

Thesis Title: *Jansenism, Holy Living and the Church of England: Historical and Comparative Perspectives, c. 1640 - c. 1700*

Candidate: Thomas John Palmer

College: St. Cross College

Degree: D.Phil., Theology

Word Count: 99078

### *Short Abstract*

This thesis examines the impact in mid- to later-seventeenth century England of the major contemporary religious controversy in France. The debates associated with this controversy, which revolved around the formal condemnation of a heresy popularly called Jansenism, involved fundamental questions about the doctrine of grace and moral theology, about the life of the Church and the conduct of individual Christians. In providing an analysis of the main themes of the controversy, and an account of instances of English interest, the thesis argues that English Protestant theologians in the process of working out their own views on basic theological questions recognised the relevance of the continental debates. It is further suggested that the theological arguments evolved by the French writers possess some value as a point of comparison for the developing views of English theologians. Where the Jansenists reasserted an Augustinian emphasis on the gratuity of salvation against Catholic theologians who over-valued the powers of human nature, the Anglican writers examined here, arguing against Protestant theologians who denied nature any moral potency, emphasised man's contribution to his own salvation. Both arguments have been seen to contain a corrosive individualism, the former through its preoccupation with the luminous experience of grace, the latter through its tendency to elide grace and moral virtue, and reduce Christianity to the voluntary ethical choices of individuals. These assessments, it is argued here, misrepresent the theologians in question. Nevertheless, their thought did encourage greater individualism and moral autonomy. For both groups, their opponents' theological premises were deficient to the extent that they vitiated morality; and in both cases their responses, centring on the transformation of the inner man by love, privileged the moral responsibility of the individual. Their moral 'rigorism', it is suggested, focusing on the affective experience of conversion, represented in both cases an attempt to provide a sound empirical basis for Christian faith and practice in the fragmented intellectual context of post-reformation Europe.

*Jansenism, Holy Living and the Church of England: Historical and Comparative Perspectives, c. 1640-c.1700*

|                                                                             |     |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| <i>Acknowledgements</i>                                                     | iii |
| <i>Conventions</i>                                                          | iv  |
| <i>Abbreviations</i>                                                        | v   |
| Introduction                                                                | 1   |
| <i>Note on Terms</i>                                                        | 8   |
| <i>Part 1 Jansenist Anti-Laxism and Restoration Religious Thought</i>       |     |
| Chapter 1: The Jansenist Critique                                           | 10  |
| 1) Development of the Critique                                              |     |
| 2) Substance of the Critique                                                | 27  |
| - <i>Probabilism</i>                                                        | 35  |
| - <i>Anti-Probabilism</i>                                                   | 45  |
| Chapter 2: Its Transmission into England                                    | 67  |
| 1) English Engagement with French Religious Discourse                       | 68  |
| 2) The Origins of the Jansenist Translations                                | 90  |
| - <i>Evelyn's Translations and Early Restoration Religious Politics</i>     | 93  |
| - <i>The Journall of All Proceedings and the Blackloist Connexion</i>       | 109 |
| - <i>The Mystery of Jesuitism Series and the Anglican Clerical Interest</i> | 121 |
| Chapter 3: Its English Reception                                            | 134 |
| - <i>A Common-place-book</i>                                                | 138 |
| - <i>Anti-Probabilism and Anti-Calvinism</i>                                | 151 |
| <i>Part 2 Rigorism and Moralism</i>                                         |     |
| Chapter 4: 'Jansenist Augustinianism' and the Springs of Pastoral Rigorism  | 174 |
| - <i>Molinism</i>                                                           | 178 |
| - <i>Jansenism</i>                                                          | 184 |
| - <i>Rigorism</i>                                                           | 193 |
| - <i>Anti-Calvinism</i>                                                     | 203 |
| Chapter 5: Anglican 'anti-Augustinianism' and the Theology of Holy Living   | 212 |
| - <i>Anti-Calvinism and the Theology of Holy Living</i>                     | 221 |

|                                                                                                                             |                                                                |     |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| -                                                                                                                           | <i>Moralism</i>                                                | 230 |
| -                                                                                                                           | <i>Rigorism</i>                                                | 246 |
| Chapter 6: Two Case Studies                                                                                                 |                                                                | 253 |
| -                                                                                                                           | <i>Jeremy Taylor on Augustine and Original Sin</i>             |     |
| -                                                                                                                           | <i>Herbert Thorndike on Jansen and Liberty</i>                 | 267 |
| Chapter 7: A Popular Asceticism: Antoine Arnauld's <i>Fréquente Communion</i> and<br>Jeremy Taylor's Doctrine of Repentance |                                                                | 281 |
| -                                                                                                                           | <i>The Fréquente Communion and the Psychology of Penance</i>   | 286 |
| -                                                                                                                           | <i>The Worthy Communicant and the Discipline of Repentance</i> | 296 |
| -                                                                                                                           | <i>A Primitive Template</i>                                    | 311 |
| Conclusion                                                                                                                  |                                                                | 322 |
| <i>Appendix</i>                                                                                                             | <i>'Lax' casuists mentioned in the text</i>                    | 329 |
| <i>Bibliography</i>                                                                                                         |                                                                | 335 |

## *Acknowledgements*

This thesis could not have been undertaken without the award of a doctoral grant from the Arts and Humanities Research Council, whose assistance I gratefully acknowledge. It could not have been completed without the support and advice of my two supervisors, the Reverend Canon Dr. Judith Maltby, and Professor Richard Parish. From first to last Judith displayed great patience and generosity with an eccentric project and a dilatory supervisee. Richard came in at an important stage, and his careful and assiduous criticism appreciably diminished the degree of incompetence evident in the final product. As well as my supervisors, the unhappy parties who submitted to reading parts of the thesis included: Dr. Tom Fedrick-Illsley; Dr. Sarah Apetrei; Dr. Andrew Palmer; and Dr. Anne-Marie Drummond.

## *Conventions*

Old Style dating still in use in England has not been altered, but the year is assumed to begin on January 1<sup>st</sup>. I have tried to use modern critical editions of early modern works where available. Where original works are used I have tried to retain the original spelling except where it may produce confusion. Unless otherwise attributed, translations from foreign languages are my own. Place of publication is London unless otherwise stated. Scriptural texts in English are quoted from the King James Version. Capitalisation is arbitrary, but hopefully consistent. In the regrettable absence of satisfactory alternatives, the masculine universal pronoun is used; it does have the merit of reflecting the usage of the writers under discussion.

N.B. References to the works of Catholic casuists are in the abbreviated form given by French and English critics. It is not the accuracy but the incidence of these citations which is of interest. A list of casuists and of their works is given in the Appendix.

## *Abbreviations*

|                        |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
|------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>AMJ</i>             | <i>Additional to the mystery of Jesuitism. Englished by the same hand</i> (1679)                                                                                                                                                                                       |
| Arnauld, <i>Œuvres</i> | <i>Œuvres de Messire Antoine Arnauld, Docteur de la Maison et Société de Sorbonne</i> , 43v. in 38 (Paris, 1775-83), ed. Gabriel Du Pac de Bellegarde and Jean Hautefage                                                                                               |
| BL                     | British Library                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
| Ch. Ch. Lib., Oxf.     | Christ Church Library, Oxford                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |
| Clark                  | Ruth Clark, <i>Strangers and Sojourners at Port-Royal. Being an account of the connections between the British Isles and the Jansenists of France and Holland</i> (New York, 1972 [1932])                                                                              |
| <i>CLP</i>             | Blaise Pascal, <i>Les Provinciales ou Les Lettres écrites par Louis de Montalte à un provincial de ses amis et aux RR. PP. Jésuites</i> , ed. Louis Cognet, rev. Gérard Ferreyrolles (Paris, 1992)                                                                     |
| <i>CPR</i>             | <i>Chroniques de Port-Royal</i>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
| <i>DTC</i>             | A. Vacant (dir.), <i>Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique</i> , 15 vols. (Paris, 1889-1950)                                                                                                                                                                            |
| <i>ESTC</i>            | English Short Title Catalogue                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |
| <i>FC</i>              | Antoine Arnauld, <i>De la fréquente communion, où les sentiments des Pères, des Papes et des Conciles, touchant l'usage des Sacrements de Pénitence &amp; d'Eucharistie, sont fidèlement exposés</i> (5 <sup>th</sup> ed., Paris, 1646, first publ. 1643)              |
| <i>JEH</i>             | <i>Journal of Ecclesiastical History</i>                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
| <i>JM</i>              | <i>The Jesuits morals. Collected by a doctor of the colledge of Sorbon in Paris. Who hath faithfully extracted them out of the Jesuits own books, which are printed by the permission and approbation of the superiours of their Society</i> [tr. Israel Tonge] (1670) |
| <i>ODNB</i>            | <i>Oxford Dictionary of National Biography</i>                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
| <i>MJ</i>              | <i>Les Provinciales: or The Mystery of Jesuitisme, discover'd in certain letters, written upon occasion of the present differences at Sorbonne, between the Jansenists and the Molinists, from</i>                                                                     |

*January 1656. to March 1657. S. N. Displaying the corrupt maximes and politicks of that society. Faithfully rendered into English (1657)*

*Pensées* Blaise Pascal, *Pensées*, ed. Louis Lafuma, 2 vols. (Paris, 1958)

*PL* *Patrologia Latina*

*RH* *Recusant History*

Schroeder H. J. Schroeder, *Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent* (London, 1960)

*ST* Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae*

The works of Thomas Aquinas accessed at [www.corpusthomisticum.org](http://www.corpusthomisticum.org)

*UN* Jeremy Taylor, *Unum Necessarium, Or, The Doctrine and Practice of Repentance*, in *The Whole Works of the Right Reverend Jeremy Taylor, D. D.*, ed. Reginald Heber, rev. and corrected in 10 vols. Charles Page Eden (London, 1850-54)

## *Introduction*

The seventeenth-century Jansenists of Port-Royal, the reformed Cistercian abbey near Paris which became the spiritual heart of a controversial movement for renewal within post-Tridentine Catholicism, have often inspired comparison with the puritan critics of the post-reformation English Church. With their insistently expressed concern for doctrinal purity, clerical standards and lay godliness, the Jansenists, like the puritans, disturbed the civil and religious authorities, who attempted through policy and polemic to define these troublesome tendencies as dissident, sectarian, and, in the case of the Jansenists, heretical. At the moment when the Jansenist controversy first came to a head in the 1640s and 1650s, however, the parallel is not so clear; for the English puritans, after the defeat of the royalist cause, had to a degree succeeded in establishing a version of the more perfectly reformed Church and godly commonwealth after which they had thirsted for the better part of a century. The puritan-hammering Church of Bancroft and Laud had been eclipsed; a short walk away from the urban sister-house of Port-Royal des Champs, Port-Royal de Paris in the Faubourg St. Jacques, a few of her unhappy remnants could be found during the Interregnum celebrating Prayer Book services in Sir Richard Browne's embassy chapel in the Faubourg St. Germain, or in the lodgings of John Cosin, the future bishop of Durham, at the Louvre.<sup>1</sup> Along with illegal, clandestine gatherings in England, such expatriate congregations now represented virtually the whole visible life of the antebellum Church. The Long Parliament had banned the use of her liturgy and the observance of traditional major feasts, attacked the jurisdictional and economic basis of episcopal church-government, and finally abolished

---

<sup>1</sup> On the royalists in exile see Eva Scott, *The King in Exile* (1905); *ead.*, *The Travels of the King* (1907); P. H. Hardacre, 'The Royalists in Exile during the Puritan Revolution, 1642-1660', *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 16, 4 (1953); Robert S. Bosher, *The Making of the Restoration Settlement. The Influence of the Laudians 1649-1662* (New York, 1951), ch. 2; Geoffrey Smith, *The Cavaliers in Exile, 1640-1660* (Basingstoke, 2003).

episcopacy itself, and established, if in a limited sense and without striking success, a national Presbyterian Church.<sup>2</sup> Cathedral life was stopped, and parochial clergy and university members who failed to show themselves amenable to the new dispensation were harassed, and, in a significant number of cases, ejected from office, left with a choice between ‘suffering’ at home or abroad, or making some form of concession to the times.<sup>3</sup> The reality may not always have been as drastic as their rhetorical laments on the theme of persecution represented; but it was now the turn of the ‘confessors’ of the oppressed Church of England to play the part of dissidents and conventiclers.<sup>4</sup>

The Port-Royal group, under heavy pressure to renounce heretical views they denied holding, had an equally legitimate claim to persecuted status; and, as Ruth Clark has shown, they felt sympathy for the plight of the English exiles. Linked to Port-Royal circles by numerous personal connections, the royalists received considerable material assistance from this quarter.<sup>5</sup> Little can be made of the report, which we have only from Anthony à Wood, that Richard Steward (chaplain and clerk of the closet to Charles II) went ‘very far in making an accommodation between the Jansenists and the Reformed Party’ while in Paris in the late 1640s.<sup>6</sup> But it is clear that, in sociological terms, the two groups were very similarly

---

<sup>2</sup> John Morrill, ‘The Attack on the Church in the Long Parliament, 1640-42’, in D. Beales and G. Best (eds.), *History, Society and the Churches* (Cambridge, 1985), pp. 105-24; *idem*, ‘The Church in England 1642-9’, in Morrill (ed.), *Reactions to the English Civil War* (Basingstoke, 1982). The fullest account of the period is W. A. Shaw, *A History of the English Church ... 1640-1660*, 2 vols. (1900).

<sup>3</sup> A. G. Matthews, *Walker Revised* (new ed., Oxford, 1988).

<sup>4</sup> Much new light has been shed on the subject of ‘Anglican survivalism’ in recent decades: see Morrill, ‘The Church in England’; John Spurr, *The Restoration Church of England 1646-1689* (New Haven-London, 1991), ch. 1; Judith Maltby, *Prayer Book and People in Elizabethan and Early Stuart England* (Cambridge, 1998), chs. 3-6; *ead.*, ‘From *Temple* to *Synagogue*: “Old” Conformity in the 1640s-1650s and the Case of Christopher Harvey’, in P. Lake and M. Questier (eds.), *Conformity and Orthodoxy in the English Church, c. 1560- c. 1660* (Woodbridge, 2000); *ead.*, ‘Suffering and Surviving: the Civil Wars, the Commonwealth, and the Formation of “Anglicanism”’, in Stephen Platten (ed.), *Anglicanism and the Western Tradition* (Norwich, 2003); Kenneth Fincham and Nicholas Tyacke, *Altars Restored* (Oxford, 2007), ch. 7; Fincham and Stephen Taylor, ‘Episcopalian conformity and nonconformity 1646-1660’, in Jason McElligot and D. L. Smith (eds.), *Royalists and Royalism during the Interregnum* (Manchester, 2010).

<sup>5</sup> Clark, chs. 3-6.

<sup>6</sup> *Athenae Oxonienses*, 2 vols. (1691-2), ii, p. 80; Clark, p. 54; Paule Jansen, *De Blaise Pascal à Henry Hammond. Les Provinciales en Angleterre* (Paris, 1954), drew attention to a reference, in John Fell’s account of the MSS of the leading episcopalian theologian Henry Hammond, to ‘a piece of a letter from the Bp. of Derry [John Bramhall] about the death of Sr. George Ratcliffe and the hopes of doing good with the Jansenists’:

circumstanced. In the middle of the century it was the episcopalian loyalists, not the puritans, who shared with the Jansenists the character of an embattled sect.

It is one of my assumptions in this thesis that the analogy, curious though it is, can be stretched a little further. The controversy which engulfed Port-Royal and made a party of the ‘Jansenists’ centred on their critical assessment of contemporary formulations of the theology of grace and salvation, and on their connected critique of ‘lax’ moral theologians and confessors who were encouraging a general deterioration in standards of Christian morality. Similar issues exercised the leading theological lights among the English episcopalians, whose views on grace and salvation were also attacked as unorthodox, and also manifested themselves in a pronounced preoccupation with moral standards. As a matter of fact the direction in which each group was held to have erred located them on opposite sides of the golden thread of orthodoxy as their critics conceived it. The Jansenists, for their part, considering themselves the true ‘disciples of St. Augustine’ in an age which has been called the century *par excellence* of the bishop of Hippo, undertook to defend the doctrine of irresistible grace, that necessary assistance which, as Augustine argued against the Pelagians, is alone capable of rescuing man from the abyss into which he has sunk himself by his sin.<sup>7</sup> Opponents both contemporary and modern have criticised the excessive pessimism of this theological outlook, which, encouraging a preoccupation with sin, produced a harsh and unrealistically rigorous moral teaching. The most active theological spokesmen of the English episcopalian cause, by contrast, inherited and elaborated a doctrinal argument which, being directed against a strain of Protestant theology whose exaggerated emphasis on the gratuity of salvation and the impotence of human nature seemed to them a recipe for apathy or licence, looks very much like an emancipation from the baleful influence of Augustine’s authority.

---

Bodl., Tanner MS 88, f. 70, cited Jansen, p. 83. Wood had mentioned ‘that publick-spirited man *Sir George Ratcliffe*’, a legal expert to Lord Strafford who attached himself to the Duke of York during the exile, in connection with Steward’s initiative.

<sup>7</sup> Henri Irénée Marrou, *Saint Augustin et l’augustinisme* (Paris, 1955), p. 168.

The shortcomings of this soteriological argument, in the eyes of its critics, lay in its *overestimation* of human moral potential, and resulted in an excessively legal moral teaching, at once too demanding for fallen nature and too formal for the life of grace. Were we seeking pairs of seventeenth-century theological opposites, then, we could hardly do better than the Jansenists and the exponents of this argument among those to whom, thanks to the strengthened identity conferred upon them by conditions of adversity, we may now refer as Anglican divines.

All the same, I do not, in proposing a ‘comparative’ study of aspects of their theological views, intend anything facetious. The debates associated with the invidious name of Jansenism, which stirred the whole Roman Church and to which Anglican exiles in Catholic Europe were immediately exposed, involved fundamental theological questions which were neither exclusive to any party of Christian theologians, nor, in many cases, susceptible of final resolution. I do not think I shall be claiming very much when I assert that these questions were of inherent interest to English theologians who were in the process of working out their own relationship to the theological legacy of the sixteenth-century reformation; and the elements of this thesis which I have qualified, in my title, as ‘historical’, are concerned with the impression made on Anglophone onlookers by the principal themes raised in the course of these intra-Catholic debates. This inquiry into the impact of the major contemporary Catholic controversy is offered as a contribution to our understanding of the intellectual horizons of English thinkers in the mid- to late-seventeenth century. Given the quantities of original work produced in diverse fields of theological and scholarly inquiry by those to whom the label Jansenist has become more or less firmly attached, I think it may justifiably be regarded as a preliminary account only.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> There is a brief survey in ch. 2, below, pp. 68-89.

There is a danger that the reader confuses this historical account of English interest in the intellectual phenomena of the Jansenist controversy with an attempt to establish a case for ‘Jansenist’ influences on English religious thought. It might well be possible to execute a series of case-studies along these lines – though to be really satisfying I think it would have to comprehend the eighteenth and probably the nineteenth century as well<sup>9</sup> – but it should be emphasised at the outset that this is no part of my intention here. What I have attempted in the ‘comparative’ aspects of this thesis is to use the theological views of the Jansenists as a point of contrast against which the evolving theological sensibility which forms my subject in the English context may fruitfully be examined. While the Jansenists worked under different theological pressures and, in some respects, from diametrically opposed theological premises, the problems with which they grappled were broadly comparable; and it is my suggestion that the solutions they arrived at can help to throw some of the motivations and priorities of the English thinkers into relief.

In the first chapter of this thesis I examine the Jansenists’ attack on contemporary moral theologians whom they accused of propagating a ‘lax’ methodology conducive to ill-discipline and moral irregularity. This argument reflected a reforming outlook which historians of early modern French Catholicism, appropriating part of the technical nomenclature of moral theologians, have become accustomed to describe as ‘rigorist’. Moral rigorism was not a peculiar attribute of the Jansenists: many among those who shared the Tridentine aspiration after a better informed, more disciplined and more committed worshipping community took the view that it would best be realised through a severe pastoral approach. But the theological assumptions of the Jansenists, which I shall go on to discuss in

---

<sup>9</sup> See Clark, ch. 18, on eighteenth-century readers; and John Barker, *Strange Contrarieties. Pascal in England during the Age of Reason* (Montreal-London, 1975). One of the most notable collections of Port-Royal materials in nineteenth-century England, now housed at Keble College Library, Oxford, was that of the Tractarian priest Henry Morgan; his *Port-Royal and other Studies* (1914), while not, as the casual library-catalogue browser might hope, a first-hand account of Caribbean piracy, is nevertheless an interesting set of portraits.

greater depth in chapter four, predisposed them to a particularly thoroughgoing form of rigorism. Envisaging the moral life of man as a pair of scales, with concupiscence in one balance and charity in the other, they were intolerant of any suggestion that the failings of the sinful should be accommodated or indulged. In the later 1650s they made a *cause célèbre* out of the less rigid, perhaps more realistic pastoral approach counselled by other clerical reformers, evidence, in their view, of a pernicious ‘relâchement’ of moral standards; as I show in chapters two and three, meanwhile, this campaign of rigorist polemics made a significant impact in England.

The Anglican theologians examined in this thesis were receptive to the French critique of ‘lax’ morals because the question of morality bore closely on their own theological priorities. Their theological case was constructed chiefly against a predestinarian, *sola fide* understanding of grace and salvation, which they depicted as a doorway to antinomian anarchy. The determinist framework of this soteriology, associated in their minds with the name of John Calvin, seemed to them to remove all incentive to moral endeavour. Consequently they were concerned to carve out a meaningful role for obedience in the theory of justification, and placed great emphasis on the stringent prescriptions for ‘holy living’ set out in the Christian revelation. To the ‘speculative’ theology of their Calvinist antagonists, with its emphasis on the faith of the elect, they opposed a ‘practical’ or affective theological approach, focusing on the transformation of the will which must be predicated of a justified man. The circumstance of disestablishment functioned as a spur to this anti-Calvinist argument; in sermons and printed works these Anglican divines exhorted their benighted flock to witness to the truth of their cause, like the early Christians under persecution, by lives of sincere repentance and unimpeachable holiness.

My concern in the second part of this thesis is to suggest that this ‘holy living’ strain of Anglican theology represented a form of moral rigorism which may plausibly be compared

with that of the Jansenist writers. Although the Jansenists defended the effective operation of grace, they too concentrated predominantly upon the *formal* conversion of the will from sinfulness to charity. The acculturation of the appetites through a rigorous penitential regime was therefore recommended in both cases. The effect of this approach was to place the practical weight of responsibility for his moral condition and ultimate salvation squarely on the shoulders of the individual. In this sense I think it is correct to identify among both sets of thinkers signs of a movement towards greater individualism and moral autonomy. In the case of the Jansenists such a tendency is often attributed to a predestinarian theology which, placing a premium on the illuminative experience of grace, filled the elect believer with an unshakeable self-conviction. In the case of the Anglicans, conversely, it is often related to the value they ascribed, in the course of reacting against a Calvinist soteriology predicated on their irremediable corruption, to man's natural moral faculties; for the tendency of this 'liberal' approach was to reduce the state of grace to a consecutive series of good moral choices, voluntarily undertaken, in response to the Christian Gospel, by free, autonomous agents. As the following chapters will make clear, I do not believe that either of these suggestions fairly reflects the substantive theological statements of the writers in question. In seeking to provide reliable theological and epistemological guarantees for the moral responsibility of individual Christians, however, they each laid out a characteristically rigorist template which, being founded on the absolute priority of interior conversion, did contain an individualist tendency. In this respect both streams of thought seem to exemplify that perennial Christian tension, at its most acute in the post-reformation era of confession-building, between the logic of conversion and the logic of institution.

### *Note on Terms*

Throughout this thesis I use categories which are open to objection on the grounds either of anachronism or of polemical over-determination. I do not make any claim for the superiority of these conventional choices, nor do they reflect ideological preferences. My rule has been convenience, and I qualify the relevant terms as follows.

By ‘Anglican’ I do not intend a body of theological and ecclesiological views characterised by any putative philosophical quality. In general terms my use has a purely institutional sense, denoting loyalty to an ecclesial body distinguished, after the parliamentary attack on the Church in the 1640s, by the circumstances of persecution and proscription. Thus Henry Hammond, for example, referred to ‘the Anglican Church’ in 1647.<sup>10</sup> In the majority of cases my use of ‘Anglican’ is narrower still, signifying a specific group of episcopalian divines united by a theological agenda centred on the adjustment of Calvinist soteriology. This group, the subject of chapter five, I also design the ‘holy living’ theologians.

The Calvinism against which these writers constructed their arguments was a polemical entity, referred to the theological formulations of the Synod of Dort and the Westminster Assembly. Its relationship to the thought of Calvin may be contestable, but is irrelevant to my analysis.

Like ‘Calvinist’, ‘Jansenist’ was a term of abuse, and one whose use is complicated by the formal heresy it is supposed to denominate. I use ‘Jansenist’ interchangeably with

---

<sup>10</sup> *Of the Power of the Keyes: Or, Of Binding and Loosing* (1647), sig. A3r. While I agree that the term is anachronistic in relation to the earlier history of the English Church, however, it must be said that to refuse it on the grounds that the majority of late-Elizabethan and early-Stuart churchmen were doctrinally ‘Calvinist’ seems merely to affirm the Anglo-Catholic ‘myth’ about the identity of Anglicanism.

‘Port-Royalist’ to indicate a small number of writers who were associated materially with the convents of Port-Royal, and intellectually with the controversial views of the theologian Cornelius Jansen – the *abbé* de Saint-Cyran, Antoine ‘le grand’ Arnauld, Blaise Pascal, Pierre Nicole. While the term ‘Jansenist’ usefully suggests the family relationship between their views in many areas, I do not intend to define ‘Jansenism’ on the basis of my treatment of those views.

Such an exposition would be inauthentic were a more historically satisfactory label substituted for their polemical *bête-noire*, ‘Semi-Pelagianism’. The same argument cannot be made for the anachronistic terms ‘laxisme’ and ‘rigorisme’. I am concerned throughout the thesis to argue for the application of the latter; in the case of the former, I have tried to distinguish the polemical image from the real tendency which it signified.

## *Part 1*

### *Jansenist Anti-Laxism and Restoration Religious Thought*

#### *Chapter 1*

##### *The Jansenist Critique*

###### 1) Development of the Jansenist Critique

The 1650s witnessed the culmination of the first phase of the distinctive French movement for theological and pastoral renewal known as Jansenism. In the bull *Cum occasione* of 1653 Innocent X condemned Five Propositions extracted from the *Augustinus* of Cornelius Jansen (1585-1638), bishop of Ypres, where Jansen reclaimed as Catholic truth the Augustinian theology of grace appropriated and distorted by the Protestant reformers.<sup>1</sup> The Jansenists, who made his teaching their own, unsuccessfully attempted to defend its orthodoxy on the grounds that the heretical propositions were not contained in the *Augustinus* and did not represent Jansen's true sense (the 'question de fait'). Alexander VII issued another bull, *Ad sacram* (1656), condemning the Propositions in the sense of Jansen, and an assembly of French bishops convoked by Cardinal Mazarin designed a Formulary to the same effect, to which subscription was required from all French ecclesiastics, whether secular or regular. A conjunction of religio-political forces now opposed the Jansenists, from which they were barely shielded by the Gallicanism of the *parlementaires* and what sympathy they could generate among churchmen and public opinion at large. In 1661 the 'petites écoles' run at Port-Royal, where for a short time the future Duke of Monmouth was counted among the

---

<sup>1</sup> Jansen's work was (posthumously) published Louvain, 1640. It is discussed below, ch. 4.

pupils, were stopped, and the novices dispersed.<sup>2</sup> The *conseil d'état* demanded unqualified subscription to the Formulary; and when in 1664 the new archbishop of Paris, Hardouin de Péréfixe, was in a position to take decisive action, he quelled the recalcitrant nuns of Port-Royal de Paris and Port-Royal des Champs with an ugly show of force. A measure of stability was only restored at the end of the 1660s, when Clement IX engineered a compromise with the non-jurors, who were now able to subscribe without committing themselves on the *question de fait*.<sup>3</sup>

Thus by the end of the 1650s the reformist ambitions of the Port-Royal group, their history marked since the 1620s by the progressive alienation of increasingly powerful interests in Church and state, seemed to have ended in abject failure. Yet to the modern observer the decade also represents a high-water mark for the Jansenist critique of contemporary Catholicism. From the travails of the Port-Royalists' intellectual leader, Antoine Arnauld (1612-94), which ended in his expulsion from the Sorbonne in February 1656, emerged its most pithy and perhaps its most influential expression in the satirical *Lettres Provinciales* of Blaise Pascal (1623-62).<sup>4</sup> With arresting brilliance Pascal denounced 'une morale relâchée' propagated principally by the indulgent moralists and confessors of the Society of Jesus. The origins of this canker, argued Pascal, lay in 'la doctrine des opinions probables', according to which an individual is not obliged to obey the moral law if there exists, in a particular case, any 'probable' opinion – either 'intrinsically', in virtue of rational

---

<sup>2</sup> Clark, p. 61.

<sup>3</sup> In English see Nigel Abercrombie, *The Origins of Jansenism*, (Oxford, 1936), pt 1; Alexander Sedgwick, *Jansenism in Seventeenth-Century France* (Charlottesville, 1977); William Doyle, *Jansenism* (Basingstoke, 2000); and the excellent long essay by Louis Cognet, 'Ecclesiastical Life in France', in Hubert Jedin and John Dolan (eds.), *History of the Church*, 10 vols. (1965-81), vi. Good introductory works in French are Cognet, *Le jansénisme* (Paris, 1961); Jean Orcibal, *Saint-Cyran et le jansénisme* (Paris, 1961); see also Antoine Adam, *Du mysticisme à la révolte. Les jansénistes du XVIIe siècle* (Paris, 1968); René Taveneaux, *Jansénisme et Politique* (Paris, 1965), pp. 7-50; and behind all C. A. Sainte-Beuve, *Port-Royal*, 3 vols. (Paris, 1953-55 [originally 1840-48]).

<sup>4</sup> The letters appeared episodically from January 1656 to March 1657.

arguments, or ‘extrinsically’, in virtue of the authority of learned doctors – in favour of liberty.<sup>5</sup>

Pascal’s plea for *une bonne morale et sévère* made a significant impact, heightened by an apparent mark of divine approbation in the form of a miraculous cure bestowed upon his niece by a thorn from the Holy Crown.<sup>6</sup> The General Assembly of the French Clergy, which in March 1657 closed the door on the *question de fait* by accepting the bull *Ad sacram*, nevertheless endorsed Pascal’s arguments against ‘les nouveaux casuistes’, decreeing that the confessors of France would henceforth administer the sacrament of penance according to the strict rules outlined by St. Carlo Borromeo, archbishop of Milan, in his *Avvertenze ai Confessori* of 1575.<sup>7</sup> This was done in order to counteract

certaines opinions modernes, qui ont tellement altéré la Morale Chrestienne, et les maximes de l’Évangile, qu’une profonde ignorance seroit beaucoup plus souhaitable, qu’une telle science, qui apprend à tenir toutes choses problématiques, et à chercher des moyens, non pas pour exterminer les mauvaises habitudes des hommes; mais pour les justifier, et pour leur donner l’invention de les satisfaire en conscience.<sup>8</sup>

Notwithstanding his failure to vindicate Jansen’s orthodoxy, then, it seems Pascal succeeded in convincing contemporaries that there existed a connection between a debasement of pastoral standards and a new moral ‘science’, built upon the doctrine of probable opinions, and realised in the vitiation of the sacrament of penance. *An Apologie pour les casuistes*

---

<sup>5</sup> The doctrine is discussed below, this chapter.

<sup>6</sup> For an early notice see Madame de Sévigné, *Lettres*, ed. E. Gérard-Gailly, 3 vols. (Paris, 1953-57), i, p. 112. Of the truth of this miracle of the *sainte-épine*, which took place at Port-Royal on March 24<sup>th</sup>, 1657, the Duke of York was convinced by the Maréchal de Turenne. His brother Charles II was apparently also persuaded: Clark, pp. 55-6.

<sup>7</sup> The work was printed at Paris, 1657, as *Instructions de S. Charles Boromé [sic] ... Aux Confesseurs de sa Ville et de son Diocese*. The most thorough treatment is now Jean-Louis Quantin, ‘De la rigueur au rigorisme. Les *Avvertenze ai Confessori* de Charles Borromée dans la France du XVIIe siècle’, *Studia Borromaica*, 20 (2006), pp. 195-251; further literature is cited ch. 7, n. 25, below.

<sup>8</sup> Lettre-préface, ‘L’Assemblée Générale du Clergé à Messieurs les Évêques de France’, in *Instructions de S. Charles Borromée* (Besançon, 1839), pp. 7-8. The letter may reasonably be attributed to Antoine Godeau, bishop of Vence.

published in December 1657 by a Parisian Jesuit, Georges Pirot, was condemned by episcopal censure in nineteen dioceses between April 1658 and May 1659. By mid-1658 the doctors of the Paris Theology Faculty decided to proceed to a thoroughgoing censure of the work; this was finalised in July, and authorised by Louis XIV in October for publication in French and Latin.<sup>9</sup>

The *Provinciales* did not meet with this apparent success by accident. The doctrine of probable opinions (probabilism, in modern terms) had been a subject of debate for half a century. Allowing for greater flexibility in administering the sacrament of penance, it was well-adapted to a positive and comprehensive pastoral strategy, such as suited a newly confessional age. The Jesuits, who quickly came to view the hearing of confessions as a central plank of Catholic renewal, took it up enthusiastically; their study of moral cases (casuistry) came increasingly to be coloured by it. But the urge to be ‘mild’ and ‘approachable’, if potentially more fruitful than a rigid pastoral approach, did carry with it the risk of over-indulgence.<sup>10</sup> Claudio Aquaviva, general of the Society, alerted his fellow superiors to this danger in 1604; in 1613 he again warned against too great a liberty of opinion. Theologians such as Comitulus, Rebellus, and even Cardinal Bellarmine raised doubts about allowing the choice of a less probable opinion, and these were echoed by Aquaviva’s successor Vitelleschi in 1617.<sup>11</sup> From the mid-seventeenth century the Dominican order became increasingly hostile to the doctrine, as a novelty which departed

---

<sup>9</sup> Georges Pirot, *Apologie pour les Casuistes contre les calomnies des Jansénistes* (Paris, 1657); Thomas Deman, ‘Probabilisme’, in *DTC*, XIII, cols. 515f. A useful though not unprejudiced history of this work is in I. de Récalde, *Écrits des Curés de Paris Contre les Jésuites* (Paris, 1921), pp. 329-49; the censures are followed *ibid.*, pp. 350-62; but see now Jean-Pascal Gay, *Morales en conflit. Théologie et polémique au Grand Siècle (1640-1700)* (Paris, 2011), pp. 210-41. A number of the episcopal censures were framed with the collaboration of Port-Royal writers, including Pascal: Jean Mesnard, ‘La collaboration des Ecrivains de Port-Royal aux censures contre l’*Apologie pour les Casuistes* (1658-1659)’, *CPR*, 32 (1983), pp. 3-20.

<sup>10</sup> John W. O’Malley, *The First Jesuits* (Cambridge, MA, 1993), pp. 136-51, quote at 142; A. Jonsen and S. Toulmin, *The Abuse of Casuistry. A History of Moral Reasoning* (London-Berkeley, 1988), pt. iii; Gay, *Morales en conflit*, ch. 8.

<sup>11</sup> See Deman, ‘Probabilisme’, cols. 497-501. Paul Comitoli, SJ (1544-1626), and Ferdinand Rebello, SJ (d. 1608), were nevertheless sometimes included in hostile lists of ‘lax’ casuists.

from the moral teaching of Thomas Aquinas. The general chapter of 1656, claiming papal approval, ordered Dominican confessors to avoid the ‘lax’, uncertain and paradoxical opinions of modern doctors.<sup>12</sup> Dominicans would henceforth stand in the vanguard of the argument against allowing the choice of a less probable opinion.<sup>13</sup> At Jansen’s institution of Louvain, scene of long-standing tensions with the Jesuits, propositions illustrative of the ‘new morals’ were censured on numerous occasions in the late 1640s and 1650s.<sup>14</sup> The Holy Office was sensitive to the issue, censoring works of casuistical theology which contained ‘lax’ resolutions, and in 1665-6 Alexander VII issued decrees against forty-five ‘errores doctrinae moralis laxioris’.<sup>15</sup> In 1679 Innocent XI censured sixty-five similar errors, including the proposition that it is probable ‘posse iudicare iuxta opinionem etiam minus probabilem’.<sup>16</sup>

The French Church had been exercised by a perceived *relâchement* in pastoral standards for several decades before the *Provinciales*.<sup>17</sup> This was related in some ways to a deeper conflict of ‘theological cultures’, with institutional as well as ideological aspects.<sup>18</sup> Gallican hostility to papal incursions on French ecclesiastical autonomy, while strongest among the political classes, was always well-represented at the Sorbonne, and made for tensions with the ambitious Society of Jesus, specially vowed to papal obedience and

<sup>12</sup> Deman, ‘Probabilisme’, cols. 502f.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*; Jean-Louis Quantin, ‘Le rigorisme: sur le basculement de la théologie morale catholique au XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle’, *Revue d’Histoire de l’Eglise de France*, 89, 222 (2003), pp. 23-43.

<sup>14</sup> Deman, ‘Probabilisme’, cols. 520-3; Lucien Ceysens, *La première bulle contre Jansénius: sources relatives à son histoire, 1644-1653*, 2 vols. (Brussels, 1961), i, 568, 576, 715, 723-4; *ib.*, ii, 316, 347-54, 481, 484-6; *idem*, *La fin de la première période du Jansénisme. Sources des années 1654-1660*, 2 vols. (Brussels, 1963-65), i, 141, 261, 317, 637, 664, 673, 680.

<sup>15</sup> E.g. the *Somme des péchés* of Étienne Bauny, SJ, placed on the Index in 1640; and the *Theologiae moralis fundamentalis* of Jean-Lobkowitz Caramuel, O. Cist., recalled for correction after its publication in 1651. Alexander VII’s decrees in Henricus Denzinger (ed.), *Enchiridion symbolorum definitionum et declarationum de rebus fidei et morum* (33<sup>rd</sup> ed., Freiburg-Rome, 1965), 2021-65.

<sup>16</sup> Denzinger, 2101-67: the first four propositions concern probabilism; an Eng. ed. printed London, 1679, as *The Roman Wonder*; cf. ch. 3, below, pp. 141-2.

<sup>17</sup> In 1619 the Sorbonne had censured several lax opinions in a work by Pierre Milhard, OSB, *La Grande Guide des Curez*; see Gay, *Morales en conflit*, pp. 104-8; Robin Briggs, ‘The sins of the people. Auricular confession and the imposition of social norms’, in his *Communities of Belief* (Oxford, 1989), pp. 297-300.

<sup>18</sup> Jean Delumeau, *Le Catholicisme entre Luther et Voltaire* (6<sup>th</sup> ed., Paris, 1996), pt. 3, ch. 4; Gay, *Morales en conflit, passim*.

privileged by exemptions from episcopal control.<sup>19</sup> The *dévo*t party which championed the cause of Catholic reform in France, though by no means insular in outlook, included influential figures, such as Cardinal Pierre de Bérulle (1575-1629), whose theological preferences did not coincide with those predominating among the Jesuits, and whose vision for reform privileged the role of the secular hierarchy over that of the regulars. The notion of *une morale séduisante*, meanwhile, fitted easily into a picture of unscrupulous and disruptive Jesuit ambition, and contributed to the condemnations in 1641 of a work *De hierarchia et hierarchiis* by the future French provincial, Louis Cellot, and the *Somme des Péchez* of another Jesuit, Étienne Bauny, denounced by the Assembly of the Clergy in the same year for its ‘corruption des bonnes mœurs’. These condemnations prefaced an offensive against ‘la théologie morale des Jésuites’ which reflected, as much as a concern for ‘bonnes mœurs’, the hardening of party lines.<sup>20</sup>

The *Provinciales*, therefore, took their place in a long-running battle between the perpetrators of a supposed moral ‘relâchement’ and the *soi-disant* defenders of a purer *morale*, which on the field of polemics would come to bear the device of ‘rigorisme’.<sup>21</sup> Whether or not they constituted a genuinely constructive intervention in a technical debate, there is no doubt that the *Provinciales* and other Jansenist attacks on ‘les nouveaux casuistes’ helped to discredit the probabilist method, and, along with a widespread aspiration after a

---

<sup>19</sup> Bernard Chédozeau, ‘La faculté de théologie de Paris au XVIIe siècle: un lieu privilégié des conflits entre gallicans et ultramontains (1600-1720), *Mélanges de la Bibliothèque de la Sorbonne*, 10 (1991), pp. 39-102; Alain Tallon, *Conscience nationale et sentiment religieux en France au XVIIe siècle* (Paris, 2002).

<sup>20</sup> Gay, *Morales en conflit*, pp. 115-70; A. D. Wright, *The Divisions of French Catholicism, 1629-1645* (Farnham, 2011), pp. 162f.; on Bauny cf. Briggs, ‘The sins of the people’, pp. 300-302; Richard Parish, ‘Le Père Étienne Bauny. SJ: La *Somme des péchés qui se commettent en tous états* face aux *Lettres Provinciales*’, *French Studies*, 63, 4 (2009), pp. 385-98.

<sup>21</sup> Jean-Louis Quantin, *Le rigorisme chrétien* (Paris, 2001), pp. 15-22.

‘clear and simple’ theology, founded on an empirical archaeology of the sources of Christian faith and morals, contributed to the gradual preponderance of a ‘rigorist’ culture in France.<sup>22</sup>

\*

The emergence of a distinctive ‘Jansenism’ in the 1630s and 1640s, centred on Jean Duvergier de Hauranne, *abbé* de Saint-Cyran (1581-1643) and from 1635 spiritual director of the convent of Port-Royal, in some ways reflected increasing tensions within the French Catholic reform. The *de facto* leader of the *dévot* party and Saint-Cyran’s mentor, Bérulle, died in 1629, and, having been discountenanced in 1630, the *dévots* found themselves opposed to an administration which committed France to a *politique* foreign policy.<sup>23</sup> The Jesuits, meanwhile, already seen as a hindrance to reform prosecuted through the secular hierarchy, were increasingly dependent on the favour of the crown and the Richelieu administration.<sup>24</sup> For Saint-Cyran, leaving ultramontanism definitively behind, the cause of Catholic reform came to be inextricably linked to the extirpation of an all-pervasive Jesuit menace. With him originated the anti-Jesuit critique which would find its apotheosis in the *Provinciales*.

Two major influences shaped Saint-Cyran’s attitude to his former preceptors.<sup>25</sup> At Louvain he was a contemporary of Cornelius Jansen; they met in Paris in 1609, forming a friendship which led to a five-year co-habitation at Saint-Cyran’s Bayonne estate from 1611. This period was spent in methodical study of scripture and its patristic commentators; after

---

<sup>22</sup> A. Degert, ‘Réaction des “Provinciales” sur la Théologie Morale en France’, *Bulletin de Littérature Ecclésiastique de Toulouse*, 5<sup>th</sup> ser., 5 (1913), pp. 400-20; Quantin, ‘Basculement’; *idem*, *Le rigorisme chrétien*, pp. 40-106; *idem*, *Le catholicisme classique et les Pères de l’Église. Un retour aux sources (1669-1713)* (Paris, 1999), pp. 103f.; Henri Gouhier, ‘La Crise de la Théologie au Temps de Descartes’, printed in his *La Pensée Religieuse de Descartes* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., Paris, 1972).

<sup>23</sup> Jansen would displease Richelieu by criticising his alliances with Protestant powers in a pamphlet, *Mars Gallicus*, of 1635.

<sup>24</sup> Wright, *Divisions*, esp. pp. 121-84.

<sup>25</sup> The *abbé* benefited from a Jesuit education as a schoolboy in south-west France, and then at the Jesuit *collège* in Louvain, where Léonard Lessius was his prefect of studies.

his return to Louvain in 1617, Jansen developed a special concern with Augustine.<sup>26</sup> These erudite exertions engendered a conviction that the Church required a reinjection of primitive clarity and vigour. For Jansen the most pressing issue was the new Jesuit theology of grace, developed by Luis de Molina (1535-1600) and Léonard Lessius (1554-1623). These theologians evinced a dangerous over-confidence in human nature, teaching that election is conditioned by foreseen merits and that the effect of grace depends on human consent.<sup>27</sup> Even the Council of Dort, said Jansen, though misunderstanding assurance and perseverance, got closer to the Catholic doctrine of predestination; from 1621 he and Saint-Cyran were discussing ‘cette affaire de Pilmot’, a scheme to correct the enemies of the Catholic doctrine of grace.<sup>28</sup>

A pronounced Augustinianism also characterised Saint-Cyran’s other great influence, Bérulle. Throughout 1622 Saint-Cyran visited daily with Bérulle, spending, he says, six or seven hours in Bérulle’s ‘closet’. As a result his views assumed an ‘authentically Bérullist’ cast.<sup>29</sup> Bérulle’s was a mystical theological temperament rendered outward-looking and active by an all-encompassing focus on the incarnation. This he compared to the Copernican revolution: the relations between heaven and earth are reversed now an incarnate God presides over the celestial hierarchy. The ‘christological theocentrism’ of this *apostolus verbi*

<sup>26</sup> Jean Orcibal, *Les origines du Jansénisme*, 5 vols. (1946-62), ii, pp. 138-48; *idem*, *Jansénius d’Ypres (1585-1638)* (Paris, 1989), pp. 69-72.

<sup>27</sup> See ch. 4, below, on Molinism; on Lessius, Xavier-Marie le Bachelet, *Prédestination et Grâce Efficace. Controverses dans la Compagnie de Jésus au temps d’Aquaviva (1610-1613)*, 2 vols. (Louvain, 1931), i, chs. 2 & 3.

<sup>28</sup> *Naissance du Jansénisme, découverte à Monseigneur le Chancelier par le Sieur de Preville* (Louvain, 1654), pp. 5, 7, 14, 22-4, 43-4. ‘Pilmot’ has generally been taken to refer to Jansen’s plan for a systematic exposition of the doctrine of St Augustine, and by extension the general desire shared by Jansen and Saint-Cyran to renew the Church by means of a reinvestment of primitive purity in dogma and discipline under the direction of the secular hierarchy. Henri Bremond elevated it into a fabulous anti-Jesuit conspiracy indicative of Saint-Cyran’s delusional and unstable character: *Histoire Littéraire du sentiment religieux en France depuis la fin des guerres de religion jusqu’à nos jours*, 12 vols. (Paris, 1916-36), iv, ch. 4. (A new edition of Bremond’s *Histoire*, in 5 vols., has been issued under the direction of François Trémolières [Grenoble, 2006].) It does however seem that a definite structural programme was envisaged, involving the establishment of the French Oratory in Flanders: Adam, *Du mysticisme à la révolte*, pp. 71-9; Orcibal, *Jansénius d’Ypres*, pp. 119-30.

<sup>29</sup> *Lettres Chrétiennes et Spirituelles, de L’Abbé de S. Cyran*, 3t. (Lyon, 1674), t. 1, pp. 436-7, cf. letters LXIII and LXVI in the same volume for more praises of Bérulle. Yves Krumenacker, *L’école française de spiritualité. Des mystiques, des fondateurs, des courants et leurs interprètes* (Paris, 1998), p. 272; Adam, *Du mysticisme à la révolte*, pp. 94-7.

*incarnati*, as Urban VIII called him, underwrote a demanding template for moral renewal.<sup>30</sup> The Word became incarnate that he might be apprehended by the creature; the creature cannot enter into this apprehension except by a reciprocal participation in his divinity. This is a process of divinisation for which Christ provided a model by living a human life. Bérulle described the imitative life in ascetic and sometimes mystical terms, dwelling on the ‘nothingness’ of man and the necessity of self-abnegation. A tireless and influential reformer of the clergy, Bérulle’s foundation of the French congregation of the Oratory was inspired by the same incarnational ideal. The mass-celebrating priest was exalted as the bridge between humanity and the archetypal eternal priest.<sup>31</sup> By analogy with the celestial hierarchy, Bérulle evolved a high doctrine of episcopacy; like the pedagogic and pastoral brief of the Oratorian priests, this inclined the Jesuits against him.<sup>32</sup> Insofar as he held up the same incarnational standard to both clergy and laity, his demanding outlook was an ambiguous mixture of elitism and, for want of a better term, spiritual ‘populism’. It profoundly marked the thought of Saint-Cyran and his successors at Port-Royal.<sup>33</sup>

When, in the early 1620s, the Jesuits allied with the enemies of Bérulle, who was suspected of trying to bring the French Carmelites under Oratorian control, Saint-Cyran took the chance to subject them to a wide-ranging theological critique. He published a four-volume demolition of a work by François Garasse, SJ – the *Somme théologique* of 1624 – which, in defending Christianity against free-thinking and libertinage, seemed to concede too

---

<sup>30</sup> On Bérulle’s thought I have been helped by Krumenacker, *L’école française*, esp. ch. 3, his quote at pp. 186-7; Jean Orcibal, *Le Cardinal de Bérulle, évolution d’une spiritualité* (Paris, 1965); Erik Varden, *Redeeming Freedom: The Principle of Servitude in Bérulle* (Rome, 2011); Leszek Kolakowski, *Chrétiens sans l’Église. La Conscience religieuse et le lieu confessionnel au XVIIe siècle*, tr. Anna Posner (Paris, 1969), pp. 389-435.

<sup>31</sup> Michel Dupuy, *Bérulle et le sacerdoce: étude historique et doctrinale* (Paris, 1969); for his influence see Krumenacker, *L’école française*, *passim*; William M. Thompson (ed.), *Bérulle and the French School: Selected Writings* (New York, 1989).

<sup>32</sup> Alison Forrestal, *Fathers, pastors and kings. Visions of episcopacy in seventeenth-century France* (Manchester-New York, 2004), pp. 51-7.

<sup>33</sup> Cf. ch. 7, below.

much to the arguments it purported to refute.<sup>34</sup> Saint-Cyran criticised a pragmatic view of Christian conduct, complacent in its confidence in the competence of natural reason to determine action. This would entail ‘la corruption et depravation de l’Ethique Chrestienne’.<sup>35</sup> Although Saint-Cyran identified only a few ‘lax’ propositions in Garasse’s work, he established a connection, which the Jansenists would emphasise for the next century and a half, between a degraded methodology, a lax morality, and the Society of Jesus.<sup>36</sup>

Saint-Cyran’s next blow against the Jesuits came in the form of a pseudonymous intervention in disputes within the English Catholic community. The English secular clergy, discomfited by the presence of rivals in the mission field whose methods and aims they disapproved, had been agitating at Rome since the end of the sixteenth century for the restoration of the hierarchy in England. In 1623 Urban VIII finally appeased them with the appointment of William Bishop as titular Bishop of Chalcedon. The Holy See undoubtedly considered him to possess only the extraordinary jurisdiction of a vicar apostolic. Bishop’s successor, Richard Smith, nevertheless attempted to stamp his authority on the mission. He adopted an abrasive policy towards the regular clergy, attempting to bring their finances under his control, and insisting upon the Tridentine decree that parishioners only receive the sacraments from their own priest unless the ordinary approved otherwise.<sup>37</sup> The regular clergy were thus obliged to apply to Smith in order to exercise the functions of hearing

---

<sup>34</sup> François Garasse, *Somme théologique des Véritez capitales de la Religion chrestienne* (Paris, 1625); Saint-Cyran, *Somme des fautes et faussetez capitales contenües dans la Somme théologique de P. Garasse*, 4t. (Paris, 1626), see esp. t. ii, ep. ded. to Richelieu; Adam, *Du mysticisme à la révolte*, p. 97; Orcibal, *Origines*, ii, pp. 26-82; Sainte-Beuve, *Port-Royal*, i, l. 1, pp. 335-8.

<sup>35</sup> Saint-Cyran, *Somme des fautes*, ii., sig. e(ii), v. (sic.); cf. *ib.*, i, sig. g, r.

<sup>36</sup> Gay, *Morales en conflit*, pp. 109-10; Orcibal, *Saint-Cyran et le jansénisme*, p. 16, thus calls 1626 ‘un tournant dans l’histoire de la spiritualité française’.

<sup>37</sup> Session 23, Chapter 1, and Session 24, Chapter 3, renewing the stipulations of the famous decree of the fourth Lateran Council in 1215, Canon 21, *Omnis utriusque sexus*: ‘all the faithful of either sex, after they have reached the age of discernment, should individually confess all their sins in a faithful manner to their own priest at least once a year’, Norman Tanner (ed.), *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, 2 vols. (1990), i, p. 245.

confession and granting absolution. Smith came under virulent attack from two English Jesuits, Edward Knott and John Floyd.<sup>38</sup>

Under the name Nicholas Smith Knott published his *Modesta et brevis discussio aliquarum assertionum D. doctoris Kellison*, a response to Matthew Kellison's *Treatise of the Hierarchie* (1629), where the rector of the English College at Douai commended episcopal authority and condemned Jesuit papalism by contrast. Floyd followed with a Latin translation of his *Apology of the Holy See Apostolicks Proceeding*, under the pseudonym Daniel à Jesu.<sup>39</sup> Smith appealed to his episcopal colleagues in France, and a condemnation by the Archbishop of Paris (Jean-François de Gondi) was followed by a censure from the Sorbonne in February 1631, after 'solemn and mature deliberation' in general committee.<sup>40</sup> Floyd continued the controversy with vituperations upon the censure written as Hermannus Loemelius.<sup>41</sup> Saint-Cyran, as 'Petrus Aurelius', responded with two tracts in which he defended the episcopate, in the high register learnt from Bérulle, against the anti-hierarchical arguments of the Jesuits, and vindicated the censure passed upon them by the theology faculty.<sup>42</sup> He subjected the 'Molinisticam Societatem' to the most violent of recriminations, argued that the bishops, unlike regular clergy, were of the essence of the Church, and limited the pope's infallibility to

---

<sup>38</sup> On this history see John Bossy, *The English Catholic Community 1570-1850* (1975), pp. 11-74; Michael Questier (ed.), *Newsletters from the Caroline Court, 1631-1638: Catholicism and the Politics of Personal Rule* (Camden Soc., 5<sup>th</sup> series, 26, 2005), Introduction; ch. 2, below, pp. 103-5.

<sup>39</sup> *Danielis à Jesu apologia pro modo procedenti Sedis Apostolicae in regimine Angliae catholicorum tempore persecutionis cum Defensione Religiosis Status. Praefixa admonitio ad lectorem Hermannii Loemelii* (St Omer, 1631).

<sup>40</sup> *Censura illustrissimi & Reverendissimi in Christo Patris ... die trigesimo mensis Januarii praesentis anni 1631 lata in quasdam propositionas Hibernicas, et duos Libellos Anglicanos ...* (Paris, 1631).

<sup>41</sup> A very full description of all these proceedings is given in *Petri Aurelii Theologi Opera*, 3t. (Paris, 1646), t. 1, sigs. e(i), r. *et seq.* See also Orcibal, *Origines*, ii, pp. 334-75; and cf. Anthony F. Allison's trilogy of articles on 'Richard Smith's Gallican Backers and Jesuit Opponents': 'Part I: Some of the Issues Raised by Kellison's *Treatise of the Hierarchie*', *RH*, 18 (1986); 'Part II: Smith at Paris as Protégé of Richelieu 1631-c. 1642', *ibid.*, 19 (1988); 'Part III: Continuation of the Controversy 1631-c. 1643', *ibid.*, 20 (1990).

<sup>42</sup> *Assertio Epistolae Illustrissimorum ac reverendiss. Galliae Antistitum, Qua libros Nicolai Smithaei & Danielis à Jesu damnarunt* (Paris, 1632); *Vindiciae Censurae Facultatis Theologiae Parisiensis* (Paris, 1632).

questions of faith and morals insofar as he speaks as chief of the Church and guardian of that which Christ has enjoined and prescribed.<sup>43</sup>

In his vindication of the censure Saint-Cyran again associated the Jesuits, led by ambition to multiply contradictory moral cases without heeding the danger to penitents, with a spirit of moral permissiveness. Indicating a historical narrative of Jesuit ‘laxism’ based on their writings, Saint-Cyran added, to more traditional areas of criticism in ecclesiology and politics, dubious morality as an essential element in the polemical image of the Society.<sup>44</sup> To the profusion of modern works he opposed the core of scripture and tradition; to scholastic complexity and flexibility he opposed primitive simplicity and rigour. Interestingly he spent a portion of the *Assertio* defending John Barnes, renegade Benedictine author of a treatise, based on scripture and the fathers, especially Augustine, against the casuistical doctrine of equivocation.<sup>45</sup> Barnes has been described as a ‘precursor of the *Provinciales*’:<sup>46</sup> his *Traicté et dispute contre les équivoques*, published with the backing of the Sorbonne in 1625, was certainly influential, and was admired by later English writers such as Edward Stillingfleet.<sup>47</sup> Barnes hoped for the reunion of Rome and Canterbury on the basis of a Gallican theory of independent national churches, writing several tracts in the service of this case.<sup>48</sup> His eccentric avocations earned the cruel return of perpetual imprisonment at Rome, from 1628 until he died, not before having lost his sanity, in 1661.

---

<sup>43</sup> See *Petri Aureli Theologi Opera*, t. i, p. 72, on Floyd’s ill-advised attempt to satirise the Sorbonne’s censure by applying it to the Apostles’ creed; and *ib.*, t. I, p. 248; t. ii, pp. 22f., 157f., *et passim*.

<sup>44</sup> On this ‘véritable déchaînement contre le relâchement moral et ses sources théologiques’, see Gay, *Morales en conflit*, pp. 111f.

<sup>45</sup> *Petri Aureli Theologi Opera*, t. 1, pp. 256-62. Augustine’s unequivocal position is laid out in his *De mendacio*.

<sup>46</sup> Maurice Nédoncelles, *Trois Aspects du Problème Anglo-Catholique au XVIIe Siècle. Avec une analyse des XXXIX articles d’après Chr. Davenport et J. H. Newman* (Strasbourg, 1951), ch. 1.

<sup>47</sup> Ch. 3, below.

<sup>48</sup> Some of his proofs were incorporated into the English translation of Isaac Basire’s *De antiqua Ecclesiae Britannicae libertate, The Ancient Liberty of the Britannick Church* (1661), pp. 41f.

The writings of Petrus Aurelius were heralded by the French clergy, receiving marks of recognition from the episcopal bench and on four occasions in the 1630s and 1640s from the General Assembly of the Clergy. The Dean and Secretary of the English Chapter, the administrative body of the Catholic secular clergy in England, thanked Aurelius for his most devout labours in the service of Mother Church. Intellectuals of international standing such as Hugo Grotius acknowledged the proficiency of his work.<sup>49</sup> During the 1630s Saint-Cyran would propagate a distinctive spirituality – characterised by a penitential method of interior ‘renouvellement’, to be accomplished before the penitent dares to participate in the eucharist<sup>50</sup> – which condemned by contrast the superficial and corrupt morality of the Jesuits. His intensely inward focus appeared subversive in some eyes, and threatened to endanger the intermediary role of the hierarchical Church – a tendency made clear in the work of his most famous disciple, Arnauld, *De la fréquente communion*, where Arnauld seemed to question the *ex opere operato* efficacy of the sacraments.<sup>51</sup> But it was the same set of oppositions which inspired Saint-Cyran, that Carthusian-in-spirit, as his editor called him, to dwell on silence and solitude, as it did the violent paranoiac of the pages of Bremond to assail the Society of Jesus:<sup>52</sup> that which is interior, permanent, and substantial, was set against that which is exterior, equivocal, and empty; the timeless and immutable laws of God, communicated in the concise record of his revelation, against the recent and flexible determinations of the casuists, contained in endless cacodoxical catalogues.

Of Arnauld’s work, which carried on this argument, and appeared to great acclaim in 1643, it is only necessary to state here that it exhibited all the hallmarks of the method traced

---

<sup>49</sup> *Petri Aureli Theologi Opera*, i, sig. î (vi), v.-r.; Orcibal, *Saint-Cyran et le jansénisme*, p. 17.

<sup>50</sup> See e.g. Saint-Cyran, *Le Cœur Nouveau. Explication des Cérémonies de la Messe. Et Exercice pour la bien entendre. Raisons de l’ancienne Cérémonie de suspendre le S. Sacrement au milieu du grand Autel*, in *Théologie Familiale, avec divers autres petits traitez de dévotion* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., Paris, 1669)[1st ed. 1627], pp. 110-11. The suspension of the host in the pyx expresses the essence of the sacrament of the eucharist, which comprehends ‘un grand nombre de suspensions admirables’ (p. 271), especially that of concupiscent nature which is replaced by a new nature flowing from the grace of Christ; cf. ch. 7, below.

<sup>51</sup> Ch. 7, below.

<sup>52</sup> *Lettres Chrétiennes et Spirituelles*, t. I, sigs. o (vi), r. *et seq.*

out by Saint-Cyran, and achieved through the verve and clarity of its arguments a considerable impression on the public consciousness.<sup>53</sup> An equally important contribution to the controversy under discussion was the small work which Arnauld composed and published in the same year (possibly with the collaboration of his Sorbonne colleague, François Hallier), *La Théologie Morale des Jésuites*. Following a campaign against Jesuit pretensions, prompted by institutional jealousy and prosecuted by Godefroi Hermant, later known for his patristic biographies, this work invented the generic method followed by Pascal in the *Provinciales*.<sup>54</sup> It presented a catalogue of propositions in morality extracted from casuistical works and arrayed in a de-contextualised series calculated to produce an impression of horror in the reader.<sup>55</sup> The extracts were indiscriminate and covered a diverse terrain within the four main areas of ‘la morale chrestienne en général’, specific precepts of the divine law, the use of the sacraments, and ecclesiology. They introduced a cast of criminous characters whose names would be familiarised by repetition: the majority of citations were from two censured books, Bauny’s *Somme* and Cellot’s *De hierarchia*, a work in defence of Knott and Floyd which also pleaded for the modern casuists. This exploitation of discredited figures fused the association between lax morality, casuistry, and the Jesuits.

The form and much of the content of the Jansenist critique had thus been determined: it was only left to Pascal to clothe it in his attractive conceit. Pascal’s polemical assumptions and methods did not differ from what has already been described. The *Provinciales* themselves, however, did give rise to some new developments. The first sign of the new momentum they imparted to the debate over casuistry was the initiative now taken by the diocesan clergy of Paris and Rouen. The Parisian *curés* were in combative mood in the 1650s. They agitated in behalf of their exiled archbishop, the *frondeur* Cardinal de Retz.

