

THE
PRINCETON REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1856.

No. I.

ARTICLE I.—*The Church Review and Register for October 1855.* Art. VI. “Professor Hodge on the Permanency of the Apostolic Office.”

As even the more important periodical publications of one denomination circulate only to a limited extent within the bounds of other Churches, we may, without offence, state for the information of some of our readers, that the *Church Review* is an Episcopal Quarterly, published in New Haven, Connecticut. It is ably conducted, and seems to represent the high-church party in the Episcopal Church, as distinguished on the one hand from the Puseyites, and on the other from the Evangelicals.

In the last number of the *Review* there is an article on an Address delivered in May last before the Presbyterian Historical Society. The object of the article is to present an argument, from the pen of Bishop McIlvaine, in favour of the permanency of the apostolic office. This argument the Reviewer commends to our special notice. He pronounces it perfectly unanswerable; saying that a man might as well question one of the demonstrations in Euclid, as to contest either its pre-

ART. VI.—*The Gospels: with Moral Reflections on each Verse.*
 By Pasquier Quesnel. With an Introductory Essay by the
 Rev. Daniel Wilson, D. D., Vicar of Islington; now Bishop
 of Calcutta. Revised by the Rev. H. A. Boardman, D. D.
 In two volumes. Philadelphia: Parry & McMillan, 1855.
 8vo. pp. xli. 648, 646.

PROTESTANTS have never been slow in acknowledging the excellencies of good books produced by men within the pale of the Romish Church. In some of these cases, indeed, the authors have fallen under the animadversion of Popes and Councils, for the very works which edify and delight us. Jansenius, Pascal, Nicole, Arnauld, and Quesnel, have in various degrees received the affectionate praise of evangelical Christians. Our own pages, in more than one instance, have been largely occupied with the writings and fortunes of the Port Royalists; and we are glad of this new occasion to acknowledge our debt in the same quarter.*

In a former instance we drew largely on the labours of Dr. Reuchlin, to whose elaborate history of the Port Royal, the celebrated article under that rubric in the *Edinburgh Review*, by Sir John Stephen, is likewise greatly indebted. We give full notice that in what follows we have borrowed freely from the same copious magazine of recondite facts. The sources on which Reuchlin chiefly relies are indeed beyond our reach, comprising a literary history of Port Royal, by Clemencet, in manuscript, and sundry others in the Archives of Paris.

Quesnel was born at Paris, July 14, 1634. He was descended from a Scotch family of rank; and when we reckon backwards and consider the religious state of the upper class in Scotland, and their close connection with France in the days of Knox, Buchanan, and Welch, we are ready to conclude that it was the prayers and teachings of some Eunice or Lois, which resulted in the eminent piety of the young Parisian. His grandfather was a painter and his father a bookseller. After classical and theological studies at the University, he

* See *Princeton Review*, 1830, p. 170, Art. *Provincial Letters*: 1834, p. 471, *Jansenius*: 1845, p. 239, *Jesuits*, and p. 252, *Pascal*: 1849, p. 467. *The Arnaulds*.

entered the Congregation of the Oratorium Jesu, or Oratoire, in 1657, and took priest's orders in 1659. Two of his brothers, Simon and William, were also Oratorians. These religious persons followed the rule of St. Augustine, but without monastic vows, and comprised some very learned men among their number, such as Malebranche, the philosopher; Morin, the linguist; and Richard Simon, the liberal critic. Young Quesnel seems to have been early led to the use of the pen, and under the generalship of St. Marthe was entrusted with the preparation of important religious writings. Thus, with Juhannet, he produced in 1677 a *Précis de Doctrine*, or theological syllabus for the Congregation. When, in 1685, the court demanded of all Oratorians subscription to the formula against Jansenism, Quesnel was found by the inquisitorial visitor, Camoin, at Orleans, whither he had retired, because in 1681 the archbishop of Paris had banished him from that diocess. The archbishop had a grudge against him, partly because Quesnel had not dedicated to him the works of St. Leo, and partly because he had declined to enter upon some controversies in which that prelate had looked for his aid. Quesnel refused signature and stated his reasons in writing, but the archbishop announced to the fathers of the Oratory that such signature was the king's express command. Meanwhile, Quesnel had sought refuge in Brussels, where he joined the great Arnauld; and from this place he sent his answer of February 13, 1685. During his residence in the Spanish Netherlands he maintained perfectly amicable relations with the Oratorians of the country. In 1684, the deputies from these religious houses had attended a general convention of the order held at Paris. Conformably to views here expressed, Picquerry, superior of the Flemish houses, declared in 1687 that he would not dishonour his king by subscribing instruments proceeding from another sovereign. He complained also, that the influence of the Jesuits was impairing the strength of the Augustinian doctrine in France.

We have spoken of the edition of St. Leo's works.* It was

* S. Leonis Magni Papæ I. Opera omnia, nunc primum epistolis triginta tribusque de gratiâ Christi opusculis auctiora, secundum exactam annorum seriem accuratè ordinata, appendicibus, dissertationibus, notis, observationibusque illustrata. Accedunt S. Hilarii Arelatensis episcopi opuscula, vita et apologia. Paris, 1675. 2 vols. 4to.

one of several labours which entitled Quesnel to a place among the learned. For the basis of his text he used an old Venetian manuscript, which after being the property of Cardinal Grimani was now possessed by the Oratoire. The notes upheld the Gallican doctrines concerning church-liberties. The work appeared in two quartos in 1675, and in July 1676 was condemned by the Congregation of the Index; and this, as a French cardinal who was present says, without taking time so much as to peruse the volumes. Quesnel prepared a defence, which Arnauld persuaded him to suppress lest he should still further embitter his relations with Rome. In 1700 a second edition in folio appeared at Lyons.

