

1990

Constitutional Bishops and the Catholic Press During the Early July Monarchy: Gregoire and Talleyrand

M. Patricia Dougherty

Department of History, Dominican University of California, patricia.dougherty@dominican.edu

Survey: Let us know how this paper benefits you.

Recommended Citation

Dougherty, M. Patricia, "Constitutional Bishops and the Catholic Press During the Early July Monarchy: Gregoire and Talleyrand" (1990). *History | Faculty Scholarship*. 1.
<https://scholar.dominican.edu/history-faculty-scholarship/1>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the History | Faculty Collections at Dominican Scholar. It has been accepted for inclusion in History | Faculty Scholarship by an authorized administrator of Dominican Scholar. For more information, please contact michael.pujals@dominican.edu.

Constitutional Bishops and the Catholic Press During the Early July Monarchy: Grégoire and Talleyrand

M. Patricia Dougherty, O.P.
Dominican College

The Catholic Church's attitude toward the French Revolution remained hostile throughout the nineteenth century. The Revolution had overthrown authority and had unleashed violent anticlericalism by creating the Civil Constitution of the Clergy and requiring an oath of allegiance to it (law of 27 November 1790). The Pope had condemned this Constitution and suspended the clerical oath takers (including seven bishops) on 13 April 1791; the resultant schism, disorganization and civil war left a bitter memory among the Catholic leaders who desired unity. The Concordat between Napoleon and the Pope (signed in 1801 and proclaimed in 1802) ended the schism and provided the legal framework for church-state relations for the next century.

This value of unity and its opposite evil--schism--are constant themes in the articles which appeared in Catholic newspapers in the early July Monarchy. These themes form the basis for the disappointment expressed at the time of the death of the unrepentant abbé Grégoire in 1831 and for the joy over the deathbed retraction of Talleyrand seven years later. Both Henri Grégoire (1750-1831), the son of a Lorraine tailor, and Charles Maurice de Talleyrand-Périgord (1754-1838), the son of a noble, had played decisive roles in the adoption of the civil constitution and were among the first oath takers.

Grégoire, a priest by choice and conviction, was ordained in 1775. By 1789, he had a reputation for being "liberal and tolerant, the enemy of fanaticism and of superstition."¹ In 1791, he was elected constitutional bishop of Loir et Cher. Seriously concerned with the status of religion in France, he attempted to renew and invigorate it (especially during the Directory). An ardent democrat, he favored a republican form of government and served as a member of the Convention (even appearing at sessions during the height of the Terror in his episcopal robes). After the Concordat which he opposed, Grégoire withdrew from political involvement and resigned his bishopric in accord with the agreement between the Pope and Napoleon.

Talleyrand became a priest because a childhood accident resulted in lameness and prevented him--as the oldest son of a noble--from pursuing a military career.² Ordained in 1779, he became the Bishop of Autun ten years later. In October 1789, he proposed putting ecclesiastical property at the disposal of the nation; in 1791 he consecrated new constitutional bishops. Shortly thereafter he ceased functioning as a cleric and became first a diplomat to Great Britain and then an emigré during the early years of the Republic. He returned to France after the Terror and served the Directory, Napoleon, the restored Bourbon kings, and Louis Philippe. After helping to negotiate the Concordat, Talleyrand requested and received from the Pope a recognition of his lay state. The Pope withheld dispensation for him to marry; nevertheless, in the fall of 1802, Talleyrand married Catherine Worlée Grand, a divorcee and an adventuress.

M. Patricia Dougherty

Forty years after the Revolution and thirty years after the Concordat, these two creators of the constitutional church died. The issues raised by the Catholic newspapers in reporting these deaths give us an excellent insight into the opinions held by major segments of the Catholic population of France in the 1830s toward the French Revolution and toward proper church-state relations.