---

<sup>53</sup> Analysed ch. 7, below.

<sup>54</sup> See Gay, *Morales en conflit*, pp. 132-40, 153-7; Gustave Lanson, ‘Les Provinciales et le livre de la théologie morale des Jésuites’, *Revue d’Histoire littéraire de la France* (1900), No. 2, pp. 169-95.

<sup>55</sup> In England it can be consulted in the BL, C.150 n. 12.

Fired with the ideas of Richer, they aimed at total autonomy in their own parishes.<sup>56</sup> The Jansenist attack on the Jesuits, regulars bound especially to the pope, was therefore sympathetic, and its outlines were now incorporated into their ‘mentality of opposition’.<sup>57</sup> In May 1656, after Pascal’s seventh letter, they decided corporately to pursue a condemnation ‘de ces pernicieuses maximes’.<sup>58</sup> At the same time a dispute was developing at Rouen, where the *curé* Charles du Four, inspired by the *Provinciales*, had preached against Jesuit moral theology.<sup>59</sup> The archbishop, François II de Harlay, was solicited for arbitration, leading to the production of the *Requête présentée par Messieurs les Curez de Rouën à Monseigneur leur Archevesque*. In September the two bodies of *curés* joined forces, and there appeared the *Advis de messieurs les curez de Paris, à messieurs les curez des autres dioceses de France sur les mauvaises maximes de quelques nouveaux casuistes*. With it were joined the *Requête* of the Rouen *curés*, and an *Extrait de quelques-unes des plus dangereuses propositions de la morale de plusieurs nouveaux casuistes fidèlement tirées de leurs ouvrages*, which has been attributed to Arnauld and Pascal. De Harlay delated the matter to the Assembly of the Clergy, to whom the *Second Advis des Curez de Paris* and the *Suite de l’extrait de mauvaises propositions* were presented.<sup>60</sup> Meanwhile an anonymous work concentrating on one casuist, Emmanuel Mascarenhas, appeared.<sup>61</sup> Where Pascal had sought to provoke popular outrage,

---

<sup>56</sup> On the ideas of Edmond Richer, syndic of the Paris Theology Faculty in the early-seventeenth century – expressed in his *De ecclesiastica et civili potestate libellus* (Paris, 1611) – see briefly Cognet, ‘Ecclesiastical Life in France’, pp. 88-9.

<sup>57</sup> Richard M. Golden, *The godly rebellion: Parisian curés and the religious Fronde, 1652-1662* (Chapel Hill, 1981); *idem*, ‘The mentality of opposition: The Jansenism of the Parisian curés during the Religious Fronde’, *Catholic Historical Review*, 64, 1 (1978), pp. 565-80.

<sup>58</sup> Gay, *Morales en conflit*, pp. 204f. for more detail on the following narrative.

<sup>59</sup> *Lettre d’un ecclesiastique de Rouën à un de ses amis, sur ce qui s’est passé au iugemen du procez, D’entre M. du Four, Abbé d’Aulney, cy-devant Curé de S. Maclon de Rouën: et le P. Brisacier Jesuite, Recteur du Collège de la mesme Ville* (n.d.), Ch. Ch. Lib., Oxf., Allestree S.1.25(23).

<sup>60</sup> *Second advis ou lettre des Curez de Paris à messieurs les curez des autres dioceses de France sur leur premier advis touchant la fausse et pernicieuse morale du temps; Suite de l’extrait de plusieurs mauvaises maximes des nouveaux casuistes recueillies par messieurs les Curez de Paris et présentées à Nosseigneurs de l’Assemblée générale du Clergé de France le 24 novembre 1656* (Paris, 1656).

<sup>61</sup> *Extrait de quelques propositions d’un nouvel Auteur Jésuite nommé Mascarenhas, imprimé chez Cramoisy en cette année 1656 et qui se vend depuis le mois d’octobre* (Paris, 1656).

these writings sought to persuade the *curés*' ecclesiastical superiors in their capacity as doctors and teachers;<sup>62</sup> they received a work concentrating specifically on the doctrine of probability as explained by the Cistercian Caramuel.<sup>63</sup> Despite the irregular corporate action of the *curés*, the Assembly evidently agreed with the thrust of the critique: it was at this point that it ordered Borromeo's *Instructions* for confessors to be printed and disseminated throughout the dioceses of France.

The atmosphere now became considerably more heated with the intervention of 'le jésuit pyromane', Georges Pirot. His *Apologie pour les Casuistes* appeared in December 1657, and must number among the most counter-productive apologies in the history of the Church.<sup>64</sup> Inopportunistly attempting to justify the very aspects of the casuistical tradition which Pascal condemned, Pirot shut the stable door after the horse had bolted, and his provincial, Cellot, paid for this clumsiness with his position.<sup>65</sup> Pirot's effort was a gift for the Jansenist party, and throughout 1658 and 1659 there appeared a series of writings which lustily carried on the campaign against 'relâchement'. Known collectively as the *Écrits des Curés de Paris*, these included significant contributions from Pascal, who produced the first two, the fifth, and the sixth, and Pierre Nicole (1625-95), who produced the third and fourth.<sup>66</sup> As well as seeking ecclesiastical censure the *curés* petitioned the *parlement*. Their agitations bore fruit in the form of numerous episcopal censures and the censure of Pirot's work by the Sorbonne.<sup>67</sup>

These various writings, petitions, and censures all focused on the slackening of moral standards, and agreed in attributing responsibility to the new casuistical method, which

---

<sup>62</sup> Cf. Gay, *Morales en conflit*, p. 208.

<sup>63</sup> *Principes et suites de la probabilité expliqués par Caramuel l'un des plus célèbres entre les Casuistes nouveaux dans un livre imprimé en 1652 intitulé Theologia Fundamentalis.*

<sup>64</sup> Gay, *Morales en conflit*, pp. 210f.

<sup>65</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 232-3.

<sup>66</sup> Conveniently consulted in Récalde (ed.), *Écrits des Curés de Paris*.

<sup>67</sup> n. 9, above.

inevitably produced, on account of its reliance on natural reason, a system adapted to the frailties and peccadilloes of sensual man. Like the *Provinciales*, they trained attention on the doctrine of probabilism, which was seen to be the root cause of this flexibility in morals, and concerning which debate would continue throughout the 1660s and 1670s.<sup>68</sup> It is time to examine the subject in greater detail.

---

<sup>68</sup> Gay, *Morales en conflict*, pp. 264-88.

## 2) Substance of the Jansenist Critique

‘What man can find salvation in a legal quibble?’

Mr. Harding

As the foregoing survey demonstrates, the Port-Royalists’ critique in moral theology was formulated and developed within a highly polemical context, and any account of their campaign against the modern casuists must acknowledge a number of straw men among the enemy casualties. Despite the damning appearance of the unpalatable casuistical propositions arrayed in various catalogues, for example, it is their relative paucity and narrowness which appears against the background of the vast literature from which they were extracted.<sup>69</sup> It was, moreover, inaccurate to father these propositions, themselves not always representative or widely maintained, upon the Jesuits as a body.<sup>70</sup> Some of the most roughly handled casuists were not Jesuits at all, such as the erudite Cistercian Caramuel, or Diana, a Theatine clerk. Finally, as Jesuit apologists represented from the start, a significant gap frequently existed between the aims and intentions of the targets of the polemic and those with which they were credited.<sup>71</sup> To read the *Provinciales* one would suppose their author indifferent almost to the real pastoral difficulties addressed by casuistical attempts to elucidate the application of the moral law.<sup>72</sup> That such a judgement might be problematic is suggested by the fact that he convicts the casuists precisely of being excessively speculative, and by

---

<sup>69</sup> Gay, *Morales en conflit*, pp. 154-5, shows that, of 120 propositions set out in *La Théologie Morale des Jésuites* of 1643, ‘on n’a ... que 20 propositions qui relèvent directement de la casuistique’.

<sup>70</sup> On French Jesuits see L. W. B. Brockliss, ‘The *Lettres Provinciales* as a Jansenist Calumny: Pascal and Moral Theology in Mid-Seventeenth Century France’, *Seventeenth Century French Studies*, 8 (1986), pp. 5-22; Gay, *Morales en conflit*, pp. 593-6.

<sup>71</sup> Examination of the counter-strategy of Jesuit polemicists is in Gay, *Morales en conflit*, pt. I; Richard Parish, *Pascal’s Lettres Provinciales. A Study in Polemic* (Oxford, 1989); for case studies see *idem*, ‘Le Père Étienne Bauny’; K. Krabbenhoft, ‘Pascal contre Caramuel’, *XVIIe Siècle*, 133 (1981), pp. 435-42.

<sup>72</sup> Cf. Roger Duchêne, *L’Imposture littéraire dans les Provinciales de Pascal* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., Paris, 1985), pp. 138f.

consequence therefore insufficiently practical. It does however indicate the extremely one-sided nature of the *Provinciales* as a literary and apologetic entity. Under one aspect they were really a public relations exercise, pleading in behalf of a reformist platform increasingly discredited by the accusation of heresy under which its proponents laboured. Pascal induced readers to share in the letter-writer 'Montalte's' outrage by developing a clear and common-sensical voice, often impassioned but always reasoned, which was itself a rhetorical device.<sup>73</sup>

Nevertheless, despite the evident slanting of Port-Royalist productions like the *Provinciales*, which blended apology with satire and polemic against the Jesuits, the advantages of establishing any thoroughgoing distinction between 'polemic' and 'ideology' are not clear.<sup>74</sup> Apart from the obvious danger that the distinction in any given case will be more or less arbitrary, there is also the dubious implication that works of 'polemic' must be considered untrustworthy guides at best to 'ideological' commitments defined by contrast as genuine or timeless. That certain occasions or genres of literary production will be less affected by polemical forces than others is not to be disputed. But the distinction, if insensitively applied, may easily result in an unbalanced analysis, distorted by a credulous treatment of supposedly 'ideological' works together with the exclusion of supposedly 'polemical' lines of argument. Precisely this danger becomes apparent when the impulse, just and necessary as it is, to counterbalance the disproportionate credit which has historically attached to the critique enshrined in the *Provinciales*, is quickened by a contemporary concern to rehabilitate aspects of the ethical methodology there satirised. It is one thing to acknowledge that the methodology and conclusions of the casuists were comprehensible in their own terms. It is another to discount the arguments in which Pascal denounces them as so much 'polemic', and impute to him in consequence positions deduced, with what skill

---

<sup>73</sup> On Pascal's rhetorical strategy see esp. Duchêne, *L'Imposture littéraire*; Parish, *Pascal's Lettres Provinciales*; Gerard Ferreyrolles, *Blaise Pascal: Les Provinciales* (Paris, 1984), pp. 43-72.

<sup>74</sup> This line is taken by Gay, *Morales en conflit*: it must be emphasised, however, that his careful exposition avoids the pitfalls mentioned here.

another may judge, from texts in which he expresses himself more ‘sincerely’. Such, it may be supposed, is the procedure of modern apologists for casuistry, who present Pascal as an enemy to casuistry *tout court* – no matter that this equation produces a moral rigorist who scorned the application of the moral law.<sup>75</sup>

Regardless of its object, or the validity of the objections canvassed, any negative criticism will reveal the concerns of the critic and reflect his positive ambitions. It is in this spirit that the following exposition of the Jansenist critique of probabilist casuistry is undertaken. Our interest in the casuistical method and its tradition extends only so far as it serves to measure the programme of its detractors. This is what we will presently seek out in the English context. It is by the presence of the criticisms of the Port-Royalists, however unjust, and of their citations, however loose or inaccurate (though generally they were neither),<sup>76</sup> that we will gauge the impact of their writings among English thinkers. In order to gain a true sense of Anglophone reactions to this material, some coherent and synoptic account of the Port-Royalist critique must also be provided.

\*

A brief apology for this synthetic approach may still be necessary, since there are various reasons why a distinction might be put between those Jansenist ideas about moral and sacramental theology which Pascal distilled in the *Provinciales*, and those concerning the doctrines of original sin and irresistible grace summed up, however accurately, in the Five Propositions. Pascal’s first three letters intervened in the cause of Arnauld, threatened with censure by the Sorbonne after denying that the Propositions, now episcopally as well as

---

<sup>75</sup> Esp. Jonsen and Toulmin, *The Abuse of Casuistry*; Emile Baudin, *Études historiques et critiques sur la philosophie de Pascal*, 3 vols. (Neuchâtel, 1947), iii: *Sa critique de la casuistique et du probabilisme moral*.

<sup>76</sup> *CLP*, nn., *passim*; but cf. Duchêne, *L’Imposture littéraire*, pp. 171-84, on the highly rhetorical manner in which Pascal disposes them.

papally condemned, were as a matter of fact to be found in Jansen's *Augustinus*.<sup>77</sup> With Arnauld having lost his defence and been expelled from the Sorbonne in February 1656, Pascal's fourth letter, dated February 25<sup>th</sup>, abandoned the subject of the theology of grace in favour of an offensive against the moral theology of the Jesuits. The letters from the eleventh to the unfinished nineteenth were mostly occupied with defending, against Jesuit counter-polemics, the criticisms broached in the previous seven. So there is justification for regarding the polemic against laxist casuistry in the *Provinciales* as an occasional device, resorted to when vindication on the properly doctrinal front had become impossible. That the Port-Royalists themselves hoped for a more sympathetic hearing if the moral theological part of their case was presented apart from the dogmatic is suggested by the statement, probably Pascal's, in the *Factum pour les curés de Paris*, that 'il n'y a aucun rapport d'une de ces matières à l'autre'.<sup>78</sup> Supposing it holds, that is, the case against Jansen in no way diminishes that against the casuists.

These considerations, however, should not prevent us from seeking, as well in the *Provinciales* as in other works whose contribution to the anti-laxist campaign we have surveyed, a coherent theological attitude consonant with doctrinal views exposed elsewhere. The literary front launched by Arnauld after the death of Saint-Cyran thirteen years earlier included not only works on penance and grace, but also the *Théologie morale des Jésuites*, a major source for Pascal's citations.<sup>79</sup> The notion that a clear separation should be made between moral theology and the doctrine of grace and salvation would have been vigorously rejected by Pascal and his associates. The same question, in their view, that of man's nature and destiny, is merely treated under different aspects. Doctrine and morality are reciprocally

---

<sup>77</sup> See Arnauld, *Seconde Lettre à un duc et pair de France*, 3rd ed. (Paris, 1657 [1st ed. 1655]), at pp. 90f.; cf. *CLP*, pp. 338f.

<sup>78</sup> Printed in Récalde (ed.), *Écrits des Curés de Paris*, p. 79; quoted Jan Miel, *Pascal and Theology* (Baltimore-London, 1969), p. 125.

<sup>79</sup> Lanson, 'Les Provinciales et le Livre de la Théologie Morale des Jésuites'.

related. Hence their claim against the Jesuits was that an anthropocentric theology and a worldly morality were mutually reinforcing.

That Pascal, putting the relationship in an interesting way, found in ‘le relâchement de leur [the Jesuits’] morale *la cause* de leur doctrine touchant la grâce’, shows the importance they attached to the outward, ethical side of this equation, far more, in their theology, than a mere sign of the inward.<sup>80</sup> This statement may contain a historical point, since the doctrine of probabilism was worked out before the system of Molina. More fundamentally it encapsulates Pascal’s case against the casuists, who, making man equal to his duties by accommodating those duties to his frailty, managed to combine the opposed errors of naturalism – an overestimation of human capacity resulting in presumption – and scepticism – an abandonment of the search for truth resulting in insouciance – which he refuted in the *Entretien avec M. de Saci*. There he showed, as he would in the *Pensées*, that the paradox of man, his end so great, his nature so weak, is resolved only in the union of two natures in the incarnate God.<sup>81</sup> Morality should treat what is thereby made possible; taking as their subject the limits of the permissible, the casuists seemed to Pascal to concern themselves only with the symptoms of man’s frailty, failing therefore to grasp the essential idea of the cure.

Vous y verrez [in their books] les vertus chrétiennes si inconnues et si dépourvues de la charité, qui en est l’âme et la vie ... que vous ne trouverez plus étrange qu’ils soutiennent que tous les hommes ont toujours assez de grâce pour vivre dans la piété ... Comme leur morale est toute païenne, la nature suffit pour l’observer.<sup>82</sup>

The distance between the capacity of fallen man and the supernatural morality laid down by Christ, on the other hand, indicates the accuracy of the Augustinian account of efficacious

---

<sup>80</sup> *CLP*, p. 78, my emphasis; see chs. 4 & 7, below.

<sup>81</sup> *Entretien avec M. de Saci*, first printed 1728. My copy is in the Brunschvicg *Pensées*, ed. Ch.-M. des Granges (Paris, 1961), pp. 39-51; cf. Sainte-Beuve, *Port-Royal*, i, l. 3, pp. 811-24; Richard Parish, *Catholic Particularity in Seventeenth-Century French Writing* (Oxford, 2011), esp. ch. 1.

<sup>82</sup> *CLP*, p. 78.

grace. Given this close relationship between the question of how and how far the moral law obliges, and that of grace and the role of man *vis-à-vis* its operation, it seems justified to assume that the Jansenist critique of laxist casuistry ‘est inspirée par une pensée positive et qu’une doctrine morale cohérente’ can thence be recovered.<sup>83</sup> For Pascal ‘Jésus-Christ est l’objet de tout, et le centre où tout tend’.<sup>84</sup> ‘This phrase’, as Krailsheimer writes, ‘must be borne constantly in mind as one reads not only the *Pensées* but also the *Provincial Letters* and Pascal’s other religious works’.<sup>85</sup>

To the Jansenists the casuists’ isolation of the conscience as the measure of morality, separated from the eternal and immutable law it ought to subserve, seemed the counterpart of Molina’s exaggeration of free will into the measure of grace.<sup>86</sup> But this is no more to say that they rejected the problems the casuists attempted to solve than it is to say that they dismissed the problems of divine grace and foreknowledge upon which Molina exercised his ingenuity. The vehemence of the attacks launched by Arnauld, Pascal, Nicole and others on the method and results of the casuistical specialists can give the misleading impression that they rejected the casuistical endeavour as such. Baudin, for example, convicted Pascal of throwing the baby of casuistry and probabilistic reasoning out with the bathwater of laxism.<sup>87</sup> Others, thinking of Pascal’s mathematical genius and the so-called Cartesianism of Port-Royal, explain this lapse in terms of the aspiration after an impossible degree of certainty in morals: ‘je ne me contente pas du probable, je cherche le sûr’.<sup>88</sup> The pragmatic casuists, by contrast, were guided by Aristotle’s warning in the *Nicomachean Ethics* (I.3, 1094b) that an ‘educated man’ will seek only that degree of precision which is appropriate to the nature of the subject-

---

<sup>83</sup> Jean Mesnard, ‘Pascal et le problème moral’, *L’Information littéraire*, 1 (1966), p. 1; cf. Miel, *Pascal and Theology*, pp. 124f.

<sup>84</sup> *Pensées*, 449.

<sup>85</sup> *Pensées*, tr. Krailsheimer (Harmondsworth, 1966), p. 26.

<sup>86</sup> Molina made the effect of grace conditional upon the free response of man, see below, ch. 4, pp. 181-2.

<sup>87</sup> Baudin, *Études historiques*, iii, pp. 7-8 *et passim*.

<sup>88</sup> *CLP*, p. 84.

matter.<sup>89</sup> On this analysis the Jansenist approach to morality, being totally intolerant of uncertainty, would have been categorically inconsistent with casuistry, understood as the science of managing the inevitable uncertainty involved in applying general moral principles to particular cases.<sup>90</sup> Then the Jansenists must have renounced all interest in practical morals – so that this assessment seems not so much to explain as to explain away their writings on the subject.

The question of certainty did figure largely in the Jansenists' rejection of the 'new' casuistry of the period, but it would be imprecise to pose it in terms of an absolute opposition between the certain and the doubtful, or between demonstrative and probabilistic reasoning. This was not the issue at stake. No traditionally-minded moralist held, as Hobbes for example effectively did, that morality could be an exact science like geometry, conclusively deducible from a series of axioms. As Arnauld pointed out in his *Dissertation Théologique sur la probabilité*, certainty in this mathematical sense belongs in the sphere of morality only to God.<sup>91</sup> It is not that certainty in morals is inaccessible to man: he has access to demonstrative moral knowledge in the form of universal principles disclosed by the light of nature and by revelation, and more specific principles can be necessarily deduced from these. But in morals the object of knowledge is not truth only, but also action; and with action we are not dealing with the necessary and universal, but with the contingent and changeable. The conclusions drawn from moral principles are affected by the particular aspects of a given case: the same

---

<sup>89</sup> Jonsen and Toulmin, *The Abuse of Casuistry*, e.g. at p. 241.

<sup>90</sup> A succinct definition of 'casuistry' is in *DTC*, II, cols. 1859-77. In a more general sense it signifies the practical application of the knowledge of moral duty in specific cases. As such it is a universal and daily activity. The need for technical and expert casuistry, however, only arises in cases where some doubt exists either as to the content of the moral law or as to its bearing on a given case; where there is no doubt about the law and its application there is no obstacle in the way of action.

<sup>91</sup> This *Dissertation* was translated by Nicole and included as the first note on the fifth letter in his Latin edition of the *Provinciales*: 'William Wendrock', *Ludovici Montalti Litterae provinciales de Morali et Politica Jesuitarum, e Gallica Latinae linguae versae cum notis per Guglielmum Wendrockium* (Cologne, 1658) [Wendrock]. I have consulted the 6<sup>th</sup> ed. Cologne, 1700; the *Dissertatio* at pp. 106f. I refer to the Latin where necessary, and occasionally for cross-reference, but quote for convenience from the faithful French translation by Mlle de Joncoux, *Les Provinciales, ou Lettres Ecrites par Louis de Montalte. Avec les notes de G. Wendrock*, 3t. (n.p., 1699) [Joncoux], t. 1, at pp. 276f.

action may realise the good in one case but not in another.<sup>92</sup> Morals are therefore essentially an empirical study, not an abstractly speculative one. Since the objects of this study are changeable they are not the objects of knowledge but of opinion in varying degrees of persuasion.<sup>93</sup> One would therefore have to be, as Arnauld observed, ‘tout-à-fait dépourvu de bon sens, pour nier’ that there are probable opinions in morality.<sup>94</sup> The task of the moralist is to inform the conscience in order that it may ascend from doubt and probability to a degree of certainty about the application of moral knowledge in this or that case sufficient for action. All this was common ground to the parties to the debate over casuistry. It was in relation to the method or rule whereby uncertainty is resolved, and the sort of certainty which can license action defined, that differences might arise.

We are not, then, confronted here with the clash of two systems, as it were fully worked out and irreconcilable in first principles, but with an argument between the common heirs of the tradition of Catholic moral theology over its legitimate interpretation and development. The ‘probabilist’ method of resolving the uncertainty that hinders action, which rose to ascendancy in Catholic casuistry of the late-sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, emerged as the result of a comprehensible line of historical development. What the Jansenists disputed was neither the subject-matter nor the necessity of casuistical theology, but (their contribution being mainly negative and backward-looking) its development in a direction they asserted to be illegitimate and corrupt. *Abusum non tollit usum*: as in other related areas of praxis such as eucharistic discipline, the Jansenists, partisans of penance and consequently

---

<sup>92</sup> Jonsen and Toulmin, *The Abuse of Casuistry*, lay a great deal of stress on the notion of circumstances as affecting moral value (Cicero, in *De Invent. Rhetor.* i, famously listed seven: who, what, where, by what means, why, how, when; Aristotle, *Nic. Ethics* III.1, 1111a, also has ‘what about’; Aquinas discusses circumstances *ST*, IaIIae, Q. 7). This, in their view, exemplifies the flexible, taxonomic, realistic approach to morals which the rigid and dogmatic Pascal could not stomach. In the fourth *Provinciale* it is the ‘Jansenist’ who has to expound this unobjectionable concept to the ill-read ‘good father’: *CLP*, pp. 69-70.

<sup>93</sup> These are essentially the views of Aquinas, *ST*, IaIIae, q. 94; cf. q. 100, a. 1; IIaIIae, q. 120, a. 1. As well as the *Nic. Ethics*, esp. X.6, there is a precedent in Plato’s discussion of the insufficiency of laws in respect of the variability of men and actions in the *Statesman*, 294a-300c.

<sup>94</sup> Joncoux, p. 278.

panegyrists of the confessor or spiritual director for whose benefit the casuists wrote, looked for reform, not reduction.<sup>95</sup>

### *Probabilism*

Probabilism, which Pascal described as ‘le fondement et l’A B C’ of modern casuistry,<sup>96</sup> represented, as we have indicated, a method for resolving the conscience where the conformity of a proposed action with the moral law cannot be certainly known. The substance and development of the doctrine can be most conveniently outlined by examining the views of Aquinas on the conscience: these generally formed the starting point for later discussions of the subject, which indeed can largely be traced through Thomistic commentaries.<sup>97</sup>

Aquinas says we have knowledge of some moral principles in the same direct, intuitive way we grasp speculative principles like that of non-contradiction. These basic principles constitute the general premises for reasoning about moral action. Their application to particular circumstances is the function of the conscience. Just as in speculative reasoning, there is room for error. One may start from a faulty axiom, or reason falsely from a sound one. In either case, however, the judgement formed by the conscience must be followed, or we should act wrongly, that is against reason, the faculty by which understanding creatures

---

<sup>95</sup> See e.g. Arnauld’s stringent list of qualifications for the confessor, bearing out the phrase which he quotes from Bérulle, that ‘the conduct of a single soul is more difficult than the government of a kingdom’: *FC*, pp. 96-100, 251. They are modelled on François de Sales, *Introduction à la vie dévote*, in *Œuvres*, ed. A Ravier (Paris, 1969), pp. 38-40. Saint-Cyran’s reputation of course rests on his work as a spiritual director. One can even point to ‘Jansenist’ books of casuistry in François Genet, *Théologie morale ou résolutions des cas de conscience selon l’Ecriture Sainte, les Canons et les Saints Pères* (Paris, 1670); Jacques de Sainte-Beuve, *Résolutions de plusieurs cas de conscience touchant la morale et la discipline de l’Eglise* (Lyon, 1702).

<sup>96</sup> *CLP*, p. 85.

<sup>97</sup> Deman, ‘Probabilisme’, col. 481; Bernard Häring and Louis Vereecke, ‘La Théologie Morale de S. Thomas d’Aquin à S. Alphonse de Liguori’, *Nouvelle Revue Théologique*, 87e année, 7 (1955), pp. 673-92.

are moved in accordance with the divine plan. Since it can be in error, therefore, the conscience can oblige us to sin.<sup>98</sup> But it is never good to sin: '[agere] contra legem semper est malum'.<sup>99</sup> This disjunction, between the immutable nature of the good and man's competence to discern the way thither, presents a difficulty. To what extent are the deficiencies of the conscience culpable, and how may they be compensated for?

This question needs to be set in the context of Aquinas's general understanding of moral action.<sup>100</sup> An act only has moral value when it is voluntary, that is, purposive. The end of all human life is its own highest good, happiness in God. The object of voluntary action in general is therefore goodness itself; when we want particular things it is because they appear good to us. In identifying an end and pursuing it, that is inclining towards or intending it, logical priority is given to the intellect, since we must be aware of something before we can intend it. The mind presents the will with an apparent good; the will desires it; the mind then deliberates about the best means of fulfilling the desire, and the will's consent to one of these alternatives will terminate in action. But although the moral value of an action is therefore defined in relation to the mind, i.e., to the end by which it is ordered, it is also dependent on the will. The general object of goodness moves the mind to identify particular ends, and the pursuit of any good is a function of desire. This means the passions also have an important role in determining moral action, since they can directly stimulate desire or aversion regardless of some intended end.<sup>101</sup> So for Aquinas three qualities are important for a moral agent: clarity of intellect, uprightness of will, and a culture adequate to the countervailing stimuli of the affections. The man who achieves the right balance between knowledge and

---

<sup>98</sup> *ST*, Ia, q. 79, a.12-13; IaIIae, q. 19, a. 4-6; IIaIIae, qq. 53-5; [*Q*]uaestiones [*d*]isputatae de [*v*]eritate, qq. 16-17.

<sup>99</sup> *Quaestiones de [Q]uodlibet*, VIII, a. 13.

<sup>100</sup> *ST*, IaIIae, qq. 1-21; cf. q. 71, a. 1. Helpful is Rebecca DeYoung, *Aquinas's Ethics: Metaphysical Foundations, Moral Theory, and Theological Context* (Notre Dame, 2009).

<sup>101</sup> *ST*, IaIIae, qq. 22f.; cf. *Qdv*, q. 16, a. 3, ad. 3.

inclination, issuing in good choices, is a prudent man. He discerns the good accurately and is habituated to choosing it.<sup>102</sup>

Defects in the mind and will eventuating from the fall (ignorance, disordered desire), combined with the particularity and contingency of action, hinder us from apprehending and choosing the good in particular instances.<sup>103</sup> For Aquinas, then, there must exist, in order to avoid the disorder of sin and fulfil our purpose within the universal order, an obligation to remedy these defects as far as possible.

The clearest deficiency arises from ignorance, either of the law or of aspects of a particular case. If the intellect is not equipped to make correct judgements, it becomes easier to explain how one may sin while obeying the conscience. The more broadly ignorance is conceived, the more easily can actions arising from faulty judgements be excused. Aquinas, however, defined this excusable ignorance quite narrowly: the ignorance must precede the act, so that the act is caused by it; and it does not comprehend what one ought to or could know, but has neglected to discover. Wrong action resulting from ignorance of some crucial fact or positive law may be excusable, but ignorance of what we are obliged to know – the natural law, the articles of faith, and whatever duties appertain to our station – is negligent, therefore voluntary, and therefore culpable.<sup>104</sup> So there is an obligation to inform the conscience by supplying it with more knowledge of the moral law. An erring conscience must be changed or ‘set aside’ (‘depositus’).<sup>105</sup>

An ignorant conscience errs because, by reason of absent data, its deliberations terminate in a wrong choice; and unless the ignorance was invincible, this indicates a bad will, eager to enjoy some immediate good without troubling about the greater good. But it

---

<sup>102</sup> *ST*, IIaIIae, q. 47; IaIIae, q. 57, a. 4-6, q. 58, a. 5.

<sup>103</sup> See *ST*, IaIIae, qq. 85-7; *ib.*, 76, 78, a.1.

<sup>104</sup> *Ib.*, q. 76; cf. q. 6, a. 8; q. 19, a. 6.

<sup>105</sup> *Qdv*, q. 17, a. 4, ad. 8; *Quodlibet*, III, q. 12, a. 2, ad. 2.

can also happen that the conscience remains suspended in deliberation. The means which we propose to ourselves for choice can always (since no particular good can be perfectly good) appear good in one perspective, bad in another. Moreover, the moral value of any action is affected by the circumstances in which it takes place. If different contingencies keep presenting themselves to our mind, there is nothing, as Aquinas says, to stop deliberation being potentially endless.<sup>106</sup> Clearly that is bad, since deliberate action is the essence of morality. The conscience must be resolved so that we have an obligation to act in one way and not another.

There are two sorts of irresolution. We may be unable to assent to any one alternative, or to assent without fear. In this case we doubt whether the proposed action is lawful. In a well known passage, much quoted by Jansenist writers, Aquinas makes it clear that to act despite such trepidation is itself sinful, whether or not the action is lawful.<sup>107</sup> Someone who acts while entertaining this doubt sins simply by putting himself in danger of sinning, ‘loving a temporal good more than his own salvation’.<sup>108</sup> If action is wrong so long as a danger of sin is apprehended, there is an obligation to resolve the doubt.<sup>109</sup> If the doubt persists, Aquinas invoked what Deman describes as the ‘universal’ rule of medieval theologians, the jurisprudential principle which, in the thirteenth century, Innocent III had already applied to morals, ‘in dubiis pars tutior eligenda est’.<sup>110</sup> That is, of possible alternatives, the ‘safer’ (‘tutior’) or less risky one is to be chosen: if we suspect an action is unlawful, we must avoid it. Thus by this tutiorist rule an obligation to act or abstain is created even when uncertainty is unresolved. The scrupulous conscience is provided with a means whereby it can descend to

---

<sup>106</sup> *ST*, IaIIae, q. 10, a. 2; q. 14, a. 6.

<sup>107</sup> *Quodlibet.*, VIII, a. 13. The passage is brought up in the sixth *Provinciale*, *CLP*, pp. 104-5. See also Wendrock, pp. 132f. (Joncoux, pp. 315f.).

<sup>108</sup> ‘Periculo se committit et sic procul dubio peccat, utpote magis amans beneficium temporale quam propriam salutem’.

<sup>109</sup> Cf. *Qdv*, q. 17, a. 4.

<sup>110</sup> ‘Semper est accipiendum illud quod habet minus de periculo’; (*ST*, IIIa, q. 83, a. 6); ‘Si dubium sit, debet vel secundum verba legis agere, vel superiores consulere’ (*ST*, IaIIae, q. 96, a. 6); Deman, cols. 424-30.

action despite its doubts. The more widely doubt is conceived, the more insurance there is against the possibility that the conscience obliges an agent to sin. Ignorance of a law, for example, could be interpreted as a doubt about permissibility, thus creating an obligation either to inform the conscience or to take the safer path. The reverse of course is also true: ignorance might be extended to cover cases of doubt.

The second form of irresolution arises when conflicting courses appear equally good. This possibility follows inevitably from the fact that moral action takes place in a contingent world: moral deliberation must by definition be opinionative rather than demonstrative. And any opinion, as distinct from knowledge, supposes the potential truth of a conflicting opinion. So in moral action we must be content with what we can judge to be ‘probable’.<sup>111</sup> This word ‘probable’, deriving from ‘probare’ (to prove, approve, recommend, etc.), has a somewhat ambiguous force. On the one hand Aquinas, following Aristotle’s definition, understood it as that which is approved ‘by all or by many or by the wise’. It does not proceed to *scientiam*, the object of demonstrative argument, but to *opinionem*, the end of ‘dialectical’ argument.<sup>112</sup> Thus, as Byrne says, ‘it suggests *approbation* with regard to the proposition accepted, and *probity* with regard to the authorities who accept it’, and only in this sense connotes evidence or ‘provability’.<sup>113</sup> On the other hand, Deman is undoubtedly right to argue that Aquinas’s notion of probability is ‘pénétrée de l’idée de vérité’.<sup>114</sup> ‘It must be said’, Aquinas remarks, ‘that when there are two contrary opinions about the same thing, one of them must be true

---

<sup>111</sup> *ST*, IIaIIae, q. 70, a. 2 (‘probabilis certitudo’); IaIIae, q. 96, a. 1, ad. 3; IIaIIae, q. 1, a. 4 & a. 5, ad. 4. Edmund F. Byrne, ‘Situation et probabilité chez Saint Thomas d’Aquin’, *Revue Philosophique de Louvain*, 64, 84 (1966), pp. 525-49; *idem*, *Probability and Opinion: A study in the late-medieval presuppositions of post-medieval theories of probability* (The Hague, 1968). It is possible, however, to over-estimate the degree of relativity this implies. ‘Excellence in deliberation’, says Aristotle, is not opinion, because ‘correctness of opinion is truth’: possibility is not equivalent with probability. *Nic. Ethics*, VI. 9, 1142b; A. Gardiel, ‘La “Certitude Probable”’, *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques*, 5 (1911), pp. 441-85, at 445-7.

<sup>112</sup> Aristotle, *Topics*, 100b20-21; Aquinas[?], *De Fallaciis*, c. 2, 636; also e.g. *Expositio libri Posteriorum Analyticorum*, I, l. 44.

<sup>113</sup> Byrne, *Probability and Opinion*, p. 188.

<sup>114</sup> Deman, col. 431.

and the other false'.<sup>115</sup> Since the false opinion will entail sin, Aquinas clearly thinks that an opinion has value, and should command the assent of the intellect, only on the basis of its proximity to the truth; the primitive 'calculus of probabilities' which Byrne discerns in his conception of deliberation illustrates the same thing, insofar as it is inspired by Aquinas's fundamental aspiration after a progressive conformation to truth culminating in the intellectual vision of God.<sup>116</sup> Thus for Aquinas 'probable' signifies, as well as what is worthy of approbation, what is likely to be true. Otherwise, since he believes that the law is immutable and that it is always evil to transgress it, it would not make sense for him to maintain that a probable opinion is sufficient to resolve the conscience, i.e., that it gives a non-demonstrable certainty sufficient for action.<sup>117</sup>

Aquinas's response to the problem posed by the deficiencies of the conscience, then, was not exactly indulgent. Only a prior invincible ignorance of fact or positive law can excuse from sin; in doubts the tutorist rule applies where strenuous effort to inform the conscience fails; and a probable conscience is bound by the same obligation to truth which binds the doubtful conscience.<sup>118</sup> But the concepts with which he was dealing might be qualified in other ways. Ignorance might be conceived more broadly. It might also be extended to cover cases of doubt. In the same way the sphere of probability might be enlarged to comprehend doubt, on the principle that in both cases the potential truth of a conflicting opinion is recognised. Thus the liberty to follow a probable (authoritative) opinion would replace the obligation to take the safer way. These less stringent qualifications are possible in virtue of the underlying assumption about the rights of the conscience. If it is sin to act against the conscience, it might be concluded that the resolution of the conscience must

---

<sup>115</sup> *Quodlib.*, VIII, art. 13: 'quando sunt duo opiniones contrarii de eodem, oportet alteram esse veram et alteram esse falsam'.

<sup>116</sup> Byrne, 'Situation et probabilité', p. 530, etc.

<sup>117</sup> *ST*, IIaIIae, Q. 70, a. 2; Gardiel, 'La "Certitude Probable"'. The account in Lorraine Daston, 'Probability and evidence', in D. Garber and M. Ayers (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Seventeenth-century Philosophy* (Cambridge, 2012), pp. 1111-12, is elliptical.

<sup>118</sup> Deman, cols. 418-37, makes the case that this position characterises medieval theology in general.

preserve from sin. Aquinas was very far from holding this view. The conscience can be in error. For Aquinas the rightness or wrongness of any act is defined by the end with which it is intended: as we saw this implies both the ability to perceive the truth and the disposition to act conformably. The eternal moral order, of which the conscience is merely the *porte-parole*, is the fixed standard of human action.<sup>119</sup>

The later medieval period, however, did witness a tendency to qualify this theoretical rigidity. The institutionalisation of annual private confession in canon 21 of Lateran IV in 1215, a symptom of the Church's drive systematically to regulate the moral lives of the laity, stimulated an increasing level of attention to the problems posed by the conscience.<sup>120</sup> Deman has traced how a more indulgent attitude to the conscience developed in literature intended to assist confessors in dealing with penitents.<sup>121</sup> The emphasis naturally came to fall rather on how the conscience could be eased than on the rigorous obligations imposed upon it by the law. Thus, for example, the distinction between doubt, where assent is impossible, and probability, involving imperfect assent, became less clear. The criterion of probability, which for Aquinas implied what is most likely to be true, was relaxed, and the sphere of the doubtful, with its severe obligation, thus contracted. These developments reflected the fact that, in practice, the confessor is more anxious to circumvent the scrupulous conscience, which hinders action for fear of error, than to correct the false conscience. Where the first priority is the resolution of the conscience, the tendency is inevitably to stress its own prerogatives above the claims which the truth holds on it.<sup>122</sup>

---

<sup>119</sup> *Ib.*, cols. 418-19.

<sup>120</sup> Jonsen and Toulmin, *The Abuse of Casuistry*, chs. 5 & 6; cf. Thomas N. Tentler, *Sin and Confession on the Eve of the Reformation* (Princeton, 1977), pp. 31-46.

<sup>121</sup> Deman, cols. 444-57; Jean Delumeau, *Le péché et la peur. La culpabilisation en Occident (XIIIe-XVIIIe siècles)* (Paris, 1983), pp. 222-9 covers similar ground, but in general sees the literature, with its 'inflation prodigieuse du nombre des péchés', as further evidence of the doleful progress of repression or 'culpabilisation'.

<sup>122</sup> Cf. Henry Charles Lea, *A History of Auricular Confession and Indulgences in the Latin Church*, 3 vols. (1896), ii, pp. 286-300.

This subtle tendency to homogenise the sphere of the uncertain, so that a doubtful opinion merges with a probable one, had by the early sixteenth century penetrated more properly theological thinking.<sup>123</sup> Theologians of the Dominican school at Salamanca followed Aquinas in the assumption that certain knowledge in practical morals is inaccessible, and that the probable certainty which must therefore suffice for action is guaranteed by the authority of the wise, and by implication that of good reasons. They inclined, however, to give the conscience greater freedom in cases of doubt. The obligation to inform the conscience remained, and the tutorist rule applied where it was impossible to give assent, but these theologians gave the doubtful conscience an easier path to action by widening the criteria of assent. Tending to value an opinion on account of its ability to secure assent and license action, they gave greater weight to the authoritative sense of ‘probable’ than to the veridical. Since a probable opinion is by definition worthy of approval, there is nothing to hinder assent to any one among various such opinions. For Aquinas our choice of a probable opinion is dependent on our persuasion of its truth; this automatically excludes any other opinion, which becomes simply that to which the mind cannot assent.<sup>124</sup> As Deman remarks, the later view creates a separation between moral action and that inward condition of the intellect and will which for Aquinas defines its moral value.<sup>125</sup> Whereas in Aquinas truth is the rule to which the conscience must bend, a process facilitated by a habitual disposition to virtue, here responsibility is delegated to the authorities who render an opinion worthy of acceptance, and the conscience fulfils its obligation in choosing any of these.

The elision between the probable and the doubtful was rendered explicit by Barthélemy de Medina, first a novice then a master at the school of Salamanca. In 1577 Medina published the view that ‘if an opinion is probable, it is licit to follow it, even though

---

<sup>123</sup> See Deman, cols. 457-63.

<sup>124</sup> Cf. Gardiel, ‘La “Certitude Probable”’, pp. 442-4.

<sup>125</sup> Deman, cols. 461-3.

the opposite opinion is more probable'.<sup>126</sup> For Aquinas a 'more probable' opinion would have implied trepidation about accepting its opposite. In Medina's formula the doubtful ('less probable') has been converted into a probability. The safety which Aquinas maintained must be sought in doubts Medina guaranteed by probability. Medina was in fact a faithful Thomist, and broached this idea in commenting upon those sections of the *Prima Secundae* which we examined above. He stressed that an opinion is only probable because it is 'conformed to right reason and to the judgement of prudent and wise men'.<sup>127</sup> Just as in speculation we may, though lacking certainty, follow such an opinion without unreasonable danger of error, so in practical morals we may do so without danger of sin. It would therefore be contradictory both to hold that an opinion is probable and that it may not be followed. A conflict between opinions which are each conformed to right reason can only be a conflict between the good and the better, between precept and counsel. And it would be unreasonable to expect penitents always to follow the most perfect course: so 'if this thesis is not admitted, it will cause the torment of timorous souls'.<sup>128</sup>

Medina's argument, however, did depart from the spirit of Aquinas's views. For Aquinas it is the intention which determines whether an action is worthy of praise or blame. The action itself is incidental to the moral end, which is defined in relation to the mind that identifies and the will that pursues it.<sup>129</sup> To act well involves 'a personal and living assimilation to the truth',<sup>130</sup> probability is therefore a function of this process. This cultivation of the moral personality is absent from Medina's formula, which *presupposes* the goodness of some act or other in virtue of its 'probability'.<sup>131</sup> Thus it opened the way to an

---

<sup>126</sup> See *ibid.*, cols. 463-470, and the entry by M-M. Gorce, *DTC*, X, cols. 481-5, giving extracts from Medina's *Expositiones in Primam Secundae Divi Thomae* (1577).

<sup>127</sup> *Ib.*, col. 483.

<sup>128</sup> *Ib.*, col. 484.

<sup>129</sup> *ST*, IaIIae, q. 3.

<sup>130</sup> Deman, col. 467.

<sup>131</sup> Cf. Gorce, *DTC*, X, cols. 484-5.

‘extrincésisme’, which, with its undoubted pastoral utility, became increasingly pronounced.<sup>132</sup>

Gabriel Vasquez, for example, again commenting on the *Prima Secundae*, elevated the implicit distinction between the probable opinion as that which derives from authority, and as that which best convinces the mind of its truth, into a theoretical one. It may be inferred from this principle that, since any probability is by definition safe to follow, an ‘extrinsic’ probability based on the opinion of doctors may be preferred to an ‘intrinsic’ one based on good arguments. As Pascal noted this was a very useful principle, and one which, by the time he wrote the *Provinciales*, had advanced to the stage where the authority of one ‘grave’ doctor could make an opinion probable.<sup>133</sup> It promoted a clear separation of the speculative from the practical, suggested by Medina who put them in an ‘analogical’ relationship, and foreign to the spirit of Aquinas, for whom practical certainty implied some endeavour to resolve speculative doubt.<sup>134</sup> Francisco Suarez further forestalled the possibility that a speculative doubt might hinder action by bringing in ‘practical principles’ to ease the process of deliberation, borrowed from the interpretative rules used by canonists to guide themselves in doubtful cases:<sup>135</sup> the principle that ‘in dubiis melior est conditio possidentis’, meaning that, man being in possession of liberty, the burden of proof lies with the law that would constrain him; and the principle that an insufficiently promulgated or doubtful law does not bind.<sup>136</sup>

---

<sup>132</sup> Quantin, *Le rigorisme chrétien*, pp. 51-70, at 61.

<sup>133</sup> *CLP*, pp. 85-6; the usual source cited for this opinion was Emmanuel Sa’s *Aphorismi confessoriorum* (1612), p. 183.

<sup>134</sup> Quote Medina, in Gorce, *DTC*, X, col. 483.

<sup>135</sup> Jonsen and Toulmin, *The Abuse of Casuistry*, p. 169.

<sup>136</sup> These reflex principles are often cited as the characteristic doctrines of probabilism, e.g. John Mahoney, *The Making of Moral Theology. A Study in Roman Catholic Tradition* (Oxford, 1987), p. 227.

Thus by the seventeenth century Aquinas's view had been reversed by his exegetes:<sup>137</sup> doubt no longer created an obligation to seek the truth or take the safe path, but a liberty to choose among diverse 'probable' opinions. The practical certainty necessary for action had no necessary dependence on an objective truth, but was defined simply as the persuasion of the conscience, which casuists sought to facilitate as far as possible. This facility was well suited to the contemporary context, defined by rapid social, economic and cultural change, and the unwonted existence of viable confessional alternatives. Pascal's 'Jansenist' was not being wholly unjust in claiming that the Jesuit confessors were all things to all men.<sup>138</sup> The pride of probabilism, which swiftly achieved semi-orthodoxy within the Society, lay precisely in this ability to salve the conscience despite its inherent defects and the challenges posed by a mutable world.

### *Anti-probabilism*

The principle that a probable opinion may be followed, even if it is less certain and less safe than another, was therefore both logical – a probable opinion cannot be rendered improbable by the existence of conflicting opinions, which indeed it supposes by definition – and highly functional. How then should we account for the vociferous Jansenist reaction? To what did they object in the doctrine of probabilism?

One idea is that they basically missed the point. The casuists, according to this line of argument, were grappling constructively with the problem that the best sort of certainty available in morals is merely probable. The Jansenists, by contrast, believed an absolute

---

<sup>137</sup> Cf. Häring and Vereecke, 'La Théologie Morale', pp. 673-87.

<sup>138</sup> *CLP*, pp. 75-6.

certainty was available, but that it was necessarily an immediate divine inspiration; they discounted arguments brought by human reason as so many screens blocking out this illumination.<sup>139</sup> This gives us the pleasing paradox that, though Pascal originated the modern mathematical concept of probability, as a religious thinker he advocated, from a profoundly anti-rational perspective, a return to undifferentiated dogmatic certitude.<sup>140</sup> And it is certainly the case that, for the Jansenists, ‘probability’ was merely a measure of the fallen human condition. It may be ‘the very guide of life’, in Butler’s phrase, but this is a fact to be deplored.<sup>141</sup> The debility which renders us dependent thereon is a punishment for sin, which it cannot therefore extenuate.

It by no means follows from this position, however, that the Jansenists should have dismissed casuistry as simply misguided. It is precisely the imperfection of man’s moral faculties which makes it necessary to compensate as far as possible. The more acutely this debility is felt, the more urgently should the means be sought whereby man, notwithstanding his waywardness, can conform himself to the moral law. In this sense we should expect to find in the Jansenists a passionate commitment to casuistry. And this is precisely what we do find in works like Arnauld’s *Dissertation* or the *Provinciales*. They argued that the probabilists were bad casuists, who facilitated action *despite* the imperfection of nature, rather than by *overcoming* it.<sup>142</sup> As the technical register of their case shows, they were

---

<sup>139</sup> Jonsen and Toulmin, *The Abuse of Casuistry*; Baudin, *Études historiques*, iii, pp. 69f. *et passim*.

<sup>140</sup> Baudin, *Études historiques*, iii, pp. 23, 119f., is followed by James Franklin, *The Science of Conjecture. Evidence and Probability Before Pascal* (Baltimore, 2001), ch. 4; Richard H. Popkin, *The History of Scepticism From Savonarola to Bayle* (rev. ed., Oxford, 2003), pp. 180-4, similarly suggests that Pascal thought of grace and reason as mutually exclusive.

<sup>141</sup> Joseph Butler, *The Analogy of Religion*, ed. G. R. Crooks (New York, 1860), p. 84; cf. [Antoine Arnauld and Pierre Nicole], *La Logique ou L’Art de Penser* (Paris, 1662), pt. iv, ch. 12, pp. 438f., where in treating probability as a necessary rule in human affairs, the ‘jugement que l’on fait si une action est bonne ou mauvaise, digne de loüange ou de blâme’ is reserved from the discussion. There is a serviceable English tr. by Jill Vance Buroker, *Logic or the Art of Thinking* (Cambridge, 1996).

<sup>142</sup> There was an analogy here with the Protestant idea of the *justus peccator*, discerned also by English writers, which we shall pursue in chs. 3 & 4, esp. pp. 153-5, 203-10.

committed to the same inquiry as the casuists. They were eager to establish that probabilism represented an unwarranted departure from the teaching of Aquinas.

It was undoubtedly opportune for the Jansenists, whose orthodoxy was in question, to emphasise the conformity of their thought with that of Aquinas. This ought to encourage some scepticism in the face of their self-conscious invocation of his authority. On the other hand, it is hard to see that, were their real position inconsistent with that of Aquinas, any benefit should have accrued from such an esoteric affirmation of his arguments – which, on this supposition, could have served only to undermine the apology they were committed to sustaining. In other words, even if we assign this resort to a ‘Thomist refuge’ to purely tactical motives, we should expect to reach one of two conclusions: either that the Jansenists were incompetent tacticians, since such a manoeuvre could only produce incoherence; or that there existed some real compatibility between their case and the thought of Aquinas. It should not be remarkable that the second conclusion can be demonstrated in relation to an essentially traditional understanding of the conscience; but the exposition which follows, if it holds, can perhaps be taken to strengthen the case that such compatibility was increasingly recognised in a more general sense by certain among the Jansenists, especially Arnauld.<sup>143</sup>

According to Arnauld, following the argument of the Parisian *curés*,<sup>144</sup> there are ‘deux règles de nos actions’, founded ‘sur l’autorité de l’Ecriture, des Pères, et de St. Thomas’. These are the law of God and the conscience. To act against either of these is to sin. The probabilists ‘overturn’ both rules. They undermine the law by converting ignorance into probability; and they undermine the conscience by converting doubt into probability. From

---

<sup>143</sup> Cf. Jean Laporte, *La Doctrine de Port-Royal*, 2 vols. [of projected 3] (Paris, 1923), t. II, *Exposition de la Doctrine (D’Après Arnauld)*; Sylvio Hermann de Franceschi, *Entre saint Augustin et saint Thomas. Les jansénistes et le refuge thomiste (1653-1663): à propos des 1<sup>re</sup> · 2<sup>e</sup> et 18<sup>e</sup> Provinciales* (Paris, 2009); *XVIIe Siècle*, 259 (2013), on Arnauld, Thomas D’Aquin et Les Thomistes; and ch. 4, below, pp. 194-5.

<sup>144</sup> *Suite de l’extrait de plusieurs mauvaises maximes des nouveaux casuistes recueillies par messieurs les Curez de Paris et présentées à Nosseigneurs de l’Assemblée générale du Clergé de France le 24 novembre 1656* (Paris, 1656).

these errors flow ‘les conséquences les plus horribles’. Thus, in Arnauld’s view, nothing more is needed to avert the danger than to re-establish the authentic position of ‘St. Thomas’ on the two rules of human action. As we saw, this is that ‘dans le droit naturel une opinion probable fausse n’excuse point de péché’, i.e., that ignorance of what we ought to know is culpable; and that of ‘deux opinions probables, il faut choisir la plus sûre et la plus probable’, i.e., that which engenders the least fear of sin and appears most likely to be true.<sup>145</sup>

Arnauld holds that the moral law is eternal and immutable: considered in themselves, moral precepts ‘ne sont autre chose que cette loi éternelle et souveraine, qui est la loi naturelle, sur laquelle les Hommes doivent régler [sic] toutes leurs actions’. Men possess ‘les notions de bien et du mal, que la Nature et la Religion ont imprimées dans notre âme’. But the shadows which cloud the post-lapsarian human spirit mean that this law, evident in itself, is not always evident to man. Even with the light of revelation, ‘qui renferme et qui explique toute la Loi naturelle’, his ignorance and wilfulness is such that he cannot always apprehend or fulfil his duty.<sup>146</sup> His moral judgements must therefore often be attended by uncertainty. Arnauld convicts the casuists of confusing the analysis of this shortcoming established by Aquinas. In so doing they endanger souls by encouraging them to act with an illusory sense of security.

In the first place they confuse the concept of non-culpable ignorance. Aquinas holds that we sin by acting according to a false moral proposition, even though we are acting according to the conscience. Since the truth is objective and immutable, the evil done by violating the law of God is not in question. The only question is whether, had we not been ignorant of some crucial aspect of the case, we should have acted otherwise. Aquinas thinks

---

<sup>145</sup> Joncoux, pp. 277-8 (Wendrock, pp. 106-7).

<sup>146</sup> Joncoux, pp. 298, 323, 435, 299-300; cf. Pascal on ‘les lumières naturelles’, *CLP*, pp. 255-6.

such ignorance would excuse in the case of fact or positive law, but not in the case of natural law or the articles of faith. Pascal's 'Jansenist' proves it out of Aristotle's *Ethics*:

Vous voyez donc ... quelle est l'ignorance qui rend les actions involontaires; et que ce n'est que celle des circonstances particulières qui est appelée par les théologiens ... l'*ignorance du fait*. Mais, quant à celle du *droit*, c'est-à-dire quant à l'ignorance du bien et du mal qui est en l'action ... voici les paroles [d'Aristote]: *Tous les méchants ignorent ce qu'ils doivent faire et ce qu'ils doivent fuir; et c'est cela même qui les rend méchants et vicieux.*<sup>147</sup>

Arnauld discusses the crucial evidence of *Quodlibet* VIII.13, in which Aquinas considers the controversial question of pluralities. Of two contrary opinions about the same thing one must be true and the other false. If an individual acts against what is in fact the true opinion, he is not excused from sin, even though he believed it to be false.<sup>148</sup> In whatever 'appertains to faith or good morals, no one is excused if he follows an erroneous opinion of some doctor: for in these things ignorance is no excuse'.<sup>149</sup>

Probabilism, as we have seen, allowed that either opinion can be followed without sin, since the mind has assented on 'probable' grounds (the authority of the learned). Arnauld claims that this is simply to free action from the rule of truth. Ignorance is either a source of error or a spur to enlightenment. In annexing cases of ignorance to the competence of probability, the probabilists are denying that a better knowledge of the moral law might be available. This is why critics so often referred to them as 'Academics', 'Scepticks' or

---

<sup>147</sup> *CLP*, p. 69; *Nic. Ethics*, III.1, 1110b.

<sup>148</sup> Wendrock, pp. 132f., 163-5 (Joncoux, pp. 315f., 365-7).

<sup>149</sup> *Quodlibet.*, III, a. 10; quote by Arnauld/Nicole, Wendrock, p. 135 (Joncoux, p. 320): 'In his vero quae pertinent ad fidem et bonos mores, nullus excusatur, si sequatur erroneam opinionem alicuius magistri: in talibus enim ignorantia non excusat'.

‘Pyrrhonians’.<sup>150</sup> Aquinas, by contrast, thought the erring conscience should be ‘deposed’; and, indeed, ‘rien n’est si commun que de voir les hommes tomber dans des erreurs, et en être relevés et corrigés par d’autres plus éclairés en cela qu’eux’.<sup>151</sup> The probabilist formula may achieve a settled conscience, but it is not the solution to ignorance, which is enlightenment. If the truth is fixed and immutable, and it is sin to act against the law, it must be sinful to follow one of two contradictory moral propositions.

Arnauld’s implication was that probabilism divorced the moral agent from the eternal moral law. His actions are not correlated to the truth but to the opinions of doctors, which, since they suppose the potential truth of the contrary, are false to the proportion of one half.<sup>152</sup> This is to abandon the search for enlightenment, or, in other words, the endeavour to re-align a crooked nature with its true rule, the eternal law of God. By a necessary corollary it is also to impede it, since the more it chooses badly, the less the will is disposed to choose well.

Arnauld acknowledged the essential difficulty. In applying moral knowledge to action, we enter the realm of opinion, and the truth or falsity of any opinion will not always be clear. Sometimes contrasting opinions will elicit an imperfect assent; sometimes they will preclude assent entirely. The Jansenists saw that the chief mechanism of probabilism was its elision of doubt and probability.<sup>153</sup> By reducing cases of doubt to cases of probability, it allowed penitents to choose a course of action without necessarily being persuaded of its correctness, the conscience being resolved by the persuasion that it is licit to follow a probable opinion. So, as Arnauld put it,

---

<sup>150</sup> E.g. Joncoux, pp. 362-4; *Lettre Pastorale* of Nicolas Choart de Buzenval, bishop of Beauvais, *contenant la réponse à une requête que les Curez de son Diocèse luy ont présentée dans son synode dernier, contre le livre intitulé, Apologie pour les Casuistes* (Paris, 1658).

<sup>151</sup> Joncoux, p. 282 (sic).

<sup>152</sup> Wendrock, pp. 111-12 (Joncoux, pp. 293-4).

<sup>153</sup> Cf. the *Factum pour les Curés de Paris*, in *Ecrits des Curés de Paris*, ed. Récalde, p. 67-8.

Il s'agit entre les Probabilistes et nous, de savoir si un homme qui dans sa conduite suit une opinion fautive, est hors de péril et en sûreté de conscience devant Dieu, parce qu'il croit avec plusieurs autres cette opinion probable.<sup>154</sup>

The probabilists were able to answer 'yes' because, remarking that scientific certainty was impossible, they defined practical certainty ('sûreté') as the resolution of the conscience, and argued that it is illogical to claim a probable opinion may not be followed. The Jansenists took the general point, but denied the idea that following a probable opinion is equivalent to settling the conscience. This, as Arnauld indicated, should rather be understood in terms of avoiding 'péril' and attaining 'sûreté' (in the sense of safety or security rather than of demonstrative 'certitude').

In relation to doubt, it was easy to make the case that the probabilists were simply guilty of a technical error. Since doubt is a condition in which the mind cannot give assent, it defines a different sort of conscience to one that has given assent on the basis of probability. An 'equal probability' is equivalent to a doubt, both supposing that the mind has not assented to one side or the other. This was a useful way of arguing, for the 'new casuists' still paid lip-service to 'cette règle du Droit Canonique, ou plutôt du Droit Naturel', as Arnauld called it, 'in dubiis pars tutior eligenda est'.<sup>155</sup> However, as he also pointed out, they only applied it in cases of 'practical doubt', and as they held that speculative doubt gives the benefit of probability and does not preclude practical certainty, this meant never. Therefore they exposed penitents to 'péril', the danger of acting unlawfully.<sup>156</sup>

---

<sup>154</sup> Joncoux, pp. 337-8.

<sup>155</sup> Joncoux, p. 376.

<sup>156</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 398-92.

Arnauld appears to have included in his understanding of the ‘safer path’ the obligation to inform the conscience.<sup>157</sup> On this obligation he lays considerable stress, and it informs his treatment of that most important species of uncertainty, probability. Reliance on probability in morals, he admits, is a part of the human condition. Every probable opinion, moreover, supposes the potential validity of its opposite. But this does not mean that every probable opinion is of equal value. In itself, every moral opinion is either true or false. To us it is only probable because we cannot assume that we do not perceive the false as true or *vice versa*.<sup>158</sup> The principal risk in acting on these uncertainties, as Arnauld says, quoting from Aquinas, lies in not knowing on what side truth lies:<sup>159</sup> we shall sin in acting according to a false opinion, whether or not we are persuaded of its truth. So the palmary obligation in respect to probable opinions is to ensure that the moral personality is equipped to give in its judgements on the side of truth. This is to choose the most probable and the most sure, that is, the opinion which seems likeliest to be true and carries least fear of peril; for as Aquinas says this sense of risk accompanies every difficult moral decision, ‘at least when one does not see clearly where the truth lies’.<sup>160</sup> This obligation simply does not appear in the probabilist theory, where the probable opinion is ‘safe’, or ‘sûr’, by definition.

In establishing what it substantially conveys, Arnauld is concerned to evolve Aquinas’s notion of the sort of man who acts well. The casuists, he says, groundlessly parrot the axiom that ‘quiconque suit une opinion probable agit avec prudence, et ainsi il ne pèche pas’. But is it axiomatic that ‘il y a de la prudence à suivre une opinion probable’? Not on the definition of Aquinas, for whom ‘la prudence véritable et chrétienne n’est autre chose qu’un jugement droit, que la connoissance de la justice éternelle fait porter des choses que l’on doit

---

<sup>157</sup> Cf. Kenneth E. Kirk, *Conscience and Its Problems. An Introduction to Casuistry* (1927), p. 263n., on this common ambiguity.

<sup>158</sup> Joncoux, pp. 300f.

<sup>159</sup> *Quodlibet.*, IX, a. 15.