But the work of which we have prefixed the title to our remarks is that by which Quesnel will be remembered. He began to prepare it at Paris, as a spiritual help to young Oratorians. At first it consisted only of devotional observations on the words of Jesus; and it was occasioned by a rule of the house according to which every inmate was obliged to digest a collection of our Lord's sayings. Father Nicholas Jourdain also published a book of the same sort, which Quesnel translated into French, at the instance of Count Brienne. The Marquis d'Aigues and some other pious persons urged him to treat the four gospels in the same manner. It appeared at Paris, in 1671, in duodecimo.* Vialart, bishop of Chalons, upon the recommendation of the marquis, read the work, and recommended it in a pastoral letter to his clergy and the Christian public. A third edition in three volumes appeared in 1679; and in 1694 there was a Latin version at Lyons. Before his retirement at Orleans, he had been advised by the celebrated Nicole, to prepare similar reflections upon the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles; and he worked at this both at Orleans and Brussels. The result was a volume of notes on the whole New Testament, printed in 1687. This, however, led to some alteration in his original *Morale*; for as the remarks on the Gospels were brief compared with those which followed, they were expanded in the following editions to a

* "Abrégé de la Morale de l'Évangile; ou Pensées chrétiennes sur le texte des quatre Évangélistes, pour en rendre la lecture et la méditation plus facile à ceux qui commencent à s'y appliquer."

proportional length, so that the entire work as re-wrought appeared in 1687 at Paris, in two duodecimo volumes, and again in 1693-1694, and repeated reprints at Paris and in Holland, till at length it filled eight volumes and contained an exhortation by the author to the study of the Scriptures. Urfe, bishop of Limoges, recommended to him the preparation of a manual upon those scraps called the "epistles" and "gospels" by Romish and other Churches; and Quesnel complying, added also reflections on the Old Testament passages used in the Missal. But as the copy of this latter part was lost between Brussels and Paris, the former was issued by itself. It is not a little significant that so many dignitaries should have approved these pious labours. We have spoken of Vialart; Noailles, his successor in the see of Chalons, was no less favourable; for when he had read the book and observed its influence among the priesthood, he also recommended it in a pastoral letter of date June 23, 1695; being the very year in which he was preferred to the archbishopric of Paris. In his new post he published, the year following, an instruction on Predestination and Grace. At this juncture appeared the fatal *Problème Ecclésiastique*, which was condemned to the flames in 1699 by a decree of parliament, as also at Rome.

The archbishop caused a theologian of learning, not connected with the author's party, to prepare for the press a corrected edition, which came out in 1699 at Paris. Though Quesnel was privy to this, he took no part in it. It ought not to be omitted that at this stage of the affair Bossuet interested himself on the side of Quesnel's writings, and defended them against opponents, in the *Justification des Réflexions*, printed in 1710. There is a current anecdote, that even his Holiness Pope Clement XI. gave the Reflections a reading, by which, as he declared, he was "singularly edified." A person of quality expressed his surprise that Père la Chaise should be found reading Quesnel; to which this wily persecutor replied, that he had done so daily for two years, and that the contents of the book made a deep impression upon him.

But this good opinion was so far from being universal, that Humbert de Precipiano, Archbishop of Mechlin, feeling disturbed by the controversies which had begun to agitate his

diocess, took advantage of an ordonnance which the Jesuits had procured to be issued by the king, and on the 30th of May, 1703, caused Quesnel to be arrested and brought to his palace at Brussels. He was thrown into three prisons, of which the last was only four feet square. One of these was so damp and noisome that hundreds of fungi started out of the mouldering walls. He lay in duress for some months before he was acquainted with the offence alleged, or had a hearing. Such were the modes of the old regime, such is the contrast with our blessed Anglo-Saxon and Protestant liberties. Trinity Sunday came round, a great day among ritualists; but he was forbidden to assist at mass, being considered as to all intents and purposes excommunicated. The reasons were, first, that he had said mass without the archbishop's leave; secondly, that he had done the like in his domestic chapel; and thirdly, that he had books in his possession which were forbidden by Rome. All his papers were attached. No doubt Monsigneur was aggrieved by one of the daring Oratorian's publications,* as well as by Arnould's book on Frequent Communion. On receiving tidings of these events, William Quesnel, at this time a priest of the Oratory, set measures on foot for his brother's enlargement. But though he hastened to Flanders, he was not permitted to see Pasquier. William, proceeding in due form of law, notified the archbishop July 6, 1703, of his *acte de recusation*, repeating the same on August 6, and September 4; he also appealed to the king, as in his sovereign council of Brabant. All this proving fruitless, William proceeded to exchange methods of law for stratagem; and on the 13th of September attempted to promote his brother's escape from prison. In this he received valuable aid from the Marquis d'Aremberg, who at an earlier day had been rescued from great straits by William. The conduct of the hazardous undertaking was entrusted to Count Salazar, a Spaniard, to whom d'Aremberg promised his daughter in marriage if success should crown their efforts.

The roof of an inn was contiguous to the prison wall; upon this roof the Spaniard mounted, with a dexterous workman.

* "Très humble remontrance à M. l'archevêque de Malines sur son décret du 15 Janvier 1695 pour la prohibition de plusieurs livres."

The first night their operations were interrupted. The prisoner had been aroused, and trembled in every limb; he threw himself on his knees, and offered up his freedom as a sacrifice to God. But the stillness of death ensued, and he was left in uncertainty for many hours. About eleven o'clock the following night, the work was resumed, and about one, a practicable breach was effected, through which the emaciated priest thrust himself, after he had pushed through his breviary, missal, and crucifix. It must be recorded, with pain, that this good but misguided man ascribed his escape to Mary, whom he had passionately besought to help him. His absence was first remarked about two o'clock in the afternoon, when some one came to bring his dinner. The city gates were immediately closed, and remained so for three days. Although the news was conveyed to the archbishop with much precaution, by his confessor, he is said to have swooned. The French Oratorians found it necessary, in consequence of this adventure, to debar William Quesnel from residence in their communities. Pasquier lay in hiding at Brussels until October 2d. In Namur, he was arrested by Ximenes the governor, under a general order of the King of Spain, forbidding any one to pass through the place; but he remained unknown. A respectable burgher became his security, and he was let free, but was again intercepted in Holland. Here he was not so easily disentangled. In reply to the archiepiscopal warrant of caption, we find his *motif de droit* of date February 13, 1704; in which are set forth his reasons for dreading the jurisdiction of the archbishop of Mechlin, who had charged him with several crimes. What are called in French law the *raisons de suspicion et de recusation*, are the illegality of his imprisonment, since the church allows a priest to be imprisoned only in case of gross and notorious delinquencies; the archbishop is himself a party concerned; the whole proceeding is prompted and directed by the Grand Vicar, Henry Van Susteren, of Amsterdam, a pupil and tool of the Jesuits; for, adds he, "None can be the friend of the Jesuits, without being their slave." He recalls to mind in this reclamation the fact that Ernest Ruth d'Ans, the excellent canon of St. Gedula, had been pursued into exile by the Jesuit rancour, because he was Arnauld's com-

panion and secretary. "And I also," says he, "had pronounced my own condemnation, if I had acknowledged this partial jurisdiction, inasmuch as for nine years it was my distinguished happiness to be the table companion of that famous doctor. So fanatical is the archbishop against Jansenism, that to be accused of it before his tribunal is the same as to be condemned. He has given the printer a dispensation to employ even festivals in printing such libels as *Le Jansenisme destructeur de toute religion.*"

