

THE  
CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY  
of AMERICA PRESS   
Washington, D.C.

---

The Catholic Historical Review: Forty Years

Author(s): Carl Wittke

Reviewed work(s):

Source: *The Catholic Historical Review*, Vol. 42, No. 1 (Apr., 1956), pp. 1-14

Published by: [Catholic University of America Press](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25015985>

Accessed: 28/04/2012 03:09

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at  
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Catholic University of America Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to  
*The Catholic Historical Review*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

# The Catholic Historical Review

---

---

Vol. XLII

APRIL, 1956

No. 1

---

---

## THE CATHOLIC HISTORICAL REVIEW—FORTY YEARS

BY  
CARL WITTKÉ\*

Forty years have passed since the CATHOLIC HISTORICAL REVIEW made its bow to the historical profession in April, 1915. In that time the journal has carried 468 articles, 218 items of "miscellany" averaging ten pages in length; shorter notes and comments; hundreds of book reviews; and from 1921 to 1928 inclusive, a section entitled "Chronicles." Bishop Thomas J. Shahan, professor of church history and Rector of the Catholic University of America, served as editor-in-chief from 1915 to 1929, although the late Monsignor Peter Guilday was the driving force behind the REVIEW from its inception, and succeeded to the title of chief editor in 1929. Dr. John Tracy Ellis, the present managing editor, has served in that capacity practically since 1941, although Guilday continued to hold the title of editor-in-chief during his prolonged and fatal illness from 1941 to 1947. With one exception, the board of editors have been members of the faculty of the Catholic University of America, and all have been priests, with the exception of Charles H. McCarthy, Leo J. Stock, Richard J. Purcell, and Martin R. P. McGuire. Of the sixteen advisory editors of the past forty years, six have been priests. The remainder were recruited from the history faculties of Queens College, Georgetown University, Saint Louis University, Loyola of

\* The editors of the REVIEW take this opportunity to thank Dr. Wittké, Dean of the Graduate School of Western Reserve University and distinguished historian of American immigration, for his generous response to their request to have the first forty years of the journal surveyed by an outsider. Dean Wittké's latest work is *The Irish in America* (Baton Rouge, 1956).

Chicago, Seton Hall, the Catholic University of America, and the Archives Department of Canada.

Cardinal Gibbons hailed the launching of the REVIEW in 1915 with a foreword in which he expressed his pleasure that the venture originated at the Catholic University of America, and would help "proclaim the worth and greatness of this noble institution." In an article entitled "The Spirit of the *Catholic Historical Review*," Bishop Shahan deplored the tendency to reduce all human action "to terms of physical and material science" and called for theologians, thoroughly trained in historical scholarship, who could meet their opponents "on the field of history," and defend the thesis "that God rules over the affairs of mankind and disposes all things according to His own purposes." He argued that the historian has a sacred obligation to seek the truth and to explain its meaning, and he regretted that many historians were not trained in a philosophy which "admits the supernatural." He defined the function of the American Catholic historian as saving "the science of history from extravagant speculation and . . . exploitation in the interest of untried theories," and rescuing from oblivion "the names and deeds of those who . . . planted the faith in the new world."

The first six volumes of the REVIEW were concerned almost exclusively with articles on the history of the Church in America. Thereafter, the journal devoted more space to Catholicism in Europe, and, to a lesser degree, the rest of the world. Charles H. McCarthy's article in Volume I took sharp issue with Charles Kendall Adams' work on Columbus. Paul J. Foik, librarian of the University of Notre Dame, contributed an important article on early Catholic journalism in the United States, and Frederick J. Zwierlein began a series with an article on the Diocese of Rochester, which ultimately developed into his two-volume work on Bishop McQuaid. John C. Fitzpatrick of the Library of Congress wrote on "The Preservation of Ecclesiastical Documents," and Waldo G. Leland, of the American Historical Association, pleaded for the collection, preservation, and publication of source materials in Catholic history. A section dealing with "Documents" was begun with Volume I, and the book reviews, mostly unsigned, dealt with Catholic books primarily. Before the end of the year, however, the reviews took note of the work of such outstanding American non-Catholic historians as Fish, Beard, Dunning, Cheyney, and many others. In the section on "Notes and Comments," significant articles from other historical journals were

called to the attention of the reader, and Catholic educators were urged to use the *History Teacher's Magazine*. Additional items dealt with bibliography, a rebuke to Catholic historians for failure to attend the recent annual meeting of the American Historical Association, and an editorial note pleading for higher standards of scholarship and recognizing that "many things handed down as historic fact about the Church in America in Catholic circles are based on romance and misconception" (I, 476).

