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

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

legibus stabilitam." The word "established" is found also in the English of Canon IV., used of "the form of liturgy;" and in Canon VI. of the "rites and ceremonies of the Church," standing in the former for *stabilitam*, in the latter for *constitutas* (Canon V. may be compared). But, although these Canons exhibit the origin of the word, none of them warrants the use of the term "Established Church" as a proper designation of the Church of England, and I can only repeat my objection to it. I can attach no meaning to the phrase "Ecclesia stabilita;" and, if it is said that the short title is convenient, I can only refer to the enormous mischief generated in the Church by the designation of an Act intended to simplify the proceedings of Ecclesiastical Courts, by the short title "Public Worship Regulation Act."

C. A. SWAINSON.

ART. II.—THE REVOCATION OF THE EDICT OF NANTES.

IN a former article we traced the first beginning of the persecutions in the provinces, and the abortive revolt in Languedoc which afforded plausible justification for increased severities. It remains to describe the development of the *Dragonnades*, the striking at last of the great blow, so long and so carefully prepared, and the story of the Dispersion.

If Marillac enjoys the unenviable distinction of having invented the "*mission bottée*," he must yield to another the credit of having elaborated its resources and multiplied its effects. The Memoirs of Foucault[1] are an invaluable witness—as coming from one who was the protagonist in the drama, and as relating with the utmost candour, and even pride, his share in the persecution. Foucault came to Béarn at Colbert's death in partial disgrace, transferred to this secondary post from the rich district of Montauban. He determined to follow in the steps of Marillac, and secure the favour of the dominant party at Court. That which makes his whole personality even more despicable than his model, was his utter indifference to the beliefs which he oppressed so cruelly. He was a cool-headed, ambitious man of the world, scholarly in his tastes, and had edited the treatise of Lactantius *de morte persecutorum* in his earlier days. While Colbert's subordinate, he had acted in the spirit of that great statesman, he had been kind to the Huguenots. In the last stage of his

[1] "Mémoires" (1641-1719), publ. par. F. Baudry, 4to. 1862.

life, the needs of fortune-making past, he was to drop the *rôle* of persecutor, and become once more the genial and indulgent philosopher.

Even in the period of persecution he was always smooth in manners; he had, as a contemporary describes, "the soul of an inquisitor with the face of a courtier." He disliked the priests, but flattered and served those of whom, in his Memoirs, he was to speak as "*gens oisifs et inutiles.*" His work at first was that of the "exclusions." He found that out of the two hundred *avocats* at Pau, no less than one hundred and fifty were Huguenots. The reader may think that a large reduction in this somewhat startling number might indeed have been beneficial, but his method was to debar all the Huguenots from the right to plead. In August, 1684, Foucault visited Paris in order to test, by personal observation, the state of royal and ministerial feeling. He had an audience with Louis at Fontainebleau, where he assured his sovereign that "all Béarn yielded to him the old fealty to Henri IV." Louis, who when not blinded by flattery and false reports, possessed a keen insight into the conditions of the kingdom, replied rather doubtfully that the *Béarnais* were always a difficult folk to manage. Then Foucault explained his plan, or rather the object of his design, leaving the means untold. He suggested that five Huguenot temples were amply sufficient in the district to satisfy the letter of the Edict. The King sanctioned the closing of the rest. The remaining details were equally acceptable, and before the end of the interview, Louis manifested his approval by calling in all the Ministers of State, and Foucault relates with pride that his praises were sounded by the royal lips: "*Il leur parla de moi plus avantageusement que je ne méritais.*"

