

THE
PRINCETON REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1862.

No. I.

ART. I.—*The Limits of Religious Thought*, examined in eight Lectures, delivered before the University of Oxford, in the year 1858, on the Bampton Foundation. By HENRY LONGUEVILLE MANSEL, B. D., &c. Boston: Gould & Lincoln, 1859.

THIS book assumes that Christianity is related to philosophy. We therefore propose to consider Christianity from a speculative point of view; and, in the course of the discussion, to show the import of Mr. Mansel's argument, and to determine its value in Christian evidences.

Philosophy culminates in theology. God is the ultimate problem to which all the lines of philosophical investigation conduct. It is, therefore, proper for philosophy to inquire, whether, from a speculative point of view, Christianity is entitled to the high pretension which it assumes, of being a revelation from God of transcendental truths pertaining to the respective characters of God and man, and from these characters explaining the government of the one, and disclosing the duties of the other.

It is obvious that if philosophy must, from the principles and the laws of human reason, pronounce, there is no God; or if it

ART. II.—*Mémoires sur la Vie de Messire Philippe de Mornay, Seigneur Duplessis, &c., par CHARLOTTE ARBALESTRE, sa femme.* Treutzel, Paris, 1824.

THE history of the Reformed Church of France is like an epic, for we may say of it that it had a beginning, a middle, and an end. From her origin during the reign of Francis I., until Henry IV. gained the throne, in common with her Dutch sister, she was a "church under the cross." From the publication to the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, though she enjoyed only a sort of surly recognition by the state, as a "pretended reformed" church, her condition was comparatively peaceful and prosperous. From the Revocation to the Revolution, she aptly styled herself "the church in the desert." To all appearance she had ceased to exist in France, for nearly a century; her ministry and membership seemed to have been utterly exterminated, or, as her persecutors called it, "converted to the catholic faith." During the first two of the above-mentioned periods, she could show a roll of worthies not inferior to that of any other church in Christendom, presenting a splendid array of theologians, pulpit orators, scholars, authors, civilians noble in rank and station, but nobler still for their heroic deeds.

In the long list of historic names that adorn the annals of the French Reformed Church, not one is more truly illustrious than that of Philip de Mornay. Above all his contemporaries, he was a many-sided man, and yet every side of him exhibited rare excellence. He was a statesman, a diplomat, a general, a theologian, a scholar, an author, an humble Christian, a fearless confessor of the faith. In the camp, the cabinet, and the court, he was tempted to abandon the cause of truth, but from early manhood to his dying day, he stood firm as a rock, unmoved by the flatteries and the frowns of a monarch to whose service he had devoted his life and fortune—a monarch to whom he had been bound by common struggles, common sufferings, and a personal friendship of unusual intimacy, but who,

in an evil hour, meanly consented to assume the cloak of hypocrisy in order to win a crown.

The Romish party used to call De Mornay "*le Pape des Huguenots.*" As he never evinced and was never accused of a disposition to play the pope, in the sense of lording it over his co-religionists, this soubriquet of his enemies is a striking proof of the high position he held in the Reformed church, of his commanding influence, and of the large share he took in the movements of his times. Voltaire, whose judgment certainly could not have been biassed by religious prejudices, pronounced him, "*le plus vertueux, et le plus grand homme*" of the Protestant party.

"Jamais l'air de la cour, et son souffle infecté,
N'altéra de son cœur l'austère pureté."

Another eminent writer of later times declares that Philip de Mornay is beyond dispute, "*un des beaux caractères de l'histoire moderne; appelé à jouer un des premiers rôles, à l'une des époques les plus mémorables de l'histoire de France, il allia un zèle ardent à une grande modération, et sut à la fois gagner l'amour des Protestants et l'estime de ses ennemis.*" This is high praise, yet we think that every candid reader of his life will agree that it is not more lofty than just.

About twenty years after the death of De Mornay, five stately tomes were published by the Elzevirs of Leyden, bearing the title of *Memoires de Philippe de Mornay*.* The first volume contains a full narrative of the life and times of De Mornay, a part of which was written by his intimate friend Jean Laille, pastor at Charenton, and one of the greatest preachers of that age. In the remainder of the series, we have the correspondence, public and private, of De Mornay, besides numerous state papers from his pen, and we need hardly add, that they open to the historian a rich mine of information in regard to the most important transactions in church and state during the reigns of Henry III., Henry IV., and Louis XIII. Yet these plethoric tomes include only a portion of the material furnished by De Mornay's busy pen, to illustrate the stirring

* One of the volumes seems to have been printed in France, and two of them in Amsterdam, but the series is uniform in size.

times in which he lived. All the letters, and parts of letters, by which contemporary personages might have been compromised, were suppressed, viz. those to and from the Dukes de Rohan, and de la Tremouille, President Jeannin, Henry IV., Marie de Medici, Louis XIII., and many others high in rank or office. Two centuries after his death, an enterprising publisher of Paris (Treutzel) proposed to issue a complete collection of the letters of De Mornay, together with his commentary on the history of De Thou, written in an interleaved copy of that work. The plan embraced sixteen volumes, only twelve of which were published, extending to 1614, but though incomplete, they form an invaluable complement to the more widely known Memoirs of Sully. The first volume of this last series (1824) contains a Memoir of the life of Duplessis Mornay, written by his wife, Charlotte Arbalestre, "pour l'instruction de son fils," which for two centuries had slept in the dusty archives of the family in the old chateau de la Foret-sur-Sèvre. It is an exquisite piece of biography, and a noble monument of Madame de Mornay's intelligence and culture as a Christian woman, and of her affection as a Christian wife and mother. We wish we had room for some extracts from the admirable letter prefixed to it, in which she utters her maternal hopes and wishes to "mon fils."

Philippe de Mornay, baron de la Foret, seigneur Duplessis-Marly, conseiller du Roi, capitaine de cinquante hommes d'armes, gouverneur de Saumur, (such were his hereditary titles and offices,) was descended from one of the oldest noble houses of Normandy, and was born at la Foret-sur-Sèvre, 5th November, 1549. His father was a zealous Romanist, and two of his paternal uncles had good reason to adhere to mother church, as both of them were among her high dignitaries, one being Bishop of Nantes, the other, Abbé of Beauvais, besides having other rich benefices, all of which he intended his nephew ultimately to enjoy. Like so many other great and good men, De Mornay was, under God, indebted to his noble and pious mother for the training which enabled him to render his name illustrious. Though she did not openly identify herself with the Reformed party while her husband lived, she had long had a warm love for the pure gospel, and

at the risk of domestic strife, she early sought to instil the same feelings in the heart of her boy. M. de Mornay dying when Philip was about ten years old, his pious mother was left free to form her own church relations, and to carry out her own plan for the education of her son, with an openness and energy which in other circumstances she could not have ventured to employ. The good seed was planted in a genial soil. In his fifteenth year, De Mornay became a diligent student of the New Testament; he turned his back upon the seductive and splendid career open to him "in the church;" and he seems then to have heartily accepted the faith, to the defense and diffusion of which, all his powers were given with an unfaltering devotion, from dawning manhood to his dying day.

Those were troublous times in France, when nothing seemed easier than to kindle the flames of civil war. For many a century, to fight under some one's banner, had been, we might almost say, the normal life of most of those in whose veins flowed knightly and noble blood. No wonder, therefore, that the young De Mornay, when about eighteen, sought and received his mother's reluctant consent to his joining an older brother in the camp. But the Lord had other designs in regard to him. Kept at home for many months by a severe accident, he occupied the time in the cultivation of those literary tastes which were not less strong than his desire to take part in the stirring scenes of the camp and the campaign. The war was ended before he recovered his health, he therefore went abroad to complete his education by travel, in the course of which he visited Switzerland, Germany, and Italy, not as a mere sight-seer, but as an earnest student. At Geneva, Frankfort, Venice, and other cities, he stayed long enough to form many intimate friendships, to prosecute various branches of science, and to make himself master of the German and Italian languages.

