insignificant Jewish convert, Johann Pfefferkorn, whose character was very questionable. Erasmus has described him as a man who "from a disreputable Jew, became a still more disreputable Christian." Of course, all that was said against him by the humanist friends of Reuchlin may have been exaggerated by the natural bias of indignation. Yet, it is clear enough that, in several senses, he was an undesirable person with whom to have any dealings. Moved either by bigotry or by personal spite against his late co-religionists, he contemplated certain active measures against them. To this end, he sought and obtained the support of the Dominicans of Cologne. Through their influence, he received from the emperor a mandate which enjoined on all Jews in Germany to deliver up to Pfefferkorn such of their Hebrew books as were inimical to the Christian faith. The mandate also constituted Pfefferkorn the sole judge as to what books should be destroyed. After some tyrannous and

[1] With the freedom of a humanist, Reuchlin had written a comedy, *Sergius vel Capitis Caput*, as a skit upon a well-known friar. He withdrew it, however, before it could be performed. According to the account given by Melanchthon (*Briefsammlung*, 1552), he did this on the advice of his friend Dalburg—see Geiger, *op. cit.*, p. 81.

malicious attempts against the Jews at Frankfort-on-Main, he presented himself before Reuchlin at Stuttgart, with the request that the great Hebraist would assist him in his campaign. Nothing was farther from that scholar's intention, and he refused.

Reuchlin did not stand alone, in his dislike for Pfefferkorn's inquisitional mission. Other persons of importance and learning manifested their opposition to it, or took measures against it. For that reason, the Emperor decided to authorise the Archbishop of Mainz to examine the whole matter. Through this prelate he issued an order to certain Universities and individual scholars to express their opinions on the course to be adopted with regard to the Hebrew literature in question. Being one of those so commanded, Reuchlin obeyed.

His reply (August, 1510) was a learned classification of the Hebrew books. Most of them, he explained, were useful for study and for imparting information. Others of them gave helpful aid to biblical exposition. Of the later rabbinical compositions, two only, in his opinion, merited to be destroyed, the *Toldoth Jeschu* and *Nizachon*, because of their blasphemous nature. Leaving the Hebrew books aside, Reuchlin discussed, with sound judgement, the results that would issue from depriving the Jews of their literature. He pointed out that the Jews had their rights as fellow-citizens of the German nation. He proposed means for the encouragement of Hebraic studies.

As a reply, Reuchlin's opinion constituted, in effect, an adverse criticism of not only Pfefferkorn's mission but of all kinds of repressive measures directed against the Jewish people and their literature. It is hardly likely that he would have expressed himself thus candidly if he had thought that his opinion would be

made public. He declared afterwards that he was under the impression that he was furnishing a private statement. Nevertheless, whether by accident or design, it came into the hands of Pfefferkorn himself. Furious with its contents, that person proceeded, with the assistance of his friends, to stir up a persecution against the great Hebraist. The Dominicans of Cologne now advanced into the open as the antagonists of Reuchlin. The latter had been since 1485 the proctor of their Order in Germany, an office from which he had derived no gain. At that time, the Dominican Order was exceedingly powerful and numbered amongst its members many who were eminent for scholarship or character. Jacob von Hochstraten the Inquisitor, through whom they conducted their proceedings against Reuchlin, appears to have been a man of some pretentions to erudition. As such he had been one of those commanded by Maximilian to give his opinion, and had done so temperately enough. In the subsequent progress of this dispute, he wore the garb of a relentless opponent of Reuchlin, but quite possibly he may have served, in that capacity, merely as the prominent figure behind whom sheltered the vindictive malevolence of meaner spirits.[1] It has also to be admitted that if Reuchlin had either kept silent when Pfefferkorn attacked him, as he did in his *Hand-*

[1] It is not a little remarkable that the *Letters of the Obscure Men* were, by name, directed against Ortwin Graes, or Ortuinus Gratius, not against Hochstraten. The former person, comparatively unimportant, seems to have been by no means deserving of being made the butt of the keenest piece of ridicule that age had seen. Personal hatred may have accounted for the selection of the victim. Hochstraten, in 1512, had assisted at the burning of Van Ryswick—Cp. Jourdan (G. V.), *Movement towards Catholic Reform*, London, 1914, pp. 151 and 159.

spiegel, or if Reuchlin had at least refrained from coarse and unseemly vituperation in his *Augenspiegel* (or *Mirror*), as he entitled his response to Pfefferkorn, he would probably have deprived his antagonists of their power to injure him. As it happened, however, the retort evoked by his *Augenspiegel* was a citation from Hochstraten to appear before him in Mainz to defend his orthodoxy.

The nature of such an attack on a man of Reuchlin's high character, eminence as a scholar, and rank among the German nobility; the duration of the affair; the number of investigations or trials involved; the final relegation of the matter to the papal decision, drew the attention of all Europe to the dispute. Its most immediate and outstanding effect was to unite in a close brotherhood, as it were, the scattered scholars of Western Christendom.[1] Each of them saw himself vitally concerned in the Reuchlinian affair. If the German humanist were crushed, each feared his own turn might come some day; at the least, the lamp of knowledge would be for ever dimmed. Lefèvre d'Étaples wrote from Paris to Reuchlin[2]: "if thou dost conquer, we conquer with thee." After the Bishop of Spires had given Reuchlin a half-hearted acquittal, with which the Dominicans of Cologne refused to be satisfied, Erasmus (August, 1514) wrote to Reuchlin from Basle[3]:

[1] Fleury (Jean), *Rabelais et ses Oeuvres*, Paris, 1877, tome I, p. 45: "Les savants de tous les pays formaient une sorte d'association à la manière des premiers chrétiens, la *République des Lettres*: le mot date de cette époque."

[2] Herminjard (A. L.) *Correspondance des Réformateurs*, Paris, 1878, tome I, pp. 15–18.

[3] *Illust. Vir. Ep.*, edit. 1519, pp. III^{b} 4^{a}. The quotation given is from the translation by Nichols (F. M.), *The Epistles of Erasmus*, London, 1904, vol. II, pp. 156, 157.

"While I was staying in England, I received your letter, with the Bishop of Spires' judgement of acquittal, which I communicated to several learned friends, of whom there is none who fails to respect your fertile and happy genius. They laughed; and urgently demanded to see the condemned book, concluding that it was something splendid from the character of its opponents. I refer especially to the Bishop of Rochester (Fisher), a man of the highest integrity and a consummate theologian, and John Colet, dean of St. Paul's in London. For my own part, I had some doubt, lest you should have written something incautiously, seeing that the Bishop's sentence was expressed timidly and acquitted you of *open* heresy, until I obtained the book at Mayence and read those heretical, irreverent and impious articles of yours; and then I could not suppress a laugh. But when I had read that condemnation (Hochstraten's) so charmingly written, it was to me quite a sufficient apology to justify your acquittal; and I did wish most heartily that it might come into the hands of all the learned! When again I read your Apology composed with so much spirit and eloquence, and such an exuberance of learning, I seemed to myself to be listening not to a culprit making his defence, but to a conqueror celebrating his triumph. One thing I wanted, for I will speak in a plain and friendly way. I should have liked you to be more sparing of digressions founded on commonplaces, and moreover to have abstained from downright invective. But if the former is a fault, it is the fault of one who is overflowing with literary talent and erudition; and in the other matter, it is hard to fix a limit to the soreness of another."

In another letter from Basle to Reuchlin (March, 1515), Erasmus quotes the very words of a letter he had received from Bishop Fisher [1]:

"To return to Reuchlin, if he has published any works which are not in our hands, pray have them sent to us. For I am extremely pleased with his erudition, and do not suppose there is anyone now living who comes nearer to Giovanni Pico" (della Mirandola).

[1] Nichols, *op. cit.*, p. 176.

We have the letter Fisher himself wrote, in June, 1516, to Erasmus, in which he says [1]:

"I have written to Reuchlin. I do not know whether he has had my letter, but I will write again. His letter to you has reached me safely. Its prolixity gave me much pleasure. He appears to me to hold the palm over all living authors, whose works I have read, in the treatment of abstruse questions of Theology and Philosophy."

In short, the learned were busily engaged at this time writing to one another about the dispute or to the persecuted scholar himself. Others of them employed their literary talents in the composition of epistles to Pope and Emperor, on his behalf. For example, Peter Galatin, a man deeply versed in Hebrew, Chaldee, Greek and Latin, and, like Reuchlin, a lover of cabalistic disquisitions, wrote a treatise (the date given in the colophon is 4th September, 1516), *De Arcanis Catholicae Veritatis.*[2] To it he prefixed a dedicatory epistle to the Emperor Maximilian, in which he expressed the pain he was feeling at the poisonous slanders poured by the evil-minded on the magnificent learning of Reuchlin and the false accusations of heresy made against that great man.[3] He stated his con-

[1] Eras., *Op.* III, 1587C.

[2] *P. Galatini de Arcanis Catholicae Veritatis, libri XII.* . . . Francofurti. M.DC.XII. To this edition of Galatin there is a preface Ad Lectorem, in which the author is described thus: Galatinus certe vir prudens, in Hebraicis, Chaldaicis, Graecis & Latinis literis absolute doctus, ad unicum scopum sua scripta collimat.

[3] "Non parva animi sollicitudine iam pridem angebar, Maximiliane Caesar Auguste, quum multiplicem eximiamque Capnionis doctrinam pestiferis, ac venenatis invidentium morsibus indigne adeo lacerari viderem: ut quam plurima eius dicta, Orthodoxae fidei maxime congruentia, nonnulli haereseos nota falso calumniari auderent."

The colophon at the end of Galatin's work gives the date: Barii, M.D.XVI, pridie nonas Septembris.

viction that the Pope and Maximilian himself were favourably disposed to Reuchlin. Galatin's book was designed as a fully-worked-out proof that the Christian faith and doctrine are to be found in the Jewish literature, both Old Testament and Talmud, thereby setting up a complete defence of Reuchlin's teachings. It consists of a series of conversations, on various matters of argument, divided into twelve books, between Galatinus, Capnio, and Hogostratus. The method usually followed is that Reuchlin (Capnio) propounds questions, such as: "Is the Talmud to be received by Christians?" which Hochstraten opposes, and Galatin at full length defends.

Reuchlin himself explained his system of exposition in a treatise *De Arte Cabalistica*, in three books,[1] which he dedicated to Pope Leo. It was published in 1517. At the beginning of the Third Book is an allusion to the dispute, the decisions arrived at in the course of it, and the reference of the cause to the Papal judgement. The work concludes with an epistle to Leo, wherein Reuchlin appeals for a sympathetic reception of his studies. In his own conviction of freedom from heresy he is supported, he states, by the opinions of the learned men of all countries, even of Rome itself. They are assuring him that, by his labours, he is building up and strengthening the Church, in various tongues, "to the Holy Spirit, Who, by means of the diversity of all the languages, has been gathering the nations into the unity of the faith." Moreover, they are declaring to him that he has been the first to bring back Greek erudition into Germany, and the very first to present and hand over to the Universal Church the science and

[1] Appended to Galatin's work, in the 1612 edition, is *Ioannis Reuchlin Phorcensis Legum Doctoris de Arte Cabalistica libri tres*. On pp. 774, 775 is the Epist. to Leo X.

the learning of the Hebrew tongue. Wherefore he hopes, and he trusts not vainly, that future generations of Churchmen will not prove ungrateful to his services.

The comparatively calm and judicious words and acts of the leaders on both sides to the dispute were not copied by the rank and file. Feeling, indeed, was growing more and more acrimonious. Solidarity among the promoters of the new learning was becoming a reality. Their opponents, whom they regarded as hostile to every kind of learning save that type of scholastic philosophy and biblical interpretation which were taught in their schools, were presenting an even more united front. Over the Reuchlinian affair, the two parties, like two armies, waged warfare. From the friars and their friends came too free denunciations of heresy and atheism. The humanists replied by such lampoons as the *Letters of the Obscure Men*, which made the learned in Germany, France, and England, laugh heartily at the expense of their adversaries.[1] Thomas More himself is responsible for the statement that the friars actually at first took the *Letters* as serious compositions written in their honour, and were correspondingly furious when they realised their mistake.

As may easily be conceived, this battling between friend and foe did not advantage the cause of Reuchlin. Though the Emperor and Pope, and many of the Cardinals at Rome, were very favourably disposed towards him, yet the urgent canvassing of Hochstraten,

[1] Cp. what Creighton (Bp. Mandell), *History of the Papacy*, London, 1901, vol. 6, pp. 54, 55, says: "The Obscure Men have their frailties, and they fall before their temptations; but they do not rejoice in wrong-doing, and they feel remorse for their sins."

supported by the disagreeable ferment raised by the affair, induced Leo X to suspend the whole matter by a *mandatum de supersedendo*, thus giving a verdict for neither party (July, 1516). Erasmus, and many others of Reuchlin's friends, perhaps even the great scholar himself, considered that this was the end of the affair.[1] Henceforward, he lived a very quiet life, with his books and his studies. But if he had forgotten his enemies, they had not forgotten him. They finally, in 1520, obtained that verdict against him, which they had so long sought from the Pope.

To the *savant* himself, except that he lost a considerable sum of money over the business, the verdict was not unwelcome ; it gave him rest at last from his adversaries. To them, it gave a barren triumph, for Franz von Sickingen threatened to lead the knights against them and storm their convent. To the Papacy, the decision was a costly one, for the popular elements in Germany which had learnt to look upon Reuchlin as a persecuted German, went over to the support of a bolder champion of their nation, Martin Luther.

II. GUILLAUME BUDÉ

Strictly speaking, the humanists cannot be called reformers of religion ; at least, not in the sense the term bears when applied to Luther, Zwingli, and Farel. They yearned and laboured for what, in actual fact, was a revolt of the intellect, though they regarded it as a " restoration of good letters." They demanded freedom to study, to think, and to express their thoughts openly. Many of them were deeply religious men, and these, when they made an assumption of liberty

[1] Eras., *Op.* III, 1575A. Cp. *ibid.*, 1110C.
Erasmus evidently thought this might be the conclusion of the case.—Eras., *Op.* III, 1623A.

of thought, extended it quite naturally to liberty of religious thought.[1] Observant men of learning, especially if they be seriously minded persons, can rarely avoid some allusions in their works to the moral conditions of the world in which they are living. The humanists, although their main preoccupation was the diffusion of learning and its triumph over ignorance, were not blind to the low state of morals and religion of their day. The religion around them hardly represented, in their eyes, that of apostolic times. Frequently their correspondence and treatises, although dealing with matters of secular knowledge, contain remarks which reveal the existence among them of a general desire for a restoration, or revival, of primitive evangelical piety. Sometimes too they express their opinions as to how this improvement is to be effected. Their suggestions, it is true, make pathetic reading when compared with the actual course which events took in subsequent years. And yet, it is just certain that their own literary movement was initiating an intellectual revolution which would lend force to a religious upheaval. "The Faculty of theology in Paris, the Sorbonne, kept a distrustful watch upon the progress of the humanism which was restricting its domain, threatening its authority, and, above all, developing, by the methods proper to it, the spirit of free enquiry."[2] That is profoundly true of the first half of the sixteenth century, and most true of the decade 1524–34, the period of Noël Béda's activities.

[1] This is true, even in spite of what Geiger, *Johann Reuchlin*, p. 150, says of Reuchlin's attitude towards the official Church of his time. Geiger's statement is open to some correction.

[2] Plattard (Jean), Professeur à la Faculté des Lettres de Poitiers, *Guillaume Budé et les Origines de l'Humanisme Français*, Paris, 1923, p. 25.

The fact is that the latter, and such as he, saw more clearly than the humanists, that, if the latter were not the actual promoters of ecclesiastical change, they undoubtedly suggested it to other minds. For that reason, the cause of humanism itself was for a time in great danger.

Quite possibly—it may be asserted—if John Colet of St. Paul's, London, had lived long enough (he died in 1519), and Johann Reuchlin also (he died in 1522), they would not have approved of the turn events took in Germany, Switzerland, and France, within the ten years that followed their decease. Yet they would, in justice, have admitted that there had been a desperate need of some sort of amelioration in the domain of religion.

Amongst the humanists there is none who more excellently than Guillaume Budé illustrates for us the general attitude of his kind towards the problems of their age. Like his fellow-lawyers, Reuchlin and More, he was, as we shall see, at once conservative in outlook and observant of the evil conditions of the times.

Guillaume Budé was born at Paris on 26th January, 1468. The family to which he belonged had, for several generations, held honourable offices, of a legal and administrative nature, in connection with the royal Court. With the design of initiating Guillaume in a similar profession, his father sent him, at the rather early age of fifteen years, to study law at Orleans. From the particulars given us later, we infer that Guillaume was no more studious at this period of his career than were the other students at Orleans, and he, as they also, learned little more there than to play games with his companions. He must, however, have imbibed, whether at Orleans or Paris, enough of law to observe the defects of the existing system of teaching it.

It was some time after he had returned to Paris that he began to devote himself with keenness to classical, especially Greek, studies, contrary to the wishes of his father. The latter, to win him over to follow the traditions of the family, had him admitted among the secretaries of the royal Court. Guillaume soon quitted this occupation, though he retained the friendships he had formed at Court, and subsequently took part in two embassies to Italy.

There was at that time at Paris a Greek teacher, George Hermonymus, who, either from lack of pupils (and consequently of finances), or from an inability to impart knowledge, supported himself principally by copying manuscripts of classical works. From this inferior master Budé learned somewhat of the Greek tongue. A much better teacher, Lascaris, visited Paris for a brief time in 1502 or 1503, and Budé profited by his presence to obtain some lessons in Greek. But, judging by his own statements, Guillaume Budé was largely self-instructed. That to us is almost incredible, in view of the remarkable proficiency he attained in speaking and writing the Greek language. However that may be, and by whatever means he gained his knowledge, Budé, before the first decade of the sixteenth century was ended, had become recognised as one of the great Grecians of the age.[1]

His father had died in 1502, his mother in 1506. These parents left a considerable patrimony to be divided among their progeny. As they had twelve surviving children, the portion of the inheritance which fell to Guillaume, one of the younger sons, was small, but sufficiently ample to enable him to give himself

[1] See Tilley (Arthur), *Dawn of the French Renaissance*, Camb. Univ. Press, 1918, pp. 269–87, for an excellent account of Budé's literary labours and interests.

up entirely to his literary work.[1] He married in 1505 or 1506, a union which, like that of his own parents, was blessed with a numerous offspring. When he died in 1540, his widow and family continued to reside at Paris until the dreadful Eve of St. Bartholomew caused them to flee for safety to Switzerland and Pomerania, for apparently the whole family had become Protestant. Perhaps it is this particular, coupled with the high estimation he always retained in the minds of his reforming friends and the remarkable circumstances of his burial,[2] that gave rise to the rumour that he died a Protestant. A descendant of the family, M. Eugène de Budé, has (in 1884) contradicted the report.[3] Whether this biographer be right or wrong in his contention does not, however, come directly within the purview of our present thesis.

The work which won for Budé his greatest fame, according to Sir Richard Jebb, was his *Commentarii Linguae Graecae* (1529).[4] Undoubtedly, this book proved very serviceable to his contemporaries and to the students of his own nation who, during subsequent generations, devoted themselves to Greek literature. Yet, his two best-known works are his *Annotationes in quattuor et viginti Pandectarum libros* of 1508, a book which revolutionised the methods in vogue of teaching civil law, and his *De Asse et partibus ejus Libri quinque* of 1515, which dealt with the monetary systems

[1] *Gulielmi Budaei viri Clariss. Vita per Ludovicum Regium*, &c., Parisiis, 1540, p. 25.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 50: "Elatus est noctu, ut ipse anno antequam moreretur testamento praescripserat, sine ulla pompa funeris, praeunte unico lumine, comitantibus doctis plurimis, & viris primariis eius urbis, vulgi maximo concursu."

[3] Plattard, *Guillaume Budé*, also contradicts it, pp. 29 ff.

[4] *Cambridge Modern History*, vol. I (Camb. Univ. Press, 1902), p. 576.

of the Greeks and Romans.[1] In these two books, but especially in the latter, he digresses from the subject in hand and introduces reflections on the affairs of the world in which he is living. For the enquirer into the thoughts of Budé on those affairs, the digressions of the *De Asse* are full of interest and value. In them the man himself stands revealed; his character and ideals are made manifest.

The first great fact that appears is his anxious patriotism. He is a Frenchman, who loves France. So intense is that love that he suffers pain when he realises that the usual estimate of Frenchmen in his days rates them as men of action, a nation of fighting-men, incapable of culture and learning. In ten long folio pages,[2] he enlarges on the question: Must the literary royalty of the Italians remain unchallenged by Frenchmen? In ancient times, as Strabo attests, the Gauls were susceptible of culture and devoted to literary pursuits. Is it impossible that Frenchmen shall, in the present age, be able to claim the favours of the Muses?

But Budé did not stop at adjurations or appeals to his countrymen. He toiled hard to bring about the end he so much desired: to foster in the hearts of his people a love of "good letters," and to incite them to win for themselves the laurels of literary glory.[3] The

[1] Delaruelle (L.), *Guillaume Budé*, Paris, 1907, ch. IV, pp. 130–57, emphasises its great importance as a scientific work in that age.

[2] *GVLIELMI BVDAEI Parisiensis Consiliarii Regii de Asse & partibus eius libri quinque. . . .* Parisiis, An. M.D.XLII., fol. *XV* to *XXIV*.

[3] See Lavisse, *Histoire de France*, t. V, pt. I (Paris, 1903), pp. 291 *et seq.*, and Plattard, *op. cit.*, p. 28, for an account of Budé's successful efforts for the intellectual glory of his country.

times were not favourable to his yearnings. Political and military difficulties occupied the minds of the rulers of his nation. Financial troubles never so crushed the people and the royal exchequer. Liability to grave danger beset such efforts as he was making, arising from the angry and suspicious hostility of the Sorbonne. Through the difficulties and in spite of the hostility, he laboured unceasingly, till at length he had the joy of seeing (in 1529), the Collège de France founded, with its Royal chairs of Greek, Hebrew and Latin. It was a triumph, in which he had always believed, and with which he had comforted the minds of the learned, during the days of doubt and uneasiness.

In another digression, he speaks as a Christian. To him, as such, the assembly of the Council of Pisa, being a political engine, albeit the politics were those of his own king Louis XII, was a horror and a sacrilege. Nevertheless, to him, as a *good* Christian, the conduct of Pope Julius II, who had provoked that political action, was no less hateful than it was to Erasmus [1] and (later) to Rabelais.[2] Nor was that the only sight which fired his indignation: the clergy were the possessors of all the wealth of the kingdom, after the king and princes, and the object of their greatest endeavours was to accumulate still greater riches. The idleness of the monks, the luxury of the prelates, the corruption of the ecclesiastical courts, the complete forgetfulness of the precepts of the Gospels, stirred him to a saddened anger. Yea, even the holy things are turned to a sacrilegious trade; the whole indulgence

[1] Eras., *Op.* IV, 484 A, D (*Encomium Moriae*).

[2] *Pantagruel*, bk. IV, 50: "Je les ay veu (nos derniers papes) non aumusse, ains armet en teste porter, thymbré d'une tiare persique. Et tout l'empire christian estant en paix et silence, eux seulz guerre faire felonne et tres cruelle."

system is penetrated with financial jobbery: "The indulgences that grant pardons are actually purchasable, bestowing with a sordid beneficence impunity for crimes and freedom from the divine precepts."[1] And it must be remembered that Budé wrote these words nearly three years before Luther made his famous protest against the system at Wittenberg!

The state of the Church was such as, in the opinion of Budé, urgently required a reformation.[2] Yet, like others of his contemporaries, he felt the need of restraint in his demands. He and they alike dreaded the extent to which remedial measures might have to go. Therefore, whilst he expressed the hope that the College of Cardinals would work for the restoration of the Christian life of the Church, he said, "but I do not think that the ulcers, in so delicate a body, should be cut to the quick." Budé fixed his strongest expectations on Leo X restoring the ancient discipline, and, to that end, summoning the reforming Council so ardently and for so long demanded by all good Christians. But, says Dr. Delaruelle, "there was something of naïveté in expecting from the Medicean pontiff a reformation of which the papacy was to be the first victim."[3]

Unlike many of the writers of that era, he refrained from satirising the papacy and the prelates; his censures on the religion of his times contained no rationalism. His religious outlook was a simple one. Without dogmatising as a theologian, or adopting the

[1] *GVL. BVDAEI*, &c., *ut supra*, fol. CXCIX: "Mitto nunc tesseras non modo ueniales, sed etiam uenales, impunitatem scelerum, et solutionem sacrarum legum sordida benignitate largientes."

[2] Plattard, pp. 29 & 35.

[3] *Guillaume Budé*, pp. 188–9.

creed of a philosopher or humanist, he turns to the study of the Scriptures, and seeks no commentary to understand them. He speaks as one who has exercised himself in the reading of them: he makes them the basis on which he founds his study of wisdom. His devotion circles round the thought of Christ the Saviour; his religious service is the expression of his obedience to the commands of Christ. The Christian thought of Budé, therefore, corresponds little with that of the official Church of his time; it is, in fact, that which he held in common with Lefèvre d'Étaples[1] and that holy Franciscan, Jean Vitrier, whose life Erasmus has described in his long and admirable epistle to Jodocus Jonas.[2]

From what has been said, it will be noted that Guillaume Budé had several features of strong resemblance to Johann Reuchlin, in character, in thought, and in outlook on the circumstances of that age. The truth is, that they both stood forth as excellent representatives of one important class of humanists. Speaking of such as Reuchlin, his biographer, Dr. Ludwig Geiger, has stated what is the outstanding difference between such men and the Reformers properly so called[3]: "German humanism was neither irreligious nor trifling, Italian humanism was both. . . . If they strove against the representatives of the old faith and their vices, they left untouched the dogmas of the same. Humanism concerned itself little with particular theological disputes, its outlook ranged over a

[1] Tilley, *Dawn of the French Renaissance*, pp. 233–56, has an excellent chapter on Lefèvre and his friends. For Lefèvre's religious thought, consult Jourdan (G. V.), *Movement towards Catholic Reform*, London, 1914, pp. 251–79.

[2] Eras., *Op.* III, 451E–462A.

[3] *Johann Reuchlin*, p. 149.

wider field. Humanism was not a mere forerunner of the Reformation, its function was not merely to furnish the incitements which that movement put in execution. Humanism and Reformation constituted two factors in the progress of the spiritual development of the sixteenth century, but the results of the former were capable of a much more extensive application than those of the latter ever succeeded in attaining."

These words can be applied to Budé, and to all the religiously minded humanists in France and England, as well as to Reuchlin in Germany. And it is a sure fact that some of them, such as the two under consideration, Reuchlin and Budé, hardly entered into what could be termed a dispute on a point of theological dogma. Just as certainly, however, there were others of them, Lefèvre, Erasmus, Colet, and, probably through their connections with these, most of the English humanists, who overpassed that border-line.

III. FRANÇOIS RABELAIS

Let it be well considered that this present paper is about to deal with a subject which cannot be omitted. That is to say, it cannot be passed over without serious loss by anyone who wishes to comprehend the problems offered by the sixteenth century. To read histories of the Reformation, by whomsoever written, and in support of whichsoever side they may have been compiled; or to peruse political histories of that period; or to search the State Papers of those times, will not suffice. One must know how men thought, in order to know how they lived and why they performed the things they actually did. It was a curious age—that one on which our eyes are fixed. Men at that date did strange acts, some of them very horrible, very brutal, which we to-day (I wonder if always with sin-

cerity) condemn. And they were not consummate monsters, the persons who did them. They had, for their actions, reasons which appeared eminently satisfactory to themselves, if not to other persons. So much by way of preface.

Colet and Reuchlin had passed away. Budé, Lefèvre, Briçonnet, Roussel [1] still lived in France, but the first-named concerned himself only with his literary work, the second had retired with his biblical translations to the protection of the Navarrese Court, the third had been forced to a limitation of his efforts for improving religion in his diocese, and the fourth had found safety in a close attendance on the learned and pious Queen of Navarre, Marguerite d'Angoulême, the sister of the French King.

The time had, in fact, arrived when criticism and ridicule alike, as reforming instruments, had become dangerous for those who used them. Humanism and the study of Greek were now looked upon as things to be resisted to the farthest limits, for they seemed to be closely allied to heresy. Humanism and heresy, to the minds of the medievalists, were threatening the whole ecclesiastical structure, either by suggesting or by initiating change. The course of events in Germany; the Lutheran movement; the revolt of the knighthood and the insurrection of the peasants, followed by the Imperialist sacking of Rome; the political efforts of Cardinal Wolsey at home and his foreign schemes and intrigues; the unappeasable rivalry

[1] Gérard Roussel (born 1480), a pupil of Lefèvre, preached at Paris, under the protection of Queen Marguerite of Navarre, during 1533, at which time he greatly influenced John Calvin. Roussel, in 1535, was nominated to the bishopric of Oléron by the King and Queen of Navarre.—Herminjard (A. L.), *Correspondance des Réformateurs*, Paris, 1878, t. I, p. 79, and t. III, p. 312.

between Francis I and the Emperor that, from time to time, burst into open war—these had made Western Europe a very disturbed area, in which there were many problems to be solved; the religious problem was far from being the easiest of them.

The adherents of the older order, especially if they were conscientious men, felt that they must act, giving and seeking no quarter, as champions of what they believed to be true against what they were convinced was false, or, at any rate, inimical to the settled system of things. Thoroughly roused to this work, they had proceeded zealously to seek for individual objects of attack.[1] Thus it happened that Louis de Berquin, a gentleman of Picardy, of unblemished life and character, fell before their fury, having been tried, condemned and burned, with indecent haste, in one day, to prevent King Francis delivering him out of their hands, as he had done on a previous occasion. A few years after, Jean de Caturce was burnt at Toulouse,[2] though, indeed, he was not a reformer, but died a martyr in the cause of liberty of thought. These two were merely the representatives of numerous others who had been sacrificed to the dread of men that feared their side would lose unless it was supported by these excessive measures. For a time, even Marguerite d'Angoulême seemed in danger, but that was more than King Francis would permit, and he promptly put his sister's inquisitor in gaol.

It was impossible, however, that men should be

[1] Even Clement Marot, though first poet of the age and friend of King Francis, suffered imprisonment and exile.—Tilley (Arthur), *Literature of the French Renaissance*, Camb. Univ. Press, 1904, vol. I, p. 9.

[2] Rabelais alludes to this event in *Pantagruel*, II, V. See *François Rabelais*, by Arthur Tilley, M.A. (French Men of Letters Series), Philadelphia and London, 1907, p. 39.

cravenly reduced to silence in the midst of so much that deserved criticism—so many evils that, in later years, would undergo belated correction. So, the humanists of the third and later decades of the sixteenth century went to school to those of the latter half of the fifteenth, and learned a valuable lesson from them. If immunity from persecution was possible for a Poggio or Filelfo, and the members of the Medicean academy, it was equally possible for a Rabelais in the sixteenth, as indeed also for a Montesquieu in the eighteenth, but undoubtedly on the same terms. To speak openly in criticism, as John Colet had been used to do, and to say it in the vernacular; or to employ sarcasm, as Ulrich von Hutten [1] and his friends had done, and to share it with the common people; or even to render into the vulgar tongue holy books and portions of the Scriptures, as Berquin had tried to do—that had now become unsafe for one's life and property. But, in spite of the angry feelings abroad and the watchful suspicions of the zealous, it was quite easy to utter the severest denunciations in any language, classical or vernacular, provided that the vehicle chosen were coarse enough or obscene. A saintly Berquin had to die, a gently pious Lefèvre had to flee, but a Rabelais could stay and laugh. And laugh he did, at everyone and everything, high and low, rich and poor, sacred and profane,[2] and much

[1] *Ulrich von Hutten* (1488–1523), *His Life and Times*, by David Friedrich Strauss, Eng. trans. by Mrs. Sturge, London, 1874, pp. 226–260.

