

sufficient grace deserts no man, and the stamp of baptism always remains. The repentant sinner is always welcome to His divine arms. There has been, as it were, a partial divorce between him and his Redeemer; something like the divorce from bed and board which may take place among married Christians. The blessing of Christ is on the married couple from the beginning; the ring that symbolizes their union is blessed, and abundant graces are showered on them through the sacrament, enabling them to bring up their children in the fear and love of God. This is the only doctrine that will sanctify the family and save the State; and this is the doctrine of the Holy Catholic Church alone.

THE CHURCH OF FRANCE AND THE REVOLUTION.

The Gallican Church; a History of the Church of France from the Concordat of Bologna, 1516, to the Revolution. W. Henley Jervis, Canon, etc. London, Murray, 2 vols., 8vo., 1882.

History of France. W. H. Jervis. London, Murray, 1882.

State of Society in France before the Revolution and the Causes that Led to that Event. De A. Tocqueville; translated by Henry Reese. London, Murray, 1882.

Les Origines de la France Contemporaine. H. Taine. Paris, Calmann Levy, 1880, 2 vols.

The French Revolution. H. Taine. London, Daldy & Co., 1881, 3 vols.

“THE history of the Papacy is the martyrology of nations!” exclaimed the Abbé Grégoire, in one of his petulant diatribes against the authority of the Holy See. The definition would have been more just and accurate had he put it thus: “The history of nations is the martyrology of the Papacy.”

The one has, in truth, been so bound up with the other that the narrative of the world's wars and revolutions, its struggles and triumphs, the rise and progress and decay of its dynasties, from the Christian era to our own time, might be written as a running corollary on the margin of the history of the Papacy. The destinies of both have been so closely interwoven that the records of the one cannot be fully written without including the records of the other, and nowhere has this solidarity been so strikingly exempli-

fied as in the annals of the nation that long gloried in the title of "eldest daughter of the Church." France, above every other country, for centuries so identified her interests with those of Christianity, that her very existence came to depend in a measure on the maintenance of this union, and, therefore, it followed that whenever she fell out with the Church the disagreement partook of the nature of a conjugal quarrel, bitter, personal, ending in that rancorous hatred which comes with the violent rupture of a sacred natural bond. Her quarrels with the Church have invariably turned to direct rebellion against God, to defiant upheaving against His law, and a satanic effort to break and abolish His authority.

The Revolution opened its campaign by a legitimate charge against the higher clergy; but this specious pretext soon proved to be a mere feint and the starting-point of a fierce and wholesale attack upon religion itself, which was speedily to culminate in the savage slaughter of numbers amongst that section of the clergy against whom the reformers avowedly had no grievance, a crime which in its turn was the prelude to an act of blasphemy unparalleled in the history of peoples. When the Convention passed a decree denying the existence of "one named God," the Revolution reached that point where its excesses recoiled upon itself.

Mr. Jervis, in the preface of his remarkable work on the Revolution and the Church,¹ boldly challenges M. Thiers's assertion that the National Assembly aimed only at reforming abuses, that it made no aggression upon the spiritual or ecclesiastical power, but confined its action to legislating for temporal reforms. This misrepresentation was sedulously propagated by the would-be reformers of the time, and has been maintained ever since by the apologists of the Revolution, who fail to perceive that the Assembly of '89 began by assailing the relations of the Church with the State, and attacking points of doctrine, thus provoking the schism that sundered the Church of France at that period, and has remained an ill-closed wound up to our own day.

Mirabeau, more honest, or, at any rate, more clear-sighted than the rest of his colleagues, bluntly told them that "if they wished to have a revolution they must begin by decatholicizing France."

This work of decatholicization was, according to Mr. Jervis, begun by, or, at any rate, within the Church herself. It strikes us that he very much exaggerates the importance of the incident on which he lays his heavy charge, namely, the petition of the lower clergy for the redress of some of their grievances against the higher. The clergy of all ranks had a perfect right to petition the crown, its relations with the Church being what they were at that period, filial, friendly, and chivalrous. The curés were conse-

¹ *The Gallican Church and the Revolution.* (Kegan Paul.)

quently guilty of no disloyal act when they appealed to the king to alleviate the unjust and vexatious burdens which pressed upon them. They had a right to petition the crown for redress against the temporal irregularities imposed upon them by those prelates and abbots whose wealth and luxury had become a scandal to the faithful, whose large emoluments, drawn for the most part from sinecures, were a crying injustice which weighed heavily on the zealous, overworked, and ill-paid priesthood. That the coincidence of this appeal with the first mutterings of the Revolution was in itself unfortunate and may have been ill-advised, we are ready to admit, but we cannot accept that it sounded the signal and led the way to that attack upon the Church of France which ended in its overthrow. The breach between the higher and the lower clergy was no doubt doubly to be regretted at a crisis when the ancient order of things, ecclesiastical and civil, was about to stand its trial before the nation; but, deeper down than this misunderstanding, there were causes within the Church of France which were imperilling its very existence. Foremost amongst these was Jansenism, an organic disease which had long been a dissolving agency at work enfeebling and dividing it. From a mere theological controversy, Jansenism had worked its way into the domain of politics and was now a distinct element in the approaching Revolution, though a far less powerful element than Protestant historians are apt to suppose. The Jansenists had been crushed under the two preceding reigns, but they had not been killed or extinguished even by the Bull *Unigenitus*; they were still a faction, a smouldering fire, ready to be fanned into a flame by the first blast of the Revolution. The moment it broke out they threw themselves into it with passionate enthusiasm. Their influence, however, at this crisis has been considerably overrated. Even had they risen above sectarian ambitions and revenges, and sacrificed their personal cause to the interest of the Church, they were not powerful enough to arrest the onset of the Revolution and its ruinous results. The heart of the nation never went over to the Jansenists; their doctrines had never become "popular." Then, as now, the nation was divided, roughly speaking, into two classes, orthodox Catholics and unbelievers. Jansenism was not indigenous to the soil; it was an imported growth that flourished only within a certain radius and under conditions that were not indigenous. The fact, nevertheless, remains, that the Jansenists were a power in the National Assembly, and that they lent a strong hand to the ruin of the Church by throwing their weight on the side of the Left, composed chiefly then, as in the Chamber of to-day, of atheists, fanatics, and adventurers, including *ninety-nine degraded priests*. The rôle of the Jansenists under the Revolution was precisely that

which is being enacted in the present day by a handful of *prêtres défroqués* in France, in Germany, and in Switzerland. The groups of ecclesiastical *révoltés* in league with the Jacobins of '93 has its prototype in every age; it is always the same type, the same secret springs setting in motion the same machinery. Men who, finding the yoke of the perfect life intolerable to their hungry, rebellious passions, break loose from it and pair with the enemies of the Church in representing that yoke as odious, dangerous, and contemptible, and in vilifying the ideal they have betrayed; Doms Gerles, who first dishonor and cast off their monastic habit, and then join with the Jacobins of the day in attacking the doctrine and discipline of the Church, trading on the ignorance and the prejudices of those who hate her, sowing discord amongst souls, and making capital out of their knowledge of sacred science and their familiarity with sacred subjects.

Like all factions in white heat of rebellion, the Jansenists were to a great extent blind to the ultimate issue of the onset in which they joined; but the leaders of that onset had a perfectly clear view of their purpose, which was to deprive the Church of her temporal pre-eminence, to humiliate and bring her into bondage to the State, and thus more effectually to attack her essential power and uproot that indigenous plant of Catholicity which the Revolution of all periods has rightly enough regarded as the greatest obstacle in its path. The Assembly, however, was too clear-sighted to proclaim openly this clause in its programme. It knew well that, for all their outcry against the higher clergy and the feudal system still in force in their temporal estate, the mass of the people were at heart loyal to the Church, and that any direct attack upon her would alarm the national susceptibilities and throw national sympathy on the other side. It therefore went cautiously to work, keeping its batteries covered until the moment should arrive for unmasking them with safety and effect. This opportunity came in the form of an ecclesiastical committee, which was appointed for the purpose of redressing the grievances of the inferior clergy and reforming the organization of the Church generally.

The leading spirits of this committee were Treilhard, a barrister and a Jansenist; Camus, the bitterest of Jansenist leaders; the Abbé Grégoire, curé of a parish in Lorraine, a man of unimpeachable integrity in private life, but of more than doubtful orthodoxy. The Assembly named some men, such as Bishop Borel, by way of a blind to public opinion, but the presence of the three first-named sufficiently proved what the drift and aim of the committee was intended to be. The members themselves were not in accord; they started from different points and had different goals in view; they were consequently not qualified to work in harmony or op-

pose a firm and united front to the attack which was advancing with the formidable strength of union.

But however much the committee lacked in the main this force of united action, it was fully united on one point, which was to strike at the authority of the Holy See by establishing the independence of the Gallican Church. It started by demanding the restriction of the Papal prerogative of instituting bishops, a prerogative which dated, not, as is often erroneously supposed, from the Concordat of 1516, but from the earliest days of the Church. The right of institution always belonged to the Pope, the only difference being that in primitive times the bishops were elected by the faithful, and later on by the chapters, until in 1516 the right of presenting the bishops for institution was ceded by the chapters to the sovereign, and secured to him by the Concordat passed between Leo X. and Francis I.

Another hostile step of the committee was the attempt to raise the position of the lower clergy at the expense of that of the higher, demanding that the bishops, abbots, etc., should be reduced to an inferior social standing by being deprived of their revenues and those vast endowments which dated from mediæval times.

The fact that abuses existed is undeniable; the need for some reform was manifest; but when historians assert that this need was among the main causes, some go so far as to say the chief factor in the Revolution, they lay themselves open to the charge of gross exaggeration and historical inaccuracy. M. de Tocqueville, an authorized witness quoted by Mr. Jervis, declares as the result of his own patient and searching investigations, that "there never was a body of clergy in the world more remarkable than the Catholic clergy of France at the moment when they were surprised by the Revolution," and he adds that, after entering on the study of the subject full of prejudices, he left it off full of respect.