De Mornay returned from Italy in September 1571, and spent the ensuing winter at Cologne, where he became involved in a theological debate with a learned Spaniard, which occasioned his publishing a small treatise in defence of the Protestant theory of the visible church. It was a hasty production, but it served as the basis of his *Traité de l'Eglise*, which

appeared six years afterwards, and was quickly translated into Latin, English, German, and Italian. At this very time the patriots and reformers of the Netherlands were in the midst of their tremendous struggle with Spain; the butcher Alva was at his bloody work, and the young De Mornay, during his residence at Cologne, was so near the battle ground, as to be almost if not actually a spectator of its dismal yet heroic scenes. His deepest sympathies were enlisted in behalf of the United Provinces, and their glorious leader, William of Orange, fighting as they were against fearful odds for the gospel and for freedom. He visited Flanders, and stayed there long enough to comprehend the merits of the Revolt of the Netherlands, and to see with his own eyes the horrible fruits of the ruthless bigotry of Rome. On his return to France, he drew up a Memoir on the state of the Netherlands, so admirable for its statement of facts, its cogent and eloquent reasonings, and its sagacious suggestions, that it excited the wonder of the venerable Coligny, elicited the warmest praise from Scaliger, and was deemed by De Thou worthy of being incorporated with his history of his own times. Yet its author was then only in his twenty-third year. His object was to induce the Hugonot princes to coöperate with William of Orange, but his plans were suddenly frustrated by the matchless perfidy of St. Bartholomew—that blackest day in the annals of France. De Mornay and his mother were in Paris when this “horrible tempest” burst upon the kingdom, and with great difficulty they reached the sheltering walls of his paternal castle of Buhy.

The Reformed Church never fully recovered from this blow, and while the escaped remnant of her membership was yet stunned by it, there would have been no cause for wonder if they had concluded that their contest with Rome was utterly hopeless. After a carnage which stupefied all Europe, (Rome excepted,) one would have supposed that all who had a spark of humanity would have made ready to fly from France as from a land given up to demons. In the words of an old chronicler, “la face de la France estoit horrible;” that of Flanders was nearly as bad; and in these circumstances, it is not surprising that De Mornay and his fellow Hugonots

resolved to remove to some distant region, where they would be safe from the crushing tyranny of Rome. Sweden, Ireland, and America, were each thought of, but as the violence of the storm abated, the scheme was dropped, and De Mornay, who had meanwhile gone to England to engage the good offices of Elizabeth for the "churches under the cross," at the urgent entreaties of his mother and other friends, returned to the land of his birth, to become one of the chief actors in the after scenes of that troubled period.

In January 1576, he was married to Charlotte Arbalestre, the youthful widow of M. de Fauquière. Like De Mornay, she was a zealous Protestant, and had also been in imminent peril at Paris during the Bartholomew massacre. For more than thirty years they were spared to each other, and her *Memoirs*, which unhappily she did not live to finish, abundantly prove that she was a wife every way worthy of such a husband. She was indeed one of the most illustrious "ladies of the Reformation." She died in 1606, after a long and painful illness, aggravated by the sad and sudden tidings of the loss of her only son, a young man of high promise, for whose instruction she had written her *Memoirs* of her husband's life. Sympathizing warmly with the heroic Hollanders in their struggle for freedom, he had joined the army of Maurice of Orange, and fell in the assault on Guildres, in his 26th year. De Mornay, who survived his wife nearly twenty years, never ceased to mourn her removal as the heaviest of earthly afflictions. When on her deathbed, with a rare unselfishness, she made him promise that he would not suffer his grief for her to interfere with his public duties. It was a promise easier to give than to keep. He soothed the sorrows of his heart by composing some sonnets to her memory, which display poetical abilities of a high order.

The marriage of De Mornay was almost exactly coincident in date with the formation of that memorable League, which involved France in a series of wars, (known in history as the Wars of the League,) that brought the kingdom to the verge of perdition, and which, with a few intervals, lasted from 1576 till 1596. The Romish priesthood and the Guises were the parties to it. The former, whose ferocious bigotry had been quickened

by the Bartholomew massacre, hoped to crush "heresy" utterly, and insisted that there could be only one religion in France consistently with the safety of the state. Accordingly the supremacy of the Catholic church was the ostensible object of the League; but the Guises, who were the prime movers in it, had another object, about which they were far more concerned; their ambitious eyes were fixed upon the crown. We may explain, in a few sentences, how they came to indulge in these lofty aspirations. No royal house in Europe had a fairer prospect of continuance in an unbroken line than had that of Valois at the death of Henry II. in 1559. He left four sons by his queen, Catherine de Medici—so long the real monarch of France. Two of these sons, viz. Francis II. and the infamous Charles IX., had in succession occupied the throne, but both of them had died young, and without lawful issue. Henry III. (the third son) had so little hope of wearing the crown of France that he accepted gladly the elective one of Poland, and when he left it, probably he never dreamed of again seeing his native land. On the death of Charles IX. he became king of France, and instantly returned thither to enjoy his good fortune; but he too was childless, and his only surviving brother, the duc d'Alençon, was unmarried, so that the early extinction of the house of Valois had become an almost certain event. In that case, the legal heir to the throne was Henry de Bourbon, the young king of Navarre, the political head and hope of the Hugonots. Catherine, failing her own issue, was quietly plotting to transfer the crown to her relatives of the house of Lorraine. The Guises, a younger branch of the same family, wanted it for themselves. The tender consciences of both were quite scandalized by the thought of its being worn by the heretic Henry of Navarre.

Such were the contingencies in view of which "the Holy League" was formed. Henry III., who had excited the contempt of Europe by the manner of his quitting Poland, was the most notorious and consummate Sybarite of that age. As Michelet says, "*Il y laissa le peu qu'il avait de viril; ce qu'il rapporta en France ne valait guère qu'on en parlât.*" It is absurd to suppose that such a creature could care who or what came after him. Like his brothers, he was the mere tool of his

mother; but by a sudden flash of sagacity, or a freak of fancy, he now proposed, to the intense disgust of Catherine and the Guises, to put himself at the head of the League. For a short time he acted in that capacity; but before two years had passed he discovered that the Guises had as little love for Henry de Valois as for Henry of Navarre, and that both they and the Romish priests were as ready—should the emergency arise demanding it—to thrust the one from the throne as to exclude the other. He therefore deemed it necessary to propitiate the Hugonots, which he did by the edict of Poitiers in 1578.

Such was the state of parties in France at the moment when De Mornay, with the dew of his youth fresh upon him, began his public career, in one of the most eventful periods in modern history. How thoroughly he comprehended the condition of France, the causes and the cure of the horrible disorders under which she groaned, is shown by a public paper, written by him in 1576. It is entitled "*Remonstrance aux Estats de Blois pour la Paix, sous la personne d'un Catholique Romain,*" and in every point of view is a most masterly production; one so replete with political wisdom, so eloquent in expression, in a word, bearing so many marks of statesmanship and philosophy, that, if it had been written in English, it would have taken rank among the loftiest political classics of our language. Yet its author was a young man of twenty-five. He shows, in the first place, how essential peace was to all interests and all classes, from the king to the peasant—that "amid the clang of arms and the braying of trumpets the voice of good laws cannot be heard"—"that the poor labourer loses more in one day through the excesses of a rude soldiery, than he would pay in taxes and imposts during a whole year." We wish that our space allowed us to quote other passages in which he depicts the miseries of civil war, as they are so perfectly applicable to the circumstances of our own unhappy land.