As might have been expected, the prelate nevertheless pronounced sentence upon the case, on November 10, 1704. Upon the invitation of Coddés, archbishop of Utrecht, a man himself compromised with Rome, Quesnel now betook himself to Holland. The truly French and equally Jansenian vivacity of his temper, under persecution, showed itself in the critiques to which he subjected the prelate's sentence.* After the death of the archbishop, in 1711, Quesnel presented a petition to the high council of Brabant, not so much that they should investigate the case, which properly belonged to the canonists, as that they should pronounce the foregoing violent proceedings against him to have been unlawful, and therefore null. But Van Susteren, in the spirit already attributed to him, prevailed on the States' council to stay this proceeding.

We must now follow our careful authorities to the contemplation of the persecuting storm, as it rises in another quarter. In 1703 and 1704, beginnings of process against the Reflections made themselves known in France. Pamphleteers denounced Quesnel as a heretic, and disturber of ecclesiastical peace. It has been observed that the propositions cited are very much the same with those condemned by the Unigenitus. M. Adry informs us, that Noailles incurred the pontifical displeasure, by maintaining episcopal rights, according to the Gallican doctrine, in a convocation of clergy in 1705. Clement XI. made the Cardinal feel this by means of briefs, addressed to the king and bishops in 1706. This emboldened the enemies of Jansenism to make a fresh assault on our author. Several French editions

* 1. "Idée générale du libelle publié en Latin sous ce titre, 'Motif de droit pour le Procureur de la cour ecclésiastique de Malines.'" 2. "Anatomie de la sentence de M. l'archevêque de Malines."

were now before the public. For six and thirty years the book had been read in France with manifest blessings. It had been translated into Latin and English. Yet at this late day a decree was procured from the Pope, dated July 13, 1708, which condemned the work in severe terms, yet without citing particular passages. This decree was replied to, the year after, in a very lively production, which was generally ascribed to Quesnel.* As to the decree itself, it could not be published in France, without royal approbation; such was the remnant of state freedom, for which the Gallican party contended. But prelates were in the meantime eagerly condemning the work; so did the bishops of Luçon, Rochelle, and Gap, in 1710 and 1711, without reference however to the Pope's doings. But the Jesuits busied themselves in various parts of the kingdom in circulating ingenious caveats against Quesnel.

All this was, however, only a preliminary laying of the train. A number of bishops were getting up a letter, subscribed by high names, and requesting of the king to interfere against Jansenism. The mine was at one time discovered before it exploded; for the rough draft of a letter, which the Abbé Bochart de Saron was carrying from Teller to the Bishop of Clermont, fell into the very hands of those whom it was meant to destroy. The wishes of the anti-evangelical party were nevertheless conveyed to Louis XIV.; and in 1711, he wrote to the Pope, requesting from him a formal constitution, which should condemn the book, with specifications. What the see of Rome desired was now granted, namely, assurance that Louis would earnestly enforce its decision; so, in 1712, a Congregation of cardinals, prelates, and theologians was called, to sit upon the matter. Upon being informed of this summons, Quesnel lost no time in writing to the Pope; there was no reply.

The result of all was the famous bull, *Unigenitus Dei Filius*, a translation of which is found in the Appendix of the Philadelphia reprint. It is named, as is usual, from its first words, and bears date September 6, 1713. There are few

* "Entretiens sur le décret de Rome contre le Nouveau Testament de Chalons, accompagnés de réflexions morales."

more signal days in the history of Romish error and apostacy from truth. One hundred and one propositions alleged to be in the book were extracted and condemned, and every vindication of the same, past or present, was also condemned.

Dr. Wilson extracts an interesting passage from one of Matthew Henry's prefaces, which shows how the Protestant world regarded the constitution.

“The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ is the effectual principle of all manner of good; is necessary for every good action; for, without it, nothing is done, nay, nothing can be done. That it is the effect of a sovereign grace, and the operation of the almighty hand of God. That when God accompanies his word with the internal power of his grace, it operates in the soul the obedience it demands. That faith is the first grace, and the fountain of all others. That it is in vain for us to call God our Father, if we do not cry to him with a spirit of love. That there is no God, nor religion, where there is no charity. That the Catholic Church comprehends the angels, and all the elect and just men of the earth of all ages. That it has the Word incarnate for its Head, and all the saints for its members. That it is profitable and necessary at all times, in all places, and for all sorts of persons, to know the Holy Scriptures; and that the holy obscurity of the word of God is no reason for the laity not reading it. That the Lord's day ought to be sanctified by reading books of piety, especially the Holy Scriptures; and that to forbid Christians from reading the Scriptures, is to prohibit the use of light to the children of light.” Mr. Henry adds, “Many such positions as these, which the spirit of every good Christian cannot but relish as true and good, are condemned by the Pope's bull, as impious and blasphemous. By this it appears, that popery is still the same thing that ever it was—an enemy to the knowledge of the Scriptures, and to the honour of divine grace.”

To this summary we take the liberty of adding a few of the condemned propositions, which have not been made prominent by Dr. Wilson. 1. “In vain, O Lord, thou commandest, if thou thyself dost not give that which thou commandest.” This will be recognized as scarcely differing from the famous saying of Augustine, which rang through the whole Pelagian cam-

paign.—10. “Grace is an operation of the almighty hand of God, which nothing can hinder or retard.”—27. “Faith is the first grace and the fountain of all others.”—32. “Jesus Christ gave himself up to death, that he might by his blood for ever deliver his first begotten, or the elect, out of the hand of the destroying angel.”—76. “There is nothing more spacious than the Church of God, because it is composed of the elect and just of all ages.”—80. “The reading of the Holy Scriptures is for everybody.”