The committee had not been many months in operation, when the Assembly, emboldened by the hostility excited in the public mind against the Church by that party whose interest it was to inflame it, gave expression to its own animosity by a series of decrees which no longer left any doubt as to its veritable aim. The proletarian revolt of August was followed by a vote of confiscation of the feudal privileges of the higher clergy, and soon after this the proposed Declaration of the Rights of Man gave rise to a debate as to whether or not the document should begin by any recognition of the Providence of God. This trumpet call at least gave forth no uncertain sound. The clergy, thoroughly alarmed, rose to the defence in the Assembly. The Abbé Grégoire declared that to omit such a recognition would be to expose France to the reprobation of civilized Europe. The phrase was eventually adopted, but the

discussion marked a new date in the attitude and tone of the Assembly. From this time forth, a great change was visible, outbreaks of democratic violence became frequent, and were characterized on the part of the popular leaders by a determination to bring the Church and the clergy into odium. The clerical deputies were insulted on their way to the Assembly, and the Abbé Grégoire complained from the tribune that the curés who were the first to prove their disinterested desire for reforms, by abandoning the titles and supporting the law for the abolition of plurality of benefices, "were day after day outraged by the populace in the streets of Paris." But this protest was drowned in the roar of the battle, which had begun in terrible earnest. The house was now at open war with the Church. The priests were panic-stricken. Many sought safety betimes in flight, seeing that the tide was rising and flight would soon become impossible.

Amongst the crowd of maniacs and mediocrities who held the stage of the Revolution at this period, the figure of Talleyrand stands out like the hero in some sanguinary and brutal romance, a distinct and picturesque individuality, a man nobly born and allied to the oldest houses in France, possessed of large wealth and enjoying a high position in the Church, into which he had been forced without the shadow of vocation. The venerable Abbé Devoucoux, vicar of Autun, Talleyrand's future See, relates how he had heard his brother priests of St. Sulpice speak with anguish of having had to take a part in the ordination of the young nobleman. "We have often heard eye-witnesses declare," he says, "that it was a source of harrowing torture to the director of St. Sulpice, to whom fell the mission, of preparing the heart of the Abbé Talleyrand for the awful ministry that he was assuming, without apparently attaching any particular importance to it." The highest offices and emoluments were at once given to this unlikely minister of the gospel, who as Bishop of Autun stood forward in the Assembly to vilify and despoil his own order and reduce them to the condition of State menials. But Talleyrand possessed that supreme instinct of the politician which taught him to detect, with prophetic certainty, the issue of the rising storm and of changes yet undeveloped. He saw how the fight was going and where his best interests lay, and he made it unhesitatingly his goal, careless of principle, of every consideration but personal gain. The Revolution seized on him as an invaluable instrument. His position, his birth and fortune, his brilliant art and acquirements gave an air of entire disinterestedness, almost of heroism, to his rebellion against a régime which favored him so abundantly, and lent a weight to his utterances quite apart from their real value.

When the debate on Mirabeau's motion for disendowment

came on, in October, 1789, Talleyrand was one of its most ardent and powerful supporters.

Camus, the Jansenist, stood forward, on the other hand, to defend the beleaguered clergy, and his defence was followed by an eloquent and telling speech from the Abbé Maury, their accredited champion. "Our possessions guarantee yours," he said. "We are attacked to-day, but if we are victimized now, it will not be long before you become the prey of the spoiler." Pending the decree for the confiscation of Church property, the Assembly dealt a heavy blow at the liberty of the Church. One week after this stormy debate, the abolition of religious vows in convents of both sexes was proposed, and, contrary to rule and precedent, carried at the same sitting.

The week after this, a mob of armed miscreants surrounded the Archbishop's palace and gave the hesitating legislators within to understand that they were expected to proceed to the business of spoliation without further delay. This act of terrorism, backed by Mirabeau's clever tactics and weight in the Assembly, had the desired effect. The public vote of confiscation of Church property was passed. Well might the Abbé Maury cry out in despair, "There is truly no despotism so terrible as that which puts on the mask of liberty."

Treilhard, who was working actively in the Ecclesiastical Commission, pushed on his advantage by proposing that convents and monasteries should be suppressed in all the larger towns, and only allowed to stand in villages or remote places where they were of use to the population, whereas the revenues of those in towns would be more useful to the State by helping to shake off the spectre of bankruptcy to which Mirabeau pointed in his memorable speech. The final debate on the disposal of ecclesiastical property gave rise, however, to an incident which showed that the full and true animus of the majority was directed not against the wealth of the clergy, or the abuses which had grown out of it, but against religion itself.

Dom Gerle, a member of the Ecclesiastical Committee, rose before the Assembly and, with a view to clearing the committee of the charge of an anti-religious aim and spirit, demanded in its name that a decree be passed to the effect that the Catholic Apostolic and Roman religion is and ever will remain the religion of the nation.

The motion was applauded frantically by the Right, whilst the Left clamored for an adjournment, which was finally carried amidst indescribable violence and confusion. The two camps spent the night making ready for the battle of the morrow, which, it was felt, would be a decisive one. The Left assembled at the Jacobin Club

in the Rue St. Honoré, while the Right met in a great hall on the opposite side of the street, and arranged their programme, confident of a great victory. "This time they cannot escape us," said the Abbé Maury; "this motion is a match lighted under a barrel of gunpowder." Meanwhile, the man who had struck the match was being sharply taken to task at the Jacobin meeting, where his motion was censured as stupid and dangerous. Dom Gerle was an ex-Carthusian monk, one of those ninety-nine corrupt and degraded priests who swelled the Jacobin ranks in the Assembly.

The sitting of the next day was stormy, but, after several hours' wrangling, the order of the day was carried without a vote being taken on the motion. The victory, nevertheless, remained with the Jacobins. The nation tacitly refused to proclaim itself Catholic, consequently an open breach had been made between it and the Church, and the faction which had determined on her ruin was henceforth dominant. The Catholics now fully realized the perils of their position and the fate which was in store for the Church at the hands of the Revolution. Thousands throughout the country made enthusiastic demonstrations of their attachment to the faith, and meetings were held in all the large cities. As a natural result of this excitement, collisions took place between the civil and military authorities, and murder, pillage and sacrilege prevailed in many districts for weeks together. At last martial law was proclaimed.

The Assembly was alarmed at the extent of the conflagration it had lighted, and the Ecclesiastical Committee saw that some measures must be found for arresting it before the whole country blazed into civil war. The spoliation of the clergy had thrown them on the world without a career, and, in the great majority of cases, without a livelihood; their position as the first of the three estates of the realm was abolished; the Assembly had reduced them from the condition of independent proprietors to that of state functionaries, and it now became incumbent on it to regulate their situation in accordance with the new organization, and to frame an entirely new system. Camus supplied this demand by bringing forward his famous *Constitution Civile du Clergé*, a scheme which was destined to become the most terrible agent of crime and misery in the wide programme of the Revolution. The adoption of the *Constitution Civile*, in fact, inaugurated the real Reign of Terror, to which the disendowment of the Church and the disorder and dismay caused by that measure, had been only a prelude. The Assembly, without the smallest reference to the Holy See, proceeded to legislate for the Church with a high-handed insolence that was no longer restrained by any authority, divine or human. Fifty bishops were suppressed at one blow, the boundaries of dioceses. and

parishes were abolished. The entire ecclesiastical organization was broken up. Bishops were henceforth to be elected by the people *without reference to Rome*. Things were, said the Assembly, to be remodelled on the Church of primitive apostolic times. Camus and Treilhard discoursed, with the assurance of orthodox theologians, on the doctrine and discipline of this Church of their imaginations, bewailed the lamentable abuses which had grown up out of the abandonment of apostolic customs, and discussed the reforms that were to be effected in the Church of France. This eventful debate was one of those farcical touches that every now and then gleam like a ghastly joke on the blood-red tragedy which was in process of enactment. The spectacle of these improvised politicians setting up for divines, quoting the Fathers, laying down the law concerning things spiritual and ecclesiastical, contending for the bringing back of the Church of Christ to the austere simplicity of the apostolic discipline must have raised many a laugh, provoked many a scathing sarcasm from the wits of the Right, while inflicting many a pang too deep to find utterance in satire.

The chief aim of the Civil Constitution, as is apparent at the first glance, was to destroy the authority of the Holy See and sever the Church of France from its guidance and jurisdiction. The bishops elected by the clergy were not even to be allowed "to address themselves to the Bishop of Rome to obtain from him any confirmation." They were to owe their institution solely to the metropolitan, who in his turn was to be controlled by his clergy, and not permitted to refuse institution without having their sanction for so doing.

"It was mere sophistry, it was simply disingenuous," says Mr. Jervis, "to pretend that changes such as these were mere external details, which the civil power had a right to regulate at its pleasure. Rightly or wrongly, the vast majority of Catholics were convinced that spiritual authority, spiritual jurisdiction, spiritual mission, reside in the person and office of the Pope. In their view this was a primary article of faith; and none knew better than the Ecclesiastical Commissioners that, in attempting to abolish that belief, they were doing what must deeply wound the consciences, not only of the bishops and the clergy, but of all the more religiously minded laity throughout France. *But it was precisely in this point that they resolved to take summary and signal vengeance for the "Unigenitus" and all the miseries which had resulted from it for seventy years past.*"

The concluding passage, which we have italicized, contains one of those verdicts which historians of a certain school are prone to deliver on ecclesiastical enactments; but in Mr. Jervis's case his habitual capacity and rectitude of judgment make this erroneous

estimate concerning the *Unigenitus* and its consequences surprising. Indeed, it is hard to believe that Mr. Jervis is quite serious when he credits the uproarious Revolutionary Parliament, intent first on upsetting and then on obliterating every vestige of spiritual authority in the kingdom, with troubling itself about an old theological dispute, and making haste "to take signal and summary vengeance" on behalf of the discomfited Jansenists of seventy years before. The zeal of the Assembly was turned in another direction. True, it allowed, as we have seen, the Jansenist element, strong at that period amongst the lawyers, to enter largely in that mock tribunal entitled the *Comité Ecclesiastique*, but was not this rather because Camus and Treilhard were to the fore as obvious instruments, eager to do the work in hand and serve the Revolution by their hatred to the Church? It was not that the Revolution hated the Jansenists less, but that it hated still more the Church of Rome, whose bitter enemies they were, and it surmised shrewdly enough that to aid and employ those who aimed at separating France from the spiritual jurisdiction of Rome, was a sure and short way towards stamping religion out of the country altogether. If Mr. Jervis were to represent the suppression of the Jesuits by the Parliament of 1762 as an act of vengeance brought about by the Jansenists of that day, there might be some show of reason for the assertion; but to represent the Civil Constitution of the Revolutionary Parliament of 1790 as a tit-for-tat at the *Unigenitus*, is to commit himself to an argument which is refuted by its own absurdity. The bull *Unigenitus* was not the triumph of Jesuitical, but of Catholic doctrine, the doctrine which had never changed, but had been taught by the Church from the beginning. Jansenism was, in reality, a form of the old Novatian heresy, presented in a modern dress to the Pharisees of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and it had been tormenting the Church of France for sixty years before the Holy See formally condemned it. Amongst those who, with Louis XIV. and the Jesuits, had been earnest in demanding that condemnation, were St. Vincent de Paul, M. Olier and the community of St. Sulpice, Bossuet and the doctors of the Sorbonne, Cardinal de Bérulle, etc., in a word all that was most eminent in the Church of France for piety and learning.