<sup>160</sup> *Ib.*: ‘nisi expresse veritas habeatur’; Wendrock, p. 134 (Joncoux, p. 318).

faire'. A judgement which is false and 'contraire à l'éternelle vérité' bespeaks imprudence; but this is what results if every probable opinion is allowed to settle the conscience.<sup>161</sup>

The prudent man seeks the truth: 'on est imprudent lorsque, voyant de la contrariété entre des opinions probables ... on n'entre dans aucun doute; ou lorsqu'étant dans le doute, on passe à l'action avant que d'en être éclairci'. Thus imprudence 'dans le jugement' implies imprudence 'dans la conduite' – 'la négligence qu'on a eue à chercher la vérité et à purifier son cœur'.<sup>162</sup> Prudence, then, as Aquinas teaches, is a habit or disposition in which the balance between knowledge and inclination is such that we can make the right choices. This involves the cultivation both of the will and the intellect. For

il y a une union si étroite entre la foi et la raison, la piété et la vérité, qu'on ne peut en abandonner une, sans les abandonner toutes.<sup>163</sup>

A bad choice 'est une preuve évidente que le cœur n'aime et ne cherche point la vérité': the will rests in an immediate good without troubling about the higher.<sup>164</sup> The cultivation of love and knowledge is thus an indispensable part of acting well.

Man must therefore resort 'aux moyens que Dieu a établis pour trouver la vérité'. These include, firstly, prayer. We must petition God for the wisdom and strength to seek the truth and purify our hearts (cf. Jas. i 5). Secondly, we may consult 'des personnes pieuses et éclairées'. It is not 'une chose mauvaise en soi, que de consulter plusieurs Docteurs, quand on les consulte pour découvrir la vérité'.<sup>165</sup> Indeed, as we saw, the Jansenists entertained very exalted notions of the spiritual director – 'un Homme qui dans cette fonction tient la place de

---

<sup>161</sup> Joncoux, pp. 339-40 (Wendrock, pp. 147-8); *ST*, IaIIae, q. 57, a. 5-6, q. 58, a. 5; IIaIIae, q. 47.

<sup>162</sup> Joncoux, p. 340 (Wendrock, p. 147).

<sup>163</sup> Joncoux, p. 376.

<sup>164</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 368.

<sup>165</sup> *Ib.*, pp. 340, 396-7, 416.

Jésus-Christ'.<sup>166</sup> Thirdly, the individual must make a careful examination of the whole matter for himself, and choose what appears true. We have, as Pascal says, the Scriptures, and then Popes, Councils and Fathers to interpret them.<sup>167</sup> Of these we can make an empirical study.

Ce n'est pas un amas confus d'opinions qui n'ont aucune solidité, qui rend un homme savant; mais l'étude de l'Antiquité, la lecture exacte des Saints Pères, et une méditation humble et continuelle de l'Écriture Sainte. Ce sont-là les sources où l'on doit puiser la science de la Morale Chrétienne.<sup>168</sup>

This helps us to choose the *most* probable opinion, understood as that which is likeliest to be true: 'la solidité est fondée dans la vérité'.<sup>169</sup> We will not achieve a perfect certainty, for 'il n'y a personne qui puisse être sûr' of having known the truth and followed it in every instance. But we will have the 'sûreté' of knowing that we are avoiding the path of most risk, and the peace – 'repos' – that comes of knowing that we have sought 'sincèrement à connoître la vérité'. This resolution of doubt and fear by a sincere search for the truth is what characterises the Christian life: Arnauld quotes Phil. ii 12, 'work out your salvation with fear and trembling'. It is the only way to achieve 'la paix et la tranquillité', a paradox evident in the saints, characterised by their 'crainte pieuse'.<sup>170</sup>

The fundamental error of probabilism, then, is that it gives 'une sûreté prétendue'. This word 'sûreté' is of great importance. As part of a technical vocabulary relating to conscience, it is opposed to the 'certitude' which comes with knowledge. To be sure is to be persuaded by an opinion; when we talk of 'certainty' in practical morals, we refer either to the persuasion that this opinion is conformed to the truth, or to the knowledge that it carries

---

<sup>166</sup> *Ib.*, p. 407; above, n. 95; cf. Pascal's *Mémorial*: 'soumission totale à Jésus-Christ et à mon directeur'.

<sup>167</sup> *CLP*, p. 94.

<sup>168</sup> Joncoux, p. 431 (Wendrock, p. 202).

<sup>169</sup> Joncoux, pp. 292-6, at 292: the reason which makes a probable proposition, according to the Jesuits, ought to be 'considerable and solid'.

<sup>170</sup> Joncoux, pp. 397-9; cf. *Pensées*, 721; *CLP*, p. 195; *Deuxième Écrit des Curés de Paris*, in Récalde, ed., *Écrits*, p. 89.

the least danger of sin. Thus Arnauld, discussing Aquinas's example of pluralism, remarks that, if there is danger of sin on one side and not the other, one cannot say that a less probable opinion is opposed to a more probable one, but that a probable opinion is opposed to 'une opinion certaine'.<sup>171</sup> 'Certain' here designates safety or security: it is contrasted to the false security which consists in a persuasion of the permissibility of probable opinions. True 'sûreté', as we have just heard Arnauld argue, is the result of a whole process of moral formation, a sort of living erudition, both intellectual and existential. This is what the Jansenists demanded in the place of probability.

It is thus necessary to be sensitive to the ambiguity of the word 'sûr', translated by Krailsheimer, for example, interchangeably as 'certain' or 'safe'.<sup>172</sup> What Pascal, like Arnauld, opposes to probability, is not a demonstrative certainty, but a concept of practical certainty understood as security. The Jansenists, as we have seen, acknowledged that, in Aristotle's terms, practical wisdom is distinct from scientific knowledge, as that which cannot be necessarily demonstrated: 'no one deliberates about things which are invariable', and 'there is no demonstration of things whose first principles are variable (for all such things might actually be otherwise)'.<sup>173</sup> Pascal had these basic moral concepts in mind when composing the *Provinciales*, as the Jansenist's discussion of Aristotle on circumstances at the end of the third letter shows. He appreciated the distinction between scientific certainty and the 'safety' by which medieval theologians licensed action in doubtful cases. The word 'sûr' carries this connotation of security. In Nicole's Latin 'certum' is equated with 'verum' and contrasted to 'falsam'; 'securitas' denotes the practical certainty which, he argues, the probabilists misconceive. Joncoux translated these terms respectively with 'certain' and

---

<sup>171</sup> Wendrock, p. 167: 'non minus probabilem magis probabili anteponit, sed certae probabilem' (Joncoux, pp. 371-2).

<sup>172</sup> *The Provincial Letters*, tr. Krailsheimer (1967), Letters IV-VI (cf. p. 92 for 'sûreté' rendered as 'serenity').

<sup>173</sup> *Nic. Ethics*, tr. David Ross, III.3-5, 1139b-1140b; cf., for e.g., the *Logique* (1662 ed.), pt. iv, ch. 12.

‘sûreté’.<sup>174</sup> It may therefore be of some significance that ‘Montalte’s’ much-quoted outburst in the fourth letter reads, ‘je ne me contente pas du probable, je cherche *le sûr*’, rather than ‘*la certitude*’.<sup>175</sup> In the sixth letter it is precisely this tutorist concept of security or safety which Pascal opposes to probability:

que répondrait-on, si l’on objectait qu’afin de faire son salut, il serait donc aussi *sûr*, selon Vasquez, de ne point donner l’aumône, pourvu qu’on ait assez d’ambition pour n’avoir point de superflu, qu’il est *sûr*, selon l’Évangile, de n’avoir point d’ambition, afin d’avoir de superflu pour en pouvoir donner l’aumône? Il faudrait répondre, me dit-il, que toutes ces deux voies sont *sûres* ...<sup>176</sup>

In the *Pensées* Pascal remarked that the casuists ‘ont plaisamment expliqué la sûreté, car ... ils n’ont plus appelé sûr ce qui mène au ciel’. Here he also returned to the ‘différence entre *repos* et sûreté. Rien ne donne l’assurance que la vérité; rien ne donne le *repos* que la recherche sincère de la vérité’.<sup>177</sup>

The concept of ‘sûreté’ signified the obligation to endeavour ‘a personal and living assimilation to the truth’. The casuists’ redefinition of ‘sûreté’ as the persuasion of the conscience, Arnauld argues, abstracts the moral agent from the eternal order in which he must participate. In distinguishing the speculative from the practical, the casuists drive a wedge between the mind which forms and the will which intends an end conformed to the eternal moral order, and the moral value of action. The goodness or badness of an action does not derive from its conformity to the law, insofar as it promotes or hinders the general good in a particular case; instead it is legally fixed by the opinions of doctors.<sup>178</sup> The knowledge and intention of the commissioning subject are irrelevant. Sin is treated, not as a disorder of the

---

<sup>174</sup> E.g. Wendrock, pp. 108, 149f.; Joncoux, pp. 278, 342f.

<sup>175</sup> *CLP*, p. 84, my emphasis.

<sup>176</sup> *Ib.*, p. 97, cf. pp. 99, 100, 107, 109, 131, 274, 279, 280.

<sup>177</sup> Ed. Lafuma, 916, 599; on the ‘sincere quest’ cf. 721 & 722.

<sup>178</sup> Cf. Béatrice Guion, *Pierre Nicole moraliste* (Paris, 2002), pp. 692-6.

moral faculties, but as a commodity, to be quantified and classified according to conditions which vary independently of our apprehension and pursuit of truth and goodness.

This is amply demonstrated in the ‘peccatum philosophicum’ discussed by Pascal in his fourth letter, the artificial ‘direction of intention’ treated in the seventh, and the arbitrary distinction of mortal and venial sins criticised in the ninth.<sup>179</sup> In each case a false relationship is substituted for the reciprocal economy between the will and the act. The ‘philosophical sin’ excuses transgressions of the law by distinguishing the conditions necessary to an offence against reason from those necessary to an offence against God. An offence against God, the doctrine runs, supposes a free transgression of his law, that is, the knowledge and capacity to fulfil it. If these are absent, the act may contravene right reason, but ‘theologically’ it is not a sin.<sup>180</sup> In other words, a distinction is put between reason and law. ‘O, le grand bien que voici pour des gens de ma connaissance! ... car ils ne pensent jamais à Dieu; les vices ont prévenu leur raison’.<sup>181</sup> A similar manoeuvre facilitates the ‘grande méthode de *diriger l’intention*’. Here sin is excused by ‘deflecting’ the intention from the evil commissioned to the good received thereby, for example by seeking revenge for the sake of honour rather than that of revenge itself.<sup>182</sup> The moral truth perceived by the mind is thus made irrelevant to the intention: the moral agent is insulated from the objective and immutable law of which, according to Arnauld after Aquinas, his participation constitutes the essence of morality.

Despite Arnauld’s talk of ‘une union étroite entre la foi et la raison’, there is certainly a difference of tone which distinguishes the Jansenist arguments from those of Aquinas. The former often appear sharply to separate the capacities which man has by nature from those which he has by grace. ‘Car il y a une vie de raison, et une vie de foi. La lumière de la raison

---

<sup>179</sup> On mortal and venial sins see ch. 7, below.

<sup>180</sup> *CLP*, pp. 54f.; Henry Charles Lea, ‘Philosophical Sin’, *International Journal of Ethics*, 5, 3 (1895), pp. 324-39. The distinction itself is traditional, cf. Aquinas, *ST*, IaIIae, a. 6, ad. 5.

<sup>181</sup> *CLP*, p. 58.

<sup>182</sup> *Ib.*, pp. 115f. Cf. the fragment on duelling, *Pensées*, 644. See Duchêne, *L’Imposture littéraire*, pp. 149-59, for a salutary contextualisation of this ‘doctrine’.

est la règle de celle-là, et la lumière de la foi la règle de celle-ci'. Uncertainty appertains to reason, 'la vérité constante et certaine appartient à la foi'. Arnauld gives the following sophism: grace is the principle of knowledge and love; to incur the risk of sin by following a false rule is to evidence the absence of grace. He calls prudence a gift of Christ, whereas for Aquinas it is a natural virtue, the perfection of our constitutional capacity to deliberate and choose well about what is good for us.<sup>183</sup>

This difference, however, is more apparent than real. The Jansenists did not think in terms of a sudden *éclat*, whereby the predestined faithful are enabled at a stroke to see the truth which only appears obscurely to the reprobate, and to act accordingly. As we have seen the acquisition and cultivation of knowledge and love is a lifelong process, never perfected, and performed in fear and trembling. It is the work of grace, or the fruit of faith, in the sense that it supposes the orientation of man's intellect and appetites, both rational and sensual, to their proper end. The highest good of the rational creature is God as the source of Mind.<sup>184</sup> The perfection of our natural capacities, Aquinas would say, is only achieved as part of this general orientation towards God as our ultimate end.<sup>185</sup> Such an orientation cannot be produced by man's natural powers alone.<sup>186</sup> Since right decisions depend on this orientation, true prudence must be a gift of God and not just an acquired virtue.<sup>187</sup> Justifiably, therefore, Arnauld writes that 'si nous l'entendons de la conscience, comme le veut St. Thomas, il faut nécessairement que ce soit de la conscience réglée par la foi'.<sup>188</sup> Its judgements are produced by an intellect disposed to seek the truth about God's law and a will formed by the love of

---

<sup>183</sup> Joncoux, pp. 331-4, 367-8, 399, 417; *ST*, IaIIae, q. 47. The Jansenist understanding of grace is discussed below, ch. 4.

<sup>184</sup> 'La raison veut que nous-nous aprochions toujours le plus près que nous pouvons de la vérité', Joncoux, p. 367, cf. pp. 373-5.

<sup>185</sup> See esp. *ST*, IIaIIae, q. 23, a. 7: 'sine caritate potest quidem esse aliquis actus bonus ex suo genere, non tamen perfecte bonus, quia deest debita ordinatio ad ultimum finem'.

<sup>186</sup> See *ST*, IaIIae, q. 109, a. 3.

<sup>187</sup> *ST*, IaIIae, q. 65, a. 2-5: 'Virtus vero ordinans hominem ad bonum secundum quod modificatur per legem divinam, et non per rationem humanam, non potest causari per actus humanos, quorum principium est ratio, sed causatur solum in nobis per operationem divinam'. Cf. Häring and Vereecke, 'La Théologie Morale', pp. 677-9.

<sup>188</sup> Joncoux, p. 334 (sic) (Wendrock, p. 143).

God. The ‘heart’ which Pascal opposes to reason is nothing more than this integration of all the rational faculties by their proper end. It has ‘la vérité’ for its object.<sup>189</sup> His insistence on this figure of the ‘heart’ reflects his conviction, shared with Aquinas, that the disposition to seek the truth and live by it is ultimately formed by love.<sup>190</sup>

We are thus in a position to take seriously the Jansenist claim that they rejected the role in conducting the Christian life, not of reason, but of corrupt or defective reason. The divagations of the casuists, says Arnauld, show they have ‘étouffé en eux les lumières naturelles de la raison et du bon sens’. Again, ‘la doctrine que je viens d’expliquer, n’est pas une doctrine que St. Thomas eût inventée. Il l’avoit tirée des oracles infaillibles de l’Ecriture, de la suite constante de la Tradition, et des plus vives lumières de la Raison’.<sup>191</sup> The casuists, unlike Aquinas, make no provision for the process of moral formation whereby man can utilise his moral and intellectual faculties in order to play his appointed role in the eternal moral order. They ‘soumettent la décision à la raison corrompue et le choix des décisions à la volonté corrompue, afin que tout ce qu’il y a de corrompu dans le nature de l’homme ait part à sa conduite’.<sup>192</sup> Because absolute certainty is inaccessible they abandon the search for truth entirely. But there is a sort of certainty which can bring *sûreté* and *repos* to the conscience: it is the certainty of the heart, and the certainty of the heart is the heart seeking after truth.

The Jansenist criticism of the *human* reasoning of the casuists was therefore, in a sense, a defence of *eternal* reason and of man’s participation in it. The casuists, they claimed, occluded man’s real nature, divorcing it from its final end by abstracting it from its place in the eternal reason. The ‘casuistical’ man is an unnatural man, absolved of his duty and hence prevented from realising his true end. The culmination of Pascal’s critique of the casuists is

---

<sup>189</sup> *Pensées*, 110, 424, 423; cf. esp. Jean Laporte, *Le cœur et la raison selon Pascal* (Paris, 1950); Hélène Michon, *L’Ordre du Cœur. Philosophie, Théologie et Mystique dans les Pensées de Pascal* (Paris, 1996), pp. 224-40; Philippe Sellier, *Pascal et Saint Augustin* (Paris, 1970), pp. 80-105.

<sup>190</sup> *ST*, IIaIIae, q. 45.

<sup>191</sup> Joncoux, pp. 432, 320 (Wendrock, pp. 203, 136: ‘lumen rationis’; ‘evidentissimo rationis iudicio’).

<sup>192</sup> *Pensées*, 601.

thus reached with Antoine Sirmond's opinion that the active love of God is not a necessary precept. The love of God, for the Jansenists as for Aquinas, is the foundation of the entire moral life of man, giving him direction and purpose. It is 'le fondement de la Religion chrétienne'.<sup>193</sup>

Sirmond's argument was not in fact outlandish. His work *La Défense de la vertu* (1641) was framed against a doctrine of 'pur amour', which, disowning all creaturely ends, tended to collapse the moral and theological virtues into a disinterested charity, and threatened to terminate in passivity. Sirmond wanted to reassure people, worldly people especially, that God does not demand an impossible perfection: that actions done with some other motive than the pure love of God may also be meritorious. Within the commandment to 'love the lord thy God with all thy heart' (Mt. xxii 37, Lk. x 27) he distinguished a precept and a counsel. The precept refers to execution, meaning the attempt to fulfil the law: 'if you love me, keep my commandments' (Jo. xiv 15). The counsel, however, refers to 'affection'. The more perfect part is for the will to be inclined towards God so that obedience always issues from love of him. In Sirmond's view the precept to love God is fulfilled by an 'effective' charity; so long as someone is not in a state of mortal sin, practising the law, that is acting according to right reason, is enough to merit salvation. No sanction attends the failure to love God 'affectively', so that our actions are formally defined by this intention; and to demand that the will should be continually exercised in such acts of love is to demand a perfection proper to the citizens of heaven.<sup>194</sup>

However defensible, Sirmond's distinction of precept and counsel, his separation of the outward and effective from the inward and affective, encapsulated the Jansenists'

---

<sup>193</sup> [Antoine Arnauld and François Hallier] *La Théologie Morale des Jésuites*, in Arnauld, *Œuvres*, t. xxix, pp. 76-7.

<sup>194</sup> Sirmond's doctrine analysed in Gabriel Joppin, *Une Querelle Autour De L'Amour Pur. Jean-Pierre Camus, Évêque de Belley* (Paris, 1938), p. 2, ch. 2; not inaccurate is [Antoine Arnauld], *Dissertation Théologique Sur le Commandement d'aimer Dieu*, tr. by Nicole and included as his third note on the tenth Provincial Letter, § 2. I quote from Arnauld's *Œuvres*, t. xxix.

argument against the casuists. Defining sin extrinsically in terms of permissibility (we are not so much commanded to love, concluded Sirmond, as not to hate),<sup>195</sup> they eschewed concern with the inward cultivation of virtue. It is instructive that in this controversy over the nature and obligation of charity the Jansenists found themselves aligned with Jean-Pierre Camus, bishop of Belley and disciple of François de Sales. Camus, apostle of an ‘amour pur et désintéressé’, who claimed the authority of the mystical tradition, would later be cited by Fénelon against Bossuet.<sup>196</sup> His stark opposition of perfect charity to the taint of self-interest certainly anticipated the passive disinterestedness of Quietism.<sup>197</sup> The Jansenists too built their ascetic programme on the Augustinian contrast between *amor sui* and *amor Dei*. ‘La Raison et la Nature nous crient’, affirmed Arnauld, ‘que tous les hommes sont obligez d’aimer Dieu, et qu’ils doivent lui consacrer leur cœur par un amour chaste et désintéressé’.<sup>198</sup> But they rejected the exaggeration of this principle for the same reason they abhorred Sirmond’s palliation of it, namely that it devalues active moral endeavour. The ‘disinterested’ soul does not disown all its own movements as impure, and passively await those of God. This mystical self-abnegation is equivalent to the abnegation of moral responsibility encouraged both by the extreme pessimism of Luther and Calvin, and by the complacency of the casuists.<sup>199</sup> It is the opposite of what God demands from us. ‘Non seulement Dieu nous commande de l’aimer de tout notre cœur, il veut encore que nous l’aimions de toute notre âme et de toutes *nos forces*’ (cf. Lk. x 27).<sup>200</sup> The disinterested will does not renounce its own activity; but it only acts for God. It is not the will itself which is

---

<sup>195</sup> *CLP*, p. 189, n. 2.

<sup>196</sup> Joppin, *Querelle*, pp. 56-7, 64, 70.

<sup>197</sup> *Ib.*, esp. pt. 1.

<sup>198</sup> *Dissertation Sur le Commandement d’aimer Dieu*, p. 16.

<sup>199</sup> Pierre Nicole, *Réfutation des Principales Erreurs des Quietistes* (Paris, 1695), l. I, chs. 11&12, *et passim*; cf. Guion, *Pierre Nicole moraliste*, pt. 1, ch. 4, esp. pp. 187-97, 250-60.

<sup>200</sup> Arnauld, *Dissertation sur le Commandement d’aimer Dieu*, p. 28, my emphasis; Nicole, *Réfutation*, l. 1, chs. 13-14.

the principle of corruption, but the cupidity which inclines it to false ends.<sup>201</sup> We cannot, therefore, be assured that God is acting in us by declining to think or act for ourselves; rather, our good thoughts and good actions assure us that they come from God.<sup>202</sup> Hence Nicole would cite against the Quietists the Tridentine anathema on those who claim that free will, ‘by assenting to God’s call and action, in no way cooperates towards disposing and preparing itself to obtain the grace of justification ... but that, as something inanimate, it does nothing whatever and is merely passive’.<sup>203</sup>

On the contrary, love is by definition active: it is ‘une effusion du cœur’, a certain *pondus*, in the terms of Augustine, which bears the will towards the loved thing. Sirmond’s distinction of ‘effective’ from ‘affective’ love is a nonsense, because an action commissioned with the end of pleasing God could only issue from a will inclined towards him by love.<sup>204</sup> To undermine the internal ‘culte’ of Christianity, as Saint-Cyran described the love of God, is thus, says Arnauld, to destroy the external ‘culte’ which evinces it.<sup>205</sup> The sacrifice of Christ is the great sacrifice of love which makes possible the heavenly city. To be incorporated with him is to join in this holocaust of love.<sup>206</sup> ‘If you love me, keep my commandments’; but if there is no love, there is no obedience.

---

<sup>201</sup> Cf. *CLP*, p. 223, where ‘*l’ouvrage de Dieu*, c’est-à-dire la nature’, is opposed to ‘*cupidité ... l’ouvrage du démon*’.

<sup>202</sup> Nicole, *Réfutation des Quietistes*, p. 70: ‘On ne connoist pas qu’elles sont bonnes, parce qu’elles viennent de Dieu; mais on connoist qu’elles viennent de Dieu, parce qu’elles sont bonnes’.

<sup>203</sup> *Ib.* p. 77; Schroeder, pp. 42-3: ‘si quis dixerit liberum hominis arbitrium a Deo motum et excitatum nihil cooperari assentiendo Deo excitanti, et vocanti, quo ad obtinendam justificationis gratiam se disponat; sed velut inanime quoddam nihil omnino agere, mereque passive se habere, anathema sit’.

<sup>204</sup> Arnauld, *Dissertation sur le Commandement d’aimer Dieu*, pp. 18, 25-7; cf. ch. 4, below, pp. 202-3 & n. 139.

<sup>205</sup> *Ib.*, p. 31; Saint-Cyran, *Lettres Chrétiennes et Spirituelles*, t. II, Letter LXXIV, p. 15; cf. Letter XCIII, pp. 257f; t. III, Letter CLI; Nicole, *Réfutation*, l. II, chs. 7-8.

<sup>206</sup> Arnauld, *Dissertation sur le Commandement d’aimer Dieu*, p. 32, quoting at length from Augustine, *De civ. Dei*, X.3.

This inward condition of the will, then, verifiable by the acts it produces, is the best moral index we have, the highest form of certainty to which we can aspire.<sup>207</sup> It must be the role of moral theology and casuistry to minister to it. But, as Pascal argued in the tenth *Provinciale*, the ministry peculiarly suited to achieving this, the sacrament of penance, was evacuated of all meaning by the casuists' 'finesses'.<sup>208</sup> For Pascal, following the argument of Arnauld's *Fréquente communion*, the end of the sacrament is to nourish and authenticate such a true state of repentance as will allow us really to participate in the holocaust of love re-enacted in the eucharist.<sup>209</sup> A sincere sorrow for sin, arising not from selfish motives but from the offense done to the loved object, must animate our repentance. This holy contrition, or charity, is, as we have seen, active and deliberate. It is the desire to redirect a life disordered by sin to its true end in God. It therefore produces the corresponding external effects: a full and frank acknowledgement of sin, and a life changed by avoiding the common occasions of sin, and by doing such acts of satisfaction as may expiate sin in the measure that they recalibrate the internal disposition according to its true object.<sup>210</sup> Then, being sure that the sin is loosed in heaven, the earthly confessor may absolve his penitent. The casuists, by contrast, allowed that attrition, 'même conçue par le seul motif des peines de l'enfer', is sufficient with the sacrament of penance to the remission of sins.<sup>211</sup> They allowed confession to be slight and disingenuous. They did not demand that proximate occasions of sin be avoided, nor did they require penances as evidence of a change of life; in fact they never bound at all, but held that even habitual sinners with no intention to reform themselves should never be refused absolution.<sup>212</sup> Thus they offered an 'assurance' antecedent to obedience, one which, indeed, 'pourrait bien porter les pécheurs ...'. But genuine 'sûreté', for Pascal and his associates, is

---

<sup>207</sup> Hence those who would reason clearly, according to Pascal's wager, should start 'en prenant de l'eau bénite, en faisant dire des messes, etc.': *Pensées*, 418; cf. fr. 936.

<sup>208</sup> *CLP*, p. 172.

<sup>209</sup> Cf. ch. 7, below.

<sup>210</sup> 'Cette véritable conversion de cœur, qui fait autant aimer Dieu qu'on a aimé les créatures', *CLP*, p. 182.

<sup>211</sup> This 'attritionist' position was allowed by the Tridentine decrees – Schroeder, pp. 91-2, 102.

<sup>212</sup> *Ib.*, pp. 172-87, letter XVI; cf. ch. 7, below.

enjoyed only in the proportion that sin is restrained and overcome. Pascal specifies that this is a matter for ‘l’*espérance*’ and not ‘la *certitude*’.<sup>213</sup>

\*

The essence of the Jansenist anti-Jesuit critique, then, was that ‘les nouveaux casuistes’ divorced morality from the eternal law. The Jansenists did not reject casuistry as such, but advocated a return to medieval tutorism, which they synthesised with the ideal of moral development outlined by Aquinas. The casuists, according to this case, were in fact anti-casuists: they did away with doubt, the efficient cause, so to speak, of casuistry, and with virtue, its final cause. Although the Jansenists are often depicted, thanks to their conscientious dissidence, as heralds of the modern, subjective notion of the conscience, it may be observed that their understanding of morality was fundamentally objective;<sup>214</sup> it was their opponents who reduced morality to the subjective claims of the conscience. This objectivism, on the other hand, encouraged an understanding of probability that bears some relation to the modern concept, which Pascal’s mathematical work advanced so significantly. The casuists still considered probability as belonging exclusively to opinion. According to the Jansenists, the ‘probability’ of an opinion was constituted by the best evidence: in respect to establishing the content of the law, this, as Arnauld pointed out, can be boiled down to good scholarship.<sup>215</sup> This will constitute a reasonable demonstration. Historical fact cannot be established with ‘une certitude métaphysique’; here, as Arnauld and Nicole argued in the *Logic*, ‘nous nous devons contenter d’une certitude morale’.<sup>216</sup> Since the tradition of the Church is a matter of historical fact, it is, in consequence, for ‘les yeux’, the ‘légitimes juges’ of fact ‘comme la raison l’est des choses naturelles et intelligibles’, to establish the right

---

<sup>213</sup> *CLP*, p. 289.

<sup>214</sup> See e.g. Franklin, *The Science of Conjecture*, p. 64, for the former view; Mahoney, *The Making of Moral Theology*, p. 229, for the correct one.

<sup>215</sup> Wendrock, pp. 202-3 (Joncoux, pp. 431-2); cf. Ian Hacking, *The Emergence of Probability. A Philosophical Study of Early Ideas About Probability, Induction, and Statistical Inference* (new ed., Cambridge, 2006).

<sup>216</sup> *La Logique*, pp. 457-8.

interpretation.<sup>217</sup> Faith does not destroy ‘la certitude des sens’; ‘ce serait au contraire détruire la foi que de vouloir revoquer en doute le rapport fidèle des sens’.<sup>218</sup> This scholarly empiricism corresponds to the insistence on right behaviour as an index to the internal disposition; taken together they amount to a somewhat modest understanding of the constituent parts of certainty, which contrasts strongly with the luminous afflatus the Jansenists are often said to have championed.

Probabilism, as they argued, made ignorance more valuable than truth, and rendered scholarly inquiry into antiquity and theological discussion of the content of the law pointless.<sup>219</sup> Devaluing knowledge, it inevitably devalued virtue, since ‘que moins nous connoissons Dieu, moins nous connoissons ce qui lui est agréable’.<sup>220</sup> Right reason is that by which man participates in the eternal moral law; satisfying themselves with corrupt reason, the casuists naturally licensed the transgression of an endless list of its particular precepts. Probabilism, in other words, was a cipher for laxism. The doctrine of equivocation or ‘mental restriction’, when we speak contrary to what we believe to be true, was only the most obvious symptom of a morality in which the value of action is sundered from the mind and purpose of the moral agent.<sup>221</sup> This is the path described by the *Provinciales*, which illustrate, from the fourth to the tenth letters, the progression from ignorance – probability, ‘philosophical sin’, the direction of the intention – to the denial of the fundamental motive of moral action, the love of God, by way of specific perversions of the law as it relates to man’s worship of God and his interaction with his neighbour. These examples of the immoral conclusions which the casuists reached from their essentially anti-moral, because anti-teleological principles, were the common stock of rigorist polemics in France. We will meet them soon in the hands of

---

<sup>217</sup> Cf. Pascal, *Préface pour le traité du vide*, in Jacques Chevalier (ed.), *Œuvres complètes* (Paris, 1954), p. 530.

<sup>218</sup> *CLP*, p. 374.

<sup>219</sup> Joncoux, pp. 348f.

<sup>220</sup> Augustine, quoted Joncoux, p. 300.

<sup>221</sup> *CLP*, pp. 164f.

English writers, who pounced enthusiastically on this ready-made demolition of Catholic casuistry. First, however, we need to examine the paths by which the Jansenist critique entered English discourse.

## *Chapter 2*

### *Transmission into England*

This chapter explores how the Jansenist critique of contemporary moral theology entered into the consciousness of English readers. In part one English engagement with the original works of the Port-Royalists is examined. This was evidently serious and sustained, and extended beyond the most notorious products of the controversy surrounding the Five Propositions, the *question de fait*, and the Formulary. The fact that a significant number of Jansenist writings were subsequently translated into English is therefore not surprising. Part two consider the parties responsible for these translations and their motives. The Jansenist works were introduced to an English audience by a network of royalist Anglican writers and policy-formers. This network was engaged in a broadly collaborative effort to collect elements of the Jansenist critique, although different purposes in publishing English translations can be discovered among its constituents. Edward Hyde, Earl of Clarendon, and his ally James Butler, Duke of Ormond, viewed the Jansenist anti-Jesuit polemic as a tool to split the indigenous Catholic community and realise their own domestic religious policy. This strategy was based on an astute reading of English Catholic politics, as is demonstrated by the affinities between the outlook of the so-called Blackloists and the contents of the Jansenist critique. Clerical members of the royalist Anglican network, meanwhile, were also interested in the apologetic value of the anti-laxist polemics; the significance of this interest will be explored in chapter 3.

## 1) English Engagement with French Religious Discourse

Proficiency in French was a matter of course for the learned elite of seventeenth-century England. The level of familiarity deepened over the course of the century as circumstances contributed to an increase of traffic between the two nations. The marriage of Charles I to Henrietta Maria established an enclave of French Catholics at Whitehall. Huguenots emigrated to England and engaged in public life, sometimes embarking upon careers in the Church. During the civil wars and Interregnum many of those who remained loyal to the episcopal Church and to the crown sought exile abroad, generally spending some significant portion of time in France. English affairs were reported in the *Nouvelles ordinaires de Londres* published by the Huguenot du Gard from London. The revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685 saw another influx of refugees. The scholarly channels never ceased to remain open; both erudition and controversy dictated that the learned, especially churchmen, should be conversant with French publications. How common this ground had become by the later seventeenth century is shown in numerous instances of reciprocal interest, such as the praise which Bossuet, on behalf of the French clergy, communicated to George Bull for his *Defensio fidei Nicænae* of 1685; or even the qualified regard initially evinced for the first two volumes of Burnet's *History of the English Reformation*, of which the French translation quickly ran through four editions, prefixed by a letter in which the author expressed his veneration for the French nation and especially for 'les ecclésiastiques de France', whom he placed above 'tous les ecclésiastiques romains' for power of discernment.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> See Charles Bastide, *The Anglo-French Entente in the Seventeenth Century* (London-New York-Toronto, 1914); John Stoye, *English Travellers Abroad 1604-1667. Their Influence in English Society and Politics* (rev. ed., New Haven-London, 1989), pt. 5; Norman Sykes, *From Sheldon to Secker. Aspects of English Church History 1660-1768* (Cambridge, 1959), ch. 4; F. Cabrol, 'Bossuet, ses relations avec l'Angleterre', *Revue*

It was natural, therefore, that numerous erudite English clergymen possessed or demonstrated familiarity with many of the seminal works of the Jansenist critique. The great impression made by the *Provincial Letters* doubtless stimulated such acquisitions. But earlier phases of the Jansenist critique had not passed unnoticed. The works of Duvergier – who, when his relations with Richelieu were cordial, had almost travelled to England as chief almoner to Henrietta Maria<sup>2</sup> – had aroused interest among a wider constituency than the Catholic clergy alone. In a way it is surprising that his writings in defence of episcopal power were not more widely cited by English defenders of episcopacy in the 1640s and 1650s, given their impact in France and the thoroughgoing patristic evidence they amassed. Of course ‘Petrus Aurelius’ wrote as a Tridentine Catholic, which diminished the attractiveness of his work for Protestant authors. Nevertheless, the *Opera*, first published in Paris in 1642, were reasonably well-known. Richard Allestree acquired them in the 1646 edition.<sup>3</sup> Henry Hammond cited Aurelius against the Jesuits in his treatise on confirmation; it is possible that Allestree’s copy had originally belonged to him.<sup>4</sup> By the reign of Charles II Edward Stillingfleet could refer to ‘the famous *Abbot* of *S. Cyran*’, and delineate both the place of Aurelius in the history of English Catholicism, and the contents of his writings.<sup>5</sup>

It was not only Saint-Cyran’s ecclesiological writings which might interest English Protestants, but his spiritual teaching too. His aim to reinvigorate the sacrament of penance

---

*d’Histoire Ecclésiastique*, 27, 3 (1931); Bruno Neveu, *Erudition et Religion aux XVIIe et XVIIIe siècles* (Paris, 1994), pp. 223-4; Georges Ascoli, *La Grande-Bretagne devant l’opinion française au XVIIe siècle*, 2 vols. in 1 (Geneva, 1971), pp. 237-42, quote at p. 237.

<sup>2</sup> René Rapin, *Histoire du jansénisme depuis son origine jusqu’en 1644*, ed. Abbé Domenech (Paris, n.d.), pp. 171-2.

<sup>3</sup> *Petri Aurelii theologi Opera* (Paris, 1646); Ch. Ch. Lib., Oxf., Allestree I.1.1.

<sup>4</sup> Hammond, *De confirmatione sive Benedictione post Baptismum Solenni, per Impositionem Manuum Episcopi, celebrata, Commentarius ex sententia Ecclesiae Anglicanae* (1661), p. 29, cited in Jean-Louis Quantin, *The Church of England and Christian Antiquity. The construction of a confessional identity in the 17<sup>th</sup> century* (Oxford, 2009), p. 281. Hammond left Allestree a number of his books on his death, of which the list compiled by J. B. Hibbits is unlikely to be complete: J. B. Hibbits, ‘Henry Hammond (1605-1660) and English New Testament Exposition’ (Unpublished Oxford D. Phil, 1951), Appendix B; J. W. Packer, *The Transformation of Anglicanism 1643-1660* (Manchester, 1969), p. 204.

<sup>5</sup> Stillingfleet, *[A Discourse Concerning the] Idolatry [Practised in the Church of Rome]* (1671), pp. 427-8; *idem*, *The Council of Trent examin’d and disprov’d by Catholick tradition* (1688), pp. 79-80.

through the practice of delayed absolution and spiritual *renouveau* constituted the major cause of his notoriety in France, having inspired striking conversions to a non-religious life of penitential solitude which shocked a society they seemed to condemn. Richelieu, sensing danger from this world-denying, spiritually elitist, and Protestant-sounding doctrine, moved to have Saint-Cyran incarcerated.<sup>6</sup> But imprisonment only enhanced the reputation and influence of this latter-day apostle, providing the ideal context from which to disseminate a religious ethic framed around heroic fortitude. The letters of spiritual direction composed by Saint-Cyran at Vincennes were collected and published as the *Lettres Chrétiennes et Spirituelles de Messire Jean du Verger de Hauranne Abbé de Saint-Cyran* in 1645, forming the major foundation of his later reputation as a spiritual writer.<sup>7</sup> They were widely known among English writers. John Cosin, who as chaplain to the exiled royalists oversaw the spiritual welfare of English Protestants in Paris from 1645 to the restoration, was particularly well versed in Saint-Cyran's religious output.<sup>8</sup> Cosin owned a copy of *Les reliques de messire Jean du Verger de Hauranne*, a Jesuit production published at Louvain in 1646, which, though designed to besmirch his reputation, contained extracts from many of Saint-Cyran's writings: from Petrus Aurelius; from the *Lettres chrétiennes*; from the *Théologie familière*, a catechism for children censured by the Paris archdiocese in 1643;<sup>9</sup> *Les Maximes*

---

<sup>6</sup> Orcibal, *Saint-Cyran et le jansénisme*, pp. 29-39; Louis Cognet, 'Le mépris du monde à Port-Royal et dans le jansénisme', *Revue Ascétique et de Mystique*, 41 (1965), esp. p. 396.

<sup>7</sup> See ch. 7, below, on the *Lettres chrétiennes*.

<sup>8</sup> Cosin's library has been catalogued electronically and can be consulted through the Durham University Library catalogue. It has been treated by A. I. Doyle, 'John Cosin (1595-1672) as a Library-Maker', *The Book Collector*, 40, 3 (1991), pp. 335-57; and in reference to its contents of Huguenot provenance, by Elfrieda Dubois, 'La bibliothèque de l'évêque Cosin à Durham et sa collection de livres français de théologie et de spiritualité protestantes des XVIe et XVIIe siècles', *Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire du Protestantisme français*, 128 (1982), pp. 173-88. I have not had access to D. G. Ramage, 'Cosin's French Books', *The Durham Philobiblion*, 2 (1955-69).

<sup>9</sup> The censure was lifted the following year. Saint-Cyran, *Théologie familière, avec divers autres petits traitez de dévotion* (Paris, 1669). This catechism magnified the effects of the fall, which not only enslaved man to his passions and to the devil, but rendered him absolutely incapable 'de se defendre de tant d'ennemis, ny de se delivrer de sa misère' (pp. 11-12); the weight of concupiscence in fallen nature means not only that man cannot fulfil the least of God's commandments without the gratuitous gift of grace, but that every act of his obedience requires a further such efficacious gift, so that 'nous dependons ... toujours de la misericorde de Dieu' (pp. 56-8). The duties of religion are resolved into the virtue of charity, that is the love of God purely for his own sake, to whom all must be referred (pp. 38-40). The divine aid man requires therefore cannot be supplicated with any

de l'Abbé de Saint-Cyran, a hostile abstract of his theology prepared by the commissaries of Louis XIV in the course of the case against him; the *Chapelet Secret* of Mère Agnès, which Saint-Cyran had defended;<sup>10</sup> the commentary on Augustine's *De sancta virginitate* by the Oratorian Claude Séguenot, falsely attributed to Duvergier and made the immediate pretext for his arrest, on account of its positions on human nature and divine grace, contritionism, and absolution;<sup>11</sup> and finally *De la fréquente communion*, commonly believed, and by the Jesuits polemically asserted, to be the work of Saint-Cyran.<sup>12</sup> Cosin also owned the *Théologie familière* in its fourth edition, revised and corrected in light of the censure.<sup>13</sup> He had also invested in the *Apologie* which Duvergier's most celebrated convert Antoine le Maistre wrote in answer to the damning conspectus of Saint-Cyran's theology commissioned during the proceedings against him.<sup>14</sup>

Knowledge of Saint-Cyran persisted. Cosin's younger contemporary Allestree, whose library attests to the acquisition of an intimate knowledge of the Jansenist controversy in the later 1650s and 1660s, obtained the 1674 edition of the *Lettres chrétiennes*, augmented with another of the abbot's ascetical tracts, on the poverty of Christ.<sup>15</sup> Poverty, according to Saint-Cyran, is 'le fondement de toutes les vertus religieuses': it addresses the dual aspects of man,

---

other motive than 'un desir sincere de l'aimer [Dieu] parfaitement': the sacrament of penance is designed to form this disposition, and therefore does not end with confession, but consists principally in good works and mortifications (pp. 76-9); only with such a disposition can the supreme moment, the eucharist, be encountered worthily (pp. 72-6).

<sup>10</sup> See Louis Cognet, 'Le Chapelet secret du Saint-Sacrement', *Bulletin de la Société des Amis de Port-Royal*, 1951, pp. 3-14; Orcibal, *Origines*, ii, pp. 305-334; Jean-Robert Armogathe, 'Le Chapelet Secret' de Mère Agnès Arnould', *XVIIe siècle*, 170 (1991), emphasises the unorthodoxy of the work, which Cognet can excuse and which Orcibal considers Saint-Cyran to have resolved.

<sup>11</sup> Orcibal, *Saint-Cyran et le jansénisme*, p. 30.

<sup>12</sup> Saint-Cyran, *Les Reliques du Messire Jean du Verger de Hauranne, Abbé de Saint-Cyran, Extraites des ouvrages qu'il a composez & donnez au public* (Louvain, 1646).

<sup>13</sup> Saint-Cyran, *Théologie familière, ou breue explication des principaux mystères de la foy. Reueüe et corrigée sur l'original. Avec deux autres petits traittez. L'un de la confirmation, et l'autre de la messe* (Paris, 1643).

<sup>14</sup> Le Maistre, *Apologie pour feu Monsieur L'Abbé de St. Cyran, Contre L'Extraict d'une Information pretenduë que l'on fit courir contre luy l'an 1638 & que les Iesuites ont fait imprimer depuis quelques mois, à la teste d'un Libelle diffamatoire intitulé, Sommaire de la Theologie de l'Abbé de Saint Cyran, & du sieur Arnould* (Paris?, 1644).

<sup>15</sup> Ch. Ch. Lib., Oxf., Allestree S.4.10: *Lettres Chrétiennes et Spirituelles, de Messire Jean du Verger de Haurane Abbé de S. Cyran. Nouvelle édition, Augmentée d'un Traité de la Pauvreté de Iesus-Christ, du même Auteur* (Lyon, 1674).

restraining the material desires of the flesh and the disordered desires which afflict the spirit, and so, by contradicting the *amour-propre* which characterises our fallen condition, opening the ‘royal way’ to the love of God and hence to salvation.<sup>16</sup> Works like this and the two volume *L’Aumône chrétienne ou la tradition de l’Eglise envers les pauvres*, published by Le Maistre in 1651, come to the heart of Saint-Cyran’s spirituality, expressing the strict assimilation of evangelical counsel to precept involved in making the incarnation the central practical principle of Christianity. This implies nothing outlandish or extreme: despite the nostalgia of Saint-Cyran and his intellectual successors, superhuman acts of asceticism were not usual among the Jansenists. A platonic harmony was the end of the soul which endeavoured to regulate itself by achieving conformity with Christ. Striving after the counsels of perfection represented a heroism equal to or greater than that exhibited in ascetical displays – hence the ‘heroism of charity’ evident at Port-Royal, for example at the time of the Frondes.<sup>17</sup> Later English authors evidently continued to find these aspects of Saint-Cyran’s spirituality relevant. George Morley, the restoration bishop of Winchester, owned the *Lettres Chrétiennes* in three volumes.<sup>18</sup> John Tillotson, archbishop of Canterbury under William III, actually possessed a first edition.<sup>19</sup> His close colleague Stillingfleet, like Allestree, owned the 1674 Lyon edition; his copy of Duvergier’s *L’Aumône Chrétienne* was likewise the edition printed at Lyon in 1674. He also had a later edition of the collection owned by Cosin, *Les Nouvelles et anciennes Reliques de Mr. Jean du Verger de Haïranne*, published in 1648, and even the first volume of Saint-Cyran’s denunciation of Garasse, the *Somme des fautes*.<sup>20</sup> Isaac Barrow, the great restoration preacher, and first Lucasian Professor

---

<sup>16</sup> Orcibal, *Origines*, v, pp. 445-7.

<sup>17</sup> On these topics see R. Taveneaux, ‘Port-Royal, les pauvres et la pauvreté’, and ‘Port-Royal ou l’héroïsme de la sainteté’, both in his *Jansénisme et Réforme catholique* (Nancy, 1992); for a eulogy Jean Racine, *Abrégé de l’Histoire de Port-Royal* (Paris, 1767), pp. 65f.

<sup>18</sup> Winchester Cathedral Library, *George Morley’s Library Catalogue* (1682), f. 126.

<sup>19</sup> Paris, 1645. See *Bibliotheca Tillotsoniana: Or a Catalogue Of the Curious Library of Dr. John Tillotson Late Archbishop of Canterbury* (1695), p. 78.

<sup>20</sup> Paris, 1626: see above, pp. 18-19, on this work. Newport J. D. White (ed.), *A Catalogue of Books in the French Language, Printed in or before A.D. 1715, Remaining in Archbishop Marsh’s Library, Dublin, with an*

of Mathematics in Cambridge, possessed a volume of the *Instructions chrétiennes tirées des lettres de l'abbé de St Cyran* edited by the Port-Royal *solitaire* and eldest brother of 'le grand' Arnauld, Robert Arnauld d'Andilly, and published in 1672.<sup>21</sup>

In other words, this author, not always considered relevant beyond the history of French Jansenism, had a persistent currency among English thinkers. I have instanced influential episcopalian writers, but he was also read by puritans. Richard Baxter, who as we shall see was among the first to use the Jansenist critique of the Jesuits, knew him as an opponent of Sirmond.<sup>22</sup> Theophilus Gale, the first English historian of Jansenism, praised the 'Sanctitie', 'Science', and 'Humilitie' which made him an unparalleled spiritual guide and comforter. 'He exhorts much to *self emptiness, spiritual povertie, humilitie, faith in Christ*', the '*usefulness of afflictions*', 'and more especially to *love God more than ourselves, and our neighbours as much ...* which, according to his Master Austin, contains the *Morals, Logic, Physick, and Politics* of true Christian wisdom'.<sup>23</sup> This broadly distributed interest continued into the eighteenth century. The nonjuring spiritual writers Thomas Ken and William Law both read the *Lettres Chrétiennes*. Most interestingly, John Wesley, in his *A Plain Account of Christian Perfection* of 1766, translated (though without attribution) about a third of the *Instructions chrétiennes* collected by d'Andilly, recommending them 'immediately after the Holy Scriptures as the object of profound and frequent meditation'. In Saint-Cyran's insistence on the interior disposition of love, on a profound conversion from the old life of the creature to the new life of Christ within, to be effected by a strict adherence to the narrow

---

*Appendix, relating to the Cashel Diocesan Library* (Dublin, 1918), pp. 55, 77. On the publishing history of Saint-Cyran's works see Louis Moreri, *Le Grand Dictionnaire Historique, ou le mélange curieux de l'histoire sacrée et profane*, 10 vols. (20<sup>th</sup> ed., Paris, 1759), t. 10, pp. 538-9.

<sup>21</sup> Bodl., Rawl. MS D. 878, f. 54v.

<sup>22</sup> Baxter, *The true history of councils* (1682), p. 101.

<sup>23</sup> Gale, *The True Idea of Jansenisme, both Historick and Dogmatick* (1669), pp. 13-16.

way exemplified by Christ in his poverty, charity, and humility, Wesley discerned an ‘inward religion’ or ‘religion of the heart’ which powerfully expressed his own convictions.<sup>24</sup>

If English familiarity with so relatively obscure a figure as Saint-Cyran is a little remarkable, the acquaintance of English writers with the work of his famous disciple, Antoine Arnauld, is more to be expected. Nevertheless, the relevance of Saint-Cyran may suggest that the attention paid to Arnauld was not necessarily simply his due as a philosopher and controversialist of European significance, but might also reflect interest in the similar themes developed in his own works.<sup>25</sup> At the very least, Arnauld took up the cudgels against the Jesuits with a quantity of zeal which even Protestants could hardly hope to overmatch. He was also, of course, a doughty controversialist in behalf of the Catholic Church: an opponent who had to be acknowledged, and one, perhaps, whose critical stance contributed a piquant leaven for readers of a different confessional persuasion.

Certainly the works of Arnauld, ‘so celebrated and considering a person as he is knowne to be’, as Sir Robert Southwell wrote in 1683, were very well known by English readers in the second half of the century.<sup>26</sup> The *Frequent Communion*, which had such a considerable impact upon conceptions of spiritual guidance and sacramental practice in France, can be found in many libraries.<sup>27</sup> It is difficult to specify how soon after its publication it came to more general attention; many scholars owned later editions. Jeremy Taylor however must have known it since at least the early 1650s, when the *Unum*

---

<sup>24</sup> Orcibal, *Saint-Cyran et le jansénisme*, pp. 146-9; *idem*, ‘Les spirituels français et espagnols chez John Wesley et ses contemporains’, *Revue de l’histoire des religions*, 139, 1 (1951), pp. 50-109, at pp. 66f; cf. *idem*, ‘L’originalité théologique de John Wesley et les spiritualités du continent’, *Revue Historique*, 222, 1 (1959), pp. 51-80. A ‘clergyman of superior learning’ once scornfully told Hannah More that ‘*Jansenism is only Methodism in French*’: [L. Howard], *The Yorkshireman, A Religious and Literary Journal By A Friend*, 5 vols. (Pontefract, 1832-37), iii, pp. 223-4.

<sup>25</sup> Cf. ch. 7, below, on Jeremy Taylor and Arnauld’s *Fréquente communion*.

<sup>26</sup> BL Add. MS 38015, f. 280r.; cf. Clark, ch. 15.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. René Taveneaux, *Le Catholicisme dans la France Classique 1610-1715*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1980), t. 2, pp. 345-7; Cognet, *Le jansénisme*, p. 44; Jean Orcibal, *Le Premier Port-Royal – Réforme ou Contre-Réforme* (Paris, 1957), pp. 25-6.

*Necessarium* began to form in his mind.<sup>28</sup> Cosin, as we have seen, knew the work from the Jesuit-produced *Reliques* of Saint-Cyran, published in 1646. He also owned Arnauld's *Défense de la Verité Catholique* of 1644, where Arnauld defended the teaching of the *Frequent Communion* on the sacrament of penance against the then-Calvinist Théophile Brachet de la Milletière,<sup>29</sup> claiming a middle ground between excessive rigour and the 'excès étranges de relâchement, que quelques Catholiques' (instancing Cellot and Bauny) 'ont avancé'.<sup>30</sup> The young John Evelyn, whose sense of ecclesial identity was so profoundly shaped by his experience of the persecuted but proud remnant of the episcopal Church presided over by Cosin in Paris, also owned an early edition of this work, along with various ephemeral pieces provoked by the *Frequent Communion*.<sup>31</sup> Richard Allestree knew the debate over penance and frequent communion from an early date: he acquired a copy of the Jesuit scholar Denis Petau's response to the *Frequent Communion*, published in 1645, *De la Pénitence Publique, et de la Préparation à la Communion*, along with a fairly full abridgement of both works.<sup>32</sup> He eventually procured a copy of the seventh edition of Arnauld's tract, published in 1656, and even bought one of the more specific works to appear during the controversies which succeeded its initial publication, a defence of the incidental

---

<sup>28</sup> Below, ch. 7.

<sup>29</sup> De la Milletière was expelled from the Reformed Church after the meeting of the national synod of Charenton in 1645, and consequently received into the Catholic. A scathing notice is in Pierre Bayle, *Dictionnaire Historique et Critique*, 4 vols. (5<sup>th</sup> edition, Amsterdam-Leiden-La Haye-Utrecht, 1740), iii, pp. 390-93. For more on this dispute see R. J. M. van de Schoor, *The Irenical Theology of Théophile Brachet de la Milletière (1588-1665)* (Leiden, 1995), ch. 5. On discipline in the French reformed Church R. A. Metzger, 'Notions of sin and penance within the French Reformed community', in K. Lualdi and A. T. Thayer (eds.), *Penitence in the Age of Reformations* (Aldershot, 2000), pp. 84-100.

<sup>30</sup> Arnauld, *Défense de la Vérité Catholique. Contre les erreurs et les hérésies de S. de la Milletière dans son livre intitulé: Le Pacifique Véritable* (Paris, 1644), printed in Arnauld, *Œuvres*, t. xxviii, at pp. 530-1.

<sup>31</sup> Evelyn would actually try, unsuccessfully, to part the impecunious Cosin from his library – *ODNB*, s. n. 'Cosin'; BL Add. MS 78632 [Evelyn's library catalogue, 1687], ff. 30v., 31v., 32r.: the incidental pieces include a *Lettre circulaire de Messieurs les Prelats assemblez à Paris 29<sup>th</sup> Nov. 1643, le procez verbal fait en ladite assemblée, et la satisfaction du P. Nouet de la SJ: envoyez à Nosseigneurs les Prelats de France* (Paris, 1643); *Lettres écrites à Notre St. Père le Pape, et à Monseigneur le Cardinal Barterin, par Messieurs les Archevêques &c. Approbateurs du livre de la fréquente communion* (Paris, 1644); *Remarques Chrestiennes, et Catholique sur le livre de la fréquente communion qui a passé nouvellement souz le nom de M. Antoine Arnaud* (Paris, 1644). On Evelyn in Paris cf. John Spurr, "'A Sublime and Noble Service'. John Evelyn and the Church of England", in Frances Harris and Michael Hunter (eds.), *John Evelyn and his Milieu* (2003), pp. 150-53.

<sup>32</sup> Petau, *De la Pénitence Publique, et de la Préparation à la Communion* (Paris, 1645); *Abbrégé de la doctrine du livre de la fréquente communion et de sa refutation comprise dans les livres de la pénitence publique, et de la préparation à la communion*: these are both bound together in Ch. Ch. Lib., Oxf., Allestree S.1.16.

remark made in the preface, ‘qu’on voit dans les deux Chefs de l’Eglise, qui n’en font qu’un, le modele de la pénitence’.<sup>33</sup> (The Jesuits, playing on fears about Richelieu’s French patriarchy, unconvincingly lit upon this phrase as prejudicial to the unified authority of the papacy.<sup>34</sup>) Isaac Barrow possessed a copy of ‘Arnault de frequente Communion’, which he perhaps picked up in Paris, where he was resident when the first of Pascal’s letters in defence of Arnault appeared in early 1656. Interested in the scientific circles in which Arnault and Pascal moved, Barrow’s letters seem to show him sympathetic to the stance adopted by Arnault in his religio-political travails.<sup>35</sup> Morley owned the *Fréquente communion*, Petau’s *Pénitence publique*, and Arnault’s initial rejoinder the *Tradition de l’Eglise sur le sujet de la Pénitence et de la Communion* (Paris, 1645).<sup>36</sup> John Tillotson, for his part, owned the Latin version of the *Fréquente communion*, which appeared in quarto in 1647, the *Tradition de l’Eglise*, and the *Apologie pour M. Arnault contre un libelle intitulé Remarques Judicieuses* (1644).<sup>37</sup> Thomas Turner, the Tory president of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, in the 1690s, and brother of the nonjuring bishop Francis, also possessed the Latin *Fréquente communion*.<sup>38</sup> The bishop of Lincoln Thomas Barlow, who considered the works of the Jansenists a useful resource for English students of divinity, owned the 1669 French edition.<sup>39</sup>

<sup>33</sup> Ch. Ch. Lib., Oxf., Allestree S.2.4: this copy bears the unpleasant frontispiece of the 1648 edition, depicting, under the superscription *Sancta sanctis*, the arrest of an unworthy communicant, while horrified saints look on; Martin Barcos [nephew of Saint-Cyran], *De l’authorité de S. Pierre, et de S. Paul, qui reside dans le pape, successeur de ces deux apostres* (Paris?, 1645): Allestree N.5.5(1); Tillotson also owned this work, *Bibliotheca Tillotsoniana*, p. 78.

<sup>34</sup> See Racine, *Abrégé de l’Histoire de Port-Royal*, pp. 76f.; Arnault, *Œuvres*, xxvi, pp. LI, LVf. Despite the arguments of Barcos a decree of Innocent X in 1647 condemned the proposition wherever it appeared: Dominique de Colona, *Dictionnaire des Livres Jansénistes, ou qui favorisent le Jansénisme*, 4 vols. (Anvers, 1752), i, pp. 75-6.

<sup>35</sup> Bodl., Rawl. MS D. 878, f. 54v.; Percy H. Osmond, *Isaac Barrow. His Life and Times* (1944), pp. 51-5; Clark, p. 135.

<sup>36</sup> *Morley’s Catalogue*, ff. 117, 125.

<sup>37</sup> Arnault, *De frequenti communione Liber, in quo SS Patrum, Pontificum, et Conciliorum de poenitentiae atque eucharistiae sacramentorum, usu sententiae summa fide proferuntur ...* (Paris, 1647); *Bibliotheca Tillotsoniana*, pp. 12, 78.

<sup>38</sup> C.C.C. Lib., Oxf., LRZ.6.18(MR 2).

<sup>39</sup> Below, ch. 3; Bodl., F 76, 77 Linc. Barlow and Robert Boyle were lifelong book-swappers, and often discussed the Jansenist controversy and religious developments in France: see Michael Hunter, Antonio Clericuzio and Lawrence M. Principe (eds.), *The Correspondence of Robert Boyle*, 6 vols. (2001), e.g. iv, pp. 251, 330-1, 414; v, p. 127. Boyle’s connexion with the Jansenists, via his sponsorship of the Irish Bible, is described below, pp. 86-7.

William Wake had a copy of the edition printed at Lyon in 1683.<sup>40</sup> Stillingfleet had Petau's *De la pénitence publique*, the *Office du S. Sacrement* of the nuns of Port-Royal (consecrated to the perpetual adoration of the sacrament), and followed the ensuing debate in works such as the French reformed writer Matthieu Larocque's *Réponse à un livre intitulé L'Office du S. Sacrement* (1665) and the *Histoire de l'Eucharistie* of 1669.<sup>41</sup> Burnet praised 'Mr. Arnaud', 'whom for his Book of *Frequent Communion*' – 'wherein he was engaged so much to the bettering this Age ... and in representing to us the true Spirit of Holiness and Devotion in the Primitive Church' – 'I shall ever honour'.<sup>42</sup>

Arnaud's arguments about the discipline of the early Church constituted only one aspect of the wider case against 'lax' modern morality, and other works in which he and the Jansenists carried forward this critique were also familiar to a learned Anglophone audience. The forerunner of the *Provinciales*, Arnaud's and Hallier's *La Théologie Morale des Jésuites, et Nouveaux Casuistes* of 1643, though certainly not so widely known as the *Fréquente Communion*, contributed to the notoriety of the Jansenist campaign. 'Les Jésuites', as Hermant recorded, 'en furent irrités au dernier point, et firent voir par la multitude et la contradiction de leurs réponses, l'extrême embarras où ils se trouvaient réduits', and some of these attempted refutations were owned by English churchmen.<sup>43</sup> Wake, for example, possessed the *Réponse au Libelle intitulé la Théologie Morale des Jésuites* of 1644 by the former confessor to Louis XIII, Nicolas Caussin, SJ, in which Caussin reported much of the work he was refuting.<sup>44</sup> Stillingfleet had the *Lettre d'Eusebe à Polemarque sur le livre de Monsieur Arnaud de la fréquente communion* (1644), a response to Arnaud's *Lettres de*

---

<sup>40</sup> Ch. Ch. Lib., Oxf., WF.6.9.

<sup>41</sup> White (ed.), *A Catalogue of Books*, pp. 145, 148, 111; cf. *Morley's Catalogue*, f. 121; on Larocque see Bayle, *Dictionnaire Historique et Critique*, iii, pp. 55-6.

<sup>42</sup> Gilbert Burnet, *A relation of a conference held about religion at London, the third of April, 1676 by Edw. Stillingfleet ... and Gilbert Burnet, with some gentlemen of the Church of Rome* (1676), pp. 114-15; cf. Stillingfleet, *A discourse concerning idolatry*, p. 178.

<sup>43</sup> *Mémoires de Godefroi Hermant ... sur L'Histoire Ecclésiastique du XVIIe Siècle*, ed. A. Gazier, 6 vols. (Paris, 1905-1910), I, bk. 3, p. 227.

<sup>44</sup> Ch. Ch. Lib., Oxf., WO.7.22.