[2] Thuasne (Louis), *Études sur Rabelais*, Paris, 1904, points out what he believes to be the parody of Pantagruel's pedigree modelled on the genealogy given in St. Matthew's Gospel, Chap. I. The pedigree occurs in *Pantagruel*, bk. II, 1, and is to be found in vol. I, pp. 222–4, of Ch. Marty-Laveaux, *Les Oeuvres de Rabelais*, Paris, 1869.

more at the humbugs, the hypocrites, the cheats, the ignorant, and the cruel, employing boisterous extravagancies to give point to his witticisms. As, for instance, when he ridiculed those who Latinised their French, speaking what Rabelais called, in amusing vein, "la verbocination latiale." As, likewise, when recounting the visit of Pantagruel and Panurge to the deathbed of the poet Raminagrobis, whose orthodoxy seemed doubtful, he jested about the ministrations of religion and the immortality of the soul.[1]

He was a humanist, at a time when to be such rendered him liable to misrepresentation, and misrepresentation might prove the signpost to the stake. He had already, when a friar at Fourtenay, aroused hostility by his studies in the Greek text of the Pauline Epistles, and had received cheering encouragement from the letter Budé had written to him.[2] But sym-

[1] *Pantagruel*, bk. III. See Fleury (Jean), *Rabelais et ses oeuvres*, Paris, 1877, t. II, pp. 13–16.

[2] Smith (W. F.), *Rabelais*, London, 1893, vol. II, p. 490: "And for this Slander they have discovered a Disguise and an Opportunity of no ordinary Kind. For since many various Doctrines of those now called Lutherans have been spread abroad, contrary to the Beliefs of the Old Interpreters, and expressly remodelling the Customs that have for a long time been received in the Church, and some of our Party have been charged with taking part in this Innovation, upon this those who are hostile to Greek Studies, laying hold on an invidious Charge and decrying the Hellenists, as Innovators for the Subversion of Orthodoxy, have all but succeeded in banishing those who are devoted to Greek Literature, as guilty of Heresy. For they laid great Complaints, slanderously asserting that the Teaching of Greek Literature began to be prevalent with us at the same Time as the pernicious Introduction of the Dogmas of the Lutherans. Lighting on an Opportunity of this kind, men who were utterly unable to speak artistically, but yet clever at putting on the Appearance of Respectability, easily ranted

pathetic words were not sufficient, and he had run away from Fontenay, doffing his monastic garb as he went. Rabelais, whatever other qualities he possessed, had not a forgiving disposition. Ever after, he lost no opportunity of pouring upon the whole body of the mendicant orders—and some of them did not deserve it—a madly merry wit that had a barb to it. Yet, the only character in his Pantagruel who is really wholesome and honourable is Friar John of the Trencherites, "a right monk," quoth Rabelais, "if ever there was any since the monking world monked a monkerie." From Rabelais that was high commendation, and he thus portrayed a fellow-friar of his Seuilly days, whom he still loved.[1]

His humanism put him in danger. That he learned at Toulouse, in June, 1532, and he "did not stay there long when he saw that they caused their regents to be burned alive like red-herrings, for he said: 'Now God forbid that I should die this death, for I am by nature

down and persuaded the simple unlettered People; making it out to be a Function of true Religion to insult the Nobility and Dignity of Learning."—Extract from the epistle of Guillaume Budé to François Rabelais a Franciscan brother, dated "In our City, January 27 (1523)."

Tilley (Arthur), M.A., *François Rabelais*, p. 26, thinks this year-date ought to be 1524.

[1] Anatole France, *Rabelais*, Eng. trans. by Ernest Boyd, London, 1929, p. 23. The portrait of Friar John is in *Pantagruel*, bk. II: "En l'abbaye étoit pours lors un moine claustrier, nommé frère Jean des Entommeures, jeune, galant, frisque, dehait, bien adextre, hardi, aventureux, delibéré, hault, maigre, bien fendu de gueule, bien avantaigé en nez, beau depescher d'Heures, beau debrideur de messes, beau decrotteur de vigiles; pour tout dire sommairement, vrai moine si onques en feut, depuis que le monde moinant moina de moinerie; au reste clerc jusques ès dents en matiere de breviaire."

sufficiently dry already, without being further heated.' " He needed not to have feared to share the fate of Caturce, if only he had adopted the expedient of silence regarding the facts of life around him. But, being a humanist, he could not bring himself to that, he preferred to voice his opinions by means of buffoonery and obscenity, thus safeguarding his freedom and his life.[1]

The success of Rabelais' plan of authorship will be apparent if it be observed that he held at least two parochial charges, was appointed to an agreeable position in the collegiate Abbey of St. Maur-lez-Fossés, and, in them all, was described as fulfilling his duties creditably. Not only so, but, when he died in 1553, he departed this life, if not strictly in the odour of sanctity, at any rate in a natural manner, " bearing the esteem of the most eminent men of his time."[2]

The " most eminent men " did not include either the theologians of the Sorbonne or the Calvinist leaders at Geneva. These men took life and religion too seriously for jesting about them. So serious, indeed, were the former, that they could not tolerate any deviation from what they termed Catholic tradition. The latter were just as serious and could not overlook the capital crime of Unitarianism, or see any good in one like Rabelais who, as Calvin declared, " after welcoming the preaching of the Gospel had been smitten with blindness." He wrote those words in

[1] Fleury, t. I, p. 11.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 12 : " Ces plaisanteries de Rabelais, si choquantes pour nos oreilles, ne choquaient personne à son époque, puisque un des soutiens de l'église catholique, le cardinal Duperron appelait *Pantagruel* le *livre* par excellence et refusait d'admettre à sa table quiconque ne l'avait pas lu."

:550,[1] but, as far back as 1533, on the first appearance of the earlier books of *Pantagruel*, he had condemned them roundly.[2]

The " most eminent men " were themselves humanists. Rabelais had always lived with them, and had powerful protectors among them. In 1534, he went to Rome with Jean du Bellay, bishop of Paris, when that noble ambassador was endeavouring to assist Henry of England's matrimonial affairs at the Vatican. He attended his patron as medical adviser, for Rabelais had gained some proficiency in the healing art, when that patron and his brother, Guillaume du Bellay, seigneur de Langey, were ready to support their king in a project of ecclesiastical reform in France, of a kind similar to that which Henry and Cranmer were effecting in England. All Rabelais' friends were humanists, and almost all of them favourable to reform, though not of the Genevese pattern. The Cardinal Jean du Bellay, his brother René du Bellay, bishop of Mans (the same who made Rabelais curé of S. Christophe-du-Jambet), the Cardinal de Tournon, the Cardinal du

[1] Thuasne, *op. cit.*, p. 405 : " Cette comparaison de Rabelais avec le philosophe de Samosate [Lucian], Calvin allait la reprendre trois ans après dans son ouvrage *De Scandalis*, dans un passage où il ne nomme pas tout d'abord l'auteur de Pantagruel (IV). Mais plus loin, il n'hésite pas à le faire, et dénonce Rabelais et quelques autres d'avoir ' par leur outrecuidance diabolique,' profané l'Évangile, ' ce gage sainct et sacré de la vie éternelle ' (V)."

To this Rabelais replied in Bk. IV, 32 (which appeared entire in 1552), where he referred to " les demoniacles Calvins, imposteurs de Geneve."

[2] " Se pro damnatis libris habuisse obscoenos illos Pantagruelem "—Herminjard, *Correspondance des Réformateurs*, III, 110, ep. of John Calvin to Fr. Daniel, end of October, 1533. Plattard, *Vie de Rabelais*, suggests that Rabelais may have met Calvin at Orleans, in 1528–9.

Perron, Bishops Geoffroy d'Estissac and Jean de Montluc, admired and befriended his genius, and they, as humanists, entertained, to a greater or less extent, the possibility of a Gallican reformation.[1] So likewise

[1] Friedmann, *Anne Boleyn*, II, 76, speaks of Jean du Bellay as "almost a Protestant," and quotes the despatch of E. Chapuis to Charles V, 16th June, 1535 (Vienna Archives, P.C. 229½, i, fol. 97): "Sire ce Roy a ce que jentends nest seullement picque destre faict ledict evesque Cardinal mais a cause de celluy de Paris auquel en toutes choses avoit grande confidence mesmes pour ce que avant cette creation il se tenoit pour maulvais papiste. Il na aussi gros plaisir de l'auditeur de la chambre."

Lavisse, *Hist. de France*, V, 1, IX (Paris, 1904), p. 196: "Il y eut parmi eux des prélats tolérants, zélés et d'esprit ouvert: Jean du Bellay, évêque de Paris, Jean de Monluc, evêque de Valence, et bien d'autres,—on en comptait plus de treize sous Henri II;—mais on les accusait précisement d'incliner vers la Réforme et de fait ils n'y répugnaient point tous, de sorte qu'ils n'étaient pas une force pour le catholicisme."

Anatole France, *Rabelais*, p. 44: "Geoffroy d'Estissac loved the humanists and did not hate the Reformers"; p. 160: "Etienne Lorens, who was one of the King's men, apparently liked to associate with scholarly people, with leanings towards the Reformation"; p. 127: (King Francis) "was inclined towards a wise, moderate, and royalist reformation of the Church of France. Suddenly, in the month of October, 1534, an audacious gesture on the part of the Reformers, a piece of insolent bravado on the part of those known as Sacramentarians, drove him on to the side of the hangmen."

Cp. also Smith (W. F.), M.A., *Rabelais in His Writings*, Camb. Univ. Press, 1918, p. 128.

For Cardinal Odet de Châtillon, consult *Cambridge Mod. Hist.*, III, 11.

It is not a little interesting to observe that Burckhardt (Jacob), *op. cit.*, p. 468, remarks a similar "Protestant" spirit as existing in Italy among the cultured and humanistic: "The poems written in Italian in the fifteenth and the beginning of the sixteenth century, in which we meet with genuine religious feeling, such as the hymns of Lorenzo the Magnificent and the sonnets of Vittoria Colonna and of Michelangelo, might have been just as well composed by Protestants."

the lord of Langey, G. du Bellay, his officer, Étienne Lorens of the Château Saint-Ayl, and many another prominent nobleman or military leader, of humanist sympathies and intense national aspirations. The Cardinal Odet de Châtillon, another of Rabelais' patrons, to whom that person, in 1552, dedicated the Fourth Book (probably the finest portion) of *Pantagruel*, took a bolder step than any of the French humanists. He definitely joined the reformers. His brother, the Admiral de Coligny, was already a great leader of the Huguenots, and as such was assassinated at Paris in the massacre of the Eve of St. Bartholomew 1572. The Cardinal de Châtillon took his place among the Huguenots at the Battle of St. Denis (1567), was proscribed, but escaped to England, where a short time after he was poisoned by his valet.

The person, however, who would presume to imagine that all that is in *Pantagruel* is a monstrous burlesque on the life of the sixteenth century, should be disabused of such a notion. Inseparably mingled with the laughter is profound wisdom, is an amazingly extensive erudition. The book may be the work of a buffoon, sometimes a vulgar buffoon, occasionally a foul-tongued buffoon; but the buffoon is a genius and one of the greatest. Viewed from one point, if the coarseness and indelicacies could have been removed, *Pantagruel*, by its fertility of spontaneous invention, by its amusing yet wise nonsense, by the happy spirit of its phrasing, might have formed a prototype of *Alice in Wonderland*. With similar necessary excisions, it might have turned out to have been a suggestive parallel to the *Pilgrim's Progress* [1]; it might have constituted the treasure-house from which

[1] See Fleury, *Rabelais*, II, 296 *et seq.*, on this point.

modern educationalists had drawn their wisest plans [1]; it might have originated a sane system of philosophy, based on common experience; or it might even have given rise to a gentle, merciful theology.[2]

He had, indeed, no message for the illiterate, ordinary rabble. Rabelais, although too human to be a mere hanger-on of the great, was no democrat, in matters of soul or intellect. He would not, perhaps, have questioned the dictum, *Vox populi, vox Dei*, but he would have declared that the God referred to has been the same through all the ages, whatever name the mob may have given him, at every new stage in time—a God who carries a paving-stone in one hand and a bludgeon in the other—a God who delights to see madmen brandish incendiary torches, to behold the flowing blood of the best of men, and to smell the roasting flesh of the worthiest of mankind—a God whose real name is Ignorance.

And, finally, in the closing pages of the Fifth Book of *Pantagruel*, that Book which was not published until ten years after Rabelais' death, the end of all Pantagruel's journeying lies patent: he arrives at the Oracle of the Holy Bottle—the goddess Bottle that speaks the oracular word, TRINC. Trinc—"drink your fill at the fountains of knowledge. To know, in order to love, is the secret of life. Avoid the hypocrites, the ignorant, the cruel: free yourselves from vain terrors; study man and the universe; learn to know the laws of the physical and moral world, so that you may obey them and them alone; drink, drink

[1] See Fleury, *Rabelais*, II, 309 *et seq.*, esp. p. 317, for François Guizot's (in his *Annales d'Education*) appreciation of Rabelais' wise suggestions.

[2] See *ibid.*, II, 290 *et seq.*

knowledge; drink truth; drink love." (Anatole France, *Rabelais*.)

It is a mistake to assume that the underlying purpose of Rabelais' raillery, merriment, and coarseness was other than a serious one. Ostensibly, indeed, the Sorbonne attacked the Rabelaisian books as being *contra bonos mores*. These theologians, on that ground, might well have attacked other books of the times, which, however, they passed over. But the true cause of hostility was that the bent of his humanism was towards reform.[1] He was seeking—and they sensed it—to express by an extraordinary method what Erasmus had intended by his *Praise of Folly*. The very sources from which he borrowed[2] (I omit Erasmus here deliberately), from Lucian of ancient days, from Teofilo Folengo and Francesco Colonna of more recent date, and from other laughers like them, contained religious censures mixed with merriment of a rough texture. Now and again, the French humanist assumes quite definitely the voice of a religious teacher, and his utterances, on such occasions, command all the greater attention because of their setting. In one place, he addresses the overwise in their own conceits: "By whom were you taught to discuss and talk in this way of the power and predestination of God? Hush!

[1] Smith (W. F.), *op. cit.*, p. 127. Briand Vallée du Douhet was accused of atheism, but was really inclined to Reform.—Plattard, *Vie de F. Rabelais*, pp. 65, 66.

[2] Thuasne (Louis), *Études sur Rabelais*, in a long section, pp. 27–157, recites the great number of passages in Rabelais' works that reveal traces of borrowings from Erasmus, and then examines those that show dependence on Folengo and Colonna. Burckhardt (Jacob), *Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy*, London (Harrap) 1929, p. 428, n. 4, thinks that Folengo gave Rabelais the impulse which resulted in Pantagruel and Gargantua.

humble yourselves before His sacred presence and recognise your own shortcomings."[1] Another time, he makes the genial giant Gargantua, who, after a comic battle, combs cannon-balls out of his hair and eats (accidentally, as it were) six pilgrims on his salad, advise his son to exercise himself, for some hours daily, in the study of the Old Testament in the Hebrew and of the New Testament in the Greek, and to love and fear God, " and on Him to cast all thy thought and all thy hope, and by faith formed in charity to cleave unto Him so that thou mayest never be separated from Him by thy sins." [2]

The humanistic tastes Rabelais had imbibed from Pierre Amy and Budé [3] led inevitably to sympathy with those who were demanding opportunities for a general study of the Scriptures and a course of living modelled upon the standard of Christian life therein portrayed. Instances of that sympathy are fairly numerous. He expresses the opinion that, if there are heresies and errors to be found, these should be

[1] See the end of the Prologue to the Fourth Book of *Pantagruel.*

[2] *Pantagruel,* bk. II.

[3] Delaruelle (L.). " Ce que Rabelais doit à Érasme et à Budé," in *Revue d'Histoire littéraire de la France,* t. XI, Paris, 1904, p. 254. Delaruelle is probably correct enough when he asserts, speaking of the definite plan and material of Rabelais' authorship : " A Guillaume Budé Rabelais ne doit que peu de chose, ou du moins il ne doit rien qui soit, si je puis dire, essentiel à son oeuvre." But he adds, in a footnote : " J'attirerais plutôt l'attention sur la critique très libre que Budé fait des moeurs du haut clergé. Elle a pu contribuer à emanciper l'esprit de Rabelais vis-à-vis des choses religieuses."

Delaruelle, moreover, makes clear the fact that, speaking in a general way, Rabelais was an independent thinker and employed his borrowings in an independent fashion.

removed, not by persecution, but by teaching the "true and lively Catholic faith."[1] He shows disfavour to worship of the saints and the cult of the B.V.M. In his lifetime, he was denounced for uttering propositions "scandalous, heretical, and offensive to pious ears." He spoke irreverently of the Sorbonne and its theologians.[2] In the Fifth Book of *Pantagruel*, which appeared after his death, he ridicules excessive adulation of the person of the Pope, makes fun of the ecclesiastics proceeding to the Council of Trent, and describes, in a word-picture that has won him fame as an artist, the storm which came over the world from that meeting, whereby Pantagruel and his fellow-travellers were nearly drowned beneath the mountainous waves. By his description of the "Ringing Island"[3] he turns to mockery the mechanical routine of religious observances in the monasteries, the ringing bells, the chanted hours, the varied garb, the fish-eating, the former quarrels over rival claimants to the papacy. He represents Aedituus, the conductor, as explaining that all the strange "birds" that inhabit this island, the bish-hawks, cardin-hawks, and pope-hawk, spring in upward order from the clerg-hawks, who themselves come, some "out of a vast country called 'Want-o'-bread,' the rest out of another towards the west, which they style 'Too-many-o'-them.' From these two countries flock hither, every year,

[1] *Pantagruel*, bk. III, pp. 29 and 51.

[2] Smith (W. F.), *Rabelais &c.*, pp. 127, 128. Cp. Plattard, *Vie de F. Rabelais*, pp. 134–7, esp. p. 138: "On ne saurait témoigner plus de respect pour l'Evangile, ni plus de zèle pour ceux qui s'en constituaient les champions contre les faux-prophètes."

[3] *The Works of François Rabelais*, translated by Sir Thomas Urquhart and Peter Motteux (published by Gibbings & Co., Ltd., London, 1897), vol V, ch. III & IV.

whole legions of these clerg-hawks, leaving their fathers, mothers, friends, and relations."

When one comes to the question, What was Rabelais' religion? Was he in truth a Christian? It is not a little difficult to frame an answer. The greatest part of the difficulty does not arise from the man himself and his books. His biographers, in spite of the fine talents they employed upon the task of following his thought, have furnished the major portion of the obscurity at this point. Where the domain of intellect and erudition is concerned, they have, indeed, succeeded admirably in assigning his due place to him. Where, however, his religious convictions are under consideration, I know of none who has made a creditable success of determining them. This fact is evident from the contradictions in their own statements. One biographer—no less an one than M. Jean Fleury, of whose work Anatole France made such great use, asks: "Was Rabelais a heretic?" To this he replies: "in a certain sense, yes; in a technical sense, no. To be heretical, error on a point of dogma is necessary, and Rabelais has never cast blame upon any one of the dogmas taught by Rome."[1] Whether, in the mind of M. Fleury, rejection of several such dogmas constitutes "casting blame" or not, I do not know; but, even if it could not be proved that Rabelais was guilty (judged by Roman standards) of heresy in the first degree, at any rate it is possible to prove "a certain degree of probability in his opposition."[2] And this is shown by M. Fleury himself, when he asserted that Rabelais rejected some dogmas, and

[1] Fleury, *Rabelais*, II, 282.

[2] *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, vol. VII (1910), *sub voce* "Heresy," by J. Wilhelm, S.T.D., Ph.D. Cp. also, Garzend (Abbé Léon), *L'Inquisition et l'Hérésie*, Paris, 1913, pp. 71–80.

again, when he declared: "The complete exhibition of his intimate thought . . . would have led him to the stake." [1] Nor does Professor Lemonnier (Lavisse, *Histoire de France*, tome V.), do full justice to his thought, when he classes him as "a philosophical deist, sceptical regarding revealed dogmas and organised cults, ardently eager for toleration."[2] Even in such an excellent piece of work as Dr. Preserved Smith's *Age of the Reformation*,[3] Rabelais does not receive a just appraisement. Mr. Arthur Tilley, in his books on Rabelais and on the French Renaissance, probably comes the nearest of English writers, as Anatole France, in his lectures on Rabelais, the nearest of French, to an equitable and sympathetic understanding of this remarkable man's religious beliefs.[4]

[1] Fleury, II, 278: "Rabelais a-t-il une foi aussi complète en l'immortalité de l'âme? Ici le doute est permis." P. 290: "Il n'admet pas que celui qui n'a pas fait de mal, ait une pénitence quelconque à faire. Dans sa conception de la vie, il n'y a pas de trace du péché originel." And p. 295: "L'exposition complète de sa pensée intime, inconsciente peut-être pour lui, mais évidente pour nous—l'aurait conduit au bûcher."

[2] Tome V, pt. I, p. 312. The same opinion appears in Mayrargues (Alfred), *Rabelais, étude sur le seizième siècle*, Paris, 1868, p. 259.

[3] Pp. 187–97 and 694 (London, 1920). Nor, in his *Erasmus* (New York and London, 1923), although there are numerous allusions to Rabelais, does Dr. Pres. Smith throw any really helpful light on Rabelais' convictions. Yet, the appreciative summary of Erasmus' character, on pp. 439–41, might, with few alterations, have been applied to Rabelais.

[4] Tilley, *François Rabelais*, pp. 328–42, gives a very complete survey of the evidence regarding Rabelais' religious opinions. He shows that when *Gargantua* (the "most Protestant" of his works) was produced in 1534, Rabelais was on the side of the reformers (that is, the so-called "pacific reformers"). Later he changed attitude, not against reform, as such, but against the Calvinist method of it. "To Rabelais,

And yet, Mr. Tilley assumes a consistency and uprightness in his loyalty to the Roman Church,[1] of which I have failed to observe any satisfactory trace in the *Pantagruel* or elsewhere, whilst M. France presents some of those very incongruities of assertion that are a usual feature of French opinion on Rabelais.[2]

Still another biographer, M. René Millet, describes the religious ideals of Rabelais, and even of Erasmus, in terms that are really only applicable to the humanism of fifteenth-century Italy.[3]

Unquestionably, there were in the heart of Rabelais sentiments, there were in the mind of Rabelais thoughts, about God and Christ, which had never presented themselves to the hearts and minds of the erudite pagans who thronged the courts of the Italian princes. One part of him, it must be admitted, made common cause with them, and, on that side, he remained a heathen of their peculiar class. But there was another

therefore, Calvin's intolerance must have seemed a violation of the right of free enquiry equally unjustifiable with that of the Catholic Church. He must also have regarded with peculiar repugnance the rigid discipline in morals which Calvin had imposed upon pleasure-loving Geneva. For, like the whole Renaissance, Rabelais underrated the value and the importance of moral sternness; he forgot that by self-restraint and self-discipline are built up the characters of strong men and strong nations" (p. 338).

[1] Tilley, *François Rabelais*, p. 340.

[2] *Rabelais*, pp. 172, 245, & 262.

[3] *Rabelais*, par René Millet, 2nde édit, Paris, 1904, p. 176: "Entre la Renaissance et la Réforme, à égale distance de l'insouciance païenne et du fanatisme biblique, il y eut, au XVI^e siècle, un groupe de penseurs un peu dédaigneux qui rêvaient un christianisme élargi, dégagé de la lettre. Érasme est le chef de ce groupe. . . . Selon Mutian (un des disciples d'Érasme), le christianisme est ou devrait être la doctrine de l'humanité pure."

part of him, and this side of him resembled nothing that was theirs. It is here we obtain a glimpse of the Rabelais who believed in God and loved Him. Fortunately, M. Millet has shown us that he knew the passage which reveals this amazing Rabelais, who, even in the moment of a sincere religious emotion, forgets to lay aside the motley cap and bells. It is that wherein Pantagruel is represented as coming upon an ancient legend, related by Plutarch, of the death of the great god Pan, about the time of Tiberius :

"' I would interpret it, said he, of that great Preserver of the faithful, Who, in Judaea, was slain ignominiously by the jealousy and wickedness of the pontiffs, doctors, priests, and monks of the Mosaic law. And this interpretation does not seem to me unfitting, for, by actual right, He can be called, in the Greek language, PAN. Seeing that He is our ALL, all that we are, all that we have of life, all that we possess, all that we hope for, is He, in Him, of Him, by Him. He is the good Pan, the great Shepherd, Who, as the shepherd Corydon attests, not only bears love and affection towards His sheep, but His sheep-guardians.[1] At Whose death took place wailings, sighs, terrors, and lamentations throughout the entire engine of the Universe, heavens, earth, sea, and hell. To this interpretation of mine agrees the time. For, indeed, our very good, very great Pan, our only Preserver, died in Jerusalem, when Tiberius Caesar was reigning at Rome.' When Pantagruel had ended his discourse, he remained in silent and deep meditation. After a while, we saw the tears roll down from his eyes, big as ostrich-eggs."

To this revelation of Rabelaisian thought M. Millet appends a comment of an entire and understanding justice :[2]

[1] P. Virgilii Maronis Bucolicon Liber : *Ecloga* II, 32–33 :
Pan primus calamos cera conjungere plures
Instituit : Pan curat oves oviumque magistros.

[2] Millet, p. 178.

" I have never read this passage without thinking of the powerful Christ of Michael Angelo, Who possesses, blended upon His forehead, the grandeur that is Christian and the forceful serenity of the ancient gods. God of the soul and God of nature, He has been reconciling mind and matter, the ancient world and the new. How far finer this than the pale Christ, of the bleeding heart, shown to the faithful in the pictures of to-day."

However, what most, if not all, modern French biographers of Rabelais fail to observe is that the intellectual France of Rabelais' day had wistful religious yearnings which are absent now from French culture or even comprehension.[1] In the France of recent date there is nothing which, in its entirety, represents the thought of Erasmus, Lefèvre, Marguerite d'Angoulême, Budé, Rabelais. Accordingly, when learned Frenchmen allude to the French Renaissance, it is of Joachim du Bellay, Melin de Saint-Gelais, Jean Daurat, the school of Ronsard, Montaigne, Jean Antoine de Baïf, and the others like these, they are speaking. It is this that makes it possible for one of them to say: " He (Rabelais) is a child of the pagan Renaissance and takes his place among the philosophers of ancient days of whom he gives us a glimpse in the ' isle of the Macreons ' " ; and to fancy that determines the entire scope and character of the thought of the French humanist. But it only partly describes him.

The earlier French Renaissance, to which Rabelais,

[1] Tilley (Arthur), *The Literature of the French Renaissance*, Camb. Univ. Press, 1904, vol. I, p. 28: " When a contemporary says of Guillaume du Bellay, ' that he desired the ancient and apostolic form of religion to be restored by moderate means,' he is describing the attitude of the majority of the humanists." This allusion is to the opening words of the letter Oswald Myconius wrote to Joachim Vadianus from Basle, towards the end of May, 1534.—Herminjard, III, 183.

as well as Budé, belonged, bore some affinities to the Renaissance in Germany and England of a kind which gradually ceased to exist after the sixteenth century had entered on its second half.[1] In neither England nor Germany did an opposition between what was old and what was new manifest itself so completely as has been the case in France, Italy, and Spain, where it has ever been the tragedy of intellectualism. And, therefore, the reforming elements in the first-named lands, and in the countries of the Nordic races generally, never broke so entirely with ancient erudition and literary authority. The English Reformation, as guided by Cranmer and Parker, displayed its moderating influence by the retention of much that was old, even medieval, as well as by maintaining the traditions of Classical learning and culture. Nor can it be

[1] In the Conclusion to his great work on Rabelais, M. Fleury (II, 574), with fine discernment, marks the difference between the Renaissance and the Reformation : " The XVIth century has likewise its double intellectual movement : the Renaissance dominates during the first half, the Reformation the second. But the two movements do not reciprocate assistance. Both were parts of the same idea ; the reaction against the Middle Age, the return to antiquity. The Renaissance, however, took everything from antiquity ; it sought to assimilate all the civilisation of Greece and Rome. The Reformation, on the other hand, only took from antiquity the Christian development which has stood in hostile opposition to this civilisation ; it limited itself to the putting in opposition to the traditional interpretation the individual interpretation of the Bible. The two movements, sympathetic at first, soon separated. The more restricted absorbed the broader, the Renaissance was stifled by the Reformation and by the Catholic reaction which followed it." The learned biographer must here be thinking of Italy and France, for a little later on he contrasts the Renaissance in these two countries alone, and his reference to the stifling of the Renaissance took place principally in them.

asserted that the judgement of Melanchthon, and such as he, in Lutheran Germany, was cast in opposition to the erudition of bygone ages. M. Nisard, with fine discrimination, ranges Melanchthon alongside Erasmus and Sir Thomas More, as one of the heroes of the Renaissance.[1] However much Genevese and Helvetic ideals based themselves on contemporary thought rather than on the traditions of antiquity, it would be very erroneous to affirm that English and German ideals have appreciably imitated them. Definitely and consistently, the latter have always exhibited the value of ancient thought and advertised the great and aidful contribution made to their formation by ancient learning.

For the reasons just mentioned, it would appear as if a correct and adequate appraisement of the representative savants of the early French Renaissance already enumerated is most likely to be obtained to-day in those countries where the Reformation employed the Classics of Greece and Rome for the enrichment of its aspirations and the deepening of its religious convictions.

POSTSCRIPT TO "FRANÇOIS RABELAIS"

I would like here to express the great pleasure it gave me to peruse the latest work of Professor Jean Plattard, *La Vie de François Rabelais*, Paris & Bruxelles, 1928. It does not present any essential reason for the alteration of any statement in the above paper, but, if it had been earlier in my hands, would have undoubtedly contributed much to the production of a more perfect composition. All that can now be done is to employ it for the completion of the note below,

[1] Nisard (D.), *Études sur la Renaissance* (Érasme, Thomas Morus, Melanchthon), Paris, 1885.

on the matter of greatest difficulty in Rabelais' character, viz., his religion.

On pp. 112–14 and 134–7, Professor Plattard goes carefully into the question of Rabelais' religious opinions, and concludes (against the decision of M. Abel Lefranc, for whom " la pensée secrète de Rabelais, c'est le rationalisme ") that Rabelais, at this date (1534), was on the side of the Evangelicals. He bases his conclusion on the vow of Pantagruel (ch. XXIX), in which occur the thoughts and expressions of Lefèvre, Briçonnet, Cop, and Roussel. But he notes, justly enough, that Rabelais was no more inclined for martyrdom than was Montesquieu when he announced : " Je voudrais bien être le confesseur de la vérité, mais non pas le martyr." With equal justice, Plattard asks (p. 138), if the Evangelicals would have crossed, without hesitation, the threshold of this abbey of Thélème which had for its only rule : Fay ce que vouldras, Do what you like. The Professor wisely opines that possibly Clement Marot might have been content to do so, but it is very doubtful if Marguerite d'Angoulême would.

On p. 139, Plattard continues : " In fact, the Evangelism of Rabelais was only superficial. That was the form his Christian thought took, under the influence of his reason whose bent was towards Deism. . . . He had a confidence in human nature which was incompatible with the principles of Christianity. But by this act of faith in human nature our humanists were not moved to reject Christianity. They aimed at combining Evangelism and the spirit of the Renaissance. Of this movement, quite general among them about 1534, there is probably no more remarkable witness than the *Gargantua*."

Plattard (pp. 203–4 and 217–18) makes the following

comments on the religious ideals of Rabelais in his later years. When, in 1553, under King Henry II, a Gallican crisis arose against the authority of the Roman Curia, Rabelais took the side of his country and King, and, in the episode of Papimanie (Fourth Book), he satirises the Court of Rome on the point of its temporal ambitions. His attitude, however, towards the reformers had been determined by the action of Francis I, when that monarch had definitely broken with them. The fact was that Evangelism had satisfied his needs of independence in his religious thought. But the day in which Calvin published his *Institutes of the Christian Religion* brought the existence of Evangelism to an end. There had come into being a doctrine and organisation separated from the Catholic Church, which made itself the Reformed Church of France. Faced with the two systems, Rabelais stayed in the traditional Church, though he insisted on retaining his absolute liberty of thought, the very thing the Church (when it had the power to assert its authority) refused to grant.