Such was Jansenism; such, in other words, was the approach to Reformed faith of a party not yet excluded from the title of catholicity, and honestly attached to the communion of Rome. Though a majority of bishops at the convocations of clergy in 1713 and 1714 agreed in approving the bull, Noailles, and a few others protested; and when after the death of the tyrant the persecuting force was somewhat remitted, it became apparent that in several universities and theological faculties it was only the arm of government which had enforced the condemnatory acts.

In Amsterdam, a city honoured beyond all others as an asylum for persecuted faith, our author passed the last fifteen years of his life, in great retirement. He commonly ventured abroad only when on Sundays and holidays he went to church or visited the clergy. His home was with good Dubois, who had been his fellow prisoner in 1703, and was now driving a little trade in books, that he might help Quesnel. For a long time Fouillou and Petitpied, refugee doctors of the Sorbonne, were also with him, assisting him in works, which their host printed. Both had been expelled from France in consequence of the *Cas de Conscience*. The bad air of Holland gave poor Fouillou a phthisic which vexed him long. At the time when they were struck by the fulmination of the Unigenitus, the three men were meditating a history of these great controversies. The two Sorbonnists wrote notes to a work on part of the subject.* In 1718 Petitpied was allowed to return to France and was reinstated in the faculty; but in 1728, after the death of

* “Histoire du Cas de Conscience par J. Louail et Françoise Marg. de Juncour,” 8 vol. in 12. Nanci, 1705—1711.

MM. de Bayeux and de Lorraine, he was put in prison. He escaped at a happy moment when his guard was playing with a cat. So in 1729 he fled once more to hospitable Holland, and was received by his brother exiles with open arms. Five years after, a certain Marchioness Vieuxbourg obtained permission from Cardinal Fleury for Petitpied to return to his native country; but his right hand was already crippled with much writing and he was preparing for his end, which took place January 7, 1747, at the age of eighty-two.* This leads one to observe the great age to which sedentary scholars and persecuted exiles sometimes drag out their threatened lives. Besides these pious companions, Quesnel enjoyed likewise the society of many travellers who sought him out for the sake of his cause and his virtues.

In the latter part of November, 1719, Quesnel was taken with an inflammation of the lungs, violent stricture of the chest and high fever, of which he died on the second day of December, at the age of eighty-five years and some months. As the termination was foreseen, he received the Romish sacraments, on the second day of his illness. In these hours we discern both the firmness of his superstitious adherence to ascetic usage, and the humble sincerity of his heart. When the officiating priest was ready, Quesnel insisted upon getting out of bed; a practice very common with moribund Catholics; notwithstanding his debility, he dressed himself, knelt while the celebrant read prayers, and received extreme unction as he lay on the foot-mat of his room. Amidst these uncommanded and unnecessary penances, we doubt not his soul was fixed on that Jesus, to exalt whom he had lived and suffered; for he was dissolved in tears, so that all present were deeply moved. When he was again put into bed, he signed a confession of his faith, in the presence of two apostolical notaries. He had done the same thing before, in his appeal to a future General Council and in his spiritual testament. In this instrument he declares it to be his purpose to die in the bosom of the Catholic Church, in which he had always lived; that he believed all the truths

† His last words were, "Ne tradas bestiis animas confitentes tibi, et animas pauperum tuorum ne obliviscaris in finem."

which she teaches and condemned all the errors which she rejects. He further acknowledges the Pope as the first Vicar of Christ, and the apostolic see as the centre of unity. "I abide," says he, "in the belief, that in my Reflections and in my other writings, I have taught nothing but what is perfectly conformable to the faith of the Church. If against my will aught that goes to the contrary has ever escaped from me, I revoke and abhor it, and submit myself beforehand to whatsoever the Church may determine respecting my writings and my person. I renew my protestations against the manifest injustice of those who have condemned me unheard. I persist in my appeal from the Pope's Constitution to a future General Council, in regard to all the matters of complaint, in which I have cried to the Church for justice; while I abhor every spirit of schism and separation." This act, like similar ones in the history of Pascal, Fénelon and others, suggests many sad reflections. Among others, it reveals the stupefying influence of Romish training on even great intellectual powers, and at the same time enhances the wisdom, faith and courage of the great Reformers. Admire and love as we may, we must still admit with sorrow that the gulf is immense between a Pascal, an Arnauld or a Quesnel, and a Luther, a Calvin or a Knox.

Fouillou with pious consideration noted the chief traits of the venerable sufferer. The Psalms were his principal consolation. Letters were written to friends, to seek their intercessions for the old man now dying. He gave his benediction to the whole family of exiles, holding out the crucifix to be kissed by them; and when the physician said that any moment might be his last, he cried, *Benedic, Domine, hoc sacrificium tuo sancto nomini præparatum*. His remains were taken to Warmond, a village near Leyden, and interred in the Van der Grast cemetery, where repose the ashes of Codde, Steenhoven, Baarchmann, Van der Croon, archbishops of Utrecht, and of other Dutch Romanists.

By those who form their judgment of Quesnel's muscle and nerve, from the "Moral Reflections," he would be judged as imperfectly as if we should conclude from Pascal's devotions, from Nicole's Treatise on Peace, or from the mighty Arnauld's logical exercises, that these men were capable only of meek sub-

mission; each of them was a mighty man of valour, and a man of war from his youth. As we shall have occasion to show in the sequel, our author wrote voluminously. When Le Tellier came into possession of his private papers, the wily courtier believed that he should now be able to ruin the officious Jansenist. Many a closet-council was held with the faithless Maintenon, once herself not far from the kingdom of God; and the great lady is said to have read passages to the king, in the evenings of several years. Shortly after his breaking prison, Quesnel addressed a keen letter to Van Susteren, the Vicar General. In this he demands restoration of his books and manuscripts, which had for the most part been perfidiously delivered to the French Jesuits. "But I doubt not," says he, "that the Jesuits, who have a bull for everything, have one for retaining other people's goods." He uses fiery scorn in treating of the treachery with which they ransacked and exposed the writings in which were recorded his family and personal affairs, and the most secret exercises of his soul before God. He reminds the Jesuits of the unparalleled treachery of their manoeuvres in regard to his friend and master, Arnould; how they had meanly sought to make him odious with every prince and court within their reach; accusing him to the Pope of holding one opinion, and to the king, then embroiled with Innocent XI., of holding exactly the opposite.

