

EDMOND RICHER

and

THE REVIVAL OF GALLICANISM

1600 - 1630

Thesis submitted for Ph.D. Degree - May 1928.

Donald O Soper

Soper (D.E.)

EDMOND RICHER

and

THE REVIVAL OF GALLICANISM

1800 - 1830.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTORY.

CHAPTER II.

EDMOND RICHER.

CHAPTER III.

THE REVIVAL OF EPISCOPALISM.

CHAPTER IV.

THE REVIVAL OF REGALISM.

CHAPTER V.

THE OUTCOME.

CONCLUSION.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

BRITISH LIBRARY
OF POLITICAL AND
ECONOMIC SCIENCE

157578

INTRODUCTORY.

I. "La Religion ne crée pas seulement le lien qui unit l'homme à Dieu. Elle règle et surveille les relations entre l'homme et l'homme.... L'art de gouverner les hommes est invinciblement uni à la mission de les catéchiser de les convaincre et de les améliorer.¹ Gabriel Hanotaux is stressing here the duality implied in the life of a civilized community. He is indicating the necessary connection and interaction between the world of ideals and the world of affairs, and more particularly he is saying that there must be a "modus vivendi" between the church and the state.

In modern times the various theories and doctrines which have been propounded in the attempt to arrive at a true relationship between the spiritual and the secular "imperia" have naturally divided themselves into two broad classes. On the one hand there are the theories which give the primacy to the spiritual. They find their most rigid and extreme presentation in the ultramontaniam of a writer like Jean Porthaise, Bishop of Portiers, who not only claimed for the Pope the monopoly of spiritual authority, but also held that all secular authority is from the church, and derives its validity from papal sanction. Logically protracted they end in the church as a "societas perfecta", containing

1. Gabriel Hanotaux "La France en 1614" p.413.

within itself all the instruments of secular as well as spiritual administration. On the other hand there are the theories which invest the secular arm with supremacy. Erastianism holds that the church is the creature of the state and finds its apotheosis in the communistic conception of the church as but an "epiphenomenon" of the political and economic structure.

Within these two broad divisions there have been many attempts to reconcile high conceptions of both "imperia" in one system. Gallicanism is the name which has been given to such attempts made in France. Ecclesiastically under the name of episcopatism the history of Gallicanism is the history of a theory of the constitution of the Catholic Church which in opposition to Ultramontanism seeks to conserve its authority and at the same time to make room for national and independent development by treating it as an aristocracy with the Pope as "primus inter pares" rather than a monarchy with the Pope as absolute. From Gerson through Richer and Bossuet to the Revolution, episcopatism was advanced as the basis of a national church, but it finally succumbed before the Vatican Council of 1870. Politically under the name of regalism, the history of Gallicanism is the history of a doctrine of the state which, by its insistence upon the divinity or necessity of political sovereignty, and the existence of fundamental law, provides the authority for intervention and control by the state in

the affairs of the church. With its roots far back in the history of medieval France, (there are indications of regalism even with Saint Louis), finding its champions among the lawyers as well as with the Sorbonne, given almost the force of law by Pithou, it finally succeeded in wresting recognition from Rome itself and now enjoys that "indépendance tolérée" whereby the crown possesses in the words of Puyol "le droit de controle sur les decisions et la conduite des ministres de l'Eglise."¹

Before we discuss the Revival of Gallicanism in the opening years of the seventeenth century, which is particularly associated with the name of Edmond Richer, it will be necessary briefly to indicate the background of political and ecclesiastical thought in France during the sixteenth century, out of which this revival sprang. Revivals do not emerge "in vacuo"; Richer is only intelligible in terms of his predecessors, and the events of 1614 are linked up with the tragedies of 1572. Figgis says that "political liberty is the residuary legatee of ecclesiastical animosities." There can be no doubt that political thought during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries in France was the outcome of the Reformation and the Civil Wars of Religion. Following upon the moral and doctrinal cleavages of the first half of the sixteenth century, in 1562, had begun a series of desolating

1. Ed. Puyol. "Edmond Richer" Vol.I. p.8.

conflicts which all but broke up France. Devastation, impoverishment and demoralisation followed and the question of immediate urgency was that of reconstructing government.

II. THE POLITIQUES AND ABSOLUTISM.

Perhaps the most significant of the results of the Civil Wars was the acceleration it gave to the secularization of politics and government. Out of the chaos of spiritual loyalties thinkers turned from the Pope as the focus point of authority and unity, to the King. There was growing a sense of the need for recognition of a single will as supreme and endowed with power to make law absolutely, and alongside this - "the conception of this needed sovereign power as ordained and directly created by God as his agent for the welfare of society".¹ The absolutist theories had been formulated in the law schools of France under the stimulus of the "reception" of the Corpus Juris which was one of the outstanding elements of the Renaissance. Towards the middle of the century, public events forced the procedure of the study of the corpus juris into new channels. Jacques Cujas and the new school of jurists sought to connect Roman law with the actual institutions of their own time, and the work of the 'civilians' helped the lawyers to see law-making power

1. J.W. Allen. "A History of political thought in the sixteenth century". p.273.

as the very essence of sovereignty and suggested to them the embodiment of such sovereignty in the King of France; but they tended from the first to substitute the idea of Divine Sanction for the idea of delegation. As early as 1563 it was being argued among the Royalists that the only alternative to permanent anarchy and general brigandage was the recognition of an unlimited duty of submission. After the massacre of Saint Bartholomew in 1572 it became increasingly obvious that religious uniformity was a forlorn hope, and out of this scepticism which was soon to develop into the deeper scepticism as to the truth of religion itself, the Politique began to crystallize his thoughts and look to a religious toleration based upon a political absolutism as the one solution. Andrew Blackwood,¹ Pierre de Belloy,² and Louis le Roy,³ at about the same time began to advance similar theories of the Divine Right of Kings, theories which were to be summarised and formulated by Barclay in his "De Regno et Regale Potestate" which was published at Paris in 1600. In the main these writings assert that God alone creates sovereignty and confers this sovereignty, which is a right to demand absolute obedience as a duty, upon the Kings of France in precisely the same way that He gave authority to Saul and David: therefore rebellion must be wrong in every conceivable

-
1. "De Vinculo Religionis" began in 1575 and completed in 1611. "Apologia pro Regibus" 1581.
 2. "Apologie Catholique" 1585. "De l'autorité de Roi" 1587.
 3. "De l'excellence du Gouvernement Royale" 1575.

case. Both in form and in content these theories are religious. Bodin was to herald the wider scepticism and demonstrate that actually the basis of the French monarchy and the belief in the Divine Right of Kings were alike utilitarian and were destined to remain so. The emergent absolutism which Bodin foreshadowed in the "Republic"¹ is a political authority derived from human nature and from human need rather than from Divine fiat. "You may eliminate from Bodin's "Republic" all his references to God and to princes as the lieutenants of God, and the whole structure will remain unaltered, but if you eliminate God from the system of Barclay nothing will remain".² Bodin found his conception of sovereignty involved in the very idea of the state and the recognition of legal sovereignty as its distinguishing mark. Thus, where the earlier writers invoked God as the necessary ground of the state, Bodin achieved its complete secularisation and conceived of a self-subsistent political structure based upon sovereignty, the family, and private property. So the theories of political absolutism which were born in a religious struggle and matured in a theological cradle grew up to forsake their early associations and historically "it is those who lost faith in the divinity of right, and of Kings, who believed in the absolute right of the political sovereign".³

1. "The Six Books of the Republic" 1576.

2. J.W. Allen "History of political thought..." pp.415-416.

3. J.W. Allen p.393.

III. THE HUGUENOTS AND CONSTITUTIONALISM.

Of hardly less significance were the doctrines and systems promulgated either by, or in the interests of, the Huguenots. It is easy to understand that their theories would naturally tend to become associated with constitutional forms of government - they had everything to lose in an absolutism spiritual or political. As with the Politiques, Huguenot thought before 1572 is inchoate and inconsiderable, but out of the terrible events of that year, certain ideas emerged into at least partial recognition. Hotman attempted in the "Franco Gallia" published in 1573 to provide arguments for a limited monarchy in France. He attempted to secure historical authority for the sovereignty of the States General to prove that the King should be restrained by the authority "des gens des bien et l'honneur comme representant la personne du peuple lequel les commet à cela et leur donna cette puissance."¹ In the composite work the "Reveille Matin des Francais" of 1574, it is more definitely the community that confers power conditionally on the King, and not upon him alone but also to a number of magistrates whose ordinary functions are subordinate. Both these works are a general indication of the Huguenot trend of thought which hoped to find a cessation of strife and persecution and a political security in vesting ultimate authority in the

1. "Franco Gallia"- French of 1574 Chap.1. p.12.

community as a whole, thus treating the obligations of ruler and subject as reciprocal. It was out of this that was formulated in the "Memoires" of 1576 and the important "Vindiciae contre Tyrannos" of 1579 what can broadly be called a contract theory of government and which implies a "pactum" made between a community and its sovereign and argues that if the sovereign breaks the "pactum" then, and only then, the community possesses the divine right of rebellion against the tyrant. These conceptions formulated in the interests of a religious sect came to be championed by the Parlementaire in opposition to unrestricted absolutism. The study of the "Lex Regia" under the stimulus of Salamonius and Buchanan gave to the Parlementaires both the conception of law as limiting all governmental action, and the ideas of the sacredness of customary right out of which later they made bold to claims of veto on royal edicts and to reassert the supremacy of the States General.

IV. THE LEAGUE AND ULTRAMONTANISM.

Unlike the two preceding movements of thought, which started out in the main to preserve the state and to abolish disorder, the Catholic League which was formed in 1576 sprang from the desire to preserve true religion. Amid much confusion of thought two things constituted its strength "the belief that true religion was in danger, and the belief that national

unity had been gravely compromised by the grant of privilege to the Huguenots".¹ The Pamphleteers of the League all come back to religion. Just because the true faith is the real bond of society it follows that the King of France must be a Catholic and his duty must be to extirpate heresy. If a heretic mounts the throne he is no true King but an imposter whom the true believer cannot obey, but must depose if necessary by force of arms. Jean Boucher published his "De justa abdicatione" in 1589 and the "De justa republicae" of unknown authorship appeared at the same time. Both these works, though often incoherent, testify to the doctrine that the people must always preserve its unity even at the expense of deposing its King or even abolishing its monarchy. The Sorbonne expressed the spirit of the League quite consistently when in 1590 it declared that to assist Henry of Navarre was to commit mortal sin. These contentions inevitably raised the problem of the relationship between the Papacy and the sovereignty of France, and though the nationalistic element in the League predominated, its theories tended to take on the colour of Jesuit papalistic doctrine, particularly after the excommunication of Henry of Navarre by Sixtus V in 1585, and to become associated with the positions taken up by Bellarmine in his "Tractatus de potestate summi pontificis" of 1610. This important writer, whom his adversaries found so difficult to oppose, because of his moderation

1. J.W. Allen p.344.

and aversion to invective, thought that the Pope, who derives his authority directly from Christ and has not only the cure of souls as his charge, but whose function it is to see that men are governed so that their final salvation is not imperilled, must have the power to set aside any law or any person by which or by whom men's spiritual welfare is endangered. He can depose Kings, not at his discretion but "*ad finem spiritualem vitae aeternae*". The secular state is founded on man's need in this world and the King is a delegate minister of the community. It has an authority independent of the church in origin, but this authority is overshadowed by the supernatural end to which mankind moves, and therefore it is for the spiritual to direct the temporal in the interests of man's eternal vocation. The League then came to be associated not only with tyrannicide but also with the ultramontanist theories of the Jesuits. It was left for the Jesuit Mariana¹ to show that there was enough in Bellarmine to justify the national and secular state resting on those very earthly needs and on the will to peace and security, in believing itself to be autonomous, potentially and logically independent of any church.

Amid this mass of political and religious thought which was appearing in France by the year 1575 one fact is of supreme significance. There is an unmistakably secular trend in the theories, not only of the absolutists and constitutionalists,

1. "De Rege et regis institutione" 1598.

but also implicit even in the pamphlets of the League. Among much that was conflicting and contradictory all were looking, consciously or unconsciously, towards a political structure existing in its own right and free from the embarrassing sanctions of the church.

Why then did this secularizing process not take more immediate effect? The answer is to be found in the last great factor in moulding the thought of France at the end of the century, which has yet to be noted. After 1575 The effects of the Council of Trent can be seen not only in the thought of the church but more especially in the great moral and spiritual regeneration which it achieved; and it is the impact of the new concordant and incisive Catholicism which resulted from Trent, upon this welter of political thought which is reflected in the attitude of the Crown, the Parlement, the Episcopate and the Sorbonne at the opening of the seventeenth century.

V. THE COUNCIL OF TRENT.

The Council of Trent achieved two important results. It crystallized Catholic doctrine and practice round an absolute Papacy and it restored authority to the whole system of Catholicism. By a clear cut statement of belief it shut the door in the face of further reform or concession, and

labelled the heretic. Though it took no cognizance of the new learning and reset its doctrines in the scholastic mould, the Council of Trent gave to Roman Catholicism the immense advantage of a "united front". Trent was the final victory of papal absolutism. After long and heated debates the Council decided against the "de jure divino" doctrine of the episcopate in favour of the theory that the bishop is only ordained as superior to the priest "de jure pontificio".¹ This of course was the official death blow to episcopatism; it meant the decisive triumph of papal over conciliar government and implied the infallibility which it left the Vatican Council of 1870 to state. Moreover, the French delegates acquiesced in this victory. The Cardinal of Lorraine who went to Trent to uphold the Gallican liberties, and whose arrival was so much feared by the papalists was won over by the Pope and went home an ultramontanist.² By the separate concordats which Pius IV through Cardinal Morone made with Austria and Spain, and which the Council accepted, and by the decree "proponentibus legatis"³ which ensured that in any oecumenical council it is for the Pope through his legates to initiate discussion and propose the subjects to be considered, this victory was practically demonstrated. Moreover, Trent not only enunciated catholic orthodoxy and authority, it fostered an executive to implement its claims.

1. See History of Council of Trent by Fra Paolo Sarpi, translated by Nathaniel Brent 1640.

2. Ib. pp.719.

3. Ib. pp.720, 721.

It was a Jesuit Lainez¹ who more than any other theologian was responsible for the rejection of the "dejure divino" theories of the episcopate and it was a Jesuit Salmeron who was the chief protagonist of the "proponentibus legatis" decree. The Papacy was quick to take advantage of the zeal, loyalty and scholarship of the Order of Jesus and the Jesuits came to be accepted as the criteria of orthodoxy and the interpreters of the Tridentine Decrees. The influence of Trent, through the Jesuits, upon the League has already been observed. As we consider the political and religious positions taken up by the various institutions in France in the years 1590-1600 it will be seen that Trent further made it impossible for those who were endeavouring the task of reconstructing government after the civil wars, to ignore the claims of a consolidated catholic church.

VI. THE CROWN.

This is pre-eminently seen in the acceptance of Catholicism by Henry of Navarre. Whatever views may be held as to the sincerity of his conversion, and whatever may have been the subsequent absolutism of his reign, it was a public recognition of the power of the new catholic spirit. The League had been right - the King of France must be a Catholic. However, with his first Mass behind him, and with the rapid disintegration

1. Ib. p. 722.

of the League in progress, Henry IV showed that his real objective was internal peace and security based upon a royal absolutism and religious toleration. A practical man of affairs rather than a consistent theorist, Henry grasped the reality after which the thinkers like Barclay were struggling. He thought of himself as absolute; he wrote to James I that a King "n'est responsable qu' à Dieu seul et à sa conscience" and because in fact he was absolute he was astute enough to discourage its proclamation. Mariéjol calls him an opportunist "Les principes céderont à l'opportunité, les actes seront adaptés aux circonstances et aux personnes. Il ne met pas sa gloire à briser les résistances et à braver l'opinion; à l'occasion, il cède ou paraît céder. Il calcule exactement ce qu'il peut tenter sans danger et il va au bout de son pouvoir sans le dépasser."¹ He gave lip-service to the claims of the parlementaire to a share in the government, but when he made promises as to the notables at Rouen in 1596 to receive their counsels and to follow them, these promises were nothing more than compliments to pave the way for the demand of subsidies. It cannot be doubted that Henry IV hoped for a unity of faith in France, yet he was only prepared to foster that unity in the atmosphere of a religious peace based on toleration. He strove to preserve in his actions an impartial "via media". If he was anxious to convince the Catholics as to the sincerity of his conversion

1. J.H. Mariéjol, "Henri IV et Louis XIII". "Histoire de France (Lavissee) Vol. VI, p.24.

he did not neglect to affirm his intention of maintaining the Edict of Nantes and while he fostered his new faith by the reformation of the University of Paris and the recalling of the Jesuits, he remembered his old friends and allowed the people of La Rochelle to strengthen the walls and fortifications of their city. Henry IV gave practical justification to the claims of the Politique; the national spirit which the success of his reign generated made the revival of Gallicanism certain and his assassination was also the death blow to the doctrine of tyrannicide. Richelieu, Bossuet and Louis XIV were already in sight.

VII THE PARLEMENTAIRES.

The lawyers of the Parlements, particularly of the Parlement of Paris, were the depositories of political Gallicanism, and, as always in France, it was among the lawyers that political theories found their most receptive hearing. It was here that the process of secularization was most marked. The reception of the Roman categories and the doctrines of the Huguenot constitutionalists had the effect of crystallizing their regalism. Pithou is the outstanding example of the lucidity and brevity combined with absoluteness with which the Parlementaire was beginning to urge the Gallican liberties. The more secular minded they became, the more they asserted that it was not the duty of governments to

maintain true religion and stamp out by force what the church called heresy, "the more clearly they conceived the state as independent of any one form of religion, the more were they bound to a Gallicanism as extreme as Servin's."¹

There is however another element in the attitude of the Parlements in 1700 which is new and the direct result of the Council of Trent. Regalism had been held as a doctrine independent of theories as to the constitution of the Catholic Church. Pithou, Thomassin and Marca held that questions as to the absolutism of the Papacy and infallibility had nothing to do with the Gallican liberties. The impact of the Tridentine positions forced the lawyers to ground their regalism in an opposition theory to the claims of Papal absolutism. "La principale raison, disait Nicole, que les Parlements ont eu de s'opposer fortement à l'établissement de cette doctrine est qu'ils ont bien jugé qu'elle entraînait nécessairement la supériorité du Pape sur les rois".² De Thou, Servin, Harlay and Omer Talon saw only too clearly that the decrees of Trent carried with them the legality of papal interference in the conduct of the French King. Accordingly they began to support episcopatism and to defend the ancient spirit of the Sorbonne. Briefly, the Parlements were Regalist, the political thinkers

1. J.W. Allen. p.376.

2. Ed. Puyol "Edmond Richer" Vol.1. p.24.

made them Erastian and the Council of Trent forced them into Episcopatism.

VIII. THE SORBONNE.

If the Parlements are the home of regalism it is equally true that episcopatism is the child of the Sorbonne. As a theory it was championed by doctors of the Sorbonne such as Gerson and D'Ailly at the time of the great schism in the Catholic Church, as the one doctrine which could survive the quarrels of Pope and anti-Pope, and down to the sixteenth century, the spirit of the Sorbonne was linked up with episcopatism. During the sixteenth century in face of the menace of the Reformation and during the Civil Wars the Sorbonne forsook its traditions, rallied wholeheartedly to the Papacy and provided the League with some of its staunchest supporters. Its doctors studied Bellarmin and approved the most extreme Ultramontaniam, and yet within a few years a reaction has set in, under the influence of Richer the ancient spirit of the Sorbonne is revived and the positions of Gerson, D'Ailly and Almain are being promulgated afresh in the ardour of revival. The reasons for this reaction are to be found mainly in the excesses of the League spirit which defeated its own ends after the coronation of Henry IV. Gerson had championed episcopatism in the interests of

Christendom at large, the Sorbonne imbued with a national fervour came to think of episcopatism as the possible basis of a state church which, hand in hand with the new monarchy, would restore political and religious prestige throughout France. The very success of Henry's reform of the University of Paris as opposed to the futility of the League after 1594 justified the Sorbonne in the belief that the welfare of the church in France was inextricably bound up with the new monarchy.

IX. THE CLERGY.

The church in France at the end of the sixteenth century presented a sorry spectacle of disorganisation and demoralization. From two sources however reformation and new vitality were emerging. The General Assembly of the clergy in 1596 while candidly admitting the parlous conditions prevailing in almost every diocese yet testify to a new national consciousness. This was the natural result of the triumphant royalty in Henry IV, for as Puyol says "l'administration des diocèses était à cette époque une fonction aussi politique qu'écclésiastique, la plupart des évêques étaient des cadets de famille dont les aînés occupaient les postes principaux de la cour; le maniement des affaires générales du clergé rapprochait perpétuellement des ministres du roi les grands

dignitaires du clergé. Pour toutes ces causes l'épiscopat français se sentait incliné vers la royauté par les liens multiples."¹ Moreover, many of the clergy were also 'politiques' in their demands for the independence of the secular power. The parlementaires could rely upon them to champion the Gallican liberties, and the Sorbonne was to find in them some of the fiercest opponents of ultramontanism. Reformation and Revival were however appearing from another quarter. The Jesuits and the League were fostering an active piety and mysticism which was as rigid in its Catholic orthodoxy as it was widespread in its effects. Madame de Saint Beuve whose brothers were prominent "ligueurs" and who founded the "Ursulines", Bérulle who founded the Oratory, Sénauld, its second general, Madame Accane who introduced the Carmelite Order into France are all examples of the revival within the church in France which proceeded along the lines of the League and Ultramontanism. Again, though Henry IV refused to publish the decrees of Trent the decrees of reformation could be seen effectively operating in the reform of the monastic orders which was in full swing by the year 1600. The importance of this element in the religious reformation within the Gallican church cannot be overstated, for the loyalty which it inspired in such men as Du Val for "Saint Siège" was to be determinate of the Gallicanism

1. Ed. Puyol "Edmond Richer Vol. 1. p.32.

which the church was finally to accept. More and more the clergy found themselves pledged to a double loyalty in which national and papal claims vied with each other. We shall see that they achieved a compromise and called it "Duvallisme".

Such then briefly was the general condition of political and religious thought in France at the beginning of the seventeenth century, when Richer appeared. The significance of the Reformation had been internationally to consolidate Catholicism, nationally to strengthen the state. In the world of practical affairs Henry IV had built his authority upon the rock of secular absolutism and out of the religious problem had evoked a new nationalism. The legal profession which in France as everywhere was to be the main support for the strength of the state had conceived a political allegiance independent of the church and was face to face with the problem that to maintain international Catholicism meant a divided loyalty. The parlementaires and the lawyers resolved their problem by becoming Erastian and found themselves logically pledged to Episcopatism as the only effective answer to the Papal claims. The church with its theologians could not react to the situation with the thoroughness of the parlementaires. The unity and integrity of the faith was still a matter of prime importance and yet the episcopate realised that some sort of Gallicanism was the necessary reply to the

League on the one hand and the Huguenot on the other. The more the church recovered in spiritual virility the more it realised that its debt of gratitude for that recovery was due as much to royal as to religious authority. The stage was set for a revival of Gallicanism and in that revival Edmond Richer was to take a leading part.

EDMOND RICHER
=====

I. There are two accounts of the birth and early years of Edmond Richer and they do not agree. The one is contained in "La Vie d'Edmond Richer" by Adrien Baillet and published in 1714, and the other is from an anonymous document attached to the manuscript of Baillet's book in the "Bibliothèque Nationale".

According to Baillet, who from first to last treats Richer rather as a legendary hero than an historical person, Edmond Richer was born at Chaours in Champagne in 1559 of poor farming stock, and until the age of eighteen he worked on the land with no education save the very slight tuition of the village school. His elder brother designed for the church, having absorbed the family resources, Richer would have been forced to spend the rest of his life at Chaours had he not been possessed of indomitable will and insatiable ambition. He went to Paris and there by superhuman efforts he worked his way through the University and finally, after long years of heroic labour, he won his doctorate in theology. Such in brief is Baillet's version. "Elle n'est peut-être pas aussi exacte qu'elle est intéressante",¹ and when contrasted with the account in the anonymous document it is difficult to

1. Ed. Puyol "Edmond Richer", Vol.1. P.53.

treat seriously. This other biographer can be quoted in full. "Richer naquit non à Chaours mais à Chesley, village du diocèse de Langres. C'est ce que l'on a appris d'une personne digne de foi, mieux instruite que M. Baillet, tant sur le lieu de la naissance de Richer, que sur la situation dans laquelle il se trouva, avant qu'il allât étudier à Paris. Voici ce qui m'a été communiqué là-dessus. Richer est né dans un village nommé Chesley au diocèse de Langres entre Troyes et Tonnerre. Ayant perdu son père et sa mère lorsqu'il était encore fort jeune, et étant demeuré sans biens et sans aucun secours humain, il fut obligé de s'abandonner à demander l'aumône. Il vint pour ce sujet dans une petite ville à deux lieues de Chesley nommée Chaours, où s'étant présenté à la porte d'un maréchal qui se nomme Hénault, bisaïeul maternel de celui qui écrit ceci et qui l'a appris de son père, cet homme qui le trouva bien fait et d'une physionomie qui marquait de l'esprit, lui fit plusieurs questions et fut si content de ses réponses qu'il le prit chez lui et l'envoya à l'école avec quatre fils qu'il avait. Quand il y eut appris à lire et à écrire, en lui enseigna un peu de latin: il sut bientôt tout ce que son maître pouvait lui en apprendre. Alors il forma la résolution d'aller à Paris et pria son bienfaiteur Hénault de l'y envoyer, en lui disant qu'il voulait chercher fortune. Hénault y consentit avec regret parce qu'il l'aimait, et ne pouvant lui donner un

grand secours, il se contenta de lui faire faire un habit de drap, mit deux écus dans sa poche, et le congédia en lui disant: Va, mon enfant, Dieu te bénisse et te conduise. Lorsqu'il fut à Paris, la Providence l'adressa à un docteur de Sorbonne qui logeait au collège de Boncourt. Le docteur le recut d'abord en qualité de domestique; mais ayant remarqué en lui un esprit excellent, il le prit en affection, se fit un plaisir de lui faire continuer ses études, le poussa jusqu'au doctorat, et le fit légataire universel de son bien qui était assez considérable. En cet état, Richer manda à son premier bienfaiteur que par la grâce de Dieu, il était en état de lui rendre le bien qu'il lui avait fait dans ses premières années; qu'il lui envoyât ses enfants et qu'il en prendrait soin. Hénault qui avait alors marié son fils aîné, envoya les trois autres à Richer, et de ces trois frères, l'un a été docteur de Sorbonne, l'autre chartreux, et le troisième médecin de M. le prince de Condé."¹

This account commends itself by its lucidity and authority, and would seem to be corroborated by the one reference which Richer himself makes to his early years. In his "Historia Academiae Parisiensis" he mentions that one of two Jesuits who perished in Paris of the plague in 1580 had taught him the rudiments of reading and writing at Chaours in 1568.² Whichever version, however, is true, certain

1. Document attached to manuscript of "Baillet's Life of Richer. Bib. Nat. Fr. 2109.

2. Ed. Richer "Historia Academiae Parisiensis" Vol.II. P.508.

elements in Edmond Richer stand revealed. From his earliest years he showed signs of a determination, ambition and ability which marked him out from his fellows and commended him to influential acquaintances.

Of Richer's studies at Paris before he obtained his doctorate again little is known with any degree of certainty. In fact the only precise details as to his progress during the fifteen years during which he was studying for that honour are contained in the "Mémoires de Richelieu". "Richer, dit le grand cardinal, arriva au collège du Cardinal Lemoine, et se mit à servir un docteur nommé Bouvart, demeurant audit collège, ayant nombre d'éccoliers en pension chez lui. Il fit au dit collège ses études d'humanité, où il réussit assez bien; mais en philosophie, il ne réussit pas si bien, n'ayant jamais pu pénétrer dans le fond de cette science. Ayant achevé son cours, et obtenu le degré de maîtrise ès-arts, il alla régenter à Angers, où, après avoir passé quelques années, il revint à Paris, régenta la philosophie au collège de Bourgogne, et entra au cours de théologie dans la Sorbonne. Durant sa demeure audit collège il fut peu aimé, à cause de son naturel fier et hautain."¹ His studies were finally successful for he relates in the "Apologie de Gerson"² that he took seventh place in the list of thirty-four licentiates in

1. "Mémoires de Richelieu." Chapter 20.

2. Edmond Richer "Apologie de Gerson" Axiom 8. P.38.

Theology in the year 1592 and the degree of doctor was conferred upon him the same year. Though this is all that is specifically known as to the particular studies of Richer, the general course of instruction and examination leading up to the doctorate in theology at Paris in the sixteenth century is well known, and because this scholastic education had important results upon his later thinking and outlook it will be necessary to indicate its main characteristics.

