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

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

ART. VI.—CHURCH AND STATE IN FRANCE.

1. *The Jesuits: their Constitution and Teaching.* By W. C. CARTWRIGHT, M.P. London: Murray. 1876.
2. *Comment l'Église Romaine n'est plus l'Église Catholique.* Par M. L'ABBÉ MICHAUD. Paris: Sandoz. 1872.
3. *The White Fields of France.* By H. BONAR, D.D. London: Nisbet. 1879.
4. *Histoire des Protestants de France.* Par G. M. FÉLICE. Sixième édition. Toulouse. 1874.
5. *Histoire du Synode Général de l'Église Reformée.* Par EUGÈNE BERSIER. Paris: Sandoz. 1872.
6. *La Crise Actuelle.* Par M. EMILE DE BONNECHOSE. Troisième édition. Paris: Meyrueis. 1868.
7. *Le Correspondant.* 1879.
8. *Le Signal.* 1879-80.

I.

IN a former Article we presented a historical review of the relations between Church and State in France during the past century. It must, however, not for a moment be lost sight of that the conflict between them is but the late manifestation of a struggle which has almost been perennial in France. With all her patronage and support of Rome, France was contending for her religious liberties in periods when by comparison England was contentedly Popish. A violent effort at the Reformation set us completely free. It was the misfortune of France, and of the world, that a declaration in favour of Protestantism, which might not have been quite impossible in the reign of Francis I., came to nothing.[1] It is hardly possible to imagine, so far as man can judge, what unnumbered wars would have been spared to mankind by a different result. Abandoning, however, such speculations, and reverting to the present, we have the fearful spectacle of two frightful antagonists contending for the mastery in France. Church and State there present themselves now in the horrible attitude of superstition and infidelity. Which will gain the mastery? How between them shall France attain to "God and Liberty"? We do not doubt that there are in that country many sorely perplexed partisans of neither extreme, who sigh like Falkland for "peace" in the midst of opposing factions. But how is their voice to make itself heard in the midst of the din and tumult of internecine war. With one con-

[1] The allusion is to the correspondence between Francis I. and Melancthon, in 1535.

sent all hold the present state of things, especially in the important matter of education, to be most unsatisfactory and dangerous. It does not suit the policy of either of the chief contending parties to proclaim the fact, but in reality the old conflict over the Gallican liberties is substantially resumed, to all appearance under very unfavourable circumstances for the Church. From the pressure of Rome, she, through her bishops and clergy, has for a long period ceased to struggle in any effective manner for these liberties. This task has devolved upon the laity almost exclusively. As French laymen are in too many cases very imperfectly under the influence of religious belief, their support of religious liberty is eccentric, and may be dangerous. Nevertheless, this is the real question at issue in France just now, as it was in the days of the Pragmatic Sanction. The opposition to Romish subjugation has passed out of the hands of kings and bishops into those of popular assemblies and tribunes of the people, out of those of religious men into those of sceptics and infidels.[1] It is hardly possible but that harm and loss will be gained. By common consent, therefore, although there is difference of opinion regarding the symptoms of the malady and the malady itself, there is disease in France in the vital matters of religion and education. "The whole head is sick, and the whole heart is faint." Some declare there is no God; others cry that there is no liberty. For the moment, apparently, the struggle of the patient has exhibited itself in favour of liberty rather than of "God." But this is not and cannot be a wholesome state. To whom then is France to look for remedy, and where is remedy to be found?

The first and most natural resource would be to call in the aid of the Church. Professedly the large majority of the French people still nominally adhere to Romanism as their creed. Multitudes are in such profound ignorance that they know of no other form of religion. We venture to assert that if the Church of France were in any measure or degree what the Church of England is, this would be not only the natural, but