The leading Catholic paper during this time was the tri-weekly L'Ami de la religion, Journal ecclésiastique, politique et littéraire (1814-1862). L'Ami was directed by laymen (from 1814 to 1844) but had close ties with the clerical hierarchy in France. Its tone was moderate; it was mildly Gallican and conservative. L'Ami intended to work within the political system and to change and influence it that way.³ Thus, it opposed the systemic change advocated by the daily L'Avenir of abbé Félicité de Lamennais. The liberal, ultramontane L'Avenir (October 1830-November 1831) with its motto "God and Liberty" advocated church acceptance of and leadership in political democracy and social reform. Another liberal paper was the biweekly Le Correspondant: Liberté civile et religieuse (March 1829-August 1831).⁴ Monarchist until the July Revolution, the paper then concentrated on securing legal guarantees for Catholic worship. It could not effectively compete with L'Avenir with whom it held similar ideas. The main competitor of L'Ami was the daily L'Univers religieux (1833-1860; 1867-1914) founded by abbé Jacques Paul Migne on 5 October 1833.

Of these four important Catholic papers,⁵ only L'Ami published throughout the 1830s. L'Ami de la religion, L'Avenir, and Le Correspondant reported on the Grégoire affair (May and June 1831) and L'Ami and L'Univers on the Talleyrand deathbed reconciliation (May 1838). In the Grégoire affair, L'Ami emphasized the rightness of Archbishop Hyacinthe Louis Quélen of Paris and the wrongness of Grégoire and provided more details and background support of the archbishop than did L'Avenir which stressed principles. Le Correspondant had only a few articles on the events surrounding the death of Grégoire. It reported the problems reluctantly because its readers needed to be informed. It would have preferred to report on the courageous stance taken by Grégoire during the Convention than on the lack of submission by Grégoire to the decisions of the Church.⁶ Le Correspondant discussed the principle of religious liberty in much the same way as did L'Avenir.

The Grégoire affair began in Paris in early May 1831 when the dying constitutional bishop requested the last sacraments from the pastor of Abbaye aux Bois, the parish in which he resided. The curé consulted archdiocesan officials who explained the precise steps that Grégoire had to follow before receiving the sacraments: "A firm renunciation of the constitutional schism, an explicit condemnation of the errors of the so-called civil constitution of the clergy, an unambiguous retraction of the oath to this constitution, contrition for the schism and for the intrusion [i.e., his replacing the valid bishop by his election to the see of Loir et Cher]."⁷ Via letter to Grégoire, Quélen expressed the hope that Grégoire would abjure his errors for the consolation of the Church "which you have saddened for so long."⁸ Grégoire refused. L'Ami described Grégoire's response to Quélen as full of "blindness, injustice, and stubbornness."⁹ Despite this and possibly ignorant of the archbishop's condition for sacramental reception, the queen's chaplain--abbé Marie Nicolas Silvestre Guillon--administered the last rites. Guillon, recently nominated by the July Monarchy to the bishopric of Beauvais, did not personally inform Quélen of his actions until about a week after the event. (By then, Quélen had learned of Guillon's action by means of an announcement in the press.) Quélen characterized Guillon's ministering to Grégoire as a

Grégoire and Talleyrand

"deplorable example of weakness."¹⁰ After Grégoire died--unreconciled, the archbishop refused to allow a Catholic burial.¹¹ The state commandeered the church of Abbaye aux Bois in Paris and "imported" Catholic priests to conduct the services for the former bishop of Loir et Cher.

Moderate L'Ami and liberal L'Avenir supported the archbishop, criticized the actions of abbé Guillon and protested the state's violation of the sanctity of a church. In a series of three articles entitled "Liberté des cultes" (20, 21 and 23-24 May), L'Avenir demonstrated that Quélen had acted according to both the "rules of faith" and the "rules of charity."¹² Le Correspondant entered the public discussion on 20 May (a week to ten days after the other Catholic papers). It appealed to civil authorities to use the law fairly--to allow priests to make decisions about worship in their religion and supported the Archbishop who was being persecuted for doing legally what was within his authority to do. It made no mention of Guillon's activities.