The actual course of study was spread over fifteen years and the candidates passed through four stages. Beginning as "étudiants", after six years they proceeded by examination to the rank of "bachelier". For seven years the "bacheliers" taught, debated and preached, and at the end of this period presented a thesis which, if satisfactory, obtained for them the "licence" to teach theology anywhere. The "licenciés" after solemn initiations proceeded to the position of "maîtres" or "docteurs" at the beginning of their fifteenth year of study. In terms of an English University the four stages would roughly correspond to undergraduate, graduate, don, and fellow or professor.

During this whole period theology was the exclusive subject of study, and the scholar was expected to devote to it the whole of his time. Baillet recounts the fact that Richer during the years 1580-92 gave twenty-two hours every

day to study and two to sleep.¹ The system of teaching exclusively followed was the Scholastic method. All processes of thought were deductive, all arguments "a priori".

Maldonat, who in the seventeenth century revolutionized the teaching of Theology in the University of Paris, has left on record a detailed examination of the curriculum.² For hours every day the student would listen to lectures by the doctors, lectures which were dogmatic in form and were intended to be learnt by heart. After these lectures the students gathered for "repetition" so that the actual words of the doctor might be committed to memory. Then at regular intervals debates were arranged upon the same subjects and each student would attempt to reproduce at the shortest notice whole sections of what he had learnt, whilst finally every few weeks the doctors would set papers upon their lectures and publish honours lists of their pupils. The advantages of this system of education are obvious. By the constant "repetitions" memory was trained and the student accumulated a whole wealth of factual knowledge. In the debates quickness of brain, ability in argument and repartee were stimulated. The whole system tended toward precision, conciseness and logic - C'était une méthode d'instruction, orale et mutuelle, qui habituaient, l'esprit à la précision, la mémoire à la fidélité,

1. A. Baillet "La Vie d'Edmond Richer" P.4.

2. Le P. Prat "Maldonat et l'Université de Paris au XVI^e siècle". Paris 1856.

et qui permettait aux théologiens formés à pareille école, de payer en toute discussion, rubis sur ongle, ainsi qu'aimaient à dire les Sorbonnistes, c'est-à-dire à donner sur-le-champ des solutions claires, appuyées d'arguments et d'autorités à l'épreuve de toutes les contradictions."¹ Yet the disadvantages are equally apparent. The continuous study of one branch of knowledge to the exclusion of, and without reference to, other fields of thought must result in a lack of perspective and balance, particularly when that subject is theology, and what the scholastic method gained in precision it lost in erudition. Moreover, the result was static rather than dynamic, for the deductive method left no room for research and the "a priori" arguments could not be consolidated by any originality in the arguer. Again the system produced logicians rather than philosophers, thinkers whose contentions held good within certain circumscribed limits but who made no attempts to put those contentions against the widest backgrounds, or to carry them through to their ultimate implications. Finally it was only the exceptional student who could retain individuality of outlook amidst the dogmatism of the lecture room and the mechanical drudgery of "repetition", and the exceptional student by the very dogmatism and rigidity of the scholastic instruction

1. Ed. Puyol "Edmond Richer" Vol.1. P.69.

found himself forced into heresy. Richer was an exceptional student, and his later thought was not merely the product of his educational training and yet its effects can be clearly seen and will emerge in the study of his doctrines. It is sufficient here to mention the "a priori" basis of his episcopatism in which the final and decisive justification is the word of Christ himself, or more obviously still he logically sees episcopatism as the basis of regalism, but unphilosophically fails to see that his episcopatism ultimately implies multitudinism.

Richer in 1592 was tall and austere in appearance, of great dignity of manner but of little charm. His personal life was characterized by a rigorous asceticism which had alienated him from social amenities and had already begun to undermine his health. "Il avait beaucoup de piété, dit un auteur bien informé de tout ce qui touche à notre auteur; il vivait fort austèrement. On dit qu'il jeûna le carême de l'an 1589 au pain et à l'eau, portant la haire et le cilice,"¹ says Dupin in his Ecclesiastical History of the sixteenth century, and there can be no doubt that during the years of the League and the Siege of Paris, Richer lived in poverty and semi-starvation. He was appointed treasurer of the Sorbonne and certainly the example of self-denial that he set and the economical habits he imposed upon his colleagues

1. Dupin "Hist. Eccl. du XVII^e siècle" Vol.1. P.377.

go far to explain the astonishing fact that throughout the Civil Wars the Sorbonne was able to preserve the sequence of its religious exercises and theological classes unbroken.

By temperament Richer was a theologian rather than a preacher. Baillet is indignant that his hero has been accused of a lack of unction in the pulpit¹, but neither physically nor by inclination was he fitted for the work of exhortation. The various sermons of which there are records are confined to the exposition of dogma rather than the conviction of sin. In fact Richer himself in his History of the University 1589-1595 says: "La mauvaise santé de Richer ne lui permit pas de prêcher alors, ce qui lui procura l'avantage de ne point se mêler par ces prédications dans les troubles de ce temps comme faisaient les autres prédicateurs. Et lorsqu'il fut tranquille, il se livra tout entier à chercher les moyens de fixer les bornes des deux puissances et d'affirmer la paix entre l'empire et le sacerdoce: il y travailla toute sa vie, regardait cette paix très nécessaire au gouvernement politique et ecclésiastique."² Though it is reasonable to assume that

1. Ad. Baillet, P.10.

2. "Edmundi Richerii fragmentum historiae Academiae Parisiensis tempore unionis vulgo la Ligue post mortem Henrici III, hoc est ab anno 1589 ad annum 1595 (Bib. Nat. Man. fr. 10,561)."

even in 1592 Richer was seeking to reconcile the claims of the church and the state, the actual basis of that reconciliation he undoubtedly believed to be ultramontaniam. He had not as yet broken away from his ecclesiastical home. He was a violent "Ligueur" and Bellarmen was his favourite author. In one of his theses he champions the most extreme Papalist claims, proclaims himself a partisan of the Guise, and exalts Jacques Clément.¹ Even in 1594 he combined with Duval in petitioning the Faculty of Theology to rescind its decree, which approved the expulsion of the Jesuits. He refused to attempt to persuade the Faculty to make an act of submission to Henry IV on the grounds that Henry had not received absolution from the Pope and therefore such an act would be an insult to the Papacy. His life was so unimpeachable, his attitude so correct, and his actions so disinterested that despite his youth he won the respect and admiration of the King as well as the University, and the post of Grand Master of the College of Cardinal Lemoine having fallen vacant he was elected, at the instigation of the court and with the approval of the Faculty of Theology, to fill this most difficult position. Several reasons combined to make the appointment acceptable to Richer. The doctorate in theology carried with it but few duties and offered scarcely any opportunities for teaching. The doctors formed a sort of

1. "Hist. Acad. Paris" Book IV. P.134.

academy or board of examiners according to Thurot while the bachelors formed the actual teaching staff of the Faculty. Again, the stipend, apart from student's fees, was quite insufficient. Richer had already applied for a canonry of Notre Dame but this was not to fall due until 1612. Richer accepted the post and as Grand Master quickly made his name.

II. Richer: Grand Master of College of Cardinal Lemoine.

This College was founded in the fourteenth century by Lemoine, the Cardinal who acted as intermediary between Philippe-le-Bel and Boniface VIII. The Cardinal had endowed it with a hundred bursaries and when the college became affiliated to the University of Paris these bursaries were placed at the disposal of poor students. The college enjoyed a distinguished prosperity in the fifteenth century and like many others was a sort of republic with its own laws and many immunities and privileges, but when Richer took charge of it in 1594 it was in a parlous condition. The public disorders had given the opportunity to the students to overthrow discipline and to abuse their liberties. The League had suspended the course of studies and had placed a garrison within its walls. The finances had disappeared and most of the furniture was either stolen or destroyed. Moreover, situated as it was near to the Saint Bernard gate of

Paris the fabric of its buildings had been considerably damaged by gunfire and one wing had been quite abandoned for demolition. To add to these tremendous problems which faced Richer, the remaining students and occupants of the college viewed either with fear or with hostility the prospect of a rigid dictatorship such as they would have to accept under him, and attempted to frustrate his projects by appealing to their ancient immunities. It is a remarkable tribute to the administrative power of Richer that within a few months he succeeded in making the college of Cardinal Lemoine a model of order and economy. He took the dispute with the students to the Parlement of Paris and obtained the verdict, which empowered him to use the most extreme disciplinary measures with the bursars.¹ With the aid of a royal grant he restored the finances, enlarged the actual buildings and increased the bursaries. In order to improve the standard of the theological debates he composed manuals of rhetoric which have the stamp of originality and by his own example of correctness and piety re-established the prestige of the college and unquestionably became "le modèle des grand-maîtres de l'Université". Such was the sincerity and zeal of Richer that when the work of reformation was completed he renounced any personal gain, and applied his well-earned financial rewards to the further increase of the

1. See sentence of Provost of Paris against three bursars
11 Oct. 1602 - Jourdain "Hist. de L'Univ. de Paris" P.23.

bursaries. In this case as always even Puyol admits that
"il donna l'exemple du plus louable désintéressement."¹

III. Censor of the University.

The rapid transformation of the college of Cardinal Lemoine brought fame to Richer and marked him out as the leader of the reform movement within the University. It is not then surprising to find that he took a prominent part in the reformation instigated by Henry IV at the beginning of the seventeenth century. All the colleges had suffered much the same fate as had the College of Cardinal Lemoine. Academically and financially bankrupt they had been filled either with soldiers from abroad or refugees from l'Ile de France. "Il n'y avait plus de clôture, plus de discipline."² To add to the confusion, what attempts had been made for reorganisation had come from the Jesuits, who had introduced new methods of instruction. By 1595 they had been expelled and the general condition was worse than ever.

Henry by royal authority appointed a commission of ecclesiastics and lawyers including Renaud de Beaune, Archbishop of Bourges, Achille de Harlay, First President of the Parlement of Paris, De Thou & Ségulier to report after an

1. Ed. Puyol. pp.84-85.

2. Mariéjol. Vol.VI. Part 2. P.98.

exhaustive inquiry into the general condition of the University.¹ The Pope was not consulted, although such a reform was the prerogative of the church inasmuch as the universities were of ecclesiastical foundation. Under Charles VII, following the disorders of the hundred years' war, the new statutes for the Reform of the University of Paris were promulgated by d'Estouteville, the papal legate. The profound change in the conception of the powers of the King is shown no less by the fact that the Pope made no protest against this abrogation of pontifical right, than by the remarkable justification of Henry's action made in a speech by De Thou, one of the commissioners. "Aussi est il certain que le soing du prince doit embrasser tous les ordres de son Estat. Aussi voyons-nous que les empereurs, par leurs constitutions, ont réglé l'ordre et la police ecclésiastique.

Pareillement, les roys de France qui ont succédé aux empereurs, et sont estimez empereurs en leur royaume ont en pareil soing de la discipline ecclésiastique et de l'instruction de la jeunesse qui en fait partie, et d'autant plus qu'ils sont oingts et sacrez et participent en quelque manière au sacerdoce."

Following the report the new statutes of Reformation

1. Jourdain "Histoire de l'Université de Paris au XVII^e et XVIII^e siècle" pp.2-18.

were ratified by Parlement in 1598 and in 1600, four censors were appointed to superintend the carrying out of the measures for reform.¹ Of these censors Richer was the principal and most active.

It is difficult to be certain as to the part played by Richer in 1595-98. Jourdain thinks that Richer sat with the commission. Etienne Pasquier in his "Recherches de la France"² is content to insist that Richer gave every possible assistance to the inquiry. Here as in other cases the "Memoires de Richelieu" are much more explicit. "Sur un bruit qui courut que les jésuites sollicitaient d'être rappelés dans l'Université, estimant que le meilleur moyen de les en empêcher était de procurer quelques réformations, Richer obtint un arrêt par lequel un président, des conseillers et quelques-uns de l'Université furent nommés pour y travailler. Il dressa les constitutions et les règlements de tous les arts et de toutes les facultés, les fit homologuer en la cour, et publier en l'Université."³

Whatever part Richer took in the actual preparation of the new statutes, and it is reasonable to suppose that his own

1. Decrees of Parlement of Paris 15th September and 17th September - see Jourdain p.18.

2. Etienne Pasquier "Recherches de la France". Book IX.Chap.25.

3. "Mémoires de Richelieu" Book XX.

efforts for reform must have influenced Henry IV, it is impossible to over-estimate the part he played in putting them into force. Richer carried out the rôle of censor with the same inflexibility and thoroughness that he had displayed as a grand master. He completely overshadowed his fellow censors, and the opposition especially from the College of Liseaux was concentrated upon him, so that his life was often in danger, and he was obliged to protect himself with an escort. Despite all this he enjoyed once again a great personal triumph. Finances were regularized, discipline was re-established, the wearing of cap and gown was made compulsory, banquets were forbidden, the syllabus was codified and the methods of the Jesuits in the lectures and debates of the colleges stamped out, the scale of professors' fees and salaries was fixed, the opposition of doctors like Critton of the College of Liseaux was nullified by appeal to the Parlement of Paris¹ and in all these reforms it was Richer who took the foremost part and displayed the greatest zeal and ability.

Unquestionably the leading personality in the four faculties of the University, he was also looked upon with favour by the court which could not but approve his patriotic zeal, and he was the friend of the Parlementaires who were

1. Decree against Bauen and Critton 1602 22nd November.
Jourdain p.19.

gratified at his policy of co-operation with, and reliance upon them in matters of dispute within the University. It was at this point that Richer the Ligueur becomes Richer the Gallican and when he was elected Syndic of the Faculty he entered upon the task of reviving the Gallican spirit with all the new-found enthusiasm of a convert. But some attempt to explain the change in his outlook and beliefs is essential to the proper understanding of his later enterprises.

IV. Richer's Conversion to Gallicanism.

Dupin in his "Histoire Ecclésiastique du dix-septième Siècle" puts Richer's conversion in 1592 as a result of his study of Scripture and Church history. "En 1592, touché des malheurs des guerres civiles, il se mit à étudier l'Ecriture - Sainte, Les Pères, Les Conciles, et l'Histoire de l'Eglise; et ayant reconnu par cette étude combien il avait été trompé, il enconcut une véritable douleur, condamna les sentiments qu'il avait approuvés, et, pour ainsi dire, adorés étant bachelier; embrassa généreusement et soutint depuis avec constance ceux qu'il avait condamnés."¹ It is difficult to believe this account, for there is no hint in his work for the doctorate in theology of a falling away from

1. Dupin "Hist. Eccl. du XVII^e siècle". Book 1. p.377.

ultramontanism in 1592 and moreover in 1594 he is still in perfect agreement and collaboration with Duval and the other papalists in the Sorbonne.

"The Memoires of Richelieu" assert that Richer's conversion dates from the taking of Paris by Henry in 1594, and is mainly political in origin.¹ "Dès que la ville de Paris fut prise, le 22 mars 1594, qui fut le commencement des affaires du roi, il changea d'opinion, et ils furent tous étonnés, en Sorbonne, qu'ils l'ouïrent parler tout au contraire de ce qu'il faisait auparavant, et non-seulement blâmer la Ligue, ses partisans, et ses maximes, mais se mettre à hanter familièrement les huguenots, et, entre eux, La Popelinière, historien haineux et infâme, qui a écrit l'histoire des troubles avec beaucoup de passion et de mensonge. Ce qui mut aucune fois ses confrères de lui dire qu'il se donnât garde qu'il n'entrât dans les opinions erronées contre le chef de l'Eglise, dans lesquelles plusieurs de ceux qu'il hantait, étaient; mais, sans répondre, il méprisait ce qu'ils lui disaient."

Puyol approves this account and says that in 1594 Richer was passionately advocating the cause of Henry, who was as yet unabsolved by the Pope, and was trying to secure the loyalty and submission of the Sorbonne.

1. "Mémoires de Richelieu" Book XX.

The historical facts, however, make this version inadmissible for we know from his "Historia Academiae Parisiensis" that Richer resolutely refused the request of Henry through Segulier to persuade the Sorbonne to make an act of submission, solely on the grounds that Henry had not received Papal absolution in 1594.¹ He threatened with others to leave Paris rather than insult the Holy See by such an act and so great was the opposition led by Richer that Henry renounced the attempt.

No conversions are sudden, though often the ultimate stages are catastrophic and it is a mistake to attempt to read Gallicanism into Richer's thought or activity before 1598. His conversion was a slow process which undoubtedly had its roots as far back as his scholastic education. Independent reading of church history, which was only possible to him after 1592, led him to question much that hitherto he had tacitly accepted. He was obviously much influenced by Gallican thinkers like Servin, Gilot, Le Fevre and Sarpi, the episcopal historian of the Council of Trent. He came into touch with parlementaires like Harley and De Thou. His love for the Sorbonne led him to study its history and enabled him to understand its ancient spirit as represented by Gerson, D'Almain and Major. All these factors inclined him towards

1. Hist. Acad. Paris. Vol.IV.

the Gallican positions, but it may be hazarded that none of them would have made a Gallican of him. It needed the practical problem of the reformation of the University of Paris to complete and consolidate his conversion. After the coronation of Henry, Richer was forced to realise that it was to the King and not to the Pope that he must look for the sanction and support necessary for a reformation. Security, retrenchment, order, could only come from the new Monarchy. Richer joined the "Catholiques royaux", and although he still maintained a modified ultramontanism he obtained the position of Grand Master of the College of Cardinal Lemoine because he was a "bon serviteur du roi".¹ As the reform movement within the University developed it became clearer that not only was the Pope doing nothing, but the Jesuits who represented the new ultramontanism were the chief agents of disruption and the real enemies of order and unity within the colleges. "Ils fondèrent dans les grandes villes et dans toutes les provinces, des collèges, décentralisèrent l'enseignement ruinèrent l'autouté théologique de la Sorbonne et l'autorité morale des universités. Leurs maisons d'instruction furent les centres de propagande ultramontaine. Des congregations et des associations unirent un vue de l'action romaine les jeunes gens et les hommes fait.

1. "Mémoires de Richelieu" Book XX.

L'Eglise et la nation furent coupées en deux, et pendant tout l'ancien régime, ces divisions ne cesseront plus."¹

Moreover in 1603 the Jesuits were permitted to return to France, and despite the conditions whereby they had to become nationalized and were prohibited from teaching outside their own colleges, by 1605 they were re-installed in the college of Clermont in Paris and by 1609 they were publicly teaching theology and one of their order was confessor to the King.

Richer saw that it needed more than patriotism to counteract the influence of the Jesuits. The Gallican theories which had no doubt by this time commended themselves to him intellectually, he now realized to be the only effective answer to the Jesuit teaching and the one logical ground for a patriotic Catholicism.

So the transition from Richer the "Ligueur" to Richer the Gallican, which Baillet naively dismisses by remarking that "Dieu ne permet pas qu'il demeurât longtemps dans son aveuglement"² is, upon examination, the reasoned and common-sense progress in the mind of a practical theologian face to face with a set of circumstances which demanded a new outlook and a new strategy. By 1604 Gallicanism was for Richer an "idée fixe." He became the acknowledged leader of episcopalist thought in the Sorbonne, and in 1608 his

1. Mariéjol. Vol.VI. Part II. p.96.

2. Ad. Baillet, p.7.

nomination as Syndic of the Faculty of Theology enabled him to use his great renown and personal influence to foster an organised attack upon Ultramontaniam, and a revival of Episcopatism.

THE REVIVAL OF EPISCOPALISM

I. Richer: Syndic of the Faculty of Theology.

The beginnings of the Revival of Episcopatism within the Sorbonne are more than the enthusiastic efforts of a converted "ligueur" to win his fellows over to his new faith; they are the calculated acts of a statesman who fully understood the possibilities offered by his position as Syndic of the Faculty of Theology¹, and his consequent influence in the Sorbonne, to promote an ecclesiastical revolution throughout France. Three main objectives can be distinguished in the activities of Richer from 1608 onwards. In the first place, realising the enormous prestige of the Sorbonne and the truth of the maxim that "avoir La Sorbonne, c'était donc avoir le clergé tout entier", he used his power as Syndic to secure the success of the episcopal theories by stamping them with its official authorization and approval. Secondly, he attempted to secure the permanence of episcopatism by creating and fostering within the Sorbonne a Gallican party. Thirdly he attempted to give episcopatism a wider political significance by identifying the decrees of the Faculty of Theology with the opposition to ultramontanism and thus

1. Nomination of Richer 2nd Jan. 1608. See D'Argentré "Collectio" Vol.2. part 2. p.1.

encouraging the belief that ecclesiastical Gallicanism was the best weapon in the hands of the new monarchy against the Trentine claims.

A survey of the various enterprises of Richer will serve to illustrate these main objectives.

The position of Syndic of the Faculty of Theology, to which Richer was elected in 1608, was potentially the most influential ecclesiastical office in Paris if not in France. The Faculty of Theology itself, which had its origin in a humble theological seminary, had come in the sixteenth century to hold pride of place and to control religious teaching throughout the University of Paris, and it continued to hold this prominent position until its final suppression in 1791. It was composed of doctors of theology, "Sorbonnists", those resident or studying at the Sorbonne, "Navarriates" of the college of Navarre, "Réguliers" of various mendicant and other religious orders affiliated to the University and "Ubiquistes" who were unattached to any particular college, and the whole body of doctors was controlled by a general assembly which met once a month. Of this general assembly there were two executive officers corresponding roughly to the Chancellor and Vice-Chancellor of an English University, the "Doyen" instituted in 1296 who was the senior secular doctor resident in Paris and the "Syndic" instituted in 1384 who was the real head of the

Faculty. "Le Doyen avait les honneurs de préséance: Le Syndic avait l'influence réelle."¹ Richer could not have wished for a more favourable appointment in view of his projects, for as Syndic he would not only control the administration of the Faculty and the Sorbonne in particular, but he would also control the measures to be put before the general assemblies. Moreover he alone would prepare the examinations and judge the theses of the bachelors, and finally it was again his sole prerogative to draw up and codify the acts and conclusions of the Faculty, as well as to provide for their implementation. Again his position as one of the censors of the University gave him a unique opportunity of dealing drastically with the separatist spirit which the Sorbonne in particular had shown in face of the royal reform. Hébert who preceded Richer as Syndic had found it impossible to introduce the royal measures, and it was mainly because of this failure that he resigned. Richer's maiden speech to the general assembly on 15th January, 1608, is significant as showing the frame of mind in which he accepted office and as indicating the radical reforms which he was about to inaugurate. "Il déclara qu'il ne pouvait ni ne voulait accepter le syndicat, que tous les docteurs ne promissent de travailler avec lui pour recouvrer et rétablir

1. Ed. Puyol. Vol.I. p.116.

l'ancienne discipline de la Faculté, qui était tout à fait abatârdie; à quoi toute la compagnie s'obligea par promesse et remercia Richer du soin qu'il en voulait prendre."¹

First, then, Richer set to work to gain the ear of the general clergy by attempting to secure for episcopatism the official patronage of the Sorbonne. He saw that the enforcement of the royal statutes of reform could be used to foster the traditions of the Faculty, and the restoration of the archives, which could be undertaken ostensibly in the interests of this reform, could be instrumental in winning the Sorbonne back to its ancient doctrinal positions. To restore the archives was to reawaken an interest in men like Gerson and D'Almain, not only among the members of the Sorbonne itself but among the great company of clergy and theologians throughout Paris and France who looked to that august assembly for leadership and guidance. This work of restoring and classifying the ancient registers of the Faculty was completed with Richer's customary thoroughness, and so was preserved for later thinkers, Gallican and otherwise, invaluable documents which otherwise might quite easily have perished. Jourdain pays a great tribute to this work of Richer apart from its Gallican bias. "L'ordre qu'il avait établi fut maintenu par ses successeurs et servit

1. "Syndicat de Richer" p.5.

à conserver les copies authentiques du plus grand nombre de Les délibérations mémorables, qui furent souvent, au dix-septième siècle, la règle de l'Eglise de France, et qui sont restés l'un de ses titres à la vénération des peuples."¹

The ultramontanists in the Sorbonne led by Duval and Filesac, who had been suspicious of the real intentions of Richer when he had put in hand the first complete edition of the works of Gerson, together with representative writings of D'Almain de Major and Pierre D'Ailly, were not slow to see the real import of these enterprises, and any doubts they may have had as to projects of the Syndic were speedily dispelled in March 1608. On the 15th March Richer appealed to the Faculty for permission to print a complete list of the doctrinal findings of the Sorbonne and to send a copy to all doctors and students in theology so that they would never uphold a proposition contrary to the teaching of the University of Paris. Taken by surprise the general assembly gave its consent only to discover that it had practically professed episcopatism and was decreeing "sous une forme indirecte, une véritable profession de foi, obligatoire pour tous les candidats qui poursuivaient les différents grades."²

Accordingly, at the next general assembly Duval and Filesac, who represented the ultramontanist majority, were able to

1. Jourdain. "Hist. de l'Univ." p.47.

2. Ib. p.48.

secure the withdrawal of the permission which the Faculty had accorded Richer.¹ Frustrated in this larger scheme the Syndic nevertheless succeeded in reprinting with the authority of the Faculty the decrees of the Sorbonne against the errors of Luther, and the monk Jean Sarrazin, which decrees contained most of the doctrines of the ancient Gallican doctors; and as Richer joined to these decrees the oaths by which the doctors of the Faculty undertook to defend the doctrines of the Sorbonne he actually achieved much the same result as would have been obtained by his more comprehensive scheme.²

Meanwhile Richer was also endeavouring to form within the Sorbonne itself a Gallican party. He seized every opportunity offered by criticisms of his actions to argue publicly the Gallican positions, and to show that ultramontanism was hostile to the best interests and the prestige of the Faculty of Theology. He used his official position to prevent Duval and Filesac from presenting papalist claims at the general assemblies, and Ubaldini complained bitterly that in the public debates of the university, owing to the manoeuvres of Richer, "les ennemis des pouvoirs du Pape avaient toujours la parole: les partisans jamais." Yet so correct were his actions that his opponents were powerless in the

1. "Hist. Acad. Paris" Vol.IV. p.65.

2. First published in 6 pages under title of "Articuli fidei sacrae Facultatis Theologiae Parisiensis" 1608.
Reprinted 1611 & 1616.

knowledge that so long as he kept within his legal rights as Syndic he was amply protected by the King and by the Parlement of Paris. The following example of the tactics of the Syndic will serve to show the way in which he was discrediting the ultramontanist claims on grounds for which he could not be attacked while Ubaldini and Duval were powerless to avert the resultant desertions from their ranks among the members of the Sorbonne. "Le 20 Octobre 1610 dans l'assemblée ordinaire ... Richer se plaint qu'un Jésuite l'a accusé d'avoir rayé d'une thèse cette proposition: Summus Pontifex immediate habet auctoritatem a Christo. Il s'élève contre cette accusation qui n'irait à rien moins qu'à déshonorer le syndic de la Faculté et la Faculté elle-même. Les propositions qu'il a supprimées sont tout autres. Elles sont ainsi conçues: Unus solus Pontifex maximum immediate habet auctoritatem a Christo, omnes autem alii Episcopi ab illo, imo etiam ipsi apostoli eandem a Divo Petro accepturi erant, nisi Christus in clavium collatione apostolos praevenisset. La doctrine exprimée par ces propositions est contraire aux décrets de la Faculté de théologie de Paris, en particulier à la condamnation de Jean Sarrazin."¹ Richer further endeavoured to secure the support of the bachelors in theology. He appealed to their loyalty and warned them that by supporting ultramontanism they would be disturbing the

1. d'Argentré "Collectio" Vol.II. Part II. p.15.

national peace by disquieting the Huguenots but he was also able to achieve his objective in a more practical manner. One of the duties of the Syndic was to examine the theses of the bachelors in theology. Richer insisted that all such theses should be submitted to him a month in advance in order that he might give adequate care and attention to each, and so careful was this examination that no theses which contained doctrines contrary to Gallicanism were passed by him. He definitely says in the "Syndicat", "Richer résolut de ne permettre pas durant son syndicat qu'aucun bachelier soutînt quelque proposition contraire aux maximes de la Sorbonne; et si aucun l'entreprenait, le syndic biffait la thèse."¹ By this means Richer was assured year by year of a growing Gallican party with a "united front", drawn from the younger doctors of the Faculty and the dispute with the Dominicans was to show how well Gallicanism was served by men from this party, such as Bertin.

In the third place Richer was able to give a wider political significance to his activities within the Sorbonne and so to identify episcopatism and the Faculty of Theology itself with the European revolt against the papal pretensions, and more particularly with the national repudiation of ultramontaniam. During the dispute of Bellarmine and Fra Paolo Sarpi over the Venetian Interdict, Richer in the name of the

1. "Syndicat de Richer" p.7-8.

