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

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

office for ever. They complete a great example; they animate the ministers of Christ; they confirm the souls of the disciples; they suit themselves to danger and persecution, to disappointment and loneliness, to the darker hours of life, and to the near approach of death. Written under all these circumstances, they more especially belong to those who are placed in any of them. The Spirit of the Lord filled the spirit of the writer, and the spirit of the writer breathes for ever from the page, cherishing in other hearts the same certainty of faith and fixity of purpose, the same unwavering reliance and serene assurance. He will know one day—it may be that he knows now—how it has been given him to minister these supports to the whole Church through generations, of whose long succession he could not have dreamed. Truly his last trials were not ordained in vain. In a larger sense than he supposed the great thought of love which sweetened his sorrows and glorified his hope has proved, and will yet prove, to be true.

I endure all things *for the elect's sake*, that they also may obtain the salvation which is in Christ Jesus with eternal glory.

There is laid up for me the crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, shall give to me at that day, and *not to me only, but also to all them that have loved His appearing.*

T. D. BERNARD.

ART. II.—DR. DÖLLINGER ON MADAME DE MAINTENON.

THE remarkable articles which Dr. Döllinger published last July in the *Allgemeine Zeitung* seem to have escaped notice in England. The title under which they appeared was, "The Most Influential Woman in French History," and they will be found in the numbers of that journal (now transferred from Augsburg to Munich) for July 6, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15. The object of the present article is to give a summary of their contents. They will give to some persons a new view of the famous woman of whom they treat. Dr. Döllinger shows that historians have done Madame de Maintenon very serious injustice. They have been silent respecting much that is very much to her credit, and have attributed to her many things of which she is quite guiltless; and he points out how this injustice has come to pass. Above all, he indicates how necessary a correct appreciation of her career is, in order to form a true view of modern ecclesiastical history.

The remark is an old one that the history of women in France shows how the Salic Law has been neutralized. In no other country have women, whether natives or foreigners, had so deep and wide a political influence. When Napoleon came to Paris in 1795 he remarked that it

was only there that women deserved to govern. The men thought only of them, and lived only through and for them. A woman must live six months in Paris in order to know what her power really is, and how she can direct affairs. And this was said just at the very time when the Court, in which women had had such influence, had been swept away by the Revolution.

The series of French Queens, who as dowagers and regents understood the art of ruling, begins with Blanche of Castile, mother of Lewis IX. Then we have the contrast between two leading women in the shameless Isabella of Bavaria, wife of Charles VI., and the heroic Joan of Arc. The whole period from 1483 to 1590, with the exception of the reign of Lewis XII., is marked by the increase of female influence in politics. Louisa of Savoy, the mother of Francis I., was able to lead her son almost blindfold, to the ruin of herself and of France. "The women appoint everybody," said Tavannes, "even the generals." Bishops also often owed their promotion to them. Diana of Poitiers and Catharine of Medicis are two more strong instances of this tendency. Then follow Mary of Medicis, wife of Henry IV. and mother of Lewis XIII., and Anne of Austria, wife of Lewis XIII. and mother of Lewis XIV. It was during the rule of the latter that Mazarin said that of the many political ladies in France there were three, any one of whom was equal to ruling or ruining a kingdom. His policy was to play them off one against another, or to buy them off with money and promotion. From the women of his day we pass on to the subject of these articles.

From his childhood Lewis XIV. had been thrown constantly into female society. Mazarin and the Queen had shamefully neglected his education, and he was never encouraged to study. His ignorance made him dislike the society of cultivated men, and he fell back upon that of the other sex. During the greater part of his life female society was the atmosphere in which he always chose to live. His first serious attachment — for Mary Mancini, Mazarin's niece — was broken off. Mademoiselle de la Motte d'Argencourt was forced into a nunnery. Then he married, without any affection for her, Maria Theresa, daughter of Philip IV. of Spain; and forthwith the series of the women and girls, who one after another, and sometimes simultaneously, attracted the King's fancy, begins. At first such things were kept secret; but soon they were paraded before the world. At Court, at public ceremonies, on his travels, and even on his campaigns, he gave his mistresses a foremost place. He set public opinion at defiance, and public opinion succumbed to him. The favourites of the King received, not only recognition, but homage. But the King himself drew the line clearly at one point. He never allowed his mistresses to interfere in affairs of State.

It was at this point that Frances of Aubigné, then widow of Scarron, came within the circle of his intimates. At first he took little notice of her. But gradually, with calm, slow, but sure progress, this woman, three years older than himself, first attained to equal influence with others over him, and then, with ever increasing and unwavering power, took complete possession of his head and heart, became indispensable to him, and rendered it impossible for any other woman to win his fancy. This extraordinary woman, now for 166 years in her grave, still lives in the historical outcome of her actions; and, as in life, so also in death, exercises a mighty power of attraction upon all those who approach her. Her very history is fascinating. Nevertheless, there is scarcely another of her sex who both during her lifetime and since her death has been so shamefully misrepresented.

