

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

ART. VI.—REVIVAL IN THE GALLICAN CHURCH.

1. *Charles de Condren, &c.* By H. SIDNEY LEAR. London: Rivingtons. 1877.
2. *Bossuet and his Contemporaries.* London: Rivingtons. 1874.
3. *Fénelon, Archbishop of Cambrai.* London: Rivingtons. 1877.
4. *Bossuet Dévoilé par un Prêtre de son Diocèse en 1690.* 2^e edition. Paris: Sandor. 1875.
5. *L'Intolérance de Fénelon.* Par A. DOUEN. Nouvelle édition, augmentée. Paris: Sandoz. 1875.
6. *The Gallican Church.* By the Rev. W. H. JERVIS, M.A. London: Murray. 1872.

THE Gallican Church is a subject of considerable interest just at present. The recent Pan-Anglican Synod was moved with compassion for its forlorn condition. Men like Mr. Gladstone and Dean Stanley have deemed it worth their while to manifest interest in M. Loyson's (Père Hyacinthe) effort to resuscitate it. For it must be carefully kept in mind that, in the proper sense of the term, the "Gallican Church" has now no existence; it is a thing of the past. In its room, mainly through the inability of the First Napoleon to cope with the mingled finesse and obstinacy of the Papal authorities, there has in lieu of it been introduced into the heart of France a Roman garrison, owning all allegiance to a foreign Power, and only nominally French. This Frenchmen understand; those especially who seek to be free from foreign interference. But neither the present nor the past Church have any real hold upon the French nation. The yoke of priestly observance has for a long time been most reluctantly submitted to. That yoke is now broken. What will be the future even of religion is a problem. Meanwhile, amongst ourselves there are some persons who imagine that it would be a good thing for France if the old Gallican Church could be reproduced. They are for this reason disposed to augur favourably of M. Loyson's experiment, as though a married priesthood, the participation of the laity in the Cup and Mass in French, had been possible features of that Church. Some imagine that it was in certain respects superior to our own Church; at any rate, that it produced more conspicuous instances of saintly life. They would like to have something corresponding to what they fancy it was in England. Those who have studied French history know that for a very considerable portion of its existence it was remarkable for disorder and corruption. They know also that the Gallican liberties, although there was

an amount of deference ostensibly paid to the Pope, meant really an interference of the State—that is, the Monarch—with the Church quite as great, if not greater, than what now exists in England. Some, however, point to a revival period in it commencing in the reign of Louis XIII. and extending through that of Louis XIV., and would fain avert contemplation from the rest of the Church to this restricted portion; if they could, they would like to suppose that this part was the whole.

It would be impossible to treat the subject exhaustively in the pages of a magazine; still some comments upon the Gallican Church at the height of this revival may be profitable and interesting. It is a fair period for viewing the influences of choice Roman Catholic teaching in a Church. We see the system at its best, selecting a peculiarly favourable development out of the mass of surrounding corruption. General readers can study the main incidents of it in Mr. Lear's writings, the chief object of which is through the medium of the past in France to shadow out what he considers would be profitable in England now. English Churchmen, therefore, are specially interested in all this. He is, we suppose, an English Churchman himself, but his writings are purely derived from Romish sources; there is nothing in them but what might have been written by an intelligent and liberal-minded Roman Catholic. As written for English readers, they are carefully expurgated from the more stimulating absurdities congenial to unreformed or vitiated palates. The absence of these peculiarities detracts, however, from the faithfulness of the portraiture, and is calculated to leave a most erroneous impression. Mr. Lear is a courtly painter. He presents rather the aspects which he would wish his sitters to assume than what they really presented in all respects to the men of their generation. His disposition towards unqualified eulogium has been encouraged by the admirable qualities, in many important particulars, of those whom he commemorates.

A very brief retrospect of the religious condition of France before the period of the priestly revival will be necessary. Three parties existed in the country from the time of Luther and Calvin. There were the Huguenots, who, partly by force of arms, but mainly under the influence of religious zeal, formed a section of the community remarkable for strictness of life and purity of religious doctrine. As a body they framed their lives in conformity with this doctrine, and were conspicuous for many excellent qualities, rendering them most valuable citizens, deeply inspired with the love of freedom and filled with hatred of Romish superstitions. In marked opposition to them were the adherents of the Catholic League. These were what we would nowadays describe as Ultramontane fanatics of the most unscrupulous.