The bull *Unigenitus*, which condemned the heresies of Port Royal concerning grace, sin and justification, in no way threatened or entrenched upon the liberties of the Gallican Church; but it was the policy of the Jansenists to pretend that it did, and to set themselves up as the champions of those imperilled liberties. It was in this character that they stood forward in the Assembly. They aimed at breaking up the entire ecclesiastical constitution,

and establishing in its place a "National" Church. The very name witnesses to the fallacy of the idea. A national church is as great an impossibility as a national sun. As God hung the sun in the material heavens that its beams might lighten the whole world, so did He place the Church in the spiritual heavens that it might shine equally to all the nations, irrespective of races, nationalities or governments. The Church can be neither national, nor royal, nor imperial, because Christ made her catholic and universal.

It was at this character of divine and universal supremacy that the Jacobins attempted to strike, when they decreed the sundering of the hierarchy from its dependence on the Holy See. The prelates and Catholic deputies denied, and many of them eloquently disproved, the right of the Assembly to lay hands on these spiritual relations, for it was mere paltry and transparent hypocrisy to pretend that they were not touching the spiritual, while thus tampering with the temporal jurisdiction of the Holy See. The destruction of the former was what they aimed at in attacking the latter. The point at issue was not how many bishops there should be and who should consecrate them, but whether the civil power had not the right to impose laws on the spiritual, and thus uproot, by violating them, the very foundations of the divine organization of the Church.

The champions of the Church fought manfully to avert this sacrilegious violation, urging on the Assembly that to confound the civil with the spiritual jurisdiction would be fatal to both. But the very force of the argument constituted its weak point. The destruction of the spiritual authority, as vested in the Holy See, was precisely what the Jansenists aimed at, while the Jacobins aimed at the overthrow of all authority.

The Civil Constitution was framed with the direct intention of detaching the higher clergy from their lawful head, and exciting a spirit of insubordination amongst the lower clergy towards the higher, than which nothing could be more fatal to the spiritual and social well-being of the Church, nor, consequently, better fitted to work out the purpose of the Assembly.

The Jansenists, had they been accused of complicity with the Revolution in this purpose, would have denied it; but it is none the less certain that in trying to establish a national church on the ruin of the Church universal, they made themselves the active and voluntary agents of the Jacobins. The Abbé Grégoire warned the house to beware of throwing the kingdom into a schism, but admitted that "it was the intention of the Assembly to reduce the authority of the Pope to its proper proportions." The Assembly needed not to be urged in this direction. After several weeks spent in wrangling over the stipends to be allotted to the clergy,

and other minor details, the Civil Constitution was voted with all its clauses on the 12th of July, 1790. All the bill now lacked to give it force of law was the royal sanction.

Louis XVI. was already in communication with Rome on the subject; but steam and electricity had not yet annihilated space, and the answer was necessarily slow in coming. The King, meantime, could scarcely have had any doubt as to what that answer must be. No Catholic instructed in the catechism could suppose that the Holy See would sanction a law which declared monastic vows illegal, which despoiled the clergy, secular and regular, repudiated the authority of Rome altogether in the spiritual and temporal organization of the Church. Pius VI. had up to this point refrained from interfering with current events in France, but he intimated to the King that this silence was not to be construed into indifference or approval, and that he would raise his voice as soon as he felt the moment had arrived for doing so with effect. The King strove to stave off the signing of the Constitution until the promised utterance should have been delivered; his whole soul recoiled from complicity in a deed which was equally repulsive to his conscience as a Catholic and his dignity as a sovereign. Powerful influences were used to strengthen this repugnance and fortify the wavering will of the monarch; Marie Antoinette and the Princess Elizabeth joined with eminent and holy prelates in dissuading him from the fatal concession; but Louis lacked the high-spirited courage of the Queen and that strength of principle which would have enabled him to stand out against the overbearing dictates of the Assembly and the increasing clamor of public opinion. On the 24th of August he signed the death-warrant of the Church of France.

Mr. Jervis points, with an emphasis which implies a certain discreet blame, to the fact that the official condemnation of the Civil Constitution did not come from Rome until the following March. He forgets, in the first place, that a hundred years ago diplomacy was not served by the magic agents now at its command, that a considerable time elapsed before a message could be conveyed from Paris to Rome, and again before an answer could be returned. The question at issue was one of the most momentous which had been raised in the history of the Church, and, before judgment could be delivered, it was essential that every move of importance should be accurately reported and clearly defined, that results, even, to a certain point, should be developed.

He forgets, moreover, that patience and long-suffering silence have been the immemorial policy of that august and supreme power, which is represented by its enemies as ever ready to overrule the legislation of governments and the liberty of nations, and to intermeddle uninvited in mundane affairs. He forgets, again, that the

Mighty Mother does not narrow her vision of human events to the present hour, or limit her scope and action to one place, or time, or people; but, taking her stand upon the watch-tower of eternity, views them as they will affect the great family of the nations to the end of all time.

Without going back to the great Revolution of '93, we see this majestic attitude of the Church exemplified in the petty revolutions of a later date. We see her always Christ-like in her gentleness towards the erring, in her forbearance towards the renegades and the rebels, hoping for their repentance, waiting for their return, believing in them when they have ceased to believe in each other, or in themselves, reckoning with human weakness, human vanity and passion, as no earthly power reckons with them; shrinking to the verge of weakness from irritating the self-love of her enemies, lest it should stand in the way of their return by making submission more painful and difficult. This has ever been the policy of the Church, a policy whose triumphs, even in this world, sometimes illustrate with divine illumination the truth of the beatitude.

Had Louis XVI. waited before signing the Civil Constitution until Rome had formally condemned the revolutionary principles which it embodied, would this abstention have modified the current of events and checked the nation in its headlong downward course? It is impossible even at this distance to venture on an answer to this question. It seems easy, indeed, to speculate in the light of subsequent results on the chances that were in favor of the monarchy, had the King at this critical moment asserted his rights and courageously exercised the royal veto; there was chivalry in the heart of the nation still, both to the throne and to the altar, and a bold and heroic appeal from Louis might have even now turned the tide and saved him—perhaps.

The new system began its operations appropriately enough by violence. The See of Quimper, in Brittany, became vacant, and the electors were at once convoked to proceed to the nomination of a new bishop. The cathedral chapter naturally refused to accept the nominee (who was no other than a member of the Ecclesiastical Committee which had brought about the system under which he was elected), and continued to administer the diocese, *sede vacante*. In a neighboring district an incumbent was presented to a vacant benefice; the local magistrates closed the church door against him, the population broke it open and installed the new pastor triumphantly. These scenes were repeated all over France. The Assembly saw that it had raised a spirit of resistance too widely diffused to be dealt with locally or in individual cases, and that some strong general measure of coercion must be applied.

This resolution took effect in the form of an oath of allegiance

to the Civil Constitution, which was to be compulsory on every ecclesiastic in the kingdom. This oath, which was to include a pledge of "fidelity to the nation, the king, and the new constitution," was to become obligatory within a week from the date of the decree; it was to be taken publicly by every priest throughout France having cure of souls, and was to be administered in all the parish churches at the end of mass, in the presence of the municipal authorities, who were to attest the fact in due form. Any ecclesiastics refusing, or inciting others to refuse to take the oath, were to be punished by the forfeiture of their stipends, to be deprived of their civil rights and declared incapable of any civic function. The words "*Constitution Civile du Clergé*" were to be kept out of the formula, which was perfidiously worded with a view to entrapping the unwary into the belief that they were performing a mere act of adherence to the political constitution, which involved no disloyalty to the spiritual or ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and consequently no surrender of principle in that direction. Mirabeau, in a speech of extraordinary power and rancor, supported the oath. The Abbé Maury denounced it as an act of illegal persecution, and warned the Assembly of the danger of making martyrs of the clergy. Camus followed with a brilliant vituperation of the Papacy, and declared that "the Pope had no right to any authority in the Church of France."

The debate closed, of course, by the adoption of the oath, November 27th, 1790. Louis XVI. was once more called upon for his signature. Helpless, weaker and more bewildered than ever, he implored for a delay, but the Assembly was in no mood to grant it. Marie Antoinette threw herself at his feet with the saintly Princess Elizabeth, and entreated him with tears to withhold his sanction from this last treacherous attack on the faith and conscience of his subjects; but Louis had no strength left but the strength of inertia and despair. He signed the decree. What it cost him to do so was expressed in his bitter exclamation on the morrow: "I had rather be king of Metz than king of France on these conditions; but it must soon come to an end."

The Abbé Grégoire, the day after the royal sanction had been obtained, mounted the tribune and said he was ready to take the oath. He was followed by sixty curés. Talleyrand and Gobel, bishop of Lydda, were the first members of the hierarchy to follow this initiative. The bishop of Clermont arose and proceeded to say that he would take the oath on the distinct understanding that it did not include the authority of the Assembly in spiritual matters. He was roared down at once. Cries of "The oath, pure and simple!" cut short every attempt he made to explain, and the house announced that the delay to "ecclesiastical public function-

aries" for taking the oath would expire the next day. That next day's sitting was a memorable one in the Assembly. Grégoire tried to rally the clergy to his side, protesting, amidst the suppressed murmurs of the house, that the oath was not incompatible with the integrity of principle, "as the Assembly did not pretend to judge men's consciences, or even demand an internal assent." The agitation at last grew so boisterous and threatening that it spread from the house to the street without, and Bailly, the mayor of Paris, was sent for to maintain order amidst the excited populace. More than two thirds of the clerical deputies refused to take the oath, "giving a noble lesson," says Mr. Jervis, "of faithfulness to the obligations of conscience at the expense of worldly interests, and winning an irrefragable title to the honors of confessorship." Mirabeau himself paid a tribute to their merit, exclaiming: "We have seized their property, but they have preserved their honor!"

One result was at once achieved by the compulsory ministration of the oath, it divided the clergy into two hostile camps—the *assermentés* and *non-assermentés*. The Revolution had now made the threatened schism a fact. It was announced that on the following Sunday the clergy of the metropolis were to take the oath. Bailly and his police officers repaired to Notre Dame in great pomp, to administer it to the clergy of the cathedral. The six vicars-general refused it in a body; the theological seminaries next followed, including the one thousand eight hundred doctors of the Sorbonne, and likewise refused to swear.

At St. Sulpice the clergy, forty-six in number, all refused the oath. The mob rushed into the church, violently maltreated the venerable curé, whom they dragged down from the pulpit and would have killed but for the timely help of some national guards. In other churches the clergy exhibited the same firmness and loyalty, and the mob the same savage violence. Similar scenes were enacted in the provinces. Everywhere the decree was enforced with ruthless severity. Those who refused the oath were not only deprived of office, but prohibited from officiating as priests at all, and any disobedience in this respect was to be visited with penalties which amounted to deprivation of all means of existence.

