THE PLACE OF JANSENISM IN FRENCH HISTORY

WALLACE K. FERGUSON
Cornell University, Ithaca, New York

Jansenism was a peculiarly high-minded religious movement within Catholicism, but it exercised very little influence on the development of Christianity in France. This article undertakes to place the movement in its historical setting and to indicate the reasons for the Jesuit opposition as well as the relations of the movement to political and papal interests.

The Jansenist movement is one of the most interesting of the religious phenomena since the Protestant Reformation, and one of the most difficult to understand or to account for. At first glance it is strikingly reminiscent of the Reformation, possessing many of the same ingredients—a revival of Augustinian theology, an opposition to formal religion and to the papal control of the national church, and an insistence on a high standard of morality—yet it is essentially an independent movement, called forth by the peculiar needs of the time. The Jansenists showed no sympathy with the Protestants, no desire to break with the Catholic church or to co-operate in the attempt to free the French church from papal control, until the Gallican movement had lost much of its strength, with its royal support, and the Jansenists themselves had lost much of their original character. Jansenism, too, unlike the Reformation, though it had a strong influence on the morality and culture of the period, left practically no lasting impression on French theology.

A subject of such interest has naturally attracted the attention of many historians; yet there is no one book which adequately traces and explains the rise, development, and final practical dissolution of Jansenism as a religious, social, and political movement. This may be due partly to the fact that

most writers on the subject who have had a sympathetic interest in the Jansenists have been attracted, as was Sainte-Beuve, by the personality of that remarkable group of individuals who made Port Royal the center of the movement, and have as a result confined their study of it largely to its relation to the convent. On the other hand, those unsympathetic with the Jansenists have, for the most part, attacked the problem from the standpoint of a religious bias that has rendered the value of their work negligible. Many, too, have been interested chiefly in the literary productions of the Jansenists. Others, again, have apparently felt the impossibility of making an exhaustive study of the movement as a whole. I have here merely attempted to trace its rise and development in the briefest possible form, at the same time trying to explain, first, why it should have occurred at the time and in the form it did, and, second, how and why it developed from a purely religious and moral movement into one almost purely political. In following this plan I have been forced practically to ignore the actual history of the Port Royal group, as well as their literary productions, and to deal only with the movement as a whole, in its relation to the religious, social, and political conditions of the time.

Jansenism was essentially the revival, in a particularly acute form, of the perennial struggle of the few austere and deeply religious souls whose standards of theology, as of morals, are absolute, and to whom compromise with mediocrity is impossible, against the great mass of the people, whose standard is mediocrity and whose weight of inertia constantly tends to lower the spiritual level of the church. It was a reaction against everything for which the great majority of the people in the church stood at the time—hence its opposition to the Jesuits, who, in their attempt to lead and control the mass, were forced to adopt the principles of the mass. It was not at first in any sense a popular movement, nor could it be while retaining its original character. Its chief virtue lay in the in-

tense religious ardor of its exponents, and such ardor was impossible to the masses. Moreover, its very successes perforce led to its final weakening, for, as it was based on reaction against popular tendencies, in proportion as it succeeded in reforming these conditions it lost the driving force that had originally inspired it.

As Jansenism was in essence a reaction to the tendencies of the time, it might be well to indicate at once what these tendencies were. During the second half of the sixteenth century, the Counter-Reformation, by meeting the reform of the Protestant churches with a corresponding reform of the outstanding abuses in the Catholic church; by ignoring controversial points which seemed impossible of settlement, while at the same time attacking the most vulnerable points of the Protestant doctrine; and by concentrating the energy of the church on a popular religion at once practical and spiritual, had won France for the most part back to the ancient church. It had developed in the process a strong religious sentiment which found its highest expression, in the first decades of the seventeenth century, in the undogmatic *amour de Dieu* of the sweet-souled St. François de Sales and, later, in the practical charity of St. Vincent de Paul. But St. François, who possessed the most vital religion of any man of the time, died in 1620, and with him passed all spiritual warmth from the orthodox church. The representative figure of orthodoxy in the next generation was to be the cold and moderate Gallican, Bossuet. There was nothing in the practical charity of St. Vincent de Paul, fine as it was, to satisfy those austere theological minds to whom the crucial point in religion is the relation of the individual soul to an omnipotent God.

Meanwhile, contemporary with this purely Catholic movement and, while outside it, still safely within the church, ran other currents of thought inspired as much by pagan as by Christian ideals, and in form largely determined by the manner in which the various types of mind reacted to the uncer-

tainty and strain of the long civil religious wars. The Renaissance had turned men's minds to a consideration of the classical philosophies. During the troubled period that followed when religious wars had divided Christendom against itself and shaken its faith in the authority of the church, many turned to the philosophers for comfort. They found it in the belief in the human reason as the ultimate sanction, as opposed to the more Christian faith in revealed authority. Finally, Montaigne, while remaining formally Catholic, developed a purely rational or skeptical viewpoint. He touched on almost all aspects of classical philosophy in his inconclusive way. His *Essais* may be considered in a sense the inspiration of two quite different types of thought which developed during the last decades of the sixteenth and the first of the seventeenth centuries.

Of these, by far the most vigorous and high-minded was that which Fortunat Strowski names the "neo-Stoic." Men of deep and earnest thought, of austere morality, men possessed of an innate tendency to trust their reason rather than their emotions, thought they perceived in the Stoic philosophy a reasonable sanction for morality and religion. They found in it, too, a refuge from the strain of life in a troubled time, other than the supernatural comfort of religion. It gave them a high standard of duty and morality, a contempt for all passion, and a liberating conception of man as sufficient unto himself and independent of all external contacts. They found its glorification of the human reason as the sole sanction much more gratifying than the blind faith in authority which was all the Catholic church had to offer. Yet these men were not consciously un-Christian. Justus Lipsius, of Louvain, and Guillaume du Vaire, the two greatest writers of the neo-Stoic school—the one in the realm of theory, the other in that of practice—labored to show that Christianity and a modified form of Stoicism were not incompatible; that, indeed, Stoicism was in reality a preparation for and a complement to