But all this explanation of Plattard's is very far from justifying his remark on p. 49, concerning the body of French humanists: "Le concile de Trent allait plus tard satisfaire leurs désirs de réforme." See Lavisse, *Hist. de France*, V, liv. IX, p. 196 (Paris, 1904), and *Pantagruel*, bk. V.

VI

The Aims of Cardinal Wolsey

PREFACE

THE Aims referred to in this Essay are chiefly those which actuated his foreign policy. Even the most autocratic of governors are swayed by some overmastering principle of action. In Wolsey's case, that principle was his patriotism, perhaps it were better to call it, his sense of being an Englishman. Whatever may be said or thought of him, his administration at home and abroad produced a degree of safety of life and property unusual in those days, and brought a humanity into legal jurisdiction even more exceptional. England undoubtedly benefited from his exercise of power. Some there may be who, agreeing with Thrasymachus rather than with Socrates, in the argument as to whether rulers govern for their own advantage or that of their subjects, would assert that Wolsey's chief object was his own benefit. The facts hardly support that opinion, and there does not appear to be any reason for doubting the sincerity of the patriotism which is observable in his letter to Gardiner (7th February, 1529) concerning the papacy:

"I doubt not but ye do profoundly consider as well the state wherein the church and all Christendom doth stand now presently, as also the state of this realm and of the King's secret matter, which if it should be brought to pass by any other means than by the authority of the church, I account this

prince and realm utterly undone. Wherefore, it is expedient to have such one to be pope and common father to all princes as may, can, and would give remedy to the premises. . . . Wherefore, Mr. Stephen, since now ye be so plainly advertised of my mind and intent, I shall pray you to extend omnes nervos ingenii tui, ut ista res ad effectum perduci possit. . . . Scito omnia apud hunc regem et me esse grata et rata."

Yet, it is in his foreign policy alone that a clear line of continued action is discernible. In his home administration, Wolsey could not pursue a straight line. The condition of the courts of law was too ill-regulated, too badly defined, for him to have followed a simple course, beyond, indeed, that of gathering as much of jurisdiction under his own control as he could compass. The public finances were likewise in an imperfectly arranged state. So also with parliamentary procedure and powers. In the circumstances, the only " aim " he could adopt was that of governing them all, in his effort to effect the nation's good. That his aims, whether foreign or domestic, were noble or even justifiably right, or that they were the best that could have been devised in that age, or that they were those most likely to confer happiness and strength on his fatherland, is not the matter before us and will not form any part of the Essay. But that it was Wolsey's intention that they should be all this and more seems plain enough.

PART I

It is a common error to suppose that success must immediately attend on genius or extraordinary virtue. As a matter of experience, failure quite as remarkable seems to be, in the majority of such cases, the first of all results. Perhaps this circumstance has had something to do with the production in our character of

that trait which makes us unable to appreciate with proper justice the grandeur or heroism of a man who belongs to our own times. The trait has often been commented on, and almost as often derided, yet it exists in most, probably all, of us. Contemporaries are too near the incidents to do otherwise than judge them according to their first appearances, too affected by favour towards or hostility against the persons of our day to assign them their just awards. And if there should at any time stand forth a man of an unique career, in which are mingled together success and failure, each spectacular in magnitude, it appears certain that the relative values of these and of the man himself can alone be correctly appraised by some later generation. A remarkable instance of this is afforded by the brief *Life of Cardinal Wolsey*, written by his gentleman-usher, William Cavendish, of which the opening words show that Cavendish no less indeed than his contemporaries, believed that Wolsey's life-work had ended in complete failure: "Who pleaseth to read this history advisedly may well perceive the mutability of honour, the tottering state of earthly dignity, the deceit of flattering friends, and the instability of Princes' favours. This great Cardinal having experience of all this, witness his fleeting from honour, the loss of friends, riches, dignities, being forgotten of his Prince; whilst Fortune smiled, having satiety of all these, and she bending her brow, deprived him of all terrestrial joys, who by twenty years' study and pains had obtained so great wealth and dignity and in less than one year lost all. And thus was his honour laid in the dust." True, all that concerned the Cardinal's own ambitions, hopes, and yearnings, had met with ruin. But the greater things, the measures he took for the advancement of his country's peace,

prosperity, and security at home, the prestige of his fatherland abroad raised by his haughty masterfulness towards foreign princes and their ministers, the commanding position in European affairs which he gave to England by his diplomatic labours, did not encounter the like ill-fortune. His best work outlived him and bore fruit.

In 1509, when Wolsey's name first occurs in the State Papers, he is discovered occupied in helping to prepare the people for war.[1] The war (against France) came in 1513, but produced little good for England.[2] Wolsey's work had however shown its quality. Largely through his efforts,[3] there had come into being an English army formed upon a plan which led to the genesis of a national fighting force, as distinct from the feudal assemblies of earlier times, and an English navy, embryonic no doubt, but full of potentialities. "The tiny fleet that sailed against France in 1513 under Sir Edward Howard, opened the glorious history of the British Navy."[4]

It was fortunate for Henry that he had, at this time, such a competent adviser and agent to employ as Thomas Wolsey. That person's marvellous abilities

[1] *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic,* Henry VIII, vol. I, no. 679, 20th November, 1509.

[2] Busch (Wilhelm), *England's Kriege im Jahre 1513*: *Guinegate und Flodden* (Historische Vierteljahrschrift, 1910, 1), p. 42 f., declares that whatever success was attained in northern France was due to the English forces. He shows also that it was on England that the heavy financial responsibility of the campaign fell.

[3] *Lett. and Papers, Henry VIII,* vol. I, nos. 3946, 3951, 3972, 3974, 3977, and others, most of them exhibiting Wolsey's hand, show him immersed in the business of fitting out and victualling the army and the fleet.

[4] H. A. L. Fisher, *Political History of England* (London 1906),

were now required to checkmate the astute treachery of Henry's allies. Ferdinand had obtained all that he wished for from the war [1] and was negotiating a truce with Louis XII for his own advantage, whilst he allowed his agents to discuss eagerly with the English monarch, his own son-in-law, the details of another campaign against France. And Maximilian was an accomplice of the Aragonese. Henry had treated them with a youthful confidence, but was experiencing at their hands a duplicity which gave him an impression from which he never recovered. Henceforth, the game of astuteness and selfishness became such a part of English politics as caused the continental monarchs to regret that they had taught the English king, young as he was, the principles of the game. Deeply seated in the minds of the English people as the traditional hatred of France was, it could not prevent Wolsey from perceiving the boundless advantages of maintaining a policy of friendship with England's hereditary foe. For his part, Louis was much more anxious for an alliance with Henry than with either Ferdinand or Maximilian.[2] Henry thereupon, through Wolsey, opened negotiations with Louis, in the method of secrecy which appeared to be that most approved by his late allies, for a peace which was to be strengthened

[1] See Knight's despatch to Wolsey, 4th October, no. 3451, and especially Stile's from Valladolid, 13th January, 1573, no. 3662, and 19th March, 1513, no. 3807. Ferdinand's double-dealing was made abundantly clear by the letter of James IV of Scotland to Henry, 24th May, no. 4112, enclosing a copy of the truce made on 1st April between Spain and France. Cp, also Busch, pp. 44 ff.; also Pollard, *Henry VIII*, pp. 59–73.

[2] Ep. of Loys d'Orleans and Thomas Bohier to Wolsey, 16th March, 1514, in which the good feelings of King Louis XII for Henry are declared.—*Lett. and Papers, Henry VIII*, vol. I, no. 4883. See Knight's advice to Wolsey, 2nd May, no. 5029.

by the marriage of Louis to Henry's sister Mary.[1] The effect of this pact was immediate and great. It punished both Ferdinand and Maximilian, and it increased very considerably the strength and prestige of England.

It was Wolsey's first triumph.[2] Such a union as that of England and France was regarded, in those days, as a thing impossible of achievement, on account of the age-long hatred of the two peoples and the well-known pretensions of the English kings to sovereignty in France. But the pact was highly unpopular in England—people, nobles, even the Royal household were opposed to it. And yet, it was the policy most fruitful of good to England. This Wolsey saw, and

[1] The story of the complicated secret negotiations of all four, Henry, Louis, Ferdinand and Maximilian, is somewhat amusing reading. Mary, of mature years, was supposed to be betrothed to the boy-prince, Charles of Castile. Henry actually instructed his agents in Flanders to proceed with these negotiations, whilst, unknown to them or anyone else, he and Wolsey were pushing on the French marriage (*Lett. and Papers*, no. 5139, May, 1514). In the same month of May, Henry gave not the slightest hint of the French business when Philippe de Bregilles, Margaret of Savoy's agent at London, heard the rumour talked about at the English Court that there was on foot a project of marriage between King Louis and Margaret herself. Henry contented himself with saying that he would not believe it, he was so sure of Margaret. It was Louis he was sure of, but he did not say so.—*Lett. and Papers*, no. 5140. But, on 12th June, Henry wrote to Margaret of Savoy, the most sincere of his allies, and warned her of the grounds he had for breaking the betrothal of Mary and Prince Charles.—*Lett. and Papers*, no. 5758. On 30th June, Gerard de Pleine reported to Margaret the plain-speaking of Wolsey, on the manner of treatment meted out, not only by Ferdinand but also Maximilian, to King Henry in the matter of the truce with France, and of their tricky evasiveness concerning the marriage between Mary and Charles.—*Ibid.*, no. 5203.

[2] See King Louis' letter of thanks to Wolsey, 5th August.—*Ibid.*, no. 5302.

for that reason, pursued it to the end of his career. The great prestige that now came to England, giving her at once a foremost position in European politics, and contributing not a little ultimately to the high place of the nation in the affairs of Europe during subsequent centuries, proceeded from the union of France and England in the year 1514.[1] The alliance freed England from the dangers of raids on the Scottish border, gave free course to English commerce in the Channel, opened new markets abroad, and enabled the country to grow stronger and richer through the maintenance of peaceful internal conditions. Henry took his place among the great princes of Christendom. As his representative and man of affairs, Wolsey stood forth a mighty power to be reckoned with in the councils of the nations, and, responding to the high estimates commonly formed of him and the prince he represented, he surrounded himself with a splendour hardly less than regal. If it be true, and it is indeed so, that " no subject of the crown in the whole course of English history left upon his contemporaries so deep an impression of wealth, power, and magnificence," there was a purpose lying deep in all this pomp and evidence of power. No other monarch of the time could have tolerated such a display of grandeur save one, who not only realised the intention of it all, but also felt that the greatness of his servant added to, rather than detracted from, his own royal magnificence. The King who possessed a minister, of whom it could be said, " He is in very great repute,

[1] Lavisse (Ernest), *Histoire de France*, t. V, pt. I, p. 115, seems to think that the suggestion of the marriage, between Louis XII and Mary, came from the French side. This is contradicted by *Lett. and Papers, Henry VIII*, nos. 5327, 5353, 5387, and 5398.

seven times more so than if he were pope" (*Giustiniani Despatches*, Appx. II, 309), was thereby rendered a very mighty monarch indeed.

It is only too evident that this triumph of Wolsey's policy issued from the momentary agreement of that policy with his King's inclinations. Henry himself was not permanently disposed to weigh favourably the advantages of an alliance with France against the traditional hostilities and prejudices of his people. And when, shortly afterwards, King Louis died, all the labours of Wolsey were undone. Henry returned to his earlier friendships, and now became a partner with Ferdinand and Maximilian in their tricky games against the new King of France, Francis I. Wolsey, the instrument of his King's machinations, has been charged with the entire blame for them.[1] But we must be at least just to him, however unpleasant we may find the perusal of his variations in policy and frequent diplomatic double-dealings, during the years 1514–18. With unwavering consistency, he at all times put his King's commands above everything else, even above prudence and honour. Wolsey was, in

[1] Lavisse, *op. cit.*, pt. II, p. 20, suggests, aptly enough, though it is almost certainly an error in judgement, that there was an agreed divergence of opinions between Henry and Wolsey, whenever they sought an occasional pretext for abandoning their engagements: "Wolsey exercait certainement une grande influence sur l'esprit de son maître. . . . Ce n'est pas à dire cependant qu'Henri VIII se soit entièrement effacé, mais plutôt que le Roi et son ministre eurent à peu près les mêmes idées, et peut-être, les quelques divergences dont on croit saisir entre eux la trace n'étaient-elles qu'une habileté, qui excusait et facilitait les variations si fréquentes de leur diplomatie." English scholars have a higher estimate of Henry's independence.—Dr. J. Gairdner, in *Trans. Roy. Hist. Socy.*, 1899, p. 85: Henry "was scarcely less a master of statecraft than Wolsey himself."

truth, a patriot. He loved England, and yearned to make her the first country of Europe. There was then no voice of the people to hear, no public opinion to consult. For him the King and the fatherland were identical.[1] Present-day critics may censure him for many of his diplomatic operations. His contemporaries did that too. But, in strict fairness, it must be pointed out that he followed the only road which was then open to an English patriot.

Probably, Wolsey himself experienced a sentiment of genuine pleasure, when, for the second occasion, he gained his King's approval of a closer connection with France. Quietly, secretly, and not without the exercise of some adroitness,[2] he effected the necessary preparations. At length, on 2nd October, 1518, a treaty was signed in London between England and France,[3] which professed to include the Empire, Spain, and the Papacy. Contemporary opinion esteemed this treaty a great triumph for Wolsey. The Venetian envoy, that gossiping despatch-writer, expressed his mind freely on its value,[4] and Bishop

[1] The identity of King and fatherland, in the mind of Wolsey, is appreciatingly explained in Law (Ernest), *England's First Great War Minister*, London, 1916, p. 243.

[2] *Cal. Stat. Papers, Venice*, II, 1022.

[3] Once more, it would appear, that Lavisse, *op. cit.*, pt. II, pp. 20, 21, has said what is only partly true, and that what he represents as the aim of the policy of Wolsey and Henry, viewed as one, is scarcely just to the Cardinal: "Ils ne songèrent pas à un rôle idéal d'arbitre, trop haut pour leur génie et pour leur ambition; ils voulurent tenir la balance égale entre les deux rivaux et n'intervinrent jamais entre eux qu'à leur propre profite. Ils trouvaient aussi une satisfaction d'amour-propre à se voir sollicités de part et d'autre. . . . Leurs sympathies n'allaient pas du côté de la France."

[4] *Lett. and Papers, Henry VIII*, vol. II, no. 4453. Cp. also, *ibid.*, 4540.

Fox wrote on 30th October, " It is the best deed ever done for England ; and next to the King, the praise of it is due to Wolsey." Fox was right, for by it Henry had been raised to a more commanding place in European affairs than any King of England before him.

One would have thought that England and England's King would have shown themselves shrewd enough to observe how advantageous to them was the great peace thus concluded with France. But, unquestionably, the unpopularity of the French nation was deeply rooted in the minds of the English ; it continually reappeared and exercised a disturbing influence on all Wolsey's best work. Henry was willing enough to enjoy the benefits derived from peaceable relations with King Francis and the French, but he entertained no genuine sentiments of amity towards them.[1] He kept all his sincerity for the alliance with Charles of Spain, his wife's nephew, who had become Emperor on the death of Maximilian (1519). And yet, it is extremely doubtful if the young Emperor had any truly friendly feelings towards England, though, indeed, he had excellent reasons for impressing Henry and his subjects with an appearance of friendship.

The years that followed 1519 will always prove painfully sad ones for admirers of Cardinal Wolsey. They are those which reveal him at his lowest level. How much of the culpability for the perfidy practised at the Conference of Calais (1521) against King Francis,[2]

[1] Cp. the wording of Wolsey's despatch of 29th August to Clerk.—Brit. Mus. Vitellius, B. IV, 145–50, quoted in footnote to Barrillon, *Journal*, vol. II, p. 207.

[2] *Journal de Barrillon*, pp. 181–2. Francis seems to have been hoping, though not unaware of the duplicity of which he was the victim, that an alliance against the Emperor might

as well as for the egregious blunder of entering into the League with Charles against the French—so little serviceable to English interests—can be rightly and entirely laid upon Wolsey is not a matter to be easily decided. Nor will it be a simple affair to contradict the historian who describes Wolsey as no diplomatist but an adroit master of men.[1] No evidence that would lighten his guilt in the smallest degree is discoverable in the Cardinal's correspondence. Yet this latter circumstance may, indeed, be capable of explanation. He possessed too many enemies, ever on the alert for a slip of tongue or pen,[2] for him, at this juncture, to have uttered a word to a supposed friend, or to have left a sentence in his letters, such as might have exhibited a serious divergence from the expressed wishes of his royal master. And, at this point of time, that master was himself altogether under the sway of the anti-French elements in England and the Imperialist influences at the Court. One notable fact will always afford good ground for suspecting that the inconsistencies of Wolsey's diplomacy, during this part of his career, so discreditable to his

possibly issue from the Conference.—*Ibid.*, p. 221. For an account of Wolsey's shameful activities, at this juncture, see *Lett. and Papers, Henry VIII*, vol. III, pt. I, Introduction, XXXVIII–XL.

Lavisse, *op. cit.*, pt. II, p. 26, thinks that some of the blame for this treatment of Francis is due to that King himself: "Peut-être cependant Henri VIII n'aurait-il pas osé violer ouvertement son devoir de médiateur, s'il avait trouvé une bonne volonté pacifique plus décidée chez François Ier."

[1] Fisher, *op. cit.*, pp. 233, 234.

[2] Cp. what Erasmus said of him, after his fall, Eras., *Op.* III, 1347E, F, ep. of John Vergara: metuebatur ab omnibus, amabatur à paucis, ne dicam à nemine. It is hardly fair criticism, but indicates clearly enough that Wolsey had extremely few sincere friends.

genius, and so hard to explain, proceeded from the introduction into his foreign political labours and aims of designs of an entirely different character. That fact is the unshaken confidence and friendliness of King Francis towards him,[1] even during and after the shameful duplicity of 1521. Anyone who will take the trouble of consulting such a contemporaneous record as the *Journal de Jean Barrillon*, published by M. de Vaissière in 1899, can hardly fail to be struck with the French King's trust in the Cardinal. Francis,[2] no doubt, realised that Wolsey would always be found true to his fatherland and would always seek the means most likely, in his estimation, to exalt England; but he appears also to have known that the Cardinal recognised, as no other important Englishman then did, that the surest method of exalting England, so far as foreign relations could effect it, consisted in an enduring alliance of friendship with France.[3]

Every alliance England had made with the Empire, during the early years of the sixteenth century, had brought her nothing but loss. So it was in regard to the war that began in 1523. Charles alone derived advantage from it. England, nearly as impoverished as France,[4] was groaning beneath the weight of taxation. Yet, when the lucky accident of Pavia (1525)

[1] *Journal de Barrillon*, pp. 302–8.

[2] *Ibid.*, pp. 185, 186, and the letter of the French ambassadors at Calais to Francis, 5th August, pp. 205–6. Francis, at this time, was making every effort to bring about an Anglo-French alliance against Charles.

[3] See the letter of Francis, 16th August, to his delegates at Calais, *ibid.*, p. 221.

[4] The financial straits of Francis are well illustrated by the desperate expedients he was forced to adopt, such as the seizure of the riches of several famous shrines, according to the *Journal d'un Bourgeois de Paris sous François I^er^*, pp. 164, 165.

put King Francis as a captive into the Emperor's hands, and the latter thus had the power, if he also had the will, to aid his English ally and uncle to realise some of his ambitions, Charles yearned after a peace that would suit himself and a profitable matrimonial alliance with Portugal.[1] It was quite obvious that he was the grandson of Maximilian and Ferdinand.

Wolsey had never trusted Charles; he was less inclined to trust him now. In the older historians, Wolsey's dislike for the Emperor has been attributed to disappointment over the Papal election which followed the death of Pope Leo X.[2] It is true that the adroitness of Charles, who, having promised his aid to the English Cardinal in obtaining the tiara, made elaborate arrangements to render that aid ineffective, might very well have aroused the displeasure of Wolsey and probably did. But the Cardinal probably knew he had, in any case, very little chance of election, since Englishmen, and he himself especially, were not popular in Rome, at that period, because of their patriotism. It is, moreover, true that after Adrian and Clement had been successively elected, Wolsey evinced towards them nothing but the sincerest tokens of a warm personal regard.

It was now essential to the re-establishing of his favourite plan of a strong pact with France, that he should thoroughly convince his royal master of the Emperor's treacherous disposition. To this end, Wolsey adopted the expedient of intercepting the corres-

[1] *Lett. and Papers, Henry VIII*, vol. IV, no. 1453.

[2] For example, Prescott, *Hist. of the Reign of Charles the Fifth*, London, 1857, vol. I, p. 337. These older historians seem unable to view any move of Wolsey's against Charles without the notion that it was inspired by a personal pique.

pondence which passed between Charles and one of his Spanish ambassadors. The hostility reciprocated equally by the Cardinal and the Emperor forthwith became manifest to all men.[1] But Wolsey did not care; he had at last succeeded in winning the full support of his King. And the best hopes for the peace of Western Europe lay in the fact that, on 30th April, 1527, Henry signed, at Westminster, a treaty of peace between England and France. One article of this treaty will ever command attention, on account of the events which issued from it. It is the one that provided that the Lady Mary, Henry's daughter, should marry either Francis himself or his second son, Henry, Duke of Orleans.

For the third and last time, Wolsey's policy had achieved a signal triumph. He had done what he considered the best for his country's interests. So fiercely, however, were his compatriots opposed to this new French alliance that the Cardinal, for a while feared that his life was imperilled.[2] National prejudices die hard no doubt; but, it is only proper to add, that there was now present something more than prejudice to awaken the bitter resentment of Englishmen. If the Lady Mary married a French prince closely related to the French crown, there was a danger, real enough to have furnished matter for grave consideration, that, in the event of her succeeding to her father's throne, England might ultimately become a mere province of France.[3] The prospect was too appalling for a patriotic Englishman to contemplate, even as a remote possibility, with calmness of mind.

[1] Fisher, *op. cit.*, p. 256.

[2] *Lett. and Papers, Henry VIII*, vol. IV, no. 3105.

[3] Pollard (A. F.), *Henry VIII*, p. 177, quoting *Venet. Cal.* II, 1103.

But Wolsey, if a contemporary report be authentic [1] —it wears the appearance of being so—had already foreseen the peril, and was engaged in devising a scheme by which a more acceptable provision for the succession might be made.

PART II

Judging by the reasons usually advanced, the evidence is altogether insufficient for assuming that Henry spoke untruthfully when he declared that the question of the validity of his marriage with Katharine of Aragon had been raised first by the Bishop of Tarbes during the negotiations which took place relative to the matrimonial alliance for the Princess Mary. The statement quite possibly, may have been a royal and convenient falsehood. Or, as Katharine appears to have believed, perhaps Wolsey put the doubt into the French bishop's mind. But, in the circumstances, any guess may wear an appearance of certitude. Yet, as we feel justified in pointing out, depreciatory allegations of this sort were just the kind that would arise in the course of delicate foreign diplomacy or political

[1] Fisher, p. 270. Pallavicino, *Vera Œcumenici Concilii Tridentini. . . . Historia*, Cologne, 1717, pars prima, 73, § 3, and 74, § 4–8, states (but he adds, nisi fama maligne obstrepat) that Wolsey was moved to the suggestion of the divorce by either malice against Charles, or in order to merit well of the King and nation. He also asserts that Wolsey was anxious to promote a marriage between Henry and Margaret of Valois, sister of Francis I, and that Wolsey employed the Bishop of Tarbes to suggest this marriage, the divorce from Katharine having been first obtained. But, whilst Wolsey was on his way to France, he received word from Henry not to proceed any further with any arrangement for a new marriage—a message whose import he well guessed. Pallavicino's is only one of many versions which, in their general import, have much that is similar.

bargaining. For England, however, the subject was too grave to be regarded as a matter of academic or diplomatic debate. Whether he had, or had not, anything to do with the origin of the question, Wolsey was the one man who would be disposed to view it in its most serious and even threatening aspect. His excellent administration of home affairs, though less of a pageant, illustrated and explained his foreign policy. The life and welfare of his countrymen, the peace, happiness, and prosperity of the homeland, were always his first, almost his only, consideration, though his compatriots did not give him credit for such disinterested ambitions. Accordingly, in his estimation, the succession constituted a vital point which touched the well-being of the country he loved.[1] He would not wish that there should occur any more

[1] The author of the *Harleian MS.* 6382, *Life of Fisher*, pp. 46–8, blames Wolsey more than anyone else for the origin of the divorce-question, and declares that he had a grudge against Queen Katharine.

As to whether the Bishop of Tarbes was or was not the prime mover of the question, by throwing doubt on Mary's legitimacy, is a point that will never be satisfactorily determined, but that he actually raised it seems evident. Cp. Bridgett (Rev. T. E.), *Life of Blessed John Fisher*, London, 1890, pp. 149 and 154, and Brewer (*Reign of Henry VIII*, vol. II, p. 163).

The topic of the succession had been, as far back as 1519, a subject of gossip among the foreign ambassadors. The Dukes of Norfolk and Suffolk had entertained hopes in this direction, but the Duke of Buckingham lost his head (in 1521) on account of voicing his ambitions too loudly—see *Venet Cal.* II, 1287; Pollard (A. F.), *Henry VIII*, London, 1905, p. 181.

The overmastering desire of Henry and Wolsey to provide a secure heir to the throne is reflected in the suggestion of Cardinal Campeggio (October, 1528) of marrying the Duke of Richmond, Henry's illegitimate son, to the Princess Mary, his half-sister !—see *Lett. and Pap., Henry VIII*, vol. IV, no. 4881.

uncertain titles to the throne, lest civil war, so recently in the land, might return. At the same time, he harboured no desire to see a foreign prince ruling over England; that, at least, is made clear by a passage in the letter of Du Bellay, the French ambassador, to Montmorency, dated 8th November, 1528. When, therefore, Henry first mentioned the subject of the divorce, the King's alleged scruples fitted in with England's needs so well that the minister seized on them avidly as calculated to produce a fairly simple solution of an otherwise difficult problem. If only the divorce from Katharine could be secured—and such ruptures of the matrimonial bond, for political objects, were by no means uncommon [1]—it might be possible, so

[1] Dr. R. H. Murray, *Anglican Essays*, London, 1923, pp. 71, 72: "Past precedents suggested the ordinary facility of securing a divorce at Rome. Alexander VI had divorced Louis XII from his queen. . . . Besides, had not Henry's own sister, Margaret, and both the husbands of his other sister, Mary, also secured divorces? . . . Henry VIII could hardly help reflecting that at Rome no opposition to either of these divorces was offered. The reason was obvious. Neither Margaret nor Angus had an Emperor for a nephew; his wife had, and that was the cause of his undoing." Certainly, the compliance of the Vatican (when not deterred by political complications) is illustrated by Dr. Murray's further statement: "On September 18, 1530, Casale tells Henry: 'A few days since the Pope secretly proposed to me that your Majesty might be allowed two wives. I told him I could not undertake to make any such proposition, because I did not know whether it would satisfy your Majesty's conscience.'" See also Lord Acton's *Lect. on Mod. History*, pp. 137, 140.

The bull confirming the validity of the Duke of Suffolk's divorce from Margaret Mortimer, and his subsequent marriages to Ann Browne and (after her death) to King Henry's sister, Mary, dated 12th May, 1528, furnished an exact type of the bull King Henry wished to be issued in his own case. Why was it granted to the Duke and refused to the King?—see Pollard, *Henry VIII*, p. 199.

thought Wolsey, to arrange a marriage between Henry and a French princess,[1] a union from which might spring the desired heir. Thoughts of the agony and grief of the proud Spanish princess who had long occupied the rank of lawful Queen of England, and who had faithfully, nay devotedly, fulfilled the duties of a wife to King Henry, perhaps never entered the Cardinal's mind. It was not that he lacked sympathy, but the destiny of the land he loved overmastered in him all other considerations. Besides, he knew of only too many instances where princesses and queens had to sacrifice their private feelings to the welfare of millions. Obstacles he foresaw would arise, chiefly at the Vatican, obstacles of a political rather than a religious nature, to any such project as that to which he was now putting his hand. From the Imperialist side powerful opposition was bound to come, on both family and political grounds ; that was to be expected, and for it provision had to be made. Wolsey entertained little fear of defeat from that quarter. The main thing, to obtain which he would need to exert all his powers and abilities, was the decree of divorce from the Papacy. He believed it possible to convince the Court of Rome that the divorce was justifiable on moral grounds. He was convinced of that himself, and Wolsey had a wonderful way of convincing others on matters whereon he had made up his own mind. But the political indigence of the Vatican constituted the most dangerous obstacle of all. This the Sack of Rome and the subsequent captivity of the Pope enlarged to abnormal proportions. The Cardinal saw that whatever hopes he might foster of procuring the decree from Clement, if free, were incapable of fulfilment by a Pope in prison among the Imperialists, or,

[1] Fisher, *op. cit.*, p. 270.

if no longer a captive, yet under Imperial influence. Whilst, therefore, Clement continued in captivity, Wolsey eagerly sought to attain his object by getting into his own hands the authority to grant the decree. With this end in view, he formulated several schemes, one after the other. Current opinion, especially that of the Spaniards,[1] regarded him, at the time of the Sack of Rome, as one who would not hesitate to propose that the Gallican and English Churches should break away from the Roman obedience, if thereby he might facilitate a re-marriage on Henry's part. If Hall's *Chronicle* can be relied on, many Englishmen would readily have supported Wolsey in such a measure for the provision of what was recognised as a great national need. But that Wolsey was cordially in favour of a marriage with Anne Boleyn, either at this or any other time, may be safely doubted, in spite of the evidence that Burnet sets forth.[2] For the purpose of obtaining the divorce, however, Wolsey had come to the conclusion that his aim could be better accomplished by something less than an assertion of independence, viz., by an extension of his legatine authority. One of his plans,[3] therefore, included the assembly of the Cardinals on French soil, and their appointment of him, during the term of the Pope's imprisonment, as a

[1] See Gattinara's letter to Charles V, 8th June, 1527, quoted in Creighton, *Hist. of the Papacy*, London, 1901, vol. VI, p. 349: "The opinion of many of your Majesty's servants is that the Apostolic Seat should not be entirely removed from Rome; for then the King of France will set up a patriarch in his kingdom, and deny obedience to the Apostolic Seat; the King of England will do likewise, and so will all other Christian princes."

[2] Gilbert Burnet, *Hist. of the Ref. of the Church of England*, Dublin, 1730, vol. I, pp. 40, 41.

[3] Creighton, *op. cit.*, pp. 353, 354.

kind of Papal Vicar, with powers of administration and dispensation. To the alarm of the Papal nuncio in Paris, the proposal was taken quite seriously in France. In September, 1527, he proposed to Clement that the Pope should grant him a general faculty to do and execute all things, as long as his Holiness remained in durance. All Wolsey's projects were too revolutionary to meet with any success. From the Cardinal's point of view, the share in Papal government which he sought would have been merely a temporary measure, one designed to enable him to pronounce a decree of divorce for Henry without involving Clement in direct responsibility for it. He did not, however, observe that what he asked would have shaken the authority of the Papacy to its foundations.

Wolsey was certainly in a very precarious position. On the one hand the nobility were eager for his removal from power ; on the other, the merchants hated his French policy, because they feared it would injure the trade with Flanders. At Court, he had no friends, for, whilst the Queen and her supporters regarded him as the originator of the divorce-project,[1] the Boleyn family, and especially Anne herself, disliked him because they believed that he was opposed to the

[1] Gairdner (J.), *New Lights on the Divorce of Henry VIII* ; Fisher, *op. cit.*, p. 275. Dr. Gairdner, in *Trans. Roy. Hist. Socy.*, 1899, p. 79, quotes Sanders's report of Wolsey's acknowledgment that he, and he alone, was responsible for the origin of the divorce-project. Gairdner adds, that Wolsey said this to shield Stephen Gardiner. Later on, at p. 81, Dr. Gairdner notes that Cardinal Campeggio reported to Rome that to Wolsey the whole business was distasteful but that he felt he must satisfy the King. The Venetian ambassador likewise observes (by hearsay) that Wolsey did not wish the divorce to take place, but supposes that the English Cardinal was persisting in the project because he feared to lose his influence if Anne Boleyn became Queen.