[1] "L'exécrable journée de la Saint Barthélemy," dit M. de Chateaubriand, "ne fit que des martyrs; elle donna aux idées philosophiques un avantage qu'elles ne perdirent plus sur les idées religieuses, ainsi quelques millions de protestants de moins et plusieurs millions de philosophes ou d'incredules de plus. Voila le bilan de la Saint Barthélemy. Qu'est ce donc que les prêtres ont gagne à diminuer le nombre des disciples de Luther et de Calvin pour accroître celui des enfants de Montaigne et de Voltaire? Ils y'ont gagné la réaction anticatholique du dixhuitième siècle, les hostilités de l'assemblée constituante, les Massacres de l'Abbaye, les proscriptions de '93. Et quoi encore? l'esprit de notre époque. Cet esprit qui a passé de la France en Italie n'a pas dit sur le catholicisme son dernier mot."—De Félice, *Histoire des Protestants de France*, p. 228.

the expedient resource.[1] If the modern French Church sat loose to the trammels of the Papacy; if it had an independent and indigenous existence; if it were really national; if it set forward, even with partial admixture of corruption and error, the great saving truths of Christianity in a clear and saving manner; if it proclaimed and *used* the Bible as its great religious Charter; if it heartily recognised liberty of conscience and liberty of religious worship; if it kept clear of gross impostures and fanatical delusions, making no demands upon the human intellect inconsistent with Scripture and with reason, France might and France ought to commit her destinies to that which was once her Church. The Church of England is all this to us. The most enlightened men and the most ardent lovers of freedom can and do draw near to God through her medium. If they dissent from her doctrine and discipline, without let or hindrance, they follow out their religious convictions as they please. There is of course infidelity in England as there is also superstition, but neither of these is paramount. But what is the condition of the Church in France?[2] It is no longer the Church even of Fenelon and Bossuet. It may parade those great names, but it has no principles now in common with those which the latter, at any rate, so strenuously upheld. The Gallican liberties are as offensive to modern French prelates as they were dear to him.[3]

[1] In the *Correspondant* for July, 1879, l'Abbé Martin has an article on "L'Enseignement en Angleterre." It is disfigured with those astonishing blunders which Frenchmen habitually make concerning England. He asserts that children are brought up in England without religious teaching. He opines that there are several thousands of nuns in connection with the Church of England. The reply to the Abbé Martin is easy: if the Church with us had been to England what the Church in France has been to France, it would long since have ceased to exist as a national institution, it would not have been suffered to teach Englishmen.

[2] Even French ecclesiastics seem unable accurately to define this condition. Three Abbés have recently stated their views. M. l'Abbé Bougaud, Vicar-General of the Orleans Diocese, has published a pamphlet which has run through four editions, "Le grand péril de l'Église de France." M. l'Abbé Martin is controverting him in the *Nineteenth Century*. M. l'Abbé Michaud has undertaken to prove "Comment l'Église Romaine n'est plus l'Église Catholique." He maintains that it is neither one, nor holy, nor Catholic, nor apostolic, but that it is anti-Catholic and anti-Christian, its whole subtlety being (*singer Dieu*) to ape God. In all these three views there is truth. The Church in France is in great danger. It has made great exertions of late years to reassert its ancient dominion. As l'Abbè Martin explains, "regiments have been formed, troops have been disciplined, the ranks have been filled up, and an army has been formed." L'Abbé Michaud has demonstrated, with no ordinary force and ability, that the present Church in France, especially since the Vatican Council, is a compound of Judaism and Paganism rather than a true representation of Christianity.

[3] De Maistre describes Bossuet as the forerunner of the Jacobins, and the declaration of the Gallican liberties in 1682 as the cause of the death of Louis XVI. and the Terror!

It may be conceded that in episcopal palaces and in presbyteries there does exist jealousy of the regular clergy. A certain amount of hostility has ever and will ever prevail. But since the Restoration of the Monarchy in 1815, and notably during the last twenty years, the Church in France has been ultramontane and foreign, Papal and not French. Latterly, it is no exaggeration to say the Church in France, as, indeed, the Romish Church in all countries, is little other than the Order of Jesuits. As it has been admirably and most truly stated,

> Silently, but ruthlessly, that stealthy organization, which calls itself the Society of Jesus—in grim pursuit of what it calls the greater glory of God—has laid siege to, broken into, and razed those glorious and venerable sanctuaries, in Italy, in Germany, and above all, in France, whence, during generations, there had beamed forth across the wide plain of the Catholic world, with the calmly luminous glow of purified light, the mellow gleam of a religious sentiment, which did not divorce the fervour of Catholic piety from candid learning and heartfelt attachment to liberties, any more than it considered it essential for the triumph of the faith to propagate a belief in coarse superstitions, and to fortify the Church by a network of trickeries. Having succeeded step by step in outlawing every element that betrayed a policy for organic freedom, the Society of Jesus, in our time, has set the signature on their work by that momentous stroke in the Vatican Council, which has dogmatically identified the Church with the Order, and has practically transformed, at all events for the present, the organization of the former into an enlarged house of the latter.—*The Jesuits*, by W. C. Cartwright, M.P.