Christianity. To accomplish this, as Chevalier remarks, "they christianized Stoicism and rationalized Christianity." They adopted—and adapted—the parts of both which most answered their needs. The result of the combination was a Christianity reasonable, strongly moral, and almost wholly lifeless —without warmth, without enthusiasm. Indeed, in its tendencies it seemed to be really anti-Christian, certainly anti-Augustinian. It was incompatible with any doctrine of original sin, of the bondage of the will, or of the futility of the human mind's attempting to understand the inscrutable will of God. The Stoics had no feeling of human depravity, no conception of the necessity of grace to salvation, and, as a consequence, no vivid faith in Christ as the Redeemer. To the Augustinian mind, the content of their thought was not religious at all. For humble faith they had substituted pride of reason—*l'orgueil de savoir*. In so far as Stoicism had any theological tendencies, they pointed toward a decided Pelagianism. Reason and morality are the keynotes of the system. In philosophy it found its highest expression in the scientific reasoning of Descartes; in literature, in the self-consciously reasoned and utterly loveless virtue of Corneille's heroes. During the remainder of the century it was for the most part driven underground by the Jansenist reaction, to reappear, minus the Christian coloring, in the philosophy of the eighteenth century.

Though important, this Stoic group was comparatively small. The reaction of the great mass of the people to the pagan influence and to the strain of the long religious wars was very different. Beginning with the skepticism of Montaigne, which had been further unintentionally popularized—and considerably changed in the process—by the believing Pierre Charron, it degenerated into frank libertinism, devoid of any religious feeling, yet too cynically indifferent to break with the church. There was no definite doctrine, theory, or philosophy of libertinism, save as it was a declaration of freedom from the restraints of traditional authority. It was merely a state

of mind—a post-bellum state of mind. Practically, it included laxity in both morality and religion. The long wars had left France, as it were, emotionally exhausted. While the struggle lasted—or at any rate, in its first stages—there must have been much of the idealism that is indispensable to a fighting morale. With peace came reaction; and this reaction was strongest among the generation who had grown up during the war, who had seen only the demoralization of its last stages, when any real religious feeling had left it. To them all aspiration or enthusiasm, especially in matters of religion, must have seemed very futile. There would be no martyrs in this generation. All they asked of society was the privilege of enjoying themselves as they saw fit. All they asked of religion was that it disturb their manner of life as little as possible. They were cheerfully indifferent to moral or religious problems. They did not even take their skepticism seriously. They had no objection to remaining within the church and performing its rites, if that were the easiest thing to do. Here enter the Jesuits. "Behold the fathers who have taken away the sins of the world."

The Jesuits in France were forced to a change of policy about the beginning of the seventeenth century. On the one hand they found their own influence over the people slipping, owing to the unpopularity of their political activities during the late war and to their devotion to ultramontane interests. On the other hand they found that the church was losing its control over the people with the growth of the libertine spirit. They therefore determined on a policy that would restore their endangered leadership by making them indispensable to the people and which would at the same time reconcile the people to the church. This policy was to compromise with the spirit of the time. They gave the people what they wanted, a moral system and a theological doctrine that would allow them to follow their own inclinations without reproof from the church. They did not encourage lax morality, but, as Pascal

pointed out, neither were they much concerned with discouraging it.

The opportunity for developing the first part of this policy came through the office of the confessor. The natural result of the Jesuit policy was an attempt to make confession as easy as possible. All they needed was a doctrine which would justify the confessor in adopting the most lenient interpretation of the degree of sin. From this necessity grew the practice of casuistry, with the nearly allied doctrine of probabilism. Casuistry, which consists in establishing cases of conscience, to be used as precedents by confessors, is as old as the penitential system. The Jesuits, however, developed it to a refinement of subtlety hitherto unequalled. They took as a premise the definition of sin as the conscious violation of the will of God. If in any case it could be shown that the sinner had sinned without full consciousness of his sin as such, they held that the confessor was justified in granting absolution to all similar cases. The doctrine of probabilism afforded the penitent an additional chance. Inasmuch as authorities disagree as to the extent of sin in any given case, the confessor is justified in following the most lenient interpretation to be found in any reasonably good authority, whether he himself agrees with it or not. Indeed he is in duty bound to accept it, for who is he, a humble confessor, to refuse absolution in a case which is defended by even one man of more authority than himself? In all cases the penitent was given the benefit of any possible doubt. The office of confession became a mere formality devoid of any real religious significance. The mass of the people remained in the church, but neither they nor the church were any the better therefor.

The second part of the Jesuit policy called for a theological doctrine which would not only justify their system of morality but would also reconcile those whose religion was a philosophy based on reason. Their moral opportunism was of service only in holding the careless mass of the people. The

Stoics had no need of it. Their indifference to the church was based on entirely different grounds. Faced with this double necessity, the Jesuits inevitably turned to Pelagianism. There are two essential premises to Pelagianism, which admirably suited the Jesuits' purpose: first, that man is at liberty to do good or evil according to the dictates of his own free will; second, and the logical result of the first, that man is not by nature evil, otherwise none would be saved. The Jesuit Molina, who revived Pelagianism in the last years of the sixteenth century, made a subtle addition to the original doctrine that rather stole the thunder of the Augustinians, while leaving Pelagianism substantially unaltered. He asserted that God has given to all men, universally, a *sufficient* grace, which, while it does not in itself render a man just, yet gives him the power to save himself and by prayer or good deeds to earn the *efficacious* or saving grace. This assumption that all men were possessed of sufficient grace, and were not damned by original sin, justified the further assumption that they were probably good. In other words, it justified the confessor in giving the penitent the benefit of the doubt. The other implication of the doctrine—that man's will is free—meant little to the mass of people. Molinism, to them, meant simply freedom to be indifferent. To the Stoics, however, it meant much more than that. It gave them a theological justification for their philosophy with its glorification of the human will and reason. Also, it vindicated the pagan philosophers who were their inspiration, by showing that they had possessed at least sufficient grace.

