



Durham E-Theses

Some aspects of Jansenism

Moreton, H. A. V.

How to cite:

Moreton, H. A. V. (1962) *Some aspects of Jansenism*, Durham theses, Durham University. Available at Durham E-Theses Online: <http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/9923/>

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a [link](#) is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

H. A. V. MORETON

SOME ASPECTS OF
JANSENISM

M.Litt. Thesis, 1962

C O N T E N T S

ABBREVIATIONS and NOTE

INTRODUCTION i - xiv

PART ONE

Jansenism in France

THE EARLY STAGES	1
The <u>Lettres Provinciales</u>	5
GALLICANISM AND RICHERISM: part sources of Jansenism	11
THE SECOND JANSENISM	25
Pasquier Quesnel	26
Guy Drappier	41
Nicolas le Gros	50
EVENTS LEADING UP TO THE COUNCIL OF EMBRUN, 1727	56
AN EXAMPLE OF OPPOSITION TO THE COUNCIL OF EMBRUN AND TO THE REFUSAL OF SACRAMENTS	76
THE PARLEMENTS AND JANSENISM: THE REFUSAL OF SACRAMENTS	
(a) During the episcopate of Archbishop Vintimille, 1729-46	85
(b) During the episcopate of Archbishop Beaumont, 1746-81	103
CONCLUSION OF PART ONE	140

PART TWO
Jansenism in Italy

FRENCH INFLUENCE ON THE MOVEMENT	145
NEW DISCOVERIES ABOUT THE JANSENISTS IN NORTH ITALY	173
THE WORK OF JANSENISTS IN ROME	182
SCIPIONE DEI RICCI, 1741-1810	202
RICCI AS BISHOP OF PISTOIA AND PRATO	223
THE SYNOD OF PISTOIA, 1786	234
CONCLUSION	241
APPENDIX A A note on certain documents	244
APPENDIX B Jansenist miracles and convulsions	253
BIBLIOGRAPHY OF WORKS CONSULTED	264
INDEX	275

ABBREVIATIONS AND WORKS FREQUENTLY CITED

(For full details see the bibliography, pp. 264-274)

- A. & D. Pistoia, Synod of. Actes et décrets du concile diocésain de Pistoie de 1786. 1788.
- Cat. Hist. Pavie de Fourquevaux. Catéchisme historique et dogmatique. 1750-68. 5 vols.
- D.T.C. Dictionnaire de théologie catholique. 1903 - 15 vols. Index in progress.
- N.E. Nouvelles Ecclésiastiques, 1728-1802. 26 vols.
- Gazier. Gazier, A. Histoire générale du mouvement Janséniste. 1923-4. 2 vols.
- Préclin. Préclin, E. Les Jansénistes du xviiiè siècle. 1929.

NOTE

Spelling and accents in French - more especially from Italian quotations - may often appear to be incorrect, but the original has been copied.

INTRODUCTION

Many contributing causes led to the French Revolution - social, political, philosophical and financial. Religious problems also played their part and became intermingled with other causes. Among the many religious controversies of the 17th and 18th centuries, Jansenism is the most important, partly because it was one of the most permanent. Usually Jansenism is thought of as a purely theological problem - a heresy in the minds of many - dealing with the problems of Grace, Predestination and the Nature of Man, showing itself as a struggle with the Jesuits and resulting, in the early stages, in the suppression of Port-Royal, the headquarters of the movement.

Professor Abercrombie (1) has dealt very fully with the theological and historical problems of Jansenism in its earliest phase up to the destruction of Port-Royal in 1709. This very valuable book takes us to the end of the 17th century, a long cry, it might be said, from the Revolution. But, says Abercrombie, (2) "the enemies of Jansenism were human and impatient; and in their efforts to exterminate every trace of Jansenism they aroused a dispute which ensured the continuance of that heresy for another century and a half." It is generally admitted that religious quarrels had a bearing on the Revolution.

The bitter quarrels between the Jansenists and the Jesuits, and especially the publication of the Bull Unigenitus, dealt a bitter blow at religion and weakened the sense of authority. In the 'cahiers' collected in preparation for the calling of the States General there is general denunciation of the religious orders and the higher clergy. When the States General was summoned, no progress could be made because the three Orders - Clergy, Nobles and the Third Estate - would not meet as

(1) Nigel Abercrombie, The Origins of Jansenism. O.U.P. 1936.
The great work of Ste-Beuve also ends with the destruction of Port-Royal. C.A.Sainte-Beuve, Port-Royal. 3rd ed. Paris. 1867. 4 vols.

(2) *Op.cit.* p.301.

a single voting chamber. Progress was made only when some of the clergy left their own Order to join the Third Estate. It was this defection of the clergy which really started the French Revolution. Many of the clergy held Jansenist opinions; their influence can be seen in the Ecclesiastical Committee where the prevailing opinion was Jansenist and which drew up the Constitution Civile du Clergé which caused such havoc to the French Church.

If the English bibliography on this movement is small, (apart from works on Pascal) the French bibliography, on the other hand, is enormous. The great difficulty for the student is that the early books are rare and difficult of access. One is greatly indebted to the National Central Library for its help, to the ease with which microfilms can be obtained from the Bibliothèque Nationale of Paris, and to the invaluable Bodleian Library. Further study revealed additional difficulties. At the outset one was warned by so experienced a writer on Jansenism as Préclin that there was much difficulty with regard to bibliography. The first of the difficulties, he says (I) is the dispersion of the sources. "Le premier obstacle, tout technique, quelque difficile à surmonter qu'il soit, pourra être vaincu par des chercheurs patients, que ne rebuteront point de longues années d'efforts employés à dépouiller les richissimes dépôts de la Bibliothèque Nationale, de la collection Gazier, des bibliothèques de Sens, de Troyes et d'Auxerre".

There are other difficulties. The Bodleian Library has much Jansenist and anti-Jansenist material. So many of the large number of pamphlets and documents are anonymous and frequently undated. They could be studied much more objectively if one knew the exact date and the circumstances. The writers are usually extremely partial and one is apt to draw wrong inferences. This is so, for example, with the religious communities; if the superiors were often favourable to Jansenism it does not follow that the whole order was favourable; or, on the other hand, if the superiors were hostile, the order itself might be favourable.

(I) E. Préclin. Les Jansénistes du xviii^e siècle et la Constitution civile du Clergé. Paris. 1929.

Carreyre, a well documented writer on Jansenism admits that hardly any diocese escaped some Jansenist influence, though, of course, much would depend on the actual bishop. It is said, for example, that the municipal library at Troyes is rich in Jansenist works because Bossuet's nephew was bishop there from 1716-1742 and was very favourable to the Jansenists; his diocese was a refuge for those exiled from other dioceses. There exists at Sens a large amount of material from the opposite point of view.

Some writers consider Jansenism as a 17th century movement, having little or no connection with the Revolution at the end of the 18th century or with the stirring events in Italy in the 18th and 19th centuries. It is true that one of the outstanding Jansenists - Pascal - has a permanent interest for us and his Provinciales and the Pensées have become classics. But although it is also true that the first passionate wave of what we might call 'pure' Jansenism fades towards the end of the 17th century, its work is nevertheless carried on into the 18th, though under different aspects. Its influence persisted, especially among the lower clergy and many of the laity and it is the purpose of this essay to trace these movements up to the time of the suppression of the Jesuits and also to make some reference to the influence of Jansenism on Italian struggles.

Theology (I) will not figure more than is necessary in a work which is meant to be historical; but to ignore theology completely would make it impossible to understand Jansenism. It is commonly said that jansenism owes its origin to the book Augustinus which was written by Jansen, or Jansenius, Bishop of Ypres, published in 1640, two years after the author's death and condemned, under Jesuit influence, in 1653, thus giving rise

(I) For the theology of Jansenism: Jean Laporte, La Doctrine de Port-Royal. La Morale. Paris. 1951-2. 2 vols. and J. Paquier, Le Jansénisme: étude doctrinale. Paris. 1909.

to the famous controversy of the 'Five Propositions'. This theological position was accepted by Jansen's friend Jean Duvergier de Hauranne, usually known as the Abbé de St.Cyran, who was the director of the monastery of Port-Royal des Champs. The abbess of Port-Royal was Angélique Arnauld, whose brother, Antoine Arnauld was a friend of St.Cyran. Through these, Port-Royal became involved in the controversies of the period and this was particularly so after the publication of Arnauld's work De la Fréquente Communion, in 1643.

But to say that the Jansenist movement owes its inception to Jansen is to misunderstand the religious and theological situation of the period. Gazier, (I) in the introduction to his well-informed volumes on Jansenism says that to write the history of Jansenism is to believe in a phantom. It is the Jesuits who believed in this phantom. There never were any real Jansenists since the first aim of those so called was to deny the doctrine condemned in the five propositions and which are supposed to be in Jansen's book. It is true, however, that there existed a body of people - moralists and theologians - who were distinguished by a particular outlook, who might be called Jansenists, Pascalians or Port-Royalists; enemies on the one hand of Protestantism, Modernism and Humanism and on the other hand of the new Romanism and the idea of development of, and addition to, the dogma of the Church. Unlike human institutions, they would say, Christian teaching cannot undergo development. They were disciples of St. Paul, ^{and} St. Augustine, and would agree with Bossuet; "The Church never varies; it is heresy which began by innovating and innovates always". It was because some of the Jesuits were the great innovators and especially because some of them encouraged a lax morality, that the Jansenists became the bitter enemies of the Jesuits, an enmity which had its repercussions

(I) A. Gazier, Histoire Générale du Mouvement Janséniste depuis ses origines jusqu'à nos jours. Paris. 1923. 2 vols.

well into the 18th century.

The Jansenists were thus a puritan party within the French Church basing their theology - even if at times pushed to an extreme - on the great north African theologian, St. Augustine of Hippo. Now this spirit of Augustinianism was not new, which justifies Gazier in the statement of his which we have noticed. Jansenism therefore stood for something much more profound than a quarrel with the Jesuits, although this is a permanent element in the movement. The Jansenists were reformers. They resemble the 16th century reformers in this, that they looked back to the life and discipline of the early Church, maintaining the tradition of the Fathers, standing for freedom of conscience, fighting against the tyranny of an intolerant orthodoxy imposed by Rome or by the State. This may account for the note of severity in Jansenist teaching and practice. Jansen's book is then but one aspect of the movement. Gazier, the great apologist of Jansenism says: "C'est même une chose très surprenante de voir ces jansénistes laisser absolument de côté l'Augustinus et les questions si âprement discutées autour d'eux, de la Grâce efficace par elle-même et de la prédestination gratuite. Je ne crois pas qu'il en soit parlé une seule fois dans les sept ou huit cents pages que Besoigne a consacrées à cette partie de l'histoire de Port-Royal. J'inclinerais à penser que Jansénius ne figurait pas dans la bibliothèque des Messieurs et que saint Augustin n'était pas leur livre de chevet". (1)

Professor Adam, in his Zaharoff Lecture for 1959 Sur le problème religieux dans la première moitié du 18e siècle (2) takes us back to the Spanish doctor, philosopher and theologian Raymond de Sebond (died 1432) who wrote the treatise Theologia naturalis. (3)

(1) Op.cit. vol. I, p.75

(2) Oxford. 1959

(3) See Montaigne, Essais. Apologie de Raymond. vol. 2, p. 12.

For Sebond, man is the starting point; religion is born in the necessity of the human condition. What man needs is a Saviour. Sebond is no optimist about human nature. Such a theology is in violent contrast with that of the humanists, among whom were many Jesuits. From these two contradictions flow two currents of thought which are seen throughout the 17th and 18th centuries. The religious revival in France under Henri iv and Louis xiii is based on St. Augustine's teaching. Bérulle (1575-1629), following Sebond, is a good example with his tragic conception of life, (1) and the importance of redemption. The controversy was by no means new. It goes back to the rivalry between St. Augustine and Pelagius. Pelagius exalted human nature to such an extent that it could accomplish its own salvation without the aid of grace. St. Augustine, to combat Pelagianism, insisted on the necessity of grace as a free gift of God and taught a doctrine of predestination which ran the risk of lessening the natural powers of fallen man. The quarrel is perennial - a recurring feature in theological history. (2) Its extreme features are seen in Luther and Calvin; also, according to their opponents, in the Jansenists. It was there, however, in a more moderate form in St. Thomas Aquinas.

Jansen, Pascal and the other Jansenists are then not innovators. The Pensées of Pascal - with its religion of salvation - is Augustinian and in line with the medieval Augustinian tradition. Anti-humanist writers are found in Racine, Boileau, La Bruyère. It is, perhaps, a religion of pessimism. When Bérulle advanced his teaching, France had just passed through a period

(1) See also: P. Pourrat, La Spiritualité Chrétienne. Paris. 1947-51.
4 vols. Vol. 4, p.48 sq.

(2) See article "Augustinisme" in Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique. Cited hereafter as D.T.C.

which had been given over to violence producing, naturally enough, the need of a Redeemer. This is 'crisis' theology. "C'est le même pessimisme, c'est le même refus d'adhérer à l'oeuvre historique qui s'élabore sous leurs yeux, qui explique le jansénisme et sa doctrine de la grâce. A lire les Cinq Propositions, qui pourrait croire que des hommes et des femmes ont préféré la persécution, l'emprisonnement, l'exil, plutôt que d'y souscrire? Mais il s'agissait en réalité de savoir si l'on acceptait ou non cette interprétation moderne de la religion qui, pour sauver le prestige et la puissance d'une hiérarchie, sacrifiait les exigences radicales de l'esprit chrétien, qui fermait les yeux sur l'injustice et l'imposture, qui remplaçait l'attente du salut dans le Christ par l'acceptation complaisante de l'ordre moral et de l'ordre politique établis. Et parce que le même pessimisme et le même refus d'adhérer inspiraient Bossuet et ses disciples, c'est en vain qu'ils souscrivaient avec insistance à la condamnation des Cinq Propositions. L'opinion publique, le roi même, ne pouvaient voir en eux que des jansénistes larvés". (1)

With this background we are in a position to study the Jansenist movement. But first of all, one question must be faced. Did Jansenism survive long enough into the 18th century to have any influence on the opening stages of the French Revolution? Opinions differ. Thus Voltaire (2) suggests that the Convulsions (1727-1731) at the tomb of the Deacon Paris brought the movement to an end. No longer supported by people like Arnauld, Pascal and Nicole, the sect fell into a state of degradation. Voltaire was writing about half-way through the 18th century. Professor Cobban, in his recent A History of modern France (3) speaks of the 'so called Jansenism' of the 18th century Parlements. On the other hand, Jette (4) who speaks well

(1) Adam, op.cit. p.14. (2) Voltaire, Siècle de Louis xiv. Paris.n.d.

(3) Harmondsworth.1957. p.83.

p.449

(4) M.H. Jette, France Religieuse du 18e siècle. Paris. 1956. p.39

of early Jansenism, says: "En 1771, des 'hommes nouveaux' furent introduits dans la Magistrature, et la Haute Cour privée d'attributions politiques en dépit des grognements populaires. Mais il était bien tard pour l'Eglise Gallicane à laquelle, comme nous allons le voir, le Parlement uni aux Jansénistes, avait déjà porté de rudes coups". Jette adds an interesting note: "De récentes enquêtes sur la déchristianisation de certaines provinces ont prouvé que les régions les plus anti-cléricales aujourd'hui encore, sont celles où le Jansénisme a sévi. Citons, par exemple, le diocèse de Sens, où pendant soixante ans fut enseigné un catéchisme d'esprit très janséniste." We return to this later.

For the author of La Spiritualité Chrétienne (I), "Le Jansénisme et le quietisme sont les deux grandes hérésies modernes qui ont influé sur la spiritualité"... and "Une spiritualité à tendances plus pessimistes, telle qu'il la fallait pour qu'elle eût prise sur les esprits plus ou moins imprégnés de rigorisme, se trouve partout en France, dans la seconde moitié du xviii^e siècle et même au xviii^e". More violent still, in its opposition to Jansenism and in its belief that Jansenism survived into the 18th century is Bourlon. (2) "Le Jansénisme, en effet, fit encore plus de mal à la religion catholique en France que le Protestantisme. Mieux adaptée au tempérament français au xviii^e siècle surtout, plus dissimulée et plus habile, car elle se cramponnait obstinément à l'Eglise catholique, cette sournoise hérésie devait faire en France de rapides progrès et de faciles conquêtes, surtout parmi les âmes d'élite." And speaking of Quesnel (3)

(1) Pourrat, op.cit. vol.4, préface p.vi, and p.49.

(2) J.Bourlon, Les Assemblées du Clergé et le Jansénisme. Paris. 1909. p.2.

(3) Ibid. p.138

Bourlon says: "Quesnel, échappé de façon si singulière, des prisons de l'archevêque de Malines et désormais en sûreté dans les Pays-Bas, criblait de ses traits mordants tous ses adversaires; le P.Gerberon l'aidait de son mieux; leurs livres étaient répandus par toute la France, malgré la police de Louis xiv, et ils faisaient de nombreuses conquêtes, surtout dans le Clergé de second ordre et dans la bourgeoisie parlementaire". In concluding his book, Bourlon says: "Refugié chez les parlementaires et les gallicans d'extrême gauche, il (i.e. Jansenisme) inspirera encore le fameux Comité ecclésiastique de 1790 et rédigera la Constitution civile du Clergé. Mais chose plus grave, et que malheureusement les assemblées n'ont pu empêcher dans beaucoup de provinces, un trop grand nombre de curés à la cervelle étroite contribuent, par des rigueurs exagérées, à transformer le sens religieux en torture morale, et à fausser singulièrement l'idée de la religion catholique: ils exaspèrent ainsi les rancunes au coeur du peuple et préparent, dans les campagnes surtout, les réactions violentes et sanglantes de 1793". While admitting the great extension of Jansenism, Bourlon's book is an attempt to show that the clerical 'Assemblées du Clergé' were constantly hostile to it. One has to remember, however, that Louis xiv was determined to stamp out Jansenism and his control over the bishops was almost absolute; he gave orders that the assemblies must find means to extirpate the rebels. All ecclesiastics were to sign the 'Formulary'; the opponents were to be treated as heretics and communities where Jansenism was taught were to be dispersed. (1) Knox (2) assumes the continuity of Jansenism. "In the following century (i.e. the 18th) when Gallican

(1) See A.Rimbaud, Histoire de la Civilisation Française. Paris. ~~1921~~ [n.d.]
2 vols. vol. 2, p.44.

(2) R.A.Knox, Enthusiasm. Oxford. 1950. p.205

opposition to the Bull Unigenitus had swelled the ranks of the movement, it (i.e. Jansenism) was to have its own bank, its own newspaper."

De Maistre (I) also speaks of this 'caisse publique invisible' which must be a reference to the famous "Boîte à Perrette", started by Nicole to aid Port-Royal. Later, many gave large sums. Money was needed to carry on the work of the schools, to print books and to aid the victims of the Formulary. The fund still existed after the Revolution. (2)

It may be ^{of} interest at this point to consider the work of the Comte J. de Maistre because it was written in 1817 and is evidence of the survival of Jansenism. De Maistre is probably the bitterest opponent of Jansenism and is also a very severe critic of the Gallican Church in the 17th and 18th centuries. The book is a supreme effort to rally the French Church to the doctrine of Ultramontanism, the aim of which was to advance the papal power and the doctrine of infallibility. As so much of French ecclesiastical life in these centuries was in violent opposition to this doctrine, we shall expect to find in de Maistre, for whom the 'Libertés de l'Eglise Gallicane' were an immense absurdity, a total condemnation of Gallicanism, with which Jansenism was linked. True, the greatest culprits were the Parlements, especially that of Paris. "Protestant dans le xvie siècle, frondeur et janséniste dans le xviii, philosophe enfin, et républicain dans les dernières années de sa vie, trop souvent le parlement s'est montré en contradiction avec les véritables maximes fondamentales de l'Etat. (3)

(1) J. de Maistre, De l'Eglise Gallicane. Lyon. 1859, p.35

(2) See references in Gazier, ^{op. cit.} Table Alphabétique; Perrette.

(3) De Maistre, op.cit. p.7

"Ce fut surtout le tiers-état, c'est-à-dire le grand nombre qui s'opposa à l'admission du concile;(i.e.Council of Trent) et cela devait être, car il y a dans le protestantisme un caractère démocratique fait pour séduire de tous côtés le second ordre".(1) "Pour me renfermer dans l'objet que je traite, je ferai remarquer que le caractère le plus distinctif et le plus invariable du parlement de Paris se tire de son opposition constante au Saint-Siège." (2) "Ce même esprit s'était perpétué jusqu'à nos jours dans le parlement, au moyen du jansénisme qui n'est au fond qu'une phase du calvinisme. Les noms les plus vénérables de la magistrature en étaient atteints". (3) "Le germe calviniste, nourri dans ce grand corps, devint bien plus dangereux lorsque son essence changea de nom et s'appela jansénisme."(4) "Mais le jansénisme n'étant point une maladie particulière aux parlements, il est nécessaire de l'examiner en lui-même pour connaître son influence générale dans son rapport avec l'objet que je traite". (5) This de Maistre proceeds to do and expresses the opinion that "l'Eglise, depuis son origine, n'a jamais vu d'hérésie aussi extraordinaire que le jansénisme", (6) and quoting a friend of the Abbé Fleury; "Le jansénisme, dit-il, est l'hérésie la plus subtile que le diable ait tissée".(7) Jansenism reached its plenitude in Port-Royal. "Bientôt Port-Royal pourra désoler l'Eglise gallicane, braver le Souverain Pontife, impatienter Louis xiv, influencer dans ses conseils, interdire les imprimeries à ses adversaires, en imposer enfin à la suprématie." (8)

(1) De Maistre, op.cit. p.6. (2) Ibid. p.8. (3) Ibid. p.9.

(4) Ibid. p.14. (5) Ibid. p.17. (6) Ibid. p.18. (7) Ibid. p.19.

(8) Ibid. p.35.

Important too for our study is de Maistre's charge that Port-Royal "Plantait dans l'état un germe démocratique, ennemi naturel de toute hiérarchie". (1) "Le même esprit de démocratie religieuse les conduisit à nous emposter de leurs traductions de l'Écriture sainte et des Offices divins. Ils Traduisirent tout jusqu'au Missel pour contredire Rome qui, par des raisons évidentes, n'a jamais aimé ces traductions. L'exemple fut suivi de tout côté, et ce fut un grand malheur pour la religion." (2) After contradicting Voltaire's statement that Jansenism was no longer dangerous, de Maistre says; "Belles phrases de poète, qui ne tromperont jamais un homme d'Etat. Il n'y a rien de si vivace que cette secte, et sans doute elle a donné dans la révolution d'assez belles preuves de vie pour qu'il ne soit pas permis de la croire morte. Elle n'est pas moins vivante dans une foule de livres modernes que je pourrais citer. N'ayant point été écrasée dans le xviiè siècle, comme elle aurait dû l'être, elle pu croître et s'enraciner librement". (3) And to conclude our references from de Maistre: "Quoique dans la révolution française la secte janséniste semble n'avoir servi qu'en second, comme le valet de l'exécuter, elle est peut-être, dans le principe, plus coupable que les ignobles ouvriers qui achevèrent l'oeuvre; car ce fut le jansénisme qui porta les premiers coups à la pierre angulaire de l'édifice, pas ses criminelles innovations". (4)

Not only did Jansenism survive; it spread far afield, especially in Italy. The extensive influence of Jansenism and Gallicanism on Italian thought is well brought out in Vaussard (5) from whom a few passages are quoted, although this will be dealt with later.

(1) De Maistre, op.cit. p.42. (2) *ibid.* p.52. (3) *ibid.* p.102
 (4) *ibid.* p.107. (5) M.Vaussard, Jansénisme et Gallicanisme aux origines religieuses du Risorgimento. Paris. 1959.

"De Dupac de Bellegarde, venu en Italie en 1774, la notice nécrologique que lui consacrent les Mémoires de Picot rapporte qu'il fit passer en Allemagne et en Italie 'pour plus de dix millions de livres de son parti'. En monnaie de l'époque la somme serait colossale, puisqu'elle correspondrait à quelque trois milliards de nos francs. Le chiffre demeure au reste invérifiable. Ce qui est certain, c'est que Clément et lui inondèrent littéralement le monde ecclésiastique italien d'oeuvres jansénistes, richéristes et gallicans." (1) "Au seul Ricci, M. Rodolico mentionne que Dupac de Bellegard^e adressa plusieurs milliers de volumes pour une somme d'au moins dix mille écus". (2) "Une note à Clément de Mgr. Foggini, datée du 3 mars 1773, en règlement d'une caisse de livres destinée à divers, et une liste d'ouvrages désirés par le chanoine De Vecchi, vers la même date, donnent, elles aussi, une idée de ce qu'était en ce dernier tiers du xviii^e siècle la diffusion extraordinaire de la littérature ecclésiastique janséniste ou gallicane en Italie." (3) "Tous ces prêtres ou religieux nourris d'oeuvres françaises d'inspiration port-royaliste ou gallicane parlent de la France comme d'une patrie spirituelle, avec une véritable ferveur". (4)

Gourolin's Catechism was translated into Italian in order to oppose Bellarmine's Catechism; Sacy's Bible avec explication⁽⁵⁾ was held in high esteem as were Nicole's Essais de Morale⁽⁶⁾. Richer's defence of the second order of the clergy and the rights of laymen in Church affairs was influential in 18th century Italy when French Jansenists were proclaiming jurisdiction 'jure divino' of the parish priests. Jansenist influence was the basis of the reforms of the famous Italian Council of Pistoia in 1786. There was, too, a

(1) Vaussard, op.cit. p.20. (2) Ibid. p.21. (3) Ibid. pp.27-8.

(4) Ibid. p.34.

(5) Many editions of this work by Le Maistre de Sacy were issued.

(6) P. Nicole, Essais de morale. Paris. 1671-8. 4 vols.

a reverse movement, for Grégoire, the leader of the revolutionary clergy in France wrote to the Bishop of Pistoia (Ricci) for advice. The Acts of the Council of Pistoia would be of great help in drawing up the Constitution Civile du Clergé and Préclin (1) estimates that the Italian Council was one of the influences which contributed to the preparation of the Constitution Civile.

Jansenism survived; but it must be admitted that its character changed, undergoing the influences of such thinkers as Richer, Quesnel, Drappier and others whom we propose to study later. It gathered to itself all who maintained the same principles and the same severity, rallying poorly paid clergy, those anxious to introduce liturgical reforms such as the Liturgy in the vernacular, the Bible in French, the suppression of new devotions. One can well understand the conclusion of Préclin (2): "Le succès de la Révolution, bien loin d'être le résultat du hasard providentiel, est l'incontestable fruit des doctrines ici exposées" (i.e. Jansenist, Richerist, etc.). The Jansenists were essentially puritans and rigorists; they refused to accept the low religious tone and morality of the Jesuits who were the king's confessors and condoners of his flagrant immorality. The Jansenists were not alone in their opposition. The Dominicans had opposed them as had the Oratorians and the French episcopate; the hostility of the University of Paris and the Parlements was of long standing. The Sorbonne had declared that the Jesuit Society was perilous in matters of faith and the enemy of the peace of the Church.

But kings and popes favoured them, either through fear or for political reasons, and it was towards the Jansenists that the Jesuits brought their fiercest hatred. They did their utmost to suppress them and while indeed they succeeded, from the material point of view in the destruction of the Jansenist property of Port-Royal (1709-1713) (3), the spirit of Jansenism remained.

(1) Préclin, op.cit. p.489. (2) *ibid.* p.538.

(3) Henri Grégoire, Les Ruines de Port-Royal des Champs. Paris. 1809.

PART ONETHE EARLY STAGES

The real trouble began with the publication, after his death, of the book Augustinus by Bishop Jansen. (I) It was a long and serious work and written in Latin. Jansen had been a professor at the University of Louvain. The name Jansenist was given to the French movement because Jansen was a great friend of some of the leading figures of Port-Royal. His many works had met with no opposition and were frequently reprinted. His Discours sur la réformation de l'homme intérieur ran in to more than a hundred editions. The Augustinus contained nothing new; it was a careful and logical arrangement of the teaching of St. Augustine, which had been accepted by the Church throughout the centuries. Jansen affirmed that he was a loyal son of the Roman Church and submitted himself to the judgment of the pope. The Augustinus was approved by 50 doctors and 6 doctors of the Sorbonne who saw in the work the pure doctrine of St. Augustine. It was published with the approbation of the University of Louvain and was well received.

The publication of the book in 1640 gave the Jesuits their chance. Jansen had fought them in Spain and Louvain. Had there been no Jesuits we should have heard of no Jansenists. While the book was giving St. Augustine's teaching, Jansen had in mind the problems of his period. Official theology was dry and academic and had little effect upon the people. Jansen saw the

(I) Cornelius Otto Jansenius, Augustinus. Paris. 1641.
 2 vols. in 1.
 (First published in Louvain in 1640.)

need of a deep spiritual experience and conversion; but conversion depends on the grace of God and upon His good pleasure. This difficult doctrine seems to approach very near to Calvin's doctrine of Predestination; but Jansen was opposed to the Protestants and had been in controversy with them at Louvain; he insisted that salvation could only come through the Roman Church. The Jesuits maintained that the book contained five heretical propositions. Actually the Augustinus owed its origin to the publication of a work by the Jesuit Molina which was considered to be an attack on the teaching of St. Augustine and Molina's book (1) was condemned in a Bull of Pope Clement viii who died before signing the condemnation. Richelieu, who had ~~his~~ his own private quarrel with Jansen, (2) did his best to have Jansen's book condemned. In the meantime, the Jesuits' anger fell on Jansen's great friend Antoine Arnauld who had written a book De la Fréquente Communion which was an attack on Jesuit confessors who gave easy absolution. The book was based on Eastern and Western Fathers as well as on contemporary theologians and was by no means purely Augustinian. (3) Although the book was well received it was also violently attacked. Arnauld went into hiding for nearly forty years but the book was never officially condemned.

(1) L. Molina, Concordia liberi arbitrii cum gratiae donis. Lisbon. 1588. Another edition: Antwerp. 1595.

(2) Gazier, op.cit. vol. 1, p.47

(3) For a fuller discussion: *ibid.* vol. 1, pp.48 sq.

Arnauld had also undertaken the defence of the Augustinus, the result of which was the determination of the Jesuits, especially after their failure over the De la Fréquenté Communion, to destroy the Jansenists, thus opening up a series of events which were to split the Church of France. The Augustinus must be officially condemned. The story is told in full in Gazier (1); less fully and with less sympathy in Bishop (2) and in Poinset (3) where the writer admits that the five condemned propositions are not actually found in the Augustinus but are a summary of the book.

Cornet, a former Jesuit, and Syndic of the Sorbonne, brought before the Faculty seven subversive propositions, five of which were later attributed to Jansen. On examination, the motion for condemnation met with violent opposition on the part of 70 doctors whose appeal to the parlement was upheld and silence was imposed on the two parties. Later, a M. Habert, whom Arnauld had defeated in an argument on Jansen's book, having become Bishop of Vabres, undertook to have the book condemned at Rome. Letters for and against the condemnation were sent to Rome, the opponents including several bishops; two years later, however, in 1653, the Five Propositions were condemned, thus beginning a long series of equivocations.

(1) Ibid. vol. 1, chapter 5.

(2) M. Bishop, Pascal; the life of genius. London. 1937.
Chapter x.

(3) M.D. Poinset, France Religieuse du xviiè siècle. Paris. 1958.
p. 61

The Faculty was assembled and the Chancellor Séguier, representing the king, gave a note of despotism. The room contained a large number of mendicant monks which caused Pascal to say that it was easier to find monks than reasons. Arnauld was condemned and excluded from the Sorbonne. The Jansenists accepted the Bull, agreeing to the condemnation of what was contained in the Five Propositions, but denying that they represented the views of Jansen.

We are not entering into the doctrinal details of this controversy, but it must be stated that it was precisely these theological disputes which divided the nation and contributed, in some measure, to the trouble which led to the Revolution. For these disputes were not confined to the theologians; they became matters of common gossip. Mazarin was annoyed by the partisanship of the public. Bishop (I) quotes him as saying: "The women do nothing but talk about it, although they understand nothing of it, no more than I do". The bourgeoisie took an eager interest in the proceedings, the irreconcilables among them recognising in the Jansenists the party of independence, of protest against authority. Fact and doctrine, Grace, sufficient and efficacious, were argued in the salons and disputed in whispers in the taverns."

It is at this point that we meet the famous "Formulary", which people were forced to sign in an attempt to end the dispute.

"Je, N, reconnais être obligé en conscience de condamner de

(I) Op. cit. p. 219

coeur et de bouche la doctrine des cinq propositions de Cornélius Jansénius contenue dans son livre intitulé Augustinus, que le pape et les évêques ont condamné, laquelle doctrine n'est point celle de Saint Augustin, que Jansénius a mal expliqué contre le vrai sens de ce docteur."

A new champion for the Jansenists was needed; he appeared in the person of the famous Pascal, who, before his conversion to Jansenism in 1654, had been a brilliant scientist and mathematician. Moreover, he was one who knew how to write in a way which would appeal to the public. The result was the Lettres Provinciales. Bishop (1) who does not seem to be a great lover of Jansenism, observes that the writing of these Letters was one of the important dates in French social, spiritual and literary history.

The LETTRES PROVINCIALES, 1656-1657

These can be dealt with briefly since there are excellent books on Pascal in English, some with good bibliographies and dealing with early Jansenism. (2) The Lettres were a pronounced success from the start. Arnauld's condemnation would have been a great success for the Jesuits but for these letters. Pascal was determined to bring the matter to the bar of public opinion. Voltaire (3) calls them "Un modèle d'éloquence et de plaisanterie. Les meilleurs comédies de Molière n'ont pas plus de sel que les

(1) Op. cit. p. 220.

(2) See bibliography.

(3) Op. cit. p.434

premières Lettres Provinciales; Bossuet n'a rien de plus sublime que les dernières". ~~These~~ They were something new in journalism. They were written in French, a French which was clear, full of life and movement, more striking than previous works in French such as those of Descartes, Balzac (Letters) or Montaigne; satirical, sarcastic, ironical and eloquent, they brought into full daylight the problems of moral theology which previously had been studied in Latin or confined to theologians.

In a long and interesting introduction to the Lettres Provinciales, Brunetière (I) makes a great defence of the Lettres against the adverse criticisms of de Maistre and others. Pascal, he says, did for moral theology what Descartes did for philosophy. The world must be made interested in and must debate the principles of moral conduct which the theologians teach. It is true that their influence on the parish clergy was immense and brought discredit on the whole Jesuit Order.

There are 18 letters. They were read by the learned and the ignorant. Pascal was able to compel even the indifferent to interest themselves in the matter. The first letter, written in January, 1656, dealt with the condemnation of the Five Propositions.

(I) F. Brunetière, ed. Pascal. Provinciales. Lettres
I, IV, XIII et extraits. Paris. 1918.

There are two questions, one of fact and one of doctrine. Were the Propositions in Jansen's book? That is a matter of fact. The Jansenists denied that they were there. On a matter of fact the pope may err. As for the question of doctrine, Pascal tells of his visits to theologians without getting any satisfaction. But the Jansenists denied the doctrine which was attributed to Jansen. Letters 1, 2, 3, 17, 18 are dogmatic in character, dealing with the Five Propositions. The other letters are a deliberate attack on Jesuit ethics and are based, not on St. Augustine but on St. Thomas Aquinas. They examine many questions, probabilism and intention, for example, with a particular scrutiny of the work of the Jesuit Escobar, which was a collection of the moral judgments of 24 Jesuit canonists. In them Pascal found plenty of material on which to pour his scorn. Gazier (I) remarks that "il révéla à ses lecteurs surpris et indignés ce que la pudeur ne le contraignait pas de passer absolument sous silence." The last letter was published in 1657; Pascal ceased writing them and turned to the Pensées.

(I) Op. cit. vol. 1, p. 106.

The effect of the Lettres Provinciales was enormous. Wendrock (i.e. Nicole) published a Latin translation in 1658 and in his introduction he told of the great reception which the Lettres received everywhere and how they stimulated the hostility of the clergy against the Jesuits after the exposure of their doctrines. He told how the clergy of Paris and Rouen appealed to the General Assembly of the Clergy to take action. The Letters were not condemned by the Sorbonne nor by the pope; they were, however, put on the Index, not because of their contents but because they were written in French. (1) The Latin edition was not put on the Index. That they had a wide circulation is clear. Bishop (2) estimates that Pascal "saw his works running into editions of 20,000 or 30,000, enormous for the time. He heard them quoted and commented by the man in the street. He knew that they were read aloud in every salon". Bishop, who traces the influence of the Lettres, is worth further quotation. (3) "God's anger held in store for France the cataclysm of the Revolution. And the provinciales have a place among the events bringing on the cataclysm. The immediate results of the provinciales, hardly hinting at the distant future, were vexatious enough. The average man became, in his own conceit, a theologian and a critic of theologians. The simply pious were shaken in their trust, the cynical encouraged in their cynicism. The little letters, says Père Rapin, were well received by the simple, the unreflecting, and by all those who lived in some license, and especially by women, who found in those letters means to authorize their gallantries by the too free opinions which Pascal falsely attributed to the Jesuits, not to mention the mockers and all court idlers, who seek only for

(1) Gazier, op.cit. vol. I, p.103.

(2) Op.cit. p.227. (3) *ibid.* pp.255-6.

diversion, and whom he won to his side. Add to these classes the upper bourgeoisie, traditionally class-conscious, jealous of the authority of Pope and King On the Jesuits, the immediate effect of the provinciales was disastrous. The letters gave to the popular mind, already ill-disposed towards the Society, a new grievance. Jesuit fathers were jeered in the streets, were nicknamed 'Escobars'. All casuistical speculation gained an ill-repute, as something synonymous with relaxed morality. Bossuet, whose orthodoxy cannot be questioned, led a vigorous campaign against the 'ordures of the casuists', and against the readiness of Jesuitical confessors to 'put cushions under sinners' elbows' ... The work of the provinciales continued, long after their immediate effects were catalogued in history. ... Among Jansenists the little letters remained an encouragement to rebellion for a century and more."

The last of the letters was written in 1657. In these letters Pascal covered the Jesuits with ridicule while abroad Jesuits were giving their lives ~~for~~ for the faith. While few, says Poinsonet, had read the Latin work - the Augustinus - there are few now who have not read the Lettres Provinciales. In 1661 the Assemblée du Clergé took up again the matter of the Formulary. M. de Péréfixe, the Archbishop of Paris, in 1664 made an attempt to make things easier by making a distinction between "fact" and "doctrine", but the nuns of Port-Royal refused to sign. In 1665 a new formulary came from Rome which the king ordered to be signed without distinction or restriction. In 1669 the remaining nuns submitted - materially - to the formulary but not in spirit, and in order to avoid further disputes, Pope Clement xi and the king appeared more conciliatory, provided that the matter was not discussed in France. This Clementine Peace lasted from 1669-1701 but was shattered by a case of conscience. A question was put to the Sorbonne: Can one

give absolution to a penitent who reads Arnauld's ^{De} La Fréquente Communion and who refuses to admit that the Five Propositions are in the Augustinus but is content with a respectful silence? This raised once more the question of 'droit' and 'fait'. 40 doctors of the Sorbonne said: Yes; absolution must be given. A brief from Rome added fuel to the flames. Louis xiv, exasperated, determined to put an end to the 'heresy'. A Bull was obtained in 1705 putting an end to the 'respectful silence' and demanding a total submission to the Formulary. It was the end of Port-Royal - a story often told. "Plus que les Provinciales peut-être, la destruction de Port-Royal des Champs avec la dispersion des corps ensevelis dans le cimetière abbatial - ceux des Arnauld, de Hamon, de Racine - a touché l'opinion publique, et l'a touchée au vif." (I)

It is the end of the first period of Jansenism.

(I) Poinsenet, op.cit. p.72.

(1)
GALLICANISM and RICHERISM; PART SOURCES OF JANSENISM.

The story so far is perhaps better known than its sequel. The Jansenist movement was not killed but its character changed. The new storm centre is Pasquier Quesnel whose famous book - Les Réflexions morales ⁽²⁾ - was condemned by the Bull Unigenitus. Quesnel (1634-1719) was a member of the Oratory which ^{he} was forced to leave because he had withdrawn his signature to the Formulary. Taking refuge in the Low Countries, he became the intimate friend of Antoine Arnauld. Although a Jansenist, Quesnel underwent other influences, reminiscent of the quarrels of the Conciliar Movement; so, the new Jansenism reflects Gallican and Richerist ideas. Therefore, before attempting a discussion of Quesnel's views and influence, it is necessary to say something of the views of Richer (1559-1631) with regard to the Church and its government. Richer is of great importance because of his influence on later Jansenist writers and it is interesting to note that the sub-title of Préclin's great work is: "Le développement du richérisme. Sa propagation dans le Bas Clergé". But Richer had been influenced by Gerson (1363-1429) whose works he published. Gerson, following Marsiglio, William of Ocam and Dante, takes us back to the period of the struggles between Emperor and Pope and the schism in the papacy (1378-1417). Inevitably there was a great flood of controversial literature dealing, on the one hand with the relations between Church and State, and on the other hand with the insistent demands for reform in the Church, in her head and members. Dante in his De Monarchia had claimed divine origin and jurisdiction for the supreme temporal power, in this case the Holy Roman Emperor. Marsiglio of Padua defended even more strongly the Emperor's position. William of Occam, one of the foremost scholastics of the 14th century, advanced opinions which were to influence the Protestant reformers of the 16th century.

(1) For sources of information about the Gallican Liberties see Appendix A, pp. 249-251.

(2) See pp. 27-40.

Some of the views of these reformers find expression in Gerson especially with regard to the independence of the French Church and its relation to the papacy. Gerson's views need examination, therefore, because of his influence on Richer. Gerson was Chancellor of the University of Paris and one of the most influential men in France. He was the ruling spirit in the Councils of Pisa and Constance. The Council of Pisa failed to heal the schism in the papacy; on the contrary, it introduced a third pope. Gerson had advocated the earlier system of Church practice to end disputes, the calling of a General Council; in a number of tracts he maintained that a Council was superior to a pope and even had power to depose a pope. His influence at Constance was sufficiently great to have the three popes deposed and a new one elected. The acceptance of the conciliar theory is important for our period for we shall find many who carry on Gerson's theories and appeal to a Council beyond the pope; they are called "appelants". Gerson's first premise is that the Church is sovereign but delegates its power to a representative General Council. The logical conclusion is that neither the pope nor the council is infallible since that right belongs to the universal Church. Bishops and priests hold their authority from Christ and not from the pope, who, like any other Christian, is subject to the decisions of a general council; the Church can call a council without the consent of the pope. Gerson goes farther. The French Church is not necessarily bound to Rome and could, if necessary, unite with another bishop. This was not so revolutionary as might appear, for Gerson noted that the first four General Councils were not convened by the pope. Moreover, priests as well as bishops should have a vote. These democratic doctrines did not, however, deny that the papacy was of divine origin, but if the pope did not act as a pope should act, the Church

had the right to separate from him and even depose him by means of a general council. But Gerson was opposed to the idea that an individual's private opinion was superior to that of the Church.

We can now turn to Richer, whose importance is seen, not only in the later influence of his teaching, not only in his ecclesiastical opinions, but also on the fact that it was he who revived the spirit of Gallicanism (whose roots lay farther back in French history) at a moment when the French Church, at the end of the 16th century was faced with difficulties. More important still was the fact that Richer revived Gallicanism in the very heart of the theological teaching - the Sorbonne, for it was the Paris Faculty which had the preeminence in French theological thinking. Richer used all his powers to suppress Ultramontanism and even called in the aid of the Parlement. Although by the middle of the 17th century the French Church seemed to be in a strong position with regard to Rome, at the end of the 16th century the French Church was faced with difficulties, and the revival of Gallicanism was a deliberate protest against Ultramontanism, a doctrine which asserts that the Church is a pure monarchy of which the pope is sovereign and having supreme power. He therefore possesses the essential qualities of sovereignty; he has complete jurisdiction over the Church, with no superior on earth and is infallible. The Church's sphere is not limited to that of dogma for she must control all the activities of man and since politics is a human activity, it is therefore something with which the Church is concerned. Such a system is bound to raise the problem of Church and State. The Sorbonne had maintained, and Parlement agreed, that the ecclesiastical power had no authority over kings in temporal matters and that even in ecclesiastical affairs the pope's power was limited. The Christian state was independent of the Church.

The law of the Church was accepted but only if the king decided that it was good for the State; this is a form of national catholicism which led to much royal and parliamentary interference in the affairs of the Church. Kings, Bishops, Parlements and theologians have therefore their part in Gallicanism in its varying forms, ecclesiastical and political, showing itself at times as episcopal, parliamentary, royal or richérist. The condemnation of Gallicanism by Pope Alexander viii in 1690 accentuated reactions among the lower clergy, who had grievances of their own in any case, and who were urged on by the views of Richer who exalted the second order of the clergy. The "royal" form of Gallicanism is thus noted by Puyol (I): "Nos rois ont agi, dans leurs rapports avec l'Eglise, de la manière la plus inconstante et ont adopté, successivement, les maximes les plus opposées." ... "Le caractère général de la politique de nos rois: c'est l'égoïsme. La politique française s'était désintéressée de toute préoccupation, religieuse ou autre, qui ne répondait pas à l'intérêt le plus particulier et le plus immédiat." This is sufficient to explain the changing attitudes of Louis xiv with regard to the papacy while always keeping a strict control over the ecclesiastical assemblies. But it was the parliamentarians, of Paris especially, who secured the triumph of Gallicanism. They were powerful because they controlled the administration of justice. Books which attacked Gallican principles were condemned to be burnt. Papal bulls could be refused publication. The doctors of the Sorbonne were ordered to obey the Parlement in theological matters, although at times the king exercised restraint if it suited his purpose. Remembering medieval

(I) E. Puyol, Edmond Richer: Etude historique et critique sur la Rénovation du Gallicanisme. Paris. 1876. 2 vols. vol.1, pp. 12, 13.

quarrels between French kings and the papacy, they were determined in their opposition to the Roman claims of absolute sovereignty. Many of the parliamentarians were probably influenced by the opinions of the Protestant reformers; certainly some of them favoured Richerist and Jansenist ideas. "La principale raison, disait Nicole, que les Parlements ont eue de s'opposer fortement à l'établissement de cette doctrine (i.e. the pure monarchy of the pope) est qu'ils ont bien jugé qu'elle entraînait nécessairement la supériorité du Pape sur nos rois". (I). Therefore, any directions from Rome or elsewhere which seemed contrary to the independence of the king were condemned. They rejected ultramontanism and supported episcopalianism, i.e. an aristocratic idea of ecclesiastical monarchy as opposed to the papal idea of a pure monarchy. Episcopalianism would make the pope a "primus inter pares": it would justify the appeal, heard often enough, to a General Council - a renewal of the Conciliar Movement. This hostility of the Parlement is to be seen in the 18th century particularly, especially with regard to the publication of the Bull Unigenitus. We shall see later that Quesnel, and others, made Richer's views popular.

Richer was born in 1559; he studied theology in Paris and was received into the Sorbonne in 1587. At first he read nothing but the scholastic divines and lived a very ascetic life; his great authority was Bellarmine, who was the great advocate of papal claims which were causing much controversy at the time. He took his doctor's degree in 1590 and was elected great master of the College of Cardinal le Moine. Troubled by the civil wars of 1592, he turned to the study of Holy Scripture, the Fathers, the Councils and the history of the Church. These studies changed completely his outlook and henceforth he condemned what previously he had approved. In 1605 he printed the works of Gerson. The papal Nuncio would not allow these works to appear in France and they were badly printed in Italy.

(I) Quoted by Puyol, op.cit. vol 41, p.24

Richer was elected "Syndic" (I) of the Faculty of Theology in 1608, his principal task being to maintain the ancient maxims of the Faculty and to prevent innovations. Disputes and troubles soon arose over the presentation of theses which contravened the Decrees of the Council of Constance and the maxims of the Gallican Church. The articles to which Richer objected were: (1) that the Roman pontiff is infallible in faith and practice; (2) that a Council is in no case above the pope and (3) that it belongs to the pope to determine things doubtful. Such teaching was contrary to the General Councils, to the liberties of the Gallican Church, the polity of the kingdom and the ancient decrees of the Faculty of Theology of Paris. The result of the quarrel was Richer's publication of his work on the Civil and Ecclesiastical Power. Its title was De Ecclesiastica et Politica Potestate Libellus, published in Paris in 1611 and is usually known as the Libellus. It was a small book in which he established the principles ^{on} of which the maxims of the French Church and the Faculty of Paris, concerning the authority of the pope and a general council, were founded.

The book caused a great commotion and ~~the~~ efforts were made to condemn the book and depose Richer from his Syndicate and these efforts succeeded ultimately owing to the influence of the Regent, Marie de Médici^s, who was entirely devoted to the interests of the papacy. We need not follow the persecution which Richer had to undergo but it resulted in the reprinting of his book in which he annexed to each chapter proofs of the propositions he had

-
- (I) The office of Syndic of the Faculty of Theology was founded in 1384. There were two presidents of the Faculty, one, the Dean, who held a position of honour; the other, the Syndic, who held the executive power and therefore had the real influence. He saw to the administration and supervision, examined theses and proposed subjects for deliberation. He was the controlling factor.

advanced. In view of Richer's influence on Quesnel and the propagation of Richer's views throughout the 18th century, we think it advisable to give a summary of his ideas as set out in his book on ^{the} the ecclesiastical and civil power. He is concerned to establish the doctrine of the Church of France and the Paris Theological Faculty on the questions of the pope's authority and the government of the Church. The doctrines of the early Councils on papal authority are worked out in his treatise Historia Conciliorum Generalium (I). In the Preface to these four volumes he describes how the Cardinal du Perron and others attacked him for what he said in the Libellus and how Du Perron's friends explained that while he himself did not disagree with the truth of what Richer had written, yet the ecclesiastics as a whole preferred to be governed by the pope alone. Realising therefore that a definition of the powers of both Church and State was long overdue, and disregarding the fact that no theologian had yet had the courage to face the displeasure of one or the other by writing what he thought to be the truth, Richer decided to deal in greater detail with the things which he had only touched upon briefly in his former work. He blames the priests and theologians for their ignorance in matters of Church government, for it was such uncertainty that was the cause of heresy and schism. Richer then cited other writers on the necessity for papal supremacy and closed with a plea for accurate and truthful argument. There is naturally an amount of repetition in his works. The Libellus is set out in a series of maxims, of which we give a summary.

The 1st Maxim. Ecclesiastical jurisdiction belongs primarily and essentially to the Church and not to the sovereign pontiff and other bishops, except ministerially. He gives an interesting foundation for this principle. The first intention of God and Nature regards the whole agent, before it can be applied to any of its parts; e.g. the faculty of seeing is given to the whole of man, to the end that he may exercise it by means of the eye, which is the organ of it; the eye is

(I) For Richer's works, see Bibliography, in Puyol, op.cit. vol. 2, pp.419-433.

made for man. The School of Paris has always taught, conformably to the spirit of the ancient doctors of the Church, that Jesus Christ, when ~~he~~ founded the Church, gave primarily, more immediately and more essentially, the keys of jurisdiction to all the Church than to St. Peter. He gave the keys of the Church to be exercised by the ministry of St. Peter; because all jurisdiction belongs, primarily, properly and essentially to the Church, whereas it does not appertain to the sovereign pontiff and the bishops but only instrumentally, ministerially and with regard to the execution of it, in like manner as the faculty of seeing does to the eye; and he quotes I. Corinthians 3/21-23. Richer says that we must understand by this the popes and prelates separately, and not conjointly, and assembled in a general council which represents the universal Church. He admits that the authority of the pope proceeds from Jesus Christ, but the preservation of it and its propagation depends on the Church, for it is the duty of the Church to fill a vacancy in it. The keys were given to the whole Church, but given immediately to the episcopal order.

The 2nd Maxim. Jesus Christ has given immediately the keys and jurisdiction to all the hierarchical order. To them His mission and authority are given, supporting his statement on St. Paul and St. Bernard. He refutes the idea that in the sequel the sovereign pontiff should communicate this to other bishops and that all authority proceeds from the pope, for he says that for 1400 years benefices were conferred by election and he proves his point from Scripture and the Fathers.

The 3rd Maxim. This deals with the definition of the Church. The Church is a monarchical state, instituted for a supernatural and spiritual end, modelled by the Sovereign Pastor of our souls, our Lord Jesus Christ, into an aristocratical government. Jesus Christ is the essential and absolute Head and having a wholly monarchical power over it. He can never be divorced from His Church and one cannot say this of the pope who is only the ministerial chief. The

Holy See has been vacant sometimes three years, sometimes seven. The perpetuity of the Catholic Church is true whether the pope be living or whether the Holy See is vacant.

The 4th Maxim. This confirms what has already been said. It is bad reasoning to attribute to the pope what belongs to Jesus Christ.

The 5th Maxim distinguishes the state of the Church from the government of it. The state is monarchical and the government aristocratical, for the Church ought to be governed by the Canons and not by an absolute power. Anciently, the government belonged to the Provincial Councils. As the bishops succeeded by divine right to the Apostles, the priests succeeded by the same right to the 72 disciples and ought to have a share in the government of the Church.

The 6th Maxim establishes that the infallible power of making Canons belongs to all the Church, or to a General Council which represents the Church and not to St. Peter alone or to his successors.

The 7th Maxim recalls the discussion of the early Fathers on St. Luke 22/32: "But I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not; and when thou art converted, strengthen thy bretheren." Richer, like some of the Fathers, maintains that this regards only the person and particular facts of St. Peter and cannot be made use of to establish his infallibility or that of his successors.

The 8th Maxim says that Councils are necessary for the government of the Church. Decretals and bulls of popes oblige only as far as they are conformable to the discipline of the Canons and the received and approved decrees of Councils.

The 9th Maxim establishes these principles: the plenitude of the pontifical authority does not extend over the universal Church assembled in a general council, but only over particular Churches; even then, the pope cannot execute canons but only interpret

them, except when the pope or his legate presides. It is only since the time of Pope Gregory vii that the popes have attributed to themselves an absolute authority. But Richer allows that the popes have had the right of summoning councils and also that when a council cannot be called, the pope may make laws, but such laws do not oblige until they are received by the consent of the Church.

The 10th Maxim deals with the relation of the Church to the State. The Church - as the assembly of Christians - has but one essential head - Jesus Christ; nevertheless, she is governed differently as to civil affairs by the civil power and in things spiritual by the pope. The two powers are distinct - the pope acts for things spiritual and the prince for things temporal.

The 11th Maxim. As the powers are distinct, the manner of exercising them is different. The Church has no temporal dominion, nor the right of the sword; it is instituted for a spiritual end and cannot use force and temporal punishments.

The 12th Maxim asserts that the prince or civil magistrate is the avenger and protector of the divine law, natural and canonical, and may make laws to maintain it. He proves this by the usage of Christian princes, by Constantine's statement that he was the bishop of the external part of the Church and by the Roman Pontifical which makes kings ^{the} and vicars of Christ for the external government of the Church and by the example of Emperors who formerly summoned councils. It follows from this that the temporal prince is lawful judge of appeals from abuses. The liberties of the Gallican Church proceed from this; the acts of the Court of Rome cannot be put into execution against the country's customs and uses.

The 14th Maxim is concerned with refuting the arguments advanced in favour of papal supremacy but admits in

The 15th Maxim that the pope is the chief in a general council as to affairs relating to the preaching of the Word of God, the administration of the Sacraments and the execution of the Canons.

But he denies that the pope is so in things that relate to the direction of the Council.

The 16th Maxim deals with a Canon ascribed to a Council of Rome: "No one can judge or have authority over the first See." This was a particular council and does not refer to a general one and anyone versed in antiquity, says Richer, can see that the canon is supposititious and in any case one ought not to trouble oneself with people who advance arguments in their own cause.

The 17th Maxim deals with the Church. Its purpose is to attain eternal life by the good government of souls. St. Peter is there, not for his own sake, but on account of the Church. So the Church may, by a natural and divine right, hinder the pope ^{from} governing in such a manner as may tend to the ruin of the Church as defined in the Council of Constantinople, Sessions iv and v.

The 18th Maxim discusses what that power is. Some ascribe this to the Church in temporals. This Richer denies if it extends to constraint over kings and princes.

Richer supports his arguments, quoting precedents from the history of the French Church and submits his book to the judgment of the Catholic Church.

Richer's Apologia pro Joanne Gersonio.

This was badly printed in 1605 and reprinted in 1676. It contains the same principles as those in the De Ecclesiastica et politica potestate libellus but explains more largely, laying great stress on the value of councils, which, however, must deal with questions of right and not of fact. God has given ecclesiastical authority to all the Church. The priesthood, which is the source of all ecclesiastical jurisdiction, belongs to her and she exercises it by the hierarchical order. He declaims against the prohibition which some have made of the people reading the Holy Scriptures. He advises the bishops, assembled in council, to restore the ancient canons instead of making new ones. In his last chapter

he deals with the position of the pope, according him a primacy, but insists that the bishops and priests together compose the senate of the Church, which was anciently governed, and ought to be still, by bishops and priests in common.

Richer wrote other works; the above summary ~~of them~~ gives a sufficient idea of the trend of his thoughts. That Richer was important, we hope to show in the sequel. To quote Du Pin:(I) "The efforts which his adversaries made to gain him, or to bring him to a retractation, make known sufficiently how much they feared him".

We conclude our treatment of Richer by a short examination of the charges made against him. He has been accused of advocating "Parochisme" (Presbyterianism ?) and "Laïcisme or Multitudinisme" (Congregationalism ?). Préclin (2) says: "A ses débuts, le richérisme est une synthèse subtile d'épiscopalisme, de régéralisme et de parochisme. Pour les rapports de l'Episcopat et de la Papauté, E.Richer adopte l'essentiel du gallicanisme de Gerson. Pour les rapports de l'Eglise et de l'Etat, il s'en tient au gallicanisme parlementaire, tandis que pour définir la situation respective de l'Evêque et du Prêtre, il reprend les doctrines et les arguments des Pères de Bâle et des docteurs de Paris. C'est dire que le richérisme fourmille de contradictions visibles qui ne s'élimineront que peu à peu par l'épuration des éléments étrangers au parochisme. La rupture avec le gallicanisme épiscopal s'accusera après 1730, l'opposition avec le gallicanisme parlementaire au moment de la Révolution. Comme les deux gallicanismes, le système

(I) L.E.Du Pin, A New ecclesiastical history of the 17th century. Oxford. 1725. Vol. 1 (re-published in this edition). Part 1, p.71.

(2) Préclin, op.cit. p.II.

de Richer est une doctrine de juste milieu, éloignée des deux positions extrêmes occupées par l'ultramontanisme et le presbytérianisme ou le laïcisme protestant. Aussi, à maintes reprises, les disciples du théologien parisien soutiendront-ils les mêmes doctrines ou feront-ils les mêmes démarches que certains évêques ou que les parlementaires. Par rapport aux autres doctrines, il revêt une triple originalité, sa conception de l'autorité dans l'Eglise, de l'origine des pouvoirs sacrés, des droits du second ordre. Mais, faute d'avoir défini où s'arrête dans l'Eglise le pouvoir du peuple et des cures, le richérisme, interprété par des esprits audacieux, peut se rapprocher des vues du pasteur David Blondel. Ce sera le cas au xviii^e siècle."

Richer's teaching can easily be summarised:

(i) Jesus Christ gave the keys (i.e. ecclesiastical jurisdiction) in common to the whole priestly order, represented by the Apostles and the 72 disciples.

(ii) The power of making laws resides in the universal Church and not in individuals.

(iii) A legitimately assembled council represents the universal Church and holds its authority directly from God. Therefore, the pope is subject to a General Council.

(iv) The real power in the Church resides in the episcopate (each bishop ruling his own diocese) which, united in a General Council has complete authority over the Church. In this ecclesiastical aristocracy, the pope is the head but he cannot dominate the episcopate. He is an elected president.

Richer rejected the charge that he was conferring power to the laity, but he did introduce a democratic principle in allowing to the laity the right of participating in ecclesiastical elections: i.e. they might nominate the person to be ordained, but he gives them no place in the actual ordination. There is, then, no truth in the charge of "laïcisme". What about the other charge - Presbyterianism? Presbyterianism has no place in its system for the episcopate and for Richer the episcopate was essential, If there

is any element of Presbyterianism in Richer it is in the fact that he wanted to extend the powers of the second order. In the Council of Bâle a large number of clergy of the second order took part in the deliberations. In his Libellus, Richer claimed earlier authority. Bishops rule the Church, but they must not make their own decisions. What the oecumenical council is with regard to the pope, so is the diocesan synod with regard to the bishop, for the senate of the Church is composed of the bishops and all priests having charge of souls. The bishops are the successors of the Apostles; the priests are the successors of the 72 disciples. Formerly, says Richer, priests governed the Church in common with the bishops.

THE SECOND JANSENISM

The last of the Lettres Provinciales had been written in 1659. Pascal had failed to vindicate Arnauld in the eyes of ~~the~~ authority. The Formulary was imposed on all, nuns as well as priests, for although at first the oath was imposed on suspected Jansenists, who went into hiding, the government began to persecute the nuns of Port-Royal. When in 1665 the king and the pope determined to force the signature on everyone, four bishops protested, but made a doubtful submission. This was accepted and peace (the Clementine Peace) came in 1669, but it was short lived. In 1679 Mme de Longueville died. She was the king's cousin and held the Jansenists, Port-Royal in particular, in great honour. With this protection gone, the king, now more than ever under the influence of the Jesuits, at once proceeded to stamp out all traces of Jansenism. A violent persecution of Port-Royal broke out and many were driven away, and many friends of Port-Royal died during this period.

With the appointment of a new Archbishop of Paris - de Noailles - Port-Royal was left in peace; but the Archbishop had put himself into a false position. He appeared to favour Port-Royal and yet he knew that its destruction by the king and the Jesuits was certain. Now de Noailles had praised a book by Quesnel - Les Réflexions Morales - which had had a remarkable success for 25 years and this gave the Jesuits their opportunity to attack the Archbishop who, lacking courage and fearing the anger of the king, turned into a persecutor of Port-Royal. Under pressure from the king, the pope signed a bull which meant the extinction of Port-Royal in 1679. The miserable story has often been told and need not be repeated here; its destruction brought to an end the first period of Jansenism. That Jansenism was by no means dead at the beginning

of the 18th century is seen in the fact that Fénelon, after his condemnation and submission, undertook a vigorous attack on Jansenism. But a new period was being ushered in, the 18th century, which is the century of the bull Unigenitus.

PASQUIER QUESNEL. 1634-1719

The first phase of Jansenism - which we may call 'pure' Jansenism - was concerned purely with matters of theology and morals. The second stage opens on a matter of theology but is linked with other movements, Gallican and Richerist. Although there are other writers, e.g. Jacques Boileau who in 1676 published his De Antiquo jure presbyterorum in regimine ecclesiastico in which he maintained that the Church should be governed by bishops and priests in common, and Vivien de la Borde (1680-1748) the Oratorian, writing in 1714 his famous Témoignage de la Vérité in opposition to Unigenitus, reviving the teaching of Richer, and Nicolas le Gros (1675-1726) a Jansenist, opponent of the bull, wrote in his Du Renversement des Libertés de l'Eglise gallicane in favour of the superiority of a council over the pope, reproducing Richerist ideas and advancing the claims of the second order of the clergy, and Drappier (who demands a special note), the real storm centre is Quesnel, for it is his work which led to the Bull Unigenitus. We propose to confine our first attention to his work rather than to the writings of the others although there is much similarity in their views. "A la fin de 1716," says Préclin (I), "les idées mi-gallicans, mi-richéristes de Le Gros gagnent peu à peu les Universités, les chapitres, les curés de paroisse."

Quesnel had joined the Oratory in 1657 and like other members of that Order was known to have strong Jansenist sympathies.

