

RTP 1042 p

ROMAN CATHOLIC
AND
ANGLICAN ACCURACY

A public correspondence between

G. G. COULTON, M.A.

and

The Revd. HERBERT THURSTON, S.J.

London :

SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, HAMILTON, KENT & Co., Ltd.,

1927.

Price 6d. net.

Bibliothèque Maison de l'Orient



129922

The first and last letters are dated from day of writing ; those to *The Western Morning News* (Nos. 2 to 13) from the day of publication. Printer's errors are corrected (e.g., *gently* for *flatly*). Formal addresses and conclusions are omitted.

G. G. C. to Fr. THURSTON, Feb. 9, 1927.

I have now found time to look into your 8 strictures on my *Medieval Village*.

(1) You write (p. 557) that I "go on to cite with approval the statement of Henri Sée." This, in the only possible sense which your argument implies, is not true. In my very next words (p. 143), I suggest that some readers may "discount this heavily as the verdict of a French man of science who has, perhaps, little reason to love the official Church;" and two pages later (145) I suggest that Sée, under cross-examination, would probably have softened his verdict.

(2) On p. 559 you accuse me of quoting William of Auvergne from an edition which does not exist, viz., that of Rouen, 1674. This, again, is not true. The Rouen edition of 1674 is in the Cambridge University Library, press-mark E. 7, 10. I have, however, given the wrong page-number, misled by the bad print; my reference should run not 354 but 364; and this shall be duly corrected among my *errata*.

(3) You infer that I have "not consulted the Latin originals [of St Joan's trial], edited by Quicherat," and therefore that I have made an "interested mis-statement."

Why should I consult Quicherat, when I tell my readers plainly that I quote from the more recent and more accurate edition of Champion? Why, instead of looking up my references to Champion, do you continually confront me with Quicherat, who (as you yourself note) "in several places has transcribed his texts rather carelessly"? Is it my business to defer to your accidental prejudices and ignorance, instead of writing for the ordinary straight-forward public?

(4) You write (p. 361) "The only record of the trial which we possess is the official record of the greffiers," from which you proceed to quote textually in order to confound me. This is not true; we possess a great deal of the evidence in two separate records; and, if you had verified my references, you would have seen that I quote correctly from the record which comes first.

(5) By ignoring this, you are able, with a specious show of truth, to accuse me (p. 563) of being "unable to interpret a plain text in its obvious sense." No competent Latin scholar would venture to call the sense of the text which I quoted obvious, though he might well have differed from my translation. The text from which you say "Dr Coulton translates"

is, indeed, quite obvious, and shows my own conjecture to have been wrong. Here again, I shall publish the correction ; but please verify my references or merely take the trouble to read again the Latin original which I give in my footnote, and you will see that it is not from the text quoted by you that I translate ; therefore, here again, the blame which you cast upon me owes much of its weight to your own carelessness.

(6). You criticize my description of Jeanne d'Arc's as "the normal religious *education* of a peasant *girl* of the better sort," by which, as the words I here italicize might show you, and as the next page confirms, I mean Jeanne's home life, before she rode out on her military mission at the age of about 19. A considerable proportion of the evidence with which you try to confute this refers to her later and public life.

(7). You accuse me of straining Hugues de St-Cher's words, by "tacking on to [his criticism of clergy and Religious] a passage about the sins crying to heaven, which has no connection whatever with what precedes. Mr Coulton's reader will inevitably infer that the Cardinal is still discussing the misdoings of the regular clergy, but he is commenting now upon an entirely new verse of the Psalm (lxxvii 59)." Here, again, the trouble is due to your own carelessness or ignorance. It is true that the commentator, having dealt with one verse, passes on to the next ; but to say that he then ceases to discuss the misdoings of the regular clergy is quite false. He actually begins his commentary on this new verse thus: "*Audivit Deus, the evils of clergy and Religious*"; and then, a few words later, "now there are four sorts of sins," &c., just as I give it on p. 144 of my book. Then he goes on with *Sacerdotes, Religiosis, clericum et Religionem, statum clericorum vel Religiosorum, de clericis et Religiosis*. All these references come in his comment on verses 59 and 60 ; and five other such repetitions occur before we get to the bottom of the column. I can only conclude that you made no attempt to read even two or three lines of the commentary before you brought this railing accusation against me.

(8). I protested against Delisle's verdict that "medieval writers, on *almost all* occasions, *have never failed* to speak of the labourers with the most touching sympathy and the keenest solicitude." I point out that Delisle gives only two pertinent quotations, neither of which bears out the strong words which I here italicize. Against him I bring fifteen more directly pertinent quotations from the Middle Ages, and the generalizations of Lamprecht, a writer as eminent as Delisle himself. You quote against me only two medieval authors, one of which, you claim "entirely bears out the verdict of

Delisle." I reply that it does nothing of the sort; when at least fifteen medieval writers have spoken of the peasant with scorn, how can the production of one single sympathizer, even when added to Delisle's two, "entirely bear out" Delisle's "on almost all occasions . . . have never failed"?

(9) I quote Alvarus Pelagius on the peasant, as part of my evidence for the assertion that "medieval writers are generally scornful of the peasant." You stigmatise this as "little short of childish," because Alvarus finds five times as many bad things to say against women as a class than against peasants as a class. But you cannot be ignorant of the notorious fact, emphasized by Chaucer, that the medieval clergy nearly always speak ill of women. How then does this affect the fact that they also wrote scornfully of the peasantry? We may think their judgment foolish in both cases; but the foolish scorn in one case, far from disproving foolish scorn in the other, only goes to increase the probability. We must, therefore, still more definitely recognise the only fact with which my text is concerned, that Alvarus is "scornful of the peasant."

This, then, is the fashion in which you habitually back-bite me under cover of Roman Catholic magazines which, in accordance with your traditional censorship system, either refuse protests outright or suppress the heretic's letters at the point when the believer's excuses have led him into still more indefensible mis-statements. I must, therefore, deal with you by the only method which I have found really successful with certain controversialists of your communion. You may choose any Professor of Latin or of History you like, at any University in England, Scotland or Wales, so long as he is head of his faculty and not a mere assistant. Let us each send him a cheque for ten guineas, with a promise to abide by his decision. Let him take five for his trouble, give five to any undenominational charity he chooses, and return ten to you or to me, according as he decides in your favour or mine, by a clearly-expressed public verdict, upon these seven points. If you plead that this 20th century ought to have grown out of this kind of thing, I agree entirely with you. It is painfully like the state of things at medieval Universities, when the authorities complained that men cared little for perjury or excommunication, so that it was necessary to inflict small money fines instead. But the shame of this proposal, if shame there is, must be upon your head and not upon mine.

You will see that I have marked this letter *public*; for I claim the right of treating your reply, or your silence, as a public matter.

- 2) From "H. J.," to *The Western Morning News*, April 8.

Since Mr Tom Miners's letter appeared in last Monday's *Western Morning News* I have got hold of a copy of Mr Coulton's "The Medieval Village." I only suggested that, Mr Coulton's other works having been shown to have many mistakes in them, I was not prepared to take him as a trustworthy authority, but I did not condemn his book unread, and I was not referring to what Mr Belloc and Mr Chesterton said. They are both amusing writers, but I for one—and I think I may claim, "though I say it as shouldn't," that I know quite as much about the Middle Ages as they (or even Mr Coulton) do—do not agree with all their idealizations of that period, especially with regard to their "anti-capitalism" fad, with which I have no sympathy. If I was referring to any of Mr Coulton's opponents in particular, it was to a much more trustworthy and impartial writer, my friend, the Rev. Herbert Thurston, S.J., whose knowledge of ecclesiastical matters is unrivalled and who is more concerned with getting at facts than with running any particular side, though he does happen to be a Jesuit.

- (3) G. G. C. to *The Western Morning News*, (about May 5).