To recapitulate: The religious interest of the age was entirely practical. The finest Christian effort was directed toward practical charity, like that of St. Vincent de Paul. The finest thought of the time was occupied with a philosophy the inevitable goal of which was deism. The religion of the mass of the people was purely formal. They obeyed the church as they did the laws of the land, and for the same reason. It would have been impolitic not to. The philosophy of the intel-

lectuals and the laxity of the masses were alike condoned by the Jesuits and justified by their Pelagian doctrine of Molinism, their casuistry, and probabilism. There is no place in this scheme of things for an enthusiastic, highly spiritual, personal religion of the kind that dominates the whole life and thought of the individual. Yet religious enthusiasts whose souls demanded such a religion undoubtedly existed. No age is complete without them. Such characters would inevitably react against all the formal and, from their viewpoint, irreligious conditions in the church; and the strength of their reaction would be in proportion to the greatness of the need. In their equally inevitable attempt to find a doctrine that would justify and inspire their reaction, they would naturally turn to Augustinianism, which would answer their needs as fully as the converse doctrine of Pelagianism answered those of the Jesuits. Hence Jansenism.

As the Jansenist doctrine was simply a revival of pure Augustinianism, there is no need to enlarge upon it, save to point out a few of the reasons why it was so admirably fitted to motivate the reaction against the above-mentioned moral and religious conditions. In the first place, the doctrine of original sin, unrelieved by any universal "sufficient" grace, swept away at one stroke the premises on which Molinism and probabilism were built. Implying as it did that man was essentially wicked, it made it impossible to give him the benefit of the doubt. Secondly, the conception of an objective and irresistible grace as the sole means of salvation, which carried with it the idea of the bondage of the will, struck at the heart of the Stoics' belief in the efficacy of the human reason, as well as at the faith of the masses in their ability to achieve their own salvation by the conventional good works and the purely formal observance of the church's rules. The doctrine of irresistible grace, too, implied that those who had received it would inevitably —and, as it were, in spite of themselves—lead exemplary lives. Conversely, those who were not leading exemplary lives

could not have received it, and so must be among the damned. It left no place for indifference or mediocrity. The whole effect of the doctrine was to raise the standard of the religious life, to make perfection rather than mediocrity the norm. Finally, the doctrine of predestination, as interpreted by most Augustinians, introduced into religion an element of terror that had long been absent and that was incompatible with the Jesuits' system of religion-made-easy. It was no religion for the masses. From a social viewpoint, this is perhaps the most significant difference between Jansenism and the Jesuit system, and goes far to explain why Jansenism could never have become a state religion. The elect of Jansenism formed a small group of religious aristocrats who would alone be saved, whereas the Jesuit doctrines admitted the mass of the people to salvation. The Jansenist saw religion as a purely personal matter between the individual man and his God. The Jesuit thought of religion in terms of society as a whole.

The great revival of Augustinianism was begun by two young men at Paris, neither of whom, however, was a Frenchman. They were the Fleming Cornelius Jansenius, later Bishop of Ypres, and the Basque Jean du Vergier de Hauranne, better known as the Abbé de Saint-Cyran. They had both received their university training at Louvain, where Justus Lipsius was teaching his high Stoic morality and where, some twenty years previously, Baius had attempted in vain to revive Augustinianism within the Church, in opposition to Molina on the one hand and to Calvinism on the other. They were completely out of sympathy with life as they found it in Paris. Together they began to study the Fathers in an attempt to find a doctrine that would guide and motivate their instinctive reaction to the conditions about them. They found just the doctrine they wanted in Augustine, and in 1611 De Hauranne took Jansenius home with him to Bayonne, where they spent the next six years in an intensive and exhaustive study of that Father. In 1617 Jansenius, the theorist of the pair, returned

to Louvain to continue his study. Ten years later he began his *magnum opus,* the *Augustinus.* He had scarcely finished it when he died, in 1638. The work was published two years later by his friends, first at Louvain, then at Paris.

Meanwhile, De Hauranne, who was more interested in moral reform than in theological doctrine, returned to Paris. In 1620 he was made Abbé de Saint-Cyran and commenced his campaign for moral reform inspired by Augustinianism. Here he received the greatest help from the famous Arnauld family, whose brilliance of intellect and religious fervor were to make them the central figures of the Jansenist movement. The first of his converts in this family was the young abbess of Port Royal, always known in Jansenist history as "la Mère Angélique." She was strongly attracted by the moral severity, the somber doctrine, and the fiery enthusiasm of the apostle of Augustine, and in 1623 procured his appointment as director of the convent. In the years that followed, Port Royal became the center of a religious revival at once ascetic and evangelistic. A small but brilliant group of earnest and deeply religious men, most of whom had given up wealth and influential positions in forsaking the world, came to live as hermits about the convent of Port Royal des Champs. Of these, the most important at this time were the brothers of la Mère Angélique: the scholarly Arnauld d'Andilly, perhaps the best type of the Port Royal hermit; and the theologian Antoine Arnauld, called *le grand.* The revival at Port Royal was well established when, in 1640, the publication of the *Augustinus* united the theological doctrine of Jansenius and the practical reform of Saint-Cyran and formed what was hereafter to be known as Jansenism.

The *Augustinus* had an immediate and widely felt influence, which was greatly increased when Antoine Arnauld published, some three years later, a treatise *de la Fréquent Communion,* popularizing its doctrines and emphasizing their moral significance. There is nothing original in the doctrine of the

Augustinus, yet it came as a revelation to all those who had long been discontented with the religion taught by the church of the day. Lavisse says of its influence and of that of the *Fréquent Communion:*[1]

Il fit grande impression sur les hommes et les femmes qui, dans les monastères, dans les familles bourgeoises, au Parlement, dans le monde, à la Cour même ne voulaient pas croire que Dieu fût facile á satisfaire et souhaitaient des difficultés et des sévérités dans la vie religieuse. Le jansénisme était comme attendu.