Growing warmly vehement, he adds: "But since our friends are among our richest possessions, I have a right to demand of you the restoration of my friend, as properly my own. I speak of M. De Brigode, as you well understand. Give me back this friend then; give him back to himself, to his family, to a pious widow, whose very vitals you lacerate, renewing in her the pangs of a mother by your inhuman treatment. For six months you have kept him in prison, notwithstanding the public dissatisfaction. That you might always have in your fiery furnace the mystical number of *three* children of Israel, you have on my account, and as if to be my substitute, incarcerated one of the holiest and most laborious men of the diocese, Verschoven, vice-pastor of St. Catharine's. You have torn him from the chosen vineyard to make him rot in gaol, till he shall fall down before Nebuchadnezzar's image. Sorrow pierces my

heart, when I behold how you have wasted this part of the Lord's heritage. *Singularis ferus depastus est eam.*"

Père la Chaise, as French story abundantly relates, was one of the marvels of that age. A quarter of a century before, this creeping Jesuit had been made confessor to the king. A long step upward was taken when he advised and directed the marriage with Madame de Maintenon. In old age he had the court at his feet; and, when on his death bed, he was consulted by the old monarch about the choice of his successor. La Chaise had made great ado over a case of Quesnel's papers. Whoever came in—it was, "Voilà tous les mystères d'iniquité du père Quesnel." He cackled over the nest of memoirs, letters, sketches, and especially the "jargon," the cipher, in which were contained treasons against state and king. There is a letter of Quesnel to la Chaise, without date, in which he dares him to make public the contents of this incendiary escritoire, or else to sit down with the reputation of a quacksalver crying his wares. The use of a cipher, he says, is no certain proof of any black art; princes, and even his Holiness, keep people whose business it is to write in cipher, and to decipher what is thus written by others. The Jesuits are not wholly ignorant of the art; though, to say truth, it was condemned at Rome. And he attacks the Jesuits, in regard to the villanous disguises which they were known to have assumed in their missions.

It is agreed among most Protestants, that there have been instances of true piety among persons still remaining in connection with the Church of Rome, and maintaining many of her errors. If a catalogue were made of the exceptional names admissible to such favourable judgment, it would be found, we think, that most of the modern ones are those of Frenchmen. Few English papists, we are sure, would come into such a record; of Italians and Spaniards there would be none; and of other continental ecclesiastics, little is known among us. We do indeed suppose, that among those German scholars and poets, who in revulsion from the rationalism of Paulus, and the pantheism of Fichte and Schelling, threw themselves into the bosom of Rome, when Stolberg and his companions went over, there were some who knew the truth. We have ourselves seen spectacles in the Catholic worship of Germany which taught us that under that

horrible superstition there is much earnest and tender experience. Still the fact remains, that we look chiefly to the Church of France for instances of vital religion. The Gallican doctrine tended to liberty of investigation. The presence of the Huguenots, in high places, including some of the greatest families of the kingdom, whetted the wits of ecclesiastics as long as toleration lasted; and even after the Revocation, since the assault was kept up from the Low Countries and the Palatinate. Above all, the followers of Baius and Jansenius, and the entire reaction against the Jesuits, with such literary auxiliaries as the Racines, Boileau, and Pascal, preserved the minds of thousands in a state of wakefulness. Since the days of the old Pelagian and Semipelagian wars, we may safely say, the works of Augustine were never so studied as by Jansenius and his followers and opponents. The doctrines of predestination and unconditional election, of total depravity, of human inability, of vicarious atonement, and of justification by faith, stand out prominently in the writings of Quesnel and his friends. When the foundation of their hope is expressed, it is always discovered to be the righteousness of Christ, and not any works or observances.

And here we may take occasion to correct what is a prevalent and injurious error with regard to the purity of subjective religion as found among French Catholics. Careful distinction must be made between parties equally claimed as eminent for holy devotion; and our judgment, if pronounced with due understanding, will not award indiscriminate praise, with one hand to the upholders of sovereign grace, and with the other to the abettors of a scheme of self-righteousness and justification by means of our own merits. Ascetic devotion and mystical rapture have always existed in the Church of Rome, in connection with some of the crudest errors and foulest crimes. Protestant zealots for a sort of refined quietism have sometimes culled from surrounding impurities, phrensies and even horrors, the less loathsome parts of such experiences as those of St. Francis Borgia and St. Teresa; but equal self-annihilation and equal soaring of pure love can be found in the rhapsodies of St. Ignatius of Loyola. These are infinitely remote from the elevations of Arnauld, St. Cyran, Nicole and Ques-

nel, with whom the great procuring cause of justification, the work of Christ, is made to fill the field of vision. Such men had their raptures also, just as Welch and Rutherford and Boston had theirs; but raptures warranted by a sound and explicit theology in regard to the ground of the sinner's acceptance. As we consider it untranslatable, we must omit a paper of Pascal's, which was found after his death sewed up in his clothes, as a testimony of marvellous revelations.* The Tridentine dogma of Justification, framed as it was expressly to counteract and annul the Lutheran and Reformation tenet on that head, must, if intelligently and consistently carried out, lead to its own school of experience, a school showing no higher products in its best estate than the beautiful figments of a Sales, a Bourdaloue, or a Fénelon. For if justification is "et sanctificatio et renovatio interioris hominis per voluntariam susceptionem gratiae et donorum;" then the whole regards of the soul seeking to be justified must be necessarily directed towards the bettering of its own subjective condition; a process which we observe honestly carried on by the mystical Romanists and their imitators.