He next proceeds to discuss the question, whether uniformity in religion was essential to the peace and prosperity of the kingdom. "Two religions—say many—cannot be allowed in France." "I wish, with all my heart, that there was but one religion, but since mere wishing will do nothing to the purpose, *il faut vouloir ce qu'on peut, si on ne peut tout ce qu'on veut.*"

He then proceeds to demonstrate the falseness and the folly of this notion by an appeal to historic facts, and by a train of reasoning founded on the nature of religion, and the necessary results of intolerance, which is very remarkable, considering the author's years, and the age in which he lived. He writes, be it remembered, in the name of a Catholic, and his argument is directed to two classes, viz. to those who hold the above position in regard to "two religions"—*pour la conscience*, and to those who hold it *pour l'état*; in other words, to those who were actuated by a false zeal, and to those who were governed by a false prudence. "As for the first of these classes, I entreat them to distrust those passions and illusions by which they are induced to see things not as they are in truth. We have been accustomed to regard these people (heretics) as monsters, to hang them as if they were wild beasts. But they are men with the same nature and condition as our own. We have refused all fellowship with them. But they are Christians, who worship the same God that we do, trust in the same Christ, believe in the same Bible, children of the same Father, and heirs of the same inheritance. We have tried to persuade ourselves that they are not true Frenchman; but their language, their purposes, their love of country, their hatred of those enemies who have sought to invade and ruin it, and their notable services for the kingdom, abundantly demonstrate what sort of Frenchman they are. The sole difference between them and us is on this one point, viz. the many abuses which we, as well as they, confess to exist in our church. They, hopeless of reformation, have withdrawn from it, while we expecting a better state of things, with a good conscience abide in her communion. Both are seeking our salvation, both fear to offend God, both cleave to the same Christ. Suppose we are taking different roads, must we cut each others' throats? If a man is in error, enlighten him, but do not burn him; if he is infected, wash him, but do not drown him. Would you prefer that these people should become atheists rather than remain as they are? By intolerant laws you may make men atheists; but by so doing you bring them into a condition worse for *themselves*, since they then believe nothing; worse for *us*, since they fear nothing; worse for the *state*, since

those who have no God, can have no reverence for earthly rulers. I tell you, that you may make them hypocrites, but you cannot make them Catholics; you may convert them into infidels, but you cannot command their faith; and if you oblige them to be false to their God, you have destroyed their conscience, and have prepared them to act deceitfully in the whole business of life." We wish that the limits of our article would allow us to quote other parts of this eloquent argument for religious toleration.

It was at this juncture, in 1576, that De Mornay visited Henry of Navarre, on the earnest invitation of the latter. The acquaintance then formed, quickly ripened into a friendship singularly intimate and tender, and which continued unbroken, until Henry took that step, so fatal to his own fame, to his family, and to France, of disowning Protestantism, and hypocritically pretending to have been converted to Romanism.

Henry had special need of just such a friend as De Mornay, for at no period in his career was the prospect of his wearing the crown of France more gloomy than now. By his cowardly profession of Romanism, at the bidding of Charles IX., during the massacre of Bartholomew, he had shaken the confidence of the Hugonots in his honesty, and without their united and hearty support, his cause was hopeless. By the same act he had awakened the suspicions, and chilled the sympathies of the Protestant princes. Young as De Mornay was, few men were so capable as he of repairing the mischief produced by his apostasy, at home and abroad. The firmness of *his* religious principles had been tested amid the bloody horrors of St. Bartholomew. He was of noble birth; he held the pen of a ready writer, and he could handle the sword like an accomplished soldier; in a word, he was equally at home in the cabinet and the camp. Catherine, Henry III., and the Duc d'Alençon, had already employed him in delicate and important missions, and he was known and honoured by many of the most distinguished personages in England, Belgium, Switzerland, and Germany, for his writings and his personal virtues. He threw himself into the cause of Henry of Navarre, with a devotion so ardent and true, so unswerving and unselfish, that he richly earned the place in Henry's heart, which for many

a year he unquestionably held. To Philip De Mornay, more than to any other man—not excepting Sully—was Henry of Navarre indebted for the throne on which he sat as Henry IV. of France. But this first Bourbon paid his immense debt to De Mornay, just as the Bourbon family paid theirs to the party which won for them the crown of St. Louis—by shameless ingratitude and treachery.

As Henry was the first Bourbon who occupied the throne of France, a brief notice of the Bourbon family will not be out of place—a family, by the way, which succeeded in winning and wearing the crowns of France, Spain, and Naples—the first and last named of which they have lost for ever.

The Bourbons were descended from Robert Count de Clermont, the sixth and youngest son of St. Louis. By his marriage with Beatrice, heiress of John of Burgundy, and Agnes Lady of Bourbon, he acquired possessions which made him one of the most powerful feudatories of the kingdom. His eldest son Louis took the title of Duke of Bourbon, the name by which the family was subsequently known in the annals of France. In 1503 the two families of Bourbon and Montpensier were united in the person of Charles de Montpensier, whose son, the celebrated, or we should rather say, the notorious, Constable Bourbon, in an age crowded with great events—the disruption of the Papal power by Luther, and the efforts of Charles V. for universal empire—made himself heard and felt amidst the din and tumult of the world. The military talents of the Constable were of a high order, and they were devoted to the service of France until a real or imaginary insult led him to transfer them to Charles V., whom he helped to win the famous battle of Pavia, when Francis I. was taken prisoner. At the death of the “Great Constable,” Charles Duke de Vendome became by marriage the head of the Bourbon family. His eldest son, Antony de Bourbon, married Jane, the daughter and heiress of Henry d’Albret, King of Navarre, a Hugonot, and a Calvinist; and their eldest son, Henry of Navarre, who was educated by his pious mother in the Reformed faith, ultimately became Henry IV. of France.

There are some striking points of resemblance between the history of the Bourbons and that of the Stuarts of Britain.

Both were indebted to Protestantism for their crowns; both were guilty of the basest treachery to the parties which had stood by them with unflinching loyalty in the dark and gloomy day; both came to a miserable end. When Mary Stuart was thrust from the throne she had disgraced, by crimes which had rendered her unworthy of respect as a woman or a queen, her son, James VI., then an infant in his cradle, might have been, and doubtless would have been, quickly disposed of, but for the steady loyalty of the Presbyterians of Scotland. True, his title was unquestioned, but if the Presbyterians had been indifferent, if they had not been as steadfast in their loyalty as they were in their religion, the Stuart might have been forced to give place to a Douglass or a Campbell. How those fared, who had kept ward and watch over the cradle of the infant monarch, when the infant had become a man, it is not necessary for us to tell. The title of the Bourbons to the crown of France was as clear and unquestionable as was that of the Stuarts to the crown of Scotland, yet their claims were resisted by a faction vast in numbers and resources, capable of mustering great armies, encouraged by the blessing of the Pope and the active sympathy of Spain, and if the Presbyterian Hugonots had not thrown themselves into the contest, as they did, with the most perfect union and unflinching devotion to the cause of the young heir of the house, a Lorraine or a Guise might have wielded the sceptre and shaped the destinies of France. Certainly the only throne which a Bourbon in that case could ever have occupied, was that of the insignificant kingdom of Navarre. Henry, who owed so much to the Hugonots, did not, indeed, openly persecute them; he published an edict securing their religious liberties; but even during his own reign, its provisions were coldly observed, or practically annulled. On the eve of victory, after years of struggles and sufferings, he meanly became an apostate and a hypocrite to subserve his own selfish interests, leaving his faithful and heroic Hugonots to bear, as best they could, the brunt of Romish bigotry and partisan hatred, intensified by the bloody contests in which they had engaged for him. Both the Bourbon and the Stuart reaped what they sowed. They ruthlessly drove into exile the choicest spirits of France and Britain, men of whom their