On his return to his province he performed his masterstroke. Empowered to close all but five of the Huguenot "temples," he selected for the assumed amnesty precisely those against the ministers of which had been lodged accusations of breach of the recent restrictive laws. It was but for a short time that they survived the rest. Within six weeks all public Huguenot worship was abolished in Béarn, and the pastors forced to leave the province. Congratulations came from Court to reward these achievements. "The King reads my reports with pleasure," he boasts in his Memoirs, "and puts them aside to be read once more." Eager to preserve this pre-eminent favour, Foucault advanced to stronger measures. He wrote for a *blank order* to employ soldiers, asserting that no violence would be used, that the "simple sight of them" would suffice. The first of these armed missionary journeys "converted five thousand souls." He ventured to promise

that, within two months, not a single Huguenot should be found within the province. Every expedient was now employed. The *Noblesse* were intimidated by a proposed inquisition into their titles. The easiest terms of abjuration were accepted: the sign of the cross made once, the recitation of the creed in Latin, or of the *Paternoster*, even the utterance of the bare words "*Je me réunis*," sufficed to satisfy the political requirements of these new missionaries. Some of the curés, to their credit be it said, were more merciful than these secular persecutors, and kept silence as to apparent submissions, the reality of which they had the best reasons for doubting.[1] But Foucault and his subordinates were prepared to treat the slightest recalcitrance on the part of the *nouveaux convertis* as an act of formal relapse, to be visited by severest penalties.

A fitting counterpart to the "Memoirs" of Foucault, in their naïve admissions of complicity in these cruelties, is furnished by Cosnac, Bishop of Valence, once a sort of valet or factotum in the days of the Fronde to the Prince de Conti, and rewarded with a bishopric for his dubious services in arranging a marriage between his patron and one of the nieces of Cardinal Mazarin. He also excelled in the destruction of the Huguenot "temples" in his diocese, reducing the original number of eighty to twelve, then (after a visit to Versailles) further reducing the twelve to two, which seemed, from their reputation for prompt obedience to every edict, absolutely secure. But the Bishop's ingenuity triumphed. One of them was condemned in Council, on the strength of a false representation. The other was closed by a direct royal edict, granted on Cosnac's prayer. So he rivalled Foucault in anticipating the work of ultimate revocation, while he far outstripped him in the language of fulsome loyalty. It is hard to believe that a monarch, not without mental power, could have accepted such a compliment as this: "I will dwell only on this feature of your admirable life, Sire, for you are too glorious to be surveyed entirely. I should quote in vain the praises given to early Christian emperors: they would furnish but insufficient matter to express the glory which your Majesty has gained in the interests of religion." This was the spiritual food on which Louis fed at this time; grosser at times, sometimes with more refinement and suggestion, but still, whether from a Bossuet or a Cosnac, ever the same in substance, until at last,

[1] One curé preserved his Huguenot parishioners from the soldiery by offering them the following elastic formula: 'I acknowledge the Catholic Church *as it was in the days of the Apostles*, and I renounce and abjure all errors which have since been introduced.' (Benoist, "Hist. de l'Edit," iv. 361.)

as if by revelation, came the admission, after the disasters of war, after the monarch's own death, in the opening words of Massillon's discourse, "GOD ALONE IS GREAT."

And so the work went on, the same means employed, the results varying only in accordance with the personal character of the Intendant. At Orange, the Huguenot minister Chambrun was tortured into abjuration. He was deprived of sleep, his cell constantly occupied by soldiers, until body and soul broke down. At Bordeaux, the Marquis de Boufflers so well obeyed the advice of Louvois, that by the month of August (1685) no fewer than 130,000 Huguenots had abjured. In Normandy, all the temples had been closed already before the year 1684. The proved talents of Marillac were employed here for a time, with the expected success.[1] At Caen, the official instructions were almost equally explicit. The Intendant was to "make use of the King's troops in order to oblige them to change their religion." If an almost humorous incident could be noticed amid the sombre surroundings, we might smile at the phenomenal voracity of the Dragoon missionaries, who devoured Gargantuan repasts at the expense of the Huguenots, the lengthy bill of fare having been preserved in official archives.[2] At Meaux, Bossuet did not disdain, after closing the temples, to beg from the Government their materials.

At Paris, a different procedure was required by the conditions of the population, and the certainty that any cruelties would be at once known in other countries. Up to the very last the famous temple at Charenton continued its services, and the adroit La Reynie, Chief of the Police, confined his efforts to the extremest exercise of the edicts excluding from civil privileges and public institutions of help. His great engine was in the stringent law against the so-called "Relapse." As soon as an alleged act of "reunion" had taken place, the victim was surrounded by moral barriers, and no return was possible. If it could not be obtained, the logic of Dragoons, when possible, was then invoked.