By the end of the first year the new REVIEW was well on its way. It required years of further editorial experience and changes before the present format and standards of the journal were perfected, and to establish the rules of editorial and bibliographical techniques. As late as 1925, the practice with reference to footnotes and bibliography and book reviews had not yet been completely standardized.

The fundamental question to be asked in connection with any new journal is—why was it established? Obviously, one good reason is that there are not enough historical journals to carry all the contributions of merit in the field. Another is that religious forces in the building of the United States have been neglected by historians, although our religious heritage has had an important functional significance in our history, and needs to be objectively evaluated. The separation of Church and State has been a fundamental concept of the American constitutional system, but this should not divert attention from the fact that religion and the life of the state are in many ways most vitally interrelated. To try to estimate the share of the Church in maintaining peace, order, and public morality, in establishing respect for government, and in preserving the many social controls which have been developed over the years, would be trying to measure forces which are no less important because at first glance they may seem to be somewhat intangible. Leland believed that American Catholics "have done much more for their history than . . . Protestant denominations" (II, 390), but maintained that there was a real place for a special journal devoted to this area of study.

Still another reason for launching the new enterprise undoubtedly was a desire to add to the intellectual reputation and stature of American Catholicism, to promote sounder scholarship, and to help destroy what leading American Catholics have termed "the ghetto mentality" of inferiority and isolation prevalent for a long time among so many of their fellow religionists. The causes of this sense of

cultural inferiority, and the consequent need to band together for mutual support and sympathy, may be found in the early experiences of Catholics in America; the fact that for a long time the Church was an immigrant church, lacking a substantial middle class; and the anti-Catholic bigotry which has marked several periods in our history. In comparison with the intellectual activities of leading European Catholics, American Catholic historians in earlier years revealed what the REVIEW characterized in 1918 as "a lack of training," which "gives an ephemeral character to most of the work done by Catholic writers of history," who lacked the kind of intellectual discipline to be acquired only in "the historical laboratory" (IV, 380). Five years later Guilday, who was thoroughly trained in the field, pointed out that only a few American Catholic historians were "producing works of value." Another able Catholic historian (Charles G. Hebermann) observed that "many of our Catholic histories read partly like the pages of a ledger and partly like catalogues of bishops and priests." Although American Catholics rapidly acquired wealth, numbers, influence, and strength of organization, many of their leaders still contend that their intellectual prestige has not risen to a degree commensurate with their material progress.

History is a unique discipline. Its votaries are forced to select and to interpret what they find, and to exercise a rigidly trained imagination to reconstruct scenes and events long past. In the words of Trevelyan, the historian tries his best to cope with reality and fact, but the image of truth must always be reflected through the prism of his own finite mind. In this sense history falls just short of being a science, and remains one of the humanities and a creative art. In a way that is always, to a considerable degree, personal to him every writer of history recreates the past by subjecting it to certain norms of judgment and value. These inevitably involve to some degree the historian's philosophy of life, and, in many cases, his theology. Moreover, history, as Becker and Beard insisted, is constantly being re-written in terms of present-day interest, experience, and values. Lord Acton pointed out long ago that the only completely detached student is a dead one, because by that time he would no longer care.

If this is true of all historical scholarship, it is particularly true when history deals with theology and religion. It is not surprising, therefore, to find the REVIEW, especially in its earlier years, becoming involved in discussions of what is "Catholic history," and in what

sense we may speak of a "Catholic historian." Obviously, there can be only two kinds of history, good and bad, and the basis of comparison is the verifiable amount of truth they contain and the method and style of presentation. Many Catholic writers have argued that any other kind of history would be both theologically and philosophically unsound. There is no special kind of Catholic historiography, although, perhaps, a Christian scholar should be more humble, and, therefore, more eager to become a more competent scholar.

