

Charles-Marie de Veil.

(Continued from page 81.)

HIS CATHOLIC CAREER.

Charles, duc de Schonberg, godfather of Charles-Marie, had died in 1656. But Louis XIV, godfather of Louis-Compiègne, was waxing like the sun in his splendour, a Roi Soleil. He sent his godson to the same university, and it is interesting to speculate on the relations of the elder, the theolog, and the younger, the linguist; the one under monastic régime, the other perhaps swaggering at one of the colleges. Louis-Compiègne proved his worth in 1667, publishing a Latin version of three tractates by Maimonides, on Fasting, Solemn Expiation, and the Passover; it was dedicated to the Abbé Le Tellier, of the Royal Chapel, extolling his maintenance of Gallican liberties. It is in the preface to this work that we learn the ancestry of the two brothers. In 1669 he followed on with Maimonides on the Calendar, dedicated to Tour d'Auvergne, cardinal-designate, a member of the Turenne family. In 1671 he was appointed Professor of Oriental Languages at Heidelberg, where the ancient university was being resuscitated after the Thirty Years' War; Spinoza had been vainly invited to come. The inaugural lecture of Louis-Compiègne on the Origin of Hebrew was published there, dedicated to the Count Palatine: as it was actually delivered in his presence, and his time was precious, the lecture was cut down; though Louis at the lecture could not set forth all the proofs of Hebrew having been the original language once spoken by all men, before Babel, it is a pity he did not print them. He soon got back to Paris, this time as Interpreter of Oriental Languages in the king's library.²⁷ And there in 1673 he put out a fifth tractate of Maimonides, on Wedlock; this was dedicated to J. B. Colbert. All this was published by the younger brother before Charles-Marie appeared in print.

Meantime Charles-Marie had not only learned Latin, learned theology, passed through a university, held a professorship, but he had the rather unusual experience of passing from the Augustinian congregation to that of Sainte-Genevieve.²⁸ It seems the fate of every ancient religious body to stagnate; as it

²⁷ Floquet, I, 291; citing *Mélanges publiées par la Société des Bibliophiles Français*, 1826.

²⁸ Floquet, I, 286; citing Bayle, december 1684 and september 1685.

is an evidence of divine life that from every such torpid body there shall spring another with youth and energy. In 1634 Charles Faure organized a reformed offshoot, which was named after Sainte Genevieve, whose chapel at Paris is well known to-day as the Pantheon. Augustine was an African, Genevieve a Parisian; and Gallican patriotism rallied to the new Congregation, which was often in practice called the Gallican. Charles-Marie had indeed entered the Augustinians, and had vowed lifelong fidelity to that Order; but statute lxxx permitted a prelate to dispense from the vow. Bossuet was now bishop of Condom, and as he had really borne much of the expense of the long training, he was legally and morally able to secure an honourable exit from the Augustinian Congregation. The Gallican on the other hand had a statute not to take a man from another Order; but it depended largely on the king, and Bossuet was tutor to the dauphin. The transition was arranged quietly, and in October 1674, Father de Veil made his début in print as a Priest and Canon Regular of the Gallican Congregation, Doctor of Theology in the Royal Academy of Angers.

Louis-Compiègne was a mere translator from the Hebrew. Charles-Marie published an Angers a commentary on Matthew and Mark, based on the Greek, the Fathers, Hebrew rites and idioms, and an array of writers both old and new, with original remarks. He told his readers that he took the plain literal meaning of the text, and had not disdained to consult even heterodox writers (probably Calvin and Beza) but he emphasized his direct knowledge of Hebrew idiom, dialect, usages and customs. The work was naturally dedicated to Bossuet.