Recognising then the great truth that the State in France has now to do with Jesuitism, "pur et simple," it is necessary clearly to understand what the attitude of France towards the Jesuits has been. The originators of the Society were not Frenchmen, but Spaniards.[1] It was, however, in a small church on what were then "the lonely heights of Montmartre," where a large church is now being erected to the "Sacré cœur de Jesus," that in 1534 the first seven members laid the foundation of the Jesuit association. Whatever else the vast structure, when completed, may profess to commemorate, it will testify to the world that on that particular spot Jesuitism sprang into existence. In 1561 the Jesuits first obtained a legal footing in France. In 1594 they were sentenced to banishment from France, as corrupters of youth and enemies of the King and of the State. Ten years afterwards, through most discreditable influence, according to Saint Simon, they were, despite the strenuous opposition of the Parliament of Paris, restored by the peremptory order of Henri IV. "Assurez moi de ma vie" was the constant

[1] No Frenchman has ever yet been General of the Order of Jesuits.

answer of the king, who feared nothing "hormis le couteau Jesuitique." He perished by it. From a similar fear, Louis XIV., though ever struggling against them, chose his confessor from the Order. When Père la Chaise died, he selected the Père le Tellier to succeed him. "Il voulait vivre et vivre en sureté." Père la Chaise had warned him, "qu'un mauvais coup était bientôt fait et n'était pas sans exemple."[1] During the whole of his reign there was a struggle, and eventually a successful one, for Jesuit supremacy, in despite of the convictions and opposition of all well-wishers to their country. Through the confessional, and the hold which they obtained on public instruction; through their power and the wealth acquired by commercial enterprises of a most questionable character; by their learning and strenuous opposition to all which Rome deemed heresy; by the subtlety of their policy and the wonderful organization of their Society; finally, by their professed devotion to the Papacy, which they exalted by crushing not only the temporal power, but also the episcopal and general councils; they made themselves for nearly two centuries masters of the position. But, in so doing, they provoked relentless enemies. It is not too much to say that France never has forgiven them. Their favourite project was to establish the Inquisition there. When one of their chiefs (Père Lallemant) broached this project to the Marshal d'Estrées in the Abbey of St. Germain des Près, the Marshal, after listening to him for some time, told him that were it not for where they were he would have him thrown out of the window into the street.[2]

At length the day of retribution came. By an arrêt of Parliament, 1762, "the Jesuits were declared to be an institution from its nature inadmissible into any well-ordered (*policé*) state, as contrary to natural right, trespassing in all spiritual and temporal authority, and aiming at introducing into the Church and into States a political confederation, under the pretext of a religious institution, the essence of which consists in restless activity, by all sorts of underhand and public means, in order to obtain at first absolute independence, and then after that the usurpation of an authority." This embodies the deliberate judgment of France on the Jesuits. It is sometimes asserted that this is an obsolete decree. It was re-asserted in 1764; on the 13th of May, 1777; on the 18th of August, 1792; on the 3rd Messidor, an XII. (22 June,

[1] See "Mémoires de St. Simon," ch. ccxvi. for the whole of this most interesting historical anecdote.

[2] "Mémoires de St. Simon," ch. ccclxx. A similar proposition was made to the Duke by the Père du Halde, author of the "Lettres Edifiantes," and secretary of le Père le Tellier.

