

ART. III.—ON CHURCH AND STATE IN FRANCE.

1. *L'Église et la Révolution Française.* Par EDMOND DE PRESSENSÉ. Paris, Meyrueis: 1864.
2. *L'Église Gallicane dans son Rapport avec le Souverain Pontife.* Par le Comte JOSEPH DE MAISTRE. Lyon, Pelagaud: 1874.
3. *Histoire du Gouvernement Parlementaire en France.* Par M. DUVERGIER DE HAURANNE. Paris, Lévy Frères: 1871.
4. *Le Correspondant:* 1879.
5. *Manuel du Droit Public Ecclésiastique Français.* M. DUPIN. Cinquième édition. Paris, Plon: 1860.

I.

ON the 21st January, 1535, "all Paris was astir; the streets were hung with drapery; reposoirs were erected;" a solemn procession defiled through it;—"many bodies of the saints"—were carried through it. The Virgin's milk; our Lord's purple robe; one of His many crowns of thorns; one of the numerous true crosses on which He was hung; the relics of Sainte Genéviève were brought out of their shrines. Cardinals, archbishops, and bishops preceded the Host under a magnificent canopy, borne by princes of the blood; then followed Francis I., bareheaded, and on foot, the Queen, the courtiers, the university, the corporations, all walking two and two, with lighted torches, "exhibiting marks of extraordinary piety." The object was a reparation because the sacrifice of the Mass had been openly impugned by the Huguenots. The reparation was completed by the plunging up and down into flames of three "heretics." The wretches "were made to feel that they were dying." The people were filled with cruel joy; savage thirst for blood was aroused in them.

On the 21st of January, 1793, there was another gala day in Paris. There was again a procession through the streets of the great city. On this occasion there were no reposoirs, no relics, no priests, no nobles; but there was a king borne along in a tumbrel to the scaffold. Once more the people were filled with cruel joy, once more the savage thirst for blood was aroused. "Une multitude sans Dieu vaut une multitude idolâtre."

During the intervening period of four hundred and fifty-eight years, the Church of Rome had reigned supreme in France. One third of the country belonged to ecclesiastics. At the

expiration of it the throne, the nobility, the priesthood were swept away, and France was reeling to and fro drunk with blood and crime, having made the miserable exchange of atheism for superstition. For the time the desolation was complete. Society had to be built up afresh out of ruins. Nearly a hundred years have elapsed and the work is yet incomplete. The struggle is still severe between those who would restore the past and those who would reconstitute France on the principles contended for at the Revolution. It will be our task to note the chief incidents of this protracted conflict and to comment upon them.

II.

It is a mistake to consider Frenchmen irreligious. In the seething times which preceded the Revolution, it is perfectly true that there was a dissolute crew of nobles and philosophers, of infidel priests and debauched abbés, whose only creed might be summed up in "let us eat and drink for to-morrow we die." But poor Jacques Bonhomme had little share in all this ghastly revelry and these wild speculations.¹ During the revolutionary period there were the most frantic excesses of mocking infidelity, and up to the present time there are multitudes of Frenchmen absolutely "without God in the world." But the whole history of the Huguenots shows that there is in Frenchmen a capacity for worshipping "God who is a spirit, in spirit and in truth," without fetichism and without cumbrous ceremonial. The marvellous and rapid manner in which religion was restored in France after the delirium of the Reign of Terror, points in the same direction. In the Constituent Assembly Mirabeau declared, "Dieu est aussi nécessaire que la liberté au peuple Français." In the Convention, even Robespierre maintained that the idea of the Supreme Being and of the immortality of the soul is "un rappel continuel à la justice ; elle est donc sociale et républicaine." Again he affirmed, "Si Dieu n'existait pas, il faudrait l'inventer." In the same spirit M. Portalis le Père, when introducing the Concordat and the Organic laws to the Legislative Assembly, propounded the question, "La religion, est elle nécessaire aux hommes ?" In answering it he first inquired whether a new religion could be established. To this he re-

¹ For the full account of this wonderful contrast, see Merle d'Aubigné's "History of the Reformation in Europe," vol. iii.

² The reference was to "Théophilanthropie," a new system set on foot by the Directory. It was a sort of Deism, of the kind suggested by Rousseau in his "Contrat Social ;" La Reveillère Lepaux was the hierophant of it. The ritual was as absurd as that of Modern Positivists. The officiating ministers were clad in white robes with rose-coloured sashes, and preached on tolerance, filial piety, commercial honesty, and similar topics. This, however, was soon found to be very wearisome, and the

plied in the negative. What religion was possible? Christianity. Nor was this policy confined to isolated expressions of a few republican leaders. In 1792, the Fête of Sainte Genéviève was celebrated with enthusiasm in Paris by multitudes. More than a thousand persons could not gain admittance into the Church. The Commune endeavoured to put a stop to the "Fête des Rois," but only succeeded in creating great scandal.