But as the summer of 1685 passed away, the struggle was already at an end. The Huguenot *people* were conquered, or at least paralyzed. Even in the Cevennes, where such heroic resistance was to be made later, all was silence and submission. And so it seemed that the great Edict of 1598 was no longer more than a mere form of words, a worthless parchment, and that to

[1] Louvois, in this instance, was provoked to write all his mind: "Il n'y a de plus sûr moyen que d'y faire venir beaucoup de cavalerie, et de la faire vivre chez eux *fort licencieusement*." (A. Michel, "Louvois et les Protestants," p. 250.)

[2] "Bulletin de la Société de l'Hist. du Protes." ii. 580.

declare its revocation was not to change anything, but merely to declare what had come to pass. The choice of the exact moment was indicated also by contemporary events in Europe. In February, Charles II. of England had been succeeded by his brother; a concealed Roman Catholic by one who gloried in that religion; a monarch amenable in some respects to public opinion, giving place to one determined to suffer no will but his own, and to carry out in practice once more the wildest theories of personal monarchy. But even James II. was not at once to be depended on. Was his throne secure, men asked, with a double invasion threatening from the camp of exiles in Holland, where they found a base of operations in the territories of the prince who was himself in three years to occupy the throne? But that double invasion of Monmouth and Argyle set forth, made its efforts, and failed utterly and irretrievably. Argyle was executed in June, Monmouth in July; and now James seemed one of the strongest monarchs in Europe. He had the deepest obligations to Louis XIV., and could be counted on with a double reason of gratitude; for, in his case, there would be the hope of future favours in the way of French subsidies. No other Protestant nation was to be feared. William of Orange had no longer a European coalition at his back. Charles XI. of Sweden had hereditary links of alliance with France, and was now reposing after a protracted struggle with Denmark. Only one power came into consideration, and that not on account of its area and population, but from the pre-eminent genius of its ruler. For nearly two generations the States of Brandenburg and Prussia had been governed by Frederick William, who had well merited his title of "Great Elector." Without a great army, he had exercised such an influence in the concluding portion of the Thirty Years' War as to receive without dispute a great enlargement of territory; he had created a navy on the Baltic; he had defeated Sweden at Fehrbellin. Once he had protested against the injustice of the treatment of the Huguenots, and Louis XIV. had replied with a forced courtesy, not wishing to provoke one who might be a formidable foe. But alone he could not influence the policy of France. And so the blow fell.

The last Protestant academy (Montauban) had been suppressed in March; in *June*, the great Church of Caen was closed, and Du Bosc, the most eloquent of Huguenot preachers, condemned to perpetual silence; the penalty of the galleys was imposed on all who should seek safety in voluntary exile. *July* witnessed the suppression of all Protestant worship in Sedan, a few days later (July 30th) in every episcopal seat, and the prohibition to print or circulate Protestant literature in any form; in *August*, a decree appeared that Huguenot

orphans were to be educated in the Roman Catholic faith under all circumstances; in *September*, physicians and apothecaries were forbidden to practise any more. And in the midst of these important acts there appeared a vast number of minor edicts, importing small vexations, hardly to be regarded in the presence of weightier evils, and almost incomprehensible under the theory that the great and final stroke was already determined on. What, for instance, was the object of the edict of July 13th, declaring that the chaplains of private châteaux might not exercise their ministry for more than three years in the same place?

From this and other similar cases two possible conclusions seem admissible:

(1) That the Revocation was not finally determined on until the very last.

(2) That the real movers, Louvois, and his father the Chancellor, on one side, and Madame de Maintenon, had some reason to conceal their object from the King, or from one another.