1802).[1] Similar proscription will be found in the Penal Code of 1810, and in the law of 10th April, 1834. In 1828, three educational establishments were closed by royal ordinance (June 13). In 1845, when the question was raised of the readmission of the Jesuit order, "the Chamber confiding in the Government—that it would insist upon the execution of the laws of the State," dismissed the question from consideration. At the present day and hour the law is in full force, and is likely to be enforced unsparingly. Upon this point, France has officially never changed or wavered. Through the supineness and connivance of successive governments the law has been evaded and defied, but it should be noted that each government which has been supine and conniving has fallen even though propped up with bayonets.[2] Now that to all practical intents and purposes Romanism and Jesuitism are convertible terms, is it probable that France would receive a remedy from such hands so odious to it and so persistently spurned?

Our conviction is, that if the Church in France could purge itself from complicity with Jesuit aggression and Jesuit intrigues it would not now be fighting a desperate battle for its own existence and for the instruction of the young. But since the Vatican Council that is impossible. Jesuitism could stir up France against Germany and lead it to Sedan, but the overthrow of the empire whose powers it wielded was only a conclusive step in the destruction of itself. It has now inextricably identified the Church with its own fortunes. May not the Church be involved in one common ruin with the Order? It is a further question whether, if France did not resist Jesuit aggression till the death, would she have any hope of liberty. If she delivered over the rising generation to ecclesiastics who can only speak and act at the volition and monition of Jesuits, what would be her hope for the future? Are the doctrines of the Syllabus to be the rule for French consciences? Can French bishops or French priests teach outside these fatal propositions, the handiwork of the Jesuit faction? At present there is in France fierce rebellion against the pressure of the Church; war with it and hatred towards priests; there are terrible aberrations

[1] L'Abbé Sicard has an article in the *Correspondant*, "La Question de l'Enseignement et les Congrégations religieuses au dernier siècle." He admits the expulsion of the Jesuits in 1762, but totally pretermits all mention of the successive confirmations of this expulsion during the subsequent portion of the century. The purport of his article is to show that Frenchmen of all classes wished them back again. This desire, if it existed, exhibited itself in fresh decrees against them!

[2] Le clergé, assisté de Louis Philippe, de M. de Broglie, et des magistrats a vaincu l'Université—M. Leon de Faucher, à M. Henry Reeve, 7 May, 1844. In July, 1848, Louis Philippe, as he himself said, just like Charles X., landed at Newhaven as Mr. Smith.

in religious matters. And how are these met on the part of the Church? By Peter's pence, by pilgrimages to ridiculous centres, by mystical associations, by attempts futile enough, such as banquets and religious demonstrations, by revolting teaching degrading to the intellect and morals of the nation. But will these heal the hurt? There has not in the recent action of Jesuitism, which is the propelling influence of the Church of Rome, been the slightest attempt at finding means to reconcile faith and morality with the great development of reason, and with the new social and civil conditions of nations.[1] Complete and entire subjugation of the conscience and the intellect is the inexorable claim preferred. To this, it is certain, France will not submit. Her instinct teaches her statesmen that they have not to do with Frenchmen, but with a foreign power over which they have no real control. It was no idle assertion of M. Dupin in 1845 that "the most characteristic trait of the French people is its antipathy for everything which bears the name or recalls the doctrines and practices of the Jesuits." Until the Roman Church in France can and will resolve itself into a distinctly national church, casting off Jesuitism openly and really, as a serpent casts its slough, the intellect and the statesmanship of France will be hostile to it.[2] No power but

[1] On the contrary, as Mr. Gladstone truly maintains, "the extreme claims of the Middle Ages have been sanctioned and have been revived without the warrant or excuse which might in these ages have been shown for them."