Sorbonne protested against Bellarmin's attacks upon Gerson and sent a copy of his "Apologie de Gerson" to Venice. Again in 1609 Archpriest Blakewell appealed to the authority of the Faculty of Theology for justification in his authorization of the oath of allegiance which James I. was demanding from the Roman Catholics in England. Ubaldini and his assistant Scappi appealed in their turn to the Sorbonne to repudiate Blakewell or at least to adopt Duval's suggestion of enunciating authoritatively the ancient rights of the Papacy over England. Richer defeated both these projects of Ubaldini and so effectively silenced his opponents that they found it impossible even to propose the question in the Sorbonne. The general interpretation of these events was naturally that whether the Sorbonne was definitely episcopal or not, it was most certainly no longer the professed champion of ultramontaniam.

While Richer was attempting to overthrow ultramontaniam and to secure a real place for episcopatism within the Sorbonne, he was fully aware of the power and influence of the international protagonists of the Papacy, the Jesuits and the Dominicans outside its walls, and so these enterprises were but the preliminaries to a concentrated attack against the Jesuits and the Dominicans in turn.

II. Richer and the Jesuits.

In his efforts as censor to reform the University of Paris, Richer had already been brought into opposition with the Jesuits, and their systems of education, as the real enemies of unity and discipline. Now in his attempts as Syndic to overthrow ultramontaniam within the Sorbonne he was faced with the Jesuits as the interpreters of the Council of Trent and the most devoted and able exponents of the Papalist claims. Just as his hostility to them in 1597 was the result of his loyalty to the royal reform, so in 1610 his uncompromising opposition to the order is the necessary counterpart of his zeal for Gallicanism. No other explanation is needed of his persistent attacks. It is superfluous as well as uncritical to insist upon a fundamental vindictiveness in the character of Richer, as Puyol does, to account for his attitude.¹

The assassination of Henry IV by Ravallac provided the "casus belli". Ravallac had been imbued with the doctrine of tyrannicide and on the day of his execution the Parlement of Paris requested the Faculty of Theology to renew the ancient decrees against tyrannicide. Richer, who had already tacitly recognized the royal intervention in the reformation of the University, now refused to oppose this parliamentary

1. Ed. Puyol. Vol.I. p.141.

intrusion into a matter of doctrine. He brought the request before the Faculty on the 4th June, 1610, and "l'Histoire de l'Université de Paris" contains a full account of his speech. He clearly showed that tyrannicide as a doctrine was inseparable from the doctrine of infallibility and the ultramontanist positions. The blame for the murder of Henry ought justly to be laid at the door of the Jesuits because they were the depositories of these doctrines in France. "Il ose dire que la doctrine qui, d'après l'enseignement des Jésuites, accorde au Pape le pouvoir de déposer les rois, a mis le couteau à la main de Ravallac."¹ If Richer was mistaken in asserting that individual Jesuits were the accomplices of Ravallac he was undoubtedly right in holding the Jesuit order responsible for the propagation of the theories which had animated the assassin, and in insisting that a renewal of decrees against tyrannicide to be effective must be accompanied by measures against its proponents. The Faculty in part convinced by Richer's logic, in part swayed by the wave of public feeling against ultramontanism, concurred. The decrees of 1413 against Jean Petit, the Dominican, were renewed and the Sorbonne condemned a thesis in which the Jesuits defended tyrannicide.² Richer

1. "Pièces justificatives de l'Histoire de l'Univ. de Paris" by Jourdain, p.32.

2. Recueil de pièces concernant l'Histoire de Louis XIII Paris 1717. Vol.IV. p.1-22.

himself went further; he collaborated with the Parlement in the condemnation of "Le traité de la puissance temporelle du souverain pontife" which Bellarmin had just published at Rome (1610) because it tended "à l'élevation des Puissances souveraines ordonnées et établies de Dieu, souslèvemens des sujets contre leur prince ... induction d'attenter à leurs personnes et Estats."¹ He instigated the condemnation of the book of Mariana in which Jacques Clément was eulogised and finally in 1612 persuaded the Parlement to compel the Jesuits to take an oath to uphold the doctrine of the Sorbonne relative to the sanctity of the King's person.

These measures together with the wave of patriotism provoked by Ravallac mark the real beginnings of the Gallican revival. "L'agitation gagna l'Université, où le Gallicanisme, affaibli depuis la Ligue, commençait à se ranimer."² Yet despite these assaults upon their influence the Jesuits were by no means impotent or friendless. Henry IV had in pursuance of his policy of a "via media" allowed them more and more privileges from 1603-1609. In 1606 he had allowed them to return to Paris and in 1609 he had given permission to the order to open public courses in theology at the College of Clermont. Richer had been successful in opposing in the Faculty the registration of these royal decrees. Now

1. Mariéjol. Vol. VI. Part II. p.148.

2. Ib. p.149.

in 1610 instead of the compromises of Henry the Jesuits confidently expected the fullest support from the Italian Marie de Medici who had been nurtured at a court which professed the utmost devotion to the Holy See and who was personally a devout Catholic. In the words of the "Memoires de Richelieu", "Dès que Dieu eut appelé à lui le roi Henri IV, ces bons Pères sachant combien les passages et changements des choses sont favorables à ceux qui ont des affaires, présentèrent requête à la reine-mère, régente, afin qu'il leur fût permis de régenter par eux-mêmes, non-seulement dans Paris, mais dans toutes les villes où ils seraient appelés."¹ This request was presented to Marie de Medici on the very afternoon of the assassination of Henry and the regent issued a new decree permitting the Jesuits further privileges including a mandate to teach humanities as well as theology at the college of Clermont. This decree was cleverly presented for registration when Parlement had just entered upon vacation and after the Facultés of law and medicine had been persuaded to remain neutral. "Mais Richer est là, toujours là." He rallied the University, obtained from the Faculty of Theology a reconsideration of a preliminary decision they had already made in favour of the decree, secured the recall of Parlement, and so martialled the

1. "Mémoires de Richelieu" Book XX.

opposition that the Jesuits were forced to withdraw. So twice within a year the University, thanks to the efforts of Richer, had rebuffed the Jesuits. The influence was considerable and exactly what the Syndic had desired. France was dissociating itself from ultramontaniam as ecclesiastical policy. The General Assembly of the Dominicans at Paris in 1611 offered to Richer the opportunity to discredit it as a theological doctrine.

III. Richer and the General Assembly of the Dominicans.

Following upon a request made by Henry IV through his ambassador at Rome for the introduction of certain reforms into the Dominican Houses in France, a chapter general of the order was called and met at the Jacobin convent near to the Sorbonne on 20th May, 1611.

As the custom was the deliberations of this assembly were interspersed with theological debates to which the court and the university were invited. The General of the order, Augustin Galamin de Brixiguella, obtained by a special act of the Faculty of Theology authorisation for bachelors of the Sorbonne to dispute with the Dominicans in this festival of oratory which was spread over eight days.¹

1. d'Argentré "Collectio" Vol.II. Part II. p.43.

Richer saw the splendid opportunity offered by these public orations to secure publicity for the Gallican theories, and to strike a blow at the authority of the teaching of the Dominicans, who throughout France were staunch upholders of the Papacy. "On peut dire que les couvents des moines sont autant de citadelles que Rome a bâties dans tous les Etats."¹ Richer thought the psychological moment to have arrived on 27th May, when Wilbert Rosembach of the Convent at Cologne was presenting a thesis on the subject of Penance and the Eucharist. Contained in the thesis were the following propositions:- 1. The Pope can neither err in faith nor morals. 2. The Council can never be above the Pope. 3. It is for the Pope alone to propose the matters for deliberation in the Council, to confirm or reject what the Council has decided and to impose final silence on all. Here was a clear cut exposition of the Tridentine claims reiterating the "proponentibus legatis" decree and stating the infallibility which the Council of Trent had left implicit, a doctrinal statement over against which the ancient spirit of the Sorbonne could be enunciated with equal clarity and lack of ambiguity.

Richer fired the first shot in what was to become a general engagement by protesting publicly in the name of the

1. Jurien. "Accomp. des Prophéties" Vol.II.

Faculty against this vaunting of the papal claims in defiance of the public good¹ and declared that "si le roi Henri le Grand eût vécu, l'on se fût bien gardé de mettre en avant de telles propositions."² The effect of this outburst was profound; the spirit of friendly debate disappeared at once under a wave of fierce partisan feeling, and the efforts of Coeffeteau the Prior of the convent of Saint Jacques and Cosme Morelles of the University of Cologne, who was president of that session of the assembly, to have the thesis withdrawn or at least prevent a debate, were powerless against the demand for a full discussion. Richer entrusted the task of replying to the thesis into the capable hands of Claude Bertin, one of his most brilliant disciples. Bertin stated his answer in the form of a syllogism which was at one and the same time a refutation of the three propositions and a statement of episcopatism. "All that is contrary to a legitimate oecumenical council is heresy. This proposition that the Council can never be above the Pope is contrary to the legitimate oecumenical council of Constance. Therefore it is heresy." Bertin was here stating the greatest historical justification for episcopatism which, if agreed, proves the episcopal position, and if rejected leaves the way open for infallibility and the absolutism of the Pope. The

1. For full account of incidents see Perrens "l'Eglise et l'Etat" Vol.II. pp.35, 36.

2. "Syndicat de Richer" p.17.

fourth and fifth sessions of the Council of Constance definitely ascribe the supremacy to the oecumenical council. Martin V as Pope confirmed all the acts of the Council of Constance which were concluded in Synod, i.e. "in materiis fidei, conciliariter et non aliter nec alio modo", acts in which he had taken a part as Cardinal before his promotion. So much is beyond dispute. If the fourth and fifth sessions come under the confirmation of Martin V then episcopatism is proved; if the fourth and fifth sessions for any reasons are exempt from that confirmation then episcopatism is not proved, and in face of other Papal pronouncements, is false. The dispute which became general raged around this problem. Du Perron, Morelles and the Papalists adduced arguments contending that the decrees of the debated sessions only applied to a time of schism, that the Pope issued a separate Bull confirming the condemnation of Huss and Wyclif in the fifth session as an indication that he did not approve all the acts of the session, and that the voting by nations in the absence of cardinals at Constance destroys its claim to being oecumenical. The Gallicans maintained that the opposition required special and specious pleading to maintain a difficult interpretation of an historical event in preference to the simple and obvious one, that bulls were never used by Popes to approve conciliar acts and that the absence of

cardinals in the fourth and fifth sessions was no authoritative objection to its decrees being "conciliariter". This is not the place to proffer a solution to the problem; it is enough to indicate that Bertin seems to have enjoyed the best of the argument; his contentions were simpler and shorter than those of the other side, and Richer seems justified when he records the conclusion of the dispute by saying: "M. le cardinal Duperron voyant que Bertin pressait Morelles, et voulait poursuivre son argument, commanda qu'on sursît à cette matière, disant qu'il fallait disputer du sacrement du 1'Eucharistie, et ainsi finit cette dispute."¹

Whatever be the ultimate truth with regard to the fourth and fifth sessions of the Council of Constance in relation to episcopatism, the immediate advantage of the dispute lay with Richer and his adherents. The authority of the ultra-montanists had been effectively questioned in a great public assembly; problems which the Council of Trent had conveniently buried had been unearthed and given new life and vigour, and the theological basis in episcopatism for the claims of the Parlementaire had been promulgated for the first time, since the consolidation of the new monarchy, with clarity and thoroughness.

The Parlement of Paris was not slow to show its approval of Richer and its intention to support him. The Dominicans

1. Ed. Puyol. Vol.I. p.191.

had announced a thesis for the 29th May containing a similar proposition to the first of the 27th May. "It is for the Pope alone to define the verities of the faith, in the doing of which he cannot err." Richer opposed the presentation of the thesis and appealed to the Parlement to stop it, and this they did by putting an interdict upon the debate until the offensive proposition was removed. Verdun, who had been chosen by the influence of the Nuncio to succeed the Gallican, Harlay, as first president of the Parlement, and was thought to be a staunch supporter of the ultramontanists, was a man of weak will and was won over by Richer to the disgust of Ubaldini, and though Duperron and others defied the interdict and assembled on the 29th May, Richer was able to prevent the attendance of bachelors and so to frustrate their efforts to secure a debate. The ultramontanists still, however, had a course of action open to them; they could rely upon the support of Marie de Medici. Ubaldini and Duperron appealed to the court. They reminded Sillery the Chancellor that attacks upon the authority of the Pope were also attacks upon the legitimacy of Henry's children because it was upon Papal authority that Henry's first marriage was declared void and his union with Marie made possible; they appealed to the Regent's piety, they accented the disastrous effects of another display of Gallican opposition and they won their point. Sillery vetoed the action of the Parlement and the thesis was

presented elegantly by Choquet of the Province of Flanders in the absence of Richer and all opposition. "Ces discours furent pleins de belles recherches et de beaux rapports des passages de l'Ecriture avec les sentences des Pères anciens qui laissèrent l'étonnement et l'admiration aux Pères religieux étrangers aussi bien qu'à tous les autres qui l'entendirent."¹ So the chapter general finished in the same spirit in which it had begun and the victory was claimed for the Pope, but although the enterprises of Richer had been checked and the action of the Parlement overruled, the presentation of the second thesis did little to heal the breach or repair the damage caused by the first, but had rather served to strengthen the alliance between the Gallican elements in the University and the Parlement of Paris, and also incidentally to hasten the publication of the "Libellus." For Richer saw that both he as Syndic and the Parlement were powerless in the face of a royal rapprochement between the crown and the Papacy unless they could rely upon a church in France which was predominantly episcopal. The publication of the "Libellus" was intended to secure this support from the church as a whole.

IV. The "Libellus."

Richer records in his "Syndicat" that he had been engaged

1. See Ed. Puyol. Note to p.200. Vol.I.

upon the writing of his "magnum opus" the "Libellus de ecclesiastica et politica potestate" for upwards of ten years¹, and having completed it was waiting for the right moment to publish. He believed that moment now to have arrived. The dispute with the Dominicans had convinced him that the attacks upon ultramontanism to be effective needed a positive basis and rallying point in episcopal doctrine. The Gallicans ought to have a common charter. Moreover the parlementaires were anxious to support him and were urging him to further enterprises. Richer had made one significant convert in Verdun, the president of the Parlement of Paris, who from being upon his appointment a "devôt" now had become an enthusiastic disciple of Richer and "ne parlait que des maximes et libertés de l'Eglise Gallicane."² Verdun requested from Richer on behalf of the Parlement a full statement of the ancient doctrines of the Sorbonne. The Syndic determined to accept the opportunity offered by this request to publish the Libellus, but before doing so he submitted it to the judgment of several competent authorities including Gamache, the professor royal at the Sorbonne. "Philippe Gamache vit soigneusement le livre et y nota quelques choses, lesquelles Richer corrigea selon que Gamache l'avait désiré."³ With these precautions Richer sent a manuscript

1. "Syndicat de Richer" p.65.

2. Ed. Puyol. Vol.I. p.217.

3. "Syndicat de Richer" p.66.

copy of the book to Verdun with a covering document explaining his reasons for so doing, and a few weeks afterwards had three hundred copies of the "Libellus" printed and circulated fifty of them among his friends.

V. Analysis.

The "Libellus" is a short treatise of about eight thousand words, written in Latin in the form of a deductive argument and divided into eighteen chapters. Each chapter is an admirable combination of brevity and clarity, and the whole work is both a remarkable piece of finished scholastic reasoning and a model of what a popular manifesto should be. The "Syndicat de Richer" describes the general theme of the work as follows:- "Le Libellus contient deux sortes de propositions, à savoir: les principes et les conclusions qui en sont tirées. Nul ne peut révoquer en doute que l'ancienne doctrine de Sorbonne consiste en ces trois chefs: 1. Que Jésus-Christ a conféré les clefs, c'est-à-dire la juridiction ecclésiastique en commun et par indivis à tout l'ordre sacerdotal, lequel était représenté par les apôtres et les soixante-douze disciples; 2. Que la puissance d'ordonner et faire des lois infaillibles résidait dans toute l'Eglise universelle, mais non aux particuliers séparés du général; 3. Que le Concile général légitimement assemblé

représentait proprement et par excellence l'Eglise universelle, et conséquemment tenait de Dieu immédiatement son autorité; dont il s'ensuivait que le Pape était sujet à la direction et correction du Concile général. Quant aux conclusions et inductions que Richer avait recueillies de ces trois principes, il était prêt à montrer qu'elles étaient tirées conformément aux règles de logique et de théologie, et à la doctrine des anciens Pères et Décrets du concile de Constance et de Bâle."¹

The eighteen chapters may be divided geometrically into one main theorem adduced from two axioms and followed by fifteen supplements or riders. The first axiom lays down that ecclesiastical power is found essentially in the church, administratively in the Pope and the other bishops, or to use the clumsy but useful philosophical terms, noumenal power resides in the church, phenomenal power in the bishops of the church.² The second axiom asserts that Christ gave authority to the ecclesiastical hierarchy by His commission of power to all the apostles and the disciples, and not merely to Peter.³ This of course is the fundamental concept.

1. Syndicat de Richer. p.78.

2. "Jurisdictio Ecclesiastica, primario ac essentialiter Ecclesiae, Romano autem Pontifici atque aliis Episcopis ministerialiter tantum, sicut facultas videndi oculo, convenit." (Cap.1.)

3. "Christus, immediate et per se claves sive jurisdictionem ordini hierarchico contulit, per immediatam et realem missionem omnium Apostolorum atque discipulorum." (Cap.11).

Just as the Council of Constance is the historical justification and ground of episcopatism so this is the biblical and theological foundation, and Richer supports his contention by extensive quotations from John, Romans and Ephesians which quotations, he argues, outweigh in importance the incident at Caesarea Philippi of the giving of the keys to Peter.

From these two axioms is deduced the main theorem of the Libellus which is printed on the flyleaf of the three hundred copies and is amplified in the third chapter. The church is a monarchical state instituted for a divine end and limited by an aristocratical government.¹ Jesus Christ is the supreme monarch of the church and has delegated his supreme authority to the hierarchical order which governs the church as a divinely ordained aristocracy. The remaining fifteen chapters, which are supplementary to this main proposition, group themselves under seven riders which can be stated in brief.

The first which is contained in Chapter IV is that since Christ is the essential monarch of the church, Saint Peter only

1. "Ecclesiae definitio, per causas essentielles
Ecclesia est politia monarchica, ad finem supernaturalem instituta, regimine aristocratico quod omnium optimum, et naturae convenientissimum est, temperata a summo animarum pastore Domino nostro." (Cap.III).

possesses executive power as the administrative head of the church.¹ The second which is found in Chapter V distinguishes the state of the church from its government. Formally the church is a monarchy in order to preserve its unity and to secure efficiency; really the church is an aristocracy to secure a powerful and infallible administration. In Aristotelian terms the church is "status monarchicus, politia aristocratica."² The third rider in chapters VI and VII asserts that the infallible power to make decrees and canons resides in the whole church, or the general council which represents the whole church.³ The fourth in chapter VIII argues that the frequent meeting of general councils is therefore absolutely essential to the welfare of the church.⁴ The fifth is found in chapters IX, XIV, XV, XVI and XVII and

1. "D. Petrus est solummodo caput ministeriale, Christus autem Dominus absolutus, fundator, caput et fundamentum essenziale Ecclesiae; unde argumenta quae ducuntur a capite ministeriali ad essenziale caput, fallunt adicto secundum quid, ad dictum simpliciter." (Cap. IV).
2. "In Ecclesia, Status a regimine distinguitur: nam Status monarchicus est, ad unitatem atque ordinem vindicandum, necnon ad efficacem exequationem canonum: regnum vero aristocraticum propter salutare consilium, infallibilem providentiam, et constitutiones canonum: Ecclesia enim canone, non absoluta potestate regitur." (Cap. V).
3. "Infallibilis potestas decernendi aut constituendi canones, totae Ecclesiae, quae est columna et firmamentum veritatis, non uni et soli Petro competit: idque praxi Ecclesiae comprobatur." (Cap. VI) Cap. VII is an examination of Luke 22 verses 31 & 32 to demonstrate that the prayer of Jesus did not prevent Peter from subsequently denying his Lord, and thus did not make him infallible.
4. "Frequens celebratio conciliorum est simpliciter et absolute necessaria ad Ecclesiam melius sanctiusque regendam..." (Cap. VIII)

is an elucidation of the powers of the Pope. The power of the Papacy does not extend beyond the execution and interpretation of the divine laws, natural and canonical, in relationship to individual churches, and the establishment of provisional edicts and canons.¹

The sixth is stated in chapters XI and XVIII. The authority and sanction of the church are purely spiritual. The church has no resort to force and cannot exert any power over the persons or property of its members. Any indirect power which the church exerts upon the state must be in strict accordance with this principle.²

The seventh and last rider is the statement of political Gallicanism and is treated in chapters X, XII and XIII. The church universal or the Christian commonwealth has one foundation, Jesus Christ, but because it includes a material as well as a spiritual sphere, the government is shared by

-
1. "Quousque plenitudo potestatis Papal se extendat" (Cap. IX)
"Confutatio argumentorum, quibus absoluta potestas Romano Pontifici tribuitur" (Cap. XIV). "In Concilio generali congregato, Papa habetur caput, quo ad verbi divino predicationem, administrationem .. et executionem canonum" (Cap. XV). "Explicatio huius canonis, Nemo indicabit primam sedem." (Cap. XVI). "Causa finalis Ecclesiae" (Cap. XVII).
 2. "Cum Ecclesia neque territorium, neque ius gladii habeat a Christo et ad finem supernaturalem spirituales tantum instituta sit, de mediis necessariis ad beatitudinem, suasive tantum et directive non coercive poenas temporales irrogando, indicat." (Cap. XI)
"Quid sit Ecclesiam habere potestatem indirectam in temporalia et solutio argumentorum contrariorum." (Cap. XVIII).

the bishops and the temporal magistrates.¹ It is for the spiritual arm to use spiritual coercion upon the souls of the church; it is for the political arm to protect the ordinances, the territory, and the material welfare of the church and to correct abuses so that together the highest good is attained.

Such in outline is the substance of the "Libellus." It is the most incisive and balanced argument in the writings of all the French theorists for that episcopatism which is common to Gerson and Bossuet, to Pierre D'Ailly and La Luzerne. The contentions of Regnier, La Hogue, and Bailly all find their classic expression in the pages of the Libellus, of which Puyol has given an admirable summary.

"L'aristocratie ecclésiastique, disait-il, se compose surtout des Evêques qui renferment en eux les pouvoirs principaux de l'Eglise. Les Evêques considérés chacun dans leurs diocèses sont les véritables souverains de leurs églises. Quand ils

1. "Quamquam Ecclesia unicum habeat caput essentielle, nihilominus in ratione exercitii, atque exequutiones regiminis a Papa et a Principi politico differenter gubernatur" (Cap.X). "Princeps politicus ut dominus republicae ac territorii, vindex est atque protector legis divinae, naturalis, et canonicae: Quare eum infinem leges figere, et gladium distringere potest." (Cap.XII). "Princeps politicus, ut Ecclesiae protector, et vindex canonum, index est legitimus appellationum quas ab abusu vocant; et hinc Ecclesiae Gallicanae libertates originem sumpserunt." (Cap.XIII).

sont réunis ils composent un sénat ou^t des Etats-Généraux qui ont toute autorité sur l'Eglise universelle ... Toute l'autorité essentielle se trouve dans l'Episcopat. C'est sur lui que repose l'Eglise: c'est à lui que tout pouvoir sacré a été remis ... Le Pape est le monarque de l'Eglise placé à la tête de cette aristocratie. Néanmoins, il ne domine pas sur l'Episcopat ... L'Episcopat est tout-puissant, le Pontificat est subordonné; l'Episcopat est essentiel à l'Eglise; la Papauté accessoire."¹ The merit of Richer's work must be considered in reference to its twofold character. It is both ecclesiastical doctrine and practical propaganda. The ultimate truth of the doctrines of the "Libellus" does not lie within the scope of this inquiry. Richer is able easily to adduce biblical authority and quotation for his axioms, but no more easily than can a Quaker or a Seventh Day Adventist find biblical justification for his, and it may be entered as a caveat that finally neither episcopatism, nor infallibility can be argued "a priori". The church is an emergent organism having its origin in a "faith once delivered to the saints" rather than a static structure pre-formed by the giving of some keys to Peter.

However, if the axioms be accepted then the main theorem is true in that it insists upon the essential monarchy of

1. Ed. Puyol. Vol.I. p.236-237.

Christ himself, and rules out the absolute monarchy of the Pope. The church is governed by those to whom Christ delegated His power, i.e. the regency of those who in the absence of the monarch have been deputed to carry on his work. Richer calls this an aristocracy, which is true as far as it goes, but if the seventy received commissions to convert the world as well as the twelve, then logically they, too, have authority "de jure divino"; the church is a democracy and Richer is at one with Marsiglio of Padua. We shall see that his opponents accused Richer of Multitudinism and contended rightly that Richer in vesting authority in the church in the first axiom and the main theorem was really giving the keys to the "communauté des fidèles". Richer attempts to save the unity of Christendom by giving to the church the appearance of a monarchy, but the distinction between the form and substance of ecclesiastical government savours of the arbitrary and reflects upon the author's piety rather than his logic. Nevertheless the general principle of a divinely ordained aristocracy is in harmony with the conception of the church as a fellowship or community, and as such links up the church in France with the church in Ephesus and Corinth. Moreover the supremacy of the general council as the depository of infallibility follows naturally from Richer's premisses and represents the church as an organic whole. So much for

the philosophical and theological value of the conception of the church in the *Libellus*. It remains to assess the value of the "*Libellus*" and especially of the seven corollaries as a practical programme for the church of the seventeenth century and especially the church in France. As the manifesto of episcopatism it possesses the "*trinoda necessitas*" of clarity, simplicity and brevity, and forms the credal basis for ecclesiastical Gallicanism. It states the case with an authority and directness which had hitherto been the prerogative of the Papalists and is the complete and unsuccessful answer to the Council of Trent. It is further a real attempt to bring the church into line with the current trends of political thought and action. The decentralizing effects of the consolidation of the nation state, and the Reformation movements, had been to challenge the idea of a united Christendom and to necessitate a new loyalty to a national church. Provision is made for this process in the "*Libellus*." The ascription to the bishop of divine sovereignty within his own diocese and to the state's general of absolute power paves the way in the thought of Richer for a Gallican church serving the highest spiritual ends in co-operation with national ideals. Moreover the secularization of politics carried with it the more complete entrance of the political sovereign into ecclesiastical affairs. Richer facilitates this movement by his proclamation of the purely spiritual sway

of the church and thus gives regalism a foundation not only in necessity but also in doctrine.

In short the "Libellus" provides a creed and thus a rallying point for the episcopal clergy; it justifies the actions of Henry IV and provides for their repetition; it upholds the claims of the Parlementaires and offers for those claims an ecclesiastical foundation, and above all it is a plea for nationalism. That it must finally become involved in a doctrine of secular sovereignty with which it is incompatible was not yet apparent.

VI. The Opposition.

While the theory of episcopatism was being disseminated, events had been moving with rapidity towards a crisis. The Jesuits returned once more to the attack and through the influence of the court, Sillery, the Chancellor, was contemplating the issue of letters patent giving the order equal teaching facilities with the other branches of the University of Paris. Richer was informed and at his instigation the University brought an action before the Parlement in December 1611 to confirm the repressive acts against the Jesuits of the previous year. During the course of this action La Martellière, who was with Servin the chief spokesman for the University, quoted passages from the "Libellus" as indicative

of the doctrines of the Sorbonne, and, as has been noted earlier in the chapter, the Jesuits were forced to take an oath to follow the teaching of the Sorbonne; they were prohibited from opening any college in Paris, and the Parlement decided in the near future to pronounce upon the fundamental problems involved in the dispute. The influence, however, of the court and the orthodox opposition of the high clergy was becoming daily more marked, and now this "entente" between the university and the Parlement seemed to many who professed Gallican sympathies to be a direct attack upon the Catholic faith. Duperron was able to persuade Marie de Medici to stop the Parlement from pursuing its attacks upon the Jesuits. Filesac and Gamache who hitherto had been staunch supporters of Richer took fright at the thoroughness of the Syndic, and fearing schism allied themselves with Duval, thus forming within the Sorbonne an influential opposition party which soon won recruits. The cry was raised that Richer was attempting to make Gallicanism a doctrine of the state, and when in 1612 the remaining two hundred and fifty copies of the Libellus were circulated throughout the university a tempest of opposition arose which broke in a flood of polemic and died down only with the deposition of Richer himself.

The various pamphlets and treatises provoked by the Libellus are uneven in quality and only one of them, the

"Elenchus" of Duval, worthy to rank either as literature or argument with Richer's work. It will be sufficient merely to indicate the nature of most of these works, for in an examination of the "Elenchus" will be found the best arguments of all the others, and the basis of that attitude of the majority of the clergy in France which finally determined the Gallican "via media" of 1630.