It was in the previous year—the day is not certain, but probably it was the middle of June—that Madame de Maintenon attained the end of her ambition in becoming, by a private marriage, the consort of Louis XIV.[1] There were but three witnesses, Louvois, Bontemps, and Montchevreuil. The doubt as to the date gives proof of how well the secret was kept. And now she found what she had gained. Her business was, as she wrote bitterly afterwards, "to amuse a man *qui n'est plus amusable*." Her niece, Madame de Caylus, relates that once, as they were regarding the great carp swimming slowly in the marble basins of Marly, Madame de Maintenon exclaimed: "They are like me, they regret their mud." S. Simon gives an account of the daily life of this extraordinary couple; "they were never separated; each day Madame de Maintenon was installed in the room where the King received his ministers and gave audiences. She heard everything, and seldom uttered a word. Sometimes the King asked her advice. In that case she never seemed to interest herself for any person or cause, but she generally agreed with the Minister."

Turning to Dangeau's diary, under date of Monday, Oct. 22, 1685, we find the following:

Fontainebleau. The king, after dinner, attended the stag-hunt in his carriage; there were with him Madame la Duchesse de Bourbon and Madame de Maintenon. That day was registered the repeal of the Edict of Nantes, and all remaining temples were at once ordered to be destroyed. In the evening there was an Italian comedy.

[1] Art. "Aubigné" in Haag, "France Protestante," i. 531.

And now let us examine the Edict of Revocation.

The preamble, very skilfully drawn up, gave a number of reasons, once forcible, now irrelevant, for the granting of the original Edict. The main object was to prove that, from the first, it had been *intended* as a temporary measure. It was asserted that Henri IV. always planned the final reunion of the two religions; that, in the reign of his successor, the Edict had been at one time suspended, and at last very materially altered. Finally, it was declared that, as the greater and better part of the population had already abjured their errors, the Edict was no longer needed.

The first article proceeded to declare the Edict withdrawn and annulled. All places of Huguenot worship to be suppressed, whether in public temples, or in the private chapels of the *seigneurs*. The pastors were to leave the kingdom within fifteen days, in case they still refused to abjure. Pensions and other bribes[1] were freely offered. Above all, the attempt to seek religious liberty by voluntary exile, except in the case of the ministers, was to be punished with the galleys. And then, with an irony that can hardly have been wholly unconscious, the Edict of Revocation ended with the words:

Those of the R.P.R. who still persist in their errors, may remain in peace and continue their trade and business, without hindrance, on giving full obedience to the above articles.

CAR TEL EST NOTRE PLAISIR.

Beneath the signature of Louis appeared the trembling characters of the aged Chancellor Le Tellier,[2] and the document was sealed with the great seal of green wax, on bands of red and green silk. The last assurance was a mockery. Louvois, in sending the Edict to the provinces, wrote: "His Majesty intends that the greatest severity (*les dernières rigueurs*) should be shown to those who will not abjure, and those who aim at the foolish glory of being the last should be driven to the last extremity." And so the Dragonnades went on, while the tide of voluntary exile was draining out of France the best part of the population.

How was the Revocation received by the Roman Catholics? By officials, who saw vast future emolument in the confiscations, with enthusiasm. By the Gallican clergy, anxious to prove orthodoxy after expressing their disregard for Rome, with triumph. Bossuet's funeral oration on Le Tellier, who died a week after signing the Revocation, was pronounced at

[1] Huguenots abjuring were to be permitted to become *avocats* without probation, and on paying half the usual fees.

[2] An excellent *fac simile* has been recently published by the Society of French Protestant History, and issued with the October number of their *Bulletin*.

the Church of St. Gervais (Jan. 25, 1586), in presence of a vast assemblage, the Nuncio, archbishops, bishops, dukes, marshals of France, and dignitaries of all classes. As usual, Bossuet entered into a detailed history of his subject's political life. At the close, he described the Revocation, and introduced one of those high-flown compliments to the King, which alone convince us how greatly the canons of good taste can be modified by time. "Take your sacred pens, ye who compose the annals of the Church, and hasten to place Louis with Constantine and Theodosius." And, after drawing a parallel between the forcible suppression of Paganism by the Christian emperors, he said:

That is what our fathers admired in the first days of the Church. But our ancestors saw not, as we are seeing, a heresy disappear at once, the wandering flocks returning in multitudes, our churches too narrow to receive them; their false pastors abandoning them even without waiting for the order [*this was unworthy of Bossuet* (!)] and happy to plead banishment as excuse. . . . . Touched with such marvels, let us pour forth our hearts in admiration for the piety of Louis. Let us carry our acclamations to Heaven, and let us say to this new Constantine, this new Theodosius, this new Marcian, this new Charlemagne, what the 630 Fathers at Chalcedon once exclaimed . . . . "King of Heaven, preserve the king of the earth!"