These misrepresentations have in the main three sources. The first is the revelations of La Beaumelle, who about 150 years ago wrote a de-

tailed history of this lady, and published a large number of her letters. He was an audacious and unscrupulous forger. Many of the letters were his own composition ; many more were garbled and utterly transformed by interpolations. This was proved in 1866 by La Vallée, who had all the originals. Meanwhile it was precisely the falsified portions which had been supposed to be specially characteristic of her ; and the view of her derived from them still prevails in spite of the exposure. People still believe in the cold, calculating, vain and ambitious woman, who gradually elbowed De Montespan out of the King's favour, and then took her place. La Beaumelle also forged letters from her to the notorious Ninon de l'Enclos, and thus contrived to throw suspicion on her earlier life, which her contemporaries attest to have been without reproach.

The second source of misrepresentation is the great master of narrative and of delineation of character, the Duke of Saint-Simon. He was far younger than she was, and had scarcely ever seen her. He detested her, because, according to his view, she had forced her way into a society far above her, and by her shameless audacity had disturbed all Court traditions, and had disgraced the King in the eyes of Europe. In the poisoned atmosphere of Versailles there was plenty of scandal to be picked up respecting a woman who was the envy of everyone, and who was surrounded with an air of mystery. Saint-Simon swallowed the gossip eagerly and preserved it. Chéruel and Ranke have shown how utterly untrustworthy he is on this subject.

The third source is the correspondence of Elizabeth Charlotte, Duchess of Orleans, the wife of Lewis's younger brother. Like nearly all German princesses who have married into France, she was a most unhappy woman. Her husband treated her infamously ; and in what she had to endure the King was not altogether blameless. But she chose to hold Madame de Maintenon responsible, and in her concentrated hatred she eagerly heard and repeated and recorded the most monstrous statements respecting her. Her letters are full of contradictions and of the most palpable falsehoods ; and during thirty-five years, with one or two remarkable interruptions, they teem with accusations (based on no evidence and at variance with known facts of history) of the most atrocious crimes. Three things may be pleaded in extenuation of her calumnies. (1) She lived in a scandal-loving Court, at which anyone favoured by the King was an object of intense jealousy. (2) She was frantic with indignation and grief at her own wrongs and sorrows. (3) The crimes which were attributed to Madame de Maintenon were not incredible, for such things had occurred at the Court of France. That Charlotte herself did not seriously believe all that she records is shown by the fact that she tells us how often and how earnestly she had striven to become intimate with Madame de Maintenon. And she places us on our guard against all her statements when she confesses to the King that it was love for him which made her hate the woman whom she regarded as her rival.

From 1669 to 1673 or 1674 Madame Scarron was at Vaugirard taking charge of the King's children by Madame de Montespan, and she saved money enough to buy the estate of Maintenon. When the King had these children brought to Court, their governess came with them. Their mother's relation to the King caused her much distress ; but her confessor told her that she might do much good at Court, and must not leave her situation. At first Lewis thought her conceited and fanciful, and took little notice of her. But gradually she attracted him more and more, and gave him what was an entirely new experience to him—quiet friendship with a woman and intimacy without passion or excitement. In 1678 he made her Marquise de Maintenon, and in 1680 freed her from her dependence upon Madame de Montespan by attaching her to the house-

hold of the Dauphiness. Soon afterwards Madame de Montespan left the Court. As early as 1675 the governess of her children had ventured to point out to the King the scandal which his adulteries caused: and at last she succeeded in winning him back to his long-neglected Queen. In July, 1683, the Queen died in her arms; and early in 1684 Madame de Maintenon was secretly married to the King by the Archbishop of Paris. With the approval of her spiritual advisers, one or two bishops, and the Pope himself, this marriage was kept a profound secret, sorely against her own wishes. The secrecy compromised her character, and made her relation to the King appear worse than ambiguous. But she was told that she must make this sacrifice for the good of the King's soul and for the welfare of the Church. Thereupon she destroyed all the letters and documents which could have borne testimony to the marriage. But the letters of the Bishop of Chartres, both to her and to the King, place the fact of the marriage beyond a doubt.

With Lewis, ruling meant commanding. He regarded himself as the controller of men's souls as well as bodies, and as the fount of all right and honour. No one could be anything in France except by the grace of the King, and all greatness was an emanation from his. Those who approached him must do so in an attitude of complete dependence and submission, and consequently men of independent minds commonly stayed away. Absolute monarchy he considered to be not only one form of government, but the only one which was in accordance with the will of God. With all this he held strange views respecting truthfulness and the fulfilment of sworn compacts. Even these, he maintained, an absolute monarch might set aside when political and royal interests were seriously at stake; and his faithlessness became so notorious as to cause much delay in the conclusion of treaties, greatly to the detriment of France.