The opposition to Jansenism on the part of the Jesuits and the clergy whom it condemned was instant and bitter. For several years the struggle went on inconclusively, each year adding to the numbers and influence of the Jansenists. Finally a crisis came in 1649, when Nicolas Cornet presented to the Sorbonne for examination the well-known "five propositions," which he asserted contained the doctrine of Jansenius. The Parlement of Paris, already dominated by the Jansenists, prohibited the examination, whereupon eighty-five bishops united in sending the propositions to the pope, together with a demand for a "clear and certain" judgment upon them. After lengthy consideration Innocent X condemned them without qualification in the Bull *Cum Occasione* of 1653. The propositions had been cleverly chosen with a view to placing the Jansenist doctrine in the worst possible light. Various opinions have been expressed as to the fairness with which they represented the doctrine of Jansenius, of which Harnack's is worth quoting, as being probably the most penetrating analysis of the situation:[2]

They were designed [he says] to separate off the extreme conclusions of Augustinianism and give them an isolated formation, that thereby it might be possible to reject them without touching Augustine, but that thereby Augustinianism might be slain.

The Jansenists now found themselves in a position in some respects not unlike that of Luther after the publication of the

[1] Lavisse, VII, 1, 89.

[2] Harnack, *Hist. of Dogma,* VII, 95.

Bull *Exsurge Domine*. However, there were very cogent reasons why they could not follow Luther's example and break with the church. They had no sympathy with the Protestant Reformation and no desire to cause another schism. Whereas Luther, though receiving his original inspiration from Augustine, had gone beyond him to St. Paul's liberating doctrine of justification by faith alone, Jansenius, in adopting Augustine's doctrine *in toto*, accepted with the rest his high conception of the indispensability of the sacraments and of the unity and authority of the Holy Catholic Church. A complete break with the church, then, was unthinkable to these disciples of Augustine, with their revered Father's bitter pamphlets *contra Donatistas* before them. On the other hand, the Augustinian doctrine permitted of opposition to the despotic papal control of the whole church, and the Jansenists could have sympathized heartily with the Gallican claims for the equality of all bishops. They had not yet, however, fully realized their position with regard to the Jesuits and the papacy. Also, for reasons that will appear later, they were debarred from the royal support which, as potential supporters of the Gallican claims, they should have received.

Still, though unwilling to break with the church, their convictions were far too deep to permit of absolute submission to the papal will. In the face of this dilemma, they hit upon a compromise that seemed to offer freedom to hold their own opinions, while still permitting them to render formal submission to the pope. The compromise was suggested by the learned Antoine Arnauld. It consisted in a subtle distinction between the power of the pope to judge matters of right and of fact. They accepted the papal condemnation of the propositions as heretical, but contested the pope's right to determine the fact of their authorship by Jansenius, at any rate in the sense in which he had condemned them. The pope answered this quibbling in the following year by an even more compre-

hensive Bull. Mazarin saw to it that the Bulls were given royal sanction. The debate seemed to be closed, and Arnauld agreed to keep a "respectful silence." As a matter of fact, nothing was settled. Still maintaining that Jansenius' doctrines had not been rightfully condemned, the Jansenists continued to submit to the church and avoid trouble. Their policy did maintain peace for a time, but it had placed them in a false position—a position from which they were never to free themselves. Their quibbling and legal subtlety were in unperceived contradiction to their moral and religious aspirations. This was their first compromise with the world. Others would inevitably follow.

Before this compromising attitude could have any perceptible effect on the prestige of the Jansenists, an abler man than Antoine Arnauld came to their rescue and gave a new impetus to the movement. Blaise Pascal was still a recent convert to Jansenism, filled with the first enthusiasm of the proselyte, when he began to write the *Lettres Provinciales* in 1656. The intervention of Pascal marks a turning point in the development of Jansenism. After the first three letters, in which he pilloried the opponents of Arnauld, who was being tried at the Sorbonne for heresy, he turned the full force of his powerful polemic against the Jesuits. Hitherto the Jansenists had attacked chiefly the moral and theological conditions which the Jesuits represented. Pascal turned the attack on the society itself. From this point on, peace between the two parties was impossible. Moreover, in pointing out the Jesuits, who were the champions of the papacy, as the personal enemies of his sect, Pascal did much to identify the Jansenist cause with that of the Gallicans. At the same time the *Lettres* probably gained more converts to Jansenist morality than any other work. Their immediate effect added to the influence and prestige of the movement to such an extent that all persecution was suspended for a time.

Unfortunately, about this time, when Jansenism was rap-

idly gaining strength and seemed almost on the eve of victory, it attracted the enmity of the court, an enmity that remained an almost constant factor in the situation throughout the reign of Louis XIV. The occasion of offense was the connection formed by the Jansenists with the Cardinal de Retz and the other leaders of the Fronde. The connection was inevitable, as both the Fronde and Jansenism drew much of their support from the same classes. After the arrest of De Retz in 1652 and his escape to Italy in the following year, many of the Jansenists defended him openly and demanded his recall. He had always favored the movement, and his position as archbishop of Paris had made him an invaluable ally. Mazarin at any rate —and here he was but following in the footsteps of Richelieu, who had distrusted Saint-Cyran and the Arnaulds—was firmly convinced that the Jansenists were not well disposed toward the court.[3] He lived in constant fear lest the religious sect should form the nucleus of a political party. This fear seems to have become more acute during the last year of his life, and he made a final attempt to settle the matter definitely before the time when the young king would be called upon to handle the affair alone. At his urgent instigation, the Assembly of Clergy of 1661 drew up a formulary to be signed by all ecclesiastics. It was a complete renunciation of Jansenism. Then began what was known as "the great persecution." The novices, pensionaries, and postulants of Port Royal were forced to leave the convent, and no more were to be received in the future. Finally the solitaries were dispersed. La Mère Angélique, whose life had been the finest example of the Christianity of Port Royal, and Blaise Pascal, who represented its finest thought, both died a few months later, and Jansenism was left to the leadership of the politician and the doctrinaire.