In commenting on the affair, each paper reflected its own values. For L'Avenir, the question was clearly one of the separate realms of church and state. In the religious sphere, it argued, the Church had a right to identify its own members, and Grégoire was not a member.¹³ The basis for this argument was a rational syllogism: Catholic priests rely on the faith and discipline of the Church rather than on their own consciences; the Church (in a papal bull) condemned the Civil Constitution of the Clergy; Grégoire refused publicly to adhere to this bull; therefore, Grégoire was not a Catholic priest. L'Avenir continually stressed the separate areas of responsibility and authority for the church and the state. The state was not a competent judge of the beliefs of a religion. L'Avenir lauded the archbishop's "firmness in maintaining Catholic independence."¹⁴

In the political sphere, L'Avenir denounced the state's "outrage against our religion"--committing a sacrilege by changing a "place of prayer and sacrifice" into an "unclean cemetery"--and warned that "peace [the ostensible reason for the state's taking over of the church] bought by a crime is not a good peace."¹⁵ Further, the cold-blooded violation of freedom of religion in a state where liberty was supposedly sacred was shocking. The state should implement its own Charter (freedom of religion) and should not intervene in the internal operation of religion. This same criticism was echoed by Le Correspondant which cited the examples of Belgium, England and the United States to illustrate the correct attitude of the state toward religion--one of protection of holy places and of ministers of religion.¹⁶ L'Avenir never pointed out that Grégoire exemplified the church under the control of the state. But it issued a warning: "Kings of the earth! . . . a eulogy of sacrilege . . . for a regicide. That is justice."¹⁷

For L'Ami, the church and state needed to be mutually supportive. In a three part article, it suggested, however, that the state (especially the Orleanist government which did not protect Catholicism) should voluntarily give up its nomination of bishops and its intervention into Catholic affairs (dogmas, teachings and rules of the church) because royal nomination "compromised the interests of clergy and the aim of religion."¹⁸ L'Ami, unlike L'Avenir however, approved of state salaries for clergy.

The events of May and June 1831 seemed to demonstrate the problems that L'Ami had pointed out in the three-part series. L'Ami was not pleased with Guillon as an episcopal nominee because his was a political rather than a religious appointment: he had been the chaplain to Louis Philippe's wife since 1820. Likewise, L'Avenir objected to the appointment because it was a symbol of the alliance of church and state. L'Avenir wanted bishops who knew how to resist

M. Patricia Dougherty

civil authority.⁹ Guillon's disregard for Quélen's orders reinforced L'Ami's opposition to the nomination. L'Ami felt vindicated when the Pope withheld the episcopal confirmation.

For L'Ami, hierarchical authority and obedience were essential values of society and church. Guillon had undermined these values by his lack of submission to the archbishop's orders and in his submission to the government's request to minister to Grégoire. In contrast to Guillon's action, L'Ami pointed out the exemplary behavior of the clergy of Abbaye aux Bois who followed the directives of their archbishop. And, according to L'Ami, no priest from the Parisian clergy assisted at Grégoire's funeral (i.e., all Parisian priests--even Guillon-obeyed Quélen).²⁰

L'Ami justified the condition (of renouncing the Civil Constitution of the Clergy) imposed by the archbishop on Grégoire by citing authority. It developed and proved that Quélen was acting in accord with papal wishes concerning the return of constitutional clergy. Neither L'Ami nor L'Avenir discussed the constitutional bishops who had refused to retract their oaths but had become bishops under the Concordat (e.g., Louis Belmas of Cambrai and Claude Le Coz of Besançon).²¹ With an ironic twist, L'Ami cited the papal letters of Pius VI in a collection edited in 1798 by the same abbé Guillon who disobeyed his superior in 1831. L'Ami let the facts speak for themselves and did not denounce Guillon in this article. It described Guillon as a "well educated . . . skillful editor . . . [and] wise author," and approved of Guillon's views of the terrible schism unleashed by the Civil Constitution of the Clergy.²²