One of the first pamphlets to appear was "La Monarchie de l'Eglise" by Pelletier¹, a friend of Duperron. It is concerned with the moral rather than the intellectual problems of the Libellus and concludes by asserting that divine justice "conduisait aux abîmes ceux qui jettent les premières semences de leur désunion par la haine extrême qu'ils portent aux Jesuites." While not without evidences of theological ability it is chiefly significant as an early indication of the emphasis which was predominantly to be placed on the moral and spiritual implications of Richer's efforts in all the subsequent writers. Richer professed himself to be disdainful of Pelletier's work as also of the "Deux Avis ..." by the King's almoner Bouju de Beaulieu², whom he accused of being unable to write in Latin. The work

1. Pelletier "La Monarchie de l'Eglise, contre les erreurs d'un certain livre intitulé de la puissance Ecclésiastique et Politique" 1612.

2. Bouju de Beaulieu "Deux Avis ..." 1613.

of Beaulieu is certainly difficult to read, but it is a sincere effort to preserve the unity of the church which the writer thinks is threatened by episcopatism, and appeals to the crown "à ne permettre qu'aucune personne, sous le nom Catholique, fasse courir des écrits parmi le peuple, qui soient contre l'Eglise, et pour couler entre nous l'erreur et la division."¹ The first attack from the Faculty of Theology was the "Advis d'un docteur de Paris" by Durand² who was one of its most renowned doctors. Whereas Pelletier and Beaulieu had contented themselves with statements of the errors of the "Libellus," Durand defends the theories of papal absolutism and examines thoroughly the claims of Richer in a treatise which, despite a poor style, has much clear thinking and shows the influence of Duval's thought in its emphasis upon the schismatic tendencies of the "Libellus." The two remaining writers beside Duval to be mentioned are Forgement and Sirmond the Jesuit. The "Lettre envoyée à M. Edmond Richer"³ and the "Jacobi Cosmae Favricii notae stigmatae" of Forgement⁴ and Sirmond respectively are

1. "Deux Avis" p.4.

2. C. Durand "Advis d'un docteur de Paris".

3. N. Forgement "Lettre envoyée à M. Edmond Richer" 1614.

4. "Jacobi Cosmae Favricii, notae stigmatae" 1612.

probably the two most ferocious and worthless efforts in personal invective in the history of the seventeenth century.

The "Elenchus, Pro Suprema Romani Pontificis in Ecclesiam Autoritate" by Andre Duval¹, the former friend and fellow student of Richer, is the really representative answer to the "Libellus" and an examination of its chief characteristics will be sufficient to indicate the general trend of the polemic. Duval himself was not only recognised in the university as one of the leading theologians, he was also respected as one of its finest men. Such different men as Richer, Bentivoglio, and Vincent de Paul all bear witness to his saintliness of character. Puyol, who treats Duval as a hero, goes so far as to say of him that "il est impossible de démêler une imputation sérieuse contre la personne et une argument victorieuse contre la doctrine."² The "Elenchus" certainly bears out much of this praise in its careful and restrained argument and its kindliness of tone, and it is evident that Richer himself recognised in his former friend his most powerful opponent as well as his most generous foe. Duval's work is more than twice as long as the "Libellus" and under forty-two sections treats the contentions

1. A. Duval "Libelli de Ecclesiastica et politica potestate Elenchus" 1612.

2. Ed. Puyol. Vol.I. p.309.

of Richer "seriatim".

This method obviously does not lend itself to symmetry and there is an absence of that logical sequence of argument which characterises the "Libellus". In the opening paragraphs the author makes clear what is the dominant motive underlying the work. He is attempting to refute Richer's theories because they strike at the unity of the Catholic church and in their depreciation of the powers of the Pope they are provocative of schism. It is the horror and moral iniquity of schism which governs his outlook. He does not hesitate to say "Multos Calamitoso hoc tempore de schismate, et defectione a sancta sede Apostolica (etsi Catholicorum nomen et insignia prae se ferant) cogitare video."¹ He makes no attempt, as does the "Libellus", to find a "modus vivendi" between the new nationalism and the government of the church; he makes no comment upon the regalism of the "Libellus", but repeatedly affirms that "spiritualibus enim non de temporalibus nostra est instituta disputatio." With this strict limitation of his criticism, Duval in the first ten chapters sets out the traditional conception of the Catholic church as a divinely ordained monarchy which depends for its well-being upon a devout and uncompromising loyalty to Rome. The power of the keys given to Peter constitutes the only basis of unity and

1. "Elenchus" p.5.

order, and the theories of Richer can only result in a breaking away from the church of Cyprian, Constantine and Augustine, which will mean a schism with all its deplorable results. From this¹ Duval goes on to examine Richer's main theorem and to argue that his aristocracy can only finally land the church upon the shores of multitudinism and that therefore there is no difference between the theories of episcopatism and the "universal priesthood" of Calvin and Luther. The final chapters are devoted to a repudiation on behalf of the Faculty of Theology of the doctrines which Richer contended had expressed its true spirit, and to a reproach that the Syndic should have so compromised one of the greatest bulwarks of the true faith.² Duval throughout is the orthodox ultramontanist of the school of Bellarmin. Where he is not contradicting Richer as to the interpretation of scripture, (scripture which is generally patient of many interpretations, and never explicit of one), he is martialling authorities rather than arguments to confute his opponent's contentions. Apart from the question of multitudinism, which is admittedly the weak link in the chain of Richer's argument, the "Elenchus" is an expository sermon whereas the "Libellus" is a philosophical inquiry, for Duval and Richer are

1. Ib. Chap. 20-39.

2. "Elenchus" Chaps. 40, 41, 42.

fundamentally irreconcilable. Richer is the radically-minded theologian attempting to give the church such a constitutional form as could progress "pari passu" with the demands of a developing community, convinced that the interests of church and state are inter-dependent, and seeing the highest interests of the church subserved when it meets the needs of its age. Duval is the orthodox zealot believing the "venerable mosaic" of the church to be the one stable and permanent institution in a changing world, certain that its power depends upon an unbroken unity of tradition and authority, and seeking its highest good by an uncompromising loyalty to its head.

The further attacks upon Richer and the "Libellus" and the ultimate repudiation of episcopatism were to demonstrate that the majority of the French clergy were orthodox Catholics and were not prepared to exchange their unity for reason, but believing unity to be above reason, were to estrange themselves from the parlementaires and give up any logical claims to their liberties, rather than risk the dangers of schism.

VII. Condemnation and Deposition of Richer.

While this literary campaign was progressing Ubaldini the Nuncio was active in attempting to secure the support of

the court and the episcopacy against the "Libellus." He wrote to the Queen and her ministers that Richer's book was nothing but "un épilogue de l'abominable doctrine de Marsile de Padua, d'Illyricus, de Fra Paolo Sarpi et de tous les hérésiarques qui ont jamais écrit contre la suprématie de saint Pierre; une répétition des passages des Pères et de l'Ecriture que ces hérésiarques avaient détourné de leur sens, pour les amener à leurs opinions; une attaque audacieuse non-seulement contre le temporel, mais encore contre la pure autorité spirituelle et la primauté du Saint-Siège."¹

Obtaining little satisfaction from Sillery, the irresolute Chancellor, Ubaldini turned his attention to the Sorbonne and instructed Scappi to make a personal canvas of all the doctors to persuade them to do justice to Rome by condemning the Libellus. Scappi found that the staunch followers of Richer, although active, were few in number, the chief among them being Hébert, Parent, Mincé, Roguenant, Hennequin and Garnier. He found that the ultramontanists who desired to overthrow all opinions and doctrines in the Sorbonne save the doctrines favourable to Papal infallibility were also few in number, although they comprised such influential doctors as Gamache, Filesac, d'Ysambert and Duval. The great majority of the doctors formed a middle party which desired

1. M. Perrens. "L'Eglise et l'Etat" Vol.II. p.110.

to maintain liberty in theological opinions and which was hostile to extremes of doctrine. "Ils laissaient à l'enseignement de la Faculté une latitude qui lui permettait d'accepter parmi ses membres, des Gallicans et des Ultramontains aussi bien que des Thomistes et des Molinistes."¹ However, in two things they were firm. They were opposed to any movement which attempted to label the Faculty with any particular doctrine and they were staunch in their defence of the unity of the Catholic church. It was upon these two points that Scappi was able successfully to solicit their opposition to Richer. Once again it was the action of the Parlement of Paris which provided the occasion for the demonstration of this opposition.

Richer was fully aware of the activities of Scappi and Ubaldini, and sought the help of de Bellièvre the procuror-general against the condemnation which he feared would result. The day before the Faculty assembled in February 1612 representatives were summoned before the Parlement to explain the movements within the Sorbonne. The Doyen truthfully answered that the nuncio was attempting to secure the censure and deposition of Richer. Once again the Parlementaires stood by their ally. They prohibited the Faculty from further deliberation on the matter, ordered

1. Ed. Puyol. Vol.I. p.335. from "Summa Theologica" of P. Gamache 1627.

Richer to bring to their registry all the copies of the "Libellus" still in his possession, condemned Forgement for acting as guide to Scappi without royal permission and promised in due course to pronounce upon the orthodoxy of the "Libellus". Ubaldini was indignant. He proclaimed that this was "la plus grande affliction qu'il eût encore ressentie" and intimated his intention of withdrawing to Rome. This prospect of rupture with the Holy See, following hard upon the dramatic and provocative action of the Parlement of Paris, was the signal for a rapprochement between the ultramontanists and the middle party within the Sorbonne, and for a general consolidation of the episcopate against Richer. The Nuncio was promised that if he would postpone his departure satisfaction would be given him. Without defying the Parlement, the general assembly of the Faculty of Theology on the third of February was able to show its disapproval of Richer and to strike a blow at his theories. Richer had published at the same time as the "Libellus" a small pamphlet containing several decrees of the Faculty which were favourable to his system.¹ This pamphlet not falling within the prohibition of the Parlement was successfully attacked. Filesac made a complaint against those who, without permission, published the conclusions and secrets of the Faculty, and

1. See Durand "Avis d'un Docteur de Paris". p.162.

petitioned "qu'il fût ordonné qu'à l'avenir les livres des conclusions de la Faculté, lesquels jusqu'à ce jour avaient toujours été en la puissance du syndic, seraient renfermés sous trois diverses clefs, et que l'on ne pourrait jamais publier ni communiquer aucune chose appartenant à la Faculté, sans avoir eu auparavant permission d'icelle."¹ The Faculty decreed, as desired by Filesac, and the ultramontanists now sought further to satisfy the already mollified nuncio by a royal pronouncement, but despite the oratory of Duperron the vacillating court would take little direct action. However, it authorised Duperron to call together a number of bishops to examine the doctrines of the "Libellus" but rather than accept any further responsibility it was tacitly agreed that the Pope should be encouraged to demand the condemnation of the Syndic himself. Accordingly Ubaldini wrote asking the Pope to take action and to stimulate "la timidité de la Régente par des stimulants gaillards."² Whilst Duperron was arranging for the assembly of bishops which eventually was to meet in the Province of Sens, another political factor was emerging and giving the opposition to Richer yet another pretext. The preoccupation of the pamphleteers with the

1. "Syndicat de Richer" p.79.

2. Letter to Pope. 10 Nov. 1610.

ecclesiastical system of the "Libellus" had led to the general misapprehension that Richer was a believer in political as well as spiritual aristocracies. Amid the general disorders of the regency, and the independent attitude of the princes, the Prince of Condé professed himself an ally of the Syndic and lost no opportunity of championing Richer before the King and the Parlement. Again many Protestants attempted quite unjustifiably to trace a similarity between the views of the "Libellus" and the claims of Turquet the Protestant agitator. Duperron and others took full advantage of these movements of thought. "Duperron disait que Richer était l'ennemi juré de tous les rois et de tous les états monarchiques et que par les mêmes maximes qu'il attaquait la monarchie du Pape pour établir son aristocratie, il ruinait pareillement celle de tous les rois et princes souverains."¹ They went further and insinuated that the publication of the "Libellus" was but a means of drawing attention to the invalidity of the marriage of Marie and Henry IV, and thus opening for Condé the way to the throne. These attacks were as profitable as they were perverse and go far to explain the thoroughness of the censure which the bishops of the Province of Sens were to place on Richer's system, yet the royal ministers were above all anxious not to alienate the

1. "Syndicat de Richer" p.86.

Parlement of Paris, and thus risk a concordat between the Parlement and the princes, and so were content to await the letters from Rome which would relieve them of the necessity of further action, and would encourage the episcopate to repudiate Richer themselves, without royal aid. The Papal letters arrived in the middle of March and on their authority the Queen gave permission for a provincial council of bishops to meet at Sens to pronounce upon the "Libellus," but as a sop to the Parlementaires insisted that the censure should include the following clause "sous néanmoins toucher aux droits du roi et de la couronne de France, droits, immunités et libertés de l'Eglise Gallicane." On the nineteenth of March 1612 the bishops unequivocally condemned the theories of the "Libellus" as "falsas, erroneas, scandalosas, schismaticasque," and this censure was promptly confirmed by a decree of the Congregation of the Index.¹ Moreover to insure against any loophole of escape for Richer owing to the "safeguarding of Gallican liberties" clause Ubaldini obtained a similar condemnation of the "Libellus" from a provincial council of the bishops of Aix, and in this second document there was no mention of such safeguards. The Bishop of Paris, Gondi, followed these censures up by having them solemnly promulgated on the following Sunday in all the churches throughout Paris. The triumph of the opposition was only too

1. Cardinal Duperron "Ambassades et negociations" 1633.
pp. 862-867.

apparent to Richer, who by his very loyalty to episcopatism would be forced to recognize the authority of the provincial councils unless he could prove them illegitimate.

"Véritablement, raconte-t-il lui-même, il semblait que toutes les puissances de la terre voulussent conspirer ensemble à la ruine de Richer et qu'il n'y eût personne qui prît soin de sa défense, que messieurs du Parlement; si ce n'est toutefois qu'étant assisté et spécialement soutenu de la grâce de Dieu, il ne fut jamais plus résolu, et ne dormit pas moins, assuré du rempart de sa conscience et d'une droite intention qu'il n'avait jamais viciée d'aucune mauvaise circonstance."¹

There remained one line of defence for the Syndic. He could appeal by writ of error. This "appel comme d'abus" was one of the most zealously guarded of the Gallican liberties. It was the right of resort to the secular magistrates against a decision of the Pope, the Bishop or a superior officer of the church. Of obscure origin it had many historical precedents after the Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges and was incorporated in Pithou's charter of "Les Libertés de l'Eglise Gallicane."² It was hated and persistently attacked by the clergy. Fleury says: "Si quelque étranger zèle pour les droits de l'Eglise et peu disposé à flatter les puissances temporelles voulait faire

1. "Syndicat de Richer" p.3.

2. P. Pithou "Les Libertés de l'Eglise Gallicane" 1594.

un traité des servitudes de l'Eglise gallicane, il ne manquerait pas de matière; et il ne lui serait pas difficile de faire passer pour telles, les appellations comme d'abus."¹

In 1610 the episcopate had succeeded in preventing its application to the Sacraments offices and discipline of the church, but they were unable to go farther owing to the hesitancy of Marie de Medici and the court. Consequently although the regent's almoner, Cardinal Bonji, implored Richer not to resort to this method of attempting to override the censure of the Council of Sens, he could not prevent the Syndic from presenting to the chancellory in April 1612 an appeal by writ of error against the Council. This appeal was based on nine grounds upon which Richer claimed the Council to be "ultra vires". These reasons in the main are trivial, the only really important contentions being that the censure is contrary to the authority of the King and the Parliament, and that Richer himself was not given the opportunity to defend his system.

The way in which the ultramontanists secured the rejection of this appeal provides very sorry reading and reflects little credit upon those who in the interests of religion, true and undefiled, were endeavouring to disgrace the schismatic. In the first place the Chancellor tried to

1. Fleury "Nouveaux Opuscules" 1818. p.183.

kill the appeal by a policy of red tape and inaction, then, when Richer took it direct to the Parlement, Verdun was directed on the authority of the Queen not to proceed with it and was encouraged to be loyal by a handsome bribe. If we are to believe Baillet this bribing was not confined to the President of the Parlement,¹ and it is difficult not to agree with Richer himself when he claims that it was only the exercise of unfair methods that prevented the Parlement from continuing to uphold an ally to whom it had hitherto remained true.

The road to the deposition of the Syndic was now clear but the policy of royal inaction still made progress difficult for Ubaldini. The faculty "voulut déposséder Richer de son syndicat, ne pouvant souffrir qu'étant homme de si mauvaise réputation en sa doctrine, il fût honoré de cette charge première,"² and armed with this authority he requested the regent to dismiss Richer, adding that there was little hope of a voluntary retirement on the part of the Syndic. The Pope supported this request through de Brèves the ambassador; "il plût a Leurs Majestés pour marque de leur ressentiment contre Richer, de le faire au moins déposséder de la dignité de syndic."³ Yet the court would take no responsibility. "La reine et le chancelier, écrivait Ubaldini, seraient charmés

1. B. Baillet. p.370.

2. "Hist. de la Mère et du fils" 1730. Vol.I. p.283.

3. Request of Pope through Brèves his ambassador 27th April, 1612.

si les théologiens voulaient priver Richer de son office; mais je ne les trouve pas aussi disposés à y coopérer que je le voudrais."¹ Accordingly it was decided to proceed with the deposition of Richer at the next assembly of the Faculty of Theology in June. Ubaldini was able to persuade the regent to take steps preventing the Parlement of Paris from interfering with the deliberations of the Faculty. The ground was well prepared so that in the actual assembly the voting should be predominantly anti-Richer and the doctors Harlay and Gonault were entrusted with the task of formally requesting the deposition of the Syndic, yet so courageously did Richer defend himself that it was not until the assembly of September that the Faculty could come to any decision and only then because letters patent from the privy council were received ordering them to proceed with the election of a new Syndic. Filesac was voted in unanimously and proceeded at once to drive home the ultramontanist victory. Richer was threatened with expulsion if he published any further editions of the "Libellus" and the archives of the Faculty were taken out of Richer's hand and given over to a commission. Gondi the Bishop of Paris obtained the withdrawal of Richer's candidature for a canonry of Notre Dame and instituted a mild persecution of Richerists, but such persecution was

1. Letter of Ubaldini. 19th Jan. 1612.

unnecessary, for the cause of episcopatism was lost at any rate for the time. Its chief protagonist had been abandoned by his protectors. Sillery had become afraid of the episcopalists; Verdun had been intimidated and the Parlement lacked the courage to defy the court. Yet even if it be allowed that this victory was a victory of truth over error, and unity over schism, the way in which it was achieved reflects little credit on any of the combatants except the defeated.

No adequate criticism of this episcopal revival can be made without reference to the revival of regalism for which it was intended to be a foundation, and therefore such criticism must wait until some account has been given of that recrudescence of political Gallicanism which accompanied and finally outstripped its ecclesiastical counterpart. However, it will be useful to recapitulate and briefly to review its main features. The episcopatism of Edmond Richer may be considered as pure theology, as ecclesiastical doctrine, and as political theory.

It was as an attempt to arrive at the true meaning and form of the Catholic church that the "Libellus" was almost exclusively attacked. Richer argued that though it had the appearance of a monarchy, scripture, tradition and reason proved the church to be in reality a commonwealth governed by a divinely appointed aristocracy of bishops, who individually were the monarchs of their dioceses and collectively were

infallible. As has been noted earlier, as a refutation of papal absolutism it is a perfectly tenable doctrine vouched for in the Gospels and among the Fathers. It harmonizes more easily than does ultramontaniam with Pauline theology and would seem to many to express the Christian spirit of fellowship and underline the Christian emphasis upon collective and social values, better than does the orthodox Romanist autocracy, and above all it does not carry with it that element of artificiality which Papal infallibility cannot escape. But like many other theories it is strong in what it asserts and weak in what it omits. Richer presents a logical and powerful case against any real monarchy in the church by his arguments that real power resides in the church as a whole, but his limitation of the divine commission to the bishops is quite arbitrary. The reasons against monarchy are just as powerful arguments for a democracy as complete that of Marsilio of Padua.¹ To say, as Richer does, that the seventy have an equal "de jure divino" commission to convert the world with Peter and the eleven is really to give the electoral right to all Catholics and to destroy the very meaning of the

1. Marsilio of Padua in the "Defensor Pacis" attacked the Papal theory of society and laid down that the supreme authority in the state is the whole body of citizens. A general council to be valid must be summoned by them and composed of priests and laymen. He denied the supremacy of Peter over the other apostles and declared that in the early church presbyter and priest were synonymous terms.

word hierarchy. Multitudinism inexorably follows from the second axiom of the "Libellus"; and just as inexorably must implicate the bishop in its depreciation of the Pope. This again is the explanation of the opposition to the Libellus. The episcopate in France rejected Richer not because they knew his aristocratic system to be false, but because they feared the ultimate positions which such a system would impel them to maintain.

Nevertheless it can be submitted that there is no such thing as pure or unrelated theology and that theological doctrines emerge from the interaction of spiritual aspirations and practical conditions operating at any given period, as Marsilio had also argued in the "Defensor Pacis". The Papacy did not descend ready made from the apostolic age but was the response of a vigorous but scattered church to an age which demanded unity and co-ordination to meet its needs. The doctrine dutifully followed in the wake, the scriptural quotations survived by selection and the Fathers of the Church only became parents by later adoption. So ultramontaniam or episcopatism must be examined in the light of its practical and spiritual efficiency, rather than in the light of its philosophical purity. The Council of Trent and the "Libellus" were both answers of the church to the movements of thought and action of their day. The merit of Richer's episcopatism is that it attempts to give the church a real and natural place

within the nation state and to enable it to accommodate itself to the new loyalty whereas the Council of Trent strengthens Catholicism internationally but makes no provision for a national spiritual consciousness. By his insistence upon the purely spiritual function of the church Richer gracefully recognises the increasing secularization of the means of coercion and thus relieves Catholicism of the embarrassment of a temporal power which was rapidly becoming an anomaly. The episcopate of the Council of Trent is bound to an ultramontanist loyalty, so that the national needs of any bishops can only be met by papal concession. The episcopate of Richer is free to co-operate in a royal reform, or pronounce upon a question of orthodoxy because it possesses in itself the fullest authority and needs no higher court of appeal. The practical efficiency of Richer's doctrines can best be seen in the later relations between France and the Papacy. Though Bossuet was careful not to profess episcopatism yet it was manifest that the declaration of 1682 was founded and could only be founded on the episcopatism of Gerson and more particularly of Richer. When the Revolution attempted to organize the Gallican church it had to go further than the Declaration and found itself forced to return to the system of the "Libellus". Against all this had of course to be set in 1612 the one problem of schism. The orthodox Catholic considered it better to have a united church even if that

church were built on concession and compromise rather than risk the dangers of ecclesiastical revolution. Europe was tired of religious strife and the Huguenots were a big enough problem in themselves to warn the rank and file of the French clergy against the prospects of a break with Rome. The episcopal game was not worth the orthodox candle.

Finally the "Libellus" is political theory. Any modern summary of Gallicanism is forced to treat episcopatism and regalism as two quite disparate systems, championed by different groups within France and having no bond of unity but rather hostile to each other. Richer is the one Gallican thinker who attempted in one comprehensive system to co-ordinate the claims of the Parlementaire, the King and the Church. Instead of a spasmodic opposition to papal authority on the one hand and a questionable number of so-called Gallican liberties on the other, Richer visualized a comprehensive scheme whereby the Bishop, the King and the Secular Magistrate would all take a defined part in the Christian commonwealth. The "Libellus" was to be the real ground of the Gallican liberties because it interpreted them in terms of a theory of church and state. The church was asked to view these liberties as the beneficent complement of its spiritual power and the necessary protection of its episcopate from the pretensions of the Pope while the Divine Right of

Kings and the other claims of regalism which Richer elaborated in later pamphlets were to flow naturally from this fountain head rather than justify themselves merely by usage and the recourse to doubtful precedent and still more doubtful concessions by the Papacy. One example will suffice. Pithou claims that one of the Gallican liberties is the King's authority to convoke councils within his realm. Without such a system as that of the "Libellus" this authority precariously rests upon a power of interference in the government of the church which the Papacy could never finally hand over to the King, and the historic precedent of the calling of the Council of Orleans in 511 "by order of his most glorious Majesty King Clovis" with all its attendant difficulties. But granted episcopatism, then this authority is firmly established upon a dual foundation, the Divine Right of Kings which is implied in the purely spiritual power of the church, and the freedom of an all-powerful episcopate in a States General to meet the needs of its country in collaboration with the temporal magistrates.

Whereas the episcopate was forced to return to the "Libellus" as a foundation for its liberties, an examination of the revival of Political Gallicanism in the early years of the seventeenth century goes to show that the increasing power of the state and the growing secularization of politics enabled the political liberties to survive without any reference to

their ecclesiastical background and that although Richer feared that the rejection of episcopatism would mean the extinction of regalism, Richelieu was able to show that those very liberties could be defended better in terms of "raisons d'état" than by reference to any ecclesiastical theory even one as trenchant as that of the Libellus, while the very victory of regalism revealed a problem of sovereignty upon which "Richérisme" itself goes to pieces.

THE REVIVAL OF REGALISM.

I. THE REGALIST TRADITION.

The Revival of Regalism in France at the beginning of the seventeenth century was both the acceleration of a process of action and the interpretation of a movement of thought. On the one hand the years 1598 - 1630 were a period of rapid extension in the claims made for the Gallican liberties, and on the other hand, these liberties for the first time were codified under basic principles and related in terms of a comprehensive system.

Political Gallicanism emerged during the Middle Ages in the attempts of the civil society to defend itself against the invasions of the clergy, and in the slowly maturing belief that the clergy should be confined to the spiritual domain. From the Assembly of Vincennes in 1329 to the Ordinance of Villers Cotterets of 1539 efforts were continually being made to restrict ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and these efforts gradually came to be associated with certain liberties or rights which were claimed for the civil society over against the church. Naturally the greater part of these liberties clustered round the Kingship. The King claimed the authority to nominate bishops. Clovis, Charles Martel and Charlemagne undoubtedly exercised this right and encountered

little opposition. At the time of the Great Schism however the French clergy succeeded in re-establishing election thanks to the Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges in 1438 but their success was fleeting for by the Concordat of 1516 onwards the King appointed the bishops and the Pope confined himself to giving them canonical orders.

The King claimed the right to convoke Councils. During the whole of the Merovingian period councils did not assemble except with royal authority, for instance "A council of Bishops assembled in the town of Orleans by order of His Most Glorious Majesty King Clovis" (Council of Orleans of 511). After 843 and the Treaty of Verdun this authority was submerged until Hugues Capet assembled the Council of Saient Basel in 991, and at the time of the Great Schism Charles II convoked four Councils in Paris, while in 1438 Charles VII called together the Council of Bourges to decide between Eugenius IV and the Council of Basel. Though in the sixteenth century the Kings seemed to have forgotten their right in reality they had but modified its use, for "Assemblies" of the clergy were frequently called after 1561, and though they were primarily charged with finding supplies for the royal exchequer, they often embarked upon matters of a theological or disciplinary character.

The King who nominated his bishops and convoked his councils also came to administer the property of vacant

bishoprics. The collection by the King of the revenues of episcopal property during the vacancy was called the temporal "regale" while the collation of the benefices which chanced to become vacant during this time was called the spiritual "regale". Up to the seventeenth century this "liberty" was accepted with comparative acquiescence by the church, as witnesses the fact that Brittany was brought under the Regale in 1598 without a murmur of dissent by the episcopate or by Pope Clement VIII. However this was not to be the case during the seventeenth century, for it was the attempt in 1673 to bring the remaining provinces of Languedoc, Provence, Dauphiné and Guyenne into line which provoked the general convocation of the clergy in 1681 and led to the Declaration of 1682.

Again from feudal times when all ecclesiastical property was the King's or the lord's who gave the use of it to the bishop, the King claimed the right to tax the church property. The struggle was long and bitter. In 1215 Innocent III in the Lateran Council forbade laymen to tax the property of the church, but in certain grave cases a "tithe" might be granted with Papal sanction. Philip the Fair in 1294 freed himself from this humiliation only to be threatened with excommunication by Boniface VIII in the Bull "Clericis Laicos". Though a year later Boniface retracted after being terrified by the threats of the French King, in 1301 the Papal offensive was resumed in the Bulls "Ausculta Fili" and "Unam Sanctam" which

went so far as to claim control over the political authority of the King of France. Boniface, however, was thwarted; his successors apologised to Philip the Fair and finally in 1560 the third estate declared that all ecclesiastical property belonged to the King and the clergy were but the usufructuaries. Therefore the King could not merely tax ecclesiastical property he could also transfer it if he so desired.

In matters of doctrine and worship the King assumed a certain authority of supervision and censorship. In 556 Childebert having heard that Pope Pelagius had become implicated in the affair of the three chapters submitted him to two doctrinal examinations. In 1247 - 1302 Philip the Fair instituted the "Placet", a measure which subjected to royal authorization the circulation of Papal Bulls in France. On this authority Charles VII in 1423 placed an interdict upon all Bulls which granted benefices in France and Catherine of Medici, Henry III and Henry IV forbade the acceptance of the Decrees of the Council of Trent relating to reform.