Saint-Simon and the Duchess of Orleans are prejudiced witnesses, and record much which they might have known to be untrue; but if we wish to have a complete picture of the woman who subdued this most royal of royal despots, we cannot set them on one side. Other contemporary evidence is not very abundant. People in France did not dare to say openly, much less to write and publish, what they really thought about persons and things; and writers outside France were not very well informed as to what went on at the French Court. Versailles was then the centre of Europe, but Europe was not admitted behind the scenes there. The Abbé Choisy has not much to tell us, excepting the secret midnight marriage. The memoirs of Languet de Gergy, afterwards Bishop of Soissons, tell us more; but, though they were not intended for publication, all the dark parts are left out. The Venetian ambassadors' reports give a favourable account of her, especially as regards her peaceful disposition, her calming influence upon the King, and her modest retiring mode of life. On the whole, those who knew her best speak best of her. The letters of the Princess Orsini and of Marshal de Villars to her breathe genuine admiration. Fénelon writes to her in a tone of the deepest respect. In short, no woman in history has ever been more loved and admired, and none has been more hated. But the hatred was always the result of envy. "Her place," as Madame de Sévigné says, "is unique in the world; there has never been her like, and there will never be another such." The idol of France belonged to her exclusively; and thereby the desires and aims of a whole Court of women were doomed to helpless and hopeless failure, and that in a land in which, as the Duchess of Orleans said, "There isn't a kitchenmaid who does not think that she has the ability to rule a kingdom."

Besides these, we have the witness of the two chief personages them-

selves. Frances of Maintenon has left us a portrait of herself in her writings, and especially in her letters. The King's letters, while expressing his ideas and feelings, are written in a style which probably owes a good deal to her. Her letters are among the very best in French literature. They are clear, compressed, dignified, and often sententious. Her business letters are models of simplicity and pregnant brevity. They have all the warmth and depth of a woman's feeling, combined with all the force and clearness of a man's intellect. They are the mirror of a noble soul, living above rather than among its surroundings.

The common view that Madame de Maintenon was a thoroughly shrewd, calm, cold, and calculating woman, is in the main quite wrong. On the contrary, she was highly sensitive. To be affectionate was almost a necessity to her; and she had a passionate craving to benefit others by her exertions. She possessed in the highest degree the art of being all things to all men, and could teach and charm village children with the same fine sympathy with which she awakened and guided the conscience of the King. With Lewis personal impressions were more potent than principles; and the impression which his wife made upon him was that of a person who, without a thought for herself, cared only for him—his health and his happiness, and, above all, the welfare of his soul. Distrustful of everyone else, and ever suspecting an interested motive, he enjoyed in her a perfectly unselfish devotion. Accustomed all his life to the incense of Court flattery, he heard for the first time from a person who belonged to him something of the truth and reality of things. A friend for such a king as Lewis was an impossibility. He might have flatterers and favourites, but no real friend. His wife filled the vacant place.

Lewis's craving to have this woman of his choice almost always at his side is amazing. Her very presence seems to have calmed and quickened him. In 1698, when she was already sixty-three, he used to visit her in her apartments three times a day, not to converse, but simply to work in the same room with her. To her no small inconvenience he had his writing-desk placed by her bedside, and worked there constantly with his ministers while she was lying in bed. He often consulted her, but, as she told her confessor, his views and principles were painfully different from her own. It might seem as if, in asking her advice, he was departing from his principles as absolute and infallible sovereign. But, just as he was persuaded that he had taught his ministers all the statecraft they knew, so he was convinced that in taking his wife's advice he was merely getting back what she had learned from him. "*Votre solidité*," as he used to call her, could only give him back his own wisdom.

But her influence had close limits. She detested the ceaseless wars: yet her spiritual directors assured her that these wars were waged in the interests of the Catholic faith, and she allowed herself to be fooled by confident expressions of coming triumphs. What could be more pleasing to her than to believe herself to be the wife of a new Lewis IX., the chief defender of the faith, and the enlarger of the boundaries of the Church? But did it never stagger her to see this champion of the Church making alliances with the hereditary foes of Christendom, and supporting Turkish invasions of Christian lands? She had also her misgivings about the despotic power of the King. Could such a system be Christian? But it was the Church which had fostered it, and Bossuet, the leading Churchman of the realm, had declared that it was in accordance with the French constitution and with Divine ordinance. Here and there she could hinder or shorten the imprisonment of those arrested by the King's orders, but the system itself she was powerless to change. Her recommendations of persons for promotion were not always happy,

notably in the case of the Minister Chamillard. But in other cases her attempts to bring really excellent men to the notice of the King failed, owing to his disinclination to come in contact with men of superior ability and culture. He could not bear to be excelled, and he feared to have the deficiencies of his own education exposed. His passion for costly building she entirely failed to check. Once, when the finances were in a desperate state, she ventured to remonstrate respecting the extravagant expenditure at Marly, and received a decided rebuff.

In fact, this woman, who received the homage of a Queen, lived the life of a slave. The Bishop of Chartres told her that this was God's will respecting her. For the good of the Church and of the kingdom she must lay herself out to amuse, please, and if possible guide, from day to day and from hour to hour, her wayward and self-willed husband. This is the meaning of the new kinds of social entertainments which she was perpetually inventing for him, and of the dances and fêtes in her apartments, to which she was ever inviting him, and that at times when her own heart was heavy enough at the calamities of the country, and when she knew that money could ill be spared for such things. And often all in vain. The sated, jaded, and defeated monarch would sometimes declare that he was no longer *amusable*, and would pour out his lamentations upon her. This much-admired and much-feared sovereign came to a woman for strength and encouragement, and made her share all his troubles, while he left her to bear her own sorrows alone.