But the great difficulty of the new system had yet to be faced and overcome; this was the consecration of the new bishops. Nearly one hundred Sees were suddenly vacant, owing to forced resignations. It had been urged with emphatic iteration that, according to the custom of antiquity, the right of institution belonged exclusively to the metropolitan of the province, but now that the Assembly called upon the metropolitans to exert their fallacious right, they refused to do so. Finding every attempt to persuade them unavailing, the Assembly abandoned its strong

point of primitive custom, and decreed that any *assermenté* bishops throughout France might confer canonical institution on any *assermenté* priest without the consent of the metropolitan.

Cazalès courageously denounced in the house the monstrous absurdity and peril of this decree, which must lead inevitably "to the miseries of schism and religious strife. The people will begin to have doubts," he said, "of the validity of the sacraments. . . . You will see Catholics wending over the face of the country in pursuit of their persecuted ministers. . . . Ought you to hesitate to withdraw a decree which must needs produce so many and such great misfortunes?" But the time was long past for such warnings and appeals. The schism was already accomplished, the clergy were divided, and their flocks were already a prey to cruel and distracting doubts. On the whole, the majority was on the side of loyalty. Out of the fifty-two curés of Paris twenty-nine refused to take the oath, and out of the six hundred and seventy priests ministering in the capital four hundred and thirty did likewise. "This majority," observes Mr. Jervis, "is the more remarkable when we consider that, on the one hand, the clergy were plied with all the arts and cajoleries addressed to their natural feelings and self-interest, while, on the other hand, they were exposed to a system of intimidation, the effects of which became more formidable with each day's experience. It must be recollected in addition that no authoritative condemnation of the oath had as yet been promulgated by the Holy See."

The consecration of the new bishops was proceeding with what haste it could. Gobel, bishop of Lydda, the first with Talleyrand to take the oath, had been, as a reward, named to the Archiepiscopal See of Paris, but he could find no one to give him institution. He applied in vain to several of his brother prelates, who had themselves taken the oath, but recoiled from this open breach of ecclesiastical law and discipline. Gobel was finally driven to apply to the magistrates to help him, and they ordered Talleyrand to perform the function. Talleyrand had no more authority to confer the institution than the magistrates themselves, but he gave his services for the occasion, and "amidst salvos of artillery and an imposing parade of civil and military authorities," Gobel was solemnly enthroned as Archbishop of Paris at Notre Dame.

This notable performance closed Talleyrand's ecclesiastical career. He felt probably that the game, as regarded his priestly vocation, was played out, and that the time had come for discarding that rôle and starting in a new one.

Gobel, in his character of metropolitan, next imposed hands on Grégoire, who had been named Bishop of Cher-et-Loire. Mr. Jervis speaks of this ecclesiastic as "beyond comparison the most

distinguished member of the Constitutional episcopate, in respect of general ability and learning, and more especially as to the depth and consistency of religious principles." He assigns at best but a pitiable eminence to Grégoire in placing him at the head of those false or faint-hearted prelates who deserted to the enemies of the Church, either from the lowest motives of self-interest, like their leader, Talleyrand, or from cowardice, or wavering faith; but admitting that Grégoire was honest in the first instance, that he started, like other deluded enthusiasts, with a belief in the exalted motives and salutary purpose of the national movement, it is impossible to believe in "the depth and consistency of the religious principles" of the man who clung to the Revolution when it furled its flag of liberty and generous reform, plunged into unparalleled criminal license, and proclaimed itself the uncompromising enemy of God and religion.

When all the vacant Sees were filled up, the difficulty of finding *curés* for the vacant parishes still remained to be coped with. No orthodox priests would, of course, obey the call of the Constitutional bishops, but there was no lack of *assermentés* ready to take their places. "The elections were for the most part anomalous and disorderly. It was impossible to exercise anything like due discrimination; those who offered themselves were accepted without question, and the result was that the vacancies were filled by a motley crew of monks who had broken their vows and quitted their convents, of ex-professors, unsuccessful and inefficient schoolmasters, of needy adventurers, little troubled by considerations of principle or conscience, provided they could secure the means of subsistence, and of priests who for various causes had incurred ecclesiastical censure. Prudhomme, the new bishop of Mans, was reduced to such straits in order to complete his list of clergy, that he gladly welcomed a troop of young ecclesiastical students who had been dismissed from other dioceses for misconduct, and after a residence of a fortnight in his seminary admitted them to Holy Orders."

No wonder the populations fought shy of such pastors. In many localities the utmost efforts of the authorities failed to force the people to accept their ministrations, or enter the churches where they said mass. After some few months the Constitutional clergy fell into such discredit that in desperation they turned on the orthodox priests and accused them of exciting the faithful against them, whereas they themselves, the non-jurors, were the men who deserved to be denounced as traitors to their country, aristocrats and rebels. The non-jurors retorted by warning the faithful against pastors who had no valid authority for ministering to them, and whose commission was schismatical.

This antagonism soon vented itself in open violence. In Paris, the chapel of the Sisters of Charity, which was served by non-juring priests, was attacked by the mob, who scourged and beat the nuns and drove them out into the streets, mad with pain and terror. Similar outrages were perpetrated in many other quarters. The framers of the *Constitution Civile* began to perceive that they had raised a fiend who was too strong and too lawless to be trusted as an auxiliary. They saw with dismay that their splendid achievement met with approval only from a turbulent minority, that the bulk of the people stood aloof from it, aggrieved and hostile, and, what was more alarming still, that clearsighted partisans of the Revolution were already condemning it as a rash and fatal transaction. "Your detestable *Constitution du Clergé*," said Mirabeau to Camus, "will destroy the Constitution that we are making for ourselves."

This confusion and the disappointment of the authorities were further heightened by the appearance of the Papal brief, "Caritas," which Rome, true to her policy of magnanimity and patience, had withheld till April, 1791, four months from the date of the enforced oath to the Civil Constitution. The brief definitively condemns the principles of the *Constitution Civile*, the schismatical act of Talleyrand and those who followed his example in consecrating the schismatical bishops, and ends by an earnest exhortation to the orthodox clergy to remain bravely at their posts, and to the faithful to avoid all communion with the false shepherds who had been placed over them by illegal powers. This mandate from the Holy See was followed immediately by numerous recantations of the oath from those who had taken it under momentary weakness of conscience or judgment. The Assembly, frightened by the effect of this second brief, relaxed its tyranny against the Holy See, and took some steps to check, or seem to check, the onset of the Revolution against the Church. But its master move was the repudiation of the two briefs as false. They had not been addressed to the Council according to established custom, and there was no nuncio at Paris to act as medium of communication between the Holy See and the Church; these circumstances gave a coloring of truth to the charge of non-authenticity, and led to a confusion which disturbed the minds of honest people who had no direct means of assuring themselves of the orthodoxy of the documents.

Camus was too wise and well-informed to doubt for a moment the authenticity of the briefs, but he feigned to do so, and attacked the Papal utterances, declaring that, even if authentic, the Pope had no right to interfere in France or to condemn the acts of the Constitution.

Persecution grew bolder and fiercer every day. Enraged at the

preference of the people for the non-juring priests, the Assembly determined to take more wholesale measures for getting rid of them. A law was accordingly passed whereby, at the petition of any twenty residents, any such priest might be banished by the local magistrate within twenty-four hours, the least delay or opposition on the part of the priest to be visited with prompt and stringent penalties. The Jacobins knew that Louis would in all probability refuse to sanction this draconian decree, which was passed simultaneously with one disbanding the Royal Guard and ordering the formation of a camp of twenty thousand *fédérés* under the walls of Paris, "in hopes," says De Moleville, "that the King would reject them," and thus precipitate his own downfall.

Louis was, indeed, in a state of mind bordering on distraction. He had never been the same from the fatal moment when he signed the Civil Constitution, and now that resistance to further exactions was too late to avail, he found courage to resist. When the document was presented for his sanction, he affixed the royal veto to it, and dissolved the Cabinet. General Dumouriez, who remained in office some few days after his colleagues, used his influence to make Louis sign the decree, urging that, after having accepted the Civil Constitution, it was worse than folly to draw back now.

"Yes, I committed a great fault," replied Louis, mournfully, "and I reproach myself for it." And so Dumouriez pleaded in vain.

This veto of the King was almost the last act of royal prerogative exercised by Louis XVI. It was performed on the 19th of June, and was answered on the morrow by the *émeute* of the Faubourg St. Antoine. The mob invaded the Tuileries, burst open the doors of the King's apartment, and ordered him to recall the ministry and sign the decrees. In this extremity the kinghood rose up in Louis; he faced the rioters without quailing, and declared that violence should never extract from him a concession injurious to the welfare of his subjects. In less than two months later, he was deposed and a prisoner, and the Assembly ruled that the decrees which he had refused to sanction should have force of law.

Mr. Jervis here, as through the course of the whole history, introduces passages of the stormy debates of the house with a skill of selection which adds singularly to the brilliancy and force of his narrative; he makes us read on with the breathless interest that we feel in some actual occurrence of our own day, combined with the fascination of a powerful historical romance.

That must truly have been a sensational *séance* when Tallien arose, terrified the Assembly with the announcement that in a few days the soil "would be purged of the presence of every refractory priest," and Danton roared out in his stentorian tones: "Yes, the tocsin is about to sound the signal for a general onslaught on

the enemies of France." A scheme of wholesale massacre was, in fact, quickly set on foot. On the night of the 29th, two days after this sitting, domiciliary visits were made in Paris, three thousand persons, chiefly priests and religious, were arrested, and every prison filled to bursting. The butchery began on the 2d of September. The first victims were twenty-three priests, who were conveyed from the Mairie to the Abbaye and butchered there. At the Carmelite Convent of the Rue Vaugirard, one hundred and fifteen were slaughtered.

Next day, nearly one hundred priests were massacred at the Seminary of St. Firmin; others at La Force, and "six hundred were burned alive on the Place Dauphiné."¹ Throughout the provinces blood flowed in torrents during these dreadful days. The Revolution, like a drunken savage, seemed possessed of a demon of murder.