*Polemarque à Eusebe, et d'un Théologien à Polemarque*, where the Jansenist, demonstrating by reference to the works of the casuists the futility of the early Jesuit apologetic strategy to disown or qualify the 'lax' propositions attributed to them, in a sense determined the more assertive apologetic approach later typified by Pirot.<sup>45</sup>

These instances testify to a wider interest in the Jansenist controversy as it developed during the 1640s and 1650s. The attempt to vindicate the Augustinian doctrine of grace as explained by Jansen, in contrast to that of the 'disciples of Molina', characterised as Pelagian or Semipelagian, was followed in works such as Arnauld's *Apologie de Monsieur Iansenius Evêque d'Ipre*, the *Recueil de divers ouvrages touchant la Grâce*, or the later *Apologie pour les Saints Pères de l'Eglise, Défenseurs de la Grâce de Jésus-Christ*.<sup>46</sup> This controversy, which resurrected the bitter and unresolved dispute between the Jesuits and the Dominicans over the operation of divine grace, was a gift to Anglican apologists constantly reproached with the charge of disunity, and they watched its course closely.<sup>47</sup> Some, like Herbert Thorndike, who recorded his 'respect' for the 'learning and judgement of ... Jansenius', went so far as to investigate the *Augustinus* itself.<sup>48</sup> Others read of the papal anathematisation of the Five Propositions,<sup>49</sup> of Arnauld's unsuccessful attempt to slip its terms by a distinction of

---

<sup>45</sup> White (ed.), *A Catalogue of Books*, p. 7. Details of the controversy are in Arnauld, *Œuvres*, xxix, pp. IV-X; on Pirot's *Apologie* see above, p. 25.

<sup>46</sup> Arnauld, *Apologie de Monsieur Iansenius Evêque d'Ipre et de la Doctrine de S. Augustin, expliquée dans son liure, intitulé, Augustinus*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1643-44); *Recueil de divers ouvrages touchant la Grâce* (Paris, 1645); *Apologie pour les Saints Pères de l'Eglise, Défenseurs de la Grâce de Jésus-Christ* (Paris, 1651). See e.g. *Bibliotheca Tillotsoniana*, p. 77; Ch. Ch. Lib., Oxf., Allestree T.3.1; *Morley's Catalogue*, ff. 117-18.

<sup>47</sup> For examples of this kind of polemical point-scoring see John Bramhall, *A just vindication of the Church of England, from the unjust aspersion of criminal schism ...* (1654), pp. 213-14; *idem*, *Schisme guarded and beaten back ...* (The Hague, 1658), p. 235; Thomas Peirce, *The divine philanthropie defended* (1657), n. p.; later examples include Stillingfleet, *A Rational Account of the Grounds of Protestant Religion* (1665), Preface, pp. 101-2, 460-1; *idem*, *Idolatry*, pp. 443, 456; Henry Dodwell, *Two Short Discourses Against the Romanists* (1676), p. 84.

<sup>48</sup> Thorndike, *An Epilogue to the Tragedy of the Church of England* (1659), ii, p. 193: see ch. 6, below, for Thorndike's reading of Jansen; cf. e.g. *Morley's Catalogue*, f. 25; Morley also possessed the more accessible work of Jansenius, *Discours de la Réformation de l'Homme intérieur*, which was brought out in 1644, *ibid.*, f. 121; Allestree C.2.9; Gilbert Burnet had read at least tome I of the *Augustinus* on the history of Pelagianism and Semipelagianism, as a reference in his discussion of the 17<sup>th</sup> article of the Church of England shows: *An Exposition of the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., 1700), pp. 148, 150-1.

<sup>49</sup> E.g. *C[alendar of the] Clar[endon] S[tate] P[apers]*, ed. Ogle, Bliss, Macray, Routledge, 5 vols. (Oxford, 1869-1970), ii, p. 224; cf. p. 265; Ch. Ch. Lib., Oxf., Allestree S.1.13 [Collection of papers relating to the condemnation of the *Augustinus*]; S.1.25(3) [Innocent X's bull *Cum Occasione*]; S.1.25(5) [Declaration of the

*droit et fait* (between the pope's right to condemn heretical propositions, and his capacity to discern their presence in a given place),<sup>50</sup> and of the subsequent difficulties entailed by the imposition on all French ecclesiastics of subscription to a formulary condemning the propositions in the sense of Jansen.<sup>51</sup> In 1664 the *Journal* of Louis-Gorin de Saint-Amour, agent for the Jansenist cause in Rome, was translated by one 'G. Havers'. He noted the 'weight, extent, and difficulty' of the questions raised by the Five Propositions and the 'incredible subtlety' of the contributions to the debate, perceptively remarking that 'in these Points the doctrine of the *Jansenists* is in some respects different from that of the *Calvinists*; yet not so much, but their subtle Adversaries took advantage of the Conformity, to contrive Five Propositions capable of a double Construction, namely, both according to the opinions of *Jansenius*, and those of *Calvin*'.<sup>52</sup> Nicole's vindictory *Lettres d'une hérésie imaginaire* also began in 1664, and were widely owned in England. It is no surprise that, their interest

---

King concerning the bull]; S.1.25(11) [deliberations in the Assemblée Générale du Clergé de France concerning the Five Propositions, 1660-1661]; Bodl., B 22.1(2) Linc.[Barlow's copy of *Cum occasione*]; White (ed.), *A Catalogue of Books*, p. 97 [*Mémorial Historique de ce qui s'est passé depuis l'année 1647, jusques à l'an 1653, touchant les Cinq Propositions* (Cologne, 1676)].

<sup>50</sup> The argument was propounded in Arnauld's *Seconde Lettre à un duc et pair de France* of 1657, following his *Lettre à une personne de condition*: the matter in question was the victimisation of the Jansenist party in the person of the Duc de Liancourt, and the upshot was Arnauld's expulsion from the Sorbonne. For these works see Allestree S.1.11(1) and (2).

<sup>51</sup> E.g. Allestree S.1.25(7) [*Esclaircissement de quelques difficultez sur la signature du fait* (1664)]; S.1.25(14) [Letter from the bishop of Alet to the curé of Saint Nicolas du Chardonnet defending his refusal to subscribe the formulary]; S.1.25(15) [on the same subject]; S.1.25(19) [*Défense de l'ordonnance de Messieurs Les Vicaires Généraux de Monseigneur le Cardinal de Retz...pour la signature du Formulaire*]; S.1.25(20) [*De la signature du formulaire ... pour servir d'Apologie à ceux qui refusent de signer le Formulaire sans restriction*]; S.1.25(22) [Letter from the bishop of Beauvais to the king regarding the signature of the formulary without restriction]; S.1.25(24) [narrative of affairs in a *Lettre d'un théologien de Rome*]; S.1.25(27), S.1.25(28) [Letters from the bishops of Angers and of Vence to the king regarding the signature of the formulary]; S.1.25(41) [*Nullitez et abus du troisième mandement pour la signature du formulaire*]; White (ed.), *A Catalogue of Books*, p. 97 [*Recueil de pièces publiées en l'affaire des Eveques d'Alet, de Pamiers, de Beauvais, & d'Angers, qui ont été poursuivis pour avoir distingué le fait du droit dans leurs mandemens sur la signature du formulaire* (Cologne, 1669)].

<sup>52</sup> *The Journal of Monsr. de Saint Amour Doctor of Sorbonne, Containing A full Account of all the Transactions both in France and at Rome, concerning the Five Famous Propositions Controverted between the Jansenists and the Molinists, From the beginning of that Affair till the Popes Decision* (1664), sig. A2. This work was owned by, among others, Burnet, who met Saint-Amour in Paris in 1683, judging him 'a sincere and worthy man', who 'told me, his whole life had been one campaign against the *Jesuits*; and spoke of them as the great plague of the Church ... He lamented also that sharpness of stile with which his friend *Arnauld* treated the Protestants; for which, he said, both he and all his friends blamed him' – *Bibliotheca Burnetiana* (1730?), p. 13; Burnet, *Bishop Burnet's History of His Own Time*, 2 vols. (1724-34), ii, p. 566. Cf. also Stillingfleet, *Idolatry*, pp. 438, 450-51.

having already been piqued to this extent, English readers should have been so struck by Pascal's intervention in this controversy in 1656.

Certain parties in England received the letters as they appeared episodically from January 1656 to March 1657.<sup>53</sup> Some English readers, such as Evelyn and Morley, acquired the first Cologne edition of the collected letters.<sup>54</sup> The campaign of the curés of Paris and Rouen provoked by the *Lettres* and by Pirot's intemperate response was also known contemporaneously in England.<sup>55</sup> Works such as Arnauld's *Nouvelle Hérésie des Jésuites*, swiftly translated into English, were well-known in the original French.<sup>56</sup> The translation of Pascal's *Lettres* and various ancillary Jansenist works into English will be treated below, and is the true measure of their impact in England. Either the French *Lettres* or their English translation, *The Mystery of Jesuitism*, are henceforth extremely common in English libraries.<sup>57</sup> It is worth noting, however, that new contributions to the critique in France continued to be noticed in England. Pierre Nicole's Latin translation of the *Provinciales*, written and published at the end of the 1650s, contained substantial 'Notes et Dissertations, où les plus grands principes de la Morale Chrestienne sont expliquez d'une maniere aussi

---

<sup>53</sup> Below, pp. 90-91.

<sup>54</sup> BL Add. MS 78632, f. 28r.; *Morley's Catalogue*, f. 123; Tillotson would also acquire it, *Bibliotheca Tillotsoniana*, p. 85; Barrow's copy is undated, but he was on the continent at this time: Bodl., Rawl. MS D. 878, f. 54v.

<sup>55</sup> E.g. Allestree S.1.25(40) [*Advis de Messieurs les Curéz de Paris, à Messieurs les Curéz des autres diocèses de France, sur les mauvaises maximes de quelques nouveaux Casuistes* (1656)]; Allestree S.1.25(26)[pastoral letter of bishop Choart de Buzenval of Beauvais, responding to the *requeste* of his curés against Pirot's *Apology* (1658)]; Allestree S.1.25(34) [*Factum de Messieurs les curéz de Paris contre la Thèse des Jésuites*]; Allestree S.1.25(35) & (36) [Jesuit responses to the factums and 'impostures' of the curés and Jansenists]; Allestree S.1.25(38) [Censure of the *Apology for the Casuists* by archbishop de Gondren of Sens (1658)]; Allestree S.1.25(40.1) [*Extrait de quelques-unes des plus dangereuses propositions de la morale de plusieurs nouveaux casuistes*]; Bodl., Rawl. MS D. 878, f. 66r. [*Réponse aux Lettres Provinciales* (Liege, 1658)] (library of Richard Perrinchief, prebendary of Westminster and St Paul's and biographer of Charles I); BL Add. MS 78632, f. 39r.; White (ed.), *A Catalogue of Books*, p. 100 [*La Doctrine des Jésuites et Nouveaux Casuistes combattue par les Curéz de France, et censurée par grand nombre de Prélats, et par des Facultés de Théologie Catholique* (1659)]. Cosin owned a work of uncertain but clearly Jansenist provenance, intervening on behalf of the curés of Paris in a dispute over jurisdiction which had escalated into a pamphlet war with the Jesuits: [?Arnauld], *Réponse au libelle intitulé Dom Pacifique d'Avranches, rempli d'erreurs et de calomnies, contre la...memoire de feu Monseigneur l'évesque de Bellay, composé et distribué par les Iesuites, en l'an 1654* (Lyons, 1654): the work is discussed in Arnauld, *Œuvres*, ii, pp. LXXI-LXXIV.

<sup>56</sup> E.g. BL Add. MS 78632, f. 30r.; Allestree S.1.25(9); White (ed.), *A Catalogue of Books*, p. 84.

<sup>57</sup> We note with interest that Gibbon, though not specifying whether in French or English, claimed to have read the *Provinciales* 'almost every year' and modelled his satirical style thereon: *Memoirs of My Life*, ed. Betty Radice (1990), p. 100.

éloquente qu'édifiante et solide'.<sup>58</sup> Other notable works included the Sorbonnist Nicolas Perrault's 'encyclopédique' *Morale des Jésuites extraite fidèlement de leurs livres*,<sup>59</sup> composed around the time of the *Provinciales*, which would be published in English in 1670;<sup>60</sup> a lengthy compilation, under the title *La Théologie Morale des Iesuites, et Nouveaux Casuistes*, of the many writings, decrees and censures which had appeared against 'Jesuit morality' up to the time of the *Apology for the Casuists*;<sup>61</sup> and the complement to Perrault's *Morale des Jésuites*, *La Morale Pratique des Jésuites*, which appeared in 1669 and was also swiftly translated into English.<sup>62</sup>

Although these works were essentially polemical they nevertheless implied the religious sensibility and programme of reform disseminated in the constructive works of Saint-Cyran and Arnauld, and it is possible to suggest that these positive or constructive aspects of the Jansenist critique continued to engage English interest. The famous moral essays of 'l'une des plus belles plumes de l'Europe', Pierre Nicole, were read in England, as were the arguably even more influential *Réflexions morales* of Pasquier Quesnel.<sup>63</sup> Similarly Pascal was increasingly recognised as a keen psychologist and religious philosopher on account of his *Pensées*, which first appeared, in abridged form, in 1670, and were translated

---

<sup>58</sup> See e.g. White (ed.), *A Catalogue of Books*, p. 142; *Bibliotheca Burnetiana*, p. 7; *Morley's Catalogue*, f. 97; quote is Antoine Arnauld, *Phantosme du Jansénisme, ou Justification des Pretendus Jansénistes par le livre mesme d'une Savoiard Docteur de Sorbonne leur nouvel accusateur; intitulé Les Préjugez légitimes contre le Jansénisme* (Cologne, 1686), p. 4. Stillingfleet quoted Nicole's third note on the third *Provinciale* in *A Sermon preached before the King ... March 7, 1679* (1679), pp. 51-2.

<sup>59</sup> Mons [Amsterdam], 1667; quoted Gay, *Morales en conflit*, p. 283.

<sup>60</sup> See e.g. White (ed.), *A Catalogue of Books*, p. 100; on the English translation below, p. 92; on the original work, Gay, *Morales en conflit*, pp. 283-6.

<sup>61</sup> Allestree S.1.14: *La Théologie Morale des Jésuites, et Nouveaux Casuistes: Représentée par leur Pratique, et par leurs livres: condamnée, il y a déjà long-temps par plusieurs Censures, Decrets d'Universitez, et Arrests de Cours Souverains: Nouvellement combattie par les Curez de France; et censurée par un grand nombre de Prelats, et par des Facultés de Théologie Catholiques* (Cologne, 1667).

<sup>62</sup> White (ed.), *A Catalogue of Books*, p. 100; on the English translation below, p. 92; on the original work, Gay, *Morales en conflit*, pp. 286-8.

<sup>63</sup> Quote Bayle, *Dictionnaire Historique et Critique*, s. n. Nicole. The first volume of the *Essais* appeared in 1671. English owners included Allestree S.3.3-5 (vols. 1-3, 1675-76); Barrow, Bodl., Rawl. MS D. 878, f. 54v.; Stillingfleet, White (ed.), *A Catalogue of Books*, p. 134; *ibid.* for Quesnel's *Réflexions morales*.

into English in 1688 by one of Robert Boyle's acquaintance, and afterwards in 1704 by Basil Kennet.<sup>64</sup>

\*

Our concern here is principally with English knowledge of the Jansenist critique of contemporary moral theology, but the influential work of the Port-Royalists in other spheres such as apologetics, pedagogy, and scriptural and liturgical scholarship also contributed significantly to English awareness. There is space here to mention some of the more important works to engage attention across the channel.

The defensive campaign against the 'domestic enemies' of the Church (the Jesuits) which occupied Jansenist apologists in the 1640s and 1650s was extended in the 1660s to the 'external' enemy of Protestantism. The attitude towards the eucharist exemplified in Arnauld's *Fréquente communion*, with its emphasis on the faith and obedience of the receiver, rendered the Port-Royalists vulnerable to the charge of crypto-Calvinism.<sup>65</sup> In answering this charge they elaborated their own conception of Catholicism. For Arnauld, the more distinctly the idea of Christ's real presence on the altar could be impressed, the more stringently could the real sacrifice on the part of the faithful receiver be conceived. Numerous important works on this subject appeared, mostly written against the Huguenot pastors of Charenton and especially their most active polemicist, Jean Claude. These included the *Tradition de l'Eglise touchant l'Eucharistie* (Paris, 1661), a series of patristic gobbets concerning the real presence which composed the major part of the *Office du Saint-Sacrement* designed for the use of the nuns of Port-Royal;<sup>66</sup> in 1664 *La Perpetuité de la Foy Catholique touchant l'Eucharistie, avec la Réfutation de l'écrit d'une Ministre contre ce*

---

<sup>64</sup> Ed. de Port-Royal, Paris, 1670. See e.g. White (ed.), *A Catalogue of Books*, p. 142 (3<sup>rd</sup> ed., Paris, 1671); *Bibliotheca Burnetiana*, p. 42 (ed. 1701); the subject of the *Pensées* is treated by Barker, *Strange Contrarieties*: see chs. 2-4 on the later Stuart period.

<sup>65</sup> Cf. Robin Briggs, 'The catholic puritans', in his *Communities of Belief*, pp. 340-1.

<sup>66</sup> The *Office* included an interesting preface where Arnauld justified the use of the vernacular by reference to the spirit of the Church, who wants her children to be nourished by her prayers, in contrast to her custom which, obliging to the use of Latin for public prayers, attenuates this end.

*Traité*, which denied on historical grounds that the doctrine of the real presence was ever regarded as an innovation;<sup>67</sup> and from 1669 to 1674 an expanded version of this work in three monumental volumes, known as ‘la grande’ *Perpetuité*. Similar arguments were carried forward in Nicole’s *Préjugez legitimes contre les Calvinistes* of 1671, and Arnauld’s *Réponse Générale au Livre de M. Claude* of 1672. In another significant work of 1672, *Le Renversement de la Morale de Jésus Christ par les erreurs des Calvinistes touchant la Justification*, Arnauld set out to show that Calvinist dogma destroyed Christian morality.

These works of the Port-Royalists against the Huguenots of Charenton can be found in many English libraries.<sup>68</sup> There were points of inherent interest – the discussion of patristic witnesses, for example, at a time when, if we are to believe Burnet, the Church of England had no very well-defined position on the eucharistic presence.<sup>69</sup> Of interest too were the arguments over the confession of the oriental churches which followed Arnauld’s assertion of the unity of west and east in the doctrine of the real presence.<sup>70</sup> The Church of England possessed, in the archdeacon of Northumberland, an important witness in this matter: Isaac Basire had travelled widely in the east as an Anglican apostle in the 1640s and 1650s, thus acquiring ‘a reputation as an authority on eastern matters’.<sup>71</sup> Basire never had the time to

---

<sup>67</sup> For the bibliographical history of this work see Arnauld *Œuvres*, xii, pp. i-lvi; Pierre Nicole/Antoine Arnauld, *La Perpetuité de la Foy de l’Eglise Catholique touchant l’Eucharistie. Avec la Réfutation de l’écrit d’un Ministre contre ce Traité* (4<sup>th</sup> ed., Paris, 1666), pp. 1-37.

<sup>68</sup> E.g. Cosin (DUL): la ‘petite’ *Perpetuité* (ed. 1666), and Claude’s *Réponse* (1666); la ‘grande’ *Perpetuité*, t. 1 (1669); Allestree: la ‘petite’ *Perpetuité* (ed. 1666), Ch. Ch. Lib., Oxf., Allestree O.8.12; la ‘grande’ *Perpetuité*, t. 1 & t. 2, Allestree N.3.9; *Le Renversement de la Morale*, Allestree S.1.19; *Réponse Générale au Livre de Claude*, Allestree O.8.10; *La Créance de l’Eglise Grecque*, Allestree S.4.21; Perinchief: la ‘grande’ *Perpetuité*, t. 1, Bodl. MS Rawl. D. 878, f. 62v.; Stillingfleet: la ‘petite’ *Perpetuité* (1666); la ‘grande’ *Perpetuité*, 2t. (1674); *Le Renversement de la Morale* (1672); *La Créance de l’Eglise Grecque* (1672), White (ed), *A Catalogue of Books*, pp. 137, 7; Morley: la ‘petite’ *Perpetuité* (1666); la ‘grande’ *Perpetuité* (1669); Claude’s *Réponse à la perpetuité...de M. Arnauld* (1666) and the *Réponse à M. Arnauld* (1670), *Morley’s Catalogue*, ff. 117, 125; Tillotson, Claude’s *Réponse à la perpetuité* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed., 1671), *Bibliotheca Tillotsonia*, p. 85.

<sup>69</sup> Burnet, *History*, i, pp. 134-5, on the modish fudge current at Court concerning the ‘most unconceivable manner’ of Christ’s real presence; cf. C. W. Dugmore, *Eucharistic Doctrine in England from Hooker to Waterland* (1942), ch. 4.

<sup>70</sup> Originally broached in the first, ‘petite’, *Perpetuité: op. cit.* (4<sup>th</sup> ed., Paris, 1666), pp. 464f. This argument was apparently entirely the work of Arnauld and not Nicole: Arnauld, *Œuvres*, xii, p. xx.

<sup>71</sup> *ODNB*, s. n. ‘Basire’; quoted Colin Brennan, ‘The Life and Times of Isaac Basire’ (Unpublished Durham Ph.D., 1987), see pp. 235-7.

write up his materials properly, but his research became known.<sup>72</sup> Claude enlisted his support, as Basire reports in a letter to Evelyn of 1669,<sup>73</sup> and Basire was afterwards attacked by defenders of Arnauld, and directly by Nicole and Arnauld in ‘la grande’ *Perpetuité*.<sup>74</sup> Burnet, for one, felt that ‘M. Arnauld has said all that can be said in such a Cause’.<sup>75</sup>

The Jansenists’ eagerness to educate French Christians by publishing the historical content of the faith in the vernacular was part of a wider pedagogical and pastoral endeavour which in some respects mirrored the concerns of English churchmen.<sup>76</sup> The ‘Cartesianism’ of Port-Royal is not self-evident,<sup>77</sup> but Arnauld, a strident critic of the corrupt and corrupting philosophy of the schools, was an enthusiast for the new science.<sup>78</sup> Two of the works which rendered his name most famous among English-speaking intellectuals were those in which he clearly pinned his colours to its mast, the *Reasoned and General Grammar*, and the so-called *Port-Royal Logic*.<sup>79</sup> Produced with the collaboration of Claude Lancelot and Nicole, both these works make clear their affinity with Descartes, seeking to establish universal rules through a critical, rational method consisting in the accurate inference of more complex ideas

---

<sup>72</sup> See e.g. the description of his eastern travels sent to Sir Richard Browne in 1653: *CClarSP*, ii, pp. 228-9.

<sup>73</sup> BL Add MS 78683, no. 14: ‘I did, awhile agoe, returne unto Monsieur Claude, who undertakes Monsr Arnauld, a competent answer to his most materiall questions, wch he has received ... of this you may be assured, that I shall never be wanting to serve the Catholick church, especially at the Request of such as you ...’

<sup>74</sup> [Anselme de Paris], *La Créance de l’Eglise Grecque Touchant la Transubstantiation, défendue contre la Réponse du Ministre Claude au livre de Monsieur Arnaud* (Paris, 1672), bk. 3, ch. 7. This debate continued in both French and English, with Arnauld receiving support from the curious English Catholic Abraham Woodhead, in *The Greeks opinion touching the Eucharist misrepresented by Monsieur Claude in his answer to M. Nicole* (1686); and the opposite opinion from the eccentric French Protestant Jean Aymon, in *Monumens authentiques de la religion des grecs et de la fausseté de plusieurs confessions de foi des chrétiens orientaux* (La Haye, 1708), at p. 76.

<sup>75</sup> Burnet, *A relation of a conference*, pp. 114-15.

<sup>76</sup> On the famous ‘petites écoles’ of Port-Royal see Frédéric Delforge, *Les Petites Ecoles de Port-Royal 1637-1660* (Paris, 1985).

<sup>77</sup> The association was made, for example, by the Huguenot Pierre Jurieu, *La politique du clergé de France* (n.p., 1681), pp. 107-8, and certainly by the authorities; see Henri Gouhier, *Cartésianisme et Augustinisme au XVIIe Siècle* (Paris, 1978), pp. 81f.; Tad M. Schmaltz, ‘What Has Cartesianism to Do with Jansenism?’, *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 60, 1 (1999), pp. 37-56. Cf. Gouhier, ‘La Crise de la Théologie au Temps de Descartes’, printed in his *La Pensée Religieuse de Descartes* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., Paris, 1972); Geneviève Rodis-Lewis, ‘Augustinisme et cartésianisme à Port-Royal’, in E. J. Dijksterhuis et al. (eds.), *Descartes et le cartésianisme hollandais* (Paris, 1950); Steven Nadler, ‘Cartesianism and Port-Royal’, *The Monist*, 71, 4 (1988), pp. 573-84.

<sup>78</sup> Lewis, ‘Augustinisme et cartésianisme’, p. 148; Gouhier, *Cartésianisme et Augustinisme*, pp. 137-8.

<sup>79</sup> *Grammaire Générale et Raisonnée* (1660); *La Logique, ou L’Art de Penser* (1662).

from those which are simple and can be clearly and distinctly grasped.<sup>80</sup> They were highly influential in England as well as in France.<sup>81</sup>

It is interesting that the Port-Royal theologians were slurred with Cartesian rationalism, since they are usually characterised, in contrast to the rationalist, speculative theological mode of the Jesuits, as anti-rationalist and, as it were, historicist in outlook. In fact the Jansenist programme, being resolved from an argument about grace into a framework for moral and pastoral theology, was strongly intellectualist in shape. Despite the anti-rationalist rhetoric of some of its proponents, it articulated an essentially Platonist outlook, looking for the progress of the rational soul or mind, freed from the uncertainties of the sensible world, towards the unity which is its origin. Its criticisms and recommendations in relation to contemporary theology and praxis aimed at establishing those conditions which could promote, and altering or effacing those which inhibit the acquisition of this veridical type of science.<sup>82</sup> In undertaking their great enterprise of scriptural and liturgical scholarship, the gentlemen of Port-Royal were realising the ambition implicit in their theological critique, to lead individual Christians out of the cave. This work was also bound to make an impression on English Protestants, standing proudly as they did on ‘the Bible and the Bible only’.

From 1653 to 1693 Port-Royal produced a new translation of the whole of the Bible, with notes and ‘les grandes explications’; a French edition of the Vulgate; works on biblical history, chronology, and geography; and liturgical materials, including the book of hours

---

<sup>80</sup> See e.g. *The Art of Thinking. Port-Royal Logic*, tr. James Dickoff and Patricia James (Indianapolis-New York-Kansas City, 1964), p. 7; Bernard Roy, ‘Reasoned Grammar, Logic and Rhetoric at Port-Royal’, *Philosophy and Rhetoric*, 32, 2 (1999), pp. 131-45.

<sup>81</sup> The *Logic* was taught at Oxford and Cambridge in the nineteenth century, *Logic*, tr. Dickoff and James, Introduction. Some examples of ownership among English churchmen are: Allestree, Ch. Ch. Lib., Allestree S.6.1 [*La Logique, ou L’Art de Penser*], Allestree d.7.23(1) [*Grammaire Générale et Raisonnée*]; Allestree d.6.3 [*Nouvelle méthode pour apprendre facilement la langue latine*] - Barlow, Bodl., 8vo. H 96 Linc. [*La Logique*]; Barrow, Bodl. MS Rawl. D. 878, fo. 54v. [*La Logique*], cf. Perinchief, *ibid.*, fo. 65v. [*La Logique, Nouvelle méthode pour ... latine*]; Stillingfleet, *A Catalogue*, p. 109 [*Nouvelle méthode pour apprendre ... la langue latine* (1667), *Nouvelle méthode pour apprendre ... la langue grecque* (1656)]; Burnet, *Bibliotheca Burnetiana*, p. 8 [*Ars Cogitandi*].

<sup>82</sup> Cf. ch. 1, above, and ch. 4, below.

called *L'Office de l'Eglise*, and *L'Office du Saint-Sacrement* discussed above.<sup>83</sup> The Tridentine missal was published in French in 1660 by an associate of Port-Royal, Joseph de Voisin, and the ordinary of the mass was often controversially appended to Port-Royalist writings. In 1688 Nicolas Le Tourneux would publish the entire Roman breviary in French.<sup>84</sup> A less restrictive attitude towards the vernacular dissemination of scriptural and liturgical materials prevailed in France than in southern Europe, but the Port-Royalists outstripped the standard French position in arguing that knowledge of scripture and the prayers of the Church was, more than a right, 'un *devoir*'.<sup>85</sup> 'Elle [scripture] s'offre à tous, et elle se proportionne à tous ... tous y puisent indifféremment'.<sup>86</sup> This attitude put them beyond the pale of conservative Catholic opinion, and made it impossible to secure in France the requisite approbations and privileges necessary to print the New Testament in 1667; it was imprinted by the Protestant Elzeviers of Amsterdam under the name of Gaspard Migeot of Mons, with a privilege from the king of Spain.<sup>87</sup>

The *Mons* Testament made a considerable impact in England. Robert Boyle, for example, intending to sponsor an Irish Testament through the press, had the Jansenist

---

<sup>83</sup> See Bernard Chédozeau, 'La Publication de L'Ecriture par Port-Royal: Première Partie: 1653-1669', *CPR*, 33 (1984); *idem*, 'La Publication de L'Ecriture par Port-Royal: Deuxième Partie: L'Ancien Testament de la "Bible de Sacy" – 1672-1693', *ibid.*, 35 (1986).

<sup>84</sup> *Idem*, *La Bible et la Liturgie en Français. L'Eglise tridentine et les traductions bibliques et liturgiques* (Paris, 1990) pp. 117f.; *idem*, *Port-Royal et la Bible. Un siècle d'or de la Bible en France 1650-1708* (Paris, 2007), pp. 82-3; see chs. 7-12 on the *Biblia Sacra* (the edition of the Vulgate produced by Lancelot) and other works of chronology and geography; and ch. 14 on the new Port-Royal translation of 1662 of the *Imitation de Jésus-Christ*. For a portrait of le Tourneux from a nineteenth-century Tractarian perspective see Morgan, *Port-Royal*, pp. 74-81.

<sup>85</sup> The norm in France was established by the fourth 'regula' of the *Index*, promulgated with the bull *Dominici gregis* in 1564: any putative lay reader must obtain a written permission from a clergyman, given only when his 'capacity' to read such texts without danger is established. See Chédozeau, *La Bible et la Liturgie*, pp. 11-44; *idem*, 'Les grandes étapes de la publication de la Bible catholique en français du concile de Trente au XVIIIe siècle', in J-R. Armogathe, dir., *Le Grand Siècle et la Bible* (Paris, 1989), pp. 341-60.

<sup>86</sup> Louis-Isaac Lemaistre de Sacy, Préface, in *Le Nouveau Testament de Nostre Seigneur Jésus Christ, Traduit en François Selon l'édition Vulgate, avec les différences du Grec* (Mons [Amsterdam], 1667), sigs. ii, v., vi, r. (my emphasis). Cf. F. Ellen Weaver, 'Scripture and Liturgy for the Laity: The Jansenist Case for Translation', *Worship*, 59 (1985), pp. 510-21; *eadem*, 'The Bible and Port-Royal', *Citeaux*, 41, 1-2 (1990), pp. 66-100.

<sup>87</sup> Frédéric Delforge, *La Bible en France et dans la Francophonie. Histoire, Traduction, Diffusion* (Paris, 1991), pp. 129-32; L. de Saily, *Étude Bibliographique du Nouveau Testament de Port-Royal, dit de Mons et des impressions du Libraire Migeot de 1664 à 1703*, Société des Bibliophiles Belges, no. 36 (Mons, 1926), pp. 12-36.

example in mind.<sup>88</sup> Boyle consulted with various clerical friends in London, and was advised that de Sacy's preface would be an ideal introduction to the Irish Testament. As he wrote to Henry Jones, bishop of Meath, in April 1681,

the most intelligent divine I have advised with here about it is earnest to have the Preface that the Jansenists have premis'd to their translation of the New Testament, which being a piece of great learning and piety and much esteemed by the better sort of Romanists themselves, 'tis judged that if it be publish'd in English ... it may very much recommend the Introduction of the Irish Testament to the better sort of Papists themselves.<sup>89</sup>

The translator Andrew Sall, an ex-Jesuit, professed himself 'not a little joyed to hear so great an advance to right made in the Romish church as to suffer the word of God to come out in the vulgar tongue'.<sup>90</sup> The 'intelligent divine' was most likely one of Stillingfleet, Barlow of Lincoln, or Burnet, all close to Boyle and equally well-informed about the Jansenists. Stillingfleet possessed both of Arnauld's major defences of the *Mons* Testament.<sup>91</sup> Their common friend Evelyn possessed the 1672 edition of the Testament itself.<sup>92</sup> Other works relating to the controversy were also owned by various churchmen in the period.<sup>93</sup>

---

<sup>88</sup> Boyle, who was Governor of the Company for the Propagation of the Gospel in New England in his later years, also contributed to a catechism and a New Testament in Turkish, and for a similar design intended by the East India Company – see Gilbert Burnet, *A Sermon Preached at the Funeral of the Honourable Robert Boyle: At St Martin's in the Fields, January 7 1691/2* (1692), pp. 26-8.

<sup>89</sup> Boyle, *Correspondence*, iv, p. 249. Cf. R. E. W. Maddison, 'Robert Boyle and the Irish Bible', *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, 41, 1 (1958), pp. 81-101.

<sup>90</sup> Boyle, *Correspondence*, iv, p. 219.

<sup>91</sup> Cf. Edward Stillingfleet, *The Doctrines and Practices of the Church of Rome Truly Represented; In Answer to a Book Intituled, A Papist Misrepresented, and Represented, &c.* (1686), pp. 138-9. Arnauld's works were, with Nicole, *Défense de la Traduction du Nouveau Testament imprimé à Mons (contre les sermons du P. Mainbourg Iesuite)* (Paris, 1668/9); and the *Nouvelle Défense de la traduction du Nouveau Testament imprimé à Mons, contre le livre de M. Mallet ...* (Cologne, 1682). The whole controversy is treated at length in the préfaces historiques to tomes VI-VIII of Arnauld, *Œuvres*. B. Chédozeau is preparing a monograph on the subject.

<sup>92</sup> BL Add. MS 78632, f. 35r. So did Morley, *Morley's Catalogue*, f. 126.

<sup>93</sup> E.g. the first *Défense* by Allestree, Ch. Ch. Lib., Allestree S.3.16; also *Recueil de diverses pièces publiées pour la traduction du Nouveau Testament, imprimée à Mons: contre ceux qui en ont interdit l'usage, ou combattu les passages ...* (Cologne [Paris], 1669), in Allestree S.3.17, S.2.20; also WN 7.6-8 in the Wake bequest. Allestree also invested in de Sacy's translation of the Old Testament as it appeared in the 1670s, including 1 & 2 Kings, Proverbs, Isaiah, and Ecclesiastes. Stillingfleet had the original *Défense* and the *Nouvelle Défense* of 1682, and *L'Evesque de Cour opposé à L'Evesque Apostolique: Entretiens sur l'ordonnance de*

The question of vernacular scripture was intimately tied up with that of the pastoral and liturgical reform pursued by some Jansenist or Jansenist-sympathising ecclesiastics. The ‘Augustinian’ school of ecclesiastical reformers influenced by Bérulle and Saint-Cyran, seeking to form a new learned clergy and to renew the spiritual lives of the souls under their care on the primitive model, emphasised universal active participation.<sup>94</sup> This encouraged a movement to recover the proper liturgical traditions of the French Church; most of the important examples of these ‘neo-Gallican’ liturgies were produced with some Jansenist involvement.<sup>95</sup> One cognate work was highly influential, and became well-known in England: this was the *Rituel d’Alet* of Nicolas Pavillon, the rigorist bishop of Alet, produced in collaboration with Arnauld and Martin de Barcos, nephew of Saint-Cyran. The *Ritual* was a detailed catechetical programme designed to school the lay Christian conscience through the auspices of an educated and disciplined clergy.<sup>96</sup> It spread throughout France;<sup>97</sup> and it was possessed, along with similar documents relating to the diocesan administration of other reforming bishops, by numerous English churchmen, who were exercised by identical aspirations – exemplified in Burnet’s *Discourse of the Pastoral Care* of 1692 – after discipline and education.<sup>98</sup> Similarly the pastoral letters of the rigorist reforming bishop Antoine Godeau were translated and published by Basil Kennet in 1700.<sup>99</sup>

---

*l’Evesque d’Amiens contre la Traduction du Nouveau Testament à Mons* (Cologne, 1674), *A Catalogue*, pp. 8, 17, 18.

<sup>94</sup> L. Pérouas, ‘La Pastorale Liturgique au XVIIe siècle’, *Mélanges de Science Religieuse*, 23, 1 (1966), pp. 30-44; Joseph Bergin, *Church, Society and Religious Change in France, 1580-1730* (New Haven-London, 2009), chs. 7-9; Taveneaux, *Le Catholicisme*, t. 1, pp. 115-22, 145-221.

<sup>95</sup> H. Leclercq, ‘Liturgies Néo-Gallicanes’, in Fernand Cabrol (ed.), *Dictionnaire d’archéologie chrétienne et liturgie*, 15 vols. in 30 (Paris, 1907-53), t. IX, cols. 1636-1729; Quantin, *Le Catholicisme classique*, pp. 493-503; F. Ellen Weaver, ‘The Neo-Gallican Liturgies Revisited’, *Studia Liturgica*, 16, 314 (1986/87), pp. 54-72; cf. *eadem*, ‘Liturgy for the Laity: The Jansenist Case for Popular Participation in Worship in the seventeenth and eighteenth Centuries’, *ibid.*, 19, 1 (1989), pp. 46-59; *eadem*, ‘Contribution des Port-Royalistes aux Liturgies Néo-Gallicanes’, *CPR*, 35 (1986).

<sup>96</sup> Paul Broutin, *La Réforme Pastorale en France au XVIIe Siècle*, 2 vols. (Tournai, 1956), ii, pp. 399-411. Pavillon also established and personally superintended a small seminary: manuscripts relating to its organisation are discussed by Bernard Chédozeau, ‘La formation du clergé à Alet pendant l’épiscopat de Nicolas Pavillon (1639-1677)’, *CPR*, 32 (1983).

<sup>97</sup> Weaver, ‘Liturgy for the Laity’, pp. 50-53; Jean Dubu, ‘Le Rituel d’Alet’, *CPR*, 32 (1983).

<sup>98</sup> E.g. John Cosin had the *Rituel de Alet* (DUL); Stillingfleet had works of Godeau, including *Homélies sur Dimanches et Festes de l’année* (Paris, 1682) and his *Discours sur les Ordres Sacrés* (Paris, 1658); also a

Burnet provides a fitting conclusion to our survey:

Nor is the Learning of the *Gallican* Church that for which they are chiefly to be esteemed: It must also be acknowledged, that from the study of the Ancient Fathers many of them seem to have derived a great measure of their Spirit ... They have endeavoured not only to discover the corruptions in Morality and Casuistical Divinity, and many other abuses in the Government of the Church, but have also infused in their Clergy a greater Reverence for the Scriptures, a deeper sense of the Pastoral Care, and a higher value for Holy Orders, than had appeared among them for divers Ages before ... There are many things among them highly Imitable, and by which they are a great reproach to others, who have not studied to copy after these patterns they have set them. The World will be forever bound to Honour the Names of *Godeau, Paschall, Arnauld*, and the Author of the Essays of Morality.<sup>100</sup>

---

*Recueil des pièces publiées en l'affaire des Evêques d'Alet, de Pamiers, de Beauvais, & d'Angers, qui ont été poursuivis pour avoir distingué le fait du droit dans leur mandemens sur la signature du formulaire envoyé par le Pape Alexandre VIII* (Cologne, 1669), and a *Lettre* of Pavillon of Alet to Hardouin Péréfixe, Archbishop of Paris, published at Cologne, 1683: *A Catalogue*, pp. 88, 97, 137; Morley had the *Statuts Synodaux du Diocèse d'Alet* (1675), *Morley's Catalogue*, f. 126; Allestree had a great many documents relating to the diocesan rule of the Jansenist-sympathising bishops Pavillon of Alet, Henri Arnauld of Angers, Nicolas Choart de Buzenval of Beauvais, Godeau of Grasse, as well as to the Formulary affair and that of Pirot's *Apologie pour les Casuistes*: for example the *Catechisme* of Henri Arnauld, the *Statuts synodaux du diocèse d'Alet*, and political and pastoral letters touching the formulary and the *Apologie* by Godeau, Arnauld, Pavillon, and de Buzenval; as well more general matter on French ecclesiastical life, such as the *Procez verbaux de L'Assemblée Générale du clergé de France* for 1655, 1656, 1665 and 1666, or *Des iugemens canoniques des évêques* (1671), all in the Allestree bequest, Ch. Ch. Lib.

<sup>99</sup> Kennet, *Pastoral Instructions and Meditations ... Recommended to the Clergy of His Diocese by Antony Godeau, Bishop of Grasse and Vence* (1700).

<sup>100</sup> Gilbert Burnet, *The letter writ by the last Assembly General of the Clergy of France ... translated into English, and examined* (1683), Preface.

## 2) The Origins of the Jansenist Translations

Anglican writers of this period had, therefore, measured the significance of contemporary debates in the country where many of them found asylum during the 1640s and 1650s. But readers did not need to be familiar with French books in order to understand the issues at stake. The remainder of this chapter describes how they reached an Anglophone audience, and begins to assess what opinions were entertained as to the relevance and potential application of these debates.

\*

The *Lettres Provinciales*, which made a profound impression in France, having been circulated in unusually large numbers despite the dangers involved in their production, were translated almost immediately in 1656-57 as *Les Provinciales: or, The Mystery of Jesuitism*.<sup>101</sup> This was available in England by August 31<sup>st</sup> 1657 at the latest, Pascal's final letter having appeared on March 24<sup>th</sup>, and was presumably worked up as the letters came out in France.<sup>102</sup> In 1658 there followed the *Additional to the Mystery of Jesuitism Englished by the same hand*. This laid out the apparently unanimous condemnation of the *Apology for the Casuists* and the maxims it defended among the diocesan clergy of France. It included various requests, letters and factums of the pastors of Paris and Rouen against Pirot's work, and the judgment passed against it by the Paris theology faculty, as well as extracts from the lists of 'dangerous propositions' produced as accessories to the outcry. Many of these pieces would later appear in the large collection entitled *La Théologie Morale des Jésuites, et*

---

<sup>101</sup> *MJ*.

<sup>102</sup> *A Catalogue of the pamphlets, books, newspapers and manuscripts* collected by George Thomason, 2 vols. (1908), ii, p. 191; Clark, p. 103.

*Nouveaux Casuistes*, published in 1667.<sup>103</sup> A second edition of the *Lettres* themselves was also produced in 1658, with the *Additional*s and another four occasional pieces appended. These were among ‘the most vendible books’ at the time.<sup>104</sup> A separate work, also available in 1658, *A further Discovery of the Mystery of Jesuitism*, was another series of translations, mainly of pieces by the French Jesuit Pierre Jarrige, who had briefly apostatised to the reformed religion and carried on a struggle with the Society while resident in Leiden between 1647 and 1650. These writings did not possess the topical interest of the previous collections, being general fulminations against the Jesuits which concentrated predominantly on their sinister politics, cruelty and ambition.<sup>105</sup> In 1659 another topical work did appear, *A Journall of all Proceedings between the Jansenists and the Jesuits*, a translation of the *Septième écrit des Curez de Paris, ou Journal de tout ce qui s’est passé tant à Paris que dans les Provinces de France, sur le sujet de la Morale et de l’Apologie des Casuistes depuis le commencement de l’an 1656 iusqu’en Feurier 1659*.<sup>106</sup> In 1662 Arnauld’s short work, *La Nouvelle Hérésie des Jésuites* was ‘translated out of the French original’ as *The New Heresy of the Jesuits*.<sup>107</sup> This was reproduced in 1664 together with a translation of Pierre Nicole’s *Lettres de l’Hérésie Imaginaire* (that is, Jansenism), the recent Gallican declaration of the Sorbonne touching papal infallibility, and extracts, accompanied by ideological glosses, of various letters and other pieces ‘relating to this Abominable mystery’ of Jesuitism.<sup>108</sup> Nicole’s 1662

---

<sup>103</sup> *La Théologie Morale des Jésuites, et Nouveaux Casuistes: Représentée par leur Pratique, et par leurs Livres* (Cologne, 1667).

<sup>104</sup> William London, *A catalogue of the most vendible books in England orderly and alphabetically digested...* (1657), p. 123.

<sup>105</sup> *A further Discovery of the Mystery of Jesuitism in a Collection of severall pieces representing the Humours, Designs, and Practices of those who call themselves the Society of Jesus* (1658), preface.

<sup>106</sup> *A Journall of all Proceedings between the Jansenists, and the Jesuits: From the first coming abroad of the Provincial Letters to the Publication of the Censures of the Clergy of France, and Theological Faculty of Paris passed upon a book entituled An Apology for the Casuists. Together with the Censure itself of the said Faculty. Publish’d by a Well-wisher to the distressed Church of England* (1659).

<sup>107</sup> Anon, *The new heresie of the Jesuits: publicly maintain’d at Paris in the Colledge of Clermont, by conclusions, printed 12. Decemb. 1661. Denounced to all the bishops of France. Translated out of the French original* (1662).

<sup>108</sup> [John Evelyn], *Μυστήριον της Ανομίας, That is, Another Part of the Mystery of Jesuitism: or, The New Heresie of the Jesuits, Publickly maintained at Paris ... Together with The Imaginary Heresie, in three Letters* (1664).

work *Les Pernicieuses conséquences de la nouvelle hérésie des Jésuites contre le Roy et contre l'Estat, par un advocat au Parlement*, was published in English translation in 1666.<sup>109</sup> Two more works of 1670 may be mentioned, one a translation of a tract, perhaps by Sébastien de Cambout de Pontchateau, sometime gardener at Port-Royal, entitled *The Moral Practice of the Jesuites demonstrated by many remarkable Histories of their Actions in all Parts of the World*;<sup>110</sup> the other a translation by Israel Tonge of Nicolas Perrault's *The Jesuits Morals*.<sup>111</sup> In 1679, with London in the grip of anti-Catholic fever after the specious discoveries of Titus Oates, the *Provincial Letters* or *Mystery of Jesuitism* was reissued, this time with the imprimatur of the bishop, Henry Compton. Another moment of paranoia saw it reprinted in 1744.<sup>112</sup>

Who was responsible for these translations, and with what purpose in mind? The first three works, that is the initial version of the *Provincial Letters*, the *Additional*s, and the *Further discovery*, were all anonymous. The *Journall of all Proceedings* was translated by 'H. H.', who also contributed a short preface, though without identifying himself any further. The 1662 translation of the *Nouvelle Hérésie* and the two later works of 1670 were also anonymous. Fortunately, however, it is possible to approach the question by way of the two translations produced in the mid-1660s, the *Imaginary Heresy* of 1664 and the *Pernicious Consequences* of 1666. For these were done by John Evelyn, that multifaceted traveller, diarist, writer, horticulturalist, numismatist, bibliophile, founding member of the Royal Society, and devout churchman. In his diary entry for January 2<sup>nd</sup> 1665 Evelyn recorded that 'this day was published by me that part of the Mystery of Jesuitism translated and collected by me, though without my name, containing the Imaginary Heresy, with four letters and other

---

<sup>109</sup> [John Evelyn], *The Pernicious Consequences of the New Heresie of the Jesuits against the King and the State. By an Advocate of Parliament* (1666).

<sup>110</sup> This may have been a collaborative work: see Gay, *Morales en conflit*, pp. 286-7.

<sup>111</sup> JM.

<sup>112</sup> Jansen, *De Blaise Pascal à Henry Hammond*, p. 57; Barker, *Strange Contrarities*, pp. 23-4.

pieces'.<sup>113</sup> The translation of Nicole's *Pernicious Consequences* which appeared the following year was also Evelyn's, and together the two works constitute 'The Mystery of Jesuitism, 2 parts, 8vo' which he included in the list he later drew up of his own works.<sup>114</sup> Proceeding from the strongest grounds of evidence to the weakest, that is from Evelyn's translations, to the *Journall* by 'H.H.', to the anonymous *Mystery of Jesuitism* series, it is possible to construct an outline of the parties responsible for the translations and of their motives.

### *Evelyn's Translations and Early Restoration Religious Politics*

Of the *Pernicious Consequences* Evelyn wrote to his friend John Wilkins, at this time vicar of St Lawrence Jewry in London and Secretary of the Royal Society, 'Sir, that I presume to send you the consequence of what I formerly published in English, on the controversy betwixt the Jesuits and the Jansenists, speaks rather my obedience to a command from that great person, than my abilities to have undertaken, or acquitted myself as I ought'.<sup>115</sup> The great person, we learn, was the Lord Chancellor, Edward Hyde the Earl of Clarendon, from whom the requirement came, through his son and occasional secretary, Henry, Lord Cornbury, to translate the work.<sup>116</sup> Evelyn addressed his prefaces to 'My Lord', and notified Cornbury upon completion of the first translation in 1664.<sup>117</sup> His time pressed in these years by a varied portfolio of public commitments, Evelyn was not exactly willing: as

---

<sup>113</sup> E.S. de Beer (ed.), *The Diary of John Evelyn*, 6 vols. (Oxford, 1955), iii, p. 393. Evelyn added 'Translated by John Evelyn' to the title page of his own copy – Geoffrey Keynes, *John Evelyn. A Study in Bibliophily with A Bibliography of his Writings* (Oxford, 1968), facing p. 126.

<sup>114</sup> Clark, p. 107n.

<sup>115</sup> William Bray (ed.), *Diary and Correspondence of John Evelyn, F. R. S.*, 4 vols. (1859-62), iii, p. 192.

<sup>116</sup> *Ibid.*, iii, pp. 149-50.

<sup>117</sup> de Beer (ed.), *Diary*, i, p. 431n.

he wrote to Cornbury on February 9<sup>th</sup> 1665, ‘being late come home, imagine me turning over your close printed memoirs’ – presumably collected materials illustrating the history of the controversy, of which some appeared with the *Imaginary Heresy* – ‘and shrinking up my shoulders; yet with a resolution of surmounting the difficulty animated with my Lord Chancellor’s and your Lordship’s commands, whom I am perfectly disposed to serve, even in the greatest drudgeries, to the translation of books’.<sup>118</sup>

Evelyn was a literary man who engaged in translation work – apart from his more famous rendering of Lucretius, he translated French works by Gabriel Naudé, Mazarin’s librarian, by Roland Fréart on architecture, and also by the *solitaire* d’Andilly on fruticulture. Even so, the decision to charge this essentially menial task upon a man so occupied as was Evelyn with official business and his own avocations is curious, and argues some more peculiar aptness in him. Evelyn, whose romantic tag ‘ἀπλανώς’, steady, or fixed, also describes his politics, was near the centre of the group of loyalist politicians and churchmen who worked steadily for the twin cause of church and crown after the civil wars, and at the restoration assumed high office and positions of influence.<sup>119</sup> He was married to the daughter of Sir Richard Browne, the English resident at Paris, whose embassy was the focal point for royalist exiles in that city, his chapel, presided over by John Cosin, constituting in a sense the last remaining visible remnant of the dismantled episcopal Church. Browne, like Evelyn, was firmly aligned with the counsels of royalists like Hyde, Secretary Edward Nicholas, and James Butler, later Duke of Ormond, who opposed political courses inimical to the integrity of that Church and her identity with her monarchical head.

---

<sup>118</sup> Bray (ed.), *Correspondence*, iii, p. 149.

<sup>119</sup> BL Add MS 15948: Letters from Evelyn to Sir Richard Browne, 1647-1649. Evelyn was during these years separated from his new wife Mary, Browne’s daughter.

Evelyn then was a friend and a trusted ally.<sup>120</sup> He had also other titles qualifying him for the work. He had travelled in France in the 1640s, and while in Paris contracted a personal acquaintance among the Port-Royalists. He visited the ‘Count de Lian Court’s palace’ in March 1644 to look at the ‘curiosities and pictures’, remarking the duke’s assiduous courtesy, and remembering the visit years later.<sup>121</sup> It was the Duc de Liancourt’s intimacy with Port-Royal which indirectly gave rise to the *Provinciales*, since it was on that account that an over-zealous confessor at Saint-Sulpice, refusing him absolution, provoked the famous letters of Arnauld and hence the Sorbonne trial in which Pascal intervened. Evelyn had also met, and formed an unflattering opinion of, Ludovic Stuart d’Aubigny, nephew and latterly a close friend of Charles II, who was raised in France among sympathisers of Port-Royal, and whose ecclesiastical career was coloured by his association with the Jansenist party.<sup>122</sup>

Evelyn sympathised with the Jansenists, looking on them as persecuted dissidents against papal tyranny. These ‘poor Jansenists’, he wrote, ‘charg’d with no less Crime than Heresie, for disowning’ the ‘pernicious doctrines’ of the papalist, king-killing Jesuits, ‘with the Church of England are the only Confessors amongst all the Christian professors now extant, that I could ever reade of or discover’.<sup>123</sup> It is Evelyn’s conviction, notwithstanding his fatigue, in the relevance of the Jansenist polemics to his own ideological commitments, which helps to explain Hyde’s selecting him for the work. ‘But why call I this a drudgery?’ he asked in writing to Cornbury: ‘who would not be proud of the service, in which I find God

---

<sup>120</sup> For Cornbury’s ‘esteem’ for him see Samuel Weller Singer (ed.), *The Correspondence of Henry Hyde, Earl of Clarendon and of his brother Laurence Hyde, Earl of Rochester*, 2 vols. (1828), i, pp. 250-1, 237-8.

<sup>121</sup> de Beer (ed.), *Diary*, ii, pp. 112-14; Bray (ed.), *Correspondence*, iii, p. 199, letter to Henry Howard of 1667.

<sup>122</sup> Clark, chs. 6-7.

<sup>123</sup> Evelyn, *Pernicious Consequences*, Preface: ‘Confessors’, presumably, in the sense of the early Christian confessors under persecution; Evelyn was accustomed to speak of his benighted Church in this register.

and the King concerned? ... Nor is it small in my esteem that God directs you to make use of me in anything which relates to the Church, though in my secular station'.<sup>124</sup>

What was the history of Hyde's own interest in these works? It seems both he and his ally Ormond quickly discerned the potential utility of the dissentient chorus now arisen in the Catholic fold, and therefore began to amass a collection of works brought forth by the controversy. Hyde had followed the affair at least since the time of *Cum occasione*, the papal bull of 1653 which condemned the Five Propositions. He saw 'divers little discourses printed against the bull' in that year.<sup>125</sup> Letters from Arnauld, concerning the formulary condemning the propositions enjoined on French ecclesiastics, and from Antoine Le Maistre on the bull *Ad sacram* of the hostile Pope Alexander VII (which ruled out Arnauld's attempt to stand on the *question de fait*), were translated and preserved among his papers.<sup>126</sup> J. C. Hayward has called attention to the Port-Royalist works catalogued in the library amassed by Hyde and his sons.<sup>127</sup>

Hyde's main informant in Paris was Richard Bellings. Bellings, later knighted, had been an influential figure among the confederate Catholics in 1640s Ireland, and was on very close terms with Ormond. After Cromwell's victory in Ireland he travelled to Paris where he lived throughout the 1650s under the assumed name of 'Mr. Kingstonn'.<sup>128</sup> Hyde called him a 'jewel', continuing to use him after the restoration to translate papers from European languages.<sup>129</sup> During these years Bellings knew men associated with the Jansenists. The 'Dr.

---

<sup>124</sup> Bray (ed.), *Correspondence*, iii, p. 151.

<sup>125</sup> *CClarSP*, ii, p. 224; cf. p. 265.

<sup>126</sup> Both translations are in the hand of John Nicholas, eldest son of Sir Edward Nicholas, to whom Hyde, in avuncular fashion, delivered numerous such literary and intellectual commissions during the period of exile. *CClarSP*, iii, pp. 292, 299-300; cf. *ibid.*, iv, pp. 411-12; Richard Ollard, *Clarendon and his Friends* (1987), p. 174.

<sup>127</sup> 'New Directions in Studies of the Falkland Circle', *The Seventeenth Century*, 2 (1987), at p. 40.

<sup>128</sup> *ODNB*, s. n. 'Bellings'.

<sup>129</sup> Ronald Hutton, *Charles the Second. King of England, Scotland, and Ireland* (Oxford, 1989), pp. 89, 215, 265. Cornbury thought him 'a very good man', and dined with him weekly in later years: Singer (ed.), *Correspondence of Henry Hyde*, i, p. 223; ii, index s.n. 'Bellings'.

Cologhon' he mentions, for example, was probably Dr. John Callaghan, also a confederate Catholic and a dependent of Ormond, who stayed at Port-Royal in retreat between 1647 and 1649, under the confessor who would oversee Pascal's conversion, Antoine Singlin.<sup>130</sup> In 1657 Bellings was sent by the king to Louvain to confer with Dr. John Sinnich, a theologian who had known Jansen and furnished the *Augustinus* with an approbation. Sinnich, a 'penetrating' critic of probabilism, was esteemed by Arnauld as an authority on grace. In 1655 Bellings went to Poland with Lord Muskerry, Ormond's brother-in-law, at the suggestion of Mère Angélique, who says Bellings translated the Latin version of *De la fréquente communion* into English, though this translation has never been discovered.<sup>131</sup> He certainly acquired numerous other Port-Royalist works.<sup>132</sup>

It is no surprise if Bellings did entertain genuine sympathies for the Jansenists: throughout his career he showed himself to be of that strain of Stuart Catholic sentiment which, looking for relief on the grounds of political loyalty, was willing to repudiate the jurisdictional claims of the papacy and to seek distance from less conciliatory co-religionists. He authored the Irish Remonstrance or Formulary of Loyalty of 1661, an oath based on an earlier formula devised by the Catholic convert and friend of Edward Hyde, Serenus Cressy, which aimed to establish the consistency of Catholic religion with political allegiance to a Protestant monarch.<sup>133</sup> It acknowledged the sovereign authority of Charles II in all civil and temporal affairs, renounced the pretensions of 'all foreign power, be it papal or princely, spiritual or temporal' to absolve his subjects of their allegiance, and execrated 'damnable and

---

<sup>130</sup> *CClarSP*, ii, p. 204; Clark, pp. 32f.

<sup>131</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 51-2, 60; quote is Jonsen and Toulmin, *The Abuse of Casuistry*, p. 172.

<sup>132</sup> BL S.C.295(2) [*A Catalogue of the Library of the Honourable Rich. Arundel Bealing Esq. (1725)*]: these included the *Logic*, the method for learning Latin, the *Instructions chrétiennes* of Saint-Cyran compiled by d'Andilly, 'la petite' and 'la grande' *Perpétuité de la Foy*, Nicole's 'moral and theological instructions', the *Pensées* in an edition of 1714, and 'le Nouveau Testam. du P. Quesnel, 8 vols. in 4, Paris, 1696' (pp. 8, 9, 11, 14, 17, 19, 21).

<sup>133</sup> Serenus Cressy, *Exomologesis, or, A faithfull narration of the occasion and motives of the conversion unto Catholique unity of Hugh-Paulin Cressy* (Paris, 1647), pp. 72-9. Hyde had known Cressy since the convivia at Great Tew in the 1630s.

wicked' doctrines including mental equivocation, tyrannicide, and the infallibility of the pope without the consent of the Church and even in matters of fact.<sup>134</sup> As its historian and supporter Peter Walsh, who had known and admired Jansen at Louvain and had French connections, made clear in his retrospective explanations, it was a document with considerable Gallican affinities. Ormond used it cynically to divide the Irish clergy against itself. When, however, he tried to press it, together with the Gallican articles of the Sorbonne, upon the Irish clergy in congregation in 1666, they deprecated the proposal as 'Jansenist'.<sup>135</sup>

The relevance of European Catholic affairs to the Irish clergy, who naturally had affiliations within the wider European church, meant Ormond was in receipt of pertinent materials from various sources.<sup>136</sup> Peter Talbot, for example, the future archbishop of Dublin, who was hostile to Jansenism and opposed the Gallican-sounding Remonstrance, sent Ormond 'the answer to the Jansenians calumnies against the Jesuits' from Brussels in August of 1656.<sup>137</sup> On the other hand Ormond patronised the Irish Jansenist O'Callaghan, who he proposed for an ill-fated mission to Rome to negotiate support for Charles in 1653. O'Callaghan was employed by Lord Muskerry, Ormond's brother-in-law, as tutor to his sons. Muskerry's daughter was a *pensionnaire* at Port-Royal, and he enjoyed the friendship and assistance of the Duc de Luynes, a firm friend to Port-Royal, and of its abbess, Mère Angélique. Muskerry experienced a profound renewal of faith upon reading Arnauld's *De la fréquente communion*: this was perhaps during his trip to Poland with Bellings, since Bellings

---

<sup>134</sup> Anne Creighton, 'The Remonstrance of December 1661 and Catholic Politics in Restoration Ireland', *Irish Historical Studies*, 34, 133 (2004), pp. 16-41.

<sup>135</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 39; Clark, p. 206.

<sup>136</sup> Many Irish seminarians received their training on the continent during this period. By the 1620s there were three religious houses in the city of Louvain which functioned as colleges for Irish students. Irish clergy are shown to have been coloured by this proximity to the traditions of Jansenist theology and Gallican ecclesiology prevalent at the institution in Thomas O'Connor, *Irish Jansenists 1600-70: religion and politics in Flanders, France, Ireland and Rome* (Dublin, 2008).

<sup>137</sup> *CClarSP*, iii, pp. 158, 174. This was possibly Fr Annat's *Eclaircissement de quelques difficultés morales touchant l'état présent du jansénisme*, the first Jesuit response to Pascal, which appeared between the fourth and fifth of the *Lettres*.

is supposed to have translated that work into English. Ormond himself later acquired Jansenist works, such as Arnauld's letters and his *Tradition de l'Eglise*.<sup>138</sup>

Bellings supplied both Hyde and Ormond with information on the Jansenist controversy. In February 1658, for example, he promised Hyde a copy of 'the apollogy, whereof I formerly writ'. This must have been the *Apology for the Casuists*, published in December 1657, which as Bellings or 'Kingstonn' recorded, 'makes a noise in the court and in the parliament'. 'I am promised a true narrative of the progresse it hath gone, and the contentions concerning it; and if I find it fitt to be sent in a letter, you may receive it the next poast'.<sup>139</sup> The 'narrative of ... the contentions concerning it' presumably consisted of the requests, letters, factums and censures which followed the appearance of the *Apology*, and which would see print in English translation in the *Mystery of Jesuitism* series. In August Bellings told Hyde, 'You will receive with these a sixt piece sett forth by the curats of Paris', that is the sixth of the *écrits des curés de Paris*, which upbraided the Jesuits for failing, in the *Sentiment des Jésuites sur le livre de l'Apologie des Casuistes* of 1658, to dissociate themselves from a work already condemned by the Sorbonne and the bishop of Orléans.<sup>140</sup> 'Certainly these late differences have been the occasion of much good', Bellings went on, indicating the direction of his sympathies:

all they write is edefying and excellent; and this admirable. This copy may be layd by unsullyed, to be added to the rest in the last volume of your books; and you, Mr. Sidnam, and your friends, may make use of that sent Mr. Sidnam, who lookes not after collections'.<sup>141</sup>

---

<sup>138</sup> Clark, pp. 33-53.