Royal match. The numerous underlings of the Court did not veil their malicious envy of his eminence and power. All the factions of the country, however much they differed, were, in fact, in agreement upon one point: enmity to Wolsey. The King had hitherto been his strong protector and friend, but had already displayed towards him considerable irritation and a mean cupidity, because Wolsey had presumed to make a conventual appointment which was not in accordance with the royal will. Indeed, Henry's meanness on this occasion was very marked; it was, in fact, excelled only by his unseemly anxiety later on to obtain possession of the sum of money which the dying Cardinal had received from some grateful friends for his most pressing needs.[1] Overseas, the Empire was vindictively hostile, the Vatican cold and mistrustful. There was one direction, and one only, in which the Cardinal could look for sympathy and appreciation—to France, but the French alliance had been one of the principal causes of his present distress.

His final plan was the establishment of a European peace. He desired that England, France, and the Empire should join together in partnership; but it was patent that the terms he proposed for this project were such as would have rendered the first-named country the arbiter of Christendom. One of the earliest consequences of the scheme, if it had matured, would have been the Pope's independence of the Imperial party. Apparently Wolsey still entertained the belief that Clement, if only he were free to act according to his own inclination and judgement, would have proved favourable to the matter of the divorce.

[1] *Lett. and Papers, Henry VIII*, vol. IV, nos. 4507, 4509; William Cavendish's *Life and Death of Thomas Wolsey, Cardinal*, ch. XX.

But all his efforts were futile; he merely increased, for the time being, the burden of his diplomatic labours.

Once, and once only, did what appeared to offer an opportunity of accomplishing his desires present itself to him. Pope Clement fell ill in January, 1529. Towards this pontiff Wolsey had always manifested sentiments of real friendship and esteem, but he was in too perilous a condition of fortune to overlook the unique chance of retrieving his position, which a vacancy in the Papacy would afford him. If only he could gain the tiara, he felt that all might yet be well with him; he could grant King Henry's wish and win back his favour, he would also be able to overcome his English and foreign foes, and thus be sufficiently powerful to strengthen that French confederacy which he had ever believed the best for England's prosperity. During Clement's illness, therefore, the Cardinal put forth all his energies to secure election, in case the Pope's indisposition should end fatally. But the Pope recovered. His restitution to administrative capability shattered the last hope of Wolsey. A few months later, the Emperor and the Vatican concluded a treaty at Barcelona, and the Archduchess Margaret, Regent of the Netherlands, met Louise, mother of the French King, at Cambrai. As a force in foreign diplomacy Cardinal Wolsey was already dead. Ruin, absolute and complete, had overtaken the policy through which he had expected to exalt his country and make her the first European power. The course, moreover, which the King's divorce-suit was to take was vitally affected by these two pacts of June and July, 1529[1]; and,

[1] The French ambassador was acute enough to forecast what would happen when Wolsey should be "dead or executed."—*Lett. and Papers, Henry VIII*, vol. IV, nos. 5862, 6011.

incidentally, the doom of the Cardinal himself was sealed by them.

His fall was a national catastrophe. To many, whether friends or foes, he had stood for a pillar of national strength, and to these it seemed as if the authority of the State itself was shaking to a collapse, as rumour followed rumour concerning his removal from office. It can hardly have been affection (Wolsey had never looked for, or attained, popularity); it certainly was not pity (he still clung to a proud dignity); that caused the thousands at Cawood-gate to cry to him, "God save your Grace," as he issued forth under arrest for high treason. It was much more the unspoken thought, "We shall never see his like again."

His utter grandeur blazed forth in the last three years of his life; not so much in the days of his great triumphs, as in those of his adverse fortune and stress, did his genius display itself. His aims and project may have been wildly impracticable, but they were so, only because they were centuries before their time.

As we visualise him tottering to his fatal break, we count his personal qualities, his career, his fate, alike unique. "He took a wider and juster view of the problems of his time than any English statesman has ever done." Quite true, but there was more even than that in him, which endowed him with an illustrious singularity. Belonging by training and office to a medieval system, he nevertheless pursued a course of political action, and laid well and truly the foundations of a political establishment, which opened the modern era of the world. Within the ambit of his political outlook, therefore, there met and coalesced the medieval conception of Christendom as a whole and the recognition of the claims of the national entities that were coming to a fuller life around him.

So remarkable was he, by position and by the policy he strove to complete, that, if one were asked to indicate the point of time when the Middle Ages ended and modern times began, one could reply, "at eight of the clock, on the morn of the Eve of St. Andrew, 1530," for that was the day and hour when Thomas Wolsey breathed his last breath, a citizen of the old world who laboured for a new; who, when he fell, unwilling to be satisfied with the ideals and methods of a receding era and protesting vigorously against some of an era fast approaching, fell across the threshold that divided the two. Thus he ended, in such fashion as precluded anyone henceforth from describing him as the last of the one or the first of the other; he remains the figure of a great personality, unique, singular, alone.

VII

More and Fisher

I

IT is granted to only a small number of men to be consistent. Perhaps, it is as well that it should be so. The usual lot of man is to alter and change, whether with the advancing years or with a growing experience, or with an increasing perception of one's interests. Outward circumstances, too, derived from the world in which we live, exercise such an influence over us that, sometimes consciously, sometimes unconsciously, we move with them. These observations refer to the ordinary days of comparative tranquillity. When, however, the epoch becomes one of rapid and stupendous changes, when familiar methods and ways of thinking transform themselves into others quite different, when old landmarks vanish with disconcerting quickness and new ones appear as suddenly, when ancient rules of government and authority are revised or rejected—it is then that only God can afford to remain the same, yesterday, to-day and for ever.

Thomas More, son of Sir John More, one of the royal judges, was born into such an era. It is customary to-day for historians and writers to quarrel with one or with many of the men who lived in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, and to give us information concerning their errors. Yet let us, at least, be honest,

and this, I know, some of us are trying to be. If Joan of Arc was then condemned by ecclesiastical judges and suffered martyrdom at the hands of English soldiers,[1] the former, in these days of ours, have atoned, as far as mortals can ever atone, by ranking her among their saints, and the latter do honour to her memory with a homage that is sincere.

When Savonarola died Thomas More was about eighteen years of age, a student at Oxford, whither he had been sent by a distinguished patron. He had already been in the service of this patron, Lord Chancellor Morton, afterwards Cardinal, and had won the high esteem of that great and prudent ecclesiastical statesman. Observant as he was, he must have noted, while in the Cardinal's household, the efforts of his master to reform the all too apparent abuses in the ecclesiastical domain. That this is so seems likely enough from the fact that at Oxford young More showed a marked inclination for the study of the pious works of Pico della Mirandola. As Pico had been, and had died, an ardent follower of Savonarola, a student of his works hardly could fail to entertain a similar, perhaps a greater, dissatisfaction.[2]

It was at More's house later on that Erasmus wrote his *Praise of Folly*. This title formed a play upon the name of Thomas More, *Encomium Moriae, Moros* being the Greek for a fool, which Erasmus was very far from

[1] For contemporary estimates of Joan of Arc as a witch and deserving her fate, consult the Chronicle of Monstrelet, a Frenchman of Cambrai, and the *Formicarius* (Douai, 1602), p. 385; of Johann Nider, prior of the Dominican convents at Nuremberg and Basel.

[2] Nisard (D.), *Études sur la Renaissance*, Paris, 1855, p. 162.

considering his friend to be.[1] It was, indeed, not the only time when the great Dutch scholar had so played with his friend's name.[2] With the subject-matter of this book More was in complete accord. In it the world of their day, and especially the religion and the ecclesiastical system then existing, were held up to a keen and biting ridicule. It is not to be thought that either More [3] or Erasmus, or any of the great and pious ones of the time, was not imbued with deep reverence for sincere religion and fervent faith and holy service, wherever found. But, for all that, they were unquestionably dissatisfied with the widespread corruption of morals.

It is a little beside the mark to lay emphasis on a work written by More himself about the same date, though on it his fame as an author rests.[4] His " Utopia " may be viewed as prophetic and far-seeing,

[1] Nisard, pp. 145, 187.

[2] Seebohm (F.), *Oxford Reformers*, London, 1906, p. 113, quoting Cresacre More's *Life of More*, p. 93.

[3] The opinion of Erasmus on More's character was exceptionally high (Eras., *Op.* III, 474, 475). Later on, however, he saw more clearly how his English friend was somewhat inclined to superstition: Erat enim mentis tam religiosae, ut propior esset superstitioni quam impietati.—Eras., *Op.* III, 1770B. The words may possibly be explained away, yet there will always remain a certain amount of adverse criticism in them, such as is remarked on in Nisard, pp. 186, 187. The translation of them, given in Bremond (Henri), *Sir Thomas More*, translated by Harold Child, London, 1904, p. 33, is: " He makes no mystery of his sentiments on that point, for he is so given to piety that if he leaned in the least degree to one side or the other, it would be in the direction of superstition rather than impiety." Bremond finds fault with Nisard for his deduction from the sense of the expression, but Erasmus' words plainly justify it.

[4] For an excellent critique on the *Utopia* consult Nisard, *op. cit.*, *Thomas More*, § IV, pp. 178–85.

bringing into notice ideals of reform in national and municipal directions that have been only very slowly realised in action during comparatively recent generations. Although the part of this work which treats of religion is probably the most interesting and peculiar, yet, as an index to the author's own settled opinions it must be dismissed. Beyond displaying a broadness of view—perhaps one ought to say a largeness of heart —towards others who might differ from him at that period of his life, no deductions of considerable value can be made.

The years passed on. More steadily advanced in the profession of law, more by character even than by his ability and attention. He had, while still young, incurred the displeasure of King Henry VII by speaking too candidly in the House of Commons, and he had found it necessary to live in exile on the Continent until that monarch was dead. All that had happened years before and had been forgotten when he attained, probably through the good offices of Cardinal Wolsey,[1] a high place at Court. Frankly, it was not his desire. There was in the atmosphere of the Court then too great a temptation to accommodate one's views of upright conduct, and even of morals, not merely to the whims of a royal patron, but, still worse, to the opinions of one's fellow-courtiers. Among the few, the very few, of that age who maintained a high degree of consistency in his life to the end, stands More. Even at Court he remained the patriot he had early shown himself to be, the conventually minded, even ascetic, Christian gentleman he always was. To the Court there was for him a counterpoise—his home at Chelsea. Here, surrounded with his children and their animal

[1] Walter (W. Jos.), *Sir Thomas More, His Life and Times*, London, 1840, pp. 96–8.

pets, he dwelt as in another atmosphere, one wherein paternal care and filial obedience mingled with a strict system of religious observance and individual piety.

It is hard to know whether More is to be counted among the humanists. That he could ever be ranked with Erasmus or Reuchlin is quite impossible. The same difficulty arises when we ask concerning his legal abilities—whether he is to be considered as having been a pre-eminent lawyer or a statesman of commanding capability. When he eventually was called upon to take the place of the fallen Cardinal Wolsey and assume the office of Lord Chancellor, he could have entertained no illusions in regard to his powers to wield the baton fallen from the hands of so great a man as Wolsey ; nor could he have believed that he owed his high advancement to the excellence of his genius. The divorce question was now the most prominent State problem. The failure to solve that problem had brought about the ruin of the mighty Cardinal. It was that which was to be brought before More for solution, as well as he knew. Kings—even Kings like the Tudors, who, to abase the aristocracy, raise the commonalty to office and power—scarcely ever go so far as to put a commoner of no great family or influential connections into the highest office in their kingdom without a clear reason for so doing—a reason with a price attached to it,

The suggestion has been made that probably More took the Lord Chancellorship in the hope that the divorce question would be abandoned. That suggestion comes from Campeggio and Chapuys. As More showed something more than ordinary loyalty to the cause of Queen Katharine, such a notion appears quite natural, but it requires considerably greater

evidence than is forthcoming to establish itself as a fact.[1]

When More was assuming his new and exalted office, he made a speech, as he stood at the King's side, in which he condemned, in no measured terms, his predecessor in office. He did not realise then that he was incidentally making a contribution to that royal autocracy, which, in its fullest exercise, would betoken the arrival of a new political institution that would work More's own undoing. The accuracy of Hall's report of this speech can hardly be impugned, since it is corroborated by Chapuys' account of it to the Emperor :

" And as you see that amongst a great flock of sheep some be rotten and faulty, which the good shepherd sendeth from the good sheep, so the great wether which is of late fallen, as you all know, so craftily, so scabbedly, yea, and so untruly juggled with the King, that all men must needs guess and think that he thought in himself that he had no wit to perceive his crafty doing, or else that he had presumed that the King would not see nor know his fraudulent juggling and attempts. But he was deceived, for his Grace's sight was so quick and penetrable that he saw him, yea, saw through him, both within and without, so that all thing to him was open, and according to his desert he hath had a gentle example to other offenders, but

[1] See Gairdner (J.), *Transactions, Royal Historical Society*, new series, vol. XIII, London, 1899, p. 93, and *Spanish Cal.*, IV, pt. I, p. 325. Perhaps Nisard, p. 211, had the same basis for the following statement : " Il entra dans le ministère, avec une opinion arrêtée contre le divorce qui devait en être l'unique affaire, espérant peut-être que le roi serait guéri de sa fatale passion par l'impossibilité d'y convertir son royaume." Nisard himself here errs in underestimating the power of Henry to carry his people with him in this matter.

More's maiden speech, quoted in the text, is given in Hall's *Chronicle*, Ellis's edition of 1809, p. 764. Cp. also Walter (W. Jos.), *op. cit.*, pp. 170, 171.

clearly declared that whosoever hereafter shall make like attempt or commit like offence shall not escape with like punishment."

The justest, and probably the truest, explanation of More's harsh words against Wolsey is to be found in Professor Pollard, *Wolsey*, p. 256 (and other passages). To More, as a lawyer, Wolsey's intrusion into the various courts was an unwarrantable interference; to More, as an Englishman, Wolsey's management of public business, without the authority or concurrence of the King, was equally abhorrent, and More had complained about this as early as 1518; to More, as a Christian, Wolsey's heaping up of valuable Church preferments upon himself and his illegitimate son (called Thomas Wynter), was a sacrilegious crime. But, apart from all this, as a matter of strict legality, the charge contained in More's speech was in accordance with the facts.

By the Englishmen of More's day the divorce problem could not be dealt with on a simple basis. There were sides to it that had to be carefully weighed and estimated. It was not simply a matter of a King's sensual desires, or the same King's antipathy to a wife who had ceased to engage his affection. There was more than these rather sordid conjugal affairs at stake. If this had not been so, it is quite impossible to explain More's acceptance of the Chancellorship. Is it indeed that we must here remark one of those rare inconsequences of that notable man, in an age when such inconsequences were common because men, not devoid of moral sense, were too often guided by those events over which they had no control?

The opposition of the Pope to a divorce, or annulment rather, on any grounds, made it highly advisable that the men most worthy of consideration in the

Kingdom should be prevailed on to support the King's course of action: hence, probably, More's elevation to the Chancellorship; hence, most certainly, the urgent necessity of securing his adhesion, even after he had retired from that exalted, but perilous, position.

The known probity, incorruptible fairness and devout character of Sir Thomas More constituted him one of those on whose approval hung the moral value of King's and Parliament's actions. Without that approval, clearly given, future generations—if not perhaps, also that then existing—might well question the legitimacy of the succession, from the moral point of view, which might even affect and impair the political and national.

It was a terrible position for a man of high spiritual character. More did not question the right of Parliament to fix the succession, and it was not the succession itself of which he could not approve, or even the repudiation of Papal jurisdiction in England. On a former occasion he had strictly counselled Henry to confine that jurisdiction within much narrower bounds than the King then was disposed to do [1]; and, in later

[1] Nisard, pp. 262 and 268. More had protested against King Henry's insisting upon the divine institution of the papacy, when he wrote against Luther. See Wm. Roper, *Life of Sir Thomas More*, Chiswick, 1817.

For the text of his reply to Tyndale, consult *The Workes of Sir Thomas More, Knyght*, London, 1557, vol. I, p. 615.

See, in addition, More's Letter to Cromwell, February or March, 1533/4, in Roper's *Life*, pp. 141–3, esp. 143 (or, *Workes*, vol. II, 1426–7, esp. 1427, col. 2): "For albeit that I have for mine own part such opinion of ye pope's primacie as I have shewed you, yet never thought I the Pope above the general counsaile, nor never have in anye boke of mine, put forth among ye Kinges subiectes in our vulgare tonge, avaunced gretly ye Popes auctorite."

days, when replying to the strictures of William Tyndale, More had thus expressed his views on the Papacy as an institution :

" I never putte the Pope for parte of the dyffinicyon of the churche, diffynyng the churche to be the common knowen congregacyon of all christen nacions under one head ye pope. Thus did I never defyne the church, but purposely declyned therfro, because I wold not intrike & entangle ye matter with two questions at once. For I wist verye well that the church being proved thys common knowen catholyke congregacion of all chrysten nacions abyding together in one fayth, neyther fallen of nor cutte of : there myghte be peradventure made a seconde question after that, whether over all that catholike churche the Pope must nedes be headde and chiefe governour or chiefe spirituall shepehearde, or elles that the unyon of faythe standing among them all, every province might have theyr own chief spirituall governour over it selfe, withoute any recourse unto the Pope, or any superioritie recognised to ani other outward persone."

When the oath was presented to him, however, it involved two things to which More's conscience could give no assent. First, it required him to swear to a belief that Henry's marriage with Katharine had been an infraction of God's law ; secondly, that Henry was supreme head of the Church of England on earth.

Regarding the first, some bishops had already said that, in their opinion, Pope Julius's dispensation for that marriage should never have been granted, but that the long continuance of the marriage would now make it a greater crime to dissolve it. Regarding the second, Kings of England had, in fact, been heads of the English Church, in its temporal aspect, but what now was asked of More was, in effect, to fill with Henry, a layman, that place at the head of the spiritual administration of the Church left vacant by the repu-

diation of the Papal jurisdiction. This was how More understood it; this was what the House of Commons in 1604, in effect, protested against [1]; this was more than members of the Reformed Churches to-day would be inclined to agree to.

For conscience's sake More died. Even his judges were anxious to deliver him. His scrupulous care in agreeing to all that a patriotic Englishman and good Christian might admit, and merely refraining from expressing an opinion, favourable or otherwise, on points where his conscience bade him hesitate, found sympathetic and appreciative hearers among them. The necessities, not less of the Kingdom itself for its stability and succession, than of the new Queen for her child, and of Henry for his position and authority, were thought to demand the sacrifice of a man whose conscience stood in the way.[2]

When More laid his head on the block on that fatal 6th July, 1535, a good man laid down his life for his nation as truly as any other patriot ever did.

II

Like double stars in the firmament, the two names of More and Fisher companion together as one, and when either of them is spoken the other must needs be added as its complement. They resembled each

[1] Hallam (H.), *Constitutional History of England*, 5th edit., London, 1846, vol. I, p. 307.

[2] Gairdner (James), C.B., *The English Church in the Sixteenth Century*, London, 1904, pp. 158, 159.

For More's conscientiousness in the matter, see Letter V to Mrs. Margaret Roper, his daughter, when she had tried to persuade him to take the oath of Succession. Roper, *Life of Sir Thomas More*, London, 1903, pp. 153–5 (King's Classics Edition).

other in the purity of their lives, in the candour of their convictions, and in the death they suffered. Yet there is a difference between them, and it lies in the glory of their memory. Around More there plays the pathetic halo of a martyrdom that he honourably sought to avoid, but could not. Upon Fisher his sheltered life of an ecclesiastic and scholar imposed fewer of the difficulties which beset his fellow-martyr. In some sense, too, it may be said that he rushed upon his fate.

John Fisher was born in Yorkshire of a father who was, as Dean Colet's had been, a mercer. At Cambridge Fisher's attainments gained him a great reputation. In his forty-fifth year (1504) he became Chancellor of his University and Bishop of Rochester. All his energies and ambitions were concentrated on raising the prestige and worth of Cambridge among the universities of Europe. There was, indeed, in his heart not a little of that honourable jealousy which still exists between the two great English universities. For his purpose he adopted the methods which had been in vogue for some time whenever educational foundations were contemplated. He assisted in the dissolution of some minor monastic foundations.[1] Upright as he certainly was, pure and noble in his conceptions, he was still essentially the learned scholar and man of his time. Later on, it is true, he opposed the dissolution of monasteries; but, if he did, it can be shown that the objects to which the revenues so released were certain to be applied affected his views on the justice or propriety of the spoliations.

[1] Gasquet (Francis Aidan), D.D., *Henry VIII and the English Monasteries*, London, 1895, vol. I, pp. 63 *et seq.*; cp. also pp. 246, 247. See Mullinger, *Dict. Natl. Biog.* (1921–2), *sub.* "Fisher, John."

If Fisher was not, strictly speaking, a humanist, his close friendship with English and foreign scholars who were, and the letters that passed between him and them testify to his sympathies with classical studies. His eagerness in urging Erasmus to come to Cambridge and assist, by his learning and reputation, in reviving there the studies of ancient literature, show plainly his predilections. No voice spoke more forcefully in praise of Erasmus's great work (his edition of the Greek New Testament), no mind followed more comprehensively the labours of the Dutch scholar.[1]

So great was his appreciation of this splendid achievement that he set himself to learn Greek, although nearly sixty years of age. When we remember what those labours of Erasmus included—severe criticism of the religious opinions and practices of the day, and the methods that were then being employed for the maintenance of the Christian faith—we realise that Fisher could have been no narrow-minded ecclesiastic. Erasmus, too, knew his friend. His description of the Bishop as not merely a man of upright life, but one possessed of deep and varied learning and a soul above all meanness, should give Fisher high rank among the fathers of the Church.

The calm that surrounded the scholar's life could scarcely continue to be his during those turbulent years of national and religious upheaval in which his old age was cast. Though he fought as a champion against Luther and the reformers, he was far from being as bitter in his attacks as many unfortunately were in those days. He was too great a scholar for

[1] Erasmus to Thomas Halsey, Eras., *Op.* III, 102D; ep. to Prince Ferdinand, *ibid.*, 735A. See also Gasquet, *Eve of the Reformation*, London, 1913, p. 144.

that. Some have even regarded him as the real author of King Henry's book against Luther; but, whatever may be said about Henry's later life and deeds, the King was himself a remarkably able theologian. Fisher evidently thought so; for he supported his Sovereign in the controversy. Yet scholarship was not the only side of his mind that the Bishop displayed towards his Lutheran opponents. He showed a commendable disposition of fairness by rating highly the ability and piety of their writings.

It is at least questionable if some of Fisher's views on certain doctrines would be found to agree, in all particulars, with these same doctrines as they were more clearly defined after his death. The fact is that, in the early part of the sixteenth century, there existed, due to a number of causes, a degree of latitude in the interpretation of Christian theology that, later on, became impossible. Towards the end of his life religious controversy had the effect of giving sharp outlines to Fisher's ideas about religious and ecclesiastical affairs. No doubt, he was somewhat embittered by the prevalent fears of religious revolution and the political turmoil of the age. The time, truly, had come when every man had to range himself definitely on the one or the other of two sides.

For Fisher the divorce question represented merely one portion of the greater problem: "Was the nation to be permitted to lose its soul by tampering with God's laws?" The spiritual significance of this question was the only thing in it that Fisher really cared about. What share foreign politics might have in the answer to the divorce question as he saw it, or how the national needs were to be accommodated to

the reply, did not directly concern him.[1] His high integrity and deep piety were bounded by those limits alone which a life, devoted to academic interests and ecclesiastical duties, usually imposes upon itself. His "strength was as the strength of ten, because his heart was pure." His qualities were not joined to any of those other qualities which an acquaintance with the public affairs of the world would have given him.

In his naïve uprightness he assumed, as it were, the rôle of St. John the Baptist when he presented himself before the Legate's Court (June, 1529); but he forgot that the Baptist, to assume the rôle, had cut himself adrift from all organisations, both ecclesiastical and political, though a priest by birth, lest his message as a prophet should be trammelled by the ambitions of either. It is surely to be remarked in Henry's favour, however he may be represented by embittered critics as a monster of cruelty (and if he were, he lacked not for suitable companions in the nations around him), that, on this occasion, he did not combine with Anne

[1] The bull of Julius II is given in *The Life of Fisher, transcribed from Harleian MS.* 6382, by the Rev. Ronald Bayne (Oxf. Univ. Press, 1921 for 1915), pp. 42–4. In it the assumption is made that probably Arthur and Katharine were man and wife: "illudque carnali copula forsan consummavissetis dictus Arthurus prole ex hujusmodi matrimonis non suscepta desessit."

It is worth noting, as illustrating the difference in character between Fisher and the men of his time, that the proposal of a subterfuge for him was made in the correspondence of a person attached to the Vatican addressed to Du Bellay, bishop of Paris. This was, that Fisher should take the oath in order to be free to go to Rome and receive the Cardinal's hat, when the Pope would, in all likelihood, absolve him for the crime against his conscience. If Fisher heard of the suggestion, he certainly was above acting upon it. Paul Friedmann, citing Paris Bibl. Natl. MSS., fr. 19577.

Boleyn in fulfilling the corresponding rôle of Herod and Herodias. He was extremely angry, and showed it, but he refrained from active reprisals.[1]

More serious still was the part that Fisher played in the dangerous movement connected with Elizabeth Barton. Gasquet's statement that Cromwell was anxious to connect Fisher with this Nun and her treasonable revelations requires more proof than the Cardinal has given. Unfortunately, Fisher connected himself with her quite sufficiently for any court of justice. At first, Sir Thomas More believed her to be a simple, self-deceived woman, but he came later to have a less favourable opinion of her character. To the predictions of this "silly Nun," as he called her, he, sensing the use that revolutionary elements in the nation and foreign plotters might make of them, wisely and patriotically refused to listen. Fisher had not the same prudence, and became implicated in the affair.[2] Attempts have been made to prove his innocence of

[1] The King replied to Fisher by a counter-address to the Legates (*State Papers*, vol. 54). See Bishop Gardiner's refutation of Fisher's attempt to institute a comparison between King Henry and Herod.—Janelle (Prof. Pierre), *Obedience in Church and State*, Camb. Univ. Press, 1930, pp. XIX and 6, 7.

It seems a pity that critics, both in those days and in ours, have never sufficiently considered that Henry's morals such as they were, compared "not unfavourably with those of other sovereigns. His standard was neither higher nor lower than that of Charles V . . . it was not lower than those of James II, of William III, or of the first two Georges; it was infinitely higher than the standard of Francis I, of Charles II, or even of Henry of Navarre and Louis XIV."—Pollard, *Henry VIII*, p. 186.

[2] Gasquet, *Henry VIII and the English Monasteries*, vol. I, pp. 139 *et seq.*—Note the statement made by the author of the *Harleian MS.* 6382, *Life of Fisher*, pp. 83, 84.

For More, see the second letter in Appendix to Roper's *Life of More*, Chiswick, 1817.

treason. That, however, is impossible. Two despatches of Chapuys make it abundantly clear that, in September and October, 1533, Fisher was guilty of complicity in treason. He told Chapuys that if Charles V invaded England he would be doing "a work as agreeable to God as going against the Turk," and suggested that the Emperor should make use of Reginald Pole, "to whom, according to many, the Kingdom would belong." Again, Chapuys reports, "the holy Bp. of Rochester would like you to take active measures immediately, as I wrote in my last; which advice he has sent to me again lately to repeat."[1] That he had anything to do with the plot soon after set on foot by the friends of the Princess Mary [2] is not provable, but his inclination—the inclination of a man whose training and disposition rendered him unable to weigh the full consequences of his public actions—to mix himself up with treasonable projects gives an air of probability to the suggestion that he had. Unfortunately, Fisher's want of prudence and calm made the position of his friend More less easy and reflected suspicion upon that person. The plottings had no chance of success, but they were real enough and dangerous enough to arouse the anxieties of Henry and his agents. This probably explains why the royal officers were so urgent with Fisher and More to take the oath which acknowledged the legitimacy of Anne's offspring,[3] and—what ran parallel to

[1] See *Lett. and Pap., Henry VIII*, vol. IV, 6199; VI, 1164, 1249. Chapuys' despatches are dated 27th September and 10th October. Consult Pollard, *Henry VIII*, p. 332, n. 2.

[2] Friedmann (Paul), *Anne Boleyn*, London, 1884, vol. III, ch. X, pp. 29 ff.

[3] The circulation of such vile calumnies and slander, as are reported in the *Harleian MS.* 6382 *Life of Fisher*, pp. 92–4, if known to Henry, as is quite probable, would have rendered him

this—the King's supremacy over the Church of England.

Even still there was a hope that neither of these noble-hearted men would be put to death for a conscientious scruple. Cranmer was solicitous in his advice that the oath, in the limited form in which they were willing to take it, should be deemed sufficient. So the matter might have fallen out if a fatal blunder had not been committed. This was the elevation to the Cardinalate of Fisher by Pope Paul III on the 21st May as Cardinal Priest of St. Vitalis. The Pope afterwards declared that he was unaware that the relations between King Henry and Fisher had been so strained. That may, indeed, be a fact, though its possibility is somewhat difficult to comprehend.[1] If the Pope was ignorant of Fisher's position in the King's regard, it is strange that the elevation to the Cardinalate occurred at the moment when a serious conspiracy was on foot to overthrow Henry and, with the Boleyn marriage, all projects of reform. When the facts are carefully

more than ever determined that the oath should be taken by the leading men of the realm and especially by such as Fisher, who was looked up to by the originators of the slanders.

The one story in this MS. that bears a strong likelihood of truth is that Anne was reported to Henry as having leanings towards reform (or "heresy," as it is of course denominated in this MS.). The truth in this tale would explain the source of the filth with which her name is loaded. Observe what Pollard, *Henry VIII*, pp. 186, 187, says: "The gross immorality so freely imputed to Henry seems to have as little foundation as the theory that his sole object in seeking the divorce from Katharine and separation from Rome was the gratification of his passion for Anne Boleyn. If that had been the case, there would be no adequate explanation of the persistence with which he pursued the divorce."

[1] Friedmann (Paul), *Anne Boleyn*, vol. II, pp. 70 *et seq.* Casale's letter is in *State Papers*, VII, 425.

weighed, the letter of Casale of 29th May will be found to agree with them, and it will also make it fairly possible to consider Paul III as having been not so very ignorant of the true relations between Fisher and King Henry as he professed. Henry's Court was surrounded by envoys and ambassadors, hostile, censorious, and garrulous. These used to furnish their masters with almost daily despatches, full of the smallest details of gossip and intrigue.

Lack of information in any European Court at the time is not easy to imagine. The private statement of Lord Cromwell, too, is not without importance, that, in conferring a hat on Fisher, the Pope had signed his death-warrant.[1] This appraisement of the situation seems to be correct, if we regard the circumstances. The probable explanation, from the Papal point of view, is that the advisers of the Pope did not rightly estimate the attitude of the people of England and the strength of Henry's position among them.

It is not the only time that the psychological temperament of the English has caused blunders, and serious ones at that, in foreign statesmen's minds. Even Fisher himself did not wish for the hat. We have his own word for it, and that suffices; but the blunder for him was a fatal one. The eminence of his character and influence, together with his opposition to the divorce—and, of course, to the royal supremacy—made him a serious obstacle to Henry's plans. His elevation to the Cardinalate ranged him as pre-eminent

[1] Chapuys to Charles V, 30th June, 1535: "Cremuel me dict que le pape estoit cause de sa mort et que le dict pape avoit faict très mal et très follement de lavoir faict cardinal actendu que cestoit le pire enemy que le Roy son maistre eust."—Vienna Archives, P.C. 229½, I, fol. 103, quoted in Friedmann, II, p. 77.

among the political enemies of the Government, and that was something that called for quick and decided action. The oath now had to be presented to both Fisher and More in its original form and no other.[1] No kind of limitation or qualification could be, or would be, admitted. For them the alternative now was plain—the oath or the block. They had not faltered before; they did not falter now. They chose the latter. Fisher died on the 22nd June, More on 6th July.[2]

The papal brief to Francis I, issued on 26th July, shows clearly enough that serious questions of political import had been and were mixed up with the purely spiritual matters involved in Henry's marriage and assertion of his supremacy. Sir Thomas More, and indeed Fisher too, were Englishmen of strong national sentiments, and would have quite definitely rebutted Pope Paul's claim to temporal suzerainty over England, if they had heard it asserted; the mere suggestion that their King could be ever described as guilty of *lèse-majesté* towards the Popedom would have called forth from them an indignant protest. Indeed, it is more than probable that it was this very claim, put forth in Pope Paul's brief, which made Bishop Stephen

[1] For a discussion as to this double-sided oath, see Bridgett (Rev. T. E.), *Life of Blessed John Fisher*, London, 1890, pp. 267–70. Professor J. P. Whitney, *The Reformation*, London, 1907, pp. 320–42, gives an admirable summary of all the forces which led up to the oath, and made it a necessity of the times.