(I) Préclin, op.cit. p.65

In 1671 he published his book Morale de l'Évangile. This early work already contained 10 of the propositions which were to be condemned in 1713, by which time the book, constantly augmented and finally called Réflexions morales, had run through more than 40 editions. Bossuet and others approved the book. During the short Clementine Peace, Quesnel had withdrawn his signature to the Formulary and with the new outbreak of persecution he was banished from Paris in 1681 and in 1685 he fled to Belgium to be with Arnauld. In 1703 he was arrested by the Archbishop of Malines but escaped and settled in Amsterdam. Arnauld died in 1694 and Quesnel became the recognised leader of the Jansenists. It is with the condemnation of his book that a quarrel, much more serious in its effects than the condemnation of the Augustinus, broke out and which was to trouble France throughout the 18th century. The trouble started over the opening up again of the problem of the signatures to the Formulary. A Jansenist had imprudently asked a body of theologians if a confessor could give absolution to a penitent who, while condemning the Five Propositions, did not attribute them to Jansen. The doctors agreed. Demands were then made to the pope who issued the Bull Vineam Domini in 1705 which renewed previous bulls which, it had been thought, would bring the controversy to an end. Louis xiv accepted the bull eagerly and called an Assembly of the Clergy.^{De} Noailles attacked certain clauses which were too ultramontane and the Commission which was set up to examine the bull reasserted certain Gallican principles.^{De} Noailles did not escape the hostility of the Jesuits; he was attacked because he had favoured Quesnel's Réflexions. Therefore, Quesnel's book, which was considered to favour Jansenism, must be condemned. It had already been condemned in Rome in 1708 but its condemnation was not accepted in France and the success of the book continued. The next year, the king's confessor, Le Tellier, took the matter in hand and

his influence over the king led to the publication of the Bull Unigenitus in 1713. Louis xiv imagined that the bull would be accepted without difficulty, but from the first it met with serious opposition from the Parlement, several bishops and the religious orders. It was no longer, as in 1653, a question of Five Propositions in Latin; this was an attack on a book written in French, easily understood and popular for 40 years. "The bulk of the nation", says Galton, (I)"the lower clergy, the lawyers and the Parliaments were staunch against the bull; they judged, by a ^{sound} ~~second~~ instinct, that their Gallican liberties depended on rejecting it. The Regent gave in through fear and laziness; Louis the Fifteenth, through inexperience; Dubois, because he wished to be a Cardinal; and Fleury, because he wanted to be Pope; and thus the Court and most of the hierarchy lent themselves to the Jesuits' design." The Jesuit success was indeed short lived for they were banished from French territory in 1764, but the quarrels in religion led to the formation of a body of critics which produced a hatred of prevailing injustice and weakened the power of the crown. The result was to be seen later.

We now turn to a summary examination of Quesnel's book, 101 propositions of which were condemned. Later we must examine the work of Guy Drappier and Nicolas Le Gros who advanced even farther than Richer and Quesnel the rights of the second order.

The title of Quesnel's work is: Le Nouveau Testament en Francois avec des Réflexions Morales sur chaque verset, pour en rendre la lecture

(I) A.H. Galton, Church and state in France, 1300-1907.
London. 1907. pp.38-39.

plus utile et la Méditation plus aisée. (I)

The book opens with a Mandement from de Noailles when he was Bishop of Châlons, followed by a Mandement from the preceding Bishop of Châlons recommending Quesnel's work; then come two Approbations by the Paris doctors followed by the permission of Charles, King of Castille and Aragon etc. to print. There is a long Preface explaining why the work was written and indicating the necessity for a Christian to read the New Testament. "Il n'est pas nécessaire d'arrester long tems le Lecteur à l'entrée de cet Ouvrage, pour lui faire entendre en quoi il consiste. Le seul titre suffit pour en faire connoître le dessein & la nature. On en donna il y a vingt ans la premiere partie au public; & la vûë qu'on eut, fut d'attirer à la lecture de l'Evangile de Jesus-Christ ceux qui pour se dispenser de le lire & de le mediter, se plaignent du peu d'ouverture qu'ils ont pour faire des reflexions utiles sur les merveilles de la vie du Sauveur, & de la secheresse où ils se trouvent quand ils veulent mediter ce livre divin. On crut que l'on pourroit du moins en guerir quelques-uns de cette espece de dégoût qui deshonore la parole de Dieu, pour peu qu'on les aidât à entrer dans l'esprit des mysteres de son Fils, & qu'on leur frayât le chemin aux grandes veritez qui sont renfermées dans les actions & dans les paroles de nôtre divin Maître." (2)

As one might expect, there are quotations from St. Augustine. (3) "Ut totum genus humanum quodammodo sint homines duo, primus & secundus. Tout le genre humain est réduit à deux hommes, au premier & au second. Tous ceux qui sont nez du premier, font partie du premier; & tous ceux qui sont regenez dans le second, appartiennent au second ... C'est proprement dans la cause de ces deux hommes qu'est renfermée toute la loi chrétienne, dit ailleurs le même Saint: de

(I) Bruxelles. 1700-1702. 8 vols. in 4.

(2) *Ibid.*, préface, pp. xi, xii.

(3) *Ibid.*, préface, p. xviii. Spelling throughout is Quesnel's.

ces deux hommes, par l'un desquels nous avons été vendus pour être esclaves du péché, et dont l'autre nous a rachetés de la servitude de nos péchés; par l'un précipitez dans la mort, par l'autre délivrez pour jouir de la vie; le premier nous ayant perdus en lui-même en faisant sa propre volonté, au lieu de faire la volonté de celui qui l'avait créé; le second nous ayant sauvés en lui-même en faisant non sa volonté propre, mais la volonté de celui qui l'avait envoyé".

Quesnel's work covers the whole of the New Testament and we can give only a few representative examples which show Jansenist doctrine and Richerist influence.

The Bull, (I) usually known as Unigenitus but sometimes referred to as the Constitution, condemning Quesnel's book, is, from the theological point of view an extraordinary document even allowing for some of the extreme severity of the Réflexions, for it condemned much of the traditional teaching of the Church and doctrines which had been held by Bossuet and other bishops. Thomas (2), in his valuable book on the Unigenitus struggle says: "La première lecture de la Constitution, des cent une propositions condamnées, ne peut d'abord qu'étonner. Dans l'"Histoire de l'Église" de Funks, traduite par Hemmer, on remarquait, à propos de l'Unigenitus, que certaines propositions condamnées, séparées de leur contexte, paraissaient bien orthodoxes. Elles le paraissent encore. Enfin, quand on connaît le contexte, elles semblent le rester et c'est leur condamnation qui continue à étonner."

Quesnel is likened to a wolf in sheep's clothing and like an abscess "séduisant avec d'autant plus de facilité ceux qui ne se

(I) J.-F. Thomas, La Querelle de l'Unigenitus. Paris. 1950. This gives the text of the Bull and a list of the condemned propositions.

Gazier, op.cit. vol. 2, pp.309 sq. in addition to the propositions gives the condemnations.

(2) Thomas, op.cit., p.35.

défient pas de leurs pernicieuses entreprises que, comme des loups qui dépouilleraient leur peau pour se recouvrir de la peau des brebis, ils s'enveloppent, pour ainsi parler, des maximes de la loi divine, des préceptes des Saintes Ecritures dont ils interprètent malicieusement les expressions et de celles mêmes du Nouveau Testament, qu'ils ont l'adresse de corrompre en diverses manières, pour perdre eux-mêmes. ... Après avoir donné toute notre application à découvrir la cause d'un mal si pressant et après avoir fait sur ce sujet de mûres et sérieuses réflexions, Nous avons enfin reconnu très distinctement que le progrès dangereux qu'il a fait et qui s'augmente tous les jours, vient principalement de ce que le venin de ce livre est très caché, semblable à un abcès dont la pourriture ne peut sortir qu'après qu'on y a fait des incisions." (I)

The link with Jansenist doctrine, especially the doctrine of Grace, is evident in the book and frequently meets with condemnation. On St. John 3/8 (which is not condemned) Quesnel comments: "La grace n'est due à personne, & c'est par la volonté & la miséricorde de Dieu que les dons de son Esprit se distribuent aux hommes, pour en faire des enfans de Dieu & des hommes spirituels. C'est un grand prodige, & un mystere incomprehensible, qu'un vrai chrétien qu'on voit se renoncer et se haïr lui-même, et combattre toutes ses inclinations, sans qu'on voie ni le principe qui le fait agir, ni la fin où il tend, ni les biens qu'il espere."

St. John. 3/18. "Qui n'est point en Jesus-Christ par la foy demeure en Adam et dans sa condamnation. La foy qui nous justifie, n'est ni la fausse confiance des heretiques, ni la foy morte et sterile des mauvais catholiques: mais celle qui change le coeur et qui fait aimer les maximes de l'Evangile."

The severity of Jansenism is seen in Quesnel's commentary on

(I) Thomas, op.cit. p.25, quoting the bull.

St.Luke 1/20. "La sainteté de Dieu le rend severe à punir les moindres fautes des saints. Quel traitement ne doivent donc point attendre les impies? Apprenons par exemple que Dieu pardonne souvent les fautes sans en remettre toute la peine. Une pensée, une parole de défiance est une faute plus considerable dans ceux qui connoissent par experience la bonté et la puissance de Dieu. Un silence de neuf mois pour une parole de défiance est au jugement de Dieu une penitence proportionnée".

And also on St.Luke 2/48. "La rigueur sainte avec laquelle Jesus-Christ traite ceux qu'il aime, les laissant souvent dans la peine et dans l'affliction, est un mystere que l'amour-propre n'entend point. Nulle douleur égale à celle d'une ame qui aime Dieu et qui croit l'avoir perdu. Il faut qu'il en coute des larmes pour retrouver Jesus-Christ perdu."

The new element introduced by Quesnel is his debt to Richer. We take the highly controversial texts dealing with the primacy of St. Peter over the other disciples. On St.Matthew 10/2, Quesnel says: "Primauté de S.Pierre entre les Apôtres". "Il n'ya qu'un esprit de schisme et de division qui puisse refuser de reconnoître la primauté que Jesus-Christ a instituée pour conserver l'unité dans le corps des Pasteurs; Dieu unit souvent dans la grace ceux qu'il a unis dans la nature, afin qu'on sache qu'encore que la nature ne soit pas un degré à la grace, elle n'y est pas toujours un obstacle", and on verse 5 he adds; "Les mêmes instructions sont données à tous et en commun, pour établir l'uniformité de maximes, de conduite et de discipline." The essential texts are, of course, St.Matthew 16/16-19, which are the basis of the papal claims. Quesnel comments: "Saint Pierre comme chef et modèle des Apôtres prend la parole pour tous et au nom de tous. Un seul parle pour marquer l'unité de la foi, l'unité de l'apostolat, l'unité de l'Eglise qu'il represente, l'unité de la personne de Jesus-Christ". ... "La préeminence de Saint Pierre est la recompense de sa

foi. Sa vertu, sa force et sa grace apostolique pour fonder l'Eglise, est renfermée dans son nom. Il l'emprunte de Jesus-Christ pour montrer qu'il emprunte de Lui sa puissance. L'Eglise est inébranlable et éternelle, parce que la foi qu'elle a pour fondement est ferme et invariable." "Le pouvoir de remettre tous les pechez est donné à l'Eglise et à tous les Evêques en la personne de Saint Pierre pour faire connoître que ce pouvoir ne se trouve pas hors ^{l'unité} de l'Eglise."

There is a distinct Richerist note in Quesnel's commentary on the election of Deacons in Acts 6/2: "Toute l'Eglise estoit gouvernée et fut assemblée par tous les Apotres en commun & par indivis: tant l'esprit d'unité, de charité et d'humilité regnoit alors dans les Pasteurs. C'est une conduite sage, humble et pacifique des Pasteurs, de ne faire aucun changement considerable dans l'Eglise contre son Esprit et son inclination. Rien n'est plus important pour eux que cette instruction, de ne pas quitter le spirituel pour le temporel. Le ministere de la predication est la principale fonction des Apôtres, des Evêques et de tous les Pasteurs: c'est ce qui doit faire leur plus grande sollicitude."

And on verse 3: "Ce qui se fait ici est l'abregé de toute la discipline des ordinations ecclesiastiques. C'est à l'Eglise de présenter les ministres de l'autel et aux pasteurs de les ordonner."

On verse 6: "Ancien usage de l'Eglise dans l'ordination". "La priere et l'imposition des mains y sont employées à tout. Les simples fidelles peuvent avoir part à la presentation et à la postulation: la consecration appartient aux seuls evêques. C'est à Dieu de former les ministres par son Esprit: c'est à toute l'Eglise, et surtout aux pasteurs de l'attirer par la priere."

Another note on "primacy" is seen in Quesnel's commentary on Ephesians 4/ II: "La primauté, la plenitude et la fecondité de tous les ministeres, sont dans les apotres et dans leurs successeurs. Les Evêques qui sont de droit divin, n'ont leur mission parfaite et accomplie, qu'après que Jesus-Christ, l'Apostre et l'Evêque éternel de l'Eglise est entré dans la consommation de son sacerdoce."

In view of the emphasis today in the Roman Catholic Church on the necessity of Bible reading and the great efforts made towards that end, such as the Bible de Jérusalem which is an excellent modern translation, the condemned propositions 79-85 in Quesnel are of particular interest. These propositions deal with the translation of the Scriptures and their use by the laity. Proposition 79, (I. Corinthians, 14/5) reads: "Il est utile et nécessaire en tout temps, tous lieux et à toutes sortes de personnes, d'étudier l'Écriture et d'en connaître l'esprit, la piété et les mystères." The condemnation reads: "Temeraria, scandalosa, injuriosa Ecclesiae, perniciosa in praxi, erroneas ac haereticas et haeresibus favens." Quesnel had written: "L'étude des langues n'est pas inutile à l'Église. Une critique savante et exacte de la lettre de l'écriture a son usage dans les occasions; mais il est utile et nécessaire en tout temps, en tous lieux, et à toutes sortes de personnes d'en étudier et d'en connaître l'esprit, la piété et les mystères."

Proposition 80 (Acts 8/28) reads: "Celle (la lecture) de l'Écriture entre les mains mêmes d'un homme d'affaires et de finances marque qu'elle est pour tout le monde." The condemnation is similar to that of 79. Quesnel had written: "C'est ainsi qu'on sanctifie les voyages par les lectures de piété. Celle de l'Écriture sainte entre les mains même d'un homme d'affaires et de finances, marque qu'elle est pour tout le monde. Cette lecture porte une bénédiction particulière, et attire de grandes grâces. Rien n'est plus propre à entretenir les sentimens de piété que l'on remporte chez soy en revenant de la prière publique."

Proposition 81 (Acts 8/31) says: "L'obscurité sainte de la parole de Dieu n'est pas aux laïcs une raison de se dispenser de la lire" and is condemned "Praetermisit sanctissimus Dominus noster ut dubiam". Quesnel wrote: "L'obscurité sainte de la parole de Dieu

n'est pas aux laïques une raison pour se dispenser de la lire. Prétendre la pouvoir entendre par son propre esprit et sans secours des Docteurs de l'Eglise, c'est une étrange présomption. Dieu a voulu la condamner dès le commencement de l'Eglise dans une occasion miraculeuse, pour confondre l'orgueil de l'esprit humain. Dieu veut instruire les hommes par les hommes. Il envoie un Interprete et un Evangeliste, par un miracle caché aux yeux de l'homme, sous l'apparence d'une rencontre inopinée et de pur hazard. Combien il y en a de semblables qui ne sont point connus." Quesnel had written on St. Matthew 5/2: "Quand nous ouvrons le nouveau Testament, c'est la bouche de Jesus-Christ qui s'ouvre pour nous. C'est la fermer aux Chrétiens que de leur arracher des mains ce livre saint, ou de leur tenir ferme en leur otant le moyen de l'entendre."

Proposition 82 reads: (Acts 15/21) "Le dimanche, qui a succédé au Sabbat, doit être sanctifié par des lectures de piété et surtout des Stes Ecritures. C'est le lait du chrétien que Dieu même, qui connaît son oeuvre, lui a donné. Il est dangereux de l'en vouloir sevrer." The condemnation is: "Vel omittere, vel ad summum censuranda ut suspecta de errore in propositionibus praecedentibus clarius contento, et periculosa in praxi." Quesnel had written: "La fidelité des juifs à la lecture de la parole de Dieu, confond les pasteurs et les chrétiens qui la négligent. Le dimanche qui a succédé au sabbat doit être sanctifié par les lectures de piété, et sur tout des saintes Ecritures. C'est le lait du chrétien, et que Dieu même, qui connoist son oeuvre, luy a donné. Il est dangereux de l'en vouloir sevrer."

Proposition 83, on St. John 4/26: "C'est une illusion de s'imaginer que la connaissance des mystères de la Religion ne doit pas être communiquée à ce sexe (feminin) par la lecture des livres saints, après cet exemple de la confiance avec laquelle J-C. se manifeste à cette femme (la Samaritaine). Ce n'est pas de la simplicité des femmes mais de la science orgueilleuse des hommes qu'est venu l'abus des Ecritures et que sont nées les hérésies." Condemnation: "Periculosa et seditiosa."

Quesnel's commentary was: "Quelle consolation dans nos doutes et dans nos miseres, de savoir que nous avons Jesus-Christ pour Sauveur et pour maître. Il confond les docteurs orgueilleux, en se découvrant à cette pauvre femme qui est dans l'erreur, dans le schisme et dans le desordre, plutôt qu'aux Pharisiens savans et d'une vie austere. C'est une illusion de s'imaginer que la connoissance des mysteres de la religion ne doit pas être communiquée à ce sexe par la lecture des livres saints, après cet exemple de la confiance avec laquelle Jesus se manifeste à cette femme. Ce n'est pas de la simplicité des femmes, mais de la science orgueilleuse des hommes, qu'est venu l'abus des écritures, et que sont nées les heresies. Plus on a de religion et de pieté, plus on a droit de se nourrir de la parole de Dieu, et de ses veritez."

Proposition 85 is in the same category.

Propositions 90-92 deal with excommunication and show a tendency towards 'laïcisme'.

Proposition 90 on St. Matthew 18/17: "C'est l'Eglise qui en a l'autorité (de l'excommunication) pour l'exercer par les premiers pasteurs, du consentement au moins présumé de tout le corps."

Condemnation: "Scandalosa, erronea, schismati favens et sapiens heresim."

Quesnel's commentary is: "La 3e regle de la correction, est de recourir avec zele à l'autorité pour découvrir le peche, sans dessein de diffamer le pecheur. Enfin la 4e regle que la charité, la prudence et le zele obligent de garder la correction, est de separer l'incorrigible, de peur qu'il infecte les autres, et afin de le guerir. L'excommunication est le dernier remede, extraordinaire et reserve aux incorrigibles pour des fautes mortelles. C'est l'Eglise qui en a l'autorité pour l'exercer par les premiers pasteurs, du consentement au moins presumé de tout le corps. Ceux qui méprisent l'excommunication quand ils l'ont meritée, ne savent ce que c'est que d'être devant Dieu

comme un payen, et de n'avoir ni Dieu comme pere, ni J-C. comme sauveur, ni l'Eglise pour mere, ni les chrétiens pour freres."

Proposition 91, on St. John 9/23. "La crainte ^{même} d'une excommunication injuste ne doit jamais empêcher de faire notre devoir. On ne sort jamais de l'Eglise, lors même qu'il semble qu'on soit banni par la méchanceté des hommes, quand on est attaché à Dieu, à J-C. et à l'Eglise même par la charité." (Periculosa, suspecta, scandalosa et favens schismati.) Quesnel's commentary on the verse is: "La crainte d'être privé de ses charges, de ses emplois, et de quoi que ce soit de temporel, ni la crainte même d'une excommunication injuste ne nous doit jamais empêcher de faire nôtre devoir. Celle-ci ne nuit à celui qui en est frappé, que quand il s'en est rendu digne; et elle retombe sur ceux qui l'en frappent, quand ils le font injustement. On ne sort jamais de l'Eglise, lors même qu'il semble qu'on en soit banni par la méchanceté des hommes, quand on est attaché à Dieu, à Jesus-Christ et à l'Eglise même par la charité. Le S.Esprit, à qui il appartient principalement de lier et de délier, ne se rend jamais le ministre de la passion ou de l'aveuglement des hommes."

Proposition 92 on St. Paul. Romans 9/3: "C'est imiter St. Paul que de souffrir en paix l'excommunication et l'anathème injuste, plutôt que de trahir la vérité, loin de s'élever contre l'autorité ou de rompre l'unité." This is condemned as "Scandalosa, temeraria, injuriosa in sanctum Paulum, et favens schismati." Quesnel's comment on the verse says: "Voilà jusqu'ou peut aller la charité d'un pasteur, prêt à sacrifier tout, et ses plus saints desirs mêmes à la gloire de Dieu et au salut du prochain. Qui risque pour Dieu et par son Esprit une voie de son salut ne fait que la changer pour une autre. Rien n'est plus assuré que ce que l'on hazarde pour la charité. C'est imiter saint Paul que de souffrir en paix l'excommunication et l'anathème injuste, plutôt que de trahir la verité, loin de s'élever contre l'autorité, ou de rompre l'unité. Ce n'est pas être pasteur

que de ne vouloir rien sacrifier au salut des ames. L'exemple de S. Paul est la honte des lâches et des mercenaires devant les hommes, et leur condamnation devant Dieu. Souhaiter des choses possibles, c'est trop peu à sa charite et à son zele."

Proposition 93 on St. John 18/II and St. Luke 22/51: "J-C.

guérit quelquefois les blessures que la précipitation des premiers pasteurs fait sans son ordre, il rétablit ce qu'ils retranchent par un zèle inconsidéré". (Injuriosa Ecclesiae, scandabosa, pernicioosa in praxi et schismati favens.) On St. John 18/II Quesnel wrote: "Jesus apprend aux ecclesiastiques et aux pasteurs, à s'abstenir de toutes voies violentes. Il guerit quelquefois les blessures que la precipitation des premiers pasteurs fait sans son ordre. Il rétablit ce qu'ils retranchent par un zele inconsidéré; et il leur ordonne de remettre dans le fourreau une épée dont ils frappent à contre-tens. Quoi qu'il en coûte, il faut obéir à Dieu. Celui qui l'aime, ne peut souffrir qu'on lui ravisse les occasions de souffrir pour lui. Pour les regarder comme un don et un present de la main de Dieu, il faut être un vrai disciple de Jesus-Christ qui a le premier mis la souffrance en honneur et en fait connoître le prix. Gardons-nous bien d'être de ces pecheurs qui fuyent le calice de la mortification et de la penitence, et sont ravis de trouver des confesseurs qui les dispensent et les empêchent, par leur conduite, de regarder la penitence comme une grande grace, et comme un don precieux de la misericorde de Dieu. Quelque éclairés que soient, quelque autorité qu'ayent dans l'Eglise ceux qui nous détournent de faire penitence, ou qui nous en dispensent sans raison, croyons plutôt Jesus-Christ qui nous ordonne de la faire, et qui nous apprend à l'aimer et à pratiquer dans un esprit d'obéissance. Heureux le penitent qui dit à un de ces imitateurs de Pierre: Ne faut-il pas que je boive le calice qui m'est donné de Dieu par un

amour de Pere, pour éviter l'arrê^t qu'il prononcera un jour avec la rigueur d/n juge inexorable?"

On St.Luke 22/51, Quesnel wrote: "Jesus-Christ ne permet ~~pas~~ le mal que pour en tirer un plus grand bien. Il nous enseigne à rendre le bien pour le mal. L'Esprit de Jesus-Christ et de ses vrais disciples, ne souffre pas que des particuliers repoussent par voye de fait une violence autorisée du nom des magistrats legitimes, quelque injuste qu'elle soit. La vengeance particuliere et la revolte publique sont inconnues aux vrais chrétiens, qui font gloire de perdre plutôt la vie de l'ôter aux autres. Le seul miracle qui ne paroît point demandé à Jesus-Christ c'est en faveur d'un ennemi et d'un aggresseur injuste; et il le fait non pour se délivrer, mais par le seul motif de la charité et de son propre mouvement."

The last condemnation, IOI, deals with compulsory oaths and reminds us of the Formulary. Quoting Quesnel on St.Matthew 5/37, it says: "rien n'est plus contraire à l'esprit de Dieu et à la doctrine de J-C. que de rendre communs les serments de l'Eglise, parce que c'est multiplier les occasions des parjures, dresser des pièges aux faibles et aux ignorants et faire quelques fois servir le nom et la vérité de Dieu aux desseins des méchants". This is condemned as "Temeria, injuriosa Ecclesiae, ac favens haereticis et haeresibus".

Quesnel had written: "La simplicité se trouve ordinairement avec la verité. Gardons-nous bien d'employer le jurement pour de petits interêts temporels: c'est abuser de la religion, et faire servir Dieu à l'argent. L'abus du jurement vient ou de la défiance de celui qui l'exige, ou de la malice de celui de qui on l'exige, ou de legereté, ou d'irreverence. La sagesse, la probité et la religion remedieront à tout. Rien n'est plus contraire à l'esprit de Dieu et à la doctrine de Jesus-Christ, que de rendre communs les sermens dans l'Eglise: parce que c'est multiplier les occasions des parjures, dresser des pieges aux foibles et aux ignorans, et faire quelquefois servir le nom et la verité de Dieu aux desseins des mechans."

The extracts chosen from this storm centre of theological controversy show not only the continuation of Jansenist teaching, with its severity, and at times its gentleness, but also the reintroduction of Richerist influences in their reaction against papal supremacy and the introduction of ideas which would give a larger place to the lower clergy and even to the laity. The condemnation of the Reflexions produced two opposing parties, 'Acceptants' of the bull and the 'Opposants'. The Opposants were in difficulties during the reign of Louis xiv but they had more hope during the Regency when more is heard of a National Council. The first signal of opposition to the condemnation was the appeal of four bishops, Montpellier, Boulogne, Senez and Mirepoix. They were soon joined by the Theological Faculty of Paris, other bishops and many of the lesser clergy. The 'appeals' were condemned but the Regent thought he had procured an agreement between the opposing parties by the famous Accomodement of 1720 by which all seemed to accept the bull on a condition, but it displeased both parties and the Appellants (i.e. the Opposants) reappealed and the conflict continued, leading to some important events, the first of which was the Council of Embrun which led to the condemnation of the Appellants but which did not, however, bring an end to the struggle. The next stage is the refusal of the sacraments in which the Parlements take a hand, mixing Gallicanism with Jansenism; then the miracles and convulsions at the tomb of the Deacon Paris and finally the appearance of the Nouvelles Ecclésiastiques. (1)

But before proceeding with the consequences of the condemnation, it is necessary to examine the views of Guy Drappier and Le Gros who advanced still farther the claims of the second order of the clergy.

(I) For further details see Appendix B, pp. 253-263.

(2) Nouvelles Ecclésiastiques, 1728-1803. 26 vols. For further details see Appendix A, pp. 246-8. Cited hereafter as N.E.

GUY DRAPPIER (d.1716)

Guy Drappier was Curé of Saint-Sauveur at Beauvais and was a noted Jansenist. His work, (I) which is very repetitive, is an exhaustive survey of the history of the Church; nothing seems to be omitted - from apostolic times, Councils and Synods - to prove that the government of the Church is collective. At times, he appears to approach Presbyterianism, but the bishops are recognised as the guardians of the traditions of various Churches; but he insists that the curés must have their share in government. The first volume consists of a long Preface followed by 21 Articles which are an appeal to ancient authorities to prove that Bishops and Curés acted in common. His intention is made clear in the opening sentence of the Preface which is headed: "A l'Eglise de Jesus-Christ". "C'est pour vous que j'ai entrepris cet Ouvrage; c'est à vous qui j'adresse, afin que vous en jugiez ... Cet esprit saint ne tend point à ce que vos Ministres dont il a établi deux ordres, celui des Evêques et celui des Prêtres ou Curez, par ce qu'il les a jugés nécessaires pour l'avancement de son ouvrage, dominant les uns sur les autres; ce qui ne pourroit produire que du mal ... Jesus-Christ n'a rien promis à ces esprits hautains. Qu'on lise l'Evangile: l'on n'y trouvera pas seul mot qui favorise ceux qui s'attribuent à eux seuls toute vôtre autorité, qui est une autorité aussi commune que l'esprit qui vous anime ... Cette fin est aussi celle que vos Pasteurs doivent uniquement se proposer."

Drappier will have nothing to do with schism. "Les Brebis ne peuvent vivre sans Pasteur. Si elles se détachent de leur Pasteur légitime, pour courir après d'autres qui s'ingèrent d'eux-mêmes dans la conduite des ames, se disent Pasteurs et ne le sont pas, qui ne s'en mêlent que pour vivre..."

(I) G. Drappier, Du gouvernement des Diocèses en commun par les Evêques et les Curez. Bale. 1707. 2 vols.

Drappier opposes any novelties in religion."Des qu'elles (i.e. nouvelles pratiques) ... elles sont bien suspectes, dit saint Bernard." ..."L'Evangile et la sainte Tradition ne nous justifient donc point? C'est à ces nouveautez que doivent s'opposer tous ceux qui apartiennent à Jesus-Christ. Mais si cet esprit est un et commun tout y doit donc être commun, particulièrement entre ceux qui ont part au gouvernement du Troupeau par leur vocation et par leur charge." The union of the two orders is seen in the history of the French Assemblées. "Mais cette union des deux ordres ne parût jamais avec plus d'éclat que dans les Assemblées du Clergé de 1625, 1635 et 1645, particulièrement dans cette dernière, où Monseigneur l'Archevêque de Rouën ayant exposé à l'Assemblée son Livre de l'Histoire Ecclesiastique pour le soumettre à son jugement, ce Livre fut distribué à Messeigneurs les Prélats, et à Messieurs du second Ordre."

The Preface ends with a great appeal to unity in the Body. "C'est par ce moyen que tous les membres qui sont dispersez dans toute la terre, se réunissent en un seul corps, que toutes les différentes bergeries deviennent une même bergerie, que tous les differens Pasteurs deviennent un même Pasteur, et que toutes les différentes brebis, soit qu'elles ne soient que brebis, soit qu'elles soient brebis et Pasteurs, deviennent une même brebis en Jesus-Christ nôtre Seigneur."

The sense of the unity of the Church dominates the book and this unity is the foundation of the government of the Church of which Christ is the sole founder and ruler. Starting with the beginning of the Christian Church, he dwells on the spirit of unity which animated them. "Un esprit d'union et de concorde, qui portoit tous les Disciples de Jesus-Christ, et les premiers et les seconds à ne rien cacher à leurs Freres, à ne se rien attribuer en particulier; mais à s'entre aimer de coeur et à se communiquer tout, à tout faire en commun et de concert dans le même Esprit, principalement ceux d'entr'eux qui etoient chargez de la parole de l'Evangile, comme le sont encore aujourd'hui les Evêques et les Curez ...

L'esprit d'empire n'avoit point là de lieu; s'il y eût été il auroit tout gâté; et ne gâte tout aujourd'hui que parce qu'il a gagné le dessus, et qu'il régné en quelque maniere dans la Maison du Seigneur". Therefore, as soon as difficulties did arise among the disciples, the Apostles took immediate steps to prevent discord and ordained seven deacons who "furent élus de concert". The next difficulty (Acts xv) was settled "par le reglement que firent les Apôtres et les Prêtres en commun." The circular letter (Acts xv v.23) is sent out in these terms. "Les Apôtres, les Prêtres et les Freres, à nos Freres d'entre les Gentils ..." "Cette forme de Gouvernement en commun a dû depuis ce tems-là, et doit encore jusqu'à la fin des siècles, servir de modèle à tous ceux qui sont chargez de la conduite du Troupeau de Jesus-Christ." "Cet esprit d'union étoit alors vigoureux dans tous les Disciples de Jesus-Christ; mais dans la suite il commença à se ralentir; les Apôtres mêmes eurent l'expérience, et en même tems le déplaisir de la voir affoibli dans plusieurs, et eux obligez de le renouveler souvent par de nouveaux efforts." Drappier gives examples of this, such as I. Corinthians. 10/II.

The second Article is summarised before the discussion of it: "Motifs de l'union des Coeurs parmi les Chrétiens; ces Motifs sont communs à tous. L'interêt particulier et l'esprit de domination ne doit point y avoir de part. Les Evêques ont reconnu les Prêtres pour leurs Comprêtres. Les Papes en ont usé de même: Saint Hierome, S. Epiphane, S. Alexandre. Les Curez d'Alexandrie assemblez avec leur Evêque, et autres, pour examiner la doctrine d'Arius." St. Paul, St. Peter, St. John and many early Fathers and Popes are quoted to prove his point. The collaboration between bishops and priests is illustrated in the appointment of St. Matthias: "tout y fut fait de concert, quoi que S. Pierre présidât à ce premier Concile de toute l'Eglise ... Ce grand Apôtre scavoit qu'il n'avoit pas été fait le premier pour commander aux autres avec empire; mais pour aller le premier aux affaires de son Maître et y animer ses Confreres." But in time this order changed: "Il y en a eu dans la lie des siècles qui les (i.e. les curés) ont traitez comme leurs Vassaux, obligez à leur obeïr à

l'aveugle, comme si les grands biens, les Seigneurs et les dignitez, qu'ils ont jointes à leurs Evêchez, les avoient changez d'Evêques qu'ils sont, en Princes purement seculiers ..." A good example is seen in Alexander, Bishop of Alexandria, who condemns the Arians only after consulting with his priests. "Convocat itaque Alexander presbyteros, et alios quosdam Episcopos praesentes, et examinationem hujus (Arii) facit et interrogationem". (I)

Article 3 deals with canons of the Apostles and Apostolic Constitutions in which he finds many proofs of his assertions. "Certes si les Prêtres sont les Conseillers nez de l'Evêque, il est juste que l'Evêque fasse tout de concert avec eux, et qu'il n'aille point consulter des Etrangers, pendant qu'il en a de tout portez chez lui ... Il ne peut, sans contrevvenir au bon ordre, les mépriser, pour se servir d'autres Conseillers à qui leurs Brebis n'appartiennent ~~aucunement~~ aucunement."

In the 4th Article we read: "Le concert des Evêques avec le Clergé est la force des Eglises. Un autel, un Ministre, un Sacrifice, une Chaire, un Pasteur. Tous comprêtres en Jesus-Christ; S.Ciprien, S.Corneille, le Clergé de Rome."

Much use is made of St.Cyprian and Drappier goes on to say (2) that in France some bishops have so increased their temporal goods and honours that the dignity of the cures has diminished. "Qu'est-ce donc qu'une Eglise parfaite, sinon l'Evêque, Les Prêtres, les Diacres et le Peuple, tout cela uni ensemble avec ordre fait une Eglise; tout cela ensemble fait l'Eglise Catholique par tout où elle se trouve, soit à Rome, soit ailleurs. L'Evêque en est le chef ministériel où il est établi, et non pas le Maître pour y commander avec empire, cette qualité de Maître n'appartient proprement qu'à Jesus-Christ." (3) "S'il arrivoit que l'Evêque contrevint lui-même à

(1) Drappier, op.cit. vol.1, p.24. (2) Ibid., vol.1, p.42.

(3) Ibid., vol.1, p.82

la Tradition qui coule de source, au lieu de la maintenir, les Prêtres qui veulent s'y tenir, et qui en sont les garands au défaut de l'Evêque y doivent suppléer au nom de l'Eglise qui en est toujours la gardienne".

Articles 5, 6 and 7 quote early Fathers including St. Augustine who frequently uses the term 'compresbyter'. There is a pertinent remark in Article 9 (I): "Si les Evêques disent, donnez-nous des Curez, des Diacres qui soient purs, éclairez, desintéressez comme ceux de la première antiquité de l'Eglise; et nous ne ferons rien que de concert avec eux. Nous répondrons à cela; donnez-nous des Evêques qui soient aussi humbles et aussi zelez pour le bien de toute l'Eglise et pour le salut des ames, qu'étoient les Apôtres ... et qui soient aussi détachés qu'eux des affaires du siècle, et de tout ce qui sent la pompe de Satan..." "Que les Eveques résident dans leurs dioceses .." (2). "Pour ce qui regarde la Doctrine, les prieres, la participation des Sacremens, il en est de même: tout y est commun, les Evêques n'y ont rien à part; tout leur est commun avec les Prêtres et le reste du Clergé et le peuple." (3) And so, in article after article, Drappier quotes Father after Father, Council after Council, including Councils under Pope Gregory (4) which prove his contention that bishops acted in concert with the lower order.

The 21st Article deals more specifically with the argument from Councils, beginning with the Council of Elvira in 305. The 7th Canon of the Council of Tours in 567 "défend aux Evêques de déposer aucun Abbé ou autre Archiprêtre sans le conseil de tous leurs Comprêtres et des Abbez de leurs Diocese." A decree of the Synod of Auxerre in 578 is quoted: "Ici se sont les Abbez et les Curez du Diocese d'Auxerre, qui parlent et ordonnent de tout avec leur Evêque sous les peines Canoniques. Ils souscrivent ces Ordonnances Synodales pour

(I) Ibid., vol.1, p.129.

(2) Ibid., vol.1, p.130.

(3) Ibid., vol.1, p.133.

(4) Ibid., vol.1, pp.214 sq.

leur donner toute l'autorité qu'elles méritent, et dont elles ont besoin pour être exécutées sans contradiction. L'Evêque d'Auxerre les signe le premier, ensuite sept Abbez, et enfin trente-quatre Curez, et trois Diacres en la place de leurs Curez." (I)

The second volume begins with the argument that bishops need the collaboration of the curés for their own defence and starts with Alexandria and the Arian heresy. The Emperor's letter (i.e. Constantine) is addressed to "Episcopis et Presbyteris Catholicae Ecclesiae."

Article 26 deals with the question of the proximity of the order of the priesthood to that of the episcopate. He who is not fit to be a bishop is not fit to be a curé. St. Paul establishes the same qualities for both. Drappier records a curious event. (2) "Dans la vie de Pelage, Pape qui fut élevé au Pontificat en 555, il est remarqué d'un Curé d'Ostie, ce qui n'est, ce me semble, marqué nulle part d'aucun Abbé Prêtre, qu'il ordonna et consacra Pape avec deux Evêques." "Pelagius natione Romanus ex patre Joanne vicariano, sedit annos undecim, menses decem, dies 18 et dum non essent episcopi qui eum ordinarent, inventi sunt duo episcopi Joannes de Perusio, et Bonus de Ferentino, et Andreas Presbyter de Hostiâ, et ordinauerunt eum Pontificem, tunc enim non erant in Clero qui eum possent promovere." "Dans ce défaut d'Evêques", adds Drappier, "on n'alla point chercher un Abbé Prêtre, dont on n'aurait pas manqué, mais un Prêtre, un Curé, on choisit celui d'Ostie, ou l'un des Curez d'Ostie, s'il y en avoit alors plusieurs."

English examples are given, e.g. Egbert, Archbishop of York in 747 (3) and Robert, Bishop of Durham in 1276 (4) which give Drappier further instances of common action between bishops and curés.

The 30th Article brings us to the Reformation period in a

(1) Ibid. vol.1, p.242.

(2) Ibid., vol. 2, p.41.

(3) Ibid. vol. 2, p.48.

(4) Ibid., vol. 2, p.61.

discussion of the reforming Synod of Augsburg in 1548, where the bishop acts in concert with the priests and Drappier adds the comment that some bishops still dominate their clergy and do not consult them. "Il y en a qui en gardent une toute opposée: ce n'est plus chez eux que domination dans les Synodes, on n'y propose plus rien, on n'y met plus rien en délibération, on ne va plus aux suffrages, les Status en sont dressés tout prêts avant qu'on les convoque, on se contente de les y lire, et l'on prétend que sur cette simple lecture, et sans aucun consentement, tout le Clergé et sur tout les Curez sont obligés en conscience et sous peine de desobéissance et de péché de les exécuter à l'aveugle." This was often due to the fact that the bishops had only consulted the lawyers who did not understand the spirit and rules of the Church and who turned everything to the advantage of the bishops who consulted them. (1)

Article 32 asserts a new principle in favour of the second order. "Sans doute aussi que la Consecration des saintes Huiles et du saint Crême, qui se fait le Jeudi Saint par l'Evêque, accompagné de douze Curez de la ville et de la Campagne, vient de l'unité Sacerdotale qui est entr'eux, parce qu'il est raisonnable que ce qui doit être employé par tous les Pasteurs pour la sanctification des Fidèles, soit préparé par tous, c'est-à-dire, par l'Evêque et par quelques-uns des Curez representans leurs freres. Cela est marqué dans les anciens Ordinaires des Eglises, dans celui de Rôuen qui est imprimé à la fin du Livre de Jean, Evêque d'Avranches en ses termes". (2) If necessary, the curés can consecrate the oils without the bishop. Drappier lays stress on the fact that the consecration of oils by the clergy and of their being called to add their voice in synods, marks clearly the ancient principle of the government of the Church in common between bishops and other clergy. The Roman Pontifical, he says, makes the

(1) Ibid. vol.2, p.68.

(2) Ibid. vol.2, pp.74 sq.

point clear (1) as do the 15th century Councils of Pisa etc. Later there is an interesting argument against the Jesuit Bellarmine who, according to Drappier's argument, contradicts himself when he argues that in the early Councils of the Church only bishops were present.

(2). And so Drappier continues, returning time and again to the Scriptures, the Fathers and many Councils to support his principle. "Ainsi la distinction que quelques-uns ont inventée depuis quelque tems, et que le Concile de Trente n'a point continuée ni autorisée, de voix décisive et de voix consultive par raport aux premiers et aux seconds Pasteurs, est sans fondement, n'étant appuyée sur aucun endroit de l'Ecriture, sur aucun temoignage des Peres, sur aucune décision des Conciles, ni sur aucune raison; et il y a bien de l'apparence qu'on ne tâche de l'introduire que pour anéantir l'autorité divine des Curez par une envie demesurée que l'on a de dominer sur eux avec empire, et de les exclure de tout honneur, de tout droit et de tout rang, dans l'Eglise de Jesus-Christ." (3)

In his conclusion he warns opponents of the danger of their opposition. "La raison de tout cela, c'est qu'il n'ya qu'un Sacerdoce commun aux Evêques et aux Prêtres." (4) "Cette unité qui est immortelle dans l'Eglise de Jesus-Christ aussi bien que Jesus-Christ même, fait que quand le Pape qui est mortel vient à mourir, l'Eglise ne meurt point pour cela, son Chef essentiel qui est Jesus-Christ est toujours vivant." (5) "Il faut avouer hélas! les choses sont bien changées: car comme la Cour de Rome a tout remué pour dépouiller les Evêques de leur autorité primitive, afin d'établir la Monarchie du Saint-Siege; aussi il y a des Evêques qui à l'imitation de la Cour de Rome, n'oublient rien pour s'en former

(1) Ibid., vol. 2, p.86

(2) Ibid., vol.2, pp.191 sq.

(3) Ibid., vol. 2, p.201

(4) Ibid., vol.2,p.262

(5) Ibid., vol. 2, p.263

aussi une dans leurs Dioceses, ôtant à leurs Curez tout le pouvoir qu'ils ont reçu, afin de tout régler et de tout faire avec une puissance absoluë et que les Curez ... ne passent plus que pour des commis révocables à leur volonté ...".

NICOLAS LE GROS (1675-1751)

At a time when the revolt of the second order of the clergy is active, in the early 18th century, and when contacts are being made with other episcopal Churches (England and Russia) which would strengthen their position against the bull, Nicolas le Gros appears as a strength to the Jansenist party. Already a convinced Jansenist before he is made a priest, Archbishop le Tellier made him a Canon of his cathedral and then Director of the Petit-Seminaire, a position which he lost when le Tellier was succeeded by a friend of the Jesuits. Le Gros then went into exile with Quesnel but returned under the Regency and gained the support of the Paris Parlement, and much popular sympathy, in defence of some imprisoned curés. His best known work is the Du Renversement des Libertés de l'Eglise gallicane.(I) Here we meet with the similar type of argument which has already been discussed, namely that a Council is superior to the pope, whose position is assured but whose authority is limited. Kings are the protectors of the rights of prelates, but sovereignty over the Church belongs to the oecumenical council. Following Richer, he maintains that the promises made by our Lord to the Church were given to the whole body, but it is for the pastors to exercise this authority. With Quesnel he asserts that it is the Church which has authority to excommunicate and this is to be carried out by the chief pastors with the consent of the whole body. Le Gros is a strong upholder of the rights of the second order. Bishops should not act without the advice of their Chapters and clergy united in synod. For le Gros, the Bull Unigenitus breaks all the rules and has no authority.

A Déclaration royale du 4 août 1720 had attempted to silence the appellants but this only led to more protests from Parlement and

(I) Nicolas le Gros, Du Renversement des Libertés de l'Eglise gallicane. /No place given/ 1746. 2 vols.

from other Jansenist writers including J.J. Duguet (1649-1733) who had already written, in 1679, Conférences ecclésiastiques ou Dissertations sur les auteurs et la Discipline des premiers siècles de l'Eglise. (1) They were public lectures given at the Seminary of S.Magloire in Paris. Like the other Jansenist writers, Duguet deals with the matter historically but with much fuller treatment of disputed points. From the laxity of the present he appeals to an earlier discipline. In dealing with the Letters of St. Ignatius, he rejects the Calvinist interpretation of the episcopate whose preeminence he recognises. In his 53rd Dissertation, dealing with the 4th Canon of the Council of Nicea, Duguet discusses the appointment of bishops. Have the laity a share in this? (2) He discusses the dangers set out by many writers; "Mais on ne doit pas conclure de ce devoir (i.e. to oppose imprudent elections) que l'élection n'appartenoit qu'aux Evêques et que le peuple n'avoit pas d'autre droit que celui d'y consentir et de l'accepter. Il est au contraire tres evident que ce devoir suppose que le peuple élieroit veritablement et qu'il proposoit les personnes qu'il jugeoit dignes de l'episcopat ..." (3) "Les Prêtres avoient eu anciennement plus de part aux Conciles provinciaux que ne leur en donnent les Conciles que nous venons de citer et le peuple meme y étoit quelquefois appelé ... Il est vrai que le peuple ne conserva pas long-tems cet honneur et que les exemples où il ait été consulté sur les matieres de la Religion sont rares. Mais les Prêtres eurent long-tems une grande part aux affaires ecclesiastiques; et sette coutume paroissoit avoir son fondement dans l'Écriture." None the less Duguet gives a preeminence to Rome. With such views it was clear what line Duguet would take with regard to the Déclaration royale; but he was joined by many others,

(1) J.J. Duguet, Conférences ecclésiastiques ou Dissertations sur les auteurs et la Discipline des premiers siècles de l'Eglise. Pavia. 1789. 6 vols.

(2) Ibid. vol. 5, p.269.

(3) Ibid. vol. 5, p.351.

including the Faculty of Theology. None the less, the Declaration forbidding an appeal made things difficult and le Gros, with others, was compelled to leave Paris.

The advent to power of Fleury in 1726 who was an ultramontanist caused an attempt to bring bishops, priests and laity into submission if they were suspected of Jansenism; the Faculty of Theology and the Parlement were also involved and thousands of Lettres de cachet compelled a measure of silence. Préclin says: (I) "Des milliers de lettres de cachet allaient contraindre au silence les voix des plus timorés. Fleury et les évêques chassent les jansénistes en place des Universités, des collèges et des séminaires. Ils vont tarir le recrutement du parti en imposant la signature pure et simple du Formulaire, démarche qui éloigne les appelants de l'épiscopat, du sacerdoce. Une déclaration draconienne sur la librairie semble l'arrêt de mort de la presse et des livres hostiles à la Bulle. De 1726 à 1730, la politique de Fleury semble réussir. Il vient à bout des évêques chefs de parti: Noailles et Soanen. Les prélats et les prêtres d'un jansénisme tiède, intimidés, renoncent à toute opposition. Condamnés à une défensive sans gloire, les disciples de Richer doivent engager la lutte sur le terrain glissant choisi par le rusé prélat. Ils la poursuivent, de 1730 à 1750, sous la forme d'une vigoureuse contre-offensive."

This counter-offensive soon appeared. When it was thought that de Noailles, Archbishop of Paris, was about to submit, there was an outburst of opposition. Nicolas Petitpied (1665-1747), a friend of Quesnel, spent much time in exile for his opinions, and on his return to Paris he became the leader of the appellants and his active propaganda gained many supporters. In the diocese of Paris 120 curés and 400 ecclesiastics of whom 78 were doctors of the Sorbonne,

(I) Op. cit. p.112.

were in revolt. In the same year, 1727, the Council of Embrun was held. The agitation continued and in 1733 Nicolas le Gros appeared again with his Mémoire sur les droits de second ordre du clergé. (I) In this work his ideas are more advanced than in his earlier work in which he distinguished between the order of bishops and priests. In the new work, priests are admitted to councils and often have the decisive voice. In diocesan councils, the bishop must consult his clergy before taking decisions. The Mémoire has 20 Articles and takes a middle position between the Ultramontanist and Protestant views. There is little need to reproduce arguments which are similar in these writers and le Gros' Avertissement has more interest. "Ce sont deux excès également blâmables, que d'étendre trop les droits du second ordre du clergé, ou de leur donner des bornes trop étroites. L'un et l'autre ne peuvent être que très pernicieux à l'Eglise, parce qu'ils renversent le gouvernement que Jesus-Christ y a établi lui-même, et qui en fait toute la gloire, aussi bien que toute la force. Les Hérétiques ont donné dans ces deux extrémités condamnables. D'une part, ils ont égalé le second Ordre au premier,^{en} refusant aux Evêques la prééminence, que l'écriture et la Tradition leur attribuent. De l'autre, ils ont dépouillé les Prêtres du droit qu'ils ont d'offrir le Sacrifice; fonction qui fait leur grandeur, et qui est le fondement de la divine puissance, que Jesus-Christ leur a donné. Dans l'Eglise même, on peut dire qu'on a quelquefois trop étendu ou trop réservé le pouvoir du second~~x~~ ordre. En Espagne, il semble qu'il soit seul chargé du dépôt de la Foy, en la Personne des Inquisiteurs, qui s'y conduisent comme s'ils étoient les juges uniques des erreurs et de ceux qui sont infectés de ces erreurs. Les Evêques de ces Royaumes paroissent ignorer leur pouvoir et quel usage leurs saints Prédécesseurs en ont fait pour le bien de

(I) Nicolas le Gros, Mémoire sur les droits du second ordre du clergé. 'En France.' 1733.

l'Eglise. L'attention qu'on a eue en France à faire valoir les droits des Evêques, trop méconnus ailleurs, a fait quelquefois aussi oublier ceux du second ordre. De-là il est arrivé que plusieurs voudroient aujourd'hui réduire les Prêtres à la servile fonction d'Huissiers, ou de Crieurs publics, qui annoncent sans discernement ce qui a été jugé à leur inscû. On en est venu même jusqu'à demander si les Curez sont témoins de la Foy, ou du moins s'ils le sont de droit Divin, et à supposer qu'ils ne devroient point s'embrasser des Questions qui agitent l'Eglise parce qu'ils ne doivent avoir aucune part à la décision.

Il n'est pas possible de garder le silence, lorsque le Sacerdoce de Jesus-Christ tombe dans un tel avilissement. Les Evêques et les Prêtres doivent également concourir à en soutenir les droits et la dignité. Ce Sacerdoce leur est commun, quoique dans un degré différent, et leurs interêts sont tellement liés, qu'on ne peut relever ou rabaisser ceux-ci que ceux-là ne le soient en même tems.

D'un côté, il n'ya presque point de différence entre les Evêques et les Prêtres, disent les Peres, en ôtant tout aux Prêtres on ne laisse donc presque rien aux Evêques, et le Sacerdoce de Jesus-Christ paroissant méprisable, on ne voit pas comment les Evêques sont respectables, puisque tout leur avantage consiste à posséder la plénitude du même Sacerdoce, dont les Prêtres n'ont, pour ainsi dire, qu'une participation moins parfaite.

D'un autre côté en relevant la dignité Episcopale, on releve beaucoup la Sacerdotale, qui la suit de si près, et reciproquement, si on respecte autant qu'on doit celle-ci, on revere infiniment celle-là, qui est aussi au-dessus. Plus on fait d'honneur au pouvoir qu'ont les Prêtres, mieux on sçait ce que l'on doit aux Evêques, qui ont un pouvoir qui n'a pas été communiqué aux Prêtres et qui exercent celui-même qui leur est commun avec ces derniers, d'une maniere plus sublime, plus parfaite plus indépendante ..."

With this prudent balance of episcopal and priestly authority,

Le Gros speaks of the efforts of Boileau and Drappier with the same object in view and then proceeds, in his 20 articles, to prove his contention. The style is different from Drappier's, although, like Drappier and Duguet, he reviews the historical material; the style, however, is easier and he takes trouble to deal with objections.

THE EVENTS LEADING UP TO THE COUNCIL OF EMBRUN, 1727

We revert to the events mentioned on page 40 which followed the publication of the Bull Unigenitus, dealing in this chapter with the events leading to the Council of Embrun and with the Council itself. It was in 1713 that the king received the reply to his letter of 1711 to the pope asking for the condemnation of Quesnel's book. That letter had asked that the condemnation should not be made public until it had been accepted in France, possibly because the king was anxious to save the principles of Gallicanism and also the distinction between the spiritual and the temporal. The Bull was presented to an assembly of bishops. The king had chosen 50 bishops who, he thought, would be diplomatic enough to draw up a formula of acceptance which would displease neither the pope nor the French people. 40 bishops accepted and they issued, in March 1714, an Instruction Pastorale des Quarante, which de Noailles and 8 bishops could not accept. This Instruction was variously received in France. The Catéchisme historique et dogmatique (I) says of this assembly: "quoique l'assemblée reconnût qu'elle ne pouvoit point imposer d'obligation aux autres évêques, on leur envoya la Constitution avec les Lettres Patentes du Roi, qui leur enjoignoient de la recevoir & on les pressa vivement d'obéir." Some published it as sent by the assembly; others received it only in a relative manner and some published it with their own explanations. Cardinal de Noailles had now abandoned his advocacy of Quesnel because of the pope's condemnation, a change of opinion which not only led to attacks on the Archbishop but which also began a series of attacks on the Constitution, as the bull was called. It was difficult for many people to see in Quesnel "un loup ravissant, un faux prophète, un maître de mensonge, un séducteur des simples, un fourbe hypocrite ... un enfant du diable" as the bull had described him. Mémoires attacking the bull appeared side by side with Jesuit articles in support.

(I) J.-B.R. de Beccarie de Pavie de Fourquevaux, Catéchisme historique et dogmatique Nancy. 1750-68. 5 vols. (First publ. 1729-30. 2 vols.) For further details see Appendix A, pp. 244. Cited hereafter as Cat. Hist.

Divisions quickly appeared among the bishops of the assembly. Eight of them demanded explanations from the pope. The king settled the matter, for the moment only, by issuing a lettre de cachet ordering the bishops to their dioceses and forbidding them to leave without further order. The bull was registered by the Parlement, this act being necessary to validate the bull in France, and the Sorbonne, too, was forced to accept it. Louis was determined to be obeyed; with varying interpretations the bull was published in a large number of dioceses, but not without difficulties. De Noailles was not happy; he wanted peace but he also wanted explanations from the pope and these were not forthcoming. Opposing bishops issued their own 'mandements' and there were attempts at reconciliation between the 'acceptants' and the 'opposants'. Thomas (I) considers this to be important and quotes l'Abbé Jean Louail. "Il (l'Abbé Louail) nous apprend que les négociations commencèrent presque tout de suite après les assemblées de la Sorbonne. 'L'acceptation violente qu'on avait extorquée à cette savante compagnie - écrit-il - et l'apparence qu'il y avait qu'on en exigerait de semblables dans tous les diocèses firent craindre à plusieurs personnes bien intentionnées, que bientôt le mal ne devînt pas sans remède; que la Constitution ne parût pas reçue partout purement et simplement et que par là elle ne fût pas, à la fin, regardée dans toute l'Eglise comme une règle de foi. Elles crurent donc que, puisqu'on ne pouvait pas empêcher absolument qu'elle ne fût reçue, il fallait au moins faire en sorte qu'elle ne le fût qu'avec des modifications qui laissassent des ressources à la vérité et à l'innocence. Le moyen qui leur parut le plus propre pour faire réussir ce dessein fut que M.le cardinal de Noailles, de concert avec les prélats qui lui étaient unis, donnât lui-même les explications qu'il avait demandées au pape, en faisant promptement une instruction pastorale exempte des défauts de celle des quarante: relativement à laquelle il accepterait la Constitution."

It was hoped that a large number of bishops, defending the rights of the episcopate and the maxims of the kingdom, would prevent the pope

from condemning the Instruction that de Noailles would issue and would also prevent the king from upholding the Jesuits against so large a number of opponents. Gallican liberties were thus linked to doctrinal matters. Gazier(I) in a note quotes a letter preserved in the Vatican Library which shows how great was the opposition to the bull. "Tous les Pères de l'Oratoire, les Bénédictins, presque tous les moines de Citeaux et de Saint-Bernard, les chanoines réguliers, les Dominicains, et grand nombre d'autres mauvais moines et religieux d'autres ordres, avec tout ce qu'il ya a de prêtres séculiers pour révolter les fidèles contre les sacrés oracles de Sa Sainteté et leur inspirer du mépris pour elle et pour le Saint-Siège."

The opposing bishops were anxious to safeguard their own positions as bishops and in this way they were not merely Gallican;(2) they were also unprepared to accept as pure doctrine what they considered to be bad doctrine. "Il ne suffit pas", writes the Bishop of Mirepoix, (3) "pour bien juger, d'appeler bon ce qui est bon; il faut aussi appeler mauvais ce qui est mauvais. Vous m'entendez, Monseigneur. Au surplus je crois que, pour la conservation de la vérité et des droits de l'épiscopat, nous devons résister non seulement jusqu'à la déposition, comme vous le dites, mais jusqu'à la mort inclusive-ment."

To force the acceptance of the Constitution by the opponents, it was determined to call a National Council. To ensure the Gallican Liberties, the Council was to be called both by the pope and the king.

(1) Op.cit. vol.1, p.250

(2) For the discussion among the bishops, see Thomas, op.cit. pp.54 sq.

(3) Ibid. pp.72, 73.

In a book published in London in 1710, L'Esprit de Gerson, ou Instructions Catholiques touchant le Saint-Siège (I) the writer maintains that it is not the duty of the pope to call councils; this privilege belongs to Christian princes; "Néanmoins, en l'état que sont aujourd'hui les principautés chrétiennes, il est plus aisé et convenable que la convocation s'en fasse en son nom (du pape), non pas de droit mais pour la commodité ... C'est aux princes à la demander et à obliger le pape de les convoquer de dix ans en dix ans, et eux-mêmes de concert de les assembler s'il refuse ou néglige de le faire."

The affair moved slowly. Efforts were made to persuade some of the opposing bishops and other theologians to write in favour of the Constitution. The pope was not eager to allow a National Council and the king, so it seems, felt that he was being misled by his Jesuit advisers.

The death of Louis xiv in 1715 left the religious difficulties unsolved. The Bull Unigenitus of 1713 was not accepted by the whole of France and, according to Gallican principles, a papal decree could not become part of the law of France until it had been accepted by the Church of France and passed by the French Parlement. Louis' royal supremacy could not be exercised beyond the grave. The new king, Louis xv, was but 5 years old and Philip, Duke of Orleans, acted as Regent from 1715-1723. Although he set a bad example from the point of view of morality, he was anxious to obtain peace in the country. Louis xiv's policy was abandoned. Hostility to the Jansenists ceased. More power was put into the hands of Parlement whose liberties had been suppressed for so long. De Noailles was received at Court; opponents of the

(I) Eustache le Noble (or the Archbishop of Lyon), L'Esprit de Gerson, ou Instructions Catholiques touchant le Saint-Siège. London. 1710. Quoted by Thomas, op.cit. p.90 note.

Constitution were released from the Bastille; 'lettres de cachet' against exiles were revoked. Liberty was restored to the Sorbonne which then revoked their earlier acceptance of the bull. The Jesuits were out of favour, possibly because they were upholders of the old régime. Permission to dispense the sacraments, given by de Noailles to the Jesuits of Paris in 1715, was withdrawn from them in August 1716, with the exception of the five Jesuits attached to the court. The Sorbonne applauded the Cardinal's decision and the Bishops of Metz, Verdun, Montpellier and others decided to follow this decision in their own dioceses. At the same time the clergy of the second order expressed their adhesion to the opposing bishops. Speaking of the Paris clergy at this time the Catéchisme Historique (I) says: "que le témoignage du second ordre devoit être d'un grand poids dans les affaires de l'Eglise & que ceux qui étoient chargés d'enseigner les vérités de la religion étoient aussi chargés d'en défendre le dépôt quand il étoit en danger." The laity also must take their part. "Aussi vit-on dans l'affaire de la Constitution des témoignages rendus à la vérité dans plusieurs occasions par des laïques dont plusieurs même ont eu le zèle d'adhérer à l'appel par des actes authentiques: & leur zèle bien loin d'être regardé comme excessif a mérité de justes louanges de la part des personnes les plus éclairées sur l'affaire de la Constitution..." "Le Parlement de Paris condamna même par arrêt du Mars 1718 à être brûlée par la main du bourreau, une lettre adressée à M. le Régent par M. de Mailly, archevêque de Rheims, à qui son dévouement à la Constitution mérita bien-tôt après un chapeau de cardinal."

In several dioceses where the bull had been published there appeared letters from parochial clergy, canons and religious who withdrew their acceptance of the bull. In 1719 there were published three big

(I) Cat.Hist. vol. 2. p.269.

volumes: Le cri de la foi, ou Recueil des différents témoignages
rendus par plusieurs Facultés, Chapitres, curés, communautés
 ecclésiastiques et réguliers au sujet de la Constitution Unigenitus,^(I)
 by l'Abbé Nivelles.

The dioceses of Orleans, Reims, Beauvais, Rouen joined in the protest and in the diocese of Paris, the protests were particularly numerous especially among the parochial clergy. Carreyre (2) stigmatizes this as Presbyterianism. He quotes (3) part of a letter which the clergy sent to de Noailles. "Les curés se félicitent de vivre 'sous un chef qui ne connaît pas l'esprit de domination, si éloigné de celui de Jesus-Christ;' ils ajoutent: 'Son Eminence sait que les curés sont pasteurs de droit divin, quoique dans un ordre inférieur ... Sous un tel successeur des Apôtres, nous avons la confiance de nous donner, après les conciles, la qualité de successeurs des 72 disciples'; puis ils attaquent le bulle qui 'proscrit cette doctrine', et ils veulent conserver précieusement 'les anciennes traditions'." Such claims on the part of the lower clergy to be judges in matters of doctrine naturally made Rome, and many bishops, uneasy. Quesnel himself offered to make a long journey to put his case before the bishops; they had refused to hear him on an earlier occasion; "Mais maintenant que tous ces nuages ont été dissipés par les exposés si clairs et si précis que j'ai faits de mes sentiments dans plusieurs écrits et particulièrement dans les sept Mémoires, où j'ai marqué sur chacune des 101 propositions les sens véritable et naturel qu'elles ont et où j'ai découvert les déguisements dont mes ennemis s'étaient efforcés de l'obscurcir, j'espère, dis-je, Mgr. que maintenant, après tous ces éclaircissements, je trouverai Votre Altesse Eminentissime et tous Messieurs les prélats plus

(I) Quoted by : J.Carreyre, Le Jansénisme durant la Régence. Louvain. 1929-1933. 3 vols. vol. 1, p.123.

(2) Ibid. Vol:1,p.123

(3) Ibid. vol. 1, p.124.

disposés à m'écouter plus favorablement et à me rendre justice. Je m'en tiens assuré, si vous daignez, Mgr, m'accorder l'honneur de votre puissante protection et faire valoir auprès des prélats assemblés les preuves si pressantes que j'ai données, en tant de différentes occasions, de la pureté de mes sentiments et de la justice de ma cause". Il demande qu'on lise ses écrits, et, dit-il, "si cela ne suffit pas et que Messieurs veuillent m'entendre en personne, et recevoir ma confession de foi, de ma propre bouche, quelque péril qu'il y ait pour un homme de 83 ans d'entreprendre un voyage de cent lieues au coeur de l'hiver, je ferai un effort et je risquerai tout, si on m'en donne la liberté, pour avoir la consolation d'aller me jeter aux pieds de Messieurs et leur expliquer de vive voix les sentiments de mon coeur".

(1). D'Aguesseau, who became Chancellor under the Regency in 1717 had pointed out the difficulties at the beginning of hostilities when he said that "Cette bulle serait la croix, non seulement des théologiens, mais encore des premiers magistrats du royaume." (2). D'Aguesseau had played a big part in religious affairs during the reign of Louis xiv; in 1703, commenting on the papal brief of that year, he had written: "Nos libertés, dont nos pères ont été si justement & si saintement jaloux, ne consistent pas seulement à ne pas recevoir des Loix contraires à nos moeurs, mais encore à n'avoir point d'autres Loix que les nôtres dans ce qui regarde la justice et la discipline. Tout ce qu'une puissance étrangere veut entreprendre de faire dans le Royaume doit être toujours suspect, quand même dans le fond on n'y trouverait rien que d'innocent; ainsi le Bref du Pape sera, si l'on veut, une Ordonnance juste, nécessaire, avantageuse à la paix de l'Eglise; mais c'est toujours l'ouvrage d'une Puissance étrangere, qui n'a point d'autorité immédiate parmi nous pour tout ce qui est de police & de discipline.

(1) Ibid. vol. 1, pp.127,128.

(2) Ibid. vol. 1, p.1.