As there were, in the time of the Dragonnades, French Huguenots, who were "tortured, not accepting deliverance that they might obtain a better resurrection," so in the revolutionary era there were French bishops and clergy equally prepared for similar martyrdom. In the massacre at the Carmes there were scenes of heroism displayed worthy of the times of Irenæus; conspicuous among all was the venerable Archbishop of Arles, thanking God that he had his blood to offer to Him. Of course there was another side of this picture. While these holy men were willingly offering themselves up to a cruel death, apostate priests in the Church of St. Eustache were dancing the carmagnole round a bonfire in which missals, copes, and relics were burning. Still the sentiment of religion was not extinct, but revived rapidly in France; it exists now even among those who, seduced by what is termed philosophy, or ensnared by evil passions, are, in darkness and confusion, feeling about after God if haply they may find Him. Too often the upshot of their baseless speculations is that they

Find no end in wandering mazes lost.

But yet there are depths of religious feeling which can be stirred in Frenchmen; there are multitudes among them ready at any moment to cry out, "who will show us any good?" When any great preacher, like Lacordaire, or Ravignan, or Hyacinthe, mounts the pulpit at the conferences at Notre Dame, and brings, or is supposed to bring, a message from God, the vast church is filled, not only with the drilled supporters of clericalism, but with souls athirst for the water of life, wherewithal to quench their consuming thirst. Why, then, certainly ever since the Revolutionary era, and indeed long before it, have the French laity appeared to be in antagonism with Christianity? Why, under all the successive phases of Government, has there been a perpetual struggle against religion, presented to them under the form of Romanism, whenever that struggle has been

listeners had to be paid for attending. It was a remarkable instance of the complete failure of a "croyance sans mystères et sans dogmes" to become a religion, even under circumstances apparently most favourable. This is the perpetual difficulty of Unitarianism.

possible ?¹ Why has, since the Reformation, the conflict been unceasing between the intelligence of France and Ultramontaniam ?

The answer to this must be found in the words of Mirabeau, which we have already quoted. France wants God, but France wants liberty also. During the days of the Second Empire, we were much touched with the words which fell from the lips of a most distinguished Frenchman in Paris, as he was speaking of England. Glancing at the police present at a meeting, he exclaimed, "Et nous autres Français, nous aimons aussi *un peu* la liberté." In order to develop this position it will be necessary to review, in a brief historical sketch, the relations which have existed between the Church of France and the State since 1789. The date might be removed further back with much advantage, but it will suffice in an article like the present, to show how what may be summed up in "Dieu," has been unceasingly presented to Frenchmen in an attitude irreconcilable with "la Liberté."

III.

In his most interesting volume on "l'Église et la Révolution," M. de Pressensé, in a very able manner, proves that throughout the whole of that stormy period, ecclesiastical questions, not merely relating to the property of the French Church, but also to its tenets and maxims, constantly occupied the attention of those who successively rose to power. He asserts that the aim and object of the Revolution was "Liberty." Equality was a subsidiary matter. The question of religion badly understood and hastily resolved, was, he maintains, the proximate cause of the Reign of Terror. In order to understand this we must review the attitude of the clergy. In 1787, La Fayette, in the Assembly of Notables, had been instrumental in procuring the Edict of Toleration of that year. By this edict non-Catholics (*par pudeur* no other name was given to them!) were allowed to live in France and to practice their professions or trades; they were permitted to marry, and to register the birth of their children before civil officers; regulations were also made for their burial, although no permission was hereby accorded for

¹ Le caractère le plus distinctif et le plus invariable du parlement de Paris se tire de son opposition constante au Saint Siège. Sur ce point jamais les grandes magistratures de France n'ont varié. Déjà le XVII^e. siècle comptait parmi les principaux membres de véritables Protestants tels que les Présidents de Thou, de Ferrière, &c ; on peut lire la correspondance de ce dernier avec Sarpi, dans les œuvres de ce bon religieux ; on y sentira les profondes racines que le Protestantisme avait jetées dans le parlement de Paris. . . . Ce même esprit s'était perpétué jusqu'à nos jours dans le parlement, au moyen du Jansénisme qui n'est au fond qu'une phase du Calvinisme.—De Maistre, sur l'Église Gallicane.