The success was immediate. A second edition was called for next year, and came out at Paris. This was well reviewed on 6 January, 1676, in the *Journal des Sçavans*. In that same month he completed a second commentary, on the Song of Songs. It might be interesting to compare this with the commentary previously issued by Bossuet on the same book. De Veil's work was dedicated to Paul Beurrier, head of the Gallican Congregation, and abbé of Sainte-Geneviève-du-Mont itself, the church dating from 511 A.D. The dedication appreciates the honour done to the author in advising him to devote his life to scriptural exposition. Other documents show that his superiors had indeed thus determined his life-work, and that the doctors of the faculty of theology in Paris held a very high opinion of his books. He had been transferred from Angers to Paris, where he was now a member of the ancient community of Catharine, Val des Ecoliers, which in 1646 had been united with the new Gallican Congregation, retaining however its former name. In this capacity it would be his duty to take a turn in regular parish

work. Obviously this was like harnessing a race-horse into a brougham.

By June he was transferred again, from Paris to Melun, forty miles up the Seine, to the priory of Saint Ambrose. But this time he was no longer a canon, he was the Prior, the Rector of the community and of the town. Under him was a staff of canons, who would do the parochial work at his allotment, while he was free to devote himself to his studies. A third instalment of his work appeared in 1676, a commentary on Joel, dedicated to his diocesan, Jean de Montpesat de Carbon, archbishop of Sens, primate of the Gauls and of Germany. It reiterates that he was assigned to this kind of work.²⁹ The *Journal* gave him another favourable review in December, while the king gave him copyright for six years.

His fame was now well established. But some people overwork a willing horse. And there were ecclesiastical and theological quarrels where the combatants were eager to enlist fresh pens. Bossuet believed that de Veil would become one of the greatest defenders of the faith.³⁰ The Jansenists had been denounced as Calvinists in Catholic clothing; their seminary at Angers was closed in 1676, and the faculty of theology there was being purged.³¹ But Calvinists as Huguenots were very real, and were protected by the edict of Nantes. Charles-Marie had added to his commentary on Matthew and Mark an excursus against the Huguenots, and he was urged to go further down this bye-path. Bossuet and his former diocesan Arnauld were both at work on these points of doctrine and ritual; and indeed they had been orally discussed at Melun itself many years before.

Charles-Marie avowed that he had studied heterodox books. So far he was not attracted by them, although with his insistence on the plain literal meaning of Matthew, he need not have objected to Theodore of Mopsuestia and the Anabaptists taking the Song of Songs for what it purports to be, a praise of faithful love plighted between man and maid. But he knew the value of oral discussion before printing, and he welcomed the opportunity of a weekly study-circle. Melun is not far above Paris, and Bossuet was tutor to the Dauphin at Saint-Germain, further down the Seine. The two friends seized the opportunity of steady study, both of the Bible, and of controverted theological points. And from Paris itself they were able to attract other

²⁹ There is a puzzle in the two Approbations. The former was by Beurrier, in February, and styles him a member of the Gallican congregation: the latter was in March, and calls him still an Augustinian. It is a marvel that the two were printed together, for the second is obviously belated in its facts.

³⁰ Letter of 1677/8, in *La Séduction éludée* (Berne, 1686). See note 40.

³¹ *Revue de l'Anjou*, XVI, 284.

scholars, including Louis-Compiègne, the courtier. A regular Fraternal was soon instituted in Bossuet's quarters.

On the lighter side, this is caricatured by the Abbé de Longuerue, another of the courtiers who never lived at his abbey of Sept Fontaines, but simply drew its revenues.³² His skit speaks of the two brothers de Veil, both of them decidedly ugly, dining at St. Germain every week, with d'Herbelot, equally ugly, and Nicole Thoynard, not yet invested with his peruke. The fare was frugal, but a wit apologised on the ground that they were Condomophages. A more serious writer tells us that this circle included also Claude Fleury, Eusèbe Renaudot, and others; and that the meal was only an interlude in the critical study of the Bible.³³ Of this Bossuet wrote often, with affectionate references to "mes rabbins." Most of the circle in after years gave abundant evidence how they had profited by their intercourse.