Although he made no public utterance, Fénelon, in all his writings, showed his full approval of the Revocation. He makes use of the illustration of "parental correction." In a *Mandement*, delivered in 1714, he expressly declared that the Church was forced to cut off "gangrened limbs," was bound to suppress all indocility by force, and to abstain from "cowardly compassion."[1]

And this strange aberration of really great minds was shared, not only by their colleagues, but by people of all orders of culture. We find even the kindly Madame Sévigné telling her correspondent that "the Dragoons have proved themselves excellent missionaries, and that no monarch had ever done a greater deed than the Revocation." There was only one utterance, as far as we know, from among that generation, though it was kept secret in memoirs, meant only to see the light after the writer's death. Saint Simon has left a page of burning condemnation, that has only the fatal disadvantage of being read now when all agree with it, or profess to do so.

In spite of the prohibition an exodus commenced, which has no parallel in the history of modern Europe. From the year 1685 onwards, for more than ten years, in all directions,

[1] He quoted with approval St. Augustine's words about the Donatists where he declares: "*medicinali vindicta, terribili lenitate et caritatis severitate . . . . ubicunque isti lupi apparuerint conterendi sunt.*" (Douen, "L'Intolérance de Fénélon," p. 157.)

towards England, Holland, Switzerland, North Germany, there passed away the best of the French nation, to receive gracious welcome in those lands where they were to become faithful and profitable citizens.[1]

To effect an escape at all, many performed unwillingly the form of abjuration. "The dread," says Dumont de Bostaquet, "of seeing so many women and children exposed to the insults of the troopers . . . constrained me to subscribe my engagement to embrace the Catholic religion at the ensuing Christmas."[2] Others made use of false passports, which had served a similar purpose for many others. Of both expedients those who availed themselves could plead in excuse that not the saving of property, but the honour of wives and sisters, had been the sole influencing motive. But a vast number disdained this means of averting the difficulties of flight. Thousands were captured on the way, and filled the frontier prisons; in that of Tournay there were 700 such captives alone in 1687. Others were sent to the colonies, and perished under a confinement comparable to the "middle passage' of the slave-trade.[3] To estimate the number of the refugees is only approximately possible; the statistics furnished are often incapable of verification. According to the report of Bouchu, no less than 15,300 left the single province of Dauphiné, between the years 1683-7.[4]

Every means was adopted to stay the exodus. Threats, false reports of shelter refused in the foreign lands, were employed in vain. The remaining Huguenots were assured that, in England, more than ten thousand refugees had perished through the hardness of the climate, and from starvation, and that the rest were eager to return. Spies followed those who had escaped, and sometimes succeeded in decoying back those who hoped to regain some part of their abandoned possessions. Or else they elicited the names of relatives who had not yet effected their escape, and their movements in France were watched. Great rewards were offered for the capture of fugitives; he who secured one received half the forfeited goods; he who could procure the arrest of twelve was for ever freed from taxes. But nothing stayed the emigration. The seaports of England and Holland were crowded; the captains of merchant vessels on these coasts amassed fortunes.

[1] The exodus had begun, indeed, at an earlier period. From 1681, the expressions of sympathy in England, and the offer of civil privileges, had attracted numerous refugees. In Holland there were many who arrived from 1683 onwards; and so, rather later, in the other countries. (R. L. Poole, "Huguenots of Dispersion," Chaps. IV.-VII.)

[2] "Mémoires de Dumont," p. 107.

[3] R. L. Poole, "Huguenots of Dispersion," pp. 30, 31.

[4] Arnaud, "Histoire des Protestants de Dauphiné."

It is said that £200,000 was paid in fees for passage alone. Sometimes the sentries on the frontiers were bribed by the offer of more than the capture itself would have secured them. Most arrived penniless at the place of refuge.