pulous character. Some idea may be formed of the lengths to which the Leaguers were prepared to go when we state that it was in contemplation to dethrone Henry III., to confine him for life in a monastery, to require the complete submission of the States-General of France to the See of Rome, to take decisive measures for the total suppression and abolition of the Reformed religion, revoking all edicts favourable to it, and to secure the complete recognition of the sovereignty of the Pope by abrogating for ever the so-called liberties of the Gallican Church. This plot was "viewed with cordial sympathy by many of the prelates and a large majority of the parochial clergy of France."¹ Subsequent history proves with what undeviating tenacity the objects of the League have been pursued from that time to the present hour. Beyond both these parties was the bulk of the French nation, steeped, for the most part, in abject poverty and the most profound ignorance. The biographer of St. Vincent de Paul describes them as like "scattered sheep without spiritual pasture, without sacraments, without instruction, and with scarcely any external aids to salvation. They scarcely knew whether or not there was a God. Of the mysteries of the Trinity and of the Incarnation they had no apprehension whatever." Yet the Church of France was in the possession of princely revenues. Religious foundations of all sorts abounded throughout the land. Glorious cathedrals reared themselves in magnificence. But, except amongst the Huguenot congregations, there was spiritual death. The French clergy especially were dead. It would be hardly possible to conceive anything more frightful than the sad condition of the French Church in the seventeenth century, viewed as a Christian institution. In his "Revival of Priestly Life" (p. 43), Mr. Lear quotes the authority of a French bishop for the fact that there were "seventy thousand priests in his diocese either drunkards or of impure life." Another bishop did not think that with one exception there was "a priest in his diocese capable of any ecclesiastical office." The name was held to be synonymous with ignorance and debauchery. There is no reason to believe that the dioceses referred to were peculiarly exceptionable. In France altogether there were one hundred and thirty sees. Even making the most enormous deductions there must have been five hundred thousand of profligate and ignorant priests in France during that century.² Very many of the

¹ For an account of this, *in extenso*, see "Church of France," vol. i. p. 174.

² It would be utterly impossible in these pages to justify this statement. One anecdote may, perhaps, without breach of decorum, be related. The Bishop of Langres, M. Simiane, by no means the worst of his order, commonly termed "le bon Langres," was a gambler, fond of playing for heavy stakes. He lost at Court large sums

bishops were little better, if at all better, than the priests. What must have been the condition of convents and nunneries, the inmates of which found in these priests their confessors and directors? There was confessedly most pressing need for a revival if religion was not to perish altogether out of the country, beyond the pale of the Reformation.

But what was the nature of this revival when it did occur? Mr. Lear has, with singular propriety, defined it as a "revival of priestly life." In some respects this was a benefit to France. But was it what she needed? The definition, though strictly correct, is, after all, too limited. What France then needed, and what might have saved her from the calamities which overtook her in the days of the eighteenth century, was the "revival of Christian life." Between this last and the "revival of priestly life" there is a wide distinction. This religious movement, was then, and still is, a failure.

In considering this failure, it is but justice to admit that Mr. Lear's heroes were possessed of many admirable natural qualities, and were remarkable for many Christian graces. It would be a grievous want of charity to question the sincerity of their personal piety or the fervour of their zeal. There is a good deal in the display of their religious life which jars with Protestant belief and with the plain teaching of the Word of God. Superstition and false doctrine are commingled with their most devout aspirations. So far, Mr. Lear, almost unconsciously, presents them in their weakness as well as in their strength. It would be a deplorable thing for England if there was a reproduction of such personages amongst us. Their erroneous teaching would completely counterbalance the holiness of their lives. This may not prove a popular statement, but it is a truth. Whoever would set them up before him as examples ought to have spiritual discernment, enabling him to winnow the chaff from the corn; otherwise he, too, may be led into serious error. Indiscriminate admiration of them, even as presented by Mr. Lear, would be a fatal mistake. Still more so would this be the case when it is borne in mind that his statements are partial and defective.

But to what is their failure to be attributed? Most unquestionably at no period did they influence or enlighten the mass of the French people. Success of this description is not claimed for

at billiards. Thereupon he withdrew quietly into his diocese, where for six months, in profound retreat, by constant practice he studied all the intricacies of the game. On his return to Paris, by arts familiar to professional gamblers, he inveigled his former antagonists into playing for large sums which he won, and, indeed, more than he had lost. He had been chief almoner to the Queen of Louis XIII., one of the principal promoters of the revival of the priestly life.

them, while to a limited extent they produced some improvement in a portion of the clergy. Even in Paris and in Versailles they wholly failed to stem the torrent of corruption. What success they had was with individuals who were persuaded by them to join their religious communities, and, according to the French phrase, to become "dévots."¹ Steadily, however, they alienated from religion all that was enlightened and intellectual in France beyond their own narrow precincts. Jansenism they persecuted to the death, though it formed part of their own Church. They arrayed, too, against themselves, the deadly hostility of the French Parliaments, over which, at times, they triumphed, but by which, eventually, they were crushed. When the Revolutionary period commenced, the French clergy were left utterly friendless; nowhere could they find partisans, nor was there one eminent name among themselves to shed lustre upon them at the period of their extinction.

The failure of such excellent men as De Condren, De Berulle, Saint Vincent de Paul, M. Olier, Bossuet, Fénelon, in establishing any permanent influence or extensive reformation in France may in part be attributed to the endless religious squabbles in which they were constantly engaged. There is a mistaken notion afloat that Rome, like the Jerusalem of the Psalms, is a city that is "at unity in itself." Nothing can be a greater delusion. Some years ago an inexperienced young man, in quest of religious unity, joined the Plymouth Brethren. He was much startled, but not shaken in his purpose, when asked, "Which sect of them?" The same question might most pertinently have been put in the seventeenth century. There were Jesuits and Oratorians, Jansenists and Quietists, all disputing and jangling with one another, sometimes invoking the King, sometimes the Pope, sometimes the Parliament, to settle their disputes and to discomfit their adversaries by violent means. In the opinion of a very favourable critic, Mr. Jervis, those who at the commencement of the eighteenth century exercised the chief influence upon ecclesiastical affairs in France "were men of a very different stamp from the Arnaulds and Nicoles, the Fénelons and Bossuets of the preceding generation." But exhausting controversy had so long been preying on the vital powers of the Church that intellectual and spiritual growth