To quote Lord Acton once more, it is the duty of historians "to suffer no man and no cause to escape the undying penalty which history has the power to inflict on wrong." When he opened the Vatican Archives in 1883 Pope Leo XIII defined the canons of sound historical scholarship in words that have been often quoted, "No effort should be spared to refute inventions and falsehoods; and the writers must always bear this rule in mind: that the first law of history is, not to dare to utter falsehood; the second, not to fear to speak the truth; and moreover, no room must be left for suspicion of partiality or prejudice."

The papal statement poses the problem common to all historical scholars, and they have dealt with it with varying degrees of success and forthrightness, whatever their religion. Ludwig von Pastor, son of a Protestant father and a Catholic mother, wrote a history of the popes which won him the title of "model Catholic historian." Yet, in his own words, he found no need to hide the Catholic past "behind the cassocks of ecclesiastics." Ranke's *History of the Popes*, on the other hand, was expressly forbidden by the Church, although an article in the REVIEW suggests that permission to use it will be "readily granted to those who have a good reason to ask for it" (V [N.S.], 285). The author of that comment admitted that there were ugly as well as noble phases in the history of the Church, primarily because mortals fail to live up to its teachings. John A. Ryan's article on "The Attitude of the Church toward Freedom of Speech," although primarily concerned with the larger issues involved, touched upon this problem also (VIII [N.S.], April 1928).

Charles H. McCarthy's presidential address before the American Catholic Historical Association in 1924 was concerned with "stresses and omissions" in the writing of American history (IV [N.S.], 27-46). Thirteen years later, in another presidential address, entitled "The Place of History in Catholic Education," Herbert C. F. Bell characterized the tendency to study church history in a vacuum as "a

palpable absurdity"; pleaded for more and better scholarship among Catholics; recommended a better understanding of the Church's adversaries; and insisted that "no man ranked by the Church as a great heretic has failed to show some elements of greatness" [XXIII (January 1938)]. James J. Walsh, a Catholic leader in medicine, in another contribution to the REVIEW on "The Church and Cures," advised "an ultra-conservative position with regard to healing of any and all kinds," including "cures, healing shrines and health restoring by spiritual means" [V (N.S.), April 1925].

On several occasions, writers in the REVIEW have urged the preparation of a "Catholic List of Historical Publications." A professor of history at St. Ignatius College, Cleveland, maintained that such a list should include "such works of non-Catholics as contain practically no errors," and exclude all works "likely to endanger the faith" of the reader. He favored including all Catholic authors, good or bad, however, because "they are correct in regard to Faith and Morals" [IV, 76-79]. A short article in the issue of January, 1937, urging that history be divorced "from the entanglements of philanthropy, social service, psychology and economics," demanded that the discipline be restored to its proper place as a record of man's "advance towards God," and that it be taught "as a kind of contemplation," "in the light of divine love and divine providence."

A somewhat similar article by John M. Cooper, published in 1925, which included an uncompromising statement of Catholic theology, continued with the statement that students must be trained to understand "that the Church is not a structure hanging up in the clouds," with a membership "drawn from the angelic hosts." An essay on "Catholic Truth and Historical Truth" [VI (October 1920)] by a London cleric warned historians against "indiscreet zeal for the interests of doctrinal orthodoxy"; but condoned, without fully approving, the occasional "suppression and withholding of facts," for the sake of religion, charity, "reverence for those in authority," "in the interest of justice and historical truth," and to "vindicate the authority of the Church and the truth of Catholic doctrine." The article concluded with the categorical assertion that there is no discrepancy between Catholic and historical truth. The following year, a Jesuit historian, writing in the REVIEW, pleaded for a return to the sources; he characterized most non-Catholic historians as honest seekers after truth, and concluded that Catholic historians could not properly pose "as the sole authority or . . . supreme court of Catholic historical sources."