A friendly correspondent has drawn my attention to a long letter in your issue of April 8 from "H. J.," in which that gentleman (or lady) stigmatizes me as a man whose writings "have been shown to have many mistakes in them," in contrast with "a much more trustworthy and impartial writer, my friend the Rev. Herbert Thurston, S.J., whose knowledge of ecclesiastical matters is unrivalled."

Since I earn my living as an official teacher of history in the University of Cambridge, you will doubtless permit me a brief defence against this direct attack.

Fr. Thurston has more than once attacked me under cover of Roman Catholic publications which shelter him from full exposure. He recently reviewed my "Medieval Village" in an Irish magazine. Knowing by experience the uselessness of asking for fair play in any such journal, I sent a letter by registered post, on February 10, straight to the reverend Jesuit himself. Taking eight of his points, I opposed in each case my own evidence to his assertions, pointed out the cowardly nature of these attacks, and concluded thus: "I must therefore deal with you by the only method which I have found really successful with certain

controversialists of your communion. You may choose any Professor of Latin or of History you like, at any University in England, Scotland, or Wales, so long as he is head of his faculty and not a mere assistant. Let us each send him a cheque for ten guineas, with a promise to abide by his decision. Let him take five for his trouble, give five to any undenominational charity he chooses, and return ten to you or to me, according as he decides in your favour or mine, by a clearly-expressed public verdict, upon these seven" [there really were eight] "points. . . . The shame of this proposal, if shame there is, must be upon your head and not upon mine. You will see that I have marked this letter *public*; for I claim the right of treating your reply, or your silence, as a public matter."

To this plain challenge Fr. Thurston has made no answer whatever. Therefore I take this occasion of repeating it in your columns; and I prophesy confidently that he will again shrink from it, though I can no more anticipate what particular excuse he will plead than you or your readers can. But you and they will then understand that, if he still remains silent, it will be pardonable in me to waste no further trouble upon a critic who, when we appeal to his conscience through his purse, loses the courage of his own opinions.

Thanking you, sir, and "H. J.," for this opportunity of vindicating my accuracy against a persistent and irresponsible backbiter.

(4) G. G. C., May 18.

"H. J." ought really to read again his own words before writing to imply that I have misinterpreted them. He distinctly asserted that I had been shown to have made "many mistakes"; that he could not accept me as "trustworthy"; and that, among my opponents, he was now referring "in particular" to Father Thurston.

In pleading now "I certainly made no 'attack'" on Mr Coulton, and in representing me as "unduly touchy" because I take this opportunity of claiming a fair hearing against Father Thurston in an independent paper, he seems neither accurate nor courageous. If "H. J." permitted himself to describe a local physician or lawyer as a man whose many mistakes had been exposed, and who was not trustworthy on points directly concerning his profession, he would find his touchiness assume a very practical form, and he would not escape by treating him as foolish for having taken serious words in a serious sense.

His surprise at Father Thurston's silence now (for, as he says, that gentleman is seldom at a loss for some sort of answer) shows an imperfect appreciation of the tactics of professional Roman Catholic controversialists. They gain their hold over half-informed readers, who have ordinarily no time to verify references or to pursue a subject to the end, precisely by these guerilla tactics. They are always on the watch to pounce upon errors on the other side, but they carefully avoid committing themselves, under cross-examination, to more important discussions. There is no Roman Catholic writer with a real sense of responsibility (let us say a recognized University teacher, or prominent Jesuit, or a man whom the Bishop of his diocese would vouch for as a competent champion for his Church) who would dare to discuss, by fair reply and counter-reply, the historical question of Papal Infallibility, or the crooked methods of Roman Catholic historians in the past and up to the present day, and allow me to print the discussion at my own expense. To any of your readers who doubts this, I venture to point out that I have published some of the relevant facts in a review article, reprinted under the title of "Roman Catholic History" (Simpkin, Marshall & Co., 6d.). It was written in reply to another Jesuit; he was offered space in the same journal to meet me, but declined.

"H. J." suggests that these gentlemen are repelled by strong language. That is not so; their own language is violent when they write in the shelter of their own sectarian publications. It is not my language that silences Father Thurston, but my facts. To quote the briefest of my eight points: He accused me of inaccuracy for quoting from the 1674 Rouen edition of Bishop Guillelmus Alvernus. He writes "It was printed at Orléans and not at Rouen." Yet, in fact, it was not only published at Rouen, but this is plainly stated on the title page of a copy in our University Library, press-mark E. 7, 10. This I pointed out to my critic, and this is a fair specimen of the secret reasons which withhold him now from risking the test to which I challenge him.

(5) H. T., May 25.

Living in London, I naturally do not see "The Western Morning News." But a correspondent personally unknown to me has kindly sent me a cutting from your issue of May 18, in which I find my name figuring prominently in a letter from Dr G. G. Coulton under the above heading. Of the nature of the correspondence which has preceded I have not the least

idea, but in that letter he remarks: "It is not my language which silences Father Thurston, but my facts," and by way of illustration he refers to the 1674 edition of the works of Gulielmus Alvernus, otherwise called William of Auvergne, which he declares was printed at Rouen and not, as I stated, at Orléans.

Let me point out first that this detail, a point of no consequence, was not mentioned in the text of my article, but only casually in a footnote, which I hope I may be allowed to quote entire:

"Without accusing Dr Coulton of special negligence, his references are not always accurate. He asserts that Bishop William of Auvergne 'writes of servilia opera as unworthy of self-respecting men': and gives as a reference 'Opera Rouen, 1674, I, 354, i.g.' There is undoubtedly an edition of William's works dated 1674, but it was printed at Orléans and not at Rouen, and the folio indicated says nothing whatever about servile work."

Obviously my main complaint was that the reference is wrong, and Dr Coulton does not deny that the wrong page was cited in his book. In a private letter he has expressly admitted the fact. But he says that the edition he cited was published at Rouen. I can only say that the copy of this 1674 edition in the British Museum which I had consulted there was published "Aureliæ," i.e., at Orléans. Further, the copy in the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris is also described in their printed catalogue as published at Orléans, and thirdly, Dom Ceillier in his "Auteurs Ecclésiastiques" (Vol. xxiii., p. 482) describes this 1674 edition as bearing the imprint of both Orléans and Paris, "apparently," he says, "because it was printed in the former and sold in the latter city." It is interesting to learn that Dr Coulton considers this—to use his own words—"a fair specimen of the secret reasons which withhold him (Father Thurston) now from risking the test to which I challenge him."

Of the triviality of all this, your readers may judge. If Dr Coulton is surprised that I, among others, am not eager to accept the challenges and "défis" of which he is so lavish, I venture to suggest for one thing that one does not care to have any unnecessary relations with an adversary whose ideas of courtesy to opponents are abundantly exemplified in this very letter; and, for another, that such correspondence with Dr Coulton involves a prodigious waste of time. He is a man who, as everyone soon finds out, is never content to allow the matter to rest when both sides have had their say, but who goes on and on over some ridiculously trivial detail, which, like that cited above, is often a mare's nest of his own creation.

(6) G. G. C., June 1.

"H. J." may be right about the survival of the rudest ; but it is better to aim at the survival through comparative brevity, clearness and accuracy.

Fr. Thurston writes, "He [Mr C.] declares that the book was printed at Rouen, *and not, as I stated, at Orleans*. These words italicized are quite untrue, as any reader may see who cares to refer to my letter. I carefully refrained from saying anything about the Orleans edition for two very good reasons. First, I knew very well that a book has often been "published" at different places, and that scholars, to whom it does not in the least matter where it was printed, very properly make a point of naming the place where, on the title page, it is proclaimed to have been published. The copy which I used here definitely proclaims itself as published at Rouen, "Rotomagi." Therefore (and this is my second point) it is indifferent to me and to your readers at how many other places the book may have been published. Fr Thurston has specified, as one of my inaccuracies, that I had quoted from a Rouen edition, which, his words plainly imply, did not exist. The existence of a hundred non-Rouen editions would not affect my accuracy there ; his point is, the non-existence of this Rouen edition ; yet this edition, in fact, may be seen by anyone in the University Library here.