The Assembly, having now deposed the King, found itself in a difficulty concerning the civic oath. It was a palpable absurdity to make men swear "fidelity to the King," when royalty was abolished, so the formula was altered to a pledge to maintain, to the utmost of their power, liberty and equality. The question had now to be answered, whether this new oath was compatible with the conscience of a Catholic and a priest. It seemed, on the face of it, *no* more than an adhesion to the *political* principles on which the Revolution had first started. Many of the most respected of the orthodox clergy viewed it in this light, and were of opinion that it might be adopted. The venerable Abbé Emery took this view; but, with his usual docility to the Holy See, he declined to pronounce one way or the other until Rome had spoken, or at any rate until some directions could be obtained from the bishops. It was not, however, easy to obtain advice from either of these sources; distance, and the difficulties and obstacles and perils in the way of communication, interfered between the consulting party and the counsellors, and a decision had to be come to which admitted of no delay. Numbers of his holiest and most esteemed brethren entreated the Abbé Emery to take upon himself the responsibility of deciding for them, and to authorize them by his personal example to take the oath. If they refused it, there was nothing for them but the alternative of starvation or the plague-stricken shores of Cayenne, while their exile would be to thousands of Catholics the deprivation of all sacramental succor and spiritual consolation.

The Abbé, in sore perplexity, applied to those in the Assembly who had drawn up the new formula, and being positively assured by them that the terms "liberty and equality" were to be understood simply as the repudiation of a despotic covenant and invidious

¹ We leave to Mr. Jervis the responsibility of this statement, which we have not been able to verify from any of the sources at hand.

privileges, he consented to take the oath without further hesitation. His example was followed by numbers of the vicars-general, the congregation of St. Sulpice, and the clergy of Paris. Unfortunately, this led to a controversy between those of the clergy who took the oath and those who refused to take it. These latter censured the Abbé Emery, who replied that he had done what his conscience dictated under the circumstances, and that he was ready to retract the moment the Holy See notified its disapproval. Meanwhile, the oath was taken by the majority of the *non-assermentés* throughout France. The Abbé Emery's conduct was no doubt justified by the advantages which the orthodox clergy thus acquired in the exercise of their ministry; but the compromise which resulted in these advantages also produced many evils. The clergy and the faithful grew perplexed on the subject of the oaths; many confounded the new formula with the old one, and the ministrations of orthodox priests were rejected because they were supposed to have taken the oath of allegiance to the Civil Constitution. Some of the clergy had taken both oaths, some had rejected both; some had taken the first and refused the second; others had rejected the first, while they complied with the second. This anomalous state of things had at any rate one good result: it showed up the proceedings of the Assembly and its ecclesiastical legislation as the farce they were, and made the Revolution appear grotesque as well as brutal in its excesses.

It soon became evident that those who had taken the second oath had made a useless concession, and that nothing short of apostatizing, and throwing in their lot with the Revolution, would appease its savage hate. Priests who had taken the oath were arrested, exiled, or guillotined. The Abbé Emery himself was in prison before many months, and was detained there for a year and a half, his name being day after day smuggled off the list of doomed prisoners who were called for to be tried for their life.

Fresh edicts were fulminated against the priests, surpassing in ferocity all previous ones. A general edict was issued ordering them to quit France within forty-eight hours. Those apprehended in the country after this delay, were to be executed within four and twenty hours. Priests were conveyed in batches on convict-ships to the deadly swamps of West Africa, suffering on the voyage every species of cruelty and indignity.

In contrast to this barbarous treatment at the hands of France and her government, the persecuted clergy met with boundless hospitality and sympathy in other countries. Some two thousand of them reached the Pontifical States, and received there from Pius VI. the welcome of a father and a prince. Catholic Spain opened her arms to the exiles, and her bishops and clergy gave to

the world a noble example of evangelical hospitality. The Austrian Netherlands were not behindhand in this generous competition, and such was the kindly zeal of the Swiss mountaineers that there were numerous instances of young men and women going out to service in order to make room in their straitened homes for the perishing wanderers from France. After citing abundant proofs of the kindness of other nations, it is permissible to quote the Abbé Barruel's testimony to the charity exercised by Protestant England toward the Gallican clergy. "It was necessary," says the Abbé, in his *Histoire du Clergé*, "to have lived three years in the midst of French Constitutionalists, Maratists, and Jacobins of every description, in order to appreciate the refreshment and enjoyment which the first aspect of these Englishmen imparted to our priests on their arrival." He enters into details of the hospitality tendered to himself and his fellow-exiles, and describes how crowds of strange but welcoming faces met them at the harbor, and disputed the privilege of entertaining them, "seeming," he declares, "more anxious about our means of subsistence than we were ourselves." Conveyances were placed at the exiles' disposal, and those who were anxious to reach London were taken there free of expense; country houses were opened to others, money was placed in their hands, and nothing was left undone to soften the miseries of their position. The number of the *émigrés* increased with such rapidity that it was soon found necessary to organize measures on a large scale for dealing with their wants. The royal residence at Westminster, called "King's House," was placed at the permanent disposal of as many French priests as it would hold, and a committee was formed for collecting funds under government patronage for their support. There were soon six thousand French priests in England and Jersey, but in proportion to the strain put upon the public generosity, the relief increased. The committee, in ministering to the needs of the exiles, bore witness to the courage, fortitude, and gentleness which they exhibited amidst their trials. "Not content with vying with each other in the most rigid parsimony," said the commissioners, "they have evinced an unintermitting anxiety to lessen, by every effort in their power, the weight of their charge upon the community." Mr. Bowdler, the Protestant president of the committee of relief, declared that the suffering clergy spoke of their banishment and privations "with the feelings of men, but with the piety and resignation of Christians."

In striking contradiction to this exemplary conduct of the persecuted priesthood of France abroad, was that of their Constitutional brethren at home. The majority of these latter had taken wives, or were leading scandalously immoral lives; many had thrown off the restraints of religious belief altogether, and openly professed

infidelity ; a certain number apostatized, and appealed to the Assembly for pensions, on the score that they had renounced the profession of lies and abominations by which they had been gaining a livelihood, and with which the Church had for centuries been demoralizing humanity. " We advance from miracle to miracle," wrote the commissioners Lequino and Laignelot, from La Rochelle, " eight functionaries of the Catholic worship, with a Protestant minister, *unpriested themselves* on Thursday last, in the presence of the whole population, in the temple of truth, heretofore the parish church. . . . They tested their oaths by burning their letters of priesthood in a vase full of incense. All the people, Catholics and Protestants, swore, with acclamations, to forget their ancient superstitions. . . . A large picture of the Rights of Man is about to replace the tabernacles of ridiculous and childish mysteries, and other pictures on the walls will commemorate the Constitutional act."

The abjuration of Talleyrand's anointed, the Constitutional bishop, Gobel, soon followed these disgraceful scenes. The unhappy old man was, in truth, but the tool of the Jacobins, and the victim of his own cowardly weakness.

Hébert and several of his confederates repaired in the night-time to Gobel's house, waked him up, and informed him that he must on the morrow go to the Convention and publicly abjure and deny Jesus Christ, and proclaim his religion a tissue of lies and absurdities. The terrified old man fell on his knees, and implored them not to exact this act of sacrilege from him ; he clung to them, he rolled on the floor in agonies of despair, but the answer to his cries was, " Thou must do it or die." He was not prepared for the alternative, so the next day he gave to the world the grotesque and monstrous spectacle of his public apostasy, and walked out of the Convention with a red cap on his head in place of the mitre which he had cast down and dishonored.

Twenty other Constitutional bishops followed Gobel's example, and publicly abjured Christianity in language of the foulest blasphemy. These personal apostasies were the prelude to the diabolical farce enacted at Notre Dame, when a naked woman was enthroned on the altar of the true God.

In the other churches of Paris similar abominations were perpetrated, notably in the venerable old church of St. Sulpice, where a blaspheming fanatic rushed into the pulpit and defied the Almighty to strike him dead for denying His existence. " He strikes not !" cried the maniac ; " therefore it is manifest that He does not exist !" The popular madness had now reached the flood-mark, which was the signal for it to pause and to recede. Robespierre saw this, and his political instinct, quickened by personal hatred of Hébert, the prophet of the Goddess Reason, prompted

him to stand forward and denounce this persecution that was being carried on in the name of Atheism. At a sitting of the Jacobin Club, November 20th, 1793, he made a speech in which he declared that Atheism was aristocratic, whereas "the idea of a great Being who watches over oppressed innocence and punishes triumphant wickedness is altogether popular. If God did not exist it would be necessary to invent Him."

The fête of the Supreme Being followed in June as the practical development of this blasphemous *credo*. Before the year was out Robespierre's head fell under the knife of the guillotine, and the Revolution received its death-blow.

Robespierre's death, which opened the prison doors all over France, came in time to save the Abbé Emery, who had been for seventeen months in daily expectation of being led to the scaffold. During all that time the old paladin priest had been doing the work of an apostle amongst his fellow-prisoners in the Conciergerie, instructing, converting, consoling, and encouraging them. Writing to the Holy Father after his liberation, the Abbé Emery assures him that numbers of the Constitutional priests who were in prison with him, and left it for the scaffold, died penitent, retracted their oath before the tribunal, and were through his ministry reconciled to the Church. Of the eight schismatical bishops, including Gobel, who died by the guillotine, the majority made their confession and recantation into the Abbé Emery's hands. The Revolution had been mortally stricken when Robespierre fell, but it was not yet killed; it lingered on like a wounded wild beast, convulsed and still infuriated in its agonies. Tallien, Barras, Fouché, Thibaudeau, and Barère were not inclined to repeal the draconian edicts of the Terror. The Jacobin clubs and committees, that had held the country gagged, bound, and bridled, a contemptible minority tyrannizing and terrorizing an overwhelming majority, were still in force, and the Directoire which replaced the Convention carried on its work of anti-Christian persecution with undiminished malignity, though with a change of formulas. The Goddess Reason and the Supreme Being were deposed, and the churches were opened in certain places. The first day that the Holy Sacrifice was offered up openly in the great cities is fitly described as "a day of general resurrection." But the Republic, which proclaimed that it "recognized no form of religion and took no account of priests," was not to let this joyous dawn grow into the full light of noon. Just as the Church and the faithful were beginning to breathe, the *coup d'état* of 18th Fructidor (September, 1795) came to dash down the cup of peace and unsheathe the sword once more. The use of church bells was forbidden, and vast numbers of priests were again seized and thrown into prison; the Decade

was substituted for Sunday, the Gregorian calendar was abolished, a new oath was exacted from the orthodox clergy, incompatible with their conscience, and other intolerable conditions were imposed on them.