In this group of students, Charles-Marie came again to close quarters with his brother. For a short time Louis-Compiègne had been professor at Heidelberg, where a great Calvinist confession had been drawn up early in the century. And as friends were pressing Charles-Marie to study this doctrine in order to refute it elaborately, he would not lack knowledge where to turn; Ferri of Metz had issued a standard exposition. Just outside the gates of Paris was Charenton, where the Huguenots had their chief Temple, served by four ministers including Henri Claude and Max de l'Aigle. Whether he made their personal acquaintance at this stage is uncertain. But he did not confine himself to clerical circles, for he became friendly with Théodore Maimbourg, whose wife was an ardent Calvinist. The trend of De Veil's thinking was evident when in June 1677 he publicly declared to his metropolitan in the dedication of his *Joel*, "me nunquam ab angulo meo ne latum digitum quidem discessurum." Did the archbishop murmur, Methinks the Prior doth protest too much?

It is always difficult to decide which of many factors is decisive. But one has certainly been overlooked at this stage. Antoine Arnauld had been publicly apostrophised by Charles-Marie as "Clarissimus Ecclesiae Christi sacerdos, doctor Sorbonis, apostolicae sedis sincerus ac religiosissimus cultor, studiosissimus Ecclesiae unitatis et disciplinae, novitatis profanae ac hereticae pravitatis debellator invictissimus, orthodoxae veritatis, et semel traditae fidei vindex acerrimus, ac defensor fortissimus." Arnauld had collaborated with Nicole in a massive work against the Huguenots, "La perpétuité de la foi de l'église

³² Louis Dufour de Long: *Longueruana* (Berlin 1754) page 54.

³³ Floquet: *Bossuet, Précepteur du Dauphin*, pages 422-424.

catholique touchant l'eucharistie." Yet this did not save the Jansenists from renewed persecution by the Jesuits, so that in 1679 both Nicole and Arnauld had to flee to the Netherlands. It may well be imagined with what disgust de Veil would observe the bigotry which drove away one of his idols.

He would be able to see that Jansenism was largely Calvinism within the Catholic church, and it must have been hard to find Bossuet and Arnauld on different sides. He would equally be able to see that if he sided with Ferri and Claude, an unfrocked priest was badly equipped to earn a living; and that the edict of Nantes offered no protection to any apostate, so that he would certainly have to follow Arnauld into exile.

The Low Countries were quite attractive to a Frenchman, from Metz. Language would present no acute difficulty. At Rotterdam, Utrecht, The Hague, Amsterdam, there were large colonies of Huguenots, including great scholars; and it was conceivable that there would be scope as a lecturer in theology. The Netherlanders were most hospitable to refugees, for it was quite clear that the Edict of Nantes was no longer any real protection; and a peace was also within sight to end the war between France and the Low Countries.

Such considerations would have to be weighed by the convert, who had to choose a new country. It was at least fortunate for him that he had no family to support, and might live as frugally as Spinoza, even though he had no handicraft whereby to earn his living.

HUGUENOT.

The details of the change were not reported at any length, and only by a formal testimonial two and a half years later do we learn that he came over to Protestantism in August 1677.³⁴ From another source, by no means contemporary, we hear that the scene was Holland.³⁵ For some years a namesake had lived there, Friedrich Ragstatt de Weile, who did publish on the issues between the churches. But there is no evidence of any intercourse; and Friedrich came from Germany, whose language he used.

There was a M. de Veilde, who in October 1677 bore a letter from Sir Leoline Jenkins at Nimeguen to secretary Coventry.³⁶ As our Charles-Marie was presently in touch with this circle, it has been read with some expectation, especially as the bearer was a *religieux*. Yet he was not a "minister," and though this may mean, not a Huguenot pastor, it seems against the identifica-

³⁴ Prefixed to his *Ecclesiastes*.

³⁵ Crosby: IV, 253.