In her letters she tells us something of what she had to endure. She, consort of the first monarch in the world, had less freedom than a shopkeeper's wife. Her beloved husband was her heaviest cross. She was ill and in need of complete rest; and she was ever compelled to ceaseless activity. Both body and mind were perpetually on the stretch. The King liked change; and she was dragged from Versailles to Marly, from Marly to Clagny, from Clagny to Trianon, and from Trianon back to Versailles, and sometimes was housed in rooms which were barely furnished, and of which the walls were not yet dry. Moreover, in Lewis's palaces everything was built for effect, nothing for health or comfort. "For the sake of symmetrical proportion," she says, "we must all of us catch our deaths." How, with her frequent illnesses, she lived through it all, and remained always bright and helpful, is a marvel. But both she and Lewis had this in common—they could conquer weakness and sickness of body by sheer strength of will. But with this difference: that what she did out of love and a profound sense of duty, he did out of selfwill and pride. Her patient and sympathetic endurance was really heroic.

One of her many troubles was being obliged to refuse so many of those who begged of her. It was a principle with her never to ask Lewis for money. She never even secured a provision for herself in case of his death. Lewis had reduced the nobility to poverty. Life at Court was very costly; and those who lived there were constantly subsidized by the King. Numbers of people believed that Madame de Maintenon could obtain these subsidies for them. She had only to ask, and they would get them. They did not get them; and they cursed her for their ill-success. She says that it is piteous to be always saying "No" to those whom one longs to serve: she will never be fairly judged till the last day. She was well aware of the daily crop of pasquinades which were directed against her. "We live here on calumnies," she says in one place; and in another, "We are accustomed to living on venom."

In those days people distinguished between piety and devotion. The "pious" (Frommen) contented themselves with conforming to traditional religious observances. The "devout" (Devoten) endeavoured to

make religion a reality. Everyone about the King had to have a confessor, and Lewis liked to know from those who interested him, to whom they went to confess. The pious often changed their confessors. The devout kept to the one whom they had first chosen; and generally had in addition a spiritual director as well. Absolute obedience to this director was inculcated as the highest of virtues, and the most insignificant acts became sanctified if they were done in obedience to him.

It was a momentous thing for the history of France that Frances had given her whole confidence to the Sulpicians, an order of priests without special vows, who devoted themselves to the education of the clergy. In the religious controversies of the time they held a middle place. With the Jesuits they contended against Jansenist doctrine and preached absolute submission to the Pope and his decrees. With the Jansenists they distrusted the penitential system and casuistry of the Jesuits. Godet des Marais was the Sulpician whom she selected as her director, and he continued to be such after she had got him made Bishop of Chartres, down to his death in 1709. As such he was the most influential prelate in the Gallican Church, and on the whole he did not seriously misuse his opportunities. She consulted him on the most trifling matters; not because she lacked the power to decide for herself, but because she wished to have the merit of obedience. She sent him monthly reports of herself, and one can see from his replies how conscientious and thorough she was in her self-examination. It is less pleasing to notice the tone in which he sometimes addresses her. It may have been well to set before her the lofty, if impossible, mission of being the support and consolation of the Church, the guardian-angel of the King, the reforming spirit of the world. But was it wise to assure her that God had placed in her hands the welfare of the State and the Church, and the salvation of a mighty king? Was it right to speak to her of the spotless innocence of her life and the certainty of her eternal happiness? She herself blames him for thus feeding her self-love with his praises, and he replies by telling her that she has completely overcome all pride and vanity; while she knew only too well the contrary. The Bishop comes very near to worshipping the work of his own hands.

Very different is the line taken by her other spiritual director, Fénelon, a man of the same school as Godet, but of a far superior type. Fénelon was, if not by nature, at any rate by religion, made to be a director of the consciences of men. She laid her soul bare before him, as before Godet, and what he writes to her is of great importance in estimating the statements of Saint-Simon and of Elizabeth Charlotte. Like Godet, he sets before her a scarcely attainable ideal; but he gives her stronger stuff than ceaseless praise and consolation. She is (he says) too cold to those who do not agree with her, too anxious about the good opinion of others, and sets too much store on the consciousness of her own virtue. In short, self is with her a still unbroken idol. She is not to fritter away her emotions in the female friendships of which she is so fond: that is only a refined form of selfishness. She must husband her resources and watch for the opportunities which God may place in her way of inducing the King to adopt the best measures and the best men. There is only one love that is pure—the love of God.

This was written in 1690. Four years later Fénelon wrote in equally plain language, but anonymously, to Lewis himself. His reign hitherto has been nothing but a series of unrighteous wars prompted by ambitious greed, and vanity. His faithlessness about treaties makes wars endless. He has turned France into a huge hospital, a hospital without comfort or even food. He has made the nation bankrupt in order to teach his Court a boundless luxury, and has enriched himself in order to be sur-

rounded by swarms of murmuring beggars. His religion is mere fear and superstition. His confessor, La Chaise, does not do his duty; and Madame de Maintenon and the Duke of Beauvilliers are afraid to tell him what they think of the real condition of affairs. The King showed the letter to his wife, and she spoke of it to Archbishop Noailles. Such severe out-spokenness, she said, did no good. It embittered and discouraged the King, but it did not convert him:—a confession alike of the truth of the charges and of her own powerlessness to remove the grounds of them. The whole incident shows us the depth of her oft-repeated wish for flight from her surroundings, and of her longing, in spite of all her love, for death. After possessing for ten years the heart of this absolute King, she had seen the country over which he ruled, and the Government with which he ruled it, reach a far darker condition than before. The letter was indeed severe; but its chief severity was its truth.