Things seemed on the point of plunging into more inextricable confusion than ever when the remnant of the Constitutional bishops who had escaped the guillotine, had recourse to the idea of a national council which was to discuss and adjust all differences between the orthodox and schismatical clergy, and between both these again and the state. This curious assembly, of which the Abbé Grégoire was to be the moving spirit, was inaugurated with great pomp at Notre Dame on the feast of the Assumption. A mock attempt was made to obtain the co-operation or approval of the Holy See; but naturally Pius VI. ignored the whole proceedings. The Directoire avenged the national council for this affront by at once ordering the French troops to seize the Pontiff, then in his eighty-third year, paralyzed and stricken with many painful infirmities, and to remove him from Rome to Valence. Throughout the journey of sixty days the "citizen Pope," as the Republican escort styled him, was treated like a convict of the lowest class, lodged in rooms which were purposely ornamented with engravings of loathsome immorality, and reduced to such straits of poverty that he was obliged to sell the silver buckles off his shoes. He reached Valence in the last stage of exhaustion and suffering, lingered there for a year in captivity, and died with a blessing on his lips.

It seemed now truly that the gates of hell had prevailed, that the Papacy was destroyed forever, and the triumph of the Revolution secure. But once again that triumph was to be frustrated. A Nemesis was at hand in the person of the brilliant young captain, whose victorious fame had clothed him with the prestige of a demigod in the dazzled eyes of his countrymen.

Bonaparte, with the electric instinct of genius, felt that the Revolution had run its course, that France, in stamping the Church out of her midst, had, to use Talleyrand's expression, "taken out our bones," and that the first step towards reconstructing this maimed and mutilated body was to put the bones back again. The *coup d'état* of the Orangerie put the young hero at the head of the nation, and he set promptly to work to quell the strife of parties and passions that was still raging fiercely all over the country. Flushed by victory, with a sense of universal power, he proceeded to sweep away the vexatious laws and barriers that had been created by the Jacobins. The absurd Decade was abolished, as well as the oath of hatred to royalty. The churches were opened definitively and the priesthood relieved from the harassing legisla-

tion which had so long pursued them. Bonaparte, who had the unerring intuition of a born ruler of men, knew that men were only to be ruled by that curb of inward assent to a divine law, without which outward barriers are of little avail. "Men who have no God are not governable," he said long after at St. Helena. "I saw those men at work in '93; you don't govern them; you shoot them down." He meant to govern Frenchmen, so he determined to call in the Church as the most efficient of police to assist him in the task. For this purpose he opened negotiations with the Holy See in order to find a *modus vivendi* which should reconcile the new order of things, mended by him, with the immutable exactions of the Church. Pius VII. was far more desirous to bring about this reconciliation than Bonaparte himself, and Cardinal Consalvi was promptly dispatched to Paris to treat with the man who held the destinies of France in his hand. Bonaparte received the Papal legate with the utmost cordiality, but when it came to adjusting the rights and principles of the Church with the requirements of his own despotic policy, the First Consul unmasked his batteries and showed the real motive of his conciliating overtures. His conduct throughout the whole transaction offers an example of violence, bad faith, insolence, and audacity unparalleled in history. Lying was a weapon that Bonaparte had always used as freely as grape-shot, so much so that "to lie like a bulletin" became a popular saying in the *grande armée*, and this weapon he employed unscrupulously in dealing with the Holy See.

The history of the Concordat is ably and interestingly summarized by Mr. Jervis, and with remarkable appreciation of facts and characters. He shows us, on the one side, Consalvi, shrewd, lofty-minded, patient, courteous, eager for conciliation and ready to embrace it at every cost save that of principle, and imbued with a faith in the good faith of his adversary which from a noble nature must have called out a worthy response; and, on the other hand, Bonaparte, treacherous, imperious, and violent, demeaning himself by turns like a maniac, a mountebank, and a hypocrite, indulging in outbursts of frenzied rage, in tricks and threats and cajolery, ignoring every principle but expediency, crushing every argument by his overpowering personality, and having recourse to deliberate fraud in the end when every other means had failed him. A copy of the treaty, which had received the approval of Bonaparte himself and of the Papal legate, was about to be officially signed by both, when luckily Consalvi discovered that the document had been falsified, and laid down the pen with an exclamation of dismay. Bernier, Talleyrand, and Portalis sheltered themselves behind the First Consul, whose characteristic defence of the fraud was that so long

as a document was not signed "one always had a right to make changes."

The grand obstacle that stood in the way of a final arrangement was the question of the new hierarchy which was to replace the ancient one suppressed by the Revolution. Ten metropolitan and fifty suffragan sees were to be created, and the Cardinal Legate was to be empowered to give canonical institution to the new prelates. But here an insuperable difficulty presented itself, *i. e.*, that of bringing about a compromise between the orthodox clergy and the *assermentés*, between the confessors who had bravely stood to their colors, and risked all and lost all save life in their loyalty to the Church, and those faithless servants who had deserted her in the storm. These latter, it is true, professed themselves penitent and were humbly petitioning to be received back to their allegiance. Both Consalvi and the Abbé Bernier were prepared to go to the utmost limits in admitting the sincerity of their repentance and the honesty of the alleged motives which had led them astray; but it was indispensable before they could be appointed pastors over the faithful that they should make not merely a sincere but a public and complete recantation of their errors.

Bonaparte and the Jacobins fought with all their might and all their authority to save the Constitutionals from this bitter humiliation; but Consalvi was implacable. "They must confess and retract their errors," he maintained, "and declare that they accept the decrees of the Holy See relating to the affairs of France, that is, the briefs condemning the civil constitution and the unlawful ordinations which took place under its sanction."

With this ultimatum the Cardinal Legate quitted Paris and returned to Rome to submit the long-contested treaty to the Holy See. Pius VII. had been prepared from the starting to make every concession within the limits of theological possibility in order to restore France to Christianity and heal the breach made between the nation and the Church by the Revolution, but when it came to actually signing the Concordat his courage almost failed. He held the pen in his hand for a moment, and exclaimed with unconcealed emotion: "I will sign it, but in doing so I am going to the very gates of hell!"

The mighty and momentous transaction received the Papal sanction on the 15th of August, 1801, and Cardinal Caprara was dispatched with the document to the First Consul in the capacity of Papal Legate.

No signature, however, could insure Bonaparte's good faith, or bind him to the loyal fulfilment of his plighted word. He at once opened out again the burning question of the recantation of the Constitutionals, and the battle that had been so long and painfully

contested, had to be fought all over again. The result was that five months elapsed between the signing of the Concordat by the Pope and its presentation to the Chambers. When finally it was submitted to them, it was not in its integral form as it had come from Rome, but with a superadded text called *Articles Organiques*, an appendage which, as Consalvi remarks in his *Mémoires*, "almost entirely overturned the new edifice which we had taken so much pains to build up. Whatever the Concordat had exacted in favor of the liberty of the Church and its worship was once more brought into question by means of the Gallican jurisprudence, and the Church of France had good reason to fear that she might soon find herself reduced to slavery."

The indignation of Pius VII. on learning the swindle that had been practiced upon him was equal to his dismay. He at once protested solemnly in the Consistory against this fresh manoeuvre of the First Consul, to whom his protestation was speedily transmitted. But Bonaparte ignored it. He coolly issued a proclamation summoning France to rejoice at the restoration of the Catholic Church, and a solemn festival was forthwith held at Notre Dame to celebrate the reconciliation of the nation with the Holy See.

Pius VII. was deeply wounded by this conduct and wrote an autograph letter to the First Consul, in which he appealed to his honor and good faith to cancel the enactments which the Holy See was credited in France with having sanctioned, while it condemned and deplored them. To this, Bonaparte returned an evasive answer, but assured the Pope that the Organic Articles could in no way interfere with the execution of the Concordat. This assurance was both treacherous and untrue. The Organic Articles were a petty, vexatious and ridiculous piece of legislation, framed, not, we will grant, for the express purpose of impeding the execution of the Concordat, but as a means of escaping from it, and counteracting it in case of need. For instance, Art. 1 rules, "No bull, brief, decree, mandate, provision, signature serving as a provision, nor other expeditions from the court of Rome, *even concerning individuals*, can be received, published, printed or otherwise put into execution, without the authorization of the Government."

Art. 3. "The decrees of foreign synods, even those of the General Councils, cannot be published in France until the Government shall have examined them," etc.

Art. 4. "No national or metropolitan council, or diocesan synod, no deliberating assembly can take place without the express permission of the Government."

Art. 11. "Archbishops and bishops may, *with the authorization*

of the Government, found Cathedral chapters and seminaries in their dioceses, but all other ecclesiastical establishments are prohibited."

Art. 12. "Archbishops and bishops may take the title of citizen or monsieur, but all other qualifications are forbidden."

Art. 17 rules that every nominee for a bishopric "shall be examined in doctrine by a bishop and two priests named by the First Consul, the examiners to send up a report of the examination to the councillor of state charged with matters concerning worship."

Art. 20. "Bishops cannot leave their dioceses without the permission of the First Consul."

Art. 25. "The bishops are to send in every year to his councillor of state the names of those seminarists who are destined to the ecclesiastical state."

Art. 26. "The bishops can ordain no one until the person to be ordained shall have been approved by the Government."

Art. 39. "There is to be but one liturgy and one catechism for all the Catholic churches of France."

These few extracts from the *Articles Organiques* will suffice to show the drift and animus of the instrument which was presented and printed as "*une Convention passée le 26 Messidor, an IX., entre le pape et le gouvernement français,*" and which Protestant writers are apt to speak of as having been recognized and accepted by the Holy See. The Pope, as we have seen, indignantly denounced the imposition from the first, and never ceased to denounce it. His successors have repudiated the Organic Articles with the same absolute and unqualified denial; they have been willing to let them fall into oblivion, as a law that has become obsolete without having been repealed, but from time to time the voice of the Holy See has continued to be raised in protest against them as an illegitimate and intolerable piece of legislation, calculated to interfere at every step with the dignity and freedom of action secured to the Church of France by the Concordat.

Having thus *posed* himself as the patron of the Holy See and the restorer of religion, Bonaparte claimed his reward. He invited Pius VII. to come and crown him Emperor of France. The invitation, though couched in a style of filial deference, was in reality the command of a despot who meant to enforce it. Pius VII. was willing to acknowledge the benefits which his high-handed patronage had secured to the Church, but what chiefly inclined him to condescend to the imperial demand, was the hope of obtaining the suppression of the *Articles Organiques*, a bait that was held out to him from France, and which those around him were of opinion he should make every possible sacrifice to secure. The Pope, moreover, was anxious to apply a salve to the wound, as yet but partially closed, between the two classes of the clergy, and to con-

sole the faithful, sorely tried by the schism, which still lingered on and disturbed the peace of many. These various motives combined to decide him to accede to Bonaparte's request.

The story of the Papal visit, from the moment the Sovereign Pontiff set foot on French soil to the day he left, reads like a chapter from some mediæval romance, in which fact and fiction, the sublime and the ridiculous, the pathetic and the grotesque, are curiously interwoven.