In a later article, L'Ami showed the errors of Grégoire. "All his writings are full of errors," it explained. Of utmost discredit for Grégoire was that "he had sanctioned and fomented a deadly schism, he had rekindled the Jansenist invectives, [and] he had attacked the legitimate rights of the Holy See."²³

L'Avenir also revealed hostility toward schism, but this seemed secondary to its advocacy of the principles of church-state separation and religious liberty. Le Correspondant treated schism in several places: it feared a return to the schismatic church of 1791 and it belittled the priests who conducted Grégoire's funeral by labelling them as apostates and schismatics.²⁴

Neither L'Avenir nor Le Correspondant attempted to discuss or evaluate the life and work of Grégoire. In contrast and probably because of its self-professed goal of providing a record for posterity, L'Ami devoted over half an issue (9 of 16 pages) to a biographical sketch of Grégoire one week after his death.²⁵ L'Ami explained its rationale: his writings and acts as priest and politician were relevant to the history of the revolution. It added that it would refrain from "reflections and judgments which would lengthen this notice too much."²⁶ This article is relatively straight-forward although it contains some editorializing. For example, in discussing Grégoire as a member of the Convention which voted the death penalty of Louis XVI, L'Ami acknowledged that Grégoire was not present for the vote--he was on an official mission to Savoy. Though he had signed a letter approving of the trial, Grégoire later explained that he had not approved of the death penalty. L'Ami did not consider this letter sufficient to absolve him from complicity in the king's execution. Four years later in 1835, it would refer to Grégoire as a "cold-blooded regicide."²⁷ L'Ami, a longtime supporter of the Bourbons, did not forgive Grégoire for his role in the Convention or for his religious role in schism. L'Avenir had also described Grégoire by the epithet "regicide" when in fact he technically was not one.²⁸

Grégoire and Talleyrand

In the biographical sketch, L'Ami was anxious to be truthful and yet to cast a certain amount of doubt on the integrity of Grégoire. L'Avenir, also, questioned Grégoire's integrity by implying that there were irregularities in his being granted permission to say Mass by the first two archbishops of Paris after the Concordat.²⁹

And finally, L'Ami pointed out that for thirty years Grégoire had claimed a title (Bishop of Blois) that did not belong to him. The Civil Constitution of the Clergy designated the constitutional bishops by the name of the department (Loir et Cher) not by the city! Even Quélen, in the narrative of this affair found in the archdiocesan archives and in the published circular to the Parisian clergy, objected strenuously to this episcopal title usurped by Grégoire.³⁰ Quélen explained that if Grégoire signed a retraction as Bishop of Blois it would be unacceptable because "this title would imply a canonical institution which had never existed."³¹ Interestingly, L'Avenir referred to Grégoire as the former constitutional Bishop of Blois on 7 May and thereafter only as M. Grégoire.

The Catholic newspapers were on the defensive in the early July Monarchy and felt threatened by the anticlericalism which had been prevalent since Louis Philippe had become king. In the face of real threats and remembering the violence of the 1790s, the Catholic papers and leaders sought strength in unity--even when they disagreed as L'Ami and L'Avenir did (e.g., over democracy, church-state separation). Grégoire was a symbol of the lack of unity, of the schismatic church even though he had promoted religion and had never forsaken the priesthood. His life and work were reflected only in the light of one act--his unequivocal refusal to retract his oath to the Civil Constitution even though that constitution was no longer in effect. Grégoire's participation in the Convention and its trial of Louis XVI was the other factor which was unpardonable for Catholics who shared the legitimist attitude of L'Ami. Grégoire's intemperate speeches and writings against monarchies were cited as evidence of his being at least a regicide "in thought" if not "in deed." Even in 1837, L'Ami criticized Grégoire's Mémoires because his language "breathed his hatred for the non-juring clergy" and expressed "gross insults" for Louis XVI.³²