¹ This change of pursuits, after a life of worldliness, is a recognised phase of Romish religion. It will be best illustrated by an amusing incident recorded in St. Simon's Memoirs, which abound with illustrations of it. A courtier of Louis XIV., after a life of dissipation, joined the Camuldolensian Brotherhood. A friend visiting him inquired how he managed to pass his time? The reply was, "Je m'ennuie, je fais ma pénitence; je me suis trop divertí." He died shortly afterwards of jaundice and of ennui. But his penitence had been a set-off against his dissipation.

was stunted. The revival of priestly life in France produced no more substantial effect upon the nation than, to use an expression of Napoleon, *œufs à la neige* to satisfy hunger. In the eighteenth century Cardinal Dubois was the ruling ecclesiastic, the Jansenists were busied over the miracles wrought at the tomb of M. Paris, and Archbishop Languet was giving currency and vogue to the hallucinations of Marie Alacocque! The Cardinal de Rohan, and Talleyrand figuring as Bishop of Autun, were conspicuous ecclesiastics towards its close. As Lord Macaulay says, "No Bossuet, no Pascal came forth to meet Voltaire," but the squabbling of Jesuits and Jansenists lasted unintermittingly till the deluge came. At that time impiety was rife among the higher order of ecclesiastics, and ignorance had far from disappeared from among the inferior clergy.

A more serious cause of failure was the persecuting spirit so largely fostered by this "revival of the priestly life." The era of this revival was also the era of the Dragonnades and those religious persecutions which have rendered the reign of Louis XIV. infamous, despite all its glories. There had been, at a previous period, religious persecutions and religious wars in France, but in the early part of the sixteenth century these last had terminated. The strongholds of the Huguenots had been surrendered; the last vestige of independence was taken from them. Henceforward they could have subsisted only as a religious, not as a political element in the kingdom. Excuses might be put forward for forcible measures against a political party suspected of embroiling France; but when the Huguenots were overthrown by arms, and powerless to resist, clemency would have been policy. It certainly would have been consistent with any true revival of Christianity. Now, no reader forming his conclusions from Mr. Lear's volumes would connect the revival which he treats of with the persecutions to which the Huguenots were subjected. This is one main defect of his publications. He parades before the public a number of saintly or quasi-saintly personages overflowing with Christian graces, with words in their mouths "smoother than butter," intent apparently on heavenly things, and seeking only, in the most affectionate manner, the welfare of the poor and wretched. But there is a reverse side to his picture. Religious intolerance, which produced the most deadly perils to France, and eventually to its Church, sprang mainly, if not exclusively, from the revival of the priestly life. The chief promoters of this revival possessed enormous influence in the courtly circles of Paris and Versailles. As confessors and directors they had the ear of the King, who declared, *l'Etat c'est moi*, and of all his mistresses and

chief counsellors. In the midst of all the splendid harlotry of the Court of France there were constantly, at intervals, compunctions of conscience, and remains of religious fervour. The piquant description given by the Duke of Noailles, of the sick favourite, with one eye turned to God and the other to the King, describes in a most lively manner the religious condition of the upper classes in France, upon whom this revival of priestly life chiefly operated. Whenever these intervals of religious excitement prevailed, by skilful management the direction of repentance was turned upon the extirpation of what was termed heresy. Zeal for the conversion of Huguenots took the place of charity; in everything but an apostolic sense it covered the multitude of sins. When religion presented itself in this aspect, in Louis XIV. a new Constantine, a new Theodosius was proclaimed to the world. We cannot pretend to follow the story of the Huguenots in all its frightful details. It would be difficult for the readers of Mr. Lear's books to imagine that there even had been such a story simultaneous with, and intertwined with, the saintly lives he enumerates. We must venture to assume that our readers believe in the story of Huguenot sufferings, and that they have some information about its chief horrors. Our business is simply to connect with it the most eminent names signalised by Mr. Lear in his "Revival of the Priestly Life in France."

It was in 1622 that the Pope, Gregory XV., established the "Society for the Propagation of the Faith." Eleven years earlier the Congregation of the Oratory was created by M. de Bérulle, afterwards a cardinal, in the Faubourg St. Jaques, at Paris. According to Mr. Lear, he had great success in converting Huguenots. Cardinal du Perron had said of him, "If you want both to convince and convert a heretic, take him to M. de Bérulle. In the opinion of Henri IV., "he had never lost his baptismal innocence!" There is a cursory allusion to M. Bérulle being mixed up a good deal with political affairs, in which multitudes lose a great deal of baptismal innocence; his zeal for convincing and converting heretics displayed itself strangely. We do not gather from Mr. Lear with whom the design and execution of the siege of Rochelle originated. Though usually ascribed to that most mundane of Churchmen, Cardinal Richelieu, it was mainly the project of the saintly De Bérulle! It was his influence in the Council of State that finally determined the King to besiege La Rochelle, contrary, in the first instance, to the advice of Richelieu. He embarked in this scheme from "the strongest conviction of the necessity of annihilating the power of the Huguenots." His earnest entreaty to Richelieu was that he would not thwart the prayers he was offering for the success of the siege. Beyond a question, he did crush the

Huguenots. How many of them were convinced and converted by his saintly counsels and prayers is not on record, but the Royal camp was filled with a well-disciplined array of priests, monks, and missionary preachers. De Bérulle might have taken for his motto, on this memorable occasion—

Flectere si nequeo superos Acheronta movebo.