Il n'en faut pas davantage pour s'abstenir de la recevoir." (I)

To quote D'Aguesseau again: (2). "Aucune constitution des papes, en matière de doctrine, ne peut être revêtue de l'autorité du roi, sans une acceptation légitime et suffisante de l'Eglise gallicane; autrement, on reconnaîtrait le pape infaillible et seul juge de la foi, contre les maximes fondamentales de nos libertés; or l'acceptation qui se fait par les évêques, trouvés fortuitement ou réunis arbitrairement à Paris, n'a jamais été regardée comme une acceptation suffisante; ils ne forment ni un corps véritable, ni une assemblée canonique, et leurs résolutions, quoique respectables par le nombre et la qualité des prélats, ne peuvent être regardées que comme des préjugés et non de véritables jugements. A plus forte raison en est-il ainsi, quand la division a troublé le concert des évêques. Dans ce cas, l'ordre canonique est, après avoir tenté toutes les autres voies de conciliation, de faire régler leurs différends par une assemblée canonique d'évêques ou d'avoir recours au pape. Le Prince, dont l'autorité n'est que l'accessoire de celle de l'Eglise, en matière de doctrine, ne peut suppléer à une décision régulière: décider contre les évêques, ce serait se rendre juge de la foi et chef de l'Eglise gallicane, ce que le roi a certainement en horreur."

The pope disapproved the return to favour of de Noailles who was so strongly supported by the Paris clergy, regular and secular, and also by the Paris Faculty of Theology. This Faculty took a lively interest in attacking the upholders of the Constitution. Provincial universities, especially Nantes and Reims, joined the opposition which only led to disputes with the bishops. The bishop of Nantes refused to ordain anyone, or allow anyone to say mass in his diocese, who did not accept the bull.

(I) H.F.D'Aguesseau, Oeuvres. Paris. 1759-89. 13 vols. vol.13, p.330 (Observations sur le bref du 12 Fevrier, 1703).

(2) Carreyre, op.cit. vol. 1, p.6.

The Bishop of Reims excommunicated some of his clergy and he himself was condemned by the Parlement on 28th May, 1716. Le Gros was a great opponent of this bishop. Discussions were violent; pamphlets appeared in all parts of France; confusion was complete. Rome was fully informed. The negotiations between France and Rome have a curious - but by no means exact - resemblance to similar efforts between the English Court and Rome over the so-called divorce of Henry VIII. Ambassadors and representatives came and went; they sent and received letters. What the opposing bishops wanted was some explanations of the bull. These the pope refused to give. There must be a complete acceptance of the bull first. The Regent was doing his best to effect some reconciliation. The pope's greatest opposition was to de Noailles. In France, a group of bishops drew up a body of doctrine which might be accepted by both parties - upholders and opponents. The Abbé Chevalier was to take this to Rome to persuade the pope to accept it. Unfortunately for their cause, Chevalier was accompanied by de la Borde who would certainly be held in suspicion at Rome. The Cardinal La Tremoille, agent for French affairs in Rome, found difficulty in having audiences with the pope and wrote that no progress was being made. The pope refused to sanction the nomination to bishoprics and benefices of those whom he suspected of Jansenism. Bulls were refused to the Bishops of Clermont, Troyes and Rodez. At the end of 1716 things were especially difficult. Four briefs arrived from Rome; one for the Regent, one for de Noailles, one for the upholders of the bull and the fourth to the Sorbonne to suspend their privileges. If de Noailles would not submit he must be reduced by force and lose his cardinal's hat. To the accepting bishops, the pope refused any explanations and decided to proceed against the opponents. The threat to the Sorbonne was more serious; penalties were decreed against the doctors who had refused the bull and the Faculty was forbidden to accord doctors' degrees. The Sorbonne refused to submit to this and an 'arrêt' of the

Parlement forbade the reception of bulls from Rome without Letters Patent of the king. Other Parlements followed suit - Rouen, Rennes, Dijon, Toulouse and Bordeaux.

Any attempt at reconciliation was rendered futile by the act of the four bishops of Mirepoix, Montpellier, Boulogne and Senez who, in March 1717, entered the Sorbonne and made their appeal to a future General Council. The Syndic Ravechet, a bitter opponent of the bull, did his utmost to support the appeal which was a mixture of Gallicanism and theology. (1) The appeal spoke of the evils of the bull, its attacks on the hierarchy, the rights of bishops and the liberties of the kingdom. 97 of the 110 doctors declared themselves in favour of the appeal which quickly obtained new supporters among ecclesiastics and religious communities. The Regent, tiring of the dispute, acted quickly. Ravechet died on his way to exile; the four bishops were ordered to leave Paris and the Sorbonne was forbidden to assemble. Protests and counterprotests were numerous. The writer of the Catéchisme historique et dogmatique (2) justified the appeal: "Cet appel est canonique & conforme aux regles de l'Eglise & à l'usage de tous les siècles. Puis que le Pape n'est point infallible, comme le Clergé de France l'a toujours soutenu, autorisé en cela par les Conciles généraux de Constance & de Bâle, & par la doctrine & l'usage de toute antiquité; que quand on a lieu de croire qu'il s'est trompé, & que la décision qu'il a donnée peut causer de grands maux à l'Eglise, on est en droit d'appeler de son jugement à un Tribunal supérieur & infallible, qui est celui de l'Eglise représentée par le Concile; et qui pourra faire usage d'un tel droit si les Evêques & les Facultés de Théologie ne le pouvoient?" The appeal is neither heretical nor schismatical. (3). "Les quatre Evêques ne peuvent dissimuler les maux

(1) For the point^s of the appeal: Thomas, op.cit., p.116.

(2) Cat.Hist. vol.2, p.253

(3) Ibid. vol. 2. p.255

introduits dans l'Eglise: mais en même tems qu'ils y apportent un remède efficace, ils conservent pour les Pasteurs légitimes tous les égards qui leur sont dûs & font une protestation authentique de leur amour pour l'unité, & de l'horreur qu'ils ont de toute séparation schismatique."

The upholders of the bull demanded provincial councils, the condemnation of the Sorbonne and several universities and the deposition of the rectors of several Faculties. The mémoires of the acceptants, asserting that the appeal to a General Council was invalid was answered by a mémoire of the opponents giving reasons why the appeal should be allowed and this mémoire is interesting because it reasserted the powers of the second order of the clergy and the Gallican liberties. The four bishops were not inactive; their number increased to 16. Troubles broke out in various dioceses, for example at Reims where there was trouble between the bishop and the university which had the support of the Cathedral chapter. The two most troubled dioceses, after Paris, were Auxerre and Montpellier. The Regent wrote to all the Parlements forbidding them to concern themselves with appeals. He still hoped for a peaceful settlement and still showed kindness to the Jansenists and at last he imposed silence. But this did not bring peace. Fortune was turning against the Jansenists. D'Aguesseau, who had been friendly to de Noailles and the Jansenists, was dismissed from his post, in January 1718, and was replaced by Argenson, a friend of the Jesuits, and event which would be pleasing to Rome. In March of the same year the Inquisition at Rome published a decree condemning the appeal of the four bishops as schismatic and heretical, which decree was promptly condemned by the Paris Parlement.

There was a ray of hope when the Pope granted the bulls for the consecration of bishops which he had refused in 1716; there were three archbishoprics and twelve bishoprics vacant in 1718 and the pope naturally expected that the new bishops would accept the bull; unfortunately

at the same time the Regent's Conseil, wearied of the pope's refusal of the bulls, appointed a lay commission with clerical advisers, among whom was the noted Jansenist Nicolas le Gros. This was an attempt to force the pope's hands but it would appear that the bulls were sent from Rome before the deliberations of the commission. The appellants still refused to accept the Constitution unless the pope first gave explanations but the pope still demanded acceptance before explanations; all he could do was to threaten excommunication and a schism was feared. Carreyre (I) quotes a letter from the pope to Cardinals Rohan and de Bissy, in which he spoke of "La nécessité où il se trouvait d'employer des remèdes un peu plus forts, pour ramener les rebelles au droit chemin"; il évitera tout ce qui pourrait alarmer, au sujet des maximes et des libertés de l'Eglise gallicane; il n'excommuniera point les opposants; il les déclarera seulement séparés de sa communion; or, ajoutait-il, "ces deux peines sont différentes. L'excommunication prive ou suspend au moins un évêque de toutes ses fonctions et interdit à ses confrères et à ses diocésains tout commerce avec lui; mais, pour être privé de la communion du Saint-Siège, un évêque ne perd pas sa juridiction et cette privation n'empêche ni ses confrères, ni ses diocésains, de communiquer avec lui."

The Bull Pastoralis officii, separating from his communion those who did not accept the Constitution was published in Rome and given to the Regent; it naturally caused much disquiet and resulted in de Noailles publishing his act of appeal, supported by his chapter and clergy, several religious communities and bishops and by 261 doctors of the Sorbonne. The parlements of Paris and the Provinces (Rouen, Aix, Metz, Grenoble, Rennes, Bordeaux, Toulouse) reacted vigorously with their 'arrêts d'appel'. There was more in this than the mere refusal to accept the Constitution for it was clearly recognised that the pope was attempting to assert the doctrine of infallibility and

(I) Op.cit. vol. 2. p.44.

so reduce the bishops to mere executors of his decrees. The Councils of Bâle and Constance were still remembered in France; hence the pope's opposition to any appeal to a General Council. It was in this disturbed period that Du Pin was in correspondence with the Archbishop of Canterbury with a view to the union of the French and English Churches.

In 1718 we hear of the famous Bishop Languet, Bishop of Soissons in 1715, where there was much Jansenist opposition, and in 1721 of the Archbishop of Sens who was perhaps the greatest and ablest opponent of Jansenism in this period. (I) Carreyre, in his second volume on Le Jansénisme durant la Régence devotes chapters 3 and 4 to Languet's Avertissements and the troubles to which they gave rise and his chapter 5 gives full details of the troubles in the dioceses of Soissons and Tours. The bishop was much concerned with the revolt of the second order of the clergy. His first great work was the Avertissement de Monseigneur l'Evêque de Soissons à ceux qui, dans son diocèse, se sont déclarés appelants de la Constitution. From his own point of view it was a reasoned statement against the appellants and a serious examination of Quesnel's Réflexions. The Avertissement was successful and led him to produce more. His second Avertissement dealt largely with the historical problems raised by de la Borde and le Gros; it too was a reasoned document. A multitude of secretly printed pamphlets led to the third Avertissement which was more bitter in tone and accused his opponents of advancing Protestant opinions; with such views, he maintained, the Church would become a republic. But Languet's writings had some influence and he was congratulated by the pope. But the bishop wanted more than congratulations; he wanted a definite condemnation. In a letter to Cardinal Paulucci, which demanded more from the pope, Languet wrote: "Il n'y a presque plus aujourd'hui que les évêques qui

(I) The unpublished Languet Collection is in the municipal library at Sens. It is summarized by Carreyre in the Revue d'Histoire de l'Eglise de France. vol. 10. 1924. pp.441-460.

soutiennent la religion dans ce pays: nous avons contre nous une partie des religieux, des peuples, des prêtres, des grands du royaume; nous sommes persécutés par les Parlements. Il ne reste aux évêques de consolation que celles qu'ils peuvent attendre du Saint-Père, leur supérieur et leur chef; ne serait-il pas bien triste pour nous, si, tandis que nous travaillons à la défense du Saint-Siège, nous ne recussions pas quelques assurances que nos travaux lui sont agréables, que notre doctrine est bonne et telle qu'un évêque peut l'enseigner?"

(I) Languet continued his campaign and was soon involved in a controversy with the Bishop of Angoulême and also with de Noailles who, in January 1719, published his Première Instruction Pastorale au clergé de son diocèse sur la Constitution Unigenitus which once again demanded explanations of the bull from the pope; one serious objection in de Noailles' mind was the fact that those bishops who had accepted the bull believed in the pope's infallibility; this meant that they had not examined the bull before assenting to it; they accepted it blindly. De Noailles' Pastorale was met by a trenchant reply from Languet; it was a clever refutation and clearly attempted to separate de Noailles from the other appellants and de Noailles was certainly moving away from his former positions.

Because of the serious division in the country the Regent, on the 5th June, 1719, issued a new declaration demanding silence for a year. Was the Bishop of Soissons having too much influence? Was Parliament becoming too restive? Was Rome too adamant in refusing explanations? Were the clergy of the second order causing too much trouble in the dioceses? In any case the Regent wanted peace. The writings of the Bishop of Soissons were condemned but the Regent prevented the publication of the condemnation much to the dissatisfaction of Parliament. Dubois now enters the scene with his intrigues. There is doubt about the continuity of the policy of the opposing bishops, for if the pope

(I) Carré, op.cit. vol. 2, p.121.

was unwilling to grant bulls for the consecration of doubtful people there could be no guarantee of any succession. A body of doctrine - Explications sur la Bulle Unigenitus - was drawn up and signed by 38 bishops. If de Noailles and his friends could accept this, peace might come. Great efforts were made to obtain the signature of the other bishops. Messengers were sent throughout France for this purpose, one of them, an appellant, l'Abbé Pastel, being sent to the opposing bishops. He had special instructions and it was to be inferred that de Noailles and the appellant bishops with him at Paris had promised to sign as soon as 80 bishops had approved it; this, it was thought, would ~~awaken~~^{wake} the opposition. Sufficient signatures must be obtained before the opposing bishops could act together and also to present Rome with a kind of fait accompli, i.e. a document signed by the majority of bishops. But the affair dragged on. De Noailles gave the impression of submitting but his letter to his clergy caused doubt. Dubois, mixing up with international politics while pretending to promote peace in France, was intriguing for a cardinal's hat while the Jansenists were doing their utmost to prevent de Noailles deserting them. The pope was still suspicious of de Noailles; after five years of dispute the pope could, or would, not do anything. To keep silent would seem to tolerate the opposition; to force a decision might mean a schism in the French Church. Could Letters Patent solve the problem? But the parlements were jealous of their Gallican principles. And so things dragged on until the death of Pope Clement xi in 1721; his successor, Innocent xiii, pope for less than three years, maintained the attitude of his predecessor. In 1722 the king, still under the Regent's influence, issued orders that no one was to be admitted to a benefice who had not signed the Formulary. Chancellors of the universities were forbidden to grant degrees unless the Formulary was accepted. The attempt to obtain peace - the Accomodement of 1720 - had failed.

The king assumed his majority in 1723 and Dubois, now a cardinal,

became his first minister. More than 3000 'lettres de cachet' were sent out within 18 months. The one hope of the Jansenists was the appointment of the new pope, Benedict xiii, a Dominican attached to the Thomist doctrine and opposed to the laxity of the Molinists. It is recorded of him that "Il étoit Religieux de l'Ordre de S. Dominique & avoit vécu dans la Religion, dans l'Episcopat, & dans le rang de Cardinal avec une simplicité, & même une austérité peu commune dans une personne de sa naissance & de son rang. Il a toujours témoigné de l'attachement pour les vérités et la Grace & de la Prédestination, pour la bonne Morale, la discipline exacte sur la pénitence: à cela il joignit beaucoup d'amour pour les saintes pratiques de l'antiquité, & il en avoit donné des marques par son attention à tenir des Conciles dans son archevêché de Benevent, à y instruire lui même son peuple et ses ecclésiastiques." (1)

But it was soon evident that the Curia was more powerful than the pope; the intrigues of the Jesuits and the sympathy of the French Court prevailed over ^{any} the sympathy the pope might have had for a severer doctrine and discipline. His brief Demissas preces to the Dominicans upheld the doctrine of St. Thomas and St. Augustine. One part of it reads: "Méprisez donc généreusement nos chers fils, les calomnies qu'on a mises en usage pour noircir vos sentimens, particulièrement sur la Grace efficace par elle mesme et par une vertu intrinseque, comme parlent les Ecoles, Gratia per se et ab intrinseco efficaci: & sur la Predestination gratuite à la gloire sans aucune prevision des merites: sentimens que vous avez enseignés jusqu'à présent avec honneur, que votre Ecole se glorifie à juste titre d'avoir puisés dans S. Augustin & dans S. Thomas & qu'elle soutient avec une louable fermeté être conformes à la parole Divine, aux Décrets des Conciles, aux décisions des Souverains Pontifes, & à la doctrine des Peres de l'Eglise." (2)

(1) Cat. Hist., vol. 2, p. 338.

(2) Ibid., vol. 2, p. 341

But the brief also upheld the bull Unigenitus and so pleased neither the Jesuits nor the Jansenists. De Noailles felt encouraged by the brief and submitted to the pope for his approval a body of doctrine in 12 articles which was freed from the obscurities of the attempted Accomodement of 1720. Gazier (1) says that the pope promised to approve this document but that he met with too much resistance. Some of the French bishops threatened the pope that they would separate from his communion if favour was shown to de Noailles. Some indication of the division among the French bishops is seen in the preparations for the Assemblée Générale of the clergy. The acceptants were determined to ruin their opponents. The Bishops of Arles and Marseille determined to break away from the appellants. At the Narbonne assembly the Bishop of Montpellier, by the king's order, was refused admission and the Bishops of Narbonne, Nîmes, Saint-Pons and Carcassonne were opposed by the Bishops of Agde, Béziers, Alais et Alet. Quarrels broke out in other dioceses during the preparations for the assembly of 1726. De Noailles at last signed a 'mandement d'acceptation'. "Dieu nous est témoin," he writes, (2) "que, dans toutes les démarches que nous avons faites, nous n'avons eu pour objet que d'opposer un rempart à la licence des fausses interprétations, de calmer les troubles qu'elles excitaient parmi vous ... de mettre à couvert les vérités attaquées".

A letter written by de Noailles, which was not to be published until after his death, declared his real ideas of the Council of Embrun and on the bull. "C'est ce qui nous oblige, dit-il, de déclarer, comme nous le déclarons par ce présent acte, que ce n'a jamais été notre intention de recevoir, comme on l'a prétendu, ladite Constitution Unigenitus; ni de révoquer notre appel, ni de rétracter non plus la doctrine contenue dans notre Introduction Pastorale du 14 Janvier 1719,

(1) Op. cit. vol. 1, p.268

(2) Thomas, op.cit. p.231

ni d'approuver en aucune maniere le prétendu Concile d'Embrun, & la condamnation du saint-Evêque contre lequel il a été tenu..." (I)

The cardinal's submission caused much distress among his clergy who unsuccessfully demanded a synod. Provincial prelates sided with the Paris clergy. The Bishop of Senez, Soanen, issued an Instruction Pastorale in August 1726 which was the real cause of the calling of the Council of Embrun. In this Pastoral he strongly defended Quesnel's Réflexions morales. Other bishops supported him. A Provincial Council was not, however, the kind of council that the opponents of the bull wanted. Their wish was an oecumenical council like those of the 15th century. The Council of Embrun was aimed chiefly against the Bishop of Senez, whose Instruction Pastorale was not welcomed by the French court. The Archbishop of Embrun, Tencin, had received the king's permission to call the council "pour examiner et ordonner ce qui sera jugé nécessaire et utile pour conserver sans tache le dépôt de la foi, pour diriger les moeurs sur la règle de la vie chrétienne, pour corriger les excès, et pour ranimer la vigueur de la discipline ecclésiastique, afin que, s'il y a eu quelque chose d'attenté contre l'obéissance due à l'Eglise catholique, nous réprimions avec zèle l'opiniâtreté de ceux qui résistent ..." (2) The Bishop of Senez belonged to the Province of Embrun. 'Lettres de cachet' were sent to the bishops of the province with instructions, so that the council was acting under royal authority. Thomas (3) refers to a letter of the 5th July 1727 in which it is stated that the object of the council was to end the controversy, to depose and exile the Bishop of Senez. An example must be made and the Bishop of Senez was the obvious person. The humble bishop did not realise at first that his fate was determined in advance for he wrote to the Archbishop of Embrun to say that he

(1) Cat. Hist. vol. 2. p.224

(2) Thomas, op.cit. p.243

(3) Ibid. p.243

hoped that the Provincial Council would uphold the ancient doctrines of the Church. Later he wrote to the lawyers of the Paris Parlement asking them to help him. 20 of the more famous of them produced the Consultation pour la cause de M. de Senez, in which they maintained that the Instruction Pastorale of the bishop warranted no condemnation and that such a condemnation would violate the authority of the universal Church and the Gallican liberties. It must be remembered that the doctrine of papal infallibility was not yet a dogma and it was still believed by many that an oecumenical council was superior to the pope. But the Jesuits had already determined on the theological advisers to assist the bishops in the council. A number of doctors of the Sorbonne drew up a consultation in favour of de Senez; 120 ecclesiastics wrote in his support and 800 regular and secular priests signed a statement in his favour. Because of his age - he was over 80 - the bishop was free, according to canon law, to absent himself from the council, but he determined to go, saying that he hoped that the council would be ^a preliminary to a General Council. He reaffirmed that he would appeal to such a general council and that he would enter an 'appel d'abus' to the Parlement against anything that might be done to his discredit. He also wrote to the king, via the Cardinal de Fleury, to acquaint him of his doubts. The Council opened on the 16th August 1727. The two theological advisers of the Bishop of Senez were expelled; the bishop's Instruction Pastorale was examined and the bishop refused to acknowledge the competency of the council. As the bishop was a prelate of France, custom demanded that he should be judged by 12 bishops and so invitations were sent to bishops of neighbouring provinces. At a later session of the council, in September, the Bishop of Senez handed in a writing in which he renewed his, and his adherents', appeal to a general council. Because the affair was still considered, in 1727, to involve the doctrines of Jansen, his questioners demanded if he still denied that the Five Propositions were in Jansen's Augustinus. Finally the bishop was condemned. His further appeal to a future oecumenical council was, of course, of no avail. He was suspended from all priestly and episcopal functions until he retracted. A 'lettre de cachet'

condemned him to the Abbey of Chaise-Dieu in the mountains of Auvergne, 1200 metres high in a very exposed position. There the octogenarian bishop lived on for 14 years. The Jesuit victory aroused a storm of protest; 50 Paris lawyers entered their protest; 12 bishops with de Noailles at their head, wrote to the king protesting at this defiance of the liberties of the kingdom. 32 Paris incumbents, 300 in the diocese of Paris, 500 secular priests and 1400 others joined in the protest. But the upholders of the bull seemed to have succeeded. (I)

(I) There is a long résumé of the Council in the N.E.: Table, vol. 1, pp. 426 sq.

AN EXAMPLE OF OPPOSITION TO THE COUNCIL OF EMBRUN
AND TO THE REFUSAL OF SACRAMENTS

One of the most interesting examples of the opposition to the Council of Embrun, and also to the refusal of sacraments (1) is well illustrated in the Diocese of Troyes where J.B. Bossuet, nephew of the famous Bishop of Meaux, was bishop from 1718-1742. The Diocese of Troyes was noted for its Jansenist sympathies. Early in 1705 some of the monasteries had been opposed to the bull Vineam Domini. (2) "Le Jansénisme continuait à diviser le diocèse de Troyes comme toute l'Eglise de France." (3) The then bishop's acceptance of the bull Unigenitus had caused discord in the diocese, whereas a new bishop - Camille le Tellier - was popular because he was an ardent Jansenist. When Bossuet became bishop, many of the clergy renounced their acceptance of the bull and many clergy who had been sent into exile found refuge there and Bossuet provided them with charges in his diocese. Their discipline over their parishioners was strict and in some cases met with stiff opposition. "La protection dont Bossuet couvrait les Jansénistes pouvait aller jusqu'à la partialité choquante." (4)

-
- (1) See also pp. 103 - 139 for other examples of the refusal of sacraments.
- (2) A. Prévost, Le Diocèse de Troyes: histoire et documents. Domois. 1923-26. 3 vols. Vol. 3 is particularly useful.
- (3) Ibid. vol. 3, p. 47.
- (4) Ibid. vol. 3, p. 86

One of the first refugees was Nicolas Petitpied. (1) Many examples are given of a number of clergy who, in 1716, withdrew their acceptance of Unigenitus and appealed to a future council. (2) Even in the earlier days, when the Augustinus was published, a secret society had been formed in the diocese of Troyes, "une compagnie secrète du Saint-Sacrement" to oppose it. (3). Bishop Malier of Troyes had supported the four bishops who made the distinction between 'fait et droit'. The Oratorians were in favour of Jansenism and distributed their literature which was printed in Holland. Their premises were searched from top to bottom without success and the inhabitants showed some restiveness when it was thought that the Jesuits were to replace the Oratorians. But under Bishop Bossuet Jansenism flourished. In the Assemblée of 1700, which was called to discuss Jansenism, Bossuet, then only a deputy of the second order, protested when it was decided that the clergy of the second order had only a consultative voice. As Bishop of Trâyes, he invited Le Gros to preach in his diocese and he supported the Bishop of Montpellier in the Assemblée of 1725. While Bossuet defended the Jansenists, the Court sent military into the diocese to search houses for Jansenist literature. Those found in possession of anti-Unigenitus literature were to be sent to the Bastille.(4) The diocese was a home for much hostile printing, including the Nouvelles Ecclesiastiques. Prévost, (5) in giving an account of the seriousness of the Jansenist influence, adds: "Dans les

(1) For Petitpied's views, see: N.E. 19 août, 1738

(2) Prévost, op.cit. vol. 3. p.50

(3) Ibid. vol. 3. p.478

(4) N.E. 12 jan. 1728

(5) Op.cit. vol. 3. pp73 sq.

campagnes, les nombreux cantons infestés par l'erreur offraient le spectacle d'une intensité religieuse rappelant apparemment les déserts de la Thébaïde. Des Laboureurs fixaient sur leur charrue une sorte de pupitre où ils plaçaient, ouvert, le Nouveau Testament, pour y jeter de temps en temps les yeux, afin de se tenir le plus possible en la présence de Dieu". The picture the writer gives of the Jansenists is one of extreme severity.

The Jansenist sympathisers in Troyes strongly supported Bishop Soanen who was condemned at the Council of Embrun. Bossuet, who supported Soanen, received congratulations from his clergy and chapter on returning from the council. Unafraid of royal displeasure, Bossuet wrote to the king, who had already written to Bossuet "Si vous ne vous rétractés dans peu, il vous fera sentir tout le poids de son autorité et de son indignation". Bossuet replied that the indignation of God is still more to be feared. The Nouvelles Ecclésiastiques (I) says that such a letter is equivalent to an act of appeal. To the adversaries of Jansenism Troyes became "L'égoût du royaume et l'asile des novateurs". Its petit séminaire became a recruiting ground for Jansenism, not only for the diocese of Troyes, but also for Sens, Châlons, Reims and Orléans. The writer of the history, although hostile to the Jansenists, admits that the numbers increased, that the teaching was of a high order and that the rules were strictly kept. Not only the petit séminaire, but also several religious communities supported Jansenism. The Carmelites, for example, received nuns who had been expelled from other communities for their adherence to Jansenism.

It was during Bossuet's episcopate that Jansenism was particularly severe. "Nulle part les règles chères aux dissidents concernant l'administration de la pénitence n'étaient plus rigoureusement

(I) N.E. 26 déc. 1743.

appliquées que dans le diocèse de Bossuet. Avec un clergé janséniste édifiant et les monastères jansénisants d'une exacte régularité, le peuple se pénétrait fatalement de l'air empoisonné de l'hérésie; il acceptait les usages anti-catholiques et peu à peu, tout en restant attaché à la foi et à l'Eglise, il s'habitua à ne plus fréquenter les sacrements, sources indispensables de la vie chrétienne." (1) In many parishes first communion ceased; sometimes people were deferred until 30 years of age and children were not presented for Confirmation. Frequently boys were not admitted to Holy Communion before 18 and girls before 16 years of age. The writer blames this Jansenist severity for the abandonment even of Easter Communion among adults. Bossuet himself aided this severity and recommended one new parish priest to postpone the Easter Communion until he could know the spiritual state of his parishioners. (2) The civil authority, however, exiled many of the leading Jansenists.

Like other bishops - Auxerre, Montpellier, Metz and Castres - Bossuet forbade the use of the service in connection with the canonisation of St. Gregory (Hildebrand) and defended his action by appeal to the writing of his uncle, the Défense de la déclaration de l'Assemblée du clergé de France de 1682 (3) It was inevitable that Bossuet would be in trouble with his Metropolitan, Languet, 'Le marteau du Jansénisme', who became Archbishop of Sens in 1730. Bossuet's letter to Languet (4) was a declaration of war against the metropolitan who was already in difficulties with some of his clergy. Bossuet was joined by Caylus, Bishop of Auxerre. Bossuet's letter to his diocese was of 67 pages in which he attacked the views of his metropolitan. Bossuet's views were accepted in neighbouring dioceses and the strength of his position is seen

(1) Prévost, op.cit. vol. 3, p.88

(2) Ibid. vol. 3, p. 88

(3) J.B. Bossuet, Défense de la déclaration de l'Assemblée du clergé de France de 1682. Amsterdam. 1745.

(4) N.E. 22 Oct. 1731

in 1735 when the Province had to nominate a deputy for the Assemblée of the clergy. Bossuet was chosen instead of Languet because he represented the opinion of the greater number. The nomination displeased the Court and Bossuet was not allowed to attend the assembly where, it was considered, his influence would be dangerous for both Church and State. A canon of Reims, Pelletier, denounced Bossuet to the metropolitan, asking him to pass judgment on his suffragan. Parlement took notice of the affair and condemned Pelletier.(1) This history of the Diocese of Troyes supplies ample material about the extent of Jansenism during the episcopate of Bossuet. It extended to the seminaries, to the schools and the villages. The discipline was severe. "Quel dommage que tant de zèle ait été mis au service d'une mauvaise cause". Bossuet supported his teaching by employing a new weapon which was a feature of Jansenism. He turned his attention to the public worship of the Church and introduced changes which are of interest today. (2) Jansenists were put in charge of these reforms which demanded a return to antiquity, a preference for Bible passages and speaking in an audible voice. "Le canon doit être dit à haute voix; dangereuse innovation, capable de faire désirer au peuple l'emploi de la langue vulgaire dans les offices divins". A Royal Commission invited Bossuet to withdraw his Missal and he made some corrections.

Bossuet retired in 1742 and was succeeded by Poncet, a noted anti-Jansenist. This was probably done with deliberate intention to weaken Jansenist activities. Prévost comments that "La réaction ne s'opéra pas dans difficultés, sans une lutte acharnée, finalement couronnée de succès". The Nouvelles Ecclésiastiques of 1743-4 tell of the opposition to the new bishop and the latter's actions. He stipulated

(1) N.E. 20 oct. 1735

(2) Prévost, op.cit. vol. 3 chapt. 27

that only those clergy should officiate in his diocese who (i) accepted the Formulary of Pope Alexander vi; (ii) who receive de vive voix the Constitution Unigenitus as the dogmatic and irrefutable judgment of the Church. 50 clergy of Troyes and others in the country districts refused to submit and in spite of the bishop's actions, he was unable to deal with the widely spread Jansenist teaching.

This interesting history of the diocese of Troyes gives us much information about the refusal of sacraments, especially after 1752 when both king and parlement intervened. In view of what was considered to be Jansenist heresy, a declaration of faith, which in this case meant acceptance of Unigenitus, was demanded. But, says Prévost, "Beaucoup de malheureux, s'obstinant dans leur refus jusque sur leur lit de mort, étaient décédés sans recevoir les derniers sacrements: de là une vive émotion et, de la part des opposants, les plus ardentes récriminations. Des plaintes s'élevaient de tous les points de la France. Le roi soutenait les évêques fidèles. Mais, pour les Parlements, l'occasion de faire ployer sous leur autorité, s'il était possible, ces grands dignitaires de l'Eglise dont la haute position leur portait ombrage, était trop favorable pour qu'ils ne fussent pas tentés de la saisir. Aucun règlement n'existait sur la question de refus des sacrements qui pût être invoqué par l'autorité judiciaire. C'était une lacune. Aussi le Parlement décida-t-il d'adresser au roi de respectueuses remontrances pour qu'il y fût pourvu. Manifestement, il sortait des limites de la juridiction civile pour empiéter sur la juridiction ecclésiastique seule compétente, soit pour tracer souverainement les règles du refus des choses saintes aux indignes, en vue d'éviter la profanation, soit pour appliquer ces règles aux cas particuliers. Louis xv se contenta de faire savoir qu'il ne voulait pas ôter du Parlement toute connaissance des refus de sacrements, mais qu'il exigeait qu'on lui en rendit

compte. Il s'attendait à ce que le Parlement, connaissant ainsi ses intentions, cesserait toute procédure sur cette matière." Parlement, however, forbade ecclesiastics to refuse publicly the sacraments or to demand acceptance of the bull. Thus, from the official ecclesiastical point of view, Parlement was going beyond its powers, and disobeying the king.

After trying to punish the Parlement, the king imposed a silence in 1754, which allowed exiled priests to return to the diocese of Troyes, where lay people were active in their opposition to the upholders of the bull. The bailliage seized the goods of clergy who refused to administer and ordered the Chapter to appoint successors. On one occasion, the bishop himself took charge of a parish and the bailliage seized his goods too because he refused to administer.(1) The bishop was in trouble on a later occasion. He had done his best to persuade a dying person, but felt compelled to withhold the sacraments. The sick man died without them whereupon the bailliage fined the bishop 3000 livres, and because he could not pay they seized his furniture ~~for~~ to that value.(2)

King and Parlement were informed of the trouble in Troyes. Louis xv blamed the precipitate action of the bailliage, but he added that he was also displeased with the bishop. Without doubt the king was afraid of the violent agitation and in a 'lettre de cachet' the bishop was exiled to the Abbey of Reclus, which, since 1744, had been used as a house of correction for the clergy. A Jansenist incumbent was condemned to spend three months there in 1754. The Nouvelles Ecclésiastiques of 27 fév. 1755 informs us

(1) Prévost, op.cit. vol. 3, p.174

(2) N.E. 15 mai, 1755.

that a place nearer to Troyes was found for the bishop. This was at Méry-sur-Seine from which place he was able to carry out his diocesan duties and even do the work of the parish which was without an incumbent. This exile of the bishop seems to have been ordered to facilitate peace between Rome and France. (I) According to Louis xv certain bishops were too zealous and indiscreet, which produced disorders. The pope, Benoit xiv, was displeased; on the other hand, Parlement was pleased and thanked the king. The bishop, Poncet, was able to communicate with his clergy and advised them still to refuse the sacraments unless they fulfilled the conditions demanded. He issued a Pastoral Instruction, which was printed secretly, denouncing the Jansenist schism although this was contrary to the king's declaration of 1754 demanding silence. This Instruction, which was approved by 40 bishops, became the signal for a new attack on the bishop. Parlement ordered the Instruction to be torn and burned, for it defied the king's order and compromised the person of the sovereign. Poncet was not intimidated and he protested strongly that it was for the bishops alone to deal with bishops and matters of doctrine. In a Mandement of 1756, the bishop in attacking the parlement's decision to burn his Instruction, complained that the Parlement was interfering with the authority and jurisdiction of the Church. This mandement aroused the wrath of the Troyes magistrates who forbade the clergy to read the Instruction. Bishop Poncet was banished to Murbach in Alsace and towards the end of the year there appeared a Lettre circulaire aux cardinaux, archevêques et évêques de France, presumably by Poncet, reproaching the cardinals and others for not supporting him. He pointed out that in ~~dis~~obeying the Parlement he was not disobeying the king. In October 1756 the pope, hoping to lessen the conflict

(I) Prévost, op.cit. vol. 3, p.177

between the civil and ecclesiastical authorities, issued an encyclical which suppressed the demand for a 'billet de confession'. In the following year Poncet was allowed to return to his diocese. (I)

(I) N.E. 30 jan. 1758

THE PARLEMENTS AND JANSENISM

(a) During the episcopate of Archbishop Vintimille, 1729-1746. (1)

While Louis xiv lived there had been much trouble over the Bull Unigenitus but the Parlements had been in no position to exercise any real opposition excepting on the occasion when Parlement registered the bull only with reserves, which was the starting point of future struggles. There is, however, evidence that Louis himself had some doubts. Had he been deceived, or falsely directed by his ecclesiastical advisers? He is reported as saying to the Cardinals de Rohan and de Bissy: "qu'ils savoient bien que jamais il n'avoit rien entendu à cette affaire, qu'il s'étoit conduit par leurs avis, qu'il s'en remettoit à leur conscience et qu'ils en répondroient devant Dieu." (2) On another occasion he had said: "Je suis de la meilleure foi du monde; si vous m'avez trompé, vous êtes bien coupables, car je ne cherche que le bien de l'Eglise". These seem to be his final sentiments for at heart he was a Gallican.

The Regent had tried to make peace but had failed and with the accession of de Vintimille to the Archbishopric of Paris, and also of other anti-Jansenist bishops elsewhere, the opponents of the bull were treated with severity. The authority of the Court was needed for this repression and 'lettres de cachet' became frequent. Cathedral Chapters were reconstituted; members were excluded from the Faculties and sent into exile; Religious Communities were disturbed. The Ursulines of Orleans and Beauvais had be^{en} deprived of the sacraments for some time and those members suspected of Jansenism were removed. The Chartreux suffered more severely. To force them to accept the bull, members were punished with exile, and a decree of 1725 condemned those who resisted to perpetual imprisonment on bread and water and deprivation of sacraments.

(1) For further details of some of the material used for the following pages, see Appendix A, p. 252.

(2) Cat. Hist. vol. 2, p.227

About 30 of them, to escape punishments, escaped to Holland where they were able to live according to their rule. In such ways it was hoped to prepare the way for the acceptance of the bull. Opposition came from many quarters; clergy, religious communities, laity, and especially from the lawyers. An interesting question immediately arises. Does the opposition of the parlements and the lawyers indicate a genuine sympathy with Jansenism? A distinction must be drawn. It is very doubtful if many Parliamentarians were Jansenist in any theological sense. The large probability is that very few were so convinced. It is well known that men of all shades of religious opinion, or even of none, were represented in the parlements. Their interests were Gallican,^{i.e.} the defence of the Gallican liberties and hostility to any outside interference in the country's internal affairs, spiritual or temporal. This meant a definite hostility to the papacy, not to the office of pope as such, but hostility to the claims of the papacy to control politics, since religion must touch every side of man's life. It is interesting to note that in 1729 a printed sheet was circulating in France which contained the Légende for the Office of Pope Gregory vii whom Pope Boniface xiii had just canonised; in the Légende Pope Gregory was called "Romanae libertatis vindex". This reading was made compulsory for all who had to use the Roman Breviary. Now Gregory vii (Hildebrand) had deprived Henry iv of his crown and freed his subjects from their oath of loyalty. The 18th century Légende turned these things into an act of piety and a sign of the pope's zeal for the House of God. It also confirmed the idea that the pope had control over temporal princes. The Paris lawyers saw the danger of this legend. 95 of them drew up a consultation attacking it. The Paris Parlement, in an Arrêt du Parlement de Paris suppressed the legend "qu'à la faveur de ce prétendu supplément du Bréviaire Romain,

on mit dans les mains des Fidèles, dans la bouche des Ministres de la Religion jusqu'au milieu de nos saints Temples & de la solennité du culte divin, ce qui tend à ébranler les principes inviolables & sacrés de l'attachement des sujets à leur Souverain, & ce qui blesse les maximes que l'on a toujours soutenues dans ce Royaume très-chrétien avec la constance la plus invincible". (1) Other parlements followed suit but their efforts were frustrated by secret orders which the upholders of the bull obtained from the Court. (2) At the same time there appeared in French, and once again in 1745, Bossuet's Défense de la Déclaration de l'Assemblée du clergé de France de 1682. (3)

On doctrinal grounds Jansenism was not hostile to the office of the papacy but the Jansenists were determined to limit the power of the papacy over bishops and other clergy. Thus, for different reasons, one political, the other religious, Jansenism and Parlement were fighting a common cause.

Consider the lawyers' case. As soon as the Légende appeared, the magistrates, as Gallicans, suppressed it. Some of the Paris clergy asked their archbishop to add his authority to that of parlement but he refused to answer their letter. The appellant bishops, however, used the occasion of the legend to assert their inviolable attachment to the king. The lawyers had concerned themselves with the condemnation of the Bishop of Senez at the Council of Embrun and although it was only a provincial ecclesiastical judgment, it interested the lawyers from three points of view: (a) the form of judgment; (b) the competence of the tribunal; (c) the 'corps de délit' imputed to the accused. As for (a), the lawyers found that the most inviolable rules had been broken and that no notice was taken of the objections raised by the bishop; (b) the tribunal was not competent to judge the bishop who had made a valid canonical appeal to a higher tribunal; as for (c),

(1) N.E. 1729, p.130.

(2) Ibid. 1730, p.18

(3) Amsterdam. 1745. Published by Bossuet's nephew, bishop of Troyes.

the Bishop of Senes had committed no crime in appealing against the Constitution; moreover he had held to the Clementine peace.

It was a matter of dispute whether the lawyers had overstepped their powers; they were acting as Gallicans. "Mrs les avocats ne peuvent-ils pas dire leurs avis touchant l'atteinte donnée à Embrun au Droit naturel, au Droit des gens, aux Lois Civiles et Canoniques? S'il y a des points de Théologie traités dans leur écrit, ils regardent (comme il est dit leur Apologiste) une portion de la Théologie qui est commune aux Jurisconsultes avec les Théologiens: c'est la Théologie du vrai Droit Canonique: ce sont les premiers principes sur lesquels est appuyée toute la juridiction Ecclésiastique, & sur quoi son exercice doit être réglé. Or qui peut contester aux avocats la qualité de Canonistes? Qui peut leur refuser de connoître et de donner leur avis sur des matieres qu'ils enseignent publiquement dans leurs écoles, qu'ils traitent dans les disputes de leur Faculté, qui sont en partie l'objet des examens qu'ils sont obligés de subir pour acquérir leurs degrés?" (1) As their Apologist had said (2) the lawyers had shown a noble attachment to the inviolable maxims of the State and to the salutary rules of jurisprudence of the kingdom. To their deep knowledge of the law they added a care for the Church. "On y entend parler des coeurs vraiment François, héritiers du zèle de leurs ancêtres pour la gloire de la Couronne, pour la paix de l'Etat, pour les libertés de l'Eglise Gallicane, pour la sureté des sujets du Roi, contre les entreprises des Ultramontains".

Royal interference made this protest of the lawyers ineffective. Their Consultation was suppressed by an Arrêt du Conseil d'Etat. The king promised to uphold the decrees of the Council of Embrun. Hence, Royal supremacy and Gallican liberties were in opposition, and when Archbishop de Noailles accepted the Constitution, the way would appear to be open for the general acceptance of the bull. Nevertheless the

(1) Cat. Hist. vol. 2., p.395

(2) Question nouvelle. A-t-on droit d'accuser Mrs les Avocats d'avoir passé leur pouvoir? Quoted in Cat.Hist. vol.2, p.394

Court had to proceed with caution because of the excesses of the upholders of the bull who now wanted to make the Constitution an article of faith. A certain St. de la Lande upheld this thesis in the Sorbonne in January 1729. (1) Parlement at once took notice of it but the king took the matter in hand himself, preventing the parlement from acting and forbade the Sorbonne to entertain theses which would cause trouble. The Archbishop of Embrun complained to Cardinal Fleury of the intolerance of parlement but for his pains he was sent in disgrace to his diocese. It would ^{thus} appear that, according to the Court itself, the Constitution was not regarded as an article of faith, which means that there existed a division among the acceptants. Some, like Rome and the Jesuits, the Archbishop of Embrun and others, did so regard it. The Court, while accepting the Constitution, did not regard it as an article of faith, and the attitude of parlement was clear. On the other hand, if it was not an article of faith, of what use was it? Why harry dioceses, religious communities and private persons in order to make them sign the Formulary? The answer of some of the bishops would be that if it was not an article of faith, it was none the less not contrary to the faith. This was denied by the Jansenists and rejected by parlement.

The 'Remonstrances' (2) quote an 'arrêt' of the 15th May, 1733, which condemned two books supporting the bull: "C'est dans ce même esprit que nous avons déjà eu l'honneur de représenter à V.M. et que nous ne craignons point de lui représenter encore aujourd'hui puisque les motifs les plus pressants l'exigent de notre zèle, que le caractère le plus essentiel d'un dogme de foi consiste à fixer et à déterminer par une décision claire et précise ou une vérité à croire ou une erreur à condamner, et qu'une bulle qui proscrie en général cent propositions extraites d'un livre, sous une multitude de qualifications respectives et de différents genres, sans appliquer aucune de ces qualifications à aucune des

(1) N.E. Fév. 1729, p.3

(2) Remonstrances du Parlement de Paris au xviiiè siècle. Paris. 1888 1895. 3 vols. vol. 1, p.306.

propositions condamnées, n'est point par sa nature un dogme ni une règle de foi". What worried Parliament most, perhaps, was the condemnation of Quesnel's Proposition 91 which was one of the maxims of the realm.

Barbier had noted in his Journal (I) of April, 1730 "que les membres du Parlement ne s'embarrassent pas pour le fond de la consultation, pour savoir à quel carat doit être l'amour de Dieu, ni combien de sortes de grâces Dieu a fait pour ceux qui habiteront ce bas monde. Cela ne les regarde pas, c'est de la théologie; mais ce qui les lanterne dans la constitution, c'est la 91e proposition qui est condamnée et qui porte que la crainte même d'une excommunication injuste ne nous doit jamais empêcher de faire notre devoir. La Cour de Rome prétend que, quand elle excommunie, même à tort et à travers, l'on doit suivre ses volontés à la lettre et que par là elle peut excommunier les rois et dégager les peuples du serment de fidélité. Et en effet le dessein de la Cour de Rome s'est manifesté dans cette légende de Gregoire vii: c'est ce qui révolte le Parlement. ..."

The division of opinion in the country was acute. If the Constitution was not an article of faith, the Jansenists could not be considered as heretics for refusing it. They were, and convinced that they were, within the Church. The Nouvelles Ecclésiastiques (2) tell of a Libelle entitled: Refutation de l'opinion de plusieurs Catholiques de France qui prétendent qu'on peut toujours communier licitement, quant au spirituel, avec les ennemis de la Constitution Unigenitus, tant qu'ils sont conservés dans la Jurisdiction, & tolérés dans l'Eglise (ainsi qu'ils le supposent) & qu'ils n'en sont pas séparés, ni nommé-ment excommuniés." This document was denounced in parlement and ordered to be torn and burnt by the hangman. But the Libelle, and other similar documents, aimed at stirring up opposition to those who would not regard the Constitution as an article of faith; according to them, the opponents, whether he be bishop, priest or layman, was automatically excommunicated, and if bishop or priest, deprived of all jurisdiction.

E.J.F.

- (1) E. Barbier, Journal du règne de Louis xv. Paris. 1847-49. 4 vols.
 (2) N.E. 22 mars, 1729 and 26 mars, 1729.

Such an opinion had serious consequences. Could people who refused the Formulary be communicated or confessed? The appointment of de Vintimille to Paris caused greater difficulties to the opponents of the bull; several of the Paris clergy refused to obey him and when they sought protection from parlement the king forbade parlement to deal with matters relating to the Constitution. In an attempt to finish the affair, the king held a 'lit de justice' to register the bull as a law of the realm, assuming, apparently, that it was a law of the Church. A majority of the members of parlement opposed this, but the king ordered it to be accepted, which led to many hostile demonstrations from parlement throughout the year 1730. The Parlements of Rouen, Rennes and Dijon also made demonstrations against the king's declaration. Some bishops, taking advantage of the declaration, began an attack on those of their clergy who refused the Formulary, suspending them from their functions. This happened in the dioceses of Boulogne, Rheims, Amiens, Soissons and Orleans. The parlements again showed their power by suppressing the edicts of the bishops and the clergy remained in their places.

Another clash between the spiritual and the temporal is seen in a consultation drawn up by lawyers in favour of some of the clergy. This was in 1730 and caused some commotion because it definitely treated of the limits of the two powers. The doctrine of the kingdom is, according to this consultation, that the Church has the right, of itself, to deal with spiritual matters only, and she can administer spiritual penalties only. It is from the Prince that she derives the public character of jurisdiction and coercive power. Certain bishops condemned the consultation and were supported by an Arrêt du Conseil, whereupon 230 lawyers presented a mémoire to the king which produced an Arrêt du Conseil in favour of the lawyers. But this was not the end of the matter, for the consultation laid down the principle of the limits of the two powers, on which parlement was to act so frequently during this troubled period. The Bishop of Laon was one of the bishops who had, at the first, opposed

the consultation of the lawyers and his 'mandement' against the consultation was condemned by parlement; in like manner, the mandement of the Archbishop of Paris was suppressed. The archbishop appealed to the Conseil du Roi which gave an 'arrêt' against parlement. The lawyers then refused to plead; some were exiled but they were soon recalled.

The quarrel continued over the years after 1730 and the king again attempted to end the matter by forbidding the problem to be discussed, but the Chancellor, in the name of the king, wrote to the bishops on this question reminding them that it was from the king that they held their exterior jurisdiction and coercive power. The Bishop of Laon attempted to sustain his mandement but met with the opposition of parlement which suppressed his Pastoral Instruction as "contraire à l'autorité du Roi et à la justice" and revoked his permission to print. The penalty for breaking this order was to be the loss of his temporalities. Parlement, although forbidden to discuss the bull, was not daunted in their wish to defend the clergy. The king would allow no Remonstrances to be made to him and some of the leaders of parlement were banished. On receipt of the news parlement ceased all functions and remained totally inactive. The king ordered them to renew their duties, which they did, but their first act was to issue an 'arrêt' against the mandement of the Archbishop, forbidding him to publish his mandement. This action sheltered the clergy but irritated the Court which quashed the 'arrêt' and sent the President and three Conseillers, who were considered to be the leading spirits, into exile. Parlement acted boldly by sending in their resignation. Such an act was quite unexpected. The Court negotiated with the Grand'Chambre and with generous promises the members were recalled; a Declaration followed which reserved to the Grand'Chambre only any discussion of ecclesiastical matters. This meant, however, that parlement could not give protection to the clergy who were troubled by their bishops, and the members "prennent de nouveau le parti de surséoir tout exercice de leurs charges, jusqu'à ce que la Déclaration soit retirée et que leurs Confrères exilés leur soient rendus."

"Sur cela, le Roi mande le Parlement à Versailles & y tient le 3 Septembre (1732) son Lit de Justice, où le Parlement, conformément à son Arrêté refuse d'opiner. La Déclaration ne laisse pas d'y être enregistrée: mais le Parlement de retour à Paris déclare dans un Arrêté, que la Compagnie n'a pu, ni entendu donner son avis au Lit de Justice, attendu le lieu où il a été tenu, & le défaut de communication des matières qui devoient y être traitées; qu'elle ne cessera de représenter au Roi l'impossibilité où elle est d'exécuter ladite Déclaration du 18 Août, & qu'itératives Remontrances seront faites sur le retour de Messieurs qui sont absens: les Chambres demeurant assemblées, jusqu'à ce qu'il ait plu au Roi de donner réponse aux dites Remontrances. Une générosité si bien soutenue attire à chacun de Messieurs des Enquêtes & Requêtes une lettre de cachet qui les exile en divers endroits du Royaume. Mais enfin la Cour, désespérant d'affoiblir un zèle qu'elle voit être à l'épreuve de tout, rappelle tous ces Messieurs, & retire la Déclaration qui avoit eu des suites si facheuses." (I)

The reassembled parlement made it clear that they were not defeated and continued to defend the clergy of the second order. The Gallicanism of parlement is seen in a memorable 'arrêt' of February, 1733, in which professors and others were forbidden "de rien avancer qui puisse tendre directement ou indirectement à affoiblir, ou altérer les véritables principes sur la nature & les droits de la Puissance Royale & son indépendance pleine et absolue, quand au temporel, de toute autre qui soit sur la terre; à diminuer la soumission et le respect dûs aux Canons reçus dans le Royaume, & aux libertés de l'Eglise Gallicane: à favoriser l'opinion de l'Infaillibilité du Pape, & de sa supériorité au dessus du Concile Général; à donner atteinte à l'autorité du Concile Oecumenique de Constance, & notamment aux Décrets contenus dans les Sessions iv & v du dit Concile, renouvelés par celui de Bâle: dans lequel enfin le Parlement déclare, comme un principe inviolable, que l'autorité du Pape

(I) Cat. Hist. vol.2. p.464.

doit être réglée par les Saints Canons, et que ses Décrets sont réformables par les voies permises et usitées dans le Royaume, notamment par celle de l'Appel au futur Concile".

The parlements considered themselves as a kind of depository of royal authority and as such were charged with the duty of keeping peace in the country and of seeing that the Canons were observed: since the bull produced disorder, even the threat of schism, and as it was contrary to the Gallican principles, the parlements maintained a determined opposition to it. The parlements saw also, that apart from the purely religious side of the question, there was the problem of the temporal power over against the ultramontane claims. But in spite of this, persecutions continued against those who opposed the bull. (I)

We have seen that the King in a 'Lit de Justice' of March, 1730, made a declaration registering the bull as a law of the State against the opinion of parlement. But the Paris parlement, like the other parlements, did not consider this declaration as influencing their judgments. They persisted in their opinion that the bull was not, and could not be, considered as an article of faith. They looked at the bull in its bearing upon the State and the laws of the kingdom. In spite of the efforts made since 1713 to have the bull accredited, parlement saw the insufficiency of its foundations. The Letters Patent of Louis xiv ordering the bull to be accepted were indeed registered in 1714, but in so doing parlement did not consider the bull to be the judgment of the Church, since it was not accepted by all the bishops and because it concentrated all power in the pope. Why then were the Letters Patent registered by parlement, even with repugnance and restrictions? The king forced the acceptance to prepare the way for its acknowledgment by the French Church, by putting the bull into the hands of the French

(I) For the severe prison treatment and threat of execution of people accused of Jansenism, see N.E. 1730, pp. 41 sq. and pp. 67 sq.

bishops who could thus receive it from the king and not from an external authority. Thus the parlement was forced to make the acceptance of the bull depend on its acknowledgment by the bishops. But since there was open hostility to the bull by some of the bishops, and since there was no unanimity among those who did accept it, parlement's condition could not be carried out; thus, the Paris parlement was hostile to those who acted as if the bull represented the judgment of the French Church. Other parlements followed the example of Paris. That the king's Declaration of 1714 did not make the bull a law of the State was clearly recognised by the Bishop of Bayeux who wrote to the king on the subject. A part of the letter reads: "Les Parlements, en enregistraut la Déclaration, ont bien prévu qu'il pourroit venir un temps de faire revivre & de poursuivre au Concile l'Appel que la Déclaration, au moyen de l'accomodement, vouloit qu'on regardât, non comme nul, mais comme de nul effet, puis qu'ils l'ont maintenu dans toute sa force, par cette clause de l'enregistrement qui mérite une attention singuliere: que ce soit sans préjudice de l'appel au futur Concile. Ce temps est arrivé, Sire, puis que toutes les conditions du traité ont été violées, que toutes les voies d'accomodement sont épuisées sans fruit, et que le moyen d'une acceptation relative & restrictive, embrassé par condescendance, n'est pas encore du goût de nos adversaires."

For similar reasons, the king's Declaration of 1730 did not make the bull a law of the State because it still lacked the unanimous authority of the bishops. The Council of Embrun and the dissemination of the Légende of Gregory vii made parlement see more clearly the dangers of acceptance. The parlements of Brittany, Normandy and Burgundy showed their alarm by issuing strong remonstrances; the parlements of Toulouse, Aix and Metz only registered the Declaration on absolute orders, and this was done only in the Grand'Chambre, although this tribunal could not register a new law without the consent of the other Chambers; éven in other parlements, events made them leave the law on

one side because of the inconvenience which it caused. Even the Court realised that the 1730 Declaration would be ineffective. It was reported (1) that the Cardinal de Fleury and the Chancellor gave an assurance to the Premier Président, in the name of the king, "qu'on ne feroit aucun usage de la Déclaration." Orders were given in all the provinces to prevent its execution, so the magistrates attested in the assembly of parlement on the 19th April, 1730, without completely calming the alarm of the members. The next year parlement issued 'arrêts' against the writings of the Bishops of Embrun, Laon, Marseille and Sisteron. While parlement was thus clearly opposed to any idea that the bull was an article of faith, the Court, too, seemed to be coming to the same opinion for in 1731 (2) a circular letter from the king, written by M. Chauvelin, Garde des Sceaux, was sent to the bishops advising them to abstain from insisting that the bull was an article of faith and from demanding acceptance of it. Nine acceptant bishops complained to the king about this, but an 'arrêt du Conseil' suppressed their letter. (3)

One of the difficulties which the bull presented was the fact that some of Quesnel's propositions which were condemned were, in their natural sense, good. This was particularly so with regard to Proposition 91; moreover, the bull was so variously interpreted, so many modifications introduced, that it was impossible to regard it as an article of faith. (4)

(1) N.E. 1730, p.89. (2) Ibid., 1731, p.164. (3) Ibid., 1734, p.167-168.

(4) The N.E. of 17 juillet, 1781 has a long article containing information from Rome in which it is asserted that Unigenitus was not considered as an article of faith. Translating the Latin Decree by Marefoschi it says: "Le Concile Romain n'a nullement reconnu la Bulle Unigenitus pour Regle de Foi; et cette dénomination répugne à la condamnation des cent-une Propositions prononcée in globo; ce qui rendroit la regle de Foi incertaine. Ces mots: "Nous reconnoissons pour Regle de Foi, furent ajoutés dans l'impression par M.F.A. Fini Evêque d'Avellino, Secrétaire du Concile & ensuite Cardinal. On rapporte que cette fourberie fut tramée au noviciat des Jésuites contre l'intention du Concile, & que le Pape foible & fort âgé, qui aimoit Fini, la dissimula, on n'en eut point de connoissance. C'est ce qu'a particulièrement attesté le Pape Benoît xiv, qui avoit rempli la fonction de Canoniste dans ce Concile, & qui a raconté le fait à plusieurs personnes". (This note is continued on the next page.)

This was pointed out to the king in a 'Remonstrance' from the Rouen parlement in 1753. Here again, Jansenism and the parlements were in agreement, but from differing points of view. The parlements were charged with safeguarding the public peace and the due execution of the laws of the Church; they must therefore refuse to consider as an article of faith a statement which had not that necessary qualification; they examined it from what was considered an external point of view. They therefore turned their attention to (i) the form of the bull, which they found to be irregular, because the sense was not clear; (ii) the claim that the bull was accepted by the whole Church was illusory. For the parlement, therefore, the bull was a judgment which judged nothing, a decision which decided nothing; and it affected the laws of the realm. Such is indicated in a letter which the Grand'Chambre of the Parlement of Aix wrote to the king in 1753. "Depuis que les censures conglobées & accumulées, sans note distincte pour chaque proposition, ont commencé d'être en usage, on s'est plaint qu'elles étoient sujettes à beaucoup d'inconvénients, qu'elles n'éclaircissoient point la doctrine, & donnoient lieu aux surprises: ... Les maximes les plus importantes pour l'Eglise & pour l'Etat paroissent commé enveloppées dans un épais nuage par la condamnation indéterminée de cent-une fameuses propositions: aucune vérité n'étoit éclaircie ... aucune erreur n'étoit démasquée; et un vaste champ étoit ouvert pour supposer des erreurs imaginaires ..."

The ecclesiastics who opposed the bull saw things rather differently.

Note (4) continued from preceding page.

A similar suggestion is made by Codignola. (E. Codignola, Illuministi, Giansenisti E Giacobini nell'Italia del Settecento. Firenze. 1947. pp.18 and 70). He says that Andujar, Bishop of Tortona, together with Marefoschi and Bottari, had subscribed a document attesting that the statement contained in the Acts of Benedict xiii's Synod of 1725 that the Bull Unigenitus was a Rule of Faith was introduced secretly by the Jesuits. Andujar assisted at the Synod as a theologian.

Their duty was to preserve the ancient faith and oppose new errors. Therefore, the condemned propositions must be considered in themselves and also in relation to the precise explanation of the author of the propositions. For them the bull attacked the ancient doctrine and favoured errors; and although the censures of the bull were indeterminate and obscure, the bull none the less promoted false doctrine; hence the appeal to a General Council. The opposing ecclesiastics did not believe that all the acceptants adhered to the errors of the bull; like the magistrates, they saw the lack of unanimity among the acceptants. The two views, parliamentary and ecclesiastical, are different but not opposed to each other; one supports the other.

Although what has been said may give the impression of a kind of stalemate between the Crown and Parlement, there was, however, little peace for the opponents of the bull. One of the first effects of the king's Declaration of 1730 was the destruction of several establishments where opposition was sustained. (I) The Paris parlement became implicated in the matter, first of all in connection with the Consultation de quarante Avocats and secondly over the Nouvelles Ecclésiastiques. The Consultation of the 40 avocats concerned some bishops who were emboldened by the 1730 Declaration; they attacked the opposing clergy. In the dioceses of Boulogne, Amiens, Rheims, Soissons and Orleans, clergy were suspended from their functions; they obtained 'Arrêts de défense' from the Paris parlement and the Court came to the rescue of the prelates. In September 1730 there appeared a Consultation in favour of two incumbents and a Canon of Orleans signed by 40 lawyers. The result expected would be that these ecclesiastics who had obtained such 'arrêts de défense' could resume their duties without recourse to the ecclesiastical authorities. In October, the prelates who were embarrassed obtained an Arrêt de Conseil which suppressed the Consultation "comme contenant

(I) N.E. 1730, pp.225 sq.; 1731, pp.253 sq.

des propositions contraires à l'autorité du Roi, séditieuses, & tendantes à troubler la tranquillité publique". To satisfy themselves, the lawyers, now numbering 250, signed a Requête and the original 40 signed a Declaration; in November a second Arrêt du Conseil arrived stating that the king was satisfied with the declaration of the lawyers. Now the lawyers in their declaration had firmly stated that the secular power was bound to preserve the public peace and protect the ecclesiastical Canons and must therefore take note of any abuses committed by ecclesiastical superiors in the exercise of their duty. When certain bishops protested, it was not only parlement which attacked their Mandements, but the Court also threatened to seize their temporalities. Then de Vintimille, Archbishop of Paris, launched an Ordonnance, in January, 1731, attacking the Consultation, to which parlement replied, "que l'Eglise n'a d'elle-même, ni pouvoir coactif, ni Jurisdiction extérieure, & proprement dite." But this was precisely what the Archbishop considered as heresy. "Tout le for extérieur & toute la Jurisdiction coactive dont jouit l'Eglise, est une concession de la Puissance temporelle, qui par-là demeure en droit de connoître de l'abus qu'on fait, soit contre la tranquillité publique dont elle est gardienne, soit contre les Canons dont elle est d'ailleurs protectrice." (I)

It is not easy to follow the sequence of events because there is much contradiction and inconsequence. The Court wished to maintain the Gallican principles and at the same time was anxious to find an accommodation between the bull and the claims of parlement. After the above mentioned incident the king ordered silence in his 'arrêt' of March 1731, and parlement, seeing that essential principles were being attacked, issued an 'arrêt' in which it restated these principles in a résumé of the Laws and Ordonnances of the kingdom. This was in four

(I) Cat. Hist., vol.3, p.128.