By 1838, the relations between the Catholic Church and the July Monarchy had improved. And this is an important factor in the more lenient attitude toward Talleyrand and his errors during and after the Revolution. Also important are his noble status and the fact that he had not been tainted with the blood of the Bourbon king since he was in exile during the Convention. And, Talleyrand was the nephew of Quélen's predecessor, Cardinal Alexandre Angélique Talleyrand-Périgord³³ whose last words had been to leave to Quélen "the soul of Prince Talleyrand to be saved."³⁴

In the Parisian archdiocesan archives, there is no extant correspondence between Grégoire and Quélen prior to the May 1831 events (possibly because of repeated looting of the archiepiscopal residence in 1830 and 1831). And yet there is quite a stack of documents concerning Talleyrand.³⁵ The documents indicate that Quélen actively sought the reconciliation of Talleyrand, Prince of Bénévent. But none of Quélen's activities appeared in the Catholic papers. The newspapers, instead, left the impression that Talleyrand repented of his sins on his own.

Talleyrand became ill in early May and died on 17 May 1838, at the age of 84. He received the last sacraments and was buried as a Catholic layman in a religious funeral. The publicity surrounding this death was much less than that for Grégoire. The main focus of the articles in the Catholic papers concern the deathbed retraction and its positive consequences for the Church. L'Ami

M. Patricia Dougherty

described the declaration as "brilliant respect for religion and a welcome atonement for the Church."³⁶ It also traced some aspects of Talleyrand's life which presaged his last minute conversion--for example a 1821 speech to the Chamber of Peers in which Talleyrand lovingly recalled his memories of St. Sulpice (i.e., his early seminarian education).³⁷ L'Univers did very little of its own reporting; it provided facts and reprinted relevant articles from other newspapers (e.g., L'Ami, Le Temps, Gazette de France). In describing the funeral, it noted the "imposing majesty of this religion from which Talleyrand had not in vain invoked mercy."³⁸ Both papers remarked on the appropriateness of Talleyrand's family motto "Rè que Diou" (Nothing except God) which decorated banners in the church at his funeral Mass.

In general, L'Ami's articles were more detailed and more accurate than those of L'Univers. L'Ami was well-informed (probably by sources in the archdiocesan offices³⁹). The paper outlined the steps Talleyrand had taken to affect his re-union with the Catholic Church (for example, the conversations with abbé Felix Dupanloup over the previous three months). These articles and the reports on the deathbed scene are remarkably similar to (but much shorter than) Dupanloup's own account written in February 1839 and published in 1910.⁴⁰ Yet, L'Ami's articles did not hint at Quélen's role in bringing Talleyrand back to Catholicism. Either L'Ami was uninformed (rather unlikely) or it chose to omit reference to Quélen for its own (unknown) reason. The impression is that Talleyrand took the initiative: "Fifteen days before his death, the prince had written, without anyone asking him for one, a declaration."⁴¹ Yet, the archival documents show that Talleyrand's niece had a draft of what was required (though Talleyrand's did not resemble it), and Dupanloup recounted that Talleyrand had asked his niece what he must do to die "in the Roman, Catholic, and apostolic religion."⁴² Thus, Talleyrand knew what was required of him by 26 or 27 March⁴³--nearly six weeks before he wrote his first declaration.