Discussions of this nature continued to appear in the CATHOLIC HISTORICAL REVIEW for a number of years. They point up the problems that arise when history becomes involved with dogma and theology. The questions they raise need not be developed further here, and many obviously involve fundamental problems in philosophy, as well as historical scholarship. Apparently, for a number of scholars, the issues poses something of a dilemma from which they have not been completely able to extricate themselves, although discussions of this basic problem occur less frequently in the later volumes of the REVIEW.

With the passing years the REVIEW steadily expanded its scope of interest. The American Catholic Historical Association was organized in Cleveland in 1919, at the time of the annual convention of the American Historical Association. J. Franklin Jameson, the Nestor of that Association, was in the audience when the new organization was launched, gave it his blessing and wise counsel, and became its only honorary member. Once again, Peter Guilday was the driving force which brought the new organization to life. The Association made the REVIEW its official organ, and beginning with 1921, Volume VII, the journal widened its scope of interest to include the history of the Church throughout the world. Volume XVIII, e.g., was devoted almost entirely to the Church in the contemporary world while Volume XXVI dealt with Latin America.

After twenty-five years the Association's membership list had grown to only 729. During this period, about fifty articles, dealing with the American Church, and drawn from papers read at the Association's annual meetings, found their way into the REVIEW. Forty-six dealt with the Church in modern European countries; twenty-six with the mediaeval Church; twelve with Latin America. Thirty-nine were concerned with historical methods, and nineteen with the philosophy of history and matters of interpretation. In 1933 the Association published its first volume of documents—*United States Ministers to the Papal States: Instructions and Despatches, 1848-1868*, ably edited by Leo F. Stock. The policy of accepting papers, read at Association meetings, practically automatically for publication in the REVIEW, came to an end in 1941, largely because too many were of inferior quality. Since that time they have been accepted only if the editorial staff of the REVIEW regarded them as of superior merit.

A random sampling of the REVIEW reveals an impressive and steadily broadening interest in the kind of historical articles considered

worthy of publication. There is a variety of contributions dealing with the Church history of Ireland and England; the continent of Europe, including Poland and Russia; Canada and Latin America; and the Philippines. Many of the articles deal with topics of equal interest to Catholic and non-Catholic historians, such as a study of the domestic economy of the early English Dominicans; Lamennais' career in France; the gildsman of Toulouse; two articles, wholly in French, dealing with Byzantine and French Church history, and a third on "La paroisse et l'habitant canadien sous le regime français." William R. Riddell of Canada contributed a lead article in 1928 on the status of Catholicism in the Dominion. Robert H. Lord, a convert who became a priest, wrote on mediaeval parliaments. Articles on the history of Ireland were popular, but the number dealing with the Middle Ages is less than one might expect, in view of recent scholarship concerned with rehabilitating the period, and the dominant role of the Church in this stage of the history of the western world. Francis J. Tschan discussed the reasons for the decadence of Spain; Parker T. Moon wrote on the social Catholic movement in the France of the Third Republic, and Carlton H. J. Hayes in 1932 reviewed "The Significance of the Reformation in the Light of Contemporary Scholarship." Both Moon and Hayes were converts. There were other articles about Erasmus, Grotius, Renan, a number of popes and saints, and dealing with many other topics of special importance to church historians.

The same expansion of interest occurred in the field of United States history, originally, and still, the REVIEW's major concern. The REVIEW published much of the late Gilbert J. Garraghan's material on the American West and the role of France in early Mid-America; an article by the Dominion archivist on Catholic historical sources in the Canadian archives; Professor John J. Meng's "French Diplomacy in Philadelphia, 1778-1779," a lead article by Edmund C. Burnett on the Continental Congress; Howard R. Marraro's excellent studies in the Italian-American field; Leo F. Stock's article on "Catholic Participation in the Diplomacy of the Southern Confederacy," and Gaillard Hunt's controversial essay on the possible relation of Cardinal Bellarmine's works to the Virginia Declaration of Rights.