³⁶ W. Wynne: *Life of Sir Leoline Jenkins* (London 1724), II, 229.

tion. Moreover, the purpose of his visit was to communicate a method of preserving ships from the depredations of worms, a topic for which neither the Talmud nor the university of Angers would be likely to prepare. And otherwise Charles-Marie never showed any interest in such topics, not even in a later commentary on Jonah. Nevertheless the dates do fit very neatly.

A late writer, quoting no authority, says that Charles-Marie and Louis-Compiègne had a third brother, who also became Christian, and settled in Holland. The statement is most improbable, and may perhaps be an inference from the existence of these two men.

Hollanders were good friends with England at this time. In November William of Orange crossed to marry his cousin Mary Stuart. And about the same time Charles-Marie was in England, having established relations with Jean Maximilien de l'Angle, who for eighteen years had been minister of the Huguenot church in the Savoy. They called together on Sir Joseph Williamson, a secretary of state. He was not only a city man, an Oxford LL.D., president of the Royal Society, but he had been plenipotentiary at a congress in Cologne four years earlier. He was evidently sympathetic, and asked for a statement in writing. This was put in on 23 December, a handsome document which might impress the secretary.³⁷ It frankly states that he was short of money, "court d'argent"; it refers to Max de l'Aigle and Henri Claude, also to one of the French secretaries of state, Henri Justel. It also mentions that he has another commentary ready for the press, on *Hosea*. It does not allude to ships or worms.

He might have appealed soon to the marquis de Ruvigny; sent in 1678 by Louis XIV on a special mission to king Charles; for Ruvigny was not merely a Huguenot, he was actually their deputy-general. But it does not seem that de Veil ever knew him, though in after years his brother and his nephew did.

Pierre Bayle discerned a little later that "L'Angleterre est la païs du monde où les profonds raisonnemens métaphysiques et physiques, assaisonnés d'érudition, sont les plus goûtés et à la mode."³⁸ And the Huguenots were proving this already. Papillon and Dubois were just about to be elected sheriffs of London. In literature there was quite a demand for translations from the French. To say nothing of novels, law, medicine, war, which were beyond the scope of de Veil, there appeared within this year Dugard's *Dialogues of Lucian*, the

³⁷ State Papers Domestic, Charles II. Volume 398, numbers 180, 181.

³⁸ *Lettres Choiesies* (1710): II, 106.

Funeral of the Mass from the French, the *Conversion of a Capuchin of Paris*, a Latin work on the Jansenists, the *Liturgy in French*, Du Moulin's *Soliloquies*, Du Moulin's *Treatise of Peace*, le Vayer's *Prerogative of a Private Life*, de Luxancy's *Treatise against Irreligion*, Duport's *Poemata*, *Bellum Papale*, *Compendium Biblicum*; two of these authors were presbyters of the Church of England.³⁹ For a scholar of de Veil's peculiar ability, there was clearly ample scope in England.

Hardly had he arrived, than he fell ill, and there was some delay. It gave the opportunity for his old friend Bossuet to send him a most touching appeal from Saint Germain on 2 March 1677/8, assuring him that he might return without fear: "vous y trouverez un appui très-sûr pour toutes choses, un ami, un frère, un père, qui ne vous oubliera jamais, et jamais ne cessera de vous rappeler à l'Eglise par les cris qu'il fera à Dieu." There is no sign of any reply, or of any future intercourse.⁴⁰

ANGLICAN PRESBYTER.

Within a very few weeks, Charles-Marie found a welcome in Anglican circles, where his published works served as good credentials. He revised his *Magnum Opus*, the Latin commentary on Matthew and Mark, taking out of it the controversial excrescences supporting Catholic rites, and on 29 March it received the imprimatur of William Jane, canon of Oxford. Three days later he was formally received into the Church of England.

