

H-France Review Vol. 16 (July 2016), No. 139

Franz Xaver Bischof and Sylvio De Franceschi, eds., *Histoires Antiromaines II*, *Chrétiens et Sociétés*, Documents et Mémoires n° 23 (Lyon: Édité par l'équipe Religions, Sociétés Et Acculturation (RESEA) du Laboratoire de Recherche Historique Rhône-Alpes (LARHRA, UMR 5190), 2014. 258pp. 20€ (pb). ISBN 979-10-91592-08-6.

Review by Charles Lipp, University of West Georgia.

The complex and, at times, fraught history of the Catholic Church and France has long received scholarly attention. This collection of eight essays co-edited by Franz Xaver Bischof, of the Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität, Munich, Germany, and Sylvio De Franceschi, of the École Pratique des Hautes Études, Paris, aims to contribute to that larger project by focusing narrowly on a particular aspect of the intellectual history of the Church from the sixteenth through the early-twentieth centuries. The essays emerge from a one-day conference held in Munich, Germany, in September, 2012, that continued discussions from a session held in Lyon, France, two years earlier. Both meetings aimed to study, as De Franceschi states in his introduction to the collection, “the question of connections between Catholic Anti-Romanism and the genesis of the European historiographical tradition” (p. 5). De Franceschi asserts that Catholic Anti-Romanism was, from an early point, “preoccupied with establishing historical foundations for its political and ecclesiastical claims,” and justified critiques of Papal authority through developing and employing a particular ecclesiastical historiography that matched its claims (p. 5). The second session resulted from a view that crucial primary sources merited further investigation, especially as regarded style and methodology (p. 5).

Of the volume's eight essays, seven discuss French issues and are written in French. The other piece, written in Italian, explores Catholic historiography in the context of the Counter Reformation Spanish monarchy's cultural politics. While an interesting point of comparison, French historians may find this essay less useful than the others. The seven French-focused pieces together cover a broad chronology. However, the book does not pay equal attention to all centuries. The first three essays concern the Old Regime, the other four cover a more concentrated timeframe: the period from the post-1815 Restoration Monarchy to the first years of the 1900s. Reflective of the overall project's origins, the essays remain discrete in and of themselves. The contributors investigate how particular sources made their own historical and historiographic arguments. The authors largely accomplish this aim through offering detailed summaries of the works and arguments, liberally supported with extensive quotations. Most of the essays, five of seven, include appendices containing related material, including additional long excerpts from the sources. Connections to the larger European historiographical tradition remain implied in most of the contributions.

The opening essay, “De l'anecdote à l'événement historique: L'affaire Jean Tanquerel (1561),” by Pierre-Jean Souriac of the Université Jean Moulin-Lyon 3, thus stands out from the others in terms of approach. Rather than a detailed look at a particular author or work, Souriac instead explores how an event seen as minor in its own time became an example used by later scholars as a Gallican historical consciousness began to emerge over the 1600s. In 1561, Jean Tanquerel submitted a thesis to the

Sorbonne studying the rights of popes to depose kings. In December of that year, the theology student was interrogated and condemned by the Parlement of Paris, actions recorded in the Parlement's papers. Tanquerel begged the king's forgiveness, and promptly disappeared from the historical record. The final debates of the Council of Trent and the opening shots of the Wars of Religion overshadowed the brief uproar surrounding Tanquerel and his thesis. By the end of the sixteenth century, the incident became increasingly used in Gallican arguments regarding the relationship of the French Church to Rome. Even today, Souriac notes, scholars still refer to Tanquerel to illustrate the emergence of an "absolutist" Gallicanism, one that had moved away from an earlier democratic approach to one that defended royal authority over the Church in France. Souriac links his arguments to issues raised by Jotham Parsons concerning the Gallican intellectual tradition.[1]