The great majority of contributors to the REVIEW have been Catholics, although the journal is open to non-Catholic historians also. Beginning with Volume II more than thirty non-Catholics have

published articles in the REVIEW, and others have contributed book reviews. Because of a natural interest in Pacific Coast history the editors welcomed contributions by Herbert E. Bolton, Charles E. Chapman, and Herbert I. Priestley of the California group of Spanish-American historians. Lawrence M. Larson published an article on the Church in Greenland; Arthur S. Aiton considered the Church-State issue in Latin America; Kenneth Scott Latourette wrote on the Christian missionary movement; Ray A. Billington contributed an excellent article on "Maria Monk and Her Influence"; and Perry Miller another on "The Puritan Theory of the Sacraments in Seventeenth Century New England."

The REVIEW contains considerable material on phases of United States history which are of equal importance to Catholics and non-Catholics. By way of illustration, attention may be directed to articles which throw light on such American issues as the controversies over "trusteeism," "Americanism," and "Cahenslyism"; the school question in politics; the role of Catholic chaplains in the wars of the United States; and the rise of religious orders and their services to their communities. Billington's bibliography of anti-Catholic propaganda in the United States to 1860 is invaluable. The students of immigration will find articles on Know-Nothingism and the A. P. A. Noteworthy articles of general interest include Henry J. Browne's critical study of Archbishop Hughes' attitude toward western colonization; Sister Mary Evangela Hawthorne's account of Bishop Spalding's work on the Anthracite Coal Strike Commission; John T. Farrell's article on "Archbishop Ireland and Manifest Destiny"; Harry J. Siever's "The Catholic Indian School Question and the Presidential Election of 1892"; and an edition of letters by Dorothy G. Wayman, in July, 1954, which throws light on Theodore Roosevelt's unsuccessful maneuvering to get a cardinal's hat for Archbishop John Ireland. For students interested in American journalism, Paul J. Foik has a contribution on early Irish-American papers, and there is a partial list of the Catholic press in the United States in Volume IV; Thomas F. Meehan has written a "Catholic Literary History of New York, 1800-1840," and Marraro an informative article on "Rome and the Catholic Church in Eighteenth Century American Magazines." Material of this kind is important to all teachers and scholars in the field of general United States history.

A section of the REVIEW, entitled "Documents," has been devoted to source material from the field of church history. The selec-

tions cover a wide range from sources for local parishes and the lives of humble priests, to letters and journals of men of distinction, and correspondence between prelates and governments. In 1920 Guilday issued a guide to materials in American Church history in the archives of the Archdiocese of Westminster, 1675-1798, and again and again the REVIEW pleaded for a comprehensive and scientific bibliography, and for a "modern history of the American Church." When the first volume of Jefferson Papers appeared, the editor reiterated his plea for "critically edited compilations of official documents and . . . the most important private papers of clerical and lay leaders."

A section entitled "Miscellany" was concerned with similar material in the later years of the REVIEW. The miscellany in the issue of October, 1935, e.g., was devoted to a long and favorable discussion of Toynbee's philosophy of history. In 1938 John E. Sexton published material in this section on the religious policy of Massachusetts toward the Indians from 1760 to 1769; in 1944 thirty-eight pages were devoted to Bishop Spalding's student letters; and in 1952, Paul Knaplund edited and published some Acton letters. Volume XXXI (January, 1946) contains valuable articles on Catholic archives in the United States.

The section of the REVIEW known as "Notes and Comments" has been developed into one of the most interesting parts of the journal, at least for professional historians. Here one finds a constantly expanding coverage of activities in the whole historical field dealing with books, periodicals, important gatherings, obituaries, and personal notes. The section is not limited to Catholic history, and seeks to call attention to noteworthy articles in current periodicals and to the activities of other historical societies.

The book reviews of an historical journal often are more promptly read by scholars than the longer articles at the beginning of the magazine. Book reviewing remains an art, which only some acquire. One finds in all historical journals too many instances when the reviewer seizes the occasion to ride his hobby, air his erudition, and give expression to his prejudices, rather than give the reader a clear summary of what the book is really about. Moreover, once a book has been assigned to a reviewer, the editor is virtually obligated to print what he gets for publication. In this respect, the editors of the CATHOLIC HISTORICAL REVIEW have undoubtedly had the same problem as their colleagues who direct the more secular

journals. Book reviews, like articles, vary greatly in merit, but sometimes they give the reader a better taste of the special flavor of an historical journal than the more major articles.