[2] The distinction between Romanism and Jesuitism, existed once in France. But from the very outset of the introduction of the Order there was danger of the two being confounded. So far back as the reign of Henry IV. that king felt it necessary to explain to the Parliament of Paris (1599), even then mistrustful of Jesuitism, "Je suis catholique, roi catholique, catholique romain, *non catholique Jésuite*. Je connais les catholiques Jésuites; je ne suis pas de l'humeur de ces gens là; ni de leur semblables." It may be worth while noting that in 1715 Father Jouvency, a Jesuit, wrote a Latin history of the Company. In it he ennobled as saints of the first rank, and as martyrs deserving public worship, Jesuits most abhorred for the furious disorders of the League, for the Gunpowder Plot, and for the conspiracies against the life of Henry IV. He maintains the superiority of the Pope over the temporal power of kings, his right to absolve subjects from their fealty, finally, that which is received as a dogma among them the right of killing tyrants, that is, kings inconvenient to them. This book was "muni de l'approbation de ses supérieurs." The Parliament was anxious to do its duty, but Louis XIV. "aima mieux tout passer aux jésuites que de les irriter au hasard des poignards." The book was therefore suppressed, without being burned by the hangman as the Parliament wished. The three superiors of Jesuit establishments in Paris were brought before the Parliament and admonished. So the affair was hushed up "à l'indignation du public, et au frémissement du parlement à qui le roi mit un baillon à la bouche." See "Mémoires de St. Simon," ch. cccxl. Compare the present different attempts made in England to rehabilitate some of those Jesuit martyrs.

force will inflict it upon the nation. Then would it groan and heave under it as Enceladus under Ætna. As it is impossible now-a-days to consider Romanism, much less Gallicanism, apart from Jesuitism, we look in vain to that ecclesiastical system for a remedy of the ills of France. Jesuitism, with all its subtle dialectics, can never delude the people into the notion that it can reconcile for them God and liberty. Even if there were value in its teaching concerning "God," it never can, nor does, refrain from crushing "liberty" when it has the remotest chance of doing so. Its hatred of liberty is what the rattle is to the snake. It warns those who meddle with it of approaching death. Plainly, if there is to be healing for France it must proceed from some other source.

II.

The next appeal for help would naturally be to French Protestantism, which is now the designation of the old Huguenot Church. If glorious memories, if countless martyrdoms, if persevering zeal for God and liberty, maintained through centuries, if present intelligence and political influence, wholly disproportioned to its diminished numbers,[1] could bring sufficient remedy, French Protestantism might be an important factor. No one can in thought recur to its history in the past without being conscious of the wonderful power for reconciling God and liberty that a Church has, which makes the Bible its Magna Charta, so long as it retains its faith in the Word of God complete and unimpaired. In this respect the Huguenot Church is not solitary, but it is a conspicuous instance of it. Belief in the truths of revelation, in the supernatural as well as its moral teaching of Holy Scripture, enabled the Huguenots, though crushed to the earth by brutal force most relentlessly exercised, still to resist and to survive. It was the one arm on which French Protestantism had to rely subsequent to the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, the most glorious period of the Huguenot Church. It was the rod and the staff which Rome could not wrench from them, and which comforted them when walking for a century through the valley of the shadow of death. When the revolutionary era arrived there was a remnant left, both in France and in the countries among which the exiles had been scattered. French Protestantism in '93 contributed more than its quota of victims to the Reign of Terror. One circumstance is so remarkable that it deserves a record here. The delegate of the Convention in the

[1] The Protestant population of France has been variously estimated. By the census of 1866 there were 1,591,250 Protestants. This official statement, however, considerably exceeds the returns made by the synods and consistories. They would not have estimated the number at a million. Since that period, too, there has been the loss of Alsace and Lorraine,

Department of the Gard, on the 16 Prairial au 11 (4 June, 1793), published a decree ordering priests and pastors to withdraw within eight days twenty leagues from the places where they had ministered. He did not trouble himself to draw it up, but simply transcribed an ordinance found in the office and dictated by the Jesuits in the reign of Louis XIV! It was only in the Consulate of Buonaparte that Protestantism in France can be said to have enjoyed peace and freedom. It then began to cease from a trembling heart and failing of eyes and sorrow of mind; its life no longer hung in doubt, and it had assurance of life. But the liberty accorded it was only liberty of existence. There was no persecution; no violence from any quarter; full and continuous security. But it was internal liberty walled-up, so to speak, within the temples. All sound, all religious movement, was strictly prohibited. There could be neither journals, nor associations, nor controversy, nor proselytism; if there was the slightest idea or attempt at transgressing the boundaries in which religion was imprisoned the iron hand of Napoleon instantly drove it back.[1] A Catholic village wished to join the Reformed Church. The minister went to visit it. He found himself immediately confronted with the Government and had to retire. During the fourteen years of the Consulate and Empire French Protestantism has no history. After the Restoration, with the exception of fanatical outbreaks in the south, for which neither the Government nor the ecclesiastical authorities are fairly responsible, Protestants were not subjected to violence, but attempts were made at insisting upon compulsory conformity with Romish ceremonies in their judgment idolatrous; no kind of liberty of proselytism was tolerated, although violent controversial attacks on Protestantism were encouraged. During the period of the Monarchy of July there was little improvement. Still Protestantism somewhat increased, but until the present time there has been too much truth in the assertion that "*la plupart des Français ont trop peu de foi pour changer de religion.*" M. de Félice said with sorrow, and only with too much truth, that no government whatever in France has yet known how to practise religious liberty thoroughly, "on est libre chez nous d'être incrédule; on n'est pas encore pleinement libre de proclamer sa foi et de célébrer son culte selon sa conscience." This was written in 1861.