In his apologetic memoirs of Madame de Maintenon,¹ the Duc de Noailles remarks, with singular truth, but apparently without being conscious of the danger of his statement—"Dès la prise de Rochelle il se forma comme une croisade spirituelle pour les conversions." This is most accurate. We get a right understanding of the horrors of the reign of Louis XIV. when we estimate them as another and, we trust, a last Crusade. When Urban II., at the Council of Clermont, preached the first Crusade, he exhorted the multitude to "redeem their sins, their rapine, their burnings, their bloodshed, by obedience." He dwelt upon the easiness of the remedy for sin now proposed—plenary indulgence of all sins for Crusaders. God, it was then said, had instituted a new method for the cleansing of sins. Some remedy for sin was as urgently needed in the reign of Louis XIV. as in that of Philip I. Religious wars and religious persecution by which spiritual favour could be ensured through tormenting heretics, real or imaginary, was always a cherished priestly nostrum in France. The condonation of sensuality, by the sufferings of heretics, was a convenient creed, constantly preached and implicitly believed in. It suited the policy of Rome; it supplied a pressing necessity of French kings. What has been wittily termed "*La pénitence au dépens d'autrui*," was never more needed than by Louis XIV., nor was it ever more practised. In immediate connection with his theory of the Crusades, De Noailles adds, "En 1626 St. Vincent de Paul institua le Congrégation des Prêtres de la Mission." Throughout the persecution of the Huguenots, until toleration was reluctantly yielded in 1787, the worst features of a Crusade in dealing with them were retained. There was the union of preaching and persecution; of frocked and booted missionaries. The spectacle witnessed at La Rochelle confronted the Huguenots at every turn.

Now, what was the attitude of eminent prelates and priests, conspicuous in the revival of priestly life, who might have been deemed superior to the base passions which influenced the vulgar herd, from the King, with his mistresses and courtiers, downwards to his dragoons? Fléchier is a celebrated name in the Church of France. He has been described as "a pious, tolerant, charitable Bishop, almost canonised by the

¹ "*Mémoires de Madame de Maintenon*," vol. ii. p. 312.

Protestants of his diocese." For his missionary services he was made Bishop of Nîmes. At first his apparent success was great, but when the Cevennes rose in revolt, and he saw "the fruit of seventeen years of labour lost," in which he had been assisted by the dragoons of Baviile, and the fiendish ingenuity of the arch-priest Du Chayla, he cried out to God and to the dragoons, beseeching them "to crush the cruel heads of the rebellious, and to annihilate the wretches" in his diocese. Bourdaloue was engaged on a similar mission in the South. Great hopes were entertained at Paris that "the dragoons and the Bourdaloues" would give the *coup de grâce* to heresy.

Bossuet had his share in these mixed operations. In his life of Bossuet (pp. 310, 311), Mr. Lear mentions one or two instances of the great prelate's interference on behalf of the Protestants of his diocese; he remarks also that he "studiously avoided any military support, and used every effort to give the Protestants as full liberty as was possible after the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes." The Cardinal de Bausset, in his life of Bossuet, upon whom, no doubt, Mr. Lear relies, states that "he never applied to the King for any act of severity against a single Protestant." He adds that "there is no proof that he had any share in what preceded or immediately followed the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes." He asserts that he never persecuted a single Protestant; that he alleviated their sufferings. It is probably by this testimony that Mr. Lear has been misled. But an eye-witness has described how all the Protestants of the villages of Nanteuil, Quiney, Condé, &c., were converted in less than two hours by Bossuet, when brought forcibly into his palace! He has recorded how, escorted by the cuirasseurs of M. de la Chaise, nephew of Père la Chaise, the King's confessor, the Protestants of La Claye were summoned to the house of M. d'Herouville, the King's maître d'hôtel, and were told by Bossuet that if they did not sign the Act of Abjuration next day the "troops would turn their heads for them." A more cruel case still is adduced. At Claye there was a person, Isaac Cochard, on his death-bed. The official despatch of the Minister is still extant, recording that, "at the prayer of the Bishop of Meaux, orders were issued to arrest the Sieurs Cochard, father and son; these orders were issued solely on account of their religion." Bossuet stands charged with going himself to the house of the dying man with the Intendant and with the Lieutenant-General le Valery, holding a *lettre de cachet*; a guard and a cart were in waiting to carry away the dying man. On this occasion Bossuet is charged with exclaiming, in a rage, that "as soon as the breath was out of his body he should be cast into the sewers, and that his only son should be taken from him." In Meaux, two women, Marie Clavel and Jeanne Rossignol (1688),

had their heads shaved and were shut up in the General Hospital. Three years afterwards the King, not the Bishop, wrote to inquire whether they could conveniently be released. Whatever Mr. Lear's judgment may be, it is quite certain that, in preference to acquiescing in the tender mercies of Bossuet, the non-Catholics of Meaux emigrated in all directions. Abundant official evidence of this, and of far more than we can find room for, will be found in the "Pièces justificatives," attached to the brochure on Bossuet at the head of our Article. We recommend Mr. Lear to study and to refute them—if he can. Perhaps he may be led, on reconsideration, to modify the statement that Bossuet always pursued the line of gentleness and tolerance (p. 536) in his own diocese. What we have adduced cannot by him or any one else be reconciled with gentleness and tolerance.