These remarks seem necessary, in order to guard those readers who come fresh to these studies against the mistake of classing such piety as that of Pascal and Quesnel with the vague devotion and dangerous enthusiasm of Guion and Fénelon. For native temperament sweet beyond all words, for elegance of lettered accomplishment, for clear spiritual insight, for mastery of language, and the magic of high persuasive eloquence, as well as for self-control and resolved meekness, we may travel over the world of history and find no second Fénelon. Yet these qualities must not blind us to the enormous errors of his creed. We would draw a keen line of demarcation between him and the Jansenists; he would have drawn it himself, for when poor Quesnel was to be made an example, Fénelon joined in the persecution. This whole affair of Fénelon and the Quietists demands a careful re-investigation. The public has been accustomed to draw its information from gar-

* "Ravissement et Profession de Foi." *Pensées de Pascal*, ed. Faugère, vol. i. p. 239.

bled extracts of his writings. Let us have them as they lie in his own works; and let us carefully weigh the momentous burdens which he hurls upon Calvinism and evangelical faith. As in the case of a Barclay or a Channing, let not the loveliness of the man cause us to accept his peculiarities of belief; such a method would lead us to the adoption of creeds diametrically opposite to one another; as for instance are those of Quesnel and Fénelon on the matter of Grace. If an angelic charm of person and a witchery of style never surpassed could make us Pelagians, we should surrender to the Archbishop of Cambray; but his tenets are unscriptural.

It is remarkable, in the writings of the French mystics, how little is founded on the word of God; and how fantastically the text is perverted, in a good part of the scanty citations. It is still more remarkable how seldom the person and works of the Lord Jesus Christ are brought into prominence, in the voluminous correspondence of Madame Guion and Fénelon, and in the publications of both. It is startling to find this whole school floating away in an elysian contemplation, and delicious death to self and worldly entities, in which the very notions of sinfulness and pardon seem at length to be left far behind. There is not in literary history a phenomenon more curious than the private correspondence of Madame Guion and Fénelon, in its earlier stages. We wish, for the sake of candour, that more of this had been revealed by the biographers of both. For unction and impassioned eloquence, Guion was not inferior to her spiritual son; for such she entitles Fénelon again and again. The anile dreams which she now and then announces to him, and which he humbly receives and investigates as divine messages, indicate the mighty priestess. If she had been a divinely commissioned Deborah, she could not have found a more deferential Barak.* But the complete examination of this misapprehended and entangled affair, may well occupy an entire article. Suffice it now to say, that while, as Bossuet seems to have conceded, the connection between Madame Guion and Fénelon was

* "Lettres Chrétiennes et spirituelles sur divers sujets qui regardent la vie intérieure, ou l'esprit du vrai Christianisme. Nouvelle édition, enrichie de la correspondance secrète de M. de Fenelon avec l'Auteur." A Londres, 1767, 1768. Vols. V.

above all suspicion of earthly taint, it was on her part enthusiastically absurd, and on his part weakly credulous. It would be lamentable confusion to mistake this type of religion for that of the Port Royal; even the superstitions of the latter, and they were many, are of a widely different order.*

When we say of Jeremy Taylor, of Massillon, or of Neander, that he is grossly erroneous in some of his theological opinions, we do not thereby signify his exclusion from the kingdom of grace; let the same interpretation be given to our criticism of the pure and elegant archbishop. A thorough knowledge of the scheme of free redemption as founded in God's sovereignty, would have saved him from many of his wanderings. His Latin treatise, *De Summi Pontificis Auctoritate*, impugns the Jansenists by name, in regard to the Pope's indefectibility in matters of faith; and his own submission, beautiful as it is for consistency, is a monstrous apostacy from reason and individual faith. The *Lettres Spirituelles*, matchless for the perspicuous and elegant exhibition of a certain mystical experience, teach a most unscriptural doctrine concerning perfection of holiness in this life. His letters to a Benedictine father, on Predestination, are from beginning to end a denial of the Augustinian and Pauline doctrine of decrees. In a word, while his fascinating treatises are in a certain sense spiritual, they are not in any high sense evangelical; there is much of devotion, of pure love, of rapture, and of interior death, but little of the atoning sacrifice of Christ, or of communion with him as "the Head of every man." And this resembles very closely a sort of poetical religion, which is common in German pulpits, and which is rapidly becoming familiar to us, by means of the winning and scholar-like, but vague and uncandid rhapsodies of Maurice and his school. In the same degree is it opposed to the distinct gospel utterances of Jansenists such as Quesnel.

We have been led to dwell on this contrast between two classes of amiable French Catholics, partly because we often

* A mortifying chapter in their history is the affair of the Abbé Paris; the dear good man was dead before these horrors were enacted, which are spread in the text and plates of such books as "La Verité des Miracles opérés par l'Intercession de M. de Paris; par M. de Montgeron Conseiller au Parlement." Utrecht, 1637, quarto. This infatuation and mental *ramollissement* may be studied in connection with the modern cases of Judge Edmonds, Robert Owen, and Dr. Hare.

find them confounded by negligent students, and partly because the contrast itself is articulately set forth in the contemporary history of doctrine. We have seen how Fénelon, forgetting the wounds of persecution, joined in the clamour against Quesnel. He addressed the long-harassed old man in 1711, accusing him and his fellow Jansenists of virtual defection from Catholicity, joined to a cowardly hypocrisy. The editor of Madame Guion's correspondence grows warm beyond all quietistic decorum, in speaking of M. Phélipaux, author of the *Rélation du Quietisme*. "Observe," says he, "who this man is, who repeats all these rumours in his book. A Jansenist! In that word I have said all. *O tempora! O mores!* O inconsistency, duplicity, pharisaism, pushed beyond all that could be imagined. A Jansenist criticizes and blames the submission of M. Cambray; that is, he finds it not complete, and would have it inward as well as outward! A Jansenist! Let all the world judge. Where is shame? or how could audacity go so far? Jansenists—those who, as is universally known, not only do not submit themselves inwardly, but are outwardly indocile towards the decrees of the court of Rome; are schismatics, refuse the bulls, are constantly appealing from them as *an abuse*, stun the universe with the noise of their refusals, and are a monstrous member in the Roman Church for which they are preparing ruin and venturing at length to undermine its constitution. A Jansenist!"* The school of Quesnel had indeed given some great provocation to the school of Guion. We have often wondered that the eulogists of that amiable devotee and accomplished poet should have paraded before the world the colloquy in which she is logically torn to pieces by "the eagle of Meaux." The reader melts into commiseration at the inequality of a combat between a sensitive woman and the magnificent Bossuet. But this was a conversational defeat, not admitting of thorough attack or defence. He who would see the dogmas of the Quietists searched out to their foundation, and that foundation utterly subverted, must go to a Jansenist argument and peruse the cogent polemic of Nicole. His treatise upon Quietism was just through the press, in

* *Lettres Chrétiennes*, etc., Vol. V. Introduction, page cxxiii, cxxiv.