[2] A contemporary narrative of the trials and deaths of More and Fisher, ascribed by some to Erasmus, is given, under the name of an epistle of COVRINUS (GVLIELMUS) NUCERINVS PHILIPPO MONTANO, in Eras., *Op.* III, 1763C–1771B. That it is a genuine writing of Erasmus may safely be doubted.

Gardiner, in his reply to Paul III (called *Si Sedes illa*), insist so strongly that there was no *majesty* in a Bishop of Rome to be offended; that the only *majesty* was that of the King of England; and that for *lèse-majesté* against that King Fisher had been rightly executed as a traitor.[1]

We count More and Fisher among the martyrs for conscience' sake, and we do so rightly. Looking at their executions, not from the legal point of view (and we admit that we believe the legal decision, in Fisher's case at any rate, to have been justified), but from the moral, we feel convinced that, on those days of June and July, England lost two of her noblest sons. The blame of their deaths must not be altogether placed on their avowed opponents and recognised executioners. One who is swayed by religious or political bias will, no doubt, affirm that it should. Just because More and Fisher were eminent, by character chiefly, they were pawns in the games of Charles and Francis, of Pope Paul III and the English anti-Boleyn and anti-reform revolutionaries. The treachery of Chapuys, plotting against the monarch to whose Court he was an accredited ambassador, is not more disgraceful than the propositions and intrigues of the Vatican circles. And accordingly, the cry of horror which we are told arose in the Courts of Europe was, in actual fact, an exclamation of dismay at the discovery of the fact that Henry (and England with him) was not afraid to strike at the two heroes, whose integrity and single-mindedness had been exploited by baser and more selfish men.

[1] Janelle, *op. cit.*, *Tract on Fisher's Execution*, pp. 22–65, Compare also, the *Oration of True Obedience*, pp. 68–171. written about the same time as the *Si sedes illa*.

A POSTSCRIPT ON CERTAIN PHASES OF MORE'S CHARACTER

I. His Attitude towards Tyndale's New Testament

A few months before the suspension of the Reuchlinian affair, namely, in March, 1516, Erasmus had produced his edition of the Greek New Testament, with a Latin version. It marked a further advance along the road marked out by the independence of the humanists. The very men who had supported the cause of Reuchlin—Pirckheimer, Wimpheling, Ulrich von Hutten, Mutian, in Germany; Budé and Lefèvre, in France; Fisher, More, Linacre, William Latimer, in England—and hosts of new recruits, rallied to uphold Erasmus when it became evident that he too would be attacked. For, in truth, Erasmus had initiated what was then regarded as a revolution: he had presumed, as Martin van Dorp of Louvain declared, to revise, by the use of Greek texts, the Latin Vulgate which the Church had authorised. No doubt, Erasmus was able to reply [1] (and Thomas More sent an

[1] For the ep. of Erasmus to Dorp, see *ΜΩΡΙΑΣ ΕΓΚΩΜΙΟΝ, Stult. Laus, Des. Erasmi Rot. Declamatio,* Basileae MDCLXXVI. The epistle is given at pp. 237–70, and is dated Antuerpiae, Anno MDXV.

For Thomas More's ep. to Dorp, in defence of Erasmus, see Eras., *Op.* III, 1892B–1916E, also *Thomae Mori, Angliae ornamenti eximii, Lucubrationes,* Basil., 1563, pp. 365 *et seq.* On p. 317 of the latter work, More points out that the objections now made to Erasmus' labours are the same as were, anciently, made to those of St. Jerome, who refuted them, viz. that revisions were not to be carried out by means of the Greek MSS. To the query Dorp had addressed to Erasmus: Responde jam Erasme, utram probet editionem Ecclesia? Graecamne, qua non utitur? an latinam, quam solam citat, quoties ex sacra scriptura aliquid definiendum est . . .,

independent answer to the same effect), that there was no such authorisation of the Vulgate, and that there was no necessity to seek authority from the Church in order to carry out a revision or a version of the Holy Scriptures. But, on the other hand, Erasmus could not be unaware that his work was in fact a revolutionary enterprise of the highest order, judged by the standards of his own and preceding ages. He called the New Testament "Novum Instrumentum"; he inserted "congregatio" in several places where "ecclesia" had stood; he deliberately substituted "seniores" for "presbyteri"; with equal deliberation he preferred "resipiscere" or "ad mentem redire" to "poenitentiam agere," and "Sermo" to "Verbum," as a translation for "Logos." In the *Annotationes* which followed the text, he had made several comments on the religious beliefs and practices of his times, which, a few generations later (1601) were placed on Quiroga's *Index Expurgatorius*, along with some of the so-called "digressions" of Guillaume Budé, the commentaries of Lefèvre d'Étaples, and even passages from the epistle More had written

More (on p. 320) replies. ". . . Videris ergo mihi sic colligere: Augustinus nec Evangelio duxit esse credendum, nisi Ecclesiae compelleret autoritas. At Ecclesia comprobavit, in hac translatione verum esse Evangelium. Consequitur ergo; si quid sit graecis codicibus diversum, ut verum in illis Evangelium esse non possit. Haec est (uti mihi videtur) argumentationis tuae summa; quae mihi videtur ejusmodi, quam non sit difficile solvere. Nam primum, ecclesia sic in latinis codicibus contineri credit Evangelium, ut fateatur tamen, a graeco translatum. Credit ergo translationi; sed magis tamen archetypo. Credit Evangelium in graecis esse verum; in latinis verum esse credit eatenus, quatenus fidit interpreti; in quo (ut opinor) nunquam tantam habet fiduciam, quin eum labi cognoscat humana fragilitate potuisse."

(October, 1515) to Martin van Dorp in defence of Erasmus.[1]

It is not a little remarkable, in a man otherwise so consistent in life and character as Thomas More, that the very attitude of the friars which he condemned in 1515 and 1516 should have been the same as he himself assumed in 1535 towards Tyndale and that person's New Testament. He employed against Tyndale similarly inaccurate accusations, couched in similarly discourteous language, as the friars had used towards Erasmus.

Practically, so far as a version of the New Testament was concerned, the only difference between Tyndale and Erasmus was that the Englishman had put in English (his mother-tongue) for his compatriots what Erasmus had put in Latin (to him, as it were, his mother-tongue) for the benefit of the educated, to whom Latin was a vernacular.

It may be said—it has, as a matter of fact, been often said—that Tyndale had an heretical intention. Epithets are easily applied, and can usually be returned. A pedantically exact version, such as Tyndale's was, could only have been regarded as heretical by those who were afraid of the general public coming to a correct comprehension of the literal meaning of terms to which the vested interests of an ecclesiastical party required a specialised signification to be imparted.

But, to return to Erasmus, what essential difference was there between the intention of the Dutch scholar, when he proposed alterations in the existing Latin version, and that of Tyndale, when he proposed similar alterations in the English? Both sought to give the world a *true* version, and nothing has yet been shown

[1] Jourdan, *op. cit.*, p. 166.

to prove that Tyndale's was a less true one than Erasmus's.

The fact was that, if More had not altered, the world in which he lived had. The courses of action suggested, and doctrinal restatements implied, though in theoretical form, during 1515 and 1516, had been brought into execution. Tyndale, Frith, and Cranmer were, in fact, merely trudging a further distance along the same road as Reuchlin, Lefèvre, More and Fisher had been treading. But, by this time, the two last named had become disposed, in view of the successes of Luther and of the threatened too rapid advance of reformed doctrines in England, to " mark time."

II. Was More a Persecutor?

It has been remarked that, during the period in which Cardinal Wolsey held the office of Lord Chancellor, no one was burnt for what was termed " heresy," and that when Sir Thomas More assumed office, the burnings began again. From this circumstance, the very natural deduction has been made that More was a persecutor, while Wolsey was not. Such a deduction presents us with a curious contrast in characters. Wolsey was not a man of high moral perceptions. We may, therefore, with probable accuracy, dismiss the thought that the Cardinal was actuated by a mercifulness which proceeded from the most exalted motives and Christ-like gentleness. On the other hand, More's reputation for rectitude and justice is above suspicion. In addition there is creditable testimony to show that, among his virtues, was this, that his sense of justice was ruled by compassion. Yet, the facts are incontestable : under Wolsey's administration no " heretic " was burnt ; under More's, the burnings recommenced.

The whole question has been carefully examined by

Professor A. F. Pollard, in his *Wolsey* (London, 1929), pp. 208–15. We feel it only right to say, at this point, that here, as in some other particulars, we cannot avoid being convinced that Dr. Pollard is less just to Wolsey than we would have expected from a scholar of his insight and erudition. For he applies, without (in our opinion) sufficient evidence, to the Cardinal the epithet *politique*, and then supplies us with a definition of the term from the *Mémoires* of Tavannes: "The name *politique* was invented for those who put the quiet of the realm, or their own, above the salvation of their soul and religion, who would rather that the kingdom should dwell in peace without God than in a state of war on His behalf." Certainly Dr. Pollard mitigates the harshness of the charge, later on, by recording the fact that Wolsey, through being the highest ecclesiastic in the land, cardinal and legate *a latere*, "could have burnt as many heretics as he wished, and it is to his credit that he refrained."

When More became Chancellor, being a layman, he occupied no standing in the courts-christian. His duties, in regard to heresy, were limited by the statute 2 Henry V (Stat. I), c.7. He was required to assist the Church by arresting and presenting heretics for trial and carrying out the judgements of the spiritual courts. The only fully authenticated instance of More's performing this duty was when he issued (March, 1529) the authority for the arrest of John Frith. But before he became Chancellor he had shown himself zealous enough in the execution of similar duties. Strictly, More was following, on these occasions, what was at that time accepted as law in England. But Wolsey's handling of the multiple courts of law, then in a chaotic condition, tended to the absorption of all legal authority into the single jurisdiction of a Chan-

cellor who was also Legate *a latere*. No doubt, what he did constituted a series of usurpations, yet a unified system, with clearly defined spheres of action, was a great need of the times. The effect of Wolsey's methods, however, was that he set an example which King Henry was not slow in following. Wolsey may therefore he charged with originating that monopoly of jurisdiction, ecclesiastical and secular, which became later the monopoly of the Crown. He, in truth, " revealed to Henry VIII a vision of sovereign power."[1]

The King was by no means the only one who had become familiar with such a vision. The people and the nobles of England were already convinced of the justice of the royal monopoly when Henry (May, 1532) insisted that the bishops were not to have the power to lay hands on persons accused of heresy, because it was not their duty to meddle with bodies who were only doctors of the soul. Against this claim to complete power, More and the bishops stood out and thereby incurred the King's anger. Three days later, More resigned. Yet, it is from this claim, embodied in the statute of 1534, that the modern state in England derives its being, for it signalised the approach of a new polity.[2]

Incidentally, his opposition to it marks Sir Thomas More's place in history. Even as he had felt the urge of the intellectual movement of the age and had been one of the company of the humanists for portion of their road, but stopped abruptly at the logical con-

[1] Pollard, *Wolsey*, pp. 220 and 362.

[2] Lord Acton, *Lectures on Modern History*, London, 1906, p. 142 : " The sovereignty of the modern State, uncontrolled by the opinions of men, commanded the minds both of Cromwell and Gardiner, rivals though they were. . . . It is the advent of a new polity."

tinuation of the journey, so too he had assisted in the development of the national state and the royal power, but halted when both asserted the rights natural to that development. "The cause in which he fell was not the revenues, but the liberties of the Church; his resignation was a protest not against the acts forbidding the payment of annates and appeals to the Pope, but against the restraint by the secular arm of spiritual inquisition."[1]

From these facts it will be observed that specific instances of More's persecuting zeal are rendered superfluous. His responsibility for the persecutions and burnings during his administration is to be measured not only by the statement of Chapuys (13th May, 1532),[2] but also by his resignation when the authorisation of them was withdrawn.

The two phases of More's character which form the subject of this Postscript agree exactly with the political and religious sides of that character dealt with in the Essay above and with the legal side illustrated further by his reference to Wolsey in his maiden speech

[1] Pollard, *op. cit.*, p. 355.

[2] Friedmann (Paul), *Anne Boleyn*, London, 1884, vol. I, p. 158, E. Chapuys to Charles V, 13th May, 1532, Vienna Archives, P.C. 227, III, f. 32: "The chancellor and the bishops oppose this, and consequently the King is very angry especially against the said chancellor and the bishop of Winchester (Gardiner) and is determined the proposal shall become law." See also, Strype, *Ecclesiastical Memorials*, London, 1721, tome I, pt. I, pp. 129–131.

The matter in question was the proposal that the provincial ordinances and canons should be revised by a royal commission. To this Convocation somewhat reluctantly agreed. Convocation had been pressed to declare that the clergy had no right to make ordinances in provincial councils without the royal assent. To this Gardiner had entered a strong protest.

as Lord Chancellor. His fidelity and constancy, to some ideals that were being tested, with growing intensity, before the tribunals of critical enquiry and rational negations, and to other ideals which were clearly obsolete and out of date, mark him as not only a martyr to his country's political needs but equally a martyr to the medievalism that was to pass away.

As a man who had imbibed somewhat of humanistic tastes, he had moved along the intellectual road a little way, but, when he found that that road was set towards freedom of thought, he sought his bishop's permission to read " heretical " books, thus displaying his inability to admit that the human intellect had a right to be free. As a politician who felt the nascent enthusiasm for nationalism all around him, he stood loyal to his country, and to his King as the head of the nation, but when he came face to face with a consolidation of authority which was meant to terminate the dual dominions of *regnum* and *sacerdotium*, he had reached the limit appointed by his conscience. As a lawyer, he knew the confused and deplorable condition in which the legal systems or jurisdictions then were, and no doubt sighed for the simplicity of a Utopian State, but he could be no party to such a legal unification as Wolsey had exercised and which King Henry with the compliance of the parliament was soon to monopolise.

He was consistent, in a world that demands (and needs, as a vital necessity) continual progress ; but his consistency, though rendered noble by self-sacrifice, was unreasonable in that, having realised and acknowledged the requirements of certain changes, he thought that the world should stay its career when those changes had been effected.

VIII

Paracelsus

You are to understand, that we who make
Sport for the gods, are hunted to the end.
. . . we are chased to life's extremest verge.
BROWNING.

I

HIS real name was Philippus Aureolus Theophrastus Bombast von Hohenheim. Browning, in his poem Paracelsus, has given us not so much a biographical sketch of his career as a somewhat accurate interpretation of his motives. He was born at Einsiedeln, in Switzerland, in 1493. His father, William Bombast, was a physician of note, and his mother had been matron of the pilgrim-hospital near by.[1] He was, therefore, born, as it were, into the medical profession, and received, as a natural course, from his father, his first lessons in alchemy, surgery, and medicine. The turning-point, however, in the boy's career occurred neither at home in Einsiedeln, nor yet at the high school, or college, at Basel—where, in 1510,[2] according to the fashion of his time, he assumed the name Paracelsus as a sort of translation of the patronymic Von Hohenheim—but at Würzburg. Here, in his young, impressionable years, he came under the influence of

[1] *Life of Paracelsus, Theophrastus von Hohenheim* (1493–1541), by Anna M. Stoddart, London, 1915, p. 19.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 38.

the learned Abbot Trithemius,[1] himself an extraordinary product of that age—littérateur, philosopher, alchemist, adept in magic and astrologer, and at the same time a profound student and lover of Holy Scripture. To us such an intellectual constitution as was that of Trithemius seems a curious one, but Professor H. Wildon Carr has made it evident that Trithemius was by no means a singular phenomenon for the age in which he lived : [2]

" We have a natural bias or bent which makes us in the search for truth depend primarily, and rely absolutely, on the experimental method. . . . For the medieval mind (on the contrary) the unseen world was full of occult forces, it was peopled with malignant and beneficent spirit agents, the scientific workers were the alchemists and astrologers, a suspect and uncanny folk, and successful experiment depended on the terms the experimenter was on with those spirit agents and forces. The mind naturally directed its attention rather to the experimenter than to the experiment ; it was his control of natural occult influences which was supposed to determine the event."

The effects of the influence exerted on the mind of Paracelsus by this master are observable to the end of his life. It was, for example, almost certainly at Würzburg that he became convinced that all substances, the inanimate as well as the animate, were the abode of spiritual influences and powers. Here, too, he formed an overmastering determination to devote himself to the discovery of those forces and their employment in the art of healing. Browning,

[1] His real name was Johannes Heidenberg, but he assumed the name of Trithemius from Treitenheim, near Trier. He was abbot of St. Jacob at Würzburg. See Hartmann (Franz), M.D., *Life of Philip Theophrastus Bombast, known as Paracelsus, and the Substance of his Teaching*, 2nd edit., London, 1896.

[2] *Medieval Contributions to Modern Civilisation*, ed. by Dr. F. J. C. Hearnshaw, p. 92 (Lecture III—Philosophy).

accordingly, merely states the truth when he represents Paracelsus as possessed of a great and beneficent ambition. When he betook himself to the mines of Sigismund Füger at Schwatz in the Tyrol, he was a young fellow of about eighteen years whose mind was already fixed upon a high calling to labour and self-denial. The silver mines and the adjacent laboratory —in which busy alchemists were carrying out experiments for the transmutation of metals—attracted him. He himself made researches into the nature of the metals and minerals found there, but his interest in them, and in the work at Schwatz generally, was confined to the possibility of his discovering, by analyses and combinations, some of the curative properties which he believed were resident in all substances.

From Schwatz he went forth to begin those wanderings which were destined to become a constant feature in his life-history. In later days, he explained what he always regarded as the wise necessity of this vagabondage :

"I testify that this is true concerning Nature : whoever wishes to know her must wend his way through her books upon his feet. Writing is understood by its letters, Nature by country after country, for every land is a book. Such is the *Codex Naturae*, and so must a man turn her pages."

For more than eight years, he travelled through Germany, Italy, France, the Netherlands, Denmark, Sweden, and Russia, not aimlessly, but taking service as a military surgeon or visiting mines and laboratories. Wherever he went he examined the plant and mineral products of the different countries and everywhere sought for new ideas and information relative to the object he had at heart. It has been thought that, in this manner and for this purpose, he visited England also, attracted by her lead mines in Cumberland and

her tin mines in Cornwall.[1] His longest sojourn was among the Tartars, where from being a captive he became an honoured member of the Khan's household. In 1521, we find him at Constantinople, whither, according to Van Helmont, he had accompanied the Khan's son.[2] Eastern Europe appears to have afforded Paracelsus special opportunities for acquiring additional knowledge of occult matters—the sevenfold principles of man, the qualities of the astral body, the earth-bound elementaries, and so forth. It is, however, quite possible that Trithemius had already initiated him in this curious lore. More important, in a practical sense, was the acquaintance he made, in the East, with opium, from which he extracted his most highly prized drug, *labdanum*, as he called it.

His life divides itself into distinct and recognisable parts : the first, as that in which he may be accounted a wandering student, gathering material facts, the second, as that in which he applied the knowledge he had gained, whilst still prosecuting his investigations, though on a higher and more enlightened plane. His arrival in Constantinople in 1521 ended the earlier part ; his departure therefrom in 1522 began the other. In the latter year, he came to Italy, and obtained a position as surgeon in the Imperial army. Either before this appointment, or immediately after, he took out his degree of Doctor of Medicine in the University of Salerno. And then began another series of travels, not always voluntary, but sometimes necessitated by the hostility or malice of his fellow-practitioners. One cause of offence was that he seemed able to effect marvellous cures ; another, that he usually discarded the black robe of his profession,

[1] Stoddart, p. 68.

[2] Hartmann, citing Van Helmont, *Tartari Historia.*

preferring rough attire; another still, that he consorted with all sorts of persons, at the inns or on the highways—with shepherds, Jews, gipsies, and even with executioners, teamsters, and common beggars. In all these particulars of conduct he broke away from the conventional methods and customs of the physicians of that era. At any period of time unconventionalism can be cultivated only at the price of a more or less bitter resentment. But the period in which Paracelsus' lot was cast was one in which convention dominated every calling. His defiance of it aroused such an amount of ire and antagonism against him as has damaged his reputation to the present day. The medical men of his time neither understood, nor wished to understand, that the soul of Paracelsus was set on collecting knowledge wheresoever and howsoever it might be had, and then applying it to the service of ailing humanity.[1] The direct result of their hostility was that he could not, or would not, stay long anywhere. Sometimes, indeed, as in Prussia, Lithuania, and Poland, he had to flee from his enemies, fearing for his life. Not unusually, too, having effected a cure, he was treated with base ingratitude.

Towards the end of 1526, he received his first important post. The magistrates of Basel appointed him town physician—an office which included a lectureship at the University. His difficulties now became more numerous and more complicated. He had been sponsored by Œcolampadius, the reformer, and appointed by a body which held a majority of Protestants; but the academic authorities, which included the medical

[1] *Theophrasti Paracelsi Opera Omnia*, I, 27, 28 (*De Ente Dei*, fifth part of the *volumen Paramirum*), wherein he sets forth his doctrine of disease, explaining that God is at once the author of disease and the healer of it.

faculty, were mostly of the opposite party. Hardly had he entered on his new work when his lectures were prohibited by these authorities, partly because of the novelty of his medical doctrines, and partly because he insisted on delivering his lectures in the German vernacular, instead of in the professional Latin.[1] Perhaps the fact that the Swiss and Lutheran reformers were just then emphasising the employment of the German language in public worship, to the exclusion of Latin, may have increased, if it did not awaken, their rancour against him. The same authorities tried to hinder him from practising his profession, on the pretext that he required the sanction of the whole medical body in Basel before he could do so. In all points, by appealing to the town council, Paracelsus defeated their efforts. But it was not in his nature to abide by a defensive attitude towards his opponents. When, at the Feast of St. John, in the year 1527, the students lit the bonfire in front of the University, Paracelsus came and delivered a challenge to the old school of medical erudition by casting into the fire Avicenna's Canon of Medicine. That he intended this to be a symbolic action, the medical counterpart of Luther's burning of the Papal Bull and Statutes, he has himself stated in his *Paragranum*.

His interest in the students was deep and of great benefit to them. He taught them zealously; he brought them with him when he visited his patients; he explained to them his diagnoses and methods of treatment; he led them into the surrounding country to study the herbs from which he compounded his

[1] "The glory of being the first man who taught in the German language in a German University belongs to that true German, Theophrastus von Hohenheim, to all time."—Dr. Julius Hartmann, quoted by Miss Stoddart.

remedies; he discoursed with them of chemistry and the experiments they were to conduct; and he counselled them to become the makers and compounders of their own medicines.

At this time, his fame stood at its highest point. He was greatly esteemed by learned men such as Froben and Erasmus.[1] It was not surprising, therefore, that he received many a token of honour, among the rest an invitation to pay a visit to Zürich. This he accepted, and enjoyed himself very happily with the medical students of that city. In a letter which he wrote, after he had returned to Basel, he alluded to these students as *combibones optimi*. From such a simple fact as this has been originated the oft-repeated charge of drunkenness. His fame, indeed, only seemed to add fury to the malevolence of his foes. One Sunday morning, there was discovered affixed to the doors of the Cathedral and those of the churches of St. Martin and St. Peter, a lampoon on his lectures, entitled: "The Shade of Galen against Theophrastus, or rather Cacophrastus." It purported to be a letter written by Galen in Hell to Paracelsus. Paracelsus felt very much hurt, and wrote to the town council denouncing the outrage.

But the time was drawing near when his enemies would obtain the opportunity which they desired of driving him out of Basel. By a lack of patience and

[1] See his ep. to Erasmus, and that of Erasmus to him—*Theoph. Par. Op. Omn.*, I, 485. Yet it is not a little strange that Erasmus should have alluded to him, without naming him: Tandem aliunde venit Medicus, qui dolorem (Frobenii) hactenus sedaret, ut et tolerabilis esset, et somni cibique sumendi permitteret facultatem.—*Op.* III, 1055A. It is still more strange, if, in the letter he wrote about the same date to John à Lasco, he meant Paracelsus under the expression "per medicum audacem magis quam eruditum."—*Ibid.*, 1057C.

self-restraint, he himself helped to provide them with the opportunity. A wealthy canon of the Cathedral, named Liechtenfels, fell seriously ill, and when his doctors could do nothing more for him, he issued a public offer of a very large fee to any medical man who could cure him or give him relief. He did not wish to employ Paracelsus, because of that person's friendship with the reformers, but, at length, he sent for him. In a few days, Paracelsus effected his cure. Thereupon, to the disappointment and anger of the successful physician the canon refused to pay what he himself had publicly promised, and sought to put him off with an unusually small fee. Paracelsus considered this an unfair proceeding and somewhat of an insult. He was accustomed to attend the poor free of charge, but he held that a wealthy man might at least be expected to pay what he had promised. He appealed to the law. The judges, however, favoured Liechtenfels, and decided that the small fee was sufficient. So incensed was Paracelsus by this curious piece of justice, following upon Liechtenfels' unseemly behaviour, that he wrote a "broad-sheet," in which he censured the judges for their verdict, and expressed, with Teutonic vigour, his opinion of their notion of justice. It was an injudicious proceeding on his part. Such a commotion was stirred up by it, that his friends advised him to flee by night (early in 1528). The opportunity was too good for his enemies to miss, and it was used by them to the full for the purpose of ruining him and of blackening his reputation.

Paracelsus refers to his life and work at Basel in the Preface to his *Paragranum*.[1] Towards the end of the

[1] *Theophrasti Paracelsi Op. Omn.*, I, 183 *sub fine*: "Vae ergo miserae Galeni animae. Qui si in Medicina immortalis fuisset, Manes eius in abysso inferni (unde ad me literas

Preface he discloses how hurt he had been by the publication of the lampoon already mentioned:

"Wretched soul of Galen! If he had been immortal in Medicine, his shades would not have been buried in the infernal regions, whence they addressed to me a letter dated as 'from Hell.' Truly never would I have thought that so mighty a prince of physicians would have been flung into the devil's lair. It is thither certainly that his disciples are following him. But is he indeed the prince and monarch of Medicine? or does Medicine rear itself upon such foundations?"

Once more his wandering life began and lasted, with scarcely an important interval, till his death. Paracelsus was always anxious to add to his store of knowledge; his enquiring mind, therefore, had always dictated the routes he travelled. So too now. He went to Ensisheim in Alsace, in order to examine a meteoric stone there which the inhabitants regarded with superstitious awe. From thence, he proceeded to Colmar, on a prolonged visit to Dr. Lorenz Fries, a man of culture and learning, who, like many similar scholars of that day, hoped for a reformation of the Church, but one conducted on moderate lines. Here, he received, from men like Dr. Fries, that sympathy and appreciation which the general body of his contemporaries denied him. John Oporinus had accompanied him in his flight from Basel, as a disciple and secretary. He now parted from Paracelsus, with all the appearance of grateful friendship, taking with him, as a farewell gift, a portion of that small store of laudanum which Paracelsus always carried in the

amandarunt, quarum datum erat, in inferno) non essent sepulti. Nunquam, nunquam putassem equidem, tantum Medicorum principem in podicem diaboli involare debuisse. Huc ipsum eius quoque discipuli insequuntur. Hic vero Medicinae princeps ac monarcha sit? aut super hoc Medicina exstructa stet?"

handle of his sword. But Oporinus soon after attacked his quondam master and friend with slander and vilification.[1] From him came that tale of continual intoxication, which is still repeated as an accusation against Paracelsus, but for which the false disciple made a repentant confession on his death-bed.

We find Paracelsus a little later at Esslingen, dwelling in a house that belonged to his family, prosecuting researches into alchemy, astrology, and, as reports added, necromancy. As late as 1882, there still lingered at Esslingen a tradition of the " old magician " who used to practise dark and mysterious rites by night.

But he stayed long nowhere. From Esslingen he made his way to Zürich, meeting in this place some of his reforming friends, amongst the rest Huldreich Zwingli ; thence to St. Gallen, and so on to Nuremberg (November, 1529). In the latter city, he learned that the Medical Faculty of Leipzig had placed a ban upon the further printing of his books. Although rather severe, this prohibition was issued in reprisal for his having called the ordinary practitioners of the day " impostors." Nevertheless, he stayed long enough at Nuremberg to have that handsome portrait of himself painted which, up to a recent date, might have been seen at Schleissheim, near Munich. His next journey was to Beratzhausen, near Ratisbon, where,

[1] Mr. Arthur Edward Waite, in the Introduction (p. XIII) to his fine two-volume English version of *The Hermetical and Alchemical Writings of Aureolus Philippus Theophrastus Bombast of Hohenheim, called Paracelsus the Great* (London, 1894), admits that the accusation of drunkenness was made against Paracelsus by his enemies. On the evidence of Oporinus, Mr. Waite declares himself inclined to believe it to be true. One can only assume that Mr. Waite has not heard of Oporinus' confession to Toxites that he had accused Paracelsus falsely. See Miss Stoddart, p. 157.

during a stay of some months, he continued to work at the volumes of which he had made some beginnings at Colmar. It was at Beratzhausen that he wrote the first portion of the *Paramirum*, and probably also of the *Paragranum* books which not only reveal an insight into chemistry and medical science that was very remarkable for those days, but also contain reflections on contemporary life that increase our knowledge of the world in which he moved.[1] Whilst he was thus occupied in the composition of his treatises, he continued to perform the duties of his profession, sometimes, indeed, without fee or thanks.

Again he resumed his travels. He took his way through Switzerland, moving about chiefly among the promoters of religious reform.[2] Indeed, at this portion

[1] *Theoph. Paracelsi Op. Omn.*, vol. I.

[2] Miss Stoddart (pp. 264–7) remarks that, when Paracelsus came back to Switzerland from his earlier travels, he found a readier acceptance of his opinions amongst the reformers. At this juncture he leaned towards protestantism. But, after some years of evangelistic work, during which he wrote two treatises on the Lord's Supper (one in Latin, the other in the vernacular), he drew gradually away from both parties. His attitude to both, and to the Christian faith itself, is set forth in a later discourse: "Whether they be papists, lutherans, baptists, zwinglians, they are all of them ready to glory in themselves as alone possessing the Holy Spirit and alone justified in their construction of the Gospel: and each cries, *I* am right, right is with *me*, I speak the word of God. . . . In Christ only is salvation, and as we believe in Him, so through Him we are saved. No worship of the saints is needed for that, no idol of our imagination. Faith in God and in His only-begotten Son Jesus Christ is enough for us. . . . What saves us is the mercy of God who forgives us our sins.'

Miss Stoddart quite correctly draws attention to the fact that Paracelsus never formally disconnected himself from the Roman Catholic Church and that he was buried as a member of that communion.

of his career, he undertook an active part in their projects. Ever since his days at Würzburg, when that half-saint, half-wizard, the Abbot Trithemius, had taught him, amongst many good and useful things, to study the Bible, he had been a diligent and independently minded student of Holy Scriptures. He now employed those studies in evangelistic work in his native land. A few years were thus spent; and then again he became the itinerant scholar and physician, wending his road through Carinthia, Hungary, and other places. By 1537, he had reached Kromau, where he cured the Marshal of Bohemia, Johann von der Leipnik. His reputation preceded him to Vienna, where, when he had arrived, a banquet was given in his honour (September, 1537). After he had done some further journeying he accepted the post of metallurgist under the Fuggers of Lavanthal. Here again he stayed only a short time. His wandering, indeed, only ceased when he turned his steps towards Salzburg, in 1541. Here, if anywhere, he might well have gained the restful haven for which he had long sought, where, under the protection of a powerful and sympathetic prince, he might have pursued his studies without interference from either the envious or malicious. To Salzburg he had come by the invitation of the Prince-Archbishop, Ernst, Duke of Bavaria and Count Palatine. He did not come, as some have thought, to an official position, but to be an honoured guest, a recognised ornament to the citizenship of Salzburg.