This brief historical review of the recent history of Protestantism is necessary to explain the reason why little hope of remedy can be expected for France from its own Protestantism. Never, since it first arose, and was for a season an armed power capable of self-assertion, has it been in a condition to pro-

[1] Félice, "Histoire des Protestants de France," p. 607.

selytize. So rigid was the subsequent surveillance exercised over it that its utmost efforts were concentrated on self-preservation. It is not difficult therefore to understand the value which Rome places on persecution. When from the period of Napoleon to the present time Protestantism could exist freely, still it was hemmed in systematically within its own limits. A limb or a faculty permanently disused gradually decays and becomes withered up and enfeebled. It is often a charge urged against French Protestantism that is not proselytizing. There have been periods in its history when it was so in an eminent degree. In the days of Lefèvre, of Farel, of Calvin, there was no lack of proselytism in France and beyond its borders. It ought to have been more so since the fury of persecution was restrained. But just allowance should be made for the external difficulties with which it has had to contend. Until the present time it has always been face to face with a jealous and relentless foe, wielding directly or indirectly the power of the State.

Still, French Protestantism would, during the last fifty years have been exercising immense influence if it had not had to contend with more insidious adversaries than even Napoleon's iron hand or Jesuit intrigue against it. If it had not left "its first love" after all it had borne for Christ's sake, life would, nay must, have gone forth from it to all around. But its situation was disastrous. In the midst of persecution it had been a witness for God. It then sorely needed liberty. But who were the apostles of liberty in France? Nor the church, nor the State. The philosophers of the eighteenth century—like Voltaire and Rousseau, either sceptical and profane, or sentimental and deistical—had usurped, in the absence of its proper upholders, the guardianship and propagation of liberty. It was from them alone, not that there was any religious sympathy, that the down-trodden Huguenots experienced common humanity and protection from persecution. The reflex action of this spurious philosophy was as disastrous upon the Huguenot Church as it was in England and Scotland, where it originated with Bolingbroke and Hume. Like Robertson and Blair, the few French pastors that were left "preached commonplaces about morality and natural religion, leaving almost in total eclipse the great doctrines of sin and salvation." Nor had the French Reformed Church for a long time either the means or the opportunity of revival. There was no Venn, or Wesley, to stir the mantling pools of stagnant water and to impart fresh life and vigour to them. Still there was no formal divergence of opinion. The supreme authority of Holy Scripture was admitted by all, nor were any of the supernatural incidents of Holy Scriptures called in question. Dogma was insisted upon by some, but more as barren

orthodoxy than as living principle, while morality and sentiment were the substantial creed of a powerful section.