First of all, in the case of the CATHOLIC HISTORICAL REVIEW it is significant to call attention to a steady evolution in the number and character of books reviewed; an increase in the number of books by non-Catholic authors, and in books published outside the United States; a growing practice to have signed reviews; and a slow growth in the number of non-Catholic reviewers. It is to be expected that a religious journal should pay major attention to books on religion, the lives of religious leaders, the history of religious bodies, Catholic, Protestant, and Jew. The REVIEW, e.g., has been especially interested in books which deal with Puritanism here and in England. A nine-page review of Preserved Smith's *The Age of Reformation* pointed out numerous differences about facts and interpretations, but recognized the work as a real contribution, "careful, scholarly and thought-provoking" [I (N.S.), October, 1921].

During the 1920's the REVIEW carried appraisals of books on a wide variety of subjects not directly related to religious topics, by J. T. Adams, Dunning, Cheyney, Bradford, Lindsay Rogers, Golder, Alvord, Buck, McIlwain, U. B. Phillips, Bemis, Haskins, Knaplund, Lunt, Emerton, Morison, Beard, Schlesinger, and many others who belong to the galaxy of modern American historical scholarship. The books reviewed ranged all the way from ancient and Jewish history to Beard's *America in Midpassage*; Carter's *Territorial Papers of the United States*; McIlwain's studies in political theory; Aptheker's *American Negro Slave Revolts*; the *Holmes-Pollock Letters*; and Sidney Warren's study of free thought in America from 1860 to 1914. Inter-mixed with such appraisals of significant historical literature were reviews of Mother Mary Potter's *The Brides of Christ*, and notice of still another edition of the apparently imperishable *Le voyage de Monsieur Perichon*.

That Catholic reviewers would measure and comment upon the amount of attention given to Catholicism and to the Church in works by non-Catholic historians, and discourse occasionally on the author's attitude on matters of theology and dogma, was to be expected. Relatively few, however, have specifically contended that the nature and function of the papacy and the Church are such that they cannot be judged by "purely human criteria and motives which . . . apply to secular rulers" [XXVII, 100]. Solon J. Buck's *Illinois in 1818*

was criticized for devoting too little space to Catholic influence, but the author was never charged with "intentional bias." Occasionally, as theological controversy was aroused, reviewers referred to "the unconscious arrogance found in Protestant authors" [XXXII, 439], or indulged in such unseemly language about a Protestant denomination as the reference to Universalists as "Universalist down quilts" [XXVI, 379]. Such unrestrained and intemperate language is as inappropriate in a Catholic journal as the unfair tactics and gratuitous comments of some non-Catholics, against which Catholic writers have lodged justifiable protests. By way of contrast, one may point to a reviewer from the Marist Seminary in Washington who calmly suggested that since scholars hold viewpoints as opposed as those of Catholicism and liberal Protestantism, it is folly to expect them to "interpret history in the same light or choose among a multitude of facts the same facts for special notice" [XXI, 198]. Reviews written with invective, in whatever journal they appear, are frequently the ear-mark of a pseudo-scholar, and to brand an author according to his religious or philosophical position by no means disposes of his book.

Comments of this nature do not preclude forthright reviewing. For example, a volume on *The Scotch-Irish*, reviewed in January, 1937, was properly disposed of with the deserved comment that it was "amateurish, not to say infantile." To add that it was a "messy rehash of the Protestant tradition" added little to one's knowledge of the book. Croce's treatment of the Catholic Church was properly characterized as "aloof, cold, but never insulting." The reaction of Fulton J. Sheen to Harry Elmer Barnes' *The Twilight of Christianity* was not unexpected; and Fred M. Fling's tactless selection of the miracle at the wedding of Cana, to illustrate his principles of historical criticism, quite naturally impressed the reviewer as blasphemous, and provoked him to go on to say that "the Gospels are not open to the historical critic" [VI, 525-27]. A review of Sellery and Krey's *Medieval Foundations of Western Civilization*, while calling attention to errors from the viewpoint of Catholicism, nevertheless, commended the authors for a genuine effort to deal objectively with the mediaeval Church.