kingdoms were not worthy, and in due time they were themselves forced to go forth crownless and homeless vagabonds, to wander over Europe. During successive generations, the Bourbons sowed with no stinted hand the seeds of revolution and anarchy, treachery, misery, blood, and at last they reaped a terrible harvest. As they had done to others, precisely so was it done to them. We are accustomed to call the darkest period of the French Revolution, from 1790 to 1795, "the Reign of Terror." Those four or five years were, to be sure, very dreadful, but not a whit more so than the long, long years from 1690 to 1780, not to mention Bartholomew of 1572, which exceeded far the most terrible days during "the Reign of Terror." If any one doubts the statement, let him read the story of the Dragonades, let him peruse Michelet's *Louis XIV.*

To return to De Mornay. We have stated that if there was one man to whose exertions more than to any other, Henry IV. was indebted for his elevation to the throne, that man was Philip de Mornay. Soon after their first interview, De Mornay went to England as the agent of Henry, and resided there in that capacity for two or three years. As his principal business at the English court was to disabuse Elizabeth of those prejudices against Henry, which his own conduct had excited—and a more suitable agent could not have been chosen than De Mornay, for whom the queen and her leading statesmen had a warm personal regard—he necessarily had a good deal of time upon his hands. He improved his leisure by a careful study of the Greek and Latin Fathers, with a view to the preparation of his work on the church, the composition of which occupied him six weeks. This, however, was only the first draught, which he submitted to the critical examination of the French pastors in London, and such other exiled ministers of the Reformed Church as he could get access to. It was published in 1578, was speedily translated into various languages, and from the numerous attempts to refute its facts and reasonings, we may infer that the Romish theologians regarded the book as one fitted to do their cause serious damage. One of those who undertook to prepare a reply, was the Baron de Meneville, a cousin of the author. The Romish clergy detailed to his assistance a Sorbonne doctor, named Corneille. The choice

of a helper was not fortunate, for instead of confuting he was converted by a perusal of the treatise, and soon after removing to Geneva he became a member of the Reformed church.

Within the limits of a single article, it is impossible to give in minute detail and historic order an account of all the missions upon which he was sent by the prince whom, if he served as a master, he loved as a friend. They extended to England, Scotland, Netherlands, Switzerland, and Germany, and he discharged them with prompt and untiring devotion, though they exposed him to very great perils on the sea and on the land, in the city and the country. Twice, the vessel in which he sailed was captured; and more than once he was brought to death's door by a disease contracted in Antwerp at a time when the plague was raging there. Meanwhile his facile and eloquent pen was incessantly employed in the same cause. From their first acquaintance, Henry seems to have been sensible of De Mornay's rare abilities as an author, and before they parted, in 1576, he called them into requisition, to prepare a public manifesto, expository of the purposes, plans, and hopes of the Bearnois, for the information of France and other nations. At a later period, when Henry III., fully alive to the ambition of the Guises and the treachery of the priesthood, sought to combine his interests and forces with those of the King of Navarre, the task of persuading the Hugonot public to accede to the union with a monarch whom they had so much reason to abhor, was devolved upon De Mornay. In his hands the Hugonots well knew that their religious principles and civil interests were safe. Nor was his influence as a writer confined to his own sect. His unanswerable demonstration of the title of Henry of Navarre to the throne of France, and of the emptiness of the claims of the Guises, his Remonstrance to the Three Estates of France concerning the War of the League, and other pamphlets on the same subject, were circulated over the kingdom, they opened the eyes of the loyal Catholics to the real designs of the League, and prompted them to gather around the joint banner of the two Henrys. Of these political pamphlets, M. Lacroix says: "l'éloquence y nait de la noblesse des sentiments; aujourd'hui même où de grands écrivains ont épuré, embelli la langue française, aucun manifeste ne peut offrir des expres-

sions plus vives, plus énergiques." These, however, formed only an insignificant portion of the products of his pen. His public correspondence, *i. e.*, his letters to or for Henry, fill fifteen volumes.

When released from the duties of the cabinet, he was the "fidus Achates" of Henry in the camp, and though in this sphere his services were in a measure overshadowed by those of Sully, yet they were often invaluable. To the foresight and energy of De Mornay, much more than to his own valour, did Henry owe his signal victory at the memorable battle of Contras, 20th October, 1587. On the eve of that battle both the King of Navarre and his military council had resolved not to move in advance of the Duke de Joyeuse, who was at the head of a superior force of the enemy, on the ground that the day was too far gone. De Mornay alone was of opinion that the army should at once cross the river before Contras, and thus secure an advantageous position. He urged this movement so earnestly that Henry, who was an inveterate lover of pleasure, and had intended to spend the night with some of his courtesans, at last lost his temper. "Where, in that case, shall the army lodge?" asked the king, with a good deal of tartness. "Au piquet, en présence de l'ennemi, il n'est pas de meilleure place," replied the undaunted De Mornay. Astonished at this firmness, and perhaps ashamed of his own folly, Henry abandoned the gay party, and at once put his army in motion. If he had not done so, he would almost certainly, the next morning, have suffered a disastrous defeat.

On the 1st of August, 1589, Henry III. fell by the dagger of a priestly assassin, hired and trained for his bloody work by the agents of the League. Bad as he was, both as man and monarch, his death was a heavy blow to Henry of Navarre, and to the Hugonots of whom he was the recognised leader and protector. Though Henry III. lived long enough to declare Henry IV. his rightful successor, yet there was reason to fear that the loyal Romanists who had hitherto followed his standard, would now assume a position of armed neutrality, or would join the army of the League. The dying king strongly advised his successor to "become reconciled to the church," and thus terminate the war for the crown. But Henry was not

yet ready for such an act of baseness, nor, as the event proved, was his army, though composed of Romanists and Reformed, materially weakened in consequence of his firmness. He was now, *de lege*, Henry IV. of France and Navarre, but he was the monarch of a divided kingdom; a mighty League was in arms against him, insisting that his rights as a prince had been forfeited by his apostacy from the faith; while the capital of his dominions, rebellious Paris, refused to admit him within its gates unless he became an obedient son of the church. It was a juncture of affairs well fitted to call forth all those qualities which make the hero and the statesman. "Sire," said De Mornay to Henry, a short time before, "the eyes of France are upon you. God is preparing for you and for us great things." For a while Henry seemed equal to the emergency. To the Archbishop of Rouen, who had begged him to become a Romanist, he wrote: "You tell me that if I would make the nobility and the people my friends, I must change my religion. I am sure, my cousin, that the good people of all ranks would have occasion to believe that I was utterly devoid of all religion, if they saw me pass from one to another merely for worldly considerations. *Tell those people, from me, that religion is not a thing to be put on and off as a man would a shirt.*" In a letter to Walsingham, just before the death of Henry III., De Mornay describes the king of Navarre as "un prince beau, agreable, adroit et douè de toutes parties requises pour attirer le cœur de la noblesse; en sa personne chacun remarque une vigueur de corps, une vivacité d'esprit, une grandeur de courage presque incomparable. *C'est la matière dont se sont créés les plus grands princes.*"