After the death of Mazarin, Louis XIV carried on the persecution. There were two main reasons for his distrust of Jan-

[3] For some new material on the attitude of the Arnaulds to Richelieu and the court see letters at end.

senism. They corresponded in a way to the two types that had developed within the Jansenist ranks. In the first place, he feared their political influence. He never forgot their relations with De Retz. In a reign in which religious disputes played such a large part, a difference in doctrine was a political event. Louis thought of himself as the head of the church in France. Any rebellion against the church, then, was equivalent to treason. Louis himself summed up his opinion of the Jansenists as follows, in his *Mémoires:*[4]

> L'Église . . . . était enfin ouvertement menacée d'un schisme par des gens d'autant plus dangereux qu'il pouvaient être très utiles, d'un grande mérite, s'ils en eussent été moins persuadés. Il ne s'agissait plus seulement de quelques docteurs particuliers et cachés, mais d'évêques établis dans leur siège, capables d'entrainer la multitude après eux, de beaucoup de réputation, d'une piété digne en effet d'être révérée, tant qu'elle serait suivie de soumission aux sentiments de l'Église, de douceur, de moderation et de charité. Le Cardinal de Retz, archevêque de Paris, que des raisons d'État très connues m'empêchaient de souffrir alors, ou par inclination ou par intérêt, favorisait toute cette secte naissante ou en était favorisé.

If Louis feared the influence of what might be termed the political leaders of the sect, he had little more sympathy for the unworldly, ecstatic, and ascetic group represented by the inmates of Port Royal. A state of mind such as they exhibited had no place in Louis's well-ordered scheme of things, the center of which was the convention-ridden court. Besides, it was an essentially individualistic movement, and Louis could find no place for individualism in France. The decorous, if somewhat cold, piety of Bossuet was more to his taste.

That two fairly distinct types had developed among the Jansenists is shown by their reaction to the persecution which centered about the signing of the formulary. The political leaders of the sect, including Arnauld, temporized again and sought to evade the issue by subterfuge. They were, or had been, men of the world, most of them of legal training. They

[4] Lavisse, VII, 2, 2.

had no intention of giving up their beliefs, but they saw the futility of revolt against the government and were ready to accept any legal quibble that would enable them to evade the onus while obeying the letter of the law. They used all their political influence to obtain an authorization from the Vicars General of Paris—the highest local authorities in the absence of the Archbishop de Retz—to sign the formulary with a "mental reservation," thus, as it were, fighting the devil with fire, or the Jesuits with their own weapons. This authorization was immediately annulled under royal pressure; but, despite the passionate protests of the dying Pascal, the Jansenist leaders still thought it possible to sign the formulary without disowning their beliefs. The attitude of the nuns of Port Royal, almost the only remaining representatives of the original spirit of the movement, was more noble, if more futile. They absolutely refused to sign the formulary. They awaited martyrdom, of which there was no real danger, with an ecstatic hope worthy of the early Christians whom they strove to emulate. Nothing could induce them to make the slightest compromise with the world. Neither king nor church could do anything with them. They were dispersed among different convents, only to show that they could make more trouble separately than they had made when together. Finally, they were recalled and held, virtually as prisoners, in Port Royal des Champs.

The only really effective resistance to the formulary came from four bishops led by Pavillon, Bishop of Alet. They too refused to sign the formulary, and their opposition, backed by the sympathy of many of the most prominent people in the Parlement, the higher bourgeoisie, and the court, was so stubborn and effective that they forced the king and pope to accept the "Peace of the Church," of 1668. This was really a truce, which, though it settled nothing, did succeed in suspending hostilities until almost the end of the century. During this period the influence of Jansenist morality grew uninterruptedly.

Their schools gained great prestige and began to menace the Jesuit control of education. Meanwhile the king had other troubles on his hands.

The Gallican controversy, which was to occupy most of the king's attention during the next fourteen or fifteen years, was but the culmination of a struggle that had been going on more or less quietly all through the century. The papacy had begun, during this century, to assert its rights of jurisdiction over the church at large, if not with more effect, at least with a more systematic rigor than it had shown hitherto. At the same time the French monarchy was asserting its absolute and divine right in a way that it had never done before. Both claimed absolute power over the administration of the church of France. Louis based his claims on the theory of the divine origin of the monarchy and on the episcopal theory that each bishop was, as much as the pope, the successor of the Apostles. He was supported by the majority of the bishops, by the Parlement, and by the legal profession generally, as well as by a good deal of popular feeling inspired by the usual patriotic resentment of ultramontane interference. One would naturally have expected the Jansenists, in view of their adherence to the Augustinian idea of the position of the bishops and their resentment against the papacy, caused by the papal persecutions of and by their enmity to the Jesuits, to add their weight to the movement at this time when it had royal support and every hope of success. However, even this community of interest could not wipe out the suspicion with which the king and the sect regarded each other. As a more or less independent group, always inclined to controversy, the Jansenists were, from Louis's viewpoint, a standing menace to the royal control of the national church. The Jansenists, on their side, had little desire to see papal domination destroyed, if it were only to be succeeded by royal control. Their persecution, indeed, had been caused as much by the king as by the pope. Moreover, Innocent XI, who occupied the papal see at this critical

moment, was no friend of the Jesuits, but was distinctly favorable to the Jansenists. There was even some talk at Rome of making Arnauld a cardinal. The Jansenists therefore gave their support to the papal side in the controversy over the *régale*. In doing so they forfeited their only opportunity for reconciliation with the king.

As the interest in the Gallican struggle began to die down, the Jansenist controversy again came to the fore, and, the question once reopened, both Jansenists and Jesuits prepared to carry it on to the death. This period, which occupies the last twenty years of the king's life, is marked by a decided change in the political position of the Jansenists and in their religious significance. From the political side the development is rather surprising, in view of what has just been said with regard to their attitude toward the Gallican question. It consisted of a close, if somewhat belated, alliance with the Gallican party, in opposition to both king and pope. The change in their religious feeling and attitude, less sudden and conspicuous but no less real, was the natural culmination of tendencies which had been increasingly apparent for nearly half a century. The first generations of the devotees of Port Royal were now dead, and with them had passed the true religious enthusiasm that had given the movement its original force. Such fervor could not be sustained, nor had it ever been even shared by the majority of those who called themselves Jansenists. The political party within the Jansenist ranks, on the other hand, had grown rapidly, becoming at once more worldly and more controversially dogmatic until finally it represented all that remained of the party. From this time on its significance is almost purely political. The later Jansenists were such, not so much from positive religious conviction as from hatred of the Jesuits.