As to the page, I had told him plainly that the bad type had misled me into reading 354 for 364, "and this shall be duly corrected among my errata." Therefore, the only point in dispute between us, and the sole ground on which I explicitly based my challenge, was the actual existence of a Rouen edition. This, after more than three months, he at last grudgingly admits, if, indeed, he does mean to admit it by writing now "he says that the edition he cited was published at Rouen." In other words, he now abandons the one and only point on which I had challenged him to arbitration with regard to William of Auvergne.

True, this is a most insignificant point in itself ; but it is a fair specimen of Fr Thurston's reasons for avoiding my challenges on all the others, some of which are of primary importance. I can prove, for instance, that he either had not read a whole column of Latin print which he accused me of misrepresenting, or that he is incapable of understanding the plain Latin words repeated over again in that column. I chose this smaller example because it could be clearly stated in a few words. But Fr Thurston knows very well that he could not find a competent umpire who would adjudge in his favour on the more important points of dispute between us. That is

why, though I was quite unable to anticipate his exact excuse, I confidently predicted his refusal to face the ordeal.

To argue farther with "H. J." would be interminable. It is sufficient if your readers now realize how steadily even the oldest and most experienced Roman Catholic controversialists refuse to commit themselves to any really searching test. In the last seventeen years only one has accepted my offer to print, at my own risk, anything which a responsible Roman Catholic has to say, *under cross-examination*, against the general accuracy of my writings. Readers will now understand why I underline those two words. The result of that single venture may be read in a correspondence between the Jesuit Fr Leslie J. Walker and myself, published by Simpkin, Marshall & Co. under the title of "Roman Catholic Truth" (1924, 3s. 6d.)

(7) H. T., June 6.

I am reluctant to continue this correspondence and still more to adopt the tone which Dr Coulton regards as permissible in such discussions. But the terms of his last letter leave me no choice.

In your issue of May 18 Dr Coulton wrote: "He (Fr. Thurston) accused me of inaccuracy in quoting from the 1674 Rouen edition of Guillelmus Alvernus. He writes: 'It was printed at Orléans and not at Rouen.' Yet, in fact, it was not only published at Rouen, but this is plainly stated on the title page of our Cambridge copy." No one who reads the footnote referred to—I quoted it entire in my last letter—can fail to see that this statement of Dr Coulton is calculated to give an entirely false impression. What I criticized in my footnote was the fact that by citing a wrong page Dr Coulton had rendered it impossible to verify the passage he referred to. Of this admitted error his first letter said nothing. I added, but obviously as a point which was quite secondary, that the 1674 edition of Guillelmus "was printed at Orléans and not at Rouen." None the less, that statement also is strictly accurate. This 1674 edition is everywhere referred to as the Orléans edition (see the article "Guillaumo d'Auvergne" in Miehaud's "Biographie Universelle," and in Brunet's "Manuel du Libraire," ed. 1861, II. col. 1821). I could also add other references besides those given in my last letter. The accident that the Cambridge copy has a new title page with the imprint "Rotomagi" does not alter the fact that the book was printed at Orléans.

No sane man can suppose that three separate impressions in folio of such an author can have been set up in type at different presses in the same year. Consequently it is meaningless to talk as my critic does of a "Rouen edition" as if it differed from that printed in Orléans.

What, then, has Dr Coulton to complain of? The fact that he gave a wrong page reference is admitted. My allegation that the 1674 edition was "printed at Orléans and not at Rouen" is equally justified. And yet he quotes this issue chosen by himself as a "fair specimen" of a number of other blunders I am supposed to have committed. I cannot say how fully I agree that this is a fair specimen of his grievances. When he thinks it worth while to put in print the definite grounds of his other objections, as he has done here, he will find that I am ready to do my best to answer. But so far as regards those aspects of controversy which are made up of incivility, vague insinuations and rodomontade, I confess that they have no attraction for me.

(8) G. G. C., June 11.

We can now bring Father Thurston to the real point, which, after all, is simple. Of course, it is a very small point in itself; but probably the apple of Eden was of no great intrinsic value; the important thing then was Adam's and Eve's attitude, and here it is Father Thurston's attitude towards inconvenient facts.

His review accused me of inaccuracy on two separate counts, (1) a wrong edition, and (2) a wrong page-number; this, though you would not judge it from his second letter, is the order in which he himself put the two accusations. The second count I at once admitted; I had misread a badly-printed numeral, and written 354 for 364. On the first count, however, I challenged him (as on seven others of greater intrinsic importance) to submit the case to any Latin or History professor whom he might choose in England, Scotland, or Wales. That challenge he still steadily refuses, as I foretold you he would.

Meanwhile he fills his letters with talk about Orléans, which is absolutely foreign to the question. True, he himself did attempt to smuggle it into the question by writing, "He (Mr C.) declares that the book was printed at Rouen, not, as I stated, at Orléans." This, however, as I showed in my last letter, is, simply untrue; yet he still offers no sort of apology for it, but again attempts to confuse the issue

by misleading talk about Orléans. Secondly, he has made an equally plain misstatement in speaking of my "private letter." That letter was not only marked *public* at the top of the first page, but it ended with words, "You will see that I have marked this letter *public*, for I claim the right of treating your reply, or your silence, as a public matter." And now, in this last letter, he makes a third misstatement, i.e., that I "talk of a 'Rouen edition' as if it differed from that printed in Orléans."

So far had I been from saying this that my words definitely implied the contrary probability, i.e., that these three different title-pages—Paris, Orléans, and Rouen—covered one and the same book, without any difference of text. I began this correspondence by warning your readers that Father Thurston might have some difficulty in finding colourable excuses; but I was scarcely prepared to see him flounder into three such plain misstatements within two letters.

At the end, however, he really does come to the point. He writes, "When he (Mr C.) thinks it worth while to put in print the definite grounds of his other objections, as he has done here, he will find that I am ready to do my best to answer." Will your readers kindly note this promise? For I here take him at his word. I do "think it worth while" now, and will, therefore, seek an editor who will "print the definite grounds of my other objections," and will allow Father Thurston to "do his best to answer." Will Father Thurston, here and now, promise equally explicitly, first, to fulfil his own half of this bargain, and, secondly, to grant me the right of printing my pleas and his own answers within the same covers? For I have no hesitation in promising here to print and publish the discussion at my own expense, whatever the result may be, as an object-lesson in Roman Catholic and Protestant accuracy. It is only thus that readers, on either side, can really measure one set of statements against the other; it is like the contradictory evidence before a Royal Commission; the public have then a real chance of judging for themselves, and loose statements bring final discredit upon their authors.

(3) H. T., June 17.

The triviality of the point at issue in this correspondence is simply humiliating. But Dr Coulton continues so to phrase his letters that one cannot be silent without seeming to run away from some new challenge or veiled threat. I said in my

first communication that one of the reasons why my opponent can find no one to answer him is because he goes on and on, and can never be content to leave the matter when he has had his say.

Your readers can judge the truth of this from the present correspondence, and I may note that already in 1905, twenty-two years ago, Dr Coulton was complaining in print that he could not get his grievances debated. But it was not only Catholics who were then recalcitrant. The "Athenæum," he writes, "has no space and the 'Church Times' no inclination, to allow the full discussion of the question." ("Popular Romanist Church History," preface).