The eyes of all France might well be fixed upon a man endowed with such princely qualities, and she had good reason to believe that, with such a monarch firmly seated on the throne, she would enter upon a new career of glory; that art, letters, commerce, religion, all her material and moral interests would flourish as they had never done before. True, there were difficulties to be overcome that might well appal a common man. But Henry was not a common man; Sully, De Mornay, Conde, his companions in arms, were not common men. He must cut his way with his sword to his capital and

his throne; he must crush the spirit of faction, and with a strong hand curb that ferocious bigotry against which the blood of so many thousands of martyred saints, and the sufferings of so many homeless exiles, cried for vengeance; he must compel Papist and Protestant, priest and preacher, to keep the peace, by securing to each the rights of conscience, and subjecting both to the rule and the penalties of just and equal laws. As De Mornay had demonstrated, factions and fanaticism were consuming the very vitals of France. Her grand necessity was religious liberty; and Henry was in a position to secure for her this priceless boon. He had an army ready to follow his white plume to any battle-field—an army whose valour was the product of that sort of piety which creates martyrs and confessors—an army not so numerous as that of the League, but composed of veterans resembling the Ironsides of Cromwell—soldiers whose backs no enemy had ever seen.

For five years after his accession to the crown, Henry struggled manfully with his foes. He fought many battles and gained as many victories. Slowly, indeed, but surely, he was advancing towards the goal. But at last he shows signs of weariness and weakness. He has vowed, with God's help, to redeem France from the bondage under which she has groaned for centuries; the work is half accomplished, but years of toil and self-denial may be required to complete it. If he will simply consent to assume the cloak of the hypocrite, and turn apostate, he can instantly exchange the hardships of the camp for the magnificence of the palace. Paris will open her gates; he can disband his army, as the League will be broken up. Accordingly there was an armistice between the Royalists and the League, and a talk of peace, based upon "the conversion" of the king. De Mornay, though he could not believe that Henry would take a step so dishonourable to himself, and so disastrous to France, used every effort to keep him right. "Never doubt,"—he wrote to the king—"that you will find men enough, full of courage, and resolved to seek the welfare of the kingdom—men, who under your leading will cause the Pope to see, *that it is as easy for us to make a Pope in France as it is for him to make a king.*" We have not space to describe the successive steps in Henry's so-called "conversion."

He tried to persuade himself and others that it was a political necessity, but it was a wretched farce from beginning to end. The trouble was, that while Henry undoubtedly had in himself the "stuff out of which great princes are made," his nobler qualities were vitiated by an intense sensuality,—a sensuality which, notwithstanding his kindly and generous temper, made him a thoroughly selfish man. Under the training of a pious mother, he became a Protestant in conviction and profession; but it is evident that his heart had never been touched by religion. He was a "lover of pleasure more than a lover of God." His licentiousness was notorious, and almost boundless; his amours, as the letters of De Mornay show us, were the standing scandal of the Hugonots, and some of them were attended by circumstances that were præeminently shameful. This was the "dead fly" in the otherwise goodly "pot of ointment." It was an overmastering vice, and not a state necessity, which caused his "conversion." He is styled by a certain class of historians, *Henri Le Grand*, but on what ground is this title affixed to his name? Compared with the worthless creatures who had preceded him, or with those who succeeded him on the throne, we may, indeed, style him great. He had, in an eminent degree, the qualities which win men's hearts, but Charles II. of England was as largely endowed with the same genial generosity, the same good humour and ready wit. Henry had, and to a certain extent he unquestionably exhibited, commanding abilities, which rightly used would have made him the instrument of enduring good to his country and to Europe. But in what respects was France the better for his having reigned? He left her as he found her, the miserable victim of feudalism, faction, and fanaticism. How small does "Henri Le Grand" appear by the side of his contemporary, Elizabeth of England, and much more when we compare him with the Washington of the Netherlands,—that William of Orange, who, having wrested seven provinces from the iron heel of Spain, and the bloody sceptre of Rome, converted them into an asylum for religion, freedom, commerce, art, science, and who, at last, like himself, fell by an assassin's dagger!

The eyes of the devoted and long incredulous De Mornay were at length opened. The deed was done. Henry was

“converted.” It was a dreadful blow to De Mornay as a Hugonot, a patriot, as an admiring friend and follower of his prince. But while such men as Sully allowed themselves to give a half-hearted approval of Henry’s apostasy, De Mornay never swerved from the truth and the right; he was found nobly “faithful among the faithless,” and casting aside all thought of personal consequences, with the lofty courage of a Christian, he at once uttered a kind, calm, respectful, but most pointed and emphatic protest against the fatal act. His letter to Henry on this occasion, is, in every point of view, an extraordinary production—one which only a great man, a patriotic, sagacious Christian statesman, could have written. While it breathes throughout the most ardent and reverential affection of the friend, and loyalty of the subject, it unfolds, with equal plainness and force, the disastrous folly and unmanly cowardice of Henry’s apostasy. He was, as he well might be, profoundly moved by its perusal, yet, at the first interview after he had read it, De Mornay had no reason to suppose that he had given offence, since Henry showed the same confiding and gracious familiarity which had marked their intercourse for years, while the king laboured hard to convince him that there was no reason for his gloomy anticipations.

At the moment, Henry probably felt as he spoke. His affection for De Mornay, we doubt not, was as warm as it was when, in the exuberance of his joy at the escape of the latter from a murderous attempt upon his life, he had written to say, that prince as he was, he would gladly die to save one so deservedly dear to him. He evidently wished that their old relations should remain undisturbed. But this was, in the nature of things, impossible. There was a great gulf between them—the gulf that separates treachery from truth. After such a step as he had taken, Henry must have despised himself, and while confident in the loyalty, he must have known that he had for ever forfeited the respect of a man like De Mornay. As his subsequent conduct showed, he forgot De Mornay’s untiring devotion to his cause, his vast sacrifices and toils during so many years, his immense services at home and abroad, but he never did forget or forgive that faithful letter already mentioned. Nor did he evince a much more

grateful remembrance of his obligations to the Hugonot party, to whose unwavering loyalty he was indebted for his crown. He issued, indeed, the Edict of Nantes, the proposed design of which was to secure the Reformed church of France the full enjoyment of her liberties; but some of its provisions were from the first a mere dead letter, and others were repeatedly violated in various parts of the kingdom. Henry was too much engrossed with pleasure, and too eager to convince the Papists, who all along suspected the sincerity of his conversion, that he was a good Catholic, to feel or to manifest much zeal in redressing the grievances of the Hugonots. Only two years after his apostasy, he showed how empty were those professions of unchanged affection which he had made to De Mornay, and how keenly he resented the honesty with which the latter had dealt with him in regard to his "conversion."

It came about in this way. De Mornay having withdrawn from the court to his government of Saumur, had occupied his leisure with the composition of his work on the Eucharist. (*De l'Institution, Usage et Doctrine du St Sacrement de l'Eucharistie en l'Eglise ancienne.*) It is divided into four books. In the first, he discusses the Romish dogma of the Mass, and proves that it has not the shadow of a foundation in Scripture, nor in apostolic practice. In the second, he treats of temples, altars, priests, and other things, and terms growing out of the idea of a sacrifice. In the third, he refutes the notion that the mass is a sacrifice, and conclusively shows that under the New Covenant there neither is nor can be any other sacrifice besides that offered by the Lord Jesus Christ upon the cross. The treatise, in short, is a complete and masterly manual on all the leading points in the Popish controversy—a storehouse of historic facts, patristic learning, and scriptural exposition, from which many a polemic of later times has largely borrowed. Such a work from the pen of such a man, could not fail to excite a great commotion among the Romanists. Henry, who was then seeking a divorce from his wife, Margaret de Valois, and hence wished to be on good terms with the Pope, of course looked upon De Mornay's volume as a most ill-timed publication. The Romish doctors, unable to deny its facts, or answer its arguments, were nevertheless

resolved, by fair means or foul, to bring the book into temporary if not permanent discredit.