This is the principle asserted by de la Borde in his Principes sur les deux Puissances, printed in 1753. And see N.E. 1731, p.73.

articles and the next day it was quashed by an Arrêt du Conseil and erased from the registers as contrary to sovereign authority. Although this was a rebuff to parlement, the Court nevertheless did not abandon the doctrine of the four articles. (1) Parlement is reproached for having repeated uselessly what is not, and cannot be, contested. The situation was certainly curious. In 1732 Fleury is reported as saying to the Premier Président Portail: "Je sais mieux que vous que la Bulle ne vaut rien; mais Louis xiv l'a demandée; le roi l'a reçue; son autorité ~~se~~rait compromise si elle était rejetée, il faut donc qu'elle soit reçue." But if the king was not anxious to make use of his Declaration, the militant bishops, with de Vintimille at their head, would certainly make trouble. The parlement's efforts to protect persecuted clergy were largely ineffective because matters were referred to the Conseil du Roi and lettres de cachet made justice impossible. In desperation the indignant judges ceased to appear at the Palais - an 18th century strike of judges, which was to be repeated later on. 10 lawyers were exiled and no judge appeared in the courts between the 27th August and the 26th November 1731. They resumed their duties on the understanding that they would receive satisfaction. The exiles were recalled and it was explained that there had been a misunderstanding. Things remained in a troubled state until May, 1732 when de Vintimille wrote his mandement against the Nouvelles Ecclésiastiques. (2) This was received with hostility by some of the clergy and by many of the laity who walked out of the churches when the mandement was read. (3) At de Vintimille's instigation the king called the Premier Président and others to Compiègne (10th May) and ordered them to tell parlement that the bull must not be discussed in any way nor was any action to be taken with regard to it. Parlement refused to accept this and no business was done. Considerin_g this as an act of revolt, the king

(1) N.E. 1732, p.4. (2) Ibid. 1732, p.85. (3) Ibid. 1732,
pp.98: 100 sq.

then ordered parlement to Compiègne and showed his indignation by ordering to be torn up the paper which contained the findings of parlement which was to be read by one of their number, the Abbé Pucelle, who was arrested on his return from Compiègne. Parlement remained inactive until the 23rd May, 1732, when they were ordered to the Palais where they were presented with Lettres Patentes ordering them to resume their functions. What were they to do with regard to the mandement of the archbishop? They forbade its publication and this irritated those with influence at Court with the result that some of the leading members of parlement were sent into exile. This was on the 15th June. On the 17th, the king caused an Arrêt du Conseil to be read to the remaining members which quashed their 'arrêt' of the 13th June and forbade them, under pain of suspension from their posts, to do anything against the Arrêt du Conseil. The assembled chambers were told this on the 20th June; they retired without deliberation and in less than an hour 158 magistrates met to resign their posts because they were unable to fulfil their duties. The astonished Court humoured the Grand'Chambre, which, although agreeing with the others, had not followed their example. As a result of their negotiations, the members agreed to resume their functions on the 6th July on the understanding that the king would not molest them. On the 19th August the king issued a Declaration ordering the publication of the edicts of the Lit de Justice and practically confining all business to the Grand'Chambre. Parlement, realising that this made their work impossible, issued repeated 'Remonstrances' about the return of the exiled members and the king was asked to withdraw his Declaration. He refused to reply to, or see, representatives and held a Lit de Justice at Versailles on the 3rd September to have the Declaration registered in his presence. Still protesting, the spokesman declared that, following the example of their predecessors, they could do nothing but keep silent. On their return to Paris, parlement declared that at the 'Lit de Justice' at Versailles they were unable to do anything; they could not execute

the king's Declaration and they would remain assembled in parlement until the king would reply. The only result was the banishment of the principal officers of the assembly, leaving the Grand'Chambre in session through which some reconciliation might be made. It is difficult to explain the king's attitude to parlement. Clearly he was being influenced. His advisers were persuading him that the bull was a law of the Church, for which gratitude was due to Louis xiv for his zeal against the Jansenist heresy. Those who opposed the Decree were painted not only as heretics but as rebels against the State, as people "Qui ne vouloient ni Pape ni Roi". In listening to such advice one can perhaps understand that the king was offended with parlement which still refused to accept the bull from ill considered motives. The Cardinal de Fleury was blamed for the king's hostility. The king did not like the Jesuits but he feared them. The difficult year of 1732 ended fairly peaceably with the recall from exile of the members.

It was in the same year that the Bishop of Ségur began to have doubts about the bull and in 1735 he resigned his See and in his Mandement, of which 40,000 copies were printed, he retracted all he had done in favour of the bull and adhered to the Appeal of the four bishops to a future Council. (I)

(I) The Mandement is printed in full in N.E. 1735, pp.41 sq.

PARLEMENTS and JANSENISM: The REFUSAL of SACRAMENTS.(b) During the episcopate of Archbishop Beaumont. 1746-1781

When de Vintimille died in 1746, Beaumont succeeded him as Archbishop of Paris and a new period of difficulty began for Jansenist sympathisers. Beginning with an appearance of moderation, Beaumont soon showed his zeal for the bull and his attachment to the Jesuits. One of his Grand-Vicaires was a former Jesuit, (1) and the archbishop did his utmost to extend Jesuit teaching and influence in his diocese. We thus enter into an extremely troubled period with conflicts between Constituant (2) bishops, the king and the parlements. The parlements had not taken very seriously the Declaration of 1730 when the king, in a 'Lit de Justice', had attempted to enforce the bull, and their opposition to the king became very determined after 1751. The chief cause of the trouble was the refusal of sacraments (3) to opponents of the bull. The Refus de Sacrements which accentuated the troubles and which occupy such a large place in the Registers of Parliament (4), in the Remonstrances of Parliament and in the Nouvelles Ecclésiastiques, together with much controversial literature, may be considered from two points of view. From one angle it is an expression of Gallicanism; from another point of view it is, among the lower clergy, a renewal of Richerist opinions and the assertion of the importance of the second order of the clergy. Richer had claimed, and others like N.Travers and Maultrot, had followed him in insisting that the second order was of divine origin and had its rightful place in deciding matters of Church discipline and faith. Travers went so far as to insist on the equality of bishop and priest (5) and these claims found ample support in the Nouvelles Ecclésiastiques. (6)

(1) N.E. 1748, pp.177 sq. and 1749, pp.197 sq.

(2) Constituant; so called because they upheld the Constitution, as the bull Unigenitus was so frequently called.

(3) See pp. 76-84 for refusal of sacraments in diocese of Troyes.

(4) For details see Appendix A, p. 252.

(5) N.Travers, Pouvoirs légitimes du Premier et du Second Ordre dans l'administration des Sacrements et le gouvernement de l'Eglise. Nantes. 1744.

(6) e.g. N.E. 1731, p.55; 1735, p. 206; and numerous other references.

On the other hand the bishops, especially the Constituants, argued that the priests held their powers only as it was delegated to them by their bishop. Herein lies the root of the problem of the refusal of sacraments to those who refused to accept the bull. What might be called ecclesiastical Jansenism had been considerably weakened by the mid 18th century because many Jansenist clergy had been dispossessed of their benefices and by the difficulty of ordination for those who refused to accept the Formulary. The attack must therefore be carried on, not only against the remaining Jansenist clergy, but also against the laity.

Immediate success was expected by refusing the last sacraments, and burial in consecrated ground, if they were suspected of heresy. But such success was not forthcoming because of the resistance of the laity, the clergy and the parlements.

Refusal of sacraments was not a new procedure in ecclesiastical discipline but the practice came into much greater prominence with the advent of Beaumont. Fundamentally it was a matter of jurisdiction. Had the bishop absolute control over each priest and parish in his diocese; was he able to withdraw from any particular priest the authority given to him to exercise his ministerial duties? Or, on the other hand, had the second order inherent rights of jurisdiction which they claimed as of divine right and divine institution because of their succession from the 72? "Nous ne tenons point de vous notre autorité, elle vient immédiatement de Jésus-Christ", wrote some of the clergy of the troubled diocese of Auxerre to their bishop in 1755; "Bien différents de vos officiers ecclésiastiques que vous pouvez révoquer quand il vous plaît, nous sommes vos coopérateurs et non vos délégués." N. Travers took this extreme position in his Pouvoirs légitimes and Maultrot took an even more extreme position. (I)

-
- (I) G. N. Maultrot, L'Institution divine des cures. 1778. 2 vols.
 " Dissertation sur l'approbation des confesseurs
introduite par le Concile de Trente, 1783. 2 vols.
 See also: N.E. 1785, p.185 and Préclin, Op. cit. pp.336 sq.

It was especially the Billets de Confession which caused so much controversy. In December, 1746, M. de la Motte, Bishop of Amiens, had sent to his clergy an Avis au sujet de ceux qui, n'étant pas soumis à la Bulle Unigenitus, demandent les sacrements. In this document the bishop gave rules governing priests with regard to confession, communion and burial. He took a moderate line in ordinary cases but was adamant towards the sick and dying. "Pour la communion, ils ne devaient pas la refuser à ceux qui la demandaient en public avec un extérieur décent. Mais pour le viatique et l'extrême-onction, ils devaient tenir une autre ligne de conduite: si un malade avait la réputation de n'être pas soumis à la Bulle, on devait l'interroger; s'il ne se soumettait pas, lui refuser les sacrements, parce que le corps de Jesus-Christ n'est pas moins profané par ceux qui manquent de soumission à l'Eglise que par les moeurs les plus dépravées." Barbier says (I) that parlement condemned the bishop's 'avis' and that the king quashed the parlement 's'arrêt'. Other bishops followed the Bishop of Amiens and particularly Archbishop Beaumont of Paris.

The practice was this: each sick person, to receive the viaticum, must make a confession to a priest having the diocesan's authority; if a priest who administered the viaticum was not the same person who had heard the confession, he would require a 'billet de confession' signed by the aforesaid approved priest. It happened that in many dioceses the priests to whom people made application were priests without the bishop's authority; hence the quarrel over the 'billets de confession'. Was the bishop's approval necessary for the dispensation of these last sacraments? It was the appellant clergy who most contested this theory and maintained that they had the right to choose their own collaborators in parochial functions. The Jansenist laity would have to seek a complaisant confessor or a priest who was provided with a permanent approval. This would often mean that a layman would have to go outside his own parish; to combat

E. J. F.
 (I) A. Barbier, Journal du règne de Louis xv. Paris. 1847-49.
 4 vols. vol. 3, p.7.

this, the bishops restricted suspect clergy to hearing confessions in their own parishes only, and to counteract any opposition, some of the bishops refused to appoint assistant clergy who had been nominated by the parish priests. Instead, they sent priests who were willing to accept the Constitution, but in so doing they were violating a recognised principle that such a priest must be 'de consensu parochi'. This led to cases where the parish priest refused to allow to the intruder~~d~~ priests the right of preaching, hearing confessions and teaching the catechism. There are interesting examples of the reactions of the Jansenist clergy and the intervention of parlement.⁽¹⁾ The bishops went further and authorised parishioners who were opposed to the Jansenist incumbents to go to other parishes to make their confessions, a practice which gave the Jansenist clergy the right to hear confessions of parishioners other than their own.

There was talk among the bishops of the Edit Royal of 1695, given at a moment when Louis xiv had made peace with the pope. In return for an annual payment of four millions, the king granted to the prelates an edict allowing them demands which they had long wanted. Articles x and xiii insisted that preachers for Advent and Lent must have episcopal approval. Article xi gave the bishops the right to withhold, under certain conditions, from unbeneficed clergy the right to hear confessions. Only beneficed priests and Cathedral theologians were dispensed from these formalities, but even these priests could be sent away to seminaries for three months, as a discipline, thus weakening any resistance. Article xi said: "Les prêtres séculiers réguliers ne pourront administrer le sacrement de la pénitence sans en avoir obtenu permission des archevêques ou évêques, qui pourront la limiter pour les lieux, les personnes, le temps et les cas, ainsi qu'ils le jugeront à propos, la révoquer, même avant le terme expiré, pour ^{causes} survenues depuis à leur connaissance, lesquelles ils ne seront pas obligés d'expliquer." (2)

(1). N.E. 1730, p. 179: 1744, p.144.

(2). Préclin, op. cit. p. 211.

This theory regards priests as simple delegates of the bishops, a theory naturally rejected by those who regarded the second order as of divine institution; hence the vast amount of controversial literature. With the advent of Beaumont to the see of Paris events became more violent. Parlement constantly exercised what was considered by them to be their rights to interfere, and the Registers of Parlement in this period are extraordinarily full of such details. They would say that they were not interfering in spiritual matters as such, but only in so far as they affected the public good and the peace of the realm. This right rested in the person of the king, but was exercised by parlement according to the civil and ecclesiastical laws. They were not pronouncing on dogmas, nor examining it, but, they would say, merely stating a fact that the bull did not represent the unanimous voice of the Church and therefore the magistrates had the right to repress any trouble inflicted on the people because of the bull. There was, of course, the traditional hostility of parlement to the Church, but it was increased at this period because of the growing belief in the infallibility of the pope as advanced by the ultramontane party. Thus the Parlement of Aix in a 'Remontrance' of 21 January, 1754, complained of ultramontanism. "Oui, Sire, l'Eglise Gallicane nourrit dans son sein des Ministres qui n'ont conservé de nos maximes qu'une vaine écorce pour envelopper les opinions contraires. Ultramontains dans le coeur, ils ont dénaturé l'ancien langage; ils ont créé un langage nouveau... Les équivoques se multiplient; tantôt la vérité est énervée par flatterie pour la Cour de Rome; tantôt l'opinion ultramontaine est enveloppée par la crainte des Tribunaux François; tantôt elle échappe & se montre à découvert. Cet alliage a tellement défiguré le langage de nos écoles, qu'un défenseur moderne des prétentions de la Cour de Rome a fait un Traité exprès pour prouver que le Clergé de France reconnoît l'infaillibilité du Pape. Si l'on objecte à cet Ecrivain la Déclaration de 1682, il répond que c'est une faute aussi-tôt réparée que commise: si on lui oppose la tradition de

l'ancienne Sorbonne, il trouve dans une foule de Mandements modernes des monuments propres à détruire tout l'édifice de nos libertés ..." (I)
 The preceding year the same parlement of Aix had condemned a thesis upholding ultramontane principles.

Archbishop Beaumont began by suspending confessors who were suspect. He considered the bull to be a necessary article of faith which meant that those who rejected it were outside the pale of the Church. The instances of refusal of the sacraments and the actions of parlement are too numerous to catalogue and some examples only are given. First of all the case of M. Boursier, a Doctor of the Sorbonne, who died in 1749. Since 1735 he had been hiding in various places to avoid a harsher captivity. At the age of 31 he had written La Prémotion physique; it was he who drew up the Act of Appeal of the four bishops. He died in an attic in Paris, his last place of retirement to escape his pursuers. The parish priest - M. Carnot - an admirer of this famous appellant, gave the dying man the last sacraments and officiated at the grand'messe which preceded the burial. Printed bills had spread the news of his death and a very large number of people from all parts of Paris were present at the service. It was only afterwards that the clergy of the parish knew the name of the famous person at whose burial they had assisted and they decided to separate from their incumbent. In this they were aided by the archbishop and the incumbent was exiled, by lettre de cachet, to Senlis where he died in 1759. This was an early example of the conduct which the archbishop was to follow. He advised that the sacraments should be given only to those who named their confessor or who produced a certificate from a confessor. Confessors acting without the bishop's authority were to be punished. A striking instance occurred in the parish of S. Etienne-du-Mont where a famous person, M. Coffin, formerly Rector of the University, was dying. He was noted, not only for his academic distinction, but also for the hymns which he had composed for the Paris Breviary.

(I) Cat. Hist. vol. 3. p. 271. N.E. 1748, 30 avril.

M. Coffin asked for the last sacraments but the incumbent - le Père Bouettin - demanded a 'billet de confession', in spite of the fact that the sick man had already confessed to an approved priest. The archbishop supported Bouettin and Coffin died, 21st June, 1749, without the sacraments. (1). At the Assembly of the Parlement in the next month, Bouettin's act was denounced and at the same time there appeared four Consultations signed by lawyers, dealing with the Mémoire presented by the nephew of the deceased, asserting that the refusal of the sacraments was contrary to the rules and demanding reparation from the secular judges. An Arrêt du Conseil suppressed the Consultations. (2). 18 months later the nephew himself was dying and was being refused the sacraments. Parlement discussed the matter, not only because of its interest in religion and the peace of the realm, but also because the honour of parlement was involved. Bouettin was ordered to appear and give an account of his conduct. He replied insolently that he was accountable only to his bishop and that he would administer sacraments when his bishop ordered him to do so. (3). As a result Bouettin was imprisoned, but made some sort of satisfaction before parlement the following day and was fined three livres for his lack of respect for parlement. The Archbishop was ordered to make provision for the dying Coffin. The archbishop's reply was unsatisfactory and because of this parlement demanded assurances from the king that the scandal of refusals should be suppressed. The king, while expressing his pleasure that parlement had applied to him, answered that he did not approve of the imprisonment of Bouettin and that he would use his own authority to maintain public order. This caused some consternation in parlement, but matters quietened when parlement was assured that, in order to avoid trouble with parlement,

(1) N.E. 1749, p.109

(2) Ibid. 1749, pp.149 sq.

(3) This is dealt with in the Rémontrances du Parlement présentées au Roi jeudi le 4 mars, 1750. 1751.

the archbishop had found a priest to administer to the dying man without demanding from him any adherence to the bull.(1). But parlement was not really satisfied; they felt it necessary to represent to the king the real nature of things and so 'Remonstrances' were sent to the king, justifying their treatment of Bouettin and asserting their authority to deal with 'billets de confession'; and although these 'Remonstrances' were without effect, they confirmed the parlement in its resolution to use its full authority to repress these incidents which were made more dangerous because of the indirect support they received from the Court. The archbishop soon gave the opportunity for parlement to carry out its resolutions. In 1751 there arose the problem of the Hôpital-Général which caused a great stir. This was not primarily a case of the refusal of sacraments although that was involved. This famous hospital was made up of eight houses containing more than 12,000 people, old and poor, male and female, under correction and in addition there were 6,000 children.(2). The administration and government had for a long time been controlled by Royal Declarations which had been registered in, and supervised by, parlement. It was a great work of charity, carried out by devoted clergy and laity. Unfortunately their zeal caused them to be suspected of Jansenism and from the time of de Vintimille they were disturbed by priests who supported the bull and who were introduced, bit by bit, into the different houses. With Archbishop Beaumont, however, it became a case of open war. He removed the chief ecclesiastics and lay people from a house which contained men only. (3) The Lady Superior of the Salpêtrière, a house for women only, had been deprived of many of her helpers and felt compelled to resign. The rules for appointing a new superior were carefully drawn up and the appointment was decided by the votes of a large

(1) N.E. 1751, pp.53-60

(2) The figures are those in the Cat.Hist. vol.4, pp.564 sq.

(3) N.E. 1749, pp.122-132

number of representative people - the Archbishop, the Presidents of Parlement, Police etc. In the 1749 assembly, the archbishop, ignoring the rules, nominated as Superior a woman until then unknown, who was in favour of the bull. The administrators, seeing that the archbishop was taking matters into his own hands, abandoned their interest in the work and the archbishop, by an Arrêt du Conseil, appointed people devoted to his own interests.(I). Such action produced great changes in the hospital. The Constitution Unigenitus was stressed and those who would not accept it were ill-treated and the sacraments were refused to the dying. The financial situation deteriorated sharply because, having lost the confidence of the public, financial contributions ceased. Parlement tried to remedy matters and a declaration was drawn up giving new instructions about the administration of the hospital. Two Conseillers were appointed to concern themselves with the hospital and the declaration was registered in parlement with certain modifications. In addition to remedying certain abuses, the declaration attacked the absolute power of the archbishop and his directors. The king, however, summoned the Premier Président and the Procureur-Général to Compiègne and expressed his displeasure at the conduct of parlement and asked that the declaration should be registered 'purement et simplement'. The new administrators were not to be moved. When these magistrates reported their interview with the king to parlement, the members decided to send a deputation to the king. In his speech to the king, the Premier Président complained of the injustice. "Dans ces circonstances, pour vous donner des marques de notre obéissance à vos volontés, nous enregistrons; mais nous opposons en même-temps à notre enregistrement les modifications que nous jugeons nécessaires pour prévenir les inconvénients & les desordres dans l'Administration qui pourroient résulter de l'exécution pure et simple de la Déclaration ..." The king replied to the speech by insisting

(I) N.E. 1749, pp.141 sq.: 1750, pp.45 sq.

that the Declaration be registered 'purement et simplement' and issued Lettres de Jussion to command it. Parlement replied to this, as happened in so many other cases, by 'Remontrances,' justifying their conduct and concluding with these words: "Voilà, Sire, les motifs légitimes qui ont déterminé l'Arrêt d'enregistrement que votre Parlement a rendu. Mais aujourd'hui que Votre Majesté paroît exiger de son Parlement l'enregistrement pur et simple de sa Déclaration; votre Parlement convaincu que sa vraie fidélité, sa vraie obéissance consistent à ne consentir à rien qui puisse porter atteinte à l'ordre public, aux lois & maximes du Royaume, & aux droits de la souveraineté; forcé par ce devoir, il ose supplier Votre Majesté de ne point imputer à désobéissance l'impossibilité où il se trouve de procéder à l'enregistrement pur et simple d'une Déclaration qui, bien loin de sauver l'Hôpital des dangers où il ne s'est trouvé exposé que depuis le trouble survenu au mois de Juillet 1749, en entraîneroit la ruine, & chargerait les finances de Votre Majesté du soutien entier de cet établissement qui jusqu'à présent a trouvé tant de ressources dans la confiance publique établie sur la foi de son Administration." (I)

The king's advisers in ecclesiastical matters were determined to lessen the effect of parlement's action. Orders were given whereby the Registers of Parlement were carried to the king and the minutes dealing with the Hospital were suppressed, and an 'Arrêt du Conseil,' inserted in the Registers, reserved to the king all matters dealing with the Hospital, and parlement was forbidden to deliberate the matter, whereupon the senior of the Conseillers de Grand'Chambre, M. Pinon, said to the Premier-Président: "Monsieur, la Compagnie vous déclare qu'elle pense que la défense de délibérer étant une interdiction de toutes fonctions, elle ne peut ni endend continuer aucun service." Everyone then rose and walked out. The king's mousquetaires carried a 'lettre de cachet' to each conseiller ordering him to be in parlement the following day at 8 a.m., when Letters Patent ordered them to carry on with

(I) Cat. Hist. vol. 4, p.572.

their duties. This the parlement did, but there was much discussion about safeguarding their Minutes, and representations about these matters were made to the king. (1)

It would seem that parlement was able to do little; the Hospital remained in a deplorable state until in 1758 an 'Arrêt du Conseil' re-established it in its original state. Parlement was at least justified in the end. In the meantime, parlement continued its protection for those who suffered because of the 'billets de confession'. A notable case was the Abbé le Mere who had been a great friend of the Duc d'Orléans. (2) The Abbé le Mere had lived in retirement for a long time. (3). By March 1752 he was dying and the parish priest - Bouettin - demanded not only a 'billet de confession' but also an acceptance of the bull before the sacraments could be administered. Obtaining neither, Bouettin refused the sacraments. Parlement then ordered Bouettin to appear before parlement and the archbishop was invited to attend.(4) The archbishop replied that he had no time to attend and that Bouettin was acting under his orders. Bouettin appeared, however, and was forbidden to repeat the offence; the archbishop was asked to administer to the abbé within 24 hours. But parlement was again in difficulties with the king who summoned representatives to Versailles and reserved the matter to himself alone. The abbé died without sacraments whereupon parlement ordered the arrest of Bouettin, who then disappeared.

(1) N.E. 1751, pp.93 sq.: 117 sq.: 1752, pp. 9 sq.

(2) The N.E. of 1752, pp.155,156 deal with the refusal of sacraments to the Duc d'Orléans. Sometimes the refusal had no bearing on spiritual matters; e.g. a parish priest of the diocese of Beauvais deprived his parishioners of the sacraments in order to force them to pay tithe on their apples although it had been decided that this was not due to him. 'Parlement le décréta de prise-de-corps'.
N.E., 1752, pp.170-172.

(3) N.E. 1753, pp. 61 sq.

(4) Ibid. 1752, pp.73-88.

The king again interfered, saying that parlement had disobeyed his last orders. The Premier Président replied to the king: "Non Sire, je deviendrois peu digne du choix honorable que vous avez fait de ma personne, en me mettant à la tête du premier Tribunal de votre Justice souveraine, de cette vraie Cour de France, que les Rois honoroient autrefois si souvent de leur présence, pour y venir entendre prononcer les oracles de leur Justice, si je ne vous exposois pas avec le plus profond respect, et en même-temps avec la plus grande sincérité les sentiments des Magistrats qui la composent. Dans les affaires où il s'agit de la Religion, de l'Eglise & de vos Droits, ils regardent comme un devoir indispensable d'agir. En user autrement, ce seroit manquer à la fidélité qu'ils vous ont jurée, Sire, & qui leur est aussi essentielle que leur existence. Ce sont ces sentiments, si nous osons le dire, qui ont été jusqu'à présent, & qui seront toujours le plus sûr rempart de votre indépendance absolue, & de votre souveraine autorité. Pardonnez, Sire, cette effusion de coeur à des Sujets pénétrés de respect & d'amour pour votre personne." (I)

In consequence of this, Parlement proceeded to make 'Remonstrances' to repress measures taken by the clergy in Orléans and in the diocese of Langres. These 'remonstrances' were expressed in quite vigorous language, as may be judged from these opening remarks: "Sire, jamais affaire si importante n'a conduit votre Parlement au pied de votre Trône. La Religion, l'Etat les Droits de votre Couronne sont également menacés. Un schisme fatal se déclare, moins redoutable encore par le feu de la division qu'il allume parmi vos Sujets, par le coup qu'il porte aux lois fondamentales de la Monarchie, que par le tort qu'il fait à la Religion." The 'remonstrances' go on to show how religion had suffered because of the actions of the supporters of the bull;

(I) Cat. Hist. vol. 4, p.579

clergy, lawyers, pious male and female lay people had suffered without knowing what accepted truth of the Church they had refused to believe. Philosophy had spread its errors even into the theological schools. "Etrange calamité pour un Royaume chrétien". These things, the 'Remontances' said, were allowed while the chief pastors are only concerned with forcing the acceptance of the Constitution. This clearly had reference to the incident of the Abbé de Prades, a divinity student of the Sorbonne whose highly speculative thesis was condemned. He was known to be a friend of the leaders of the new philosophical ideas and his condemnation united, for the moment, parlement and Archbishop Beaumont in their condemnation. (I) Parlement's condemnation of the abbé gave them the opportunity to remind the Faculty of Theology of its duty; it served also as an occasion for another attack on the bull. "Lorsque la Bulle vint en France, votre Parlement fit connoître à Louis xiv tous les dangers de la condamnation qui y étoit prononcée contre la proposition qui regarde la matiere de l'excommunication. Il s'ensuivroit, lui disions-nous, que les excommunications injustes, que les menaces même d'une injuste censure pourroient suspendre l'accomplissement des devoirs les plus essentiels & les plus indispensables; & de là quelles consequenses! Les Libertés de l'Eglise Gallicane, les maximes du Royaume sur l'autorité des Rois, sur l'indépendance de leur Couronne, sur la fidélité qui leur est due par leurs Sujets, pourroient être anéanties, ou du moins suspendues dans l'esprit des peuples, par la seule impression que la menace d'une excommunication, quoiqu'injuste, pourroit faire sur eux. Louis xiv sentit l'importance de ses réflexions. La Bulle ne fut reçue qu'avec les modifications les plus précises; & telles que ce sont moins des modifications, que l'assertion absolue de la proposition eondamnée. Ces sages précautions, rempart de nos libertés, jugées nécessaires par le feu Roi, confirmées par votre Majesté dans toutes les occasions ...

(I) For Barbier's comment on Beaumont's Mandement see:
Barbier, op. cit. vol. 3, p.338.

Comment les concilier avec le caractère éminent qu'on veut aujourd'hui donner à cette Bulle en l'érigeant en règle de foi? ..." (I)

With regard to the refusal of sacraments the parlement said: "La tyrannie du refus des Sacrements étant une fois introduite, on la verroit bientôt par un autre abus, plus grand encore s'il est possible, s'étendre jusques sur des matieres entièrement étrangères au dogme, & purement temporelles ... Les Ecclésiastiques se rendroient les arbitres de l'Etat & de la fortune des Citoyens, & mettroient l'admission aux Sacrements à telle condition qu'il leur plairoit". The parlement insisted that it was only by recourse to the magistrates that such occurrences could be avoided and that there should be no delay in the case of dying persons. "Saisis de crainte", concludes the Remontrances, "à la vue de si grands malheurs, nous ne cesserons de vous représenter les affreuses conséquences. Pour nous empêcher d'agir, pour étouffer notre voix, il faudroit nous anéantir; et si, par un événement que nous croirions presque coupables de prévoir, il arrivoit que notre constance à soutenir les droits de votre Couronne, ceux de l'Etat & de la Religion, nous attiroit la disgrâce de Votre Majesté, nous gémirions sans changer de conduite. Dans l'impuissance de ^htrahir notre devoir, nous n'aurions à vous offrir pour hommage que nos pleurs, en attendant que l'avenir vous justifiât combien il vous est avantageux que votre Parlement ne s'écarte en aucun temps de la fidélité inviolable qu'il doit à la Religion, à la Patrie, à son Roi, & qu'on puisse trouver dans ses Archives cette tradition non interrompue de conduite & de maximes qui assurent la tranquillité de votre Royaume, & l'indépendance de votre souveraineté."

(I) Remontrance of 15 avril, 1752. in Remontrances, vol. 1, p.491

The king's reply conceded some of the parlement's points. He said he had punished certain ecclesiastics, which meant that parlement's actions had not been entirely without effect. He wanted to avoid schism and disquiet. He never wished to deprive parlement of the full knowledge of what was going on, but he himself would decide the proper measures to take, and parlement must cease taking procedures on this matter, and resume its duties of rendering justice. Parlement saw the difficulties implied in the king's reply. Punishment could only be given after full inquiry, with witnesses, and parlement must be concerned with such things if they were to carry out the king's command to administer justice; and so, parlement issued an 'arrêt' forbidding ecclesiastics to do things tending to schism, to refuse sacraments for lack of a 'billet de confession', or demanding acceptance of the bull. They were also forbidden in their sermons to make use of such terms as heretics, schismatics, Jansenists. This was on the 18th April, 1752 and the parlements of Toulouse, Aix, Rouen and Rennes proceeded in a similar way. The Court evidently agreed with the 'arrêt' since it appeared in the Gazette de France the following Saturday, but the supporters of the bull were powerful enough to cause an Arrêt du Conseil to be issued on the 29th April. This did not altogether destroy the 'arrêt' of parlement, but it put parlement into a very difficult situation by recalling the enforced Declaration of 1730, whereby the bull was declared a law of State and Church. (I). Parlement continued to act according to its own 'arrêt'; the Court, on the other hand, maintained that the Arrêt du Conseil was the only valid law; such a situation could only lead to a rupture which was to end, temporarily, in the exile of the members of parlement.

(I) N.E. 1752, pp. 86-88

Meanwhile, the refusal of sacraments occurred in other dioceses such as Tours, Amiens, Langres and especially in Sens where the Easter communion was refused to people who presented themselves at the altar.(1) The parlements interfered and again the Court prevented parlement from doing what it considered to be its duty; and yet at the same time the Court opposed the excesses of the supporters of the bull. Other parlements had the same problem. That of Toulouse followed the example of the Paris parlement on the occasion of the refusal at Montpellier. It is the same pattern. The Toulouse parlement's action was met by an Arrêt du Conseil and Lettres Patentes. Thereupon the parlement sent 'Remonstrances' to the king. (2).

The parlements thus had ample opportunities to take measures to ensure the Gallican liberties, measures in which they constantly found themselves in conflict with the Court.(3). One of the most dangerous of these situations arose out of the refusal of the sacraments to Soeur Perpétue of the Communauté de Sainte Agathe in the faubourg S.Marceau in December, 1752. This community, where children were educated, had been protected by Cardinal de Noailles, destroyed in 1715 and restored under the Regency. It was hated by the Jesuits. The parish priest had already allowed five of the inmates to die without the sacraments; Soeur Perpétue, aged 79 and paralysed, asked for the sacraments. The incumbent, with two of his curates, visited her and demanded a 'billet de confession', and not obtaining it, refused her. A lawyer denounced this action and the incumbent and his two curates were ordered to appear before parlement. The incumbent could not be found but the two curates appeared and said that the incumbent had acted according to the orders of the archbishop. Parlement invited the archbishop to provide for the sick person but his reply was that

(1) N.E. 1752, pp.125-152. (2) Ibid. 1752, pp.153-155.

(3) Ibid. 1753, pp.73.74.93 sq.

the administration of the sacraments was a spiritual matter and he was answerable only to God and the king. Parlement then ordered a 'prise de corps' of the priest and a second invitation was sent to the archbishop who replied again in the same manner. In the eyes of parlement it was the archbishop who was the chief culprit and on the 13th December, 1752, the parlement issued an 'arrêt' "que l'Archevêque de Paris sera tenu, sous peine de saisie de temporel, de faire cesser dans le jour, par ses ordres, le scandale causé par des refus publics réitérés & persévérants d'administrer les sacrements de l'Eglise à la nommée Perpétue ... ordonne pareillement que les deux Vicaires de S.Médard seront tenus, sous telles peines qu'il appartiendra, de faire cesser dans le jour le scandale, en remplissant, à l'égard de la malade, les fonctions de leur ministere." Thus the archbishop was personally involved. But he was a peer of France and could only be judged by parlement if peers were present and so an additional 'arrêt' was issued "que tant sur les faits résultants de l'information ordonnée par l'Arrêt du jour d'hier, que sur les réponses de l'Archevêque de Paris, les Pairs seront invités, en la manière accoutumée, à venir prendre leurs places en la Cour, toutes les Chambres assemblées, le Lundi, 18 Décembre, à dix heures du matin." A new 'arrêt' ordered that the temporalities of the archbishop should be seized if the sick person were not given the sacraments. The two curates disappeared. (I)

However, the influence at Court of the upholders of the bull seemed to be stronger than ever. When the Premier Président went to the king on the 16th December to ask for his presence at the meeting on the 18th, the king forbade the calling of the peers and delivered a sealed packet to the President containing a document which he was to read to parlement. It was an Arrêt du Conseil, reserving the matter to the king himself and containing also two 'Lettres de Cachet', one addressed to the Premier Président, the other to the Procureur-Général. Parlement resolved that

(I) The details are given in N.E. 1753, pp.35-40

they would not listen to the reading of these documents and a strong representation was made to the king. The king's reply was not helpful and parlement, seeing that its privileges were attacked, called for a new assembly of parlement on the 29th to which the peers were invited, to determine what action should be taken. In the meanwhile, commissioners were appointed to report to the king: (i) "que l'évocation dont la Cour a été instruite par M. le Premier Président, irrégulière dans la forme & au fond, a rendu la nouvelle invitation indispensable; (ii) que les formes que le Parlement réclame sont les Lois de l'Etat, et que de leur observation dépend le maintien de l'autorité Royale, de l'ordre & de la tranquillité publique; (iii) que le Parlement ne connoît personne entre le Roi et lui, & qu'il ne peut & ne doit s'adresser qu'à son Souverain seul." This last point refers to the king's answer in which he had said to the Premier-Président: "Quant à vos formes, je ne refuserai jamais de vous entendre. Expliquez-vous-en avec mon Chancelier qui m'en rendra compte." Parlement had intended to meet on the 29th but on that day the king announced through his messengers that the assembly was forbidden "sous peine de désobéissance", but that he was willing to receive a deputation on the 3rd January, 1753. However, parlement heard of an event which was completely unexpected. Soeur Perpétue had been taken away on the orders of the Secretary of State (d'Argenson) and no one knew where she was. Later it was discovered that she was at the Convent of Port Royal in Paris, given over entirely to the Jesuits and where she was in captivity. The incident provided a fourth article to the representation which was to be made to the king. These four points were developed in a vigorous speech which the Premier-Président made to the king, but they met with a hostile reply and a few days later the whole Community of Sainte Agathe was destroyed. Events were moving to a climax for parlement was not to be intimidated. New 'Remonstrances' were drawn up in

22 articles and approved by parlement on the 25th January, 1753, which showed their independence of royal authority. While parlement was considering these 'remontrances', Lettres Patentes were sent to parlement forbidding them to pursue the matter of the refusal of sacraments. Parlement, however, had set out their reasons in the remontrances why they should not accept such an order and this was reaffirmed in the remontrances which were read and adopted on the 9th April, 1753. (I). The beginning of the lengthy document reads: "Sire, l'intérêt le plus précieux du Souverain est de connoître la vérité. Votre Parlement est chargé par état de la porter aux pieds du Trône. Mais ce devoir ne fut jamais plus lié avec celui de la fidélité inviolable qu'il vous a jurée. Il s'agit aujourd'hui des droits les plus précieux de la Religion & de la conservation de l'Etat: l'un et l'autre sont également menacés par le Schisme éclatant qui a excité notre zele, & ce Schisme, trop long-temps negligé, a jetté de si profondes racines, & fait chaque jour des progrès rapides, que bientôt il ne trouvera plus de barrières capables de l'arrêter. Sire, le cours de la Justice est interrompu ... Déjà les secousses violentes que le Schisme cause parmi nous, font découvrir une domination arbitraire qui ne connoît ni Loi, ni Souverain, ni Magistrats pour qui la Religion n'est qu'un prétexte, l'autorité du Prince qu'un instrument qu'elle ose employer ou rejeter suivant ses intérêts..." The document ends with an appeal to the king for assurance that parlement can carry out its indispensable functions and that the people might be

(I) The 1st edition published, with 22 articles, contained 164 pages in-12; a later edition of 380 pages was entitled: Tradition des faits, & qui vient à l'appui de ce qu'exposent les Remontrances touchant le système d'indépendance de plusieurs Ministres de l'Eglise. Cat. Hist. vol. 5, p.37.

freed from the vexations of ecclesiastics. Parlement cannot stand by and be useless spectators of the evils of the country. "Notre principale gloire, Sire, est de vous être utile; nous ne pouvons l'être qu'en ne cessant pas un instant d'agir. Nous arrêter, c'est nous anéantir."(1)

The king asked for the 22 articles only, without explanations and elaborations, to be sent to him; after much delay, he sent a reply to parlement on the 4th May, refusing their remonstrances and ordering the registering of the Lettres Patentes of the 22nd February. An annoyed parlement issued an 'arrêt' the following day in which they said that it was impossible to make the truth known to the king. Parlement "n'a plus d'autres ressources que dans sa vigilance & son activité continuelle, a arrêté que, pour vâquer à cette fonction importante & indispensable, les Chambres demeureront assemblées, tout autre service cessant, jusqu'à ce qu'il ait plû audit Seigneur Roi d'écouter favorablement ... des Remonstrances..."

Parlement had not long to wait. On the 7th May, Lettres Patentes, which had been sent on the 5th, arrived, ordering the registering of the Lettres Patentes of the 22nd February, under penalty of disobedience. Parlement replied with a unanimous 'arrêt': "La Cour, ~~est~~ en délibérant sur les Lettres Patentes en forme de Jussion du 5 du présent mois, et persistant dans l'arrêt du même jour, a arrêté qu'elle ne peut, sans manquer à son devoir & à son serment, obtempérer aux dites Lettres en forme de Jussion." (2). This remarkable 'arrêt' of parlement showed that they were unwilling to be useless spectators and accomplices in the evils which faced the country. The consequences were no less remarkable. On former occasions, which on the surface seemed parallel, parlement remained assembled. In 1752 the king refused to receive representatives from parlement until they had reassembled, and in order for such representations to be made, parlement resumed their functions. But in 1753 the king had absolutely refused to receive their remonstrances and gave no hope that he would do so in future. In these

(1) Cat. Hist. vol. 5, p.37.

(2) N.E. 1753, pp.66-68;81,82,97-99

circumstances, parlement considered that to resume their duties would mean that they would renounce what they considered to be their proper duties, although they realized that their action would provoke a storm, which broke out on the 9th May when the MM. des Enquêtes & Requêtes were all exiled to different places - Orléans, Bourges, Clermont, etc. Four of them were treated harshly as state prisoners, one, the Abbé Chauvelin being a very sick man. The only members able to assemble in parlement were those of the Grand'Chambre who were thus at a loss as to what to do; they decided, almost unanimously, "que la Cour persistant dans son Arrêté du 5 Mai, continueroit, tout autre service cessant, à vâquer à la visite & jugement des proces commencés." On the 11th May, each member of the Grand'Chambre received a 'lettre de cachet' ordering them to report at Pontoise within 48 hours, which they did, but they maintained that being but a sixth/^{part} of the whole body of parlement, they could change nothing that the whole parlement had decided. They limited their functions, while the sittings lasted, to dealing with the affairs of the 'schisme'.(I). When the holiday period arrived, each member of the Grand'Chambre received orders, individually, to go to Soissons, where there were no sittings or assemblies and they found themselves reduced to the state of mere individuals. Through the dispersion of its members parlement seemed to cease. To overcome the vacuum created by this situation a Commission of 10 Conseillers d'Etat and 20 Maîtres de Requêtes was set up by Lettres Patentes. Their duties were to end at the Feast of St.Martin when a Tribunal (La Chambre Royale) was established to take the place of parlement.

(I) N.E. 1753, pp.129-131

Their meetings took place in the Château du Louvre, and it is easily understood that their proceedings could in no way equate the ordinary workings of parlement. (I) Other legal tribunals suffered too. Meanwhile the remonstrances which parlement had drawn up and which had been refused by the king were printed and appeared in all parts of France and even abroad. It was not only the Paris parlement which was involved in the problem raised by the refusal of sacraments. Many instances are to be found in other parts of France. The parlement of Toulouse, for example, exercised its right in the affair of the priest La Croze who, in February 1754, asked for the sacraments when he was dying. La Croze had been attached to the Cathedral and lived in its precincts. One of the cathedral clergy refused to communicate him because the dying priest would not admit that the Constitution was an article of faith. The priest was summoned before parlement which fined him 1500 livres, a fine which the priest had foreseen and had caused all his furniture to be taken away. The Cathedral Chapter was asked to administer to the dying man and this was done. (2). The bishops of the Province, however, became very excited. At the same time they were assembled with the new archbishop of Toulouse who was a great upholder of the bull. They wrote to the king, complaining of the action of the parlement and the Chapter of Toulouse and it was the archbishop of Paris who presented the letter. As a result, two Arrêts du Conseil were issued cancelling the 'arrêts' of the Toulouse parlement and two 'Lettres de Cachet' were sent, one depriving four of the Canons of any actual voice in the Cathedral and the second 'lettre de cachet'

(I) The N.E. of 1754, p.76, indicates that from the 13th November to the 24th February, the whole work of the Chambre Royale during 2½ months hardly equalled that of parlement in one morning.

(2) N.E., 1754, pp.93-98.

sent into exile the invalid priest who had administered the sacraments. This latter order was revoked because the priest was too ill to travel.

(1). In 1753 the Parlement of Provence had acted in a similar way, although, different from the other parlements, their letter to the king explaining their actions, recognised a kind of authority in the bull, but they maintained that this recognition did not authorise the acceptance of the bull before the sacraments could be administered. (2)

This letter was written before the dispersal of the Paris parlement and that event only made the provincial parlements bolder, and the parlement of Provence wrote again to the king in January 1754 complaining of the Arrêts de Conseil which the bishops of Marseille & Cisteron had obtained to counteract the 'arrêts' of the parlement. Interesting, if not new, points are raised in these remonstrances - the nature of government, the relations between king, parlement and people, the efforts of bishops to extend their power at the expense of the temporal power, the four Gallican Articles of 1682, what is the rule of faith, the nature of ecclesiastical censures, etc. (3)

The pattern of each diocese was not the same. There were dioceses where the bishops were ardent supporters of the bull; in some dioceses the bishops were nominally 'acceptants' but interested themselves little in the matter; in other dioceses bishops were opposed to the bull and in yet other dioceses opposing bishops had died and supporters of the bull had been appointed in their place. Naturally there were what the opposing clergy considered irregularities and in 1753 the Paris parlement took notice of these in their remonstrance of the 9th April. "Dans combien de Dioceses, Sire, des Evêques, plus zélés pour leur domination que pour votre autorité, n'ont-ils pas abusé de votre confiance pour mettre le trouble dans leurs Eglises, & pour faire subir des Loix imaginaires à leurs inférieurs dans les fonctions

(1) N.E. 1754, pp.177,178. (2) Ibid. 1773, pp.201-3. (3) Ibid. 1754, pp.157-162.

du Saint-Ministère? Défences ont été faites, de votre part, à des Archidiacres de faire leurs visites, à des Théologiens de prêcher, à des Penitenciers de confesser, à un grand nombre de Dignitaires & Chanoines de s'approcher de la Sainte Table, lorsque l'Evêque donneroit la Communion, même de se présenter au Choeur lorsqu'il y assisteroit. Les Sacraments de l'Eglise sont-ils donc autres dans la main d'un Evêque, que dans celle d'un simple prêtre? Un Ecclésiastique, digne de célébrer les Saints mystères, est-il indigne de paroître à la face des Autels, en présence de son Evêque? Combien de Curés, fideles à leurs devoirs, ont-ils été enlevés à leurs Paroisses par des ordres que le faux zele de quelques Evêques est parvenu à surprendre à votre Majesté, & souvent remplacés par des Ministres que le Parlement est obligé de poursuivre comme prévaricateurs & perturbateurs du repos publique?" (I)

In the same month the Paris parliament took up the case of Bishop Colbert of Montpellier who had complained that the Jesuits did their utmost in his diocese to turn people against him, saying that the bishop wished to introduce a new religion, to destroy the sacraments and allow priests to marry. The remonstrance says: "Un Evêque de votre Royaume vous représenteroit, Sire, en 1724, que dans son Diocese, sous le nom de Votre Majesté, on avait interdit à des Pretres, sous peine d'exil, d'administrer l'Extrême Onction & le Saint Viatique, enjoint à d'autres, sous les mêmes peines, de se demettre des pouvoirs de prêcher & de confesser. Il vous disait, Sire, qu'il avoit reçu personnellement des prêtres revêtus de votre auguste Nom, qui lui prescrivoient d'interdire des Prêtres, d'ôter les pouvoirs d'administrer les Sacraments à des Ecclésiastiques qu'il en jugeoit dignes, de révoquer un Vicaire Général à qui il avoit donné sa confiance." This particular bishop had had a difficult time. His temporalities had been seized by an Arrêt du Conseil and until his death in 1738 he was obliged to buy vegetables from his own garden. The Jesuits enjoyed his revenues.

(I) Remonstrance of 9 avril, 1753 in Remonstrances. Vol.1, p.596

(2) Ibid.

In some dioceses, especially in Sens, there was much disquiet due to the introduction of new catechisms favouring the bull. Languet, the archbishop, claimed that it was the duty of the bishops to teach doctrine and this only served to call out a defence of the second order of the clergy. The clergy of Sens drew up a mémoire justificatif which was an attack on the idea that the pope and the bishops were alone responsible for teaching and that the clergy's duty was one of humble submission. "Puis donc que c'est une vérité certaine que les Pasteurs du second ordre ont une autorité spirituelle, & que cette autorité vient de Dieu aussi immédiatement que celle des Evêques à qui elle est subordonnée, c'est une erreur manifeste dans le nouveau Catéchisme de restreindre aux Evêques seuls le pouvoir d'enseigner & de gouverner les fideles; un défaut aussi marqué ne peut être couvert par les vérités que le Catéchisme reconnoit en quelques endroits; mais ses vérités constantes & avouées par M. l'Archevêque, demontrent la fausseté de son système sur le gouvernement Ecclésiastique."

The parlement of Rouen experienced its difficulties when they proceeded against the clergy of Verneuil and even against the Bishop of Evreux who supported them; there had been troublesome events - the imprisonment of the bearer of their remonstrances; the visit of soldiers to the parlement to delete from the registers the 'arrêts' which had displeased the Court. "Tel fut", said the parlement in its 'remontrance', "le spectacle indécent qu'on présenta aux peuples d'un combat entre l'autorité du Roi surprise & son autorité dirigée par les Loix, & exercée selon les regles dans les Tribunaux ordinaires.(1). The Rouen parlement was still in trouble with the Court in 1754, (2) as was also the parlement of Bretagne which had proceeded against the clergy who had refused the sacraments. (3).

(1) N.E. 1753, pp.169-170: 1754, pp.13-15 & 136. (2) Ibid. 1754, p.169,170.

(3) Ibid. 1754, pp. 81 sq.: 201 sq.: & 1755, p.13.

One of the effects of these remonstrances and the consequent quarrels between the king and parlements was to bring the matter of the bull more to the attention of the ordinary people. Little attention may have been paid to it while it was still a matter of discussion between theologians; but it was a different thing when magistrates of local parlements were involved in these disputes. While the quarrels with the provincial parlements continued, the Paris parlement was recalled from its exile. The king ordered the Premier Président to Versailles where a secret conference took place. There were no witnesses and no report was given; what was discussed must be imagined but evidently the king was anxious to make some advance towards parlement. A second secret conference took place at Compiègne, the result of which was that in August 1754 the Gazette de France announced the reassembly of the Paris parlement. The members were recalled without any conditions and the Chambre Royale was suppressed; two years later the parlement referred to the recall in its remonstrance of the 4th August, 1756. "Nous ne craignons point, Sire, de rappeler à Votre Majesté nos disgrâces personnelles; cet événement, unique dans l'Histoire de la Monarchie, mais dont le dénouement, qui fut votre ouvrage, ne servit qu'à faire briller d'un nouvel éclat votre sagesse consommée, votre justice & votre bonté. Proscrit, dispersé, captif, votre Parlement avoit annoncé à toute la France qu'il aimoit mieux périr, que vous être infidèle. Son rappel, Sire, dont il n'est redevable qu'à vous seul, le retour de votre bienveillance, la joie publique & l'applaudissement de tous vos fideles Sujets, firent oublier ses malheurs, & furent la preuve qu'il les aurait mérités, s'il avoit eu la foiblesse de condescendre à ce qu'on exigeoit de lui."

But to return to the recalling of parlement in 1754. The Avocat Général opened the proceedings with a speech, part of which is worth quoting from the Registers. (I). "Messieurs, Près de dix mois

(I) Extraits des Registres du Parlement relatifs aux refus de sacrements, 1749-1760. MS. xviii^e siècle. 191 et 258 ff.
For further details see Appendix A, p. 252:

se sont déjà écoulés depuis le jour ou dans ce lieu même, le chef de la justice est venu vous faire part des Ordres du Roi et annoncé au public les titres respectables de votre autorité. Vous les reçûtes alors avec toute la soumission due au Maître dont ils parloient et aux circonstances mêmes qui les avoient exigés. Mais au milieu des services que nous nous sommes efforcés de rendre, chargés de remplir le vuide immense d'un des Corps les plus considérables de l'Etat, les soins mêmes que nous prenions, loin de contenter notre ame, nous rappeloient sans cesse le Malheur que nous avions à réparer ... La moyen en effet de goûter une véritable joie, lorsqu'une Compagnie à la quelle on est attaché, a eu le malheur de déplaire à son Roi, lorsqu'on voit une partie de ses Concitoyens tomber dans la disgrâce, lorsqu'enfin les services qu'on rend à la patrie, ne sont fondés que sur les Maux qu'elle a soufferts. Mais cessons de porter nos regards sur des objets qui ne nous ont déjà que trop long temps affligés. Tous ces jours de tristesse vont disparoître, le Parlement a recouvré les bontés du Roi: la Justice va rentrer dans son Temple ordinaire. Sa Majesté vous rappelle auprès d'Elle pour y remplir vos fonctions accoutumées. Hâtons nous donc de remettre entre ses mains une autorité que nous avons reçue, non comme un présent dont on veut profiter, mais comme un dépôt sacré qu'on a impatience de rendre. Employons seulement les momens qui nous restent à faire éclater nos sentimens, et ne craignons pas de mêler notre joie à celle de tous les citoyens dans un jour où il s'agit du bien public."

On the same day the king's Declaration was read. It was an important document and gave rise to some discussion and marks an important stage in the Jansenist struggle. "Louis etc. La regulation que les officiers de notre Parlement ont pris le 4 Mai de l'année dernière de cesser de rendre à nos sujets la justice qu'ils

leur doivent à notre décharge, les refus qu'ils ont fait de reprendre leurs fonctions qui forment un devoir indispensable de leur état et auxquelles ils se sont consacrés par la religion du serment nous ont forcé de leur marquer le mécontentement que nous avons de leur conduite; le prétexte même qu'ils ont donné à la cassation de leur service ordinaire étoit de leur part une nouvelle faute d'autant moins excusable, que ne peuvent douter de l'intention où nous étions et où nous sommes constamment d'écouter ce que notre Parlement pourroit avoir à nous représenter pour le bien de notre service et pour celui de nos sujets et n'ignorant pas que nous étions instruits par ses Arrêtés de l'object de ses démonstrances, ils ne pouvoient se dissimuler qu'ils s'étoient eux mêmes attiré le refus que nous avons fait pendant un temps ressentir les effets de notre mécontentement. Nous avons écouté volontiers ce que nous a dicté notre clemence, et nous avons rappelé dans notre bonne ville de Paris les officiers de notre Parlement. Cependant toujours occupés du (I) d'appaiser les divisions qui se sont élevées depuis quelque temps, et dont les suites nous ont paru mériter toute notre attention, nous avons pris les mesures que nous avons jugé les plus capables de procurer la tranquillité à l'avenir. Et dans l'espérance que notre Parlement s'empressant par une prompte acceptance et par un travail redoublé de réparer le préjudice qu'ont pu souffrir nos sujets, nous donnera en toutes occasions des marques de sa soumission et de sa fidélité, en se conformant à la sagesse des vues qui nous animent. Nous avons résolu de le rassembler à Paris pour lui faire connoître nos intentions.

A ces causes etc. Nous ordonnons à tous et chacun des officiers de notre Parlement de reprendre leurs fonctions accoutumées,

(I) A word illegible in the microfilm of the MS. copy of the Registers; possibly 'devoir'.

nonobstant toutes choses contraires, et de rendre la justice à Nos sujets sans retardement et sans interruption, suivant les soins et le devoir de leurs charges. Ayant reconnu que le silence imposé depuis tant d'années sur des matières qui ne peuvent être agitées sans nuire également au bien de la Religion et à celui de l'Etat est le moyen le plus convenable pour assurer la paix et la tranquillité publique Nous enjoignons à Notre Parlement de tenir la main à ce que d'aucune part il ne soit rien fait, tenté, entrepris ou innové qui puisse être contraire à ce Silence et à la Paix que nous voulons faire regner dans Nos Etats; lui ordonnant de procéder contre les contrevenans, conformément aux Loix et Ordonnances. Et néanmoins pour contribuer de plus en plus à tranquilliser les esprits, à entretenir l'union, à maintenir le Silence ..."

This new imposition of silence was important. There is a difference between the silence of 1754 and that ordered in 1720. The latter was the result of a new degree of authority which was thought to be given to the bull by means of an accommodation. It was thought that peace and unanimity were obtained and the king had but to order silence to prevent further discussion. The bull was, as it were, left in possession. But this led to the appeal of the four bishops, supported by many lawyers and ecclesiastics. The silence of 1754 was an attempt to remedy the trouble caused by the supporters of the bull; the bull is not mentioned in the Declaration. Parliament, in registering the Royal Declaration, reasserted its rights (aucune innovation dans l'administration extérieure & publique des Sacrements). In its reply to the king, parlement stated that the dispersal of parlement was a dangerous example which attacked the fundamental laws of the kingdom. It was important, it said, that the king should not refuse to receive the 'remontrances' of parlement. The Royal Declaration met with a mixed reception but the following things can be drawn from it.

(i) It clearly opposed those who had refused the sacraments. Parlement had felt it to be its duty to protect those affected and in spite of the treatment it had received from the Court, it found, nevertheless, an appreciation of its conduct in the Declaration. In the future it would be the oppressors themselves who would be punished. Parlement had maintained its attitude to the bull. Parlement continued to maintain the ancient practice in France, as elsewhere, whereby the Prince regarded himself as a kind of 'exterior' bishop, regulating, not the Faith itself, but its observance. The Royal Declaration was not an ecclesiastical law.

(ii) It seems clear that the Royal Supremacy, exercised by the French kings, and now reasserted by Louis xiv, did not deal with doctrine itself. Silence was imposed on the 'matières agitées', i.e. what authority had the bull? Was it to be accepted or refused? Dogma was not attacked nor defended. For a long time the bull had been the 'matière agitée' and apart from some incidents the bull largely ceased to be effective.

(iii) In 1714 the king had tried to give the bull the highest authority but it caused more and more hostility in spite of the royal support. In 1717 and 1719, because of the trouble caused by the bull, silence was imposed on both parties. In 1720 a kind of authority was given to the bull which, in the long run, caused it to lose its force. The 1730 Declaration only increased the hostility of the parlements; the 1754 Declaration reduced the bull to obscurity. The new pope, Benoît xiv approved the peaceful aims of the Declaration. But the Declaration did not bring any immediate peace. Archbishop Beaumont and other bishops continued to demand 'billets de confession'. With more moderation, parlement continued to defend those deprived of sacraments and the bishops who openly defied the Law of Silence were sent into exile by Louis xv; Beaumont first of all to Conflans, then to Lagny and then back ^{again} to Conflans;

the bishop of Orleans to Melun, the bishop of Troyes to Mery and the archbishop of Aix to Lansbec.

Division among the bishops is seen in the Assemblée Générale of the clergy which was held in Paris from May to November, 1755. It was concerned chiefly with the difficulties of parlement and Jansenism. Bourlon (1), always hostile to the Jansenists, in recording the assembly says that "le peuple parisien était gagné en grande partie au Jansénisme". The assembly drew up 'remontrances' which were submitted to the king, in which they asserted again their complaints against the parlements. Barbier, in his Journal for October 1755, (2) says that the king promised "de faire respecter toujours la Bulle Unigenitus, de maintenir l'Eglise dans toute la juridiction qui lui appartient et notamment en ce qui concerne l'administration des sacrements. Il n'entendait cependant casser aucun arrêt du Parlement et de plus déclarait vouloir que la déclaration du 3 septembre 1754, qui prescrit le silence, soit exécutée ..." Barbier comments: "La réponse du roi portée le vendredi 24 à l'assemblée y a causé du tumulte et de la division entre les évêques."

There were rigorist bishops who were opposed by the less intransigent. 10 Latin articles were drawn up which were not considered sufficiently harsh by some of the bishops who added 8 articles of a much stricter nature. 17 prelates and 22 of the second order accepted the moderate articles and 16 prelates and 8 of the second order opposed them. Since the members of the second order had only a consultative voice and neither party had the necessary two-thirds majority, nothing was decided, which produced an embarrassing situation for the assembly. The pope was consulted but

(1) I. Bourlon, Les Assemblées du clergé et le Jansénisme.
Paris. 1909. p. 238

(2) Op. cit.

his late reply gave no help. As was to be expected, parlement made the most of the situation. Hostility to the Jesuits was growing and we need not trace the events which led to their downfall and their expulsion from France in 1764. That event may well end the French section of this work but two items of interest are added which show that the refusal of sacraments continued.

In a Recueil (I) there is a poem which is anonymous and evidently written after 1773. It deals with the opposition to the bull, the refusal of sacraments and expresses joy at the suppression of the Jesuits. It is too long to quote in full, but the following extracts are of interest.

(Opposition to the bull). "Il doit paroître ridicule
 A tout Catholique et François
 Que le Formulaire et la Bulle
 Soient mis au nombre de nos loix.

(Refusal of sacraments). Simple, ou savant, il n'est personne
 que l'on n'y veuille assujettir
 Même, on prive du pain des anges
 Les plus édifiants Chrétiens:
 et les moyens les plus étranges
 Servent au décret de soutiens.

...

L'incrédule rit en son ame.
 Il se moque de ses combats,
 Et du faux zèle qui l'enflamme;
 Blasphème ce qu'il ne croit pas.

(Expulsion of Jesuits). Heureusement, Rome elle-même
 A reconnu depuis long-temps
 Que l'abus du pouvoir suprême
 Ne forme pas les vrais croyans

(I) Recueil in Bodleian Library. Bod. Mason. DD. 302.

Depuis la loi de bienveillance (i.e. expulsion of Jesuits)
 Ouvrage d'un autre Clément (i.e. Clément xiv. Pope in 1769)
 Qui supprima la noire enéance,
 A Rome il n'est plus de ferment
 Sur la Bulle et le Formulaire.
 Pourquoi faut-il qu'en notre France
 On vexe encore le sujets,
 Et qu'on n'ait pas la jouissance
 Des doux fruits d'une heureuse paix?"

Hardy's Journal (I) was well known to students at the end of the 18th century. He was a Parisian and recorded in his diary many events which seemed to him to be important. His most interesting contribution is his persistent interest in the quarrels of the parlement with the royal authority and he records incidents of the king's unpopularity. He was a convinced Jansenist and port-Royalist. The following extract from the 25th August 1765 throws some light on the vexed question of the refusal of sacraments.

"Anne Cordelier, dite soeur St.François, religieuse au monastère des Ursulines de St.Cloud près Paris, âgée de 68 ans, privée de la participation aux sacrements depuis plusieurs années, ainsi que neuf autres de ses soeurs, par un effet de la conduite de M.de Beaumont, archevêque de Paris, se trouvait en danger de mort à cause ... d'un cancer ... après avoir fait toutes les démarches qui dépendaient d'elle auprès du sieur Beurré, chapelain de la maison, pour se procurer l'administration des derniers sacrements, elle se trouva enfin forcée, malgré son amour pour la paix, de présenter une requête au Parlement aux mêmes fins, munie qu'elle était d'un certificat du

(I) S.R. Hardy, Mes Loisirs: journal d'événements tels qu'ils parviennent à ma connaissance. 1729-1806. Paris. 1912.

sieur Belletête, médecin de la faculté de médecine de Paris, médecin du monastère, et de faire faire au susdit chapelain sommation juridique de l'administration dans les vingt-quatre heures.

26 Août. M. le Premier président, M. le Procureur général et M. le Cte de Saint-Florentin convinrent ensemble, pour éviter l'éclat, de faire ministrer la susdite religieuse de St.Cloud, au moyen d'un ordre du Roi qu'on signifierait à la supérieure, et sur les offres que le sieur Lafont, doyen du chapitre de ce lieu, avait fait faire de se prêter à cette démarche."

"Le meme jour (27 aout) le sieur Lafont, doyen du chapitre de St.Cloud, rendit visite le matin à la supérieure des Ursulines (nommée Bega, dite Ste Candide). Le soir à 5 heures, il se rendit au monastère accompagné du vicaire ... pour administrer la religieuse malade. ... Sur le refus que fit la supérieure d'ouvrir les portes, on fit chercher M.l'abbé de Breteuil ... imaginant qu'il pourrait peut-être déterminer la supérieure à se rendre; mais malgré toutes les représentations qu'il put lui faire, elle persista dans sa première réponse, savoir qu'elle n'ouvrirait les portes que moyennant des ordres de M.l'archevêque de Paris, son supérieur ecclésiastique."

"28 aout. Ce jour, fête de St.Augustin, le refus de sacrement fait chez les Ursulines de St.Cloud, fut dénoncé au Parlement, chambres assemblées:"

The archbishop although ordered to administer the sacraments, refused permission. Entries in the diary for the 29th, 30th August, 4th and 27th September, 2nd and 6th November deal with this difficulty. Because of the resistance of the mother superior, the police took part and broke open the doors of the monastery and the eight sisters were given the last sacraments.

"2 mai.1766. MM. du Chapitre de Notre Dame, supérieurs nés de l'Hôtel-Dieu, étaient rentrés dans tous leurs droits sur cet hôpital,

en nommant trois de MM les curés de Paris pour confesser les religieuses de cette maison, excessivement tourmentées par les confesseurs que M.l'archevêque leur avait donnés, relativement a l'adhésion aux actes de l'Assemblée générale du clergé" ... "Au moyen de cet arrangement la tranquillité fut rendue aux religieuses de cet hôpital."

"20 mai, 1767. On sonna à son ^{de} trompe et on placarda chacun au lieu de leur domicile, les sieurs Madier, archiprêtre, curé de St.Séverin, Gavat, curé de St.Bartelemy, Vétard, vicaire de St. Sulpice, de St.Macquer, vicaire de St.Jacques du Haut Pas, de Delagrangre, chapelain des Religieuses hospitalières de St.Mande près Vincennes: tous 5 décrétés de prise de corps, le 25 juillet 1766, pour avoir vexé et tourmenté ces religieuses, en exigeant d'elles l'adhésion aux actes de la dernière assemblée du clergé."

"19 avril, 1769. Ce jour, le curé de la paroisse de St.Sulpice (Dulac d'Allemans) qui d'abord avait fait refus d'administrer les derniers sacrements de l'Eglise au prince de Bauffremont ... s'appuyant sur les défenses qu'il disait avoir reçues de M.l'archevêque de Paris, est contraint de remplir son devoir à cet egard par M. le Premier président, qui, l'ayant envoyé chercher, lui avait parlé en ces termes: 'Monsieur le curé, je suis informé que vous avez refusé d'administrer M. de Bauffremont qui est malade sur votre paroisse et qui vous a fait demander les sacrements: si cette administration n'est pas faite dans la journée, demain matin, quoiqu'il ne doive pas y avoir d'assemblée de chambre, j'en convoquerai une, exprès pour vous faire décréter de prise de corps, réfléchissez à ce que je vous dis et retirez-vous.' Effrayé sans doute d'un pareil discours et n'osant pas faire une plus longue résistance, il administra lui-même vers 4 heures après-midi.

Ce jour on sonne à son de trompe et on placarde, chacun au lieu de leur ancien domicile, les sieurs abbé Lebrun d'Antrecourt,

vicaire de St. Séverin et Ricancel, porte-Dieu de la même paroisse, décrétés tous deux de prise de corps le 9 août 1768, pour le refus de sacrements fait au sieur abbé Galliot, prêtre du diocèse de Nantes".

"29 mai 1770. L'Abbé de Bellegarde, ancien Cte de Lyon, et Me de Lalanne, avocat au parlement, exécuteurs du testament de vénérable et scientifique personne, messire Jean Baptiste Lessesne de Menilles d'Ettemare, prêtre et théologien célèbre du parti connu vulgairement sous le nom de Janséniste, décédé à Utrecht le 29 mars précédent, âgé d'environ 84 ans, font célébrer en l'église paroissiale de St. Gervais, pour le repos de son âme un service solennel et auquel plus de 800 personnes avaient été invitées par billets imprimés ... Le curé de la susdite paroisse (le sieur Bouillerot, docteur de Sorbonne) s'était prêté de la meilleure grâce du monde à rendre ce dernier devoir à un homme dont la mémoire était précieuse, ce que le plus grand nombre de ses confrères eussent très probablement refusé de faire."