One last word on the Orléans matter. The British Museum copy of the 1674 edition of Gulielmus is, like the rest, in two volumes. The first (of over a thousand pages) bears this imprint: "Aureliæ ex typographia F. Hotot et veneunt Ambiani apud Michaellem du Neuf-Germain, bibliopolam." The second (not quite so bulky) has a different imprint: "Aureliæ ex typographia F. Hotot, et veneunt Londini apud Robertum Scott, bibliopolam." In both cases the *Ambiani* and the *Londini* are in much larger letters than the *Aureliæ*; nevertheless, the museum catalogue simply assigns the book to Orléans. Dr Coulton has twice in his letters spoken of "the Rouen edition" of Gulielmus. If we followed his example we should have to say that there was not only an Orléans, and a Rouen, and a Paris edition of these huge folios, but also an Amiens edition and a London edition, all printed in the same year. Could anything be more ridiculous?

In his last letter Dr Coulton promulgates another challenge. I should be quite quilling to accept it on condition that all the arrangements were in the hands of some competent third party and not in Dr Coulton's. If some such well-known scholar as, say, Professor Claude Jenkins or Professor Whitney, or Professor Tout, or Dr Workman—none of these, of course, are co-religionists of mine, but I know and respect their work—would consent to act as editors, I should be glad enough to set down my answer to such objections as Dr Coulton may urge against my review of his book.

But I fancy that my opponent may find some difficulty in persuading any of the gentlemen named to undertake such an invidious task. In any case, I must decline to commit myself to any scheme which involves an endless interchange of personal letters with Dr Coulton. I say "personal" for want of a better term. If I referred to a communication he sent me a few months back as a "private letter," I did so in the

sense that, so far as I am aware, it has not appeared in print. Certainly it had the word "public" written at the top and there was a notification at the end that he (Dr Coulton) claimed the right to treat my reply or my silence as a public matter. I did not answer the document, and I considered myself dispensed from doing so by the occurrence in the letter of such phrases as "you habitually backbite me under the cover of Roman Catholic magazines," or "here again the trouble is due to your own carelessness and ignorance," and so on.

I should not have thought that this sort of thing was quite in the approved manner of a University lecturer either at Cambridge or elsewhere, but no doubt Dr Coulton forms a class apart.

(10) G. G. C., June 29.

An absence of four days on business and the miscarriage of a letter posted to me are responsible for this delay in following Fr. Thurston to the new position upon which he has retreated. After promising, without qualification, to answer any exposure of his inaccuracy on more important points which I might think it worth while to print, and after receiving my immediate acceptance of this challenge, he now imports a quite unexpected and arbitrary condition, that I should choose as "editor" one of four scholars whom he names.

This condition, he expressly anticipates, will be difficult for me to fulfil. And, in a sense, he has there calculated correctly. I turned naturally to the nearest, geographically, of the four scholars, Professor Whitney, and have now secured his consent to act as "editor," under conditions which seem to him fair to both parties. He is personally as reluctant thus to interfere in a controversy as Fr. Thurston expected him to be; but, while wondering why this burden should be laid upon him, he accepts it from a sense of duty, and is willing to act, in Fr. Thurston's phrase, as "editor." He will receive from me a paper dealing mainly with Fr. Thurston's treatment of the evidence of Cardinal Hugues de St.-Cher, one of the greatest Churchmen of the Middle Ages, as to the state of the monasteries in the 13th century; a matter which Fr. Thurston cannot despise as too trifling for debate. That paper will run to 3,000 words or less; it will be communicated by Professor Whitney to Fr. Thurston, who will have the same space, or a little more, for his answer as I have taken for my exposition.

When this has been passed through Professor Whitney to me, we shall each rejoin, through him, in the same way, to the extent of not more than 1,000 words.

Then each may send to Professor Whitney, independently, a postscript of some 300 words, importing no fresh subject, but simply summarizing our separate views as to the course which the discussion has taken. I promise your readers, here and now, to print this discussion at my own risk, whatever the result may be, with no other preface or addition than this present letter, or as many of the preceding letters as Fr Thurston may think necessary to give a fair idea of our comparative accuracy. While I thus pledge myself, he, of course, must pledge himself to give me leave this time to print his side of the correspondence, a permission which he has never yet seen fit to grant me. The discussion will thus provide, as I said before, an object lesson, in one direction or the other, for the comparative accuracy of Roman Catholic and Anglican writers, when each is equally deliberate and earnest in his assertions.

I must briefly notice the second anonymous correspondent "P. J. M.," whose letter you have printed since I last wrote. He complains that I have "a grotesque 'idée fixe'" as to the untrustworthiness of Roman Catholic authors on points of history. Yet I have never written so strongly on this point as Cardinal Newman did at the height of his fame, and Lord Acton, the greatest of English-speaking Roman Catholic historians. Newman felt it quite impossible to start a Catholic Historical Review, because "unless one doctored all one's facts, one would be thought a bad Catholic." Acton spoke even more strongly concerning Ultramontanism; i.e., the party which was engineering the decree of Papal Infallibility. "It not only promotes, it inculcates distinct mendacity and deceitfulness. In certain cases it is made a duty to lie. But those who teach this doctrine do not become habitual liars in other things."

A full discussion of these words, and of Father Walker's attempts to explain them away in "The Dublin Review," may be found in the sixpenny pamphlet, to which I have already referred your readers, "Roman Catholic History." I must here repeat what I have implied in a previous letter: I have never yet come across a Roman Catholic author, with a reputation to lose, who would venture fully to discuss any fundamental doctrine of his Church and allow his opponent to print the discussion for a public comparison of the arguments, pro and contra.

(11) H. T., July 5.

Dr Coulton must indeed think meanly of my intelligence if he supposes that I could agree to accept blindfold the scheme of discussion outlined in his last letter. What he now proposes is something utterly different from any suggestion previously submitted. I am obliged to him for approaching Professor Whitney, and still more obliged to Professor Whitney for his willingness to render a service which was necessarily uncongenial, but I certainly cannot acquiesce in a plan which bases the whole matter in dispute on a single issue, and that an entirely new one.

Let me recall that in your columns on May 18 Dr Coulton spoke of his eight points of objection against my review of his book, emphasizing the absence of reply, and loudly affirming that his facts had silenced me. The points are obviously those which he had already raised in his "public" letter to me. On June 11 he still says: "I will therefore seek an editor who will print the definite grounds of my other objections," and he writes (in the plural) of "pleas" and "answers." But now I find that he intends to drop out of sight all the clear issues of fact where accuracy can be tested, and to focus the discussion upon a single point, viz., Father Thurston's treatment of the evidence of Cardinal Hugues de Saint-Cher as to the state of the monasteries in the 13th century."

My review did not raise that matter. I have never thought of questioning the fact that the Cardinal, like other earnest reformers, often speaks strongly of the decay of monastic discipline. I complained that in quoting a particular passage from Saint-Cher, Dr Coulton, according to his wont, had unfairly strained the evidence before him and had "tacked on" to his citation another gloss about the sins crying to heaven for vengeance (sodomy, murder), which had no connection with what preceded.

I do not know who is responsible for the heading "Roman Catholic and Anglican Accuracy," which is prefixed to this last letter of Dr Coulton, but it describes well enough the question really in debate between him and myself. Surely the dullest reader must see that accuracy is a matter to be determined not upon a single issue selected by one of the interested parties, but upon the whole complexus of controverted statements. My case rests upon the eight points—there are, in fact, nine, but Dr Coulton, in spite of his remarkable accuracy, has miscounted them, writing the number 7 twice over—which he has proclaimed to be blunders or misstatements. One of them, the question of the Orléans edition of Gulielmus Alvernus, a test case selected by him—

self, has been threshed out here, and your readers have been able to judge where the error lies. Dr Coulton would have to show that not one but at least five of my criticisms were unfounded if the verdict for superior accuracy is to be given in his favour.

The single issue now selected by him would give my opponent the opportunity, which no doubt he much desires, of raking together all the references to monastic scandals that he can find in the works of Saint-Cher, on the pretence that I had denied or excused them. There is nothing of the sort in my article. My contention was, and is, that he has quoted one particular passage unfairly.