Neither L'Ami nor L'Univers talked about the grievous (in the eyes of the Church) faults Talleyrand had committed: his suggestion of putting ecclesiastical property at the service of the state (October 1789), his celebration of Mass on the Champ de Mars on the feast of the Federation (14 July 1790), his oath to the Civil Constitution of the Clergy, his illicit consecration of constitutional bishops, his abandonment of his episcopal office, his invalid marriage to a divorced woman. Instead, L'Ami contrasted the revolutionary spirit with the religious spirit and applauded the virtue of forgiveness of the Church: "One instant has repaired . . . all his past life."⁴⁴ Both L'Ami and L'Univers rejoiced that Talleyrand had renounced his errors (unspecified in both newspapers and in the actual retraction that he signed). Talleyrand, the noble diplomat who had served every government (except the Convention) since 1789 made a generalized statement and signed it in front of religious and governmental witnesses on the morning of his death.⁴⁵ Paradoxically, Grégoire who, according to Guillon, had made a general profession of faith--similar to that by Talleyrand--was denied the last rites and religious burial because of his failure to be specific enough and his stubbornness regarding his oath to the Civil Constitution.⁴⁶ Talleyrand's retraction was not published even though both L'Ami and L'Univers urged its publication for the consolation of Catholics. In August, 1838, L'Ami published three paraphrased paragraphs of the retraction (obtained through a Belgian correspondent).⁴⁷ This extract accurately conveys the sense if not the words of Talleyrand's retraction. (L'Univers inserted these paragraphs from L'Ami in its issue the following day).

Grégoire and Talleyrand

What is interesting is the general nature of the retraction despite papal instructions and Quélen's drafts in which specific errors (the oath to the Civil Constitution of the Clergy and the violation of the vow of celibacy) had been spelled out. The retraction condemned "the serious errors which . . . have troubled and afflicted the Roman, apostolic, Catholic Church and in which I [Talleyrand] had the misfortune to participate."⁴⁸ Quélen must have been worried about the general nature of what Talleyrand had signed even though he had approved the document.⁴⁹ In March he had sent a copy of the draft document that he had composed to Rome; after the death of Talleyrand he wrote to the Pope requesting approval of his actions.⁵⁰ When he received on 1 June--two weeks after Talleyrand's death--the corrected draft of a retraction (dated 23 April), he immediately demanded of Antonio Garibaldi, papal nuncio in Paris, an explanation for the delay.⁵¹ (The papal correction specifically mentioned the Civil Constitution of the Clergy and the scandal which Talleyrand had given.) Six weeks later, Quélen's actions were approved in a letter from the Pope. L'Ami reported on this congratulatory letter on 26 July. (In this letter--but not in L'Ami--the Pope expressed his wish that the errors had been more specifically enumerated).⁵² L'Univers cited L'Ami's information on the papal approval of Quélen's conduct.

What mattered more than the enumeration of the specific evils was the return to the Church of an eminent politician. Whereas Grégoire's refusal to retract his errors had been perceived as evidence of the continuing errors of the Revolution, this reconciliation was a sign for the Catholic newspapers that the Church had been right all along and is evidence of the revitalization of Catholicism in the latter half of the 1830s. In 1831, church leaders would not ignore the Civil Constitution nor the execution of the king because they were under attack and blamed those recent French events for the attack. By 1838, a religious revival was already beginning and the church leaders could allow a little more flexibility in response to its errant members.

A change in the relationship between church and state (from animosity toward accommodation) can be found in both L'Ami's and L'Univers's praise of the eulogy of Talleyrand by Baron Barante in the Chamber of Peers on 9 June. L'Ami concentrated on Barante's remarks on the constituent assembly and on the last moments of Talleyrand. Barante, L'Ami informed its readers, was the first in fifty years to describe publicly the state's creation of a church as an "unfortunate attempt." This judgment was full of "truth, wisdom . . . courage."⁵³ In a similar manner, L'Univers called the judgment of Barante on the constituent assembly "remarkable."⁵⁴

The Catholic press accounts of the deaths of these two famous Revolutionary characters thus reveal the concerns and the changes in Catholic attitudes from 1831 to 1838. In 1831, there was a defensive posture: the Church was perceived as being again under attack by the state. The discussion of the "evil" Civil Constitution of the Clergy--which was in effect for a very short time and which was replaced by the Concordat and by an oath similar to that which was required in 1790--is indicative of the fear. Further, the Orleanist dynasty usurped the legitimate Bourbon king, and many Catholics were associated with legitimist sentiments in the July Monarchy. In 1831, the real and the perceived attacks on the unity of the Church blinded the leaders to Grégoire's point of view. He was seen as an obstacle and a cause of the loss of religion in France and of the rise of anticlericalism. In 1838, the church was no longer on the defensive but was on the offensive; it could look forward instead of backwards. The situation

