

Among the contemporaneous engravings, which are of great importance when signed or attributable and dated or datable, one ought to especially mention that of 1559, another of 1562 by René Boyvin, and the one executed in 1566 by Woeiriot for presentation by Beza to Renée de France, duchess of Ferrara, along with an edition of the *Opuscula* of their late friend. The likeness of 1559, a woodcut, was probably engraved at Geneva and has some relation with the founding of Calvin's Academy which was inaugurated that year. Another highly interesting document of the same epoch is the finely penned sketch by a student of 1564 representing his professor when lecturing from the pulpit.<sup>1a</sup>

A copiously illustrated essay on religious caricature and satire during the sixteenth century, along with two very useful catalogues of engraved portraits and medals concerning Calvin and his times, complete the remarkable volume, a presentation copy of which has been sent by the rector and senate of the University of Geneva, in remembrance of the jubilee, to every doctor *honoris causa* on whom a degree was conferred on that occasion.

CHARLES BORGEAUD.

*Luther und Lutherthum in der ersten Entwicklung* quellenmässig dargestellt von H. DENIFLE, O.P., und A. M. WEISS, O.P. (Mainz: Kirchheim.) I. Hauptband. I. Abt. 2d edition, 1904 (pp. xxx, 422). II. Abt. 2d edition by Weiss, 1906 (pp. xi, 486, xxiv). I. Ergänzungsband. *Die abendländischen Schriftausleger bis Luther über Justitia Dei (Rom. I, 17) und Justificatio* (1905, pp. xx, 380). II. Ergänzungsband. (Weiss.) *Lutherpsychologie als Schlüssel zur Lutherlegende*. 2d edition, 1906 (pp. xiv, 310). II. Hauptband. (Weiss.) 1909 (pp. xvi, 514).

WHEN Father Denifle approached the study of Luther he had long been well known for the profundity of his researches in mediæval scholasticism and the history of universities. Evincing the same thoroughness in the new work that had distinguished him in the old, he began his first volume with a severe criticism of the great Weimar edition of Luther's works now coming out,<sup>1</sup> a publication on which the best scholarship has been employed. Denifle was able, however, to point out a number of omissions and mistakes, due chiefly to the editors' comparative ignorance of mediæval writers, a field in which his

<sup>1a</sup> The student's sketch or sketches—there are several—and the portrait by the French engraver, René Boyvin, were first identified and published in the *Histoire de l'Université de Genève*, vol. I, *L'Académie de Calvin* (1900). The woodcut of 1559, which I found at the Library of the Société de l'Histoire du Protestantisme Français in Paris soon after the appearance of that volume, was given last year in my *1559: Pages d'Histoire Universitaire réunies à l'Occasion du Jubilé* (Genève, Georg et Cie., 1908, pp. 69).

<sup>1</sup> *Luthers Sämmtliche Werke*, Kritische Ausgabe von Knaake und Andern (Weimar, 1883). Denifle's criticism occupies pp. 30-54 of his first volume. The edition now takes Luther's works down to 1532, with some omissions.

own erudition was so extensive that he could say, "the simplest things are beyond these editors."

The Catholic scholar's work is not a biography, but a series of essays on those aspects of the reformer's life and teaching most susceptible to hostile interpretation. Most of his charges are the old familiar ones: Luther's attitude on the Peasants' War, on the bigamy of Philip of Hesse, his coarseness, his supposed drunkenness<sup>2</sup> and sensuality,<sup>3</sup> but they have never been canvassed with such merciless thoroughness. The book is a day of judgment in which Luther is called to account for every idle word and he said many. Nay more, an appeal is made to modern criminology to show that the reformer's face is of the "criminal type".

What is new in Denifle is his study of the sources of Luther's thought in medieval theology. In this department the author is unequalled, and both in his main volumes and in the supplementary one he makes an extremely important contribution to the knowledge of the subject.<sup>4</sup>

On June 10, 1905, the great scholar died, largely through the effect of overwork. "Luther has killed me", he wrote a friend on October 17, 1903. The pen which fell from his hand was taken up, as a pious duty, by his friend and fellow-friar, Father Weiss. After completing the revision of Denifle's work already begun by the latter, and, among other improvements, softening the uncommon acrimony of many expressions, Weiss supplemented it with two volumes of his own. The first of these,

<sup>2</sup> Vol. I., pp. 112-113, especially the latter, note 4. Denifle makes much of a letter from Luther to Müller, March 18, 1535 (Enders, *Luthers Briefwechsel* (1903), vol. X., p. 137), now in the Vatican archives. The unclearness with which the signature is written has caused a lively controversy over its reading. According to Evers, the first editor of the letter (1885), Denifle, and Enders, Luther signed himself "Dr. Plenus"; E. Kroker, *Katharina von Bora* (Leipzig, 1906), p. 278, reads "Dr. Hans", referring it to Luther's son; G. Kawerau, *Theologische Studien und Kritiken*, Jahrgang 1908, Heft 4, p. 603, reads "Dr. Pleures", though he can give no sense to the word; K. Löffler in *Historische Jahrbücher*, vol. XXX. (1909), Heft 1, reads "Dr. Parvus", referring it to Luther's son. I have myself seen an excellent photograph of the letter, and consider "Plenus", "Plures" or "Johannes", possibilities, but neither "Hans" nor "Parvus". According to Denifle Luther signed himself "Dr. Full" in reference to the intoxicated state in which he wrote the letter. He also suggests that Luther's numerous illnesses were due to his fondness for liquor. This is possible but does not prove the man a drunkard.