Dr Coulton is welcome to interpret my refusal to continue the discussion as he pleases. But I have no more time to waste upon an opponent who, finding that the points which he himself has raised admit of a ready answer, wriggles off on to ground which he considers more defensible. It was precisely the fear that this might happen which led me to stipulate for an independent editor. But Dr Coulton has been beforehand with me, and has shifted the issue before the functions of the editor can come into play.

(12) G. G. C., July 13.

Fr. Thurston is still supplying your readers with statements which if we were both before a court of law might place him in a difficult position. The following assertions or suggestions are inaccurate, yet without them his argument falls to pieces.

1. That my last letter "bases the whole matter in dispute on a single issue." The word I wrote was not "wholly" but "mainly"; and in fact I have always been ready to discuss all the issues with him.

2. "And that a new one." On the contrary, always the old one. My proposal was to deal with "Fr. Thurston's treatment of the evidence"—i.e., the old point at issue between us all this while, and on which I had challenged him to arbitration five months ago.

3. In order to "rake together all the evidence of monastic scandals which he can find in the works of St.-Cher." On the contrary, I had intended all along to confine myself to the half folio page which is in direct dispute between us; and hereby I explicitly promise to do so.

4. The dispute arose because I have "tacked on (words) which had no connection with what preceded." On the

contrary, I propose to translate the whole passage, showing the actual connection of the words.

5. That he and I have ever debated "the question of the Orléans edition of Guiliemus Alvernus." I have already nailed this to the counter. I never disputed this Orléans edition, with which I was and am wholly unconcerned. I asserted, nor has he ever dared to deny, that he himself blundered in pillorying me for having printed in a footnote the words, "Opera, Rouen 1674." The undoubted existence of an Orléans edition is entirely irrelevant to the fact that every word in that incriminated phrase is correct, and that Fr. Thurston could not have attacked me here if he had seen our University library copy.

6. It is therefore false to write that I "wriggle off to a ground which I consider more defensible," and have "shifted the issue." I have stood all along on my first ground, arbitration by an expert, or public and full discussion, on all the points. My only "shifts" have been that, standing always on that ground, I have faced squarely in turn every fresh excuse of his, and thus boxed the whole compass.

Le me recapitulate. This correspondence began with an anonymous writer who stigmatized me as inaccurate, who vaunted the superior accuracy of "my friend the Rev. Herbert Thurston, S.J.," and who, when I challenged him to a plain test, "rather wondered" that his friend hung back: "It is not at all like Fr. Thurston to back out of a controversy." This, as I replied at the time, showed how little he knew the real Fr. Thurston. For here is a man to whom I have successively offered (1) arbitration by an impartial expert, (2) discussion in a magazine or review, (3) discussion even under the very peculiar conditions which he introduced on June 17 in evasion of his plain promise to answer whatever I might "think it worth while to put in print": peculiar conditions which he hoped I might "find some difficulty" in fulfilling. He was right about the difficulty, but fortunately he had miscalculated Professor Whitney's sense of duty. And now, for the third time, he backs out under a smoke-screen of inaccuracies.

Let not outsiders, possibly unsympathetic, undertake to explain Fr Thurston, but let him explain himself. Let him suggest any subjects and any methods of discussion which can be fitted in with his own offer; with the offer which looked so frank and fearless, of June 6. Let him frame all this now in accordance with his own ideas of justice, but let him frame it quite plainly and unequivocally, so as to show your readers what he really did mean by that promise, and does mean now. On the other hand, let him at last promise

that he will adhere to his own printed undertaking. Meanwhile I must clearly repeat my own readiness to discuss all the eight (or nine) points on which I challenged him five months ago; here again I promise, "blindfold," to print the whole discussion at my own risk. Here is the only method I have found really effectual with professional Roman Catholic controversialists; to offer them free discussion, so long as they will permit the public to read both sides within a single pamphlet, and thus to judge for itself. Fr Thurston complains that I have a mean opinion of his intellect; let him redeem this by showing that he realizes the sterling common sense of the British public.

Therefore, though his last letter shows no sign that he will ever dare to make good his own promise, yet I shall not altogether have wasted my own time or that of your readers. Some day I hope to publish a much fuller exposure of modern Roman controversialist methods, for which I have abundant material. I shall always be hampered by their persistent refusal to allow their own words to be reprinted; fair-minded readers will always be loth to believe things against them which the production of their ipsissima verba would prove to the hilt. But, even so, this present correspondence will take me one step further towards explaining to the public why the Church of which Fr Thurston has for long been one of the most prominent champions loses her converts, in the long run, at just about the same rate at which she gains them.

(13) H. T., July 20.

A sober statement of facts does not require bluster to reinforce it. Did I really "pillory" Dr Coulton because I mentioned casually in a footnote that the book he referred to was "printed at Orléans and not Rouen"?

By what perverse mental process does he persuade himself that he has "nailed to the counter" a statement, which he himself admits to be strictly and literally true? It would be quite easy to write in the same tone, but I have no wish to rival Dr Coulton in the Goliath-like quality of his declamations. The very few readers who are likely to have followed this correspondence patiently will long ago have formed their own opinion, and will no doubt be glad enough to see the discussion come to an end.

My one object in sending you this final letter is to make it known that I am already in correspondence with a publisher over the printing of my reply to Dr Coulton's nine points.

The pamphlet will contain first a reprint of the article principally complained of, which appeared in the quarterly periodical "Studies" for December, 1926, under the heading "Dr Coulton's Medieval Village"; secondly, the full text of his "public" letter to me propounding his nine objections; thirdly, my answer to those objections; and fourthly, certain other documents and criticisms, including some extracts from this correspondence.

I may confess that the idea of a controversial discussion under what is virtually the editorship of one of the disputants has never attracted me. And it does not greatly matter whether he presides over the whole debate or only makes a careful selection, to suit his own purpose, of the points to be debated. If Dr Coulton likes to send my pamphlet to such scholars as have been named in this correspondence and to publish their criticisms, he is perfectly free to do so. He shall have copies sent him for the purpose.

(14) G. G. C., August 2.

Father Thurston now writes in lofty disdain: "I may confess that the idea of a controversial discussion under what is virtually the editorship of one of the disputants has never attracted me."

Yet, incredible as it may seem, we have here a scientifically accurate description of the course which he himself, after full reflection, deliberately chooses, to the exclusion not only of all previous offers, but of his own previous promises. How can these scornful words of repudiation possibly apply to my original challenge of submission to some competent and impartial arbiter? How can they apply to my next proposal, based on Fr. Thurston's own offer, that we should discuss in some journal which, unlike Roman Catholic journals, would guarantee equal space to both disputants, and give to neither an unfair advantage in the last word? Least of all can the words apply to Fr. Thurston's own peculiar suggestion that we should discuss under the editorship of a distinguished professor whom he himself expressly named.

From that offer he has backed out under cover of six statements which, as I pointed out in my last letter, are contrary to the facts. And now, in the name of higher justice, he refuses all the suggested guarantees of fair play in favour of a course by which he himself, one of the disputants, becomes not only virtually, but entirely and irre-

sponsibly, editor! He proposes to print something like ten words of his own to one of mine, and to reprint not the whole of this present correspondence (which alone could give the public a full and true idea of what has been said, and which I have been vainly begging him to let me print at my own cost), but "some extracts from this correspondence." Yet, in the same breath, we find him explaining unctuously that it is almost equally unjust "whether [one of the disputants] presides over the whole debate, or only makes a careful selection, to suit his own purpose, of the points to be debated!" Who, except himself, has ever made such a proposition? I told him plainly in my last letter that "I have always been ready to discuss all the issues with him," and that his own accusation to the contrary rested upon his unpardonable substitution of "wholly" for my own word "mainly," a word which practically negatives the idea of "wholly." When a man writes explicitly of the G.W.R. "main" line, he thereby reminds all his readers that this is not the "whole" G.W.R. line.