The man who could write thus of her husband could not remain her director. She returned to the guidance of Godet, whom she and many others regarded as a saint. He always said kind things to her, and found virtues in Lewis just where Fénelon found faults. She liked him to say that the King loved his people, although she knew well enough that his love never went further than empty wishes. She regarded it as providential that the breach with Fénelon occurred before he had imbued her with his questionable mysticism. She herself was to blame for preferring the brilliant Fénelon to the less fascinating Godet. She had obtained his promotion to the Archbishopric of Cambray, but there her favour to him ended. Nevertheless, she did what she could to save him from the trouble in which the publication of his "Maximes des Saints sur la Vie interieure" involved him. She negotiated both with him and with his bitter opponent Bossuet. Fénelon tried hard to win her over to his views. But she feared for her beloved institute at Saint-Cyr, where Madame de Guyon had already indoctrinated some of the nuns with her Quietism. These strained and transcendental doctrines, inculcating an ecstatic condition of existence, seemed to her repulsive and perilous. She thought that God had allowed the lofty spirit of Fénelon to fall into error, in order to teach it humility. Godet, although, like Bossuet, he had been the personal friend of Fénelon, declared himself absolutely against the "Maximes," and confirmed Frances in her opposition. Noailles was on the same side; and Fénelon himself said that he could not complain that she preferred the judgment of three such men to his own.

When Fénelon's book was condemned at Rome, as containing twenty-three erroneous propositions, Lewis added his own displeasure to the troubles of his wife. She might have known this man's opinions before she commended him to him for promotion as tutor to the royal princes and as Archbishop of Cambray. She became seriously ill from vexation and anxiety, so that Lewis at last asked her as she lay in bed, "Was she really going to die about this business?"

Fénelon submitted at once, and stopped the circulation of his book in his diocese. But he and his patroness never exchanged another word with one another. She did not believe that his submission meant real abandonment of his position, for she knew that his system was part and parcel of his mental development. And Fénelon did not conceal his conviction that justice required the condemnation of Bossuet rather than of himself. *Celui qui errait a prévalu; celui qui était exempt d'erreur a été écrasé.* He seems to have believed that, when truth came into collision with ecclesiastical obedience, the former must give way. The appearance of *Télémaque* the same year (1699) made future reconciliation between him and the King's consort impossible. The book was written for Fénelon's pupil, the Duke of Burgundy, and was published without

Fénelon's sanction. But most people thought that it was intended to set the young prince against his grandfather's methods of government, and to expose the unworthy ambitions and tyrannies of the latter.

Madame de Maintenon would probably have succumbed to her troubles much sooner had she not been able from time to time to take refuge at Saint-Cyr. Here, in teaching and in other works of charity, she found real refreshment and relief. She escaped from the moral miasmas of Versailles, and breathed a purer atmosphere. Here she could fitfully enjoy what destiny had denied to her at home, opportunity for exercising her exceptional gifts as a trainer of children. She was a true mother to the girls, and attended to their wants both of body and soul with all a mother's thoughtful tenderness. Some of them were to go into convents, and would there make known the traditions of Saint-Cyr in educating the young. Others were to go out into the world, and would be the means of regenerating family life in France. But the future of this larger class was a great perplexity to her. Only a minority of her girls became nuns; how was she to find suitable husbands for the rest? "I want sons-in-law," was her anxious cry. Her girls were well-born, and the nobility of that age were commonly poor, and still more commonly immoral. She gives as her experience of the class from which she drew her pupils that most of their marriages were unhappy. Her enemy, Elizabeth Charlotte, whose observations were made in the same society, goes still further, and says that out of a thousand marriages scarcely two were happy. It was a frightening picture which Madame de Maintenon gave to her pupils of men as she knew them. One sees that she and Larochefoucauld had received similar impressions from the nobility and gentry of that age.

Her influence upon state affairs has been greatly exaggerated by some and under-rated by others. The wide-reaching directions of her spiritual advisers must not be taken as a measure of what she was able, or even attempted, to accomplish. On the other hand, her sincere declaration that she hated State affairs is no proof that she tried to keep aloof from them. She believed it to be her duty to attempt to influence the King, especially in all ecclesiastical matters; but she detested interfering, because her intervention had such poor success. Sometimes Lewis did not listen to her. Sometimes circumstances of which she was ignorant made what she had recommended prove a failure. But there was a tacit understanding between her and the ministers that she was to have her way in Church patronage and to support them, or be neutral, in other matters. Where they could not agree, Lewis decided the question. Only twice was she present at a council of ministers; and in a letter to Archbishop Noailles she expresses the amazement, horror, and disgust with which she learnt the principles, aims, and means of the Government. And at that time she knew but a fraction of the whole.