M. Patricia Dougherty

for religion had improved (e.g., the amelioration of relations between Quélen and Louis Philippe, the belief that religion was on the rise), and the issue of the Civil Constitution of the Clergy was allowed to drop. The reconciliation of Talleyrand was seen as part of the revival of religion. And so with Talleyrand there was more negotiation--as befit an able and noble diplomat. The question of obedience and authority at the heart of the Grégoire affair was not stressed in the Talleyrand case. It is there but not prominent: one of the two documents Talleyrand signed on the morning of his death was a letter of submission to the Pope.

Notes

1. Michel Lagrée and Francis Orhant, Grégoire et Cathelineau ou la Déchirure (Paris, 1988), 37.
2. In a copy of his declaration (retraction of errors and submission to Pope) sent to Quélen for approval on 10 May 1838, Talleyrand wrote, "All my youth was directed toward a profession for which I was not born." Archives of the Archdiocese of Paris, I D IV 15, 11.
3. L'Ami, 78 (5 December 1833), 250.
4. Le Correspondant became the monthly Revue européenne (September 1831-1835) and then reappeared in 1843 as the monthly Le Correspondant. It continued publication until 1933; it reappeared briefly in 1935-36. Catholicisme Hier, Aujourd'hui, Demain, S.v. "Le Correspondant," by J. Morienvat.
5. Journal des villes et campagnes (begun in 1815 and fused with La Défense in 1892) was also published during the 1830s. It was essentially monarchist and Catholic. Copies of this tri-weekly paper covering the July Monarchy are difficult to find in archival sources--possibly because it consisted mainly of brief announcements and information for mayors and curés.
6. Le Correspondant (20 May 1831), 180.
7. A.A.P. I D IV 18, 2.
8. Letter (5 May 1831) from Quélen to Grégoire, published in L'Ami, 68 (2 June 1831), 213.
9. L'Ami, 68 (2 June 1831), 213.
10. A.A.P. I D IV 18, 4. In July, Guillon attempted--unsuccessfully, according to L'Ami--to justify his behavior.
11. Quélen reported that the President of the Council of Ministers, Casimir Périer, had informed him on May 7--three weeks before the death of Grégoire--of the state's intention of conducting a religious funeral for Grégoire. A.A.P. I D IV 18, 5.
12. L'Avenir (21 May 1831), 2.
13. *Ibid.*, (15 May 1831), 1-2; (20 May 1831), 2; (21 May 1831), 2.
14. *Ibid.*, (10 May 1831), 2.
15. *Ibid.*, (31 May 1831), 2 (signed H.L.--Henri Lacordaire).
16. Le Correspondant (3 June 1831), 212.
17. L'Avenir (1 June 1831), 2.