The practical manner in which the King came to guard these powers was by the seizure of temporalities, in the event of ecclesiastical defiance. Thus in 869 Charles the Bold to avenge himself on Hincmar of Laon confiscated the property of his church, and again in 1302 Philip the Fair seized the temporalities of the bishops who despite his prohibition attended the Council of Rome. Later the brutality

of this practice gave place to a more legal method and the seizure of temporalities was preceded by action in the civil courts. This appeal by writ of error (*appel comme d'abus*) which was of obscure origin came into frequent use after the Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges and was recognised as a legitimate method whereby action could be taken in the civil courts against a decision of the Pope, bishop, or superior clergy.

Thus before the Reformation regalism comprised a number of liberties mainly wrested from the church by dominant personalities like Philip the Fair, liberties without any real basis in a system, but pragmatically justified as efforts of the civil society to prevent ecclesiastical abuse and to restrain the church within its proper boundaries. The Reformation inaugurated a new era and although the disorders of the League and the Wars of Religion obscured the whole problem they left behind them the seeds of a revival which was to change both the form and substance of political Gallicanism. Pierre Pithou's work is the explanatory proface to this revival, and foreshadows its main characteristics. The brief and authoritative "*Libertés de l'Eglise Gallicane*" is first the claim of the lawyer equipped with all the new directness and absolutism of the "Roman Reception". Civil Society can be grounded in laws just as ultimate and binding as the canons of the church. The Gallican liberties are not a number of disparate claims; they form a "corpus" of laws

based not on ecclesiastical concessions but on fundamental right, while they indicate that absolute independence of the secular power which acknowledges no ecclesiastical interference. "A partir de ce moment les controverses changent d'aspect. Avant les guerres de la Ligue on se contentait de dire, en certains cas, que les Papes abusaient de leur puissance; depuis, aux mêmes cas, on commenca à dire qu'ils n'en avaient aucune."¹

It is in the second place the inevitable answer to the League and the Council of Trent and is the plea for a national loyalty to counteract the claims of the Roman Church after 1563. It indicates the entrance of the "politiques" and the "bons francais" into the field with their exaltation of the state at the expense of the church and their thorough opposition to ultramontaniam.

The activities of Henry IV as the successful exponent of Pithou's "liberties" have already been noted as the beginning of this revival; it now remains to examine the work of the Parlement of Paris, Richer, and later, Richelieu in the carrying on and interpreting of these earlier movements. It was for the Parlement with the aid of Richer to introduce in the States General of 1614 political gallicanism as part of the fundamental law of the realm, to codify it under four main propositions - (the Divine Right of Kings, the absolute

1. Ed. Puyol. Vol.II. p.64.

independence of the temporal power, the purely spiritual authority of the church, and the power of the King over and in the church) and finally to interpret it in Erastian terms. It was for Richelieu to employ it in the service of the monarchy not only to oppose the ultramontanist claims of Rome, but also to overthrow the very Parlement which had sponsored it, and to secure its permanence finally alongside a modified ecclesiastical ultramontanism.

II. THE PARLEMENT OF PARIS AND REGALISM BEFORE 1614.

The changed attitude towards political gallicanism which was exemplified so clearly by Pithou in 1594 became apparent in the Parlement of Paris as early as 1591, and can clearly be seen in a comparison between the opposition of Charles IX in 1564 to the bull of excommunication levelled against Jeanne D'Albret, the mother of Henry IV and the decree of the Parlement of Paris in 1591 against the excommunication of Henry IV himself.

Charles IX through his council implored the Pope "de lui faire et continuer cette faveur de cesser et révoquer les poursuites contre la reine de Navarre, et en faire témoignage et démonstration publique, autrement ne prenne le Pape à déplaisir, si ledit seigneur roi de France empêche ses censures avoir lieu et cours pour ce regard en son royaume et s'il permet auxdits prélats ses sujets se pourvoir contre

icelles par les remèdes de droit et usage de France, comme ils peuvent et doivent selon le train ancien de leurs prédécesseurs et semblables."¹ Here is no question of principle or fundamental law but merely an appeal to custom and usage.

In 1591 however the case is vastly different. "La Cour a déclaré et déclare les Bulles monitoriales données à Rome le premier jour de mars 1590, nulles, abusives, séditions, damnables, pleines d'impiété et d'impostures, contraires aux saints décrets, droits, franchises et libertés de l'Eglise gallicane, ordonne que les copies scellées du sceau de Marsilius Landrianus, soussignées Septilius Lamprius, seront lacérées par l'exécuteur de la haute justice et brûlées en un feu qui pour cet effet sera allumé devant la grande porte du palais. A fait inhibitions et défenses, sur peine de crimes de lèse-majesté, à tous prélats, vicaires et autres ecclésiastiques, d'en publier aucune copie, et à toutes personnes de quelque qualité ou condition qu'elles soient d'y obéir, d'en avoir et retenir. A déclaré et déclare Grégoire, soi-disant Pape XIV de ce nom, ennemi de la paix et de l'union de l'Eglise catholique, apostolique et romaine, du Roi et de son État, adhérant à la conjuration d'Espagne et fauteur des rebelles, coupable de très-cruel, très-inhumain et très-detestable parricide, proditoirement commis en la personne de Henri III de très-heureuse mémoire, très-chretien et très-catholique."¹

1. Dupuy "Preuves" 1651 edition p.98.

Here is no mere appeal to custom but a clash of doctrines and a violent repudiation of ecclesiastical pretensions. Richer has preserved in his "De Potestate Ecclesiae in rebus temporalibus" a conversation that he had with a parlementaire in the course of which he inquired the reason for the violence of the language in the above decree. The answer is instructive. "Et les temps et les moyens extraordinaires dont se servait la cour de Rome, lui fut-il répondu, réclamaient une telle énergie. Puisque à Rome, ajouta le parlementaire, on dépensait tant d'efforts et d'habileté pour maintenir une autorité usurpée, que ne devaient pas tenter les officiers de Parlement pour conserver intacte la majesté des rois contre les entreprises pontificales."¹

The support which the Parlement gave to Henry IV and to Richer in the years 1590 - 1613 has already been noted as the expression of their opposition to ultramontaniam. A brief survey of their chief decrees during that period will indicate the increasing Erastian character and absolutist trend of their regalism.

In the decree condemning Jean Châtel "La Cour déclare ledit Jean Châtel atteint et convaincu du crime de lèse-majesté divine et humaine au premier chef, pour le très-méchant et très-cruel parricide attenté sur la personne du roi." The decree continues: "Par fausses et damnables instructions, Châtel a dit au procès être permis de tuer les rois, et que le roi Henri quatrième à présent régnant, n'est en l'Eglise

1. Richer "De Pot. ecc. in rebus temp." p.43.

jusques à ce qu'il ait l'approbation du Pape: dont il se repent et demande pardon à Dieu, au Roi et à Justice."¹

This vigorous repudiation of the temporal power of the church as well as the doctrine of tyrannicide was quickly followed by the action against Florentin Jacob. Jacob, a bachelor in theology, inserted in a thesis which he was presenting at a public debate in the Sorbonne, the proposition that the Pope possesses authority over the temporal power. The Parlement immediately imprisoned Florentin Jacob and also Thomas Blanzky, a doctor of theology, who was President of that particular session.

The Parlement then sent two of its Presidents to the Sorbonne, and La Guesle, the procurator-general, severely admonished the Faculty of Theology. "Jacob, à genoux, assisté de Blanzky, déclara que téméairement et indiscrettement il avait publié lesdites propositions....et il en demanda pardon à Dieu au Roi et à Justice."² The doctors and bachelors were warned against a repetition of this crime against the power of the King or pain of losing their privileges, the decree was placed upon the registers of the Faculty and ordered to be read at the inaugural assembly of the Sorbonne each year.

Some little time afterwards the Parlement was informed that in a new edition of the "Jérusalem Délivrée" has been inserted a passage "contenans propos contraires à l'autorité du Roi et bien du royaume et à l'avantage des ennemis de cette

1. "Preuves" p.334.

2. "Preuves" p.120.

couronne... et sur la proposition des fulminations faites à Rome pendant les derniers troubles, et pour persuader qu'il est en la puissance du Pape de donner le royaume au Roi, et le Roi au Royaume.¹ Following upon a remonstrance by the procurator-general it was decreed that this passage be immediately suppressed.

The assassination of Henry IV and the ultramontanist tendencies of the regency of Marie de Medici went far to strengthen this movement. The work of Mariana justifying tyrannicide,² was condemned to be burnt only a few days after the execution of Ravallac and this was supplemented by an intervention in the polemic between Bellarmin and Barclay regarding the extent of the spiritual "imperium". Bellarmin's reply to Barclay in which he proclaimed the supremacy of the spiritual power was suppressed as "contenant une fausse et détestable proposition, tendant à l'éversion des puissances souveraines, ordonnées et établies de Dieu, soulèvement des sujets contre leur prince, subtraction de leur obéissance, induction d'attenter à leurs personnes et troubler le repos et la tranquillité publiques."³

One other example will suffice to indicate the Erastian trend of parliamentary gallicanism which culminated in the States General of 1614. The Jesuit Francois Suarez, a disciple of Bellarmin had written a pamphlet against the

1. Ib. p.154.

2. Mariana "De rege et regis institutione" 1589.

3. See Perrens "L'Eglise et l'Etat" p.466 and following.

Divine Right doctrine of James I. The Parlement published a decree against Suarez declaring: "les propositions et maximes contenues audit livre, scandaleuses et séditieuses, tendant à la subversion des Etats et à induire les sujets des rois et princes souverains et autres, d'attenter à leurs personnes sacrées: et les propos faisant mention des rois Clovis et Philippe-le-Bel, faux et calomnieux, a ordonné et ordonne ledit livre de Suarez, être brûlé en la cour du Plais, par l'exécuteur de la haute justice."¹

These decrees show a definite forsaking of the traditional appeal to usage and precedent and the adoption of definite fundamental concepts as their authority. As Puyol says: the Parlementaires "avaient imagine une sorte de religion d'Etat qui transportait au roi la plupart des privileges spirituels enleves au souverain Pontife."² This religion d'Etat finds its "locus classicus" in the cahier of the third estate in the States General of 1614. The power behind these decrees was similarly increasing; all the opposition to the Romanist tendencies of the court of Marie de Medici came to champion to maxims of political gallicanism so that the cahier of the third estate in 1614 was actually the political manifesto of Condé as well as the claim of the Parlement, and yet both the Parlement and the third estate were preparing for their downfall. "Le passage d'une monarchie tempérée par la

1. See "Memoires secrets de Vittorio Siri." Chap.XXI.P.170.

2. Ed. Puyol Vol.II.p.73.

subordination à l'Eglise, à une monarchie absolue s'opérait irrésistiblement par le travail même de ceux qui avaient tout intérêt à arrêter le mouvement autoritaire, malgré la résistance de la royauté qui ne comprenait pas elle-même que tout conspirait à lui donner la domination. Dans les révolutions, comme dans les combats de nuit, souvent on blesse ses amis tandis qu'on passe à côté de ses adversaires sans les attaquer. Le Parlement, au commencement du dix-septième siècle, comme plus tard en 1789, donna inconsciemment le branle à un bouleversement dont il devait être la première victime."¹

The very success which attended the promulgation of regalism during these years, the simplification of political gallicanism into a few comprehensive doctrines, the continued exaltation of the secular authority, and vigorous repudiation of ultramontaniam, were all symptomatic of a revival which was fostered by the Parlement up to 1614 and after 1622 was directed and manipulated by Richelieu to be the chief weapon in his hands for the establishment of the autocracy of the "ancien régime".

The part which Richer played in this revival especially after 1612 is just as important as, though less public than, the part he played in the revival of episcopatism. His disgrace and deposition prevented the Parlementaires from using him as their spokesman, but there is no doubt that his logical brain was behind all the attempts to interpret regalism

1. Ed. Fuyol Vol. II. p.81 and 82.

as a political system and his hand can unmistakably be traced in the cahier of 1614. While the regalists looked upon Pithou's "Libertés de l'Eglise Gallicane" as the gospel of their faith they certainly regarded the pamphlets of Richer as its creed.

Hence an examination of the political gallicanism of Richer will afford the best background against which to set the States General of 1614.

III. THE REGALISM OF RICHER.

The political gallicanism of Richer which is only treated incidentally in the "Libellus" is expounded by the author in later pamphlets of which the most considerable is the "De Potestate Ecclesiae in temporalibus".¹ It comprises four doctrines: the Divine Right of Kings; The absolute independence of the civil power; The purely spiritual authority of the Church, and the authority of the King over the church.

Richer's theory of the Divine Right of Kings which is enunciated in the second section of the "De Potestate" lies somewhere between the "De Regno" of Barclay and the "Réveille Matin" but it also shows the influence of Bodin. It cannot escape a certain Erastian tinge which certainly supports J.W. Allen's contention that "the actual basis of the French

1. "Edmundi Richeri doctoris Parisiensis, de Potestate Ecclesiae in rebus temporalibus et defensio articuli quem tertius ordo comitiorum Regni Franciae pro lege fundamentali ejusdem Regni defigi postulavit annis 1614 et 1615" 4 volumes Bib. Nat. MSS. lat. 16060 - 16061.

monarchy and of the belief in the theory of the divine right of Kings, was, and remained, utilitarian! ¹ He rejects the extreme form of the doctrine as represented by James I. According to James, Kings receive their authority directly from God, just as the bishop receives his authority at ordination, and election or heredity is nothing more than a formality; as soon as a man becomes King he is divinely inspired and enabled. This was obviously an impossible doctrine for one who had, in the "Libellus", so strenuously upheld the theory that, finally, power resides in the community (at any rate of the church) and Richer is at great pains to show that power is primarily to be found in the heart of the society which communicates it to the prince. "Potestas politica cum lege naturali immediate instituta est a Deo, quando hominem produxit ad civilem societatem, eique propterea omnia principia, semina et causas politicae potestatis immediate indidit, ut ope atque subsidio ejusmodi adjumentorum et causarum homines sese dirigerent, et adversum internos atque externos casus aut impetus, coactiva potestate, in qua majestas imperii tota consistit tuerentur. Itaque potestas politica per inductionem et consequentiam legis naturalis constituta est a Deo."² In fact in his refutation of the champion of the divine right theory, Antoine de Dominis, Archbishop

1. J.W. Allen. p.393.

2. "De Pot. Eccl. in temp." p.68.

of Spalatro he seems to argue for the constitutionalists that the civil authority is entrusted with power, "quoad habitum", and communicates its "act" and "exercise" to the magistrates."¹ If this were all, then Richer would be at one with the "Réveille Matin" and would have denied the very theory he was concerned to uphold. However, as has been said, he takes an intermediate position between personal divine right and democratic right.

He maintains that God is the immediate source of civil power in a double manner. Firstly God is the institutor of society. Secondly God is the institutor of the three principal forms of government, monarchy, aristocracy and democracy. Therefore while God has given man faculties whereby he can live in society He has also provided that man can only do so in three ways, monarchically, aristocratically, and democratically; so that when society makes its choice of one of these three forms of government it finds an organism really to hand, determined by God and provided with all necessary powers. Hence society chooses its form of government and really confers the power upon its magistrates, but God has already constituted that power and society cannot change it.

In short, while rejecting James I and Dominis and avoiding the systems of the Protestants, Richer has evolved a theory of divine right which safeguards the authority of

1. Ib. p.148.

the King and at the same time satisfies the claims of the lawyers and Parlementaires. "Ce n'est plus le droit divin des rois, c'est le droit divin des regimes."¹ Without troubling themselves as to the finer points of his argument the Parlement took over Richer's main contention that the Kingship possesses divine right and by restricting themselves in the formulation of the cahier of the third estate to the rights of the "couronne" and the "royaume" and by avoiding any formula favourable to the personal divinity of Kings they definitely adopted Richer's theory.

Moreover, later Gallican thinkers, with but a few exceptions have based their arguments on Richer mainly because he had paved the way for a transition from the Divine Right of the King to the sovereignty of the King. Like Bodin, Richer in this theory has produced a proposition which still remains operative if God be relieved of all share in its formulation and consequently the work of Richer was here as elsewhere to further the process of the secularization of government and the doctrine of the absolute authority of the political sovereign.

IV. THE ABSOLUTE INDEPENDENCE OF THE TEMPORAL POWER.

The doctrine that the Pope has no right to interfere in any way with secular jurisdiction is the central doctrine of regalism and the one to which Richer gives the closest

1. Ed. Puyol Vol. II. p.113.

attention in the "De Potestate Ecclesiae". He reviews the whole Gallican tradition from the Apostles to Corneille de la Pierre to show that "La puissance temporelle et la puissance spirituelle sont souveraines, chacune dans ce qui est de son ressort; elle n'ont que Dieu au-dessus d'elles.,... Les rois chrétiens, en tant que chrétiens, sont soumis à l'autorité des pasteurs; mais la souveraine puissance qui leur est confiée n'est pas soumise à ces pasteurs; elle en est entièrement indépendante."¹ Yet nobody realised better than Richer himself that the authorities he invoked did not prove the sort of independence necessary for a triumphant regalism. Thomas Aquinas, Cajetan, Périerius, Estius, Corneille de la Pierre, all agreed that the "imperia" of church and state were distinct and sovereign in their own sphere yet they were equally convinced of the supremacy of the church; so that when they speak of the independence of the temporal power they confine that independence within strict limits and exempt it from the direct intervention of the church. Yet all of them retain for the church an indirect power over the state "in ordine ad spiritualia".

Therefore Richer has to go further, and in chapter V of Book II of the "De Potestate" he equates this independence with irresponsibility so that no one possesses the right "de demander compte au souverain temporel de sa conduite, que personne n'a le droit de le déposer, quelque oppresseur ou

1. Du Marsais. "Exposition de la doctrine de l'Eglise gallicane" p.82.

inepte qu'il soit."¹ Moreover this addition to the common doctrine of independence is not merely an arbitrary one, for he is able to deduce the doctrine of irresponsibility from the theory of Divine Right, although that theory for him is not a personal one. Inasmuch as the Kingship is divinely ordained then it must follow that order is equally of divine ordination, for every society has need of order. Therefore all that is inimical to order in the state is contrary to Divine will, and the depositions of tyrants always produce greater disorders than their excesses, therefore again the highest good is only achieved by an unlimited duty of submission to the temporal authority.

So Richer who had rebelled against the magical and fantastic irresponsibilities of the King according to James I. found as he formulated his regalism that it was just the conviction of the wrongfulness of rebellion in every really conceivable case that was needed for the welfare of society, and that royal irresponsibility was the only effective way to preserve the independence of the temporal power. Hence having repudiated it as an implication of the Divine Right of Kings he was forced to introduce it as the only effective basis for this absolute independence of the secular power. This in itself is supremely significant as showing the Erastianism latent even in Richer who was invoking the Deity in the interests of nationalism when the whole of his

1. "De Pot. Eccl. in temp." Book II.

ecclesiastical upbringing had taught him that temporal affairs should be regarded as subsidiary to man's eternal welfare and all secular government should be directed "ad finem supernaturalem".

V. THE PURELY SPIRITUAL AUTHORITY OF THE CHURCH.

Having then safeguarded the position of the temporal ruler and the autonomous character of the state, the regalism of Richer further defines the authority of the church. Richer taking as his text "Regnum meum non est de hoc mundo" asserts that the powers of the church are purely spiritual. Its end is a spiritual end, which can, and ought only to be reached by spiritual means. Where the church has engaged itself with temporal matters it has become degraded ("reddidit Ecclesiam totam brutalem") and there is nothing further from the task of the pastor than for him to occupy himself with worldly matters.

Therefore it follows that Richer can admit no ecclesiastical immunities. If the clergy do possess any actual privileges, these privileges are concessions from the temporal power and as the church possesses no temporal authority it cannot confer any temporal rights. "L'exemption des biens et l'immunité des personnes n'ont d'autre origine que le droit civil."¹ Richer was however far too practically minded

1. "De Pot. Ecc. in Temp" Book III. Chapter VI.

to press this doctrine to its final limits and he makes a restriction in favour of certain acts which apply to the administration of worship and to certain material goods which are absolutely necessary for the life of the church. This he does by distinguishing between the "necessary" and the "superfluous" temporal rights of the spiritual "imperium". Here, as in his conception of the church itself Richer should stand with Marsiglio of Padua who refused to recognise any temporal rights of the church but Richer was a good Catholic in that he respected the church's condemnation of Marsiglio and he satisfied himself that the theory of the spiritual power of the church even with this modification would be sufficient to satisfy the regalist demands and adequate to refute Bellarmin and Suarez, and in all fairness his general principle is unequivocal. "Avant que je fusse prêtre, le roi de France par la loi divine et naturelle avait droit de direction et de coaction sur ma personne. Je ne vois pas de raison pour qu'il ait perdu ce droit quand j'ai été ordonné prêtre. Je proteste devant Dieu que j'ai souvent voulu faire violence à mon esprit et à ma conscience et me persuader par la force, soit des arguments de mes adversaires, soit des raisons que je pouvais y ajouter, et me convaincre que par le privilège de mon sacerdoce et conformément à la bulle In Coena Domini je n'étais soumis de droit divin et naturel qu'au Pape seul, et nullement au prince et aux magistrats politiques. Ma conscience m'a toujours porté à m'élever

et a combattre contre cette anarchie pestilentielle; et voilà pourquoi j'ecris contre ceux qui tiennent la verité opprimée dans l'injustice."¹ Such a statement is not the argument of a politician, it is the conviction of a reformer.

Richer rounds off his argument by an amplification of chapter XI of the "Libellus". "L'Eglise, n'a reçu de Jésus-Christ ni territoire, ni droit de glaive: elle a été instituée seulement pour une fin surnaturelle. Elle ne dispose donc pour conduire a la béatitude éternelle que de moyens de persuasion et d'une autorité de direction, et non de moyens violents et de châtements temporels."² The weapons of the church are its ecclesiastical censures and these censures can only deprive a man of the spiritual fellowship. If civil penalties and disabilities follow they are concessions made by the temporal power. Here is Richer the converted "Ligueur" realising that the only real safeguard of social peace against a repetition of religious warfare is to be found in a church, the administration of which is completely spiritualized, and its rewards and penalties completely distinct from civil administration.

VI. THE POWER OF THE KING OVER THE CHURCH.

That the temporal sovereign had a real place in the Holy

1. Ed. Richer "De Pot. Eccl. in temp." p.79.
2. "Libellus" Chap XI.

Catholic Church was not a peculiar doctrine of the Gallican, it was the accepted teaching of Rome. Richer is incontrovertible when he quotes Constantine that the King is "L'Eveque commun des affaires exterieures de l'Eglise" and instances Papal pronouncements which assert that Kings are also vicars of God and share in the ministry of the bishop, particularly in the external affairs of the church. "Le Souverain, comme maître de l'Etat et du territoire est le vengeur et le protecteur de la loi divine, naturelle et canonique. Dans ce but il peut porter des lois et tirer le glaive".¹ But it is the deduction made by Richer from this accepted theory which was the peculiar claim not only of the "Tiers-Etat" of 1614 but also of later Gallicans, such as Brunet and Durand de Maillane. Richer claimed that these powers of protection and defence, which the King possessed in relation to the divine laws, implied a royal authority not only over, and in collaboration with the church, but also within the church. The King in order faithfully to fulfil his protective functions must on given occasions intervene in matters of faith and discipline. On these grounds Richer does not hesitate to claim for regalism the sanctity of the so called gallican liberties, as the practical examples of this power of intervention. Thus the King should possess the authority to convoke general councils.

1. "Libellus" Chap. XII.

"ce n'est pas injustement mais justement, dit-il, qu'autrefois les princes chrétiens ont réuni les conciles généraux de Nice, de Constantinople, d'Ephèse, de Chalcédoine: cela regarde l'exécution de la loi divine, naturelle et canonique."¹

Similarly the "appel comme d'abus" must be recognised as a necessary weapon in the hands of a secular magistrate who is appointed guardian of the canons of the church.

"Le prince et le magistrat politique comme protecteur de l'Eglise et vengeur des canons a la suprême administration des appels comme d'abus: il ne juge que de l'abus, ce qui appartient à l'exécution des canons."² The theory of the royal authority within the church however was more, in the thought of Richer, than the logical corollary of an orthodox doctrine; it was the outcome of a practical need. While Richer was sure that the Catholic church was perfectly able to achieve its spiritual ends throughout the world, he was equally sure that the Reformation, the League, and the new nationalism had combined to make it impossible for Rome to maintain an international discipline in France. Moreover, the measure of the failure of ultramontaniam to achieve this end was the measure of the success of Henry IV to inaugurate an ecclesiastical reformation in the name of nationalism. Accordingly both in the interests of church and state, Richer the "Politique" was prepared to welcome the temporal monarch

1. "Demonstratio libelli de Ecclesiastica et politica potestate" 1622. Richer's reply to Duval.

2. "Libellus" Chap. XIII.

even into the sanctuaries of Holy Church, certain that in all except the purely spiritual domain the church must look up to the King for protection and authority, for he alone could secure "the punishment of wickedness and vice, and the maintenance of true religion and virtue."

VII. REGALISM AT THE STATES-GENERAL OF 1614.

The first part of the chapter entitled "Des Loix fondamentales de l'Etat" in the cahier of the third estate of the States General of 1614 is the real manifesto of Richer's regalism, although Richer himself took no part in its actual formulation. Cardinal Duperron has attempted to implicate Richer in the actual drafting of the cahier, but there can be little doubt that it emerged spontaneously within the third estate. The Presidents of the twelve provincial governments each brought their cahier to be compared with the cahier of the Parlement of Paris: "pour voir et adviser quels articles seroient conformes aux articles de Paris et quels non, et par l'avis de l'assemblée, resoudre les difficultez et contrarietez."¹ Out of these deliberations Claude de Piètre of the Parlement of Paris was instructed to draw up the article on the King's majesty which was to cause such a stir in the States General.

1. See Mariejol Vol.VI. Part 2. p.164

On the 15th December, 1814, the third estate was invited to pass judgment upon this article of which the substance is as follows:

"Que pour arrêter le cours de la pernicieuse doctrine qui s'introduit depuis quelques années contre les rois et puissances souveraines établies de Dieu, par esprits séditeux qui ne tendent qu'à les troubler et subvertir, le roi sera supplié de faire arrêter en ses Etats pour loi fondamentale du royaume, qui soit inviolable et notoire à tous: Que comme il est reconnu souverain en son Etat, ne tenant sa couronne que de Dieu, il n'y a puissance en terre, quelle qu'elle soit, spirituelle ou temporelle, qui ait aucun droit sur son royaume, pour en priver les personnes sacrées de nos rois, ni dispenser ou absoudre leurs sujets de la fidélité et obéissance qu'ils lui doivent pour quelque cause ou prétexte que ce soit.... Que l'opinion contraire même qu'il soit loisible de tuer et déposer nos rois, est imple détestable, contre vérité et contre l'établissement de l'Etat de la France qui ne dépend immédiatement que de Dieu." The twelve provincial governments unanimously approved the article although La Guzenne and Orleans entered reservations, the one on "la forme de l'article" and the other on the "titre de loi fondamentale qui semble trop orgueilleux au frontispice et qu'il est à propos de le mettre au preface du cahier."¹

1. For full text see Ed. Puyol. Vol. II. Note to p.86.

The Clergy, apprehensive of these deliberations, sent, on the 20th December, desiring the third estate to acquaint them as to its decisions relative to the church. De Marmiesse on behalf of the third estate refused, whereupon Fenoillet, bishop of Montpellier was deputed to put the case for the clergy. "Fenoillet loua le Tiers de 'conserver si précieusement la vie des Rois', mais pourquoi se défiait-il du Clergé, qui avait même zèle? Le Clergé, lui aussi, était prêt à déclarer 'et plus haut si faire se pouvoit...Ne touche point a l'oint du Seigneur...' A ces 'maudits et execrables assassins', il 'ouvroit les Enfers pour les damner'. Le Tiers ne pouvait donc lui refuser la communication de son article 'afin d'en faire un tout (tous) ensemble, qui seroit mis en lettres d'or, au front de leur Cahier'; - mais, '... il ne le falloit mesler avec d'autres propositions' - sur les rapports des papes et des rois, - qui sont en débat entre la France et les autres nations catholiques. Sans l'Eglise, le Tier ne parviendrait pas, par menaces et supplices, à empêcher ce qu'il craignait, les puissances spirituelles, qui disposent des peines eternelles, etait seules capables de prévenir les pernicious desseins d'un 'esprit melancolique". This speech made a favourable impression upon the third estate; according to one of the deputies the bishop spoke: "Avec une action et une grace si attraiante que nous en demeurames tous ravis", at any rate the article was communicated to the clergy and Marmiesse gave a brief

exposition of it.¹ The clergy more than confirmed in their apprehensions deputed Duperron to solicit the support of the Nobles. Duperron contended that this article was "du plus dangereux et du plus pernicieux qui fut jamais" and won over the first estate whereupon a representative company of Nobles and clergy descended upon the third estate on 2nd January, 1615, and Duperron made a speech which is both a complete expression of ultramontaniam and a complete begging of the question.