Their plan of attack was based upon the probability, or rather the almost certainty, of finding some inaccuracies in a work containing such an immense number of quotations from the Fathers, and references to them. The trick was one which has been often repeated by Popish polemics. But on this occasion, a regular plot was laid to entrap De Mornay; a plot which, there is reason to believe, Henry had the unspeakable meanness to suggest to the priests, in carrying out which, at all events, he was their hearty and zealous coadjutor. We may be allowed to dwell upon the affair, as it is one of the most notable in the literary history of France. If De Perron, the tool of Henry and his priests, and the antagonist of De Mornay, had simply affirmed that the quotations and references of the latter were incorrect or irrelevant, De Mornay might have contented himself with replying, that even if there were five hundred cases of this sort, there still remained forty-five hundred about which there could be no question, and perhaps, as it was, he should have taken this position, and challenged his adversary to make good his assertion. But De Perron charged him with deliberate fraud, by pretending to quote passages which had no existence. Henry knew that De Mornay was utterly incapable of such a crime, yet he descended to the baseness of pretending to believe it. The accusation touched the noble Hugonot, who was the soul of honour, to the very quick, and he was thus prompted to assume the task which his enemies wished to put upon him. He undertook to vindicate his quotations and references, and accordingly sent a petition to Henry, by the hands of the Duc de Bouillon, asking his majesty to appoint a commission to examine his book. The king, of course, complied with the request, named the commissioners, appointed the time (April 2, 1600,) but fixed upon Fontainebleau as the place, instead of Paris, with the evident design of embarrassing De Mornay as much as possible, as in this rural palace, he could neither have access to books, nor could he be assisted in the laborious task of collation by the friends who would have gladly lent him their aid. His enemies would not even give him a list of

the passages which they charged him with mutilating; all that they engaged to do, was to present five hundred passages at the opening of the conference, with the promise that De Mornay should get fifty of them each day for examination. These conditions were, as Casaubon says, so “sane iniquæ,” that De Mornay appealed to Henry, but without success, until the king began to fear that if he did not yield, the whole plot might fail.

We have not space for the details of the collation, but will simply describe the results in the words of De Thou, who, though a Romanist, was a man of honour. “Ex quo colloquio Perronius sibi visus est insignem de adversario triumphum deportasse, quòd *ex aliquot mille locis* in libris a Plesso allegatis, *decem* excerpisset, ex quibus arbitri a rege constituti quædam parum ad rem facere judicârunt.” A very small triumph truly, to find among several thousand quotations, exactly *ten*, which were adjudged to be not entirely “*ad rem.*” Yet the priests shouted as lustily over it, as they might have done if De Mornay’s argument had been refuted; and himself put to shame, while Henry, with an hypocrisy only equalled by that which marked his profession of Romanism, congratulated the bishops and the Papal nuncio on the happy issue of the affair.

De Mornay, certainly, had no reason to be ashamed of the result, yet the business nearly cost him his life. He had spent several days and nights, with hardly a moment’s respite for rest or sleep, in a toilsome collation of the Fathers; his generous heart keenly felt the evident and gross partiality of the king; and he was, above all, tortured with anxiety lest the cause of truth should be, in some manner, compromised by his past mistakes or present mismanagement. He bore up as long as he could, but at length he was taken violently ill, so that they had to carry him from the conference-room to his bed. His physician at once informed the king that his life was seriously in danger, and that the colloquy must close. It is scarcely credible, but the fact is nevertheless beyond dispute, that, though De Mornay was brought to death’s door, and for many weeks was confined to his chamber, the king, though in his immediate vicinity during the whole period of his illness, never once went near him. When the crisis of the disease was

long past, and De Mornay was nearly recovered, Henry had the effrontery, as we may well style it, to send a private secretary to convey to him the verbal assurance that he was still his friend. "Trust not in princes," were words which must have been often on De Mornay's lips. Such was the end of the "undying love" which Henry of Navarre had over and over again professed, and which he had good reason to feel for the man to whom he was under such vast obligations. And thus these ancient friends parted, perhaps expecting and wishing to meet no more. They, however, did meet again, but the old fellowship and the old affection were ended for ever. Their final interview occurred in June, 1607. The king, on this occasion, welcomed De Mornay with something like the kindness which marked their early intercourse, but the reason was, that he was again forced to avail himself of De Mornay's executive talent and practical wisdom in order to regulate the affairs of his little patrimonial kingdom of Navarre, which had been wholly neglected for years, and were now in the utmost confusion. This service performed, and having nothing to attach him to the court, De Mornay withdrew to his government of Saumur, and within a few years (in 1610) Henry fell beneath the assassin's knife, the victim of that very fanaticism which he had so weakly and vainly sought to propitiate, by casting truth and honour to the winds. How deeply De Mornay deplored the sad event, is evident from his letter to the magistrates of Saumur.*

What Henry IV. might have done for France and for her

* De Mornay's feelings are expressed in a letter to the Town Council of Saumur, dated 19th May, 1610. "Nous avons icy à vous prononcer une triste et une détestable nouvelle. Nostre Roy, le plus grand Roy que la Chrestienté ait porté depuis cinq cens ans, qui avait survescu tant d'adversités, de perils, de sièges, de batailles, d'assassinats mêmes attentés en sa personne, tombe enfin sous le coup d'un misérable, qui noircit en un moment tout cest Estat de duel, noye tous les bons François de larmes." As his letter was addressed to Protestants and Romanists alike, he adds, "Qu'on ne parle plus entre nous de Hnguenot, ne de Papiste; ces mots sont défendus par nos Edits. Qu'en fussent aussi bien les animosités esteintes en nos cœurs. Quand il n'y aurait point d'Edit au monde, si nous Français, si nous aimons nostre patrie, si nos familles, si nous mesmes, ils doivent désormais estre effacés en nos ames. Qui sera bon Français, me sera citoyen, me sera frere. Je vous conjure Mrs, de vous embrasser tous, de n'avoir qu'un cœur et une ame."

Reformed Church, if he had not come to an untimely end, in the meridian of his days, is, of course, simply matter for speculation. But if the question be this, viz. What *did* he do for France more than the Guises might and probably would have done for her, if they had won the crown? what did he do for the kingdom or the church, to justify the appellation of *Le Grand*? we are compelled to answer—Nothing. As we have already stated, Henry possessed some qualities which none of his Bourbon successors ever exhibited, qualities which have rendered his memory eminently popular in France. With talents of a high order he combined heroic courage, and a genial humour. He often manifested great generosity towards his enemies. He was kind hearted, and as he once said, he would have been glad if every peasant in the kingdom “had a chicken in his pot.” But, after all, he showed himself a thorough Bourbon in his boundless sensuality, his quick forgetfulness of priceless services, his cold-hearted selfishness, his unblushing hypocrisy.