Had the way been open for French Protestantism to proselytism either at home or abroad, it might, if not altogether exempt from internal differences, yet have been less a prey to them than has unfortunately been the case. But this was not so. France has no colonial empire, and very meagre relations with heathen countries in any quarter of the globe. Even Rome, which finds through Jesuit organization its chief missionary instrument in French agency, can from this cause accomplish comparatively little that is permanent and influential. There are some valuable missions of French Protestantism in South Africa, but on a very limited scale. In default of the legitimate outlets for religious zeal, questions of what are termed in France methodism and rationalism—questions not unknown among ourselves—have largely occupied the attention of French Protestants. Separation between Church and State has not unnaturally been much discussed. From the peculiarity of their position, they do not approach the consideration of this last question either as English Churchmen or English Nonconformists do. Since 1830 there has been a violent controversy going on as to whether confessions of faith are essential to the existence of a church. Some hold that there can be no church, in the true acceptation of the term, when the pulpit is open to contradictory teaching; others argue that Protestantism cannot submit to a rule which does not allow each person to form his own belief for himself with his Bible in his hand. Not content, however, with this, many of this latter party have identified themselves with the Tubingen school. In the Bible they affect to discover sublime truths and incomparable pages of history mixed up with gross errors and absurd legends. With the inspiration of the Bible, the Divinity of our Lord and his work of redemption disappear. Jesus Christ is no longer the Son of God; he is the chief of wise men; he taught that God is the Father of all mankind by precept, and also by his spotless life. It is with these conflicting opinions that French Protestantism is rent asunder, and is likely to divide itself into two distinct churches. In one of these there will be what is supposed to be liberty; in the other there will be God. How this conflict has operated may be gathered from the treatment of M. Adolphe Monod. With the utmost fervour, some years ago, he taught the need of repentance, of conversion, of salvation by the Cross of Christ alone. He inveighed against indiscriminate communion. He was in consequence arraigned before the Consistory of Lyons for having troubled the Church by attacking the noblest, the most difficult, the most holy of all religions—the religion of good works dictated by the conscience. In his defence M. Monod alleged

that his teaching was in all respects conformable to the constant teaching of Reformed Churches, and especially to that of the Confession of Rochelle. He admitted the impossibility of the two systems continuing in the same Church. But he argued that the doctrine of grace was the doctrine of the Reformed Church of France, "qu'elle est chez elle, qu'elle doit y rester," and that it was for the doctrine of works, "à sortir!" The reply made to this was, the Confession of La Rochelle was, and had been, obsolete (*tombée en désuétude*); that it was incompatible with modern customs and ideas; that the Government had negotiated with the Church of 1802, not that of 1571. By a royal ordinance in 1832, in accordance with the sentence of the Consistory, M. Monod was deprived.

What, then, is the actual condition of the French Protestant Church? A brief account of the Synods of 1873-4 will form the best reply. During the last hours of the Second Empire authority was on the point of being obtained from M. Ollivier's Government for the convening of a Synod. But the war with Germany broke out. It was, therefore, under the Government of M. Thiers that, after the lapse of two hundred years, the Reformed Church was placed in possession once more of its ancient institutions, and became mistress of its own destiny. This was due to the perseverance of the evangelical section of the Church; it is, therefore, some proof of its power and vitality. What was termed the Liberal party beforehand contested the authority of the Synod in matters of faith. Three important questions occupied the attention of the assembly—the legality and powers (attributions) of the Synod; a declaration of faith; ecclesiastical organization. It is with the declaration only that we concern ourselves. It proclaimed, in conformity with the confession of La Rochelle and all the Reformation Churches, "the supreme authority of Holy Scripture in matters of faith and salvation by faith in Jesus Christ, the only Son of God, who died for our sins and rose again for our justification." It retained, as the basis of its teaching, its worship and discipline, the great Christian facts represented in its religious solemnities and expressed in its liturgies, especially in the Confession of Sins, in the Apostles' Creed, and in the Order for Administration of the Lord's Supper. The chief struggle in the debate was over the doctrine of the Resurrection. The Confession was finally carried by a distinct majority. By the adoption of this Confession the Reformed Church, whatever may be the objects of individual members, has constituted itself nominally an orthodox church. Adherence to it will necessarily involve the purging out of the harm of rationalism. For it cannot be said of this last Confession that it is an obsolete formulary of the past. It is an emphatic protest against the

most marked peculiarities of the misnamed liberal school.[1] In the Confession there is a principle of hope, a future of life. There may be hope, but can it be said that there is life? With much regret we doubt it. We are disposed with M. Bonnechose to think that the persecutions of the past have been less fatal to the Reformed Church than its recent state of division and dependence. In 1868 he summed up the situation, "Au dedans le chaos; au dehors, et pour l'empêcher de sortir, une étroite compression." If that had continued, this eminent man predicted that the end would be death, not life. The Protestant Church has now liberty. Its first use of it has been good and wise. But will that suffice? There is a symptom that the doctrines of grace expelled with M. Monod are re-asserting themselves. But when we consider the actual condition of the Church, hardly emerging out of terrible conflict in the past, and now sorely wounded in the house of her friends, we cannot but feel that, instead of helping others, she needs help herself, and that the prospects of remedy from this quarter are at present faint indeed.