He claimed that neither the third estate nor the King had any right to touch upon a matter which was entirely for the King to decide. Kings only possess the authority to implement the decisions of the church relative to doctrine and discipline and "Ils doivent lécher la poudre des pieds de l'Eglise, se doivent soumettre à icelle en la personne du Pape..." However, in other respects the church has every reason to conserve the authority of the Kings for it is exposed to physical attack and violence equally with the other two orders. While the Councils of Toledo and Constance made ample provision for the safety of the Kingship and "la defense de toucher à leur vie est indubitable à l'Eglise.... Quant à la deposition des Rois" says Duperron, "J'en parlerai hardiment combien qu'à regret néanmoins. Je dirai... que ce point est problematique... En France ceux qui tiennent

1. Florimond Rapine Deputy from St. Pierre-le-Monstiers has left a full account of the proceedings in his "Relation".

l'affirmative ne tiennent les autres pour excommuniés (et) non plus que ceux qui tiennent la négative, ne sont réputés anathèmes. Si en France la négative est tenue, l'affirmative se tient par les quatre parts de la Chrestienté... n'estant jusques ici intervenu sur cette question aucun Concile Universal."¹ Thus while it may be a useful theory in the defence of royal authority to claim that the church cannot depose Kings, yet to make it a matter of doctrine would be far too dangerous and might easily provoke schism. In short, without actually approaching the real issues contained in the article Duperron finishes where he began. The laity have no "locus standi" in these matters. "Nous croyons que Jacques Clement et Ravallac (indignes d'être nommez) sont allez avec les Anges de Lucifer et devoierez au Diable.... Mais pour ce que est de la deposition, le Pape et nous n'y toucherons jamais. Et ^{ou} Grand Sa Sainteté aurait volente d'accorder vostre article, elle ne le pourroit, et les autres Princes de la Chrestiente n'y consentiroient jamais."²

Miron, the president of the third estate replied at once and his speech presents a vivid contrast to the cardinal's. Miron is advancing a theory of government which Duperron as representing the clergy, has completely failed to understand. He says: "Nostre intention n'a point esté d'exempter le Roy ni ses sujets de la juridiction spirituelle du Saint Siège,

1. Florimond Rapine p.308.

2. Duperron "Harangue faicte de la part de la Chambre Ecclesiastique" 1615.

mais bien garantir l'autorité royale de la déposition prétendue, de quoy l'on ne peut faire un problème en la terre du Roy où nous respirons son air, beaucoup moins parmi ses officiers.... Nos Roys, quelque pieux qu'ils ayent esté, n'ont rien soumis à l'Eglise que leurs ames et non leur Estat ni le temporel de leurs sujets.... Et quand il s'entreprend autre chose, cela produit nos appellations comme d'abus contre qui que ce soit de l'Eglise..... Cette compagnie (la Chambre du Tiers) n'a point et n'aura jamais intention de blesser l'Eglise en la résolution de cet article... et aussi peu de toucher au Saint Siège ni entrer en dispute de la puissance de nostre Saint Pere le Pape, qu'elle tient toute souveraine, mais spirituelle.... Mais nous nous garderons bien d'introduire ni souffrir ce meslange et ce pesle-mesle de puissance, sifflée par ceux qui ne tendent qu'à nous diviser pour de là nous dissiper.... L'intention donc de cette compagnie a esté de maintenir l'indépendance de la Couronne de nos Rois, qui ne peut luy estre arrachée de droict par aucune puissance, que sa Sainteté n'a point ce pouvoir, que l'Eglise ne l'a jamais prétendu....."1

To this masterly exposition of the attitude of the third estate, Duperron for the church made the traditional reply that 'ce n'estoit au tiers Estate d'interpreter, resoudre et conclure en semblables matières les questions douteuses quand elles se presentoient..."2

1. See Mariéjol Vol.VI. Part 2 p.167.

2. Ib. p.167.

To find a way out of the deadlock thus produced, both sides were forced to seek outside help. The third estate turned to the Parlement of Paris which was not slow to signify its complete agreement with Miron. On the 3rd of January, 1615, at the request of the Procuror-General, and the advocates-General Cardin de Bret, Louis Servin and Molé, the decrees against tyrannicide and the ultramontanist doctrines were renewed. Condé also supported the article, but his efforts for the third estate instead of strengthening their position, actually produced the opposite result. Condé was no politique, his reasons for supporting the article were purely selfish, and while he disquieted the court by his speech on January 3rd, the timidity of his conclusions did nothing to help the cause of the gallicans. He contended that the church possesses a spiritual authority over the King, it can excommunicate him for just cause and the Pope has the power to condemn his soul, "livrer son âme à Sathan". But in all things temporal this spiritual authority is of none effect. Whether the King be a heretic or an infidel he can still claim the obedience of the church and its financial dues. It is further not sufficient to say that the life of the King is sacred. "Admettre le droit de déposition, c'est exposer la vie du roy: Qu'au sentiment de ces ultramontains vostre Majesté pèche, on l'admoneste jusqu'à la troisième fois, elle continue on l'excommunie; elle ne se repent on la dépose de

son Royaume, on absout vos sujets de la fidélité qui vous est due. Lors, tandis que Louis XIII estoit Roy, il n'estoit pas permis de le tuer, mais, estant devenu de Roy non Roy, un autre légitime prend sa place; lors, continuant, contre l'autorité, spirituelle de Pape et temporelle du nouveau Roy esleu, à se dire Roy, c'est un vray usurpateur, criminel de leze-majesté divine et humaine et comme tel proscrit, permis a tous de le tuer." If Condé had proceeded from this to enunciate the general principles lying behind these contentions he would have rendered signal service to the third estate, but actually his conclusion shows by its timidity and compromise that he had no other objective than to gain the sympathy of the Gallicans and parlementaires, and he was not prepared to throw in his lot with them. He says: "Puisqu'en tout temps toutes rudes médecines ne sont bonnes," the King ought to stop both the third estate and the clergy from further discussion of the problem, but to allow them to retain the various articles in their cahiers until such time as the King shall make a final pronouncement in accordance with "nos anciennes maximes."¹

Condé's speech is illuminating in contrast with Miron's as indicating the real difference between the new concordant gallicanism which had emerged from "nos anciennes maximes" and the traditional "libertés de l'Eglise Gallicane", and

1. Mariéjol Vol.VI. Part 2 p.168.

events showed that Condé and Miron were irreconcilable.

The clergy in their turn appealed to the court. On the 6th January the estates were forbidden any further discussion on the article and Parlement was ordered to take no further action. This however did not satisfy the clergy who desired the total suppression of the offending doctrine. Deputies from the nobles and the bishops were sent to the King who quickly gave way. On the 19th of January the presidents of the third estate were summoned to the Louvre where Marie de Medici in the name of the King declared "qu'il n'estoit plus besoin de mettre au cahier l'article concernant la conservation de sa personne et qu'il (le roi) le tenoit pour présenté et receu: Protestant sa Majesté de le décider à leur contentement."

This decision produced "grand bruit et murmure" in the third estate and although the majority of governments were inclined to obey the royal wishes, a powerful minority clamoured for further discussion until Miron was able to indicate the lines upon which a settlement could be reached. "Le Roi sans truchement n'y ministère d'une personne qui lui dictast avait qu'il remercioit la Compagnie du soin qu'elle avoit pris de la conservation de sa personne et qu'il estoit tres aise de ce qu'elle avoit obeï a son commandement... qu'à la verité il avait evoqué a soy l'article, non pas pour le supprimer, mais pour le décider: promettoit de la respondre si favorablement que tout le monde en demeureroit satisfait et content."

Whereupon it was agreed to insert in the place of the disputed article the following statement. "Le premier article concernant la souveraineté de l'Etat du Roy et conservation de sa personne, n'a esté ici employé pour en avoir esté tiré par l'expres commandement de sa Majesté, qui a promis de le respondre favorablement et au plus tost", and so ended the dispute.¹

The ultramontanists claimed the victory and the Pope sent letters of thanks to the Clergy and the Nobles. The third estate also acquiesced a few days later in the projected publication of the decrees of the Council of Trent and the clergy took this to be an added proof of the submission of the third estate. The real victory however lay with the parlementaires. They had succeeded in promulgating the doctrines of gallicanism and although the clergy had opposed them, the King had but deferred judgment and the Sorbonne had remained significantly silent. The acceptance of the decrees of the Council of Trent could do no injury to their position and it might do something to reform the church in France, for as Miron said, not without irony, "Messieurs du Clergé se peuvent mettre d'eux mêmes dans l'exécution et observation de ce Concile, le prendre pour règle et modèle de leurs moeurs et actions et enfin en pratiquer les résolutions et documents, en retranchant la pluralité des bénéfices et autres abus auxquels il a remédié".²

1. Mariéjol Vol.VI. Part 2. p.169.

2. Mariéjol Ib.

When the States General finally broke up in March 1615 its achievements were negligible, but it had made two all-important introductions. It had introduced the new gallicanism as a political force and it had introduced Richelieu to power.

I. THE OUTCOME.

Before tracing the developments of Gallicanism after 1614 to the death of Richer, and the form which it finally assumed with Richelieu, it will be profitable to survey the general course of the revival from the year 1600 to the break up of the States General in 1615. The events of 1611-12 stand out in vivid relief, and find their true interpretation against the background of 1614, for the real significance of the "Libellus" and the "Elenchus" can only be assessed in terms of the regalism that followed them. Similarly the victory of the "politique" at the States General was conditioned by the failure of the episcopalist in the Sorbonne and 1615 marks the dividing line between the Gallicanism of Richer and the Gallicanism of Richelieu.

We have seen that the revival itself arose out of the need in France, as elsewhere, to accommodate the relations of church and state to the new political forces which had emerged from the Reformation. Edmond Richer put himself at the head of the reaction against the League, and the demand for social peace, and endeavoured to effect this accommodation from the side of the church. He is the one Gallican thinker who possesses any claim to universality; for Richer believed that, in the episcopatism of the ancient spirit of the Sorbonne

as represented by Gerson and Major, was to be found an ecclesiastical doctrine which, with certain modifications, would meet the need of the France of 1600, politically as well as spiritually. First, episcopatism was to bring about social peace by repudiating ultramontaniam and papal absolution, which Richer realized after 1598 to be the real enemy of national order and progress. Thus instead of the church being an "imperium in imperio" it would be nationalized under the authority of the King who would be head of the Gallican Church. Instead of a fundamental dualism of authority and loyalty which was becoming daily more impossible to maintain, the church would be able to express itself perfectly in terms of the state alone, its spiritual authority residing in a general council or states general, all other powers centred in the political sovereign.

Episcopatism, then, in the second place would form the ground of regalism; it would give the claims of the parlementaire an ecclesiastical justification and would relieve him of the necessity, and the church of the danger, of an interpretation of those claims in the purely secular categories of the lawyer. The demands of the church and the parlementaire being reconciled, secular society would no longer have to protect itself against the invasions of the clergy, and the so-called liberties of the Gallican church

would cease to be a number of disparate concessions wrested from an international spiritual ruler and become laws of the constitution of an autonomous national church.

Though this ambitious project might have succeeded in solving the immediate problem, it is profoundly doubtful whether it could have prevailed ultimately against the growing Erastianism or could have obviated the spiritual perils of a traditional universal church within a triumphant secular nationalism. However, this is but conjecture, for although Richer won the support of Henry IV and the Parlement of Paris, he was rejected by the Sorbonne, and the great majority of the clergy in France and with his deposition episcopatism recognized defeat. The main reasons for this rejection of episcopatism on the part of the church have already been stated and can be summarized under the heading of schism. The attack upon episcopatism was confined to its purely ecclesiastical aspect and is a demonstration of the complete inability of the church in France as a whole to appreciate the real problem which Richer had set himself to solve. The oft-repeated statement of Duval "*De spiritualibus enim non de temporalibus nostra est instituta disputatio*" is not only an indication of the general nature of the opposition movement, it is an admission on the part of the clergy that they were not interested in the problems of church and state left behind by the ravages of the League. They saw in the

"Libellus" nothing more than a number of heretical propositions which would inevitably lead to schism; there was no provision within orthodoxy for the doctrines of Richer and they were not prepared to be revolutionaries. Accordingly they rejected episcopatism and remained loyal to the Council of Trent which encouraged the faithful to believe that the Reformation had never happened. By ignoring the wider problem in 1612 the ultramontanists were able to score a victory over episcopatism and secure the disgrace of its chief protagonist only to find by 1614 that they had not only overlooked the real enemy but had even unwittingly contributed to his final victory. It is in this sense that the States General of 1614 is a commentary upon the episcopal revival of 1608-1612.

The States General is a vindication of Richer's main negative contention that there is no room for an absolute Pope and an absolute King within the France of 1610, and if the church is to take its real place within the state it must repudiate ultramontanism and papal absolution. Events showed that whereas episcopatism attempted to reach a possible "modus vivendi" between the bishop and the magistrate ultramontanism could offer none. The proof of this is, that from the deposition of Edmond Richer begins that estrangement between ecclesiastical and political Gallicanism which was never satisfactorily to be overcome. During the years before 1612 the Parlement of Paris had shown its appreciation and

support of Richer in a very practical way. It had lost no opportunities of giving its official blessing to his efforts to revive the ancient spirit of the Sorbonne; it had protected him as Syndic; it had expressed its willingness to co-operate with an episcopalist Sorbonne of which Richer would be the leader, and it took over and used Richer's political theories. As soon, however, as the Sorbonne rejected Richer, the Parlement ceased to concern itself with episcopatism, lost what little ecclesiastical background it had for its regalism and relied upon the political theories of its lawyers wherein it found secular theories of sovereignty which proved more useful for its task than any ecclesiastical doctrine.

The gap speedily widened and the speeches of Duperron for the clergy and Miron for the third estate in 1614 illustrate a fundamental difference of outlook which by 1682 had become so complete that Bossuet could write to D'Estrées, "The liberties claimed by the clergy have nothing in common with the liberties of which the magistrates talk". It was moreover the state which gained everything by this estrangement and the church which lost everything. The complete secularization of politics which was actually a "fait accompli" by 1614 was the direct result of the inability of the church to accept episcopatism or some similar doctrine, and the regalism of Richer himself illustrates this process. The

tenets of his political Gallicanism were elaborated under the shadow of his failure to resolve the duality of church and state and abolish the absolutism of Rome; he becomes the *politique*, almost an Erastian claiming with Michel de l'Hôpital, Hotman, and Bodin that the state must not suffer for conscience sake. If the church is to remain a monarchy then the position of the Kingship must be doubly safeguarded. The Pope must be restricted to the spiritual sphere, the King must rule by divine right, he must be free of any ecclesiastical restrictions - in a word he must be irresponsible.

These tenets of regalism, especially royal irresponsibility, which were intended to protect the temporal ruler in his relations with the spiritual monarch, actually produced results far more drastic than either the church or the lawyers realised in 1615. On the one hand they lead irresistibly, as will be shown in this present chapter, to the autocracy of the "*ancien régime*"; on the other hand they have the most vital influence upon the church itself. Royal irresponsibility, which follows by a fatal logic from the regalists' insistence that there must be no ecclesiastical or political restrictions upon the authority of the secular sovereign, has the inevitable result of subjugating the church to the state. The unstable balance of power between the secular and the spiritual "*imperia*" which characterized the Pre-Reformation disputes

gives place once and for all to a primacy of the state in which the temporal ruler is the self-appointed protector and censor of spiritual affairs, seeking little advice from those whom he protects, and capable of ignoring the methods of protection which they desire. In England this victory and supremacy of the state fostered disruption and led to the Wesleyan revival; in France it provoked a last attempt to arrange an episcopalist concordat in 1682 before the Gallican church in the eighteenth century degenerated into nothing more than the department of morals in a secular absolutism. Taking a still wider survey this subjugation of the church within the nation state produces in its turn a return to a spiritual ultramontaniam. Disruption in England with the secessions of the Methodists and Quakers is followed by the Oxford Movement; the subjection of the Catholic church in France throughout the eighteenth century is followed by a wave of ultramontaniam in the nineteenth. Further, might it not be conjectured that this movement will be followed by a political ultramontaniam of which the Papal Treaty of 1929 with Italy is the forerunner, and thus the circle will be complete.

To take yet a wider survey and turn from history to interpretation, the study of Gallicanism seems to bring to light the dangers of the participation of any church in secular affairs. Church and state never exist side by side

on terms of equality; either the state becomes the executor of the wishes of the church and merely provides implementation for its doctrines, or the church becomes the servant of the state to inculcate national morality. That neither of these positions is good is not merely a static judgment, but is proved by the fact that whichever society, the spiritual or the secular, is subservient, that society eventually provides within itself, by the Hegelian principle, the resolution of its problem and so presents a new one and final synthesis is unattainable. If then the church performs a real function in society and it can hardly be denied that it does, then it would follow that the free church justifies its existence not by any connection with secular organizations but by the spiritual good it can do its adherents, for the ideals which it can teach its members, and for that personal integrity and social service which those members are free to translate into terms of politics, commerce, and the general conduct of affairs.

The greater part of these wider issues was but vaguely administrated in 1614, but several had become clearly defined by 1630, and it will be the triumph of the politique in Richelieu, the downfall of the Parlement by the very theories it had championed, the foundations of the power of Louis XIV and the compromise of the church which will emerge from an

account of the outcome of the Gallican revival up to the death of Richer in 1631.

II. The Ultramontanist Reaction 1616-1622.

That the political theories of 1614 did not take immediate effect but were actually followed by a revival of ultramontaniam which persisted until 1622 is due to a number of circumstances not far to seek.

By 1617 the regency of Marie de Medici which, though Catholic in sympathy, had been weak and vacillating, had given place to an active ultramontanist policy under Louis XIII with Luynes at its head. With the murder of Concini and the substitution of Bentivoglio for Ubaldini as papal nuncio began a period of close co-operation between the Louvre and Rome which was ably fostered by Pope Gregory XV and actively followed by Luynes. Internationally friendly relations were established with Spain, which culminated in the Treaty of Madrid in 1621; internally determined efforts were made to subjugate the Protestants and resulted in the re-establishment of Catholicism in Béarn and Navarre. "Cette époque," says Ranke, "est celle de l'union la plus étroite du Pape et de tous les pouvoirs ... Cette activité incessante, énergique, venant à la suite d'une grande victoire obtenue par la force des armes, cette participation de la cour à une oeuvre

de propagation qui est à ses yeux d'un grand intérêt politique, voilà ce qui décida pour toujours la ruine du protestantisme en France."¹

The government of Luynes was the political expression of a Catholic renaissance which was spreading over the whole of Europe as a result of the reforms instigated by the Council of Trent and implemented by the Jesuits. In France Henry IV had laid the foundations of ecclesiastical reformation which was both spiritual and national. After the disgrace of Richer and the estrangements of the States General, this reformation continued, but though still a genuinely spiritual renaissance it became ultramontanist in character. The Jesuits who had succeeded by 1610 in establishing themselves in Paris obtained from Luynes in 1617 the right to teach children in their College of Clermont and the official reception of the decrees of the Council of Trent by the States General gave great impetus to the reorganization of the old orders, to the construction of churches, and to the formation of religious crusades throughout France. Still more significant the renaissance expressed itself in the bringing into being of new movements and orders. Pierre de Bérulle, son-in-law of the President Séguier, founded in 1613 the famous Oratory for the instruction of clerks in holy orders. This movement

1. Ranke "Histoire de la Papauté" Vol.III. p.96.

which professed the most rigid ultramontanism grew rapidly until in 1623 it became by papal bull a teaching order with seminaries throughout the country. Alongside the Oratory Bérulle introduced into France the Carmelites, the most austere of all the orders devoted to prayer and contemplation, and if L'Estoile is to be believed this order exerted a great influence especially among the young aristocracy. Again, whereas the sixteenth century had only seen the foundation of one new order for women in France, that of the Feuillantines in 1557, the first half of the seventeenth century saw no fewer than eleven - "Recolettes, Carmélites, Capucines, Ursulines, Soeurs Hospitalières de Saint-Charles, Bénédictines du Calvaire, Hospitalières de la Charité de Notre-Dame, Filles de Charité, Dames du Refuge, Religieuses de la Miséricorde, et Bénédictines de l'Adoration perpétuelle du Saint-Sacrement." Every new order meant the addition of a unit to the fighting forces of Rome, if not a cell in the body of ultramontanist doctrine. Yet again, while the armies of Louis XIII were fighting the protestants the Capucins were forming great crusades in the west to convert them, their methods similar to the open air missions of the early Methodists, their results often just as startling. Their Provincial of Touraine, the famous P. Joseph, was not only a powerful preacher but a sagacious administrator who, between 1612 and 1620 founded Capucin converts at Niort, Saint Maixent and

numerous other towns. The results of these missionary enterprises were to convert many Protestants to Catholicism but also to teach them an ultramontanist allegiance rather than any national loyalty.

The part played by the Sorbonne in this ultramontanist reaction is typical. It firmly refused to associate itself in any official capacity with Bérulle and the Oratory and zealously guarded the maxim that the "Sorbonne is free to hold and debate doctrines and beliefs that are problematic" and yet its influence was actually on the side of the Romanists. Under the leadership of Duval and Filesac it renewed two of the ancient decrees of the Sorbonne in favour of Papal Infallibility; it condemned in 1617 the "République Chrétienne" of Dominis¹, and would have censured Fra Paolo Sarpis' "History of the Council of Trent" but for want of a copy in Latin, and lack of Italian scholars in the Faculty of Theology. Its attitude towards the Richerists was definitely hostile, but although the disciples of episcopatism were ousted from all authority in the Sorbonne there is little truth in the assertions that they were violently persecuted. Baillet's accounts of the imprisonment and torture of Richer himself in the prisons of Saint Victor are vivid but untrue.²

1. Antoine de Dominis "République Chrétienne" England 1617.

2. Ad. Baillet. p.245.

In 1622, partly owing to the influence of the Sorbonne and partly to the enterprise of Bentivoglio, Richer was persuaded to make a declaration, intended to be a confession, with regard to the errors of the "Libellus." This declaration, with the events that preceded it, offer the best index to the strength and extent of the whole ultramontanist revival.

At the end of 1616 Ubaldini was recalled to Rome and Bentivoglio sent as papal nuncio in his stead. This was an excellent piece of papal diplomacy. Ubaldini by his implacability and violence had made his position difficult at the Louvre and estranged not only the parlementaires but also the nobility and many of the clergy from the Holy See. He was replaced by a suave diplomat who by a policy of conciliation was able to repair much of the damage wrought by his predecessor and also to take a significant part in the ultramontanist revival. Bentivoglio saw the immediate need of placating the Parlement of Paris, and set to work to win the confidence of Servin. Whereas Ubaldini had labelled Servin and his associates as heretics Bentivoglio assured them of the good wishes of the Pope, and by his moderation and courtesy won their esteem. The result of this masterly policy was that while Bentivoglio was in France, the Parlement, apart from two insignificant occasions, made no attempt to interfere in matters ecclesiastical and so left the Romanists a clear field. The Nuncio was equally successful in his

relations with the court and the Faculty of Theology. Both Louis XIII and Luynes established the most cordial co-operation with Rome and when in 1617 the parlementaire Chevalier at an assembly in Rouen spoke disrespectfully of the Pope and his methods in France, Louis not only had him dismissed, but threatened to have him thrown in the river. In the Sorbonne it was mainly as a result of a desire to please the nuncio that the decrees on infallibility were renewed and, as Puyol says, as an outcome of his enterprise "La Sorbonne elle-même luttait avec la Cour de déférence pour le Saint-Siège." It is not surprising then that in his general attempt at conciliation, Bentivoglio should endeavour to come to terms with episcopatism and Richer its leader. The publication of the "République Chrétienne" seemed to offer such an opportunity. Richer had protested vigorously against the doctrines of Dominis, for he saw in their crudity and lack of balance no parallel to his "Libellus," but rather the possibility of injury to his episcopatism, if the "République Chrétienne" was allowed to pass as substantially the same as the "Libellus". Bentivoglio interpreted this protest to mean that Richer was himself forsaking those doctrines which had occasioned his disgrace, and appealed to him both personally and through Duval to give up his heretical beliefs and share wholeheartedly in the better spirit prevailing between the Sorbonne and Rome. The nuncio wrote to Cardinal Borghèse,

"Dernièrement Richer, de lui même, a commencé à montrer quelque signe de déplaisir de ce qu'il a écrit dans son Libellus, et il a fait entendre qu'il se mettrait volontiers en rapport avec le cardinal de Retz son évêque, comme se Richer désirait de rentrer dans la soumission due au Saint Siège."¹

Finding, however, that these overtures produced no tangible result Bentivoglio persuaded Retz to appoint a commission composed of Duval, Gamache and Hébert "dans le but de traiter avec Richer et de voir en quelles dispositions il se trouvait"² and to extract from him a declaration of submission. After prolonged deliberations Richer made a declaration on the 30th June, 1622, in which he stated that his intention in writing the "Libellus" was to demonstrate "sommairement quelle était l'ancienne doctrine de l'Ecole de Paris," that he intended all his writings to be in accord with the judgments of the Holy See and the Catholic Church, that he did not wish to diminish the legitimate authority of the Pope and that he was ready to interpret all the propositions contained in his book "en un sens

1. Letter of 17th January, 1620.

2. Ibid.

véritable et catholique."¹

What then are the significant features of the ultramontanist revival as exemplified in the events surrounding Richer's declaration? First, the revival was moral and spiritual rather than theological and ecclesiastical, expressing itself in piety and missionary zeal and appealing to men's consciences rather than their intellects. Its ultramontanism was not the expression of any definite hostility to nationalism but the outcome of its religious unity and loyalty. The

1. Je, Edmond Richer, prêtre du diocèse de Langres, de la Faculté de théologie de Paris, et grand-maître du collège du Cardinal-Lemoine, fondé en l'Université de Paris, soussigné, déclare et certifie que je n'ai jamais eu d'autre intention ni volonté, en composant le traité "De ecclesiastica et politica potestate," en l'an 1811, sinon de montrer sommairement quelle était l'ancienne doctrine de l'Ecole de Paris, et parce que m'étant étudié à abréger, je me suis rendu obscur, ce qui a donné sujet à quelques-uns d'interpréter en mauvaise part quelques propositions dudit traité: je déclare et proteste que j'ai toujours entendu et entends me soumettre et tous les écrits que j'ai faits et que je pourrai faire à l'avenir, au jugement du Saint-Siège et de l'Eglise catholique, apostolique et romaine, et ai un très-grand déplaisir que quelques propositions dudit traité aient été prises contre mon intention, comme si j'eusse eu dessein de diminuer l'autorité légitime de notre Saint-Père le Pape, et celle de MM. les autres prélats de l'Eglise: ce qui ne m'est jamais venu en pensée. C'est pourquoi j'improove et déteste de telles interprétations, et toutes autres contraires à la croyance de l'Eglise catholique, apostolique et romaine, déclarant et protestant derechef, comme j'ai fait autrefois, que je suis prêt d'expliquer toutes les propositions dudit traité en un sens véritable et catholique. En foi et témoignage de quoi, j'ai écrit et signé de ma main la présente déclaration, l'an 1822, le jeudi, trentième de juin.

"Edmond Richer."

impact upon Richer was a moral impact: Richer, like Bentivoglio and Duval and unlike Ubaldini and Richelieu, was a sincere Catholic seeking his highest good in the welfare of the church. Despite his doctrinal positions, he could not but find real satisfaction in the conversions of the Capucins, the piety of the new orders and the harmonious relationships between the court and the church, neither could he remain insensible to the genuine attempts of Bentivoglio and Duval to come to terms of peace with him for the further extension of this spirit of goodwill. The "Syndicat" bears eloquent testimony to the personal problem which confronted Richer. His convictions as to episcopatism which had remained untouched, together with the petty persecutions and hatred of men like Gondi, the Bishop of Paris, urged him not to yield an inch, and yet the moral claims of the Catholic church, sincerely pressed by old friends like Duval as well as by the peaceful Nuncio, inclined him towards conciliation. The events of 1621 made him act. The death of Luynes raised again the problem of civil war and anarchy and the chief foe was the Protestant. Whereas before in 1598 Richer had championed the monarchy of Henry IV in the interests of social peace so in 1622 he issued his declaration in the belief that a unified Catholicism was the real way to restore order. This declaration was not intended as an apology for the "Libellus" but as a protestation on the part of Richer that he

was a loyal Catholic, and with all its evasions it remains an honest attempt to maintain the "unity of the spirit" of the church even in the face of divergent doctrine. Richer's declaration then is typical of the moral nature of the revival which was made possible by the good feeling, fostered by Bentivoglio, between the court, the parlementaire, the ultramontanist and the episcopalist, a revival which was to collapse, however, after 1622 because it had evolved no real strategy, and provoked no literature with which to meet the political events which followed the death of Luynes.