The first event which damaged her seriously in public opinion was the Peace of Ryswick, which in 1697 put an end to the nine years' war. Lewis had provoked this war by his aggressive policy, had exhausted the resources of his people in the prosecution of it, and had been victorious in most of the battles. And now, with the exception of Strasburg, he surrendered almost everything that he had won. France was astounded, and could find no solution of the enigma, excepting that Madame de Maintenon must have talked Lewis over. There was some truth in this. But it was the exhaustion of the country and the approach of the question of the Spanish succession which made Lewis willing to listen to counsels of peace.

In 1701 the War of the Spanish Succession began, in which Lewis stood at bay against half Europe. Here, in spite of herself, Frances had to

take a leading part. Lewis was ill, and his wife had to work with him and for him in conducting public affairs. Sometimes she conspired with the ministers in concealing bad news from him. During these twelve terrible years her wish for death was constant, so heavily did the disasters of Lewis and of France, and her responsibilities to both of them, weigh upon her. Nevertheless, no sooner was the Peace of Utrecht signed than she was once more a thorough Frenchwoman, thirsting for the glory of her royal husband. Her first thought was, not of the unspeakable miseries of his bankrupt and bleeding people, but that he had secured the Spanish succession without ceding any French territory. At that moment she seems even to have been blind to the moral corruption with which the whole of French society, and especially the Court, was tainted. She has no word of pity for the twice-ravaged Palatinate, nor for the barbarous treatment of Piedmont. The Protestants fighting for freedom of conscience are to her only "fanatics," of whom she hopes to see the land "purged." And she advises her brothers to buy up Protestant property in Poitou, where it may be had very cheaply.

Her whole attitude to French Protestantism is worth considering. In the main she was neither better nor worse than the King, the ministers, and the clergy. They were all agreed that Protestantism was a danger and a disgrace to the nation, and must be rooted out; and no means, however severe, were to be neglected in attaining this end. To Lewis it was intolerable that thousands of his subjects should regard him as a misbeliever, and in his wars with Protestants should sympathize with his enemies. His wife once ventured to recommend less cruel measures; and he told her that she seemed not yet to have got rid of her youthful Protestantism. She fully believed the doctrine which all, excepting the Jansenist clergy, preached; that liberty in religion was damnable; that the persecution of non-Catholics was praiseworthy, and that their suppression was for the sovereign a duty. Hence confiscation, imprisonment, deprivation of children, dragonades, and slavery in the galleys, are regarded by her with approval, or at least without protest. She has not a word to say when Lewis first promised Protestants a cessation of these enormities, and then persecuted them as severely as ever. In short, she remained the faithful disciple of her director Godet in all this, with one exception. He approved of compelling Protestants, who had been persecuted into apostasy, to attend mass and to receive the Sacrament. To her this seemed monstrous sacrilege. He admitted this; but said that the responsibility rested with those who required compulsion and not with those who employed it. A whole population could not be allowed to grow up in neglect of the chief ordinances of religion. She is, moreover, largely to blame for the bloody and ruinous war in the Cevennes, and it is a dark blot in her history. In this and other cases she and Lewis mutually incited one another.

The moral consequences were ruinous. Compelling people to deny their faith was fatal to religious rectitude. The Roman Catholics were barbarized and demoralized by the common spectacle of violence inflicted upon innocent people. The law courts, which had to sentence such people, ceased to command respect. All feelings of justice were outraged when thousands of men were sent to the galleys, merely for attempting to leave France, and were detained there after their sentence had expired, merely because they were Protestants. The clergy, who approved of such things, lost caste and influence. Their giving the Eucharist day by day to men who received it with repugnance and even disgust, had two effects on their own congregations. It made them despise the men who could thus profane the sacred things committed to their care; and it made them think much less of the sacred things which could be thus

profaned. The years 1685 and 1793 are more closely connected in the way of cause and effect than a superficial observer might suppose.

But it was the conversion of the King which Frances considered to be her highest and holiest task: his conversion from the dead faith and mechanical service, in which he rested, to a living faith, manifesting itself in love to God and man. She was the only person who could do anything with him in such matters, and she had but poor success. Although she believed that for this very purpose she had been raised so high, yet she feared that God considered her unworthy of so lofty a happiness. She says, and other intimates of Lewis confirm it, that the only religious motive which influenced him was the fear of hell. Bossuet once spoke to him of the necessity for the love of God in order to win forgiveness. This man of sixty years, who had been to confession over a hundred times, said that he had never heard of such a thing. The impression which his Spanish mother and first confessors made on him remained indelible. He carefully observed all externals. He recited prayers, kept fast-days, went to mass, wore relics, and avoided heretics. And he counted it as a good set-off for his sins that he observed rules, suppressed heterodoxy, and protected the Church. What his wife called holiness had no place in him. She often had to dry his tears during the disasters of the War of the Succession; but she never excited more than a transient emotion.