<sup>139</sup> Thomas Birch, *A collection of the state papers of John Thurloe, Esq; secretary, first, to the Council of State, and afterwards to the two Protectors, Oliver and Richard Cromwell*, 7 vols. (1742), vi, pp. 782-3.

<sup>140</sup> Printed in Récalde, *Écrits des Curés de Paris*, pp. 169-87.

<sup>141</sup> *Thurloe Papers*, vii, pp. 324-5.

‘Mr. Sidnam’ was the pseudonym used to designate Ormond; Bellings’s letter clearly indicates that a group of like-minded friends in the royal party were engaged in the collection of Jansenist works at the time of the storm created by Pascal’s letters.

Another of Hyde’s sources, or of Bellings’s, may have been d’Aubigny, as Clark conjectured.<sup>142</sup> D’Aubigny was close to the Hydes, and a man whose connections made him useful to the royal cause. He was a close friend, for example, of the renegade archbishop of Paris, the cardinal de Retz, with whom the royal party, through Ormond among others, carried on negotiations during 1658, hoping to persuade the cardinal to solicit Catholic support against the Cromwellian regime.<sup>143</sup> D’Aubigny was also an important figure in the attempts of the restored royalists to settle the question of English Catholicism in the early 1660s. It was to this end that, a proposal to make him bishop of Dunkirk, with jurisdiction over English Catholics, having failed, Bellings was sent to Rome in 1663 to secure him a cardinal’s hat. The mission was affected by complex political forces, but one of the ostensible reasons for its failure was the suspicion of Jansenism attaching to d’Aubigny.<sup>144</sup>

It is a question who, if not Ormond, was responsible for ‘looking after the collections’. One possibility is Sir Robert Moray or Murray, a fellow royalist and founding member of the Royal Society, who Evelyn noted, in his own copy of the work, had transmitted to him the French originals of the *Imaginary Heresy*. In the preface, on the other hand, Evelyn addressed ‘My Lord’ (Cornbury or Clarendon) regarding ‘the French copy you were pleased to consign to me’. Then again, Evelyn may have had his own supply. On the day the work was published he went to present it to Cornbury, but finding him absent, ‘I left it with my Lord your father, because I would not suffer it to be publiq till he had first seene it,

---

<sup>142</sup> Clark, p. 108.

<sup>143</sup> F. J. Routledge, ‘The Negotiations between Charles II and the Cardinal de Retz, 1658-1659’, *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 5<sup>th</sup> Series, 6 (1956), pp. 49-68.

<sup>144</sup> Clark, ch. 7; below, pp. 104-6.

who, on your Lp's score, has so just a title to it. The particulars which you will find added after the 4<sup>th</sup> letter' – including the censure of the Paris theology faculty concerning the Jesuits, and the sense of the French church concerning the pope's infallibility and power, 'lately declared by Authority', i.e. the Sorbonne— 'are extracted out of severall curious papers and passages lying by me, which for being very apposite to your controversy, I thought fit to annex, in danger otherwise to have never been produced'.<sup>145</sup> Evelyn, evidently conscientious in his desire to represent the controversy faithfully, had already interrupted printing, which began in November 1664, to insert the fourth of Nicole's letters, only published in France on June 19<sup>th</sup>.<sup>146</sup>

A final possibility for the custodian of the collection, if indeed there was only one, was the clergyman and royal agent Richard Allestree, also a friend of Evelyn's. Allestree's acquisitions reflect the impact of the *Provinciales*. Among his books is, for example, a home-made volume of miscellaneous pieces relevant to the controversy, bound up and given the handwritten title 'Tracts relating to controversies in the Church of France 1661'.<sup>147</sup> The contents are also handwritten in the front and back of the volume, which traces the controversy over casuistry through attacks, defences, and ecclesiastical censures from the time of the publication of Piro's *Apology for the Casuists*. The volume, indeed, looks very much like the sort of thing which would be produced by the corporate collecting endeavour adverted to by Bellings in his letter to Hyde of 1658. Four of the *Additional*s added to the second edition of the *Mystery of Jesuitism* were translations of works collected and eventually bound up together by Allestree: the 'Representation of the Curez of Paris to the Reverends the Curez of the other Dioceses of France' (Allestree S. 1. 25 [40]); 'A Catalogue of the Propositions contained in an Extract made of some of the most dangerous Propositions

---

<sup>145</sup> Quoted in Keynes, *John Evelyn*, pp. 124-5.

<sup>146</sup> de Beer (ed.), *Diary*, iii, p. 393n.; Clark, p. 107.

<sup>147</sup> Ch. Ch. Lib., Oxf., Allestree S.1.25.

of diverse late Casuists, in point of MORALITY, faithfully taken out of their Works' (S. 1. 25 [40.1]); 'A letter from a Curé of Rouen to a Curé in the Country, giving an account of the procedure of his Brethren the Curez of the said city, against the doctrine of certain Casuists' (S. 1. 25 [23]); and the 'Factum, or Remonstrance of the Curez of Paris' against the *Apology for the Casuists* (S. 1. 25 [34]).

\*

A group of influential royalists, then, connected by personal and ideological ties, collectively perceived some utility in the Jansenist case. Evelyn's prefaces indicate quite clearly what sort of idea Clarendon had about its relevance and application. Evelyn magnified the subversive doctrines of the Jesuits, who attribute to 'their Lord God the Pope' a personal infallibility even outside general councils and in matters of fact.<sup>148</sup> They vaunt his 'right of deposition and power' over kings, and therefore sponsor regicide.<sup>149</sup> The few 'sober Catholics' like 'Monsieur Arnaud' who 'deride these excesses' are rewarded with 'persecution'.<sup>150</sup> Next Evelyn turned to English Catholics. Any association with such doctrines, he told them, was incompatible with peaceful co-existence in the English state. Referring to the various representations made by English Catholics to the king and to parliament following the restoration, Evelyn charged 'those who of late lay at His Majesty's feet, out of that Religious pretence, the Tenderness of Conscience', with hypocrisy. 'What moral confidence can a Prince repose in the pretences of any who are thus sworn and addicted to [the Jesuits'] tenets?'<sup>151</sup>

---

<sup>148</sup> Here Evelyn was referring to the thesis defending this 'Christ-like infallibility' maintained at the Jesuit Collège de Clermont on December 12<sup>th</sup> 1661, attacked by Arnauld in his *Nouvelle Hérésie des Jésuites*, also translated by Evelyn.

<sup>149</sup> Evelyn cited the French experience with 'their darling Henry', and insinuated that the English regicides were also fired with Jesuit doctrines – a common anti-Catholic claim, cf. John Miller, *Popery and Politics in England, 1660-1688* (Cambridge, 1973), pp. 85-7.

<sup>150</sup> Evelyn, *Another Part of the Mystery of Jesuitism*, Preface; *Pernicious Consequences*, Preface.

<sup>151</sup> Evelyn, *Another Part*, sig. A4v.

Evelyn's rhetoric was carefully pointed. He implied that any who owned allegiance to the Catholic Church could not disavow the subversive Jesuit tenets. This deliberate confusion had a dual function. By fortifying, on the one hand, the negotiating position of the establishment to which the Catholics had to apply for relief – driving home the point, Evelyn implausibly premised such relief on the pope's forswearing his own power to depose kings and absolve oaths – the real price of moderation was plainly brought home to them: 'the sacrifice of that whole pragmatistical Order, which has thus set the world in Combustion'.<sup>152</sup>

Evelyn knew that 'divers of His Majesties loyal subjects' were in fact open to comparable terms. He was exploiting well-established tensions between the Jesuits and other elements of the community, especially the secular clergy, which had bedevilled English Catholicism since the late sixteenth century.<sup>153</sup> In particular he was speaking to an outlook which may loosely be termed Blackloist, from its inspiring genius Thomas White, *alias* Blacklo. The traditional objective of the secular clergy, whose ideas about ecclesiastical order and missionary strategy were affronted by the flexible organisation and vigorous mentality of the Jesuits, had been to secure from Rome confirmation of their right to elect a bishop to oversee the discharge of clerical functions in England.<sup>154</sup> The Blackloists went a step further than this 'appellant' tradition, caught between the Protestant government and the Curia, by bypassing Rome altogether. In 1647, with the secular clergy now administered by the English Chapter in the absence of bishop Richard Smith, a group including Blacklo, Henry Holden and Kenelm Digby prepared a bid for toleration under the Independents, intending to outflank an alliance of their co-religionists, including the Jesuits, who were carrying on parallel

---

<sup>152</sup> *Ib.* sigs. A5v.-A6r.

<sup>153</sup> The following paragraph draws on Bossy, *The English Catholic Community*, pp. 11-74; A. O. Meyer, *England and the Catholic Church under Queen Elizabeth*, tr. J. R. McKee (1916), ch. 4; M. A. Tierney, *Dodd's Church History of England*, 5 vols. (Farnborough, 1971 repr.), iii, pp. 39-56, v, pp. 8-93.

<sup>154</sup> Relevant materials printed in T. G. Law, *The Archpriest Controversy*, 2 vols. (Camden Soc., 2<sup>nd</sup> series, 56, 58, 1896, 1898); Michael Questier (ed.), *Newsletters from the Archpresbyterate of George Birkhead* (Camden Soc., 5<sup>th</sup> series, 12, 1998). On the controversy over episcopal 'approbation' following the eventual appointment of a bishop, see *idem* (ed.), *Newsletters from the Caroline Court*, and Anthony F. Allison's articles, cited ch. 1, above, n. 41.

discussions within the traditional parameters.<sup>155</sup> Their scheme guaranteed the allegiance of English Catholics by an episcopal hierarchy immune from Roman interference and equipped to exercise supervision over all laity and clergy, both secular and regular. All regular clergy would, on pain of banishment, acknowledge by oath that their faculties derived uniquely from the bishops. Both laity and clergy would likewise swear an oath of allegiance to be devised by the state.<sup>156</sup> This essentially Gallican scheme, indebted to ideas imbibed by its inventor Holden at Paris, left no room for the Jesuits. Indeed, the Blackloists bargained for toleration with the Roman identity of English Catholicism.

After the Interregnum the Chapter, in which the Blackloist faction now enjoyed considerable influence, especially through its secretary from 1653, John Sergeant, negotiated with the newly restored government of Charles II.<sup>157</sup> These negotiations were managed by Clarendon, charged, as the king's first minister, with realising Charles's desire to secure some form of toleration for his Catholic subjects.<sup>158</sup> Clarendon indicated approval of the idea that English Catholics should be governed by their own bishop, an important concession in that this long-cherished ambition had no hope of success unless Rome was sure it corresponded to the preferences of the English government.<sup>159</sup> Naturally such a bishop should be loyal and trustworthy; Clarendon promoted the bid to have his friend and the king's, d'Aubigny, made, first bishop of Dunkirk, then also a cardinal.<sup>160</sup>

---

<sup>155</sup> A good treatment is Allison, 'An English Gallican: Henry Holden (1596/7-1662), Part I (To 1648)', *RH*, 22 (1995), pp. 329f.; a recent one is Stefiana Tutino, *Thomas White and the Blackloists. Between Politics and Theology during the English Civil War* (Aldershot, 2008), pp. 44f.; Thomas Clancy, 'The Jesuits and the Independents: 1647', *Archivum historicum Societatis Iesu*, 40 (1971), pp. 67-90.

<sup>156</sup> Robert Pugh, *Blacklo's Cabal* [1680], ed. T. A. Birrell (Farnborough, 1970), pp. 31-3, 36-40.

<sup>157</sup> Beverley Southgate, "'White's Disciple': John Sergeant and Blackloism", *RH*, 24, 4 (1991), pp. 431-6.

<sup>158</sup> For the narrative of Charles's efforts towards toleration or indulgence see I. M. Green, *The Re-establishment of the Church of England 1660-1663* (Oxford, 1978), pp. 25-30; Miller, *Popery and Politics*, ch. 5; Robert Bosher, *The Making of the Restoration Settlement. The Influence of the Laudians 1649-1662* (New York, 1951), chs. 4-5; Ronald Hutton, *The Restoration. A Political and Religious History of England and Wales 1658-1667* (Oxford, 1986), pp. 161f.; discussion of Charles's personal religion in *idem*, *Charles the Second*, pp. 455-7.

<sup>159</sup> T. A. Birrell, 'English Catholics without a Bishop 1655-1672', *RH*, 4, 4 (1957-8), pp. 149-50.

<sup>160</sup> Clark, ch. 7.

D'Aubigny's candidature was calculated to please the most amenable of the government's Catholic interlocutors. Among the papers presented, in mid-1661, to a committee appointed to consider a bill for toleration, was one drawn up by the faction in the English Chapter affected to Blackloism. Echoing Holden's proposals of 1647, this envisaged the close regulation and monitoring of the Catholic clergy in England, conceding in return for the repeal of the penal laws the exclusion of the Jesuits from such relief, and an oath of allegiance which denied the papal deposing power. In an earlier petition the Chapter had described this doctrine as damnable and impious, replicating the most objectionable clause of the original Oath of Allegiance of 1606.<sup>161</sup> Chaptermen issued pamphlets urging that the Jesuits be sacrificed for the good of the community. Throughout 1662 the Chapter held conferences with the regulars in England, from which the Jesuits were excluded, which resulted in a declaration of allegiance unacceptable to the regulars. Thereafter they continued to negotiate alone with Clarendon towards toleration on the basis of a modified oath of allegiance and the expulsion of the Jesuits, showing the distance they were prepared to retreat from the claims of the papacy by officially approving the Irish Remonstrance.<sup>162</sup> It was the author of that document, Bellings, who went to Rome to obtain the cardinalate for Aubigny.

This step thus constituted an encouragement to the Blackloist-leaning faction with whom Clarendon was negotiating. It may indeed show him better attuned still to their agenda, for it is not clear that success for the Aubigny mission was anticipated. This uncertainty accorded well with the veiled motive many observers attributed to the more radical members of the Chapter, namely the desire, not to obtain a bishop, but the confirmation of its own authority only, and to go on indefinitely without any episcopal oversight. Sergeant developed

---

<sup>161</sup> Miller, *Popery and Politics*, pp. 98-9.

<sup>162</sup> Birrell, 'English Catholics without a Bishop', p. 151.

a high-flown genealogy, originating in the primitive era, for the Chapter's authority, and was obstructive to any step which threatened to diminish it.<sup>163</sup>

It appears, therefore, that Clarendon was deliberately attempting to exploit intra-Catholic differences, using the king's genuine desire to assist his Catholic subjects, whether in the matter of the hierarchy or more generally of relief from the penal laws, as a means by which to foment divisions among the Catholics while appearing to conciliate them.<sup>164</sup> The Duke of Ormond would retrospectively admit that as Viceroy of Ireland he had explicitly interpreted this to be the function of the Irish Remonstrance.<sup>165</sup> Some Catholics attributed the failure of the toleration bill in summer 1661 to Clarendon's opposition, and it was claimed that he encouraged animus against the Jesuits. The reasons for this mistrust are not entirely obvious, but the fact of its existence is telling.<sup>166</sup> The feeling persisted, and resurfaced in 1662-3 over the Declaration of Indulgence and the bill for implementing it, when Clarendon was again supposed to have obstructed the policy of the court.<sup>167</sup> In a confused account which seems to merge elements of the discussions of 1661 with the events of 1662, Burnet also made this case. He refers to a proposition made by the Catholics 'for having none but the secular priests tolerated, who should be under a Bishop, and under one established government', 'but that all the regulars, in particular the Jesuits, should be under the strictest possible penalties forbid the Kingdom', and claims that 'the Earl of *Clarendon* set this on; for he knew well it would divide the Papists'.<sup>168</sup> As Burnet says, 'a few honest Priests, such as *Blacklow, Serjeant, Caron, and Walsh* were for it'. These men, he implies, were working with

---

<sup>163</sup> *Ib.*, *passim*; John Sergeant, *An account of the chapter erected by William, titular bishop of Chalcedon and ordinary of England and Scotland*, ed. W. Turnbull (1853).

<sup>164</sup> Thus we reject the 'softer' reading of his administrative approach in e.g. George R. Abernathy, Jr., 'Clarendon and the Declaration of Indulgence', *JEH*, 11, 1 (1960), pp. 55-73; Abernathy is balanced by Green, *Re-establishment*, p. 220.

<sup>165</sup> Creighton, 'The Remonstrance of December 1661', p. 18.

<sup>166</sup> Miller, *Popery and Politics*, p. 99&n.; the point is discussed in Paul Seaward, *The Cavalier Parliament and the Reconstruction of the Old Regime, 1661-1667* (Cambridge, 1989), p. 170.

<sup>167</sup> Green, *Re-establishment*, pp. 223-4; see *The Life of Edward Earl of Clarendon ... Written by Himself*, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1857), ii, pp. 98-9.

<sup>168</sup> Burnet, *History*, i, p. 194.

the government: they ‘were very ill-looked on by all their own party, as men gained on design to betray them’.<sup>169</sup> He adds later that ‘the Lord *Clarendon* had many spies among the Priests’.<sup>170</sup> Burnet’s source was Peter Walsh, who with Bellings drew up the Irish Remonstrance. Walsh outlined the thinking behind the Blackloist proposals:

If the government had held a heavy hand on the Regulars and the Jesuits, and had been gentler to the Seculars, and had set up a distinguishing test, removing all sorts of power in the Pope over temporal rights of Princes, to which the Regulars and the Jesuits could never submit ... this would have engaged them into such violent quarrels among themselves, that censures would have been thundered at Rome against all that should take any such test; which would have procured much disputing, and might have probably ended in the revolt of the soberer part of that Church.

Walsh regretted that ‘though the Earl of *Clarendon* and the Duke of *Ormond* liked the project, little regard was had to it by the governing party in the Court’.<sup>171</sup> Burnet’s account may not be very exact, but it is certainly the case that Clarendon agreed with these proposals. Even after opposing the bill for implementing the 1662 Declaration of Indulgence he argued against further penal legislation against Catholics proposed under the subsequent bill to prevent the growth of popery, holding that the existing laws were sufficient if they were enforced and those Catholics dangerous to the state expelled.<sup>172</sup>

If Evelyn’s prefaces do reflect Clarendon’s intentions, the Lord Chancellor was pursuing the traditional policy adopted by the English state towards her Catholic subjects,

---

<sup>169</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 195.

<sup>170</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 225. Peter Walsh received a yearly pension of £300 from Ormond during these years: C. W. Russell and J. P. Prendergast, *The Carte Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library* (1871), p. 125.

<sup>171</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 195-6.

<sup>172</sup> Miller, *Popery and Politics*, pp. 101-2.

namely to rend them with internal divisions by confusing religious with political questions.<sup>173</sup> This was in effect to counteract Charles's desired policy while ostensibly working to implement it, which may account for Evelyn's bemused reaction to Charles's admiration of his *Imaginary Heresy*, which in early 1665 he told Evelyn 'he had carried two days in his pocket, read it, and encouraged me' - 'at which', says Evelyn, 'I did not a little wonder'.<sup>174</sup> Clarendon's later contention that he opposed the king's Indulgence on principle, while made to bolster his credentials as a sound churchman, would, on this reading, nevertheless represent his true attitude to Charles's policy.<sup>175</sup> Clarendon wanted to establish a certifiably loyal Catholic community upon much less flexible and uncertain terms than Charles, abetted by hastier counsellors like Lord Bristol, looked for - by some 'publick, irreversible and authentic Act', in Evelyn's words - and he saw the translation of Jansenist works, Gallican in politics and ecclesiology and fiercely anti-Jesuit, as a means to foster intra-Catholic divisions to this end.<sup>176</sup> Given that from 1663 Clarendon, perceived to be obstructive, was frozen out of the royal counsels on religious matters,<sup>177</sup> Evelyn's prefaces may be seen both as an *ex post facto* justification of Clarendon's policy, and as indirect attempts to continue to affect policy where he had lost substantial influence.

---

<sup>173</sup> Cf. Michael Questier, 'Loyalty, Religion and State Power in Early Modern England: English Romanism and the Jacobean Oath of Allegiance', *The Historical Journal*, 40, 2 (1997), pp. 311-29; *idem*, 'Catholic Loyalism in Early Stuart England', *English Historical Review*, 123, 504 (2008), pp. 1132-65, giving a less generous view than, e.g., Kenneth Fincham and Peter Lake, 'The ecclesiastical policy of King James I', *Journal of British Studies*, 24 (1985), pp. 169-207; W. B. Patterson, *King James VI and I and the Reunion of Christendom* (Cambridge, 1997).

<sup>174</sup> Bray (ed.), *Correspondence*, i, pp. 411-12.

<sup>175</sup> *The Life of Edward Earl of Clarendon*, ii, pp. 92f.; Green, *Re-Establishment*, pp. 207-8, 232-3; cf. T. H. Lister, *Life and Administration of Edward, First Earl of Clarendon*, 3 vols. (1838), ii, ch. 9.

<sup>176</sup> This priority of civil security is perfectly consistent with Clarendon's doctrinally minimalist approach to religion, from which some have concluded his principled commitment to a policy of toleration, so that we need not acquiesce in the cynical view of his administrative *modus operandi* propounded in Bosher, *Making of the Restoration, passim*. A balance is struck by Seaward, *The Cavalier Parliament*, ch. 7.

<sup>177</sup> *Ib.*, pp. 181f.; Green, *The Re-Establishment of the Church of England*, pp. 220f., at 225-7.

*The Journall of All Proceedings and the Blackloist Connexion*

Hyde's sponsorship of the translation of Jansenist texts thus illustrates considerable sensitivity to the calibration of internal English Catholic politics. This is further substantiated by the Blackloists' own interest in the Jansenist controversy, which underlines the astuteness of Hyde's commission to Evelyn, and supports our reading of his attempts to manipulate the internal dynamics of Catholic politics. The Blackloists also play a minor part in our narrative of the transmission of the Jansenist reforming case to an English audience.

The *Septième écrit des curez de Paris* was published in 1659 as *A Journall of All Proceedings between the Jansenists and the Jesuits*, and subscribed by 'H. H.'. Posturing as a 'Well-wisher to the distressed Church of England', and himself 'an afflicted member of a late flourishing Church', he claimed that a common enemy, in the form of the Jesuits' moral and political corruptions, was 'opening a way we never thought on, to ... produce, perhaps, in time, an union among us all'. 'Already', he continued, 'we see the Clergy of the Church of England have unanimously condemned these exhorbitant doctrines of the Jesuits ... Who knows how far the hand of Providence may carry on these beginnings?'<sup>178</sup>

The possibility of an eventual re-union of Catholics and Protestants under the Stuarts was a common feature in the rhetoric of Catholics protesting their allegiance and arguing for toleration. The reasons for persecuting Catholics, it was suggested, would be removed if the Protestants could be made to understand that Catholics were not tied to doctrines like the papal deposing power as to matters of faith. The petition which Serenus Cressy printed in his *Exomologesis*, and which provided a template for the later Irish Remonstrance, looked

---

<sup>178</sup> *A Journall of all Proceedings*, sig. A2r-v.

forward to a ‘perfect union in all civill and temporall affaires’.<sup>179</sup> According to Peter Walsh, in his *History and Vindication of the loyal formulary* of 1674, the Irish Remonstrance was similarly intended to remove misunderstandings and so facilitate a reunion of Catholics and Protestants in the British Isles.<sup>180</sup> The same arguments were made during Clarendon’s negotiations with the English Chapter in the early 1660s.<sup>181</sup> The preface to the *Journall* expressed an identical sentiment: once Protestants understood that Catholics did not profess the ‘exhorbitant doctrines of the Jesuits’, they would soon show themselves more complaisant. The author of this work, therefore, may sensibly be sought among the Catholic parties who negotiated with the state on these terms.

The most obvious candidate suggested by the initials ‘H. H.’ is thus, as Ruth Clark speculated, the Sorbonnist and *confrère* of Blacklo, Henry Holden.<sup>182</sup> The argument made in the preface to the *Journall* is one which Holden, under whom Cressy had begun to study in Paris soon before publishing his *Exomologesis*, made elsewhere. His *Analysis Divina Fidei*, published in Paris in 1652, was written in order to unite Christians. The main obstacle to such a reunion is the fact that Protestants, seeing some abuses practised in the Church of Rome, assume they are enjoined under pain of anathema. But Holden will show that these are not essential points of faith.<sup>183</sup> The translator of Holden’s book, professedly a convert from the English Church, ‘little satisfied that these scattered links of a body without a head can properly be called the Church of England’, remarked his pleasure on meeting with it, ‘which

---

<sup>179</sup> Cressy, *Exomologesis*, chs. 13-14; cf. Gabriel Glickman, ‘Christian Reunion, the Anglo-French Alliance and the English Catholic Imagination, 1660-72’, *English Historical Review*, 128, 531 (2013), pp. 263-91; for Cressy’s close links to Port-Royal see Clark, ch. 5.

<sup>180</sup> Cited in Creighton, ‘The Remonstrance of December 1661’, p. 30.

<sup>181</sup> Birrell, ‘English Catholics without a Bishop’, p. 170.

<sup>182</sup> Clark, p. 105. An alternative attribution, to the Anglican divine Henry Hammond, was made in 1954 by Paule Jansen, *De Blaise Pascal à Henry Hammond*. Reasons for rejecting this attribution, followed by Barker, *Strange Continuities*, ch. 1, and Packer, *Transformation of Anglicanism*, p. 194, are given n. 262, below.

<sup>183</sup> Henry Holden, *The analysis of divine faith, or, Two treatises of the resolution of Christian belief with an appendix of schism* (Paris, 1658), sigs. A1-2.

to my understanding laid a way open for an Union between the Church of England and the Roman; a Union I must confess I had long desired'.<sup>184</sup>

Both Holden and his associate Blacklo considered the Jansenist polemics excellent instruments for dislodging the scales from Protestant eyes and so paving the way towards union. 'Take ... the French Provincial Letters', as Blacklo wrote in 1659: 'not only vulgarly known, but render'd also into our vulgar tongue', they are heartily to be approved. 'If I mistake not, the publishing such truths is more expedient here than in any part of the world: nothing being more importantly conducive to the reduction of our separatists [i.e., English Protestants], than the discarding superfluous controversies, and contesting with them only necessary Doctrines; without engaging for the uncertain and wavering opinions of Doctors ...'.<sup>185</sup> Suggestively, Blacklo insisted that, while his own letter should not be mistaken 'for an English Provincial Letter, such keen-edg'd tools may possibly hereafter come in fashion, even among us too'.<sup>186</sup> It may be too much to connect this statement with the translation of the *Journall* by 'H. H.' in the same year; but it is certain that Holden too admired the Jansenist critique, and had earlier furnished a rather generous description of the condemned *Provinciales*, 'in which there is not a word of any doctrine proposed by the author himself, being mere citations of many licentious and scandalous opinions, taught and published ... by the Society of Jesus'.<sup>187</sup> In common with the faculty of which he was a member, he deplored the 'abominable Apology for the Casuists', an 'intollerably scandalous book' from which he

---

<sup>184</sup> Holden, *The analysis of divine faith*, sig. A3r.-v. Allison identified the translator as William Grant, a clergyman of Laudian propensities with whom Holden consulted in the process of preparing his bid to the Independents in 1647: see Allison, 'An English Gallican', p. 332; Anthony Ian Doyle, 'Gallican and Anglican: Henry Holden and John Cosin', *RH*, 30, 1 (2010), pp. 67-70; Tutino, *Thomas White and the Blackloists*, p. 58n. There is no other plausible candidate among English clerical converts in 1640s and 1650s Paris, unless it be Cressy himself, who did in his conversion narrative advert to the 'decay, and now almost vanishing of the *English Church*', which he attributed to a divine judgement upon the sin of schism: Cressy, *Exomologesis*, pp. 108-9.

<sup>185</sup> Thomas White, *A letter to a person of Honour: written by Mr. Thomas White, In Vindication of himself and his doctrine* (1659), sig. A10r.-v.

<sup>186</sup> *Ibid.*, sig. A2r.

<sup>187</sup> Henry Holden, *A letter written by Mr Henry Holden, Doctor of the faculty at Paris, touching the prohibition at Rome of Mr Blacklow's book, intituled, Tabulae Suffragiales* (Douai?, 1657/8), pp. 9-10.

extracted, after the manner of Arnauld and Pascal, some extreme examples of moral laxism.<sup>188</sup>

As well as their interest in detoxifying perceptions of Catholicism in the hope of a *rapprochement* with the state, Holden and the Blackloists had certain marked affinities with the Jansenists themselves. Both tendencies fell foul of the Holy See in the 1650s. White's *Sonus Buccinae* of 1654 incurred the condemnation of the Inquisition for its treatment of papal infallibility.<sup>189</sup> He subsequently clarified in his *Tabulae Suffragiales* of 1655 that the 'opinionem de inerrantia personali Papae' was 'archihaereticam', and the propagation of this opinion 'gravissimum peccatorum'.<sup>190</sup> Prosecuting what chess-players call an 'active' defence, White would continue to assert both his doctrinal orthodoxy and his obedience by denying the premises upon which he was censured.<sup>191</sup>

White recognised the parallel between his own position and that of the Jansenists. In the 1659 edition of *Sonus Buccinae*, treating ecclesiastical censure, he examined the Five Propositions as an illustrative example. The Propositions are evidently ambiguous and admit of different readings: Francisco Macedo, polemical theologian at the College of the Propaganda, cannot himself, in his explanation of Innocent X's constitution, avoid either the ambiguities which make the Propositions liable to the suspicion of a Manichean sense, or the

---

<sup>188</sup> Henry Holden, *Check: Or Inquiry, into the Late Act of the Roman Inquisition: Busily, and pressingly disperst over all England by the Jesuits* (1662), pp. 8, 12, 17f. The lax propositions were the classic examples concerning homicide excused by honour (Escobar, Lessius, Sanchez, Molina, Reginaldus, Eman. Sa, Henriquez, Filiutius, Hurt. de Mendoz, Becanus: *CLP*, pp. 122f, *MJ*, pp. 140f.), simony (Valentia, Escobar, Lessius, Tannerus, Caen theses of 1644 [see *CLP*, p. 225n.]: *CLP*, pp. 104-5, 224-6, 231; *MJ*, pp. 114-15, 286-8, 297), restitution (Sanchez, *Summ.*, l. 2, c. 38, nn. 94-6: *CLP*, p. 148, *MJ*, p. 179), calumny (Caramuel, Dicastillus, Hurtado: *CLP*, p. 278, *MJ*, pp. 373-4), sexual incontinence (Diana, quoted from *AMJ*, pp. 22-3, from the *Extrait de quelques-unes des plus dangereuses propositions* ... [above, ch. 1, p. 15]), and 'easy devotion' (hearing halves or quarters of the mass simultaneously – Turrianus, Bauny, Hurtado, Azorius, Escobar: *CLP*, p. 169, *MJ*, pp. 210-11).

<sup>189</sup> Tutino, *Blackloists*, pp. 117-8.

<sup>190</sup> White, *Tabulae Suffragiales De terminandis Fidei litibus, ab Ecclesia Catholica fixae* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., 1655), *Tabulae XIX-XXI*, pp. 250f.

<sup>191</sup> See esp. his discussion of heresy and censure in *Sonus Buccinae: Sive Tres Tractatus de Virtutibus Fidei & Theologiae, De Principiis earundem, & de Erroribus Oppositis. Quibus accesserunt Quaestio Theologica, de Gratia & Libero Arbitrio. Mens Augustini de Gratia Adam, & Ratio Villicationis de Medio Animarum Statu* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Cologne, 1659), pp. 182-9, 193.

opposite danger of Pelagianism which results from condemning them in an orthodox sense.<sup>192</sup> It would, therefore, be wrong to lay a ‘scholastic’ or technical censure on Jansen’s teaching. It may be that in a ‘juridical’ sense the Church must look to scandal and potential for error: consequently she ought to condemn potentially misleading doctrines even if they are not false in themselves, just as she ‘proscribed’ the *homoeousion*.<sup>193</sup> In short, while Innocent X was probably right to condemn the Propositions in a ‘juridical’ manner, there could be no justification for condemning the man, since there was enough obscurity in the question to clear him of temerarious singularity. White, indeed, asserted that, while he had not read the *Augustinus* (at whose length he ‘trembled’), nothing he had heard about Jansen’s piety, doctrine, and obedience would prevent him, were it necessary, from owning himself ‘libentissime ... discipulum’ of the Bishop of Ypres. Like White, Jansen, and his defenders, are victims of a modern Church whose functionaries are more eager to sniff out crimes than truths, and who build on the non-demonstrable axiom of the pope’s personal inerrancy.<sup>194</sup>

Holden had spoken in favour of Arnauld in the Sorbonne over the *question de fait*, and, as did Evelyn in the *Pernicious Consequences*, he compared the travails of Arnauld with those of his mentor White.<sup>195</sup> Each hoped to establish his orthodoxy at Rome while refusing to concede his position. White was persuaded to submit his work to the judgement of the Holy See; it was included, as Holden pointed out, in the same condemnation of 1657 which prohibited the *Lettres Provinciales* and certain writings of Arnauld on grace, a fact which

---

<sup>192</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 195f., at 214-15; Francisco Macedo, SJ (1614-42), then OFM, ob.; an ed. of his *Mens divinitus inspirata Sanctissimo Patri Domino Nostro Innocentio Papae X super quinque propositiones Cornelij Jansenij : et Mens Divi Augustini illustrata de duplici adjutorio gratiae sine quo non & quo* was published 1653.

<sup>193</sup> White, *Sonus Buccinae*, p. 200; presumably he is referring to the triumph of the Athanasian formula.

<sup>194</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 214-15.

<sup>195</sup> See Jacques M. Grès-Gayer, *Jansénisme en Sorbonne, 1643-1656* (Paris, 1996), p. 312; *idem*, *En Sorbonne, Autour des Provinciales. Edition critique des Mémoires de l’Abbé de Beaubrun 1655-1656* (Paris, 1997), pp. 88-90, 195, 463, 500. Naturally Holden fiercely rejected any suggestion that he subscribed to the heresy of which the Jansenists stood accused.

‘gratified’ White.<sup>196</sup> This feeling of solidarity had a substantial basis. The Blackloists shared the Jansenists’ Gallican ecclesiology, where the teaching and disciplinary authority of bishops in their dioceses and of general councils balanced the spiritual primacy of the papacy.<sup>197</sup> They inherited from the English secular clergy tradition a long-standing hostility to the Jesuits as agents of papal tyranny over national churches and disruptive enemies to hierarchy. This was intensified by the ‘new mad Heresie’ of personal papal infallibility even in matters of fact, with which ‘the Jesuites (whose flattering Policie is now come to direct blasphemy) are indeavouring to possess all the ignorant or timorous, or ambitious in *France*’.<sup>198</sup> White’s ‘obsessive hatred of the Jesuits’, like Arnauld’s, extended beyond jurisdictional issues.<sup>199</sup> Like the Jansenists, the Blackloists interpreted the new doctrine of personal infallibility as one aspect of a general Jesuit conspiracy to gain power and influence, conducted along pragmatic and flexible principles which emptied Christian faith and practice of their intrinsic meaning and validity.

White identified probabilism as an essential mechanism which undermined the principles upon which the faith must be built if it is to command assent. It introduced a spiralling relativism which makes it impossible to legislate, as much in the corporate Church as *in foro interno*. A slightly confusing factor in analysing the Blackloists’ views on this point is their tendency to refer to the English divines, such as Stillingfleet, with whom they

---

<sup>196</sup> Holden, *A letter written by Mr Henry Holden, Doctor of the faculty at Paris, touching the prohibition at Rome of Mr Blacklow’s book*, pp. 9-12; Robert I. Bradley, ‘Blacklo and the Counter-Reformation: An Inquiry into the Strange Death of Catholic England’, in Charles H. Carter (ed.), *From the Renaissance to the Counter-Reformation* (1966), p. 363. Richard Baxter noticed this parallel, *A Key for Catholicks, To open the Jugling of the Jesuits* (1659), p. 51.

<sup>197</sup> On the Blackloists’ ecclesiology see Tutino, *Thomas White and the Blackloists*, pp. 44f.; and on its ramifications in restoration religious politics see further Glickman, ‘Christian Reunion’, pp. 277-84.

<sup>198</sup> Holden, *Check: Or Inquiry*, pp. 4-5. The ready elision of the Gallican position articulated by the Blackloists and later English secular clergy with Jansenist views would ensure that the accusation of Jansenism, particularly after Unigenitus, became a potent weapon in the hands of their Jesuit antagonists, as well as in the wider politics of Jacobitism in the later-seventeenth and early-eighteenth centuries. See Eamon Duffy, ‘A rubb-up for old soares; Jesuits, Jansenists, and the English Secular Clergy, 1705-1715’, *JEH*, 28, 3 (1977), pp. 291-317; Glickman, *The English Catholic Community 1688-1745: Politics, Culture and Ideology* (Woodbridge, 2009), pp. 175-86, 224-30.

<sup>199</sup> Quote Bradley, ‘Blacklo and the Counter-Reformation’, p. 364.

disputed over the ‘Rule of Faith’, as ‘probabilists’: that is, as those who were content to make scripture the ground of belief, while admitting that the written text cannot be self-authenticating, and that in matters of Christian faith and practice a more modest ‘moral certainty’ must be accepted, compounded from a confluence of probable testimonies sufficient to convince a reasonable man.<sup>200</sup> White, however, made it clear in *Sonus Buccinae* that it was ‘les nouveaux casuistes’ he had in mind in castigating ‘probabilists’.<sup>201</sup> He contrasted Aristotle’s understanding of a probable proposition in the *Topics*, as that which merits acceptance on account of the approval of the learned,<sup>202</sup> with a new concept of probability, which ‘aliqui Moderni’ had ‘dragged’ ‘ex Scepticorum disciplina ... inter quos probabile dicebatur, quod poterat sustineri, id est, quod non aperte convincebatur’. This was a reasonable definition of the ‘intrinsic’ probability distinguished by the casuists; ‘sed nunc’, as White went on, probability also signified ‘apud Theologos ... eam sententiam quae digna est Magistro Theologiae’. This extrinsic probability, White claimed, derived from the authority of a ‘gravis’ doctor, was as dangerous as it was useless. It implied that the Church can never pronounce on matters *de fide*, positively or by way of censure:

quae enim propositio hodie est magis probabilis, cras erit minus probabilis, si interea quisquam invenerit argumentum difficilioris oppositis.<sup>203</sup>

---

<sup>200</sup> See Quantin, *The Church of England and Christian Antiquity*, pp. 217-28; Henry G. Van Leeuwen, *The Problem of Certainty in English Thought 1630-1690* (The Hague, 1963), ch. 2; Barbara J. Shapiro, *Probability and Certainty in Seventeenth-Century England* (Princeton, 1983), pp. 80-82; Robert Todd Carroll, *The Common-Sense Philosophy of Religion of Edward Stillingfleet 1635-1699* (The Hague, 1975), pp. 44-9, 57-70. See further ch. 3, below.

<sup>201</sup> The following draws on *Sonus Buccinae*, pp. 192-4.

<sup>202</sup> *Topics*, 100b20-21; the same text of Aristotle’s was, as we have seen, also cited by probabilist writers; but as the theory developed the idea of majority acceptance, and by implication that of the strongest possible arguments, was allowed to fall away. It seems Medina retained the sense of Aristotle’s definition intended by White here: see M.-M. Gorce, ‘Le sens du mot probable et les origines du probabilisme’, *Revue des Sciences Religieuses*, 10 (1930), pp. 460-64.

<sup>203</sup> Whether by coincidence or not, this reproduces the ingenuous phrasing of Caramuel in his *Theologiae moralis fundamentalis* (Louvain, 1657), n. 447 [p. 122]: ‘Propositio, quae hodie nec est probabilis, nec improbabilis, cras esse poterit probabilis, et perendie aut evidenter vera aut evidenter falsa’.

This understanding of probability thus undermines the whole concept of tradition, and with it, on White's view, all religious certainty. With Jansen, then, White affirmed the essentially historical character of theology: just as a decree from the Pope cannot stop the world turning around, if some proposition contradicts the contents of a 'certain authority', the patronage of 'mille Episcopi vel Doctores moderni' cannot render it probable. In fact the somewhat baroque 'oral tradition' of White and Sergeant cannot really be compared to the antiquarianism of the Jansenists,<sup>204</sup> whose tendency to try all in the tribunal of the early Church indicates a greater emphasis on the immutable character of the eternal truth handed down 'de main en main, et de siècle de siècle'.<sup>205</sup> But in both cases tradition functioned as a negative rule by which to measure the modern Church, and it is not too much to characterise Blackloism and Jansenism as parallel impulses within seventeenth-century Catholicism to reform the Counter-Reformation.<sup>206</sup> White desired, as Holden put it in vindicating his former preceptor, 'to lop off all excrescencies of erroneous opinion, how general soever interest or mistakes of *Probabilists* had made them'; and to 'separate uncertain opinions, from the certain Doctrine of Christ and his Apostles, pledged to us as such by Universal Tradition'.<sup>207</sup> The morality of the casuists was 'superficial' and 'Pharisaical': like Arnauld and Pascal, White's 'way was to place no goodness in external actions, but as they conduc'd to interior

---

<sup>204</sup> See e.g. Sergeant, *The Method to Science* (1696), Lesson VIII. The room left for deductions from the axioms of revelation rendered White's system somewhat labile; Bruno Neveu depicted the Blackloists as precursors of Newman, 'A la recherche de l'*aptum* théologique au XVIIe siècle: Davenport, White, Holden, Sergeant', in Christian Mouchel and Colette Nativel (eds.), *République des Lettres, République des Arts. Mélanges offerts à Marc Fumaroli* (Geneva, 2008), pp. 581-99. Cf. George Tavard, *The Seventeenth-Century Tradition: A Study in Recusant Thought* (Leiden, 1978), chs. 8 & 9; Beverley C. Southgate, 'Blackloism and Tradition: From Theological Certainty to Historiographical Doubt', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 61, 1 (2000), pp. 97-114.

<sup>205</sup> Quote is Arnauld, *FC*, p. 182. On this characteristic theme in seventeenth-century Gallican theology, see Quantin, *Le Catholicisme classique*, pp. 98-110, chs. 4 & 6; *idem*, 'The Fathers in Seventeenth-Century Roman Catholic Theology', in Irena Backus (ed.), *The Reception of the Church Fathers in the West. From the Carolingians to the Maurists* (2 vols., Leiden-New York-Köln, 1997), pp. 963f.

<sup>206</sup> Cf. Bradley, 'Blacklo and the Counter-Reformation'.

<sup>207</sup> Cf. Beverley C. Southgate, 'Covetous of Truth'. *The Life and Works of Thomas White, 1593-1676* (Dordrecht-Boston-London, 1993); *eadem*, "'Cauterising the tumor of Pyrrhonism": Blackloism versus Skepticism', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 53, 4 (1992), pp. 631-45.

perfection, and advanced charity'.<sup>208</sup> White was quite as horrified as the Port-Royalists by the 'Jesuits wicked cases', a manifest testimony to the insufficiency of 'probable opinions'.<sup>209</sup>

It was White's puckish acolyte, John Sergeant, who capitalised most obviously on Pascal's polemic. The enormities of 'the *new unlawful art of Casuistry*' were excellent grounds upon which to deny its practitioners, the Jesuits, any part of the identity of the loyal, peaceable and self-governing Catholic community which Sergeant aspired to personify.<sup>210</sup> Thus in his polemic against Jeremy Taylor, who in his 'dissuasives from popery' himself profited from the Jansenist critique,<sup>211</sup> Sergeant was careful, while expatiating upon Taylor's disingenuous citations from the Fathers and medieval schoolmen, to keep to the subject of the rule of faith: had he strayed into morals or discipline, he would, since he approved them, have found Taylor's censures of the casuists difficult to answer. Taylor's 'Reasons produc't against ... our Casuists ... concern me not', wrote Sergeant, because 'a few ... Casuists' are not 'the mouth of our Church'. To take 'the private opinions of a few Authours' for 'Catholik Faith and the Doctrine of the Church' is 'flat and unconscionable Calumny'.<sup>212</sup> Serenus Cressy took the same line in confuting Stillingfleet, pointing out that 'a *Book*' – presumably Pirot's *Apology* – 'the Author of which undertook to defend [laxist propositions], was solemnly prohibited, and condemned by the *Pope*: since which time such *Doctrins* have been wholly restrained and silenced'.<sup>213</sup> In 1679, at the time of the Popish Plot, Sergeant again

---

<sup>208</sup> Holden, *Check: Or Inquiry*, pp. 3-4; cf. White's *A Catechism of Christian doctrin* [sic] (Paris, 1659), pp. 89-99, 117f.

<sup>209</sup> White, *Religion and Reason Mutually corresponding and assisting each other* (Paris, 1660), p. 8, cf. p. 194; *idem*, *Devotion and Reason* (Paris, 1661), p. 149; cf. *idem*, *A letter to a person of Honour*, sig. A4r., where he refers slightly to the recourse which worldly men can have 'to a large and indulgent Casuist'.

<sup>210</sup> [John Sergeant], *Reflexions upon the Oathes of Supremacy and Allegiance. By a Catholick Gentleman, an Obedient Son of the Church, and Loyal Subject of His Majesty* (n.p., 1661), p. 59.

<sup>211</sup> See Chapter 3, below.

<sup>212</sup> Sergeant, *A Discovery of the Groundlessness and Insincerity Of my Ld. of Down's Dissuasive. Being the Fourth Appendix to Sure-Footing* (1665), pp. 273-4, 290-1, 302-2, 320.

<sup>213</sup> Cressy, *Fanaticism Fanatically imputed to the Catholick Church by Doctour Stillingfleet: And The Imputation refuted and retorted by S.C. a Catholic O.S.B.* (n.p., 1672), pp. 130-31.

sought to distance his own strain of English Catholicism from a subversive Jesuit one, publishing what was essentially a digest of the *Lettres Provinciales*, *The Jesuits Gospel*.<sup>214</sup>

Here Sergeant tabulated the references arrayed by Pascal and other French polemicists, occasionally citing the English translations of the late 1650s, and following the scheme of the *Provinciales* closely. He laid out the mechanics of probabilism, citing the *loci classici* amassed by French critics.<sup>215</sup> Probabilism was only the looking-glass through which the unsuspecting Christian passed into a topsy-turvy moral landscape, there to wander, ‘as it were, in a round maze’, having forsaken the chart of revelation for the wavering guide of natural reason. Here human ingenuity has discovered a taxonomy of sin divorced from the eternal standard and from the inward calibration of the individual to that standard. Here sin is a feature of the external environment, not of the inward disposition of the soul. The link between the moral value of a given act and the inward state from which it proceeds is severed: sins are arbitrarily classified as mortal or venial regardless of the inward condition which they manifest and influence. Thus Escobar was able to teach, as Pascal noted, that ‘he that hath a will to commit all venial sins if he were able, sins only venially’.<sup>216</sup> This collapse of the reciprocal economy between the will and the act is underlined by the false relationship put in its stead, wherein a superficial or artificial condition of the will governs the moral complexion of the act. The *peccatum philosophicum* and ‘that excellent Science of directing the intention’, as Sergeant says echoing the ‘good Father’, are shifts which render no sin imputable:<sup>217</sup> nothing more common than for sinners not to advert rationally to their

---

<sup>214</sup> [John Sergeant], *The Jesuits Gospel, According to Saint Ignatius Loiola Wherein Their Impious Doctrines against the Christian Faith, Their Pernituous Maxims against Christian Princes, and Their Unjust Practices destructive to all Humane Society, Contrary to the Sacred Scriptures, The Laws of God, and Right Reason, are declared* (1679).

<sup>215</sup> E.g. Sanchez, *Opus morale*, bk. 1, c. 9; Eman. Sa, *Aphorismi confessoriorum, de Dubio*, p. 183; Caramuel, *Theol. mor. fund.*, p. 138; Laymann, *Theol. mor.*, bk. 1, c. 5. Sergeant, *The Jesuits Gospel*, pp. 21-4; for the citations in Pascal see *CLP*, pp. 85-7, *MJ*, pp. 92-6.

<sup>216</sup> *The Jesuits Gospel*, p. 9, citing Escobar’s digest, tr. 2: *CLP*, pp. 160-1, *MJ*, p. 197.

<sup>217</sup> *The Jesuits Gospel*, pp. 7-9, where the discussion of philosophical sin draws on Bauny’s *Somme des péchés*, as in Pascal’s 4<sup>th</sup> letter, *CLP*, pp. 67-8; *The Jesuits Gospel*, pp. 9-12, citing Escobar’s digest, tr. 5, and Reginaldus’ *Praxis fori poenitentialis*, bk. 21, p. 260, from *CLP*, pp. 115-17 (‘notre grande method de diriger

transgression, the more so the more inveterate their habit; while interest dictates that any wicked act can be rendered good by deflecting the intention from the evil commissioned to the profit received thereby.<sup>218</sup> The sufficient condition of an evil act is made narrower in proportion as that of a good one is relaxed. ‘To do evil, there must be an evil intention; but to do good, it’s not necessary to have a good intention’.<sup>219</sup> In other words, the casuists circumvent the transformative role of grace: they promise reward to the exercise of man’s natural forces, and preserve from punishment the lapses of his natural frailty.<sup>220</sup> They frame a truly Pharisaical religion, which can be fulfilled in the letter while it is betrayed in the spirit. This is summed up, as it was for Pascal, in Antoine Sirmond’s teaching in his *Défense de la Vertu*, that the love of God is not an ‘absolute commandment’ – so that ‘a man may be saved without ever loving God’.<sup>221</sup> As the Jansenists had pointed out, this was only the most paradoxical formulation of an externalist approach to morality which ramified throughout religious and social life. *The Jesuits Gospel* went on, like them, to enumerate all the other deleterious consequences which result when the rights of the conscience are elevated above the obligations of the eternal law, and the ordination of the inward disposition separated from the value of the act. The public and private duties of religion can be fulfilled without the requisite intention, and even with a contrary end.<sup>222</sup> Proximate occasions of sin need not be avoided,<sup>223</sup> and when sin is fallen into it need not be confessed fully, nor satisfied for

---

*l’intention*’), as well as the *Mystery of Jesuitism*. On philosophical sin and the direction of intention, see above, ch. 1, p. 57.

<sup>218</sup> Pascal developed these arguments in the 4<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> letters.

<sup>219</sup> *The Jesuits Gospel*, p. 10.

<sup>220</sup> See *ibid.*, pp. 6-7.

<sup>221</sup> *The Jesuits Gospel*, p. 6; *CLP*, pp. 188-9; Sergeant is quoting directly from the *Mystery of Jesuitism* (1657), p. 255, cf. pp. 237-8.

<sup>222</sup> *The Jesuits Gospel*, pp. 4-5. Sergeant cites, for example, Gilles de Coninck’s *De moralitate natura, et effectibus actuum supernaturalium*, q. 83 (*CLP*, p. 168), to the effect that the outward act of prayer, though the spirit is voluntarily distracted, is a true act of the virtue of religion; also the sacramental teaching of Emmanuel Mascarenhas (e.g. *Tractatus de sacramentis in genere*, I, disp. 4, c. 5, on sacrilegious communions), which had been excerpted in the *Extrait de quelques propositions d’un nouvel Auteur Jésuite nommé Mascarenhas, imprimé chez Cramoisy en cette année 1656 et qui se vend depuis le mois d’octobre* (Paris, 1656), and reprinted in *La Théologie Morale des Jésuites*, pp. 336f.

<sup>223</sup> *The Jesuits Gospel*, p. 9, citing Bauny’s *Theologia moralis*, bk. 4 *De poenitentia*, q. 14, p. 94, as had Pascal, *CLP*, pp. 180-1.

condignly, nor regretted contritely.<sup>224</sup> The accessories of a holy life, such as almsgiving, can be dispensed with,<sup>225</sup> and the bonds of social life disregarded. So long as the conscience is satisfied, the eternal law is of no consequence. Sexual incontinence,<sup>226</sup> violence, homicide,<sup>227</sup> and corruption can all be perpetrated safely;<sup>228</sup> oaths and promises can safely be slipped through equivocations.<sup>229</sup> Sergeant underlined Pascal's conclusion that the casuists reversed the terms of the equation between natural and supernatural ends in borrowing his example, taken from Sanchez, of the mistaken soothsayer who is not obliged to restitution when he has used a genuine method of divination – viz., by invoking diabolical assistance.<sup>230</sup> The religio-political implications were sufficiently clear: since their morality catered to the interest of fallen nature, the Jesuits were inherently untrustworthy, and not to be countenanced as participants in the dialogue between English Catholicism and the state.<sup>231</sup>

\*

The Blackloists, then, had a number of reasons, some more principled, some more expedient, for publicising the Jansenist critique. Holden, observing the Jansenist controversy at first hand, had opportunity, means, and motive to produce the *Journall of All Proceedings*.

---

<sup>224</sup> *The Jesuits Gospel*, p. 6 and ch. XIV: on the sufficiency of attrition Sergeant cites Pascal's example from Escobar's digest, tr. 7, ex. 4, to the effect that contrition is not even necessary *in articulo mortis* (CLP, p. 185); on restitution he cited, for example, Lessius' opinion that there is no obligation to restitution in respect of money received for a criminal act, from *De Iustitia et Iure*, bk. 2, ch. 14 (CLP, pp. 145-6).

<sup>225</sup> *The Jesuits Gospel*, pp. 5-6, citing Escobar's convenient views on superfluities, in tr. 5, ex. 5 of his digest, quoted by Pascal, CLP, p. 161.

<sup>226</sup> *The Jesuits Gospel*, pp. 12-13, giving the well known example cited by Escobar of the opinion that it is no sin to let one's property for the purposes of prostitution, given in the *Troisième extrait de plusieurs dangereuses propositions tirées ... particulièrement du I. tome in folio de la nouvelle Théologie Morale d'Escobar Jesuite*, printed in *La Théologie Morale des Jesuites*, at p. 350.

<sup>227</sup> *The Jesuits Gospel*, pp. 13-16, giving the famous opinions that one can kill for a slap in order to preserve one's honour, that one can kill to preserve one's property, that one can kill slanderers or false witnesses, husbands who surprise one in the act of adultery, etc. all discussed by Pascal from the same examples in the 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> *Provinciales*.

<sup>228</sup> On judges and witnesses see *The Jesuits Gospel*, pp. 24-5, citing e.g. Escobar's opinion in his digest, tr. 6, ex. 6, given by Pascal, CLP, pp. 135-6, that in doubtful cases a judge may be swayed by a bribe.

<sup>229</sup> *The Jesuits Gospel*, pp. 17-21 replicating examples given by Pascal (CLP, pp. 164f.) from Sanchez's *Summa casuum conscientiae*, Filliutius' *Compendium questionum moralium* and Escobar's digest of the Twenty-Four.

<sup>230</sup> *The Jesuits Gospel*, p. 7; CLP, pp. 147-50.

<sup>231</sup> *The Jesuits Gospel* opens with an ascending tricolon on *The Pope*, his *Grandeur*, or *Greatness*, and his *Power*, pp. 1-4.

The evidence adduced above contributes a strong presumption in favour of his authorship. The claim made in the 1684 polyglot edition of the *Provinciales*, that the English translations were done by an English Catholic, while I think substantially false, may tend to the same conclusion inasmuch as it asserted as true what was in fact only highly plausible.<sup>232</sup>

Certainly the work suited two agendas very well, that of English Catholics seeking to ingratiate themselves with the civil power by repudiating the Jesuits, and that of Protestant ideologues and statesmen seeking to divide and tame the English Catholics. It does not seem as likely as it is tempting to think that a connection can be drawn between the later attempts to exploit internal Catholic divisions through Evelyn's translations, and the *Journall* of 1659. Holden was, certainly, 'a man well known in his person to some, and in his writings to all, or the most part of [the] English clergy' – one who had taught Hyde's old acquaintance Cressy, who forwarded letters to Hyde's friend d'Aubigny, and who, says Burnet, was among those 'honest Priests' who advocated Hyde's policy in 1662;<sup>233</sup> but he had reason enough to produce the work on his own initiative. The attribution of the *Journall* to Holden does not mean he must have translated the earlier editions of the *Provinciales* and the *Additional*s: the *Journall* was in the hands of a different publisher, it was signed, and it was framed to serve a particular agenda which the others were not.

#### *The Mystery of Jesuitism Series and the Anglican Clerical Interest*

The Jansenist critique of the new doctrine of papal infallibility and of the politically subversive and anti-hierarchical tenor of many Jesuit writings, then, was highly relevant to

---

<sup>232</sup> Clark, p. 102.

<sup>233</sup> Holden, *The analysis of divine faith*, sig. A2r.; Clark, p. 83; Burnet, *History*, i, p. 194.

English religious politics in the 1660s. Their exposure of wider questions in moral theology was no less relevant to those whose sphere of activity was more properly theological and pastoral. As Evelyn noted, the Jansenists showed how the moral theology of the Jesuits, ‘instead of edifying the Church, and conducting Consciences’, ‘eat[s] out ... the very heart and vitals of the common Christianity’.<sup>234</sup> He advised his reader first to ‘cast his Eye upon the Provincials ... which the Interpreter of these Papers had subjoyn’d to them, were they not commonly to be had at every Bookseller’s shop, and already translated into English’.<sup>235</sup> In the preface to the *Pernicious Consequences* he quoted his close friend Jeremy Taylor, ‘that most learned Prelate’, in showing that the Jesuits’ political doctrines were undergirded by the tendentious ethical theory there satirised – probabilism – which allowed any position to be justified according as necessity dictated. Just as their ambition of ecclesiastical power was served by the obsequious promotion of a theory of papal competence which left no monarch secure, so they sought to acquire influence over souls by means of a ‘theological Bawd’ which overturned all religion and morality.<sup>236</sup> The *Provinciales* thus constituted a powerful encouragement to English thinkers involved in questions of moral and pastoral theology to look more closely at French religious developments.

\*

Who, then, was responsible for the anonymous editions of the *Provinciales* and related materials from 1657-1659? The work of translation has been the subject of conjecture. The case for Evelyn derives from a bibliographical error.<sup>237</sup> If the anomalous *Journall* is by Holden, as I have argued, he was not the translator. Israel Tonge, the obsessive anti-Jesuit

---

<sup>234</sup> Evelyn, *Another Part*, sigs. A3v.-A4r.

<sup>235</sup> *Ib.*, p. 48.

<sup>236</sup> *Ibid.*, sigs. a5- a6; see Taylor, *A sermon preached in Saint Maries Church in Oxford. Upon the anniversary of the Gunpowder-Treason* (Oxford, 1638), pp. 50-51.

<sup>237</sup> Due to the title of his later work, *Another Part of the Mystery of Jesuitism*: see Clark, pp. 102f.; Keynes, *John Evelyn*, pp. 124-6. Evelyn’s copy of the *Journall*, meanwhile, bears no note of authorship such as invariably adorn his own publications: BL Add. MS 78632, f. 33r.

and original dupe in the Popish Plot affair is, *prima facie*, a likely candidate: he translated Perrault's *La Morale des Jésuites* and published two further works, *The Jesuits unmasked*, and *Jesuitical Aphorisms*.<sup>238</sup> This trilogy, however, was the product of paranoia induced by his losses in the fire of 1666. Circumstantial evidence for Tonge's involvement in the earlier series is lacking.

Most plausible is the evidence of Anthony à Wood, who names the jobbing translator John Davies of Kidwelly, in Carmarthenshire.<sup>239</sup> Davies moved to Cambridge from Oxford University after it became a royal garrison, and was admitted at St John's in 1646. There, as well as conforming under 'Presbyterian' tutelage, he learnt French, 'and afterwards going into France', during the years 1649 to 1651, 'became so compleat a Master of that Language, that upon his return, settling in *London* ... did make it his livelihood to translate Books from *French* into English ... and putting Dedicatory and other Epistles to them, gained much relief by them'. Wood attributes to him *Les Provinciales* of 1656, the *Additional*s of 1658 and the second edition of the *Provinciales*, *A further discovery*, and, lastly, the 'Journal of proceedings between Jansenists and Jesuits', for the year 1659.<sup>240</sup> Davies used his translations to secure the patronage of the powerful and well-connected.<sup>241</sup> The literary circles in which he moved in restoration London suggest the range of his connections: he was acquainted with

---

<sup>238</sup> Tonge, *The Jesuits Morals collected by a Doctor of the Colledge of Sorbon in Paris* (1670); the original was Perrault's *La Morale des Jésuites, extraite fidelement de levrs livres imprimez avec la permission et l'approbation des syperievr de levr compagnie par un Docteur de Sorbonne*, 3 vols. (Mons, 1667-9); on Tonge's authorship, affirmed by Evelyn, and on Evelyn's acquaintance with him, see Bray, *Correspondence*, ii, p. 133. On the sequels see à Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses*, ii, p. 502; John Kenyon, *The Popish Plot* (1972), pp. 50-2.

<sup>239</sup> Anthony à Wood, *The Life and Times of Anthony Wood, antiquary, of Oxford, 1632-1695*, ed. Andrew Clark, 5 vols. (Oxford, 1891-1900), iii, p. 167.

<sup>240</sup> Wood, *Ath. Ox.* (ed. 1721), ii, pp. 902-3.

<sup>241</sup> Joseph E. Tucker, 'John Davies of Kidwelly (1627?-1693), Translator from the French', *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America*, 44 (1950), and the article by E. Lord in the *ODNB*, are corrected in biographical points by David Hook, 'John Davies of Kidwelly. A Neglected Literary Figure of the Seventeenth Century', *The Antiquary*, 11 (1975).