Protestant worship, which was expressly confined to the French Church. Until the Revolution the clergy never ceased protesting against this edict. "Lord save us! the kingdom is in peril, for Protestants, contrary to the laws, are admitted to employment," was the cry of the Archbishop of Arles.¹ The last act of the assembly of the clergy in 1788, was a formal demand to the King to revoke the edict of toleration. It might with some truth be said that the first occupation of the Constituent Assembly was the question of religious liberty. The step taken was tentative, a species of compromise. "No one, it decreed, was to be molested on the score of his opinions, even his religious belief, provided the manifestation of it did not disturb public order established by law." This decree (5th November, 1789,) is worth noticing, for hitherto France can hardly be said to have got much further, if indeed quite so far, after a conflict of a hundred years.

With much more ease and completeness the relations between the Church and the State were transformed in other respects. The nation took possession of the whole property of the clergy, who from independent proprietors, became salaried agents, as they have ever since been. It was useless to make any attempt to uphold conventual establishments, then a hopeless scandal to public morality. M. de Pressensé (p. 122) shows that the system of a salaried clergy was no novelty of the French Revolution. It had been a monarchical tradition, handed down from the days of Louis XIV. In reality it was "Gallianisme à outrance." We recommend the admirers of the "Gallican" Church seriously to consider this question. Le Vayer de Boutigny, who was consulted by Louis XIV., compared the Church to a ship; this is no novelty; but he added, the helm is in the hands of the spiritual power, while the captain, who regulates its whole course, is the State. It was in vain that in the Assembly Dom Gerle strove to obtain a decree that all religions could not be admitted into France, but that the Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman religion is, and ever shall be, the religion of the nation, and its worship alone authorised. The Huguenots were permitted to return; they were to be eligible for all employment. Rabaut L'Étienne, the son of an old Huguenot minister, "an apostle of the desert," for whose head a price had often been offered, wrote in 1790 to his father, "The President of the National Assembly is at your feet." In the Constituent Assembly, Jansenism, so long trodden under foot, triumphed over its ancient adversaries. The civil constitution of the clergy was adopted. Bishops and clergy were to be elected by the people. The spirit of the Constituent Assembly may be summed

¹ *Cædimus inque vicem præbemus crura flagellis.*

up in the apothegm of the Jansenist Camus, uttered June 1st, 1790. "The Church is in the State, the State is not in the Church. We are a National Assembly; we have the power of changing the religion of the country." This is in precise accordance with the maxims of "Gallicanisme à outrance," if we substitute Louis XIV. for the National Assembly.

In these recent conflicts there had been some doubtful and imperfect gain for religious liberty. The germ of future troubles was contained in the oath imposed on the future clergy, by Article 21 of the "Civil Constitution of the Clergy," that they would be faithful to the nation, to the law, and to the king, and would maintain with all their power the constitution voted by the National Assembly. This would not seem a very formidable difficulty to an English clergyman, but it must have been a very bitter test for a French bishop or priest. Although it attacked no article of Catholic or Apostolic religion it was directly antagonistic to Romanism. Those who had so long and so cruelly persecuted, were rapidly finding themselves exposed to persecution. It is impossible not to feel sympathy with them in the terrible dilemma to which they were reduced. If the French clergy had been content to struggle for their own independence and for more just relations with the State, which was oppressing their consciences, that sympathy would be extreme. But with this they combined undisguised hatred to political liberty; then and ever since they have been in open antagonism with all who love liberty in France. In this war the Pope took the lead. Early in 1790 the National Assembly was condemned in a brief, unreservedly, for having decreed liberty of conscience and eligibility¹ of non-Catholics to military and civil employments. "The Papacy had only anathemas for France," Louis XVI. wrote earnestly to the Pope, pleading with him to accept the civil constitution of the clergy. "Even a provisional sanction could not be obtained." The two powers, the Papacy and the Revolution, Ultramontanism and Religious Liberty, were in open conflict. This is no justification for the subsequent horrors in France; but, when neither party would yield, one or the other had to succumb. The weakest, the French Monarchy and the French Church, was trampled under foot. Louis XVI. had before him the alternative of excommunication or dethronement. Fatally for himself he attempted a middle course: he fled to Varennes. Meanwhile resistance was organised at Rome. Religious liberty was condemned as monstrous and chimerical. All possibility of accommodation was cut off. The new constitution of the clergy was condemned as heretical. A schism

¹ *Habiles facti sunt acatholici ad omnia gerenda municipalia, civilia, militaria munera.*

was set up. Most of the Bishops emigrated at an early period (John xii. 11-13); a few remained at their posts, faithful to death. The flight to Varennes sealed the fate of the French monarchy. Then the wine-press was trodden throughout France; blood came out of the wine-press. To use the striking expression of Mirabeau, a thick veil was thrown over Liberty in France.