An initial ceremony, which Pius VII. insisted upon as an indispensable prelude to the gorgeous apotheosis of the coronation, was the religious marriage of Bonaparte with Josephine. With great reluctance the Emperor-elect consented to the ceremony, but exacted that it should be performed with the utmost secrecy, at midnight. The darkness, the mystery which presided over the whole scene, the nervous anxiety of the wife, already trembling for her position at the moment when it was, to ail appearances, being magnificently assured, her entreaties for the certificate, which Cardinal Fesch was so strangely reluctant to deliver, the passionate throbbing of two human hearts diversely agitated with ambition and with love, with trust and treachery, all this is as the drama within the comedy, "the life within the life," and lends a touch of nature to the semi-barbaric pageant in which the two were to play their splendid rôle on the morrow.

The sun rose merrily on the 2d of December, 1804, and it was under a cloudless sky that the hero of a hundred fights wended his way to the old cathedral and took his seat on the golden throne prepared for him. The rite proceeded amidst artillery and music. The Pope, who had come from the Eternal City on purpose to place the crown upon his head, raised the symbol of sovereignty from the altar, but Bonaparte took it quietly from his uplifted hands, and laid it on his own head.

Pius VII. having so far condescended to the wishes of the Emperor, looked anxiously for the compensations he had been led to expect, but they were not forthcoming. When he demanded the fulfilment of the promise that the Catholic religion should be declared dominant in France, he was answered that such a measure would be imprudent, and was, moreover, unnecessary, seeing that the fact of the imperial family being Catholic constituted the national religion Catholic. As to the suppression of the Articles, it was not even to be discussed.

Pius VII. returned to Rome, after a sojourn of five months in France, without having gained the smallest political advantage in any direction. The only substantial concessions he obtained from the newly-crowned successor of Charlemagne, were the re-establishment of the Christian Brothers, the Marists, and the Sisters of

St. Vincent of Pául, and an increase in the stipend of the lower clergy.

As soon as the Sovereign Pontiff had left his dominions, Napoleon gave him to understand that his position henceforth was to be that of chief almoner to the empire, and his duty to assist the Emperor to govern the conscience of the French nation through the instrumentality of the Holy See. He began by styling himself "Emperor of Rome," in addressing the Pope, and proceeded to make the most extravagant claims of sovereignty; amongst other things, he exacted that all subjects of those nations with whom France was at war, should be expelled from Rome, and their vessels ordered out of all the Roman ports. To this preposterous demand Pius VII. gave an emphatic refusal. He replied that he recognized no distinction of nationalities; those who were at war with Napoleon were just as much his children as those who were at peace with him. Threats and promises having failed to move him from this principle, Napoleon had recourse to his usual natural argument of brute force. On February 2d the French troops entered Rome, planted their flag on the Castle of St. Angelo and a battery in front of the Quirinal, took the Pope prisoner, and carried him away to Savona.

When, however, he had got thus far, Napoleon, to his surprise, found that there was a fortress within the fortress which refused to surrender to his arms, that he had come into collision with a will as resolute as his own. The Concordat was the listed field where these opposing wills once more met and pitted their strength one against the other. In the Concordat it was provided that the bishops who were named by the Emperor should receive institution from the Pope, a prerogative which had been violated by the civil constitution, and whose violation had been the chief cause of calling down the anathema of the Holy See on that scheme. A number of sees were now vacant, and the nominees of the Emperor awaited the sanction of the Pope, who refused to grant it. This resistance lasted ten months. At the end of that time there were twenty-seven sees vacant, among them the Archiepiscopal See of Paris.

The Emperor brought the whole weight of his influence and authority to bear on Pius VII. in order to compel his approval of the prelates-elect, but in vain. The Pope replied that he was a close prisoner, deprived of all assistance from his legitimate counsellors, cut off from communication with those sources of information that should guide his judgment; he was bereft even of the services of his secretary; under these conditions he could not, in conscience, accede to the imperial appeal. Napoleon, upon this, determined to fill up the vacant sees without more ado. He

sent for Cardinal Fesch to Fontainebleau, and ordered him to become Archbishop of Paris.

"Sire," replied the Cardinal, "I must wait for canonical institution from the Holy Father."

Napoleon, exasperated by this combined opposition to his will, flew into one of his imperial rages, and commanded the Cardinal to obey him.

"Sire, *potius mori!*" was the sturdy reply; whereupon the Emperor, purposely misunderstanding him, retorted:

"*Potius Mori?* You would rather have Maury? Very well; you shall have Maury!"

Maury, who had been the champion of the Church, and confessed to the faith when both these acts of courage put his life in imminent peril, Maury bowed to the iron will of Cæsar, took the metropolitan see, and held it in defiance of the Papal brief refusing him institution.

But the Emperor was becoming too impatient to go on thus coping with the recalcitrant prelates one by one; he resolved to compel submission from all by a measure highly characteristic of the man. He called a council, intimating to the bishops, "*mes évêques,*" as he styled them,—regarding the princes of the Church pretty much in the light of so many prefects and generals, high functionaries under his command—his order to pass a decree empowering the metropolitan to give institution without reference to Rome. The bishops, cowed by his overmastering violence, and dreading the consequences of an open breach, justified but too fully his estimate of their docility. The venerable old Abbé Emery alone stood out with a noble boldness, which won from Napoleon the tribute of his respect and admiration.

"That Abbé Emery is the only man I am afraid of!" exclaimed the conqueror of Europe, proving once more how supreme is the dominion of a noble character over all other powers and agencies.

The Emperor's struggle with the Holy See involved him in deeper difficulties as he went on. While the council of bishops was endeavoring to effect a compromise which might adjust, even temporarily, the difficulty concerning canonical institution, Napoleon was intent on another question of momentous interest to himself; this was the dissolution of his marriage with Josephine. The Court of Vienna having refused to entertain his suit for the hand of an Austrian archduchess until a brief from Rome should declare this marriage null and void, it became essential to obtain the brief at all costs. Napoleon convened "his bishops" again, and ordered the whole of the sacred college to come to Paris and hold a council for the purpose of granting him a divorce. Twenty-

nine cardinals answered to the call. Thirteen out of that number, including Consalvi, were of opinion that there were no grounds for declaring the former marriage void, and protested that they could not sanction nor appear at the approaching nuptials of Marie Louise and the Emperor.

Fouché exerted his utmost influence in vain to change this resolution. Consalvi, whose approval the Emperor held to be above all, declared that no power on earth should induce him either to retract his condemnation of the divorce, or to lend the countenance of his presence to the coming marriage. He and his colleagues made good this assertion; but the divorce was wrenched from the divided and hesitating council, and on the 2d of April, 1810, Napoleon led his young bride to Notre Dame amidst the thunder of artillery and the clanging of marriage-bells. The next day, the thirteen absentees presented themselves at the Tuileries to take part in some official reception, but while they were waiting, amidst all the dignitaries of the Empire, for the entrance of their imperial host, a chamberlain entered and informed them that they must withdraw, as the Emperor declined to receive them. On the morrow they received notification of the entire confiscation of their property, private and ecclesiastical, and their degradation from all external rank and dignity, including the suppression of their title of cardinal, and a sentence of exile to various remote districts, where they were to be under *surveillance* of the police. Consalvi was banished to Rheims, and kept there a prisoner until the fall of the tyrant, four years later, set all his victims free.

But the cup of Napoleon's iniquities towards the Church was not yet full. Unable to conquer "the old man of the Vatican," and seeing that the prolonged struggle with the Holy See was entangling himself and his bishops in deeper and more inextricable perplexities, he determined on once more summoning an ecclesiastical commission. The measure was a mere mockery, seeing neither privacy nor independence were insured to the commissioners. Napoleon broke in upon their sittings unannounced, attacked the questions under discussion, stormed and ranted when his judgments were disputed, and demeaned himself with his habitual violence and insolence towards the assembled prelates. Finally, on the 17th of March, he burst out into a tirade which surpassed all previous exhibitions of the kind, declared that, if the Pope persisted in his obstinacy, he, Napoleon, would tear up the Concordat, that in fact he considered it as no longer existing. The assembled prelates "maintained a scandalous silence," says Consalvi, who was informed by many present at the scene; "it was reserved for a humble priest to save the honor of his order. This priest was the Abbé Emery." When Napoleon, ignoring the whole assemblage

of cardinals and bishops, addressed the Abbé directly as the one man whose judgment he thought worth suing for, the old priest stood up, and answered him with the simplicity and boldness of a confessor, challenging his opinions, disproving his conclusions, and finally extracting from him a tacit admission of their fallacy in the exclamation that he muttered to himself, "Oh! yes: the catechism! the catechism!"

But this tribute of respect to the Abbé Emery, whose voice was heard on this occasion for the last time amongst his brethern, was not followed by any practical recognition of the principles which the venerable ecclesiastic had so valiantly defended. The Commission was dissolved, a national council was convoked, and a deputation was sent to Savona to cajole or bully the captive Pope into granting a brief empowering the metropolitan of the vacant sees to grant institution. The deputies, consisting of eight bishops and five cardinals, brought all their influence to bear on the Pontiff to induce his consent to the Emperor's demands; no argument was left unemployed to calm his scruples and persuade him that the best interests of the Church of France, the peace of the clergy and the salvation of souls throughout the Empire, united to counsel the concession. A fortnight passed in these conferences, and then the Pope yielded. He was broken in health, and his mental powers severely shaken by his long captivity and great bodily sufferings.

"In proportion," writes Mr. Jervis, "as by their skilful intervention they (the deputies) succeeded in removing the doubts and prejudices which had tormented his sensitive conscience, he showed himself infinitely relieved and comforted. His countenance resumed its natural expression of serenity; and when the affair was brought finally to a conclusion, 'he testified,' writes the prefect de Charleroi, 'a joy like that of a child who has just been delivered from some great infantine trouble.'"

But this large concession of the persecuted Pope failed to satisfy the insatiable despotism of Napoleon. The deputies, instead of being praised for the success of their mission, were received with reproaches and blame. The Emperor considered the brief far too independent in its tone and too restricted in its conditions; it was couched in terms offensive to the imperial supremacy, the Church of Rome was mentioned as "the Mother and Mistress of all churches;" in fact, the long-desired reconciliation which it had cost so much to bring about was as far off as if the Holy Father had sent away the deputies briefless.

But events, which were to have a momentous effect on the destinies of Napoleon himself, were hurrying on the issue of his quarrel with the Holy See. He set out on his fatal expedition to Moscow, and all other interests and events were for the time laid aside, when

suddenly, his attention was again directed to the captive of Savona. A plan seems to have been arranged between England and Austria for carrying away Pius VII. and placing him in a safe asylum, either in Sicily or Malta; the Pope himself being a consenting party to the scheme. Before, however, it could be carried out, the secret was discovered by the French police, Napoleon was informed of it, and an order was issued for the immediate removal of the prisoner to Fontainebleau. The utmost secrecy was to be observed concerning the journey, and the details as to the manner in which it was to be performed were written by the great captain himself from Dresden, where he happened to be when the news of the Anglo-Austrian plan reached him.