Holland and Brandenburg received the refugees gladly, liberally, in emulation as to the speedy performance of an act, the ultimate reward of which was sure. England, under the hostile auspices of James II., and disturbed by grave political debates, nevertheless responded liberally to the claim upon her benevolence. In vain did James assent to Barillon's suggestions, and order Claude's *Plaintes des Protestants* to be burnt. A great relief fund was raised, in response to a royal brief, ordering collections in every church. In the year 1687 as many as sixteen thousand refugees had been assisted, including 143 ministers, and 283 persons of rank and title. Five churches, in addition to that already existing in Threadneedle Street, were built for their use in London, and twelve more in the country. The bare waste of the Spitalfields was entirely occupied by the refugees. In one generation nine churches were built there, and the silk trade of London increased twenty-fold. Bethnal Green was also largely built on. At Greenwich, Norwich, Canterbury, Bristol, Southampton, Plymouth, Barnstaple, and Exeter, not to mention the important settlements in Ireland, prosperous communities arose, gradually to be fused with the elements of the nation. But the story of the Dispersion opens a field so vast and so important that we must forego even the attempt to sketch its outline.[1] The gratitude of the refugees was manifested in the truest and surest way, by their active and industrious life, keeping up, indeed, the best of the ancestral traditions, but willingly undertaking the necessary burthens as well as the privileges of their new citizenship. It is rather to their attitude with regard to their original country, and to their persecuting monarch, that we would, in conclusion, devote the brief space that remains to us. It is true that some of the refugees proved their gratitude to the countries which received them, by enlisting under their banners, and in some instances, as in the Irish campaign of 1690, crossed bayonets with their own countrymen, in defence of their adopted country. But there was no vindictive upbraiding, no joy in the disasters which were so soon to be the Nemesis of French bigotry and tyranny. A Jurieu may have occasionally overstepped the limits of this graceful and Christian reticence, but his was the solitary exception which proved a laudable rule. And for the

[1] The labours of Messrs. Agnew, Poole, Weiss and Burn have not exhausted the scope of inquiry, and much still remains for future research.

nobler minds among that goodly company which had abandoned all for the Gospel's sake, there was yet the feeling of patriotism, in spite of all; the memories of the fair land never more to be seen, of the old home treasured in the recollections of childhood, of the national glories not yet obscured, of the land which had given birth to Calvin and Beza, Dumoulin and Blondel, Amyraut and Daillé, Dubosc and Bochart and Claude; and in many a heart the vow was breathed, *If I forget thee, O Jerusalem!*

And even of the persecuting King himself hardly a bitter word was spoken. They had learnt so truly the lessons of subjection to the earthly power, in a manner hardly intelligible to our modern civilization, but congenial to the spirit of primitive Christianity, that to suffer in silence seemed the fitting attribute of those who were Christians in more than their profession only. And when the great orator, Jacques Saurin, in 1709, was addressing to the congregation of refugees in the Court chapel of the Hague that memorable sermon on "Fleeting Piety," which deservedly ranks as one of the masterpieces of Christian eloquence, the climax of the splendid appeal to his flock was in a prayer for the great persecutor himself, for him at whose word they had been driven into exile—"that he who had so long been the instrument of God's wrath might become one day the minister of His grace and bounty." Surely there could have been no more fitting epilogue to the great historic tragedy than in this true imitation of Christ.

JOHN DE SOYRES.

ART. III.—BIBLE CLASSES FOR YOUNG LADIES.

THE following letter, which needs no editorial preface, will be read, we are sure, with deep interest:

It has given me great pleasure to accede to your request that I should write a short account of my Bible Class for Young Ladies.

I believe there are but few well-organized parishes in the land in which at least one Bible Class does not exist for domestic servants, warehouse girls, shop girls, etc., while not unfrequently the children of their employers are left, as far as religious instruction is concerned, sadly too much to their own resources.

How often it happens that while the maids in the kitchen or servants' hall are reading and searching their Bibles in preparation for their much-valued Sunday-School Class, the young ladies in the drawing-room are left entirely without special religious teaching, and chiefly spend their time in the most frivolous occupations or in devouring literature which, to say the least of it, is not of an elevating character.