1695, when the old man breathed his last. The reader will find the principal points between the parties discussed in his work on Prayer.* This was he, on whom Pascal called in the hour of need, and whose subtle analysis added a new force to the links of steel which glitter in the *Provinciales*. The first, second, eighth, thirteenth, and fourteenth letters were revised by him, and of the fourth, ninth, eleventh, twelfth, sixteenth and seventeenth, he furnished the material. It was he who, lying perdu on the Rhine, and under the name of Wendrock, translated the *Provinciales* into Latin, and afterwards fortified the same with formidable notes. He is said to have got up the requisite latinity by a sedulous study of Terence. It must be owned that Nicole had not the spirit of martyrdom. As he fled from city to city in Germany and the Low Countries, wearing a variety of aliases, his timid nature led him to think himself continually pursued by the Jesuits. And when by Harlay's intercession he was permitted to return to Paris, he seldom went abroad, for fear of accidents. For a long period he made his abode in the remote suburb of St. Marcel, saying, "The enemies who menace Paris will probably enter by the gate St. Martin, and will have to traverse the whole city to reach me." This want of nerve unfitted him for oral controversy; and he used to say of one of his friends, "Tréville beats me in the chamber; but before he is down stairs I have confuted him." Yet this same shrinking creature was a Titan in written debate. Amidst some characteristic sneers, Bayle designates him as "*l'une des plus belles plumes de l'Europe.*" In composition he sacrificed everything to perfect transparency of thought and words, and to perfect sequence of ratiocination. Hence he failed in panegyric, in descriptive painting, and in amplificatory eloquence. We disagree with Palissat, when he says, "The reader quits these Essays without pain, and returns to them without pleasure; for readers require to be flattered;" and we agree with two better judges, namely Sévigné and Racine; of whom one says, in her joyous way, "I read M. Nicole with a pleasure which carries me away"—"There is not a word too much or too little;" and the other classes him

* *Traité de la Prière.* Paris, 1724. Vol. II. pp. 197, *et seq.*

with Pascal. Dryness should not be ascribed to writings, which have so exquisite a finish. These Essays on Morals, which so fascinated Madame Sévigné and the wits, were composed during the author's closing retreat at Paris, and fill twenty-five volumes. The edge of his scalpel was turned against play-houses, and this for a time threw off Racine; but the great poet returned to the dying-bed of his master, bringing medicine (*gouttes d'Angleterre*) which revived him for a little.

The way in which these theological disputes worked themselves into the coteries of Paris may be understood from a lively piece of contemporary gossip. "Apropos of Corbinelli," writes Madame de Sévigné, in 1690, "he wrote me a very pretty note the other day, giving me an account of a conversation and a dinner at M. de Lamoignon's; the actors were the host, M. (the bishop) de Troyes, M. (the bishop) de Toulon, Father Bourdaloue (a Jesuit) his companion, Despréaux and Corbinelli. The talk was of the works of the ancients and the moderns. Boileau stood up for the ancients, making exception however in favour of a single modern writer, who as he judged, surpassed both old and new. Bourdaloue's associate, who gave attention and was near to Boileau and Corbinelli, asked what that book might be which was so marked with genius. Despréaux hesitated to name it; Corbinelli said to him, 'Sir, I conjure you to tell me it, that I may spend the night reading it.' Despréaux replied, laughing, 'Ah, sir, you have read it more than once, I am certain.' Here the Jesuit interposed with an air of disdain, *un cotal riso amaro*, and pressed him to name an author who was so marvellous. Despréaux said to him, 'Mon père, do not press me.' The father persisted. At length Despréaux took him by the arm, and clenching it strongly said, 'Mon père, vous le voulez; hé bien! morbleu, c'est Pascal.' Pascal! exclaimed the father, all red and astounded, Pascal is as fine perhaps as falsehood can be. 'Falsehood!' rejoined Despréaux, 'falsehood! know that he is as true as he is inimitable; and he has been already translated into three languages.' That, replied the father, does not make him any the more true.

"Despréaux, who was now heated, cried out like a madman,

‘What! my father, dare you deny that one of your (Jesuits) has said in print that a Christian is not bound to love God? Dare you say that this is false?’—‘Sir,’ said the father, all in a rage, ‘one must distinguish.’—‘*Distinguish,*’ answered Despréaux, ‘*distinguish, morbleu, distinguish, distinguish* whether we are bound to love God!’ and taking Corbinelli by the arm, he retired to the other end of the room; then returning on the run, like one crazed, he would by no means go near the Jesuit, but joined a group that was still in the dining-room. Here ends my story, the curtain drops.”*

Let us be allowed, in this connection, to adduce a proof of Boileau’s love for men on both sides, by citing from his lines on Bourdaloue’s portrait, given him by Madame Lamoignon, this closing couplet:

“Enfin, après *Arnauld*, ce fut l’illustre en France,
Que j’admirai le plus et qui m’aima le mieux.”

The timidity of Nicole unfitted him to accompany his bolder companions to the fair conclusions of the system of grace. Jansenius was too high for his somewhat Erasmian mind. He wrote against the Calvinists, and in his later years supported a half-way doctrine of general grace, which dissatisfied his more manly acquaintances. Arnauld, in the seventh volume of his Letters, speaks sternly of it, and Quesnel complained warmly to Nicole himself of his defection. The fear of being considered Protestants at heart betrayed too many of the Jansenists into officious attacks upon Claude and other Calvinistic divines. This pusillanimity is charged upon them by the partisans of Fénelon. But our astonishment reaches its height when we find our excellent Quesnel condescending to say to his Jesuit adversaries, “I will say nothing of the intercourse which you have had with the Reformed minister Claude, the most formidable enemy of the Church in our day.”†

We have met with no account of the writings of Quesnel which seems so complete as that of Reuchlin; and to this we refer in what follows. The works are these:

1. “*Tradition de l’Eglise Romaine sur la prédestination des*

* Lettres, ed. Didot, 1844, Vol. VI. p. 96.