It is doubtless very self-sacrificing of Fr. Thurston to choose, among four easy alternatives, precisely the one which, he must confess, has never attracted him. But would not the public be better satisfied if, for once, he indulged his own healthy natural inclinations here, and chose a course which would spare him all editorial labours and would save him from the invidious and perplexing task of selecting such portions of this present correspondence as may be least abhorrent to pious eyes? For myself, I have already given plain pledges. I have promised, and promise again, that, if he grants me permission, I will publish the whole at my own expense. Then I should be helpless in his hands if he had the right really on his side; for a man can scarcely put himself in a more foolish position than to waste money upon showing the public how he has broken his own definite promises.

Lastly, I cannot understand the mentality of a writer who can assert that a mis-statement which I claim here to have nailed for the third time to the counter is "a statement which Mr Coulton himself admits to be strictly and literally true." I am therefore emboldened, Mr Editor, to ask that you should act here as *amicus curiæ*, even as the editor of "The Pall Mall Gazette" once did, to the gratitude of the reading public, at a similar stage of the Baconian controversy. Here are two men flatly contradicting each other again and again on a point which, small in itself, has become the touchstone of accuracy between them. When Fr Thurston writes that the statement I claim to have "nailed to the counter" is

one which I myself "admit to be strictly and literally true," I assert that, for about the tenth time now in this controversy, he has said something that is not. To this assertion I am willing to pledge such reputation as a man earns from a senior post at a great University. Fr. Thurston, if I understand him aright, pledges the reputation of an old and prominent Catholic priest to the exact contrary. Will you then, sir, either personally or through some other competent and impartial umpire at your choice, spend half-an-hour in looking through this correspondence and in deciding the vexed question, which I here briefly summarize? My points have always been (1) that a Rouen edition of Alvernus exists, and is, in fact, the copy from which I have always worked in the University Library; (2) Fr. Thurston was therefore wrong in counting it as one of my inaccuracies that I quoted this Rouen edition; he did not know of its existence, but I did; (3), I have never (as Fr. Thurston has once categorically asserted and twice afterwards implied) concerned myself with other editions, which are foreign to the discussion between us; (4), therefore all talk about other editions has only disguised Fr. Thurston's inaccuracy on the single point on which I ever challenged him in this matter, the existence of the Rouen edition. I hope I am right in thinking that less than half-an-hour would suffice to decide between us here; and I suggest that, in accordance with that decision, you should invite one or other of the disputants to contribute 10 guineas to the S. Devon and E. Cornwall Hospital. Fr. Thurston has maintained his own side here with such confident conviction, and has been so pained whenever he thought he detected signs of evasion in me, that he will doubtless catch at this chance of securing a verdict and helping a charity which every Christian priest must bless.

[We have been pleased to open valuable space to such redoubtable protagonists, but it is quite impossible for us to arbitrate between them.—Ed. W.M.N. and M.]

(15) G. G. C., Sept. 1 (to Fr. Thurston).

I have sometimes found it so difficult to be quite sure of your meaning, that I must trouble you again with a few words. I understand you clearly to refuse my repeated request for legal permission to publish, without note or comment, the whole of the *Western Morning News* correspondence which concerns you and me, starting from my letter in reply to "H. J.'s" attack (or, if you prefer, from the relevant portions

of his letter of April 8, and ending with mine of Aug. 2. But, though to me your refusal seems so clear, it may not be so definitely intended as I suppose; therefore I must so far trespass upon your time as to beg for a categorical answer. Do you, or do you not, refuse that permission? In order to arrive at absolute certainty on the point, I will take silence as equivalent to explicit and categorical refusal. We shall then both of us know exactly where we are.

(16) H. T., Sept. 2.

Most certainly you are at liberty to print any published letter of mine either of recent or earlier date. I took it for granted that you would not hesitate to do so, as I understood you to imply that your own communications were to be treated as *publici juris*. My objection was to the virtual exclusion, as I judged it, of eight out of your nine points. Moreover I was, and still am, quite at sea as to the drift of your remark (*Western Morning News*, 29 June), "He must of course, pledge himself to give me leave this time to print his side of the correspondence, a permission he has never yet seen fit to grant me." I am wholly unconscious of ever having been asked to allow my letters to be printed. I could only suppose that you were confusing me with Fr. Rickaby or some other Father.

(17) G. G. C., Sept. 4.

While thanking you for your permission, I am glad to correct a mistaken implication which you point out. On reference to my papers, I find no instance where you have explicitly refused this right of publication; I had done you injustice by confusing your action here with that of Father Rickaby and Father Gerard; and for this I must now tender you my apologies.

Armed with your permission, I shall now publish in full the correspondence which you announce your intention of publishing in part. To avoid all misunderstanding, I had better set down here the full contents of the pamphlet.

(1). Title (as chosen for my letters and approved in yours of July 5) "Roman Catholic and Anglican Accuracy."

(2). My own public letter of Feb. 9, which you announce your own intention of printing.

(3). Then, without note or comment, my letters and yours to the *Western Morning News*, prefaced by a brief extract from that of H. J.

(4). Finally, the present correspondence, which I hope may be quite brief. I am obliged to add this final section, because you again repeat an implication which is at least as contrary to the facts as that for which I, on my part have here apologized. You write "my objection was to the actual exclusion, as I judged it, of eight out of your nine points." This compels me to point out for the third time, that such "exclusion" is a pure invention of your own, for which you have not yet produced a single phrase of mine in justification. On the contrary, I have always shown my willingness to discuss *all* the points. When I proposed to deal *mainly* with St-Cher, this was for the very obvious reasons which I stated in my letters. In the first place, you had complained that the discussion of a small point was "simply humiliating" to you. I therefore specified a matter which could be thus avoided as beneath your dignity; the evidence of one of your greatest Cardinals as to the monasteries at almost their most brilliant period. Secondly, I specified the St-Cher point because that would enable me to produce the actual document in dispute between us, and thus to make good the claim of my earlier letter. I could thus "prove that [Fr T.] had either not read a whole column of Latin print which he accused me of misrepresenting, or that he is incapable of understanding the plain Latin words repeated over and over again in that column." These two reasons, which you have had before you all the while, abundantly explain why I suggested St-Cher as the main point, but without for a moment excluding the others. I must, therefore, call upon you again to produce any words of mine which can justify you in pretending that I at any time intended "the virtual exclusion of eight out of my nine points." Failing this, I must ask you to confess your mistake as frankly as I have confessed mine, and to admit explicitly that you never had any more serious reason for supposing me to have such exclusion in mind, than I had for supposing that you had previously denied me the right of republishing your published letters.

(18) H. T., Sept. 6.

I am much obliged to you for your admission that I had not refused to allow you to publish my letters. If I should unfortunately be guilty of any similar mis-statement of *fact*

in your regard, I trust that I shall be prepared to acknowledge my error with equal readiness.

But what you now ask me to retract is not a matter of fact but a matter of opinion. I can only say that in my judgement a paper of 3000 words "dealing mainly with Fr Thurston's treatment of the evidence of Cardinal Hugues de Saint-Cher as to the state of the monasteries in the 13th century" could not be written without you throwing the other eight objections so completely into the background that they would appear entirely subordinate. The matter of Saint-Cher is intricate, and would need many words for adequate statement, especially if, as I now understand, your proposal is to translate the best part of a folio page. If I had answered, as would be necessary, on the same scale, I should have had no space left to deal with the other points which as tests of accuracy are equally important.

The plain fact, my dear Sir, as I conceive it, is that you realize that upon the other eight points you have no case that can be seriously defended. The Saint-Cher matter offers a better chance because the question raised is a confusing one, and there are few readers who know anything of the character of a medieval gloss upon a Scriptural text.