The following is an interesting sidelight on later Jansenism and seems to be a kind of trick to remember the Deacon Paris and at the same time to avoid persecution. "1er mai, 1772. Ce jour, fête de St Jacques et St Philippe Apôtres, jour anniversaire de la mort du bienheureux Paris, diacre, il se fait en l'église paroissiale de St. Médard, rue Mouffetard, faubourg St. Michel, un concours beaucoup plus considérable encore que les années précédentes. Le R.P. Hardy de Levaré, chanoine régulier de la Congrégation de France, dite de Ste Genevieve et curé de cette paroisse, dont il avait été forcé de s'éloigner pendant plus de 10 ans par les poursuites faites contre lui pour cause de refus de sacrements, et qui avait eu part, comme beaucoup d'autres ecclésiastiques qui se trouvaient dans le même cas, à l'amnestie obtenue en 1771 après l'exil et la suppression de l'ancien Parlement, avait eu la précaution de faire afficher aux portes de toutes les églises de Paris un placard qui annonçait au public que le susdit 1er mai, on exposerait dans son église une

insigne relique de Ste Jeanne-Francoise Frémiot de Chantal, fondatrice et première supérieure des religieuses de la Visitation Ste Marie, dont on célébrait actuellement à Paris la canonisation dans les trois différents monastères de cet ordre ... On devinait aisément le motif qui avait engagé ce curé à choisir ce jour par préférence à tout autre ... Il cherchait sans doute à donner le change et à fournir un prétexte apparent et plausible à un concours qu'il n'était pas en son pouvoir d'empêcher et dont il lui était également difficile de détourner l'objet. L'insigne relique de la mère de Chantal dont est ci-dessus question était la moitié de son coeur, que le sieur Davignon, substitut du Procureur general du nouveau Parlement, qui se disait de ses parents, avait fait enchâsser à ses frais dans un reliquaire d'or pur ... Le susdit sieur Davignon se croyait obligé de déclarer à tous ceux qui se trouvaient autour de lui pendant la grand'messe que cette relique était beaucoup plus authentique que celle qui était derrière le choeur (voulant parler du corps du bienheureux Paris, diacre, qui reposait toujours dans le cimitière dont l'entrée avait été murée) ...

CONCLUSION TO PART ONE

Two reasons have determined the point at which the French section of this work, deliberately entitled Some aspects of Jansenism, is terminated. The first is that it would be impossible to attempt a complete history of Jansenism. Although Préclin, Gazier and others have written a great deal on this subject, it is difficult to avoid the impression that the full history of Jansenism in France will never be written. Préclin suggests that there is still a vast amount of material in various local libraries, much of which is still unpublished, and in addition to the material at the Bodleian, there is also a Jansenist Library at Keble College, Oxford, and the famous Jansenist Library in the Old Catholic Seminary at Amersfoort, Holland. New material is frequently coming to light and as recently as 1960, a large volume of 729 pages with 47 pages of sources and bibliography has appeared dealing with Jansenism in Lorraine, a region which previously had been thought to be fairly free of Jansenism. (1). Histories of various dioceses are also appearing and references to some of these which have been consulted are referred to in the bibliography. It is clear that there is a revival of interest in Jansenism. The concluding chapters of Gazier carry on the story up to and during the Revolution and a more complete history is given in the five volumes of La Gorce. (2)

The second reason for terminating the French work at the moment of the suppression of the Jesuits is that various indications led one to see that Jansenism was by no means confined to France. It had a considerable influence in Italy and as this Italian influence seems to be so little known it seemed wise to attempt some study of it and

(1) R. Taveneaux, Le Jansénisme en Lorraine, 1640-1789. Paris. 1960.

(2) P. de La Gorce, Histoire Religieuse de la Révolution Française. Paris. 1922-1924. 5 vols.

this will constitute the final part of this thesis.

But to return to France. For a brief summary we may quote J.S. Bromley who, although saying little ^f of the genuine religious spirit of Jansenism, has an interesting chapter on 'The Decline of Absolute Monarchy' (I). "What broadcast most widely the seeds of disrespect for authority, without question was the Jansenist furor, which divided the Church against itself and manoeuvred absolutism into an ultramontane position, contrary to its tradition, against the popular Gallicanism of its noisiest enemy, the parlements ... In the lives of the poor, Jansenism was known to excite a morbid enthusiasm, an extravagant hope in miracles; in the professional classes, a somewhat puritanical code of behaviour. By its light the great of this world risked implicit condemnation; it would have no demi-gods. Thus we may try to understand why Louis xiv destroyed Port-Royal and, conversely, discern an attitude of belief deeper than political opportunism in the Jansenism of the parliamentary magistrates. And yet, if 18th century Jansenism was not merely a fabrication of the Jesuits to discredit all opponents, it became above all else a political movement. It created the opening through which the parlements could double their historic role as the guardians of Gallican liberty with a false championship of the poor and oppressed. It enabled them to exploit the currents of anti-clericalism which flowed strongly when the wealthiest Estate in the land resisted the attempt of the great Controller-General, Machault, in 1749, to increase the share of taxation, and when the Archbishop of Paris chose this very moment to refuse the sacrament to dying persons who could not produce evidence that they accepted the Bull Unigenitus of 1713. The Bull, I may remind you, had condemned what had been a popular manual of piety

(I) In J.M. Wallace-Hadrill and John McManners, editors,
France: Government and Society. London. 1957. pp.141sq.

for many years. Thus, what had begun as a theological move of Jesuit against Jansenist, finally brought into focus a heap of unrelated mass resentments until the very name of Jansenism could be used by authority as a loose description of anti-~~absolutist~~^{absolutist} tendencies - what, in fact, was then loosely styled "republicanism". Its leading organ, the *Nouvelles Ecclésiastiques*, a clandestine weekly, which maintained publication from 1728-1803, reached levels of society untouched by, and often hostile to 'philosophy'. Further, the output of Jansenist pamphlets, together with the illegal circulation of parliamentary remonstrances against 'fanaticism' accustomed quite humble people to the discussion of fundamentals. ... Not for nothing did Brunetière call this "the century of Unigenitus". Unhappily for the fortunes of the monarchy, Louis xiv had both instigated the bull and made its acceptance a law of state."

Throughout this thesis contrary opinions have been quoted. France today is a 'Pays de Mission' and great attempts - liturgical and evangelistic - are being made to win back people to the Church and many of these efforts have interesting parallels with Jansenism. Large areas are dechristianised and it is frequently said that this abandonment of the Church is mainly due to the severity of Jansenist doctrine and practice. That may be so, but such a sweeping judgment may leave out of account not only the temper of modern civilisation, but also one wonders whether the admitted abuses of the period, followed by the disasters of the Revolution, might also be a real cause of decadence of Church life. In the *Recueil* already quoted, (I) there is some interesting material dealing with lay complaints with regard to the conduct of ^services. The material is evidently Jansenist inspired. One of the items in this *Recueil* is: Réflexions chrétiennes sur la précipitation scandaleuse des Messes, published

(I) Bodleian Library. Mason DD.302. (See p. 134)

anonymously but by the Abbé C.M. de l'Epée, 1786. The first paragraph begins: "Réflexion de Monsieur de Saci sur ce texte (i.e. I Kings, 2/17: Erat ergo peccatum etc.). It is an attack on priests who celebrate mass unworthily with the result that the faithful are repelled from the altar. "Les vrais Chrétiens gémissent de tout côté sur la précipitation scandaleuse des Messes. Ils se plaignent amèrement de ce qu'il leur est absolument impossible de suivre un certain nombre de Prêtres dans la célébration du Saint Sacrifice... Ils exposent à leurs Confesseurs l'agitation continuelle qu'ils y éprouvent ... D'autres qui persévérent dans l'usage d'assister tous les jours au Sacrifice de la Messe, et de s'y unir autant qu'ils le peuvent au Prêtre qui le célèbre, se placent dans quelque endroit, d'où ils puissent ne pas apercevoir l'indécence précipitation avec laquelle il fait les cérémonies respectables de cet auguste Sacrifice."

In the same volume there is a long letter, a Dénonciation à Mgr. l'Archevêque de Paris by l'Abbé H. Jabineau on the same subject, issued anonymously, probably in 1786, and which has an interesting bearing on liturgical matters. "L'abus, Monseigneur, le scandale que je dénonce à votre Grandeur est la précipitation révoltante, avec laquelle un grand nombre de Prêtres célèbrent les Mystères redoutables ... Je ne dis pas seulement que ces Ministres irreligieux osent parler à l'Être suprême comme ils ne voudroient pas parler au dernier des valets, qu'ils glissent rapidement sur des prières qui devroient reveiller tous les sentiments de la piété la plus tendre ..."

The writer proposes remedies of these abuses:

- (i) Abandon the almost universal habit of saying mass each day. Proper dispositions are demanded from the faithful who communicate frequently; for the priest it is a matter of habit.
- (ii) Payment for masses is one of the causes of saying mass daily.

(iii) Another cause of a hurried mass is that it is said in a low voice; the people hear nothing of the Liturgy. "Ils sont donc réduits, non pas à entendre, mais à voir dire la Messe; à s'unir en général au Sacrifice, dont ils ne peuvent plus suivre les différentes parties ..."

Opinions will continue to differ about the place of Jansenism in French history, yet for many the memory of Jansenism is still an inspiration. All who study the history of European education meet the Petites Ecoles of Port-Royal; all students of French literature meet Pascal, and students of the intellectual and social life of 18th century France and Italy are increasingly aware of the fierce Jansenist struggle for spiritual freedom and independence, even for revolutionary reform in Church and State. The Granges, home of the male solitaries of Port-Royal, is now a national monument, and the Maternité hospital in Paris preserves intact the memory of Port-Royal de Paris.

In this modern age some of the Jansenist ideals have been realised in the Roman Catholic Church and we shall see the struggle for them in the Italian movement.

PART TWOJANSENISM IN ITALYFRENCH INFLUENCE ON THE MOVEMENT THERE

Apart from France, and Utrecht where the Jansenist Church had broken with the papacy, it was Italy which was most influenced by Jansenism and it is with that country that the rest of this work deals, for it is clear that a study of Jansenism is in no way complete without some treatment of the Italian movement. This has an added importance because little seems to be known among us about Jansenism in Italy. (1). It was a remark of Gazier which led one to turn to this particular study. He says: "L'étude des Nouvelles Ecclésiastiques serait à recommander aux savants italiens qui voudraient bien connaître le renouvellement du catholicisme en Italie au temps de Scipio de Ricci, de Thomas Vignoli, de Tamburini, de Molinelli et d'Eustache Dégola, prêtre génois qui assista au concile de 1801 et que nous retrouverons sous l'Empire à propos de Manzoni; et du premier centenaire de la destruction de Port-Royal." (2).

But Gazier's remark may give the impression that Jansenism in Italy was a movement only of the second half of the 18th century and was a foreign importation. There is some truth in this but it is not exact, for Jansenism was dealing, primarily, with a fundamental theological problem with a long history. In France, certainly, the movement in the 18th century had become implicated with Gallicanism and Richerism. But the theological problem remained. It was the problem of Grace. Now this was not a new problem for it is well to remember that throughout its history Christianity had been faced with

(1) For a notable exception to this, see: W. Palmer, A Treatise on the Church of Christ. 2nd ed. London. 1839. 2 vols. vol. 1, pp. 355 sq.

(2) Gazier, op. cit. vol. 2, p. 157.

two opposing conceptions of the relation between God and man - man's own efforts towards salvation and the necessity of God's help, the means of Grace. The controversy about Grace is especially a western problem, for the Eastern Church seems to have offered no formal definition. St. Paul had much to say on this subject and, for him, God's dealings with people are personal. But in the course of time, Grace was considered as a kind of impersonal force. For St. Augustine, the great western authority, Grace seems to be a 'compelling power', something imposed 'ab extra'. Only the elect can receive Grace, which is both remedial and irresistible, although St. Augustine does acknowledge free will. Inevitably Grace became a matter of controversy throughout the Middle Ages. The Council of Trent dealt with the question and it was one of the great problems left unsolved at the Reformation. Molinism, which has already been mentioned in these pages (I), opposed the idea of Grace as being an impersonal power and it was the excesses of Molinism which led to the famous work of Jansenius and the struggle became centred around the Jesuits. The controversy about Grace was not, then, a purely French problem. (2)

Italy knew these struggles before Jansenism was introduced there and it was perhaps natural that those who shared in the struggle with the Jesuits should be dubbed Jansenists. Certainly, as we shall see, French Jansenism is strong in Italy in the second half of the 18th century. But no movement starts from nothing and it was the already existing hostility to the Jesuits which produced the favourable ground for the later influence. The flowering of Jansenism in Tamburini and Ricci in the University of Pavia and in the diocese of Pistoia had its precursors, going back over a long period.

(I) See p. 2

(2) See the D.T.C., vol. 1 (part 2), col. 2486 sq. for a long article on Augustinisme.

One reads of Italian Jansenism in the later years of the 17th century when Italians were accused of being followers of Baius and Jansenius, and later on, of Quesnel. But the Holy See hardly ever condemned their books, provided that there was no open solidarity with French Jansenism. These supposed Jansenists lived in perfect accord with their ecclesiastical superiors and frequently they reached the chief places in the Religious Orders and were well received at the Vatican. They had some sympathy with the French Jansenists (what Jemolo calls an 'external adhesion') but had no real part in the movement. In the first half of the 18th century there were students and writers, almost without exception ecclesiastics, called Jansenists by their opponents, who were resolutely opposed to Jesuit teaching and practice. Where were they Jansenists? In a broad sense, perhaps they were. They were such as would justify the definition which the Jansenists would have liked to apply to themselves - Catholics with little love for the Jesuits. But these so-called Jansenists in Italy in the first half of the 18th century differed much from those of the second half who had their own particular point of view, which was that of the French Jansenists who had fought the battle against Unigenitus. Is there a link between the pseudo-Jansenists of the first period and those true Jansenists of the later period? And if so, how did the one evolve into the other? The orthodoxy and good faith of the earlier group may have been questioned at times, but not condemned. Among them stand out many prominent personalities, some clothed with the cardinal's purple. Even in the 17th century there were cardinals favouring, not so much the Jansenist cause, but some accommodation over the disputed points and some alleviation of the persecutions, cardinals who considered, without the excessive severity of the French Jansenists, a movement in theology which would follow St. Augustine, and who were sympathetic to a severer ideal in morals.

Such were Azzolini, Carpegna, Colonna, Ludovisi and especially

Casandra, of whom Quesnel wrote in 1690: "Le cardinal Cassandra paraît bon esprit et bien équitable. Une douzaine comme lui dans le Sacré-Collège feraient beaucoup de bien à l'Eglise." On the death of Casandra, Quesnel wrote, in 1700: "Quoiqu'il n'ait pas fait de grandes choses pour la vérité, il avoit le coeur disposé à les faire, et il a pu empêcher beaucoup de mal." (1) Two cardinals of the 17th century stand out still more clearly in their desire to return to a more primitive Christianity and to remain loyal to the teaching of St. Augustine; they were Giovanni Bona and Enrico Noris, whose works, uncondemned at Rome, were bitterly attacked by the French Jesuit Dominique de Colonia who, in 1722, published a work which gave rise to much controversy: Bibliothèque janséniste, ou catalogue alphabétique des livres jansénistes, quesnellistes, bainanistes, ou suspects de ces erreurs, etc. Interestingly enough, this Bibliothèque was put on the Index in 1749. (2).

Enrico Noris (1631-1704), an Augustinian monk and cardinal, was said to have come from an English family and he was a great authority on St. Augustine. From Padua appeared his Historia pelagiana et dissertatio de Synodo quinta oecumenica (3) which caused much controversy. He refused the bishopric of Pistoia and for a time rejected all offers of the popes Clement x and Innocent xi, who wished to have him in Rome. He finally accepted the post of chief librarian of the Vatican Library and was made cardinal in 1695. Noris was one of the outstanding scholars of his time and his work which most interests the theologian is his history of the Pelagian heresy which he wrote when the quarrels between the Jesuits and the Jansenists were calming down at the time of the Clementine Peace in 1669. The work was largely historical in character but in the latter part of it he bitterly

(1) A.C. Jemolo, Il Giansenismo in Italia prima della Rivoluzione. Bari. 1928. pp.100, 101.

(2) First published anonymously, without place or date. Later editions; Lyon, 1735; Bruxelles, 1739 and 1744.

(3) Patavii, 1673.

attacked the Molinists. A French translation was prepared but suppressed by Le Tellier, Louis xiv's confessor. The Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique quotes a letter from Cardinal Bona to Noris with regard to this and it is one example of French contacts with Italy in the 17th century. "Je croyais que votre Révérence avait déjà été informée de ce qui est arrivé à Paris à son livre, et c'est pourquoi je ne l'en avais point avisée. En fait, tous les exemplaires imprimés ont été retirés par ordre du roi, à l'instigation du P. le Tellier, jésuite, confesseur de Sa Majesté, la même chose s'est produite à Rouen où on réimprimait l'ouvrage, avec défense rigoureuse de l'imprimer dans tout le royaume. En écrire à la personne dont vous me parlez (le Cdl d'Estrées) serait inutile, parce que nul ne peut faire échec au P.Tellier. Mieux vaut se taire, car il ne manquera pas d'ami pour prendre votre défense d'une cause si juste. Ainsi va le monde aujourd'hui; qui n'est pas moliniste est hérétique." (I). Later, in Italy, Noris was accused of being a Jansenist. Finally, under Clement xi, no lover of the Jesuits, the Holy See, in 1676, declared in favour of Noris. 40 years after his death the controversy over his work broke out afresh, especially in Spain.

Cardinal Bona (1609-1674), the great writer on asceticism who has been called the Fénelon of Italy, was one of the cultured Italians who were in touch with the ecclesiastical life of France. Bona was so immersed in his work as a scholar that he constantly refused bishoprics and missions which might take him away from his studies. His correspondence shows that around 1670 there were close contacts between Italian and French scholars. For Bona, Arnauld was a 'summus vir'. Mabillon (1632-1707), the learned French Benedictine, was, among other scholars, a correspondent of Bona.

(I) D.T.C. vol. xi (pt.1), col. 799.

Mabillon was an authority on the early Fathers and his works were translated into Italian. From his French correspondents Bona did not hide his rigorist anti-Molinist sentiments.

Montfaucon (1655-1741), another learned Benedictine, was also in Italy in 1698. He wrote many works on the Fathers, including Athanasius and Chrysostom. These French scholars visiting Italy were drawn into theological questions and were in touch with Jansenist sympathisers. The Italian Segardi had promised Mabillon that he would get Alexander VIII (1690) to read French writers. Michel Germain, a Frenchman, begged Magliabechi, a great admirer of Pascal, to show the Grand Duke and Cardinal Francesco Maria de Medici the Unité de l' Eglise by Nicole and in 1701 the Augustinian Nicola Ceppi printed, with the knowledge of the General of the Order, a translation of the second part of Mabillon's work dealing with methods of study. The book was condemned on account of its aversion to casuistry, to the problem and doctrine of probabilism, the legends of saints of whom nothing certain was known and the recommendation of the works of Jansen and Quesnel. (1)

It is thus clear that Jansenism was known and discussed in Italy even in the 17th century. The activity of Arnauld, the Provinciales, the Essays of Nicole and all the literature of the first generation of the Port-Royalists were at once known in Italy. A Latin translation of the Provinciales had appeared in Italy in 1658.

For the first half of the 18th century the evidence is still clearer: Montesquieu was in Italy in 1728 and 1729. Here and there in a recent book on Montesquieu (2) there are references to Italian Jansenism. Montesquieu himself showed some hostility to the Bull

(1) Jemolo, op. cit. p. 121.

(2) R. Shackleton, Montesquieu: a critical biography. O.U.P. 1961.

Unigenitus without being a partisan of Jansenist doctrine. On his way to Italy he discussed Jansenism in Vienna and while in Italy he was in close touch with the leaders of the Italian Jansenist movement such as Bottari, Foggini and Corsini, and it is made clear by Shackleton (I) that there were many Frenchmen, lay and clerical, in Italy, some as travellers, others as residents. On page 100 the author says that terms such as Ultramontanism were incapable of having a meaning in Rome. This may be exact as far as the 'term' itself is concerned, but there is ample evidence of detailed study of the early Fathers by Italian scholars and one imagines that such a study would inevitably raise problems about papal jurisdiction and supremacy; not would Italian scholars have forgotten the question^s raised in the Conciliar Movement prior to the Reformation. Among the Italian ecclesiastics there were many, including cardinals, who were hostile to the Jesuits, such as Tamburini, Spinelli, and more particularly the Dominican Orsi, hostile especially to the moral theology of the Jesuits and these Italians offered friendship and protection to those who were influenced by Port-Royal. Many others might be quoted, such as Cardinal Passionei whose writings retarded for a century and a half the beatification of Bellarmine. Corsini (1685-1771), nephew of Pope Clement xii and secretary to Innocent xi was held in high esteem by the Jansenists. He was the chief of the band of anti-Jesuits and the one to whom they dedicated their writings. Some, like Ferrari, the friend of Mabillon, were interested in the publication of the works of the early Fathers.

The Dominican Daniel Concina (1687-1756), to whom the Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique devotes more than 16 pages, was a famous preacher who for 25 years from 1730 preached continually

(I) Op. cit. p.102.

against relaxed morality. He was a great controversialist especially over the question of fasting in Lent. He was accused by Jesuits of being a disciple of Arnauld and Pascal but he was defended by Pope Benedict xiv. Among his more famous controversial works was one on the history of probabilism which attacked the relaxed morality of certain casuists. (1). The Jesuits bitterly attacked the book but it was well received in France. His greatest work was the 12 volume Theologia Christiana dogmatico-moralis (2), of which Benedict xiv accepted the dedication. This work, too, was welcomed in France and the parlements of Toulouse, Bordeaux and Paris condemned a hostile attack on the work.

One of the outstanding personalities of the first half of the 18th century was Muratori (1672-1751), considered as one of the most cultured men in Europe. He was claimed as a supporter of the Jansenists. In one of his earlier theological works he wrote on Grace, writing as an Augustinian but not as a Jansenist. As his numerous works appeared, he drew to himself the opposition of the Jesuits, particularly over the question of the Immaculate Conception. The Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique says of him: "Rappelant la doctrine de l'Écriture sur l'unique médiateur, Jésus-Christ, Muratori y avait enseigné que seule, en rigueur du terme, la dévotion au Christ est nécessaire pour le salut, que l'invocation des saints, et même de la Vierge, pour louable et utile qu'elle soit, ne peut être dite nécessaire." (3) These opinions of Muratori caused scandal in certain quarters and in Jesuit attacks he was accused of being a Jansenist and a heretic. Jemolo (4) thinks that there was no constant attitude in Muratori towards Jansenism. Muratori's attitude, he says, varied, for while

(1) See D.T.C. vol. 3, col. 682.

(2) Rome, 1749-1751.

(3) D.T.C. vol.10 (pt. 2) col. 2553.

(4) Op. cit. pp. 109 sq.

he was orthodox (a controversial term) in his old age, in his youth he affirmed that he was a convert to Jansenism and he collaborated with Jansenist theologians. Yet even if, in old age, he became orthodox and expressed ideas similar to those of the Molinists, he yet speaks with the voice of a Jansenist. If we limit, Jemolo continues, the term Jansenist to its original meaning, so that it comprises the supporters of the Five Propositions, or even those who do not accept Unigenitus, Muratori would not be included. But to have a general idea of the movement in Italy, we must apply the word in a wider sense to those who oppose the Jesuits in theology and morality, in the hundred points of detail in which the religious life crystallizes itself, we must consider Muratori as one of the most striking figures. We find him in the forefront against the excesses of Mariology, against revelations which aimed at changing the deposit of faith handed down by tradition and was hostile to the declaration of new dogmas. We find him among the theologians who pronounce against the practice of not giving communion in the Mass; a small point, says Jemolo, but an important point, not only for Ricci, but also for modern liturgical scholars. Jemolo admits that in the first half of the 18th century, Muratori must be considered as a central figure in Italian Jansenism, because of his authority as a great European scholar, by his wide relationships, by his passionate interest in the ecclesiastical controversies of his time and by the tenacity with which he held his own convictions. In his youth Muratori had great admiration for Cardinal Noris, head of the rigid Augustinian school and in later life he was an admirer of Tamburini, the important figure in the Council of Pistoia. It was to Tamburini that Muratori spoke of the abuses of the Church and begged Tamburini to use his authority to remedy them. Concina had high praise for Muratori and when it is remembered that Muratori was in collaboration with

all the well-known Jansenists of Italy, it is safe to include him among them.

It seems clear, then, that Jansenism was a lively topic in Italy during the first part of the 18th century. Equally clearly this period differed much from the later period when the movement can be considered as primarily a French movement. The question was raised as to whether there is any link between the two periods. Bottari and his group at the Archetto in 1757 (I) represent the last group who were sincerely devoted to the papacy, although they were ardent reformers. They bring us to the end of the first period which was followed by what Jemolo calls the 'rebels'. The link is seen in the triumph of Gallicanism and the suppression of the Jesuits on the one hand and on the other hand in the concessions which the papacy was forced to concede to temporal monarchs. Benedict xiii (1724-30), instituting the Festival of Pope Gregory vii, met with violent protestations from Holland, Venice, France and Germany, countries which saw a threat to their sovereignties. Under Clement xii (1730-40) there were increased attacks on the papacy and the privileges of the Church were invaded. Freemasonry and the movement of the 'philosophes' were often linked with Jansenism as the great enemies of the Church but Clement's condemnation of Freemasonry in 1738 had no effect. Benedict xiv (1740-58) saw the Church still more on the defensive. His 'Secrétaire des Brefs' was Cardinal Passionei, a noted friend of the Jansenists. The end of his reign saw the forces gathered to compel the destruction of the Jesuits, but the troubles experienced by Benedict xiv were increased under his successor Clement xiii (1758-69). Portugal declared war on the Jesuits and expelled them from the country and relations with the papacy were suspended for ten years. The Jesuit question became an international affair. France followed Portugal.

(I) See p. 205

Clement attempted to intervene but Gallican Liberties prevented his briefs from being accepted. In 1764 the Jesuits were condemned in France and it seemed that all the Catholic powers were determined on the destruction of the Order and a violent attack on the papacy ensued. Its temporal administration was held up to ridicule. "La cour de Rome" wrote Joseph ii in 1768, "est parvenue à se rendre presque méprisable. Dans son interne, le peuple est dans la plus grande misère, les finances entièrement décréditées et délabrées." The five years of the unhappy reign of Clement xiv (1769-74) saw the suppression of the order throughout the Roman Catholic world.

It is in these circumstances that the earlier stages of Jansenism in Italy easily pass into the second stage when Italian Jansenism came completely under the influence of the French movement. The ardent French Jansenist controversialist Le Gros was in Rome before 1760 and caused much trouble. Savio (I) gives us the contents of 30 letters from the papal archives which passed chiefly between the Cardinal Secretary of State under Clement xiii, Torrigiani, and the papal representative at Turin, the Abbé Morelli. Torrigiani complained that for some time Le Gros had been in Rome. He was, says Torrigiani, a fanatical Jansenist, opposed to unigenitus and a bitter enemy of the Jesuits. The pope, says Morelli in Letter cclxxii, had used every moderation and patience in not forcing Le Gros to leave but it was no longer possible to tolerate him in Rome; there was no reason, public or private, for him to be there and he must leave before Easter of 1762. His stay in Naples did not make things any easier owing to his friendship with Tanucci, the reforming minister of Naples.

(I) P. Savio, Devozione di Mgr Adeodato Turchi alla Santa Sede. Rome. 1938. Letters * cclxix - cclxxxix.

Jemolo's 6th chapter (I) on the "Irrequietudine di studiosi ed ansia di credenti" shows how conditions in Italy itself aided the process. Concina, the most important ally of Muratori, expressed concern at the excesses of Mariology; attacks were made against certain popular devotions and the use of images. Muratori had argued against false miracles and unhistorical traditions and there were demands for reforms in the Church services. He pleaded for liberty in dealing with ecclesiastical history; early in the 18th century Serry had claimed that Scriptural and Patristic tradition are the only real foundation for Christian dogma. Bottari had argued for the translation of the Scriptures into the vernacular and had maintained that the evils in Italy were due to the ignorance of the Scriptures. There were demands for greater participation of the laity in the mass as well as for communion within the mass and not from a previous consecration, an important point later in Ricci's reforms. Thus there was a widespread desire for a purification of theology, of morals, of history; a desire to return to origins. But these demands came mainly from ecclesiastics and, by themselves, would probably not have succeeded. In addition there was the powerful factor of the struggle in Italy between the papacy and the 'enlightened Princes' in the States of Joseph ii (1765-90) and in Tuscany, governed by his brother the Grand Duke Leopold. Great reforms were undertaken in their Italian possessions. They were both autocratic and keen on reform, both secular and ecclesiastical. Their ecclesiastical policy was to separate Church from State and to make the Church subservient to the State and it was in these reforms that Bishop Ricci was their great ally and supporter. (2) On becoming emperor, Joseph

(1) Op. cit.

(2) See Cambridge Modern History (Old series). Vol. 6. pp.603 sq.

confiscated nine-tenths of the ecclesiastical estates in Austria between 1784-89 and reduced considerably a number of monastic orders, but unlike Henry viii of England, he used the money so realised for the spiritual and educational needs of the people. Prayers and litanies were to be in German and he strongly refused any interference by the papacy in the affairs of his realm. With the help of such rulers Ricci was able to undertake his reforms in the diocese of Pistoia. It explains his success and partly explains his failure.

In the succeeding pages we may now consider some of the recent researches of Italian scholars into the Jansenist phase of their history. This is a recent development and it may be well to indicate these sources and to say something of their varying views before leading up to the climax in the Synod of Pistoia in 1786. We find differing estimates of Italian Jansenism from the various students of the subject. Rodolico (I) sees a connection between the Jansenist movement and the Risorgimento. Among the friends and masters of the famous Italians of the Risorgimento, he tells us that the names of Italian Jansenists of the 18th century recur, such as Mazzini and Manzoni. Is not this perhaps an indication of the movements of thought and faith derived from Jansenism? But had Jansenism enough strength to transmit prolific seed, after the fury of the reaction against 1789 had overthrown both Jansenists and Jacobins in the same ruin and after the restoration had buried under a layer of lava every trace of that ruin? He suggests that in the history of political parties, the progress of events brings programmes and formulae to new adaptations; sometimes the old names are forgotten and yet frequently ideas of the old programme sprout in new groups just as in the earth good seeds, left for a time, still germinate. Not differently did it happen in Jansenism.

(I) Nicolo Rodolico, Gli amici e i tempi di Scipione ^{dei} Ricci.
Firenze. 1920.

At first a theological question, interesting a limited circle, it attracted the sympathy of those persecuted by the Court, the Jesuits and the free-thinkers and was soon animated by the spirit of the struggle of the reforming princes; it drew its inspiration from the French Revolution and was vanquished first by the arms of the Austrian-Russian reaction, and then by the ecclesiastical policy of Napoleon and finally seemed to fade away with the Restoration. Yet the same people who no longer called themselves Jansenists, carried with them into other groups some of their ideas.

In an article in the Revue Historique (I) Préclin had made some preliminary studies on "L'influence du Jansénisme français à l'Etranger", where he says: "Encore que le jansénisme soit un fait de l'histoire religieuse de la France et les Pays-Bas catholiques, il est incontestablement devenu un fait de l'histoire européenne au xviii^e siècle." Préclin's chief point was to encourage others to pursue these studies and he gave some indications for further research, especially in the Austrian States and in Italy.

In the Austrian States, Josephism and Febronianism have affinities with Jansenism and all three were hostile to the Jesuits. In these states it has long been the task of scholars to explore the workings of movements conveniently called Josephism and Febronianism. Joseph ii, German Emperor from 1765-1790, is usually considered to be the father of Josephism. Actually its roots go back, in Austria, to the 13th century; it was clearly evident in the 16th century and more closely applied in practice in the 18th century, and is allied to Jansenist principles. Kaunitz, Chancellor of State from 1753, an admirer of Gallicanism, states the theory thus: "The supremacy of the State over the Church extends to all ecclesiastical laws and practice devised and established solely by man, and whatever else the Church owes to the consent and sanction of the secular power. Consequently, the State

(I) Revue Historique, Jan.-juin, 1938.

must always have the power to limit, alter, or annul its former concessions, whenever reasons of state, abuses or altered circumstances demand it." Febronianism, which owes its name to the pseudonym of 'Justinius Febronius' adopted by the coadjutor bishop of Treves in his work De Statu ecclesiae et legitima potestate Romani pontificis, like Josephism, is allied to Gallicanism, but is mainly concerned with the position of the pope, to whom a certain primacy is given. His infallibility and universal jurisdiction are denied. The pope is subject to General Councils in which ^{the} bishops are his colleagues. National and provincial synods are advocated. The ideas were not new, but they fitted well the ideas of the time.

The Nouvelles Ecclésiastiques (1) tell how the Jesuits were driven from the universities and the posts given to opponents of Jesuit laxity and papal infallibility. But Jansenist influence was greatest in Italy. Its origin there, as we have seen, was not so much the adhesion ^{to} of the condemned propositions of Jansenius as to a return to Augustinian teaching, a greater severity and an appeal to the simplicity of the early Church, an opposition to the abuses of the papal Court, to the temporal power of the pope and to new devotions. Quoting Jemolo Préclin relates (2) how "au cours de la seconde moitié du siècle, le royaume de Sardaigne fut, des Etats italiens, le seul qui ne donna pas de motifs d'affliction au Saint-Siège" and in his comment on Jansenism in the different Italian territories he says: "L'impression finale que laissent les infiltrations jansénistes dans le pays lombarde est que les doctrines venues d'Autriche, de Rome, de France, généralement rigoristes, régaliennes et hostiles au souverain pontife, ont évalué à l'époque de la Révolution, ainsi qu'au début du xix^e siècle, vers une sorte de catholicisme rouge, démocratique, analogue aux idées des jansénistes ligures."

(1) N.E., 1772. p. 109

(2) In article in Revue Historique cited p. 158.

Maurice Vaussard has a valuable article on "Les Jansénistes italiens et la Constitution Civile du Clergé" in the Revue Historique of avril-juin, 1951. He points out that until a comparatively recent period, the Italians themselves have neglected the study of Jansenist tendencies in their own country in the 18th century.

Probably the troubled history of Italy may account for this. Jemolo, a recognised if sometimes harsh, modern historian of Jansenism in Italy attributes this lack of interest to an indifference to religion in Italy after the Risorgimento (1) which Vaussard translates: "l'incompréhension absolue, le désintéressement complet à l'égard de tout ce qui touche la vie religieuse, rendait impossible que fût seulement tentée une histoire du jansénisme italien." Jemolo adds another reason (2) that few of the laity were interested; it was principally a struggle among the clergy and hence unlikely to produce any lasting effect. Vaussard traces the rise of modern studies on this subject. Written in 1951, his article is more up to date than Préclin's in the same review in 1938. Vaussard draws special attention to the letters and documents taken from the Vatican archives by Mgr Savio, particularly to the reports sent to the Secretariat of State by the nuncios accredited to the Italian sovereigns. Savio's important book will be noticed later. Vaussard says that one of the first conclusions to be drawn from a study of the documents is that Jansenism in Italy never gained the popularity among the lower clergy which it had in France. On the other hand, Jansenism was strong in the Curia, among the Italian bishops and even in the Sacred College, combined, as in France, with opposition to the Jesuits. Tanucci, the reforming minister of Naples says that he was "encouragé à lutter pour la vérité, pour la justice et pour les privilèges de son roi, et à montrer de moins en moins d'égards pour Rome,

(1) Jemolo, op. cit. p. xvi

(2) Ibid. p. 185.

par les conseils de Mgr Bottari". (1) Now Bottari, a Tuscan dignitary, was keeper of the Vatican library and was the soul of Jansenist propaganda under four popes (Clement xii - Clement xiv); he died in 1775 at the age of 86. For Jemolo (2) these men are rebels, but they include men like Ricci, Tamburini, Serrao, Solari, Degola and many others, men of irreproachable character and ardent faith, men who tried to make the churches of Tuscany, Lombardy, Naples and Genoa independent of the Holy See. Vaussard says that for the most part they were learned men and many of them were librarians. There were differences of opinion among them as there were among the Jansenists of France. They produced their own literature, such as the Novelle Letterarie; collaborators were men such as Mabillon and Montfaucon and others of the critical school which was busy in demolishing pious legends. The Annali Ecclesiastici, which were started in 1780, were a replica of the Nouvelles Ecclésiastiques and continued the critical trend. Vaussard gives another interesting characteristic of these Italian Jansenists. Almost all were convinced 'juridictionnalistes', devoted to the enlightened despotism of rulers like Marie Thérèse, Joseph ii, Leopold of Tuscany or a Charles ii of Spain. Ricci, Bishop of Pistoia, was the great inspirer of the ecclesiastical policies of Leopold, although other writers consider Ricci as the mere tool of Leopold. Joseph ii's collaborators were Jansenists of the General Seminary of Pavia. The most astonishing thing is that the great upholders of Jansenism are found near the papacy itself. (3). Quoting Dammig, Vaussard says: "Sous Benoît xiv et Clément xiii, on ne trouve^{en} aucune partie de l'Italie un mouvement janséniste aussi fort que celui de Rome" and again, "On se serait contenté à Port-Royal

(1) Vaussard, op. cit. on p.160, pp. 244, 245.

(2) Jemolo, op. cit. chapter 7 especially.

(3) See later, p. 182

et à Utrecht des idées que les jansénistes romains avaient sur l'infaillibilité et sur le primat du pape." (1) . Vaussard names some of these people e.g. Passionei (1682-1761) who represented the Holy See at the Peace of Utrecht, later nuncio in Switzerland and Vienna and finally Secretary of Pontifical Briefs; Marefoschi (1714-1780), Secretary of Propaganda and others. Perhaps the Abbé Grégoire (Constitutional Bishop of Blois) was right when he said: "L'Italie est probablement le pays où Port-Royal a le plus de véritables admirateurs." (2) Vaussard confirms the fact that the lower clergy were not vitally interested and notes that when the Council of Pistoia failed, the lower clergy who had supported the decrees were quick to retreat. Bishop Ricci's influence, he says, was greater among foreigners, bishops, professors of dogmatic and moral theology. Quoting the Memoirs of Ricci (3) Vaussard says that Ricci's opinions were sought about the Constitution Civile du Clergé and two of his favourable replies about the Constitution, both in 1791, are quoted. After Ricci's retirement, the work was continued by the indefatigable Degola and by Solari, Bishop of Noli who was invited to take part in the National Council of France in 1801 but who was unable to leave his diocese. Degola, in his opposition to Rome, upheld the subordination of the clergy to the civil authority and Vaussard quotes an amusing note of Degola (4): "Saint Paul, dans ses épîtres à Tite et à Timothée, les charge d'établir des Evêques partout où il y en aura besoin; malheureusement il a oublié de les prévenir qu'ils auraient à se pourvoir de Bulles Papales." Like the Abbé Grégoire, he was a republican and a democrat. He obtained letters of adhesion to the French National Council of the Clergy of 1797, including important Italian ecclesiastics such as the Vicar

(1) Vaussard, op. cit on p.160, p.247.

(2) H. Grégoire, Les Ruines de Port-Royal des Champs. Paris. 1809. p. 148.

(3) Vaussard, op.cit on p. 160, p. 249.

(4) Ibid, p. 255.

General of Asti (Benedetto Vejliva) who was a notorious Jansenist, "l'homme", writes Degola, "qui a plus qu'aucun autre rendu service au clergé constitutionnel". The diocese of Asti had been a great centre for the diffusion of Jansenist literature. It was from this diocese that Grégoire received the adhesion to the Canons and Decrees of the National Council of France; but this was typical of other such adhesions.

Probably the best introduction to Italian Jansenism is a recent work by Vaussard (I). Nowhere, he says, had 18th century Jansenism a greater diffusion than in Italy. The Synod of Pistoia, a few years before the French Revolution, was condemned by the Bull Auctorem fidei, a condemnation as solemn and as serious as Unigenitus itself and it shows the importance that the popes attached to the movement. But the Italian movement did not produce personalities who could be compared with the French Jansenists; no one equal to Arnauld, Pascal, Nicole or Quesnel. The French influence was considerable, especially among ecclesiastics. There were the same negative influences - hostility to the Jesuits and to new devotional tendencies, a desire to diminish papal prerogatives and an attempt to return to early practice. Politics were intermingled, e.g. an adhesion to Josephist principles with regard to ecclesiastical legislation; Richerism is also evident. Vaussard illustrates very fully the extent of French influence and here two characters stand out: the Abbé Auguste-Jean-Charles Clément de Tremblay, confidant of the Jansenist Bishop Caylus, and Gabriel Dupac de Bellegarde. Bellegarde was a French Jansenist theologian who had received the tonsure at the age of 10 and studied theology at Toulouse. He made friends with noted Jansenists. A canonry at

(I) M. Vaussard, Jansenisme et Gallicanisme aux origines Religieuses du Risorgimento. Paris. 1959.

Lyons was given to him and withdrawn because of his compromising views; he then went to Utrecht under the famous Le Gros where he published works, including the Journal de M.l'Abbé Dorsanne. In 1763 he took a leading part in the famous Council of Utrecht, whose Acts he published with an important preface. The Church of Utrecht (1) was his principal interest and he initiated a large correspondence with Italy, Germany, Spain, Portugal and France in order to produce a reliable work on Jansenist affairs in Europe. He was encouraged by the Italian Cardinal Passionei to publish a general edition of Arnauld's works, the first two volumes of which were devoted to the life of Arnauld. Clément (de Tremblay) was in Rome as early as 1758 and established a regular correspondence with Vatican librarians. Vaussard (2) quotes Clément (future Constitutional Bishop of Versailles) as boasting, in 1788, of having "joui depuis plus de trente ans d'une utile correspondance avec ce qui (lui) a paru être l'élite des personnes éclairées à Rome; et cette liaison n'a pas peu servi à celle de bien des parties de l'Eglise avec son précieux centre." De Gros, too, was very active in circulating correspondence using such intermediaries as papal nuncios and the State Secretary of the pope.

(1) The Church of Utrecht. In refusing to accept the Bull Unigenitus the dioceses of Holland, led by the Chapter of Utrecht, separated from Rome. The pope refused to sanction the consecration of a successor to Abp. Codde who died in 1710. Cornelius Steenoven was consecrated Abp. of Utrecht by a French missionary bishop, Varlet, in 1724. In 1870, those R.Cs who refused to accept the dogma of Infallibility were excommunicated. Bishops were consecrated for them and in 1889 the Old Catholic Churches of the Netherlands, Germany, Switzerland and Austria formed the Union of Utrecht. Since 1932 they have been in full communion with Canterbury.

(2) Vaussard, op.cit. p.18

Bellegarde was able to circulate more than ten million Jansenist books into Germany and Italy. "Ce qui est certain", says Vaussard (1), "c'est que Clément et lui (Bellegarde) inondèrent littéralement le monde ecclésiastique italien d'oeuvres jansénistes, richéristes et gallicanes, soit à titre de don, soit en facilitant l'acquisition." In 1775, Del mare, professor of theology at Sienna University, wrote to Clément: "Ecco che in Italia, ^{il} l'ume va crescendo. Nicole, Quesnello, Duguet e tante opere di pietà girano per le mani ^{de} tutti i dotti" (2). Ricci, bishop of Pistoia, not only used his vast fortune to print large numbers of French works in Italian, but also received several thousands of volumes from Bellegarde. (3). The complete works of Arnauld were published in 43 volumes, many series of which were bought by Ricci and he also bought 50 copies of Mesenguy's Compendium Evangelii. Rodolico (4) states that Ricci advised the Grand Duke of Tuscany to buy 200 copies so that the work could be used in each parish. Ricci also bought large numbers of the works of Le Gros. Vaussard gives many examples of these purchases of French Jansenist works. On page 27 (5) he says: "Une note à Clément de Mgr Foggini, datée du 3 mars 1773, en règlement d'une caisse de livres destinée à divers, et une liste d'ouvrages désirés par le chanoine De Vecchi, vers la même date, donnent, elles aussi, une idée de ce qu'était en ce dernier tiers du xviii^e siècle la diffusion extraordinaire de la littérature ecclésiastique janséniste ou gallicane en Italie. La note arrive pour quatre destinataires (Foggini, Massa, Sisti, Simioli) au total de L.1059,80 (environ 350,000 fr. de 1958). Et de semblables caisses parvenaient, peut-on supposer, à intervalles rapprochés ici

(1) Op. cit. , p. 20

(2) Ibid., p. 21

(3) Rodolico, op. cit., p. 56

(4) Ibid., p. 83.

(5) Vaussard, op. cit.

ou là. Quant au chanoine De Vecchi, il commande à Paris, outre les six premiers volumes des Oeuvres complètes de Bossuet, deux exemplaires de trois ouvrages sur les grands et les petits prophètes; les Lettres imaginaires de Nicole; Les heures de Port-Royal, par M. Dumont; La fréquente Communion par M. Arnauld; Causa Arnaldina; Conférence de la Rochelle; Traité de la Liberté, par M. Petitpiéd; Thomassin, Des fêtes de l'Eglise et du Jeûne,"and others. Not only were the works of Port-Royal held in great esteem, but large numbers of portraits of the great men of the movement were wanted, beginning with Jansenius. The Bible de Sacy was translated into Italian in 24 volumes. "Tous ces prêtres ou religieux nourris d'oeuvres françaises d'inspiration port-royaliste ou gallicane parlent de la France comme d'une patrie spirituelle, avec une véritable ferveur." (1). "A la veille de la Révolution, les thèses soutenues par les élèves des Facultés de Théologie et de Droit canonique de Pavie témoignent qu'il n'est aucun des points de doctrine ou de discipline adoptés par les Nouvelles Ecclésiastiques ou le Synode de Pistoja qui n'ait aussi été enseigné en Lombardie, de sorte que ces idées ont gagné des adeptes non seulement dans l'Italie du Nord mais dans le reste de l'Empire des Hapsbourg". (2) Vaussard's second chapter is interesting because it shows the adhesion of Italian Jansenists to the Consitution Civile du Clergé and the correspondence with Grégoire.

Reference has already been made to the important book by Jemolo. In a valuable introduction of 40 pages he examines the literature already written on Italian Jansenism together with a critical examination of Jansenism itself. He draws a clear distinction between French and Italian Jansenism. In France, Jansenism knew two centuries of strife which involved all the clergy, all cultured classes and hardly spared the humbler people. It was a vast movement, from which no region was immune, which created its own mentality, which had its own heroes,

(1) Vaussard, op. cit. p.34.

(2) Ibid. p. 40

its own fanatics, its own martyrs, its own hagiology, miracles and legends. The Revolution took it out of the range of the great spiritual forces of the nation but did not succeed in extinguishing it; there remained always a circle, somewhat restricted, of faithful followers, and although it attempted no proselytism, it resembled a group of priests of an ancient religion, unshaken in their faith, but conscious of the fact that people would no longer accept their God, yet in the history of their movement showed such a force of tenacious passion and had attracted the attention of scholars. Granted the importance which the movement had in France in which many of the great names of ~~the~~ 17th and 18th century France were involved, it was not possible for it to be eradicated from popular memory. Pascal and Nicole were the two chiefs of the movement; Bossuet would appear to be a supporter; Montesquieu spoke of it in his Persian Letters; Voltaire could not fail to shoot his arrows at it; Sainte-Beuve sustained interest in it. Everyone knows that there was a Jansenist problem. Among other writers who refer to Jansenism, Jemolo quotes Loisy in Choses passées, speaking of the dominant spirit in his own Marne country "quelque peu janséniste, c'est-à-dire que les curés de l'ancien régime et leurs successeurs, dans la première moitié du xixe siècle, avaient accoutumé les campagnards à prendre le christianisme au sérieux, comme une sage et austère discipline, que l'on estimait toujours, même lorsque l'on ne s'y conformait qu'à demi". (I). But no such story, says Jemolo, can be told of Jansenism in Italy. In its rapid appearance there it was limited to certain regions; its supporters were limited to church-

(I) Quoted from Jemolo, op. cit. p. viii.

men; it produced no Italian books to assure its continuation and left no abiding memory among the people who were little inclined to theological speculations. Jansenism in Italy is marked particularly by the famous Synod of Pistoia and the papal bull condemning it. It was, says Jemolo, essentially a foreign movement, imported into Italy and lacking any local tradition to support it. As in France, it was connected with the struggle with the Jesuits; it attacked superstition and indolence; but it became linked to French revolutionary ideas; both in politics and in Church government. Jemolo acquaints us with the various criticisms of Jansenism. In Gioberti's opinion (1) it was an "eresia crudele, che spoglia il cristianesimo di quella nota di dolcezza e di bontà, che è la più divina delle sue prerogative" and the bull which condemned Jansenism was "un modello di umanità teologica".

Jemolo pays considerable attention to Rota (2) who was the first to write seriously on the Jansenist movement in Italy. For Rota, Jansenism was democratic in substance and republican in conscience. It was the true psychological pre-history of that other great 'mother' of the Risorgimento. Jansenism and Masonry were the two wings of the same army which obeyed varying generals but fought at that moment under the same banner. Jansenism and Masonry were the two principal supporters of the Italian democratic party in the pre-Napoleonic period.

Jemolo's work is largely theological in character. The study of St. Augustine's work, from which Jansenism sprang, was normal in Italy, without drawing the hard conclusions of the French Jansenists.

"Indubbiamente l'agostinianismo rigido non coincide col giansenismo. Ha commune con esso l'attaccamento a sant'Agostino. lo spirito d'immobilità per cui non vorrebbe la Chiesa si scostasse in nulla dall'ammestramento del grande vescovo, ma in più punti si allontana dall'

(1) Jemolo, op. cit. p. xii.

(2) E. Rota, Il giansenismo in Lombardia e i prodromi del risorgimento italiano. Pavia. 1907.

" Le origine del Risorgimento. Milan. 1947.

interpretazione giansenista". (I). None the less, Jemolo adds, there were strong theological resemblances between the rigid Augustinians in Italy and France. In Italy in the 18th century there was much controversy over the questions of papal infallibility, but of greater interest were the questions dealing with the life of the Church. French Jansenism, as we have seen, desired a return to primitive Christianity; one of their great contentions was that the Scriptures should be available to the laity in the vernacular and Quesnel's propositions 75-78, which dealt with this question, had been condemned. Italians too were interested. Bottari composed, but did not publish, a monograph on whether the Scriptures should be translated. He pointed out the evils which prevailed in Italy through ignorance of the Scriptures. They were not for priests and learned people only, but for each Christian. Others, like Serry, defended the condemned 86th proposition of Quesnel, which advocated the participation of the laity in the mass. This practice seems to have been common in various regions of Italy. (2). The condemnation of this practice, says Jemolo, is only explainable if it implies the use of the vernacular and he adds that the Fathers of the early Church supported this practice. This became a burning question and closely allied ~~ix~~ to it were other matters, such as saying the mass too rapidly, the multiplication of masses, the desire for a single altar in the church and the desirability of the laity communicating more frequently, and from the mass at which they were assisting and not from the reserved sacrament. These things were being discussed in 1741 and led, naturally enough, to theological disputes between the Jesuits and their opponents.

Interestingly enough (as we have already seen and shall see again) we find arguments which are now very much to the fore in

(I) Jemolo, op. cit. p. 135.

(2) Ibid. p. 255.

modern theological treatment of the Church, echoing much which had been advocated by the Jansenists. Thus Nannaroni: "Il sacrificio della Messa non è altro che un'azione commune del sacerdote insieme, e di tutta l'adunanza, supposta non sol presente, ma offerente ancora, e communicante". (1). In this matter Christians "son detti con tutta proprietà sacerdoti." The Nouvelles Ecclésiastiques refer to two other works of Nannaroni and review two more works. These deal with the same matters. (2).

Jemolo devotes his long 7th chapter to the 'rebels', especially Tamburini and the group of Pavia. (3). Tamburini deserves a special note for he was a famous personality in the Jansenist movement in Italy. Pietro Tamburini (1737-1827) had gained a great reputation as professor, first of philosophy and then of theology at Brescia, but retired to Rome owing to the suspicions of his bishop. The Empress Maria-Theresa secured his nomination as professor of moral theology at the University of Pavia where he remained for 18 years. He wrote several works which pleased the reforming princes Joseph ii and Leopold ii and during the French occupation he held the chair of moral philosophy. Tamburini is considered to be the chief representative of Jansenism in Italy both before and after the famous Synod of Pistoia. (4). His writings, as one would expect, deal

-
- (1) Jemolo, op. cit. p. 258. (2) N.E., 1771, p.149: 1772, pp.93-95.
- (3) Pavia was a strong Jansenist centre. Savio (P.Savio, Devozione di Mgr Ad.Turchi alla Santa Sede. Rome. 1938. pp.530-534) gives a list of theses sustained at Pavia, dealing with doctrinal matters, including papal prerogatives. The last 3 assert the rights of priests in the government of the Church. They are undated, but would appear to belong to a later period, under Napoleonic control.
- (4) Savio gives a letter from Tamburini to Pujati in which he tells of the great quantity of Port-Royalist books coming into Lombardy. He would like to start an ecclesiastical journal and would use the literature from the Low Countries, France & Germany. In his college they would have the means to do this. Letter cv, p.343. For Pujati, p.224 (note) and letters following.

with the doctrines of predestination and grace, drawn chiefly from the works of St. Augustine and St. Thomas Aquinas and are a severe attack on the Molinists. Answers to his works came from the Jesuits. (1). Some of his works were translated into French. From Tertullian he drew arguments against the Bull Unigenitus whose supporters maintained that the infallibility of the Church is expressed through the bishops united with the pope. Tamburini maintained that the voice of the Church has always been heard in the free and unanimous consent of her pastors, either assembled in a General Council or dispersed. The Bull Unigenitus was therefore unacceptable. He was indebted to French writers, one of whom was Rastignac (1684-1750), Archbishop of Tours in 1723. At first sight this may seem curious for Rastignac accepted the Bull Unigenitus and wrote works attacking Jansenist writers, e.g. Travers; Pichon. (2). On the other hand he showed friendship to certain Jansenists and wrote a 'mandement' based on the work of the appellant Gourlin. (3). This was the famous pastoral Instruction sur la justice chrétienne which gave rise to so much controversy. (4).

Tamburini also drew largely on the works of Arnauld. In his treatment of the sacraments Tamburini showed himself to be a practical theologian and dealt much with abuses. On the Sacrament of Order he follows a typical Jansenist line in stressing the importance of the second order, who, in the Councils, are judges together with the bishops and he demanded the calling of General Councils, the suspension of which coincided with the growing belief in papal infallibility. His Vera idea della S.Sede (5) was translated into French and shows the influence of Richerist ideas. The Church is composed of the clergy and people. The See of Rome is indefectible, but the Church

(1) N.E., 1773, pp.105-106: 1775, pp.51-52. (2) Ibid. 1748, p.55-56 & 1748, pp.65-67. (3) Ibid., 1749, pp. 77-79 et passim.
 (4) Ibid., 1750, p. 37
 (5) Pavia. 1787.

in Rome, governed by the pope, is liable to error just as is any other particular Church. When the Bishop of Rome speaks, he is expressing the opinion of ~~the~~ a local Church. If his judgment is to be accepted as universal, it requires the assent of all the churches. The pope has no right to usurp the power of Metropolitans and Patriarchs. He has no immediate jurisdiction over the dioceses of other bishops. Each bishop is equal to the pope and the authority of bishops united to represent the Church is greater than that of the pope. The primacy of the pope, which is admitted, gives him power to represent the Church, but only if he is in agreement with the whole Church, and the obedience of bishops is a canonical and not an absolute obedience. In his diocese a bishop has complete control together with his clergy in matters which do not affect the faith of the Church. The Nouvelles Ecclésiastiques give us some idea of Tamburini's opinion of the Index. (I). He says that the Index has no authority in the Imperial States; it is unable to distinguish between good and bad books; on the other hand, young people should not think that they are free to read books which are contrary to the faith.

(I) N.E., 1788, pp. 33-37.

There are several references to Tamburini's works in the N.E. until 1799.

NEW DISCOVERIES ABOUT THE JANSENISTS IN NORTH ITALY

Ernesto Codignola has recently written much more extensively on Italian Jansenism.(I). His work is of exceptional importance for a study of this subject, revealing, as it does, so much material previously unknown. Jansenism, we know, can hardly be understood apart from the general picture of the Church as it emerged from the Council of Trent. Codignola reaffirms that it was a kind of revolutionary movement which had some analogy with Calvinism or Pietism. Its actions in Italy never went beyond the narrow orbit of the ecclesiastical world, but it was not a mere reflection of foreign inspiration with no original meaning. Its birth was certainly stimulated by ideas from across the Alps, but, from the first, it had its own peculiar characteristics and spontaneity which it kept to the end. Nor is it true that the movement flowered unexpectedly in the last years of the 18th century. It had a long history which began in the later years of the preceding century. Nor did it take its rise from Masonry, Illuminism or Jacobinism with which it has sometimes been confused, for it arose among enlightened Catholics.

-
- (I) Ernesto Codignola: His Carteggi di Giansenisti Liguri, Firenze, 1941-49, is in 3 large octavo volumes; the 1st volume has 678 pages plus 262 pages of introduction; the 2nd has 777 pages and the 3rd 913 including the index. The long introduction to the 1st volume gives much information about personalities; the remaining matter contains their correspondence, much of it rare or previously unedited, although many of the letters deal with a period later than that covered in this work. A smaller work by the same author is: Illuministi, Giansenisti e Giacobini nell'Italia del Settecento. Firenze. 1947. 380 pages.

It is established early in Piedmont. The attachment of a large part of the Piedmont clergy to the revolutionary cause in the Napoleonic period is an enigma, says Codignola, if it had not been preceded by a long period of preparation. After Rome, Piedmont was the region of Italy where first the spirit of Port-Royal, and then of Quesnellism, had deep roots and this was not limited to the humbler clergy. But Piedmont had no outstanding figures like Tamburini in Pavia or Ricci in Tuscany or a Molinelli in Liguria. But there were not wanting in Piedmont personalities who were outstanding in piety and culture, although these alone could not explain the doctrinal and polemical activity that was much in evidence. One must take into account the spiritual conditions during the reigns of Carlo Emmanuel iii (1701-73) and his son Vittorio Amadeo iv (1726-96) and the trend of their ecclesiastical policy, always ready to oppose the innovations of the Curia and the Jesuits. Vittorio Amadeo ii, the precursor of the reformers of the second half of the century "ne craignoit pas la tache de Jansénisme, et à qui il eût été difficile de rien apprendre sur les intrigues des Jésuites." (I). It was he who chose Francesco d'Aguirre as collaborator to spread the ideas of Port-Royal in Piedmont and entrusted to him the reform of the University of Turin; he also gave shelter to many who were persecuted for their religious opinions and gave chairs in the university to Port-Royalists and Appellants. But this was in the 18th century. Vittorio Amadeo inherited many ideas which were then wide-spread. The inspirers of the religious policy of the monarchy were men who appealed to a tradition which was indigénous, such as Cardinal Bona who died in 1674 and who had corresponded not only with Noris and Arnauld, but also with Gerberon whom V. Amadeo had invited, but without success, to occupy a university chair. Serry, a Sorbonne doctor,

(I) N.E., 6 mai, 1742.

was for a long time professor at Padua. He had close links with Quesnel and especially with Du Vaucel who was expelled from Padua in 1709 for defending Jansenist opinions. One of Serry's disciples, Pasini, was invited by V. Amadeo ii to teach in Turin and V. Amadeo had as his bedside book Duguet's Institution d'un Prince, a book much loved also by Leopald of Tuscany. After the condemnation of Bishop Soanen at the Council of Embrun, many sought refuge in Savoy. Another Jansenist sympathiser was Brouin, nephew of Serry, who was invited by the Bishop of Vercelli to teach theology in the bishop's seminary. On the death of Vittorio, however, his position was no longer safe under the new government. "Les fortes sollicitations des Jésuites, les différents avis donnés au Ministère de Turin par M. le Cardinal Fleury, de se méfier des François réfugiés pour cause de jansénisme; enfin la déclaration que lui fit un des Grands Vicaires de Verceil, qu'il ne seroit pas agréable au nouveau Gouvernement, le déterminèrent à postuler auprès du Provincial de Lombardie une Maison où il pût finir ses jours dans la solitude." (I). Codignola gives the names of many other Jansenist sympathisers in Piedmont. In the long reign of Carlo Emmanuel iii things were more difficult for the reformers, especially after Emmanuel's reconciliation with the papacy in 1741. None the less it proved possible to publish at Turin a translation of the Imitation of Christ and also some of Quesnel's and Gerberon's works. However, the flame kindled at the end of the 17th century and the beginning of the 18th was not extinguished. Prelates and priests, though not Jansenist in the strict sense, carried on their work, hoping for a radical renewal in the Church after the pattern of Port-Royal; they sympathised with the Church of Utrecht and were ^{much} attached to Holy Scripture and the Fathers. (2).

(I) N.E., 6 mai, 1742.

(2) For a list of such prelates, see Codignola, Illuministi ... pp. 17 sq.

Naturally the movement became much stronger under French influence. (I) Casati, who became Bishop of Mondovi in 1754, was a great supporter of the reforms which were to be undertaken at Pistoia. Caissoti, Bishop of Asti in Piedmont was another great supporter of Jansenism. Pagani, writing to Ricci in 1789, calls him a "gran luce in Israele". The Nouvelles Ecclésiastiques of 27th May, 1787 give him much praise. He was a man of great courage and exercised a considerable influence and was a typical representative of the religious struggles of the second half of the 18th century. Like many of the Piedmontese bishops, he had much sympathy with the Church of Utrecht. The Nouvelles Ecclésiastiques say of him: "Nous avons sous les yeux deux lettres de M. Asti à Clement xiv; la p.iere du 9 mai 1770; la 2e du juin 1774, remplies de zèle, pour que le St. Père rendit la paix aux Evêques de l'Eglise d'Utrecht. C'est ce que demandent (dit-il dans la dernière) les Evêques de diverses Nations, qui connoissent le courage de cette Eglise, et son admirable constance à conserver le dépôt de la foi." (2).

Codignola gives so many examples of clergy in Piedmont who were attached to Jansenist doctrine that one can dismiss any idea that Piedmont was unaffected. Men like Caissotti, Berta, Bertone were not different from Tamburiné and Ricci in morals, theology, problems of ecclesiastical policy and discipline, but it is true that, unlike their companions in other parts, they were forced to exercise some restraint. Emmanuel iii and Vittorio Amadeo iii would not have supported them as would Joseph ii and Leopold. More probably they would have been handed over to the Curia and the Jesuits. V. Amadeo had forbidden any discussion for or against the Bull Unigenitus and also any reference to the four Gallican Articles. Once the country came under French influence these men and their immediate successors found

(I) See Savio, op. cit., pp. 411, 434, 494, 760 etc.

(2) N.E., 22 mai, 1787.

the liberty they longed for even if their work had no lasting importance.