There is, however, still behind one great and illustrious name, perhaps altogether the most illustrious in the revival of priestly life in France; "the most attractive and lovable among the many stars which shone in the Church's dark sky during the seventeenth century," Fénelon, the Archbishop of Cambrai. Must he, too, find his celebrated name confounded with religious intolerance? was he, too, a persecutor of the saints of God?

Who would not weep, if Atticus were he?

In many respects Fénelon was above his contemporaries. Admirable qualities distinguished him as a man and as a prelate. But when the full truth is told, it will be manifest that the spirit of sacerdotalism, especially when it has free scope, as in the Church of Rome, brings the noblest spirits to be participators in what must be stigmatised as the most atrocious crimes. Few probably are acquainted with the early history of Fénelon until he shone forth conspicuous in the Church and Court of France. By what steps did he make his way into favour? How came he to bask in the light of the King's countenance for a season, and for a season only—a light afterwards completely and for ever eclipsed. Young Fénelon, a member of a noble family, was not without friends ready and willing to push the fortunes of one so capable and deserving. It came to pass that about 1634 two establishments for the instruction and conversion of the sons and daughters of Protestants were established in Paris. Mr. Lear describes them as "a protection for women converted from Protestantism, and as a means of propagating Church teaching among those yet unconverted." We will add to this too brief description.

Very curious details have been preserved of some of the earlier of these establishments, especially when d'Argenson was, in 1679, at the head of the police, but we cannot decently advert to them.

One was founded by Anne de Croze, a disciple of St. Vincent de Paul. The rules and constitutions, drawn up by Bossuet, deserve some attention. Among them were the following:—"Wives can be received without the consent of their husbands, children without that of their father, and servants without that of their masters." We quote part of another:—"If the New Catholics persist in disobedience, the mother superior will impose punishment (*pénitences*) suitable to their weakness; if they prove incorrigible Christian care will be taken of them." What is implied in this? Another of Bossuet's articles to which particular attention should be paid is:—"If it happens that among the scholars there are any deprived of reason, the sisters and scholars are most expressly forbidden to loiter about them or to amuse themselves," &c. Now, about 1676, Louis XIV. was seized with one of his fits of devotion and remorse. He dismissed Madame de Montespan for a season, and began to fall under the influence of Madame de Maintenon. He embarked vigorously in the last most cruel crusade attempted by the old monarchy of France. In 1679 Madame de Maintenon was able to write:—"The King is thinking seriously about the conversion of heretics, and will apply himself shortly to it in good earnest." Convents for New Catholic children were multiplied. It was two days after the death of Mademoiselle de Fontanges, in 1681, that the Royal penitent, who thus had a fresh tinge, expiated his crimes and gave an edifying example of remorse by a fresh edict declaring that children seven years old might embrace the Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman (there is nothing said about holy) religion! Upon no pretext were fathers and mothers to hinder them. Then arose throughout the length and breadth of France what has pathetically been described as the "*cri des mères.*" There were many Rachels in that unhappy land when priestly life and royal penitence revived in it. It was the fashion of the day, in a land where fashion reigns supreme, to fill these convents with Protestant children of tender age, torn from their families. Madame de Maintenon, by an act of wickedness which her biographer deplores, set a conspicuous example. The King busied himself in it. What more promising situation could be found for a young man whose friends were anxious to push his fortune than to place Fénelon at the head of the chief of these establishments?

Accordingly, while he was yet under thirty years of age, he was made superior of the convent in the Rue Sainte Anne, which the King filled with proselytes. A Madame Garnier was the lady superior. According to his admirers he became "the father, the counsellor, the soul of the teachers and the scholars." If these words mean anything they simply imply