After the frightful events of the Thermidor religious questions came up again. On the motion of Cambon, in 1794, it was decreed that the "French Republic pays no expenses, no salary of any form of worship," but the liberty of public worship which had been interdicted was restored, and citizens were permitted to use the churches for different forms of worship at hours to be fixed by the civil authorities, on condition that the ministers acknowledged submission to the laws of the Republic. Under the Directory, Camille Jourdain vindicated liberty of conscience and liberty of worship. Religious feeling repressed during the last horrible crisis exhibited itself afresh. Both in the Constitutional and in the Ultramontane Church signs of new life were apparent. M. Pressensé does not hesitate to compare this feeling to that of the Jews on their return from exile at Babylon. Grégoire, the Constitutional Bishop of Blois, preached fifty times and confirmed 45,000 persons in his diocese. Thirty thousand persons attended the *Te Deum* at Notre Dame after the battle of Marengo. In the first council of the Constitutional Church, held in 1797, Bishop Grégoire reported that 40,000 parishes had restored the worship of their fathers. It is not easy to express a favourable opinion of the Constitutional Church, composed as it was of incongruous elements, lacking in fervour and spirituality. Still, if it had had fair play, which it never had, it might have gone far to reconcile for Frenchmen two ideas so long painfully in antagonism—God and liberty.

But Bonaparte, now First Consul, was meditating that transformation of his authority into Imperial power, which, at the cost of all liberty to France, he accomplished. For the metaphysicians of 1789, as he termed them, he had the most supreme contempt. He meant to be the founder of a new dynasty of emperors in emulation of Charlemagne. In an evil hour for France and for himself it occurred to him that the Pope could be a serviceable tool; a bargain might be struck mutually advantageous to both parties; religious sanction conferred by the Pope might consecrate his power, placing him on a level with the ancient kings to whose throne he was succeeding. Lafayette said to him, when negotiations for the Concordat were opened at Rome—"Vous avez envie de vous faire casser la petite fiole sur la tête." The answer of Napoleon was—"Nous verrons, nous verrons." Bourrienne, who relates the story, tells us this was the true origin of the

Concordat.¹ It is not easy to distinguish in Bonaparte what his real sentiments on religious subjects were, but he has left on record this statement:—"No society can exist without morality; there can be no true morality without religion. It is religion alone upon which a State can rest with stability and continuance. A society without religion is a ship without a compass." With him, however, the restoration of the papal power in France was a pure measure of policy. It may be summed up in his statement, "J'ai besoin du Pape; il fera ce que je voudrai." He was woefully mistaken. M. de Pressensé tells us that the Concordat was only a revised edition of the civil constitution of the clergy with the democratic element omitted. This, in many respects, was, as we have shown, the old system of the lawyers in the times of the monarchy. The delusion which mainly influenced Bonaparte was one which is not unknown to our own statesmen—"Je nourrirai les prêtres." By this contrivance he imagined that he would rule them instead of the Pope. In his contempt for the power of the Papacy—perhaps in his ignorance—he yielded to the Pope more than Ultramontanism ever could have anticipated.

But what he gave in the Concordat he withdrew virtually in the Organic laws which were presented with it and ratified by a decree of the Corps Législatif (8th April, 1802). These Organic laws were, in their main points, restoration of the old Gallican liberties. Whether through desire of precipitating negotiations, misplaced confidence in the might of the civil power, or, still more probably, reassertion on the part of her statesmen of the religious independence of France, the assent and consent of the Pope to these Organic laws was never applied for or obtained. Certainly it would have been diminution of liberty to ask for it; still, it is maintained that the Concordat was granted upon condition of its being regulated by these laws. The State thus asserted its independence; just in proportion as it maintains its supremacy even to the present day, it enforces these laws. On the other hand, the Papacy has never recognised them; it has only submitted to them. It will be readily seen what a fertile source of discord was thus created. The subsequent troubles of France result from this unhappy complication. It will give some idea of the short-sightedness of even able politicians in religious questions, that M. Portalis, when recommending the Concordat and Organic laws, urged, as a reason, that "we have nothing to fear from Ultramontane systems and the excesses consequent upon them"! He declared that monastic institutions were a thing of the past, and would not be revived! He was alive to the danger of falling

¹ De Pressensé, "L'Etat et L'Église," p. 384.

under the yoke of Rome, but conceived it sufficiently protected by "the deposit of our ancient liberties" reproduced in the Organic laws! Under these illusions the Concordat (*ensemble*), with its Organic laws, was passed. At first Napoleon congratulated himself on having restored everything in its ancient order. One of his generals replied, "Yes, except two millions of Frenchmen who died for liberty, and cannot be recalled to life." Subsequently he admitted that the Concordat was the greatest fault of his reign. "I reap what I have sown," he said to M. de Pradt in 1811; "the Concordat is the greatest mistake I have made in my life." From that time forward he was himself entangled in religious quarrels. For France the Concordat was more fatal than the subsequent defeat on the plains of Waterloo.