Tuscany was to become famous in the Jansenist struggle but during the ecclesiastical and political reaction which culminated in the 50 years' bad government of Cosimo iii, this was one of the regions of Italy which suffered with more passive indifference the clerical domination of the Jesuits. In 1737 the Comte de Richécourt wrote that "les menagements et les complaisances que la Maison de Medicis a toujours eû pour les papes aux quels elle doit pour la plus grande partie son elevation, a occasioné differents abus." (I) These abuses consisted in the wrongs of the Holy Office, the severe rule of the bishops and the established practice of giving way to the Curia in the appointment to benefices. P.Leopold's reforms were, however, prepared and made possible by the spontaneous intellectual revival among the middle classes and some of the nobility; it was indignant, yet strengthened by foreign influences, especially English and French. The centre of reform was the University of Pisa, which alone prevented Tuscany from sinking into the state of ignorance into which almost all Italy had fallen. From Pisa came the great reformers of the economy, administration and policy of Tuscany. There were, at the same time, signs of a religious revival which went back even into the 17th century, recalling such names as Noris who had written his Historia pelagiana and the Vindiciae augustinianae. Cosimo iii wanted him at Pisa University and in 1672 Quesnel wrote that Noris was "si connu par toute l'Europe pour sa profonde érudition et pour son zèle à la défense de S.Augustin" and added that his Historia pelagiana "mérite la reconnaissance de tous ceux qui

(I) E.Codignola, Illuministi, Giansenisti e Giacobini nell'Italia del Settecento. (see p. 173). p. 45.

ont à coeur la gloire de S. Augustin et de sa doctrine." (1). Noris taught at Pisa from 1677 to 1692 and, with others, was accused of Jansenism. There were others - leaders of a Catholic enlightenment - "falsi zelanti" as Ricci described them, and many others who were reformers without being easily assigned to either group, whom Codignola discusses in some detail. (2). Some of them seem to be aligned to the Jansenists in their opposition to the Jesuits, to papal absolutism and the Inquisition, and in their dealings with actual problems such as usury, the theatre, fasting, but who, although defending St. Augustine, did not consider him as the sole fountain of truth. They condemned avarice, ignorance, the worldliness of the clergy and the abuses of ecclesiastical jurisdiction. They had a high conception of the essentially spiritual function of the Church, of the value of culture and a regard for the directions of the modern state. They rejected superstitions, petty devotions and pious legends. For them, religion was a serious matter and holiness could not be separated from doctrine. Unlike the authentic Jansenists they looked sympathetically at philosophy, and Lami, for instance, had studied Locke and Leibniz. There is thus a gulf between a man like Lami and the pure Tuscan Jansenists such as Ricci, de Vecchi and many others. None the less, Lami did much to prepare the way for Leopold's reforms. These Catholics, says Codignola, were too much influenced by Locke and Montesquieu to be pure Jansenists. (3) Yet de Vecchi noted that they studied the Apostolic Fathers and the Epistles of St. Paul. Although they could not accept Quesnel's treatment of Grace, and condemned the miracles of the Abbé Paris, there was clearly some link, however slender, with the Jansenist position, and they upheld the Augustinian doctrine against the Jesuits. Lami, and others

(1) Jemolo, op. cit., p. 139. (2) Codignola, op. cit., pp. 50 sq.
 (3) Ibid. p. 55.

such as Niccolini and Cerati, wanted reforms in the education of the clergy, of the Bæviary and a reduction of Festivals and a greater knowledge of the Gospels.

Niccolini and Cerati, who were very near the Jansenists, had a great influence on the intellectual life of Tuscany in the earlier years of the 18th century. They were determined opponents of the Jesuits whom they accused of stifling freedom of study and they favoured a reconciliation with the Church of Utrecht. But they were hostile to any party spirit or theological dispute. In Rome, Niccolini met the Tuscan Jansenists Bottari and Foggini at the Archetto. Cerati (1690-1760) also exercised considerable influence in Tuscany. At first he had intended to become a Jesuit but instead joined the Oratory at Rome in 1708 where he gained some reputation. In 1733 he was invited by the Grand Duke to become Prior of St. Stephen's and inspector of the University of Pisa. He travelled extensively and had close contacts with scholars in France, England, Holland and Germany. In France he knew Montesquieu and Voltaire as well as Bishop Caylus, Boursier, Mesenguy and other Jansenists. While in Rome he was friendly with the people at the Archetto. Dammig (1), who writes from the official Roman Catholic point of view, has much to say about Cerati in his chapter on the Archetto; he asserts that with regard to ecclesiastical questions, the views of Cerati and Bottari were identical. (2). Codignola (3) questions this and draws a distinction between the Catholic 'illuminists' and real Jansenists. Earlier, Dammig, in trying to find a definition of Jansenism, said: "chi non riconosce la bolla Unigenitus, è un autentico giansenista." (4). But there were many Catholics, including prelates, who considered Unigenitus as the result of Jesuit interference in a bull which was bad in itself; but

(1) E. Dammig, Il Movimento Giansenista a Roma nella seconda metà del Secolo xviii. Città del Vaticano. mdccclv.

(2) Ibid. p. 122. (3) Codignola, op. cit., p. 63 n.

(4) Dammig, op. cit., p. 30.

they were not necessarily Jansenists. (I). None the less Cerati, and many like him, had such close contacts with the Archetto that suspicion would naturally be directed against them. Bottari had worked in Pisa before going to Rome and it seems clear that years before the Synod of Pistoia, the ideas which Ricci was later to put into effect, were already current in Tuscany.

It is interesting to read about the work of Fabio de Vecchi in Tuscany. He was made professor of Dogmatic Theology in 1777. Already in 1772 he had interested himself in an annotated translation of the New Testament, had revised a translation of Mesenguy's work on the Old Testament, was friendly with Tamburini and much interested in the Jansenist Church of Utrecht. He distributed Dutch works which Bellegarde procured for him and in November 1778 he sent to the Archbishop of Utrecht a remarkable letter of communion from the Genoese Jansenists and also persuaded his colleagues in the theological faculty to do the same. In January, 1781, Bellegarde wrote to Ricci: "On nous mande de Pavie que notre cher Comte de Vecchi, et ceux qui se sont joints à lui, il y a deux ans pour donner des temoignages de communion, sont de nouveau tracassés à ce sujet. Je desire fort de savoir si cela est vrai et en quoi cela consiste."(2). Leopold supported him as did Ricci to a large extent. Like Ricci, he was unable to see what discord would be caused by suddenly introducing changes in an attempt to return to primitive discipline. Vecchi attempted to abolish useless and profane oaths and sent a memorandum to the Grand Duke on these matters. He wanted to limit oaths to bare necessity. It was in the sovereign ruler's power to insist on this and so the nuncios and the bishops would be forced to interest themselves in these things, but Rome, says Ricci, had condemned already these good intentions by

(I) For Jesuit interference in the bull, see p. 96 note 4

(2) Codignola, op. cit., p. 98.

the Bull Unigenitus and Rome was ready to sacrifice everything rather than abandon a false position. Vecchi was accused of being a Jansenist because it seemed that in this matter of oaths he was reviving the condemned proposition 101 of the Bull Unigenitus. Vecchi found himself involved in many matters of discipline, such ~~as~~ as the solemnization of marriages in prohibited seasons, and although he had the support of the Grand Duke, the ruler's ministers offered resistance. At the Grand Duke's suggestion, Vecchi was able to assist Ricci in the formation of an Academy for the better instruction of the clergy. It was Vecchi's association with the Synod of Pistoia, where he was a leading adviser, which precipitated his break with Rome. He was also prominent in the abortive National Synod which the Grand Duke called in Florence in 1787. Vecchi died in 1821, a disappointed man.

THE WORK OF JANSENISTS IN ROME

Widespread as Jansenist ideas seemed to be, it was, however, Rome which was the real centre of the Jansenist movement in Italy. Recent studies, says Codignola, have established this fact. At Rome, and frequently among the learned hierarchy, including some of the popes, and in the Curia itself, there were strong defenders of Port-Royal, Arnauld, Pascal and of the Church of Utrecht, both before and after the condemnation. There were strong opponents of the Jesuit policy of Popes Albani and Clement xi which culminated in the Bull Unigenitus. It was in Rome, during the later part of the 18th century, that the Jansenist movement received its great encouragement. But it would be rash to infer that genuine Jansenism or any spirit of schism had affected the minds of the many theologians, cardinals and prelates merely because of the fact that they did what they could to prevent the condemnation of the Jansenists, Port-Royalists and Quesnellists, or because they showed some sympathy with their cause. In view of the varying opinions of historians, Codignola says, it is necessary to assert that the greater part of the defenders, open or concealed, (the latter more numerous than the former) of Port-Royal, etc., did not share completely the theological theses of the Jansenists, some because they had no love of controversy, some because they represented a different tendency. What seemed to link them with Jansenism was not so much the agreement in theological ideas, much less any sense of party spirit, but rather an irresistible moral impulse and a common aspiration to recover intellectual independence which had been stifled by fear of being accused of heresy. In short, the solidarity which some historians have discovered between people whose high position might have kept them from making suspect contacts and the exponents of the so-called Jansenist heresy, is seen not so much in identity of theological ideas as in a common hatred and disgust of the

slavery caused by Jesuit despotism and sometimes by the religious policy of the Holy See. In addition to the theological and historical scholars who were constantly subjected to unjust denunciation, not a few of the regular clergy (Oratorians, Augustinians, Benedictines, etc.) were exasperated by Jesuit treatment and they combined with the opponents of the Jesuits although they disagreed on some theological matters. The effort of liberation, born in the Renaissance, though incomplete, was none the less a creative movement and opened the way to many secular troubles. There was no outside force in a position to arrest it. For the moment, persecution was able to impede its advance, urged on by the more liberal Dutch, English and French, but neither the Jesuits nor the Inquisition were able to destroy, ~~ik~~ even in Italy, the creative impulse of revolutionary thought. The vindication of the claim for intellectual integrity, and for criticism, found refuge in the science of nature and historical learning, an apparently neutral ground where, none the less, writers were able to destroy traditional beliefs and discredit the principle of authority without breaking completely with traditional claims. In substance, says Codignola, (I) Galileo and his school, and Muratori and his followers, continued, in a more restrained way, the direction set by Descartes, Locke and Leibniz, but with regard to dogma they proceeded much more cautiously and discreetly in spreading the new mentality, especially in the universities and monasteries.

It was but natural that in Rome, the Capital, all the monastic orders and all currents of theological thought would find their place, and Rome had always been able to shelter moderate and tolerant students and theologians who were always eager to reconcile the

(I) Codignola, op. cit., p. 186.

faith with reason, and always inclined to admire independence of thought and to be weary of intolerance from any quarter. The close contact between the papal court and the easy compromise with worldly interests was bound to sharpen, in more liberal minds, a keen sense of repugnance of the Jesuit system and to increase the desire, not only for a reform which would restore primitive discipline, but also for a recognition that contrasting opinions might find their place in the Church. Such people were naturally allied to the new opinions; they encouraged reformers without necessarily sharing their theological opinions. There were others like-minded at the end of the 17th century who did their best to protect dissidents. The violent hatred of the Jesuits which was so universal in the second half of the 18th century was, therefore, no artificial phenomenon. It was the result of a long tension.

The destruction of Port-Royal, the condemnation of the Church of Utrecht and the persecution of Quesnel were links in a long chain of hatred against the Jesuits whose implacable hatred of any who did not share their opinions increased the number of Catholics who would not otherwise be affected by new theological thought. In such an atmosphere, and because of the vacillating policy of the popes until Pius vi, the spirit of rebellion was fomented and Jansenist opinions spread rapidly in Rome and elsewhere. Thus the so-called Jansenism is not, according to Codignola, the isolated revolt of a small group of dissenting theologians, as some assert, but a particular aspect of a phenomenon of much greater extent and which coincided with wider European movements. This interpretation is confirmed, so Codignola argues (I), by the fact that in other Catholic countries the Jesuits sought to accuse of heresy any innovators whom it was fairly easy for them to attack, and only a small number of those accused were convinced Jansenists.

(I) Op. cit., p. 189

Jansenists were already mixed with other scholars who did not share their opinions in Rome when the Augustinus and the Five Propositions were condemned. In the heart of Catholicism, in the very ante-chambers of the papacy and in the Congregation a fierce struggle was taking place of which Codignola gives examples.(I). In spite of the condemnation of the Augustinus in 1642 it was reprinted in Rome the next year and again in 1652. Jansenius' orthodoxy was defended in Rome in 1644 by two scholars who were invited from Louvain, Sinnich and Paepe. Arnauld's Fréquente Communion appeared in Rome in 1643 and this gave rise to a fierce struggle with the Jesuits. The Frenchman Bourgeois was invited to Rome to defend the work and he was followed in 1650 by Saint-Amour. Numerous converts were gained to the Port-Royalist cause through the arrival of several French missions among whom was Richelieu's nephew, Pontchâteau, in 1677. The condemnation of the Augustinus led many to doubt the good faith of Innocent and during the last 30 years of the century the reformers were protected by two influential people at the papal court - Agostino Favoriti, Secretary of the 'Cifra' and very much in the confidence of Innocent xi and also his nephew Lorenzo Casoni, neither of whom was a Jansenist. From 1682-1704 Casoni protected Du ^{Vaucel} Vaneé who was an active agent in Rome of the Quesnellists and the Dutch group. It is interesting to note how the affairs of the Church of Utrecht were debated in Rome. After Du Vaucel's flight from Rome, the Utrecht case was maintained by Maille, head of Cardinal Grimaldi's seminary and he was able to find additional supporters, among whom, later on, were Bottari and Degola. Thus the matter was becoming international. On the one hand were people like Mabillon, Gerberon, Arnauld, Quesnel; on the other hand the Italians like Cardinal Bona, Muratori and many others, Augustinians, Dominicans, Benedictines, professors at the Universities of Pisa and Padua. None of these

(I) Op. cit., pp. 190 sq.

Italians, not even the most suspected of them like Bona and Passionei, were pure Jansenists, although they were condemned as such by the Jesuits. They were all hostile to the Jesuits on whom lay the responsibility for the condemnation of Pascal, Arnauld and Quesnel. It was this condemnation which paved the way for the breaking away of the later Jansenists from any contacts with the papal court. This centrifugal movement, seen in the influence of the Jesuits on the papal court and its policy of centralisation and despotism, caused the reappearance of the struggle between bishops and popes, the claims of the parish priests, the appeal to a Council and the alliance with Gallicanism and the temporal power, all of which - besides aiming at bringing the Church back to a more primitive and spiritual state - led also to the idea of a national and independent Church as advocated, for example, by de Ricci and Degola. Yet between the earlier generation of Bona and Passionei and that of Bottari and Foggini, and between the latter and Tamburini, Ricci and Degola, there is not only a continuity but also a close link in ideals. But during the later period things had changed from the political point of view; the times were different and passions had become more embittered; the papacy and the reforming princes were engaged in their struggles over jurisdiction.

There had been some hope for the Jansenist sympathisers during the more liberal pontificate of Benedict xiv (1740-58); it was then more easy for them to translate Jansenist works and spread their ideas; there was greater confidence and aggressiveness in their public teaching and close contacts with their supporters in other parts of the country. But under Benedict's successor, Clement xiii, the pro-Jesuit policy of the Secretary of State, Torrigiani, increased the exasperation of the reformers and it was this policy which paved the way to the revolt of Italian Jansenism, which was attaching to

itself many types of people even outside ecclesiastical circles. The Archetto in Rome was not only a meeting place of Jansenists, but also of the intellectual aristocracy of Italian Catholicism, and became for a period of 30 years the headquarters of the reform movement. Bottari and Foggini were the leading characters and they were protected by several members of the Sacred College like Passionei, Corsini, Marefoschi, Solari and others. The influence of the Archetto was not confined to Rome. In Tuscany one of its greatest supporters was the learned priest the Marquis Niccolini, representative of the Catholic 'illuminationists' and also Canon Martini. At Pisa the Archetto could count on the Oratorian Cerati, a leading personality at the university who was well informed about the Jansenist controversies in France and Holland and a correspondent of foreign students whom he had met in his travels in France, Holland, England and Germany; he was also a keen promoter of the religious and intellectual revival.

Niccolini's successor at the University of Pisa, Fabroni, was also in close touch with the Archetto. At Bottari's suggestion, he translated the works of French Jansenists and continued Niccolini's work of intellectual revival. The reforming work at Pavia also had close links with the Archetto, for Natali, Tamburini, Zola and others had long been in collaboration with the movement in Rome. Not less close were the links in Turin, Naples, Genoa and even in Sicily. (I). For example, Lanze, Archbishop of Turin, was in confidential correspondence with Bottari and introduced to him in 1756 the fanatical adversary of the Jesuits, Le Gros.

Another correspondent from Piedmont with Bottari at the Archetto was Bentivoglio, Chaplain at the Court, an indefatigable distributor

(I) See Codignola, op. cit., p. 204

of Jansenist books and upholder of the ideals of Port-Royal. Three of the Piedmontese bishops adhered to the cause; they were in close touch with the Archetto and with the Church in Holland - Andujar, Bertone and Caissotti. Bottari also had his followers in Naples which became an active centre of opposition to the Jesuits. Tamucci was a famous personality there and it was in Naples that Mesenguy's Catechism was published in 1758-60.

Serrao, the reforming bishop of Potenza, who was murdered in the reaction of 1799, was won over to Jansenism during his stay in Rome through his connection with the Archetto. In Genoa, Venice and Sicily there were similar links with the Archetto. (I)

The point which Codignola is making is that it was Rome which was the real centre of Jansenist influence although he admits that in Piedmont there was an indigenous flowering of Port-Royalism. But it was in the very centre of Catholicism that the impulse of revolt against the Jesuits and the papal court took place. In Rome was formed and from Rome was dispersed throughout the peninsula a large and hardened band of men proclaiming a Christianity which was spiritual and true, men who wanted ecclesiastical reform and whose animosity towards the Jesuits was intense. All this was added to and greatly aided by the enormous amount of translations in the second half of the 18th century, and by the large number of foreign contacts; not only in France and Holland, but also in Spain and Portugal. The struggle for liberation reached its apex in Italy in the period which began with the pontificate of Benedict xiv to the end of that of Clement xiv. The Jesuits regained power under Clement xiii who published the Bull Apostolicum in 1765 in favour of the Jesuits in order to counteract the decree of the French king who had suppressed the order. But the Jesuit triumph was short lived for the papacy was totally unable to resist the

(I) Codignola, op. cit. pp. 206, 207.

pressure and Clement xiv was obliged to suppress the Jesuit order. But with the advent to the pontifical throne of Braschi in 1775 the heroic period of Jansenism in Rome came to an end. Papal indulgence and toleration ceased; papal reaction and intransigence culminated in the Bull Auctorem Fidei; nor was the Jansenist movement more successful, in the long run, elsewhere.

The Roman Jansenists no doubt considered themselves as good Catholics and followers of St. Augustine, but they were called heretics by their opponents. Many of the clergy regarded the Jansenists as a type of good Catholic who fought against the Jesuits; others saw them as a kind of fiction or phantom created by the Jesuits who needed some argument to maintain their position as defenders of the faith; others again saw the movement as a new form of Gallicanism which started in the 14th century; and yet others regarded it as a precursor of the Enlightenment and even of Jacobinism and Revolution. All this is not surprising, for it is always difficult to understand the past, especially where theology is concerned, for here prejudice can so easily affect the judgment; and Jansenism is a definitely theological phenomenon, concerned with one of the deepest mysteries of the faith - the Grace of God and the freedom of man.

Although dealing with an age-long problem, Jansenism was much affected by the errors of the time and this was particularly true of Italian Jansenism, especially at the time when it was centred in Rome. But was this true Jansenism? We have often quoted Codignola and it may be well to give the ideas of a quite different type of writer.

Dammig (I) writes that Jansenism in Rome, as in France, took its rise from a desire for reform, but it was fatal for the direction of the movement that its founders, Jansenius and Du Verger, Abbot of St. Cyran, after long years of study and discussion, drank from

(I) See page 179, and note I on the same page.

unorthodox sources, for their Louvain masters were followers of Baius and scorers of the scholastic system. It was therefore inevitable that Jansenism was hostile to the Church and had points of contact with Luther and Calvin. Each reformer, says Dammig, must ask himself two questions: (i) what is the cause of decadence, and (ii) how to bring about a reform. The founders of Jansenism saw one cause in scholasticism whose errors obscured the principles of Catholic doctrine; reform could be brought about only by a return to patristic study and austerity of living. This was a basic Jansenist principle. Jansenius, following the professors of Louvain, went back to St. Augustine but accepted Calvinist beliefs as the true doctrine of St. Augustine. This, Dammig maintains, was true of the whole Jansenist movement. The French Jansenists called themselves the disciples of St. Augustine but they did not understand him nor would they admit that Jansenius, Arnauld and Quesnel had misrepresented him and so they maintained that attacks against Jansenius were attacks against St. Augustine, who, for them, was the law for theologians and not the decisions of Rome. The Jansenists could not therefore admit that there is one living and immediate fountain of faith - the living ^{agi} ~~m~~ysterium of the Church which alone can interpret the Sacred Scriptures and Tradition. As the Protestants believe in the free examination of the Scriptures, so the Jansenists believe, in a somewhat more mitigated form, in freedom to examine tradition, and fundamental in their propaganda was the reading of the Bible.

Dammig then discusses the Jansenist doctrine of Grace which leads to the doctrine of predestination and this doctrine is clearly contained in the five condemned propositions, a doctrine which involves the belief that Christ has not died for all men. But the Jansenists themselves agreed with Rome in the condemnation, always insisting that the condemned doctrines were not to be found in

Jansenius' work, Was Jansenism then but a phantom created by the Jesuits? Dammig admits that the five propositions are never found unequivocally in the book.

Quesnel is the real pioneer of 18th century Jansenism. Pastor says that Quesnel was skilled in hiding error under words which were apparently innocent and pious, especially as most of the propositions admit of different explanations. (I). It is clear from the whole context that Quesnel interprets them in a Jansenist sense, but, detached from the context, the propositions can be interpreted more leniently. Quesnel had developed doctrines which had hardly been considered by Jansenius and it is Quesnel who is the real master of Jansenism in France, Holland and Italy, and this is confirmed, according to Dammig, by recent researches and is evidenced by the fact that the Synod of Pistoia recommended the public reading in Churches of Quesnel's New Testament. Not that dogma is always in the forefront of 18th century Jansenism, but it is certainly the inspiration of the movement.

In dealing with Jansenist morality, devotion and discipline, Dammig says much about rigorism. This aspect of Jansenism, he says, is most important. It commands the attainment of the highest perfection and it was this view of morality, rather than the dogma, which made the greater appeal in Italy. Just as the Jansenist doctrine of Grace was in opposition to Jesuit Molinism, so Jansenist rigorism was opposed to Jesuit probabilism and the whole system of casuistry, which, according to the Jesuits, showed a more humane tendency, an effort to make the way to heaven more easy; it was a more complete understanding of man as he is and of the difficulties with which he must struggle. But the moral ideas of the Jansenists were in sharp contrast and this was a development, for St. Cyran and Arnauld were more concerned with pastoral questions. It was Pascal who first

(I) Dammig, op. cit., p. 7. Dammig has many quotations from Pastor.

(L. von Pastor, Storia dei Papi dalla fine del Medioevo.

~~1858-1913~~ Roma. 1931-1934. Vol. 13-16.)

entered the lists with his Lettres Provinciales and this precisely because at the moment Jansenism was in great difficulty and needed a new advocate, and this was the salvation of Jansenism. Pascal was the man who seemed created for such a struggle with his brilliant style, his ability in discovering errors, his lack of scruple in accusing adversaries, in inventing false facts, in odious insinuations, the whole crowned with a biting irony skilfully used. He could not fail to win success. Quoting Pastor again, Dammig says that it was Pascal who started the horror of the so-called probabilism and laid the basis of the accusation that to the Jesuits the end justifies the means. (I). From then on, the opposition between the two parties did not diminish for more than a century; both sides fought bitterly and great damage was done to the reputation of the Jesuits, even among Catholic theologians.

The attack on probabilism had been preceded by an attack on the discipline concerning the administration of the sacraments, especially Penitence and the Eucharist. These new ideas were developed by Arnauld in his book on La Fréquent Communion, in which he laid down exaggerated conditions for their reception, thus making the sacraments available only to those who were leading a holy life. Quoting Pastor again, Dammig says that the Jansenists were inhuman, condemning most of mankind to eternal damnation. (2)

Jansenist zeal for reform is shown in many other ways; they were opposed to the excessive cult of the Virgin and the Saints; they wanted the Scriptures in the hands of the people, the Breviary and the Missal reformed, a greater severity in worship and a greater participation of the people in the Liturgy. The Church too, wanted

(I) Op. cit., p. 1.

(2) Ibid., p. 14

reform, but what distinguished the Jansenists was the violence of their procedures, their want of sympathy with the religious feeling of the people and their exacting demands, often in opposition to the Church.

But there were other matters in which Jansenism was involved and Dammig proceeds to discuss the question of Giurisdizionalismo. By this term Dammig does not mean so much the fixed relations between Church and State but rather the whole complex movement of living history such as it is seen in the various forms of caesar-papism, Gallicanism, Febronianism, Josephism, - which may also be considered as regalism or gallicanism in a broad sense, a delimitation between the civil and ecclesiastical power, which would endanger the divine constitution of the Church. According to Dammig, the early Jansenists would have been amazed at the attitude of their successors of the 18th century. Primarily the aims of Giurisdizionalismo were directed against the Holy See, often aided by the civil power and by certain bishops, each party struggling to increase its own activity in the ecclesiastical field. The influence of bishops is repressed as far as possible without forcing them into the arms of the pope. In addition, it is often found that bishops are opposed by the lower clergy, more for political and social reasons than for religious, seeking to increase their own rights in the Church and often supported by the civil power.

With regard to the attitude of Jansenists towards the papacy - its power and jurisdiction - one must remember that at that time papal infallibility had not been defined. But, says Dammig, this denial did not agree with Catholic doctrine. Even a doctrine not yet defined can possess a certain force, so that a contrary opinion cannot be accepted; such a contrary opinion should neither be taught

nor held without danger to faith and it fails in the dutiful submission to the authority of the Church. Infallibility of the pope was 'theologically certain'. (I) Jansenist beliefs presupposed that in the preceding centuries essential truths of the faith had been lost by the Church, but the Jansenist attitude was insincere when we consider the first decisions that Rome made against the new Jansenist doctrines. The Jansenists did not attack the decisions themselves, but tried to evade them by continual new subterfuges. This is a reference to the question of 'fact and law' which was so prominent a matter when the five propositions were condemned. Similarly, the Jansenist appeal to Gallican principles and to a General Council was quite incompatible with papal infallibility. Such Jansenist doctrine also militated against papal jurisdiction and from the beginning the Gallican Liberties constituted the strongest impediment against any successful proceeding on the part of Rome against the French Jansenists. Jansenist bishops made themselves independent of Rome and on their own initiative introduced reforms in the Liturgy and in worship. In Quesnel we see the union with 'giurisdizionalismo' carried to its completion and this union is one of the principal causes of the interest aroused by the Jansenists in Italy where the ground had long been prepared, in the doctrinal field by Sarpi and others, and in the political field by the different governments in north and south Italy. From then on, Jansenism never hesitates; against Unigenitus there is the appeal to a Council; in Holland there is ^{an} open rupture; Ricci hoped for a national Church in Tuscany; in France the Constitutional Church found its supporters in Jansenism. And yet, the Jansenists always maintained that they had no wish to separate from Catholic unity; they were the best Catholics.

(I) Dammig says nothing of the episcopal opposition to infallibility at the Vatican Council in 1870.

All this derives from Quesnel's conception of the Church - the Church of the elect. It follows that ecclesiastical authority has little meaning.

What was the Jansenist position with regard to the temporal sovereignty of the pope? Some historians see in Jansenism the roots of the Risorgimento. Doubtless there were some Jansenist influences, but the Jansenists did not deliberately aim at the Risorgimento any more than the French Jansenists were thinking of the French Revolution. Their principal interest was the reform of the Church and it remained so throughout the 18th century. Dammig admits that their orientation was religious, not political. Their sympathy with the French Revolution was because they hoped from it help in the reform of the Church. Their aversion to the temporal power of the pope sprang from the same cause because, as Ricci said, a triumph of the faith was impossible as long as the successor of the poor fisherman was at the same time heir to the magnificence of the Caesars. Even their close union with 'giurisdiz^{ion}alismo' seems to have no other motive. However much they loved to display their Gallican and Josephist ideas - so much so, says Dammig, that some historians find nothing in the 18th century Jansenism of their original theme - the most recent researches have shown clearly that their first ideas of reform were still dominant, although it is true that in the 18th century the jurisdictional tendencies were entering into a dogmatic-disciplinary programme of Jansenism. Thus Jansenism is another example of how a true reform can be realized only in collaboration with ecclesiastical authority, while at the same time wanting to realise that reform in opposition to that authority, and in this way divisions are caused in the Church. This Jansenist attitude towards the Church explains their hostility to the Jesuits who were the great allies of the papacy and so a mortal struggle became inevitable between the two reforming movements. But in Dammig's opinion the real struggle was not with

the Jesuits but with the papacy for the struggle was continued after the suppression of the Jesuits. To complete the picture, those bishops who were opposed to Jansenism had to endure the same attacks as the Holy See. They were met either by subterfuges or by open war. If, for example, the bishops threatened to deprive the rebels of the right to hear confessions - a delicate matter for the Jansenists - the reply was that for administering the sacrament of penance, priestly ordination was sufficient and no special jurisdiction was necessary. In France, the Jansenists were helped by the parlement, until at last the parlement obtained control of the party.

Under the influence of such tendencies, the ideas about the constitution of the Church became more radical. In the confusion aroused by the Bull Unigenitus, the idea was advanced that just as the pope in his decisions is bound by the consent of the bishops, so the latter are bound by the ~~666~~ parish priests and theologians; thus in the Synods of Utrecht and Pistoia, we find parish priests and theologians acting as judges in matters of faith. To revolutionize completely the constitution of the Church, only one more step was required - the placing of power in the hands of the laity; and this step was taken. It began with Quesnel; for the clergy to excommunicate, the approval of the whole Church was necessary. Next, the decisions of the Church and those of General Councils must have the approval of the laity. Of course, these ideas correspond with the spirit of the age, which glorified democracy and the sovereignty of the people and the Jansenists carried this idea into the Church itself. The Bull Auctorem Fidei, which condemned the Synod of Pistoia, placed these errors at the head of the condemned propositions. The Constitutional Church of France, which was the daughter of Jansenism, adapted itself without scruple to these democratic principles; beyond that it was impossible to go, for the hierarchical principle, given by Christ to

His Church, was completely overthrown. Jansenism prepared the way for the Enlightenment, for the Revolution and for its consequences.

Dammig refers to the Jansenist method of fighting. Leaving out of account any justification of Jansenism in the religious decadence of the day, two things made Jansenism a real danger. The first was the insincerity with which the Jansenists sought to hide their real thought. Quoting Pastor (I) he says that Arnauld ruins his great gifts of intelligence by inventing tricks and quibbles in which, under his direction, Jansenism is so rich. The second was its lively propaganda, with its centre at Port-Royal; the Jansenists were a closely allied party with their rules and statutes, and their translated works spread throughout Europe. Like the Reformation, Jansenism proved the power of printing, but in Italy its influence was less pronounced than in France.

Considered as a whole, Dammig finds ^{the} characteristics of Jansenism unpleasant; nevertheless, he admits that there were among them men of profound religious seriousness, men of lofty ideals. They were not always wrong in their criticisms and violence was not only on their side. He then returns to the question: What is Jansenism? Can a criterion be found? Two points must not be neglected. (i) Jansenism has undergone an evolution. It has not changed its position towards the Church. It remains the same in its desire for reform, in its fundamental errors in dogma, morality and discipline. But after the condemnations, the position was not seen so clearly. Instead of Jansenius' organic system, separate points were elaborated in an attempt to make it seem less dangerous. Then there is the union of Jansenism, first of all in France, with Gallicanism and later with the Enlightenment, so that the conception of Jansenism is no

(I) Dammig, op. cit., pp. 26, 27.

longer simple, but becomes confused. It is under this latter form that Jansenism enters Italy; it is Quesnellism in the garb of enlightenment, still the original doctrine, but in an ambiguous form.

(ii) What is the attitude of the Church towards Jansenism, dealing with what is, in substance an ecclesiastical-theological question and therefore decisive, even for the historian. Several official condemnations are given (I), also prohibitions of books. Against these decisions the Jansenists appeal to the fact that they are condemned 'en bloc' and therefore one cannot distinguish between what is heretical and what is not. The historian must not pass judgment without examining the papal documents, which Dammig proceeds to do, and then returns to the question whether there exists a criterion for establishing whether one is a Jansenist or not. Put in another way, is there any rule by which one can judge those circles sympathetic to Jansenism which we find in Rome in the second half of the 18th century? We can definitely discard as absolute criteria some of the errors advanced by Jansenists. One who supports 'giurisdizionalismo' in its various forms is not necessarily a Jansenist, although the 18th century Jansenists usually did uphold this theory. The same may be said about the theories regarding the infallibility and supreme jurisdiction of the papacy. An opponent of the Jesuits is not therefore a Jansenist. The historian must therefore be cautious, since Jansenists hid themselves under false banners. It is however, true that in its nature Jansenism is a theological-ecclesiastical movement which has developed errors in doctrine, morality and discipline. With regard to these errors, it is not easy to prove whether one is a Jansenist. Rigorism, for example, was supported in Catholic circles, but it was undoubtedly a product of Jansenist struggles.

(I) Dammig, op. cit., pp. 32, 33

The Church condemns only the extremes of either side. It is better to find support for the condemnations in the field of dogma, especially with regard to the doctrine of Grace and Justification. The Jansenists say that he alone is a Jansenist who defends the five condemned propositions, but since Jansenists did not defend these propositions, they therefore assert that Jansenism is a chimera; but the doctrine of the propositions is found in Quesnel and in other Jansenists to the end of the 18th century, not in the same form but with the same meaning, which is the important thing. Dammig asks whether those who rejected the condemnations were to be considered as Jansenists or insubordinates and answers that in Catholic circles the condemnation (e.g. Unigenitus) was always considered as a criterion for Jansenism. The Jansenists asserted that an appeal to a Council was not Jansenist otherwise the whole of France would be Jansenist because of the Gallican principles. But in this argument the Jansenists are speaking equivocally for they well knew that the name of appellant meant those who objected to Unigenitus. It is sufficient, says Dammig, to remember that all the popes, beginning with Clement xi considered the appellants as authentic Jansenists; even Benedict xiv, whom the Jansenists often claimed as favouring their cause, wrote to Cardinal Tencin, explaining why he (the pope) had not been able to reply to a letter of the Bishop of Soissons: "Et en effet qu'aurions-nous avancé en lui répondant? Nous ne pouvons que lui dire que sa doctrine est fausse, réprouvée, condamnée, en un mot janséniste, puisqu'il n'accepte la bulle Unigenitus qu'en termes entortillés et peu sincères." (I) And so, Unigenitus is the touchstone and Dammig expends many words to prove this conclusion. What is essential, he maintains, is to know the opinion of ecclesiastical authority.

(I) Dammig, op. cit., p. 36

Although the main part of Dammig's book is concerned with Jansenism in Rome, it was thought to be worth while to give his impressions of Jansenism in general. In dealing with Jansenism in Rome he discusses interestingly many of the characters we have already met elsewhere and adds much additional material about them. In his summing up he makes an estimate of the character of Jansenism in Rome where the fundamental characteristics of Jansenism are found, namely the necessity for a radical reform of the Church, especially in the realm of doctrine into which, during the centuries, new ideas had infiltrated. In their view it was the Jesuits who had ruined the Church with their dangerous innovations; seeking always to increase their power they were hostile to every change for the better. Their total annihilation was the only way to help the Church. But this was on the surface; the Jesuits were the great supporters of ecclesiastical authority and the real struggle was directed against the Holy See; and since reform could not be realised in accord with this highest ecclesiastical authority, it must be realised in opposition to it, and, if necessary, some of that authority must be sacrificed. For the defence of their own claims, the temporal powers could not wish for better champions, and such champions were found in some of the prelates and cardinals at Rome. Dammig says that Tanucci had assured people that he was urged to fight for the truth, for justice and the privileges of his king, through the advice of Bottari. In Roman circles, an unlimited control by the civil powers in ecclesiastical affairs was considered necessary. Every step taken by the Holy See is criticised adversely; encyclicals and bulls are covered with scorn; no heed is taken of the censorship of books. Even Port-Royal and Utrecht would have been content with the ideas of these Roman Jansenists on infallibility

and the Roman supremacy. In Dammig's opinion, there is little difference between the Roman and the French Jansenists, and little real difference between the earlier Jansenists in Rome and the later Jansenists who came under the influence of men like Tamburini and Ricci. One cannot speak of a pre-Jansenist school. Dammig admits, however, that some of the men who associated with Bottari were not true Jansenists, and he realises that he is not in agreement with other Italian writers on Jansenism.

SCIPIONE DEI RICCI (1741 - 1810)

By far the most important personality of the Jansenist movement in Italy was Scipione dei Ricci, Bishop of Pistoia, famous in ecclesiastical history because of the Synod of Pistoia in 1786. (1). Carreyre, a great authority on Jansenism, whose three large volumes (2) on Jansenism under the Regency have already been noted, begins his long article on the Synod of Pistoia (3) with these words: "Au xviiie et surtout au xviiiie siècle le jansénisme et le gallicanisme furent intimement liés. Le Synode de Pistoie est l'aboutissement logique de leurs doctrines combinées et la bulle Auctorem fidei, la préface du Concile du Vatican, qui donnera le coup de grâce au gallicanisme." This remark stresses sufficiently the importance which must be given to the Synod of Pistoia and to Ricci. Ricci's teaching does not differ from that already discussed, except that at Pistoia more importance was given to practical problems, the patrimonial ordering of the Church, the number

(1) There is ample material for the study of Bp. Ricci and his Synod. What follows is drawn largely (in addition to other books already mentioned) from:-

N. Rodolico, Gli amici e i tempi di Scipione dei Ricci.
Firenze. 1920.

L.J.A. de Potter, Vie et Mémoires de Scipion de Ricci.
Bruxelles. 1825. 3 vols.: Paris. 1826. 4 vols.

Memorie di Scipione de Ricci. Ed. by A. Galli. Florence.
1865. 2 vols.

Les Nouvelles Ecclésiastiques .

Actes et Décrets du Concile diocésain de Pistoie de 1786,
traduits de l'italien. Pistoie. 1788.

Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique.

Pietro Savio, Devozione di Mgr Adeodato Turchi alla Santa Sede.
Rome. 1938. An important, but apparently rare book.

(2) See p. 61

(3) In D.T.C., vol. xii, col. 2134.

of priests and the conferment of ecclesiastical offices; greater attention is paid to liturgical matters and to the priestly office; greater regard is sometimes paid to the directions of the civil power than to the discipline of the Church. French influence is more direct and more immediate than at Pavia and French writers are translated rather than as serving as foundation for further study. Ricci made use of French friends to compile a new breviary and missal. There was, too, a difference in the surroundings. Pavia was one of the most famous university towns of Italy, especially during the reign of the Emperor Joseph ii. Pistoia, on the other hand, was the seat of a small bishopric of little importance. But it was under the protection of the Grand Duke who was determined to legislate in even the smallest details. There was a difference, too, in the central figures. Tamburini was an outstanding personality and noted for his learning. Ricci was much less imposing as a theologian and Jemolo (I) suggests that if it had not been for his patrician birth and the protection of Peter Leopold who found a willing servant in Ricci to advance Leopold's claims to interfere in all matters, private and public, Ricci would have remained a modest member of the Jansenist movement. But Jemolo has a poor opinion of Ricci; there is no doubt that Ricci was outstanding for courage and for being the rallying point of the Italian reformers.

Rodolico stresses the importance of the many letters which Ricci had from foreign and Italian Jansenists, some known, many unknown. Rodolico studies the Ricci documents preserved in Florence and this rich material served to illustrate the life of Ricci and the changes in his diocese between 1780-1790, and much of this material was written by Ricci himself. The youthful period of his life explains something

(I) Op. cit., p. 351.

of the Italian characteristics of Jansenism. But it was French influence, especially his correspondence with Bellegarde which explains best his considerable French library. First intellectual France, then revolutionary France, brought the politico-religious problems before the minds of Italian Jansenists. French Jansenism had tried to solve these problems. The problems of the Constitution civile du Clergé agitated the minds of the Italians and Ricci was one of the most ardent supporters of the Constitution civile du Clergé. It was in 1796 that Jansenism entered the political life of Italy, siding with the Republic. The Treaty of Tolentino in 1796 marked the first breach in the temporal power of the papacy. Italian Jansenism had its share in this. Such problems are discussed by Rodolico, but they carry us beyond our immediate aim.

De Potter's work is based on autograph manuscripts and private documents of Ricci and he records in no unsparing language the scandals and abuses of the period. Ricci, he tells us, was an ardent reformer when³ reform was urgently needed. De Potter quotes Ricci as saying: (I) "J'ai pensé que l'amour de la justice et de la vérité rendait indispensable la rédaction de ces mémoires. J'étais le seul qui pût raconter certains faits importants et mettre au jour quelques documens, qui avaient jusqu' alors été généralement ignorés, ou sur lesquels on avoit le plus grand intérêt à garder le silence." De Potter is hostile to the papacy. The Catholic Religion - as it was disfigured by the popes - was incompatible with good government. The Jansenists resolved this question in a large part of Europe by their insistent opposition to religious despotism. Determined to remain Catholic, they refused to submit to an implacable enemy who considered them as rebels. In France, the Paris Parlement had to fight against king and government. Enlightened princes, too, saw the necessity of separating the spiritual power from the temporal and

(I) L.J.A. de Potter, Vie et Mémoires de Scipion de Ricci.
Paris. 1826. 4 vols. p.iii of Préface to vol. 1.

aiming at forming a national clergy, keen on the reform of worship and cooperating with the government to uphold the morality of the people. In the Austrian States and in Tuscany, the sovereigns themselves led the movement for a total reorganisation of the social and spiritual order, a movement which was ruined by the opposition of nobles and clergy. Such a prince was Leopold, Duke of Tuscany, who found a willing collaborator in Bishop Ricci.

The work by Pietro Savio is of the greatest importance. After dealing with the life of Mgr. A. Turchi, the book contains a collection of 677 letters and documents copied from the papal archives. The letters are not in chronological order and the Index needs to be consulted for the references to various personalities. The chapters give indications of Jansenism in different regions of Italy. Apart from the index, the book has 1045 pages and by itself would provide sufficient scope for an extensive study of this subject. The correspondence tells us much about Ricci and some of the information takes us into the 19th century.

In the hospitable home of Bottari, Prefect of the Vatican Library in Rome, there gathered in the afternoons of the autumn of 1757 a body of learned people, mostly Tuscans; Cardinal Corsini, Martini, Niccolini, Foggini. Amongst them was a youth of 16, a student at the Roman seminary, Scipione dei Ricci. He was born in Florence in 1741 of an ancient Tuscan family, noted for its independence. Contrary to the wishes of his mother and of the priest who had been his teacher, young Scipione was sent, when 15 years old, to Rome to study under the Jesuits. Certainly the Jesuit Fathers would have been indignant if they had known that one of their pupils frequented the Archetto, as Bottari's house was called and which was believed to be a den of Italian Jansenism. They were not real Jansenists, but sincere Catholics; they disapproved of the ostentatious conduct of some Jansenists which led them to fear a breach in the unity of the Church. But they disliked their condemnations and persecutions and were strongly opposed to the Jesuits and to their moral

theology and political conduct; they desired peace for the Church, a better education for the Italian clergy and a purification of the Church from superstition. They did not consider Jansenist doctrine to be heretical, but wished for its reconciliation with the papacy. Gazier (I) gives the impression, however, that in France, Bottari was considered a great friend of the Jansenists.

It was in the house of Bottari (come il capo di quei essi tacciano di giansenisti) that the young Ricci began to be disillusioned with Jesuit teaching, although the break was to come later. Yet he had respect for some of his Jesuit teachers and at one period he announced to his family that he intended to become a Jesuit, thinking, as he says, that becoming a Jesuit gave one a passport to Heaven. Later he recorded: "Un passaporto di tal natura non poteva trascurarsi da uno che desiderava di assicurare la eterna salute, ma nel tempo stesso mancava di lume per conoscere la vanità e la insussistenza di quella tessera." (2).

Some of the characters of the Archetto stand out clearly, The most bitter enemy of the Jesuits was Niccolini, a man of great learning, influence and wealth. He attacked the Jesuit political system and the superstitions of the faithful and ardently longed for a reform of the Church. Carlo de Brosses wrote of him: "Il serait parvenu à tout ce qu'il aurait voulu, s'il ne se fût cassé le cou, de dessein prémédité, par son extrême liberté de langue, qui il (sic) l'a fait passer par janséniste, en quoi sans doute on lui a fait tort; car il n'est rien de tout cela." (3)

Another was Foggini, librarian of the Corsiniana, "dotto in storia sacra, ma al tempo stesso apologeta della dottrina agostiniana sulla grazia." (4). Not as bitter towards the Jesuits as Niccolini and Bottari, he was anxious for reform. He knew the Ricci family and kept up

(1) Op. cit., vol. 2, p.110. (2) De Potter, op.cit. vol.1,
p. 17, note.
(3) Rodolico, op. cit., p. 5 (4) Jemolo, op. cit., p. 114.

regular correspondence with them. He attacked various miraculous impostures and remarked on the difficulty of finding pious, learned and prudent bishops. His influence was great on both Ricasoli and Ricci and when Ricci became a bishop he modelled himself on Foggini. Foggini had an idea of forming an Academy in order to stimulate learning and morality and he thought they would be much helped by the excellent French material which could be translated, especially from Paris and Luçon. He recommended the idea to Ricci and it was carried out by the young friends of Foggini. "Si tradussero opuscoli francesi; e con le opere francesi quei giovani acquistarono amicizie di dotti ecclesiastici stranieri, giansenisti, o amici di costoro. Dieci anni più tardi la diffusione di opuscoli sarà maggiore per opera della stamperia pistoiese; e degli amici stranieri l'abate Bellegarde, conosciuto dal Ricci a mezzo del Foggini, sarà il partavoce degli Appellanti di Utrecht, sarà uno degli amici più cari del vescovo Ricci, il divulgatore degli Atti del Sinodo pistoiese tra i fedeli della Francia e della Fiandre." (I). Foggini was already indicating the skirmishes in which the Jansenists would later be so furiously involved.

Cardinal Corsini, a patron of learning, was another who was hostile to the Jesuits and to him many anti-Jesuits dedicated their writings. (2). Ricci met him in Bottari's house and Corsini was, in some measure, responsible for Ricci's appointment to Pistoia. But the influence of the Archetto on Ricci was not immediate. This was seen later, after his return to Florence, but while in Rome he kept in touch with its members. He had gone to Rome to be with his paternal uncle, Lorenzo Ricci, the last General of the Society of Jesus, who was destined to die a prisoner after the suppression of the Order. It was at this period that Ricci desired to become a Jesuit. "Essere sicuro della salvazza eterna

(I) Rodolico, op.cit., p.9. (2) Jemolo, op.cit., p.104.

chi seguira Sant'Ignazio." But on the advice of his mother's confessor he was recalled to Florence where he soon lost his vocation. In Florence he renewed the ideas of the Archetto. To please his parents he studied law at Pisa and took his doctorate four years later, but abandoned the law at the age of 25 in order to be ordained. He studied at the Benedictine monastery at Florence where Augustinian doctrine and morality were taught. Ricci wrote of his training: "In questo corso di teologia la dottrina di Sant'Agostino vi er^a sostenuta con tutto il vigore, ma il ~~xx~~ rispetto a certe decretali e il timore di offendere le pretensioni della Corte romana non permisero a quei dotti monaci di dare tutto quel che forse pensavano, ma che le circostanze non permettevano." (I).

But this fear of offending Rome was soon abandoned. Ricci was ordained priest in 1766 and was soon named Canon and 'auditeur' at the Tuscan nunciature. A few years later, in 1772, he inherited the rich library of Canon Corso dei Ricci and at the same time began to work with Canon Antonio Martini (not the same person as Antonio Martin^a who was Archbishop of Florence). Both these facts were important. Corso dei Ricci, although a brother of the last Jesuit General and in early days educated by them, was hostile to the Jesuits. He spent part of his considerable fortune in buying books which he distributed widely. They were books of solid piety; in his collection were the famous letters of Dinelli, under the name of Eusebio Evaristo, which played an important part in the suppression of the Jesuits. More important was the influence of Martini, an older man than Ricci, but both were attached to the nunciature at Florence. Under his guidance, Ricci learned to question the genuineness of the Decretals and the false consequences derived from them. Martini was very learned in the problems of the 18th century, especially in the vicissitudes of Unigenitus and the Jansenists. He was in Rome when the persecution was acute and exerted himself as an

(I) Rodolico, op. cit., p. 16.

intermediary between the Gallicans and the Curia. A visit to Rome, when there was a suggestion of his entering the Prelature, only served to make Ricci more hostile to the cabals and intrigues which he saw there. De Potter quotes him as follows: "S'il est quelqu'un qui ait réussi à conserver son honneur et à rester chrétien, après être entré dans la carrière de la prélature, je soutiens que c'est un rara avis in terris." (I)

From Rome Ricci went to Naples where he made friends with Serrao, later Bishop of Polenza, who shared his opinions. Ricci was soon appointed Vicar-General of the Archbishop of Florence, a bishop who earlier was a reformer and a regalist, but had been won over to the Jesuit side. In Florence, Ricci's Jansenist sympathies became very evident. There, in addition to Martini, he met other learned people who were interested in Jansenist teaching. In the bookshop of Rigacci and in the library of Riccardi he met such people as Giovanni Lami. "Molte ore del giorno si consumavano nello studio ... profittando della conversazione del dott. Giovanni Lami nella libreria Riccardi." (2). Here Ricci found again that liberal catholicism which he had first met in Rome. Lami was one of these great liberal theologians. He had travelled a great deal in Europe, had learned much from foreign ecclesiastics and was ashamed of the ignorance of the Italian clergy. On his return to Italy he gave himself up to study. After some years at the University of Pisa he was appointed consulting theologian to deal with the problems of jurisdiction which were troubling the Regency government. He was editor of the Novelle letterarie from 1740-1767 and this gave him ample scope for propaganda, for hostile criticism and discussion of theological problems. Lami thus represents a group of Italian theologians who were sympathetic to Jansenist ideas, admiring their doctrine and austerity but disapproving of anything that attacked the papacy or threatened the unity of the Church. "Era un primo passo: la generazione che segue farà col Ricci

(I) De Potter, op. cit. vol. 1, p. 27

(2) Rodolico, op. cit., p. 21

altri passi avanti." (I)

These were the older men who were friends of the younger Ricci; their ardour will express itself more clearly 20 years later when Ricci became Bishop of Pistoia. Apart from this learned ecclesiastical circle, Ricci found in the political life of his country other elements which were to sharpen his political and religious thought. The Lorraine rule was firmly established in Tuscany. Its ministers made political reforms.

Ricci admired the work of the minister Rucellai, his struggles with the Curia, his laws on mortmain, the suppression of the Tribunal of the Holy Office (the Inquisition) and his institution of the Exequatur, forbidding decrees from Rome without royal authority. Rucellai's schemes for the reform of the Church and State were circulated for discussion. His method was to go back to origins, to trace developments and alterations, a method which Ricci was to follow later. The years 1760-1780 were years of strained relations between Church and State. Maria Theresa, aided by Kaunitz and Italian ministers, attacked ecclesiastical privileges and suppressed monasteries; political reforms were made in Parma which affected the Church; du Tillot, the minister at Parma, even broke off relations with Rome. Rodolico tells how the news that the papacy had lost Avignon was well received in Florence, (2) and the suppression of the Jesuits was hailed with joy. Ricci was a member of this group which believed that with the aid of princes and good laws, the reform of the Church would be possible. An ecclesiastical review - La Gazzetta ecclesiastica - was published in Florence in 1776, advocating such reforms and dealing with the problems of Church and State, their relationships and their limits, the light that Church history could throw on these questions, false documents and decrees "così noi non avremmo prestato fede a tanti scritti falsi a tante decretali attribuite ai primi papi; insomma a tante menzogne." (3). The review attacked the ignorance and

(I) Ibid. p. 26

(2) Ibid. p.32

(3) Ibid. p. 34

laziness of the regular clergy. Many monasteries should be turned into schools and hospitals and the inmates forced to do some useful work in society.

A more serious problem was the relation between Church and State. The limits must be clearly drawn. Marriage must be a state contract. Rodolico adds: "Sarà questo argomento trattato e poi risolto dai Gian-senisti francesi durante la Rivoluzione francese." (I). The last numbers of the review attacked ecclesiastical mortmain. The Church does not possess goods by divine authority but by the permission of princes and so princes can withdraw such rights, quoting from St.Cyprian, St.Chrysostom and St.Ambrose. The review was suppressed after six months; Ricci was one of its readers.

Letters which passed between Ricci and his friend Ricasoli tell us something of him before he became a bishop. They show his zeal for study, his severity in dress, his debt to French writings on theology, especially those dealing with the doctrine of Grace. This moral rigidity, which corresponds with the rigid simplicity required in worship, was a characteristic of Jansenism and was certainly one reason which turned Ricci and his friends towards the Jansenists. Letters to another friend, Baldovineti, in 1774, expound the tendencies which will be seen later when, as bishop, Ricci attempted liturgical reforms. While still at Florence, Ricci and Ricasoli, urged on by the government, had founded an Academy. To fulfil such a task, de Potter quotes him as saying that he wished to consult friends from Paris and Utrecht and elsewhere, from whose colleges had come so many zealous and learned priests. In the Academy friends met on Monday in each week. Their discussions dealt mainly with the Epistles of St.Paul; the aged Canon Martini was their adviser. The Gazetta ecclesiastica said that their zeal for "la buona morale cristiana, l'onore della patria e del clero ha riunito alcuni dei più probe e più eruditi ecclesiastici

(I) Ibid. p. 35

di questa città." (I) It is recorded in Ricci's correspondence to Baldovinetti that the Academy produced a translation of the Storia ecclesiastica, i.e. the Histoire ecclésiastique of Bonaventure Racine. Ricasoli paid the expenses. The Grand Duke accepted the dedication and Rodolico adds that this served as a means of avoiding any displeasure of Rome at the translation of Jansenist works. Clearly Ricci was well acquainted with these Jansenist writings. His letters record the theological works of France and Germany. He frequently translated the letters of Bellegarde in order to make them known to Baldovinetti, and Bellegarde gave Ricci much advice about the best books to be consulted. There was no doubt in their minds about the orthodoxy of these works. For Ricci and his circle, these writers were like the Catholics of early days. "Egli (Ricci) nella sua coscienza di cattolico non avrà scrupoli nel considerare i Giansenisti e gli Appellanti, non come eretici, ma quali ardenti e illuminati cattolici, semplici e rigidi nel culto, pazienti infelici perseguitati, come l'amico carissimo, l'abbate Bellegarde." (2)

Something has already been said about the influence of French literature on the Italian Jansenists but as we approach the period of Ricci's episcopate, something more might be added. We have seen that years before the French Revolution and before Napoleon's descent into Italy, other revolutionary ideas had entered Italy, a revolution not in political ideas but in the life of religion. France had close links with Utrecht where the Church had broken with Rome and where many French Jansenists had sought refuge. The old spirit of Port-Royal had found a home in Utrecht. From both France and Utrecht these ideas penetrated into Italy. Bellegarde has already been noticed in this connection. It was he who sent hundreds of letters and books to Ricci, manuals of theology and catechisms, which found their way to seminaries and dioceses, works to be translated and printed at Pistoia and works on ecclesiastical reform. "Il Bellegarde

(I) Ibid. p. 43.

(2) Ibid. p. 47

insomma è uno di quei divulgatori d'idee, che la Francia ha sempre avuto, efficacissimi, specialmente nel secolo xviii, uno di quei divulgatori, che precede, ho detto, gli emissari della Rivoluzione."(I) Rodolico says that although the French Jansenists coming into Italy were very different from those who would come later under the Republic, they were none the less involved in political problems. For they were imbued with a zeal for reformation, were democratically opposed to the autocracy of Rome and so became involved in the Italian Revolution. They upheld the rights of princes against clerical privileges and thought that in a democratic state a religious reform would be easier and that liberty and religion could be reconciled. Bellegarde's friendship with Ricci began in 1774 when he was a guest of Canon Martini. The Archetto group were occupied with the problems confronting the Church and the friendship between the French and Italian parties was deep. From Bellegarde the aged Canon Martini heard of the troubles of the Church of Utrecht and the conversations fired the imagination of Ricci and confirmed him in his adhesion to the Church of the appellants. Thousands of volumes, at great cost, and by various routes, were sent to Italy and dispatched to Ricci, especially during the time when he was bishop. By various economies, Ricci was able to amass a great number of books. Many of the parcels he received often contained several copies of the same work and these Ricci distributed to poor clergy, seminarists, monks and laymen. His great desire was to reach the second order of the clergy who were most in touch with the people. "Io credo necessario inondare il paese di buoni libri. Io non mi stanco a farne venire continuamente, ma il commercio, come Ella vede, è tutto passivo. Sicchè nella idea che ho con l'annuenza del R.Sovrano di formare una piccola scelta di buoni libri, troppo utile mi sarebbe una nuova stamperia." (2). Ricci wrote this to the Secretary of the Grand Duke, begging him to help set up

(I) Ibid. p. 54

(2) Ibid. p. 57

this printing office. The people must be taught. Bellegarde was a great help to him. On Ricci's appointment as Vicar-General of Florence, Bellegarde wrote to him: "J'espère de la bonté toute puissante de Dieu, qu'il se servira de vous pour faire du bien dans ce diocèse, et surtout pour y renouveler dans le clergé l'esprit de science et de piété, si nécessaire pour l'instruction et la sanctification des fidèles. S. Charles Borromée trouva sa (sic) diocèse dans un état pire que celui de Florence, et néanmoins quel bien n'y fit-il pas? Ne vous découragez pas, Monsieur." (I) In his Pastoral of 1782 Ricci said that ignorance prepares the way to incredulity.

In the second half of the 18th century, during the keen struggle between Church and State, the State was anxious to form ecclesiastical institutes and schools of theology. Princes spared no expense in founding new professorships and helped the diffusion of books dealing with ecclesiastical matters. In all Catholic states, says Rodólico, (2) where the rulers, as in Italy, were trying to limit the interference of the Church in matters of state, there was need of ecclesiastical studies and an informed opinion. Bellegarde wrote to Ricci in 1777: "L'Italie et l'Allemagne s'instruisent aujourd'hui bien plus solidement qu'il y a 40 ou 50 ans. Vous l'avez (vu) le progrès que la bonne doctrine avoit fait en Portugal. La mort du dernier Roi et la disgrâce du Marq. de Pombal faisoit craindre que sous le nouveau régime l'erreur ne reprit sa place, je viens néanmoins de recevoir une lettre de Lisbonne avec quelques nouveaux ouvrages publiés cette année même par le théologien de la Cour, Pereira, qui prouvent la contraire ... il travaille à une traduction du N. Testament en portugais d'après les meilleures sources. Dieu veuille continuer à protéger cet excellent théologien, On va faire imprimer un traité de la Grace ...; il a pour auteur un des meilleurs théologiens de la France, M. Gourlin." (3). In another letter Bellegarde talks

(I) Ibid. p. 58

(2) Ibid. p. 59

(3) Ibid. p. 60

of similar movements in Germany, Austria, Belgium and France. Everywhere French, German and Latin works are being translated and a real exchange of ideas and teachers is taking place, favourable to the reforming princes. Peter Leopold of Tuscany, one of the 'enlightened Princes', with whom Ricci had close connections, supported this work of translation, even before Ricci became Bishop of Pistoia. Leopold welcomed the dedication of the translation of Racine, aided the circulation of Gourlin's Institution chrétienne, laid the plans for an ecclesiastical Academy and followed with much interest the Nouvelles Ecclésiastiques. From about 1779 the Nouvelles Ecclésiastiques gave much attention to Italy and details about Italy are numerous from this time on. It was Bellegarde who introduced the Nouvelles Ecclésiastiques to Ricci. The Grand Duke welcomed the publication of the works of the appellants in defence of the Church of Utrecht. Later, Bellegarde told Ricci of a correspondence between the Grand Duke and the Archbishop of Utrecht. In one of these letters, a rough draft of which was submitted to Ricci, the Archbishop thus addresses himself to the Archduke: "Son amour pour la religion, son zèle pour l' instruction solide des peuples soumis à son gouvernement, la sagesse à laquelle Elle travaille à maintenir dans les Eglises de ses Etats les mœurs et la discipline les plus conformes à l'esprit de J.C., la protection qu'Elle accorde à ceux de ses sujets ecclésiastiques les plus pieux et les plus éclairés ..." All, concludes the Archbishop, makes us hope for the protection of the Church which has not wished "sacrifier la saine doctrine et le gouvernement épiscopal aux ennemis de l'une ~~de~~ et de l'autre." (I) All this, says Rodolico, came from French sources.

Duguet's L'Institution d'un Prince is mentioned in Ricci's Memorie as a golden book. Duguet was an appellant, an Oratorian and a friend of Quesnel. He died in 1773. When Bellegarde was congratulating Ricci on his appointment to Pistoia Bellegarde advised him to study the works of Duguet, especially his Traité sur les devoirs d'un Evêque. Bellegarde had

(I) Ibid. p. 62

Duguet's works brought to Italy and among them his L'Institution d'un Prince, which would have been of great interest to the Grand Duke. Joseph ii's creation of the Theological School at Pavia set an example to Peter Leopold who wished to set up similar establishments in Florence, Sienna and Pisa. Ricci was given the task and felt the need of help from his French friends. The Florentine Academy was made possible through the suppression of the Olivetian monastery of Pistoia which was no longer a place of serious religious activity. Ricci was to experience much difficulty with unruly monasteries in his diocese. He received considerable help from his French friends, and Dutch also, who furnished him with a liberal choice of books. After 1783 the sending of books from France became more frequent. The Academy was to be the great spiritual centre of devotion and learning and Ricci records that works on predestination, Divine Grace and the works of St. Augustine formed a large part of their library, all of which were studies dear to the heart of Jansenists. The French influence on these academies spread to other dioceses in Tuscany whose bishops were friendly with Ricci and Bellegarde. One such bishop was Pannilini who gave a catalogue of works which he had obtained from France, including Bossuet, de Sacy, Du Pin, Fleury, Racine, Le Gros (especially his De Ecclesia) and the works of Port-Royal. In this way they could counteract the doctrines of the Sadducees and Pharisees, Molinism and the teaching of Hildebrand which were a "cancroena serpeggiando" in the heart of the Church. Great praise was given to Opstraet's Pastor Bonus which was translated into French and widely read in Italy through Ricci's efforts. His appeal to antiquity and his opposition to papal infallibility appealed to Ricci; the book was put on the Index in 1776. Works of Quesnel and Le Gros, dealing with the appellants and their appeal to a General Council were in great demand and Ricci printed the Four Gallican Articles of 1682. These latter formed the basis of the programme of Leopold

and Ricci, Thus, if only for a short time, Pistoia was the continuator of French Jansenist writings.

The religious instruction of the people was one of Ricci's great ideals and the translation of French books into the vernacular was one of his main concerns. A good diocesan catechism was essential. The one in general use in Italy was Bellarmine's, which was Jesuit in tone, The Jansenists paid much attention to the publication of catechisms and, in order to combat Bellarmine's, the catechism of Colbert was introduced into Italy. (1). This was in 1717 at a time when the Archduke of Tuscany was ^{the} a fanatical Cosimo iii and as the catechism bore the name of an appellant bishop, the effort was not a success. 50 years later, Bellegarde recommended to Ricci, who at the time was Vicar-General of Florence, the Catechism of Goumlin and when Ricci became bishop, he suppressed Bellarmine's work and substituted that of Goumlin, an appellant who had published in 1720 Les Appellants justifiés, and, in 1762, the Ordonnance et Instruction pastorale sur les assertions des Jésuites. But although many of Goumlin's works were translated, his catechism proved to be the most popular and it was printed in Naples in 1776. Later on, for the sake of young people, Goumlin's two volumes of the catechism gave place to the shorter catechism of Montazet, Bishop of Lyon, who was accused of being a Jansenist. This catechism was condemned by Rome as heretical and so, in 1782, Ricci used Goumlin's catechism. He then published a famous Pastoral which was translated into German and was distributed by Joseph ii to the bishops of the Empire.(2). In his Pastoral Ricci sets out his aim for the education of his clergy and people. Much praise is given to the French writings and in addition to Goumlin, the works of Mesenguy, Quesnel, de Sacy, Racine, Bossuet and Nicole. (3). These were all French and also appellants.

(1) Savio, op. cit. p. 23 note. (2) N.E. 7 sept. 2 déc. 1782.

(3) Rodolico, op. cit. for more details, p. 82.

The Grand Duke P. Leopold and the Grand Duchess were both hostile to the monasteries and suppressed some and transformed others. The Grand Duchess aimed at the founding of an institution for the education of the young. Ricci was asked to draw up a scheme and he at once turned to his French friends. Bellegarde suggested Les Constitutions de Port-Royal as the best method to follow and though the Abbé Clément procured a copy of the rules of some of the French schools for girls. Fénelon's Education des filles and the Constitutions des filles de l'enfance were also recommended. These French schools had been suppressed by the Jesuits before 1700, although a few remained in Toulouse. In closing his letter to Ricci, Bellegarde says: "Je benis le Seigneur du zèle qu'il vous inspire pour l'éducation de cette moitié du genre humain." Among other French books used for the education of the young was De l'éducation chrétienne des enfants; Avis salutaires aux pères, aux mères et à ceux qui sont chargés de l'éducation des enfans.