that he was the life and soul of the establishment. He held this office for ten years. Of late, not only in England but in France, considerable use has been made of State Papers to rectify history. Admission to this convent, which Mr. Lear so pleasingly describes, was by order of the Marquis de Seignelay, Secretary of State, who instructed the head of the police as follows:—"His Majesty orders you to arrest (prendre) Magdalen Resoul, at Charente, and to place her among the New Catholics." The Attorney-General de Harlay writes to the Archbishop of Paris: "My Lord, I have only two or three left of your orders to admit women into convents. I beg you will send me a dozen." Orders of the same have been preserved threatening women who refused to listen to instruction after they had been arrested and imprisoned "with disagreeable consequences if they refused." In point of fact obstinate women and children were passed on to the Bastille, or to the General Hospital, the receptacle of thieves and prostitutes. By a Royal Ordinance of 8th April, 1686, if those who had been shut up for a fortnight and sufficiently instructed in that time (?) refused to be converted, notice was to be sent to the King, who would "see to it." Who gave the instructions? Who certified that in a fortnight children and women were sufficiently instructed? What befell those who were obstinate and for whom his Majesty undertook to care? An analysis of a list of a hundred and twenty-five names will be worth perusal. All that is known of thirty-one is that they were in the convent. Twenty-five, at least, under Fénelon's instructions, abjured their religion; but of these, eight only feigned assent to Romanism, and as soon as they were set at liberty escaped abroad. Five seem to have been sincere in their recantation. Sixteen of those who were intractable were placed in other convents. Nineteen were shut up in citadels and dealt with as criminals among the criminal classes. Ten were banished. Nine who had abjured and relapsed were shut up again. One of these, a Madame Paul, who had been twice converted and had relapsed, was imprisoned at Loches. After three years' imprisonment she was converted for the third time! The lot of two young Turkish girls, Maria and Ursula May, six and seven years old, was very hard. They had been for two years under Fénelon's instructions, but according to the list sent from the convent to the police they set a bad example and "ne payaient pas," so the order from the convent to the police was "les mettre à l'Hôpital Général," where, as we have said, prostitutes and all the worst criminals were incarcerated. One of the young women transferred to the prison ranks lost her hearing through the damp of the dungeon in which she was placed. One little creature, four years old, but "très déraisonnable," was sent abroad! Mademoiselle Le Coq lost her reason.

Mademoiselle des Fages, after much suffering, recanted, and was set at liberty. Immediately on her return home she threw herself out of her window and was killed. The "Dame de la Fremaye" was reported (May 7, 1686), after being four months in the convent under instruction as "having lost her reason." In the Registers of the Secretariat, 21st November, 1689, there is an order that "if she will not be converted she is to be banished." It was in labours of this description that Fénelon was engaged until 1689. They formed the chief stepping-stone to his promotion. It is *mutatis mutandis* as though Bishop Ken had risen to eminence by assiduous labours in the Court of High Commission, or Archbishop Leighton had been promoted for worrying Presbyterians.

During the period, however, that he was thus on promotion, there was a brief interlude. He was sent by the King as a missionary to the district of Aunes and Saintonge. Mr. Lear states that there was a good deal "of confusion and irritation" in these districts. This we must explain. It is stated that Fénelon stipulated that "the troops, together with all that survived of military terrorism, should be withdrawn before he entered upon what should be a work of peace and mercy." After a short stay he reported to Bossuet that the converts were getting on very slowly. Soon afterwards he returned to Paris. It will be well to place the exact truth fully before the public. It is quite true and little wonder that there was considerable "irritation." For more than four years before Fénelon's mission, as early as 1681, the district had been the scene of constant dragonnades. The result was a large number of conversions. Through the medium of the most horrible brutalities there were a thousand converts in six months in the diocese of Saintonge. But so zealous were these "missionaires bottés" that a large number of the best sailors in the kingdom emigrated. The King was alarmed at so serious a loss, and milder measures were enjoined. Still the dragonnades continued up to the very time when Fénelon set out on his mission. Very picturesque accounts of his interview with the King find place in his life. But were the troops withdrawn? Was there no violence during his mission? The pitiless accuracy of State records proves that after Fénelon was on his mission, and while he was there, troops were quartered in the houses of Huguenots who had fled to the woods "because they could not continue there during the severe winter." The houses of those who would not return were demolished, and an intimation was sent that there was no better way to persuade the Huguenots "que de bien maltraiter ceux de Barbesieux." Persecution was carried on simultaneously with persuasion in the districts where Fénelon laboured.

But how did he carry on his mission? In a letter addressed by

him, 7th February, 1686, to the Secretary of State, he urges the importance of increasing the guards at spots where emigration was lively. He adds further—it will be best to quote his own words—“ Il me semble aussi que l'autorité du roi ne doit se relacher en rien.” Again, he adds that “ authority must be inflexible in keeping men's minds in order.” He also dwells with satisfaction on a little visit which M. l'Intendant paid at Marennes, which worked wonders and made the people more tractable. Mr. Lear will not find these passages in Cardinal Bausset's life, although the letter in which they occur is there, and is quoted by the Cardinal professedly *in extenso*. In a later letter, dated March 8, Fénelon informs the secretary that “ rigorous and ever watchful authority is necessary. No harm should be done to them, but there should always be a hand uplifted to do it if they resist.” In another communication he suggests besides New Testaments, guards to hinder desertions, and rigorous penalties against deserters! We must refer our readers to M. Douen's book for the most crushing exposure we have ever read of a prevalent delusion which has misled Protestants as well as Romanists. The proofs rest on Fénelon's own statements suppressed by his eulogising biographers. His stay in this mission was very short and very fruitless. He sighed and pleaded with Bossuet to intercede for his return to Paris, from which he may have been altogether about six months absent. His short mission, which had been preceded by years of dragonnades, was followed up by a frightful massacre, ordered by the King (March 1, 1688), in which “ women were not to be spared, in order to intimidate.” Fourteen years after his mission, there were more than 60,000 heretics in the diocese of Saintonges. The Jesuit Quirbœuf, differing from Mr. Lear, explains that Fénelon's failure kept him from appearing at Court for two years; it also hindered his elevation to the Bishopric of Poitiers and as coadjutor to the Bishop of Rochelle. Four years elapsed before he was appointed preceptor to the Duc de Bourgogne. Six years after that he was made Archbishop of Cambrai, but two years afterwards he was banished from the Court, and was never restored to favour. His success as a courtier was as transient as it was brilliant.¹