You must pardon me, however, if I decline to embark upon any further correspondence, public or private. In my booklet, already in type, though not out yet, I have returned a full answer to your points of objection. Between May 18 and Aug. 2 you have printed over 5,000 words in the *W.M.N.*, and I a little more than half that amount. The whole business has already wasted a preposterous amount of time.

P.S.—I have no wish to raise any objection to your printing this letter or its predecessor if you desire to do so.

(19) G. G. C., Sept. 10.

In an ordinary way, we do not continue a correspondence in the face of great and outspoken reluctance on our correspondent's part. But then, in an ordinary way, our correspondent does not take his stand in each fresh letter upon some palpable mis-statement which, by silence, we should appear to admit and authorize. The "preposterous length," of which you complain, is due to my necessity, at every turn, of correcting mis-statements which ought never to have been made: so much will be evident to any impartial reader of this correspondence.

Your whole letter now rests upon the assumption that,

when I threw out that suggestion of 3,000 words, I should not have welcomed any counter-suggestion from you for a longer space in the interests of full discussion. That assumption is not only arbitrary but quite false. Indeed, it was contradicted in advance by my repeated promise in the *Western Morning News* to discuss the whole of the points with you. You had only to plead, on July 5, that 3,000 words were not enough, and I would at once have accepted, as I am ready to accept now, any reasonable extension which you might suggest.

Moreover, you are equally mistaken in your present assumption that, when I had dealt with St-Cher, there would have been practically no space for "the other eight objections." One of those eight has already been fully discussed, a fact which you have twice characteristically ignored. I will now deal with three more, exactly as I should have dealt with them if you had not repudiated your own proposals of June 6 and June 17, and as I will deal with them still if you are not inexorably bent upon repudiating a full discussion.

With regard to St Cher, I need only translate him in order to make my case clear. You will remember that he is commenting on Ps. lvii., and expounding the text (here given in capitals) word by word.

Verse 61. INTO THE HANDS [This may be explained] in the moral sense. [v. 59.] HE HEARD, &c. Above, we have spoken¹ of **penitents² and clergy and Religious** [i.e., regular clergy] that [v. 57] "THEY TURNED AWAY, AND KEPT NOT THE COVENANT," and [v. 59] "THEY PROVOKED HIM TO ANGER: and some unbeliever might ask 'How did the Lord know this?' Wherefore He saith, as though in answer [to such a question]: GOD HEARD [v. 59] *the evil doings of Christians, of clergy and of Religious* [compare] Wisdom I. 'The ear of jealousy heareth all things,' and James V. "The cry of them hath entered into the ears of the Lord of Sabaoth." *Now there are four kinds of sins which cry properly and especially to God against those who commit them. The first is the sin of sodomy [Genesis xviii. 20]. The second is manslaughter [Genesis iv. 10]. The third is fraud against the hireling, as St James saith (v. 4): "Behold the hire of the labourers who have reaped down your fields, which by fraud has been kept back by you, crieth, and the cry of them hath*

¹ Or possibly, "The Psalmist has spoken"—*dictum est*.

² *Poenitentibus*, probably in the technical sense of *frates* and *sorores de poenitentiae*, i.e., members of the third order of friars.

entered into the cars of the Lord of Sabaoth." *The fourth is the oppression of the poor, as it is written in Exodus (iii. 9): "The cry of the children of Israel is come unto me, and I have seen their affliction."* [v. 59]. AND [GOD] DESPISED THEM. [Compare] Job XII. "He leadeth away their priests without glory" and again: He poureth contempt upon princes.¹" And Obadiah I, "Thou art exceeding contemptible, the pride of thy heart hath lifted thee up, who dwellest in the clefts of the rocks, and settest up thy throne on high." **This is properly said to proud Religious.**

[v. 59]. AND HE REDUCED ISRAEL EXCEEDINGLY, AS IT WERE TO NOTHING. [That is], **the Clergy and Religious**, because they, abandoning the true and great good of Israel, that is to see and desire God, have turned aside to the nothingness of worldly goods. [Compare] Amos VI.: "Woe to you that are wealthy in Sion, and to you that have confidence in the mountains of Samaria," and again "You that rejoice in a thing of nought, you that say, 'Have we not taken unto us horns by our own strength?'" And Job XVI.: "All my limbs are brought to nothing." This is what the Church saith [nowadays]: Psalm LXII, "I am brought to nothing, and I knew not; I am become as a beast before Thee," that is, I am not like unto a human being.

[v. 60]. AND HE PUT AWAY, that is, repudiated, THE TABERNACLE OF SILO, that is the estate of **clergy or Religious**. HIS TABERNACLE WHERE HE DWELT in olden days AMONG MEN. [This] AMONG MEN [is said] concerning **clergy and Religious**; [a god] giving answer to men through the evidence of works, even as He was wont to give it from the tabernacle of the Apostles. But nowadays He hath put away that tabernacle; for now He seemeth not to dwell there nor to give answer; wherefore they may say what Saul said, Samuel xxviii: "the Philistines," that is the devils, "fight against me, and God is departed from me and would not hear me, neither through priests nor through dreams," that is [the dreams] of **Religious**, who ought to sleep in the sleep of contemplation, and thence to draw answers which they might give to other men concerning God's will.

[v. 61]. AND HE DELIVERED, by permitting it, INTO CAPTIVITY unto the Devil, THEIR STRENGTH, that is the strength of **the Church**, viz., **the Clergy, Prelates, and Religious**, who are the bones and the strength of the Church, according as the Church saith of the Apostles in the first

¹ *Principes*, a word which may be applied to great Churchmen as well as to worldly princes.

chapter of Lamentations, "From above He hath sent fire into my bones and hath chastised me." But now the bones of **the Church** are given over unto captivity; and [so also] by consequence, her flesh, that is the weak and feeble layfolk. Isaiah xxxviii. : "He hath broken all my bones." Prov. xxix. : "When prophecy shall fail, the people shall be scattered abroad." Wherefore the Lord complaineth to Isaiah : "Therefore is my people led away captive, because they had not knowledge," and ii. Tim. 2 : "That they may recover themselves from the snares of the devil, by whom they are held captive at his will."

[v. 61]. AND THEIR BEAUTY, that is, their reputation, or [it may signify] **the Clergy** themselves, who ought to be the comeliness of the Church, He hath delivered into the hands of the enemy."

At this point St. Cher, according to his custom, passes on to a literal commentary on the next batch of verses. When he returns to the moral exposition of this new batch, he again applies it to "**Clergy, Prelates, and Laity.**"

The lines italicised, as you will see, are those which I printed on p. 144 of my *Medieval Village*, and concerning which you have permitted yourself to write that in printing them I "tack on a passage about the sins crying to heaven for vengeance which has no connection whatever with what precedes. The reader will inevitably infer that the Cardinal is still discussing the misdoings of the regular clergy; but he is commenting now upon an entirely new verse of the Psalm (lxxvii. 59) *audivit Deus et sprevit*, and he turns to a new line of thought, viz: the four sins crying to heaven for vengeance, which will be found enumerated to this day in every penny catechism."