Secondly, the incidents surrounding the declaration of Richer show clearly to what an extent this ultramontanist reaction was dependent upon a few outstanding personalities. In a time when the Parlement had no leader, the episcopalists had not recovered from their defeat, and Richelieu not yet come to power Catholicism produced three significant champions. The revival corresponds with the period during which Gregory XV was Pope, Bentivoglio was Nuncio, and Luynes was Chief Minister of Louis XIII. To Gregory is due the active carrying out of the Trentine Reforms with all their resultant spiritual dynamic; to Luynes is due the close and obedient co-operation with the Holy See resulting in the friendly relations with Spain and the renewed onslaughts upon the Protestants. Above all it was Bentivoglio who secured the non-interference of the Parlement, the professions of orthodoxy

from the Sorbonne, and amicable relations even with Richer; and by his love of peace and avoidance of controversial issues justifies Puyol in describing the years 1616-1622 in the following terms of eulogy. "Quel moment admirable dans l'histoire de l'Eglise! Les nations catholiques en union avec le pouvoir pontifical travaillaient résolument à regagner le terrain perdu. L'activité religieuse se faisait sentir partout à la fois avec jeunesse et avec intelligence. Le pouvoir de l'Etat se mettait partout en communion avec les intérêts de l'Eglise."¹ Actually, however, there was no permanence and little reality behind this apparent harmony of church and state. The religious fervour soon died down in the face of secular problems, and with the death of Luynes, the departure of Bentivoglio in 1622 and the accession of Urban VII to the Papacy the forces of Gallicanism once again raised their heads.

III. Richelieu and the Gallican Revival 1623-1625.

Although Richelieu's advancement to power coincided with the latter years of the ultramontanist revival, actually Gallicanism was stronger in 1623 than in 1614 and the comparative ease with which the Cardinal was able to use the forces

1. Ed. Puyol. Vol.II. p.163.

of Gallicanism in 1625 for the advancement of his national policy was due in no small part to the slow but steady dissemination of episcopal and regalist theories throughout France, a process which had been proceeding alongside the Ultramontanism and gaining in strength all through the years during which Luynes had been in power.

The fact that during the whole time of Bentivoglio's stay in Paris no vital doctrine of ultramontanism had been raised and no serious clash of political theory had arisen, was not only due to the diplomacy of the Nuncio, but was an indication of the disappearance altogether of the spirit of the League. Ultramontanism as a spiritual loyalty had flourished, as a political allegiance it had become untenable. The political victory of 1614 had been complete and the measure of that victory was the extent to which even the Jesuits were becoming Frenchmen as well as religious zealots, foreshadowing in their colleges the ultimate compromise of "Duvallism" by ascribing to the Kingship "les prerogatives les plus exorbitantes" while they retained for the Pope a spiritual supremacy and infallibility. "L'influence régnante, à laquelle personne dans notre pays n'échappait complètement, portait à la constitution d'un pouvoir politique doué d'une extrême autorité."¹ Not all the missionary zeal of Father Joseph, not all the diplomacy of

1. Ed. Puyol. Vol.II. p.195.

Bentivoglio, not all the decrees of Trentine Reformation could undo the work of the "cahier" of 1614. Not all the amiable relations between the Louvre and Rome could prevent Vieuville and Richlieu, on the death of Luynes from renewing hostility with Spain in the essential interests of national policy.

Within this decay of ultramontaniam the forces of "Richérisme" had steadily gained ground. Richer himself had published a new edition of the "Libellus" (accompanied by a "Demonstratio" refuting the arguments of Duval and other Romanists) in 1622 which brought to his cause many new converts who saw the Erastian dangers of the States General of 1614. To the number of episcopalists who had stood by their Syndic in the Faculty at the time of his deposition, men like Henniquin and Jérôme Parent, were now added Urbain Garnier, Elie du Fresne de Mincé, and Bernard within the Sorbonne itself. To all his disciples Richer preached patience and silence assuring them that they would but prejudice their cause by premature action, but that their opportunity of striking an effective blow against the Romanist pretensions would soon come. "Il priaît instamment ses amis de se contenir sans rien mettre en mouvement, ne rien proposer de nouveau."¹

This opportunity presented itself in 1622. A Doctor of

1. "Syndicat" p.338.

Theology of Paris at an assembly of the Sorbonne had advocated the theories of Emmanuel Rodrigue of the order of Cordeliers, as a justification for his belief that the clergy should abandon their parishes for the cells of the regulars.

Rodrigue in various writings had advanced the theory that the regular orders of the clergy held a unique position within the Catholic church, which not only rendered them independent of the bishop but also made them immune from the temporal authority. The "politiques" saw immediately in this doctrine a real danger, especially in view of the widespread revival among the religious orders in France, and pressed for action by the Faculty of Theology. Accordingly four doctors of the Sorbonne were commissioned to examine and report on the orthodoxy of Rodrigue. The commissioners were all friends of Richer and not only did they recommend to the Faculty the censure of the works of Rodrigue but they appended to their report a statement of the episcopalist doctrine of the relationship between the temporal and the spiritual power. Despite the violent opposition of Duval and Mauclerc this report was adopted by a large majority and further action would have been taken but for royal intervention. Through the agency of Cardinal de Retz the orthodox party within the Sorbonne was able to secure an order from the King postponing further action until his return from the siege of

Montpellier.¹ The incident remained inconclusive but was a clear demonstration both of the weakness of the ultramontanists and the strength of "Richérisme" within the Faculty of Theology. This was not a complete return to the "Libellus"; the censure of episcopatism as a constitutional theory of the Catholic church was and remained final; it was the inevitable result of the political needs of the moment. The "politiques" within the church needed an answer to the claims of Rome and apart from the secularists, Richer alone provided that answer, so without committing themselves to all the tenets of episcopatism they allied themselves with Richer's party.

The situation within the Faculty of Theology was typical of the general attitude of the French clergy and can be illustrated from the attempts of Cardinal de la Rochefoucauld to silence Richer, and from the events of the general assembly of the clergy in 1625.

La Rochefoucauld was a rigidly orthodox Cardinal, profoundly shocked that a man whose book had been condemned by the Pope, two provincial councils and the Sorbonne, should continue to propagate his heresies freely, could defy the Pope

1. For complete list of decisions relative to the censure of Rodrigue see "Censures et conclusions de la sacrée Faculté de Théologie de Paris, touchant la souveraineté des rois, la fidélité que leur doivent leurs sujets, la sûreté de leurs personnes et la tranquillité de l'Etat." Paris 1720.

with a declaration such as that of 1622 and should continue to exert such a powerful influence within the Faculty of Theology. His attitude towards Richer is clearly defined in the "Syndicat". "Puisque Richer ne veut point obéir, se serait en jour écrié le cardinal, il faut le mettre dans un sac et le jeter dans l'eau. Plût à Dieu, qu'il m'en eût coûté deux cents écus d'or, et qu'il se fût fait heretique."¹ La Rochefoucauld called together a congregation of prelates at the house of Cardinal de Sourdis and promised that if they would draw up a series of articles of faith he would obtain from the King authority to impel the followers of Richer to subscribe to them. Moreover he prevailed upon Richelieu as Provisor of the Sorbonne to seek the support of that body for his project. The whole enterprise was a complete failure. In the first place the prelates could only agree upon two articles, the one that the Pope can make laws binding upon the consciences of all Christians, and the other than he can grant to members of religious orders the right to hear confession. In the second place when La Rochefoucauld succeeded in gaining the royal ear it was Richer who implored the support of the King for his defence of "l'indépendance de l'autorité souveraine, les libertés et immunités du royaume et l'ancienne doctrine de l'école de Sorbonne", and reduced the

1. "Syndicat" p.318.

Cardinal to impotence. In the third place Richelieu was so impressed by the loyalty of the Faculty and the moral support that Richer received from the clergy in Paris that "il renonça à l'intervention, laissant au cardinal .. le soin d'ordonner de cette affaire épineuse comme bon lui semblerait."¹ As if to set the seal upon Richer's success, Jean de Vieux-Pont, Bishop of Meaux, conferred upon him a vacant canonry in the Cathedral of Meaux and at the service of ordination expressed the keenest regret at having participated at the Council of Sens in the censure of the "Libellus."²

The Assembly of the Clergy in 1625 was a further indication of the extent and power of "Richèrisme" as a modified episcopatism with which effectively to answer the "dévôts" in the years 1622-25. One of the chief points at issue in the assembly was the vexed question of the privileges of the religious orders in France. On the one hand the papalists wished to retain for Rome the power to the exclusive control and administration of the "regulars"; on the other hand the "politiques" considered that in the interests of the state as well as in the interests of the episcopate any exemptions granted to the religious orders would be pernicious.

1. "Syndicat" p.366 and following.

2. Ib. p.369.

Actually the papalists found themselves hopelessly outnumbered.

"On entendait, assourdement des menées contre les réguliers et privilégiés, et l'assemblée, qui ne semblait être faite que pour anéantir les privilèges des réguliers, fit un règlement à la sollicitation des évêques, du tout contraire à l'autorité du Pape et aux privilèges des ordres religieux."¹

This disciplinary code drawn up by the assembly for application to these orders was almost identical with the rules for the conduct of the clergy and their relationship to the secular arm, which Richer himself had elaborated in various pamphlets, and is representative of the great preponderance of Richer's own thought among the bishops taking part in the assembly.

It was just at this time when many of the contentions of the "Libellus" were finding general support and when Richer himself believed that episcopatism in its completeness would find success in the general assemblies of the French clergy to compensate for its failure in the Sorbonne, that Richelieu came to power.

IV. Richelieu and Political Gallicanism.

"Il faut confesser à la louange de M. le Cardinal de Richelieu qu'il avait conçu deux desseins que je trouve

1. "Mémoires de Garasse, publiés pour la première fois par Charles Nieard" 1861.

presque aussi vastes que ceux des César et des Alexandre. Celui d'abattre le parti de la religion des réformés avait été projeté par M. le Cardinal de Retz, mon oncle, celui d'attaquer la formidable maison d'Autriche n'avait été imaginé de personne. Il a consommé le premier, à sa mort il avait bien avancé le second." So does the Cardinal de Retz characterize the administration of Richelieu alike by his emphasis upon two political motives and by his omission of any spiritual background whatsoever, for although there may be evidence for a personal piety on the part of Richelieu from the moment that he became the first minister of France the churchman vanished and the statesman took his place.

The political programme of Cardinal Richelieu was grounded in two secular aims - the sovereignty of the crown within France and the prestige of France throughout Europe. All other theories became subservient to a central doctrine of secular nationalism of which the sovereignty of the King and the absolutism of the state were the obverse and reverse of the medal. The diverse activities and apparent contradictions of the administration of the Cardinal are only capable of resolution and explanation in terms of "raisons d'état" which recognize a secular omnipotence that is as irresponsible as it is unrelated either to a spiritual end or to fundamental law.

Thus one of the first acts of Richelieu was to attempt to

destroy Protestantism as a political force threatening the absolutism of the monarchy. Accordingly La Rochelle was reduced. Yet at the same time in order to humiliate the House of Austria it was necessary to form alliances with the Protestant German states and this necessitated a policy of religious conciliation in the interests of national aggrandisement. Accordingly the guarantees made by Henry IV to the Protestants were strictly maintained. Similarly it was in accordance with his central policy that Richelieu assisted Holland against Spain, supported the Palatinate against Bavaria, affianced a princess of France to the heir to the English throne and championed the Calvinist Grisons against the Catholic Valtelins.

Of particular importance for the purpose of this examination it was strictly in accordance with his political programme that Richelieu favoured the Gallican revival in the years prior to 1626, and finally achieved the compromise of "Duvallisme;" for although in the "Testament Politique" he solemnly avers that "le premier fondement du bonheur d'un Etat vient de l'établissement du règne de Dieu"¹, the testimony of his actions shows conclusively that episcopatism, regalism and even ultramontanism, together with their various champions, were all enlisted without pledge in the interests of the absolute secular state.

1. "Testament Politique" 1708. Part II. p.38.

The relations of Richelieu with the Gallican revival fall into two periods. The first is the period from his accession to power to 1626 during which the forces of "Richérisme" were encouraged and employed to secure the final triumph of regalism and secular absolutism; the second the period of modification and compromise when the fear of religious strife and rupture with Rome threatened his secular projects.

The aim of Richelieu in this first period then was to achieve the victory of the "bon français" where 1614 had failed. The States General, though it had established regalism in the Parlement, had estranged the clergy. That estrangement persisted but Richelieu succeeded where the efforts of the Parlementaires had failed in evoking from the church itself a secular allegiance to the monarchy, and by fostering "Richérisme" obtained the ascendancy of the "bon français" over the "bon catholique" within the Sorbonne itself so that its doctors in 1626 made their first doctrinal decision in favour of political Gallicanism.

The publication of the "Libelles"¹ and the book of

-
1. Il se fit en Italie, sur la guerre de la Valteline, deux méchants livres, sans nom d'auteur, lesquels pour déguiser le lieu d'où ils venaient, on fit premièrement distribuer en Flandre, les attribuant sous main à Boucher, qui, par lettre qu'il écrivit à ses amis, s'en excusa. Le premier était intitulé "Mystères politiques," et le dernier portait pour titre: "Admonition par laquelle brièvement et fortement on démontre que la France a vilainement et honteusement fait une ligue impie, et une guerre injuste, en ce temps, contre les catholiques."

Mémoires de Richelieu, Vol. XX.

Santarel¹ provided Richelieu with the necessary opportunities with which to achieve his objective.

No sooner was it manifest by the peace of La Rochelle and the Valteline question, that the policy of Richelieu was to be dictated by purely secular considerations and that an ultramontanist policy on the part of the Cardinal was impossible than Romanist pamphlets began to appear equal in their vituperation and violence to the most frenzied of the League. Chief in importance among these were two named the "Libelles", the "Admonitio ad Regem" and the "Mysteria Politica". Probably written in Italy they emanated from Flanders and were widely circulated among the schools of theology in France. They contained much that was merely invective directed against the moral iniquity of Richelieu's foreign policy and alliances with Protestant powers, but they also revived doctrines which struck at the very root of the Cardinal's schemes. They claimed, as had the pamphlets of the League, the direct or indirect power of the church over temporal matters and more significant still they championed the democratic origin of authority as against the absolutism of the sovereign. Richelieu was quick to see the value of "Richérisme" as the answer to the "Libelles", for not only had Richer proclaimed royal irresponsibility as a tenet of his

1. "Antonii Sanctarelli ex societate Jesu, Tractatus moralis de haeresi, schismate apostasia, sollicitudine in sacramento poenitentiae ... " 1625.

regalism, but he had also denied the democratic principle and laid down an aristocratic basis for his episcopatism. Hence Richelieu appealed especially to the Gallicans to defend their King from the Libelles and the "bons catholiques". Following upon a decree by the Provost of Paris condemning all copies of the Libelles to be publicly burned, on the 26th November, 1625, the Faculty appointed a special commission to report on their orthodoxy, following which the Faculty itself made a recommendation to the general assembly of the clergy on the 1st December in these terms: "La Faculté déclarant les Libelles entièrement execrables et détestables, priaît et conjurait les révérendissimes prélats et les magistrats séculiers, par le zèle qu'ils ont à l'honneur de Dieu, à la justice, au salut du roi et au bien général de son Etat, de châtier exemplairement par toutes les voies justes et raisonnables, ce reste survenu après une ample vendange de tant de malheureux assassins du passé."¹ The general assembly in its turn approved the recommendation and appointed the Bishop of Chartres to draw up the censure of the "Libelles". Chartres proceeded not only to condemn the pamphlets in general terms, but went further and implied by denial of specific contentions in these "Libelles" the orthodoxy of many of the episcopalist positions. The victory

1. Conclusions of the Faculty of theology with reference to the "Libelles" 26th November, 1625. See d'Argentré "Collectio" Vol.II. Part 2. p.190.

of the Gallicans was startling. Spada, the papal Nuncio, who succeeded Bentivoglio in 1622, was able to induce a number of prelates to withdraw their support from the censure by Chartres¹; the Parlement interfered and attempted to nullify Spada's action²; Richelieu put an end to the quarrel by persuading the King to stop all proceedings relative to the "Libelles" pending a royal commission which actually never materialized, but the general assembly had virtually accepted regalism and had even lent its support to certain episcopalist doctrines. No one realized this better than Richer himself who proudly wrote "Nunc vivit doctrina mea".

While the "Libelles" were instrumental in obtaining the triumph of political Gallicanism in the general assembly of the clergy, Richelieu took advantage of the book of Santarel the Jesuit to win a similar victory within the Sorbonne, and as in 1610 the Jesuits were again the victims, the particular attack upon their order being the medium through which regalism found victorious expression. Santarel's book printed in Rome was intended as a handbook of doctrine for the use of Jesuits themselves and not for general publication. It contained the most rigid presentation of the extreme

-
1. d'Argentré "Collectio" Vol.II. Part 2. p.199 and foll.
 2. Ib. p.201.

ultramontanist positions and probably owing to carelessness a copy came into the possession of a doctor of the Sorbonne and through him to the notice of the Faculty of Theology and the Parlement of Paris. This was all that was needed to arouse the parlementaires into all their traditional hatred of the Jesuit order. Servin, and Omer Talon and others declaimed against the iniquitous theories and practices of the Jesuits, and their feelings were only exacerbated by the unfortunate death of Servin in the middle of a fiery oration. On the 13th March Parlement decreed that Santarel's book should be publicly burned and that the order should be publicly rebuked for permitting such doctrines to be promulgated.¹ It was at this juncture that Richelieu intervened. He convinced the court that the Jesuits themselves were a real menace to the national interests of France and persuaded the King to withhold his customary support from the order. He then forced P. Armand, the Jesuit superior in Paris, to sign a document disavowing the doctrines of Santarel and professing the claims of political Gallicanism. That once again the forces of Gallicanism should have enjoyed such an easy victory was a further indication of the extent to which the regalist theories had penetrated the ranks even of the Jesuits themselves, for as P. d'Avrigny remarked "sur les

1. d'Argentré "Collectio" Vol.II. Part 2. p.204.

propositions favorables à l'indépendance absolue des rois pour le temporel les jésuites du royaume pensent comme tous les Français."¹ But the Cardinal saw the need of establishing his regalist positions more firmly still. "L'expérience a fait connaître n'y avoir autre moyen pour désabuser les esprits prévenus par la folle opinion que cette malheureuse doctrine est catholique, ou même article de foi, que de la voir condamner par ceux qui ont autorité sur les consciences, soit par puissance ecclésiastique, soit par jugement doctrinal, sans qu'on y puisse remédier par aucune autre voie, encore qu'on en brûlat les auteurs, aussi bien que les livres; étant le propre de l'esprit humain, de se raidir aux difficultés et mépriser les supplices, quand il se persuade (encore que faussement) que la raison est de son côté et qu'il agit et souffre pour la vérité."² Richelieu turned to the Sorbonne and requested its doctors to pronounce finally upon the doctrines incorporated in Santarel's book. So well was this move timed that the Romanists in the Sorbonne were helpless to prevent a complete victory of the "Richéristes". At the beginning of April after embittered speeches on both sides the doctrine of Santarel was condemned as "erronée et contraire à la parole de Dieu .. rendant la dignité du Souverain -

1. "Mémoires de Richelieu" Book XVII.

2. "Mémoires de Richelieu" Book XVII.

Pontife odieuse ... dérogeant à l'autorité souveraine des rois qui ne dépend que de Dieu seul."¹ The University of Paris at an extraordinary assembly decided that the censure should be placed upon the register and read in public at the opening of each academic year.² It was prohibited on pain of expulsion to write or teach contrary to the decision of the Sorbonne and the provincial universities were invited to signify their agreement. It is sufficient to demonstrate the extent of the Gallican victory to add that the universities of Toulouse, Valence, Rheims, Caen, Poitiers, Bordeaux, Bourges and Orleans all issued decrees analogous to that of the Sorbonne within a month.

Thus political Gallicanism for the first time received the doctrinal support of the Sorbonne and the justification it obtained by the States General in 1614 was ratified by the premier ecclesiastical authority in 1626. The work of Pierre Pithou had been carried through to completion; the agents in that work had been the "Richéristes", the governing hand had been that of Richelieu, and ultramontaniam as a political theory had been rejected alike by the Parlementaire and the Bishop in their common desire to remain "bons francais". Although it was not until 1717 that political

1. "Censura sacrae Facultatis theologiae Parisiensis in librum qui inscribitur, Antonii Sanctarelli" d'Argentré "Collectio" Vol.II. Part 2. pp.210-212.

2. Decree of University of Paris, 20th April 1626. Ib. p.218.

Gallicanism as a codified system of maxims was professed by the Sorbonne, yet 1626 marks the real transition and crowns the Gallican revival at the beginning of the seventeenth century in its political aspect. For the declarations of 1682 and 1717 were grounded in the declaration of 1626 and although in the interests of national peace the actual censure of Santarel by the Sorbonne was revoked soon afterwards, events showed that this revocation was powerless to affect the steady increase of regalist pronouncements and edicts which emanated from the Sorbonne and found their justification in the events of 1626. That the really decisive step had been taken was obvious to all, "Ce fut, ainsi que le dit un contemporain, la revanche de la Ligue."¹

V. "Duvallisme".

Richelieu was far too wise to assume that the victory of political Gallicanism within the church had solved the main problem of church and state. No one realised better than he did that the triumph of regalism would actually bring into clearer relief the fundamental issue, which was that of sovereignty. Though the church, beginning from 1626 was to accord to the monarchy a sovereign political allegiance, so long as it remained Catholic it would still owe a

1. Ed. Puyol. Vol.II. p.296.

sovereign spiritual loyalty to Rome. The church would support the monarchy, and even profess royal irresponsibility so long as its regalism did not imply a conflict of loyalties, but so soon as political Gallicanism implied schism then the loyal churchman would be certain to betray his temporal allegiance rather than endanger his eternal welfare. It was precisely this necessity of maintaining unity and peace with the centre of spiritual loyalty, as the only hope of securing any permanent success for secular absolutism, which Richelieu stresses in the following passage from the registers of the Council of State. "Il est utile dans les Etats d'empêcher le cours des livres qui détruisent la légitime autorité des princes, et contiennent de pernicieuses maximes pour leurs personnes en faveur des papes; mais il le faut faire avec le moins de bruit et d'éclat qu'il est possible, de peur qu'il ne se trouve des furieux qui, sous prétexte de défendre les droits de l'Eglise mal entendus par eux, ne se portent à attaquer et opprimer les droits et les personnes des princes les meilleurs du monde."¹ Richelieu was prepared for the ultramontanist opposition which followed the censure of Santarel's book and it was in the spirit of this passage that he met the events of 1626-30. "Duvallisme" was the ecclesiastical concordat he made with the opposition to leave his regalism unchallenged.

1. Extract from registers of Council of State 18th July, 1626. "Collectio" Vol.II. Part 2. p.222.

Though defeated in the Sorbonne Duval and his party were far from impotent and events quickly moved towards a crisis. The appearance of a new publication called the "Somme de Théologie" by the Jesuit P. Garasse was the signal for a renewed attack by the "Richéristes" on the order, whereupon Duval threatened to defeat their projected censure by making use of the votes of doctors of the regular orders who happened to be in Paris at the time. He even went further and declared his intention of using this means to secure a new examination of the orthodoxy of Santarel. The secular doctors of the Faculty disquieted by the possibilities of such action requested the Parlement to pronounce upon the status of the regular orders in the Faculty of Theology in accordance with the ancient usage which limited the number of members of the various orders who could vote in the Faculty to two. The Parlement readily issued two decrees stating that the number fixed must not be altered "pour quelque cause et occasion que ce soit." The "Duvallistes" in the Faculty of Theology at an ordinary assembly refused to accept the action of the Parlement and accused the Richéristes and the Parlement of provoking ill feeling between Louis XIII and the Papacy.¹ Richelieu at this time was not strong enough to flout entirely the authority of the Parlement. The

1. For these various decisions see "Collectio" Vol.II.
Part 2. pp. 225-230.

Pope through Spada had clearly shown his discontent with the Cardinal's policy over the Valteline question, as well as over the negotiations with the legate Barberin and the treaty made with the Protestants, and the prolongation of these disputes relative to Santarel was but incensing the Papacy still further. Richelieu attempted to put a speedy end to the whole embarrassing situation. By royal edict on 18th July Parlement was directed to take no cognisance of the deliberations within the Sorbonne and the Faculty of Theology was ordered to send all the documents relative to the censure of Santarel to the Louvre for the King to decide finally upon the vexed question of Papal authority. Meanwhile to give satisfaction to Rome, Richelieu proposed to Spada that a formal disavowal of the censure should be sent to Rome signed by a representative number of doctors of the Faculty.¹

The events which followed this royal intervention form the crux of the whole problem. Firstly, the Parlement refused to adhere to the royal request and far from refraining from further cognizance of the activities of the Sorbonne proceeded to decree again that "aux assemblées que se font en la Faculté les supérieurs des quatre ordres mendiants ne pourront députer plus grand nombre que deux docteurs en théologie de chacun desdits couvents"². Secondly, the

1. See "Collectio" Vol.II. Part 2. p.222-223 - Council of State 18th July, 1626.

2. Ib.

Faculty of Theology similarly refused to drop the whole matter in view of a royal settlement. The "bons catholiques" continued to agitate for an official profession on the part of the Faculty of obedience to the Holy See. Richelieu attempted to give them further satisfaction by a royal decree on the 2nd November which stated that "les docteurs mendiants iraient comme ils faisaient ès-années précédentes, aux assemblées de la Faculté de Théologie"¹, but in vain. Further, to complicate the situation the appearance of a thesis by a Jacobin, Testefort, brought the University into line with the actions of the doctors and into conflict with the royal demands. Testefort had inserted in his thesis the following proposition: "La Sainte-Ecriture est contenue partie dans la Bible, partie dans les Epîtres décrétales des souverains pontifes (en tant qu'elles expliquent la Saint-Ecriture) partie dans les sacrés conciles". Not only did the Sorbonne decide "qu'il ne fallait en aucune façon tolérer la proposition de Testefort"² but the Rector of the University of Paris instructed Testefort himself to retract on the grounds that his proposition was part of the pernicious doctrines against the authority of the crown and requested the Faculty of Theology to continue its examination of the limits of Papal jurisdiction.³ Thirdly, the proposed

1. "Collectio" Vol.II. Part 2. p.322.

2. "Conclusio sacrae Facultatis qua damnatur propositio Fr. Testefort 11^{re} Decembre 1626" - "Collectio" Vol.II. Part 2. p.235.

3. Ibid.

satisfaction to the Pope was repudiated by Spada who declared that nothing short of a suppression of the censure by the Faculty of Theology would satisfy the Papacy and broke off relations with Richelieu.

Thus the Gallicanism which Richelieu had fostered in the interests of royal authority had provoked in its turn not only critical relations between France and the Papacy at a time when the imminent hostilities with England made it imperative that religious peace should be maintained, but had also driven the Parlement, the Sorbonne and the University of Paris into active opposition to that very royal authority which they had proclaimed to be both absolute and irresponsible. Richelieu himself saw that the only possible solution was a rapprochement with the Pope and the "Dévots" on the basis of spiritual ultramontaniam and by a suppression of the "Richéristes". Such action could never undo the work of the States General in 1614 and the Sorbonne in 1625 especially as the party of Duval would be its chief supporters, and at the same time in the interests of the monarchy it alone could prevent schism and secure national loyalty.

The first task was to pacify Spada and Rome. Spada himself in a letter to Richelieu expressed the essential point at issue when he wrote "Monseigneur Illustrissime nous voici à la veille d'un schisme, nous voici au serment d'Angleterre." It was the resemblance which the censures of

the Bishop of Chartres and the Sorbonne bore to James' oath of allegiance which convinced the orthodox, that religious strife and persecution must inevitably follow in France, as they had done in England, unless the secular authority guaranteed the continued possibility of the spiritual unity of the church alongside the political unity of the state. Richelieu made peace with Rome. The Bishop of Nantes, Cospeau, was sent with a royal letter to the Faculty of Theology which commanded the Sorbonne to adopt the decree relative to the mendicant orders¹ and Bérulle was entrusted with the task of obtaining within the Sorbonne the revocation of its censure of the book of Santarel pending a papal judgment upon the orthodoxy of the Jesuit's doctrines. Meanwhile in the general assembly of the Faculty in January 1627 Richelieu instructed the doctors, without further discussion, to pronounce once again upon the censure stating whether they accepted it or not. Actually there was a most violent debate, the outcome of which was that "de soixante huit docteurs cinquante n'approuvèrent pas les termes de la censure."²

Meanwhile by methods that were at once firm and yet conciliatory the resistance of the Parlement was broken.

-
1. By a royal declaration the action of the University in censuring the thesis of Testefort was nullified and the Rector personally reprimanded for interference by the King.
 2. Conclusion of the Faculty of Theology 2nd January, 1627 - "Collectio" Vol.II. Part 2. p.243.