Her chief obstacle was Père La Chaise, the King's confessor, who, like his predecessors, Dinet, Paulin, Ferrier, and Annat, encouraged Lewis in his mechanical religion. He was a Jesuit; and the Jesuit doctrines of Probabilism and of the sufficiency of "attrition" exactly suited the King. Lewis allowed him to direct nearly all Church patronage, which gave him and his Order enormous influence with the clergy and nobility; for the younger sons in noble families commonly sought provision in the Church. Madame de Maintenon says that La Chaise debased the King's conscience, and that so long as he was at his side nothing could be hoped. But she gradually came to see that La Chaise was no worse than other Jesuits, and her abhorrence of him extended to the whole Order. The King's licentious brother once said in her presence that, no matter how viciously he lived, his Jesuit confessor always absolved him and urged him to communicate: and she said that it was conduct of this kind which made the Order so detested. She succeeded in getting the Jesuits excluded from Saint-Cyr; and with the help of public opinion and of the bishops, some of whom were beginning to hinder Jesuits from hearing confessions, she hoped to be able to fight the Order, especially for the possession of the King's soul.

In the assembly of clergy at St. Germain-en-Laye, in 1700, it was she who made it possible for the bishops to condemn the casuistry of the Jesuits and their doctrine of "attrition." Bossuet and she had worked together for weeks beforehand. In his eyes, the doctrine that the love of God was not necessary to salvation, was the most perilous heresy of the age, and had much to do with the increase of immorality. The bishops had collected a number of dangerous propositions out of the moral and doctrinal treatises of the Jesuits, and this time all the efforts of the Order were unable to prevent this teaching from being formally condemned. But it was Madame de Maintenon who obtained the King's consent to the condemnation, and then only on the condition that the Jesuits were not mentioned. Evidently he did not understand the question; otherwise he would never have allowed a condemnation of the principles which enabled his own confessor to grant him absolution.

Her Sulpician advisers told her that it was her duty to bring the King and the French Church into complete subjection to the Papal See. This involved a reversal of the four Gallican propositions in the famous

"Déclaration du Clergé," issued under Bossuet's guidance in 1682. Lewis had wavered in his attitude towards Rome. On the one hand, his ideal of absolute monarchy favoured the theory of an absolute and infallible Pope. On the other hand, Richelieu, Mazarin, and his own experience had taught him the practical dangers of such a theory. An infallible Pope could absolve subjects from their allegiance and depose sovereigns. His ministers, the Parliament, the jurists, and most French theologians were Gallican. But his wife was on the other side, and she could generally make Lewis distrust any influential Gallican by saying that he held Jansenist views. This she had no scruple in doing, when directed to do so by Godet. With a woman's instinct she found a doctrine, which was so offensive to theologians, jurists, statesmen, and historians, very convenient and comforting. She had her own infallible director: why should there not be one for the whole Church? She urged Lewis day by day to abandon the four propositions. He wanted to have the Pope's help in the Spanish succession, and so, in 1693, a compromise was arranged. The "Déclaration" was not to be cancelled, but it was not to be obligatory; and newly appointed bishops, without abjuring it, might make an act of submission to Rome. But the Gallican doctrine was still maintained; and as late as 1697 Lewis declared that he would not allow the infallibility to be taught in France. Public opinion, among both clergy and laity, was so strongly Gallican, that the Sulpicians and Jesuits did not dare openly to attack the "Déclaration." In Rome the French clergy were considered worse than German Protestants. But Gallicanism, though not openly assailed, was quietly circumvented. As a theory it was upheld; but practice was made to tell more and more in the opposite direction. An opportunity for this was afforded by the Jansenist controversy.

From 1650 onwards one may count all French people, who exhibited earnestness in religion and purity in life, as Jansenists. They kept away from Court, or were repelled from it and persecuted. For all that, Jansenism increased. Almost all ecclesiastical corporations and theological writers were Jansenist. Even in Rome Jansenism was strongly represented among the cardinals, who wrote to Paris and Louvain to encourage people to remain firm in spite of official condemnations. "No heresy," says Fénelon, "had cost the Church more cautions, warnings, and damnatory decrees; and yet all these seemed to have worse than no effect." And he lets us see the cause of this fruitlessness. With much emphasis, and thus far in entire agreement with the Jansenists themselves, he declares that no one (after sixty years of scolding and condemning) knew wherein exactly the erroneous doctrine consisted. Rome had steadily refused to define the true doctrine; and teaching, which it seemed to condemn in one form, was taught in Rome itself in different but equivalent words. In short, in both camps, the Jansenist and that of their Jesuit and Molinist opponents, the conviction was the same: that what was called Jansenism with regard to the doctrine of grace was an empty phantom. Heterodox Jansenism was identical with orthodox Thomism and Augustinianism. About that Fénelon and the Jesuits were as clear as Arnauld, Nicole, and Pascal. Even Innocent XI., and afterwards Benedict XIV., were of the same view. The later decisions of Benedict XIII. and XIV. left absolutely no doubt about it. But very powerful hierarchical interests were connected with this phantom. Rome would beat no retreat and confess no mistake. The Jesuits would not abandon a weapon with which during fifty years they had silenced numerous opponents and got possession of numerous schools. Rome, therefore, held fast to its policy of proscribing certain propositions as erroneous, without ever committing itself to any other propositions as true. What was wanted was, not acceptance of truth, but submission to

authority. Indirectly to compass the Infallibility—that was the end and aim of this unreal controversy.