By this time, however, he was suffering, not so much from the ill results of his unsettled career as from the methods of research which he had customarily employed among herbs, minerals, and poisons. His habit had always been to try his preparations, in the

first instance, upon himself. By these experiments, in all probability, he had gradually undermined his health. If we take this circumstance into consideration, we will perceive how unnecessary it is for us to examine either the stories of violent ill-usage,[1] or of criminal poisoning, put forth by his admirers, or the tales of carousals, put forth by his enemies, in order to account for his unexpected death on 24th September, 1541.

For the three days which intervened between his first attack of illness and his decease, he retained his consciousness, and, in this period, made his will. Its terms are characteristic of the man's ambitions and career. He committed himself to the care and protection of Almighty God, in steadfast hope that the Eternal Merciful God will not allow the bitter sufferings, martyrdom, and death of His only-begotten Son, our Saviour Jesus Christ, to be fruitless and of no avail for him, a miserable man. He requested to be buried among the poor, his friends, at St. Sebastian's Church. He desired that the 1st, 7th, and 30th Psalms should be sung around his body, and that, between the singing of the Psalms a penny should be given to each poor man who might be found in front of the church. These Psalms may be regarded as his confession of faith in the immortality of those who love and try to serve God. His medicines, books, and instruments, he bequeathed to some friends, but he made the poor his heirs.

He was buried on the same day that he died, because his patron seized the occasion to do him a signal honour. It happened that that day was a great public day at Salzburg :

[1] Dr. Franz Hartmann, *Life of Ph. Theo. Bombast, known as Paracelsus*, is convinced that he died as the result of foul play.

" The town was crowded with country people and visitors. The Prince-Archbishop ordained that the funeral of the great physician and scientist should be celebrated with all solemnity. Paracelsus had chosen to be laid in the burial place of the poor, and doubtless many of the poor were there to bid their friend farewell and to receive what he had bequeathed to them. The Prince's mandate would suffice to secure honourable observance to his obsequies, but we should like to know that the lauds he chose were sung around him in the church." [1]

Dr. Franz Hartmann tells us that a monument to his memory stands at the back of St. Sebastian's Church, where his bones, exhumed in 1572, were re-interred. He adds that, on this monument, is a picture of him, above which is an inscription :—Philippi Theophrasti Paracelsi qui tantam orbis famam ex auro chymico adeptus est effigies et ossa donec rursus circumdabitur pelle sua—Jon. XIX. (Here is the portrait of Philip Theophrastus Paracelsus who, from the gold of chemistry, won such world-wide renown, and here lie his bones until he be clothed upon again with his own flesh.)

II

The life that had ended thus had been a busy one. His incessant movement from place to place ; his ever-willing response to the frequent appeals made to him for medical assistance ; his ceaseless analysing and experimenting—these form only a portion of the work he accomplished in the last fifteen years of his earthly existence. He composed a sufficiency of works to have done credit to the industry of a man who had had no other tasks to occupy his time and abilities. No doubt, much of what he wrote has long since passed

[1] Miss Stoddart, p. 289.

out of date; many of the ideas he expressed may be easily seen to have been a mere legacy from the mediæval conceptions of things. Yet, there does remain, after all due allowance has been made for the defects of his theories, a considerable quantity of valuable decisions, suggestions, and advice, which prove him to have possessed, for a man of that particular age and in his own particular line, remarkable acumen and knowledge.

In reviewing very briefly his work and opinions, it is well that we should recognise the prudent saying of Christoph Martin Wieland [1]: "It fell to Paracelsus' lot to be foolishly praised and foolishly censured, as happens to all extraordinary persons." Nevertheless, some of the praises were judicious enough and uttered by men of such eminence as ought to confer weight upon their judgement. For instance, Giordano Bruno declared [2]: "The highest merit of Paracelsus is, that he was the first to treat medicine as a philosophy, and that he used magical remedies (i.e. hypnotism and suggestion) in cases where the physical substances were not sufficient." Goethe, in 1810, noted with approval that the spirit and talents of this extraordinary man

[1] Quoted on his title-page by J. K. Proksch, *Paracelsus als medizinischer Schriftsteller* (Wien, 1911). He refers to it again, in the final words of his excellent little treatise: "Only on one point can we agree with any certainty: excessive praise of Paracelsus, just as also contradictory fault-finding, is altogether unjustifiable, or even—as Wieland has expressed it in one word—foolish."

[2] Quoted by Hartmann, *op. cit.* In his *De Occulta Philosophia*, Paracelsus deals with what we call suggestion and hypnotism. He considers that they can be productive of great ill, and holds that those who employ them should be under the direction of God. In accordance with the spirit of his age, Paracelsus more than half believed in sorcery and necromancy, but regarded them as agencies of the infernal powers.

were receiving a greater degree of just consideration in more recent times than in his own, a statement that attained its most exalted confirmation a century later, when, in 1910, Karl Sudhoff announced,[1] "For me Hohenheim becomes still grander the more thoroughly I come to know the whole history of Medicine."

But still more extravagant than the praises of his greatest admirers were the denunciations which his opponents expressed against him and his works, all and sundry. To one of these persons his books were "monstrous sewers, choked full with temerity!"—to another, manifestly the works of a madman.

It is astonishing how men can differ so profoundly as they do, in their views of the most outstanding natures and in their estimates of the most amazing deeds. What is equally astonishing is their readiness to assume, on the very slenderest evidence, or none, the most damaging disparagements of a person of eminence in rank or genius. Observe this example of an apostrophe uttered by a writer who might have been expected to have shown a clearer judgement[2]: "Marvellous Paracelsus, always drunk and always lucid, like the heroes of Rabelais!"—a remark which, in its charge of intoxication, is simply untrue with regard to the Rabelaisian heroes, and a stupid libel with regard to Paracelsus. Even the fact that no stain of immoral conduct—so prevalent in his days as hardly to be reckoned worthy of reproach—can be attached to his memory, has been accounted as due, not to his pureness of mind, but to some physical defect in his body.[3] Blameworthy, however, as later

[1] Proksch, pp. 5, 6.

[2] Eliphas Levi, *Dogme et Rituel de la haute Magie*, Introduction, quoted in a footnote to p. xiii of vol. I of Waite, *op. cit.*

[3] Footnote to p. xi of vol. I of Waite, *op. cit.*

writers have shown themselves, the greater blame is that of those contemporaries of Paracelsus, whose animosities invented accusations which they must have known were false. But even these are not so capable of arousing one's indignation as the surprising contradictions observable in the correspondence of Conrad Gesner. Gesner was himself a man of great genius, one of the founders of the modern science of Natural History, a fellow-countryman and younger contemporary of Paracelsus, who belonged by family to those Swiss reformers amongst whom Paracelsus had found his earliest and warmest friends. In his letters to the Imperial physician, John Craton, dated 16th August, 1561, and 24th April, 1563, Gesner roundly asserts that Paracelsus was an Arian and denied the Godhead of Christ. He repeats the slander of Oporinus that Paracelsus had commerce with demons and had dabbled in the abominations of Astrology, Geomancy, Necromancy, and similar black arts.[1] He declares he knows nothing of the writings of Paracelsus except a few sheets of some unimportant experiments, and speaks contemptuously of Paracelsus' book *De Vita Longa*, which he hears a Paracelsian

[1] *Epistolarum Medicinalium Conradi Gesneri, Philosophi et Medici Tigurini*, libri III (Tiguri, Anno M.D.LXXVII). The first letter is on fol. I vo. :—" Inde domum reversus epistolam tuam inveni, medio scilicet Iulio, quae in fine Maii scripta erat, in qua praeter alia Theoph. Paracelsi errorum meministi. . . . Theophrastus verò certè impius homo & magus fuit & cum daemonibus communicavit. . . . Basilee Medicus est, Carolostadii Theologi defuncti filius, plane Theophrasteus : qui de vita longa libellum eius ante annum edidit. Video plerosque huius farine homines *'Αρειανὸς εἶναι καὶ τὴν τοῦ χριστοῦ ἡμῶν θεότητα ἀρνεῖσθαι.*

The second letter referred to is on fol. 5 :— . . . Epistolam tuam ad Pernam legi, placuit, eam ei transmisi Martii die 14 una cum scripto tuo contra *Θεοφραστέους* Medicos Arianos.

disciple is bringing out.[1] But in his letters to a Dr. Felix Platter of Basel, who must have been one who esteemed Paracelsus more highly than Craton did, Gesner speaks in a more respectful tone of the great medical pioneer.[2] The probable explanation is to be found in the influence Craton had at the Imperial Court, for Gesner, though a Protestant, was seeking from a liberally minded Roman Catholic Emperor that rise in the social world, which he actually obtained in the form of a patent of nobility.[3] It is indicative of the treatment meted out to Paracelsus, in his lifetime, and afterwards, that the generous appreciation of Ambroise Paré (the " Father of Modern Surgery ") was suppressed for several centuries. That great surgeon, who was a young man when Paracelsus died, confesses, in the first edition of his works (published in his own lifetime) how much he owed to his Swiss predecessor in dealing with the surgery of wounds. From every subsequent edition of the works of Ambroise Paré, this passage was eliminated and only reappeared in that which M. Malgaigne published in 1840.[4]

Like many other thinkers of his time, Paracelsus handles a considerable number of topics, some of which nowadays we regard as unrelated to each other. That the opinions of this remarkable man on the subjects he deals with are of unequal value goes without saying. But this might be observed in regard to any great thinker and scholar of that epoch, perhaps of every epoch. Some of his rather candid adversaries

[1] See his letter to Craton, dated : Tiguri, 1561, Octob. die 18, on fol. 10.

[2] One letter is dated : 1559, Januarii die 16, on fol. 97 vo. fol. 10 ; the other : 1563, Octobris die 17, is on fol. 98 vo.

[3] Sir Wm. Jardine, in *The Naturalist's Library*, vol. XII (1843).

[4] Stoddart, p. 65.

were quite justified in noting defects and inconsistencies in his teachings. But their animosity was not due to these things. The doctrines he enunciated were, in many cases, the very contrary of those which the ordinary physicians and philosophers of his day received as authoritative; the ideas he propounded were new and were deliberately intended by him to supersede the age-worn theories in common use by the medical men and apothecaries of that age[1]; the methods he adopted for the diagnosis and treatment of disease were so entirely novel as to be exasperating to men who had been trained to employ, and who had all their professional lives employed, methods derived, indeed, from a far-off antiquity, but with which they were quite satisfied. Here are to be discovered the roots of the hostility with which they regarded his exercise of the medical art and his lecturings. But his manner of declaring his opinions and explaining his methods was by no means of a conciliatory kind; in fact, it lacked courtesy and what we should call modesty.[2] His manners did not allay the natural enmity aroused by his doctrines; they were unfortunate enough to be of a nature that would fan the fire of hate to a white heat. One must to-day, however, take into account a fact which is easily forgotten, that the days in which Paracelsus lived were not marked, on any side or by any class of men, by that consideration for one another's feelings which men of culture and erudition are, in our times, expected to exercise towards each other, however much they may differ in opinion. In our own times, indeed, we have

[1] Preface to *Paragranum—Theoph. Par. Op. Omn.*, I, 185.

[2] The words of Hartmann are justifiable: "He defended his mode of thinking in a manner that was more forcible than polite."

noted how impatient Pasteur sometimes was with orthodox stupidity, and, as a contrast, the unruffled mien of Lister, who could even suffer fools gladly. Neither, however, of these great men would have been guilty of Paracelsus' vituperations. Yet, so common were bad manners in the polemics of the learned at that date, that we may recognise the bitter antagonism of his contemporaries towards Paracelsus as having been excited less by his inconsiderate language than by the novelty of his doctrines.

His lack of restraint from rudeness of speech appears most manifestly in those writings which he penned shortly after he had fled from Basel :

" After me, Avicenna, Galenus, Rhazes, Montagnana, and the rest ! Not I after you, but ye after me, doctors of Paris, Montpelier, Swabia, Meissen, and Köln ; doctors of Vienna, and all who come from the countries along the Danube and the Rhine, and from the islands of the ocean ; doctors of Italy, Dalmatia, Sarmatia, Athens, Greece, Arabia, and Jewry ! I am your leader ; follow me ; mine is the monarchy. Come out of the night of ignorance ! The time will come when none of you shall remain in his dark corner who will not be an object of contempt to the world, because I shall be the monarch, and the monarchy shall be mine." [1]

In this curious ejaculation, Paracelsus is not levelling insults at the heads of the practising physicians, but at the medical deities of his era and the high-priests who had kept their worship alive. His initiation of a new medical faith was the Kingdom, wherein he, as the initiator, the author, was king. That this is what he meant seems clear from his exclaiming a little later, " Who is it that hates Luther ? A similar gang troubles me."[2]

[1] Pref. to *Paragranum*, p. 183.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 185 : " Quis vero Lutherum odit ? Similis turba me quoque lacessit."

Nevertheless, from the above passage, and others like it, one can comprehend how possibly correct may be the suggestion that the family name of Paracelsus, Bombast, is the original of the term we employ to denote "high-sounding, inflated language." Yet, Paracelsus could be, in his calmer moments, both modest and judicious [1]:

"I know my inability to say to everyone just what will please; I cannot return meek replies to impertinent queries. I know my ways and have no desire to alter them. Indeed I have not the power to change my nature. I am a rough man, born in a rough country. I was reared in pine woods and may have inherited some knots. . . . I went in search of my art, often incurring danger of life. I have not been ashamed to learn what seemed useful even from tramps, executioners, and barbers. We know that a lover will go a long way to meet the woman he adores: how much more will the lover of wisdom be tempted to go in search of his divine mistress!"

"The knowledge to which we are entitled is not confined within the limits of our own country, nor does it run to us but waits until we go in search of it. . . . Those who remain at home may live more comfortably and grow richer than those who wander about. But I desire neither to live comfortably nor to grow rich."

And again:

"Reading never made a physician. Medicine is an art and requires practice. If it were sufficient to learn to talk Latin, Greek and Hebrew to become a good physician, it would be also sufficient for one to read Livy to become a great commander-in-chief. I began to study my art by imagining that there was not a single teacher in the world capable of teaching it to me, but that I had to acquire it myself. It was the book of Nature, written by the finger of God which I studied; not those of scribblers, for every scribbler writes down the rubbish that may be found in his head, and who can sift the true from the false? My accusers complain that I have not entered the

[1] *Ibid.*

temple of knowledge through the 'legitimate door.' But which one is the truly legitimate door? Galenus and Avicenna, or Nature? I have entered through the door of Nature: her light, and not the lamp of an apothecary's shop, has illumined my path."

The writings of Paracelsus set forth a metaphysical rather than a material sense of things. His language fits his views; it was of an allegorical and mystical kind. The alchemists of his day comprehended it, for there were other alchemical works written in a similar style. Trithemius had certainly used a cryptic language. Students of the Kabbala and of the *Hierarchies* of Dionysius—favourite studies of that epoch—were familiar with a mystical form of speech. Nowadays, we should require a glossary of some extent in order to be able to make out the teaching of Paracelsus. For example, he declared that every substance possessed *Cherio*, whether they were metals, minerals or stones, and the rest, which, though reckoned inanimate, as distinguished from plants and animals, yet contain essences drawn from bodies that have lived. By *Cherio* Paracelsus signified a quintessence that has intrinsic properites of healing value. From this he deduced the theory of the transmutation of metals and minerals into other substances. Experiments for the sake of gold-getting he rejected. For him, the divine quest was to obtain curative agents.

Again, he was convinced that man possessed an operative power which is visible and another operative power which is invisible. To the latter he gave the name *Mumia*,[1] by which he meant a magnetic body, a source of vitality. One who possessed *Mumia* could use it for the arresting and the healing of disease.

[1] *Theoph. Par. Op. Omn.*, II, 504, 505, for his doctrine of the *Mumia*.

Many of his own cures he explained as proceeding from his exercise of this force, and declared that he employed his chemical compounds only in special cases.

The foundation of his system was his doctrine of the Three Substances.[1] These he called *Sulphur*, *Mercury*, and *Salt*, by which he signified *Fire*, *Water*, *Earth*, or interchangeably, *Inflammability*, *Fluidity*, and *Solidity*. He does not mention *Air*, because he regarded it as a product of Fire and Water. All bodies, organic or inorganic, animal or vegetable or mineral—man, lily, diamond—are simply varied compounds of these three substances, which constitute the body, soul, and spirit of all matter, which is one. Here Paracelsus approaches closely to scientific truth as it is recognised to-day ; in this, he may have simply made a guess, but if so, the guess was an inspired one. According to Paracelsus, the shaping power of nature, which he named *Archaeus*, fashions out of matter innumerable forms, each of them possessing its own *alcol*, or soul, and its own *ares*, or specific character. Man has an additional element, the *adech*, or purely spiritual body. This Archaeus is an invisible and lofty spirit, nature's craftsman who alters the types and reproduces them.[2] Paracelsus, in his system, used the terms, well known to the astronomers of his day, *Macrocosmos* and *Microcosmos*, but meant by them the " great world " of the universe and the " little world " of the individual man, the one being the reflection of the other.

[1] *Opus Paramirum*, lib. I, cap. II (*Op. Omn*, I, 33) : " Substantiarum tres sunt, quae unicuique suum corpus conferunt : hoc est, unumquodlibet corpus in tribus rebus consistit. Harum rerum nomina sunt, *Sulphur, Mercurius, Sal.* Haec tria si componuntur, tum vocantur corpus : nec illis quicquam apponitur praeter vitam, & cum hac cohaerens."

[2] Waite, *op. cit.*, vol. I, 97 ; vol. II, 179, 346, etc.

A few of the above terms will bring, no doubt, to the remembrance of students of Aristotle's scientific works some of the expressions, if not of the ideas, of the great Stagirite.[1] This is by no means the only instance where Paracelsus shows an acquaintance with the doctrines of Aristotle, Plato, Galen, Avicenna, perhaps even also of Maimonides and Avicebron. So that his denunciations of the Greeks, Latins, Arabians, and Hebrews, did not hinder him from using their learning as a foundation, though the building he raised was of his own designing. From this circumstance, it is quite clear that it was not these old authorities themselves who aroused his wrath, when viewed as the great scientists of the past, which, indeed they were. Rather was it that the physicians and philosophers of his own times provided him with causes for contempt, by putting the old authorities on pedestals for unreasoning adoration, and by regarding their works as containing scientific dogmas which must be accepted as infallible. Not the objects of worship in themselves, but the idolatry accorded them he held to be despicable. And, let it be noted, he challenged more than their domination over medicine and alchemy; he totally rejected the form of Aristotelian astrology which was prevalent in his days. And, in truth, it must be acknowledged that Aristotle's conception of the stars as living things, of a nature higher than that which appertains to any substance or living creature in the lower spheres, had lent itself to an exaggeration of the great philosopher's

[1] Dr. Charles Singer, in *Medieval Contributions to Modern Civilisation*, p. 129: "The main details of the hypothesis (of the parallelism of the macrocosm and the microcosm) were drawn from Aristotle, whose views of the structure of the universe were the framework on which the whole of medieval science was built."

notions about the influence exercised by the heavenly bodies over human destinies. From this had sprung a developed astrology which the Church, hostile or indifferent at first, had eventually made its own. Dr. Charles Singer remarks concerning Isidore that he

" advises the physicians to study it, ascribes to the moon an influence over plant and animal life and control over the humours of man, while he accepts without question the influence of the dog-star and the comets. He is followed by the other Dark Age scientists, who each accept a little more astrological doctrine, until finally in such a writer as Byrhtferth we get the complete scheme." [1]

How modern, in comparison, are the words with which Paracelsus overthrows the Aristotelian theories and their later developments!

" The planets and the stars neither build up a man's body, nor do they bestow on him either virtues or vices, or any other kind of qualities. The course of Saturn does not lengthen or shorten anyone's life. . . . Even if there had been no moon in the sky, there would have been persons disposed to lunacy. The stars force us to nothing; they induce us to nothing. They are free in themselves and we are free in ourselves. A wise man rules over the stars. So it is said. This does not, however, mean that he has a dominion over the stars in the sky, but over the powers that are at work in his own mental constitution, which are symbolised by the visible celestial stars." [2]

And these are the words of a man who knew nothing as yet, of the Copernican theory! No other astronomical theory was then in vogue save that whose accepted implications he thus contemns.

[1] Dr. Charles Singer in *Medieval Contributions to Modern Civilisation*, p. 132. Cp. *ibid.*, p. 118—Byrhtferth, an eleventh-century (died about 1020) English writer, " whose copious commentary on Bede's scientific work may be regarded as the final product of Dark Age science."

[2] *De Occulta Philosophia, Theophrasti Paracelsi Op. Omn.*, II, pp. 483–95. See also *Op. Omn.*, I, 7, 8.

Paracelsus was essentially a pioneer. No doubt, it may be true that his books do not chronicle any marvellous discovery regarding Anatomy, Surgery, or even the treatment of the various diseases. That J. K. Proksch has made clear [1]: "His influence on the immediate progress and broader development of Medicine is still altogether a matter of debate." But Proksch is careful to add: "His merits in regard to Chemistry, and especially medical Chemistry, have never, since Gmelin, been questioned by any historian." Among other experimental discoveries, we owe to him chloride, sulphate of mercury, calomel, flowers of sulphur, and many distillations. Zinc ointment dates from his early days at Schwatz.[2]

But it is not his discoveries in this or that department of scientific knowledge which is to be regarded as the highest glory of Paracelsus. His is an honour similar to that of Laurentius Valla,[3] who opened the gate of the true science of historical criticism to succeeding generations, though he himself can hardly be said to have realised the greatness of the science he initiated; to that of Columbus,[4] who opened the gate to the discovery of a continent of which he himself

[1] "Der Einfluss des Paracelsus auf die weitere Entwickelung der Heilkunde ist bis auf den heutigen Tag ebenso umstritten und unentschieden, wie seine Bedeutung als medizinischer Schriftsteller überhaupt"—p. 78.

[2] Miss Stoddart and Dr. Franz Hartmann.

[3] Laurentius Valla.—See Symonds (J. A.), *Renaissance in Italy, Revival of Learning in Italy*, London, 1882, pp. 259–63. Nicolas of Cusa and Enea Silvio Piccolomini had already, at the Council of Basel, upset the Donation of Constantine, but feared to publish their censures—Villari (Prof. P.), *Machiavelli*, Introd., ch. III, section 3.

[4] Washington Irving, *Life and Voyages of Christopher Columbus*, revised edit., London, 1876, bk. IV, ch. 1, and the concluding paragraph on p. 607. Compare Wasserman

never dreamt ; to that of Copernicus,[1] who opened the gate to the great modern science of Astronomy, of the full compass of which he was completely unaware ; to that of Leonard Fuchs of Swabia,[2] who opened the gate to the new methods of studying Botany, though his vision never covered more than a small portion of that realm ; to that of Pierre Gilles of Albi [3] and Pierre Belon [4]

(Jacob), *Christopher Columbus, Don Quixote of the Seas*, Eng. trans. by Eric Sutton, London, 1930, pp. 21 and 199.

Carlos Pereyra, *Historia de América Española*, Madrid, 1920, tomo I, pp. 152, 153, sums up the conclusions he had arrived at in the chapters of Part I. Of these, two are of special interest to us : I. " Columbus reached the end of his career as an explorer in 1504, and died in 1506, believing that Cuba was the *terra firma* of the East, in Mango, on the borders of Cathay." VII. " He died in the persuasion that the discovery of the mines of Veragua constituted his greatest triumph as an explorer." According to Yule, Mango, otherwise Cipango or Zipangu, represents the Chinese name, *Jippan-kwé*, the kingdom of Japan. It is a kind of translation of the native name, *Nippon*.

Other authors who may be consulted are Muñoz, *Historia del Nuevo Mundo*, Madrid, 1783, vol. I (the only one published) ; E. G. Browne, *Spain in America*, New York, 1904, and Sir A. Helps, *The Spanish Conquest in America*, vol. I.

[1] Copernicus, Nicolaus (1473–1543), Kistner (Adolf), *Kopernikus und Galilei, und ihr Kampf um das Weltsystem*, Leipzig, 1912.

[2] See *Science, Religion and Reality*, ed. by Needham, Sheldon Press, 1926, pp. 120, 121 ; and Cap. (Paul-Antoine), *La Science et les Savants au XVI^e siècle*, Tours, 1867, p. 113. The fuchsia is named after him.

[3] Article by Weiss in *Biographie Universelle*, t. 17, Paris, 1816.

[4] Cap, *op. cit.*, pp. 120–8. See also the article on Belon in *Biographie Universelle*, t. 4, pp. 131–1 (Paris, 1811) : " Gesner et Belon doivent être considerés comme les fondateurs de l'Histoire naturelle, et Belon plus particulièrement comme l'inventeur de l'Anatomie comparée, à l'époque de la renaissance des lettres."

and Conrad Gesner, [1] who opened the gate to the study of Natural Science, the range of which, in later ages, passed far beyond the scope of their imagination. Other branches of knowledge and skill might be cited as providing, at that epoch, the same phenomenon : the advent of a number of great men who by their genius were able to initiate what their successors brought to perfection. In spite of what they had to bear—and most of them suffered indignities and ill-treatment instead of being loaded with rewards and good fortune—they were the benefactors and leaders of mankind, trying to help on generations of grumblers and recalcitrants to a joyful inheritance. And in regard to themselves indeed, these men had been destined to open the gates to it, yet not to enter therein. It was to be their lot merely to view it in part and from a distance.

Paracelsus was one of these gate-openers. The splendid achievements of Vesalius (André Vésale of Brussels) strike the imagination as laying a sure and practical foundation for the science of Anatomy. His life-work, summed up in his epoch-making book *De fabrica corporis humani*, may be truly described, in company with the great book of Copernicus (published in the same year, 1543), as having put the scientific period to the Middle Ages, because " he was in full revolt against tradition, and he saw the situation clearly and saw it whole. . . . He is every inch a

[1] See the Memoir of Gesner, prefixed to vol. XII of *The Naturalist's Library* (Edinburgh, 1843), edited by Sir Wm. Jardine, for a very excellent summary of his work and its value. The earliest life, but not a very informative one, is that by Simler, entitled : Vita Clarissimi Philosophi et Medici excellentissimi Conradi Gesneri Tigurini conscripta a Iosia Simlero Tigurino, fol. 4–20, Tiguri, 1566.

modern." [1] But that career of Vesalius was rendered possible by the preceding, and more painful, career of Paracelsus. This extraordinary man's wanderings, his discomforts, the buffetings of hostility and ridicule which he had to bear, the misrepresentations and slanders and petty persecutions which he had to endure as best he might—these blunted somewhat the edge of that envenomed malice that Vesalius might otherwise have found himself called upon to face.[2] By the time he became noted in the world of learning, the medical public had grown, to some extent, accustomed to hear the authority of Galen and Aristotle flouted. And yet, was Vesalius himself content to abide by the decisions of either Galen or Aristotle? Was he always listened to with courteous acquiescence when he ventured to contradict those ancient authorities? Even in his time the battle was far from being ended; for else why did he pass from the field of contest, after 1543,

[1] *Mediaeval Contributions to Modern Civilisation*, pp. 111 & 114.

[2] *A Short History of Medicine*, by Charles Singer, M.A., M.D., D.Litt. (Clar. Press, 1928), p. 88.

See also the article on *Paracelsus and Van Helmont* in *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Medicine* (1915). Dr. C. A. Mercier, in this article makes a number of grossly unfair remarks on the biographical details of Paracelsus' career, but redeems these errors by his fine appraisement of the great service rendered to humanity and truth by Paracelsus' life-work: "They (Paracelsus and Van Helmont) were almost the first to attack the venerable citadel of authority; they were almost the first who dared to suggest that Hippocrates and Galen had not only left something for others to discover, but were not infallible in what they themselves taught. . . . It is very doubtful whether Vesalius would have had the courage to publish his discovery but for the demonstration of Paracelsus and Van Helmont that Galen could be contradicted without fire coming down from heaven to consume his gainsayer."

into comparative retirement ?[1] He never lived to see the final issue of the struggle between the cramping submission to authority which belonged to an era that was past and the spirit of free investigation and experiment which belonged to the new. Yet, when Vesalius began his work, the brunt of the battle, in the great field of Medical Science, had been already borne, and borne successfully, by Paracelsus.

[1] Ball (James Moores), M.D., *Andreas Vesalius the Reformer of Anatomy* (1514–64), Saint Louis (Med. Science Press), 1910, p. 112, shows the serious opposition that Vesalius had to overcome. Again, pp. 131, 134, Dr. Ball points out how Vesalius, in disappointment and disgust, threw his manuscripts into the fire, thus ending his career as a scientist. But, though he retired to the comparative obscurity of an Archiatrus to Charles V, his life was rendered miserable by the superstitious ignorance of Madrid, where he could hardly lay hands on a dried skull, much less have a chance of making a dissection. Finally, he went off on a pilgrimage to Palestine, as it is said, to escape the rigorous judgement of the Spanish Inquisition. From that journey he never returned, for he died of exhaustion on the island of Zakynthos.

IX

Nicolaus Copernicus and the New Astronomy

I

ON 19th February, 1473, was born,[1] at Thorn in Western Prussia, Nicolaus Copernicus.[2] His parents had, a few years before, come from Cracow in Poland. That country, accordingly, is in the same happy position as Prussia of being able to claim the renowned astronomer. He was closely related, moreover, to families of considerable standing in both states, a fact which strengthens their dual claim to his citizenship.

Nicolaus was still very young when his father died. Fortunately, his mother had a brother, named Lucas Watzelrode, who occupied an important post in the Cathedral Chapter of Frauenburg, and was soon to

[1] *Nicolai Copernici Varmiensis Canonici, Astronomi Illustris,* Vita per Petrum Gassendum ad Joannem Capellanum, amicum suavissimum (at the end of Gassendi's Life of Tycho Brahe), Hagae-Comitum, M.DC.LV., p. 292.

[2] The name has been written variously. The astronomer himself sometimes wrote it *Coppernic, Coppernig,* and *Coppernick.* Official documents and letters sometimes have *Cuppernic,* or even *Kopperlingk.* However, the most correct form appears to be *Niclas Koppernigk.* The Latinised form of the name rarely ever varies from *Nicolaus Copernicus,* as used by himself.—See Hipler (Dr. Franz), *Spicilegium Copernicanum* (Braunsberg, 1873), pp. 293–5.

become bishop of the episcopal state of Ermland. This uncle undertook the charge of educating Nicolaus and his elder brother Andreas.

The lad had just completed his eighteenth year when he was sent to the University of Cracow. It is a significant fact that his principal teacher there was Albert Brudzewski, who gave him his earliest lessons in science and astronomy, chiefly those of Aristotle, but, no doubt, with comments drawn from more recent authors. In later days, Copernicus always employed the meridian of Cracow for his observations, although his observatory was at Frauenburg.

Besides mathematics and astronomy, Copernicus studied the classics, especially Greek, at Cracow; but, when he quitted this University, at the end of 1494 or the beginning of 1495, his education was by no means finished, nor had he taken out any degree.[1] Subsequent events make this clear.

About the time of his return to Heilsberg, the residence of his uncle, now Bishop of Ermland, a vacancy in the Chapter of Frauenburg occurred. The Bishop at once appointed his nephew to the canonry. In accordance with the rules of the Chapter, Copernicus was required to qualify himself for his capitular office by proceeding to some university for an extended course of instruction in some defined art.