The bishop of London was *ex-officio* in charge of all Huguenot refugees. The bishop at this time was Henry Compton, who had been tutor to Mary, now princess of Orange. He was very keen on re-ordaining French Protestant ministers, declining to recognize their Presbyterian orders, for the matter was crucial with the English and Scotch Presbyterians.⁴¹ De Veil presented the sixth case before him, but it was unique. He had been in Catholic orders, which are indelible, and are recognized by the Church of England. Therefore when he took the oath

³⁹ *Term Catalogues*, reprint of 1903: I, 278-321.

⁴⁰ This letter was first published in 1686 at Berne by a Protestant. He did not name de Veil, nor give the year, only "le 2 Mars." From this book, *La Séduction éludée*, it was copied into the edition of Bossuet's letters by Lebel in 1818, where it is in tome XXXVII, pages 333-334; the Paris editor assigned the date 1686 to it! But in 1686 Bossuet was at Versailles from 27 February, as the *Gazette de France* shows. He was at St. Germain en Laye from 1670 to 1679, as tutor to the Dauphin. Floquet in his note, I, 288, forgets that in England the Old Style was still used.

⁴¹ F. de Schickler: *Les Eglises du Refuge en Angleterre*: II, 329.

of supremacy, the oath to conform and use the Book of Common Prayer, and signed the XXXIX articles, that sufficed; he was not re-ordained.⁴² He now entered on the most eventful year of his life.

It was naturally in clerical circles that he made his first friends. And London was like Paris in one respect, that it swarmed with ambitious clergy, especially pluralists who were absent from most of their posts, seeking for more by favour of the king. Among these were Stillingfleet, dean of St. Paul's, with Lloyd a prebendary, and Tillotson a canon; Patrick a prebendary of Westminster and rector of St. Paul's in Covent Garden; Sharp a prebendary of Norwich and rector of St. Giles in the Fields. Into their circle de Veil was soon admitted.

Now Sharp had been domestic chaplain to Sir Heneage Finch, now lord chancellor, reading daily prayers, saying grace before meat, and being called in again for grace after the sweets, with perhaps tutoring younger members of the family, and the care of the library; beyond board, lodging and official robes there would be some small stipend. Also beside the leisure, dear to a scholar, the opportunities were considerable. There was often the chance of a well-portioned marriage, in haste.

For an immigrant to obtain a sinecure was of course not to be expected. Nor was de Veil's command of English good enough for him to aspire to a chaplaincy. Yet his eminence as a scholar did secure for him a position as tutor in some noble household. In what family this post was held, has not been discovered. Charles-Marie may have succeeded Sharp with Baron Finch, the lord chancellor; but he never seems to have profited by any legal society. It is possible that he served the family of Viscount Ranelagh, whose wife was sister to Robert Boyle, who lived with them in Pall Mall; Ranelagh had not yet bought the park adjoining Chelsea Hospital, towards Fulham.

It may be mentioned, to avert confusion, that Louis-Compiègne also found 1678 eventful. In January he dedicated to the abbé Jacques Nicole Colbert, an annotated translation of *Maimonides on Divine Worship*, published in Paris. But within a few months he too became Protestant, and took refuge in England, where he presented a copy to Jean Rou.⁴³ By 1680 at least he was established in the household of Tillotson, then dean of Canterbury; in the correspondence of that great preacher are many allusions to him, which are not to be referred to the elder brother.⁴⁴

⁴² Newcourt: *Repertorium of the orders . . . conferred by the bishops of London* (1710): under date 16 April 1678.

⁴³ *Mémoires Inédits de Jean Rou*: (Paris 1857); I, 128.

⁴⁴ British Museum Additional manuscript 4236.