<sup>3</sup> Vol. I., p. 283. His strongest argument is from the letter to Spalatin, April 15, 1525 (Enders, *op. cit.*, vol. V. (1893), p. 157). Denifle tries to show that the damning words "misceci feminis" are always used by Luther elsewhere in a bad sense. Protestant historians take them, in this letter, as a joke.

<sup>4</sup> It might be objected that Denifle assumes Luther to have been mainly a scholastic theologian instead of what he was, a representative of the common German Catholic of his time. (See especially vol. II., p. 582, note 2.) This consideration may indeed lead us to dissent from the strictures of the author who accuses Luther of gross ignorance and wilful perversion of his predecessors, but it hardly affects the value of his researches.

the *Lutherpsychologie*, is an appreciation and a portrait. The writer first proves that in this study a Catholic is much more unprejudiced than a Protestant, who sees not the real Luther, but the hero of the Luther-legend; the author's own impartiality is shown by his statement that he "knows but one Church, expressed in the single word Pope". Whatever is outside this church is neither Christianity nor religion; his unbiassed estimate assumes, therefore, the character of that style of argument known as begging the question. As to the portrait it is Hamlet with the prince left out, a picture in which many a single feature is caught but the animating soul forgotten. Moreover, the whole work of Weiss is superficial and ill written. Of his habitual carelessness, or worse, in the use of sources, a characteristic example may be given. By combining three separate reports in the table-talk<sup>5</sup> he concocts a story proving Luther's gluttony and drunkenness. Among other things the Wittenberg professor tells of some men who have died of hunger and adds: "ich denke mich dabei an meine Altersgenossen von 50 Jahren; o wie dünn sind sie!" The modern writer comments: "es scheint, dass Luther einen Tonnenumfang für eine besondere Zierde oder ein grosses Glück betrachtet habe." Had he examined the context from which these words are taken he would have seen that the clause "wie dünn sind sie" could only mean "how few they are now."

The last volume of this Polyphemus-like work is not a detailed study of Luther but an attempt to arrive at a comprehensive view of his environment. The first chapter, on the antecedents of the Reformation, agrees with the Protestant historians in finding a main cause in the prevalent immorality of the time, but differs from them in the part assigned to the movement itself, which is described as the "cloaca maxima" of these evils, the great drain-pipe which carried them out of the Church. The characteristics of Lutheranism from 1517 to 1521 are found to be individualism and anarchy; after the Diet of Worms it underwent a reaction (*Rückbildung*) due to its leader's remorse and fear of consequences (compunctions which he designated as apparitions of the devil). After 1530 Lutheranism as a separate entity was lost in the larger movement of Protestantism which it poisoned with its spirit of hatred to Rome. The fifth and next to the last chapter returns to the sources of Luther's doctrine, which it finds in a mixture of German "atavism" and an importation of foreign heresies, chiefly those of Huss, of Wycliffe, and, worst of all, of Occam. This chapter has behind it some real study of the sources and suggests some of the influences which actually combined to form Luther's character and dogma. But in general the work of Weiss is almost useless to the student, who can learn a vast deal from Denifle.

PRESERVED SMITH.

<sup>5</sup> *Lutherpsychologie*, p. 188. His sources are three sayings, found in Seidemann: *Lauterbach's Tagebuch auf das Jahr 1538* (Dresden, 1872), p. 33, p. 51 and note.

*Madame, Mother of the Regent, 1652-1722.* By ARVÈDE BARINE.

Translated by JEANNE MAIRET (Madame Charles Bigot). (New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1909. Pp. xi, 346.)

THE lady, who wrote under the name of Arvède Barine, has published several works in reference to the French court in the days of Louis XIV. In the last of them she reviews the career of Madame, Mother of the Regent, who married the brother of Louis XIV., and for more than fifty years was a prominent member of the society, whose centre was Versailles, and the cynosure of whose eyes was Louis XIV.

This book does not profess to be a serious historical work, and we cannot expect in it the strict and accurate scholarship that would be demanded in a history of a different kind. It is just, however, to say that Madame Vincens was thoroughly familiar with the period and had studied most of the memoirs and correspondence which have to do with her heroine.

A heroine, indeed, the Duchess of Orleans never was, not even to a biographer. She was a daughter of Carl Ludwig, Elector Palatine, a prince of by no means an exalted character, and she received the training of a petty German court. Probably, not even in Europe at that period, was it possible to have a worse one. For such a personage the great problem of life was marriage, and Charlotte, Countess Palatine of the Rhine, was fortunate or unfortunate enough, to make what, in those days, was regarded as a great alliance. At the age of nineteen she was married to the Duke of Orleans, the younger brother of Louis XIV., and she occupied a distinguished position in the court, which was then regarded as the political as well as the social centre of Europe. Her husband was a very poor personage, and their long married life was attended by about the amount of unhappiness that was found in most similar alliances.

This work pays little heed to the political history of the time, but it gives a fairly accurate picture of the curious society in which Madame was a great personage. The story is pleasantly told, it is gossipy, and much of the gossip is interesting. Madame was one of the most prolific letter-writers the world has ever known, all her life long she was constantly sending off voluminous epistles to her German relatives; they contain a prodigious amount of gossip and a good deal of interesting information.

The splendor and the discomfort of the life at Versailles, the unwearied pursuit of amusement, the virtues and vices of those who formed the court of Louis XIV., in which it is to be feared the vices predominated, are related in the correspondence which furnishes the most important material for the life of the writer. Madame writes of sitting in her room at Versailles with a fur about her neck and her feet in a bear-skin bag and shaking with the cold. She describes the routine of her own days at the Palais Royal. They got up at half past ten and went to mass at twelve, after which they gossiped. It