He went first of all to Bologna, in 1496. The selection of this University sufficiently indicates the training which his uncle the Bishop had in view for him. Bologna was then renowned for its schools of jurisprudence. Among its *alumni* were numbered

[1] "Molti scrittori sono caduti in errore facendolo ritornare in patria come doctor medicinae di Cracovia."—Müller (P. Adolfo), *Niccolò Copernico, fondatore dell' Astronomia moderna*, traduzione dal tedesco di P. Pietro Mezzetti, Roma, 1908, p. 24.

both Bishop Lucas Watzelrode himself and the celebrated Cardinal Nicolas of Cusa.

It was fated, nevertheless, that Copernicus should there meet the man who was to exert the greatest influence on his after-career, Domenico Maria Novara. Novara was a teacher who inculcated in all his pupils a deep love of astronomy, but between him and his Polish pupil there grew up an especial bond of affection and esteem. So high, indeed, became his regard for Copernicus that the two passed easily from the relation of master and pupil to the more intimate one of colleagues.[1] There, too, at Bologna, Copernicus learned to make independent observations, as, for instance, one of the occultation of Aldebaran by the moon, of which he made use, in after years, for the calculating of the moon's orbit.

At the neighbouring University of Ferrara he made the acquaintance of Bianchini, who had had friendly intercourse with Peurbach and Regiomontanus, the greatest astronomers of their time. Ferrara indeed, continued to be for at least another generation, a notable centre of astronomical learning, for it was there that Celio Calcagnini, the fellow-pupil and friend of Copernicus, produced, in 1520, the first published book, even though it was little more than a pamphlet, which contested the geocentric system.

When one has pondered these particulars, one feels justified in maintaining that the earliest serious movements of the mind of Copernicus against the long-established Ptolemaic astronomy took place whilst he lived in Italy. It is certain that Cardinal Nicolas

[1] "So that from being a pupil, he became the assistant partner and co-operator in the observations of that most learned man, Domenico Maria."—Gassendi, *op. cit.*, p. 293, on the authority of Rheticus.

of Cusa (1401–64) had asserted the motion of the earth,[1] and that his affirmation was widely known in Italy, when Copernicus was there. Probably, too, it was during his Italian sojourn that he learned to know the past and almost forgotten theories of the heavenly motions, for "all the fragments of the Copernican theory were already old."[2]

The name of Nicolaus Copernicus was first enrolled as Canon of Frauenburg in the Acts of the Chapter in 1497. That of his brother Andreas was similarly enrolled a year later.

This Chapter was remarkable for two things: it was composed of members of the aristocratic families of Dantzig and Ermland—most of them related to one another—and each canon was supposed to be skilled in some art.[3] Accordingly, the Chapter was very complaisant in granting leave of absence to the two young members of their body, in order that they might advance themselves in their studies. Yet, it is curious to find that, in the Act giving this permission, dated 27th July, 1501, it is expressly stated that Nicolaus is to continue his study of *medicine* so as to be of assistance to the Bishop and other members of the Chapter. Where he received his medical degrees, or if he actually received any, is in grave doubt. According to some

[1] "Consideravi quod terra ista non potest esse fixa sed movetur ut aliae stellae. Quare super polis mundi revolvitur quasi semel in die et nocte." These words of the Cardinal's occur in a manuscript, preserved in the hospital of Cusa, which was first published by Professor Clemens in 1847.—Cp. Müller, *op. cit.*, p. 30.

[2] Herder (Johann Gottfried), Sämmtliche Werke, XXXVI, Stuttgart und Tübingen, 1883 (Article on "Nikolaus Kopernikus," p. 51).

[3] Prowe (Dr. Leopold), *Nicolaus Coppernicus*, Erster Band: *Das Leben*. I Theil, p. 209 (Berlin, 1883).

writers, he took his degree of Doctor in Philosophy and Medicine in 1499, after a four-year course at Padua. But this statement rests upon a false assertion by a single author.[1]

In 1876, there was discovered a diploma, issued at Ferrara on 31st May, 1503, which conferred on Copernicus the degree of Doctor in Canon Law. Thus he appears to have been making himself proficient at the same time in jurisprudence and medicine, whilst he also pursued his astronomical studies. He returned to his homeland, either in the autumn of 1505 or in the spring of 1506, with his years of travel and foreign study ended.

From the time of his return until the death of his uncle, Copernicus was in attendance on the Bishop. It seems quite possible that that prelate had entertained some notion of his nephew succeeding to the bishopric, if not immediately, then at a later date; but the probability is much stronger that Copernicus, at no time, shared such a desire or ambition. When, however, the Bishop died (29th March, 1512), it became essential that Copernicus should arrange to live elsewhere than at the episcopal palace of Heilsberg. He took up his residence at the Cathedral of Frauenburg.

This Cathedral stood on a hill, and, inasmuch as it was the centre, not only of spiritual, but also of temporal, authority in Ermland, it was a fortified building.[2]

[1] Papadopoli in his *History of the University of Padua.* Dr. Prowe is very strong in his denunciation of this assertion, and devotes three sections (pp. 295–329) of vol. I, pt. I, to a full account of Copernicus's studies at Padua and Ferrara.—Cp. Müller, *op. cit.*, p. 37.

[2] Dr. F. Hipler, *Literaturgeschichte des Bisthums Ermland*, Braunsberg, 1873, gives some account of the history of this peculiarly circumstanced episcopal state.

Here Copernicus had to fix his *curia*, even as the other members of the Chapter.

His lodging was situated in a tower which stood at the north-west corner of the oblong Cathedral enclosure. He was now free to devote himself to his astronomical studies and could not have been better placed for making observations. That he made very many more observations and experimental calculations than those he has recorded in his works is not only possible, but, in the nature of the case, probable. For this reason, the assertion that he arrived at his astronomical decisions rather by his labours in his study than by his experimental discoveries, must be received with caution.[1] The value of his observations is appraised highly by the person most competent to recognise it, his learned disciple, Joachim Rheticus. Certainly, when one thinks of the instruments he possessed, and employed, for making observations, one cannot but experience a feeling of the deepest amazement that he was ever able to produce such a finished work as his *De Revolutionibus Orbium Coelestium*. One ceases to observe anything extraordinary in the enthusiastic admiration of Rheticus for his " Dominus Praeceptor," as he termed Copernicus. The instruments, in fact, then available for making observations were few in number and wholly inadequate. The chief of them was the *Triquetrum*, otherwise called the parallactic instrument. This Copernicus tells us expressly that he employed. It was used to ascertain the height of the sun, moon, planets, and the most important of the fixed stars, and also to determine their distance from the vernal equinox. He has left a description of

[1] Dr. Charles Singer makes this assertion in *Science, Religion and Reality* (ed. by Needham), Sheldon Press, 1926, p. 127. But cp. Herder, Sämmtliche Werke, XXXVI, p. 53.

two other instruments, the *Quadratum* and the *Astrolab*, but he does not seem to have put them to any service, and, indeed, it is doubtful if he possessed an astrolab at all.[1] The quadrat, when placed in the meridian, showed the height of the sun by the shadow cast by a pin fixed in the centre of the instrument. But, apparently, the instruments mostly employed by Copernicus were the parallactic instrument already referred to and the *radius astronomicus*, the so-called Jacob's staff.

In addition to the inadequacy of the instruments with which he had to make his observations, he had to contend with something even more serious: the unreliability of the Ptolemaic catalogue of the fixed stars.[2] There was here a stumbling-block in the way of all attempts to calculate, with any degree of accuracy, the orbits of the planets. For the places assigned to the fixed stars by the ancient records did not correspond with their actual positions in the heavens when Copernicus viewed them.

Early in the sixteenth century, during the pontificate of Pope Julius II, a movement had been on foot to improve the Calendar, so as to regulate better the calculation of the movable feasts of the Church. Julius had turned the whole matter over to Paul of Middelburg, Bishop of Fossembrone, a learned mathematician, and Pope Leo X did the same, but now it was intended to put the project before the Lateran Council at its session on 1st December, 1514. Bishop Paul at once took counsel with Copernicus and others,

[1] *Nicolai Copernici Torinensis De Revolutionibus Orbium Coelestium Libri VI*, Norimbergae apud Io. Petreium, Anno MD.XLIII, bk. II, 2; IV, 15; IV, 16. See also Gassendi, *op. cit. supra.*

[2] Gassendi, pp. 308, 309.

including Bernhard Sculteti, Dean of the Ermland Chapter.[1]

The reply of Copernicus to the request to aid the business by giving his expert advice was cautious. He declared that the improvement of the Calendar depended on the most exact calculation of the orbit of the sun and moon ; that, in this regard, he could not make a final decision just yet, and it would be inadvisable to send in preliminary and inconclusive work ; that he would, however, continue to devote the greatest attention to the improvement of the Calendar which was such a burning question in the Church. Nearly thirty years later, he claimed to have redeemed his promise. In his epistle dedicatory to Pope Paul III, prefixed to his *De Revolutionibus*, he observed that the improvement of the Calendar, at the time of the Lateran Council (1514), had been rendered impossible by the fact that the length of the year and the orbit of the sun and moon were not then sufficiently determined ; but, urged by the Bishop of Fossembrone, he had given his whole attention to the more accurate observation of these things. And thus, a generation had been destined to elapse, after the closing of the Lateran Council, before Copernicus, when he published his great work, made known those results of his investigations on the length of the year, whereby he provided the basis, not merely for the *Tabulae Prutenicae* of Erasmus

[1] Gassendi, p. 309, cites as his authority for this statement Christophorus Clavius, who, in his commentaries on the *Treatise on the Sphere*, by John of Hollywood (better known as John de Sacrobosco), thus eulogises Copernicus : Nicolaus Copernicus, Prutenus, nostro hoc saeculo Astronomiae restitutor egregius, quem tota Posteritas grato semper animo, tanquam alterum Ptolemaeum celebrabit, atque admirabitur, conferens suas, &c.

Reinhold, but, more important still, for the Gregorian reform of the Calendar.

On 3rd November, 1516, Copernicus was appointed to the office of administrator, which involved his residing in the strong Castle of Allenstein and there acting as guardian of the rights and property of the Ermland Chapter. There he dwelt for four eventful years.[1] It is a fair inference that he found interest in the stirring events which were then taking place in Germany. First of all, there arose the struggle between the Dominican inquisitors and Reuchlin, and afterwards came the momentous protest of Martin Luther against the sale of indulgences and the events which followed that protest. Copernicus could not well remain ignorant of them, or indifferent to the fact that there was being extended on all sides a warm welcome by the German nation in the north to the men who were undertaking to remedy the faults which the great Council had not been able to remove. Copernicus was in no sense a secluded scholar or a cloistered ecclesiastic. For all his genius and learning, he was a man of the world, entrusted with many of the secular administrative duties of an episcopal state. He was bound to take note of the movements in northern Germany, and to decide his own attitude towards the reforming opinions which were spreading even in the country of the Vistula. The neighbouring Bishops were favourable to these new sentiments. Even his own bishop, Fabian von Lossainen, went further and spoke openly of Luther with approval, so much so indeed that the Church histories of Ermland are fond of saying that his fatal illness was the result of a dis-

[1] His term of office was broken by one year (1519–20), which he spent at Frauenburg.

graceful disease which God sent him by way of punishment.[1]

During the period of Copernicus's administration at Allenstein, relations became strained between the Teutonic Order and the Bishopric of Ermland. This circumstance furnished Copernicus with an occasion in which he showed his capacity for handling public affairs. Later, a more serious quarrel arose between the Grand-Master and the Polish King Sigismund that threatened to involve the State of Ermland which was under the suzerainty of Poland. In fact, the position of the bishopric became very difficult. There is in existence a document which makes this evident, a safe-conduct, dated 6th January, 1519, given by the Grand-Master of the Teutonic Knights to " Nicklass Coppernick " to come to him and to return home safely, accompanied by servants, officials, and bodyguard. Apparently, this was some diplomatic mission which Copernicus undertook on behalf of the bishopric, and which may have assisted in securing the favourable

[1] Prowe, vol. I, pt. II, p. 87, quotes from the *Chronicle of Ermland*, by Johann Cretzmer (Canon of Ermland, died 1604): Fabianus episcopus . . . haereticis nec clam nec publice restitit. . . . Ea de causa fuit . . . admonitus, ut officii sui memor mature provideret. . . . Sed ad haec respondebat Episcopus: Lutherus est doctus monachus et habet suas opiniones in Scripturis fundatas; si quis tantum habet animi, congrediatur et certet cum illo. On p. 156, Prowe also quotes the accusing statement about the Bishop's illness and punishment, which Cretzmer recounts, as do some others also. Their authority, however, is shown to be untrustworthy. As a matter of fact, Fabian was nominated a Cardinal by Pope Adrian VI, and King Sigismund defended him against his enemies. These two facts, suppressed by the Ermland historians, were furnished by two Polish writers, Bartoszewicz (in his *Vita Copernici*) and Polkowski (*Zywot Mikaaya Kopernika*).

position which was accorded to the fortress and town of Allenstein by the troops of the Order two years later, when the whole of Ermland was overrun by the forces of the two belligerent parties.

Somewhat over a century ago, an assertion was made that Copernicus worked out the details of his marvellous astronomical system in the tower of Allenstein Castle. The assertion has since been several times repeated. But there is no evidence worthy of note that he made any useful or valuable observations at Allenstein.[1]

In June, 1521, Copernicus finally concluded his term of public duty at Allenstein and returned to Frauenburg, where he spent the remaining two decades of his life.

Bishop Fabian died in 1523 after a serious prolonged illness, leaving the affairs of the bishopric in a chaotic confusion. The Chapter, thereupon, elected Copernicus Administrator-General during the vacancy, in order that he might bring order into the condition of the little state. He held this exalted office until the autumn of the same year.[2]

From 1524 to 1531, Copernicus was busily occupied with matters of a public nature. One of these was his

[1] Prowe, I, pt. II, pp. 130–132.

[2] An example of mistaken assumption is afforded by Müller, *Niccolò Copernico*, p. 46, when he asserts that Copernicus was appointed Administrator-General because he was regarded as the only person who could apply a bulwark against the inroads of Lutheranism. If this were so, it is extraordinary that he made no effort, when he thus possessed the power, to promulgate in Ermland the edict against Lutheranism which King Sigismund had issued in 1520, or any other ordinance of the kind. No such measure was put in force in Ermland until the following January (1524), when the new bishop, Mauritius Ferber, published a severe edict against the Lutherans and Lutheran doctrines, five days after Bishop Georg von Polenz had issued, in Samland, an edict in favour of Lutheranism.

attempt to regulate the value of money, which had been adversely affected by the war. In company with his friend Giese, he had attended the assembly of the Prussian States at Graudenz in 1522, and had presented to it a memorial, written in German, on the Prussian coinage, with proposals for its improvement. These, however, proved unacceptable at that time.[1] In 1526, he took the business in hand again. The confusion in the values of the coins was such as urgently demanded the appointment of some common standard of value. Copernicus, accordingly, set himself the task of working up his earlier memorial in a Latin dress, so as to reach a larger circle of readers.[2]

Bishop Ferber's nephew, Tiedemann Giese, about this date, wrote a book against Georg von Polenz, but it was of an eirenic character ; (see Hipler, *Spicileg. Coper.*, pp. 4–72). Giese had many friends among the Lutherans. Twelve years later (1536) he wrote his chief literary work, *De Regno Christi*, also as an eirenicon, but it was never printed, because the extreme party had the MS. destroyed.—Cp. Hipler, *Literaturg. des B. Ermland*, pp. 102–104, and Prowe, I, pt. II, pp. 170–183. Bishop Ferber, Giese, and Copernicus were kinsmen, and apparently combined a loyalty to the medieval Church with a kindly appreciation of their Lutheran friends.

[1] Gassendi, p. 295, leaves one under the impression that Copernicus, by devising an abacus, whereby the value of money could be correctly determined, settled the question at this date. That the efforts of Copernicus were, however, not without value is attested by M. Wolowski (pt. II, p. 6, of the work mentioned in the next note) : " Sigismond Ier avait su apprécier la valeur des arguments produits par Copernic en 1522. Il le fit inviter à rédiger un mémoire plus étendu ; telle a été l'origine de la : *Monetae cudendae ratio*, qui servit de base aux décisions prises par le roi en 1526."

[2] M. L. Wolowski published at Paris in 1864 a work, the first part of which is occupied with Oresmius's *Tractate on the Origin, &c., of Money*, in Latin and Old French ; the second part consists of Copernicus's *Monete cudende ratio*, with a translation, and preceded by a valuable *Entretien familier*.

In spite of his many official duties and responsibilities, Copernicus did not omit to continue his astronomical studies. Yet he has left no remark whatever upon the extraordinary theory with which, at this period, the mathematician Johann Stöfler was startling the world. There was to take place in February, 1524, a great conjunction of planets. Stöfler (who had been the instructor of both Melanchthon and Sebastian Münster) announced that the immediate effect of this conjunction would be a general flood and the end of the world. But strange ideas were, at that era, common enough concerning the consequences of such planetary conjunctions. One notion of the kind was that these conjunctions were responsible for the existence of comets; the great comet of 1472 was believed to have originated through the conjunction of Mars and Saturn. Copernicus reveals the sanity of his genius by the indifference with which he treated Stöfler's prophesying. He was much more concerned over another astronomical question.

A learned ecclesiastic and mathematician of Nürnberg named Johann Werner had published, in 1522, a book entitled *De Motu Octavae Sphaerae.* This work was sent to Copernicus by a friend of his, Bernhard Wapowski (Vapovius), a member of the Cathedral Chapter of Cracow.[1] Werner had carried out some independent observations, and, from them, had made certain deductions of his own, which he embodied in his book. His work, however, was intended to give support to the then generally accepted *Trepidation-theory.* "In order to explain the alleged irregularities in the movement of the fixed stars, the Arabian astronomers had established their so-called *Trepidation-*

[1] Vapovius had been a fellow-pupil of Copernicus, when the latter was being educated at Cracow.—Gassendi, p. 292.

theory. Werner belonged to their most zealous followers; the highest scientific development of their notion is his doubtful merit."[1]

Copernicus's reply to Werner took the form of an epistle to Wapowski, dated 3rd June, 1524, in which, whilst he praised the zeal and industry that Werner had bestowed upon his astronomical labours, he pointed out the fundamental errors on which the investigations had been conducted.

After 1531, Copernicus devoted himself with ever-increasing assiduity to the scientific studies he loved so much. By this time, too, it had become well known that he held a theory of the movement of the earth round the sun and thus stood opposed to the traditional system of astronomy.

He did not arrive at the theory which bears his name all at once. The seeds sown, either before or during his Italian sojourn, had been germinating. He had set himself to study the ancient philosophers and astronomers, in order to see if there were any possibility of lighting upon suggestions of a better harmony of the heavenly motions than that which was commonly approved up to his time, but which was manifestly imperfect. The worth of such hints could be ascertained only by experimental enquiry, or direct observation. For instance, he had before him for examination the theory of Martianus Capella. According to this author, the sun's position lay between the moon and Mars, and round it moved Mercury and Venus. But the earth was the centre of the world, for the sun itself (with the two planets in attendance) and the moon, as well as Mars, Jupiter and Saturn, circled round the earth. Apollonius Pergaeus was of opinion that the planets Mars, Jupiter, Saturn, besides

[1] Prowe, I, pt. II, p. 226.

Mercury and Venus, all went round the sun, but the sun and the moon travelled round the earth, which, therefore, still remained the central pivot of the universe. This latter theory was the one advocated by Tycho Brahe, the Danish astronomer, a generation or so after Copernicus had passed away.[1] Thus hard does error die, even among scientists, if only it be venerable enough! A close comparison of these theories with the facts gleaned from his observations of the motions of the heavenly bodies was sufficient to convince Copernicus of their inadequacy. But he came upon two other theories, each of which supplied him with portion of the truth. It bears eloquent testimony to the painful care of his observations and the critical exactitude of his calculations that he was able to combine the two, thus securing the whole truth.[2] The one theory was that of Pythagoras, who held that the sun, not the earth, was the centre of the world. The other theory was that of Nicetas and Heraclides. These learned men, for whom the earth was the central-point of the world, attributed to it a motion of its own, whereby, turning about on its axis and accomplishing the diurnal circuit from the setting of the sun to the dawn,

[1] Gassendi, p. 296, and Kistner (Adolf), *Kopernikus und Galilei*, &c., Leipzig, 1912.

[2] *Nicolai Copernici Thorunensis de Revolutionibus Orbium Coelestium Libri VI*, Thoruni, MDCCCLXXIII (the anniversary edition), p. 6 of the Preface dedicatory to Pope Paul III. Having mentioned the traditions which had come down to him, teaching him that the earth is mobile, Copernicus continued: Inde igitur occasionem nactus, coepi et ego de terrae mobilitate cogitare. Et quamvis absurde opinio videbatur, tamen quia sciebam aliis ante me hanc concessam libertatem, ut quoslibet fingerent circulos ad demonstrandum phaenomena astrorum, existimavi mihi quoque facile permitti, ut experirer, an posito terrae aliquo motu firmiores demonstrationes, quam illorum essent, inveniri in revolutione orbium coelestium possent.

it made the change of night and day. Copernicus, when he combined these two theories, did not reach this decision by mere intuition, or by a fortunate guess. Even long after his years of examination and trial had fully persuaded him of the genuineness of his discovery, he still delayed, in order that every detail might be as accurate as it was possible for him to make it. The result is that his *De Revolutionibus* sets forth the most complete scientific discovery of that, or perhaps any, age.

Even early in its career, his doctrine met with opposition and ridicule in the very neighbourhood of its origin. The animosity of highly placed persons to Copernicus, the probable result of political differences, gave a desired opportunity to the inferior public of showing their contempt for the new opinions. Instigated by the Teutonic Knights and their followers, a schoolmaster (ludimagister) of Elbing produced a comedy in which Copernicus himself and his theory were exposed to derision. The details and the date are not quite clear, but the fact of the occurrence is incontestable.[1] It appears to have taken place during the festivities of Shrove-Tuesday night, 1531.

[1] The story comes from the correspondence of Bishop Giese, cited by Broscius of Cracow (in his edition of the *De Revolutionibus*, 1612). Apparently, it was repeated from Broscius by Starowolski (*Elogia ac vitae centum Poloniae scriptorum*, Venetis, 1627), and from Starowolski by Gassendi, *Nicolai Copernici . . .* Vita, 1655, p. 323.—Cp. Hipler (Dr. Franz), *Nikolaus Kopernikus und Martin Luther*, Braunsberg, 1868, pp. 6, 7. Dr. Prowe, I, pt. II, p. 243, draws attention to a statement made by Szulc in the *Gazeta Warszawska* (2nd January, 1857) that, on the occasion, an effigy of Copernicus was borne, in a donkey-cart, through the streets of Elbing, amidst the laughter and jeers of the crowd.

In spite of, perhaps even because of, opposition, his astronomical ideas were gaining a still wider fame. They spread even as far as Italy, for a report on " the Copernican opinion concerning the motion of the earth " was presented to Pope Clement VII in the Vatican gardens, in 1533, by an official named Johann Albrecht Widmanstad.[1] High ecclesiastical circles at Rome, therefore, had become acquainted with the new theory. Cardinal Nicolaus von Schonberg, who had taken part in many public affairs of importance and was consequently a man of wide outlook, as well as a learned scholar, displayed such an appreciative interest in the new astronomy that he might well have constituted himself the patron of its public acceptance if he had not died in the year after that in which he had written to Copernicus the epistle that the latter has prefixed to his great book.[2]

As a matter of fact, the first apostles—and sponsors—of the Copernican doctrine were the two Lutheran professors, Georg Joachim von Lauchen, called Rheticus, and Erasmus Reinhold.

II

Before Rheticus came to be his guest, the calm of Copernicus's social and private life had departed. Up to 1538, the bishops of Ermland were kinsmen of his in a greater or less degree, and all had manifested most amicable feelings towards him. When, however, Johann Dantiscus exchanged the See of Kulm for that

[1] Prowe, I, pt. II, p. 274.

[2] This epistle, dated " Romae, Calend. Novembris, anno M.D.XXXVI," was placed by Copernicus directly before the epistle dedicatory to Pope Paul III (on p. ii of the 1543 ed. of the *De Revolutionibus*).

of Ermland, on the death of Bishop Mauritius Ferber, the change brought disagreeable consequences to Copernicus.

Dantiscus, whilst he was the envoy of the Polish King at the Court of Charles V in Spain, had exhibited strong leanings towards humanism.[1] Lutheran scholars, such as Melanchthon, Eobanus Hessus, Isinder and Georg Sabinus, were amongst his friends. He had returned to his homeland at the time when Copernicus was acting as Administrator-General (1523), and soon after, paid a visit to Wittenberg as the guest of Melanchthon, who introduced him to Luther. The account which he has left of the evening that he spent with the reformer and of the opinions that he formed about that remarkable religious leader, is interesting, and, on the whole, not unappreciative.[2]

In later years, when he had become Bishop of Kulm, he turned against the reforming party. He now marked his entry upon the governance of the episcopal state of Ermland with the manifestation of an even more zealous regard for what he held to be his duty. In March, 1539, he issued a stern ordinance against heresy, in which he ordered all adherents of the Reformation to quit Ermland within one month, and warned them that if they returned they would be liable to punishment "in body and life and confiscation of goods."

Copernicus had had some friendly relations with

[1] Prowe, I, pt. II, pp. 333 and 336–40.

[2] Dantiscus sent a report of this interview to his friend, Tomicki, dated 8th August, 1523. Dr. Hipler has published it in his *Nikolaus Kopernikus und Martin Luther*. An extract from it is given in Postscript B, to illustrate the estimate of Luther which a contemporary formed of him, after a casual meeting.

Dantiscus in earlier days and even whilst the latter was still Bishop of Kulm. But from that moment when the Bishop turned his newly found zeal against the members of the Ermland Chapter, an estrangement arose between him and Copernicus. The severest attack was directed against Alexander Sculteti, and this touched Copernicus, for Sculteti was a friend of his. Copernicus was always loyal to his friends ; even if they differed from him in religious beliefs, he showed them a kindly forbearance. For ten years he and Sculteti had been intimate in friendship. Moreover, Sculteti had devoted himself with great ardour to geographical studies, in which branch of learning Copernicus took a keen interest.

Dantiscus, if we are to regard him as sincere in his public utterances and acts, provides us with an arresting psychic phenomenon. Whilst, as Bishop of Kulm, he was opposing the spread of Lutheran writings and doctrines in that diocese, he was actually carrying on a friendly intercourse with humanists who had quitted the old Church. Even after he became Bishop of Ermland, he continued to correspond with Melanchthon, Eobanus Hessus, and the rest. But when Stanislaus Hosius, private secretary to King Sigismund (to which monarch Dantiscus owed his promotion to the see of Ermland), became a canon of Frauenburg, the trouble began. Hosius was a bitter opponent of the Reformation. It looks as if he was the power behind Dantiscus, by whose insistence the Bishop and Chapter were urged to adopt the very stringent measures which they applied to Alexander Sculteti and even Copernicus himself.[1]

[1] Johannes Baptista Stanislaus Hosius became, in later years, Bishop of Kulm, advanced to the see of Ermland, was Papal Legate to the Court of the Emperor Frederick, was

Sculteti, at the first attack, promptly appealed to the decision of the Roman see. Apparently, he had powerful friends in Rome, for there he found the shelter which was denied him in his homeland. The Roman verdict when it came forth was mild, compared with those issued against him by the Bishop and Chapter of Ermland. A decree from Cracow (where Hosius was secretary) proscribed him from Polish lands; the Ermland Chapter ejected him as a heretic.

Before the process of Rome had concluded, Bishop Dantiscus ordered Copernicus to cease his friendly relations with Sculteti. This the great astronomer refused to do, declaring that "he esteemed Sculteti higher than many other men."[1] As Copernicus went, in the early summer of 1539, to pay a prolonged visit to his cousin and friend, Bishop Tiedemann Giese at Löbau, Dantiscus seized the opportunity of employing that Bishop's influence over his relative, and wrote to him, from Heilsberg, on 4th July, 1539:

---

elevated to the Cardinalate, and sat in the Council of Trent as a president. To him and Seripando, as they were consummate theologians (utpote praestantibus Theologis), was committed the task of framing the Tridentine doctrine of the Eucharist.—Pallavicino, *Vera Œcumenici Concilii Tridentini Historia*, Cologne, 1717, pt. III, p. 12 (lib. 17, cap. 7, num. 4). In spite of his acknowledged superiority in theological erudition, he vainly opposed the clause in the decree on "clandestine" marriages which sought to introduce the novel doctrine that such marriages were invalid.—Pallavicino, pt. III, p. 241 (lib. 22, cap. 9, num. 6). He found it necessary in the end to tender a complete submission, though still maintaining that "hitherto the Church regarded them as illicit, but not invalid."—*Ibid.*, pt. III, p. 275 (lib. 23, cap. 9, num. 2).

[1] This particular, as well as the letter of Dantiscus to Bishop Giese, Dr. Prowe says (I, pt. II, p. 361) that he obtained from two Polish writers, Szulc (in his *Zycie Mik. Kopernika*) and Polkowski (in his *Zywot Mik. Kopernika*).

" I have been informed that Dr. Nic. Copernicus has come to thee. Thou knowest that I love him as if he were my own brother. He is maintaining a close friendship with Sculteti, and that is bad. Give him a warning admonition that connections and friendships of this kind are hurtful to him, but do not let him know that the advice comes from me. It is surely known to thee that Sculteti has taken a wife and is guilty of atheism."

The Polish historians assert (though they do not confirm their statement with a citation of his words) that Copernicus returned a courteous reply to Dantiscus saying that he would do as his Reverence desired him.

There is a letter of Giese's, dated from his Castle at Löbau, 12th September, 1539, which is an answer to one from Dantiscus. If it be his response to the letter for 4th July quoted above, then Dantiscus must have put into it, in addition to the request for the breaking off of relations with Sculteti, some remarks or insinuations which reflected gravely on Copernicus's own life. For, immediately after his enthronement as Bishop of Ermland, and before he had given serious attention to the question of Copernicus's loyalty to Sculteti, he had chosen to interfere with the comfort of the astronomer's domestic life. Copernicus had as house-keeper a relative, Anna Schillings. This lady Dantiscus ordered Copernicus to dismiss. Copernicus, now in his sixty-sixth year, did not favour the upset to his domestic arrangements which compliance with the demand entailed, but nevertheless he wrote, on 2nd December, 1538, his answer, in which he expressed his willingness to do as his Bishop requested. He added, however, that it would be very difficult for him to find as suitable a person for managing his household. But a month later (11th January, 1539) when he wrote to Bishop Dantiscus, he alluded to the matter in words

which betray a sense of hurt, if not of actual shame, at yielding to an unwarranted demand [1]:

"I have done what I had no choice but to do. I hope that the admonition of your Reverence is now completely satisfied, in this respect."

After Copernicus was dead, Anna Schillings returned to Frauenburg to arrange for the sale of a house that belonged to her. The Chapter, thereupon, wrote to the Bishop whether they could permit her to remain, in order that she might carry out the stated business. His reply, dated from Heilsberg 1543, is characteristic of the man. Whilst he left the matter to the discretion of the Chapter to grant the permission required, he added [2]:

"But we would hold it better that you should keep away from, should avoid such a pestilence (*pestis contagionem*). It is not unknown to you, brethren, how great discredit has been cast upon the dignity of our Church by this person."

It must be remembered that, as Anna Schillings was a kinswoman of Copernicus, she probably was quite as closely related to the Bishop of Kulm. Giese, therefore, in his reply of 12th September, 1539, showed a complete understanding of the situation:

"When I spoke seriously to Dr. Nicolaus of your lordship's advice, and put the whole matter before him, he seemed no little disturbed. He said that, whilst he has always given unhesitating compliance with the wishes of your lordship, he is

---

[1] "Ich habe gethan, was ich nicht habe unterlassen dürfen; ich hoffe, dass nunmehr den Mahnungen Ew. Hochwürden in dieser Angelegenheit von mir vollständig Genüge geschehen ist. . . ."—Prowe, I, pt. II, p. 365. The Latin text of Copernicus's letter of 2nd December is given by Dr. Prowe, vol. II, p. 162.