IV.

In 1789 Liberty was the aim of France; at the period of the Restoration it had to all appearance perished under the iron despotism of Napoleon. But the intervening struggles had not been altogether in vain. Much that had unshackled the nation had perished and could not be restored. In this political had fared better than religious liberty; still it too had made some progress. Protestants could live in France without civil disabilities and with some freedom of worship. This was not much, but it was enormous progress. Against this the Church of the old *régime* had contended till it was destroyed itself. At the period of the Restoration, even in the Charter of 1814, there were symptoms of a reversion to the former condition of things. In the Concordat of 1802, which the Pope had accepted, it was declared that the Romish faith was that of "the great majority of French citizens;" also that it might be freely exercised, and its worship public, subject to police regulations necessary for public peace and order. In the Charter of 1814, while equal liberty and protection was accorded to all sects, the Romish faith was recognised as "the religion of the State," and its ministers alone were to be subsidised from the Treasury. This was in the condition of France a retrograde step.

From 1814 till the expulsion of Charles X. the ceaseless object of the restored clergy was to abolish religious liberty and to undo the past. No sooner was the Monarchy established than propositions were brought forward to abolish the University and to place all colleges and schools under the Bishops; all educational establishments in the country were treated as haunts of immorality, atheism, and sedition, which must be destroyed (*anéantis*). Roux Laborie, well-known as the representative of the clergy, declared in the Chamber that all their old power and riches must be restored to the clergy. In contravention of the organic

laws all persons were compelled to dress their houses (*tapisser les maisons*) during religious processions. For refusing to do this Protestants were condemned to fine and imprisonment. Lamennais insisted that if they did not the police should do it for them. In opposition to Odillon Barrot, who maintained that in religious matters law was neutral, he declared that then "la loi est athée." The retort was prompt, that if neutral = atheistical, the law ought to be *athée*. In the opinion of Lamennais, to hold that the temporal power of kings was independent of the spiritual was atheism. In his earlier career he was one of the ablest exponents of the views of the clerical party. He stated them thus: "No government, no police, no order are possible if men are not united by one common belief, conceived under the sense of duty; therefore, in order that human societies may not be abandoned to the anarchy of opinions or to the wills of individuals, there must be an infallible power. This infallible power must be by Divine appointment, the Pope in temporal as in spiritual things; kings as well as people must be obedient, "L'Église ordonne; les princes exécutent; des deux puissances l'une décide, l'autre agit; voilà l'ordre!"¹

In 1824 a grand sensation was caused by a pastoral of M. de Croi, Archbishop of Rouen, ordering the clergy to denounce their parishioners who did not attend mass; to post on the parish or cathedral doors those who did not go to Communion at Easter,² placing in a separate list "Concubinaires," all those who had contracted a civil marriage. In 1824 a law of sacrilege was passed, by which those who profaned sacred vessels were to be punished with death; those who profaned the sacred wafers were to be treated as parricides, that is, were to be punished by death preceded by mutilation. This law was carried in the Senate by the Bishops, who declared that if it was passed they would be the first to go into the condemned cells, to exhort the guilty to suffer death with resignation; to accompany them in the tumbrils, to mount the scaffold with them and embrace them there as brethren under the eyes of the common Father of mankind! Had such a law been now in existence in England, as a consequence of the fearful outrage recently committed in Hatton Garden, the wretched criminal, not for shooting at the priests but for scattering the consecrated wafers about, would have been first mutilated, then hung, while some Romish Bishop attended the condemned man on the scaffold! This was the law procured by the vote of French

¹ La Mennais, "Progrès de la Révolution et de la guerre contre l'Église."

² It has been computed by the Romish clergy that scarcely one Frenchman in twenty-five is an Easter communicant. When the extreme importance of this participation is borne in mind, it is a fair test of the relation of the French laity to the Church. "Ils ne font pas leur Pâques."