The struggle which now ensued centered about Noailles, who had been made Archbishop of Paris in 1695, by the influence of Mme de Maintenon. Both sides tried to gain the support of this pacific and somewhat uncertain prelate—the Jan-

senists with the greater success. He pronounced in favor of the popular *Réflexions Morales sur le Nouveau Testament,* of Pasquier Quesnel, who had succeeded to the leadership of the sect on the death of Arnauld in 1693. Noailles, indeed, might have been able to secure them from further persecution, with the aid of the moderate Bossuet, who had always felt more or less sympathy for them on account of their strict morality—a sympathy which the political situation was soon to make much stronger—had not the Jesuits at last succeeded in gaining an ascendancy over the elderly king. They used their influence with him to the utmost for their own advantage. They stirred up his smoldering hatred of the Jansenists and, at the same time, labored to turn him against his former Gallican supporters. In this policy, though successful, they rather overreached themselves, for it raised a powerful Jansenist-Gallican combination against them.

As Louis grew older he became more devout, and the superstitious side of his nature gained the supremacy. Then began a duel between Père la Chaise, the Jesuit confessor, and Mme de Maintenon, the disciple of Bossuet and the friend of Noailles, for the soul of the king. The astute Jesuit seized upon Noailles's approval of the *Réflexions Morales* as the weak point in the enemy's position. He cleverly confused the moderate Gallican with the Jansenist party. Fénélon, too, having just been condemned for his dabblings in Quietism, saw in attacking the Jansenists an opportunity to retrieve his position with both Rome and the court. He had a further motive for animosity in the polemic directed against him by the Jansenist Pierre Nicole. His influence was still strong with the king and, added to that of Père la Chaise, supported by the king's own natural prejudice, was enough to decide the question. Louis determined to stamp out Jansenism once for all.

The Jansenists themselves chose this most unfortunate moment to put their position to the test. In 1701 a Jansenist presented a very indiscreet "case of conscience" for the con-

sideration of the Sorbonne. He asked whether it was sufficient to receive the condemnation of the *Augustinus* in respectful silence, though himself considering it unjustified. That was just what all discreet Jansenists had been doing for the last half-century, but the proposition put into words aroused a storm of protest. Louis demanded the co-operation of the pope in suppressing the movement forever. Clement XI replied in 1705 with the Bull *Vineam Domini,* condemning the "respectful silence" outright.

The newly allied Jansenist-Gallican party met this action, by the power they now recognized as a common enemy, boldly and skilfully. The campaign instituted by them in the Assembly of the Clergy of 1705 was twofold. As theoretical justification for resistance, they resurrected the old distinction of "right and fact" that had afforded the sect a legal protection in former cases. Meanwhile, the Gallican half of the party protested that the Bull violated the Gallican Liberties, which assert that "a decision of the Pope, even when rendered *ex cathedra,* has not the power to terminate controversies definitely, except by the acceptance and unanimous concert of all the Church." The Bull was published, but with explanations and an accompanying mandate from the Assembly which practically annulled its effect. The only practical success that the king could claim was the final destruction of Port Royal, and it is significant of the change of spirit in the Jansenist party that they submitted to this violation of their most sacred memories almost without a murmur.

The forces opposed to Jansenism began at once to organize a new offensive. Père la Chaise died in 1709, but his successor, also a Jesuit, the redoubtable Père le Tellier, proved more than capable of carrying on his policy. The reverses suffered by Louis's armies played into his hands by increasing the king's desire to placate an avenging God. Noailles and his approval of the *Réflexions Morales* were again the points of attack. Finally, Louis begged the pope to condemn Quesnel's book definitively. He himself would guarantee the enforce-

ment of the Bull. This unconditional appeal to Rome was Louis's final abdication of his Gallican claims. The pope did not reply at once, but when he did take action it was sufficiently forceful to satisfy the bitterest opponent of Jansenism. In 1713 he promulgated the Bull *Unigenitus,* condemning one hundred and one propositions from the *Réflexions,* with a thoroughness that caused many to feel that he had condemned not only Quesnel but Augustine and even Christ as well.

The *Unigenitus* did not stamp out Jansenism. In fact, the severity of the Bull, and the assumption of papal authority therein implied, attracted to the party a great deal of popular sympathy. Jansenism and Gallicanism were definitely united in the public mind. Everyone who hated Jesuits and all ultramontane interference in France became at least mildly Jansenist. The movement had never been so popular. But it had changed greatly since the early days in Port Royal. Had it not, it would never have been popular. Jansenism in France during the next two centuries was rather a state of mind and a political party than a creed or a sect. It formed a sort of puritan party within the church, marked by a more austere morality, by an emphasis on personal rather than on formal religion, by a hatred of the Jesuits, and by opposition to the pope.

That the movement should have failed to carry out its original program was inevitable from its very nature. It was essentially a reaction against some of the tendencies of thought, religion, and morals prevalent at the time, and, though it checked those tendencies and in a way changed them, it was in the long run unable to cope with them. It was out of harmony with the whole trend of modern thought. The first Jansenists were, in a sense, religious anachronisms. Augustinianism was not suited to the spirit of the age, and the mere force of a reaction was not sufficient to keep it alive. In its entirety it was not a religion to which the French people as a whole could ever subscribe. In proportion as it became popular, it was of necessity diluted and weakened.

Just what the final effect of Jansenism on the thought of

the next century may have been is difficult to determine. It did succeed in establishing a higher standard of morality. Its writers, too, had completely discredited their ancient enemies, the Jesuits. But in doing so, Pascal and the others had also discredited the doctrines that had kept the people within the church. Jansenism itself offered the people no alternative doctrine that would be acceptable to them. Moreover, the bitter theological controversies, the legal quibblings, and fine distinctions that had marked the whole career of Jansenism undoubtedly did much to feed skepticism and breed contempt for dogmatic creeds. In the long run, the mutually injurious warfare of the followers of the Bishop of Ypres and the disciples of Ignatius Loyola actually prepared the way for the full development, in the eighteenth century, of that deism and skepticism which they both abhorred.