Pius VII. was hurried away from Savona in the dead of the night, on the 10th of June, 1812, and transported across the mountains with such haste and discomfort that he fell dangerously ill, and was compelled to halt for three days at Mont Cenis. He reached Fontainebleau on the 19th, utterly prostrated by fatigue and illness. Here his external sufferings, at least, came to an end. The *Moniteur* announced that the "Pope was now free," and the hearts of the faithful were thrilled with a momentary joy in the delusive belief that the end of his humiliation and the sufferings of the Church had come. The splendid suite of apartments that he had occupied when he came to crown the Emperor were again placed at his disposal, the high dignitaries of the empire hastened to pay their court to him, and prelates flocked to kiss his feet. The autumn passed in comparative peace. On the morning of the 17th of December came the startling "29th bulletin of the Grand Army," announcing to France that the invincible soldier and his conquering legions had been overtaken by an appalling disaster. The Emperor hurried back to Paris. Even in this extremity of distress and failure and dismay, his thoughts turned to the captive at Fontainebleau as to an object of supreme and immediate importance. He arrived unannounced at the palace, and held a conference of several hours with the Pope. The account of that interview has been variously told. The belief prevailed long and generally that Napoleon had given way to personal violence, that in his ungovernable passion he had struck the infirm and aged Pontiff; but the assurance of Pius VII. himself clears Napoleon of this culminating disgrace. What remains to his charge is bad enough. That his demeanor was brutal in its fury of unrestrained violence is certain. He used the language, the tone, the insolent threatening gestures of an infuriated jailer bent on forcing a feeble and helpless captive to succumb to his will. When the Pope, unmoved by his fulsome professions of filial attachment and promises of eternal devotion, muttered with a smile, "Commediante!" the Emperor sud-

denly threw off the mask, and stormed and menaced, vowing that he would crush the Church under his heel, and pull down the Vatican on the heads of those who defied him. Pius looked up once more and muttered, "Tragediante!"

But, though his courage remained undaunted, his powers of resistance were broken down. Alone, with no one to advise him, betrayed into the belief that the clergy were eager for him to grant the concessions which would bring about a genuine reconciliation between the Empire and the Church, harassed almost into delirium, he signed the new Concordat which the Emperor presented to him. No sooner, however, was the magnetic influence of Napoleon's presence withdrawn, and the Pontiff set free from the overpowering pressure that had been exercised on him, than his presence of mind returned, and with it a sense of remorse and misery which threatened to destroy his already enfeebled reason. He refused to eat, lost his sleep utterly, and declared himself unworthy to celebrate the Holy Sacrifice. Cardinals Consalvi and Pacca obtained access to him, and reassured him by suggesting that a prompt and public retraction of the deed which had been wrenched from him in secret, and without his free agency and almost without a full knowledge of what he was doing, would repair the error, and prevent the weak and unfortunate concession from taking effect. The Pope was at once consoled by this suggestion, and, with the assistance of those able advisers, a letter was drawn up in which the recent treaty was distinctly and absolutely annulled. This letter is full of pathos, and constitutes a magnificent act of faith and humility, which reveals to us the beauty of holiness as it dwelt in the soul of Pius VII., his childlike simplicity, his entire unworldliness, the martyr-like meekness and the strength of principle which had sustained him under such long and manifold personal trials.

Napoleon felt that he was checkmated, but he concealed his anger, and endeavored through the instrumentality of Cardinal Maury to induce the Pope to recall his recantation. The attempt failed utterly. Maury was peremptorily dismissed from the Papal presence. The relative liberty which Pius VII. had, up to this period, enjoyed at Fontainebleau was now withdrawn, and his intercourse with his friends and councillors subjected to the most despotical and irritating restrictions. He had, however, regained all his wonted calmness of mind and serenity of fortitude, and now awaited his deliverance at the hands of Almighty God, satisfied to remain in bondage until His good pleasure should restore peace to His Church and liberty to His Vicar. This moment of deliverance was drawing rapidly near. Napoleon, seeing that fortune had betrayed him, and was not to be won back, that the powers of Europe, exasperated by his warfare of aggression and spoliation, had

coalesced to defeat and crush him, turned round and sought to make friends with the one solitary power that he had both wronged and robbed, and failed to conquer. He sent word to Pius VII. that he had serious thoughts of allowing him to return to Rome; but the Pope replied that these things were in the hands of Providence, and forbade the subject to be further mentioned to him.

The allied armies, meanwhile, pursued their triumphal march, and it became evident, even to Napoleon himself, that his star had set. He determined to take a last revenge on his enemies by restoring the Papal States to their lawful sovereign before they fell into possession of the powers. But this offer, which was made with an assumption of magnanimous generosity, met with cold rejection from Pius VII. He could not, he said, accept as a gift to be secured by princes or treaties, the dominions which belonged to him by right, and of which he had been unjustly despoiled.

"It may be," added the Holy Father, "that my sins have rendered me unworthy to see Rome again, but be assured that my successors will recover the whole extent of the territories which rightly belong to them." Unabashed by this rebuff, Napoleon, two months later, issued a decree announcing that the Pope was about to resume possession of the Papal States, and ordered that he should be sent back to Rome. Pius VII. immediately left Fontainebleau. But the allied armies were now in France, and it was necessary to conduct the Holy Father by a circuitous route to Savona, whence by the Emperor's orders, he was escorted under military guard to the advanced posts of the Austrian and Neapolitan forces. This took place on the 23d of March. On the 31st the allied sovereigns entered Paris. Two days later Napoleon was deposed.

The fall of Napoleon, like the death of Robespierre, came to France like the relief from a burden that had become intolerable; it was the signal for the opening of prison doors to many whose only crime had been that of standing by their principles in defiance of the despot; it was the signal for the recognition of rights that had been outraged or usurped, for the restoration of many things which had been unlawfully abolished or withdrawn; it was the signal for the Church of France to lift up her head like one from whose neck a heavy yoke had fallen.

The Restoration lost no time in proceeding to repair the evil which had been done during those memorable years—from 1801 to 1814—that the struggle had lasted between the Church of France and the Emperor. The Concordat of 1801 was set aside and that of 1516 re-established. Dioceses and parishes which had been suppressed or left vacant were reconstituted and provided with pastors; thirty sees were added to the hierarchy, thus raising

them to the number of eighty; seminaries were reopened, and an impulse given to religious activity, ecclesiastical and secular, which was hailed with joy by the Catholic heart of the nation as the dawn of a new national life.

While France was rejoicing in her deliverance, and Pius VII. giving thanks for the omnipotent mercy that had steered the bark of Peter through the tempest, Napoleon, like a lion chained to a rock in mid-ocean, was beating up and down the narrow span of his prison, uttering passionate complaints of the scant courtesy shown him by his captors. These lamentations woke no more response from the allied sovereigns than from the waves that broke upon the desolate shores of St. Helena. What claim on their pity had the tyrant who had never shown mercy to any man except when expediency or self-interest prompted him to feign it, who had overthrown dynasties, made footstools of thrones, and deluged Europe in blood for the sake of his ambition?

One sovereign alone took pity on him and lifted up a voice in his behalf. This was Pius VII. Years of cruel wrong, imprisonment, persecution and insult had left no trace of rancor in the soul of the magnanimous-hearted Pontiff. When the mother and three brothers of the deposed Emperor were compelled to fly from France after Waterloo, the Pope received them in Rome and extended to them a generous hospitality, and when, through them, he learned the sufferings of the exile, whose health was said to be impaired by the climate of St. Helena, he made an effort to obtain a change in his condition. A letter which came to light for the first time in Consalvi's memoirs, and in which the Pope pleads for the man who had so deeply wronged him, is one of the noblest and most touching examples of Christ-like benignity and forgiveness of injuries ever presented to our imitation. ". . . The pious and courageous initiative of 1801," says the Holy Father, "has caused us long ago to forget subsequent injuries. Savona and Fontainebleau are merely faults of the understanding, aberrations of human ambition; the Concordat was an act of Christian and heroic restoration. The mother and family of Napoleon have made an appeal to our compassion and generosity. . . . We are sure that we meet your wishes in charging you to write in our name to the allied sovereigns to entreat them to mitigate the sufferings of such a prisoner. It would be a source of unbounded satisfaction to us to have contributed to diminish the miseries of Napoleon. He can no longer be dangerous to any one; it is our desire that he should not be for any one a subject of remorse."

Singular and triumphant irony of fate! The Church was the sovereignty that Napoleon had most deeply wronged and most fiercely striven to overcome, and it was the only one that in the

extremity of his humiliation he could turn to for help. He had come to learn by experience that lesson which the Church has been teaching the world these eighteen hundred years, *i. e.*, that she conquers to save, not to destroy. He had warred against the Papacy, and it had defied him, standing like a fortress on a rock while the tempest raged round it, waiting in its calm strength until the word should come forth, bidding the power that had let loose the winds and put the waters in a roar, stand back, and, in its turn, bow down and do homage to a power mightier and more august. When the storm fell, and with it the enemy of the Church, the mighty Mother opened wide her arms in pardon and protection to the vanquished and prostrate foe.

AN OLD BIBLICAL PROBLEM SOLVED AT LAST.

Carmina Veteris Testamenti Metrice; Notas criticas et dissertationem de re metrica Hebræorum adjecit Dr. Gustavus Bickell. Oeniponte in libraria academix Wagnerianæ. 1882.

AMONG the publications, treating of Biblical Science, which in late years have appeared from the pen of Catholic authors, one of the most important and interesting is certainly the book on Hebrew Metres, which Professor Bickell, of the University of Innsbruck, has just given to the learned world.

By this work, we are convinced, a very old and difficult problem has at last found its long-desired solution. There is not, and there cannot be, any doubt that the Hebrew language, like its sister languages, the Syriac and Arabic, has the capacity of forming both metres and rhymes, for the metrical capability of the Hebrew is clearly shown by the Jewish literature of the Christian era, which contains a vast number of metrical works, not less artfully composed than some of the most celebrated Arabic poems. *Jehudæ Charisi*, for instance, has translated the well-known Makamas of Harriri into Hebrew verses, specimens of which are given by De Sacy,¹ and he himself has composed a very good Hebrew imitation of the Arabian poet in his Tachkemoni.

But it is quite another question whether the old Hebrew poets ever availed themselves of this undoubted aptitude of their lan-

¹ In his Harriri Preface.