[2] Prowe, I, pt. II, pp. 370, 371.

still accused by ill-wishers of furtive meetings. He denies that he has seen her, since her dismissal, except when she accidentally met and spoke with him at the Königsberg market. For myself, I know quite well that he possesses no inclination of the kind which some imagine. I am the more easily persuaded of this by his age and his incessant studies, as well as by the uprightness and honourable disposition of the man. Nevertheless, I have given him a warning not to furnish even an appearance of evil, and to this I believe he will accede. But it is right, so that your lordship may not put overmuch faith in an informer, that I should point out that men of eminence are always liable to arouse an envy which will not hesitate to give trouble to your lordship."

The irony of the whole business proceeds from the fact that, though instances of irregular living were common enough around him, no breath of slander had hitherto assailed the reputation of Nicolaus Copernicus. The uncle who had paid for his education, in spite of the austere character of his later life, had had a love-affair in his earlier career and Copernicus possessed, in consequence, an illegitimate cousin in the Burgomaster Teschner of the neighbouring town of Braunsberg. His brother Andreas, shortly after his return from Italy (about 1507), exhibited tokens of suffering from a disease, named in the Acts of the Chapter "lepra," on account of which he had to be excluded from the Ermland Chapter in 1512, and which caused his death in or about 1520. But the crowning part of the irony arises from the fact that, at the very time when Bishop Dantiscus of Ermland was condemning Sculteti, and admonishing Nicolaus Copernicus, he was himself corresponding with his wife and daughter in Spain and sending them money! No doubt, it has been asserted that, when Dantiscus entered into this marital relationship, he had not attained the higher order of the priesthood. This contention requires

more evidence than has been given. Dr. Leopold Prowe has adduced very good reasons for believing that Dantiscus had received priest's orders some years previously.[1] But, in any case, neither of the men he was lecturing and censuring, Copernicus and Sculteti, ever received the order of the priesthood.[2]

To Copernicus, in the midst of these rufflings of his home-life, there came, during the spring of 1539, a learned young man of twenty-five years who sought his friendship and his instruction in the new doctrines. This was the Professor of Mathematics at the University of Wittenberg, Georg Joachim Rheticus.

His arrival in Frauenburg, his cordial reception by Copernicus, and his sojourn of a couple of years in Ermland and Prussia, provide us with a series of remarkable contraries. That one belonging to Wittenberg who held the religious views proscribed in Ermland by the Bishop and Chapter should come to be the guest of that member of the Chapter whose scientific views were condemned by the utheran leaders at Wittenberg, was a circumstance which presented some of these contrarieties. But the most unexpected of all is that, on the one hand, Rheticus has left no indication in his writings of his ever having suffered any molestation in person, goods, or opinions, and that, on the other, the Chapter of Ermland, in spite of their fulmina-

[1] Prowe, p. 367.

[2] Some writers have considered that Copernicus was a priest because he was a canon. Flammarion, the French astronomer, actually gave the name of the Polish bishop who ordained him; but Hipler has termed this "a bold fiction." In 1531, certainly, Bishop Ferber declared that there was only one priest in the Chapter. He must have meant, in addition to the five "prelates," the Provost, the Dean, Cantor, Scholastic, and Custos.—Müller, *op. cit.*, pp. 35, 36.

tions against Lutheranism,[1] have likewise left no record of proceedings against the Lutheran in their midst or of even the mildest of protests at his presence. Equally strange is it that neither Luther nor Melanchthon, in spite of their opposition to the Copernican theory, raised any objection to his journey or to his championship of the new opinions, and that they kept his professorship open for his return to Wittenberg. All the circumstances fit in together with the most unexpected and extraordinary complaisance, but the results that have flowed from them are glorious and of fortunate import to the human race. One can but conjecture what would have become of the fame of Copernicus, and what would have been the further history of the scientific facts comprised in his doctrine, if Rheticus had not made his pilgrimage to Frauenburg and formed his admiring intimacy with the astronomer.

Georg Joachim von Lauchen was born, on 16th February, 1514, at Feldkirch in Voralberg, on the borders of the Rhaetian country. On this account he called himself Rheticus. He was educated, particularly in mathematics, at Zürich, and also at Wittenberg, where he took out his master's degree in 1535. In pursuit of further learning, he wandered off to Nürnberg to obtain instruction from Johann Schoner, and afterwards to Tübingen, seeking some additional knowledge from Johann Stöfler the former teacher of Melanchthon in mathematics. He was still residing at Tübingen when, through the influence of Melanchthon, he was recalled to Wittenberg to occupy the newly

[1] It is significant that, in April, 1540, there was made to apply to the state of Ermland the severe edict issued by King Sigismund in 1534, against those who should go to study at Wittenberg University.—Prowe, I, pt. II, p. 389.

established second chair of mathematics. Erasmus Reinhold had already been teaching there for some little time before Rheticus took up his duties. These two young men were eagerly attached to the Copernican theory, so far as they knew it. But whilst Reinhold remained at Wittenberg, and strictly performed the duties required of him, viz., to teach the Ptolemaic system, and nevertheless quite openly championed the system that was destined to supplant it,[1] Rheticus formed the resolution of gaining the fullest obtainable knowledge of the new doctrine from its greatest exponent.

A close friendship quickly arose between the famous master and the enquiring scholar—so close, indeed, that the latter extended his stay in Prussia for a much longer period than he probably had originally designed. He arrived in the spring of 1539, at that juncture in the affairs of Copernicus when envy and an ill-directed zeal were combining to render his private life unhappy. But there is a complete and honourable silence on the part of Rheticus, regarding these things. Rheticus was actually with Copernicus at the Castle of Löbau as the guest of Bishop Giese at the time when the letter already mentioned came from Dantiscus. It was there at the residence of the hospitable Bishop of Kulm that he composed, as a letter to Schoner at Nürnberg, according to a promise he had made to that teacher, but with an eye to its publication, the *Narratio Prima*. This little book, which was printed in Dantzig during the winter of 1539–40, had a long title : Ad clarissimum virum D. Joannem Schoner de libris revolutionum eruditissimi viri et mathematici excellentissimi, reverendi D. Doctoris Nicolai Torunnaei Canonici Varmiensis per quendam iuvenem mathematicae studiosum Nar-

[1] See Postscript A.

ratio Prima. Underneath this title, as a motto, was the Greek proverb: *δεῖ δὲ ἐλευθέριον εἶναι τῇ γνώμῃ τὸν μέλλοντα φιλοσοφεῖν.* The subscription to the first edition was: Ex musaeo nostro Varmiae, IX Calendas Octobris, Anno Domini MDXXXIX.[1]

Giese was so delighted with this little preliminary work that he sent off a copy of it to the Duke Albrecht of Prussia. In his letter, dated 23rd April, 1540, he refers to "the astronomical speculation of the worthy Herr Doctor Nicolaus Cupernic, canon at Frauenburg," and describes the treatise of Rheticus as a brief account of that "speculation."

After Rheticus had co-operated with Copernicus in some geographical labours, especially a map of Prussia, and had paid some visits to Dantzig and Königsberg, where he met Duke Albrecht and some of the relatives and friends of Copernicus, he returned to Wittenberg and his professional duties, in the winter of 1541–2. In February of the latter year he became Dean of the Faculty of Arts, but resigned his office before the year had ended.

In his *Narratio Prima*, Rheticus eulogised his friend and teacher with an affectionate warmth. He compared Copernicus with Ptolemaeus, but even that seemed to him an insufficient appraisement, for he exclaimed: "God has given to my Herr Preceptor, that profoundly learned man, the unlimited sovereignty in Astronomy for all time."[2] The object Rheticus sets himself to accomplish in his book is to give an account of the forthcoming great work of his instructor. In a few of his sections he only touches lightly and sketchily on the topics dealt with, apparently reserving them for

[1] See the anniversary edition of *Copernici De Revolutionibus Orbium Coelestium Libri VI*, Thoruni, 1873, p. 490.

[2] Prowe, I, pt. II, p. 439.

fuller treatment in some future *Narrationes*. These, however, he never composed. It is in the last sections of his treatise that Rheticus develops the Copernican theory of the planets.

A modern reader cannot avoid regarding it as extraordinary that a man like Rheticus should have interpolated into his scientific narrative, as he has done, a curious astrological discourse concerning the changeful effect on the monarchies of the world produced by the heavenly motions.[1] But such fancies were quite natural to the minds of the men, even learned and distinguished men, of that and the immediately succeeding ages.

If, in his *Narratio Prima*, Rheticus gave to the world a warm eulogy of his "Dominus Preceptor" Copernicus, he pronounced almost as warm a one of Bishop Giese, in the *Encomium Borussiae*, which he appended to the *Narratio Prima* in its first, second, and fourth editions.[2]

From this "Praise of Prussia," it is clear that Rheticus had none but happy experiences to chronicle of his sojourn in that land. When he left it, he carried with him a short mathematical exposition of trigonometry, in fact, a sketch of the mathematical arguments of which Copernicus was making use in his as yet unpublished great work. This little composition, though a transcript of the closing chapters of the First Book of the *De Revolutionibus*, had not in view the special object of establishing the movement of the earth, but was of a kind that would prove useful even to those who held the Ptolemaic opinions. For that reason Rheticus had it printed and circulated in 1542. Its chief interest to us lies in its Foreword, wherein

[1] Anniversary (1873) ed. of the *De Revolutionibus*, pp. 453–5.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 490, note.

Rheticus once more gives rein to his affectionate esteem for Copernicus [1]:

"This age is to be congratulated that it has still so great a worker to inspire and assist some of us in our studies. For myself, I feel that nothing more fortunate, among human things, has come my way than my acquaintanceship with such a man and instructor."

The great work was at last ready, but Copernicus was reluctant to publish it. To his friends he declared that he held as ideal the method of instruction adopted by the Pythagoreans, of teaching orally, among the initiated, the mysteries of their philosophy. But this was not a convincing argument, in the opinion of Giese or Rheticus. Finally, urged by them, he handed over to his episcopal kinsman the manuscript, having, first of all, prefixed to it a Dedication to Pope Paul III, in order to disarm his adversaries. That there were adversaries, among both religious parties, to be reckoned with appears from the fact that both Rheticus and Bishop Giese wrote *apologiae* for the Copernican theory at or about the time of the publication of the *De Revolutionibus*. In a letter of 26th July, 1543, which he wrote to Rheticus, the Bishop alludes to "that little work of thine in which thou maintainest that the motion of the earth is not contrary to the word of Scripture." But this *opusculum* of Rheticus's, as well as his *Vita Copernici*, has been lost. Giese's own apology for Copernicus has also been lost, though it was known at Cracow at the beginning of the seventeenth century.[2]

When the Bishop had received the manuscript from Copernicus he sent it off at once to Rheticus, with

[1] Gassendi, *op. cit.*, p. 314.
[2] Prowe, I, pt. II, p. 493, footnote.

whom he had apparently made arrangements for such an eventuality, whilst the latter was his guest.

Rheticus now proceeded to take measures for its publication at Nürnberg. There were several good reasons for his selection of this place. Nürnberg possessed no established Faculty which would offer opposition in defence of its vested interests. It was, moreover, a home of scientific learning; a number of erudite scholars like Johann Schoner lived there. It could pride itself on having the finest of printing presses, especially that of Johann Petrejus. Petrejus himself was a scholar, who had studied at Wittenberg and had received his master's degree at that University, but, having inherited a valuable printing establishment, he had devoted his abilities to this art. Between Rheticus and Petrejus there existed a bond of friendship. The latter had already shown an interest in the Copernican doctrines so ably advocated by his friend.

For the accomplishment of the important task he had in hand, Rheticus turned to this learned coterie at Nürnberg for their sympathy and help. But when he came to them, in mid-May, 1542, he brought with him letters of introduction from Melanchthon. That great man, in spite of his opposition to the Copernican theory, and though probably quite well aware of the reasons why Rheticus was anxious to obtain a good standing at Nürnberg, commended his young friend with generous cordiality to the leading scholars and Lutherans of that city.

Rheticus himself attended to the printing and correction of the first sheets of the great work,[1] and, for

[1] It is interesting to observe that the original MS. of the great work remained in the possession of Rheticus himself. Eventually, the Counts von Nostitz obtained it, and it was still preserved at Prague in the library that bore their name, in

the purpose of continuing this labour, came to stay at Nürnberg again in the summer of 1542. When, however, the winter season was approaching, he found himself obliged to return to his professional duties at Leipzig, where he had recently obtained an appointment. He had, therefore, to hand the oversight of the printing to Andreas Osiander, a Lutheran divine, who, among other literary pursuits, occupied himself with mathematical studies. Osiander held the charge of the Lorenz-Kirche in Nürnberg.

Whilst Rheticus was still living with him, Copernicus had written to Osiander, 1st July, 1540, on the question as to whether, in case he were to publish the doctrine of the movement of the earth, it would be likely to arouse the resistance of the philosophers and persons of a strong faith. Very nearly a year passed before Osiander, on 20th April, 1541, replied:

"Regarding these hypotheses I have always felt that, as they are not articles of faith but bases for calculation, they, though false, explain very well the appearances of the (celestial) motions. . . . It would be desirable that thou shouldest make some remark of this kind in the preface, so as the better to allay the feelings of the philosophers and theologians."

On the same day, Osiander wrote a letter to Rheticus at Frauenburg, of a similar import.[1] His views and suggestions, however, were not acceptable to either Copernicus or Rheticus.

Yet, when Copernicus's *De Revolutionibus* appeared

1873.—See Prolegomena, p. ix, of the 1873 ed. of the *De Revolutionibus*. The final printing of the book at Nürnberg was made from a transcript.

[1] *Joannis Kepleri Astronomi Opera Omnia*, edidit Ch. Frisch, Frankofurti-a-M., 1858–70, vol. I, p. 246, for these letters. The philosophers referred to were those who followed the teachings of Aristotle on Astronomy.

in print, it was found to have an address *Ad Lectorem* prefixed to it, in which it was declared that the statements in the book were to be taken as put forward, not as facts, but as astronomical hypotheses.

The intimate friends of Copernicus, especially Bishop Tiedemann Giese, were very indignant. Giese was under the impression that it was the printer who had written the preface. In a letter to Rheticus, 26th July, 1543, he speaks of it as " the impiety of Petrejus," and he begged Rheticus to bring the matter before the Senate of Nürnberg for redress.[1] Whether Rheticus did this or not, there is no means of knowing. In any case, there was no result, for the preface remained in all copies of this edition.

It is the astronomer Kepler who has revealed to us that Osiander wrote the interpolated preface. He sought, at the same time, to remove from that person the charges of bad faith or of fraud, which might be levelled at him.[2]

" He feared [says Kepler] what might have happened to Copernicus from the multitude of the philosophers ; he feared, too, that readers would be deterred from studying so splendid a work by (what would be represented to them as) the absurdity

---

[1] Prowe, I, pt. II, pp. 537 *et seq.*

[2] *J. Kepleri Op. Omn.*, Frisch, I, pp. 245–6.

Prowe (I, pt. II, pp. 533, 534) maintains : Osiander hat keine absichtliche Täuschung bezweckt. He declares further : Die Täuschung wurde auch dadurch befördert, dass Osiander's Ausführungen sich nicht etwa an einer unbeachteten Stelle vorfanden, sondern auf der ersten Seite des Werkes dem Leser entgegentraten. Zum mindesten musste daher die Auffassung vollberechtigt erscheinen, dass in Coppernicus selbst schliesslich Zweifel in Betreff der Wahrheit seines Systems aufgestiegen seien, und das jene erste Vorrede mit seiner Genehmigung, wenn nicht gar auf seinen Wunsch an die Spitze des Werkes gestellt worden sei.

of the hypothesis. For these reasons, he desired to render Copernicus's book milder to them. As for Copernicus himself, resolute in a stoical firmness of mind, he felt that he should declare his brilliant thoughts, even if they were to cause (temporary) loss to this very science. Osiander, more intent on the useful side of the matter than on the scientific, preferred to darken with a preface of his own the very true and decided theory of Copernicus. And indeed this plan of his has held sway for the last sixty years, but (as it seems to me) it is about time that the pretence should be exposed from the private letters of Osiander."

When Copernicus handed his precious manuscript over to his friend, his days were already numbered. On 8th December, 1542, Bishop Giese wrote to a canon of Frauenburg, named Georg Donner, begging him to stand by Copernicus and be a brother to him in his illness. Already, in the early months of 1543, Copernicus was observed to be failing rapidly. So, at least, Dantiscus informed the learned astronomer at Löwen, Gemma Frisius. That person replied (7th April) that, whilst he bewailed the illness of his distinguished friend, he was eagerly awaiting the appearance of the great book. Of it he declared appropriately enough :

" It is truly most fitting that this work should now arise in order that it may illuminate the setting of so grand a man with a light that shall never fall ! "

The end came on 24th May, 1543.

" On the self-same day on which Copernicus, paralysed in body and mind, breathed his last sigh, the first complete copy of the *De Revolutionibus* was brought to him. He saw it, and he touched it, the work of his life ; but already his attention was fixed on other than earthly things. A few hours after he expired. Thus it was that, according to a fine expression, with Copernicus, in a special sense, ' the end of life was the beginning of immortality.' " [1]

[1] Prowe, I, pt. II, p. 556.

POSTSCRIPT

A.—The Attitude of the Lutheran Leaders and the Authorities of the Roman Catholic Church towards the New Astronomy

Unquestionably, the first open condemnation of the Copernican theory came from Luther and Melanchthon. The opinion of the former is contained in his *Tischreden* [1]:

"There has been mention of a new astrologer who has been seeking to prove that the earth is moved and rotates, not the heavens or firmament, the Sun and the Moon. Just as if, while sitting in a wagon or ship and moving along, one were to fancy that it was the landscape and the trees which were making the journey. But here we have the usual thing: he who will be clever must devise something specially his own, which is the very best because he does it! The fool is wanting to revolutionise the whole science of astronomy. However, Holy Scripture declares that Joshua called on the sun, not the earth, to stand still!"

Whilst Rheticus was still in Ermland with Copernicus, and some months after the publication of his *Narratio Prima*, that is to say, in the autumn of 1541, Melanchthon wrote thus to a friend:

"Certain persons are fancying that it is a splendid *κατόρθωμα*[2] to furbish up an absurdity, as that Polish astronomer is doing, who applies motion to the earth and fixity to the sun. Truly prudent guides should put some check on intellectual wantonness!" [3]

---

[1] *Ander Theil der Tischreden D. Mart. Luthers* (Johan Aurifaber, Franckfurt am Mayn, anno M.D.LXVII), 639 vo.–640.

[2] A philosophical term, meaning "a thing rightly done," "a right action."

[3] Epistola D. Burcardo Mithobio, *Philippi Melanthonis Opera quae supersunt omnia*, edidit Carolus Gottlieb Bretschneider, Halis Saxonum, 1837, vol. IV, col. 679.

That there was, in the mind of either Melanchthon or Luther, any intention of adopting repressive measures against the supporters of the new theory may be at once negatived. Their treatment of Rheticus and Reinhold, the two avowed apostles of the Copernican doctrines, proves this. No doubt, Reinhold was required to teach the Ptolemaic system. That was in accordance with the terms of his appointment to the chair of mathematics at Wittenberg. But he was not hindered from publicly expressing his admiration of Copernicus and his belief that a new era in astronomical knowledge was dawning. In his preface to an edition of Peurbach's *Theoricae novae planetarum* (published, not as Gassendi states, in 1535, but in 1542), he declares [1]:

"A most distinguished labourer in this science has appeared during these more recent days, who has aroused among us great hopes for the restoration of astronomy, and who is even at this moment making preparations for the publication of his work. He dissents entirely from the Ptolemaic theory, as well in his explanation of this variation of the moon's motion as in other parts of astronomy. . . . And so, just when this department of knowledge has been experiencing the need of another Ptolemy who should revive the decaying astronomical studies, a hope has come to me that he has at last arisen for us in Prussia and all posterity will observe his wonderful genius with well-deserved admiration."

Reinhold went further than merely to utter eulogies. Later on, he wrote an exhaustive commentary on the

[1] In his 1553 (Wittenberg) edition of Peurbach's work (p. 23), Reinhold altered his reference to Copernicus thus: Verum quia hae Ptolemaei hypotheses ad parenti magnitudini corporis lune haud rite satisfaciunt, nostra aetate doctiss. Vir Copernicus, qui cum omnibus veterib. Astronomiae artificib. merito comparari potest, alias tradidit concinniores, quas suo loco exponemus.

De Revolutionibus. As his composition has been lost, we are unable to take the full measure of the advocacy he bestowed on the Copernican theory, but it is abundantly clear that he supported it strongly. Yet he maintained his position at Wittenberg undisturbed.

When Rheticus was proceeding, in May, 1542, to Nürnberg to arrange for the printing of Copernicus's great work, he carried with him letters of introduction from Melanchthon addressed to some of the important Lutherans in that city. These letters dispose of the accusation that the young friend and disciple of Copernicus had been driven out of Wittenberg by Luther and Melanchthon. For example, writing to his friend Veit Dieterich, the Lutheran divine who had charge of the Sebaldus-Kirche, Melanchthon says [1]:

"To thee and other friends I commend Joachim Rheticus, a learned man and one capable of teaching the delightful science of the (heavenly) movements. For though, in the midst of so many things to be done, I have no leisure to write at length, yet I am wishful that he should carry to thee some sort of a letter so that thou mayest know that I love this Joachim."

About the same time, Melanchthon wrote to Camerarius [2]:

"Our Joachim, the mathematician, when he understood that I was detaining him here, begged me for letters. But, although he is of great service to us and leaves us against our will, nevertheless . . ."

In a later letter to Camerarius he speaks thus of Rheticus [3]:

[1] *Phil. Mel. opera*, Bretschneider, vol. IV, col. 810.
[2] *Epistolarum Philippi Melancthonis Libri IV*, Londini, M.DC.XLII, col. 796.
[3] *Ibid.*, col. 800.

" I permitted the youthful eagerness of my friend Rheticus to run ahead, with a certain kind of enthusiasm, towards that department of philosophy in which he is engaged. But I have often said that I wished he had a little of that Socratic philosophy, which perchance may one day be his when he has a wife and children to look after ! "

Rheticus, in fact, at this date, gave up his appointment at Wittenberg in order to obtain a similar one at Leipzig, but he made this exchange at his own wish and with the help of Melanchthon and others.

The fact is that the Lutheran leaders were convinced that the statements of Holy Scripture put the fixity of the earth and the mobility of the sun beyond question. In this, they followed the logic of their own interpretation of Scripture ; but they never carried their hostility to the new astronomical theory to the length of persecuting or punishing the adherents of Copernicanism. It was not a matter that impaired the Christian faith ; it involved simply an interpretation of Scripture different from their own, one, indeed, which they regarded as erroneous. Amongst Lutherans there was no tribunal that claimed the sole and complete authority to interpret Scripture. The only restraint, therefore, which Protestants could impose, in such a case, upon the promoters of the new theory, was that which would come from the force of argument.

Six years after the death of Copernicus, Melanchthon published his *Initia doctrinae physicae.* In the chapter which is entitled, " Quis est motus mundi ? " he thus discloses the views of the leading Lutherans [1] :

" Our eyes bear witness that the sky is turned round every twenty-four hours. But some, in this particular, urged either by a liking for novelty or in order to show off their own clever-

[1] *Initia doctrinae physicae, dictata in academia Witebergensi a Philip. Melanth.*, Witebergae, M.D.LXXXV, pp. 61–4.

ness, maintain that the earth moves. . . . They even reckon the earth among the stars. . . . But though these keen-witted workmen are doing a considerable amount of research, for the purpose of exercising their abilities, nevertheless for them to assert publicly absurd opinions is not a seemly thing to do and sets a hurtful example.

"But however much a scientist (physician) may be laughed at for quoting the word of God (testimonia divina), yet we hold it for most worthy to compare philosophy with the heavenly utterances, and, in so great a darkness, to follow, as far as we can, the counsel of an authority which is of God." Here Melanchthon quotes some psalms and Ecclesiastes, ch. I, in proof that it is the sun which moves, whilst the earth stands still. He then continues: "Convinced by these testimonies, let us take the truth to heart (veritatem applectamur), and not permit ourselves to be led astray by the legerdemain of those who deem it a credit to their mental abilities to throw the sciences into confusion. . . .

"In the rotation of a circle, it is evident that the centre remains motionless. But the earth is in the middle of the world, and so it is the centre of the world; it is therefore motionless."

To Pope Clement VII and to Duke Albrecht the Copernican theory had been presented as "an opinion" or "a speculation."[1] It is, however, to the honour of the Cardinal von Schonberg and Bishop Tiedemann Giese, and probably some other members of their Church, that they entertained no illusions about the great astronomical discovery which they acclaimed so heartily. Yet, these personal convictions of theirs cannot be taken as representative of the official attitude of a Church which is not bound by the individual decisions of its members. And one has to observe

[1] Curtze (Maximilian), *Inedita Coppernicana*, Leipzig, 1878. On pp. 5–17, is given *Nicolai Coppernici de hypothesibus motuum coelestium a se constitutis commentariolus*. Curtze remarks: Es ist beachtenswert, dass hier Coppernicus selbst seine Darstellung des Weltgebäudes als Hypothese hinstellt.

that, when the *De Revolutionibus* was published, it issued from a Lutheran press, under the ægis of Lutheran scholars, was sponsored for about seventy years by Lutherans, and that part of Galileo's offence was that he kept in touch with the Copernican theory by corresponding with German astronomers (item quod circa eamdem servares correspondentiam cum quibusdam Germaniae mathematicis).

The *De Revolutionibus* issued from the press in 1543, as the work of a Roman Catholic, with a dedication to a Pope which contained an interpretation of Holy Scripture put forth by the author himself against the traditional view of his Church. It is at least a matter for question, if the book could have been so published after 1546, when the Council of Trent, at its Fourth Session, very definitely enunciated the Church's authority to judge of the true meaning and interpretation of Scripture. Copernicus would have been under the necessity of submitting his theory, first of all, to the judgement of the Church and of abiding by the result, a result that would have anticipated the decision of 1616, and would have retarded all advance in astronomical science.

For, the Sentence of 22nd June, 1633, passed upon Galileo, stated that he was condemned, not for having held a false astronomical doctrine, to wit, the doctrine that the earth moved and that the sun was the centre of the world and stationary, but for continuing to hold, teach, and promulgate this doctrine, after he had been admonished that it had been declared and defined as contrary to Holy Scripture, and further, for presuming to explain Scripture in a sense contrary to that which the Church declared to be the true sense.

It will, therefore, be seen that the attitude of the general body of Lutherans who were opposed to the

Copernican theory was a different one from that of the authorities of the Church which ultimately in 1616 and 1633 declared it to be heretical, even if the heresy involved was that less serious kind, the Heresy Inquisitorial, as the abbé Léon Garzend maintains. The only similarity between the two attitudes consisted in both parties asserting the anti-scriptural character of the Copernican affirmations. But whilst the one party could only, and did only, defend their attitude by argument, the other declared all support given to free enquiry in astronomy an offence against the teaching-authority of the Church.[1]

B.—EXTRACT FROM THE ACCOUNT, SENT BY DANTISCUS TO HIS FRIEND THE BISHOP OF POSEN, CHANCELLOR OF THE KINGDOM OF POLAND, DESCRIBING HIS INTERVIEW WITH LUTHER.—Taken from Dr. Franz Hipler, *Nikolaus Kopernikus und Martin Luther*, Braunsberg, 1868, pp. 72–4.

" . . . Hic emptis rursum equis, ut eo modo quo exieram redirem, per Coloniam Aggripinam usque Lipsiam, non sine discriminibus propter multos predones, qui hic inde grassabantur, incolumis perueni. Et cum intellexissem Ill^mum D. Ducem Georgium

[1] *L'Inquisition et l'Hérésie*, Paris, 1912, a work of considerable erudition and acuteness, in which the abbé has dealt very fully with the whole question of the anti-Galilean process. Chapter IX (*Étude de la sentence anti-galiléenne*) is specially recommended for notice. Observe, too, the footnote on p. 433 : C'est ainsi que les rédacteurs de la Sentence de 1633 envisagent le *decretum* anti-copernicien de 1616 ; ils disent, en effect, s'adressant à Galilée et parlant de la théorie du mouvement de la terre, qu'on le condemne pour avoir continué de tenir et enseigner une doctrine " après qu'elle lui avait été déclarée et définie contraire à la Sainte Écriture." L'expression revient deux fois dans le cours de la Sentence.

Saxonie Nurnbergam concessisse, nolui ut fortassis nimium curiosus Lutherum, cum Vitenberga esset in propinquo, preterire, quo tamen non sine difficultate pertingere potui. Erant enim fluuiorum tante inundaciones presertim Albis, quae propter Vitenbergam fluit, quod omnes fere segetes in decliuioribus locis sunt submerse. Audiui inter eundem multas a Rusticis contra Lutherum et illius complices diras et imprecaciones, sic enim credebatur quia per totam Quadragesimam carnibus usi sunt plerique quod ob eam rem Deus totam prouinciam corriperet. Relictis igitur equis in alia ripa cimba ad Vitenbergam traieci. Nunc ego velim quod mihi copia daretur, nam omnia scribi sic non possunt, que ibi aguntur. Inueni istic iuuenes aliquot hebraice grece et, latine doctissimos, Philippum Melancthonem precipue qui solidioris literataure et doctrine inter omnes habetur princeps. Juuenis 26 agens annum profecto et humanissimus et candidissimus is mecum per hoc triduum quod ibi absumpsi. Per illum profectionis meae causas hunc in modum Luthero exposui. Qui non Romae Pontificem et Vitenbergae Lutherum uidisset, vulgo nil uidisse crederetur, unde cuperem illum et uidere et alloqui, et quo omni suspicione conuentus iste careret, nihil mihi aliud cum eo esset negocii quam ut salue et uale dicere. Non facile a quodlibet aditur; me tamen non grauatim admisit, uenique cum Melancthone ad eum in fine cenae, ad quam sui ordinis quosdam fratres adhibuerat, qui quia albis tunicis erant induti sed militarem in modum fratres esse noscebantur, crinibus uero a Rusticis nil differebant. Assurrexit et quoddammodo perculsus manum dedit et locum sedendi assignauit. Consedimus; habiti sunt per 4 fere horarum spacium usque in noctem varii de variis rebus inter nos sermones. Inveni virum acutum, doctum, facundum, sed citra

maledicenciam, arroganciam et livorem in Pontificem, Caesarem, et quosdam alios Principes nil proferentem.[1] Quae si omnia describere velim, dies me deficeret et Cubicularius qui istas feret iam in procinctu est, unde multa congerenda sunt in compendium. Talem habet Lutherus vultum quales libros aedit, oculos acres et quiddam terrificum micantes, ut in obsessis interdum videtur; simillimos habet Rex Daciae, neque aliud credo quam utrumque sub una atque eadem constellacione natum; sermone est vehemens, ronchis et cavillis plenus, habitum fert, quo ab Aulico dignosci nequit; cum domu, quam inhabitat, quae prius monasterium fuit, egreditur ferre habitum suae relligionis dicitur. Consedentes cum eo non locuti solum, verum etiam vinum et cerevisiam hilari fronte bibimus, ut ibidem mos est, videturque in omnibus bonus socius, Germanice: "Ein gutt Geselle." Vite sanctimonia, quae de illo apud nos per multos predicata est, nil a nobis aliis differt, fastus in eo manifeste noscitur et magna gloriae arrogancia; in conviciis oblocucionibus cavillis aperte videtur dissolutus. Quis sit aliis in rebus, libri eius clare eum depingunt. Multe lectionis et scriptionis esse fertur; iis diebus ex Hebraico libros Moisi in latinum transfert, in quo opera Melancthonis plurimum utitur. Qui iuuenis inter omnes Germaniae doctos mihi maximopere placet, neque cum Luthero in omnibus sentit, de quibus omnibus coram aliquando, quod uehementer cupio, lacius.

[1] Naturally, Dantiscus does not refer to possible causes for these sentiments of Luther's.

Printed in Great Britain for Robert Scott, *Publisher*, Paternoster Row, London, E.C., *by* Butler & Tanner Ltd., Frome.