FOUR UNPUBLISHED LETTERS

The following hitherto unpublished letters of Arnauld d'Andilly and his sister, Anne-Eugénie, are from the original MSS, which form a part of the remarkable collection of autograph letters made by the late Ferdinand Dreer, now the property of the Pennsylvania Historical Society. They were brought to my attention by Professor Preserved Smith, who has himself published many letters from the Dreer Collection; and he has kindly assisted me in the work of transcription. These letters are here presented, not only as having some bearing on the foregoing paper, but in the hope that, as new material, they may be of interest to scholars of Jansenism generally.

1. ARNAULD D'ANDILLY TO THE TREASURER OF THE DUKE OF ORLEANS, 1640

A receipt for the payment of a pension granted to Arnauld d'Andilly by that famous intriguer and sponsor of ineffective revolutions, Gaston Duke of Orleans, for at least the year 1640. I can find no mention elsewhere of such a pension. This document gives evidence of a somewhat suspicious connection between the influential Jansenist leader and Richelieu's chief enemy, who formed the center of so many plots against the minister and the court. The date shows the pension to have been granted but two years before the conspiracy led by Cinq-Mars in the name of the Duke of Orleans. Such a connection, if known, must have added weight to the Cardinal's already strong suspicion of the Arnaulds and the other leaders of the new sect. As has been said, this suspicion was handed on to Richelieu's successor and was intensified by the Jansenists' relations with the Frondeurs and other opponents of the ministry.

Pour servir de quittance a Monsr. de Grandlieu Con[seill]er et Tresorier General de la Maison de finance de Monseigneur le duc d'Orleans frere unique du Roy de la somme de trois mil livres pour la pention qu'il plaist a son Altesse Royalle me donner davance lannee Mil six cent Quarante.

[On back:]

Pour quittance de trois mil livres.

ARNAULD

ROBERT ARNAULD D'ANDILLY

2. ARNAULD D'ANDILLY TO THE ARCHBISHOP OF TOULOUSE, APRIL 11, 1648

The archbishop here addressed was Charles de Montchal. He held the archepiscopal office from 1628 to 1651. He has apparently been aiding Arnauld in procuring the materials for his most famous work, *Les Pères des Deserts* (1647–52). This book shows clearly whence came the inspiration of the hermits of Port Royal.

Monseigneur

Jay differé jusque icy de respondre a la lettre si extremement obligente que vous m'avez fait l'honneur de m'escrire en m'envoyent un exemplaire de la vie de St. Antoine, sur ce que j'esperois toujours de redevoir celle de St. Dominique dont il vous plaist de me parler. Mais la honté de demeurer si longtemps a vous rendre les treshumbles remerciemens que je vous dois ne me permet pas de demeurer davantage a vous temoigner ma reconnaissance de vos faveurs & a vous protester que vous ne n'honnorez jamais personne qui soit avec plus de respect et passion, Monseigneur,

Vostre treshumble & obeissant serviteur,

ARNAULD D'ANDILLY

11 Avril, 1648

3. ARNAULD D'ANDILLY TO THE ARCHBISHOP OF TOULOUSE, JULY 13, 1648

Perhaps the greatest significance of these letters to De Montchal lies in the fact that they show an increasingly friendly relation between Arnauld and one of the most prominent members of the higher clergy—one moreover who had been strongly opposed to Richelieu. On his death, the archbishop left behind him some remarkable *Mémoires contenant des particularités de la vie et du Ministère du Cardinal de Richelieu.* It may be to these *Mémoires,* which were violent attacks on the late Cardinal, that Arnauld refers in the following letter: *ceux qu'il vous a pleu de m'envoyer.* The archbishop had probably circulated them in MS among his friends, some of whom had evidently betrayed his confidence by citing them against him.

[Address] *A Monseigneur Monseigneur l'archeveque de Tolose.*
Monseigneur

Jay de treshumbles remerciemens a vous rendre de la vie de St. Dominique qu'il vous a pleu de me prester. Je ne l'ay point fait copier a cause que l'ayant conferee avec celle qui est dans Surius[5] elle s'est trouvee toute conforme. Je la feray porter a Monsieur vostre frere pour vous la remettre entre les mains, puis que la lettre que vous m'avez fait l'honneur de m'escrire m'apprend que vous serez bientost a Paris. Vous trouverez icy, Monseigneur, la Memoire qui a esté fait sur ceux qu'il vous a pleu de m'envoyer et qui ont esté veuz exactement. Il faut avouer qu'a moins que de le connoistre par des effects il est difficile de s'imaginer qu'il y ait des personnes capables d'abuser jusqu'a un tel poinct de la bonté qu'on leur temoigne. Mais si vostre douceur n'a pû les retenir dans le devoir, je ne doute nullement que vostre fermeté ne leur aprenne a respecter vostre authorite, et ne fasse voir la verité de ces paroles que je me souviens d'avoir leues dans cet excellent ouvrage qui apprend si bien a les connoistre: Indulgentia corrumpuntur, robore ac virtute fraenantur. Comment peuvent ils traiter les autres puis qu'ils ont ainsi ozé s'addresser a vous; et qu'ils n'ont non plus apprehendé les lumieres de vostre esprit que respecté la dignité de vostre charge, pour soutenir des erreurs et refuser de les desavouer apres les avoir soutenues! Je ne doute point, Monseigneur, que Dieu ne l'ait permis pour sa gloire, afin que d'autres apprennent par l'ordre que vous y apporterez de quelle sorte ceux qui sont en vostre place sont obligez de maintenir la pureté de la doctrine de l'Eglise et l'authorité sacree de leurs charges. Je vous demande treshumblement la continuation de vos bonnes graces, et de me faire la faveur de croire qu'il n'y a personne au monde qui soit davantage que moy, Monseigneur,

Vostre treshumble et tresobeissant serviteur,

ARNAULD D'ANDILLY

13 Juillet, 1648

Je vous envoye un don qui m'est tombe entre les mains et que jay cru que vous ne serez pas fasché de voir.