Bishops. So marked was the opposition of the clergy to all liberty, that Chateaubriand, who was ambassador at Rome, declared to the Pope that, "instead of supporting the new institutions or at least maintaining silence, the clergy had blamed them in terms which impiety made a weapon of. It cried out that Catholicism was incompatible with public liberty," and that "there was internecine strife between the Charter and the priests." It would be difficult to say that it was not so.

Meanwhile the Jesuits had returned and, although prohibited by law, were attempting to assert themselves. At Amiens and Nancy they tried to force the Cours Royales to follow in their processions. The difficulty about teaching created then almost as much excitement as it does now. In spite of all efforts their success was not great, so bitter was the hostility to them. Then as now, they endeavoured to raise the cry of religious liberty. Then, as is the case now with the Belgian Bishops, the Pope was more alive to the situation than they were, accepting the ordinances passed by the Portalis Ministry in 1828. Exactly as we have recently seen, the Bishops maintained that Cardinal Benetti's letter, condemning their opposition, did not express the Pope's sentiments, and that it was a deadly blow to the Catholic religion. So fast and furious was this more than Ultramontaniam, that it provoked the most deadly hostility. We cannot stay to dwell upon the manifestations of it. It may suffice to say that all the rising intellect of France was against the Church. Too often, as it could not have both God and liberty, it chose the latter, rejecting the former, at any rate so far as the profession of religion was concerned. In the pages of the *Globe*, Saint Simon, Comte, Thiers, Ampère, de Rémusat, Saint Beuve, encouraged by Broglie, Guizot, Cousin, Villemain, indulged in the most audacious speculations. M. de Montalembert, an unimpeachable witness, declares that during the fifteen years of the Restoration the Church, so far from having gained ground, had fallen into the most deplorable discredit. Not one in twenty, even from the best colleges, of young Frenchmen turned out a Christian; the visit of an ordinary man to a church was, he said, as great a marvel as that of "a Christian traveller to a mosque in the East."

Once more the deluge came. The ancient Monarchy was swept away. The Church of France, according to Montalembert, narrowly escaped perishing with it. But if it survived under the Monarchy of July, it was with maimed powers and authority. In the Charter of 1830, the Roman religion is no longer "the religion of the State." Ministers of other religious denominations are salaried equally with priests. It was expressly declared by M. Dupin in his Rapport on the new Charter, that the terms of the former Charter had awakened imprudent pretensions to exclusive

dominion which had resulted in the disgrace of the family then reigning, and had brought the State to the verge of ruin. Once again the French Bishops and clergy had striven to arrogate spiritual and temporal despotism. Once again had France revolted against them. "Le Christianisme est mort" was a general sentiment. The clergy on their own admission were smitten with a sort of "civil death." M. de Salvandy declared, "some months ago the priest was everywhere; now God is nowhere." Six years afterwards Nôtre Dame was filled with overflowing congregations, chiefly consisting of young men, presided over by the Archbishop of Paris, whose life had been given to him for a prey, while all were hanging on the accents of Lacordaire. What had happened in the interval? For a brief interval there was liberty: and there was God. The motto chosen by Montalembert, La Mennais, and Lacordaire, for their celebrated journal *L'Avenir* was, "Le Dieu et la Liberté." To this France, not as we have said in reality irreligious, heartily responded. The priesthood had withdrawn into its proper functions, and had, too, ceased to domineer over and to wound susceptibilities.

This apparent reconciliation, however, between what was held to be God and liberty was not of long duration. We have not space to follow in detail the tracasseries of Louis Philippe's reign. We can only point generally to the enterprise of M. de Montalembert with his two friends De La Mennais and Lacordaire. Of these three De La Mennais was the eldest. He had established himself as a power in royalist and clerical circles. But he had seen how fatal to religion in France had been its alliance with the fallen monarchy. He had become a republican. In his anxiety to preserve religion, he had cast away his old political convictions. A grand hope of a theocracy, free, pure, enlightened, disinterested, floated before his vision. It was his mistake to imagine that this could possibly be the Church of Rome. When bitter opposition sprang up against the *Avenir* and the doctrines it taught, De La Mennais, in the fiftieth year of his age, was willing, in the spirit of a little child going to a father, to set out upon an expedition to the Pope to claim his sanction for the noble but Quixotic enterprise on which they had embarked of reconciling in concert with Rome "God and liberty"! They sallied forth on this wild errand, wilder than the quest of the Sangreal. The story of their failure is one of the mournful episodes of history.¹ They saw the Pope. In due season they were informed by an Encyclical Letter (15th August, 1832) that "from the infected fountain of indifferentism, the absurd and erroneous maxim—or rather the delusion—that liberty of conscience must be assured and guaranteed, has flowed."