The number of reviews which in recent years avoid religious disputation, and deal with critical, scholarly analysis, seems to be increasing. The reviews of the late Richard J. Purcell, e.g., were always scholarly, objective, and in good temper. Charles P. Bruehl's

review of a book on the Marxian interpretation of history emphasized the inadequacy of the economic theory of Marx as the ultimate key to history, but recognized that the father of modern communism had stimulated "social research" and started "a happy reaction to other equally arbitrary constructions of history." Frank Tannenbaum's book on Mexico, which took sharp issue with the record of the Church in that country, was reviewed by a prominent official of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, who considered his criticisms fully justified. Merle Curti's *The Growth of American Thought*, although "written entirely from the rationalistic viewpoint," was, nevertheless, described as a very "useful, complete and original summary." Dr. Walsh had nothing but the highest praise for Thorndyke's *History of Magic and Experimental Science*, and Theodore Maynard, although disagreeing fundamentally with Preserved Smith's thesis that "not faith but doubt has liberated and humanized the modern world," spoke favorably of his *History of Modern Culture*, and considered the author both "moderate and just." The reviewer of Latourette's *History of Christianity* correctly described the author as "unmistakably Protestant," . . . "but controlled by voluminous reading and . . . careful weighing of the evidence," and "with a kindly outlook on life." Ellis regarded Albert Post's *Popular Freethought in America* an excellent addition to historical literature on American public opinion, and wrote a painstaking, thirty-one page review article of Canon Stokes' three-volume *Church and State in the United States* in which he took issue on many points, without losing the scholar's even temper and appreciation for the author's "general fairness."

The REVIEW has not had one standard of appraisal for books by Catholic authors, and another for the work of non-Catholics. Books by fellow religionists have been roughly handled on many occasions in the REVIEW. In its first volume, there was a sharp review of an American history text for use in Catholic schools, in which the reviewer pointed out scores of factual errors. In a ten-page appraisal in Volume XXVIII of Theodore Maynard's *The Story of American Catholicism*, the reviewer expressed his irritation with the author's frequent *obiter dicta*; questioned many of his conclusions; criticized his errors and "uncritical methods" and poor documentation, and dismissed as a silly legend the claim that Jefferson wrote the Declaration of Independence from Bellarmine's work. A review of Father Theodore Roemer's history of the Church in the United States in Volume XXXVI was equally sharp, and stressed not only errors

of fact and organization, but the "colorings of the author's own mind"; his excessively "ultramontane tone," and "the emphasis on a peculiar American loyalty to the Holy See which is taken to mean the omniscience of Roman officialdom." Several reviewers took issue with Michael J. O'Brien, the indefatigable historiographer of the American Irish Historical Society, and criticized his work as the uncritically filiopietistic product of a sincere genealogist and antiquarian, but not a trained historian. A work on *Freemasonry and the Anti-Christian Movement* by a Jesuit was criticized as "frankly polemic," and containing "statements that seem to go beyond the testimony adduced." Hilaire Belloc's *History of England* was charged with errors of both fact and interpretation. A *Life of Washington*, written by a priest and published by Longmans Green in 1915 received, perhaps, the most savage review. It was dismissed as "unworthy of a serious review," "grotesquely puerile in style and unequalled in ignorance." The author was advised to make this his last book [III, 351].

This is the CATHOLIC HISTORICAL REVIEW, insofar as an article so limited can do justice to a journal which now covers a span of two score years, and as it looks to a non-Catholic historian who has used it on many occasions to good advantage. During these forty years the REVIEW has shown a steady growth in quality and in the scope of its interest. It has reviewed significant books which have been overlooked by older and better known journals. It has gradually attained a stature comparable in its field with such journals as the *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* of Louvain, the *Revue d'histoire de l'église de France*, and several German and Austrian publications, although it differs from them in many respects and has developed an identity all its own. It has stimulated interest in, and respect for, higher standards of American Catholic historical scholarship, and deserves a larger circulation and greater support than it has. It is an important historical journal which all historians, and especially those working in the special fields of cultural, intellectual, and religious history, cannot afford to ignore.

*Western Reserve University*