Charles-Marie was astute enough to see his way by intervening in a famous theological and literary quarrel, connected with Richard Simon. This French Oratorian had in 1670 entered public life by defending the Jews of Metz against the charge of a ritual murder. He was a fine Hebrew scholar, and had printed a *Histoire Critique du Vieux Testament*, which proved the starting-point of modern Higher Criticism. While he was awaiting the consent of Louis XIV to accept a dedication, his enemies learned the line he was taking, and with the help of Bossuet and the chancellor induced the council of state to interfere, so that nearly all the impression was destroyed in 1679. But two copies had been sent to England, and while scholars recognized the great merits of the work, they were taken aback by the Third Book "Wherein the method for the well translating of the scripture is treated of, and at the same time is shown how obscure the scripture is." This book claimed that usage, tradition, must determine the meaning of the Bible. This was as a red rag to Protestants. Now there was a good deal of scriptural translation actually going on.⁴⁵ In 1667 the Port Royal scholars had made a French version of the New Testament from the Vulgate, with reference to the Greek; and within two years six editions were called for. The old French Geneva version was equipped in 1669 with abundant scholarly notes. The Jansenists put out at Brussels a *Histoire et Concorde des Quatres Evangelistes*. In all such work, great interest was taken by Robert Boyle, who had furthered versions for the Massachusetts Indians and the Malays. And Boyle had won a continental reputation, for he was not only a missionary statesman, but a natural philosopher; his works had been published at Geneva in 1677. Now if Williamson was president of the Royal Society, Boyle was one of its leading members. And de Veil chimed in on 14 May 1678 with a *Lettre à Mons. Boisle pour prouver contre l'auteur d'un livre intit. "Critique du Vieux Testament" que la seule Ecriture est la règle de la foi*. This letter was dated from Fulham, and an English version invoked God's blessing on Katherine, viscountess Ranelagh. Charles-Marie took the ground that the New Testament shows our Lord frequently opposing tradition, whence the inference was drawn that for the exposition of scripture the chief qualifications were piety, learning, and especially freedom from prejudice. He gave a copy to Thomas Barlow, bishop of Lincoln, which copy is now in the Bodleian library.

While it was still in the press, a Protestant with the initials J***S.D.R. got an advance copy; Jean Regnault de Ségrais was at

⁴⁵ Darlow & Moule: *Historical Catalogue of Printed Bibles*: II, 400ff.

this time publishing anonymously in London, and lending his name to the comtesse de la Fayette.⁴⁶ The copy was sent to Simon, who was then at Belleville, just outside Paris. He was much annoyed already at the opposition he was meeting, and when he received this flank attack lost no time in hitting back, in a manuscript letter to his correspondent, on the 16th of August, signed R. de Lisle, Presbyter of the Gallican church, for he always used pseudonyms in his pamphlets. His most telling point was that if tradition is not allowed alongside scripture to determine the faith, where is the warrant for infant baptism, for which scripture supplies no order? This was quite a traditional question for Catholics to put to Protestants, and they were accustomed to find it unanswerable: there is an amusing anecdote of Charles II. inviting a debate between a Protestant and a priest; the latter played this trump card, and was much disconcerted to find it taken at once, the Protestant quite disclaiming infant baptism; on learning that his opponent was a Baptist minister, Jeremy Ives, the priest declared he had been tricked, and retired from the debate. Monsieur J.S.D.R. doubtless handed about the letter of Richard Simon, and it must have come to the knowledge of de Veil, much to his disquietude. Anabaptists in France were a matter of hearsay, but Baptists in London were plentiful.

The attention thus called to Tradition, by de Veil himself in connection with *Mark vii.*, ought to have been reflected in his revised commentary, were it only in an appendix. Yet when this appeared at the King's Arms, from Roycroft's press, there was no notice at all, and the comments on that chapter are very meagre, considering the Talmudical knowledge at his disposal. The volume was dedicated to bishop Compton *Amantissimus pauperum*, and on 11 October he gave a copy to the bishop of Lincoln; de Veil was very fortunate in obtaining wealthy patrons, in contrast to Simon; Compton's chaplain William Sill had on 12 July given his *imprimatur* to a second revised edition, this time of the *Song of Songs*, and in December this was advertised by Carr. De Veil had enough on hand to keep three printers and three publishers at work. This time he dedicated to Williamson. And he was making new friends fast, for he sent a copy *ex dono auctoris* to William Bates, a leading Presbyterian who had been chaplain to Charles II, and had by his order been made a D.D. The friendship held, and all Bates' copies are now in Dr. Williams' library.