Quesnel's devout and edifying "Réflexions Morales sur le N.T." was selected as the victim. Archbishop Noailles had approved the book, Bossuet had defended it, and it had a wide circulation. But Godet, Bishop of Chartres, Madame de Maintenon's oracle, found it heretical; and she says that he died of grief because his episcopal friends refused to condemn it. Already, in 1705, Clement XI. had taken the unheard-of step of sending the draft of the bull *Vineam Domini* to be revised by Lewis and his wife. This bull renewed the condemnation of the five propositions said to be contained in Jansen's book. Lewis now demanded a condemnation of Quesnel's, and the Pope consented on condition that Lewis did his utmost to make both clergy and laity submit. The bull *Unigenitus* condemned 101 propositions taken from the "Réflexions Morales" but in such a way as to leave the controversy in greater confusion than ever. It kindled a fire in the French Church which consumed its best material, and by the havoc which it made prepared the way for the Revolution. Yet Madame de Maintenon greeted the bull with a feeling of triumph. Her "saintly Bishop" Godet was dead, but his dearest wishes were fulfilled. The pestilential heresy had received its death-blow. Yet in thus sacrificing the best minds of France and the liberties of the French Church to the interested and empty charge of erroneous doctrine, she did more than all the mockery of Voltaire and the aggressiveness of the free-thinkers to bring on the Revolution, and to give it that anti-religious character which is one of its worst features, and which it still, in perhaps even an increased degree, continues to bear.

Hers is truly a tragic life. Her best hopes and plans were shattered, some of them before, and some of them after, her death: but shattered they all were. She saw her husband, who for thirty years had been the idol of France, go to his grave amid general execration, and his death was regarded as the salvation of the country. All her care for the royal princes had been in vain. Some had died, others gone to ruin, while her darling, the Duke of Maine, was shut out from the post which she had prepared for him. She had had to break with Fénelon about Quietism and with Noailles about Jansenism, and other friendships had had a similar end. Her efforts to convert her husband to a genuine Christianity remained fruitless. He remained the mechanical, self-satisfied Christian which his confessors had made him. Popes, bishops, and preachers had vied with one another in praising his piety and firmness in the faith, and she had followed them in promising success to his orthodox armies over their heretical opponents. When the orthodox armies were defeated, she felt her belief in a Providence shaken; but she recovered herself with the thought that these disasters were a punishment for the sins of the King and of the nation. Lewis himself admitted with tears that he had deserved such chastisement. But it never seems to have occurred to her that, in recommending him to recognise the Pretender and to persecute the Protestants, she had contributed as much as anyone to strengthen the Protestant powers and to make England supreme. As Fénelon said, "Despotism is the source of all our evils;" and it was precisely this fatal despotism which she had fostered. A few weeks before the King's death, she wrote to her spiritual director: "With the best intentions I have made so many mistakes that I dare not interfere in anything any more." Immediately afterwards she induced the King to make a will, in which the Duke of Orleans was made nominal Regent, but without any real power, while the constitution was violated by placing the children of Madame de Montespan in the succession to the crown. Parliament cancelled the will directly Lewis was dead.

Dr. Döllinger concludes these articles[1] with a comparison between Madame de Maintenon and the Empress Maria Theresa, decidedly to the advantage of the latter. Both were ornaments of their sex, combining a masculine spirit, understanding, and insight with all womanly virtues; but the one ruled through her own innate capacity, the other in the name of others whom she influenced, so that the Duke of Villeroi called her "the mole." Both practised, or too willingly sanctioned, persecution, and were zealous in the service of the Church. But the Frenchwoman, stifling her own judgment, surrendered herself absolutely to her directors; while the German allowed her confessor no influence in State affairs, and often disregarded his advice in ecclesiastical matters. Both suffered much, in that those who were nearest to them did not share their views—the one through her husband, the other through her son. Both mistook their wishes for hopes, and allowed their personal sympathies far too much play in politics, and both thereby have done much harm. But their position in history is very unequal. The memory of the great Empress is still blessed by millions, while that of the foundress of Saint-Cyr has long since died away.

ALFRED PLUMMER.

DURHAM, *November*, 1886.

ART. III.—NEW TESTAMENT SAINTS NOT COMMEMORATED.—LYDIA.

"THE kingdom of heaven is like to a grain of mustard-seed, which a man took and sowed in his field: which indeed is less than all seeds; but when it is grown, it is greater than the herbs, and becometh a tree, so that the birds of the heaven come and lodge in the branches thereof."[2] The kingdom of heaven, the Church of Christ in Europe, as it is to-day, and as it was on that memorable morning, when its message was first proclaimed and its earliest members were enrolled—what a striking exemplification of the parable does it afford! There was no synagogue at Philippi. Philippi was a military post, not a commercial town, and there was therefore

[1] The reader is requested to bear in mind that in this English summary six articles have been condensed into one, a process which does scant justice to the original. All who can do so should read the whole in the German. Mr. David Nutt, 270, Strand, would procure it.

[2] Matthew xiii. 31, 32, R.V.