The next two essays on early modern French issues relate to Souriac's piece not so much as regards approach, but rather as regards the broad subject matter. They continue to explore relations between the French Church, France in general, and the papacy during the Old Regime. Like Souriac's work, they touch on questions of Gallicanism and French society and politics. Frédéric Gabriel from the Centre National de la recherche scientifique (CNRS) devotes his essay "Ce que Rome fait à la papauté: héritages et ruptures dans le *Traité politique des différens ecclésiastiques* de Louis Machon (1653)" to a source he sees as crucial yet overlooked. Machon, part of the large patronage network surrounding Cardinal Richelieu, wrote his treatise during the first half of the 1600s. In the contemporary debates concerning authority over the Church in France, the absolutist Gallicanism discussed by Souriac flowered. In a detailed summary of the work, Gabriel shows how Machon used Church history to argue against papal claims of temporal authority. Machon contended that from the origins of the Church and for over a thousand years, popes fell under the temporal authority of emperors. This reality, according to Machon, promoted humility and spirituality on the part of popes. However, starting in the eleventh century, the situation was altered as popes rejected tradition and the Church changed its nature.

In order to demonstrate exactly how Machon built his arguments, especially as regards the use of history, Gabriel includes an appendix containing several pages of Machon's manuscript and Machon's working bibliography. In a similar manner, in "Fausse primauté du pape et vraie constitution de l'Église: la première querelle de l'*Histoire ecclésiastique* (1726-1737)," Bernard Hours of the Université Jean Moulin—Lyon 3, offers a thorough summary of the debate between Jesuits and Jansenists concerning the multivolume work of Church history. In the first conference, Hours had studied the early volumes of the work, those published by Claude Fleury. Here, he looks at the volumes published by Jean-Claude Fabre in the 1720s and 1730s, volumes which attracted the ire of the Jesuits. Like Gabriel, Hours focuses in on the uses of ecclesiastical history in the making of arguments and includes over nine pages of the source as an appendix.

Although sharing Gabriel's and Hours's basic methodology of close reading of sources, the final four essays cover a more concentrated timeframe: from the 1820s to the first decade of the twentieth century, a period that saw the final triumph of ultramontane views within the Catholic Church. In "1825-1826: Lamennais et Montlosier, un tournant antiromain," Sylvain Milbach from the Université de Savoie stresses the centrality of the Restoration era as a time of transition for Catholic Anti-Romanism. Milbach explores a debate between a counter-revolutionary noble using Gallican language and a cleric who saw the Restoration Charter's granting of freedom of conscience as tantamount to atheism and who viewed Gallicanism as a threat to the unity of the Church. In this essay, Milbach uses the debate as a means of demonstrating how certain terms of debate shifted meaning after the Revolution. He sees the debate as a final moment for Gallican polemic, pointing out that though the two men differed on certain details, they shared a hatred for the Revolution. Indeed, the debate centered not on theology, but rather on how the Church should best confront contemporary society. Within a generation, Milbach notes, Gallicanism became increasingly identified with the Revolution and, therefore, the space for Anti-Romanism to exist within the Church was disappearing.

Franceschi, in his own contribution, “La romanité ecclésiastique jugée par *l’Histoire de l’église de France* (1847-1856) de René-François Guetté,” takes readers to this later moment. Written at a moment when ultramontanism was gathering force, Guetté’s multivolume work received condemnation by the Index in the 1850s for arguing that papal supremacy within the Church arose from medieval circumstances and, so, was not found in the primitive Church. For Franceschi, the work represents a last attempt at a Gallican Church history. Franceschi devotes considerable space to methodological analysis, contending the work’s methodology remains perhaps its most interesting aspect. Guetté presented traditional Gallican arguments in modern fashion, using the approaches of nineteenth-century liberal historiography and embracing Enlightenment visions of historical progress. Inspired by the works of François Guizot and Jules Michelet, Guetté presented his account as an objective study founded firmly on source evidence. It was on this basis of recording objective truth that Guetté attempted to defend himself before the Index. In order to fully illustrate Guetté’s approach, Franceschi includes an appendix with changes the cleric proposed in his unsuccessful attempt to forestall condemnation.