III.

We hardly know whether it is worth while to dwell at all upon the recent movement inaugurated by M. Loyson (Père Hyacinthe). It has attracted some notice in ecclesiastical circles in England, if indeed it has not really originated here. Whatever importance it possesses is due to some distinguished patronage and to the zeal and abilities of M. Loyson himself. The whole thing savours very much of a private speculation, and seems little calculated to affect the community. Perhaps unconsciously it reproduces some of the features of that movement which was the precursor of the French Reformation carried on by Lefèvre, Briçonnet of Meaux, and Margaret of Navarre. We would rejoice if it were likely to be productive of as much result for good as that did. This, however, seems highly improbable. It is not by a species of homœopathic treatment, consisting in mitigated Popery without the Pope, that the spiritual condition of France is to be regenerated, "Latet ulcus." No superficial modification of existing abuses will reach the seat of the malady. A fresh arrangement of forms

[1] "Vouloir, comme les amis de l'école nouvelle veulent, qu'au sein d'un même corps, d'une même société religieuse, formée pour l'enseignement, l'édification, et la prière, on prêche et on enseigne les doctrines le plus opposées, dont les une soffenseront la conscience indignée de ceux-ci, et dont les autres provoqueront le dédain de ceux-là, c'est vouloir, non la paix, non la charité et l'amour, mais la discorde et la guerre. . . . . Exiger cela ce n'est pas la tolérance, ce n'est pas de la liberté, c'est du pur despotisme."—*La Crise Actuelle*, par M. de Bonnechose.

and ceremonies, lopping off some of the worst excrescences of vulgar superstition, the restoration of the cup to the laity, a married priesthood, are all steps in the right direction; but some of these things are especially offensive to Romanists, and there is the retention of too much to interest Protestants. We in England acknowledge the value of these improvements on the Romish system, but if this is all we had our gain would not be very great. It is the Protestant and Evangelical element infused into our Church at the Reformation which constitutes its strength. If it had been merely an improved ecclesiastical system, with some of the worst corruptions of Rome removed, it would not have survived the shocks to which it has been exposed, nor would it have been found in accordance with English conceptions of liberty and of God. Assuredly the project will not meet the necessities of France. It may serve as a plaything for dilettante antiquarians, who would like to see a Gallican Church restored, although they have little conception of what that was. But even they have little heart in it. Some who have promoted it have misgivings as to whether after all, upon their own theories, they are doing quite right. The scheme itself has no root in the affections or sympathies of any class of the community in France. It will be matter of much surprise if it does not pass away, perhaps even before the founder, without having done either harm or much good to anybody.[1]

But is there any other resource? are there any other means by which there can be reconcilement between "God and Liberty" in France?

(To be continued.)

ART. VII.—HENRY VENN.

Memoir of the Rev. H. Venn.—The Missionary Secretariat of Henry Venn, B.D., Prebendary of St. Paul's, and Honorary Secretary of the Church Missionary Society. By the Rev. WILLIAM KNIGHT, M.A., Rector of Pitt Portion, Tiverton, and formerly Secretary of the C.M.S. *With an Introductory Biographical Chapter and a Notice of West African Commerce,* by his Sons, the Rev. JOHN VENN, M.A., Senior Fellow of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge, and the Rev. HENRY VENN, M.A., Rector of Clare Portion, Tiverton. pp. 550. Longmans, Green & Co. 1880.

HENRY VENN, whose Memoir is now published, was born at Clapham, of which parish his father, the Rev. John

[1] Since this was written some discreditable revelations which have come to light confirm this augury.