Et quæ tanta fuit Romam (illis) causa videndi? Libertas!!!

Again they were assured that the liberty of the press is "a fatal liberty, which cannot be too much hated or cursed." Then, as we are informed in the pages of the *Correspondant*, "Une âme perit dans cette catastrophe, l'âme de Lamennais." The fervent defender of religion found that, as a Roman ecclesiastic, it was impossible to reconcile God and liberty. He chose the latter. But it may be permitted to ask how many more souls have perished and are even now perishing in this, to a Roman Catholic, hopeless entanglement whenever a thought of true liberty is entertained?

The shock to Montalembert and Lacordaire was fearful. But the habit of submission prevailed over the temptation to revolt. Their glorious ideal had been demolished, but there was still a certain kind of liberty to contend for. The laws of France had proscribed the religious orders which had been an incubus upon the country; they had also restricted teaching, and placed it under the control of the University. Now with Rome it is one thing, and a damnable thing, to uphold liberty of conscience, liberty of opinion, and liberty of the press, either in the abstract or when they are indulged in to her prejudice. It is another thing to urge the claims of liberty when her usurpations can be forwarded. In this subordinate quest after a certain sort of liberty, Lacordaire and his friend thenceforward employed themselves. Religious orders were forbidden by law; Lacordaire employed himself in resuscitating them. Clothed in the garb of a Dominican friar, he stood up in *Nôtre Dame*, and shaking his robe, exclaimed, "Je suis une liberté." Strictly speaking he was a lawlessness. Montalembert exerted his brilliant abilities to compass what he termed "la liberté de l'enseignement."

No impartial person will deny that there was cause for complaint in French education. It would be very easy to establish that there was mismanagement in the *Lycées*, and teaching by professors hostile to Christianity. For this a remedy was needed. The difficulty was to find one which would be suitable. Godless education is a terrible calamity. M. de Gasparin has borne his testimony, and it is that of a distinguished Protestant—"I bethink myself with terror what I was when I issued forth from this national education. I recalled what all my companions were. Were we very good citizens? I know not, but certainly we were not Christians; nor did we possess even the weakest beginnings of evangelical faith." Père Gratry has in like manner left on record a dismal account of the experiences of his early career in what we would term public schools. But what was the remedy? Towards the end of the reign of Louis Philippe "clericalism," as the French term it, was once more gaining the ascendant. But in 1848 there was once more a Revolution. There was again a

National Assembly in power. In the fundamental law which it adopted there was not even mention made of the Catholic religion. The Charter of 1830 had declared it to be the "religion of the majority of Frenchmen." Since 1848 it is "legally" neither the "religion of the State" nor the "religion of the majority." On the occasion of each revolution jealousy of "clericalism" was a main predisposing cause of it. At the issue of each, as the Sibyl came to Tarquin with fewer books, France has offered the Church of Rome fewer prerogatives. Still the partisans of Romanism did not lose heart. Montalembert and his friends, urging the plea of liberty, battled for the "liberty of teaching." When Louis Napoleon was President they obtained, in 1850, the passing of the *Loi Falloux*. By this law, which might much more appropriately have been termed the *Loi Montalembert*, licences given for opening schools were abolished; so were certificates from some authorised school for the B.A. examination. Religious seminaries were thrown open, and the religious orders were permitted to teach. An academy was created in each department, in which delegates from the local clergy held a position. There was thus freedom for Catholic teaching. Had there been prudence, enlightenment, moderation in the clergy, there would have been once more a prospect of "God and liberty." Unfortunately for France it was not so to be. Instead of what we in England understand by religious teaching, or anything like it, what Montalembert in his hour of triumph expressed his dread of in words painfully prophetic, came to pass—"Catholics were wanting to freedom."¹ There was a fresh and determined effort made to subjugate consciences rather than to teach Christian truth, also to re-assert the ancient dominion of the Papal Church. Religious congregations, notably the Jesuits, proscribed by law, established themselves during the period of the Empire with the connivance of the temporal and with the undisguised support of the spiritual authority both in Rome and in France. In a celebrated letter to the clergy of his diocese, written in 1869, M. Dupanloup numbers up with pride these congregations, and speaks of them as "cette incomparable armée pacifique, qui est comme notre armée guerrière la première du monde." But what was the feeling of France at the fresh invasion of this expelled army whose head-quarters were at Rome? It is possible that many French parents were

¹ As freedom can never be effectually established by the adversaries of that Gospel which has first made it a reality for all orders and degrees of men, so the Gospel can never be effectually defuded by a policy which declines to acknowledge the high place assigned to Liberty in the councils of Providence, and which, upon the pretext of the abuse that like every other good she suffers, expels her from its system.—"Gladstone on Vaticanism."