4. ANNE-EUGÉNIE ARNAULD TO HER NIECE, PORT ROYAL, APRIL 26, 1649

Anne-Eugénie Arnauld was the fourth daughter of M. Arnauld, "*l'Avocat*," and the younger sister of Arnauld d'Andilly, la Mère Angélique, and la Mère Agnès. All three sisters had taken orders at a very early age and had become the acknowledged leaders of the reform movement at Port Royal. Another very important figure in the convent was la Mère Marie des Anges. The daughter of M. Suryeau, an *avocat* of Chartres, she was one of the first disciples of Angélique, and was elected abbess of Maubuisson in 1627, with a view to reforming that convent. She resigned this posi-

[5] Laurentius Surius, *Vitae Sanctorum*.

tion in 1648 and returned to Port Royal, where she was elected abbess in 1654. Full details concerning her life, and that of the Arnaulds, are to be found in Sainte-Beuve's *Port Royal*.

The following letter affords a very good conception of the life and spirit of Port Royal in the days of the first generation. Its chief significance for the present purpose, however, lies in the reference to the troubled times and the enemy, who were occupying the Champs about Paris. At the time when the letter was written, the first war of the Fronde, January–March, 1649, had just been ended by an uneasy truce. The "enemy" referred to would be the royal troops who were besieging Paris. The expression leaves little doubt which side the Arnaulds favored.

Ma tres chere Niesse

La Mere Agnès nous a ordonné de vous escrire pour nen avoir pas le loisir. Elle se porte bien Dieu mercy. Elle est revenue de Paris (ou elle a esté deux mois avec la moitie des Seurs) le 5 de Mars. La Mere Marie des Anges qui a esté Abesse de Maubuisson est demeuree ycy superieure, avec les Antienne (dont jay esté si heureuse que destre l'une) pour assister les tres St. Sacrement & faire lofice Divin. Je vous puis dire Ma chere Niesse que depuis que je suis en Religion je nay point esté plus en paix que durant ce temps de trouble bien que Nostre Monastere semblast exposé estant du costé des Champs, & neantmoins les ennemis nestant point de ce coste. Sy lon entendoit moins de bruit ques autre temps, pour Nostre Eglise en tout temps lon y est en paix comme sy lon estoit au Champs. Pour vous dire ce qui mest arrivé c'est que le premier jour de Mars il me prit un sy grand seignement de nes que la seignee du bras ne le peut arester & dura cinq heures. Et cinq jours apres il me reprit aussy grand. Et il me falut seigner du pied. Je demeure fort foible & languissante. Et depuis il a encor falu me seigner pour la fievre, mais a presant Dieu mercy il ne me reste que quelque faiblesse qui menpesche de chanter au Choeur qui poura passer dans quelque temps sil plaist a Dieu. Et je reconnois Ma chere Niesse que Dieu ma redonné la vie pour commencer a le bien servir. Je croy quil vous donne la mesme pensee puis que vous desirez de vous convertir toute a luy. La Mere Agnès prira Dieu pour vous particulierement. Et pour Madame de Ste. Ange lassurant de son tres humble service. [About three words scratched out here.] Et combien elle se reconnoient son obligee de toutes ses charitez vers vous, nous luy disons le mesme par v[ost]re moyen. Je desire de tout mon coeur Ma tres chere de me souvenir en priant Dieu pour mon salut de prier pour le vostre. Et je vous suplie decouster Dieu & de le suivre en tout ce quil vous fera connoistre quil veut de vous, estant en luy toute vostre.

Sr. Anne Eugenie A.

De Port Royal du St. Sacrement le 25 Avril 1649.

[P. S. in margin in a different hand, added apparently by la Mère Agnès:]

Ma chere niepce encore que ma Sr. Anne m'ait fait parler dans cette lettre comme je len avons priee, je ne puis mempescher de vous asseurer moy mesme que je vous porte dans mon coeur & que je vous offre souvent a Dieu afin quil vous fasse la grace de naymer que la St. Eternité au regard de laquelle cette vie nest qu'un moment comme N[otre] S[eigneur] dit en LEvangile de cette semaine. Je suis toute a vous ma tres chere niece. Soyer toute a Dieu je vous suplie.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Beard, C. *Port Royal,* 2 vols. London, 1861.

Bremond, H. *Histoire Littéraire du Sentiment Religieux en France,* Vol. IV. Paris, 1920.

Brunetière, F. "Jansénistes et Cartésiens," *Études Critiques sur l'Histoire de la Littérature Française.* Paris, 1894.

Cambridge Modern History, Vol. V.

Chevalier, J. *Pascal.* Paris, 1922.

Fouqueray, H. *Histoire de la Compagnie de Jésus en France,* Vol. V. Paris, 1925.

Gazier, A. *Histoire Générale du Mouvement Janséniste,* 2 vols. Paris, 1922.

Harnack, A. *History of Dogma,* Vol. VII. Boston, 1900.

Jansenius, C. *Augustinus.* Antwerp, 1709.

Laporte, J. *La Doctrine de Port Royal,* 2 vols. Paris, 1923.

Lavisse, E. *Histoire de France,* Vols. VII–IX. Paris, 1906 ff.

Meyer, A. de. *Les Premières Controverses Jansénistes en France.* Louvain, 1919.

Pascal, B. *Lettres Provinciales,* ed. H. F. Stewart. Manchester, 1920.

Pater, W. *Pascal.* London, 1895.

Ranke, L. von. *History of the Popes,* Vol. II. London, 1913.

Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale, April–June, 1923.

Ricard. *Les Premières Jansénistes et Port Royal.* Paris, 1883.

Sainte-Beuve, C. A. *Port Royal,* 6 vols. Paris, 1878.

Séché, L. *Les Dernières Jansénistes depuis la ruin de Port Royal jusqu'à nos jours,* 3 vols. Paris, 1891.

Strowski, F. *Pascal et son Temps,* 3 vols. Paris, 1907.

Zanta, L. *La Renaissance du Stoïcisme au xvi Siècle.* Paris, 1924.