Royal decrees prohibiting the Parlementaires from meddling with the disputes in the Sorbonne having proved unsuccessful Richelieu persuaded the King to summon the presidents and representatives to the Louvre along with a number of the clergy and to charge them personally to obey his wishes. "Je vous commande," said Louis, "et sous peine d'encourir mon indignation de ne plus vous mêler des affaires de la Sorbonne. Si vous continuez de vous y ingérer je vous ferai voir qui est le maître de vous ou de moi." Whereupon Richelieu made a remarkable speech in which first of all he attacked the doctrine of Santarel and reiterated the claims of political Gallicanism and then proceeded to claim that as regards matters of faith, they were for the Pope to decide and the King, the Parlement and even the Sorbonne were not competent to examine such matters. Finally, in a burst of frankness he appealed to the Parlement to support his policy for the ill-feeling between the Papacy and the King of France was preventing a settlement of the Valteline question and imposing heavy financial demands upon the royal treasury. Further than that the Parlement must trust his leadership. "Vous direz peut-être, messieurs, que si vous saviez les motifs et la raison des conseils du Roi, assurément vous le suivriez. Mais à cela j'ai à répondre que le maître du vaisseau ne rend point de raison de la façon avec laquelle il le conduit, qu'il y a des affaires dont le succès ne dépend

que du secret et beaucoup de moyens propres à une fin ne le sont plus lorsqu'ils sont divulgués." The Parlement was completely won over,¹ and the immediate danger of schism was averted. Rome was placated, the Faculty and the University had been silenced and with his political Gallicanism uncompromised Richelieu was able to postpone his final solution of the spiritual problem in face of the pressing problems of La Rochelle and Mantua. All parties agreed to drop once and for all the thorny problem of Santarel's orthodoxy and to give their undivided allegiance to Louis XIII on the basis of the pledge with which Richelieu concluded his memorable speech before the Parlement in February 1627. "Le Roy attend une censure de Rome, qui fera d'autant plus d'effet qu'elle viendra d'une part que beaucoup tiennent partie en cette cause. Si sa Majesté ne la recoit, elle en procurera une en son royaume qui puisse être soutenue par tout le monde, et qui édifie toute la chrétienté au lieu de la diviser."

Actually the final settlement had to be postponed until 1629. After the capitulation of La Rochelle, Richelieu was fully occupied with the organization of the expeditionary force to help the Duke of Mantua to defend Casal against the Spaniards and immediately following this enterprise came the

1. See Puyol. Vol.II. pp.342-344.

campaign against the Huguenots "du Midi" so that it was not until September 1629 that he was able to devote his attention to the outstanding problems of Gallicanism. By this time the equivocal position in which the Faculty had found itself in 1626 had resulted in another controversy. On March 1st 1628 Filesac proposed in the Faculty that owing to the ignorance particularly among the bachelors of the rules and statutes, a list should be drawn up and distributed to all the members. The suggestion was adopted and a commission appointed. On May 18th at an extraordinary assembly the list drawn up by the commission was publicly read. All went peacefully until the reader reached the declaration which bachelors were required to make protesting their orthodox intentions. Filesac had drawn up the declaration in the following terms. "Je proteste, n'entendre rien avancer de contraire aux divines Ecritures, aux définitions des saints conciles ou aux décisions de la sacrée Faculté de Théologie ma mère."¹ The "Duvallistes" immediately protested that the decrees of the Papacy should be included in the declaration and that such an omission was damaging to the Pope's authority. The "Richéristes" quite logically claimed that it was impossible for a bachelor to "avow and approve" the extravagant claims of the Bulls of Gregory VII and Boniface VIII such as "Unam

1. Martin. "Le Gallicanisme Politique" p.246.

Sanctam" and particularly the Bull of Gregory XIV by which he declared Henry the Great's family to be incapable of succession to the throne of France. Thus under another form the whole problem of sovereignty was raised again. It was at this moment when the Faculty was once again divided into opposite camps when Filesac had resigned as a protest against the disloyalty of the ultramontanists to their King, and when royal irresponsibility and ecclesiastical interference in temporal matters "in ordine ad spiritualia" were being as fiercely debated as they had been in 1612 and 1614 that Richelieu returned to Paris.

The Cardinal was now in a position to reach a final settlement. The authority of the crown had been consolidated throughout France and relations with Urban VIII were most cordial. By securing the supremacy of the "Duvallistes" in the Faculty, and by breaking up the "Richériste" party, he would not only obtain peace within the Sorbonne but he would also make certain of the continued political assistance of the Papacy. Hence Richelieu championed the ultramontanists in the question of the bachelor's declaration and quickly obtained a victory for the Papal claims. To quote his own words in the "Mémoires":- "La Faculté de Théologie, par l'avis du cardinal, ordonna que de là en avant tous les bacheliers en théologie seroient obligés de faire le serment, que depuis quelque temps avoit été discontinué, de ne jamais

rien dire ni enseigner qui fût contre les décrets des saints Papes, non plus aussi que contre les décrets de la Faculté, d'autant que, comme par les décrets des papes l'autorité des souverains pontifes est maintenue, celle des rois l'est par les décrets de la dite Faculté."¹ There remained the problem of the "Richéristes" and Richelieu realized that there was one method, that was as simple as it was direct, whereby their power could be destroyed. If Richer himself could be forced to retract and renounce the doctrines of the "Libellus" then Richelieu was confident that his party would fall to pieces leaving the "Duvallistes" with unchallenged authority in the Sorbonne. So the Cardinal determined to impose his personal will upon the chief protagonist of episcopatism, to secure Richer's allegiance to Rome and his recantation of ecclesiastical Gallicanism. Having assured himself that the Parlement would not interfere, on December 4th Richelieu sent Charles Talon, brother of the advocate general, to Richer requesting him to sign a form of retractation which had been drawn up by Duval. Utterly unprepared for this bombshell Richer called together his friends, and having sought their advice assured them that under no considerations would he forsake his theories and requested an interview with the Cardinal. Richelieu received him on December 7th in the presence of Talon and P. Joseph and within a few hours Richer

1. "Mémoires de Richelieu." Book XX.

had made a full retractation, renouncing the errors of the "Libellus" and professing his complete submission to the Holy See.

At first sight this capitulation on the part of one who hitherto had maintained an inflexible front in face of all opposition, is difficult to understand, but an examination of the actual details surrounding this act of submission makes it quite clear that it was the result of three factors. Firstly, it was the victory of Richelieu, the dominating personality, Richelieu the statesman who had put into actual practice the political theories of Richer himself as well as the Cardinal of Mother Church who was speaking as the spiritual superior of the ex-Syndic. The "Defensio" bears eloquent testimony to this factor. "Richer voyait diminuer de plus en plus la liberté qu'il semblait que le cardinal avait bien voulu lui accorder dès le commencement de la conférence. Il s'apercevait que les honnêtetés dont il l'avait flatté d'abord, se tournaient insensiblement en un air impérieux, qui le lui faisait regarder non plus comme un proviseur de Sorbonne, mais comme un maître qui avait en main toutes les forces du royaume pour se faire obéir. D'ailleurs il ne lui était point permis de s'adresser au roi: outre que Sa Majesté, ne s'étant presque réservé que le nom de roi, avait laissé la disposition du reste à ce ministre. Ainsi il dit au cardinal que malgré sa répugnance, il se résoudrait

à faire ce qu'on exigeait de lui, puisqu'on l'assurait qu'il n'y avait pas d'autre moyen pour procurer la paix à la Sorbonne."¹ Secondly, it was the victory of Richer the sincere Christian over Richer the institutional theologian. Richer was an old and enfeebled man anxious above all for the welfare of the faith which he had championed with single minded zeal from the days of the League. Already once before in 1625 he had made a declaration indicative of his paramount desire to promote unity and obedience within the church and now in 1630 it was his essential orthodoxy of spirit to which Richelieu was able to appeal so successfully. Thirdly, it was the victory of the astute P. Joseph who immediately Richelieu had finished with Richer conducted the harassed man into an adjoining room where ink was ready to hand and Richer was induced there and then to clinch the interview by signing the retraction to which Joseph had prudently added, "Je reconnais que je donne cette déclaration librement et volontairement, afin que tout le monde voie mon obéissance envers le Saint Siège apostolique, et que j'ai cru devoir la consigner entre les mains de monseigneur le Cardinal de Richelieu proviseur de Sorbonne, à cause de ce que je lui dois et du respect que j'ai pour lui." (See note to p.184)

This retraction on the part of Richer proved to be

1. See Baillet p.391; Baillet is quoting from Richer's "Defensio" Book V.

the culminating act in the Gallican drama, particularly when Richelieu prevailed upon him to swear an affidavit before two notaries giving them authority to state officially that he had "volontairement reconnu et confessé avoir écrit et signé le contenu ci-dessus qui est véritable." Duval, Maucier and the ultramontanists hastened to assure Richer of their goodwill toward him; Spada assured him of the thanks of the Papacy and in the general spirit of goodwill which descended upon the Faculty of Theology the "Richéristes" disappeared as a party.

The completeness of Richelieu's victory and the terms of the compromise can be seen in the utterances of the "Duvallistes" in the Sorbonne and the Faculty immediately following Richer's action. Duval affirmed that the authority of the Pope did not extend to the temporal sphere; Besse claimed that the doctrine which ascribed to the church a direct or indirect authority over the political activities of the Kings of France was both false and contrary to the word of God, while all of them were insistent in their protestations that they rejected with horror the doctrines of the "politique romaine". At the same time these "Duvallistes" professed the fullest submission to the decrees of the Pope and asserted their absolute acceptance of his spiritual supremacy. Richelieu was content. Outside France "Duvallisme" would secure him Papal support in his efforts to

humble the House of Austria; within France "Duvallisme" would be the chief weapon with which to establish royal absolutism. That the church had put itself into a position that was theologically and philosophically untenable, and eventually would prove practically impossible to maintain, was of no consequence to the Cardinal; sufficient was it for him to be able to maintain until his death this successful evasion of the fundamental issue, and to unite in one system political Gallicanism and ecclesiastical Ultramontaniam.

Note:- The Declaration of Richer.

"Je, Edmond Richer, prêtre du diocèse de Langres, docteur de la sacrée Faculté de théologie de Paris, et grand-maître du collège du Cardinal-Lemoine, soussigné: Ayant considéré que quelques propositions du petit livre que j'ai écrit l'an 1611 de la Puissance ecclésiastique et politique ont été prises en mauvaise part, proteste et déclare que j'ai toujours voulu, et veux encore présentement me soumettre, avec le livre susdit, ses propositions, leur interprétation et toute ma doctrine au jugement de l'Eglise catholique et romaine, et du Saint-Siège apostolique, que je reconnais pour la mère et la maîtresse de toutes les églises, et pour le Juge infallible de la vérité. Je proteste que j'ai eu une très-grande douleur de voir que quelques-unes des propositions de ce petit livre aient été exprimées d'une manière qui a donné occasion de scandale, comme si j'eusse voulu diminuer ou ôter quelque chose à la juste et légitime puissance du souverain Pontife et de messieurs les prélats de l'Eglise, quoique ce n'ait jamais été mon intention. Je désapprouve fort et condamne ces propositions, en tant qu'elles sont contraires (comme elles sonnent, c'est-à-dire suivant l'expression des mots qui frappent extérieurement l'oreille) au jugement de l'Eglise catholique, apostolique et romaine. Je reconnais que je donne cette déclaration librement et volontairement, afin que tout le monde voie mon obéissance envers le Saint-Siège apostolique, et que j'ai cru devoir la consigner entre les mains de Mgr le cardinal de Richelieu, proviseur de Sorbonne, pour le respect et la déférence que j'ai pour lui. En foi de quoi j'ai conçu, écrit et signé de ma main la présente déclaration, l'an 1629, le vendredi 7 décembre, en présence de M. Charles Talon, curé de Saint-Gervais, à Paris, et du P. Joseph, capucin."

Signé RICHER, TALON et JOSEPH.

"Collectio" Vol.II. Part 2. p.302.

VI. Conclusion.

Edmond Richer did not long survive his official recantation of episcopalism and the errors of the "Libellus." The vigorous asceticism which he had practised from the days of the League combined with a selfless devotion to duty in which care of his own well-being had little place, had completely undermined a constitution never robust, and following upon a severe operation in 1629 Richer became steadily weaker until on November 29th, 1631, after a lingering fever, he died at the age of seventy-one, and was buried in the Chapel of the Sorbonne "sous cierges blancs, sans pompeuse appareil, et sans avoir le visage découvert, comme les autres ecclésiastiques de son temps, en quoi on se crut obligé de suivre ponctuellement les ordres qu'il en avait laissés par son testament."¹

The temper in which Richer spent the last two years of his life after his retractation form a good point of departure in an attempt to assess his significance. His actions during this period have caused doubt to be thrown upon the sincerity of that retractation. On December 24th he completed and put into the hands of publishers the "Edmundi Richerii Testamentum" which he had begun over fifteen years previously² and which was

1. Ad. Baillet p.406.

2. "Edmundi Richerii Testamentum" Paris 1630. Cologne 1683.

a justification in memoir form of his various enterprises. In finishing this work he made no attempt to modify the episcopatism contained in its pages and in the account of his momentous interview with Richelieu he confines himself to the statement that he found it imperative to obey the wishes of the all-powerful minister. Moreover, Richer took peculiar precautions to ensure the preservation of the numerous writings for which he was responsible after his death. In view of his continued episcopalist activity it is not surprising that Arnauld should assert that "les exactions forcées de signatures et de déclarations peuvent quelque chose sur la main et non sur le coeur."¹ Yet at the same time there is authoritative evidence to support the contention that Richer remained loyal to the spirit of his declaration. Some days after his death Duval had a statement drawn up by a notary in which a number of doctors of the Sorbonne who were present at his dying bedside certified that the Grand Master of Cardinal Lemoine died in perfect filial devotion to Rome protesting with his last breath that his retraction was both voluntary and sincere.² Granda, who was bursar of the College of Cardinal Lemoine in 1631, added a personal testimony in the Sorbonne some years later that Richer died in complete

1. "Oeuvres d'Arnauld" Vol.II. p.727.

2. This statement can be found in the "De Suprema Pontificis Potestate" of Duval, p.691.

communion with the Holy See.¹ Actually these pieces of evidence are not mutually exclusive and do not necessarily prove duplicity on the part of Richer; they merely show that Richer himself realized that the events of 1629 formed no permanent solution to the problems which he had set himself to solve in 1608. "Duvallisme" could not be regarded as the final treaty of peace between church and state; it was at best an armistice calculated to terminate hostilities in view of a far more comprehensive settlement. Accordingly Richer made his peace with Rome and found his satisfaction in the knowledge that by so doing he was helping to produce an atmosphere of tranquillity in which permanent agreement could be reached. At the same time he preserved his episcopal list writings and made provision for their publication after his death in the belief that when church and state came to the formulation of the terms of that treaty his doctrines would be found to be indispensable.

Herein lies the key to the significance of Edmond Richer - his continued insistence that the Reformation and the League had left behind them a fundamental problem of church and state which was as urgent of solution as it was insoluble in pre-Reformation terms. He saw the need of a comprehensive system which alone could reconcile the church with the growing

1. See Ad. Baillet p.404.

demands of the state; he alone realized the paramount necessity for ecclesiastical and political Gallicanism to spring from one inclusive theory, and although his proffered solution in the "Libellus" was rejected, no satisfactory alternative was found to take its place and later Gallican thinkers paid their unconscious tribute to the essential rightness of Richer's plea for comprehensiveness in their return to his doctrines. Bossuet accepted as much episcopatism as he dared and the Revolution went back to the "Libellus."

So the importance of Richer lies more in the problem that he raised than in the solution which he offered. We have already seen why the "Libellus" did not provide the real solution. On the negative side "Richérisme" was right in claiming that the state must not suffer for conscience sake and that in the interests of social peace ultramontaniam was indefensible; it was further right in asserting that within the nation state of 1594 the temporal authority of Rome had no real place. On the positive side, however, it proved unacceptable, as the foregoing examination has shown, in two essential factors. It involved a theory of sovereignty, taken over from the Roman jurists, which could only end in an irreducible "imperium in imperio", despite the elimination of an absolute Papacy and the organization of the church along national lines. Despite all the advantages which episcopatism possessed over ultramontaniam, an infallible aristocracy in spiritual matters

could never finally provide the justification for an absolute monarchy in the secular sphere. Secondly, it was the recourse to institutionalism to satisfy a social need and no formal method ever yields an adequate solution to a real problem. Episcopatism like the Oxford movement later confined itself to institutional tactics where the real demand was for objective strategy. The triumph of the nation state was the triumph of an organism which had justified its claim to satisfy a number of concrete human needs and to conserve the basic necessities of peace and order. The church was still in the main pledged to a far different end, the medieval aim of attaining "in this world knowledge of Thy truth and in the world to come life everlasting." No change, however drastic, in the structure of such a church could bring it objectively into line with the state and in the case of "Richérisme", the cry of "schism" that was raised in face of the "Libellus", was a half conscious realization not that Richer had gone too far but that he had not gone far enough.

If, however, the "Libellus" failed in its purpose, the alternatives to it in "Duperronisme" and "Duvallisme" completely failed even to approach the real problem and were nothing better than evasions of the question at issue. "Duperronisme", that is to say the position which the church took up through Cardinal Duperron at the States General of 1614 in face of the insurgent regalism of the third estate,

was nothing better than an attempted bribe. If the state would accept in principle the claims of the church to a primacy which entitled the Pope to interference in secular matters "in ordine ad spiritualia", if the parlementaires would regard the Gallican liberties as flowing from a benevolent spiritual supremacy, and if the lawyers would accept the Pope as the final protector of the King's Majesty, then the church could be relied upon to protect the interests of the state and in those interests would not enforce its rights. In short, if the regalists would omit all reference to "loy fondamentale" and Divine Right in their claims, and profess their orthodoxy, so that the church need take no official cognizance of their practices except as the outcome of papal concession, the church in its turn would unofficially encourage that which officially did not exist. "Duperronisme" is the logical outcome of the Council of Trent in its attempt to absorb within the canons of the church the political and governmental theories which emerged from the Reformation by the simple process of refusing to entertain them. The utter futility of "Duperronisme" to arrest the march of secular absolutism needs no better illustration than that of another Cardinal who within a decade of Duperron's speeches at the States General had obtained from the highest spiritual court in France a doctrinal justification of those very governmental theories which as an orthodox Catholic he ought

to have ignored.

Actually "Duvallisme" is in no better case theoretically, although Richelieu was able to secure for it a temporary success. It accentuates the errors of "Richérisme", while possessing none of its merits and strictly speaking begs the whole question. "Duvallisme" is an attempt to unite the ecclesiastical theory of the Middle Ages with the triumphant political ideas of the Reformation by a delimitation of territory. By making the primary assumption that the spiritual and the secular sphere can be and remain disparate it professes to combine political Gallicanism and spiritual Ultramontaniam in one system. This compromise, however, upon examination, is nothing more than an "entente" which can exist only so long as no vital problems arise; for in a civilized community there can be no absolute line of demarcation between the things which are spiritual and the things which are material. It is fundamentally impossible for an irresponsible secular authority operating nationally to come to terms with an infallible spiritual power operating internationally, especially when the former claims to protect the latter because the latter controls the ultimate destiny of both. There must arise a contingency in which the King with his absolute authority makes a pronouncement which involves a spiritual restriction, similarly there must come a time when a Pope with his infallible power issues a bull

implying a temporal restriction, when either or both of these cases arise "Duvallisme" has nothing to say. Lastly, neither party can remain consistently loyal to its bond; the King will continue to deal independently with heresy within his realm as Louis XIV did in 1685 and the Pope will retain his Vatican Guard; for Duvallisme makes no real attempt to answer the question which Richer had put, how to be both "bon francais" and "bon catholique".

In conclusion then the Revival of Gallicanism at the beginning of the seventeenth century is an illustration of the truth that the political liberty which emerges in the words of Figgis as the "residuary legatee of ecclesiastical animosities" creates a problem of sovereignty which the traditional concordats between church and state are powerless to solve. Richer saw the problem but failed to answer it; Duperron and Duval merely evaded it and the later history of Gallicanism is a commentary upon their failure. It would seem and has been argued at the beginning of this present chapter that any official association, therefore, between church and state is a forlorn effort to unite irreconcilables. The only possibility would appear to be a free church, and even then uneasiness will persist, for the state in its attempt to conserve what is, will of necessity still be open to the criticism and faced with the opposition of the church in its emphasis on what ought to be.

This failure and apparent "impasse", however, suggests a more fundamental enquiry in which would seem to lie the basis of a real solution. Secular omnipotence and spiritual infallibility both refer ultimately to the realm of ends. It is in the last resort the concept of purpose which dictates alike to the state and the church its governmental theories. It is simply because the professed aim of the state is essentially different from the professed aim of the church that partnership is impossible. To illustrate this from the period under survey - according to Richelieu, the pure Hegelian, the first duty of the church is to be, its second duty to be strong; hence all other forms of association must be subservient to it, its laws must be absolute and its head irresponsible. To Richer and Duval alike, the objective of the church is a "fin surnaturel", the preparation of souls for a future life, an objective of which it alone is the depository of knowledge and guidance; therefore it is the supreme community, its canons are irrevocable and its head infallible. This essential duality of purpose must preclude any satisfactory "modus vivendi" despite the most rigorous institutional modifications on either or both sides, for the respective governmental theories literally have nothing in common. The real solution therefore can only be based upon a unity of aim, for no institutional accommodations or delimitation of territory can satisfactorily compensate for the

lack of a common purpose. The Cartesian philosophy which emerged contemporaneously with the revival of Gallicanism offers a significant parallel to this problem of church and state. Descartes insisted upon the final duality of mind and matter, a dualism in which the realm of mind was governed by laws independent of and disparate from the laws which governed the realm of matter. He left behind him the insoluble problem of equating his theory with the observed unity of actual experience, until quite recently philosophers have come to regard both mind and matter as aspects of one all-embracing reality. The laws of church and state will and must remain irreconcilable until they, too, can be regarded as parts of one real objective seen from different aspects. When the state comes to be regarded as an organism, the purpose of which is to achieve the spiritual emancipation of man and to seek the ideal commonwealth, it will appreciate its reliance upon spiritual values and will forsake absolutism for experiment and co-operation. When the church realizes that its business is to seek the "Kingdom of Heaven", not in some future life but by the translation of its truths and spiritual dynamic into terms of everyday life, that the Kingdom may be built on earth, then it will see its social obligations and will forsake infallibility and adventure itself upon a progressive revelation of truth and guidance.

When, in fact, the Kingdom of Heaven and the ideal commonwealth become interchangeable terms, and there is nothing inherently impossible in the prospect, and both church and state pledge themselves to its establishment, they will form a partnership under the stimulus of which they may finally both disappear, as we know them at present, to give place to yet higher and more comprehensive social organizations.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

=====

A. SOURCES.

1. Richer (Edmond)

a. "Decreta sacrae Facultatis theologiae Parisiensis de potestate Ecclesiastica et primatu Romani pontificis .."

Paris 1611. This contains the censures of Sarrazin and Duplessis Mornay and the six articles against Luther. Condemned 3rd February, 1612, by Sorbonne.

b. "De Ecclesiastica et Politica potestate Libellus"

Paris 1611, Troyes 1612, Frankfurt 1613 & 1621. Richer's most important work and the creed of episcopatism. Condemned by Provincial Council of Sens 19th March, 1612, and Council of Aix 24th May, 1612, and by decree of congregation of the Index 10th May, 1613.

c. "Demonstratio libelli de Ecclesiastica & politica potestate" Paris 1622. The defence of the "Libellus" against the "Elenchus" of Duval.

d. "Edmundi Richerii Doctoris Theologi Parisiensis Defensio libelli de Ecclesiastica et politica potestate in quinque libros" Cologne 1701. A defence of episcopatism against Bellarmin and Duval.

A. SOURCES (Contd.)

e. "Edmundi Richerii doctoris Parisiensis, de Potestate Ecclesiae in rebus temporalibus." Cologne 1692.
Exposition of the regalism implied in the "Libellus".

f. "Edm. Richerius, Historia Academiae Parisiensis"
Bib. Nat. man. lat 9,945 to 9,948. Actually confined to a history of the Faculty of Theology.

g. "Histoire du Syndicat d'Edmond Richer" Avignon 1753. Chief source of information as to beginnings of episcopalist revival within Sorbonne.

(For minor works of Richer see "Notice Bibliographique", Ed. Puyol "Edmond Richer, Vol.II. p.419.)

h. "Vindiciae Doctrinae majorum Scholae Parisiensis"
Cologne 1683. Richer's attempt to show the episcopalist tradition of the Faculty of Theology.

2. Duval (An)

"Libelli de Ecclesiastica et politica Potestate Elenchus pro Suprema Romani Pontificis in Ecclesiam Autoritate"
Paris 1612. The representative orthodox answer to the "Libellus", exclusively concerned with the attack upon Papal authority contained in the "Libellus".

3. Pithou (P)

"Les Libertés de l'Eglise Gallicane" Paris 1594.

The first concise and authoritative declaration of regalism as a system.

4. Dupuy (M)

"Commentaire sur le traite des Libertés de l'Eglise Gallicane" Paris 1734. Contains exhaustive record of decrees and decisions relative to Gallicanism 1226-1700.

5. Richelieu.

a. "Memoires de Richelieu" Michand and Poujoulat.

b. "Testament Politique" Paris 1764.

Interesting but designed to exalt the author.

6. d'Argentre.

"Collectio judiciorum de novis erroribus..1521-1632"
Paris 1728. Invaluable collection of documents especially Vol.II.

7. Fra Paolo Sarpi.

"History of the Council of Trent" Venice 1629.

English translation N. Brent London 1640.

The best account of the Council although anti-Papalist.

8. Sforza - Pallavicino.

"Istoria del Conc. di Trento" Rome 1652.

Violently ultramontanist but valuable because author had access to Papal archives.

B. LIVES OF RICHER.

a. Baillet (Adrien)

"La Vie d'Edmond Richer" Liege 1714.

Interesting but uncritical treatment of Richer as a hero based mainly on the "Histoire du Syndicat."

b. Puyol (Edouard)

"Edmond Richer, Etude Historique et Critique sur la Renovation du Gallicanisme au commencement du XVII^e siecle" Paris 1876. The best authority on the life and work of Richer, exhaustive examination of sources, but marked ultramontanist bias.

C. AUTHORITIES.

1. Allen J.W. "Political Thought in the 16th Century" London 1928. An excellent survey from Seysell to Bodin.

2. Mariejol J.H. "Henri IV et Louis XIII" Vol.VI. Lavissee "Histoire de France" Paris 1905.

C. AUTHORITIES (Contd.)

3. Jourdain. "Histoire de l'Universite de Paris au XVII^e et XVIII^e siecles" Paris 1862.

4. Thurot. "De l'Organization et l'Enseignement dans l'Univ. de Paris au Moyen-age" Paris 1850.

5. Weill (Georges) "Les Theories sur le Pouvoir Royal en France pendant les Guerres de Religion" Paris 1891.
Best account of political ideas 1562-1594.

6. Perrens. "l'Eglise et l'Etat en France sous le Regne de Henri IV" Paris 1873. Particularly Chap.V. on the "Franco Gallia" & "Vindiciae contre tyrannos" & Chap.XII on Ultramontanism.

7. Sée (Henri) "Les idées Politiques en France au XVII^e siecle" Paris 1923. Particularly valuable for Chap.1, 2 & 3 on the evolution of the absolutist doctrines.

8. Geley. "Fancan et la politique de Richelieu de 1617 a 1627." Paris 1884.

9. Hanotaux (G)

a. "Essai sur les Libertes de l'Eglise Gallicane" Paris 1888.

b. "Etudes Historiques sur le XVI^e et XVII^e siecle en France" Paris 1886. Chaps. 6-9.

c. "La France en 1614" Paris 1913, especially Chap.4.

10. Labitte. "De la Democratie chez les Predicateurs de la Ligue" Paris 1841.

For further reference see bibliographies at beginning of Chapters in Mariejol "Henri IV et Louis XIII".

11. Marten. "l'Episcopat Francais et le Gallicanisme" Paris 1929.

ABSTRACT OF THESIS

=====

EDMOND RICHER AND THE REVIVAL OF GALLICANISM

1600 - 1630.

The accompanying thesis is an investigation, the first in English, of the significance of the revival of Gallicanism at the beginning of the seventeenth century in France and the part which Edmond Richer played in that revival. The investigation is introduced by a brief survey of the ecclesiastical and political theories current in France by 1594, and a short account of the rise of Richer to prominence in the Faculty of Theology at Paris. This is followed by an examination of the revival of episcopatism which Richer fostered in the Faculty and which culminated in his "Libellus," and of its rejection by the church. The revival of regalism is then studied in its relation to the Parlementaires and Richer and as expressed at the States General of 1614, and finally the whole movement is related to the emergence of the secular absolutism of France in the seventeenth century, and Gallicanism is examined as an aspect of the fundamental problem of church and state.