† Reuchlin, Gesichte von Port Royal, II. 812.

saints et sur le grace efficace." Cologne, 1687. 4 volumes, 12mo.—This is upon the Church authority concerning predestination and efficacious grace. Under the name of Germain he here gives an analysis of the Epistle to the Romans, and then the history of the Church-dogma till Trent, the dogma of Trent itself, the history of the famous *Congregatio de Auxiliis Gratix*, a part of their original acts, and the principal canons on this head. The third volume is chiefly taken up in answering a similar catena of the Jesuit Deschamps on the other side; this book appeared at Frankfort the same year. The fourth volume of Quesnel did not come out till 1696, and then at Liège; and bibliographers will recognize a characteristic of the age, in this migration of imprints from kingdom to kingdom, which belongs to the suggestive curiosities of literature. It occurs also as a separate work, entitled, "A Defence of the Church of Rome and the Sovereign Pontiff against Melchior Leydecker, theologian of Utrecht." Leydecker is a name greatly honoured in the Reformed theology of Holland. Quesnel had another controversy with him concerning the sovereignty of kings; the volume appeared at Paris in 1704.

2. "Apologie historique des deux censures de Louvain et de Douay sur la matière de la grace." Cologne, 1688. 12mo. The pseudonym here was Gery.

3. "Coram." A publication so called from its first word; being a new edition of the Sermons of Augustine.

4. "La discipline de l'Eglise tirée du Nouveau Testament, et de quelques anciens conciles." Lyons, 2 vols. quarto, 1689.

5. "Règles de la discipline ecclésiastique, recueillis des conciles, des synodes de France et des saints pères de l'église, touchant l'état et les mœurs du clergé." This work on Church discipline and clerical morals, was originally written by Darcis, another father of the Oratoire; but the edition of 1679 is much enlarged by Quesnel.

6. "Causa Arnoldiana," 1699.—A collection of Latin pieces, in vindication of his friend and patron, Arnauld; these were almost all written by himself and Nicole.

7. "Discours historique et apologetique." This is contained in the third volume of the "Justification of M. Arnauld against the censure of 1656;" a work which appeared at Liege, in

1702. The first and second volumes are chiefly by Arnould; the former half of the third comprises Arnould's life, and some letters of his, and St. Cyran's.

8. "Avertissement sur deux lettres de M. Arnould à M. Le Feron," etc. 1700.—The two letters of Arnould were addressed to Le Feron in 1687, about a book of one Bourdaille on the Ethics of St. Augustine, and formed part of the great casuistic controversy, and is a defence of Port Royal against certain charges.

We shall throw together in the margin a description of numerous minor and fugitive writings, as diligently collected by Reuchlin.*

It is time we should say something of the reprint which has just been issued by the Philadelphia press. Clearness and beauty of typography have certainly been secured. In comparing this with Collins's three volume Glasgow edition, of 1830, which is a sightly book, we give the preference to the American copy.

As pruned of those popish errors which hung about certain parts, but which lay chiefly in unessential phrases, the "Moral Reflections" are eminently fitted to be useful in our day and country. As Doddridge said of Leighton, we may say of Quesnel, that we never read even a few pages of his writings without elevation of mind. Bishop Wilson's commendation of the work is justly cited by Dr. Boardman; we may add of another

* Letter to M. Van Susteren, Dec. 5, 1703—"Motif de droit," 1704; already alluded to, and directed chiefly against the archbishop of Mechlin.—"A Problem, moral and canonical, proposed to M. Malo, Canon of Mechlin, and sometime official of the archbishop; to wit, which is the more probable, first, that M. de Precipiano has been for twenty years in contumacy and rebellion against the apostolic see under four popes, for being in spite of them dean and pastor of the metropolitan chapter of Besancon, or, secondly, that the apostolic see and four popes have unjustly persecuted M. de Precipiano."—"Letter to the King against the Jesuits," 1704.—"Letter to the Chancellor."—"Letter of Father Quesnel to Port Royal de la Chaise."—"Letter to an Archbishop."—"Letter of a private person to a friend."—"Letter to a friend touching what is abroad in the name of His Catholic Majesty," 1704.—"Declaration and protestation against the placard of the Archbishop of Mechlin."—"General idea of the libel of the fiscal of Mechlin," 1705.—"Letter concerning the process or *motif de droit*," 1705.—"Anatomy of the sentence of the Archbishop."—"Memoir in vindication of Father Qesnel's resort to the King," 1702.—"Father Bouhours, Jesuit, convicted of his old calumnies against the Port Royalists," 1700.—"Answer to two letters of Archbishop Fénelon," 1711.—Numerous other titles are preserved, but of publications less concerning our general subject.

Bishop Wilson, of Sodor and Man, not only that he caught much of the good Jansenist's spirit, but that he again and again borrowed from him in his well-known *Sacra Privata*, a manual of devotions, which is highly valuable when purged of those passages which inculcate the doctrine of merit.* It is not our purpose to quote from the volumes before us. They contain passages so fraught with genuine gospel truth, and such assertions of the sovereignty of the divine choice, the efficacy of grace, the inability of the sinner, the justification of the ungodly by faith, and the loveliness of the Lord Jesus Christ, as make us forget during the perusal, that the author acknowledged any allegiance to Rome. Such truth and such holiness, from whatever pen they come, should be welcome to every Christian mind.

SHORT NOTICES.

Miscellaneous Discourses and Expositions of Scripture. By George Paxton Young, A. M., one of the Professors of Theology in Knox's College, Toronto, Canada West. Edinburgh: Johnstone & Hunter. 1854. pp. 348.

WE feel a deep interest in our brethren of the Free Church in the British Provinces, and are filled with hope for their future, when we discern in them that zeal for sound education, as connected with scriptural theology, which has characterized genuine Presbyterianism in all its migrations, under Calvin, Knox, the Melvilles, and the Tennents. In 1853, the author of these discourses exchanged a pastoral charge at Hamilton for a theological chair at Toronto. The volume before us is an affectionate tribute to the people whom he left. These homiletical and expository exercitations evince sound judgment, biblical learning, and a tasteful mastery of diction, with an occasional surprise of unexpected thought. The metrical version of Habakkuk, at the close, is at once bold and successful. In speaking of this work, we may properly allude to a lecture of Professor

* We refer to the original folio edition of Bishop Wilson's works, or to some unaltered reprint, as, for instance, that of Oxford, (John Henry Parker,) 1853, 12mo.