John Aubrey, for example, and with Elias Ashmole, Evelyn's fellow *savant* and Royal Society founder.<sup>242</sup>

There is thus some circumstantial evidence for Davies's translation of the *Mystery of Jesuitism* texts. But Jansen has pointed out that their *parerga* seem to indicate the presence of a different hand to the translator. Davies was not an ideological *engagé*, and his other prefaces exhibit a different style and are always signed.<sup>243</sup> Since, however, the works were obviously intended to be entirely anonymous, this is not conclusive. The prefaces for the most part mirror very nearly Nicole's *avertissement* to the original Cologne edition, and there is no incontrovertible reason why Davies could not have produced them.<sup>244</sup> Certain additions of the preface-writer, especially his vehement anti-popery – he calls the Jesuits the 'vermine of Religion and humane Society' – are perhaps consistent with a Presbyterian background.<sup>245</sup> It does not, on the other hand, seem likely that Davies should have undertaken the work except under commission. In other places the prefaces seem to bewray the literary touch of the clergyman and controversialist. This does not describe Davies.<sup>246</sup> If we ask who could be concerned with manifesting to the English reading public the evil consequences of what was, at base, a somewhat rarefied problem of moral theology – to say nothing of the abstruse debate over sufficient and efficacious grace which occupies the first four *Lettres* – we are most likely to think of a class of men to whom public morality and moral theology were matter of daily concern: pastors and theologians. Take the following passage, for example:

If a man consider the strange and miraculous originals of Christian Religion, what cruel persecutions it has waded through, the crosses and calumnies it has thriven under, and

---

<sup>242</sup> Hook, 'John Davies of Kidwelly'. Both Evelyn and Davies translated works by Gabriel Naudé, the librarian to Cardinal Mazarin.

<sup>243</sup> Jansen, *De Blaise Pascal à Henry Hammond*, pt. 2, ch. 1.

<sup>244</sup> Nicole's preface is helpfully printed alongside the English in *ibid.*, pp. 89f.

<sup>245</sup> The charge that the Jesuits, as oath-breakers, regicides, etc., were unfit for human society, was however common at this time: see e.g. Taylor, *A Dissuasive from popery* (1664), p. 152.

<sup>246</sup> See Jansen, *De Blaise Pascal à Henry Hammond*, pp. 62-7, discussing Davies's career.

all through a rigorous observance of vertue and austerities absolutely contrary to the suggestions of flesh and blood, till at length it came to its Majesty, and forced an acknowledgement from the subdued world, he cannot certainly but withall imagine, that the same means, which contributed so much to its glorious conquest and propagation, must have the same effect in its continuance and perfection. What idea then can he conceive of those men whose maxims disagree with all obligations of evangelical purity, who level the precepts of the gospel to the corrupt passions of men, who make our tendency to future beatitudes consistent with the pleasures and enjoyments of this world, and who by their artifices of *sanctimony*, *pious sleights*, *easie Devotions*, and such *complyances* of humane invention, bring Christian Religion into contempt, and really introduce that Deisme which they unjustly object so much to their Adversaries?<sup>247</sup>

This striking passage does not appear in the first edition, and is interpolated suddenly into the course of the preface, which runs closely parallel to Nicole's original and is rendered far more mundanely. This suggests that Davies also translated Nicole's preface, and that this was subsequently embellished when the finished translation passed into other hands. The writer is clearly an adept at religious discourse. He is seemingly of an ascetic and rigorous temperament. He believes that the Gospel imposes stringent 'obligations' which the world does not sufficiently acknowledge, and identifies the health of religion with the 'rigorous observance of virtues and austerities'. He is precocious in his use of the word 'Deisme', by which he clearly means something similar to Stillingfleet in his *Letter to a Deist* of 1677,

---

<sup>247</sup> *The Mystery of Jesuitisme, corrected, with large additions*, sigs. A8v-A9r.

often given as the first recorded instance in English. This argues a familiarity with learned discourse in France (his spelling is even Gallic), where the term had an earlier currency.<sup>248</sup>

All these circumstances suggest a learned clergyman. The preoccupations of this clergyman, while perhaps generic enough, appear nevertheless to tally very closely with the outlook of those Interregnum Anglican writers who constructed a theology based around the concept of holy living. This first set of translations from 1657-1659 came at a time when the Anglican party to which Evelyn belonged had somewhat different preoccupations than those which animated Clarendon in 1664-5. Unaware that restoration was imminent, the priority of Anglican divines remained the fortification of a solid theological structure which could ensure the robustness and survival of the Church of England through an indeterminate period of marginalisation. On one side this involved the continued production of controversial writings against Rome. Another major aspect of the project, constructive rather than purely defensive, and taking its part in a longer-term, organic reaction from the tradition of predestinarian Calvinism, now further blackened by its association with the puritan rebellion, involved a pronounced focus on individual morality – that aspect of religion over which external circumstances such as the availability of public worship or of ministers of religion had no influence. This focus was so marked that its exponents have been accused of peddling a debased soteriology labelled ‘moralism’.<sup>249</sup>

Along with this tendency came an increased interest in moral theology proper, which had already led Jeremy Taylor to an engagement with the Jansenist critique in his *Unum Necessarium* of 1655 and in *Ductor Dubitantium*, which he was confecting throughout the decade, and concerning which he made periodic trips to London from Golden Grove, the

---

<sup>248</sup> See e.g. Pascal’s use in *Pensées*, 449; cf. David Wetsel, *Pascal and Disbelief. Catechesis and Conversion in the Pensées* (Catholic University of America, 1994), pp. 90-113; C. J. Betts, *Early Deism in France. From the so-called ‘dèistes’ of Lyon (1564) to Voltaire’s Lettres philosophiques (1734)* (The Hague, 1984), Part I; J. S. Spink, *French Free Thought from Gassendi to Voltaire* (1960), pp. 45-6; René Pintard, *Le libertinage érudit dans la première moitié du XVIIe siècle* (Geneva, 1983), pp. 48-9, 62-4.

<sup>249</sup> See Part 2 of this thesis, esp. ch. 5.

Welsh seat of his patron Sir Richard Vaughan. We have heard Evelyn quote one of Taylor's sermons on probabilism. The subject was close to Taylor's heart. In *Ductor Dubitantium*, published in 1660, he described the doctrine as 'diabolical', and wrote, of the 'Jesuit confessors', that they 'answer according to every man's humor, and no man shall depart sad from their Penitential chairs'<sup>250</sup> – an interesting verbal echo of Pascal in the thirteenth *Provinciale*.<sup>251</sup> *Ductor Dubitantium* was Taylor's *magnum opus*, the book of reformed casuistry on which he worked throughout the 1650s, and which represented the fruits of his attempts to resolve contemporary problems of moral theology – problems which in his view the school of casuistry so closely associated with the Society of Jesus had been instrumental in introducing.

In his view the flexibility of the casuists and the accommodations of the confessors they guided rested on a tendency to frame morality as a matter of legalistic obedience. Taylor ascribed considerable value to the Jansenist reaction from this tendency.<sup>252</sup> Evelyn's citation of his Gunpowder sermon of 1638 is interesting, and dates Taylor's interest in these questions to an early period.<sup>253</sup> Most of his literary endeavours from 1649 onwards were aimed at resolving them, and the critique launched by the Jansenists in the 1640s and 1650s was of considerable interest to him. In the preface to *Ductor Dubitantium* he went on, having castigated the lax casuists, to refer his 'Reader to the books and letters written by their parties of *Portroyal*, and to [the Jesuits'] own weak answers and vindications'.<sup>254</sup> Presumably he meant to indicate the materials printed as part of the *Mystery of Jesuitism* series, and perhaps

---

<sup>250</sup> Jeremy Taylor, *Ductor [Dubitantium, Or The Rule of Conscience In all her generall measures: Serving as a great Instrument for the determination of Cases of Conscience]* (1660), p. vii.

<sup>251</sup> *CLP*, p. 252: 'A ceux qui voudront tuer on présentera Lessius; à ceux qui ne voudront pas tuer, on produira Vasquez, afin que personne ne sorte malcontent, et sans avoir pour soi un auteur grave'.

<sup>252</sup> See ch. 7, below.

<sup>253</sup> Chillingworth's criticisms of the casuists' doctrine of probabilism are contemporaneous, see *The Religion of Protestants A Safe Way to Salvation* (1870), pp. 483-5; cf. John Tulloch, *Rational Theology and Christian Philosophy in England in the 17<sup>th</sup> Century*, 2 vols. (Hildesheim, 1966 [1874]), i, pp. 273-4.

<sup>254</sup> *Ductor*, p. vii.

François Annat's and Jacques Nouet's answer to the *Lettres Provinciales*, translated into English by the Irish Jesuit Martin Grene and published in 1659.<sup>255</sup>

Evelyn heard Taylor preach for the first time in London in March, 1655, and quickly made of him an intimate friend, his 'ghostly father', and even his pensioner.<sup>256</sup> Their correspondence shows Taylor drawing on Evelyn's library for French works, and eagerly discussing the latest religious developments.<sup>257</sup> The two had numerous opportunities for colloquy during Taylor's intermittent trips to London in the 1650s to oversee publication of his books, and they must have discussed the momentous events then in progress in France. If it were necessary to assign a likely author to the striking passage cited above from the preface to the second edition of the *Provinciales*, Taylor would be a good guess, for the passage perfectly conveys his theological outlook.<sup>258</sup> Interestingly, Taylor was not the only literary figure making regular trips from Carmarthenshire to the capital in the 1650s. John Davies, the translator, divided his time between his affairs in London and residence in his native Kidwelly, about twelve or thirteen miles south-west of Golden Grove.<sup>259</sup>

The clerical party to which Taylor and like-minded divines such as Hammond belonged composed a small and tightly-bound network during the years of puritan rule, tied together by similarity of interest and, largely, of theological outlook.<sup>260</sup> These were the figures who knew and corresponded with Hyde, Ormond, and Evelyn, who themselves

---

<sup>255</sup> *An Answer to the Provincially Letters published by the Jansenists under the Name of Lewis Montalt against the Doctrine of the Jesuits and School Divines made by some Fathers of the Society in France* (Paris, 1659).

<sup>256</sup> de Beer (ed.), *Diary*, iii, p. 95, i, p. 11; Reginald Heber, 'Life of Jeremy Taylor', in *idem*, ed., *The Whole Works of the Right Reverend Jeremy Taylor, D. D.*, rev. in 10 vols. Charles Page Eden (1850-54), I, p. xxxix; Bray (ed.), *Correspondence*, i, p. 323.

<sup>257</sup> Bray (ed.), *Correspondence*, iii.

<sup>258</sup> See chs. 5 & 7, below. Although I have never found him to use the word 'deism' elsewhere, Taylor was well read in French religious literature, as his memorialist George Rust recorded – Rust, 'Funeral Sermon [for] Jeremy Lord Bishop of Down', in Heber (ed.) *Works*, I, pp. cccxxv-xxvi; Heber, 'Life', p. lii.

<sup>259</sup> Hook, 'John Davies of Kidwelly'; *ODNB* s. n. 'Taylor'. Following his second marriage, Taylor lived from 1655 until his removal to Ireland in summer 1658 at Mandiman, near Llangadog, a few miles north-east again of Golden Grove. Another Welsh connexion is suggested by the frontispiece to *Les Provinciales: or, The Mystery of Jesuitism*, a sombre-looking engraving by Robert Vaughan, an antiquary as well as a capable and respected line-engraver. Vaughan however was from north Wales, and not, I think, any relation to the earl of Carbery.

<sup>260</sup> See Bosher, *Making of the Restoration Settlement*, chs.1 & 2, for a description of this network.

exhibited interest in and collected Jansenist works, and who prosecuted a theological agenda specifically served by the Jansenist critique of laxist casuistry.<sup>261</sup> If we add to this precondition of interest in the issues raised by the Jansenists the fact that the members of this clerical party were in correspondence with exiled friends and colleagues on the scene of the controversy, it becomes hard to avoid the conclusion that, if Jansen was precipitate in identifying Henry Hammond as the responsible figure,<sup>262</sup> it was nevertheless members of the group which Richard Baxter designated ‘Dr. Hammond’s followers’ who had a corporate interest in producing the translations.<sup>263</sup> That Evelyn spoke of ‘that part of the Mystery of Jesuitism translated and collected *by me*’ strongly suggests that the entire series, up to and including his translations of 1664-1666, constitutes a corpus possessing some degree of internal relation.<sup>264</sup> Others known to Evelyn had previously collected and translated the Jansenists’ powerful attacks on the Jesuits; Clarendon decided to repeat the trick at an opportune moment.

Hammond himself was certainly *au courant* with the controversy at the Sorbonne, and had received correspondence on the subject of the ‘accommodation’ with the Jansenists allegedly broached by Richard Steward while the royal court was at Paris.<sup>265</sup> He knew the work of Saint-Cyran on episcopal powers, which earned the father of French Jansenism the gratitude of the Chapter of the English secular clergy.<sup>266</sup> he cited Petrus Aurelius on the

---

<sup>261</sup> In contrast one can point to the Independents and Nonconformists who were attracted to Jansenism as a doctrinal phenomenon, that is to say as the extreme form of Augustinianism condemned in the Five Propositions – e.g. John Owen, preface, in Gale, *The True Idea of Jansenisme*; cf. Dewey D. Wallace, *Shapers of English Calvinism, 1660-1714. Variety, Persistence, and Transformation* (Oxford, 2011), pp. 92, 95, 101, 111-12.

<sup>262</sup> None of the evidence adduced by Jansen (*De Blaise Pascal à Henry Hammond*) to show that the ‘editor’ was a) an Anglican (he is a member of a ‘late flourishing Church’; the series is published by Royston), and b) Henry Hammond (one piece is subscribed ‘H.H.’) concludes a necessity; two of these arguments, furthermore, are based on the one anomalous work which was not published by Royston; while the style of the prefaces by no means corresponds to Hammond’s.

<sup>263</sup> Baxter quoted in Bosher, *Making of the Restoration Settlement*, p. 46.

<sup>264</sup> Bray (ed.), *Correspondence*, iv, pp. 410-11, my emphasis.

<sup>265</sup> Introduction, above, p. 2.

<sup>266</sup> See above, p. 22.

necessity of episcopal ordination in his *De confirmatione* of 1661.<sup>267</sup> His may well have been the 1646 edition of Aurelius's *opera* now in the Allestree Library at Christ Church, Oxford, for at his death Hammond left a large number of books to Allestree, of which only a portion have been firmly identified.<sup>268</sup>

Allestree was a friend of Evelyn (who recorded many of his sermons), and acted as a royal agent during the 1650s, making occasional trips across the channel to carry funds and messages.<sup>269</sup> His major religious works, hugely influential during the restoration period and for centuries afterwards, concentrated on the practical consequences of the new Anglican approach to theology, to which Hammond and Taylor gave a doctrinal framework in works such as the *Practical Catechisme* and the *Unum Necessarium*. The bequest by which he formed the Allestree Library included a large number of Port-Royalist works, probably the most significant such collection in England before the late eighteenth-century. Allestree possessed major works on both sides of the controversy dating from the mid-1640s onwards, such as Arnauld's *De la fréquente communion* and its answer by Denys Petau, *De la pénitence publique*, as well as other pedagogical and philosophical works of Port Royal, and numerous letters and pastoral charges issued by Jansenist-sympathising bishops of the later seventeenth-century.<sup>270</sup>

Allestree may have obtained the books from his cousin, the London bookseller James Allestree, who was noted for his stock of French books; equally he may have picked them up on trips to the continent.<sup>271</sup> Books were cheaper there, and Allestree's library contains French editions of the pseudo-Dionysius, of Hilary of Poitiers, Theodoret, Origen, and of Augustine.

---

<sup>267</sup> Quantin, *The Church of England and Christian Antiquity*, p. 281.

<sup>268</sup> A list was drawn up by J. B. Hibbits and is included as Appendix B in 'Henry Hammond (1605-1660) and English New Testament Exposition'.

<sup>269</sup> de Beer (ed.), *Diary*, index s. n. 'Allestree'; Bosher, *Making of the Restoration*, pp. 30, 88-9, 98-9.

<sup>270</sup> See section 1 of this chapter, above.

<sup>271</sup> Mark Purcell, "Useful Weapons for the Defence of That Cause": Richard Allestree, John Fell, and the Foundation of the Allestree Library', *The Library*, 21, 2 (1999), p. 144.

Some may also have belonged to Hammond, who as we have seen left Allestree at least 138 books at his death just before the restoration, ‘knowing that in his hands they would be useful weapons for the defence of that cause he had during life so vigorously asserted’.<sup>272</sup> His library, as we remarked before, contains bespoke collections of the many anti-casuist writings produced in the wake of the *Lettres Provinciales* and Pirot’s *Apologie*, a number of which were translated and included in the *Mystery of Jesuitism* series.

The group of Anglican apologists to which Hammond, Taylor and Allestree belonged was, as Jansen pointed out, engaged in a common endeavour to defend the Church against the attacks of Catholic proselytes, for whom the disaster of disestablishment constituted a unique controversial opportunity.<sup>273</sup> Nothing could be more useful than a damning attack upon that Society most noteworthy for the vigour and success of its proselytising, and through it upon the pontiff to whom it was bound in special obedience, and upon whose peculiar apostolic brief so much of what seemed superficially attractive in the Catholic logic of authority was made to rest. The *Mystery of Jesuitism* series thus also took its part in an established programme of Anglican apologetic in the 1650s.

One of the agents of this programme was the publisher Richard Royston, who brought out the majority of works of a loyalist episcopalian stamp during the 1640s and ’50s, and afterwards prosecuted his affairs under the patronage and protection of the restored crown.<sup>274</sup> He was also responsible for the publication of all the translations bearing on the Jansenist-Jesuit dispute which we have been discussing, save for the *Journall of All Proceedings*, and appears to have shared in the conviction that English audiences would benefit from as full an exposure as possible. To this end he was evidently supplied with materials by like-minded

---

<sup>272</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 136, 143.

<sup>273</sup> Jansen, *De Blaise Pascal à Henry Hammond*, pt 1, ch. 3.

<sup>274</sup> Allestree’s *Whole Duty*, and his other anonymous works of practical piety, however, were published by Timothy Garthwaite, an associate of James Allestree, as was Jeremy Taylor’s *Worthy Communicant*.

parties. In the *Additional to the Mystery of Jesuitism* a note was interpolated by the Stationer, ‘R. R.’ (Royston had been a stationer since the 1620s), as follows:

[I had resolved to end here,] but the two following pieces<sup>275</sup> coming so opportunely to hand, and being of so much concernment to all the transactions between the IANsenists and the MOLINISTS; it would have argued a *neglect*, if not an *envy*, of thy satisfaction, to have slipped the present occasion I had to file them up. Besides, the IESUITS, for their vindication, intending to put out THE APOLOGY FOR THE CASUISTS, &c. in English, (to which these are written by way of Answer) they may prove an *Antidote* against the *poyson*, intended the unwary world in that Master-Piece of the SOCIETY.<sup>276</sup>

\*

The evidence, therefore, suggests that the Jansenist works published as part of the *Mystery of Jesuitism* series were introduced into the English public sphere with the knowledge, approbation, and in some cases active collaboration of a group of royalist episcopalian writers and policy-formers. Intellectuals such as Taylor, Hammond and Allestree began to acquire Jansenist works from the 1640s onwards; politicians such as Hyde and Ormond, acting through friends and agents including Bellings and d’Aubigny, began to see the relevance of the controversy and to collect the works it produced in the 1650s; and when a moment arrived at which their publication seemed opportune, Hyde assigned the task to Evelyn, who knew this whole circle well, was entirely in accord with their religious and political views, and moreover had some first-hand experience of the Jansenists from his time in Paris. If Clarendon had specific political reasons in 1664-5 for his commission of works condemning the politics of the Society of Jesus, so the context of the late 1650s – if the

---

<sup>275</sup> The ‘Remonstrance of the Curez of *Paris* Against a Book intituled, An Apology for the *Casuists*’, and their defence of the same remonstrance.

<sup>276</sup> *Additional to the mystery of Jesuitism*, p. 116; *ODNB*, s. n. ‘Royston’.

inherent interest of Pascal's work to Protestant polemicists is not enough – seems adequate to explain why other, probably clerical members of the same ideological party, would find it appropriate to sponsor the publication of this most effective condemnation of the morality of the Society.

This conclusion will be borne out by an examination of the reception of the Jansenist critique among restoration religious writers: for it shows that the critique of the doctrine of probability, with its lamentable sacramental, ethical, and civil consequences, was thoroughly consonant with the developing Anglican outlook of which the construction of the 'holy living' theology in the 1640s and 1650s was one of the central pillars.

### Chapter 3

#### *English Reception of the Jansenist Critique*

It was natural that the Jansenist critique should be introduced to an Anglophone audience under the direction of an influential interest among adherents of the disestablished Church. The triumph of the puritans in England had lent new force to the arguments of Roman polemicists. The Church of England, they said, had disappeared, her episcopal leadership nullified, her sacramental life destroyed; all this was clearly a judgement on heretical schism, and her scattered children had better return to the bosom of the Roman communion.<sup>1</sup> The lure of conversion, and with it security, became both more immediate and more attractive under the precarious circumstances endured by the Anglicans in continental exile. Much of the controversial energy of men like Cosin and John Bramhall, defending the continuing ecclesial integrity of the English Church despite her outward diffraction, was expended in refuting the seductive arguments of Catholic proselytes.<sup>2</sup> A weapon so incisive as that forged by Pascal would understandably be seized upon. The Anglicans, with their significant presence in Paris, were swift to see it: Bishop Duppa, for example, however tortoise-like his seclusion in Surrey, had the collected *Provinciales* barely a month after they were printed in July 1657.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Following John Cosin's enumeration of the standard arguments deployed by Catholics at this time: cited Bosher, *Making of the Restoration*, p. 61, and see pp. 54, 61f.; cf. John Gauden, *Ecclesiae Anglicanae Suspiria. The Tears, Sighs, Complaints, and Prayers of the Church of England* (1659), pp. 300f.; Taylor, *UN*, vii, p. 14. See further Spurr, *Restoration Church*, pp. 114f.

<sup>2</sup> E.g. Bramhall, *The Consecration and Succession, Of Protestant Bishops justified* (The Hague, 1658); *idem*, *A Just Vindication of the Church of England, from The unjust Aspersion of Criminal Schisme* (1658); *idem*, *Schisme Garded and Beaten Back* (The Hague, 1658); Cosin, *Regni Angliae Religio Catholica* (1652); *idem*, *The History of Popish Transubstantiation* (1655, publ. 1676).

<sup>3</sup> For this date, not entirely certain, *CLP*, p. lxxi. Of his existence under the Commonwealth Duppa wrote, 'I secure myself the same way as the tortoise doth, by not going out of my shell' – Gyles Isham (ed.), *The Correspondence of Bishop Brian Duppa and Sir Justinian Isham, 1640-1660* (Northamptonshire Record Society, xlv, 1955), p. 52, and for the *Provinciales*, pp. 139-41.

As we saw in the last chapter, the dissemination of the Jansenist critique in the years leading up to and following the restoration reflected both the long-term ideological commitments and the immediate religio-political imperatives of Anglican churchmen. They were attempting to engineer the re-establishment of the Church on a robust basis, yet under a monarch who was suspected of crypto-Catholicism and whose avowed policy was to achieve some substantial political reflection of his personal sympathy for Roman Catholics. The argument sustained by the Jansenists was apt, as they saw it, to serve their interests. It weakened the English Catholic body, dividing it against itself, and, in redounding so drastically to the discredit of the Roman interest, it could only assist in the formation of an ideological atmosphere sufficient to neutralise the inclinations of the monarch.

In many ways, indeed, the Port-Royalist campaign against Jesuit casuistry represented simply a well-timed replenishment of the Protestant polemical magazine. Many of the themes it touched upon, especially in respect to the politics of the Society of Jesus, were well-established in English Protestant arguments. The Jesuits were enemies to kings, advocates not only of the papal deposing power, but also, like the puritan extremists, apologists for violent resistance.<sup>4</sup> They were arch-plotters, famed for their doctrine of equivocation, ‘nimble as mischiefe itself’.<sup>5</sup> Their influence lay behind the Gunpowder Plot, as it did behind the assassination of Henri IV; after 1649 it was often asserted that the fate of Charles I was also the handiwork of Jesuit spies, who, disguised as sectaries or soldiers, inspired the regicides

---

<sup>4</sup> Controversialists never failed to cite the opinion published by the Spanish Jesuit Juan de Mariana in his *De rege et regis institutione* (Toledo, 1599), who matched theorists of the pope’s power to authorise political resistance by affirming on contractualist premises the right of the people to declare a ruler tyrannical, and thus of private men to kill him. See e.g. Joseph Hall, *Epistles. The third and last volume* (1611), p. 73: ‘[our religion] shall neuer yeeld that good Iesuite, either a *Mariana* to teach treason, or a *Rauillac* to act on it’. For more background cf. J. H. M. Salmon, ‘Catholic resistance theory, Ultramontaniam, and the royalist response, 1580-1620’, in J. H. Burns and Mark Goldie (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Political Thought 1450-1700* (Cambridge, 1991), pp. 219-53.

<sup>5</sup> The words of Thomas Taylor in 1624, quoted Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, p. 193, see also pp. 43, 521-2. For earlier notices of ‘Jesuiticall æquivocation’, notorious device of undercover priests in England, see among many examples Thomas Bell, *The Anatomie of Popish Tyrannie* (1603), p. 124; Thomas Morton, *A Preamble... Concerning the Romish doctrine both in question of Rebellion and Aequivocation* (1608), pp. 43f.; William Barlow, *An Answer to a Catholike English-Man* (1609), pp. 224-6.

by propagating subversive political ideas.<sup>6</sup> Not only William Prynne, but Richard Baxter and John Evelyn too subscribed to this conspiracy theory.<sup>7</sup> Some of the speculative innovations denounced by the Jansenists – an inflated doctrine of papal infallibility, and a suspect theory of grace and free will – were also early associated with the Jesuits by English writers.<sup>8</sup> The distinction between Jesuit extremism and moderate English Catholicism, too, was a well-established political and polemical tool long before Evelyn exploited it in his translations of Jansenist works. Even the Laudians, arriving, amid much criticism, at a less exclusive view of the position of the English Church *vis-à-vis* Rome, found it therefore especially useful to magnify the excesses of the Jesuits.<sup>9</sup>

The Jansenist polemics, in other words, focusing attention on the central controversial issues of papal infallibility and the Catholic theology of grace, and providing catalogues of subversive casuistical opinions on resistance to lawful authority, oath-breaking, and equivocation, were in one sense a straightforward gift to Protestant apologists. It is no surprise to find the Calvinist bishop of Lincoln and implacable anti-Romanist, Thomas Barlow, advising prospective divinity students, in a handlist of useful works, to regard the literary controversy between the Jansenists and the Jesuits as a ‘Common-place-book, wherein we may find all the Impious Opinions of the *Roman* Church’. The Jansenists, Barlow observed, had produced many books censuring the ‘*Jesuites* wild and extravagant Opinions’. The ‘*Provincial Letters* and the *Jesuites Morals*, and the *Mystery of Jesuitism*’ were

---

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Robin Clifton, ‘The Popular Fear of Catholics during the English Revolution’, *Past and Present*, 52 (1971), pp. 33-4; Ian Y. Thackray, ‘Zion Undermined: the Protestant Belief in a Popish Plot during the English Interregnum’, *History Workshop*, 18 (1984), pp. 28-52; Spurr, *Restoration Church*, pp. 65, 267.

<sup>7</sup> For Prynne see William Lamont, *Marginal Prynne, 1600-1669* (1983), pp. 138-42; for Baxter *idem*, *Richard Baxter and the Millennium* (1979), pp. 109-13; for Evelyn *Pernicious Consequences*, sig. A3v. Thomas Barlow also repeated the story, printed by Peter du Moulin, on the authority of Prynne, in his *Vindication of the Sincerity of the Protestant Religion* (1671), that a secret council of Jesuits in London had voted to bring about the king’s death: *Popery, or, The principles and positions approved by the Church of Rome (when really believ’d and practis’d) are very dangerous to all* (1679), pp. 72-4.

<sup>8</sup> E.g. Richard Montagu, *Appello Caesarem. A Just Appeal From Two Unjust Informers* (1625), pp. 121-2, 200f.; Joseph Hall, *Christian Moderation* (1640), p. 35.

<sup>9</sup> Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, pp. 241-2, 256.

particularly to be recommended. Apologies in which the Jesuits provided a traditional descent for their opinions were so much the more useful to aspiring Protestant controversialists.<sup>10</sup> This interest of Barlow's, Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity at Oxford from 1661 to 1675, complemented that of Richard Allestree, Regius Professor from 1663 to 1679, and avid collector of Port-Royal writings. Post-restoration Oxford theologians were unlikely to miss the relevance of the controversy.

However much the *Provinciales* and other anti-laxist works fitted into the existing structures of anti-Roman Protestant polemic, they did introduce one element which was new and therefore striking: the *exposé* of probabilism and its bizarre moral ramifications. Duppa, for example, having seen Pascal's writings, immediately sent Sir Justinian Isham

a breviat of some cases, which I extracted out of the *Provinciall* Letters in French, and with them a book sent me out of France in the year 1644, (and if I am not deceived the very same which you having once seen, you often enquired after, but I could not then find it), where I find many of the same cases, and som of that prodigious nature, that I am in a maze to see that any who profess the name either of Christ, or Jesus, dare vent to the world conclusions so destructive of everything that looks like religion, that neither the Talmud, nor the Alcoran can be charged with the like.<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> Thomas Barlow, *Autoschediasmata, De studio theologiae, or, Directions for the choice of books in the study of divinity* (Oxford, 1699), pp. 43-4. Barlow died in 1691. This work was 'publish'd from the original manuscript' by William Offley. Its pedagogic nature suggests it may date from Barlow's time as Lady Margaret Professor; perhaps it originated earlier, during his time as the librarian of Bodley (1642-60). He was reportedly in the habit of circulating a very similar list in MS: Alma de Jordy and Harris Francis Fletcher (eds.), "'A Library for Younger Schollers'" Compiled by an English Scholar-Priest about 1655', *Illinois Studies in Language and Literature*, 48 (1961), p. x.

<sup>11</sup> Isham (ed.), *Correspondence*, p. 141. The other book was apparently the *Requête, Procès Verbaux et advertissements faits à la diligence du Recteur et par l'ordre de l'Université pour faire condamner une Doctrine pernicieuse et preiudiciable à la Société humaine et particulièrement à la vie des Rois, enseignée au Collège de Clairement par les Jésuites de Paris* (Paris, 1644).

There was, of course, nothing remarkable in the idea that Catholicism was more pagan than Christian, a theology of works fitted to the proclivities of fallen nature.<sup>12</sup> But in the *Provinciales* English readers found evidence that this topsy-turvy religion had been theorised and institutionalised in Catholic moral theology. Duppa's amazement at the cases proposed by the casuists indicates the new element which the Port-Royalist campaign introduced into the polemical imagination of English Protestants. It is the purpose of this chapter to gauge the nature and significance of their reactions to this material during the second half of the century.

#### *A Common-place-book*

Although probabilism and laxism, as we have seen,<sup>13</sup> already had a reasonably lengthy controversial history by the middle of the seventeenth century, and Jesuit casuistry, of such moment in the problem of recusancy, was a prominent polemical topic in England,<sup>14</sup> Protestant writers under James and Charles I – usually quick to point out disagreements within a communion whose unity was supposedly infallibly guaranteed – rarely noticed them. John Donne, in a letter dated to the period of his residence at Mitcham between 1606 and 1611, did speak disapprovingly of 'indulgent' casuists who 'allow a conscience to adhere to any probable opinion against a more probable, and do never binde [the penitent] to seek out which is the more probable, but give him leave to dissemble it and to depart from it, if by

---

<sup>12</sup> Peter Lake, 'Anti-popery: the structure of a Prejudice', in Richard Cust and Anne Hughes (eds.), *Conflict in Early Stuart England* (New York, 1989), pp. 72-105; Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, pp. 173f.

<sup>13</sup> Ch. 1, above, pp. 13-14.

<sup>14</sup> Elliot Rose, *Cases of Conscience* (1975); George L. Mosse, *The Holy Pretence* (Oxford, 1957), ch. 3; Perez Zagorin, *Ways of Lying* (Cambridge, MA, 1990), ch. 10; Alexandra Walsham, *Church Papists* (Woodbridge, 1993), p. 67; Johann P. Sommerville, 'The "new art of lying": equivocation, mental reservation, and casuistry', in Edmund Leites (ed.), *Conscience and Casuistry in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, 1988).

mischance he come to know it'.<sup>15</sup> In general though Donne is unusual in the awareness of and concern with modern Catholic casuistry demonstrated in his printed works.<sup>16</sup> Even among writers engaged in the discipline of casuistry the innovations of later Catholic casuists were rarely adverted to. William Perkins defined his own casuistry, 'collected and drawne out of the very word of God', in contrast to one 'founded in the opinions, and variable conceites of men', consisting of 'Conclusions and Positions, which are onely probable and coniecturall'; but he did not indicate that he was necessarily thinking of the modern casuists.<sup>17</sup> In his discussion of the doubtful conscience William Ames, without referring to the views of other casuists, briefly stated that although it is sometimes licit to follow a probable opinion, one can never, on an extrinsic authority, follow an opinion which one considers less probable, nor is it possible to have two contradictory opinions which are equally probable and of which either may be followed.<sup>18</sup> Of the modern casuistical authors Joseph Hall seems to have known Azorius and Lessius most thoroughly. In Hall's own cases the arbitrations of Lessius are treated with a certain respect.<sup>19</sup> But in general Hall thinks the casuists too nice, considering like Perkins that there is so much 'deceit in Probabilities' that even the most learned clerks may mistake themselves 'in the affaires of God', which 'goe not by discourse, but by revelation'.<sup>20</sup> Robert Sanderson similarly rejected a notion of extrinsic probability on the grounds that 'all men though godly and learned, are no less lyable unto errors, than they

---

<sup>15</sup> Cited in A. E. Malloch, 'John Donne and the Casuists', *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, 2, 1 (1962), p. 59.

<sup>16</sup> For other examples see esp. *Biathanatos* (1644), freely citing Emmanuel Sa, Azorius, Tolet; also e.g. *Fifty Sermons* (1649), p. 340; *Essayes in Divinity* (1651), p. 153; *Paradoxes, Problemes, essayes, characters* (1652), pp. 148-9; cf. Meg Brown, *Donne and the Politics of Conscience in Early Modern England* (Leiden, 1995).

<sup>17</sup> *The whole treatise of the cases of conscience* (Cambridge, 1606), ep. ded.

<sup>18</sup> *Conscience with the Power and Cases Thereof* (Leyden-London, 1639), bk. 1, pp. 16-17.

<sup>19</sup> Joseph Hall, *Cases of Conscience Practically Resolved* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed., 1654), e.g. pp. 8-11, 58-9, 91-2, 124, 137-8, 155.

<sup>20</sup> *Contemplations upon the History of the New Testament ... second Tome* (1661), pp. 12-13.

are to sins', but, although he censured 'the impudence of the Jesuits' in respect to equivocation, he did not especially associate them with probabilism or its cognate, laxism.<sup>21</sup>

All this changed after the publication of *The Mystery of Jesuitism* in 1657. 'Jansenism' and the satirical inventions of Pascal passed immediately into familiar currency.<sup>22</sup> *The Pragmatical Jesuit New-leven'd*, a closet-drama by an apostate Benedictine, Richard Carpenter, is a lively symptom of this new awareness.<sup>23</sup> The play is about hypocrisy. The pious frauds of Catholicism are discovered to the world through the medium of the clear-thinking Cambridge scholar and hesitating convert Aristotle Jr., who finds that he cannot commit himself to Rome on account of his commitment to truth. Lucifer appears in order to perpetrate hypocritical frauds in the guise of the Roman Church, which are all done to the end of lucre. He sends an emissary to

commend my brotherly Respects to Father *Escobar* at *Valladolid*: Tell him, his *Morals* thrive wonderfully: The *Mystery of Jesuitisme* is little available against them: they have overturn'd all Law, Right, Honesty, and deified the Jesuit, made him the great God of Nature, all cases of Conscience answering, turning, and returning to him, whenas they should return, turn, and answer to him above.

Throughout the drama jokes turn on the strange maxims of the casuists. In Act 2 Scene 5, for example, Lord Liberal's niece, hitherto 'dressed modestly', is all over vain ringlets and curlicues after her conversion by the Jesuits: '*Escobar* the *Spanish* Jesuit hath open'd a broad

---

<sup>21</sup> *Ten Lectures On the Obligation of Humane Conscience. Read in the Divinity School at Oxford, in the Year, 1647* (1660), pp. 99f.; *Nine Cases of Conscience Occasionally Determined by Robert Sanderson* (1679), p. 97; cf. *De Iuramento. Seven Lectures Concerning the Obligation of Promissory Oathes* (1655, originally in Latin, 1647), pp. 40, 193-4, 198-200.

<sup>22</sup> See e.g. Richard Flecknoe, *Enigmaticall Characters* (1658), pp. 100-102; Thomas Blount, *Glossographia* (1661), under 'Jansenism'.

<sup>23</sup> *A New Play Call'd The Pragmatical Jesuit New-leven'd* (1665).

way to these loose and heathenish Dresses. O, the Jesuits!’<sup>24</sup> There is also a cameo for John Barnes, chained with a collar of iron around his neck: because he condemned equivocation the Jesuits ‘have design’d him for madness ... he was Master of a dangerous Head-piece’. Ultimately Lucifer finds himself defeated by his own epigones: the monks and the Jesuits of this world are too many for the devil. Even his hypocrisy cannot stand up to that of the Church.<sup>25</sup>

Carpenter’s ribald and scatological mode was common to a large number of more or less ephemeral pamphlets on the policy of the Society in the following years, with a glut occurring, as may be expected, around the time of the Popish Plot and the execution of the five Jesuits in 1679.<sup>26</sup> It would be interesting to know who was responsible for translating a Jansenist edition of Innocent XI’s decree of March 2<sup>nd</sup> 1679 in condemnation of sixty-five lax propositions of the new casuists.<sup>27</sup> It was accompanied by a commentary locating the

---

<sup>24</sup> The implied reference is to Escobar’s digest of the twenty-four doctors, tr. 1, ex. 8, n. 5, and tr. 1, ex. 9, n. 13 (*CLP*, pp. 167-8; *MJ*, pp. 207, 209).

<sup>25</sup> *The Pragmatical Jesuit*, pp. 17, 19, 29f., 65; see also a comedy by the lawyer John Wilson (a client of the Duke of Ormond), *The Cheats* (1664), p. 73. Cf., on the other hand, a satire hostile to Jansenism, by the French Capuchin Zacharie de Lisieux (Ange Lambert), *Relation du pays de jansénie*, translated by ‘P. B.’ as *A Relation of the Country of Jansenia* (1668). ‘Jansenia’ is located between ‘Libertania’, ‘Desesparia’, and ‘Calvinia’.

<sup>26</sup> An especially virulent example is the piece printed in the *Further Discovery of the Mystery of Jesuitism* (1658), ‘A Discovery of the Society in relation to their Politicks’ (piece V). This appears to be a translation of an Italian work published in 1617 which may be attributable to Tommaso Campanella, *Instruzione a’ Precipi della maniera con la quale si governano li Padri Giesuiti* – see A. Marsand, *I Manoscritti Italiani della Regia Biblioteca Parigina*, vol. 1 (Paris, 1835), p. 593. It reappears as *The Policy of the Jesuits, Their Insinuation into the Courts of Princes, And most of the noble Families of Europe, Discovered* (1658); then as *A Discovery of the Society In relation to their Politicks. Written Originally, By A Well-Wisher to the Jesuits* (1658); again, translated by Titus Oates, as *An exact discovery of the mystery of iniquity as it is now in practice among the Jesuits and other their emissaries* (1679); and again, from Oates’s translation and from a French translation of the Italian original (*Les Secrets des Jésuites*), with additions from a French translation of Hieronim Zaharowski’s *Monita secreta societatis Jesu (Advis secrets de la Société de Jésus)*, in *The Cabinet of the Jesuits Secrets Opened* (1679) [ESTC R18321]. The two French pieces were from a collection entitled *Le Cabinet Jésuitique, Contenant plusieurs Pièces très Curieuses des R. Pères Jésuites* (Cologne, 1678). Similar works included, Anon. [‘A Catholick-Christian’ – John Bramhall?? ESTC, R42725], *Pyrotechnica Loyolana, Ignatian fire-works, or, the fiery Jesuits temper and behaviour* (1667), implicating the Society in the fire of London; substantially the same is Anon., *Fair Warning to take heed of Popery* (1674); [Henry Care], *The character of a turbulent, pragmatical Jesuit and factious Romish priest* (1678); ‘A. H.’, *The Jesuits Catechism, according to St Ignatius Loyola* (1679); ‘E. G.’, *The horrid, direful, prodigious and diabolical practice of the Jesuits discovered* (1679); J. A. de Hess, *The Mystery of Equivocation* (1679); Anon., *Autokatakritoi, Or The Jesuits Condemned by their Own Witness* (1679); Israel Tonge, *Jesuitical Aphorisms* (1679); Edward Cooke, *A True Narrative of the Inhumane Positions and Practices of the Jesuites and Papists* (1680); Anon., *The character of a Jesuit* (1681).

<sup>27</sup> Ch. 1, above, p. 14.

propositions in the casuists, giving scriptural and patristic excerpts which contradict them, and providing a detailed account of the battle against laxism from the condemnation of Bauny by the Sorbonne in 1641 up to 1679. The translator styled himself a loyal English Catholic, though the ‘book’s’ profession, ‘by all the Holiness which is in the Outside and Inside of a Pope, That I am all over from Head to Foot a Papist’, may give cause for doubt.<sup>28</sup> Another edition of the same decree was furnished with a preface by Gilbert Burnet, who feared it would alter but little: ‘I need not desire the Reader to observe that it is above twenty years since Complaints were first made to the Popes by some of their own Clergie in *France*, of the Immoral and Impious Doctrines of the Casuists’.<sup>29</sup> The situation by 1700 was indicated in the preface of the 1704 English edition of the Jesuit Gabriel Daniel’s *Entretiens de Cléandre et d’Eudoxe, sur les Lettres au provincial* (1694). Israel Tonge’s translation of ‘Pascal’s Warehouse’, *The Jesuits Morals*, in 1670, along with the Popish Plot, it recorded, had rekindled interest first roused in 1657 – with the result that ‘Pascal is to be met withal gay and brisk in the Ale and Coffee-Houses, and nothing wanting to make his Letters as Authentick as Fox’s Martyrologe, but to be chained to the Board’s-end’.<sup>30</sup>

---

<sup>28</sup> *The Roman Wonder. Being Truth Confest by Papists. Wherein the Clergy of the Church of England in their Charge of Heretical and Damnable Doctrines upon the Jesuits are fully and fairly Justified* (1679), ‘The Book to the Reader’. A second, identical edition, appeared as *The Jesuits Morals Condemned In Sixty-Five of their professed Maxims or Tenents* (1680). The commentary drew on Jansenist works such as the *Extraict de quelques-unes des plus dangereuses propositions de la morale de plusieurs nouveaux casuistes fidellement tirées de leurs ouvrages* which appeared with the *Advis de Messieurs les Curés de Paris* (Paris, 1656), on which p. 24, above. Cf. a translation, with attributed propositions, of the Sorbonne’s censure (3<sup>rd</sup> Feb., 1665) of the *Opusculum singularia universae fere theologiae moralis complectens* by ‘Amadeus Guimenius’ (Mateo de Moya, SJ), *A Truth Known to Very Few: viz., That the Jesuites are down-right compleat Atheists* (1680), possibly the work of the same party: it is described in *The Jesuits Morals Condemned*, p. 37, as ‘the most important Censure that ever was pronounced by the faculty’.

<sup>29</sup> *A Decree Made At Rome, The Second of March, 1676. Condemning Some Opinions of the Jesuits And other Casuists* (1679), preface. Burnet’s authorship confirmed by his *Sermon preached before the Aldermen of the city of London* (n.p., 1681), p. 21.

<sup>30</sup> *The Discourses of Cleander and Eudoxe upon the Provincial Letters. To which is Added, An Answer to the Apology for the Provincial Letters* (1704), sig. a5r. The *Entretiens* had originally been translated by the English Jesuit William Darrell and printed from St. Omer in 1694. Cf. Keith Thomas, ‘Cases of Conscience in Seventeenth-Century England’, in J. Morrill, P. Slack and D. Woolf (eds.), *Public Duty and Private Conscience in Seventeenth-Century England* (Oxford, 1993), p. 50. For more on Pascal’s reputation in the eighteenth-century see Barker, *Strange Contrarities*.

The impact of the Jansenist controversy was not only to be detected at the vulgar level. The argument over grace and free will inspired some early English commentators, such as Herbert Thorndike, who analysed Jansen's views in his *Epilogue to the Tragedy of the Church of England* in 1659, and the Calvinist theologian Theophilus Gale, resident at Caen, who would provide a *True Idea of Jansenisme, Both Historick and Dogmatick* in 1669.<sup>31</sup> But it was the view opened up by the *Mystery of Jesuitism* series on the French rigorist campaign against laxist casuistry which attracted most attention among English theologians and religious commentators. 'The *Provinciall letters, Escobar* or the other profane *Casuists* of that wicked school' were now there to be 'ransacked' by writers across the whole religious spectrum in restoration England.<sup>32</sup> Throughout the period the specific examples of casuistical enormities catalogued in Jansenist works, and often the references with which they were furnished, were cribbed by English authors. Even particular phrases and epithets became common currency. The adjective 'pernicious', for example, a *leitmotif* of the Jansenist writings (as in Nicole's *Les pernicieuses conséquences*, translated by Evelyn), rarely failed to qualify the 'maxims', 'tenets', 'opinions' or 'morals' of the Jesuits in English writings after 1660. Some differentiation of treatment may however be discerned amid this widespread engagement.

\*

The question of Catholicism was central to the religio-political agenda in the decades following the restoration of Charles II. The spectre of popery loomed behind royal projects for an Indulgence, and, after the Duke of York had openly declared himself a Catholic in 1673 by resigning as Lord High Admiral in the wake of the Test Act, behind the throne itself. There was mileage in anti-papal rhetoric for all complexions of English Protestants.

---

<sup>31</sup> Cf. below, ch. 6, pp. 267f., and above, ch. 2, p. 73.

<sup>32</sup> Gilbert Burnet, *A Modest and Free Conference Betwixt a Conformist and a Non-conformist, about the present distempers of Scotland* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., Edinburgh?, 1669), p. 10.

Nonconformists who suspected the episcopal party of inclining towards Catholicism, or, as Baxter did, of entertaining ‘Grotian’ ambitions of a reunion of the Western Church under the spiritual leadership of the pope, could, by expatiating upon the dangers inherent in Catholicism, represent themselves as an essential component in a united Protestant front against encroaching irreligion.<sup>33</sup> Conformist writers, equally, were interested to enlarge upon the threat posed by popery to true religion and the Protestant state, since by equating it with a factious and fanatical Dissent they could urge the necessity for Nonconformists to forget their differences and rally round the national Church as the essential guarantor of unity.<sup>34</sup> Considering also the circumstances described in chapter 2, whereby the Jesuits became an expendable bargaining chip in Catholic manoeuvring for toleration, and the increasingly hysterical fears, culminating in the episode of the Popish Plot at the end of the 1670s, that the court intended to sell England over to popery and thereby slavery, it should be apparent that the Jesuit casuists lampooned by Pascal were not going to enjoy a great deal of popularity among Protestant writers in the post-restoration period. The *Provinciales* and related works appeared to demonstrate conclusively that Catholicism was not only perilous in those ‘points of faith’ cleared by ‘the divines of the Reformation’, or in those political points reducible to the preaching of ‘*Treason against Princes and States*’, but also in ‘their doctrines, which concern life and practice’. ‘Their doctrine *corrupteth almost all Morality*’, as Baxter wrote; and, he added, ‘what need we fuller clearer proof, then the *Jansenian* hath given us in his *Mysterie of Jesuitism?*’<sup>35</sup>

The ‘Jansenian’s’ case against the morality of the new casuists, however, still frequently took second place to a more traditional raft of anti-Jesuit arguments. Baxter, for

---

<sup>33</sup> E.g. Baxter, *A Key for Catholics*; Joshua Stopford, *The Wayes and Methods of Romes Advancement* (n.p., 1672).

<sup>34</sup> E.g. Stillingfleet, *The Unreasonableness of Separation* (1681).

<sup>35</sup> David Clarkson, *The Practical Divinity of the Papists Discovered to be Destructive of Christianity and Men’s Souls* (1676), Introduction; Baxter, *A Key for Catholicks*, pp. 1-2.

example, simply provided an undifferentiated list of casuistical propositions, apologising lest it ‘offend your ears’.<sup>36</sup> He culled these from the *Mystery of Jesuitism*, to which he gave page references and frequently referred his reader for further substance, but he was not especially interested in the intellectual thrust of Pascal’s satire. It merely illustrated the existence within the Roman communion of differences of opinion more than equal to those which Catholic writers imputed to the Protestant. Baxter began with the opinion of Filiutius that ‘if a man have purposely wearied himself with satisfying a whore, he might be dispensed from fasting on a fasting day’,<sup>37</sup> followed this with Basil Ponce’s lax opinion on proximate occasions, cited by Bauny,<sup>38</sup> and only then introduced the doctrine of probabilism in the form of Emmanuel Sa’s statement that ‘a man may do what he conceives lawfull according to a probable opinion, though the contrary be more certain: and for this the Opinion of one grave Doctor is sufficient’.<sup>39</sup> In other words he opened the *Mystery* at the fifth letter and extracted one or two apparently reprehensible citations as he turned the pages. He stopped after a dozen or so, ‘intreating’ his reader to ‘read in the said Jansenians Myserie of Jesuitism, a volume of such passages of the Jesuites’, for he had shown to his satisfaction that the ‘Papists’ were no more ‘at unity among themselves’ than ‘the Reformed Catholicks’.<sup>40</sup> *A Key for Catholicks* was hardly a reflective work, but it may be that Baxter concentrated rather on the Jesuits ‘loose opinions’ because his own theoretical position, that ‘faith’ grounded on the perspicuous rule of God’s revealed word was the desirable means of transcending ‘uncertain probabilities’, rendered technical criticisms of the probabilist methodology irrelevant.<sup>41</sup>

---

<sup>36</sup> *Ib.*, pp. 58f.

<sup>37</sup> *Mor. Quest.*, t. 2, tr. 27, pt. 2, c. 6, n. 123 (*CLP*, pp. 82-3; *MJ*, pp. 89-90).

<sup>38</sup> Bauny, *Theol. mor.*, tr. 4 *de Pœnit.*, q. 14, p. 94 (*CLP*, pp 83-4, 178-9; *MJ*, pp. 90-1, 228-9, 374; *AMJ*, p. 22).

<sup>39</sup> *Aph.*, p. 183 (*CLP*, p. 87; *MJ*, p. 95).

<sup>40</sup> Baxter, *A Key for Catholicks*, pp. 58f., see also pp. 127-8, 229, 278-9, 335, 339, 351.

<sup>41</sup> *A Christian Directory: Or, A Summ of Practical Theologie and Cases of Conscience* (1673), bk. 1, p. 31, bk. 3, p. 157; however he did recommend, for further reading on cases of conscience, ‘*Montaltus* against the Jesuit Casuists, and the *Jesuits Morals*’, *ibid.*, p. 928.

In *The Jesuit's Catechism*, by 'A. H.', 'two Principles' were identified as the mechanisms by which the Jesuits 'will excuse [men] before the Tribunal of God's Justice from all Sin'. These were the direction of intention, 'dont l'importance est telle dans notre morale', according to the 'good Father', 'que j'oserais quasi la comparer à la doctrine de la probabilité', and probabilism itself:<sup>42</sup> 'if a thing seems to me probable, if I do it, it's no sin in me; and if I have the Opinion of one or two Doctors or Clergymen ... then it's probable to me'.<sup>43</sup> The author of this pamphlet, however, had no interest in the potential danger to penitents posed by these principles: he merely wished to show that anything could be expected of the Society, since if they 'be careful to observe' these two principles '(as they are very circumspect) they can never sin or transgress'. The real sins of the Jesuits were, as usual, their advocacy of the pope's power to absolve subjects of their obedience, and their 'science of equivocation'. The approach to casuistry unveiled in the *Provinciales* was viewed, in this case, simply as another accessory to the Jesuits' notorious political machinations.<sup>44</sup>

This perspective was common to many of the authors and pamphleteers who made use of the Jansenist catalogues. The citations they contained were borrowed to adorn old arguments, or put to a tendentious use which ignored the essentially theological case they embodied. Where, for example, Jesuitical equivocation might previously have been illustrated from the history of the Gunpowder plot or from Robert Parson's *Treatise Tending to Mitigation* (1607), writers were now able to bring in *loci* indicated by the Jansenists, such as Thomas Sanchez's *Summa casuum conscientiae*, or the extracts from Tambourini included in the later *Théologie Morale des Jésuites* and translated by Tonge in the *Jesuits Morals*.<sup>45</sup> A favourite example was 'our honest Country man, Joseph [i.e. John] Barnes, a *Benedictine*

---

<sup>42</sup> *CLP*, p. 115.

<sup>43</sup> *The Jesuit's Catechism, According to St Ignatius Loyola*, p. 15, citing Escobar's digest, ex. 3, n. 24, and the preface of his *Theol. Prob.*, with Emanuel Sa's *Aph.*, p. 183 – *CLP*, p. 87; *MJ*, p. 95; *AMJ*, p. 18.

<sup>44</sup> *The Jesuit's Catechism*, pp. 18-28: the supporting citations however, of Becanus' *Controv. Angl.*, p. 140, and Suarez, *Def. fid. Cath.*, 1. 3, c. 23, were often included in hostile French catalogues.

<sup>45</sup> Sanchez, *Summ.*, pt. 2, l. 3, c. 6 (*CLP*, p. 164; *MJ*, p. 202).

*Monk*, who wrote a book against Equivocation', since the fate he suffered (incarceration at Rome and madness) seemed to typify the sinister policy of the Society.<sup>46</sup> The author just quoted was concerned to justify the execution of the five Jesuits on the grounds that their pleas of innocence could not be credited. Invoking the principle of 'l'honneur' expounded to 'Montalte' in the *Provinciales*, he remarked that 'the honour of the Society would have been lost, had the 5 Jesuits confessed: therefore by their maxims they could equivocate'.<sup>47</sup> An even more striking example of this sort of occasional appropriation of the Jansenist case is the lawyer Edward Cooke's exclusionist tract *A True Narrative of the Inhumane Positions and Practices of the Jesuites and Papists*, by which he sought to curry favour with the earl of Shaftesbury in 1680. Cooke 'had several ... Cases' from 'the Ingenious *Louis de Montalte*, in his Provincial Letters', intending to show thereby that 'Jesuitisme, being a State-trick of Religion, on purpose devised to maintain Luxury, Pride, Pomp, and excessive Ambition, with all other gawdy Train of Worldly Honours, must therefore consequently have Gain for the Chief Element of its Constitution'.<sup>48</sup>

\*

Some writers did exhibit a greater interest in the threat to Christian morality which Pascal had intended to expose in the casuists. *Pyrotechnica Loyolana*, a lengthy pamphlet which has been attributed to Bramhall,<sup>49</sup> entered fully into the Jansenist campaign, providing

---

<sup>46</sup> E.g. *Autokatakritoi, or, The Jesuits condemned by their own witness*, p. 2. This pamphlet was directed against the Jesuit Martin Grene's *Account of the Jesuites Life and Doctrine* (1661). The author points out that 'the Sorbon Doctors ... approved and commended Barnes his book'. See also Taylor, *Dissuasive from Popery*, p. 153; Stillingfleet, *A sermon .... 1678/9*, pp. 32-3, 39, 45, quoting from Barnes's treatise. Stillingfleet quite frequently referred to Barnes's views, e.g. *A Rational Account*, pp. 616-17, 640-1.

<sup>47</sup> *Autokatakritoi*, p. 16.

<sup>48</sup> Cooke, *A True Narrative*, pp. 3-8. Cooke cited, with references, all the examples of lax opinions on homicide listed by Pascal, such as the lawfulness of killing for a box on the ear, for paltry sums of money, for calumny, etc. (*MJ*, pp. 104, 140-5, 147-9, 150-3, 304-5, 309-310, 316-17, 335, 338-9, 340-1, 343, 347, 355; *AMJ*, pp. 18-20, 98; Amicius; Desbois, regent of theology at the archiepiscopal college, Rouen; Caramuel; Lessius; Reginaldus; Layman; Escobar; Azorius; Diana; Molina; Tannerus; Sanchez; Filiutius; Becanus; Héreau [see *CLP*, pp. 246-7&n.]; Hurtado de Mendoza.)

<sup>49</sup> *ESTC*, R42725: the pamphlet is a new edition of the 1674 work *A Fair Warning to Take Heed of Popery*; Bramhall had published, in 1649, a *Fair Warning to Take Heed of the Scottish Discipline*. He died in 1663,

a historical survey gleaned from St. Amour's *Journal* (translated into English in 1664).<sup>50</sup> The Jansenist position against Molinism, 'a monstrous *Hodgpodge* of old *Errors* and *Heresies* blended together', was represented favourably, and their recent edition of the New Testament mentioned, 'which the *Fiery Jesuits* are enkindling fuel to *burn* that it may not be read, lest by that *true light* of *Gods word* there be a *manifestation* of their abominable *points of Faith*'. Just as their doctrines were opposite to 'true faith', so the Jesuits' '*maxims* are also *contrary* to all *good manners*, yea contradictory to all the *common Notices* of *Holiness* ...

*Jesus saith, strait is the gate, and narrow is the way which leads to life, and few there be that finde it. But the Jesuits say, easie is the gate, and broad the way, and many, yea any, may find it.*

The writer identified the doctrines of probable opinions and of the artificial direction of intention as 'the *prodigious Loyolan Vipers* that eat out the very bowels of *morality*',<sup>51</sup> and quoted the *Remonstrance* of the Paris *curés* (printed in the *Additional*s to the *Mystery of Jesuitism*) to the effect that the casuists teach men 'to be Scepticks in all things, and to find out the ways, not to exterminate the corrupt maxims of men, but to justify them therein, and to instruct how they may with safety of Conscience put them in practice'. He proceeded to provide a '*Scheme* of some of those *impious maxims* ... as I find them dispers'd in that unanswerable *discovery* of their *immorality*, *The Mystery of Jesuitism* containing the *Provinciall Letters* with the *Additional*s'. As in the original *Théologie Morale des Jésuites* of 1643, the author disposed these maxims within the framework of the decalogue, demonstrating thereby that the casuists

---

whereas the pamphlet refers to works and events after that date, and the attribution is doubtful. There are some indications, however, that the author shared the perspective of episcopal churchmen such as Bramhall or Henry Hammond.

<sup>50</sup> Ch. 2, above, p. 79.

<sup>51</sup> Echoing Evelyn, '[the Jesuits] eat out ... the very heart and vitals of the common Christianity': *Another Part of the Mystery of Jesuitism*, sigs. A3v.-A4r.

make it their business to represent every sin as a *diminutive*, to vent new *Notions* of *good* and *evil*, and *indulge* men in an impudent, impenitent *violation* of *all* the weighty *precepts* of the most just and holy *Law*, and the necessary *Rule* of the *blessed Gospel*.

Thus under the first commandment the reader discovers that, according to the Jesuits, it is not a necessary precept to love God; under the second, that they sanction idolatry in China,<sup>52</sup> or the activities of magicians and soothsayers, who, when mistaken, are not obliged to restitution if they have really consulted the devil; under the third, that it is lawful to swear with a mental reservation; and so on and so forth, bringing in under the second table all the destructive social implications of the casuists' opinions on the filial bond, homicide, sexual incontinence, '*theft, cheating, and symony*', calumny and equivocation, envy and ambition.<sup>53</sup>

The theological significance of these moral 'abominations' was clearly pointed out: 'Twill not need much labor to evince, that they who thus endeavor to make void the precepts of the *Law*, are not wanting to evacuate the *gracious prescriptions* of *Faith* and *Repentance* commended to us in the *Gospel*, as necessary means to *eternal life* and *happiness*'. The Jesuits, making a guide out of natural reason, were to be equated with the Quakers, whose inner light also represented a subjective rule capable of justifying wilful moral aberrancy. Thus, as the author went on, further suggesting the wing of English theological opinion to which he adhered, they do away with 'that *lively obediential believing* which our Lord Redeemer requires of every one that would be saved', that is 'the *Evangelical Doctrine of Repentance*, which is necessarily commanded, as well as *faith* in *our Lord Jesus Christ*'. The mechanism by which the Jesuits destroyed the Gospel was the vitiated sacrament of penance criticised by Arnauld in *De la fréquente communion* and by Pascal from the tenth *Provinciale* onwards. The Jesuits resolve the duty of repentance into 'a sleight *auricular confession*': this

---

<sup>52</sup> A bibliography on the 'Querelle des Rites' is provided by Delumeau, *Le Catholicisme entre Luther et Voltaire*, p. 37.

<sup>53</sup> These are all quoted *verbatim* from the *Mystery of Jesuitism* works, to which page references are given.

confession is made easy by allowing it to be general and sparing; no penance is applied preparatory to absolution, but absolution is easily granted to any, even habitual sinners who do not avoid proximate occasions, and is able to reconcile the penitent to God even if he lacks contrition but experiences merely a fear of damnation.<sup>54</sup> The author, who recognised that he had ‘made an excursion beyond mine intended bounds, while I am reciting these *pernicious maxims*’, clearly felt it was important to

disgrace this *Pageantry* which the *Ignatians* fabricate to jostle out the *real practice of Repentance* ... for though the *Jesuits* account many necessary *Commandments* in the *Gospel*, as *Evangelical counsels*, which they are at liberty to take, or not, God will not be mocked, or put off with *subtilties*: But *Whosoever shall break one of these least Commandments and shall Teach men so, he shall be called the least in the Kingdom of Heaven*.<sup>55</sup>

In depicting ‘les nouveaux casuistes’ as enemies to the ‘real practice of Repentance’ this author indicated that the Jansenist moral critique possessed a potential relevance to English religious thinkers which went beyond the useful caricature of Jesuit villainy. In fact it had much to say to a group of theologians – the same which, we suggested in chapter 2, sponsored the initial translations of the *Provinciales* into English – who had been engaged, during the 1640s and 1650s, in constructing a theology that gave a higher emphasis to moral striving, which in their view was endangered by the Calvinist-style theology of the Westminster Assembly and the early Stuart Church.<sup>56</sup> The Jansenist focus on the internal disposition of the individual, which, it was claimed, the Jesuits ignored in designing an externalist or formalist theory more suited to everyday convenience, was something they wished to emphasise in an English context too. For, if the casuists talked as though ‘God did

---

<sup>54</sup> See *CLP*, pp. 89, 171f. ; *MJ*, pp. 97, 215-27, 230-5.

<sup>55</sup> *Pyrotechnica Loyolana*, pp. 36-50 (Mt. v 19).