¹ Fénelon's promotion to Cambrai deserves some comment. In the opinion of French ecclesiastics, basking in or hoping for Court favour, sees distant from Paris were viewed as banishment. The Archbishopric of Bordeaux was refused by Bissy, Bishop of Toul; he was wise in his generation, and he afterwards became a Cardinal. Sees like Soissons, Chartres, or even Meaux, were much coveted, for the Court was still accessible. When Fénelon was made Archbishop, Harlay, the notorious Archbishop of Paris, who closed an impure life by a shameful death, was in a precarious state, Fénelon's friends were most anxious that he should succeed. His nomination to Cambrai, a “ diocèse de campagne,” was a thunderstroke (un coup de foudre) to them. Just after his consecration,

It is not without a purpose that we have dwelt at length upon this crucial instance of Fénelon. Of late years there has been a confused notion that although there is much in Romanism which it is difficult to justify, yet that it has produced instances of sanctity of a type very much more exalted than can be found in Reformed Churches. This is a most utter delusion. Books such as those of Mr. Lear tend largely to foster it, and do much mischief. The productions of Romish saints and other writers are carefully expurgated, and the most objectionable portions withdrawn from the too curious inspection of Protestants. Ignorant people are thus led to suppose that Romanism is what is submitted to them. The revival upon which we have been commenting was the best type of Romanism, but, for the reasons we have assigned, its influence was neither lasting nor extensive. Worst of all, by the outbursts of fanaticism which it encouraged, it alienated the Church still further from the nation, which identified clericalism with every species of barbarity and horror. The mistake was a deadly one, which left it to Voltaire and to his infidel crew the show of preaching charity and tolerance, a lesson never practically inculcated during or by the revival of the priestly life. We say the show, for we have not forgotten the horrible cry, however interpreted, "*Ecrasez l'infame!*" This was too faithfully acted upon in the horrors of the French Revolution, and has never been forgotten by mankind. Is it not, however, a horrible but most significant fact that, whether intentionally or accidentally, the fearful saying of the arch-infidel is but the echo of Fénelon's own¹ words in his last charge, "*Ecrasez les loups!*"—i.e., the Huguenots and Jansenists. Probably both Voltaire and the Archbishop would have disclaimed any intent of physical violence, of murders and plunder; but both were taken at their word by those whom they hounded on. Mr. Lear refers to two "mandements" as among Fénelon's last public exercise of his Archiepiscopal office,

Harlay died and was succeeded by de Noailles, a thoroughly respectable man, hated by the Jesuits. His promotion was, however, quite as much due to Court intrigues as to merit. These events occurred in 1695; two years afterwards Fénelon was ordered by the King not to quit his diocese again. This order was never revoked. His appointment to Cambrai was the first step to his perpetual banishment. If the Duc de Bourgogne, Fénelon's old pupil, had survived the aged Louis XIV., Fénelon might, indeed, have been a power in the French Court.

¹ It is worth while contrasting with Fénelon's "*Ecrasez les loups,*" as applied to those he deemed heretics, our Lord's words. He said, "Beware of ravening wolves," so St. Paul knowing that grievous wolves would come, told the elders of Ephesus to "Watch." The spirit of Rome finds its expression through the mouth of Fénelon; that of Christianity through our Lord and St. Paul.

but, with much discretion, he only alludes to and does not quote them. Our readers must decide whether any interpretation can be affixed to Fénelon's words which will not exculpate Voltaire; surely both sentiments were equally revolting and pernicious.

Upon an impartial review of French ecclesiastical history during the seventeenth century, the following conclusions must be come to:—First, that the state of religion among the clergy of the French Church was then one of the most appalling profligacy and ignorance. Again, that the vicious system in which the Roman Church glories, affixing merit to ostentatious asceticism and seclusion in religious communities, encouraging also as meritorious a spirit of the most intense bigotry, went very far to neutralise whatever value pious souls might otherwise have derived from the revival of priestly life. Sacerdotalism in a most evil form, aiming not only by fair, but also by foul, means at subjugating consciences, became, in proportion to its development, yet more fruitful in unnumbered evils. Upon internal dissensions, and the persecution of heretics, zeal was wasted which, rightly directed, might have enlightened the ignorance of the masses, conciliated love to the clergy, and raised the love of morality throughout the kingdom, with some prospect of the Church finding defenders in the hour of its great need. There is mournful truth in the saying of Voltaire, that “the quarrels of Jansenists and Molinists did more harm to the Christian religion (in France) than could have been done by four emperors like Julian one after another.” It was in this way that the best energies of the revived priestly life were expended, with Bossuet and Fénelon as Achilles and Hector, the leaders and champions arrayed against each other. As unfortunate was the crusade against the Huguenots. The clergy, as a body, were wholly unable to cope with the Reformed in argument. The Duc de Noailles admits that when conferences were proposed in Languedoc between Catholic priests and Protestant ministers, none of the former could be found competent to maintain the cause of God. Despite the vauntings concerning Bossuet and the missions of Fénelon, Bourdaloue, and others, there would have been, without State interference, no conversions. Sir Walter Scott says that Louis XI. mentioned Quentin Durward's assistance slightly, as a sportsman of rank who, in boasting of the number of the birds which he has bagged, does not always dilate upon the presence and assistance of the gamekeepers—so the Church of Rome, in her successes against heresy, makes faint allusion to the help of the civil powers. But her faith is great, whenever she can command them, in the aid of what Napoleon terms “*les gros bataillons*.” They were no small help to St. Francis de Sales when extirpating heresy in