discontented with "Liberty," as taught in the Lycées, but were they satisfied with "Dieu," as expounded to them by M. Dupanloup's army? In the mean time, under Pius IX., the Pope declared himself to be the Church. In 1859, in the presence of the assembled Bishops, he proclaimed the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception. They simply listened to him and accepted it. In his Encyclical of 1869, he declared that it is madness to desire liberty of conscience; that the clergy ought to pay no taxes; that they should have their own tribunals in criminal or civil matters; that public education must be in the hands of the priests. In that and in the Syllabus which epitomised all the doctrines of previous Encyclicals, there was, it is true, talk of liberty. But as has been well observed, "It was the liberty of the Head of the Church to claim in the name of Heaven, and to exercise by all earthly means over souls, bodies, peoples, and princes the most absolute despotism. It was the abrogation of all rights, the absorption of the individual into that ideal being, the Church, which alone is free, but at the price of the liberty of all."¹ But was this the liberty which Frenchmen wanted? A desperate and partially successful effort was made by flattering French vanity to connect the Catholic destiny of France with the military destiny. The upshot was the German war; the disappearance of the Bonapartist dynasty; the singing of Luther's Hymn in the halls of Versailles; and the establishment once more of a Republic on the wrecks of all previous kingdoms or empires of France.

Again the Church of Rome has lost ground. Each successive revolution since 1819 has stripped her of privileges. Even the last seem now in peril. It is an anxious question whether there will be still money voted for the maintenance of bishops and priests, and for the conservation of religious edifices. The bills of M. Jules Ferry threaten the destruction of the law of M. Falloux. The "Liberté d'enseignement," which has been so abused, is apparently on the point of being restrained. The Jesuits will shortly disappear, except as private Frenchmen, from France, once more free. Liberty has been reclaimed, but what of God? There is an ugly look, that at the present moment the two ideas are once more in opposition in France. On the one hand, are the serried and well-disciplined battalions of Rome receiving their *mot d'ordre* from Rome. At their disposal, as camp followers, are the remains of the ancient noblesse, political Bonapartists, whose fortunes are wrecked, and a considerable mass of the women of France. These just now are clamour-

¹ "Rome and the Council in the Nineteenth Century," by F. Bungener, p. 159.

ing for liberty as the Pope understands liberty. They also proclaim "God;" but inextricably mixed up with this are Papal Infallibility, sacerdotalism, Lourdes, La Salette, puerile and disgusting fables and practices of all sorts, together with all the revolting teaching sanctioned by Jesuitism. Lying wonders, jugglery, and absurdities form the strength and the weakness of this teaching. In opposition to them is the mass of Frenchmen prizing above all things, madly and often ignorantly, liberty. Vain in the last degree have been the efforts to show that they have any sympathy with all that is bound up with Ultramontanism, which is what is presented to them as "God." When we bear in mind that "Go to Lourdes" is the modern French synonym for imbecility, we may form some conception of how far Frenchmen are prepared to sacrifice their hardly-won liberty for this conception of religion or "God."

We have indicated, we fear only too briefly and too imperfectly, what may be fairly termed the disease from which France is still and has been so long suffering. In describing it we have endeavoured to exhibit it from the French rather than from our own point of view. It is possible, also, that the terms used may seem startling to English apprehension not accustomed to identify liberty with licence, or God with grovelling superstition. But it would not be easy otherwise to explain the dilemma which France is now in, or how the alternative presents itself to Frenchmen as a people. The question is, Can there be no remedy found whereby what seems irreconcilable can be reconciled? Must France necessarily be Voltairian, Hegelian, Positivist, or else Ultramontane and fetichist? Is there no *juste milieu*? Is there no balm in Gilead which can heal wounds, bruises, and putrefying sores? Must a Frenchman believe in Marie Alacocque in order to be a Christian? Must he surrender himself to the Pope, body, soul, and spirit, if he would acknowledge and worship God? Are liberty of conscience, liberty of opinion, liberty of speech, inconsistent with religion? The answer to this requires separate and independent treatment hereafter.

GEORGE KNOX.

ART. IV.—PRINCE METTERNICH'S AUTOBIOGRAPHY.

Memorials of Prince Metternich. Edited by HIS SON. Translated by Mrs. NAPIER. 2 vols. Bentley.

THE appearance of these Memorials has been long eagerly anticipated by a curious public. It was known that the famous diplomatist had during his long career, both as Ambassador to Paris and Minister of Foreign Affairs at Vienna,