<sup>56</sup> Ch. 5, below.

not appoint the priest to minister to holy living but to excuse it', English Protestants were no less eager to slip the bonds of religious duty.<sup>57</sup> 'Although' the vitiated sacrament of penance outlined by the casuists 'is the doctrine properly of the Roman schools, yet it is their and our practice too. We sin with greediness, and repent with leisure', and 'to confess and to absolve is all the method of our modern repentance, even when it is most severe'.<sup>58</sup>

### *Anti-Probabilism and Anti-Calvinism*

'To schoolmen I give my doubtfulness'

Donne, 'The Will'

None among the 'careless and confident' thinkers of the schools, according to the argument of the Jansenists, could have profited more from Donne's sardonic bequest than the probabilists.<sup>59</sup> Substituting for doubtfulness the illusory certainty of probable opinions, they guided penitents away from the narrow road that leads to heaven. But doubt, a corollary of sin, is a signpost which directs us to the truth. We will enjoy a perfect peace when we see that *alta luce che de se è vera*; here our *repos* lies in seeking it.

Where previous generations of English churchmen might have taxed a self-reliant Catholic works-righteousness with 'doubtfulness', the mid-century defenders of the

---

<sup>57</sup> A classic anti-laxist statement: compare e.g. the words of the Assembly of the French Clergy, in their letter to the French bishops prefacing the 1656/7 ed. of Borromeo's *Instructions aux Confesseurs* [(Besançon, 1839), p. 8], and cited in the *Factum pour les Curés de Paris*, in *Ecrits des Curés de Paris*, ed. Récalde, pp. 65-6: 'ces nouveaux Théologiens, au lieu d'accommoder la vie des hommes aux préceptes de Jésus-Christ, ont entrepris d'accommoder les préceptes et les règles de J.-C. aux interests, aux passions et aux plaisirs des hommes'.

<sup>58</sup> Taylor, *UN*, pp. 154, 419: the final superlative implies a further criticism, since Taylor remarks it is only the most rigorous among English Protestants who seek to avail themselves of the ministry of confession.

<sup>59</sup> Quote is Taylor, *Ductor*, p. iv.

established Church were more concerned with spurious Catholic claims about certainty. Chillingworth in the 1630s had undermined the case for an infallible guide to the interpretation of scripture; his argument would be carried forward by, among others, Stillingfleet and Taylor in controversy with Sergeant.<sup>60</sup> Writers who concerned themselves with morals were exercised by the analogous theory developed among Catholic casuists, who guaranteed certainty at one remove by an extrinsic authority. The Anglican response on both counts was effectively identical: the problem of the inaccessibility of an absolute certainty is not resolved but avoided by this resort to a vicarious one.

Probabilist casuistry had a twofold relevance for such writers. In the first place, the English Church was not rich in casuistical divinity. Taylor could only name ‘*Amesius, Perkins*, and the late Eloquent and Reverend Bishop of *Norwich*’ among worthy predecessors.<sup>61</sup> Catholic moral theology and casuistry were therefore necessary resources. But ‘we cannot be well-supplied out of the Roman storehouses: for though *there* the staple is, and very many excellent things expos’d to view; yet we have found the merchants to be deceivers; and the wares too often falsified’.<sup>62</sup> There was, therefore, a practical need to expose ‘false principles in ... moral or casuistical divinity’.<sup>63</sup>

Behind this literal relevance, so to speak, lay an analogical one, indicated by Taylor’s explanation of the shortfall in reformed casuistry. This dearth, he suggested, was the result of England’s thralldom to predestinarian ‘disputations’. Where men believe ‘it is not a good life that justifies man before God, but ... faith in the special promises’, the analysis of moral duty

---

<sup>60</sup> Van Leeuwen, *The Problem of Certainty*, ch. 2; Martin I. J. Griffin, *Latitudinarianism in the Seventeenth-Century Church of England* (rev. ed., Leiden-New York, 1992), ch. 7; Stillingfleet, *A Rational Account*, pp. 7-8; Richard H. Popkin, ‘The Philosophy of Bishop Stillingfleet’, *Journal of the History of Philosophy*, 9 (1971), pp. 303-19; Carroll, *Common-Sense Philosophy*, pp. 44-9, 57-70; Taylor, *The Second Part of the Dissuasive from Popery* (1667), Introduction, and bk. 1, §§ 1-3.

<sup>61</sup> *Ductor*, p. ii, i.e. William Ames, William Perkins, and Joseph Hall. Taylor’s list is missing Robert Sanderson, the most respected casuist of his day. The work of Baxter and John Sharp of York came afterwards.

<sup>62</sup> *Ib.*

<sup>63</sup> *UN*, p. 9.

and the special ministry it informs, ‘private Confession’, are devalued. As Taylor explained in 1655, he therefore had to postpone his *magnum opus* dealing with the principles of casuistry, *Ductor Dubitantium*, in order first to ‘undermine these false foundations’ by establishing the necessity to ‘live holily’.<sup>64</sup> His work on casuistry, in other words, presupposed an approach to morality distinguished from a Calvinist theology which was said to undermine it. To define a position against Catholic casuistry was simultaneously to elaborate this anti-Calvinist position.<sup>65</sup>

Indeed the analogy between these two undesirable *morales* ran very closely. There are two ways, observed Allestree, of ‘making *Religion* subservient to *vice*’. The ‘Zealots’ believe themselves among the elect, affirm that ‘God *sees no sin in his elect*’, and ‘from thence proclaim ... a general Jubilee and manumission from the bonds even of *Christ’s* as well as Moses’s Law’.<sup>66</sup>

Of the second sort are some, who by indulgent and partial glosses, seek to mollify the severity of Christ’s commands: That contrive for their Clients not the *means* of Obeying, but the *arts* of Escaping them ... These are a generation of men of whose Dexterity in this faculty the world has taken so much notice I need not name them, a sort of easie *Casuists* who ... thus enlarge the narrow way, make it a road as well for the Beast as the Man, the *brutish sensual*, as well as the *rational divine* Part of us.<sup>67</sup>

Both Calvinist theology and ‘laxist’ casuistry, on this analogy, effect a separation between the moral agent and the law of God which ought to rule his actions. The conscience is ultimately persuaded and settled, not by careful deliberation, but by a belief in the doctrines of election or probabilism. Both give a vicarious assurance of innocence, one by the extrinsic

---

<sup>64</sup> *Ib.*, pp. 8-14; *Ductor*, p. i.

<sup>65</sup> On the term ‘Calvinist’ see above, p. 8, and below, p. 213, n. 7.

<sup>66</sup> ‘Zealots’ recalls the Jewish *ius zelotarum* invoked, for example by Milton, to justify the regicide.

<sup>67</sup> Richard Allestree, *The Causes of the Decay of Christian Piety* (1667), pp. 297-9.

righteousness infallibly imputed to the elect, the other by the extrinsic probability which infallibly settles the conscience. Both therefore effectively cashier ‘God’s Vicegerent’, the conscience itself, understood as the activity of the ‘rational divine’ part of man by which he is enabled to participate in the eternal moral law. For they give a guarantee of security (the inward testimony of the Spirit; the doctrine of probable opinions), which, being sufficient in itself, looses the conscience, ‘the rule from which it is sin to recede’, from ‘the rule of this rule, God’s law’. There is, that is to say, no check to the erring conscience – which, since it is always evil to act against the law, must, as Aquinas taught, be ‘deposed’ or ‘laid aside’.<sup>68</sup> So long as ‘man does not so much as doubt of his opinion ... what temptation can he have to think of rectifying it?’ If the conscience is always infallibly secure, fallible man will, in following it, inevitably sin against the law of God. The casuists’ doctrine of probabilism was thus functionally equivalent with the Calvinists’ ‘Divine Light within themselves’: both absolved the moral agent of his responsibility to attain to the clearest possible apprehension of his duty.<sup>69</sup> Both doctrines encouraged men to ‘go on without fear ... and without scruple be confident of heaven’; both were ‘apt to produce error and confidence, security and a careless conversation’.<sup>70</sup> The proof of the pudding, argued Anglican writers, was in the eating: the outcome of this specious certainty was, in each case, rebellion, regicide, and evil living.<sup>71</sup>

Like the Port-Royalists, writers such as Taylor and Allestree focused on the obligation imposed by fear and uncertainty to take the safer part or inform the conscience, a process they similarly envisaged as relating to the cultivation of the moral personality as a whole.

‘Our corrupt and debased *nature*’ puts us outside the order established by God, expressed in

---

<sup>68</sup> Cf. Taylor, *Ductor*, i, ch. 3, § 7.

<sup>69</sup> Qus. taken from Allestree’s discussion of the conscience, in *Forty Sermons* (Oxford-London, 1684), pp. 65-78 & pp. 230-83.

<sup>70</sup> Taylor, *UN*, pp. 13, 9.

<sup>71</sup> E.g. Allestree, *Forty Sermons*, p. 69; cf. some pulpit remarks of Taylor in 1656, BL Add. MS 78364, fol. 48r; the same analogy was later drawn by Robert South, *Twelve Sermons ... Volume 2* (1694), pp. 545-7; and by William Wake, *Sermons and Discourses* (1690), pp. 200-204.

his laws. But ‘by his grace’ he mercifully ‘offers to elevate and refine this nature, bring it up to the purity of those Laws’. That is, he ‘puts us in a capacity of being *like unto him*, in which is summed up at once, all both *virtue* and *felicity*’. The more we conform ourselves to his laws, the more we are aligned with that eternal trajectory whose end is in God. ‘And on this glorious *end* every particular command of his, has a direct aspect, every one of them tending to re-impress on us some part of that divine *image* which was raz’d out by the *first sin*’. The conscience is the instrument by which this ‘assimilation’ is achieved, judging how the end should be realised in action.<sup>72</sup> The role of casuistry is therefore to minimise as far as possible the room for error in moral judgements – for ‘of all things in the world, in these things an error is most intolerable’.<sup>73</sup> But the lax casuists, ‘instead of directing men’s Consciences in the wayes of innocence and goodness ... teach them the art of *putting tricks on God Almighty* (as one called the Casuistical Divinity of the Jesuits)’.<sup>74</sup> Since this is inconsistent with the ‘indelible notions’ upon which the conscience erects its syllogisms – that is, Aquinas’s first principles of practical reason, for example that good should be sought and evil avoided – ‘he that can thus pronounce, must be suppos’d to have suppress’d and *silenc’d* that’.<sup>75</sup>

Like the Jansenists, therefore, the Anglicans charged the casuists with divesting the conscience of its office as ‘Judge’, so disabling man from conforming his actions to the law and fulfilling his role within the eternal order. The secure conscience is the one which has taken every possible precaution to ensure the truth of its judgements. By giving a security logically prior to this search for the truth, the doctrine of probabilism, like the Calvinist theory of imputed righteousness, effectively ‘imprisons’ the conscience, and thus impedes the restoration of the image of God in man.

---

<sup>72</sup> Allestree, *Causes of Decay*, p. 72.

<sup>73</sup> Taylor, *Ductor*, p. ix.

<sup>74</sup> Stillingfleet, *A Sermon*, pp. 51-2: he inaccurately cites Pierre Nicole’s third note on the third *Provinciale* in his Latin ed. of the *Lettres*. A more likely source is the *Dissertatio* on probability appended to the fifth letter; but I have not been able to locate the precise quotation.

<sup>75</sup> Allestree, *Causes of Decay*, p. 72; Aquinas, *ST*, IaIIae, q. 94, a. 1-2.

There is no reason to suppose that this position, based on the Thomist assumptions shared by the majority of seventeenth-century English moralists, was not reached organically and independently of any immediate outside influence.<sup>76</sup> It was in any case the basis of the argument against Rome that her abuses stemmed from the superfluous interposition of ‘the authority of man’ between the faithful and the Word of God;<sup>77</sup> insofar as probabilism represented merely a diversification of human authority, its repudiation followed naturally from the Protestant position.

The congeniality of the Jansenist argument to Anglican thinkers, however, does raise some questions, for it is not clear that we should necessarily expect to find any ready sympathy at all. If the Jansenists are often seen as a kind of Catholic ‘puritan’, the casuists are, by the same token, a kind of Catholic ‘Anglican’, optimistic about the complementarity of nature and grace, and willing therefore to expand the role of free will in the economy of salvation, and the competence of reason to order human conduct.<sup>78</sup> English churchmen of the mid- to late-seventeenth century inherited a tradition, that of Hooker and Chillingworth, which identified in reason a source of authentic religious knowledge capable of balancing exclusive claims made for the all-sufficiency of scripture or tradition.<sup>79</sup> To divines like Hammond, Taylor, Thorndike or Stillingfleet among the following generations, Chillingworth’s solution to the problem of authority had become conventional. The mathematical certainty proper to demonstration is not applicable to faith, which rests ultimately on the testimony of scripture; nor can it be infallibly shown that any putative guide in matters of belief is infallible. There is a necessary premise that compels assent to non-

---

<sup>76</sup> See H. R. McAdoo, *The Structure of Caroline Moral Theology* (1949); Thomas Wood, *English Casuistical Divinity during the Seventeenth Century. With Special Reference to Jeremy Taylor* (1952); Camille Well Sights, *The Casuistical Tradition in Shakespeare, Donne, Herbert, and Milton* (Princeton, 1981), chs. 1&2; also her ‘Ingenious Piety: Anglican Casuistry of the Seventeenth Century’, *The Harvard Theological Review*, 63, 3 (1970), pp. 409-32.

<sup>77</sup> Taylor, *Ductor*, pp. iv-v.

<sup>78</sup> This idea of ‘liberal’ Anglicanism is interrogated ch. 5, below.

<sup>79</sup> See further *ib.*, pp. 230-36.

demonstrable articles, namely that they are proposed as true by God; but the best kind of certainty we can obtain that scripture has this divine guarantee is the moral certainty with which we assent to any well-attested historical fact.<sup>80</sup> This moderate contentment with a limited or practical certainty sufficient for action, resting on Aristotle's rule that 'there are different degrees of certainty attained according to the different degrees of evidence', bore a superficial resemblance to the approach taken by probabilist casuists.<sup>81</sup> To the Blackloists, writers like Taylor or Stillingfleet were therefore 'probabilists': sceptics who denied the possibility of an absolute certainty, which the Blackloists thought could be 'geometrically' guaranteed in virtue of the revealed *axiomata* unfailingly preserved by tradition.<sup>82</sup> The Blackloist argument, in the hands of Sergeant, was absurdly overblown; but, if there was anything at all in the charge, then the Anglican reception of polemics formulated against precisely such an attitude among the casuists does call for some investigation.

\*

The Jansenist polemics brought before English eyes the doctrine of probabilism as the root cause of the laxism by which Roman casuists indulged human frailty.

There is a Proposition, which indeed is new, but is now the general Doctrine of the Leading Men in the Church of *Rome*; and it is the foundation on which their Doctors of Conscience rely, in their decision of all cases in which there is a doubt or question made by themselves; and that is *That if an Opinion or Speculation be probable, it may in practice be safely followed*: And if it be inquir'd, What is sufficient to make an

---

<sup>80</sup> See Chillingworth, *The Religion of Protestants*, pp. 65-7, 412-14, 185-8, 216f. The clearest account of the proportion between types of certainty and evidence is probably the mathematician John Wilkin's *Of the Principles and Duties of Natural Religion* (1675), i, ch. 1.

<sup>81</sup> Quote is Stillingfleet, *Idolatry*, pp. 568-9; cf. ch. 1, above, pp. 32-3.

<sup>82</sup> Ch. 2, above, p. 116.

Opinion probable; the answer is easie, *Sufficit opinio alicujus gravis Doctoris* ... This is the great Rule of their Cases of Conscience.<sup>83</sup>

This account of the doctrine followed that given by the Jansenists. The casuists, says Taylor, arrogate cases of uncertainty, which they therefore multiply, to the competence of probability. They sever the link between the speculative and the practical, replacing it with the ‘Warranty’ that a probable opinion can always be safely followed: ‘here is enough to give peace of conscience to him that does it’. Then ‘I may ... choose which I will, and do what I list in most cases, and yet be safe’. The casuists have thus given themselves a licence to ‘govern [men] by their own inclinations’: as Pascal made his ‘Jansenist’ explain, this meant they could be ‘severe’ or ‘gentle’, ‘strict’ or ‘loose ... so they may entertain all spirits, and please all dispositions, and ... none may go away scandaliz’d or griev’d from their penitential chairs’.<sup>84</sup>

The discussion in Taylor’s *Dissuasive* was replicated from the preface to his *Ductor Dubitantium*, where he defined probabilism – ‘this Academical or rather Sceptick Theology, *Alii aiunt, alii negant; utrumque probabile*’ – from the same sources, and, referring his ‘Reader to the books and letters written by their parties of *Portroyal*’, gave numerous examples of lax propositions.<sup>85</sup> Probabilism, on this showing, was ‘a rare way of probation’, which, ‘upon the saying of one or two persons’, gives ‘a warranty to doe actions ... so abhorrent from the law of Nature and common honesty’. To follow such a ‘probable’ opinion

---

<sup>83</sup> Taylor, *A Dissuasive from popery*, pp. 110, 116, citing Emmanuel Sa’s *Aphorismi confessoriorum*, s.v. *dubium*, as quoted *CLP*, p. 87, *MJ*, p. 95; and Escobar’s digest, ex. 3, c. 3, *CLP*; p. 88, *MJ*, p. 96; cf. Thomas Pierce, *A Decade of Caveats*, (1679), p. 20, citing Escobar, *Theol. Mor.*, t. 1, l. 2, c. 2 (*AMJ*, p. 91), and Caramuel, *Theol. Fund.*, pp. 71, 72 (*AMJ*, pp. 78-80); Gauden, *Suspiria*, p. 681, citing the *Mystery of Jesuitism*; William Lloyd, *A Sermon* (1678), p. 32, citing ‘the *Provincial Letters*’; South, *Twelve Sermons*, pp. 537-8; William Wake, *The Missionarie’s Arts Discovered* (n.p., 1688), pp. 41-2, citing Caramuel on the authority of ‘the *Provincial Letters*’ (*CLP*, pp. 102-3; *MJ*, p. 112).

<sup>84</sup> Taylor, *A Dissuasive from popery*, pp. 110-12; Pascal makes each of these points at *CLP*, letters 5 & 6, and similarly affirms that the Jesuit confessors sponsor all opinions ‘in order that none might leave [them] discontented’ (*CLP*, p. 252, ‘afin que personne ne sorte malcontent’).

<sup>85</sup> These included Emmanuel Sa, *Aph.*, v. *furtum*, on theft and restitution, a place cited in various French catalogues and later utilised by Sergeant, *The Jesuits Gospel*, p. 16, and in the *Jesuits Morals Condemned*, p. 51; Diana, *de poenit.*, that ‘a dying man is not tied to be contrite for his sins’, quoted *CLP*, pp. 185-6, *MJ*, pp. 233-4.

is, indeed, to accept an ‘improbable proof’.<sup>86</sup> Taylor’s sarcasm was echoed by Allestree, who observed that those who give ‘blind assent’ to the opinions of private persons are likely to be deceived; ‘I shall leave it to others, to estimate the *probability* that they shall not be actually so’.<sup>87</sup> Later writers who shared their concern for moral standards, such as the royal chaplain and Westminster prebendary William Owtram, would continue to express repulsion at the lawless doctrine laid out by Pascal’s ‘good father’.<sup>88</sup> Permitting men to forsake the search for truth, the function of probabilism is ‘to rob every private person of his Conscience, Reason, and Understanding’, leaving him thereby a prey to his ‘sinful inclinations’.<sup>89</sup> The pious non-juror Thomas Baker would similarly depict probabilism as a retreat from Christian freedom and responsibility into a sort of heathen academic scepticism, instancing the *peccatum philosophicum*, and referring readers to Tonge’s translation of Perrault’s *Jesuits Morals*.<sup>90</sup> ‘It would be an endless thing’, wrote William Sherlock in reflecting on Catholic failings, ‘to take notice of the loose determinations of their famed and approved *Casuists*, of their Doctrine of probable Opinions, of the direction of the Intention, by which means the very Laws and Boundaries of Vertue and Vice are in a great measure quite altered.’<sup>91</sup> South complained of

a Generation of Men, who have framed their Casuistical Divinity to a perfect Compliance with all the Corrupt Affections of Man’s Nature, and by that new-invented Engine of the *Doctrine of Probability*, will undertake to warrant, and quiet the Sinner’s

---

<sup>86</sup> *Ductor*, p. vi.

<sup>87</sup> Allestree, *Causes of Decay*, p. 369.

<sup>88</sup> See Owtram, *Twenty Sermons* (1682), p. 380, on antinomianism. Owtram was included, as ‘Ottomar’, in Joseph Glanvill’s portrait of the ‘Cupri-Cosmits’ or latitudinarian divines: Jackson I. Cope, ‘“The Cupri-Cosmits”: Glanvill on Latitudinarian Anti-Enthusiasm’, *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 17, 3 (1954), p. 278.

<sup>89</sup> *Ib.*, pp. 101-6. Owtram cited from Pascal Ecobar’s case allowing homicide for a box on the ear (in the latter’s digest, tr. 1, ex. 47, n. 48: *CLP*, p. 123, *MJ*, p. 143).

<sup>90</sup> *Reflections Upon Learning* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., 1700), pp. 71-5: extrinsic authority derived from one grave doctor and the choice of a less probable opinion produce ‘such a Morality, as the Heathen Philosophers would blush to own’. On the philosophical sin cf. Taylor, *Second Dissuasive*, pp. 261-2.

<sup>91</sup> *The Second Part of the Preservative Against Popery* (1688), p. 78.

Conscience in the Commission of any sin whatever, provided that there be but the *Opinion of one Learned Man*.<sup>92</sup>

The scornful expressions of writers like South or Taylor were not merely a product of Protestant prejudice, for as moralists they did not reject the methods and principles of the casuists out of hand. Taylor recognised that scripture could not function as a plain and comprehensive guide in every moral question, and that here man must use the God-given light of reason.<sup>93</sup> By reason man knows, as well as metaphysical, practical first principles, for example that ‘*Good is to be chosen*’, and can deduce their necessary consequents; and it is by reason that he must interpret and apply what he is taught by revelation.<sup>94</sup> In applying general moral rules to particular cases, moreover, man is forced upon probable arguments, for in the changeable sphere of ‘human transactions’, ‘unless God is pleased to interpose’, we ‘are not capable of a greater assurance’.<sup>95</sup> Since the subject-matter does not admit of mathematical demonstration, only a ‘mad man’, as Aristotle says, would expect ‘any more than arguments of a high probability’. Such a moral demonstration ‘is nothing but a coacervation of many probabilities’, and these, Taylor allowed, can arise not only from intrinsic arguments proposed by reason, but also, where the case is ‘otherwise indeterminable’, from the extrinsic authority of ‘a prudent and good man’. Nor are the philosophical treasure-troves of pagan antiquity to be neglected in this regard.<sup>96</sup> By marshalling the best arguments one can arrive at a moral or probable certainty sufficient to persuade a reasonable man for the purposes of action.

In the case of a doubtful conscience, where choice between alternatives is precluded by fear or ‘weakness of spirit’, Taylor was firm that the tutorist rule obliges. It is in itself

---

<sup>92</sup> *Twelve Sermons*, p. 537.

<sup>93</sup> *Second Dissuasive*, Introduction, ‘1<sup>st</sup> Way’; *Ductor*, pp. xi-xii, bk. 1, pp 42-62,

<sup>94</sup> Taylor, *Second Dissuasive*, Introduction, ‘1<sup>st</sup> Way’; *Ductor*, pp. xi-xii, bk. 1, pp 42-62, quote at 46; cf. South, *Twelve Sermons*, pp. 554-7.

<sup>95</sup> Taylor, *Ductor*, i, p. 122; *Second Dissuasive*, Introduction, ‘2<sup>nd</sup> Way’.

<sup>96</sup> *Ibid.*; *Ductor*, i, p. 120 & ch. 2, § 7; ch. 4, § 15; Preface, p. xi.

sinful to run the risk of sin.<sup>97</sup> Generally the safer part will also entail the commission of some good; Taylor often gave the example of restitution of goods where the lawfulness of their mode of acquisition is in doubt. It may be that there is no sin in retaining the goods, but it is always good to make restitution.<sup>98</sup> In this tutorist method Taylor was representative of English moralists of the period.<sup>99</sup> Since a scrupulous conscience is no good thing, however, Taylor was concerned to show as far as possible how a conscience which is not sure can nevertheless mount up enough good arguments, taking into account every ‘accident, circumstance, and collateral inducement’, to arrive at a probable certainty sufficient for action. In this case speculative uncertainty is consistent with practical certainty.<sup>100</sup>

If Taylor sounded, in these respects, like the casuists he criticised, it was because his moral thought was built on the same Thomist structure. His understanding of probability, however, was arguably more faithful, for Taylor limited the concept at the points where the probabilists had moved beyond the assumptions of Aquinas. He allowed arguments from authority, for example; but their power to persuade derived from their evident source in right reason. On the other hand he directly opposed arguments from reason to those from authority, when the latter are used in place of rather than as part of a reasonable argument. This sort of extrinsic authority, in Taylor’s view, issued in the same ‘peremptory affirmative’ as enthusiasts gave on the authority of the ‘Spirit of God’; and contradictory opinions among the learned undermine this idea of authority as effectively as differences among enthusiasts undermine their several claims to the Spirit.<sup>101</sup> Again, Taylor allowed, like the probabilists, that a ‘single man’ could constitute a probable authority; but only when one is satisfied, not merely as to his learning and piety, but that his opinion represents his best work, the product

---

<sup>97</sup> *Ib.*, i, ch. 5; cf. Allestree, *Forty Sermons*, pp. 72-3; Gauden, *Suspiria*, p. 680.

<sup>98</sup> E.g. *Ductor*, i, p. 144.

<sup>99</sup> Cf. McAdoo, *Caroline Moral Theology*.

<sup>100</sup> *Ib.*, i, pp. 150-52, 120, & ch. 4 § 4.

<sup>101</sup> *Ib.*, i, pp. 141-2, 44-5.

of thought and piety, and not a hasty judgement.<sup>102</sup> In other words, if the opinion does not seem agreeable either to reason or scripture, it cannot be followed; so that a doctor's authority does not really distinguish his opinion from any other arguments weighed in the process of deliberation. Whether derived from reason or from authority, a probable opinion only has value in proportion with its reasonableness and what Taylor calls its 'relation to piety', its consonance with the duties which, in his view, are plainly expressed in scripture. Thus, while one may follow a less probable opinion which is more safe, as in the case of restitution, one can never follow a probable opinion where there are greater reasons on the other side: 'the greater probability destroys the less'.<sup>103</sup>

In Taylor's view, then, a less probable opinion in cases of uncertainty is not really a probable opinion, since he assumes that degrees of probability vary in relation to the truth. Whatever their immediate source, human or divine, 'all ... truths must prevail in Conscience, because they are emanations from the fountain of truth; from whence nothing can derive that is not always true ...'

In two probables only one of them is true; and which that is, he can only take the best way of the best reason to find out; and it is impossible he should believe that which to him seems less likely, to be the more likely; and therefore so far as is in him he chooses that which is false, and voluntarily abuses his conscience.<sup>104</sup>

Taylor found in the Port-Royalist argument confirmation and further evidence of the fact that the fundamental error of 'the later casuists' was to have 'fiercely opposed this doctrine'.<sup>105</sup> To leave a more probable opinion for a less, he argued, is voluntarily to disable the divine faculty in man, to act 'unnaturally, unreasonably, and imprudently'. It is

---

<sup>102</sup> *Ib.*, p. 160.

<sup>103</sup> *Ib.*, ch. 4, § 5.

<sup>104</sup> *Ductor*, Preface, p. xii, bk. 1, p. 148.

<sup>105</sup> *Ib.*, pp. 148, 154.

not onely a danger of sinning, but a sin directly, and beyond a danger ... For besides that this hath danger, it is a most unreasonable, and a most unnatural thing, against the design of God, and the proper effects of reason.<sup>106</sup>

Since the same moral impotence describes the doubtful conscience, Taylor, while retaining the tutorist rule, laid greatest emphasis on the obligation to inform the conscience.<sup>107</sup> If the conscience can be supplied with arguments sufficient for a moral demonstration, it may be regarded as ‘probable’ or practically certain: except where the less probable is safer, ‘the degrees of safety are left to follow the degrees of probability’.<sup>108</sup> Thus by practical certainty, or security, Taylor meant the knowledge that one has taken every effort to get as close to the truth as possible.<sup>109</sup> For while it may not always be possible ‘that truth should be found ... it is highly necessary it should be searched for. It may be it cannot be *hit*, but it must be *aymed at*’.<sup>110</sup> Every available means of prayer and study must be employed to supply the conscience with sufficient knowledge that the path of duty should be clear;<sup>111</sup> and if irresolution persists application must be made to a wise and prudent person for enlightenment.<sup>112</sup> Following Aquinas, Taylor found no excuse in ignorance of the natural law, the truths of faith, or whatever ‘concerns every mans duty in special’; and excusable ignorance was limited by the obligation to conduct a sincere search for the truth.<sup>113</sup> ‘He that never inquires, sins for want of inquiry, and despises his soul because he takes no care that it be rightly informed’.<sup>114</sup>

---

<sup>106</sup> *Ib.*, pp. 147-8.

<sup>107</sup> *Ib.*, ch. 5, § 7 & ch. 6.

<sup>108</sup> *Ib.*, p. 146.

<sup>109</sup> Cf. McAdoo, *Caroline Moral Theology*, pp. 91f.

<sup>110</sup> *Ductor*, i, p. 161.

<sup>111</sup> *Ib.*, pp. 161-2, 167-8, 171-2; cf. South, *Twelve Sermons*, pp. 560f.; Allestree *Forty Sermons*, pp. 277-8.

<sup>112</sup> *Ductor*, i, p. 143; cf. Allestree, *Forty Sermons*, p. 242; *idem*, [*The Practice of Christian graces, or, The Whole Duty [of man]*] (1658), p. 87. Those with an unquiet conscience are counselled to seek advice in the Communion Service rubrics in the BCP.

<sup>113</sup> *Ductor*, iv, pp. 494-6.

<sup>114</sup> *Ib.*, i, p. 146; Allestree, *Forty Sermons*, pp. 68, 72-3.

A 'probable' opinion, in this formulation, is defined as that which is most likely to be true, and a conscience persuaded by such an opinion as 'sure' by virtue of its efforts to discover the truth.<sup>115</sup> He 'who exerts all the Powers, and Faculties of his Soul, and plies all Means and Opportunities in the Search of Truth, which God has vouchsafed him, may rest upon the judgement of his Conscience'.<sup>116</sup> This position was indeed virtually identical to that which the Blackloists called 'probabilist' in disputing over the rule of faith. But in both cases the argument was anti-sceptical in design, accommodating the inevitable uncertainty of human judgements, whether in relation to the interpretation of historical testimonies or to the analysis of moral action, while recommending, in diligent and pious research, a way to attain morally certain judgements which no reasonable man could doubt. It was the probabilists who, by allowing the choice of a less probable opinion, removed any objective guarantor of truth.<sup>117</sup>

There was, *prima facie*, nothing much to distinguish Taylor's definition of a 'probable' conscience from a right or 'sure' one, since both give assent, more or less imperfect, to compelling reasons. There is, however, an important difference between the two, for whereas there are sufficient motives in the understanding to settle a right conscience, in probabilities there is an element of choice in the decision to assent on one side while the other is not certainly to be rejected.<sup>118</sup> Because of this voluntary element, right choices depend on a right disposition in the will as much as on knowledge. If the will is not habitually disposed to choose the good, the process of deliberation between probabilities is likely to be distorted by sinful inclinations. A bad will not disposed by love of its highest end to choose whatever conduces to it is more apt to mistake a lesser good for the true good: for 'the

---

<sup>115</sup> Cf. South, *Twelve Sermons*, pp. 580-2, distinguishing this 'Confidence', which does not exclude doubt and is 'built upon ... the standing sincerity of a man's Heart', from 'Assurance'.

<sup>116</sup> South, *Twelve Sermons*, p. 558; cf. Allestree, *Forty Sermons*, pp. 279 & 243.

<sup>117</sup> Cf. South, *Twelve Sermons*, p. 539.

<sup>118</sup> *Ductor*, i, p. 119.

worldly man' proposes 'to himself the satisfactions of this world, either more particularly of some one kind, or else all in general'; but 'the Child of Light, so far as he is, designs especially the happiness of the world to come'.<sup>119</sup> Since 'the evil will perverts the understanding', then, a crucial quality in the seeker after truth is uprightness of will.<sup>120</sup> Without a habitual disposition to virtue imprudent choices will result. Conversely if the 'Heart' is conditioned by good choices,

there is no doubt, but they will ... at length produce such a *Degree of Light* in the Conscience, as shall give a Man, both a clear *Sight* of his Duty, and a certain *Judgement* of his Condition.<sup>121</sup>

This moral culture and development, directed by the love of God, was really Taylor's ideal of the Christian life. He even indulged in a sort of paradoxical encomium on probability and uncertainty, which are essential to religion in the measure that they imply choice and love. If all were evident, there would be no choice, and what becomes of all the scripture-exhortations to moral perfection? Our reliance on probabilities is fitting to what we know of man and God: man is weak and infirm, and God improves and transform him through love. Uncertainty, then,

seems to have been created on purpose, for ... vertue and for hopes, for faith and for charity, to make us beleeve by love, and to love by believing ...<sup>122</sup>

The reciprocal relationship between love and knowledge explains the weight given to the criterion of 'relation to piety' as a 'collateral inducement' in Taylor's casuistry. Along with right reason it is the negative measure of a probable proposition; and in the case where the

---

<sup>119</sup> Allestree, *Forty Sermons*, pp. 231-.2l; cf. *idem*, *Whole Duty*, pp. 71-2.

<sup>120</sup> Taylor, *Ductor*, i, pp. 6-7, 31-2; Allestree, *Forty Sermons*, p. 270.

<sup>121</sup> South, *Twelve Sermons*, p. 568; cf. Baker, *Reflections Upon Learning*, p. 75.

<sup>122</sup> *Ductor*, i, p. 122.

conscience is suspended between probabilities, it carries the casting vote.<sup>123</sup> Man must use his reason as far as he can; but the value of reason in moral deliberation derives from its source in man's highest good, and by how much the will inclines to lower ends, by so much is reason's light dimmed. As well as our minds we must 'have our senses exercised to good and evil', in the words of the letter to the Hebrews (v 14); a habitual obedience is necessary to the formation of right judgements.<sup>124</sup>

Taylor discerned in probabilist casuistry the same monstrosity abominated by Pascal: a system designed not 'to minister to holy living, but to excuse [from] it'.<sup>125</sup> The probabilist casuists ('witty' but 'vicious' persons) understood moral theology backwards. Their manuals were merely 'patrons or *indices* of sin', for, concerning themselves with the legality of discrete acts, they sought to excuse actions by securing the conscience.<sup>126</sup> But the conscience is only truly secured by acting according to the good. 'Certainty' is a function of a life lived in conformity to the law of God. Putting certainty before obedience, the casuists ignored the cultivation of the moral character. Probabilism, in short, was an enemy to the true doctrine of repentance.

For since obedience is the love of God, and to do well is the life of religion, and the end of faith is the death of sin and the life of righteousness; nothing is more necessary then that we be rightly informed in all moral notices.<sup>127</sup>

Taylor was one of the pioneers of a new Anglican soteriology which made repentance, or the love of God issuing in obedience, essential to the definition of faith.<sup>128</sup> The moral life, for those among whom this approach became conventional, involved man's contribution,

---

<sup>123</sup> *Ib.*, pp. 150-2.

<sup>124</sup> *Ib.*, pp. 42-62, 163; Preface, pp. vii-viii.

<sup>125</sup> *Holy Dying*, p. 295.

<sup>126</sup> *Ductor*, i, p. 154.

<sup>127</sup> *Ductor*, pp. vii-viii.

<sup>128</sup> Ch. 5, below.

under the conditions of ignorance and concupiscence, to the re-ordering of an interior disposition disordered by sin. Since they considered this re-ordering a condition of divine pardon, they necessarily represented the moral life in terms of a rigorous asceticism, a purgative discipline designed to reverse the creaturely tendency of fallen man and to form the habits of virtue proper to a Godward life.<sup>129</sup> Such thinkers appear therefore to have been the most sensitive readers of the Jansenist anti-probabilist polemics, where the major deficiency of the casuists was identified as their neglect of the interior disposition. Because their own theological project revolved around demonstrating the priority of repentance in the *ordo salutis*, they were already critical readers of Roman casuists. Among the propositions catalogued by the Port-Royalists, they were more likely to cite those which evidenced the casuists' formalist separation of the outward actions of religion from the inward, spiritual condition of which they are both an index and a constituent. In particular they were likely to refer to the *Provinciales* and related works for citations showing the relaxation of the sacrament of penance – that is, those which promoted attritionism, superficial confession, easy absolution, and exiguous satisfaction. For 'the *Casuists* and *Confessors* of the *Church of Rome*', as Wake put it, have 'by their mistaken Notions of Christianity' so greatly undermined 'the *necessity of Repentance*' that they have 'utterly corrupted the very nature and practice of it'.<sup>130</sup>

For someone like Taylor, in whose view 'men will for ever need a living guide', the fact that Emmanuel Sa and Tolet taught penitents to seek out lax confessors possessed a relevance that went beyond the typical idea of Catholic corruption which similar propositions suggested to many Protestant minds.<sup>131</sup> When writers who shared Taylor's theological presuppositions criticised lax casuistical tenets on, for example, inattention at mass, or the

---

<sup>129</sup> *Ib.*, and ch. 7, and ch. 4 for Jansenist soteriology and moral thought.

<sup>130</sup> Wake, *Sermons*, p. 200: he is explaining the impiety of 'wise men of the world', and next blames Calvinist predestinarian theology.

<sup>131</sup> *Ductor*, pp. xvii, 171; *idem*, *Dissuasive*, p. 86.

sort of contrition requisite for absolution, or the distinction of mortal and venial sins, it was in the course of constructing a vision of the Christian life to which an appreciation of the deficiencies of the casuists in these areas had some relevance.<sup>132</sup> Since this vision centred on man's voluntary response to the Gospel, and postulated a reciprocal relationship between outward discipline and the condition of the will, the innovations of the probabilists – who, on the Jansenist argument, by divorcing the speculative from the practical, emptied exterior devotion of all meaning, and left the will a prey to concupiscence – were to the point. In a theological argument designed to demonstrate that obedience and purity of heart are constituent parts of the loving disposition necessary to salvation, moreover, sin acquired a correspondingly greater weight as the source of disorder in the moral personality. To this theological picture casuistical propositions licensing fornication, blasphemy, homicide, theft and so on, contributed a constructive emphasis by way of contrast.<sup>133</sup>

It is too well known what one sort of men have attempted in this case, how by new-rai'd principles of Probability and directing the intention, they have reconcil'd all villainy with Christian life, made it safe yea meritorious to lye, forswear, and bear malice, to defame, revenge by either force or treachery [etc] ...<sup>134</sup>

Again, to writers for whom the use of private confession and penitential exercises were desirable, and in a certain sense necessary accessories of a holy life, the 'relâchements' perpetrated by the casuists in the practice of confession (including the notions of directing the

---

<sup>132</sup> On inattention at divine worship *ibid.*, pp. 117-20 (see *CLP*, pp. 168-9; *MJ*, pp. 209-11); on mortal and venial sins Henry Dodwell, *Two Short Discourses Against the Romanists* (1676), p. 2; Sherlock, *Preservative*, p. 79; Stillingfleet, *Sermon ... 1678/9*, p. 30; and cf. below, ch. 7; on contrition n. 139, below.

<sup>133</sup> On incontinence Taylor, *Dissuasive*, p. 114 (it is a good to lie with a woman if she is 'considered as one's wife' – i.e. sex out of wedlock or the conjugal act done for pleasure may be good. Taylor cites Sa, *Aph.*, *de conj.*; the same opinion is variously attributed in French catalogues, e.g. to Laymann, *Theol. mor.*, l. 1, tr. 3, c. 6, n. 12); blasphemy: *ibid.*, p. 113 (Tolet); homicide: e.g. South, *Twelve Sermons*, pp. 537-8; Owtram, *Twenty Sermons*, pp. 105-6 (for a box on the ear, for calumny: *CLP*, p.122-3, *MJ*, pp. 142-4; *JM*, pp. 4, 304-5, 309, 320-30); Gilbert Burnet, *The Mystery of Iniquity Unveiled* (1673), p. 85; on theft Taylor, *Dissuasive*, pp. 113 (Tolet), and pp. 153-4, citing Diana out of Escobar's digest (*CLP*, p. 145, *MJ*, p. 174); Diana also cited in *Ductor*, ii, p. 92, and *ib.*, Preface, p. ii, citing Sa, *Aph.*, v. *furtum*; Burnet, *Mystery*, p. 88.

<sup>134</sup> Allestree, *Forty Sermons*, p. 240.

intention and mental reservation),<sup>135</sup> their dispensations from penitential works such as restitution, alms-giving and fasting, and their easy absolutions, had a material bearing on the argument.<sup>136</sup>

These casuistical opinions all tended to undermine or ignore the process of moral transformation which describes the Christian pilgrimage. Stillingfleet noted that Arnauld had, though without success, ‘complained’ in his *Fréquente communion* ‘of their doctrine of the efficacy of the sacraments, that it takes away all necessity of devotion in the minds of the receivers’.<sup>137</sup> The state of interior love was, for writers who shared Stillingfleet’s theological assumptions, the foundation of the moral life, not to be separated from practice, which is both its nourishment and its fruit. As Sherlock put it,

the love of God in giving his own Son to die for us, and the love of Christ in giving himself for us, are the great Gospel Motives to obedience and a Holy Life; but these can only work upon ingenuous minds, who have already in some measure conquered the love of sin; for where the love of sin prevails, it is too powerful for the love of God; but ... a holy God cannot be reconciled to wicked men ... [and] *without holiness no man shall see God*.<sup>138</sup>

The formalism of the casuists was thus ‘most evident’ in the attritionist doctrine that a mere sorrow for sin, arising from fear of punishment, ‘with the Absolution of the Priest, puts a man

---

<sup>135</sup> On direction of intention see: Owtram, *Twenty Sermons*, pp. 105-7; Stillingfleet, *Fifty Sermons* (1707), pp. 472-3, citing the ‘condemned ... loose casuists’; *idem*, *A Sermon 1678/9*, pp. 25-6. On mental reservation and ambiguous terms, *ibid.*, pp. 32-41, citing e.g. Sanchez as in *CLP*, p. 164, *MJ*, p. 202; Sanchez also cited by Taylor, *Dissuasive*, p. 153.

<sup>136</sup> On restitution see e.g. Taylor, *Ductor*, p. v (Eman. Sa, see above n. 85); on fasting *ib.*, citing Sa, *Aph.*, v. *jejun.*, n. 8, cf. *CLP*, pp. 81-3, *MJ*, pp. 88-90; on alms e.g. Thomas Tenison, *A Defence of Dr. Tenison’s Sermon* (1688), citing Escobar, *Mor. Theol.*, tr. 7, ex. 5 as in *AMJ*, p. 95 (from the extracts of Mascarenhas, see above, ch. 1, p. 61); Allestree, *Causes of Decay*, p. 299, on ‘easie atonements’; also Taylor, *Dissuasive*, pp. 82-6, citing e.g. Suarez (*CLP*, p. 176; *MJ*, p. 222).

<sup>137</sup> *Idolatry*, pp. 178-9; see also pp. 208-9, where Stillingfleet refers to *FC*, pt. 3, cap. 7, for the argument that the lax casuists have reduced the sacrament of penance to a ‘bare confession’. See also Taylor, *Dissuasive*, p. 144; and ch. 7, below.

<sup>138</sup> *Preservative*, p. 80; the ref. is to Heb. xii 14 – see also Taylor, *Ductor*, p. 151.

into a state of salvation'. Anglican writers for whom the love of God issuing in active obedience was the formal cause of salvation very frequently cited the Jansenists – whose argument, we recall, culminated in the charge that the casuists destroyed in the love of God the foundation of Christian morality – in this connexion.<sup>139</sup> 'Those who have a mind to be satisfied in this matter', remarked Sherlock, 'may find enough of it in the *Provincial Letters*, the *Jesuits Morals*, and Bishop Taylor's *Disswasive*'. Since their casuists overthrow 'the Fundamental Motive of all', he continued, 'nothing would more effectively overthrow the *Church of Rome*, than to re-establish this Doctrine of the absolute necessity of a good life'.<sup>140</sup>

Viewed in the context of the main lines of Reformation polemic, this statement appears a little paradoxical. But it expressed the view of those for whom the Protestant allergy to works-righteousness had produced a dangerously excessive reaction. There was some constructive interest in the Jansenist anti-laxist critique for the theological partisans of 'holy living' in England because its objects corresponded closely to the positions which they wanted to discredit in the context of English theology. The Thomist shape of the Jansenist anti-probabilist argument was entirely sympathetic to this theological project. The sacrifice of Christ is a work of love, and as the cause is, so is the effect; it is love by which God effects the death of sin and the life of righteousness in man.<sup>141</sup> This case was argued against *sola fide* Calvinists, who, in the view of Anglican writers, carried their doctrine of depravity and their distrust of reason to the point where they excluded man from the possibility of growing in

---

<sup>139</sup> Taylor, *Ductor*, Preface, citing Diana as in *CLP*, pp. 185-6, *MJ*, pp. 233-4, *AMJ*, p. 98; *idem*, *Dissuasive*, pp. 76-81, 100 (Taylor criticised the casuists' notion of contrition, like Pascal – who had made the same paradox out of the Jesuits' 'sufficient' grace – as 'insufficiently sufficient': *CLP*, pp. 182f.); Sherlock, *Preservative*, pp. 80-81; Stillingfleet, *Idolatry*, pp. 180-86; *idem*, *An Answer to Several late Treatises* (1673), sigs. b4v.-c1r., citing on contrition 'the *Jesuitical Casuists* whose Testimonies are produced in the *Jesuits Morals* or *Provincial Letters*, such as *Filliutus*, *Amicus*, *Sa*, *Escobar*, *Bauny*, and *Layman*' (*CLP*, pp. 183f.; *MJ*, pp. 231f.); *idem*, *Fifty Sermons*, pp. 509-10, citing Azorius, *Inst. Mor.*, t. 1, l. 9, c. 4, as in the *Extrait de quelques-unes des plus dangereuses propositions*; Wake, *Sermons*, p. 202, citing Escobar's digest, tr. 7, c. 7, nn. 92-3 (*CLP*, p. 185; *MJ*, pp. 233-4; *AMJ*, p. 23). Cf. Allestree's Prayer for Contrition, in *Whole Duty*, pp. 583-4: 'O wash my polluted conscience...'

<sup>140</sup> *Preservative*, p. 80.

<sup>141</sup> Cf. *ST*, IIIa, q. 49, a. 1; Taylor, *Second Dissuasive*, pp. 7-8.

conformity with God. Like the probabilists, the Calvinists abstracted man from his role in the eternal order, for thus to disable the moral faculties was effectively to excuse them, as the casuists did, from their proper and truly natural activity. It was to deny that man has access, through the exercise of his reason, to an objective knowledge of his duty, and, through the intension of his will, to an empirical measure of his performance. Instead in their doctrine of assurance the Calvinists provided, as did the probabilists, an arbitrary, subjective and unverifiable form of certainty.

Indeed it may be observed that between these Anglican theologians, the Jansenists, and the probabilist casuists, there was no fundamental metaphysical or ontological difference. They all affirmed that there exists an eternal moral order and an objective standard of good, in which man participates and to which he conforms himself by virtue of the faculties of reason and will which make ‘that *likeness of God* in which He was pleased to make man’.<sup>142</sup> The anti-probabilist case involved at most an epistemological difference: it was argued that the probabilists obscured the way to the good by their promise of an illusory, vicarious security. In the Calvinists, by contrast, both Jansenist and Anglican confronted opponents who removed an objective and immutable standard of morality altogether. Like the Jansenists, Anglican thinkers argued for the right and responsibility of the mind, aided by the grace of knowledge, and the will, aided by the grace of love, to achieve a progressive conformation to the divine standard. It may be that English writers with Calvinist presuppositions were less likely to show interest in the constructive element of the Jansenist critique because, in their view, this process was underwritten and guaranteed by an antecedent certainty communicated by the perspicuous Word of God and the Holy Spirit.

Margaret Sampson has observed that there was something counter-intuitive in the endorsement, among clergy who aspired to rule the lay conscience, of the Jansenist critique

---

<sup>142</sup> Quote is Taylor, *Ductor*, i, p. 2; cf. Stillingfleet, *Idolatry*, pp. 559-60, on ‘principles agreed on both sides’.

of modern casuistry. It played into the hands of laypersons, whether anti-clerical or merely secular-minded, who wanted to annex spheres of jurisdiction traditionally claimed by clerical arbiters of conscience to the competence of secular political and economic theory. Thus

the English clergy contributed to their own loss of jurisdiction over the laity through their repudiation of casuistry and preference for preaching up an unrealistic and rigorist morality as the best means of combating lay licentiousness.<sup>143</sup>

The Anglicans would have been a little dismayed to hear their moral teaching described as ‘unrealistic’, since in their view a holy life, and all the ascetic cultivation of the moral personality this implied, was a condition of salvation. Nevertheless, Sampson’s conclusion fairly represents the state of affairs. With all their talk of ‘fuite’ and ‘retraite’, the Jansenists would not have engaged in such an arduous controversial *negotium* had they not aspired to convert the world to the lofty moral ideal which animated their arguments and gave Pascal’s satire its real force.<sup>144</sup> The English theorists of ‘holy living’ similarly aimed to show that the activity of man in all its aspects can and must be oriented and integrated by the undivided love of God. What they found so harshly criticised in Jansenist anti-laxist writings were ‘Christians who would gladly reconcile God and this world’ – a compartmentalised and worldly morality emptied of that motive which alone can give it its proper direction.<sup>145</sup>

It is not really remarkable that it should be possible to broach such a comparison in respect to the controversy over moral theology and casuistry, for the Jansenists and the Anglicans were both committed to an essentially traditional understanding of the conscience. But it is to raise a question about how both groups understood the interaction between grace and human effort in the moral life, for on this basic issue they occupied antithetical positions.

---

<sup>143</sup> ‘Laxity and liberty in seventeenth-century political thought’, in Leites (ed.), *Conscience and Casuistry*, pp. 72-118, at 117.

<sup>144</sup> Cf. Cagnet, ‘Le mépris du monde’.

<sup>145</sup> Allestree, *Forty Sermons*, p. 241.

We now need to examine in closer detail the theological foundations of the rigorist sensibility which, in both France and England, was so affronted by the assumptions and conclusions of *les nouveaux casuistes*.

## *Part 2*

### *Rigorism and Moralism*

#### *Chapter 4*

##### *'Jansenist Augustinianism' and the Springs of Pastoral Rigorism*

'Jansenism' is about as difficult a tag as any in the history of culture or ideas. The problems are broadly similar with those familiar to historians of English puritanism.<sup>1</sup> One would prefer to speak of Jansenists than of Jansenism, understanding the term in a differential or relational rather than an essential sense.<sup>2</sup> One would prefer to distinguish between intellectual commitments more specifically, by means of a range of qualifiers suitably adjusted in respect of political, geographical, and chronological context. One would prefer to restore to 'Jansenism' its proper referent in the system of Cornelius Jansen.<sup>3</sup> As ever moderation is required, since the distinctions for which historians rightly call would hardly be necessary had the larger concept not indicated some formal unity between its parts. It is only necessary that, if any aspect of this formal identity is to be invested with explanatory force, its substance should be established by careful exposition; after that the use of terms, whose significance subsists in the mental associations of the reader, is to be guided by the rule of prudence. My purpose in the following chapter is not to extract some imaginary synthetic entity out of the works of 'Jansenist theologians', but merely to suggest the connections that linked a phenomenon which, as a matter of fact, was common although not restricted to

---

<sup>1</sup> See e.g. Patrick Collinson, 'A comment: concerning the name puritan', *JEH*, 31, 4 (1980), pp. 483-8.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. arguments in Peter Lake, 'Defining Puritanism – again?', in Francis J. Bremer (ed.), *Puritanism. Transatlantic Perspectives on a Seventeenth-Century Anglo-American Faith* (Boston, 1993), pp. 3-29.

<sup>3</sup> Lucien Ceysens, 'Le Jansénisme. Considérations Historiques Préliminaires à Sa Notion', in *Nuove Ricerche Storiche Sul Giansenismo* (Analecta Gregoriana, 71, Rome, 1953), pp. 3-32; Jean Orcibal, 'Qu'est-ce que le Jansénisme?', *Cahiers de l'Association internationale des études françaises*, 3-5 (1953), pp. 39-53.

Jansenists – that is, moral or pastoral ‘rigorism’ – and certain common theoretical positions. If the suggestions are persuasive, in this case, the proof will only be the firmer in proportion with the diversity of the witnesses.

The parallel with puritanism, which has suggested itself to numerous observers both then and latterly, provides a convenient starting point in that it declares one common view of an essential or typical Jansenism. This was the view put forward, with great effect, by the Jesuits and other enemies of Jansen in the Low Countries and of Saint-Cyran and his disciples in France. It is the heresy of Jansenism, condemned in the form of Five Propositions enumerated in the constitution *Cum occasione* of Innocent X in 1653.

The Propositions indicate that the fall has corrupted man to such an extent that he has no power in himself to choose or to do the good. In this case he cannot call any righteousness his own, but must depend for his salvation on a gratuitous gift of God which has no regard to his merits. Since, on account of his corruption by sin, man’s will has no liberty to choose indifferently between good or bad, but must inevitably choose the bad, he has no power to use or reject this gift but is effectively and irresistibly determined by it. Since not all are saved, but none are saved without the free gift of grace, it cannot be said that Christ died for all men without exception. By implication, some are gratuitously elected to eternal life, others arbitrarily condemned to damnation.<sup>4</sup> On this reading, to be discovered in most Catholic works of reference, Jansenism consists in the same mistaken understanding of Augustine which underpinned the Protestant reformation. Man, it asserts, is hopelessly sunk in sin, his free will defunct, only to be saved at the whim of a sovereign will, whose distinction of those

---

<sup>4</sup> The Propositions run: 1) Some commandments of God to men wishing and striving to be righteous are impossible with regard to the present strength that they possess; and they lack the grace by which they may become possible; 2) Interior grace is never resisted in the state of fallen nature; 3) For merit or demerit in the state of fallen nature freedom from necessity is not required in man but freedom from compulsion; 4) Semipelagians admit the necessity of prevenient interior grace for single acts, even for the beginning of faith; and they are heretics in this, that they wish grace to be of such a kind as human will can resist or obey; 5) It is Semipelagian to say that Christ died and shed his blood for all men.

it nevertheless chooses to treat as righteous from those it does not is thoroughly inscrutable. By extension, it negates all morality, tending inevitably towards enthusiasm and antinomianism.<sup>5</sup>

Such a reading has a good basis in some bare statements of the Jansenists, who defended the doctrines of absolute corruption, irresistible grace, and unconditional predestination.<sup>6</sup> It provides sufficient warrant for the comparison with the puritan heirs of Calvin in England, with whom the Port-Royal group it is said to describe shared certain other characteristics.<sup>7</sup> The pessimistic anthropology it depicts was likely to generate a marked accent on moral discipline, and a censorious attitude towards those diversions, such as music or the theatre, which too easily stimulate the hedonistic urges of fallen nature. Likewise the predestinarian theology was apt to create a sect mentality, and an inflexible self-assurance. Jansenists might in this respect plausibly be compared to those Elizabethan and Jacobean puritans who sought to leaven the lump by reforming the Church from within, or again to others who condemned the lump in separating from it, as eventually came about in the schism of the Church at Utrecht in the early eighteenth century;<sup>8</sup> to those whose inflexible scripturalism dictated a vehement intolerance of the wrong-headed, or to those whose fidelity to the dictates of conscience heralded the radical individualism of enlightenment and

---

<sup>5</sup> The later, colourful history of the ‘convulsionnaires’ of St Médard unfortunately reinforces this impression: see R. A. Knox, *Enthusiasm. A Chapter in the History of Religion with Special Reference to the XVII and XVIII Centuries* (Oxford, 1950), ch. 16. On the, quite distinct, history of eighteenth-century Jansenism, Catherine-Laurence Maire, *De la cause de Dieu à la cause de la nation: le jansénisme au XVIIIe siècle* (Paris, 1998).

<sup>6</sup> See e.g. Saint-Cyran’s ‘familiar’ catechism, discussed above, pt. I, ch. 2, sec. 1, n. 9; his unpublished note *De la Grâce de Jésus-Christ, de la Liberté Chrétienne et de la Justification* printed in Orcibal, *Saint-Cyran et le jansénisme*, pp. 119-29; Pascal’s first and second *Lettres Provinciales* and his *Écrits sur la Grâce*, in Chevalier (ed.), *Œuvres Complètes* (Paris, 1954), of which the most meticulous edition is in Jean Mesnard (ed.), *Œuvres Complètes*, 4 vols. (Paris, 1964-92), iii (the texts do not differ substantially where I cite the *Écrits*, but as Mesnard has established a different order I give parenthesised refs. to his ed.); on the *Écrits sur la Grâce* cf. *Seventeenth-Century French Studies*, 35, 2 (2013); Antoine Arnauld, *Instructions Sur la Grâce Selon L’Écriture et les Pères* (I have consulted the ed. Cologne, 1700, printed with Martin Barcos, *L’Exposition de la Foi de l’Église Romaine Touchant la Grâce et la Prédestination*); and below, this chapter, on Jansenius.

<sup>7</sup> The comparison is elaborated with impeccable Catholic prejudices by Knox, *Enthusiasm*, pp. 211-13.

<sup>8</sup> Of which J. M. Neale produced a very readable account, *A History of the so-called Jansenist Church of Holland* (1904, repr. New York, 2007).

modernity. Again, Jansenism as well as puritanism has been depicted as an ideology of the rising bourgeoisie.<sup>9</sup>

These parallels may be legitimate; it could equally be observed that the French Jansenists of the seventeenth century, whose religious ideas ran along the lines of the universal visible episcopal Church and the Catholic sacramental system, do not present a very obvious case for comparison with the most reformed elements of English Protestantism.<sup>10</sup> The theology of Jansen, aspects of which were reproduced and defended more or less faithfully in the penitential theology of Saint-Cyran, and in apologies such as Arnauld's first and second in defence of Jansen or Pascal's *Écrits sur la Grâce*, recalls that of the Protestant reformers precisely because it was directed against a tendency within sixteenth-century Catholic thought which purported to contradict the major presuppositions and conclusions of Luther and Calvin. Luther acknowledged that Erasmus, in focusing on the question of free will, had put his finger on the nub of the matter.<sup>11</sup> When Jansen observed that where Calvin agreed with Augustine and the Fathers he ought to be 'congratulated', or that the Contra-Remonstrants at Dordrecht approached nearer to Catholic truth than his Louvain *bête-noire* Lessius, he undoubtedly intended a backhanded indication of the extent to which those Catholics erred, who thought to undercut their Protestant opponents by lauding the dignity and powers of human nature.<sup>12</sup> The guilty party, in Jansen's eyes, was the Society of Jesus; for, dedicated to a supple and relevant counter-offensive against the reformers, they had indeed adopted the strategy he thus objurgated. Understanding the Protestant doctrines to

---

<sup>9</sup> The thesis of Lucien Goldmann, tr. as *The Hidden God: a study of tragic vision in the 'Pensées' of Pascal and the tragedies of Racine* (1964), today enjoys about the same credit as the Weber thesis.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. the bathetic conclusion, by Bernard Cottret, to the volume edited by him with Monique Cottret and Marie-José Michel (eds.), *Jansénisme et puritanisme* (Paris, 2002): 'Jansénisme et puritanisme: une impossible rencontre'; also Briggs, 'The catholic puritans'.

<sup>11</sup> Cited by Alistair McGrath, *Iustitia Dei. A History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., Cambridge, 1998), p. 241.

<sup>12</sup> For Jansen on Dort see above, p. 17; Jansen, [*Cornelii Iansenii Episcopi Iprensis*] *Augustinus [seu doctrina S. Augustini de humanae naturae sanitate, aegritudine, medicina adversus Pelagianos & Massilienses]* (Louvain, 1640), t. III, bk. 8, ch. 21, col. 878: 'si qua in re Calvinus cum Augustino & antiquis PP. senserit, non propter Calvinum Augustino indignandum est, sed propter Augustinum Calvinum potius gratulandum'.

have destroyed free will and the incentive to good works, and believing therefore that the holy lives of Catholics would most effectively discredit their schismatic antagonists, they sought an understanding of the relationship between man and God in salvation which gave a part to man as well as to divine grace.<sup>13</sup> The most influential fruit of this endeavour was Luis de Molina's *Concordia liberi arbitrii cum gratiae donis, divina praescientia, providentia, praedestinatione, et reprobatione*, which appeared in Spain in 1588. Molina's rejection, as inimical to liberty, of the neo-Thomist scheme of grace, in which every act of the human will depends immediately on the first cause by 'physical premotion', and grace is characterised as efficacious *ab intrinseco* (of and in itself, according to the eternal decrees willed by God), led to the convocation of the famous and inconclusive *Congregatio de Auxiliis*, which met between 1597 and 1607. The ban on controversial discussions of grace consequently announced by Paul V did not end the debate, to which Jansen's *Augustinus* would constitute a weighty contribution.<sup>14</sup>

### *Molinism*

In commenting on the Pars Prima of Aquinas's *Summa*, dealing with the nature of God, his creation, and his direction of it, Molina began with an assumed postulate, the human liberty which he was concerned to protect against various forms of fatalism or determinism, arguing thence to the nature of the divine foreknowledge and omnipotence with which it is

---

<sup>13</sup> Cf. O'Malley, *The First Jesuits*, pp. 272-83 – of course 'it is a mistake to suppose that the Society ... was founded specifically to combat Protestantism', H. O. Evennett in G. R. Elton (ed.), *The New Cambridge Modern History*, 12 vols. (Cambridge, 1958), II, p. 298.