His commentaries on *Hosea* and *Joel* were augmented, and

⁴⁶ *Term Catalogues*: I, 565.

on 21 April 1679 William Sill gave his *imprimatur* for a commentary on the *Twelve Minor Prophets*. This was advertised in November by Swalle, and came out with a dedication to the Lord Chancellor, Heneage Finch, lord Daventry. It was soon broadcast, and came to the notice of his university at Angers. The situation was quite impossible from their standpoint. His famous commentaries were being altered in a controversial style, though not in the vulgar methods of Titus Oates the "doctor of Salamanca." Tradition had been expressly repudiated. And the culprit was still figuring as S.T.D. This at least could be remedied, and on 9 January 1680 the degree was formally cancelled. As the university and the Jesuits and the king were quarrelling vigorously on another point, it must have been pleasant to find some measure in which they could all unite.⁴⁷

All news travels apace, and Charles-Marie took prompt steps in response. Within three weeks he secured a testimonial from the bishops of London, Rochester and Ely, with Tillotson, Stillfleet, and Patrick, that he was in good standing with the Church of England, as a Presbyter. Henceforth he did not advertise himself even as S.T.D. emeritus, but presently he figured as D.D.; possibly this was a Lambeth degree, though there is no record of one being conferred.

During 1680, de Veil was drawn into a curious episode, which was told afterwards from two angles.⁴⁸ Eve Cohan was a Portuguese Jewess, whose father had been a magnate in the Dutch plantations in Brazil, and died worth £20,000. She was brought up by her mother at Delft, where her music-master took her occasionally to hear the organs at church, and where she read a New Testament. On this being discovered, the girl, now nineteen years old, was looked after very carefully and confined to the house. In May 1679 she escaped, by the help of Michael Verboon, a servant of her brother Jacob, living in the house. She went to him at Brussels, he took her to Nieuport, and by July they reached England, taking lodgings in Bedfordbury (Bloomsbury) with a French tailor named Lavigne. A brother and a cousin tracked them thither, and took lodgings in the same house, whereupon they got married at Knightsbridge according to Church of England rites. After her relatives failed to arrest Verboon for debt, they tried to persuade her to return to Delft. At this stage Mistress Lavigne called in de Veil, both to advise as to her safety, and to prepare her for baptism; and attempts

⁴⁷ Floquet, I, 289, citing Calmet, *Bibliothèque lorraine*, 1751, article on de Veil.

⁴⁸ Burnet: *Conversion and Persecution of Eve Cohan*, 1680. E. N. Adler: *History of Jews in London*, 1930; pages 106, 107.

were made to find some influential protector. She was arrested for debt to her mother of £2,000 and complicated intrigues were set afoot to kidnap her. De Veil had been out of town, but when he returned next day, he at once informed the lord mayor, and the vicar of St. Martin's, in which parish she had been living. Not only did these secure fair play, but as the vicar was William Lloyd, bishop of St. Asaph, he further secured the goodwill of Sir Leoline Jenkins. After being bandied from court to court, she was released by the sheriff on payment of 22/- and 40/- costs. At the trial, de Veil contributed the very dubious evidence that if a Jew swore on an English Bible, esteemed by him a profane book, and on the back side of it, then it was to him no oath. Lloyd meantime had sent to Holland for evidence, as he had been imposed upon by pretended converts. As he was satisfied, there was a service at St. Martin's on 10 October, when the woman was baptized, her sponsors being Sir Leoline Jenkins, the countess of Thanet and the countess of Clarendon. A full account was soon published, from the pen of Burnet, the famous Chaplain of the Rolls,—who did obtain a Lambeth D.D. on 29 September.

(To be concluded.)