The last two essays illustrate the impossibility by the end of the 1800s of criticizing papal supremacy from within the Church and, thereby, mark the end of the Catholic Anti-Romanist tradition. “*Le pape et le concile* par Janus (1869): Une histoire des progrès de la puissance pontificale à l’épreuve de la censure Romaine,” by Franceschi’s co-editor, Bischof, offers a detailed description of a bestselling Anti-Romanist work written by Church historian Ignaz von Döllinger, though published under a pseudonym. Published at the same time as the first Vatican Council, the book proved controversial because it argued that the doctrine of papal infallibility was a medieval invention. The work was proscribed by the Index, reflecting the overwhelming strength of ultramontane views within institutional Catholicism. Besides his description, Bischof provides extensive excerpts from the source itself, both in original German and French translation. Christian Sorrel from the Université Lumière—Lyon 2, crafts a poignant tale in “La biographie impossible: Mgr Lacroix et la *Vie de Mgr Landriot*.” Sorrel discusses a Catholic bishop’s attempt to write a biography of one of the leading liberal Catholic voices of the nineteenth century, one who sought a reconciliation of the Church with modern society. Lacroix completed his manuscript by 1904. It remained unpublished as he feared the condemnation of the Index, even though in the work, Lacroix ultimately expressed support for ultramontane views.

Taken all together, the essays illustrate pivotal moments in the Gallican intellectual tradition over its rise, development, and extinction. In so doing, this collection raises critical issues regarding French intellectual and religious history. It also introduces readers to a number of valuable sources that may be little known outside of particular subfields. The inclusion of extensive excerpts from the sources themselves through the use of appendices is particularly useful. However, because of the overall approach to work mainly within the sources as regards to how they employ history and historiography in making Anti-Romanist arguments, with rare exceptions, the essays do not fit the sources into a broader context of recent scholarship. Likewise, Franceschi devotes almost all of his five-page introduction not to framing the collection as much as to analyzing yet another mid-nineteenth century source, the ultramontane *Histoire universelle de l’Église catholique*, by the abbé René-François Rohrbacher, as a means of illustrating Church debates in the 1800s as Catholic Anti-Romanism disappeared. These strengths and weakness both likely result from the project’s origins as a narrowly conceived follow-up to a broader discussion. Therefore, this particular collection does not quite stand on its own. It will likely have most appeal to specialists of the intellectual history of the French Church.

LIST OF ESSAYS

Sylvio De Franceschi, “Introduction”

Pierre-Jean Souriac, “De l’anecdote à l’événement historique : l’affaire Jean Tanquerel (1561)”

Paolo Broggio, “La historia pontifical y católica e la politica culturale della monarchia spagnolanelletà della controriforma”

Frédéric Gabriel, “Ce que Rome fait à la papauté. Héritages et ruptures dans le *Traité politique des différens ecclésiastiques* de Louis Machon (1653)”

Bernard Hours, “Fausse primauté du pape et vraie constitution de l’Église : la première querelle de l’*Histoire ecclésiastique* (1726-1737)”

Sylvain Milback “1825-1826 : La Mennais et Montlosier, un tournant antiromain?”

Sylvio De Franceschi, “La romanité ecclésiale jugée par l’*Histoire de l’Église de France* (1847-1856) de René-François Guettée”

Franz Xaver Bischof, “*Le Pape et le Concile* par Janus (1869) : une histoire des progrès de la puissance pontificale à l’épreuve de la censure romaine”

Christian Sorrel, “La biographie impossible : Mgr Lacroix et la *Vie de Mgr Landriot*”

NOTE

[1] Jotham Parsons, *The Church in the Republic: Gallicanism and Political Ideology in Renaissance France* (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2004).

Charles Lipp
University of West Georgia
clipp@westga.edu

Copyright © 2016 by the Society for French Historical Studies, all rights reserved. The Society for French Historical Studies permits the electronic distribution of individual reviews for nonprofit educational purposes, provided that full and accurate credit is given to the author, the date of publication, and the location of the review on the H-France website. The Society for French Historical Studies reserves the right to withdraw the license for redistribution/republication of individual reviews at any time and for any specific case. Neither bulk redistribution/ republication in electronic form of more than five percent of the contents of H-France Review nor re-publication of any amount in print form will be permitted without permission. For any other proposed uses, contact the Editor-in-Chief of H-France. The views posted on H-France Review are not necessarily the views of the Society for French Historical Studies.

ISSN 1553-9172