The political life of De Mornay, in one sense, may be said to have terminated when Henry IV. abjured the Reformed faith. He was still a public man, but, as we have seen, he no longer held the intimate and confidential relation to Henry which had subsisted up to that time. He was as firm in his loyalty as ever, but he was no longer the king’s trusted friend and counsellor. On the death of the latter, he hastened to assure Mary de Medici, his widowed queen, that if he could in any way lighten the burdens thrown upon her by the sad event, his services were at her disposal—an offer of which Mary gladly and gratefully availed herself on several occasions. But, as we have said, he ceased to be a courtier—we use the word in its best sense, for in its bad sense he never was one—and the remaining years of his life were chiefly spent in watching over the interests of that Reformed church, to whose communion he had been bound from early manhood, by the deepest and strongest convictions, and for whose welfare he would cheerfully have laid down fortune and life. The Romanists, as we have before mentioned, were wont to call him “le Pape des Huguenots;” and certainly among the Reformed there was no man better fitted by intelligence, sagacity, calm wisdom, catho-

lic temper, and profound piety, to discharge the functions of such an office. But he does not appear to have had in any measure the spirit of Diotrephes. He used his utmost efforts, not without success, to preserve a good feeling between such Protestant grandees as De Bouillon, Sully, and others, and the national Synods, a task both delicate and difficult, as the former evinced a disposition to make themselves the political heads and lords of the church, and to use her as an instrument to accomplish their own personal or party purposes.

If seigneurs and synods had not been obliged to struggle incessantly with their common enemies, the king and the Pope, we think it probable that the Reformed church of France, like her sister church of Scotland, would have been forced to fight with her own professed supporters and friends, for her spiritual independence, or, to use the Scottish formula, "the crown rights of Christ." In the infancy of the Reformation in France, the influence of such great feudatories as Coligné, Conde, Bouillon, and Rohan, must have given a decided impulse to the movement, while by their feudal power they could, to a certain extent, restrain the ruthless bigotry of Rome. But when the Hugonots had become an organized party, when "the pretended reformed" religion was strong enough to muster armies, to fight battles, to demand from Valois and Bourbon securities of peace, we are inclined to believe that their connection with the Reformed church injured her quite as much as it benefitted her. She leaned too much upon these princes, and found them to be broken reeds. They at times betrayed her into measures well calculated to awaken the jealousy and to stimulate the bigotry of the king. Thus, in 1612, two years after Henry's death, one of these magnates, De Rohan, counting, perhaps, on the weakness of the Regent, Mary de Medici, undertook to enforce some feudal prerogatives of his, and thus came near rekindling the flames of civil war, under circumstances which must have made it utterly disastrous to the Hugonots. De Mornay's wisdom and energy, under God, saved the church and the kingdom from this great misfortune. Mary de Medici was very grateful to him, as she had reason to be, for this important service, and she expressed her gratitude not only in words, but by restoring to De Mor-

nay some offices of which he had been deprived, and the payment of pensions which had been suspended long before the death of Henry. Cardinal Perron, in spite of his prejudices as a Romanist, was so impressed by the real grandeur of De Mornay's character, as illustrated at this juncture and on other occasions, (which showed of what stuff men were made—occasions when it was easy to distinguish the large-hearted patriot from the narrow-minded and factious partizan,) that he was warm in his praise, and earnestly advised the queen-mother and her young son, Louis XIII., to insist upon his return to court, and to make him one of their most trusted counsellors.

We have too little space left us to notice other features of De Mornay's career with the fulness which they deserve. On the field of authorship he won a reputation no less brilliant than that which he gained in the cabinet and the camp. He was eminent alike as a theologian and a statesman, and as an author, he in no small measure added to the glory of the Reformed church of France in the most illustrious period of her history. He grappled with the great questions of that age, and handled them like a "master in Israel." He stood forth in the front rank of those heroic witnesses for the truth, who had thrown down the gauntlet to Rome, and had set themselves for the defence of a pure gospel, an unfettered conscience, and a living church; and he so demeaned himself in that position as to secure a European renown. He earned the fervent love and veneration of the French church, not only by the manifold and masterly productions of his pen, but also by the patronage he extended to her seats of learning, especially to the University of Saumur.* This Academy was founded by the National

* What Paul said of the Macedonian churches, (2 Cor. viii. 2,) may be applied to the Hugonots: "In a great fight of afflictions, the abundance of their joy and their deep poverty abounded unto the riches of their liberality" in the cause of education. In each one of the thirteen provinces of France, in 1607, they erected a college, or grammar-school, to prepare their youth for a university course. Two universities were established in 1596, and at a later period there were no less than six, sustained almost entirely by the Reformed church, viz. at Saumur, Montauban, Nismes, Montpellier, Sedan, and Die. By the Edict of Nantes, the government was bound to give a certain sum annually for their support, but the money was very irregularly paid. All branches of the Reformed church were zealous friends of sacred learning, but the poor and persecuted Hugonots on this excelled them all.

Synod in 1596, and the members of that body "entreated Monsieur le Gouverneur of that town to continue the hearty support which he had hitherto given to the scheme." During the first half of the seventeenth century, the University of Saumur had so high a reputation in France and beyond it, that most of the Protestant nations had representatives among its students. It included faculties of theology, philosophy, and belles lettres. The ancient, modern, and oriental languages were taught. There were two colleges "pour les humanités," one for Protestants, another for Romanists. In addition to all these means of education, there was an "academie d'equitation," in which the young men were trained in exercises that fitted them for the camp, if forced to go to the wars, and also to endure hardness as the soldiers of Christ. Among the professors at Saumur were some of the most famous scholars and theologians of that age, such men as Cappel, Cameron, Gomar, and in sundry instances the powerful influence of De Mornay was exerted to secure their services to the institution, in which he naturally felt a special concern, as Saumur was the seat of his government, and his place of residence.

Even at this early day the French church was disturbed by controversies growing out of the speculative tendencies of some of her leading divines. Piscator, in 1604, had broached opinions respecting the relation of our Lord's human nature to the law, which were deemed repugnant to the reformed faith. A few years later, Amyrant was taken to task for the way in which he had expressed himself on the extent of the atonement, and its relation to the decrees of God.* There was great danger of the Reformed becoming divided among themselves, a result pregnant with mischief to the good cause. De Mornay, therefore, directed all his efforts to the task of allaying the strife. Writing to one of the Synods, he says: "I shall not enter into the question, (Piscatorian.) We had better heal our old sores, rather than open new ones. We had better allow such matters to sleep, seeing that our adversaries are perpetually on the watch for our halting." He

* If our New England friends will study this portion of dogmatic history, we think they will discover that some of the distinctive features of their theology are not so new as they seem to imagine.

then warmly commends the conduct of the Reformed and the Lutherans in the Palatinate, who had declared that their difference in regard to the Eucharist should not hinder their fraternal union, as they were perfectly agreed about the thing, and only disputed about the mode, “de re constat, licet non de modo rei.” Ten years afterward, (April 20, 1614,) the venerable statesman and saint wrote in a like strain, and for a similar purpose, to the National Synod, “de croire de moy, comme de celui qui n’a plus en ce monde que son épitaphe à faire, lequel avec la grace de Dieu ne démentira ny le style ny la teneur de ma vie.” He goes to say, among other things, that pious people were expecting two results of this Synod, viz. that its authority would be exerted to suppress needless doctrinal debates, which disturb the peace of the church, and that all proper means would be adopted to heal the divisions which such debates had already produced. We may infer that his letters had a good effect, as he was chosen a member of a commission appointed by the Synod to deal with Du Moulin and Tilenus, who had fallen out on a point of theology, and to reconcile them, as happily they did.

A proper review of the numerous works of De Mornay, political and theological, would fill a long article. Our notice of them must be very brief. We have not space even to enumerate them all.