Another debt to France is seen in the publication by Ricci's friends of the Annali ecclesiastici (1780-1787). These were, for Italy, what the Nouvelles Ecclésiastiques were for France and they found enthusiastic readers and supporters in France and were quoted in the Nouvelles Ecclésiastiques. Bellegarde wrote; "Je les trouve si intéressantes que leur lecture sera une vrai consolation pour moi et pour les prelates d'Utrecht." (I). The Annali imitated the Nouvelles Ecclésiastiques, not only in their defence of the appellants but also in their struggle with the Jesuits, but the bellicose spirit of the Annali caused some apprehension to Ricci's friends.

In addition to the Annali, Jansenist ideas were spread through the collection Opusculi interessanti la religione⁽²⁾ which were printed in Pistoia under the auspices of Bishop Ricci. It is probable that the idea

(I) Rodolico, op. cit. p. 88

(2) Raccolta di opuscoli interessanti la religione. 16 vols.
Pistoja. 1783-89.

was suggested to him by Bellegarde, but in any case the editors of the collection made much use of French material, and attacked the idea of papal infallibility which was not, at that time, an article of faith. This is best illustrated by the translation of the Acts of Appeal by the four French appellant bishops. (1). The Raccolta of Pistoia published many articles of French inspiration, the result of books sent by Bellegarde and many of these books dealt with the problem of the papacy, such as La Borde's book on the temporal and spiritual power. Ricci and his followers were anxious to suppress the temporal power for the good of the Church and to increase the power of the bishops, not to form an episcopal oligarchy similar to papal absolutism, but rather to build up a democracy giving greater scope to the second order. Thus Ricci wrote to his clergy in 1787: "Voi siete, o venerabili parrochi, meglio a portata di ogni altro dei bisogni della nostra Chiesa nelle particolari porzioni, che per divina autorità governate unitamente col Vescovo. La riforma che deve intraprendersi, da me ugualmente che da voi deve dipendere e stabilirsi ... Tolga Iddio che per vedermi investito della pienezza della potestà sacerdotale io mi voglia usurpare uno spirito di dominazione sopra di voi e invitarvi quindi alla celebrazione del nostro Sinodo per obbligarvi a giurare sulle mie parole e a sottoscrivere ciecamente alle vescovili determinazioni. La potestà della Chiesa è tutta posta nella santità, nel lume, nella persuasione, nè è una monarchia, o un dispotismo il regno di Gesù Cristo, stabilito su questa terra." (2).

Rodolico says that these words were quoted, some months later, by a magistrate of the Paris parlement who added that Ricci was "un évêque digne des premiers siècles de l'Eglise." (3). Ricci, like his French advisers, believed in the divine institution of the second order and

(1) See pp. 65 sq.

(2) Rodolico, op. cit. p. 98

(3) Ibid. p. 99, but the magistrate is not named.

when Ricci was appointed to Pistoia in 1780, Bellegarde sent him many books on this question, such as: Les prêtres juges de la foi; Les droits des prêtres dans le Synode ou Concile diocésain; Les prêtres juges dans le Concile; Traité sur la part que les pasteurs du second ordre ont au gouvernement des fideles, and many other such works. (I)

Ricci's attitude to his clergy was inspired by the principles advocated in these works and the Synod of Pistoia was a confirmation of this.

As might be expected, many of these French works dealt with the Jesuit controversy; in 1784 Bellegarde sent 40 volumes dealing with the moral theology of the Jesuits. Another type of book dealt with the reform of worship, useless pomp and ceremony, and superstition. French literature helped Ricci also in his efforts to link the reform of worship to the economic condition of the clergy, a problem very serious in France, but equally serious in Italy. The simple ceremonies of the ancient Church had degenerated into a venal traffic in order to make a poor living for the clergy. For these services to be free, it was necessary that a modest living should be assured to the clergy. Here again Bellegarde was a great help. Duguet's book Sur la prière publique and other similar books found their way into the Pistoian collection.

Sympathetic as Ricci was to the second order, he knew, none the less, his powers as bishop. He was opposed to the cult of the Sacred Heart, introduced by the Jesuits, and to other devotions. He was convinced that it was his duty, as bishop, to control the preaching in his diocese. Montazet, Archbishop of Lyon, had already been concerned with this matter and had published a new Breviary and Missal, maintaining that this power was conferred upon the episcopate. The stories of saints, which form a large part of the Breviary, are important in expressing the Christian faith. The bishop who has the duty of regulating the exposition of doctrine has the right, too, of regulating matters

(I) For more details: Rodolico, op. cit. p.100, especially note 4.

referring to the saints. The Congregation of Rites, instituted by a bull of Pius v, usurped the authority of the bishop in this matter. It was legitimate for the bishops to take no account of this bull. Montazet's observations reached Ricci and were printed in the Raccolta under the title: Sulla potestà dei vescovi sulla riforma del Breviario, and in compiling his ecclesiastical Calendar Ricci followed Montazet's ideas. Ricci wrote: "Gli amici di Francia mi esibirono allora le loro fatiche: il celebre avv. Maulrot, il dotto e pio mons. Le Roy, M. Clement, tesoriere di Auxerre, ... oltre le belle memorie di M. Noguier all'ultima assemblea del Clero ..." (1) Ricci's Calendar, modelled on French works, aroused the indignation of Rome; it contained no false legends and nothing contrary to the Gospels. Bellegarde and his French friends were naturally concerned with the opposition which Ricci's Calendar created. Bellegarde was asked to suggest books which would enable Ricci to defend the directions he had given. A letter, presumably from Bellegarde, says: "Vous auriez trouvé, Monseigneur, de quoi vous défendre d'une manière triomphante dans les écrits faits dans le dernier siècle contre les brefs contre les 4 S. ts Evêques d'Alet, de Pamiers, d'Angers et de Beauvais; ils sont dans la collection des oeuvres de M. Arnauld; vous trouveriez des grands lumières sur le droit qu'ont les Evêques de régler les prières publiques de leurs diocèses et les livres liturgiques, breviaires, misses etc.; on les trouve dans divers écrits qui ont été publiés à Paris à l'occasion du nouveau Breviàire et du nouveau Missel publiés par M. Vintimille Arch. de cette ville, aussi bien que dans les écrits publiés par M. Bossuet Ev. de Troyes (neveu du grand Bossuet évêque de Meaux) contre M. Languet Arch. de Sens à l'occasion des plaintes mal fondées que fit celui-cy contre le nouveau Missel de Troyes. Ces écrits renferment d'excellentes choses à le sujet." (2)

(1) Rodolico, op. cit. p.103. (2) Ibid., p. 105

Another means of advancing Jansenist opinions was the sending to Ricci portraits of St. Cyran, Arnauld, Quesnel, Pascal, Nicole, Bossuet and many others. There was some difficulty for in 1779 Bellegarde wrote: "Je n'ai pas pu trouver ici (Utrecht) les portraits que vous desiriez de M. Arnauld, de M. Pascal etc." But in 1784 Le Roy sent 154 portraits of Jansenists. A Florentine printer reproduced many of these pictures, each portrait carrying a eulogy of the person represented. With the books and pictures came advice and incitement to reform, often accompanied by counsel for moderation. Bellegarde's correspondence shows that French and Dutch advice was sought by Ricci when he was preparing his famous Synod. He had already sent to Bellegarde his outline of questions which were to be discussed. Bellegarde and Clement sent their advice on these points, one of which was the celebrating of mass in the vernacular. Bellegarde notes other collaborators. "M. Jabinau prestre cy-devant de la Congregation de la Doctrine et aujourd'hui avocat au Parlement de Paris, Mrs les 3 Abbés Clement, De s. Marc et De Larriere et les 2 jureconsultes Le Daige Bailli du Temple et Maultrot. Les observations anonymes sont du p. Lambert dominicain, bien théologien et religieux respectable qui est fort de nos amis." (1) Naturally these friends followed very closely the work of the Synod of Pistoia in 1786 and the Acts of the Synod were printed at the end of 1788. Bellegarde received a copy in the following January and wrote to Ricci: "Plus je les médite plus j'y trouve les dogmes de la religion présentés avec cette onction qui doivent attirer l'attention et l'amour de tout le mond. Cette inspiration nous inspire la pensée de les traduire le plus tôt possible en françois et de les faire imprimer icé." (2) This was Bellegarde's last effort to help; by November 300 copies of the translation were sold and in the following month Bellegarde died.

(1) Ibid. p. 109.

(2) Ibid. pp 110.

RICCI AS BISHOP OF PISTOIA AND PRATO

Bellegarde's correspondence in the last chapter caused some anticipation of the work of Ricci as bishop but more must be said about this important period of Jansenist history. Ricci was withdrawn from his comparative obscurity by the death of the Bishop of Pistoia, Ippoliti, who had succeeded Bishop Alamanni. Both of these bishops were sympathisers with the ideals of Port-Royal, but had been unable to accomplish much for "Le diocèse de Prato, réuni à celui de Pistoie, étoit ci-devant dominé par les jésuites et pour ainsi dire à leur discrétion." (1). Bishop Ippoliti had confided to Ricci: "I libri dei Porto-realisti erano da lui preferiti ad ogni altro, e il genio con cui leggeva le Novelle ecclesiastiche di Parigi, faceva vedere quali erano le sue massime nelle questioni del secolo." (2)

Ricci was consecrated Bishop of Pistoia and Prato on the 24th June, 1780. Trouble awaited him in his diocese, for the reforms he had in mind were not everywhere popular. His first concern was to discipline the nuns of Ste Lucie in Pistoia. Although the Jesuits had been suppressed as an Order, their influence was still strong and throughout his episcopate Ricci experienced many difficulties with the religious orders in his diocese, whose reform was essential. Ricci suspected that Jesuit influence was being upheld by their introduction of the cult of the Sacred Heart and in 1781 Ricci published his famous Pastoral Istruzione pastorale sulla nuova devozione al Cuor di Gesù. (3)

(1) N.E. 17 juillet, 1781, p.115. De Potter, op.cit. vol.1, p.46.

(2) De Potter, op.cit. vol. 1., p.46, note.

(3) This Pastoral is printed on p.282 of the 2nd part of the Actes et Décrets du Concile Diocésain de Pistoie; No. xxxii; Much of it is translated in N.E. Jan. 1782, pp.5-8. And see N.E. 25 Dec. 1782, p.207.

The original Italian text is in the Bodleian.

This was a very important pastoral which was to lead to much difficulty for the bishop. He begins his letter by explaining that any devotion must inevitably be closely linked with our Lord Himself and there can be no real devotion without grace and prayer and in spirit and truth, and in our present century, he says, we have too many devotions. The one necessary devotion is lacking, the strict conformity of our lives to Jesus Christ. There is too much worldly philosophy and too many fantastic and feminine devotions. He then proceeds to an instruction on this new devotion. Rome itself had already three times refused the introduction of this Festival, but in 1765 had at last given way and allowed the celebration of the Festival but did not encourage it. The Nouvelles Ecclésiastiques of 1781 (I) call it "une ridicule et dangereuse superstition." Learned theologians had condemned it and it has no clear authority. The Pastoral continues: "Ils ne font point attention que ni la très sainte chair, ni une portion de la chair de J.C., ni son humanité entière, en la séparant, ou faisant abstraction de la Divinité, ni aucune qualité, ou affection (de l'humanité) de J.C., ni sa charité, ni ce qui en est le Symbole, ne peuvent jamais être l'objet du culte de Latrie. A Dieu ne plaise qu'aucun fidele se persuade que le S.Siege approuve la Cordiolatrie de ces dévots fanatiques ..." Christ cannot be divided; to do so is Nestorianism, which the Church has condemned. The bishop thus exhorts his clergy: "Si vous avez, M.T.C.F. une foi qui opere par la charité; si vous croissez tous les jours, comme S. Paul le recommande, dans la connoissance de J.C., c'est-à-dire de ses Mysteres, de ses exemples, de ses miracles, de sa parole, de ses privations, de ses souffrances, de son Eglise, qui est son corps mystique; si vous vous attachez à la croix de J.C. & si vous en portez l'empreinte sur vos membres; si vous vous occupez de la lecture, de

la Meditation de son Evangile, dont par la grace qui vous a été conférée dans le Sacrement de Confirmation, vous ne devez jamais rougir: si enfin vous faites, d'une maniere speciale, l'objet de vos adorations & vos chastes delices du très Saint Sacrement de l'Eucharistie, qui renferme non seulement le coeur de J.C. mais encore toute la plénitude de la Divinité, subsistant en deux natures hypostatiquement unies, & réellement presente; Sacrement que S. Augustin appelle: Le Signe de la pieté, le Sacrement de l'unité, le Lien de la charité; Si vous faites tout cela, M.T.C.F. quel besoin avez-vous d'une nouvelle dévotion au sacré coeur de Jesus, sans laquelle les vrais fideles sont parvenus durant tant de siècles, au plus haut degré de la sainteté? Et si vous ne le faites pas, à quoi vous servira-t-elle?" Ricci concludes this long pastoral by recalling that the devotion is quite new and unknown in the happier ages of the Church and gives rise to mockery and incredulity among the philosophers. (1).

One of the reforms which Ricci was anxious to introduce into his diocese was the strict observance of Lent and here he showed his independence of Rome. The papacy had ordered that any dispensations to eat meat in Lent could only be given if it was clearly understood that the dispensation came from Rome alone. Whatever dispensation he was prepared to give, he refused all demands to seek authority from Rome. "On commença alors à l'accuser de ne pas croire au pape, comme si ce nouvel article de foi eût été le signe caractéristique du catholicisme." (2). Ricci maintained that the penitential preparation for Easter was of apostolic tradition and could not, therefore,

(1) The N.E. report of this includes an account of one of the bells to be consecrated by the bishop, but on being informed that it was to be dedicated "in honorem SS. Cordis Jesu" the bishop ordered the words to be eradicated and consecrated the bell in honour of St. Stephen.

(2) De Potter, op.cit., vol. 2, p.27

be changed. The pope and the bishops were departing from this authority by allowing meat in Lent. He suggests that dispensations were so readily given by Rome in order to restrict bishops from acting on their own authority. In his Pastoral for Lent in 1781 he allowed the use of eggs, but reminded the people that fasting does not consist solely in abstaining from certain foods, but in limiting conversation, recreation, and even lawful pleasures and generally by giving up some unnecessary use of created things. This was denounced by the bishop's enemies as proof of Jansenism. (1). The Lenten Pastoral of the following year, 1782, in which the bishop explained his strict attitude, caused him more trouble. Other things were needed besides fasting - piety, penance and prayer. "Il insiste sur la nécessité d'y joindre la prière, l'aumône, la lecture de l'Écriture Sainte, la visite des pauvres malades & les autres oeuvres de miséricorde." (2). The bishop remained firm in spite of opposition.

Another of the bishop's reforms was the attack on the Invocation of Saints and the worship of images. The occasion for this was the fear of a bad harvest in Tuscany due to heavy rains. This was in 1782. "On songea", writes De Potter, "comme c'était l'habitude dans de pareils cas, à découvrir quelque'une des images que le vulgaire nomme improprement miraculeuses. Les avides gardiens des églises et des chapelles où se conservent les images profitent volontiers de ces circonstances pour amasser de nouvelles richesses ..." (3). In his Pastoral Ricci reminded his clergy and people that the Saints are our brethren through the intimate union of charity. It is right to single out Mary among the Saints, because she is the Mother of all, but he warned them that they must ^{not} have more faith in her than in the Author of Grace. If they expected help from her, they must imitate

(1) N.E. 9 Jan., 1782. (2) Ibid. 10 juillet, 1782, pp.109-110.
 (3) De Potter, op. cit., vol. 2, p. 44.

her virtues. Let them pray before the shrine but they must not put their faith in an image and so imitate the pagans.

Typical of Jansenist tendencies, Ricci did his utmost to encourage education. This was also part of Leopold's ecclesiastical reforms and with the aid of the Grand Duke, Ricci was able to found an Academy through the suppression of an ill-kept monastery. Good theologians were sought from the University of Pavia, men who shared Ricci's views. Here Ricci collected books on the Fathers, the Councils, commentaries on the Bible, ecclesiastical historians, apologists, etc. The Grand Duke's idea was that those who were ordained should have some proper function to fulfil.

Another reforming movement was to submit the Regulars to the jurisdiction of the bishop. Ricci visited the monastic establishments to inquire into their methods of teaching and De Potter gives an appalling account of the libraries and the instruction - or lack of it - in these institutions. In some cases the location of the library was unknown to the superiors. (1).

The difficulties facing a reforming bishop were considerable. The monks, supported by Rome, not only stirred up the animosity of the people against Ricci, accusing him of heresy, but they attacked the Grand Duke also, accusing him of trying to do what Henry VIII had done in England. Many of the books which Ricci had introduced were burned in the streets and Potter says that attempts were made to assassinate Ricci. (2). But much was done. Leopold, by introducing the municipal system into his states, had crippled the power of the aristocrats. Ricci's proposals, supported by Leopold, completed the destruction of this independence. Leopold appointed an administrator to deal with the revenues of suppressed ecclesiastical foundations and organised workshops to help the poor. Pistoia, with its 8,000 inhabitants, was

(1) De Potter, op. cit., vol. 2, p. 60. (2) Ibid., vol. 2, p. 80.

divided into eight parishes, with a fixed revenue for the clergy attached to each parish. The clergy, thus provided for, were forbidden to receive fees for their ministrations. No difference was to be made between rich and poor and many of the clergy welcomed the innovations.

In May, 1782, Ricci sent out a Pastoral Letter on the necessity and manner of studying religion. (I). In this pastoral the bishop fulminates against those complaisant theologians who teach that it is only necessary to know what is taught in the catechism. They put this on the same level as Holy Scripture, the Fathers and the Councils of the Church. If there are unbelievers, it is not because of the study of religion. Scorn of religion finds its source in the corruption of manners and in ignorance. Study of the faith is needed and the bishop quotes the Pastoral Instruction of the Archbishop of Lyon on the sources of incredulity. Nor must the study of religion be confined to the theologian. The second part of the pastoral deals with the manner of study, where he uses the favourite Jansenist phrase - the good books, Holy Scripture, especially, but also other books. The Bible must be available in Italian and the bishop recommends the translation of de Sacy and other French works. If one cannot afford these, he recommends others - Fleury, Bossuet, Nicole, etc. There is a real need for further instruction of the faithful. Some lax theologians teach that a low mass on Sunday is sufficient. It was to be expected that such teaching would meet with opposition and the Nouvelles Ecclésiastiques give an interesting example of this from Spain. A Spanish ex-Jesuit had written a theological and moral dissertation on the sanctification of feasts. "A l'égard de ses arguments, ils consistent à soutenir qu'il est raisonnable de

(I) Actes et Décrets du Concile diocésain de Pistoie de 1786.
Appendix. xxviii, p. 224. (Cited as A. & D. henceforth.

penser que l'Eglise ne prescrit autre chose les Dimanches et les Fêtes que d'entendre la Messe. Ce seroit un trop lourd fardeau pour la faiblesse humaine que d'obliger à communier trois ou quatre fois dans tout le cours de l'année. Seroit-ce donc un moindre fardeau que d'obliger les Fideles à tant d'autres oeuvres de pieté dans un si grand nombre de jours?" (I).

Leopold did all he could to aid Ricci. He sent out to all the bishops in his states a circular letter recommending to them a Mandement of the Archbishop of Saltzburg. (2). In 51 sections, this document was headed: "Touchant l'abolition des pompes religieuses inutiles, l'exhortation à la lecture assidue de la Bible, l'introduction d'un Recueil de Cantiques en Allemand, & autres ordonnances Pastorales, avec des Avis aux Pasteurs pour remplir dignement leur important Ministère." The Archbishop deplores the excessive ornaments introduced into the churches and the fact that more attention is paid to these than to fundamental Christian duties. In the primitive Church money was used to aid the poor: now, if there is any money left, it is used to multiply the number of these ornaments. Quoting St. Chrysostom, he says: "Ce n'est point le Corps de J.C. mais la nudité de votre prochain qui a besoin d'un vetement." In his metropolitical Church the Archbishop had removed from the altars and walls everything that shocked the good taste and ordered all the churches in his diocese to follow his example. Later in his Mandement, the Archbishop passes on to the traffic in masses, the speed in which mass is said by lazy priests, some saying it in a quarter of an hour and spending the rest of the day in idleness. To correct this, there will be in future but one seminary in the diocese where a strict training will be maintained. The reading of

(I) N.E. 17 avril, 1781, p. 64

(2) A. & D., p. 46. 2nd part.

the Bible and singing of canticles in the mother tongue are encouraged. By using this Jansenist Mandement, Leopold wanted the faithful to realise the necessity of eliminating from public worship all material and superstitious practices which the ignorance of people and clergy had introduced.

Ricci sent a Pastoral Letter which accompanied the translation of the Archbishop's Instruction. (I). He repeats the archbishop's arguments and adds that the relief of the poor, the education of youth and the needs of the state are more in accord with Christian piety than is ecclesiastical luxury. The reading of the Bible and the familiar use of good devout hymns in the language of the people are a useful means of making good Christian people. Theatrical and effeminate music is banned. The bishop then deals with the veneration of the Saints and the doctrine of Indulgences, Rosaries, Novenas and enrolment in Confraternities which do not make us holy; it is only the practice of Christian virtues which can give us the grace of Jesus Christ. The true doctrine of indulgences must be taught and people must not be misled by false doctors who tell people that by kissing an image or reciting a few prayers they can atone for outrages against Divine justice. The bishop uses strong language to denounce such expressions as: Mother of Grace, Mother of mercy, Queen of Heaven, Mediatrix; fabulous legends are attacked as also are relics if they are supposed to have some magical force.

In 1785 Ricci transformed the old bishop's palace at Prato into a seminary. At Pistoia he reorganised the bishop's school, an institution to which he was greatly attached. He supplied books for its library and turned the south ground floor rooms into an infirmary. One supposes that the bishop was influenced by the

(I) A. & D. App. viii, p.30.

methods of education at Port-Royal for he had obtained from France the books on education already mentioned. (1)

The Nouvelles Ecclésiastiques have an interesting article on Ricci's interest in the translation of the Bible into the vernacular.(2). "Ils (les curés) avoient cru pouvoir utilement introduire dans leurs Eglises, après y avoir disposé leurs Paroissiens, plusieurs usages salutaires, entr'autres, celui d'y réciter en langue vulgaire l'Oraison dominicale, la Salutation angélique, le Symbole, les Litanies du St.Nom de Jesus, et d'autres excellentes prières, dont M.l'Evêque avoit fait imprimer un petit recueil. On sait que le saint Evêque de Châlons, Felix Vialart, avoit fait imprimer ... un recueil de Litanies, où se trouvoient celles du Verbe incarné, toutes tirées de l'Ecriture-Ste & qui contenoient en substance toute la doctrine chrétienne. C'étoit, au jugement de ce digne Evêque, la maniere d'instruire le plus utile, la plus proportionnée au goût & à la portée du commun des Fideles." It was unfortunate for Ricci that the translation of the Scriptures and the Liturgy was at that time considered to be heresy. The Nouvelles Ecclésiastiques go on to relate incidents of rioting, fomented by the bishop's opponents.

Leopold's greatest help to Ricci was the circulation of a letter to all the bishops of Tuscany. The date is the 26th January, 1786 and is the prelude to the Synod of Pistoia. (3). The document contained 57 questions which were to be considered and the first point raised was the desirability of holding diocesan synods where bishops, with the aid of the parochial clergy, could consider the abuses which had crept into the Church, and which were to be remedied. Such synods should be called at least every two years, beginning with the summer

(1) See p. 218.

(2) N.E. 17 Sept.,1788.

(3) A. & D., p. 149.

of 1786. The 57 points raised by Leopold are similar to the decrees of the Synod of Pistoia which was held in September, 1786. These points are of real interest, both from the theological and practical points of view. Stress is laid on the importance of the parochial clergy and no distinction of rank was observed in Ricci's synod. Point 4 says that one of the principal aims of the synods would be to correct public prayers, to reform the breviaries and missals; false legends must be suppressed and the whole of Scripture must be read each year. This sounds familiar to students of the English Prayer Book in which the original Preface of the First Prayer Book followed similar ideas suggested by Cardinal Quignon's reform of the Breviary. This ~~was~~^{is} in Spain, but the reform of the breviary was common in France too.

Another point to be discussed in the synods was the use of the vernacular in administering the sacraments. The 5th point considered the abuses of Rome in restricting the authority of the bishops. This was an important matter for Leopold, who constantly asserted both royal and episcopal independence of Rome. Point 7 dealt with the education of the clergy which should follow the teaching of St. Augustine and similar problems are dealt with in points 7-17. Point 19 says that in each diocese a suppressed monastery should be used for a Retreat House, for a yearly retreat by the clergy. Point 27 has its own importance. The bishops are to draw up rules governing the observance of feasts. There must be only one mass at a time.

The document covers many sides of Church life. Tithes ought to be abolished because they create ill-feeling. Fees for baptisms, marriages and funerals are to be forbidden. In country churches it is desirable to have one altar only. Acts of faith, hope and charity and contrition should be recited in the language of the people. Mass must be said in an audible voice and not too quickly. Quesnel's

Proposition 86 had been condemned for advocating this. The Gospel should be read in the vernacular, a practice which is now quite common. Point 54 deals with less learned priests. To help them, it would be useful to have translations of books which might be distributed free and suggestions of such books are given, most of them translations from the French.

These 57 points make up a very important document and indicate Leopold's great desire for reform. (I). The theological items suggest that Ricci himself had prompted them. By some historians Ricci is looked upon as the mere tool of Leopold but one is not very impressed by such a judgment. Ricci strikes one as being a brave man but much in advance of his time, for many of his desired reforms are being undertaken in our own time. He was a good diocesan bishop. He made a pastoral visitation of the whole of his diocese and paid particular attention to the mountainous district, a region which had been much neglected, and in the course of which he risked his life on two occasions. His care for the lonely inhabitants of the Montagna showed him to be a real shepherd of these neglected people. Nor was Ricci a completely lone figure. Other Tuscan bishops, such as those of Cortona, Chiusi and Pienza, and Uolle shared Ricci's views and supported him. The great, if temporary, achievement of Ricci's reforms was to be seen in the Synod of Pistoia; Leopold's circular prepared the way for this.

(I) The Cambridge Modern History (Old series) vol. vi, pp. 603-5 give a good account of Leopold's reforms. The inadequate account of Italian Jansenism is probably due to the fact that the Italian histories of the movement were written later. The matters referred to can be studied in A. and D., pp. 52, 53.

THE SYNOD OF PISTOIA, 1786The success and failure of Italian Jansenism.

The long Pastoral Letter convening the Synod of Pistoia was written from one of the bishop's mountain parishes on the 31st July, 1786. (1). It was addressed "A ses venerables Freres, Coprêtres et Cooperateurs de la Ville et du Diocese de Pistoie", a distinctive Jansenist recognition of the importance of the second order. Praise is given to Leopold for his exhortations to hold diocesan synods, following the practice of antiquity. He then mentions the pope. "La sollicitude du premier des Vicaires de J.C., le Pontife Romain Pie vi m'avoit deja animé depuis deux ans à convoquer cette sainte Assemblée". It is interesting to note the bishop's regard for the rights of the second order of the clergy. He says that he has sought advice and help in prayer and from theologians, but it is the parish clergy who best know the needs of the Church. (2). It is of little use their coming merely to listen to the bishop's exhortations; they must work together to make laws for the better government of the diocese. St. Ignatius to the Magnesians and St. Clement to the Corinthians are quoted to show that the bishop must act in concert with his clergy. "Quelle consolation n'est-ce donc pas pour nous, qu'il nous soit permis d'exécuter ce qui se pratiquoit dans les beaux tems du Christianisme lorsque l'Evêque avoit toujours auprès de lui ses Cooperateurs, travaillant continuellement avec lui, & gouvernant en commun le Diocese, avec une subordination legitime? Quant à moi, mes Venerables Freres, mes Cooperateurs & mes Collegues dans le sacerdoce, je pense que, dans tout diocese, l'Evêque & le Presbytere sont unis ensemble, non comme des maitres & des serviteurs, mais comme les parties d'un même edifice, comme les branches d'un même tronc & comme

(1) A. & D. p. 20

(2) See quotation on p. 219.

les membres d'un meme corps. C'est pour ces raisons que, me glorifiant de reconnoitre l'institution divine des Cures, je vous invite tous au Synode ...". Complete liberty of speech is promised. He begs them to distinguish between the spiritual and the temporal power. The Church's authority is spiritual and should not encroach on the temporal power, although we must seek the protection of the temporal prince for the well-being of the Church. Such teaching, that reform is a matter both for the bishop and his clergy, attributed to Jansenist influence, formed the basis of the 9th proposition condemned in the Bull Auctorem fidei, the bull which condemned the Synod of Pistoia. The 2nd proposition of the bull condemned the passage in the Pastoral which dealt with the distinction between the spiritual and the temporal.

A complete list is given of those present at the Synod. The Grand Duke was represented, following ancient custom. Tamburini, described as the "Promoteur du Synode", although Ricci organised it, had already arrived from Pavia and was to be the leading spirit of the synod, aided by other famous theologians. It was said of Tamburini that he had firmly laid the foundation of the wall of separation between the Empire and the Papacy.

The synod opened with the Mass of the Holy Spirit and after the opening conference, the second session dealt with Grace and Predestination and the foundation of Christian morality and the members were exhorted to express their opinions freely and even their objections. It is not intended to give here the details of the seven sessions of the synod, much of which was naturally concerned with theological matters. (I). It may be of interest to indicate some of Ricci's practical reforms, which are also condemned. Such condemnations in

(I) These are in full in A. & D. A good account is in the D.T.C., vol. 12, part ii, cols. 2133-2201 which deals with the Bull Auctorem fidei; col. 1794 with the condemnation of the synod.

the bull cover the following, among others; masses in which the priest alone communicates; in each church there is to be one altar; relics and flowers should not be placed on the altar: (propositions 28.31.32.35.); the use of the vernacular (28.31.32.35); money must not be demanded for masses and the administration of sacraments (54). Lower orders should be excluded from the cathedrals; elderly lay people, with a salary, should be used as servers, acolytes, etc. (55); people should be encouraged to take their part in the Liturgy (55); the reading of the Bible (67); images of the Trinity should be taken away; worship of images condemned (69-72); of great interest is the condemnation of Ricci's views for the reform of the Regulars (80-83); Regulars should not have cure of souls; the mendicant orders are attacked; the multiplicity of orders leads to confusion; one order alone should be allowed, the Benedictine, and in each town there should be but one monastery and that should be placed outside the town in an unfrequented place; perpetual vows should be abolished and taken for one year only.

De Potter summarises Ricci's work for reform in concert with the Grand Duke. "Le prélat satisfait pleinement son maître. Il examina soigneusement et repesa avec impartialité tout ce qui avait été publié, jusqu'à cette époque, en matière de juridiction ecclésiastique dans le grand-duché; et, sans vouloir heurter imprudemment les prétentions de la cour de Rome ou celles des évêques, il rédigea un mémoire fort simple sur l'uniformité et l'indispensable réforme des études du clergé, l'ordination des prêtres. le salaire des curés, les droits. et les devoirs des évêques, les synodes diocésains qui devaient être tenus de deux en deux ans, les cérémonies religieuses, le culte raisonnable des images, la réforme du bréviaire, la pureté des prières publiques qui devaient être partout les mêmes, la réforme des fêtes etc. Il y traita aussi de l'usage et de l'administration des biens ecclésiastiques, des bénéfices, de la collation des cures, du mariage

(où le point principal était de bien distinguer entre le contrat civil du mariage, le sacrement et la bénédiction nuptiale), de l'abus du serment de fidélité que prêtent les évêques élus à la cour de Rome, des ordres religieux des deux sexes, du moyen de suppléer au tribunal de la nonciature dont il fallait se débarrasser, des dispenses etc. etc. Ce plan ne fut ni exécuté, ni même publié, à cause des révolutions qui, peu après, troublèrent toute l'Europe pour des sujets bien autrement importants, et à cause des intrigues du ministère national. Leopold en témoigna souvent son entière satisfaction à l'auteur, qui en a conservé la minute dans ses archives." (I).

At the 6th session of the synod a Mémoire was read and signed by 233 of the assembled clergy, with a few exceptions. It dealt with a problem dear to the heart of the Jansenists. It opens with these words: "Il suffit d'avoir quelque connoissance de l'histoire Ecclesiastique pour être obligé d'avouer que la Convocation d'un Concile National est une des voies Canoniques pour terminer dans les Eglises des nations respectives, les differens qui s'y élevent en matiere de Religion." They concern the prince too: "C'est à lui qu'il appartient de procurer cette concorde par la convocation d'un Concile National, comme étant le Pere et le Tuteur de ses sujets, le vengeur & le protecteur de la Religion dans ses Etats & l'Evêque extérieur de l'Eglise." This may sound like erastianism but the Mémoire goes father back into history. "Chaque Souverain a dans ses Etats la même autorité que les Empereurs avoient dans l'Empire Romain. Ainsi comme ces derniers avoient le droit incontestable d'assembler tous les Evêques, dans un lieu particulier, lorsque le bien de l'Eglise l'exigeoit, de même les Souverains (particuliers) sont les maitres de convoquer tous les Evêques de leur domination dans le lieu qu'il leur plait ...".

(I) De Potter, op. cit., vol. 2, pp. 255-256.

The Acts of the Synod were published and sent abroad. "L'effet du synode de Pistoie partout où il pénétra fut surprenant; il eut un succès complet, lors de son apparition, même dans la capitale du catholicisme, où la première sensation de ceux qui étaient résolus de s'en déclarer les adversaires, fut l'étonnement de n'y rien trouver de ce que la méchanceté avait inventé pour le dénigrer, et de ce dont ils espéraient pouvoir tirer avantage pour justifier leurs malignes intentions. Les actes du synode de Pistoie furent bientôt réimprimés à Florence et à Paris; on les traduisit en France, et l'on y frappa des médailles en l'honneur de Léopold et de Ricci, qui reçut de toutes parts les lettres les plus flatteuses et les compliments les plus sincères. L'Allemagne et le Portugal témoignèrent hautement leur approbation. Les évêques espagnols se hâtèrent de faire traduire un ouvrage que tout annonçait devoir servir d'exemple à tous les clergés catholiques, et devoir produire une révolution importante dans les idées et dans les choses ... Les alarmes de la cour de Rome étaient au comble, d'autant plus qu'à la même époque, le grand-duc supprima la nonciature ... Rome, étonnée de la fermeté de Léopold, n'osa rien entreprendre contre lui; elle s'attacha tout entière à perdre Ricci." (I).

But things were not so happy for Ricci in his own diocese. De Potter reports (2) that emissaries made their way to Prato and incited the people to riot on the pretext that Ricci intended to destroy an altar on which was preserved the B.V.M's girdle. In the evening, the populace, armed with sticks and hatchets went to the Church; the Church bells were rung for hours; the bishop's arms and his episcopal chair were torn down and publicly burnt, together with many books. Statues which had been removed were restored to the

(I) De Potter, op. cit., vol. 2, p. 267. (2) Ibid., vol.2, p.247

Church and much of Ricci's reforms abolished. (1). It is to Ricci's credit that when the revolt was over it was his influence with the Grand Duke which obtained clemency for the rioters.

One of the motives for holding the Synod of Pistoia was to prepare the way for a National Council. Answers to Leopold's 57 points (2) were gradually coming in and Leopold wanted to postpone the holding of further synods until after the National Council, which was fixed for April, 1787, when all the bishops of Tuscany were invited in the name of the Grand Duke to assemble at Florence. It met from April to June. The replies to the points had been contradictory and offered little hope of success. Ricci himself had doubts which he communicated to Leopold for Ricci knew of the determined opposition of the archbishop and other bishops of Tuscany to any reforms. The 57 points were discussed in the Council where there was much opposition and Leopold, in anger, dismissed the Council and threatened that he himself would carry out his reforms, but other events intervened.

It is not to be wondered at that Pistoia caused much consternation at Rome, even before the publication of the Acts of the Synod. Pius vi. appointed a commission of bishops and theologians to examine the projects and according to De Potter (3) the first two commissions found little for condemnation. Probably the pope had no wish to offend so powerful a prince as Leopold. But in 1790 the Emperor Joseph ii died and Leopold left Tuscany. In April 1790 there was a revolution and Ricci was forced to leave Pistoia and seek refuge in Florence and in spite of the Emperor's intervention, Ricci resigned his see. Ricci's condemnation was not long delayed. In 1794 the Bull

(1) N.E. 1787 , pp. 197-200.

(2) See pp. 231 sq.

(3) De Potter, op. cit., vol. 2., p.270 and Chapters 51, 52, 55.

Auctorem fidei appeared. In some ways, this bull was more authoritative than Unigenitus. It came at the climax of Jansenism; each proposition was condemned in a precise way whereas the condemnation of Quesnel was more general. From the 85 propositions condemned there was no escape. The Synod of Pistoia was merely a local diocesan council but in reality it became almost an oecumenical Council of Jansenism. It was the greatest of all Jansenist manifestoes, and the last.

C O N C L U S I O N

The Council of Florence in 1787 represented the culminating point of Ricci's activities. Many contributing causes led to the failure of his work and they can be easily summarised. In the first place, it is clear that he was much in advance of his period; the times were not propitious for his reforms and how much these reforms were needed is well set out in De Potter's work. The ordinary people were unprepared for the suppression of their popular devotions and, moreover, the movement in Italy was predominantly clerical. There were tumults at Prato, incited by his enemies. Ricci's own temperament was not helpful for he was impatient of opposition. There was, too, the fierce reaction of most of the religious orders all of which, except the Benedictines, were condemned by Pistoia. The unexpected death of Joseph ii and the consequent departure of Leopold from Tuscany removed from Ricci his greatest supporter. The explosion of the French Revolution frightened the principal reformers and the failure of the French occupation of Italy did not establish a favourable regime. The papacy, which had been in sharp conflict with the reforming princes, had strengthened its position with the appointment of Braschi to the papal throne in 1775. Any toleration and indulgence ceased from that moment and many of the reforming leaders left Rome. A policy of reaction set in which ended with the Bull Auctorem fidei.

In a book recently published (I) Vaussard gives an interesting general picture of 18th century life in Italy which does not deal particularly with Jansenism although he is an authority on that subject. The overall picture is one of an easy-going religion with much indifference and superstition at the same time much effort at reform.

(I) M. Vaussard, Daily life in eighteenth century Italy.
London, 1962.

That there was need for reform is evident. (1) Speaking of Jansenism Vaussard says: (2) "It is barely half a century since growing attention has been given by historians to the extremely important development which so-called 'Jansenist' tendencies experienced during the second half of the eighteenth century, even inside the Sacred College, the high prelature and the religious orders, mainly the Oratory and the fathers of the Pious Schools (Piarists). It appeared not only in the form of opposition to the laxity with which the Jesuits were reproached, but also of support for dispossessing the clergy of property, the reduction of the number of priests and especially of monks, a stricter observance of monastic vows, numerous liturgical reforms which it would be out of place to list in this book, and lastly an even more drastic reform of the customs of the Roman Court and the privileges of the pontifical authority."

Reference has already been made to the fact that many of Ricci's attempted reforms are now being realised in the modern Roman Catholic Church such as the translation of the Bible, an increase in Bible studies and an active participation of the people in public worship, and while we do not know what will be the results of the forthcoming Vatican Council it has been stated that two commissions have been dealing with the modernisation of the forms of worship and a more popular approach on the part of Roman authorities towards the laity. It has been made clear in this work that the Jansenists were great students of Church history and they may well have been familiar with a movement towards the end of the 8th century which anticipated some of the reforms which were carried a stage further by the Jansenists. A few extracts from a book dealing with that period may be given. (3).

(1) See for example: Vaussard, op.cit., p.204 and c/f p. 223 of this thesis.

(2) Op. cit., p. 79

(3) Carlo de Clercq, La Législation religieuse Franque de Clovis à Charlemagne (507-814). Louvain and Paris. 1936. p.307

"Cette messe ... est célébrée ... avec sermon dans la langue parlée par le peuple. Ailleurs aussi, le prêtre devra prêcher ou tout au moins lire dans l'homiliaire le commentaire de l'évangile. Le peuple doit prendre une part active à la messe; il a le privilège, enlevé à certaines classes de pénitents, d'y présenter ses offrandes, c'est-à-dire un petit pain, et si possible aussi du vin Il participe au chant liturgique, il répond aux saluts adressés par le prêtre La communion se fait sous les deux espèces."

We may well end this work with a summary of Italian Jansenism by Codignola. In his Illuministi, Giansenisti e Giacobini, (I) he sums up in a vivid and telling way the Jansenist contribution to the sequence of Church history. The Jansenist Movement, he says, has helped to prevent post-Tridentine Catholicism from sinking in the marshes of Jesuitical conformism and has prepared, by its inward resistance, the flowering of the Christian revolutionary movement at the end of the 18th century and of liberal Catholicism in the early 19th century. There is, in our Italian Jansenism, a reforming and revolutionary character - ethico-political - and not just theological. Yet in the end we have to state that, after some two centuries of struggle, the Jansenist cause was left with hardly any fighters. After the Napoleonic wars and the reshaping of a new Europe, Jansenism seems to have become a spent force. The old controversies no longer rallied antagonists to renewed struggles. The famous Nouvelles Ecclésiastiques which had so ardently supported Jansenist ideas since 1728 ceased publication in 1803. Surely that was a sign of the times and doubtless an admission of the impending final defeat.

(I) p. 325.

APPENDIX AA note on certain documents.

- (I) Catéchisme historique et dogmatique sur les Contestations qui divisent maintenant l'Eglise, où l'on montre l'origine et le progrès des disputes présentes: et où l'on fait des réflexions qui mettent en état de discerner de quel côté est la vérité, by Pavie de Fourquevaux. A Nancy au dépens de Joseph Nicolai. 1750-1768. 5 vols.

This work was written by Jean-Baptiste Raymond de Beccarie de Pavie de Fourquevaux (1693-1767) and was first published in two volumes in 1729-30. Préclin says of this obviously Jansenist Catechism that it is "Une des sources maîtresses de l'histoire du mouvement janséniste". The volumes cover the period 1729-1760, although the first volume refers to earlier events. It is not a catechism in the ordinary sense of the word, i.e. a series of short questions and answers on theological matters. The work is indeed set out in questions and answer form, but the questions are so formed as to invite long answers in favour of the Jansenist position. In reality it is a running account, a history, full of material, well set out and essential to a study of the period. The opening Mémoire summarizes the essential points of the controversy. "Il est d'une extrême importance de ne prendre pas le charge sur l'affaire de la Constitution; c'est-à-dire, qu'il faut prendre cette affaire dans son vrai point de vûe, tel qu'il est exposé dans le Mémoire des quatre Evêques, publié en 1719 et dans l'Apologie des Curez du Diocèse de Paris, publiée en 1717. Prendre cette affaire dans son vrai point de vûe, c'est la prendre telle qu'elle est/^{en}elle-même, l'embrasser toute entiere. Lorsqu'on prend ainsi l'affaire de la Constitution, on est soutenu, consolé, encouragé; et l'on est en état, non seulement de fermer la bouche à ceux qui veulent contredire, mais même de les

convaincre, pour peu qu'ils ayent de droiture et de bonne foi. L'on perd au contraire tous ces avantages, et l'on s'expose aux plus fâcheux incon^éviens, lorsqu'on laisse échaper ce point de vûe si important: alors on s'attache à quelque branche particuliere, et l'on ne sent plus la nature, ni l'importance de cette grande affaire. On sent seulement les suites facheuses qu'elle attire après elle, et il ne reste que le regret de s'y voir embarrassé. Un Prêtre^{aa} a été accusé et condamné. Des propositions, c'est-à-dire, comme on se l' imagine, des termes, des mots, des expressions ont été censurées. On reconnoît que c'est une injustice: on n'y veut point prendre de part, mais l'on voudroit n'entendre jamais parler de cette affaire; et c'est avec chagrin que l'on se voit forcé à en dire son avis. On a quelque raison de penser de la sorte. Des Religieuses ont-elles affaire de la cause d'un Prêtre qu'elles n'ont jamais connu? Faut-il qu'elles perdent leur repos pour soutenir un certain nombre d'expressions que leurs pasteurs condamnent? Dans le fonds il leur importeroit peu (à se borner à la chose en elle-même, et séparée de ses suites) que l'on attribuât mal à propos des sens véritablement mauvais à des propositions qui en seroient innocentes. Il est vrai que dans ce cas-là même, elles devraient s'abstenir de prendre part au jugement porté contre le Père quesnel et contre le texte des propositions, parce qu'il ne faut jamais prendre de part à aucune injustice. Mais il est vrai aussi que de telles questions par elles-mêmes ne les regardent guere. Ajoutons qu'il seroit bien triste pour elles de se voir exposées à soutenir de grandes et de longues persécutions pour un tel sujet; et que non-seulement la nature, mais en un certain sens la religion même & la foi fomenteroient en un tel cas leur tristesse et leurs regrets. Mais les choses changent entièrement de face, lorsqu'on ^{remet} ~~met~~ l'affaire dans son vrai point de vûe. Car on comprend alors que c'est de la verité qu'il s'agit; que c'est là l'objet dont il s'agit avant toutes choses, & plus que toutes choses; & qu'il

est question des vérités de la religion les plus grandes, les plus intéressantes, les plus indissolublement liées avec la piété. En sorte que la foi & la religion apprennent à se réjouir de ce que l'on est trouvé digne de souffrir pour/ ^{une} telle cause. Etablissons donc ce point de vûe, puisque cela est si important."

(2) Les Nouvelles Ecclésiastiques, 1728-1803

This was a weekly production and appeared without interruption between 1728 and 1803 in spite of every effort to suppress it. Its sub-title is Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de la Bulle Unigenitus. Its origin was due to the Council of Embrun in 1728. The Bishop of Senez' friends circulated at first a few manuscript pages; printed matter appeared with four pages and soon increased to eight. Its first editor was a deacon named Boucher who was followed by Fontaine de la Roche who edited it for 30 years until his death in 1771. Marc Guenin followed until the revolutionary period of 1793 and finally the Abbé Mouton who was a refugee in Utrecht. The publication and circulation of this periodical remind us of the secret publications in France during the Occupation in the last war. All the details of this clever piece of work of the Nouvelles Ecclésiastiques are not known. The government tried to suppress it. Fontaine de la Roche was surrounded by spies and troubled by police. The editor was known to three people only and those ^{three} saw him at different times. These three were in touch with other helpers, unknown to each other, and the material was printed by different printers who received the material from different people. Gazier(I) tells an amusing story of a trick played upon an agent whose duty it was to find the editor. One day a lieutenant

(I) Op. cit., vol. 1, p. 312.

of police searched a house from top to bottom, thinking to find the secret printing press. He found nothing, but on entering his carriage there awaited him a bundle of the review still wet from the press. On another occasion, it was announced in advance that a bearer of the Nouvelles Ecclésiastiques would enter Paris at the Porte de Quai Saint-Bernard precisely at midday. A careful watch was kept and several people were searched, but the bearer got through. It was a dog with a double skin. (I).

The Nouvelles Ecclésiastiques had a very wide circulation in France and abroad and they prove that there were many Jansenist supporters among all classes. The Nouvelles Ecclésiastiques are by no means impartial but they are none the less of the greatest value for they give much information, not only of the religious life and problems of the 18th century, but also of the parliamentary history and life in the dioceses. Fundamentally they are a defence of Jansenism and Port-Royal and an attack on the Jesuits. There is a complete set in the Bodleian Library including two volumes of Tables which cover the years 1728-1760 - summaries which often save much searching through the various volumes. The purpose of the Nouvelles Ecclésiastiques is stated in the Avertissement of the Table Raisonnée et alphabétique des Nouvelles Ecclésiastiques depuis 1728 jusqu'en 1760 inclusivement. "Les mémoires ... renferment... ce qui s'est passé pendant plus de 30 ans dans une des plus grandes affaires qu'on ait jamais vues dans l'Eglise depuis son établissement. La France où cette affaire a pris naissance a été & est encore aujourd'hui le théâtre des grands événements qu'elle a occasionnés. Il n'est aucune Province,

(I) Gazier, op. cit., vol. 1, p. 312

aucun Diocèse, aucune ville, ni presque aucun lieu, quelque obscur qu'il soit, qui n'en ait ressenti les effets; nul état, nulle condition n'en ont été exemptés: l'Evêque, le Curé, le Chanoine, le Militaire même et l'Artisan, en un mot tout genre de personnes en ont éprouvé les facheuses suites. La plus profonde retraite n'a pu mettre à couvert le Solitaire: la Religieuse même n'a pas été tranquille dans son cloître, ni le Magistrat dans le Sanctuaire de la Justice. Tous ces événemens sont consignés dans les Mémoires pour servir à l'Histoire de la Constitution Les événemens de ce siècle ne sont pas le seul objet des Nouvelles Ecclésiastiques ... On y remonte souvent à la source & à l'origine des maux de l'Eglise. ... Mais l'objet le plus important dans les Nouvelles, c'est la partie qui concerne la doctrine, le dogme & la morale, les libertés de l'Eglise Gallicane & les Maximes du Royaume"

The volume for 1734 has at the beginning the Mandement of 1732 of the Archbishop of Paris (de Vintimille) condemning the Nouvelles Ecclésiastiques. "Nulle malignité n'égale celle de cet écrivain; son style est celui de ces hommes méchans dont le Prophète a dit, qu'ils ont aiguisé leurs langues comme celle du serpent & que le venin de l'aspic est sous leurs levres."

Excommunication was threatened against those who read the Nouvelles Ecclésiastiques or distributed them, but this did not prevent several of his clergy writing to the Archbishop in protest, and this was followed by a long letter of 34 pages written by his parishioners to a Paris incumbent to support him in his protest.

(3) The Gallican Liberties

The Gallican Liberties supply the reason for the mutual support between the Jansenists and the Parlements. They are treated fully in an interesting book published in 1826; Libertés de l'Eglise Gallicane, suivies de la Déclaration de 1682, et d'autres pièces authentiques, avec une introduction et des notes par M. Dupin. (1) Pithou in 1594 had drawn up the Gallican Liberties in 83 articles. Several editions followed, one of which (in 1651) was highly praised by d'Aguessau. To these maxims of Pithou must be added the Gallican Declaration of 1682. In his Discours de l'unité de l'Eglise (2) Bossuet had written: "Conservons ces fortes maximes de nos pères, que l'Eglise gallicane a trouvées dans la tradition de l'Eglise universelle." Here Bossuet was illustrating his argument from the Ordonnance of Saint-Louis. These four Gallican principles of 1682 which fixed the limit of the two powers - spiritual and temporal - would seem to be taken from Pithou's work. This is not the place to trace the medieval struggles between the papacy and temporal rulers. An echo of this fear of papal interference is seen in England as late as 1829 when English Roman Catholics were seeking complete toleration. In their Protestation to Parliament they affirmed their belief that the pope was not infallible and that he had no power over kings.

The Gallican Declaration of 1682 was confirmed by Parliament and once again in an Arrêt du Conseil of 24 May, 1766, in which the King determined that the maxims of the Declaration should be "invariablement observées en tous ses Etats, et soutenues dans toutes les universités, et par tous les ordres, séminaires et corps enseignants."

(1) Published in Paris, 1826.

(2) J.B. Bossuet, Discours de l'unité de l'Eglise.

This was a sermon preached at the General Assembly of the Clergy in 1682.

The Loi Organique, resulting from the Concordat of 1801, renewed these Gallican Principles and Napoleon in 1810 published anew as a 'loi générale de l'Empire' the 1682 Declaration. Briefly, the struggle is the defence of the temporal power against encroachments by the spiritual power, more especially with regard to the papacy. Some of the 83 articles already mentioned are political; others would appeal to the Jansenists as, e.g. No. XL: "Le Concile universel est au-dessus du pape"; or No. LXXVIII: "Appel au futur Concile". Jansenists and Gallicans were at one on this question.

Nicolas le Gros wrote in 1716 his Du Renversement des Libertez de l'Eglise Gallicane dans l'affaire de la Constitution Unigenitus. "Il n'y a que ceux qui sont indifférens aux intérêts les plus essentiels de la Religion et de l'Etat, qui puissent l'être au renversement des saintes & précieuses Libertez de l'Eglise Gallicane. De leur conservation dépendent les moïens les plus surs de conserver la pureté de la Foi, la sainteté de la Morale, la vigueur de la Discipline. la paix de l'Eglise, la liberté de l'Episcopat, la dignité même du saint Siege, aussi bien que l'affermissement de la Couronne & la fidelité des sujets. Car tous ces avantages sont attachez au gouvernement de l'Eglise tel que Jesus Christ l'a institué: & on le renverse ce gouvernement, en lui substituant une domination absoluë, si on renverse nos Libertez. Travailler à les détruire c'est le crime des ennemis de l'Eglise & du Royaume,. Ne s'opposer pas à leur destruction, y consentir, y coopérer, ce seroit en des François une prévarication inexcusable." (I) Le Gros' book has been condemned as supporting Republicanism and as preparing for the Revolution.

(I) Op. cit. (See p. 50) The opening passage of the 'Avertissement'.

Glasson (I) speaking of the suppression of parlement by Louis xv sets out the political theories of parlement, mentions various remonstrances about their grievances. He then continues (2): "Jamais le Parlement n'avait été plus maltraité et jamais sa situation n'avait été plus grande dans le pays. Les remonstrances qui avaient été préparées et qui ne furent jamais lues étaient vraiment admirables par la noblesse et par la dignité de la forme, par la vigueur de la pensée, par l'élévation et la justesse des doctrines politiques. C'était un véritable traité des rapports de l'Eglise et de l'Etat, avec l'exposé de toutes les fautes que l'Etat venait de commettre à ses dépens. Les remonstrances rappellent au roi qu'il est tenu d'observer les lois; elles relèvent les torts et les empiètements du clergé, qui ont conduit au schisme; c'est un droit et un devoir impérieux pour le Parlement de poursuivre le schisme, mais il ne faut pas qu'il trouve refuge dans le Conseil même du roi. Il y a dans ces remonstrances un reflet de la doctrine nouvelle qui commençait à se faire jour et suivant laquelle la nation est au-dessus du roi comme l'Eglise est au-dessus du pape."

The author of L'Ami des Peuples in 1764 (writing from a completely different point of view) concludes: "Le spirituel et le temporel sont aussi inséparables dans un Etat bien policé, que le corps et l'âme dans un homme vivant." (3).

-
- (1) E. Glasson, Le Parlement de Paris; son rôle politique depuis le règne de Charles vii jusqu'à la Révolution. Paris. 1901. 2 vols.
 (2) Ibid., vol. 2, p. 198.
 (3) C. Robin, L'Ami des peuples. Angers. 1764.

4. The JOURNAL and REGISTERS of
Parlement.

Microfilms of the following manuscript volumes which are in the Bibliothèque nationale, Paris, were obtained:-

Journal du parlement sur l'affaire de la Constitution
Unigenitus. I. de 1752 à 1753; II. de 1754 à 1762.
xviii^e siècle. 2 vols.

Extraits des Registres du parlement relatifs aux refus
de sacrements. 1749-1760. xviii^e siècle. 2 vols.

These manuscript copies are very closely written. There are over 900 pages of the journal and over 400 pages of the registers. To summarize them, one would say that they deal very largely with parlement's concern over the opposition to the king, and parlement's interference in the cases of the refusal of the sacraments. In addition they include accounts of the parlements and the records of the dioceses.

APPENDIX B.Jansenist Miracles and the Convulsions

Much has been written about the Jansenist miracles. They fall into two definite periods and it is interesting to note that on each occasion they occur at a moment when Jansenism is in difficulties, when it meets opposition and persecution. The miracles serve as a point of departure when Jansenism flourishes again. In other words, the miracles become a justification and a rallying point. Opinions about these miracles differ, but first of all we must state the facts.

The first miracle takes us back to the time of Pascal, whose Lettres Provinciales had provoked such hostility that vengeance had to be wreaked on Port-Royal; but the hostile proceedings were suddenly stopped because, in 1656, there was much talk about a miracle which had happened to Pascal's niece, Marguerite Perrier, then 10 years old, an inmate of Port-Royal. Apparently she suffered from an inveterate ulcer in the left eye; it was cured by a touch of the Holy Thorn and the effect was astounding. The disease and the cure were not questioned, although interpretations varied. Cardinal Mazarin caused the miracle to be published officially and Jansenism gained a period of popularity as a result of the cure. Pascal, with his scientific mind, was convinced of the miracle and talks of it in his xvie Provinciale (I) and in section xiii of the Pensées (2).

The next occurrence of miracles was again at a period of difficulty for the Jansenist cause. In 1730 silence had been imposed on the Jansenists by royal decree. Hostility to them was increasing which gave rise to a vast amount of controversial literature. After 1731 miracles occurred at the tomb of the Deacon Paris in the Saint-Médard cemetery in Paris. There had been earlier miracles there in 1725; a Mme Lafosse, of the Parish of Sainte-Marguerite, was instantly cured of an illness (perte de sang) from which she had suffered for 20 years. The priest

(1) B. Pascal, Les Provinciales. Paris. 1803

(2) B. Pascal, Pensées: texte de l'édition Brunschvicg. Paris. 1958. pp. 287-313.

who was carrying the Host (it was the procession of the Blessed Sacrament on the Festival of the Fête-Dieu) was a noted appellant and therefore considered a Jansenist. Gazier (1) has some severe things to say about Voltaire's opinion of this miracle. Two years later, an appellant priest - Canon Gérard Rousse - of the diocese of Reims died and cures occurred at his grave. The most famous of these cases was that of the Deacon Paris who died in 1727. He was noted for his life of austerity and charity and had appealed more than once against the Bull. He died at the early age of 37. On the day of his burial an old woman whose arm had been paralysed for 25 years was cured by touching the bier. Other cures followed and became numerous after 1731 and it was at this time that men and women worked themselves up into fits of fanaticism, or convulsions. Such scenes were repeated throughout the country. That such scenes caused a great sensation is what one would expect. It is not within our province to pass ^{any} judgment upon them. Modern knowledge enables us to realize the power of mind over body and there is no need to doubt that these things happened. Whether the miracles were miracles in the theological sense can remain a matter of discussion. (2). It is perhaps of more value to know the estimate of these things by various writers.

Voltaire (3) who has no good opinion of Jansenism, would naturally be hostile. He does not doubt the cure of Mlle Perrier although he denies that it was instantaneous. His doubt concerns the probability that God would perform a miracle for a few muns. As for the miracles at the tomb of the Deacon Paris and the convulsions, they are but the result of fanaticism. His conclusion is (4): "Ces extravagances ont été en

(1) Op. cit., vol. 1, p.277.

(2) Paquier, op. cit. pp.487 sq., discusses this fully from the theological point of view.

(3) Voltaire, Siècle de Louis xiv. Paris. n.d. p.433

(4) Ibid. p. 449.

France les derniers soupirs d'une secte qui, n'étant plus soutenue par des Arnauld, des Pascal et des Nicole, et n'ayant plus que des convulsionnaires, est tombé dans l'avilissement; on n'entendrait plus parler de ces querelles qui déshonorent la raison et font tort à la religion, s'il ne se trouvait de temps en temps quelques esprits remuants, qui cherchent dans ses cendres éteintes quelques restes du feu dont ils essayent de faire un incendie".

Paquier who is no Jansenist, devotes his last chapter to a serious discussion of the miracle of the Holy Thorn and is critical of Sainte-Beuve who is hostile on this matter. (1). Paquier gives a full account of the miracle, quoting contemporary sources and says: (2) "La guérison de la petite Périer a tous les caractères d'une oeuvre divine... Pascal, Racine et les Jansénistes furent loin d'être isolés dans leur croyance au caractère miraculeux de la guérison de la petite Périer. Presque tout le xviiie siècle partagea cette manière de voir. Enfin, dans ses Leçons sur l'Exode, le cardinal Orsini qui, depuis, fut le pape Benoît xiii, prend ce fait comme exemple, et comme unique exemple, de miracles au xviiie siècle."

Of the 18th century miracles and convulsions, Paquier has a different opinion. While accepting the earlier miracle, he sees it as a warning from God to the Jansenists and in this way there is a close connection between it and the convulsions. (3) "Les convulsions de Saint-Médard furent la réponse de Dieu à l'orgueilleux entêtement janséniste. En permettant ces excentricités, Dieu a montré à l'humanité d'où pouvait venir pour nous la privation de la liberté, la déchéance de nos droits et la perte de notre grandeur."

-
- (1) C.A. Sainte-Beuve, Port-Royal. 3rd ed. Paris. 1867. 4 vols. Vol. 3, pp. 178 sq.
 (2) Op. cit., p. 509
 (3) Ibid., p. 523.

A serious English theologian of the last century - J.M. Neale (1) gives an excellent summary of Jansenism in France up to the period of the convulsions. He accepts the miraculous nature of the Holy Thorn "a miracle as astonishing as indisputable ... The facts of the disease and the sudden cure are not denied." (2). About the earlier miracles at the tomb of the Deacon Paris, Neale says: (3) "whatever may be said to the contrary, the belief was very general, and the witnesses unsuspected, ... and it must be confessed that, if anyone will take the trouble of looking into de Montgeron's large quarto on the subject, it does seem extremely difficult to allow sufficient evidence for any miracle, if we deny it to these. But it is also most certain that false miracles began to be got up and that with very little skill." Of the convulsions, Neale says: (4) "The spectacle was most revolting."

We should expect Gazier to deal more sympathetically with this problem. He accepts the miracle of the Holy Thorn and speaks harshly of Sainte-Beuve in this connection. (5). His ~~xxx~~ chapter xv is devoted to the 18th century miracles. A full account is given and he concludes: "Il est impossible de se prononcer d'une manière absolue et de prendre parti pour ou contre. Le plus sage, est d'attendre en silence que la science ait dit son dernier mot, si jamais elle parvient à pouvoir le dire."

Préclin shows no sympathy towards the convulsionnaires.

So much for some of the moderns. It is of more interest, perhaps, to quote from a writer contemporary with the incidents of the 18th century.

(1) J.M. Neale, A History of the so-called Jansenist Church of Holland. Oxford. 1858.

(2) Ibid., p. 27

(3) Ibid., p. 56

(4) Ibid., p. 57

(5) Op. cit., vol. 1, p. 109.

References to the Catéchisme historique et dogmatique have already been made. (I). The miracles are dealt with in vol. 1, pp. 312-343 and vol. 2, pp. 363-390. The miracle at Port-Royal is spoken of as "la protection visible que Dieu accorda à Port-Royal par les miracles qu'il y opéra, arrêta pour un tems la persécution ... le plus fameux fut celui qui s'opéra le 24 Mars 1656 sur une mademoiselle Perrier nièce du fameux M. Pascal, & pensionnaire à Port-Royal de Paris, & qui est encore vivante cette année 1728. Elle avoit l'oeil mangé d'une fistule lachrymale, dont l'humeur étoit si maligne qu'elle lui avoit carié l'os du nez & du palais, & lui tomboit dans la bouche. On vouloit lui appliquer le feu, afin d'empêcher que le mal ne gagnât davantage; & l'on avoit écrit à son pere qui étoit en province pour qu'il vînt assister à cette opération. Mais une Religieuse ayant eu compassion de cette enfant, lui fit baiser la sainte Epine de la Couronne du Sauveur qu'on avoit à Port-Royal. Elle guérit subitement & quand les Chirugiens vinrent pour faire l'opération, ils furent dans le dernier étonnement de voir que l'oeil malade ou plutôt qui n'existoit plus, étoit remplacé et étoit aussi sain que l'autre. Ce miracle après avoir été attesté par les chirurgiens et les médecins, fut publié par un Mandement des Grands-Vicaires du Cardinal de Retz qui ordonnerent des prières en action de grâces. Tout Paris accourut à Port-Royal pour voir la fille qui avoit été guérie; et ce fait fut reconnu de tout le monde. Il y eut ensuite d'autres miracles opérés par l'attouchement de la même sainte Epine. Il y en a eu la même année un reconnu par Sentence des Grands-Vicaires de Paris, & un autre qui s'étoit fait à Provins, reconnu par Sentence des Grands-Vicaires de Sens. Il s'est aussi opéré plusieurs autres miracles avant et après ce tems à Port-Royal, & plusieurs personnes dignes de foi en ont rendu témoignage; mais l'humilité de ces Religieuses les a portées à ne les pas découvrir au public, & à se contenter de s'en édifier & d'en remercier Dieu dans le silence."

(I) See Appendix A, pp. 244-246.

The Catéchisme then deals with the Jesuit reaction to the miracles. (1) "Ils n'osèrent en disconvenir; mais ils publièrent dans un écrit, que c'étoit une marque que ces Religieuses étoient hérétiques: Dieu ne faisant des miracles que pour convertir les hérétiques ..."