Savoy; they were no despicable assistants to Fénelon, to Bossuet, and Bourdaloue. But there is a Nemesis in all this. In his "France before the Revolution," M. de Tocqueville remarks that "at that period nowhere but in France had irreligion become a general passion, fervid, intolerant, and oppressive." He labours hard to account for it, but fails signally. He has left the true elements out of his calculations. With halt foot punishment was then overtaking the evildoers. As Louis XVI. was more guiltless than his predecessors, so at the eleventh hour a more tolerant spirit had possessed the clergy; but had the persecuted Jansenists, the oppressed Huguenots, no memories? Revived or unrevived, the Church of France had made itself hated of the nation. De Tocqueville remarks that the Church of England, in spite of what he terms the defects of its constitution, and the abuses of every kind that swarmed within it, supported the shock of infidelity victoriously. The clergy combated manfully in their own cause. Precisely the reverse was the case in France. She became meek in the presence of her adversaries. "It seemed at one time that, provided she retained her wealth and rank, she was ready to renounce her faith."

What, then, is the moral for ourselves? There are many just now who seem disposed to persuade the Church of England to sell her lamp for specious Roman gewgaws and fancied superior articles of Romish manufacture. It would be a sorry and an evil exchange. A higher tone and more increased spirituality, both among clergy and laity, are infinitely desirable. But we have no call to go to Rome for them. What is wanted is not a "revival of priestly life." It would be woe to England if that were resuscitated amongst us. The less the clergy are isolated from their fellow-citizens, the more they are united with them in all honourable social relations, the greater will be their strength when the hour of trial comes. Can use be made of Mr. Lear's writings? If they are perused with judgment and with spiritual understanding, if we read between the lines, it is possible to gather from them considerable warning. It is a terrible loss to the Church of Christ when a spiritual revival proves an utter failure. It is mournful to contemplate learning, talent, zeal, piety, diverted from profitable ends upon foolish and mischievous enterprises. It might make angels weep to see spirits such as he has delineated wasting their energies upon inhuman strife and cruel persecution. Those who are wise will ponder these things; they will seek sedulously to avoid the errors which frustrated what might have been the salvation of a great country. The present condition of that which professes to be the Church of Christ in Romish countries is plain evidence that

where the system of Rome is upheld, and where the spirit of Romanism prevails, hatred of religion is the attitude of the nations. Will any well-wisher to England seek to encourage these delusions amongst ourselves? No; without travelling to Rome we can find models of spiritual excellence, true saints in the annals of our Church. It will be our wisdom not to undervalue them, but to rejoice in following them even as in their day and generation they have followed and are following Christ.

GEORGE KNOX.

Reviews.

With the Armies of the Balkans, and at Gallipoli in 1877-78. By Lieut.-Colonel FIFE-COOKSON, late Military Attaché to Her Majesty's Embassy, Constantinople. Second Edition. Pp. 194. Cassell, Petter, Galpin & Co.

COLONEL COOKSON was appointed Military Attaché in May 1877, and soon after joined the head-quarters of the army of the Balkans. General Gourko had just commenced his raid, and the army of Suleiman Pasha was being rapidly transported from Montenegro by sea and rail. Confident of success, Suleiman's troops were in good spirits, healthy, and well-disciplined. While waiting for movement to the front, many of them plundered neighbouring Bulgarian villages, but their loot was taken from them and they were flogged. Abdul Kerim's plan, presumed to be one of pure defence in the Quadrilateral with concentrated forces, favoured the Russians, and in deference to public opinion he was recalled. In the meantime Osman Pasha had occupied Plevna, driving out Russian cavalry. On the 20th July he defeated with great slaughter a Russian attack. This crippled the movements of Gourko, who had passed the Balkans and wanted reinforcements. The Russians therefore turned all their available strength against Plevna. But Osman meanwhile had strongly entrenched it, and the attack of July 30th was a damaging failure.

Reouf Pasha, commanding against Gourko's advance, failed to bring up the bulk of his force, and an opportunity was lost. When Suleiman's army joined, Eski-Zara (before the war a town of 18,000 inhabitants) was taken and nearly destroyed. Soldiers engaged in plundering even the burning houses in Eski-Zara were punished; some were shot. Suleiman appears to have determined that Reouf's share of the battle should not be won. At all events Reouf was defeated in the wood of Choranlı. Had Reouf been victorious, he could have pursued the retreating Russo-Bulgarians towards the Hain Bogaz, while Suleiman could have marched at once to the Shipka Pass. Valuable days were lost. It is clear, however, that on the part of Reouf a want of military skill was shown.

Shocking stories were told by fugitives. "Wholesale massacres and outrages" were perpetrated by the Bulgarians. Accounts agreed that Cossacks looked on or incited the Bulgarians to the deeds, and were themselves conspicuous in outrages on Turkish women. On page 53 we read:—