1. His *Discours de la Vie et de la Mort*, was published about 1576. It was composed at the request of Madame de Mornay, before their marriage, and while he was paying his addresses to her. Such a request, odd as it may seem to many, is not surprising, when it is remembered that both of them had been in the midst of the horrors of Bartholomew, and that they lived in times when Paul’s words had a meaning and a force, which they have nearly lost in these days of peace, “let those who have wives be as though they had none.” The aim of this work is wholly practical, and it is written in a style of glowing eloquence.

2. The *Traité de l’Eglise, où l’on traite des principales questions sur ce point en nostre temps*, was first published in London, in 1578, but was afterward enlarged, and passed through numerous editions between 1579—99. As before mentioned,

it was the means of converting the monk Corneille, who had been appointed to refute it.

3. The *Traité de la Vérité de la religion Chrétienne*, appeared in 1581. It is an admirable defence of religion, natural and revealed, "against atheists, Epicureans, Pagans, Mahometans, and other infidels." The work is one of his best, and displays vast erudition. Yet occasionally the author indulges in reasonings more fanciful than solid, as when he attempts to prove the doctrine of the Trinity by arguments drawn from natural reason, and to establish the fall of man by natural religion.

4. *De l'Institution, Usage, et Doctrine du saint Sacrement de l'Eucharistie en l'Eglise ancienne, comment, quand, et par quels degrez la Messe c'est introduite en sa place, en IV livres*, was published in 1598.

5. *Le Mystère d'Iniquité, i. e. L'Histoire de la Papauté; par quels progrez elle est montée à ce comble, et quelles oppositions les gens de bien ont faict de temps en temps. Où aussi sont defendus les droicts des Empereurs, Rois, et Princes chrestiens, contre les assertions des cardinaux Bellarmin et Baronius*, is a goodly folio, and was first published at Saumur in 1611. The titles of the last two works, which we give in full, sufficiently explain their aim and character. The one on the Eucharist appeared just after the apostasy of Henry IV., the History of the Papacy appeared just after the death of Henry. Each of these works created a great sensation in France, and both of them were quickly translated into most of the languages of Europe. Together they form a vast storehouse of learning and logic, to which many a later writer on the Popish controversy has been glad to repair, that without the trouble of personal research, he might load himself with historic facts and patristic testimonies.

Besides these masterly contributions to polemic literature, he wrote a considerable number of volumes of a purely devotional cast. His political works were also numerous, and, as we have seen, were eminently serviceable to the cause of Henry IV. In 1571 he is said to have composed a work on *Law Ripuary, Salique, and Canon*, which was lost in the confusion caused by the Bartholomew massacre. His wife says

in her Memoirs of him, that he wrote a treatise on the Legitimate Power of Princes, and hence some have inferred, that De Mornay was the author of the anonymous volume *Vindiciæ contra Tyrannos*. Other anonymous volumes, which made considerable noise at the time of their appearance, are attributed to his prolific pen, particularly one on The Rule of Faith, and another on Councils. When we consider the long list of his acknowledged works, which would fill more than twenty quartos, and the vast reading which many of them evince, one would suppose that their author must have lived the life of a lonely and laborious scholar. Yet we know that he was one of the busiest of men in the camp and the cabinet, one of the chief actors in church and state during that stirring age.

Of the closing scene of his earthly career we have an exquisite memoir from the pen of Jean Daillé, who witnessed it. He had studied at Saumur, and for some years after his licensure he resided in the family of De Mornay as a sort of domestic chaplain, and as tutor of his young grandchildren. Not long before De Mornay's decease, Louis XIII. had taken the reins of state into his own hand, and gave signs of his purpose to imitate the policy which his unscrupulous minister and master, Cardinal Richelieu, afterwards carried out, viz. of wresting from the Hugonots, by force or fraud, all their "villes de sûreté," and thus rendering them dependent absolutely on the royal favour, and of breaking down the power of the great feudatories, Papist and Protestant, thus completely consolidating the monarchy. The gathering clouds excited extreme uneasiness in the minds of Hugonots of all classes, who, at the same time, felt that if any man could avert the tempest, it was De Mornay, the man to whom the young king, and his mother, and his father, owed so vast a debt of gratitude. They begged him to interpose on their behalf. Notwithstanding his bodily infirmities, he readily agreed to perform this last service for the cause to which his whole life had been devoted, and at once he began to prepare for his journey to Paris. But it was his Master's will that he should take another and grander journey—that to the "better country." His mission to Paris was arrested by what proved to be his last illness.

When, says Daillé, he found that the attack was more

serious than he had imagined, his first concern was to add a codicil to his will, and having thus arranged all his worldly affairs, he exclaimed, "Now I have nothing more to do but to die." During his sickness he gave so many express and clear testimonies to his faith and assurance, that we may say that in this brief space he confirmed by irrefragable evidences all that he had ever said or written concerning the truth of the Christian religion. We saw most distinctly, the gospel of the grace of God engraven by the Spirit on his heart; we saw him filled with content in circumstances which fill most men with terror. When the pastor of the congregation of which he was a member announced to him, somewhat bluntly, that his recovery was hopeless—"Is it so?" said he, "well, I am content." Not long afterwards he added, "I have a great account to render, I have received much and have profited little." The pastor rejoined, that during a long life he had happily and faithfully used his talents in the service of Christ and his church, De Mornay instantly exclaimed, "Say not I have done it—not I, but the grace of God in me." The pastor asked him, "Monsieur, do you attribute no merits to your works?" "Merits! merits!" replied De Mornay, "away with merits from me, and from every other man, be he who he may. No, I ask only for mercy, unmerited mercy." Then with a firm and grave voice he blessed his daughters and their husbands, praying them to maintain among themselves peace, "which," added he, "I bequeath to you." Then he pronounced his blessing upon their children present and absent, beseeching God to ratify it with his own holy benediction. The same was done to his nephew and niece, and to all his domestics. Lastly, and with deep solemnity, he gave a blessing to the pastor present, and to the church of Saumur, with which he was accustomed to worship, and in the spiritual welfare of which he had long taken the deepest interest. "During my life," said he, to the company in his chamber, "I have had no other aim but the glory of my God. Those who have known me, are well aware that if I had chosen other ends, it would have been easy for me to attain great riches and high honours. Pray to the Lord that he will dispose of me as he pleases. I am not disgusted with life, but I see before me onc far better than the present.

I withdraw from life, but I do not fly from it." As his children and grandchildren, for the last time before he became insensible, gathered round his bed, he took the hands of each and pressed them to his lips and said, "I commend peace and fraternal love to you all, so that you may possess in peace the inheritance and the name I leave you." On the 11th of November, 1623, he calmly fell asleep.

Such was the peaceful end of the great and good Duplessis Mornay—one of the purest spirits and brightest ornaments of his times. "You will search in vain," says La Vassor, "history, ancient or modern, for a character superior to his. Equally at home in science and the affairs of the world, he defended religion, discussed the most thorny questions of theology, he sustained the Reformed churches by his prudence, he gave good counsel to ministers of state and to princes, and even kings listened to him with respect."

ART. III.—*The Human Body as related to Sanctification.*

THE relation of the human body to the moral and spiritual condition of its occupant, is very undefined to most minds, sometimes for want of thorough attention to the subject, and sometimes from the inherent difficulty of finding the principles which adjust and determine all questions pertaining to it. At the same time, it is a question of high interest, and, as the frequent references to it in Scripture prove, the due understanding of it is important, and the sober study of it profitable.

We think an examination of the various shades of doctrine, of knowledge, and of ignorance on this subject, which have place in Christendom, will disclose the three types of opinion which obtain in reference to nearly every point of speculative and practical divinity—we mean the ritualistic, the rationalistic, and, midway between these extremes, the evangelical. According to the former, religion consists pre-eminently in "bodily exercise" of some sort; either in public