The writer of the Catéchisme sees divine help for the Jansenists in the miracles at the tomb of the Deacon Paris. (2) "Lorsque les maux inondèrent de toutes parts, & que la vérité est le plus violemment attaquée Dieu lui-même sort de son secret & vient au secours des Défenseurs de sa cause. La Capitale du Royaume retentit des Miracles qui s'opèrent au Tombeau de M. François de Paris Diacre, mort Appellant & Reappellant en 1727, & enterré à Saint Medard. Dieu en avoit déjà accordé plusieurs par son intercession, peu de tems après sa mort, & du vivant de M. le Cardinal de Noailles qui avoit commis les Officiers de l'Archevêché pour les examiner. Il y en avoit quatre de vérifiés juridiquement, & les procès-verbaux en furent remis par ordre de son Eminence au Pere Fouquet Prêtre de l'Oratoire, qui les déposa en 1731 chez Savigny Notaire. Les Curés de Paris, au nombre de plus de vingt, présentent Requête à M. de Vintimille successeur de M. le Cardinal de Noailles, y joignent une expédition desdits procès-verbaux, & prient M. l'Archevêque de les recevoir, & de faire examiner d'une manière canonique les autres faits qui se sont opérés & qui s'opèrent tous les jours par l'intercession du sieur de Paris. M. l'Archevêque ne répond point à cette Requête, ce qui engage les Curés à lui en présenter trois mois après une seconde dans laquelle ils lui indiquent treize autres miracles, offrant de lui en administrer toutes les preuves. Ils entendent (disent-ils dans cette Requête) les fideles publier avec admiration, que les paralytiques marchent, que les hydropiques sont guéris, que les membres perclus sont délivrés, que les sourds entendent, que les muets

(1) Cat. Hist., vol. 1, p. 330

(2) Ibid., vol. 2, pp. 479 sq.

parlent, que les yeux désespérément malades & presque éteints sont éclairés, que les ulcères sont refermés, que les malades à l'extrémité sont rétablis sur le champ & recouvrent toutes leurs forces, que ceux qui vont par dérision au tombeau du serviteur de Dieu, y sont frappés par une main invisible, & ce qui est encore plus consolant pour des Pasteurs, que ces merveilles sont suivies de conversions éclatantes. M. l'Archevêque répond aussi peu à cette seconde Requête qu'à la première."

The Catéchisme continues: "Les miracles se multiplient à Paris & dans les Provinces. Dieu en fait d'éclatans à Troyes, à Seignelay, à Blois, à Pezenas, à Montpellier & ailleurs. Les Constitutionnaires en sont troublés & font tous leurs efforts pour les détruire. Non contents d'en empêcher un examen juridique & régulier, ils engagent l'autorité séculière & ecclésiastique à tout employer pour étouffer leur puissante voix: de là l'attention de la Cour & des Officiers de la Police à tout ce qui concerne l'invocation du saint Diacre & ses miracles: de là les exils de tant de personnes, & les emprisonnements de tant d'autres, soit pour avoir fréquenté l'Eglise de saint Médard, soit pour avoir rendu témoignage aux miracles. Des Curés même sont enlevés pour ce second délict. On fait disparaître la veuve de Lorme, & on l'enferme dans une retraite inconnue, pour ensevelir avec elle, si cela étoit possible, la mémoire & les preuves du prodige de punition arrivé sur cette femme. D'autres personnes qui ont fait une expérience plus heureuse du pouvoir du saint Diacre sont mises en prison ou n'osent se montrer. Les Religieuses même^{ne} sont pas à l'abri de ces forces de violences. Madame de Megrigni Religieuse de Troyes est enlevée par l'Intendant de la Province qui signifie en même tems à M. l'Evêque de Troyes des défenses de la Cour d'informer du miracle opéré sur elle."

The attitude of Rome to the miracles is given: (I) "Rome de son côté lance un Bref fulminant & rempli de qualifications les plus dures contre une Instruction pastorale de M. de Montpellier sur les miracles

(I) Ibid., vol. 2, p. 481

que Dieu fait éclater en faveur de la cause des appellans. Mais le lendemain même de la date du Bref, Dieu prépare à ce Prélat une consolation contre les déclamations injurieuses de la Cour de Rome, par un miracle qui s'opère à la Verune, sa maison de campagne, & dont il ne manque pas de faire lui-même les informations & la publication. M. l'Evêque d'Auxerre publie presque en même tems un miracle éclatant opéré dans son Diocèse dans la ville de Seignelay, & dont il a fait lui-même les informations pendant plusieurs jours. La Cour supprime par un Arrêt le Mandement de ce Prélat, quoique écrit avec beaucoup de modération. M. l'Archevêque de Sens qui craint que ces merveilles du Tout-puissant ne nuisent à la cause qu'il défend depuis plusieurs années, s'efforce de les combattre dans une Instruction Pastorale remplie de principes hazardés, de faits du moins douteux, & de faux raisonnemens. Un Théologien en montre les Sophismes dans un écrit court et solide. Les Cures de Paris maltraités dans cette Instruction pastorale en appellent comme d'abus au Parlement, & s'y pourvoient au nombre de 23 par une Requête, où la vérité des quatre premiers miracles vérifiés par ordre de M. le Cardinal de Noailles, est mise dans le dernier degré d'evidence; mais la Cour empêche le Parlement de faire droit sur cette Requête. M. l'Evêque d'Auxerre qui se trouve aussi attaqué dans cette Instruction pastorale de son Métropolitain, de même dans un Décret de Rome, & dans d'autres écrits & libelles, se voit par là obligé de se défendre: & tous ces différens écrits lui fournissent l'occasion de constater de nouveau la certitude du miracle de Seignelay dans une Instruction pastorale, dans laquelle il refute solidement les difficultés frivoles qu'on oppose à ce miracle: il met au grand jour les abus multipliés & les excès intolérables du Décret de Rome qui a été supprimé par un Arrêt du Parlement & après avoir fait voir les procédés aussi indécents qu'irreguliers de M. de Sens, il met en poudre les vaines subtilités & les mauvaises chicanes de ce Prélat contre le miracle de Seignelay."

After four years the Archbishop of Paris replies to the two Requête^s of his clergy. He admits that the news of the miracles is very widespread, "mais rien n'a pu l'engager à faire des informations juridiques de ces prétendus miracles & il n'a pas même dessein d'en faire". (I).

The Catéchisme is less positive about the Convulsions, opinions on which, the author admits, are divided even among the appellants. We see an example of such division in a letter written by the famous Jansenist de la Borde in 1735: (2) Lettre du Révérend Pere de la Borde, Prestre de l'oratoire, a M.L'evêque d'Auxerre, sur le silence de la Consultation des xxx Docteurs, au sujet des Miracles opérés aux Tombeaux des Appellans. In this letter de la Borde distinguishes between the miracles and the convulsions. The Consultation did not mention the miracles, and he does not doubt that there were some: "mais de ces deux questions, la vérité des miracles est-elle incontestable? Et de cette autre: est-il permis de regarder les Convulsions comme l'oeuvre de Dieu? Ne peut-on pas séparer l'une de l'autre, & dans l'ordre de la Religion peut-on les mettre de niveau?" For many people, the first is a simple matter of fact and one might be wrong or in doubt. With regard to the convulsions the facts are not disputed. "Ce n'est pas des faits qu'on dispute ici, l'on en convient de part et d'autre: & par conséquent toute la question est une pure question de droit, sur laquelle on ne peut être dans l'erreur, ni dans le doute, que par erreur de droit, & de quel droit encore? Il se réduit à savoir si Dieu peut être l'auteur de mille indécences, de puérités, de faussetés & de mensonges sans nombre."

The Archbishops of Paris (Vintimille) and Sens use the convulsions as an argument against the miracles, about which the author of the Catéchisme has no doubt. He contents himself with these remarks: (3) "que
[quelque

(1) Cat. Hist., vol. 2, pp. 482 sq.

(2) Copy in the Bodleian Library (Mason DD.302)

(3) Cat. Hist., vol. 2, pp. 485 sq.

sentiment qu'on ait sur la nature ou sur le principe des Convulsions, on doit reconnoître de bonne foi, comme tous les Appellans le reconnoissent, qu'elles ne peuvent donner aucune atteinte, ni aux miracles qui ont été opérés avant la naissance des Convulsions, ni à ceux qui ont été opérés depuis, ou qui s'opèrent encore tous les jours sans Convulsions, ni enfin à ceux qui s'opéreroient avec des convulsions, lesquels ne renferméroient rien d'indigne de Dieu.

2. Qu'elles peuvent encore moins préjudicier à la canonicité de l'appel qui a été interjetté de la Bulle Unigenitus au futur Concile, ou à la certitude des vérités attaquées par cette Bulle, & défendues par les Appellans.

3. Que le partage même des sentimens des Appellans sur cet événement montre que leur réunion intime & persévérante dans la cause de l'appel, n'a jamais eu d'autre principe que leur amour pour la vérité, sans aucun mélange d'un esprit de cabale & de parti, puisque nulle liaison ne peut les empêcher de réclamer hautement en faveur de la vérité & de la Religion, dès qu'ils ont la moindre appréhension qu'on ne les blesse & qu'on ne les deshonne en quelque chose.

4. Enfin que les fidèles ne doivent point être ébranlés, ni scandalisés de cette espece de division, puisqu'on a vû dans tous les tems des disputes & des contestations même parmi les gens de bien & les plus grands saints; mais qu'ils doivent demeurer fermes dans la croyance des mêmes vérités qu'ils ont toujours crues, s'attacher inviolablement aux regles prescrites par la sainte Ecriture & la Tradition, éviter soigneusement tout fanatisme, être attentifs à conserver la paix & la charité; en un mot à observer exactement la maxime d'un ancien, dont la pratique est très-nécessaire particulièrement en ce tems. *In necessariis unitas, in dubiis libertas, in omnibus caritas.*"

At the end of the second volume the writer reviews what he has written. In the miracles he sees the hand of God protecting the appellants and one has the impression of a sincere writer with little of the animosity so frequent in the writings of the period.

The Nouvelles Ecclésiastiques also have something to say about the miracles and convulsions. That of the 20 May, 1773 records the death of Mlle Perrier at the age of 87. She had sent for a priest who saw a portrait of the Deacon Paris; this led to an argument in which Mlle Perrier asserted the truth of the miracles at his tomb. The priest gave her Extreme Unction but later refused to give her Communion unless she promised not to read anything against the Constitution, and to break off contacts with opponents of the Bull. Her reply is interesting: "Vous savez, M., lui dit cette pieuse Dlle que le Roi ne veut pas qu'en pareille occasion on exige des personnes de mon sexe, ce que vous exigez de moi, ni qu'on fasse les questions que vous me faites ... S.M. deffend qu'on inquiette les Fideles à l'article de la mort sur la Constitution. Je ne suis pas Anglican, répondit froidement le Curé, ni par consequent obligé de suivre les ordres du Roi dans l'administration des Sacremens." The bishop ordered another priest to administer the sacraments.

There are doubts about the convulsions in the Nouvelles Ecclésiastiques. A M. Montgeron had written in defence of the miracles and the convulsions. In an article for January 1742 the second volume of Montgeron's book (1) is adversely criticised as is a similar article for the 30 September, 1742. (2). Due weight is given to a magistrate who is accustomed to relating facts but it is a different matter when the magistrate turns theologian. In these critical times (the article says) and in events which are full of obscurities, it is essential to proceed according to the rules of Scripture and Tradition. "Dans la peinture que ce Livre nous fait des convulsions, l'on n'y présente guere ce qui s'y est mêlé de dangereux & de reprehensible." When the theologians have duly examined these extraordinary events, the Nouvelles Ecclésiastiques will report on them. But the Nouvelles Ecclésiastiques establish the miracles as e.g. 1st July, 1742, the cure of a young man for whom the doctors could do nothing.

(1) L.B. Carré de Montgeron, La Verité des miracles opérés à l'intercession de M. de Paris et autres appelans, démontrée contre M. l'archevêque de Sens. Nouvelle éd. Cologne. 1745, 1747. 3 vols.

(2) See also N.E., 1743, p. 27.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF WORKS CONSULTED

- Bib. Nat. - Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris
 Bod. Lib. - Bodleian Library, Oxford.
 H.A.M. - Writer's private Collection.
 Hfd. Cath. - Hereford Cathedral Library.

ORIGINAL SOURCES - MANUSCRIPT

- Paris. Parlement. Journal du Parlement sur l'affaire de la Constitution Unigenitus. Copie.
 1. de 1732 à 1753. 413 ff. 2. de 1754 à 1762. 535 ff.
 xviiiie siècle. 2 vols. /Microfilm/ (Bib. Nat.)
- Paris. Parlement. Extraits des Registres du Parlement relatifs aux refus de sacrements (1749-1760)
 xviiiie siècle. 2 vols. /Microfilm/ (Bib. Nat.)

ORIGINAL SOURCES - PRINTEDA. France

- Aguesseau, H.F. d'. Oeuvres. Paris. 1759-89. 13 vols.
 (Bib. Nat. and Bod. Lib.)
- Arnauld, Antoine. De la fréquente communion. Paris. 1669. (First issued Paris, 1643) (Bod. Lib.)
- Barbier, E.J.F. Journal historique et anecdotique du règne de Louis xv. Paris. 1847-49. 4 vols. (Bod. Lib.)
- Boileau, J. De Antiquo jure presbyterorum in regimine ecclesiastico. Taurini. 1676. (Bod. Lib.)
- Bossuet, J.B. (Bp. of Meaux) Défense de la déclaration de l'Assemblée du clergé de France. Amsterdam. 1745. (First issued 1682). (Latin text in Oeuvres complètes, Tome 21, 22. Paris. 1865. (Bod. Lib.))
- Bossuet, J.B. (Bp. of Meaux) Discours de l'unité de l'Eglise. (Sermon preached 1682). (In Oeuvres complètes, Tome 11, Paris. 1863 (p. 588) (Bod. Lib.))

- Boursier, L.F. De l'action de Dieu sur les créatures, traité dans lequel on prouve la promotion physique ..
Paris. 1713. 2 vols. (Bod.Lib.)
- Burigny, M. de. Vie de M. Bossuet Evêque de Meaux.
Bruxelles. 1761. (H.A.M.)
- Drappier, G. Du Gouvernement des diocèses en commun par les Evesques et les curez. Bâle. 1707. 2 vols.
/Microfilm/ (Bib.Nat.)
- Duguet, J.J. Conférences ecclésiastiques ou dissertations sur les auteurs et la discipline des premiers siècles de l'Eglise. Pavie. 1789-91. 6 vols. (Bod. Lib.)
- Duguet, J.J. Institution d'un Prince. London. 1739.
(Bod.Lib.)
- Duguet, J.J. Traité sur les devoirs d'un Evêque. /s.l./
1710. (Bod.Lib.)
- Duguet, J.J. Traitez sur la prière publique. Paris.
1707. (Bod.Lib.)
- Dupin, A., ed. Libertés de l'Eglise Gallicane, suivies de la Declaration de 1682, et d'autres pièces authentiques avec une introduction et des notes. Seconde édition.
Paris. 1826. (H.A.M.)
- Du Pin, L.E. A New ecclesiastical history of the 17th century. Vol. 1 (only vol. publ. in this ed.)
Oxford. 1725. (Bod. Lib.)
Another edition. Oxford. 1725. 2 vols. (Birmingham Univ.)
- /Du Saussoy, Abbé/ La Verité rendue sensible à tout le monde contre les Défenseurs de la Constitution Unigenitus ...
3 e. édition. Bruxelles. 1720. (H.A.M.)
- Grégoire, H. Les Ruines de Port-Royal des Champs. Nouvelle édition. Paris. 1809. (H.A.M.)
- Hardy, S.R. Mes Loisirs: journal d'événements tels qu'ils parviennent à ma connaissance. 1729-1806. Paris. 1912
(Liverpool University)
- /Jabineau, Abbé H./ Dénonciation à Mgr. l'Archevêque de Paris. /1786/
(Bod.Lib.)

- Jansenius, C.O. Augustinus seu doctrina S. Augustini de humanae naturae sanitate, aegritudine, medicina, adversus Pelagianos et Massilienses. Paris. 1641.
2 vols. in 1. (First issued Louvain, 1640)
(Hfd. Cath.)
- La Borde, V. de. Lettre du Révérend Père de la Borde ... à M. l'Evesque d'Auxerre, sur le silence de la consultation des xxx docteurs, au sujet des Miracles opérés aux Tombeaux des Appellans. [1735/ (Bod.Lib.)
- La Borde, V. de. Principes sur l'essence, la distinction et les limites des deux puissances, spirituelle et temporelle. Paris. 1753. (Bod.Lib.)
- Languet de la Villeneuve de Gergy, J.-J. (App. of Sens) Avertissement de Monseigneur l'Evêque de Soissons à ceux qui, dans son diocèse, se sont déclarés appelants de la Constitution Unigenitus. [s.l./ 1718. (Bod.Lib.)
- Le Gros, N. Du renversement des libertez de l'Eglise gallicane dans l'affaire de la Constitution Unigenitus. [s.l./ 1716. 2 vols. (Bod. Lib.)
- Le Gros, N. Mémoire sur les droits du second ordre de clergé. 'En France'. 1733. (Bod. Lib.)
- Le Maistre (Isaac Louis) de Sacy. L'Histoire du Vieux et du Nouveau Testament, avec des explications édifiantes, tirées des Saints Pères. Edition nouvelle. Paris. 1686. (Bod. Lib.)
- [L'Epée, l'Abbé C.M. de/ Reflexions chrétiennes sur la précipitation scandaleuse des Messes. [1786/ (Bod.Lib.)
- Molina, L. Concordia liberi arbitrii cum gratiae donis, divina praesentia, providentia, praedestinatione et reprobatione; ad nonnullas primae partis D. Thomae articulos. Antwerp. 1595. (Hfd. Cath.)
- Montaigne, M.E. de. Essais. Paris. [n.d./ Vol. 2. (H.A.M.)

- Montgeron, L.B. Carré de. La Verité des miracles opérés à l'intercession de M. de Paris et autres appelans, démontrée contre M. l'Archevêque de Sens. Nouvelle édition. Cologne. 1745, 1747. 3 vols. (Bod.Lib.)
- Nicole, P. Essais de morale contenus en divers traités sur plusieurs devoirs importants. Paris. 1755. (Bod. Lib.)
- Noaille^s, L.-A. de. Première Instruction Pastorale au clergé de son diocèse sur la Constitution Unigenitus. Paris. 1719. (Bod.Lib.)
- Nouvelles Ecclésiastiques; Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de la Bulle Unigenitus. 1728-1803. 26 vols. (Bod.Lib.)
- Paris. Parlement. Remontrances du Parlement de Paris au xviii^e siècle. Paris. 1888. 3 vols. (Bod. Lib.)
- Pascal, B. Pensées. Texte de l'édition Brunschvicg. Paris. 1958. (H.A.M.)
- Pascal, B. Les Provinciales. Paris. 1803. (First issued 1676-7) (Bod. Lib.)
- Pavie de Fourquevaux, J.B.R. de Beccarie de. Catéchisme historique et dogmatique sur les contestations qui divisent maintenant l'Eglise /etc./ . Nancy. 1750-68 5 vols. (First publ. 1729-30. 2 vols.) (Bib. Nat.)
- Quesnel, P. Le Nouveau Testament en françois avec des reflexions morales sur chaque verset. Bruxelles. 1700-1702. 8 vols. in 4. (Bfd. Cath.)
Another edition. 1698 (Birmingham City Lib.)
- Reymond, H. Droits des curés et des paroisses considérés sous leur double rapport spirituel et temporel en deux parties. Paris. 1776. (Bibliothèque, Nantes)
- Richer, E. Apologia pro Joanne Gersonio pro suprema auctoritate ecclesiae et concilii generalis auctoritate. Lugduni Batavorum. 1676. (First issued 1605). (Bod.Lib.)

- Richer, E. De Ecclesiastica et politica potestate libellus. Paris. 1612. (Bod.Lib.)
- Richer, E. Historia conciliorum generalium in quatuor libros distributa. Cologne. 1681-1683. 4 vols. in 1. (Hfd. Cath.)
- Robin, C. L'Ami des peuples; ou mémoire intéressant pour l'Eglise et l'Etat ... adressé à Mgr. l'Evêque d'Angers en l'année 1760. Angers. 1764. (Bibliothèque de la ville d'Angers)
- Sainte-Beuve, C.A. Port-Royal. 3rd ed. Paris. 1867. 4 vols. (Hfd. Cath.)
- Sebond, R. de /Sabunde/ La Théologie naturelle de Raymond Sebon. Trans. by Montaigne. Paris. 1581. (Bod.Lib.)
- Soanen, Jean (Bp. of Senez). Instruction pastorale. /s.l./ 1726. (Bod. Lib.)
- Voltaire, pseud. (François Marie Arouet). Siècle de Louis xiv. Paris. /n.d./ (H.A.M.)

N.B. The Bodleian Library is rich in works on Jansenism, including several Recueils de Pièces. Note especially:-

Mason DD 157 Mason JJ 142 Mason DD 302
Mason DD 180 and 3 A 1162.

All these contain a large amount of controversial material.

ORIGINAL SOURCES - PRINTEDB. Italy.

- Codignola, E. Carteggi di Giansenisti Liguri.
 Firenze. 1941-1949. 3 vols.
 (This work contains 2278 pages of letters,
 many previously unpublished. See page 173,
 note I, of text.) (H.A.M.)
- Pistoia. Synod of. Actes et Décrets du Concile
 diocésain de Pistoie de 1786, traduits de
 l'Italian. Pistoie. 1788. (Bod.Lib.)
- Ricci, S. dei. Istruzione pastorale sulla nuova
 devozione al Cuor di Gesù. Pistoia. 1781
 (Bod.Lib.)
- Ricci, S. dei. Memorie di Scipione de Ricci,
 edited by A. Calli. Florence. 1865.
 (H.A.M.)
- Savio, P. Devozione di Mgr Adeodato Turchi alla
 Santa Sede. Rome. 1938.
 (This work contains 677 letters copied from
 the papal archives. See page 205 of text.)
 (H.A.M.)

SECONDARY SOURCES(Locations are given only for foreign works.)A. General

- Cambridge Modern History. Edited by A.W. Ward, G.W. Prothero and S. Leathes. Cambridge. 1902-12. 12 vols., index and atlas. (H.)
- Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique. Edited by A. Vacant, E. Mangenot and E. Amman. Paris. 1903 - 15 vols. in 30, and index in progress. This work has excellent bibliographies. (Hfd. Cath.)
- Jervis, W.H. The Gallican Church; a history of the Church of France from ... 1516 to the Revolution. London. 1872. 2 vols.

Oxford. Bodleian Library. Catalogues.B. France

- Abercrombie, N.J. The Origins of Jansenism. Oxford. 1936.
- Adam, A. Sur le problème religieux dans la première moitié du 18e siècle. (Zahorff lecture for 1959). Oxford. 1959. (H.A.M.)
- Bishop, M. Pascal: the life of a genius. London. 1937.
- Bourlon, I. Les Assemblées du clergé et le Jansénisme. Paris. 1909. (H.A.M.)
- Bromley, J.S. The Decline of absolute monarchy. In: Wallace-Hadrill, J.M., and McManners, J., eds. France: government and society. London. 1957. pp. 134-160.

- Brunetière, F., ed. Pascal. Provinciales. Lettres
I, IV, XIII et extraits. 11th ed. Paris. 1918.
(H.A.M.)
- Carreyre, J. Le Jansénisme durant la Régence.
(Bibliothèque de la Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiast-
ique. Fasc. 2-4.) Louvain. 1929-1933. 3 vols.
(H.A.M.)
- Carreyre, J. Les Lutttes du jansénisme. (In: Revue
d'Histoire de l'Eglise de France, vol.10, 1924,
pp. 441-460.) (Glasgow University)
- Ceyssens, L. Sources relatives aux débuts du jansénisme
et de l'antijansénisme, 1640-1643. (Bibliothèque
de la Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique. Fasc. 31)
Louvain. 1957. (H.A.M.)
- Challe, A. Histoire de l'Auxerrois; son territoire, son
diocèse, son conté, ses Baronnie, son bailliage.
Paris. 1878. (Bib. Nat.)
- Charrier, J. Histoire du Jansénisme dans le diocèse de
Nevers. Paris. 1920. (Quarr Abbey, Ryde, I. of W.)
- Clercq, C. de. La Législation religieuse franque de
Clovis à Charlemagne (507-814). Louvain et Paris.
1936. (Bod.Lib.)
- Cobban, A. A History of modern France. Hamondsworth.
1957.
- Delassault, G. Le Maistre de Sacy et son temps. Paris.
1957. (H.A.M.)
- De Maistre, J. De l'Eglise Gallicane. Lyon. 1859.
(H.A.M.)
- Du Bois, L. Histoire de Lisieux. Lisieux. 1845. 2 vols.
(Bibliothèque Mazarine)
- Eastwood, D.M. The Revival of Pascal. Oxford. 1936.
- Galton, A.H. Church and State in France, 1300-1907.
London. 1907.

- Gazier, A. Histoire générale du mouvement Janséniste depuis ses origines jusqu'à nos jours. Paris. 1923-4. 2 vols. (H.A.M.)
- Glasson, E. Le Parlement de Paris: son rôle politique depuis le règne de Charles VII jusqu'à la Révolution. Paris. 1901. 2 vols. (Bod.Lib.)
- Guardini, R. Pascal: ou le drame de la conscience chrétienne. Paris. 1951. (H.A.M.)
- Jette, M.H. France religieuse du 18e siècle. Paris. 1956. (H.A.M.)
- Knox, R.A. Enthusiasm. Oxford. 1950.
- La Gorce, P. de. Histoire religieuse de la Révolution Française. 16th ed. Paris. 1922-24. 5 vols. (H.A.M.)
- La Fontenelle de Vaudoré, A.D. de. Histoire du monastère et des évêques de Luçon. Paris. 1847. 2 vols. (Bibliothèque Fontenay-le-Comte, Vendée)
- Laporte, J. La Doctrine de Port-Royal: La Morale. (Bibliothèque d'Histoire de la Philosophie). Paris. 1951-2. 2 vols. (H.A.M.)
- Lepointe, G. L'Organisation et la politique financières du clergé de France sous le règne de Louis XV. Paris. 1923. (Edinburgh University)
- Masnard, J. Pascal: his life and works. London. 1952.
- Montherlant, H. de. Port-Royal. 93rd ed. Paris. 1954. (H.A.M.)
- Mortimer, E. Blaise Pascal. London. 1959.
- Neale, J.M. A History of the so-called Jansenist Church of Holland. Oxford. 1858.
- Palmer, W. A Treatise on the Church of Christ. 2nd ed. London. 1839. 2 vols.

- Paquier, J. Le Jansenisme: étude doctrinale d'après les sources. Paris. 1909. (H.A.M.)
- Pisani, P. Répertoire biographique de l'épiscopat constitutionnel, 1791-1802. Paris. 1907. (London University)
- Poinsenet, M.D. France religieuse du xvii^e siècle. Paris. 1958. (H.A.M.)
- Pourrat, P. La Spiritualité chrétienne. Paris. 1947-51. 4 vols. (H.A.M.)
- Préclin, E. Les Jansénistes du xviii^e siècle et la Constitution Civile du Clergé. Paris. 1929. (H.A.M.)
- Préclin, E., and Jarry, E. Les luttes politiques et doctrinales aux xvii^e et xviii^e siècles. (Histoire de l'Eglise depuis les origines jusqu'à nos jours. Fondée par A.Fliche et V.Martin. 19) Paris. 1955-6. 2 vols. (H.A.M.)
- Prévost, A. Le Diocèse de Troyes: histoire et documents. Domois. 1923-26. 3 vols. (Bibliothèque de Troyes)
- Puyol, E. Edmond Richer: étude historique et critique sur la rénovation du Gallicanisme au commencement du xvii^e siècle. Paris. 1876. 2 vols. (H.A.M.)
- Rimbaud, A. Histoire de la civilisation française. Paris. [n.d./] 2 vols. (H.A.M.)
- Stewart, H.F. The Heart of Pascal and Pascal's Apology for religion. Cambridge. 1942.
- Taveneaux, R. Le Jansenisme en Lorraine, 1640-1789. (Bibliothèque de la Société d'Histoire Ecclésiastique de la France). Paris. 1960. (National Central Library)
- Thomas, J.F. La Querelle de l'Unigenitus. Paris. 1950. (H.A.M.)
- Wallace-Hadrill, J.M., and McManners, J., eds. France: government and society. London. 1957.

SECONDARY SOURCESC. Italy

- Codignola, E. Illuministi, Giansenisti E. Giacobini nell'Italia del Settecento. Firenze. 1947. (H.A.M.)
- Dammig, E. Il Movimento Giansenista a Roma nella seconda metà del Secolo xviii. Città del Vaticano. 1945. (H.A.M.)
- Jemolo, A.C. Il Giansenismo in Italia prima della rivoluzione. Bari. 1928. (H.A.M.)
- Potter, L.J.A. de. Vie et Mémoires de Scipion de Ricci. Paris. 1826. 4 vols. (H.A.M.)
- Préclin, E. L'Influence du jansénisme français à l'étranger. In: Revue Historique, Jan.-juin, 1938. (Birmingham University)
- Rodolico, N. Gli amici e i tempi di Scipione dei Ricci. Firenze. 1920. (H.A.M.)
- Shackleton, R. Montesquieu: a critical biography. Oxford. 1961.
- Vaussard, M. Daily life in eighteenth century Italy; trans. by M. Heron. London. 1962.
- Vaussard, M. Jansénisme et Gallicanisme aux origines religieuses du Risorgimento. Paris. 1959. (H.A.M.)
- Vaussard, M. Les Jansénistes italiens et la Constitution Civile du Clergé. In: Revue Historique, Avril-juin, 1951. (Birmingham University)

I N D E X

Some words such as Gallicanism, Jesuits, Paris, Rome, Papacy, Second Order of Clergy, etc. occur so frequently in the text that they are not indexed.

Abbreviations

Ab. - Abbé, Abbate, R.Père, Curé	Abp. - Archbishop
Bp. - Bishop	Cdl. - Cardinal

-
- Abercrombie, Nigel. i, 270
 Accomodement, 1720. 40, 70, 72
Actes et Décrets du Concile Diocésain de Pistoie.
See under Pistoia - Synod of.
 Adam, A. v, vii, 270
 Agde, Bishop of. 72
 Aguesseau, H.F. d' 62-3, 66, 249, 264
 Aguire, Francesco d' 174
 Aix, Bp. of. 133
 Aix, Parlement of. 95, 97, 107-8, 117
 Alais, Bp. of. 72
 Alamanni, Bp. of Pistoia. 223
 Albani, Pope. 182
 Alet, Bp. of. 72
 Alexander vi, Pope. 81
 Alexander viii, Pope. 14, 150
 Alexander, Bp. of Alexandria. 44
 Ambrose, Saint. 211
 Amersfoort, Old Catholic Seminary. 140
 Amiens, Bp. of. 105
 Amiens, diocese of. 91, 98, 118
 Amsterdam. 27
 Andujar, Bp. of Tortona. 97 (note), 188
 Angoulême, Bp. of. 69
Annali Ecclesiastici. 161, 218
 Antrecourt, Ab. Lebrun d'. 137
Apostolicum, Bull. 188
 Aquinas, Saint Thomas. See Thomas Aquinas, Saint.
 Archetto, The. 154, 179, 180, 187-8, 205-8, 213
 Argenson, M.R.V. d'. 66, 120
 Arles, Bp. of. 72

- Arnauld, Angélique. iv
 Arnauld, Antoine. iv, vii, 2-5, 10-11, 25, 27, 149-150,
 152, 163-6, 171, 174, 182, 185-6, 190-191, 197, 221-2,
 255, 264
De la fréquente communion. iv, 2-3, 10, 166, 185,
 192, 264
 Arouet, François-Marie. See Voltaire, pseud.
 Asti, diocèse of. 163
 Athanasius, Saint. 150
Auctorem fidei, Bull. 163, 189, 196, 202, 235, 240, 241.
 Augsburg, Synod of, 1548. 47
 Augustine of Hippo, Saint and Augustinianism. iv-vi,
 1-2, 5, 7, 29, 71, 146-8, 159, 168-9, 171, 177-8,
 189-190, 208, 216, 232
Augustinus. See Jansenius, C.O.
 Austrian States. 157-8, 164, 205, 215
 Auxerre, Bp. of. 79, 260-1
 Auxerre, diocese of. 66, 104
 Auxerre, Library of. ii
 Avignon. 210
 Azzolini, Cdl. D. 148

- Baius, Michel. 147, 190
 Baldovinetti, A. 211-2
 Bâle (Basle), Council of. 24, 68
 Balzac, Honoré de. 6
 Barbier, E.J.F. 90, 105, 115, 133, 264
 Bauffremont, Le Prince de. 137
 Beaumont, Christophe de, Abp. of Paris. 103-5, 107-111,
 115, 118-9, 124, 132
 Beauvais, diocese of. 61
 Belgium. 27, 215
 Bellarmine, Saint Robert. xiii, 15, 151, 217
 Bellegarde, Gabriel Dupac de. xiii, 138, 163-5, 180, 204,
 212, 214-223.
 Belletête, Monsieur. 136
 Benedict xiii, Pope. 71, 97, 154, 255
 Benedict xiv, Pope. 83, 132, 152, 154, 161, 186, 188, 199
 Benoît. See Benedict.
 Bentivoglio, Ab. 187-8
 Berta, Ab. F. 176

- Bertone, B. 176, 188
 Bénulle, Pierre de. vi
 Béziers, Bp. of. 72
Bible de Jerusalem. 34
Bible - translation of. 34, 156, 169, 180, 191, 228,
 230-1, 242
 Bishop, M. 3-5, 8-9, 270
 Bissy, Cdl. de. 67, 85
 Blois. 259
 Bodleian Library. See Oxford, Bodleian Library
 Boileau, Jacques. 26, 55, 264
 Boileau-Despréaux, N. vi
 'Boîte à Perrette'. x
 Bona, Cdl. Giovanni. 148-150, 174, 185-6
 Boniface xiii, Pope. 86
 Borde, Vivien de la. See La Borde, V. de
 Bordeaux, Parlement of. 152
 Borromée, S. Charles. 214
 Bossuet, J.B., Bp. of Meaux. iv, 6, 9, 27, 30, 79, 87,
 166-7, 216-7, 221-2, 228, 249, 264
 Bossuet, J.B., Bp. of Troyes. iii, 76-80, 87 (note)
 Bottari, G.G. 151, 154, 156, 161, 169, 179-180, 185-8,
 200-1, 205-7
 Boucher, Ab. 246
 Bouettin, Ab. 109-110, 113
 Bouillerot, le sieur. 138
 Boulogne, Bp. of. 40, 65
 Boulogne, diocese of. 91, 98
 Bourgeois, J. 185
 Bourlon, I. viii, ix, 133, 270
 Boursier, L.F. 108, 179, 265
 Braschi. See Pius vi, Pope
 Bretagne (Brittany), Parlement of. 95, 127
 Bromley, J.S. 141-2, 270
 Brosses, Carlo de. 206
 Brunetière, F. 6, 142, 271
 Bruyère, Jean de la. See La Bruyère, Jean de.
 Bulls, Papal. See under titles:- Apostolicum, Auctorem
Fidei, Pastoralis officii, Unigenitus, Vineam Domini
 Burgundy, Parlement of. 95
 Burigny, M. de. 265

- Caissotti, Bp. of Asti. 176, 188
 Calvin, John. vi, 2, 190
Cambridge Modern History. 156, 233, 270
 Carcassonne, Bp. of. 72
 Carlo Emmanuel iii. 174-5
 Carpegna, Cdl. 148
 Carreyre, J. iii, 61-3, 67-9, 202, 271
 Casandra, Cdl. 148
 Casati, Bp. of Mondovi. 176
 Casoni, Lorenzo. 185
 Castres, Bp. of. 79
Catéchisme historique et dogmatique by Pavie de
 Fourquevaux. 56, 60, 65-6, 71, 73, 85, 88, 93, 98,
 110, 112, 114, 121-2, 244-6, 257-263, 267
 Caylus, Bp. of Auxerre. 79, 163, 179
 Ceppi, Nicola. 150
 Cerati, G. 179-180, 187
 Ceyssens, L. 271
 Challe, A. 271
 Châlons, diocese of 78
 Chantal, Ste. Jeanne-Françoise Frémiot de. See Frémiot de
 Chantal, Ste. Jeanne-Françoise.
 Charles ii, King of Spain. 29, 161
 Charrier, J. 271
 Chauvelin, M. garde des sceaux. 96
 Chauvelin, Ab. 123
 Chevalier, Ab. 64
 Chiusi, Bp. 233
 Chrysostom, Saint. 150, 211, 229
 Cisteron, Bp. of. 125
 Clement, Saint. 234
 Clement viii, Pope. 2
 Clement x, Pope. 148
 Clement xi, Pope. 9, 70, 149, 182, 199
 Clement xii, Pope. 151, 154, 161
 Clement xiii, Pope. 154-5, 161, 186, 188
 Clement xiv, Pope. 155, 161, 176, 188-9
 Clément de Tremblay, Auguste-Jean-Charles. 163-5, 218, 221-2.
 'Clementine Peace'. 9, 25, 27, 88, 148
 Clercq, C. de. 242, 271
 Clermont, Bp. of. 64
 Cobban, A. vii, 271

- Codde, Abp. Pierre. 164 (note)
 Codignola, Ernesto. 97 (note) 173-180, 182-5, 187-9,
 243, 269, 274
 Coffin, M. 108-9
 Colbert, J.J. Bp. of Montpellier. 126, 217
 Colle, Bp. of. 233
 Colonia, Dominique de. 148
 Colonna, Cdl. 148
 Compiègne. 100-1, 111, 128
 Conciliar Theory. Many refs. including 11-12, 15,
 17-26, 41-55, 58-9, 66, 68, 77, 151, 171-2, 196,
 237
 Concina, Daniel. 151-3, 156
 Constance, Council of. 12, 16, 68
 'Constitution'. See Unigenitus
 Constitution Civile du Clergé. ii, ix, xiv, 160, 162,
 166, 204
 Consultation de quarante avocats. 98-100
 Convulsions. vii, 40, 253-263.
 Cordelier, Anne. 135
 Cornet, Nicolas. 3
 Corsini, Cdl. 151, 187, 205, 207
 Cortona, Bp. 233
 Cosimo iii. 177, 217
Cri de la foi. 61
 Cyprian, Saint. 44, 211

- D'Aguesseau, H.F. See Aguesseau, H.F. d'
 D'Aguire, Francesco. See Aguire, Francesco d'
 Dammig, E. 161, 179, 189-201, 274
 Dante. 11
 Davignon, le sieur. 139
 De Bissy, Cdl. See Bissy, Cdl. de
 De Burigny, M. See Burigny, M. de
 De Clercq, C. See Clercq, C. de.
 De Colonia, Dominique. See Colonia, Dominique de
 Dégola, Eustache. 145, 161-3, 185-6
 De la Borde, Vivien. See La Borde, Vivien de
 De la Bruyère, Jean. See La Bruyère, Jean de
De la fréquente communion. See Arnauld, Antoine
 De la Gorce, P. See La Gorce, P. de

- Delagrange, Ab. 137
 De la Fontenelle de Vaudoré, A.D. See La Fontenelle de
 Vaudoré, A.D. de
 De la Motte. See La Motte, M. de
 De la Roche, Fontaine. See La Roche, Fontaine de
 Delassault, G. 271
 Del Mare, Ab. P.M. 165
 De Maistre, Joseph. x-xii, 6, 271
 De Medici. See Medici, Maria de
Demissas preces, Papal Brief. 71
 De Péréfixe, H. See Péréfixe, H. de
 De Potter, L.J.A. See Potter, L.J.A. de
 De Prades, Ab. See Prades, Ab. de
 De St. Macquer, Ab. See St. Macquer, Ab. de
 Descartes, René. 6, 183
 De Sebond, Raymond. See Sebond, Raymond de
 De Vecchi, Fabio. See Vecchi, Fabio de
Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique. vi (note), 146 (note),
 149, 151-2, 202, 235, 270
 Dijon, Parlement of. 91
 Dinelli (Eusebio Evaristo) 208
 Dorsanne, Ab. 164
 Drappier, Guy. xiv, 26, 28, 40-9, 55, 265
 Drouin, R.G. 175
 Dubois, Cdl. 28, 69-71
 Dubois, L. 271
 Duguet, Jacques Joseph. 51, 55, 165, 175, 215-6, 220, 265
 Dumont, M. 166
 Dupac de Bellegarde. See Bellegarde, Dupac de
 Du Perroñ, Cdl. 17
 Dupin, A. 249, 265
 Du Pin, Louis-Ellies. 22, 68, 216, 265
 Du Saussoy, Ab. 265
 Du Tillot, G.L. 210
 Du Vaucel, Louis-Paul. 175, 185
 Duvergier de Hauranne, Jean. See St.-Cyran, Ab. de

Eastwood, D.M. 271
 Education - Jansenist. 144, 218, 230
 Egbert, Abp. of York. 46
 Embrun, Bp. of 96
 Embrun, Council of. 40, 53, 56, 72-8, 87-8, 95, 175,
 246
 Emmanuel iii. 176
 England. 50, 64, 157, 227
 Escobar y Mendoza, Antonio. 7
 Estreés, Cdl. de. 149
 Evaristo, Eusebio, Pseud. See Dinelli
 Evreux, Bp. of. 127
Explications sur la Bulle Unigenitus. 70

Fabroni, A. 187
 Favoriti, Agostino. 185
 Febronius, Justinus, pseud. (Hontheim, Johann N. von)
 159
 Febronianism. 158-9, 193
 Fénelon, François de Salignac de La Mothe-Fénelon. 26, 218
 Ferrari, Cdl. 151
 Fini, Bp. 96
 Five Propositions. iv, 2-7, 10, 27-8, 74, 153, 159,
 185, 190-1, 194, 199
 Fleury, Cdl. A.H. de. 28, 52, 74, 89, 96, 100, 102,
 175, 216, 228
 Florence. 203, 207-210, 216
 Florence Academy. 211, 216
 Florence, Abp. of. 209
 Florence, Council of, 1787. 181, 239, 241
 Foggini, P.F. xiii, 151, 165, 179, 186, 187, 205-7
 Formulary. ix, 4-5, 9-11, 25, 27, 70, 81, 89, 91, 104
 Fouquet, Ab. 258
 Fourquevaux, Pavie de. See Pavie de Fourquevaux
 France, Assemblée Nationale du Clergé, 1797 & 1801. 162
 Francesco, Cdl. 150
 Freemasonry. 154, 168
 Frémiot de Chantal, Ste. Jeanne-Françoise. 139
 French Revolution. i-ii, vii, xii, 4, 8, 158, 163, 166,
 167, 195, 197, 212, 241, 250

- Galileo, G. 183
 Galli, A. 202 (note), 269. Gallican Liberties. 249-251.
 Galliot, Ab. 138
 Galton, Arthur Howard. 28, 271
 Garnot, Ab. 108
 Gavat, Ab. 137
Gazetta ecclesiastica, Florence. 210-11
Gazette de France. 117, 128
 Gazier, A. iv-v, x (note), 2-3, 7-8, 30 (note), 58,
 72, 140, 145, 206, 246, 254, 256, 272
 Genoa. 161, 187, 188
 Gerberon, Ab. G. ix, 174-5, 185
 Germain, Michel. 150
 Germany. 154, 164, 174, 187, 215
 Gerson, John. 11-12, 15, 21-22
 Gioberti, V. 168
 Giurisdizionalisimo. 193-5, 198
 Glasson, E. 251, 272
 Gorce, P. de la. See La Gorce, P. de
 Gourlin, Pierre-Sébastien or Jean-Etienne. xiii,
 171, 214-5, 217
 Grace. i, vi, 2, 4, 31, 145-6, 152, 171, 178, 189, 190-1,
 199, 211, 235
 Grégoire, Henri. xiv (note), 162-3, 166, 265
 Gregory vii, Saint Pope. 216
 Canonization of. 79, 86
 Légende and festival. 86-7, 95, 154
 Grimaldi, Cdl. 185
 Guardini, R. 272
 Guenin, Marc. 246
- Habert, Isaac. Bp. of Vabres. 3
 Hamon, J. 10
 Hardy, S.R. 135-139, 265
 Hauranne, Jean Duvergier de. See St. Cyran, Ab. de
 Henry iv, King of France. vi, 86
 Henry viii, King of England. 157, 227
 Hildebrand See Gregory vii, Saint Pope
 Holland. 77, 86, 154, 164, 179, 187-8, 191, 194
 See also Utrecht
 Hontheim, J.N. von. See Febronius, Justinus, pseud.
 Hôpital-Général, Paris. 110-113

Ignatius, Saint. 234
Index, The. 8, 148, 172, 216
 Innocent xi, Pope. 148, 151, 185
 Innocent xiii, Pope. 70
Instruction pastorale des quarante. 56
 Ippoliti, Bp. of Pistoia. 223

Jabineaux Ab. H. 143, 265
 Jansenius, Cornelius Otto. iii-iv, vi, 1, 3, 5, 7,
 146-7, 150, 159, 166, 185, 189, 190-1, 197, 266
Augustinus. iii, v-vi, 1-3, 5, 7, 9-10, 27, 74, 77,
 185, 190-1, 266
 Jansenism- Bibliography of. ii, 148, 264-74
 Jarry, E. 273
 Jemolo, A.C. 147-8, 152-4, 156, 159-161, 166-170, 178,
 203, 206-7, 274
 Jervis, W.H. 270
 Jette, M.H. vii-viii, 272
 Joseph ii, Emperor of Germany. 155-8, 161, 170, 176,
 203, 216-7, 239, 241
 Josephism. 158-9, 163, 193, 195

Kaunitz, Prince W.A. 158, 210
 Knox, R.A. ix, 272

La Borde, Vivien de. 26, 64, 68, 219, 261, 266
 La Bruyère, Jean de. vi
 La Croze, Ab. 124
 La Fontenelle de Vaudoré, A.D. de. 272
 Lafosse, Mme. 253
 La Gorce, P. de. 140, 272
 La Lande, Sr. de. 89
 Lalanne, Me. de. 138
 Lami, Giovanni. 178, 209
 La Motte, M. de. 105
 Langres, diocese of. 114, 118

- Languet de la Villeneuve, J.J., Bp. of Soissons then
 Abp. of Sens. 68-9, 79-80, 127, 221, 261, 266
- Lanze, Abp. of Turin. 187
- Laon, Bp. of. 91-2, 96
- Laporte, Jean. iii (note), 272
- La Roche, Fontaine de. 246
- La Trémoille, Cdl. 64
- Le Gros, Nicolas. 26, 28, 40, 50-5, 64, 67-8, 77,
 155, 164, 165, 187, 216, 250, 266
- Leibniz, Baron Gottfried Wilhelm von. 178, 183
- Le Maistre de Sacy. xiii, 166, 216-7, 228, 266
- Le Mere, Ab. 113
- Le Noble, Eustache. 59
- Leopold, Grand Duke of Tuscany. 156, 161, 170, 175-8, 180,
 203, 205, 212-3, 215-8, 227, 229-39, 241
- L'Epée, Ab. C.M. de. 143, 266
- Lepointe, G. 272
- Lesesne, J.B. 138
- Le Tellier, Abp. 27, 50, 76, 149
- Lettres Provinciales. See Pascal, Blaise
- Levaré, Ab. Hardy de. 138
- Liguria. 174
- Lisbon. 214
- Liturgy and Worship, conduct of services and reforms.
 xiv, 34, 79-80, 142-4, 153, 156-7, 169, 179, 192,
 194, 203, 211, 220, 223-8, 232-3, 236, 241-3
 See also Gregory vii
- Loisy, A.F. 167
- Locke, John. 178, 183
- Lombardy. 161, 166
- London, National Central Library. ii
- Longueville, Mme. de. 25
- Lorraine. 140
- Louail, Ab. Jean. 57
- Louis, xiii, King of France. vi
- Louis xiv, King of France. Many refs. including ix, xi,
 9-10, 14, 25, 27-8, 56-9, 62, 85, 94-5, 102, 106,
 142, 149
- Louis xv, King of France. Many refs. including 28, 59, 78,
 80-3, 85 et sq. passim to 139, 251
- Louvain, 1-2, 185, 190
- Louvain, University of. 1, 185
- Ludovisi, Cdl. 148
- Luther, Martin. vi, 190
- Lyon, Abp. of. 228

- Mabillon, Jean. 149-151, 161, 185
 Machault, J.-B. 141
 McManners, J. 141 (note)
 Madier, Ab. 137
 Magliabechi, Antonio. 150
 Maille, 185
 Mailly, Fr. de, Abp. of Rheims. 60
 Maistre, Joseph de. See De Maistre, Joseph
 Malier, Bp. of Troyes. 77
 Malines, Abp. of. 27
 Manzoni, A. 145, 157
 Marefoschi, Cdl. 96 (note), 162, 187
 Marie Thérèse, Empress. 161, 170, 210
 Marseilles, Bp. of. 72, 96, 125
 Marsiglio of Padua. 11
 Martini, Canon Antonio. 187, 205, 208-9, 211, 213
 Massa, G. 165
 Maultrot, G.-N. 103-4, 221
 Mazarin, Jules, Cdl. 4, 253
 Mazzini, G. 157
 Médici, Maria de. 16, 150
 Megrigni, Mme. de. 259
 Méry-sur-Seine. 83
 Mesenguy, Philippe. 165, 179-180, 188, 217
 Mesnard, J. 272
 Metz, Bp. of. 70, 79
 Metz, Parlement of. 95
 Miracles. vii, 40, 156, 253-263
 Mirepoix, Bp. of. 40, 58, 65
 Molière, (Jean Baptiste Poquelin). 5
 Molina, Luis de. 2, 266 See also Molinism
 Molinelli, G.B. 145, 174
 Molinism. 146, 149-150, 153, 171, 191, 216
 Montaigne, Michel de. v, 6, 266
 Montherlant, H. de. 272
 Montazet, Antoine de Malvin de, Abp. Lyons. 217, 220-1
 Montesquieu, C.L. Joseph de Secondat Baron de. 150-151,
 167, 178-9
 Montfaucon, Bernard de. 150, 161
 Montgeron, L.B. Carré de. 256, 263, 267
 Montpellier, Bp. of. 40, 60, 65, 72, 77, 79
 Montpellier, diocese of. 66, 259

- Morelli, Ab. 155
 Mortimer, E. 272
 Motte, De la. See La Motte, de
 Mouton, Ab. 246
 Muratori, L.A. 152-3, 156, 183, 185
- Namroni, M.M. 170
 Nantes, Bp. of. 63
 Nantes, University of. 63
 Naples. 155, 160-1, 187-8, 209
 Napoleon. 158, 212, 250
 Narbonne, Bp. of. 72
 Natali, M. 187
 National Council of France. See France, Assemblée nationale
 du clergé
 Neale, J.M. 256, 272
 Niccolini, A. 179, 187, 206-6
 Nicole, Pierre. vii, x, xiii, 8, 15, 150, 163, 165-7, 217,
 222, 228, 255, 267
 Nîmes, Bp. of. 72
 Nivelles, Ab. G.N. 61
 Noailles, Louis-Antoine. Cdl., Abp. of Paris. 25, 27, 29,
 52, 56-60, 63-4, 66-7, 69-70, 72, 75, 88, 118, 258,
 267
 Noguier, 221
 Noris, Enrico (Henri). 148-9, 153, 174, 177-8
 Normandy, Parliament of. 95
Nouvelles Ecclésiastiques. 40, 75 (note), 77-80, 82, 84,
 89, 90, 96, 98-100, 102-4, 106, 108-111, 113, 117-9,
 122-5, 127, 142, 145, 159, 161, 166, 170-2, 174-6,
 202 (note), 215, 217-8, 223-6, 228-9, 231, 243, 246-8,
 263, 267
Novelle letterarie. 161, 209
- Occam, William of. See William of Occam
 Opstraet, J. 216
Opusculi interessanti la religione. 218
 Orleans, Duke of. See Philip, Duke of Orleans.
 Orleans, Bp. of. 133
 Orleans, diocese of. 61, 78, 91, 98, 114

- Orsi, Cdl. 151
 Orsini, Cdl. 255
 Oxford, Bodleian Library. ii, 134, 140, 142, 247, 268, 270
 Oxford, Keble College. 140
- Padua, University of. 175, 185
 Paepe, of Louvain. 185
 Pagani, C. 176
 Palmer, W. 145 (note), 272
 Pannilini, Bp. 216
 Papal Bulls. See under titles
 Paquier, J. iii (note) 254-5, 273
 Paris, Deacon François de. vii, 40, 138, 178, 253,
 255-6, 258, 263
 Paris, Bibliothèque nationale. ii, 252, 264
 Paris, Parlement. Many refs. including x, 3, 28, 50, 52,
 60, 64-5, 69-70, 74, 81-3, 85-139, 152, 196, 204
 Paris, Parlement. Journal. 252, 264
 " " Registers. 103, 107, 128-131, 252, 264
 " " Remontrances. 89-90, 103, 109, 116,
 126, 267
 Parliaments. See under names of places: Aix, Bordeaux,
 Bretagne, Burgundy, Dijon, Metz, Normandy, Paris, Rennes,
 Provence, Rouen, Toulouse.
- Parma. 210
 Pascal, Blaise. ii-iii, vi-vii, 4-8, 25, 144, 150, 152,
 163, 167, 182, 186, 191-2, 222, 253, 255, 257, 267
Lettres Provinciales. iii, 5-10, 150, 192, 253, 267
Pensées. iii, vi, 7, 253, 267
- Pasini, G. 175
 Passionei, Cdl. 151, 154, 162, 164, 186-7
 Pastel, Ab. 70
 Pastor, L. von. 191-2, 197
Pastoralis officii, Bull. 67
 Paulucci, Cdl. 68
 Pavia. 170, 174, 187, 203
 Pavia, General Seminary of. 161
 Pavia, University of. 146, 166, 170, 216, 227
 Pavie de Fourquevaux, J.-B.R. de Beccarie de. See
Catéchisme historique et dogmatique.

- Pelagius. vi, 148
 Pelletier, Canon of Reims. 80
 Pensées. See Pascal, Blaise
 Péréfixe, Hardouin de, Abp. of Paris. 9
 Pereira, A. 214
 Perpétue, Soeur. 118-120
 Perrier, Marguerite. 253-5, 257, 263
 Perron, Cdl. du. See Du Perron, Cdl.
 Peter Leopold of Tuscany. See Leopold, Grand Duke of Tuscany.
 Petitpied, Nicolas. 52, 77, 166
 Pezenas. 259
 Philip, Duke of Orleans (Regent). 28, 59-60, 64-7,
 69, 85, 113
 Picancel, Ab. 138
 Pichon, J. 171
 Piedmont. 174-6, 187, 188
 Pienza, Bp. of. 233
 Pin, L.E. du. See Du Pin, L.E.
 Pinon, M. 112
 Pisa. 177, 180, 187, 216
 Pisa, Council of. 12
 Pisa, University of. 177-9, 185, 187, 209
 Pisani, P. 273
 Pistoia and Prato, Diocese of. 146_r, 157, 162-3.
See also Ricci, S. dei
 Pistoia, Synod of. xiii-xiv, 153, 157, 162-3, 166, 168,
 170, 176, 180-1, 191, 196, 202, 220, 222, 231-241
 Pistoia, Synod of. Actes et décrets du concile diocésain de
Pistoie. 202, 222-3, 228-231, 233-5, 269
 Pithou, P. 249
 Pius v, Pope. 221
 Pius vi, Pope. 184, 189, 239, 241
 Poinset, M.D. 3, 9-10, 273
 Pombal, Marquis de. 214
 Poncet de la Rivière, Bp. of Troyes . 80, 83, 84
 Pontchâteau, Marquis de. 185
 Popes. See under names: Albani, Alexander vi, viii,
 Benedict xiii, xiv, Boniface xiii,
 Clement viii, x-xiv, Gregory vii, Innocent xi, xiii,
 Pius, v, vi
 Portail, President. 100

Port-Royal. i, iv-v, xi-xii, xiv, 1, 9-10, 25,
 145, 150-1, 161-2, 166, 170(note), 174-5, 182,
 184-5, 188, 197, 200, 218, 223, 231, 247, 253, 257
 Portugal. 154, 164, 188
 Potter, L.J.A. de. 202 (note), 204, 206, 209, 211, 225-7,
 236-9, 241, 274
 Pourrat, P. vi (note), viii, 273
 Prades, Ab. de. 115
 Prato, diocese of. See Pistoia and Prato, diocese of
 Prato, Seminary of. 230
 Préclin, E. ii, xiv, 11, 22, 26, 52, 104, 106, 140,
 158-160, 244, 256, 273-4.
 Prévost, A. 76-77, 79-83, 273
 Provence, diocese of. 125
 Provence, Parlement of. 125
 Pucelle, Ab. 101
 Pujati, G.M. 170 (note)
 Puyol, E. 14, 15, 17, 273

Quesnel, Pasquier and Quesnellism. viii-ix, xiv, 11, 17,
 25-40, 50, 56, 61, 68, 73, 90, 96, 147-8, 150, 163,
 165, 169, 174-5, 177-8, 182, 184-6, 190-1, 194-6,
 198-9, 215-7, 222, 233-4, 240, 267
Les Réflexions morales. 11, 25-40, 68, 73, 267
 Quignon, Cdl. 232

Raccolta of Pistoia. 218-9, 221
 Racine, Bonaventure. 212, 215-7
 Racine, Jean Baptiste. vi, 10, 255
 Rambaud, A. ix (note) 273
 Rapin, Ab. 8
 Rastignac, L.-J. Abp. of Tours. 171
 Ravechet, Syndic. 65
 Reclus, Abbey of. 82
Recueil (Bodleian Library Mason DD.302) 134-5, 142-4
Réflexions morales ... See Quesnel, P.

- Refusal of Sacraments. See Sacraments, Refusal of.
 Regent, The. See Philip, Duke of Orleans
Registers of Parlement. See Paris, Parlement, Registers of.
 Reims See Rheims
Remonstrances du Parlement. See Paris. Parlement, Remon-
trances du Parlement.
 Rennes, Parlement of. 91, 117
Revue Historique 158, 159 (note) 160. 274.
 Reymond, H. 267
 Rheims, Bp. of. 64
 Rheims, Diocese of. 61, 66, 78, 91, 98, 254
 Rheims, University of. 63
 Ricasoli, A. 207, 211-2
 Riccardi, A. 209
 Ricci, Corso dei. 208
 Ricci, Lorenzo. 207
 Ricci, Scipio dei, Bp. of Pistoia. xiii, xiv, 145-6,
 153, 156-7, 161-2, 165, 174, 176, 178, 180-1, 186,
 194, 195, 201-242, 269
 Richecourt, Comte de. 177
 Richelieu, Armand Jean du Plessis, Cdl. 2
 Richer, Edmond, and Richerism. xiii-xiv, 11, 13-24, 26,
 32-3, 40, 50, 103, 145, 163, 171, 267-8
Apologia pro J. Gersonio. 21-22, 267
Historia conciliorum generalium. 17, 268
'Libellus' 16-21, 24, 268
 Rigacci, Bookshop of. 209
 Richerism. See under Richer, Edmond
 Risorgimento. 157, 160, 163 (note), 168, 195
 Robert, Bp. of Durham. 46
 Robin, Claude. 251, 268
 Rodez, Bp. of. 64
 Rodolico, Nicolo. xiii, 157, 165, 202 (note) 203-4,
 206-222, 274
 Rohan, Cdl. 67, 85
 Roja, E. 168
 Rouen, Abp. of. 42
 Rouen, diocese of. 8, 61
 Rouen, Parlement of. 91, 97, 117, 127
 Rousse, Gérard. 254
 Rucellai, G. 210
 Russia. 50

- Sacraments, Refusal of. 40, 79-82, 103-139
 Sacy, Le Maistre de. See Le Maistre de Sacy.
 Saint-Amour, Louis Gorin de. 185
 St. Cloud, Les Ursulines. 136-7
 Saint-Cyran, Ab. de. (Jean Duvergier de Hauranne) iv,
 189, 191, 222
 Sainte Agathe, Community of. 118, 120
 Sainte-Beuve, Charles A. i (note), 167, 255-6, 268
 St. Macquer, Ab. de. 137
 Saint Pons, Bp. of. 72
 Saltzburg, Abp. of. 229-230
 Sarpi, P. 194
 Saussoy, du. See Du Saussoy,
 Savio, Pietro. 155, 160, 170 (note), 176, 202 (note),
 205, 217 (note) 269
 Savoy. 175
 Scriptures, translation of. See Bible, Translation of.
 Sebond, Raymond de. v-vi, 268
 Segardi, L. 150
 Séquier, Chancellor. 4
 Ségur, Bp. of. 102
 Seignelay. 259-260
 Senez, Bp. of. 40, 65. See also Soanen, J.
 Sens, Abp. of. See Languet
 Sens, diocese of. 78, 118, 127
 Sens, Library of. ii-iii
 Serrao, Bp. of Potenza. 161, 188, 209
 Serry, G.G. 156, 169, 174, 175.
 Shackleton, R. 150 (note), 151, 274
 Sicily. 187-8
 Sienna. 216
 Sienna, University of. 165
 Simioli, G. 165
 Sinnich, Jean. 185
 Sisteron, Bp. of. 96
 Sisti, Avvocato. 165
 Soanen, Jean, Bp. of Senez. 73-5, 78, 87-8, 175, 246,
 268
 Soissons. 123
 Soissons, diocese of. 68, 91, 98
 Solari, Bp. of Noli. 161-2, 187

Sorbonne. xiv, 1, 3-4, 8-10, 13-16, 52, 57, 60,
64-7, 74, 89, 108, 174
Spain 1, 149, 164, 188
Spinelli, Cdl. 151
Steenoven, Cornelius. 164 (note)
Stewart, H.F. 273

Tamburiné, Cdl. Pietro. 145-6, 151, 153, 161, 170-2,
174, 176, 180, 186-7, 201, 203, 235
Tanucci, B. 155, 160, 188, 200
Taveneaux, R. 140, 273
Tellier, Camille le, Bp. of Troyes. 75
Tencin, Cdl. Abp. of Embrun. 73, 199
Tertullian. 171
Thomas Aquinas, Saint. vi, 7, 71, 171
Thomas, J.-F. 30-1, 57-9, 65, 72-3, 273
Thomassin, L. 166
Tillot, L. da. See Du Tillot, L.
Tolentino, Treaty of, 1796. 204
Torrighiani, Cdl. 155, 186
Toulouse. 163, 218
Toulouse, Cathedral chapter. 124-5
Toulouse, diocese of. 124-5
Toulouse, Parlement of. 95, 117-8, 124-5, 152
Tours, diocese of. 68, 118
Tradition des faits... 121-2
Travers, N. 103, 171
Tremblay, Clément de. See Clément de Tremblay
Trent, Council of. xi, 48, 146, 173
Treves, Bp. of. 159
Troyes, Bp. of. 64, 133
Troyes, diocese of. iii, 76-84, 259
Troyes, Library of. ii-iii
Turchi, A. 155 (note), 170 (note), 202 (note), 205
Turin. 175, 187
Turin, University of. 174-5
Tuscany. 156, 161, 174, 177-180, 187, 194, 205, 210,
216, 241. See also Leopold, Grand Duke
Twenty-two Articles of Parlement. 121-2

Unigenitus. Many refs. including i, x, 11, 15, 26, 28, 30,
50, 141, 147, 151, 153, 155, 163-4 (note), 171, 176,
179, 181-2, 194, 196, 199, 208, 240, 246, 250, 254,

opposition to: 56-139

Utrecht. 145, 164, 211-2

Utrecht, Abp. of. 215

Utrecht, Church of. 145, 162, 164, 175-6, 179-180,
182, 184-5, 188, 200, 213, 215

Utrecht, Peace of. 162

Utrecht, Union of. 164

Utrecht, Synod (Council) of. 164, 196

Varlet, Bp. 164

Vatican Library. 58, 148, 161, 164, 205

Vaucel, L.p. du. See Du Vaucel, L.P.

Vaussard, Maurice. xii, xiii, 160-6, 241-2, 274

Vecchi, Fabio de. xiii, 165-6, 178, 180-1

Vejluva, Benedetto. 163

Venice. 154, 188

Vercelli, Bp. of. 175

Verdun, Bp. of. 60

Verneuil, clergy of. 127

Vétard, Ab. 137

Vialart, Felix. 231

Vienna. 151

Vignoli, Thomas. 145

Vineam Domini, Bull. 27, 76

Vintimille, Gaspard de, Abp. Paris. ~~85~~ 85, 91, 99-100,
103, 221, 248, 258, 261

Vittorio Amadeo ii. 174-5

Vittorio Amadeo iii. 176

Vittorio Amadeo iv. 174

Voltaire, pseud. (François-Marie Arouet). vii, xii,
5, 167, 179, 254, 268

Wake, William, Abp. Canterbury. 68

Wallace-Bradill, J.M. ~~141~~ 141 (note), 273

Wendrock, pseud. See Nicole, P.

William of Occam. ii

Worship. See Liturgy and Worship.

Zola, G. 187.