This your last sentence, of course, is the ordinary controversial trick of implying that an opponent is too ignorant to recognize things most familiar to the true Roman Catholic. Of course those four sins, together with others, are, as you say, enumerated in the Catechism; but that is absolutely irrelevant to our discussion. The fact of their being in the Catechism does not create even the slenderest presumption against the probability that Hugh might be accusing the monks of those sins. In the face of Hugh's actual words, how will you venture now to assert that his commentary on v. 59 "has no connexion whatever with what precedes," considering that it is all continuous with what I quoted, and

all turns upon that same verse 59? Naturally "the reader will infer that Hugh is still discussing the misdoings of the regular clergy," and he will infer it correctly, since Hugh takes pains to specify the regular clergy at every turn in his comments upon verses 59 to 61, in order that there should be no mistake as to his meaning. They are mentioned by name three times in the commentary on verse 59, where, you would now have us believe, Hugh has turned altogether away from the religious "to a new line of thought." These same regular clergy are specified three times again in the next two verses; and Hugh could scarcely have made it plainer than he has done, that in this moralization of verses 57 to 61 he is referring mainly, all through, to "clergy and Religious." The laity are scarcely mentioned, and, even then, only to explain how naturally they imitated the shortcomings of their spiritual pastors. That is why I explained publicly, more than three months ago, that a discussion of this actual document would show either that you had not read the original before accusing me, or that your ignorance of Latin must be very great. Any impartial reader may now see for himself that in my *Medieval Village*, if I had found room to quote the whole passage instead of confining myself to the parts here italicized, then it would not in any way have exonerated the regular clergy from Hugh's accusations, but would rather have blackened the picture.

But you accuse me of having chosen St-Cher arbitrarily, as my line of least resistance, adding: "You realise that upon the other eight points you have no case that can be seriously defended." Let me therefore take here another point, which happens to be the first of all. You accuse me of quoting Sée's statement "with approval." Your whole criticism, on this point, rests on those words *with approval*. Yet, in fact, I not only add no approving words to that quotation, but in my very next sentence I suggest that readers may "discount" those words to some extent; and two pages later I suggest that Sée himself would probably on reflection admit them to be exaggerated. What you accuse me of saying is thus, in fact, precisely what I took some pains to contradict.

Another point can be exposed with almost equal brevity. You accuse me of being apparently "unable to interpret a plain [Latin] text in its obvious sense." Now that text, to which I not only give the exact page-reference in the latest and best edition (Champion), but which I print *verbatim* in a footnote on the passage, p. 263, runs: "sed in hoc non credit, imo quod est sortilegium." Let us call this text A. I have said,

and repeat here, that no competent Latin scholar will venture to call this a plain text ; and I doubt whether any two University professors, questioned independently, would give quite the same rendering of it as it stands. Between my writing these words and posting, I happened to meet a good classical scholar and theologian, editor of one of the Loeb Classics, to whom I showed the text. He agreed with me as to its obscurity, and was inclined, though rather doubtfully, to translate much as I have translated in my text. How, then, do you attempt to fasten upon me this blunder in Latinity ? In order to give a colour of truth to your accusation, you quietly quote *another different part of the book*. This text is indeed perfectly plain, and it does really contradict the rendering which I had suggested, as less probable, in my footnote. But that very line of that very footnote, from which you yourself quote to condemn me, shows quite plainly that I am not translating from text B, as you give your readers to understand ; that I had in fact forgotten its existence, not having read this lengthy book in its totality for many years. You were perfectly right to point out that text B throws a clear light upon that text A, which had puzzled me ; but, in the face of my page-reference and my Latin quotation, you had no excuse whatever for giving to understand that I was "translating" from the easy text B, and thence to conclude my incapacity for interpreting a plain Latin text. I do not say that you did, in fact, deliberately avoid following up my page-reference, and even avoid looking at the Latin words which I printed in the same sentence with that upon which you base your accusation. But I do say, without fear of contradiction, that if you had deliberately tried to misrepresent me here, you could not, within colourable and therefore hopeful limits, have framed a more unjust accusation.

My treatment of these three points comes, I think you will find, to just about 1,550 words. That would leave us 1,450 words, (even on your hasty assumption that the limit of 3,000 was absolutely rigid) for the discussion of the other five points, of which you yourself plead that they are equally important as tests of accuracy, but plainly imply also that you think they could be discussed in less space than St-Cher. What becomes, therefore, of your assertion that you are refusing an unfair proposal which would "throw the other objections so completely into the background that they would appear

subordinate"? And with what face can you assert it as "a plain fact" that I am avoiding a full discussion because I am guiltily conscious of having no case on all the points? Did I not begin by challenging you to arbitration on all points, under some scholar chosen by yourself from among about forty of the most competent university professors? Have I not since been struggling to persuade you, for three months, to let me publicly expose my own case to your public criticisms? Here, at least, you cannot plead the subterfuge that, while saying the thing that is not, you err "not [on] a matter of fact, but of opinion." If, as you boldly claim, my consciousness of guilt is "a plain fact," then it can be tested like other plain facts. The man conscious of guilt is the man who shuns public enquiry. You yourself, upon the most trumped-up pleas, in letters which have never ended without some strange misstatement of fact, have shirked your promise of June 6; "When he thinks it worth while to put in print the definite grounds of his other objections, as he has done here, he will find that I am ready to answer them." I am now on the point of putting those things in print, and have told you so more than once; yet where now is that promise of yours which seemed so frank and fearless? Your resolve to break it at all costs is becoming more obvious at every step. You even announce that you are turning back upon it now in favour of a private arrangement of your own, by which you yourself will be accuser and judge before your own particular public. The demoralizing effect of the Roman Catholic censorship system could scarcely be better exemplified.

(20) H. T., Sept. 11.

I beg to acknowledge the receipt of the letter you have addressed to me by registered post. You must forgive me if I say that I have not, at present, time to read 13 quarto pages. I shall hope to do so later. You may make any use you like of this communication.

(21) G. G. C., Sept. 18.

I send herewith printer's proofs of our correspondence in order that you may correct errors in the text, if such exist. But, since it is important that the publication of your *ex parte* pamphlet should not long precede this reprint of our actual correspondence, I must assume that any long silence on your part will mean that no errors have been discovered, and shall then go to press.

(23) G. G. C. to H. T., Oct. 12, 1927.

Thank you for the two copies of your booklet [*Some Inexactitudes*]. I am returning one herewith, with the request that you will be so good as to blue-pencil in it, and number for the sake of clearness, all *errors of fact* which you claim to expose in me, apart from that slip of 354 for 364, the correction of which is already in the printer's hands. I make this request in virtue of my promise to all readers of *Camb. Studies in Med. Life and Thought*, that "whatever errors of fact are pointed out by reviewers or correspondents shall be publicly corrected with the least possible delay." My errata-lists for two volumes in that series are now in the press, to appear very shortly, and I am anxious to make them as complete as possible. It is not possible for me, however, to read through everything which is published under your censorship system for your own peculiar public, and I cannot read through 86 pages on the mere chance of finding grain there. You will see that, by the terms of my promise, the errors must be "pointed out" to me, and I must throw upon you the trouble of roughly indicating these in blue pencil, in order that I may waste no time over the rest.

But, lest any fair-minded person should imagine that I am neglecting your *ex-parte* pleas because I fear their truth, I am now able to refer readers to our recent correspondence, which I have made as impartial as possible by my voluntary pledge to abstain from all notes and comments in reprinting it, and which therefore presents in photographic impartiality the gulf between your conception of truth and mine.

Believe me—yours faithfully,

G. G. COULTON.

The Revd. H. Thurston, S.J.

P.S.—If you have pointed out any other errors of fact, not concerned with my two volumes in the *Camb. Med. Stud.* Series, though these will be outside that particular public pledge, yet I will gladly print at my own expense a list of such errors and send you a thousand copies for insertion in your booklet. For I wish to make it quite plain that I welcome all real corrections, from whatever source.

G. G. C.

(24) H. T. to G. G. C., Oct. 14, 1927.

I am obliged for your letter, but must deprecate further correspondence either public or private. My booklet [*Some Inexactitudes*] was not written to persuade you to correct errors, but primarily to show that if I have not previously replied to your criticisms this was because—like many others before me—I did not think it worth while, not because I had no answer to make.

Believe me,

Faithfully yours,

HERBERT THURSTON.

G. G. Coulton, Esq.

(22) H. T., Sept. 19.

I am obliged to you for your courtesy in sending me a set of proofs, but I prefer to leave the entire responsibility for the publication with you. I have not looked at the contents.