Grégoire and Talleyrand

18. L'Ami, 66 (20 January 1831), 545-550 (signed D); ibid., 67, (8 March 1831), 225-229 (D); ibid., (12 March 1831), 257-264 (D); ibid., (7 April 1831), 433-438 (D); ibid., 68 (19 May 1831), 113-118; ibid., 70 (1 November 1831), 1-6. One area in which L'Ami did not want a complete separation was in the area of finances. In contrast to L'Avenir, it approved state payment of clerical salaries and argued that "one could receive a salary without becoming a slave."
19. L'Avenir (15 June 1831), 1.
20. L'Ami, 68 (11 June 1831), 276. L'Avenir reprinted this information from L'Ami on 13 June.
21. Pius VII indicated that he would accept some schismatics as Concordat bishops if they showed signs of sincere repentance. Abbé Bernier had the task of collecting these "signs." Although Bernier reported that he was satisfied, the bishops said that they had not asked to be absolved. Adrien Dansette, Histoire religieuse de la France contemporaine, rev. ed. (Paris, 1965), 143-144.
22. L'Ami, 68 (24 May 1831), 145-150.
23. Ibid., (11 June 1831), 276.
24. Le Correspondant (31 May 1831), 203; ibid., (3 June 1831), 213. This information was not entirely accurate: one schismatic, abbé Chatel, had not been present, and another priest protested (in a letter to Le Correspondant) that rumor had erroneously associated him with the scandalous funeral.
25. L'Ami, 68 (4 June 1831), 225-233. L'Ami's editor-in-chief Michel Pierre Joseph Picot (with D-B-n) wrote the entry on Grégoire in Michaud's Biographie universelle.
26. Ibid., 225.
27. Ibid., 83 (13 February 1835), 602.
28. L'Avenir (1 June 1831), 2.
29. Ibid., (21 May 1831), 2. Jean Baptiste de Belloy became Archbishop of Paris in 1802--at the age of 93. Jean Siffrein Maury was named Archbishop of Paris by Napoleon in 1810. Despite the Pope's refusal to confirm Maury as Archbishop, Maury claimed to be archbishop until the defeat of Napoleon.
30. A.A.P. I D IV 18 (109 pages). L'Ami, 68 (2 June 1831), 209.
31. A.A.P. I D IV 18, 10. The constitutional bishops switched their episcopal titles to cities in December 1795 as seen in their joint encyclical letter of that month.
32. L'Ami, 94 (19 September 1837), 545-549.
33. Picot wrote the biographical entry for this cardinal for Michaud's Biographie universelle.
34. William F. Dennehy, "Talleyrand's Conversion," American Catholic Quarterly Review 36 (1911), 504.
35. A.A.P. I D IV 15 contains nearly a hundred different papers related to Quélen and Talleyrand. Two of these are dated in the 1820s (1821, 1823).
36. L'Ami, 97 (24 May 1838), 356.
37. Ibid., 97 (22 May 1838), 337-339.
38. L'Univers (23 May 1838), 1.

M. Patricia Dougherty

39. This view is shared by R. Limouzin-Lamothe, "La rétractation de Talleyrand: (Documents inédits)," Revue d'histoire de l'église de France 40 (July-December 1954), 233, fn13.
40. F. Dupanloup, "La Mort de Talleyrand," Revue des Deux Mondes 56 (March 1910), 112-146.
41. L'Ami, 97 (24 May 1838), 357.
42. Manifeste de Talleyrand, dated 1 October 1836. A.A.P. I D IV 15, 24
43. Limouzin-Lamothe, 230.
44. L'Ami, 97 (26 May 1838), 380.
45. The retraction was dated 10 March though it was signed 17 May. L'Ami explained the date was chosen by Talleyrand to coincide with the week when he had given the eulogy for Count Reinhart at the Academy. On that date, he was in good health so his retraction could not be interpreted as being the result of weakness due to illness. L'Ami, 97 (24 May 1838), 358. L'Univers incorrectly noted the change of date was the same as the March speech. L'Univers (19 May 1838), 1. Dupanloup admired the fact that Talleyrand had such complete control at the end even over such details. Dupanloup, 142.
46. A.A.P. I D IV 18, 8. Grégoire wrote he was willing to submit to the Church if his doctrine was found erroneous. Letter to Quélen printed in L'Ami, 68 (2 June 1838), 215.
47. L'Ami, 98 (4 August 1838), 228.
48. The retraction is printed in Limouzin-Lamothe, 236.
49. Dupanloup, 130.
50. A.A.P. I D IV 15, 33.
51. A.A.P. I D IV 15, 49b.
52. Letter printed in Limouzin-Lamothe, 239-240.
53. L'Ami, 97 (16 June 1838), 513-14.
54. L'Univers (12 June 1838), 1.