<sup>14</sup> Abercrombie, *The Origins of Jansenism*, pp. 118-24; E. Vansteenberghe, 'Molinisme', in *DTC*, X, cols. 2154-66; On physical premotion and its Dominican theorist Domingo Bañez, R. Garrigou-Lagrange, 'Prémotion Physique', in *DTC*, XIII, cols. 31-77; Laurence Renault, 'Bañezianisme-Molinisme-Baianisme', in Jean-Yves Lacoste (ed.), *Dictionnaire Critique de Théologie* (Paris, 1998).

supposed to consist, and consequently treating the related matters of providence, predestination, grace, and justification.<sup>15</sup> In adopting this philosophical approach he had already, according to Jansen, gone wrong, theology being on Jansen's view the historical project to establish matters of fact based on the data of revelation and those traditional authorities (Councils and Fathers) who followed the same method, rather than the speculative attempt to explain these realities in terms of reason and logic.<sup>16</sup> What Jansen meant, since his historical approach treated as factual considerations of a secondary order questions which are inherently philosophical, was probably just that Molina's postulates were mistaken. Where the Thomists began with God as the first cause, Molina reversed the order of priority between the unconditioned and the conditioned, so that to Jansen it appeared inevitable that the resulting system would exalt the creature at the expense of the creator. This is the basis for Pascal's later assertion that Molinism constitutes essentially an *apologia* for sinful nature against the supernatural claims which God makes upon it.<sup>17</sup> Pascal's picture of a Pelagian theology for a pagan morality, like Jansen's identification of Molinism, through its affinities with Semi-Pelagianism, with the naturalism of Pelagius, indicate the central anthropological difference which divided the two streams of thought; for the Jansenists' Augustinian conception of fallen nature as sub- or anti-natural left no room for a graduated understanding of good proportioned to the inherent capacities of actual nature. This anthropological idea, however, was very far from the caricature of radical pessimism which informs the frequent charge of crypto-Calvinism.

To understand the significance of this objection, however, we must first examine the system of Molina. His fundamental premise was that a liberty of indifference, that is the

---

<sup>15</sup> Helpful guides are Vansteenberghe, 'Molinisme'; Abercrombie, *Origins*, pp. 93-117. My references are to the critical edition by J. Rabeneck: Ludovici Molina, [*Liberi Arbitrii cum Gratiae Donis, Divina Praescientia, Providentia, Praedestinatione et Reprobatione*] *Concordia* (Oniae, Collegium Maximum, S.I., 1953).

<sup>16</sup> Jansen, *Augustinus*, t. II, *De ratione et auctoritate in rebus theologicis Liber Prooemialis*.

<sup>17</sup> *CLP*, p. 78.

freedom, given all the conditions necessary for action, to do or not do one thing or the contrary, comprises an essential characteristic of human nature.<sup>18</sup> This is adduced as a matter of common sense, and proposed against an erroneous confusion of liberty (attributed to ‘Lutherani’) with spontaneity or freedom from coercion. It is tested by reference to a distinction of the ‘states’ of humanity: the state of pure nature, the state of innocence, the state of sin, and the state of grace.<sup>19</sup> The hypothetical state of pure nature is arrived at by an equation between the state of innocence and the state of sin.<sup>20</sup> In the creation God rendered man equal to the supernatural end to which he was destined by endowing him with the gifts of faith, hope and love by which he could merit eternal life, and of ‘original justice’, a state of spiritual and bodily harmony, wherein the commandments were easily followed by reason of the absence of the movements or temptations which might divert the rational being from his end. By Adam’s sin man lost these gifts: he was stripped of the supernatural virtues, and his reason and will forfeited the strength they possessed in the state of original justice, being now more easily disordered by the passions incident to mortal existence. Hence it appears that the fall resulted simply in the withdrawal of that which was additional to nature:<sup>21</sup> in the a-historical state of ‘pure nature’, therefore, man can be thought of as retaining the use of his reason and will, though without the harmonious tranquillity which results from the subordination of the passions of the sensible creature.<sup>22</sup> The utility of this hypothesis resides in its capacity to illuminate the limits and extent of fallen nature, in which the privation of supernatural virtues and of psycho-spiritual integrity is to be thought of as a punishment which frustrates man of his supernatural end. It is to be concluded that, under sin, man retains

---

<sup>18</sup> *Concord.*, Pars I, *De liberi arbitrii viribus ad opera bona eiusque libertate*, Q. XIV, art. 13, disp. 2.3 (ed. Rabeneck, p. 14): ‘illud agens liberum dicitur quod positus omnibus requisitis ad agendum potest agere et non agere aut ita agere unum et contrarium etiam agere possit’.

<sup>19</sup> *Ib.*, disp. 3 (pp. 19-22).

<sup>20</sup> Cf. n. 71, below.

<sup>21</sup> *Ib.*, disp. 3.5-8 (pp. 21-2): the standard doctrine of Aquinas, *ST*, Ia, Q.95, art. 1; IaIIae, Q. 82, art. 3; Q. 85, art. 3. Augustine is similar in *De Gen. ad Litt.*, VI 25.36 (*PL*, vol. 34, col. 354), where he attributes immortality to the tree of life. Cf. N. P. Williams, *The Ideas of the Fall and of Original Sin. A Historical and Critical Study* (1927), Lecture VI.

<sup>22</sup> *Concord.*, I, Q. XIV, art. 13, disp. 3.2 (pp. 19-20).

his liberty, and that original justice was in the nature of an ideal arrangement of what is nevertheless man's natural constitution. In Adam man fell from an extraordinary supernatural state to a merely natural one.<sup>23</sup>

It is therefore within the capacity of fallen nature, which remains rational and free as it was created, to order its conduct with respect to the natural law, that is to choose and to perform actions which are morally good in relation to their end.<sup>24</sup> Thus the reasonable creature is capable, with his own resources, even of an act of the love of God above all things.<sup>25</sup> Nature is not, however, as Pelagius taught, adequate to man's supernatural end. For this a supernatural assistance is necessary. The act of faith requires a prevenient and 'exciting' grace which moves the intellect and the will in such a way as to produce the act of interior assent.<sup>26</sup> This grace is unconditional and granted in virtue of Christ's merits only.<sup>27</sup> Its object however does not differ qualitatively but only by degree from that of the free will; its function is merely 'de procurer aux œuvres déjà moralement bonnes un degré supérieur, et un caractère plus excellent'.<sup>28</sup> Prevenient grace, says Molina, will always be granted on Christ's behalf to him who does what he can with his natural powers towards his supernatural end.<sup>29</sup> Moreover we can either consent to or reject this special grace.<sup>30</sup> Molina thus gives free will a part in the production of those supernatural acts necessary to justification, on the principle that when two causes concur towards an effect, they both constitute integral parts of

---

<sup>23</sup> *Ib.*, disp. 3.5 (p. 21): 'peccatum namque primi parentis solum in gratuitis nobis nocuit ... ut Thomas 1 p. q. 95 art. 1 docet ... Quare natura humana post peccatum recte dicitur spoliata donis supernaturalibus quae habebat in Adamo; condita vero in puris naturalibus non diceretur spoliata eisdem donis, cum ea numquam antea habuisset'.

<sup>24</sup> *Ib.*, disp. 5.1-2 (pp. 27-8).

<sup>25</sup> *Ib.*, disp. 14 (pp. 66-9) – the general concurrence of God being supposed, *ib.*, III, *De auxiliis gratiae*, Q. XIV, art. 13, disp. 40.22 (p. 253). This tenet, denied by Aquinas at *ST*, IaIIae, q. 109, a. 3, was fiercely contested by the Dominicans during the congregations *De auxiliis*, cf. Antoine Arnauld, *Seconde Apologie pour Monsieur Jansenius Evêque d'Ipres*, in *Œuvres*, XVII, bk. 3, ch. 20, p. 331; McGrath, *Iustitia Dei*, pp. 70-90, esp. 81-2, 85-7.

<sup>26</sup> *Ib.*, I, Q. XIV, art. 13, disp. 8 (pp. 39-43); III, Q. XIV, art. 13, disp. 40.3 (p. 244).

<sup>27</sup> *Ib.*, I, Q. XIV, art. 13, disp. 9.1 (pp. 43-4).

<sup>28</sup> Jean Laporte, *La Doctrine de Port-Royal*, 2 vols. [of projected 3] (Paris, 1923), t. II, *Exposition de la Doctrine (D'Après Arnauld)*, p. 351.

<sup>29</sup> *Concord.*, I, Q. XIV, art. 13, disp. 10.1 (pp. 48-9).

<sup>30</sup> *Ib.*, III, Q. XIV, art. 13, disp. 40.5 (pp. 244-5).

the total effect.<sup>31</sup> Both grace and consent are part of the definition of the supernatural act. Molina further deposes that the act of faith so produced disposes the subject towards the infusion of a ‘habitus’ in the soul, which renders him capable of continuing to produce supernatural acts without the need of a special grace; and that hope and charity, being naturally deducible from faith, require no further special grace.<sup>32</sup> The processes of justification and sanctification, then, are represented as supposing the free co-operation of the human will.<sup>33</sup> By the theory of the simultaneous concurrence of causes the free will is held to be as essential to these effects as the indispensable preliminary of exciting grace.

Nevertheless this grace is necessary, and it is for his presentation of the agreement of this necessity with liberty that Molina is now usually remembered. Second causes, he says, are neither independent agents, nor simply ciphers for the action of the first cause. All being is from God, but this general ‘influx’ is specifically determined to particular effects by second causes.<sup>34</sup> The creature could produce no effects without this first cause, but retains the liberty of indifference and thus a causal agency by the concurrence of causes in the specific effect.<sup>35</sup> The effect of grace, including actual grace, is thus similarly pictured as receiving its specific determination from the volition of the subject. If the subject fails to accept and co-operate with this grace, it was merely sufficient; if he consents and co-operates and produces supernatural acts, it was efficacious.<sup>36</sup> Although actual grace is already a determined cause

---

<sup>31</sup> E.g. *ib.*, disp. 38.5 (p. 226); and esp. *ib.*, I, Q. XIV, art. 13, disp. 12.11 (p. 64): when two agents move an object, ‘tunc nihil est in eo motu quod non sit ab unoquoque’. Since grace has no secondary causes, Jansen dismisses this idea ‘scholae recentioris’, *Augustinus*, t. III, bk. 2, ch. 8, cols. 117-22; cf. Pascal, *Écrits sur la Grâce*, in Chevalier, p. 949 [Mesnard, p. 782], distinguishing the ‘première volonté’ from ‘la volonté suivante’: in one sense the action proceeds from the latter, since it concurs in it, but in another sense it does not, since this will is not the origin of the action; since, however, there is no sense in which the action does not proceed from the former, ‘l’action sera rapportée à cette volonté première et non à l’autre’. Also pp. 967, 981.

<sup>32</sup> *Concord.*, I, Q. XIV, art. 13, disp. 8.2-4 (pp. 33-41); *ib.*, III, Q. XIV, art. 13, disp. 39.7 (p. 243).

<sup>33</sup> Indeed Molina everywhere uses ‘pendere’ to describe the relation of supernatural acts necessary for justification to free will: e.g. concluding remarks at *ib.*, I, Q. XIV, art. 13, disp. 15.14 (p. 90).

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*, II, *De concursu Dei generali*, Q. XIV, art. 13, disp. 26 (pp. 164-70).

<sup>35</sup> *Ib.*, disp. 26.16 (p. 170): ‘quando causae subordinatae sunt inter se ita ut aliae sint magis, aliae minus universales, aliae particulares, necesse non [est] ut superior in eo ordine semper moveat inferiorem ... sed satis [est], si immediate influent in effectum’.

<sup>36</sup> E.g. *ib.*, I, Q. XIV, art. 13, disp. 12 (p. 60): ‘semper ... manet accedere aut non accedere ...’

applied to some specific end by God, the motion it imparts to the soul presupposes the vital concurrence of the human organism, which thereby participates in the effect.<sup>37</sup>

Molina then had to explain how, if the sufficiency or efficacy of grace depends on free will, divine foreknowledge can consist with this contingent determination of grace. He did so by reference to a sort of divine prescience which falls between God's knowledge of every possible configuration of being in eternity, and his knowledge of everything which in fact comes to pass by virtue of his willing a certain configuration:<sup>38</sup> his 'scientia media', before he has willed a particular configuration of future conditions, of the hypothetical behaviour of second causes in all possible circumstances. God may foreknow how persons will act under certain circumstances without thereby determining them or infringing their liberty of action. Thus he does not need to predetermine the efficacy of his grace, since he is able to know what use man will make of it under certain conditions before those conditions are annexed to his real knowledge, or knowledge of vision, by his choice to realise them.<sup>39</sup> Hence predestination is at least tied to, if not predicated on God's foresight of the use man will make of grace, though by Molina's definition the former depends on the latter.<sup>40</sup> Predestination has no final cause outside God, but other causes concur towards its taking effect, viz., the prevenient and subsequent graces offered to man on account of the merits of Christ, and the use made of them by the predestined person.<sup>41</sup>

---

<sup>37</sup> Cf. Laporte, *Exposition de la Doctrine*, pp. 359-60; Vansteenbergh, in *DTC*, X, cols. 2113-16.

<sup>38</sup> See Aquinas, *ST*, Ia, Q. XIV, arts. 8 & 9.

<sup>39</sup> *Concord.*, IV, *De praesentia Dei*, Q. XIV, art. 13, disp. 52 (pp. 337-56).

<sup>40</sup> Jansen draws out this consequence, *Augustinus*, t. I, bk. 7, ch. 18, and t. III, *Erroris Massiliensium et Opinionis Quorundam Recentiorum Parraleigon et Statera*, ch. 4, cols. 1127-1132, esp. nn. 66, 69; cf. Laporte, *Exposition*, pp. 350-57. Predestination is the subject of part VII of the *Concordia* (ed. Rabeneck, pp. 453f.).

<sup>41</sup> *Concord.* VII, *De praedestinatione et reprobatione*, Q. XXIII, art. 4 & 5, disp. 2 (pp. 587-94).

## *Jansenism*

Jansen aimed to resolve precisely the difficulty which Molina addressed: how to reconcile grace and free will without falling into Pelagianism on one side, or the Manichean fatalism which was taken to characterise the Protestants on the other.<sup>42</sup> He and his French successors considered Molinism to be little more than a redaction of Semi-Pelagianism, tending towards Pelagianism; but it was their intention to safeguard Catholic truth on the place of human freedom in the scheme of salvation.

Jansen's central disagreement with Molina is that he misunderstands the nature of this liberty. Following out the historical positivism which he set against scholastic philosophical speculation, Jansen drew his premises from the thought of St Augustine. Augustine had not started a philosophical hare by postulating a definition of human liberty established on the basis of a non-existent state of pure nature, but had drawn his definition from an historical consideration of man as he is revealed to us before and after the fall. Molinism basically misunderstood human nature as God created it; it could not therefore correctly conceive the consequences of the fall for man's relationship with God.

Like Molina, Jansen considered liberty to be essential to the constitution of human nature; but he understood this in a radically different sense. Like all created things man has a certain end: his nature is to work itself out towards this ultimate end, as the nature of the acorn is consummated in the oak. As a rational creature what is good for man, his natural end, is the source of Mind, God.<sup>43</sup> To know what is good is to desire it, to love it. To love an

---

<sup>42</sup> On the Jansenist abstraction of 'les deux erreurs contraires' from the logical tendency of 'Molinism' and 'Calvinism', by way of setting limits to a veridical enquiry, see Laporte, *Exposition*, Introduction, n. 199.

<sup>43</sup> After e.g. Aquinas, *Summa c. gentiles*, III 57.4: 'omnis intellectus naturaliter desiderat divinae substantiae visionem'. Jansen, *Augustinus*, t. II, *De statu purae naturae*, bk. 1, ch. 3, col. 687: 'hic connaturalis creaturae rationalis et ultimus finis, nec est nec esse potest alius, quam unus et verus Deus, ut vero amore diligendus';

object is to do everything within one's power to attain it, and, when once it is possessed, to desire nothing further, but to rest in its possession ('dilectio mansoria' as opposed to 'dilectio transitoria').<sup>44</sup> The happiness of man is thus to rest in the basis of his being, to return from a separate creaturely existence into an intimate loving union with God. For 'c'est un ordre de la Nature & de la Providence divine, que tout ce qui est sujet à leurs loix, & renfermé dans leurs bornes, retourne à son origine, par un mouvement perpétuel'.<sup>45</sup> The good of man lies in a certain conformity with the ultimate Good, which must inevitably follow the perspicuous and unadulterated apprehension of it:<sup>46</sup> this loving knowledge, as Augustine says in words of Plotinus quoted with approval in the *City of God*, is 'becoming like to God'.<sup>47</sup>

True liberty is to have it in one's power to attain this happiness. It is liberation from the 'regio dissimilitudinis' into true selfhood, the optimal likeness to God.<sup>48</sup> It is the freedom to know the good with the intellect, and love it with the will, and so to follow it in all obedience; it is a 'certaine Nécessité à bien faire'.<sup>49</sup> The liberty of indifference is a corollary

---

[idem], *Discours de la réformation de l'homme intérieur, prononcé par un S. evesque. Avec des extraits de M. Hamon et D. le Nain de la Trape* (n.p., n.d.), pp. 16-27, 83-4 – this discourse was translated by Robert Arnauld d'Andilly and published in 1644.

<sup>44</sup> Jansen, *Augustinus*, t. II, *De statu naturae lapsae*, bk. 2, ch. 13, and ch. 16, col. 367; Augustine, *De doctrina Christiana*, I 35 (*PL*, vol. 34, col. 34).

<sup>45</sup> Jansen, *Discours*, pp. 1-2.

<sup>46</sup> With e.g. Augustine, *De Genesi contra Manichaeos*, I 20.31: 'et haec est hominis beata vita atque tranquilla, cum omnes motus eius rationi veritatis consentiunt' (*PL*, vol. 34, col. 188).

<sup>47</sup> *De civ. Dei*, IX 17. This joining of knowing to loving is highly significant (as in Gregory the Great, *Homilia in Evangelia* 27, 'amor ipse notitia est'). By locating 'likeness to God' in the union of wills, it maintains the distinction of the creature, and the equal significance of the affective with the intellective in the religious journey: cf. Bernard McGinn, 'Love, Knowledge, and Mystical Union in Western Christianity: Twelfth to Sixteenth Centuries', *Church History*, 56, 1 (1987), pp. 7-24; below, pp. 19, 22-3, 31-2.

<sup>48</sup> The 'region of unlikeness' to God: see the *Confessions*, VII 10. 16 (*PL*, vol. 32, col. 742). The phrase comes from Plato, *Statesman*, 273d, through Plotinus, *Enneads*, I 8.13, and appears again in Bernard of Clairvaux, *Sermones de diversis*, XLII 2. See Etienne Gilson, 'Regio Dissimilitudinis de Platon à Saint Bernard de Clairvaux', *Medieval Studies*, 9 (1947), pp. 108-30. St. Bernard was in credit with the Jansenists, who considered him the last authoritative author before the 'relâchement' which set in, to the ruin of the Church, in the thirteenth century: see e.g. Arnauld, *FC*, p. 76. Jean Orcibal has noted that Jansen, in *Augustinus*, t. III, bk. 7, ch. 12, cols. 790-91, related the 'regio dissimilitudinis' of *Conf.* VII 10 to the eighth chapter of the Pseudo-Dionysius's *Celestial Hierarchy*: 'Thèmes platoniciens dans l'"Augustinus" de Jansénius', in *Augustinus Magister: Congrès international Augustinien*, 3 vols. (Paris, 1954), vol. II, at p. 1082.

<sup>49</sup> The Jansenists pointed to *De civ. Dei*, V 10, e.g. Arnauld, *Seconde Apologie*, bk. 3, ch. 3, pp. 239-40, and his quote, from Aquinas, *Summa c. gentiles*, III 138.2; cf. Jansen, *Augustinus*, t. II, *De statu naturae innocentis ... liber singularis*, ch. 6, col. 100.

of freedom, not a postulate.<sup>50</sup> Wherever there is a will there is another, psychological sense of liberty or ‘choice’, the common-sense understanding adopted by Molina, which Augustine defines in terms of desire: the will always freely chooses what it wants and we act according to our desire.<sup>51</sup> But the less the will is psychologically free to want the bad, the more it is in its power to pursue the good, and the freer it is in the absolute and eternal sense.

How is man capable of attaining this transcendent end to which he naturally tends? He has been created in the image of God, with a mind capable of knowing and a will capable of loving him. But as a material being he contains a principle of atrophy: he is drawn *ex nihilo*, and retains a tendency towards nothingness. Just as a pair of eyes, in order not to see, need only close themselves, whereas to vision light is necessary, so grace is always necessary for man to see and to do the good.<sup>52</sup> It is therefore apparent that, while Jansen did not, like the ‘Pelagius of Paradise’, his Louvain predecessor Baius, render the addition of grace an actual corollary of the constitution of human nature, he did nevertheless understand Augustine to mean that the true nature of man is only to be consummated by means of divine grace.<sup>53</sup> What is truly ‘natural’ in man, since whatever diverts and obstructs him from his end is necessarily unnatural, is not a general bodily and psychological constitution such as might be found in an imagined state of pure nature, but exclusively those facets of his constitution which reflect the image of the Creator, and which being cultivated with the assistance of divine grace render man adequate to the Godward trajectory and goal implicit in his reasonable nature.<sup>54</sup> The significance of this fact for the present discussion may easily be grasped: for those counsels of perfection which, for the very attempt to apply them, have deserved the

---

<sup>50</sup> Cf. *Ibid.*, t. I, bk. 5, ch. 28, col. 322: ‘illam indifferentem ac dominatricem arbitrii potestatem ... semper Pelagiani pupulis oculorum suorum habuere chariorem’.

<sup>51</sup> E.g. *De libero arbitrio*, III, 25.74 (*PL*, vol. 32, col. 1307).

<sup>52</sup> Jansen, *Augustinus*, t. II, *De statu naturae innocentis*, chs. 10-12, at cols. 131-4.

<sup>53</sup> Arnauld, *Seconde Apologie*, bk. 2, ch. 12, pp. 146-8; cf. J. Carreyre, ‘Jansénisme’, in *DTC*, VIII, cols. 346-8. On Baius, Abercrombie, *Origins*, pp. 87-92, and McGrath, *Iustitia Dei*, pp. 277-80.

<sup>54</sup> Viz., the qualities of reason and will which are the image of God and render the mind capable of him – *De Trin.* XIV 8.11 (*PL*, vol. 42, cols. 1044-5). This is perhaps implicit in the Pauline idea of man as ‘the image and glory of God’ (I Cor. xi 7), cf. William Ralph Inge, *Christian Mysticism* (4<sup>th</sup> ed., 1918), pp. 66-7.

opprobrious designation of ‘moral rigorism’, wear different aspects when the object to which they are applied is distinguished as between that which must be fully realised, and that which must be finally extirpated. The idea of Jansenism as an anti-rational, puritanical system founded on the principle of repression, can (in accordance with the laws of polemic) in one sense be considered its antitype.<sup>55</sup>

The concepts of nature and supernature are anachronistic in terms of the thought of Augustine, but it may be helpful so to envisage the two positions thus far sketched. On the one hand the Molinists retain the distinction pristinely, viewing man in a double aspect as an agent in two orders which have each their peculiar and equally legitimate prerogatives;<sup>56</sup> in another sense they seem to dissolve the distinction by making the two orders continuous, in that actual and subsequent graces are infallibly granted to whoever makes good use of the sufficient grace which is ‘naturally’, in the sense of universally and invariably, available. The Jansenists, on the other hand, deny such a continuity between the two orders in order to affirm an identity – an affirmation which, as will be appreciated, more readily forms the starting-point for ascetical and mystical than for moral and pastoral theology.

This anthropological postulate means that the character of man’s journey to his end in God, ‘in proportion as he grows more like him’, must necessarily be determined by the accidental conditions under which the likeness has to be realised.<sup>57</sup> Faithful Augustinians in this sense, the entire Jansenist teaching on grace, and their opposition to Molinism, revolves

---

<sup>55</sup> It will be argued in the following chapter that the same psychoanalytic indictment, when preferred against contemporary Anglican authors, is equally inapplicable in an analogous though not identical sense: the plaintiff is Allison, *The Rise of Moralism*.

<sup>56</sup> Cf. Laporte, *Exposition de la Doctrine*, p. 38.

<sup>57</sup> *De civ. Dei*, tr. Bettenson, IX 17.

around the peculiarity of the conditions obtaining before and after the fall. This distinction, according to Arnauld, is ‘la clef de la doctrine de Saint Augustin’.<sup>58</sup>

The liberty of Adam consisted in his natural ordination to the good.<sup>59</sup> His was a state of complete bodily and spiritual integrity, the state which Molina after Aquinas calls original justice.<sup>60</sup> No vain shadows occluded his spirit, no cupidinous movements stirred his heart; free from ‘omnibus affectibus terrenis’, he was fully capable of the perfect love-knowledge by which he could walk in the way to his natural end.<sup>61</sup> Adam therefore enjoyed a liberty of indifference – there was nothing to prevent him freely making use of that grace which is as light to the healthy eye, the *adiutorium sine qua non* which permits the creature drawn out of nothing to do the good, and consists in the light and love by which he can know, love, and so attain his end. The grace by means of which he could persevere in righteousness and attain to celestial beatitude was submitted to his free will: he had it in his power both to do the good and not to do it.<sup>62</sup> There was no need of a Bañezian pre-motion physically determining him to the good, because there was no necessary incongruity between his psychological liberty to act in accordance with his desires and his absolute liberty to act in accordance with his last end.<sup>63</sup>

This state of affairs was fundamentally altered by the fact that Adam did choose to contravene the divine precept. This sin represented a break in the natural order: in choosing a finite good, proposed by his own ‘amor sui’, over the infinite good proposed by God, Adam departed from the rational order under which man tends towards a transcendent end.<sup>64</sup> The

---

<sup>58</sup> Quoted Laporte, *La Doctrine de Port-Royal*, t. I, *Essai sur la Formation et le Développement de la Doctrine*, p. 47, and see t. II, pp. 441-2 *et passim*; Pascal, *Écrits sur la Grâce*, p. 957 [Mesnard, pp. 767-8]; Saint-Cyran, *Le Cœur Nouveau*, in *Théologie familière, avec divers autres petits traités de dévotion* (Paris, 1669), pp. 119-20. A non-apologetic but forceful meditation on the conformity of Jansenist thought with that of Augustine is Leszek Kolakowski, *God Owes Us Nothing. A Brief Remark on Pascal's Religion and on the Spirit of Jansenism* (Chicago-London, 1995).

<sup>59</sup> Jansen, *Augustinus*, t. II, *De statu naturae innocentis*, ch. 6, at col. 100.

<sup>60</sup> *Ibid.*, chs. 1-5.

<sup>61</sup> *Ibid.*, ch. 9, at col. 120.

<sup>62</sup> *Ibid.*, chs. 6-8, 14-16.

<sup>63</sup> *Ibid.*, ch. 20, cols. 181-4: ‘adiutorium status innocentiae non [esse] praedeterminationem physicam’.

<sup>64</sup> *Ibid.*, *De statu naturae lapsae*, bk. 1, chs. 1 & 2, and ch. 21, cols. 265-7.

trespass against the commandment was an offence against nature: hence its effect was to establish a profound rupture between man and his own true nature.<sup>65</sup> Its punishment was ignorance and concupiscence, so that where in the state of innocence harmony reigned in man's spiritual and physical constitution, the state of sin is characterised by disharmony and disorder.<sup>66</sup> With a frail intellect less apt to apprehend the good, and a weakened will obnoxious to the insistent impulse of concupiscence, man becomes incapable of pursuing his true end.<sup>67</sup> A victim of cognitive error, all his desires impel him towards carnal and terrestrial things as towards his natural good.<sup>68</sup> But the more he is dissipated among creaturely things the further he is from that unitive life with God which is the real end of his nature. 'Velle enim quod non deceat, idem ipsum miserrimum'.<sup>69</sup> The effect of the fall, then, was not just to lower nature from a gratuitous plane of supernatural ability, conferred upon it from without, but fundamentally to pervert a nature ordained to the good by superinducing upon it a second, sub-rational nature, which obscures and frustrates its true ontological tendency.<sup>70</sup> There is no middle term, no state of 'pure' nature: that is simply the Pelagian error.<sup>71</sup> The difference between this interpretation of Augustine and the scholastic understanding of the doctrine deriving from Aquinas can be expressed in terms of the simile used by the theorists of 'pure

---

<sup>65</sup> *Ib.*, cols. 268-70.

<sup>66</sup> *Ib.*, bk. 2, ch. 1: 'discordiae, lites, bella, insidiae, iracundiae, inimicitiae, fallacia, adulatio, fraus, furtum, rapina, perfidia, superbia, ambitio, invidentia, homicidia, parricidia, crudelitas ...' &c., &c. (col. 283).

<sup>67</sup> *Ib.*, chs. 2-6 on ignorance; on concupiscence, chs. 7-9. A useful discussion of Jansen's exposition in a wider context is in Michael Moriarty, *Fallen Nature, Fallen Selves* (Oxford, 2006), pp. 171f.

<sup>68</sup> Cf. *ib.*, bk. 4, ch. 12, on the virtues of the pagan philosophers, who could not discern the end their actions ought to have.

<sup>69</sup> Augustine, *De beata vita*, 2.10, quoting Cicero (*PL*, vol. 32, col. 964).

<sup>70</sup> Cf. conclusion of the arguments against the identification of concupiscence with 'pure nature', in Jansen, *Augustinus*, t. II, *De statu purae naturae*, bk. 2, ch. 21; 'radicem tanti mali' lies rather in the 'captivity' of man's 'pars superior' by the 'pars inferior' (col. 872).

<sup>71</sup> We cannot go into modern controversies surrounding the concept of 'pure nature' started by Henri de Lubac, *Surnaturel: études historiques* (Paris, 1946). It is deducible from Aquinas's understanding of the unfallen state, where the felicities subsequently lost are envisaged as gifts 'superadded' to the *puris naturalibus* of Adam's constitution. But Aquinas (*ST*, IaIIae, q. 109, a. 8) only wants to speak of man '*dupliciter*, uno modo, secundum statum naturae *integrae*; alio modo, secundum statum naturae *corruptae*'. According to de Lubac an exclusive concentration on man's supernatural destiny such as Jansen's stimulated theorists of pure nature, whose arguments, though designed to protect the gratuity of grace, had the effect of conferring a self-sufficient legitimacy on man's purely 'natural' ends. It is pretty hard to see how Jansen's position differs substantially from that of Aquinas, however, since he did not treat grace as 'natural' or necessarily owing to nature. There are some interesting perspectives in the *Revue Thomiste*, 101, 1 (2001).

nature', which was said to differ from fallen nature as a naked man differs from one who has been stripped. Molina's understanding of the effect of original sin differs from the Jansenist as a naked man differs from one who has been flayed.<sup>72</sup>

Original sin, then, introduced an absolute necessity of sinning: for where there is concupiscence there are creaturely ends, and where there is disharmony between the intellect and the passions, there is the impossibility of ruling the latter entirely by the former.<sup>73</sup> This necessity does not abrogate liberty for it consists with the free, though mistaken choice of the will.<sup>74</sup> All love of creatures must be sin, as reversal of the divine (i.e., really natural) order.<sup>75</sup> Since the basis of all human action and affection is love – love which seeks to possess the loved object, and seeks nothing further, but to rest there – to yield to creaturely desires is to seek repose in an end beneath that for which man was created.<sup>76</sup> So any affection or action based on love of a creaturely thing for its own sake is sinful as tending away from God.<sup>77</sup> It is this tendency, away from God because towards the creature, which means that when we speak of 'human nature' after the fall we are really speaking of that which is sub-natural.

The necessity of sinning in fallen nature is not an absolute necessity, original to the nature of man, but one superinduced upon nature by his sin. It follows from the empire of concupiscence, but is no less culpable for being necessary, for every sin involves an act of consent to concupiscence.<sup>78</sup> All the Jansenists after Augustine held that sin is essentially voluntary, and therefore considered the *servum arbitrium* of Luther, because it precluded real

---

<sup>72</sup> *Ibid.*, t. I, bk. 2, chs. 7-8, bk. 5, chs. 1-2, bk. 6, chs. 11-12; Arnauld, *Seconde Apologie*, bk. 2, ch. 11.

<sup>73</sup> Jansen, *Augustinus*, t. II, *De statu naturae lapsae*, bk. 3, chs. 2-3.

<sup>74</sup> *Ibid.*, chs. 1, 11, 13: 'ex necessitate boni, qua Deus malum velle non potest, sed solum bonum, probat [Augustinus] etiam incolumem manere libertatem arbitrii, quamvis similiter bonum velle non possit' (cols. 477-8); Arnauld, *Seconde Apologie*, bk. 3, chs. 5, 6.

<sup>75</sup> Jansen, *Augustinus*, t. II, *De statu naturae lapsae*, bk. 2, ch. 16.

<sup>76</sup> *Ibid.*, bk. 2, chs. 12-16; Pascal, *Écrits sur la Grâce*, p. 1003 [Mesnard, pp. 704-5].

<sup>77</sup> For Augustine's famous distinction of *uti* and *frui* see *De diversis quaestionibus LXXXIII*, 30 (*PL*, vol. 40, cols. 19-20); *De doctrina Christiana*, I 22.20-21 (*PL*, vol. 34, cols. 26-7).

<sup>78</sup> Jansen, *Augustinus*, t. II, *De statu naturae lapsae*, bk. 2, ch. 8, cols. 326-8.

culpability, to be analogous with the Molinist palliation of original sin.<sup>79</sup> If there is no culpability, no true sin, there is no necessity for penitence or expiation on the part of man. But this necessity the Jansenists were eager to asseverate.

It remained therefore to show how man, in the wretched state to which, they argued, sin had reduced him, could be equal to such work. There remain in fallen man the vestiges or remnants of the state of innocence: reason is not extinct; a spark of the divine likeness persists.<sup>80</sup> This, however, is so incapacitated from expressing itself in action by the dominion of the flesh, the law of sin in his members of which Paul speaks in Romans vii, that a grace of a wholly different order from the *adiutorium sine qua non* is needed. In order to want and to do the good an efficacious and determining grace is needed, an *adiutorium quo*, which liberates the will from its enslavement to the creature and determines it to act.<sup>81</sup> The law which dictates the return of created things to their origin is ‘si immuable & si universelle, que l’on en voit même quelques marques & quelques traits en la corruption des choses dans laquelle elles perdent leurs premieres qualitez, & sortent de leur état naturel’. But in consequence of this departure another principle of attraction has replaced the true principle, so that now ‘elle [human nature] ne peut plus être redressée que par une force extrême’.<sup>82</sup> Where psychological liberty under the empire of ignorance and concupiscence necessarily entails the free choice of the bad, true liberty depends on a grace which, being irresistibly powerful, can break the dragging fetters of sin, so enlightening the mind and transforming the will that the good can be freely chosen, that is freely willed in the sense of desired.<sup>83</sup> All

---

<sup>79</sup> Laporte, *Exposition de la Doctrine*, p. 41; for Augustine see e.g. *De vera religione*, XIV. 27 (PL, vol. 34, col. 133): ‘Nunc vero usque adeo peccatum voluntarium est malum, ut nullo modo sit peccatum, si non sit voluntarium ... quare aut negandum est peccatum committi, aut fatendum est voluntate committi’.

<sup>80</sup> See Jansen, *Augustinus*, t. II, *De statu naturae lapsae*, bk. 4, ch. 16, on the natural seeds of virtue; *ib.*, *De statu purae naturae*, bk. 1, chs. 15-17 (‘imago Dei’, ‘naturae lumen’, etc.); cf. Saint-Cyran, *Somme des fautes*, i, pp. 84-91.

<sup>81</sup> Jansen, *Augustinus*, t. I, bk. 4, ch. 7, and t. III, bk. 1, chs. 3-4.

<sup>82</sup> *Idem*, *Discours*, pp. 2-3, 6-7, 20-27.

<sup>83</sup> Jansen, *Augustinus*, t. III, bk. 2, *passim*, and *ib.*, bk. 6 *passim*. This is the thesis condemned in the third proposition (above, n. 5): freedom need only be from compulsion, not from necessity. Jansen defends it on the

desire can thus be reduced to two loves or delectations, one being inspired by and tending towards man's natural good, the other being inspired by and tending towards the sub-natural captivity of the flesh: the two loves that built the two cities, and which, according to the dictum 'as one loves, so one is', make the man.<sup>84</sup>

The existence of man in the state of grace is characterised by the conflict between these two loves. The victorious grace of Christ is necessarily irresistible, for in the state of fallen nature the will is either directed by itself, and chooses bad, or by God; if grace communicated only a possibility of action it would necessarily be inefficacious. But this efficacious grace does not constrain the will in spite of itself: its work is rather to effect the transformation of the will, so that the desire precedes the act, and the human organism accomplishes the good with a freedom reminiscent of that of Adam.<sup>85</sup> Again, this throws into relief the intellectualist shape of the Jansenist approach, after Augustine, to morality. True knowledge of his last end must effectively constrain man's desire; just so, all disordered, or sinful acts, must derive from some cognitive error regarding this end. Hence Arnauld talks about the grace of Christ in terms of perfect knowledge and love, and his master, Saint-Cyran, writes: 'comme la charité nous mène à Dieu, c'est aussi la vérité qui nous doit mener à la charité'.<sup>86</sup> This charity, the desire to rest in God (contrition, love of God for his sake), is the only motive adequate to the production of a moral act, because the value of acts is governed by the end to which they are ordered. The love of God therefore comprehends all the virtues, cardinal and theological, as love of the immutable justice in which all virtue

---

basis of Augustine's definition of the will as a 'motus animae' towards a desired object: *ibid.*, t. II, *De statu naturae lapsae*, bk. 4, ch. 21, and see ch. 24, col. 662, where a 'plena voluntas' is made the condition of liberty, 'sive ab ista ... diligendi necessitate se expedire possit, sive non possit'. Cf. Arnauld, *Seconde Apologie*, bk. 3, ch. 20.

<sup>84</sup> *De civ. Dei*, XIV 28; *In epistolam Joannis ad Parthos tractatus*, 2.14 (*PL*, vol. 35, col. 1997): 'talis est quisque, qualis eius dilectio est. Terram diligis? terra eris. Deum diligis? quid dicam? deus eris?'

<sup>85</sup> Jansen, *Augustinus*, t. III, bk. 2, ch. 27; Arnauld, *Seconde Apologie*, bk. 3, ch. 16.

<sup>86</sup> Arnauld, *Instruction Sur la Grâce*, pp. xxv-xxxii, at xxix-xxx; Laporte, *Essai*, p. 29.

participates.<sup>87</sup> But only an efficacious and determining grace is sufficiently potential to sway the fallen creature from his own ends.

### *Rigorism*

It is the property of Christian philosophy to build upon surer foundations than that which knows no redeemer. In the fallen state there always persists a psychological liberty to sin: where there is concupiscence, that is to say, there is the theoretical possibility of sin, while a habit of righteousness only supposes a continuous succession of actual graces.<sup>88</sup> The progress towards his end is therefore for the Christian, as Augustine was aware in encountering the Plotinian ascent of the soul, characterised by a duration and struggle foreign to the serene philosophical contemplative.<sup>89</sup> The equation of knowledge and virtue is intricately affected by the effects of original sin.

It was on the basis of an analysis of these effects, which constitutes ‘an interesting chapter in psychology’, that the Jansenists discussed the co-operation of the human will with the irresistible grace of Christ.<sup>90</sup> The centrality of this psychological question to their whole constructive theological effort is only the more strongly emphasised by its basis in the weakest philosophical link in their arguments. The freedom of the will after the fall is protected by the ‘power of contraries’, which we have called the psychological liberty to sin, and which must always persist alongside the movements and affections irremediably

---

<sup>87</sup> Jansen, *Augustinus*, t. III, bk. 5, chs. 1-10; cf. *ib.*, chs. 13f. on attrition, which is not made sufficient to justification by the sacrament of penance (ch. 19).

<sup>88</sup> *Ibid.*, bk. 3, chs. 15-19: the faithful would not pray God not to lead them into temptation (‘hoc est, ne deserantur adiutorio eius’) if he never withdrew his grace from the just (‘justis’) (col. 368); see Augustine, *De perfectione iustitiae hominis*, XXI (*PL*, vol. 44, cols. 316-8); cf. Pascal, *Écrits sur la Grâce*, pp. 984-1001 [Mesnard, pp. 682-702].

<sup>89</sup> Paul Henry, ‘Augustine and Plotinus’, *Journal of Theological Studies*, 38 (1937), p. 15.

<sup>90</sup> Carreyre, in *DTC*, t. VIII, col. 353.

attendant upon fallen nature.<sup>91</sup> If, as the Jansenists did assert, this ‘physical’ power of contraries can never be realised under the impulsion of grace, it does nothing theoretically to conserve liberty.<sup>92</sup> On the practical level, however, this theoretical fudge did a great deal of real work. It expresses the empirical recognition, which can be measured in many conversions and is traced most famously in the seventh and eighth books of Augustine’s *Confessions*, of the dreadful power of concupiscence, which can and demonstrably does, many times, resist that grace which on the Jansenist argument can only ever be efficacious. This efficacy, then, they maintained by qualifying it as to degree. Every grace need not necessarily aim at the same effect, so that we can envisage a whole series of ‘imperfect’ or ‘petites grâces’, which may not convert us entirely from the world, but which perhaps begin to direct our desires towards a higher and a spiritual one. Each of these graces, being ordained to a particular effect, is equally efficacious, though differing in outcome.<sup>93</sup> The formation of a loving disposition is envisaged as a balancing of scales: charity and cupidity increase and diminish proportionately.<sup>94</sup>

Following Arnauld’s censure and the *Lettres Provinciales*, Nicole and Arnauld increasingly argued that this graduated idea of grace was conformable with the Thomist distinction of sufficient grace, which communicates the possibility of action (as opposed to a

---

<sup>91</sup> Jansen, *Augustinus*, t. III, bk. 8, ch. 4, also *ib.*, chs. 5-20: though two contrary acts cannot exist together *in sensu composito*, the power subsists separately from the act (*in sensu diviso*); we cannot simultaneously will contraries, but we can do one thing and will another. The Jansenists argued that this is the power referred to in the Tridentine anathema on those who say that ‘man’s free will ... cannot refuse its assent [to God’s call and action] if it wishes’ (Canon 4 of the decree on justification, in Schroeder, p. 42): Arnauld, *Seconde Apologie*, bk. 2, ch. 18, pp. 181-3; cf. Laporte, *Exposition*, pp. 412-16. The use of this Thomist distinction is meant to indicate that if Thomism is orthodox so *a fortiori* is Jansen’s Augustinianism. As Herbert Thorndike (see below, ch. 6) pointed out, however, it actually protects a version of free will, as consisting in indifference, which Jansen categorically refuses: Thorndike, *Epilogue*, ii, ch. 21, pp. 164-5.

<sup>92</sup> Interestingly the Molinist with whom Nicole has ‘Wendrock’ converse by way of establishing the accord between the Jansenists and the Thomists about efficacious grace, admits that ‘orthodoxus est Montaltius, et Thomisti’, but cannot concede the reality of a power irreducible to act. Wendrock, p. 496, discussed in de Franceschi, *Entre saint Augustin et saint Thomas*, pp. 114-16.

<sup>93</sup> Jansen, *Augustinus*, t. III, bk. 2, ch. 27, col. 210: ‘multiplices [sunt] divinae gratiae effectus’; also *ib.*, bk. 3, chs. 13-17, bk. 8, ch. 2; cf. Laporte, *Exposition*, pp. 402-11.

<sup>94</sup> Jansen, *Discours*, p. 116: ‘nous avons d’autant plus d’amour de Dieu, que nous avons moins d’orgueil’; cf. Augustine, *Epistolae*, 157. 2.9 (*PL*, vol. 33, col. 677), ‘Iubemur ... detrahere de pondere cupiditatis quod accedat ad pondus charitatis, donec illud consumatur, hoc perficiatur’.

proximate power in the Molinist sense), from efficacious grace by which the will is determined to act.<sup>95</sup> Kinship could even by this means be claimed with the doctrine of the ‘neo-Thomists’ savaged in Pascal’s second *Provinciale* (which ‘on ... connoît mieux qu’ on ne la connoissoit alors’).<sup>96</sup> Hence Arnauld’s overtures to the Thomists in the late 1650s and early 1660s were not necessarily mere policy, as is testified by the rift that consequently arose between himself and Nicole on one side, and Barcos, the nephew of Saint-Cyran, and the Port-Royal confessor Antoine Singlin on the other. The five Articles submitted to the Jesuit Ferrier in the course of the remarkable Jansenist-Jesuit negotiations initiated by the Bishop of Comminges, Gilbert Choiseul, in late 1662 and early 1663, constitute evidence of a genuine belief on the part of certain Port-Royalists that the Augustinian distinction of ‘grandes’ from ‘petites grâces’ could be adequately formulated in the terms of scholastic Thomism.<sup>97</sup> Arnauld had to deny to friends that this represented a change of course; still, these surface movements suggest the inviolable premise which subsists beneath. Man must strive towards God with the power he has. In his *Discours de la réformation de l’homme intérieur* Jansen writes that while ‘vous n’espérez qu’en sa [God’s] seule miséricorde’, nevertheless ‘vous ne laissez pas d’agir de toute votre puissance, & avec tous les efforts qui vous sont possibles’.<sup>98</sup>

This premise is grounded in a psychology of human action which can appear monochrome, particularly in its equation of sensible and spiritual desire.<sup>99</sup> All human affection is said to have its basis in love, so that the act of the will proceeds as much, and

---

<sup>95</sup> In this they were strictly justified since their teaching did not differ from that of Aquinas, who followed Augustine in distinguishing ‘cooperating’ from ‘operating’ grace by the addition of human agency, so that ‘cooperando Deus in nobis perficit quod operando incipit’: *ST*, IaIIae, Q. 111, art. 2.4, quoting Augustine, *De grat. et lib. arb.*, 17.33 (*PL*, vol. 44, col. 901).

<sup>96</sup> On all this see de Franceschi, *Entre saint Augustin et saint Thomas*, ch. 3, quoting from Arnauld’s letters at pp. 126-7.

<sup>97</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 136-61 and Appendix IV; Henri Gouhier, ‘La crise de la théologie au temps de Descartes’, pp. 290-1. The increasing appreciation of Aquinas by Arnauld is stressed by Laporte, *Exposition*: it is already evident in the *Seconde Apologie*, e.g. bk. 2, ch. 20. See also the recent number of *XVIIe Siècle*, 259 (2013), on Arnauld, *Thomas D’Aquin et Les Thomistes*. These proceedings were followed by Theophilus Gale, see *The Court of the Gentiles*, pt. iv, bk. 3 (1678), pp. 123-4, 126-7.

<sup>98</sup> Jansen, *Discours*, pp. 117-8.

<sup>99</sup> See *idem*, *Augustinus*, t. III, bk. 4, chs. 7, 11; Pascal, *Écrits sur la Grâce*, pp. 966-7 [Mesnard, p. 795].

probably more, from *delectatio* than from the intellectual element, which would be helpless without the favourable disposition of the passionate.<sup>100</sup> Love itself is obscure, and hidden within us; but it is known by its fruits. All the inclinations of nature spring from love, and therefore evince the nature of our love.<sup>101</sup> Since a moral act must be deliberate, the act of love has to be a free act of the will. We must want what God wants from us. The desires and affections must therefore be cultivated to serve reason, just as for Plato θυμοειδές must be conditioned to take the side of λογιστικόν over ἐπιθυμητικόν – if it is ‘corrupted by bad upbringing’ we are apt to peep at corpses.<sup>102</sup> It is crucial that the disordered movements of concupiscence be ordered and regulated by reason.<sup>103</sup>

It was the same relationship between love, or desire, and knowledge, which prompted Augustine’s reflections on the Socratic theme of *nosce teipsum* in book ten of *De Trinitate*. The more clearly we apprehend ourselves as loving or desiring – the better we understand the triune activity of *mens*, *notitia*, and *amor* (or *memoria*, *intelligentia*, and *voluntas*) – so much more clearly do we apprehend the Trinity, and so much closer are we to God.<sup>104</sup> Given this crucial psychological relation, grace is to be defined as an ‘actus ... vitalis’ in the subject: it is the will of God moving those secret springs of motive, called by Augustine ‘weights’ or ‘loves’ (cf. Wis. xi 20), which determine the individual to action.<sup>105</sup> ‘It causes us simultaneously to know the good, to taste it, to embrace it, to consent to it, to persevere in it’. If justifying faith is not just adventitious and irrational (the error of the ‘Calvinists’, on the Jansenist view), but involves intellectual assent, it necessarily implies an authentic desire of

---

<sup>100</sup> *Ibid.*, t. II, *De statu naturae lapsae*, bk. 2, ch. 25; *ib.*, t. III, bk. 7, ch. 3, the will cannot consent ‘sine praëunte delectatione’.

<sup>101</sup> *Ib.*, t. II, *De statu naturae lapsae*, bk. 2, chs. 17-18.

<sup>102</sup> *Rep.*, 435c-444a, at 441a, 439e-440a.

<sup>103</sup> Jansen, *De statu naturae lapsae*, ch. 23.

<sup>104</sup> *De Trin.*, VIII 8.12, 10.14; IX 3.3; X 8-12; cf. *Conf.*, X 3.3, and see the excellent article under *De Trinitate* by Rowan Williams in Allan D. Fitzgerald (ed.), *Augustine through the Ages. An Encyclopedia* (Grand Rapids, MI-Cambridge, 1999).

<sup>105</sup> *Conf.*, XIII 9.10; cf. *De civ. Dei*, XI 28; Jansen, *Augustinus*, t. III, bk. 2, ch. 34, bk. 4, ch. 1, bk. 8, ch. 1, quote at col. 817.

God, an answering charity, which cannot consist with a preponderant desire for creatures.<sup>106</sup>

The supernaturalisation of man must come first from without; but for it actually to constitute his natural consummation it requires the self-emptying which will allow it to come from within. ‘For’, as Ruysbroeck says, ‘God is more inward to us than we are to ourselves ... And therefore God works in us from within outwards; but all creatures work from without inwards.’<sup>107</sup> The first of the mystical ways is that of purgation. Hence the neoplatonic themes implicit in the approach thus far outlined – where the good of man is related entirely to the substantial intelligible reality accessible to his reason, and his liberty defined by the domination of his will by the all-powerful will to which it is ordered (that is, by conformity with the sovereign Good) – are resolved into a practical scheme on the mystical trajectory.<sup>108</sup>

Whether or not this trajectory, if it does not aim at the ecstatic union of the Greek tradition, or the indistinct dissolution upon which Eckhartian mysticism verges, is rightly called mystical in relation to its end, is immaterial in relation to the path by which it is described – a way of ever-increasing conformity laid open by humility.<sup>109</sup>

---

<sup>106</sup> See Laporte, *Exposition*, pp. 345-7, 421-33, quote at 431.

<sup>107</sup> *The Adornment of the Spiritual Marriage*, II.3, in *The Adornment of the Spiritual Marriage, The Sparkling Stone, The Book of Supreme Truth*, tr. C. A. Wynschenk (1916). Jan van Ruysbroeck was a Flemish Augustinian canon, and one of those mystics of the school of Eckhart whose work helped to form the atmosphere in which à Kempis’ *Imitation*, whence the Jansenists drew much inspiration, was produced. The influence of these Rheno-Flemish mystics can be traced back through Saint-Cyran to Bérulle, who imbibed it both directly, and through the Carmelite spirituality with which he came into contact at the time when he made one of Mme Acarie’s circle. The theme of self-annihilation is one of several which may legitimately be followed back in this way from the structure of Jansenist thought as it is exposed in this chapter. See further Jean Dagens, *Bérulle et les Origines de la Restauration Catholique (1575-1611)* (Brussels, 1952), pp. 103-9, chs. 2-3; Jean Orcibal, *Saint Jean de la Croix et les Mystiques Rhéno-flamands* (Brussels, 1966), ch. 3 on Ruysbroeck; *idem*, *Le Cardinal de Bérulle*, pp. 24-9, 50n.

<sup>108</sup> On this subject cf. Jean Orcibal, ‘Néo-Platonisme et Jansénisme: Du *De Libertate* du P. Gibieuf à *L’Augustinus*’, in *Nuove Ricerche Storiche Sul Giansenismo*, pp. 33-57. Jansen, *Augustinus*, t. III, bk. 7, ch. 16, criticised the Oratorian Guillaume Gibieuf for his too-philosophical dualism, and his neglect of grace as the effective cause in his account of liberty; nevertheless the basic agreement on the nature of liberty leads Orcibal to attribute his disagreement with Gibieuf to ‘raisons tactiques’: ‘Thèmes platoniciens dans l’“Augustinus” de Jansénius’, pp. 1082-3.

<sup>109</sup> Hence, for example, where Dom Cuthbert Butler, in *Western Mysticism* (new ed., 2000) called Augustine ‘The Prince of Mystics’, Dean Inge (*Christian Mysticism*, p. 128) thinks the label misapplied. There is, certainly, a difference between mystical experience and the writing of mystical theology. On Augustine’s experience cf. Andrew Louth, *The Origins of the Christian Mystical Tradition: From Plato to Denys* (Oxford, 2007), pp. 128-53; on his influence Eugène Portalié, *A Guide to the Thought of Saint Augustine*, tr. Ralph J. Bastian (1960), pp. 285-8.

The emphasis on self-effacement as a condition of God's internal action may, in the polemical terms of the seventeenth century, sound like a counsel of passivity, approaching nearly to Quietism: Saint-Cyran, for whom the whole Christian life consists in openness to the internal vocations of the Holy Spirit, defined true prayer in terms of silence and passivity.<sup>110</sup> In reality it is a dynamic and active principle of humility, which relates ultimately to the Incarnation as the template for the Christian life under grace. The falls of the just man, the spiritual peaks and troughs which attend the apparent caprice of 'petites grâces', teach him humility.<sup>111</sup> They impress upon him his utter dependence on the assistance of God, and the utter gratuity of such assistance. In this state of uncertainty he can only humbly abase himself and strive to accomplish the evident precepts which God has revealed to him. If the law is an unattainable ideal without a victorious grace, the failures of the man 'wishing and striving to be righteous', in the words of the first Proposition of Innocent X, will teach him humility. The function of the law is to destroy self-love and to teach the necessity of healing.<sup>112</sup> This too is the work which the doctrine of predestination, logically maintained by the Jansenist writers to be *ante praevisa merita* (though not irrespective of original sin, which they maintained against supralapsarian Calvinists to be the condition of negative predestination),<sup>113</sup> is made to perform in their arguments.<sup>114</sup> There can be no certainty as to the grace of God, which may be granted or withdrawn, imperceptible to, or falsely perceived by man. Hence we can never act securely, or with confidence in future contingencies, but must confine ourselves humbly to the moment, contenting ourselves, in *lieu* of certainty, with the rule for action which God has left us in Christ, from whom we learn how those who are

---

<sup>110</sup> Laporte, *Essai*, pp. 79-85, *et passim*.

<sup>111</sup> Similarly Saint-Cyran's 'passive' prayer is merely a trenchant statement of the necessity of spiritual poverty, *ibid.* Jansen, *Discours*, pp. 92-112 is particularly clear on this theme, which can be encapsulated in St. Peter's 'the righteous is scarcely saved' (I Pet. iv 18).

<sup>112</sup> See Jansen, *Augustinus*, t. III, bk. 1, chs. 12-14.

<sup>113</sup> See e.g. *ibid.*, bk. 10 *passim*; Arnauld, *Seconde Apologie*, bk. 2, chs. 13-14, esp. p. 153.

<sup>114</sup> Pascal, *Écrits sur la Grâce*, pp. 954, 1006-12: 'une créance mêlée de crainte ...' (Mesnard, p. 789, has 'sur peine de damnation éternelle et de péché contre le Saint-Esprit irrémédiable en ce monde et en l'autre'); cf. Laporte, *Exposition*, pp. 447-54.

saved invariably act.<sup>115</sup> Humility is, in this way, the soul of all the virtues, as is pride of all sin: it is the spirit which animates the letter of morality, since it follows the recognition that grace is the only true principle of life.<sup>116</sup> This is where Saint-Cyran thought the point of the *Augustinus* lay ('un livre de dévotion ...').<sup>117</sup> This is what Pascal's 'Dieu caché' signifies, pointing to that wherein alone his existence and our blindness to him are resolved and comprehensible; and, from the Incarnation, to that narrow way which is the imitation of the sinless man ('le remède ... et le moyen d'obtenir ce remède').<sup>118</sup>

The extreme optimism which characterises Jansen's conceit of human nature in the state of innocence, therefore, is not confined to that state, for the remnant of the divine likeness persists in fallen nature.<sup>119</sup> This it is which must be cultivated, for man is really man to the extent that he shares in the divine nature – a participation open to him by cause of the divine image subsisting within his soul, and effective in him by virtue of the redemptive work of Christ, winning the efficacious assistance of grace whereby it becomes possible to grow in likeness to the image's original.<sup>120</sup> Everything which assists in ordering man towards his final end is natural and therefore good; everything which impedes his being so ordered is unnatural and therefore bad. Moral rigorism is therefore predicated on an ultra-optimistic, and as it were mystical anthropology, which accepts no standard of good except 'bonum omnium bonorum, bonum a quo sunt omnia bona' – 'la fin des fins', as Arnauld says out of Proclus – and views man exclusively insofar as he is a creature capable of God.<sup>121</sup> Critics who

---

<sup>115</sup> *Idem, Essai*, pp. 112-22.

<sup>116</sup> *Idem, Exposition*, pp. 371-3, 455-6.

<sup>117</sup> Claude Lancelot, *Mémoires touchant la vie de M. de Saint-Cyran*, cited Laporte, *Essai*, p. 51.

<sup>118</sup> Thus connecting Isaiah (xlv 15) to Matthew (vii 13): *Pensées*, 149, 449; cf. the interesting letter to Mlle. de Roannez of October 1656 (in Chevalier, pp. 509-11), where Pascal observes that 'si Dieu se découvrait continuellement aux hommes, il n'y aurait point de mérite à le croire'.

<sup>119</sup> Pascal's apology was intended to demonstrate the double truth that 'les hommes sont tout ensemble indignes de Dieu et capables de Dieu: indignes par leur corruption, capables par leur première nature' (*Pensées*, 444); cf. the fourteenth *Provinciale*, where appeal is made to 'les lumières naturelles', which contradict the moral enormities of the Jesuit casuists (*CLP*, pp. 255-6).

<sup>120</sup> This idea of participation has its origins in II Pet. i 4, whose verb is κοινωνέω, to have a share of, partake in.

<sup>121</sup> Augustine, *enarrationes in Psalmos*, 134.6 (*PL*, vol. 37, col. 1742); Arnauld, *Seconde Apologie*, bk. 3, ch. 17, p. 316, quoting the *Platonic Theology*, II 4 (τέλων τέλος). This citation, besides being inaccurate (Arnauld

abominate the ‘ultrasupernaturalist’ morality organised around this end miss the process of deification with which the Jansenists intercalated the apparently stark dichotomy of cupidity and charity.<sup>122</sup> If, on our analysis, ‘perfectionism’ appears to be more than a merely ‘psychological characteristic’ of Jansenism,<sup>123</sup> it is a mind habituated to the fabulous and the romantic which consequently sees in it ‘un roman cruel’, a violent theology.<sup>124</sup> Perfection is by way of aspiration rather than expectation. ‘Je ne pretends pas qu’on soit entièrement parfait ... mais seulement qu’on ait désir de l’être, & qu’on travaille pour le devenir’.<sup>125</sup> As we shall see momentarily, this is precisely how our English rigorists will explain their high standards. Conversion, penance, renewal, deification, are convertible terms in the thought of the Jansenists. ‘Toute la vertu & l’exercice du Chrestien dans ce monde’, wrote Saint-Cyran, ‘consiste à combattre & diminuër peu à peu [la] concupiscence’.<sup>126</sup> Given this provisional and progressive nature of the return to God, it is unsurprising that ‘deification’ was not itself a part of the Jansenist vocabulary; but Saint-Cyran, for example, spoke of ‘unité’ with Christ, who ‘nous a faits, non seulement chrétiens, mais Christs’. The eucharist is the supreme moment when we become ‘en quelque sorte Dieux en la terre’: as we shall see in chapter 7, this moment reflects and crowns the ontological change brought about in man by the life of repentance.<sup>127</sup>

It is this mystical optimism, not a radical ‘pessimism’, which produces the so-called ‘puritan’ or ‘rigorist’ tendency in morality.<sup>128</sup> The theory of the victorious delectation which

---

probably refers to II 8), is somewhat misapplied, since Proclus is engaged in arguing that the One transcends intellect and being and is imparticipable; but it is striking nonetheless.

<sup>122</sup> E.g. Knox, *Enthusiasm*, esp. pp. 217-20; similarly Voltaire, one of whose more insightful criticisms, nevertheless, was that Pascal wishes to make us ‘mieux que nous ne sommes’: *Lettres Philosophiques*, ed. F. A. Taylor (Oxford, 1970), p. 110.

<sup>123</sup> Cf. Orcibal, ‘Qu’est-ce que le Jansénisme?’, p. 48.

<sup>124</sup> Bremond, *Histoire Littéraire*, I, pt. 3, ch. 1, at p. 410. Cf. the delightful description of the *abbé’s* work in Laporte, *Essai*, p. xiv: ‘une *Histoire littéraire du sentiment religieux*, qui n’a pas grand-chose de commun avec l’histoire, et dont le ton n’est pas trop religieux, mais où, incontestablement, abonde la “littérature” ...’

<sup>125</sup> Saint-Cyran, *Lettres Chrétiennes et Spirituelles*, t. III, pp. 284-5.

<sup>126</sup> Saint-Cyran, *Théologie familière*, p. 58.

<sup>127</sup> Saint-Cyran is quoted in Orcibal, *Saint-Cyran et le jansénisme*, p. 58.

<sup>128</sup> *Pace* Bremond, e.g. *Histoire Littéraire*, IV, pp. 27-30.

must transform the will from a concupiscent to a contrite tendency, which seems, *prima facie*, contiguous with the polemical caricature of the Protestant conception of the operation of grace, was ultimately defended by Arnauld on the analogy of the Incarnation. The co-existence of free will with the determination of an irresistibly efficacious grace can only be apprehended by analogy with the co-existence of the two natures in Christ. Man under grace is not only a beneficiary but in some sense an image of what Jeremy Taylor will call ‘The Great Exemplar’, the Word Incarnate. Just as Christ’s human will was utterly in unison with the divine will while yet retaining its integrity, so the human will under grace is animated with divinity ‘comme notre âme même anime nos membres’.<sup>129</sup> The contrite disposition of the soul, in other words, is a sort of transparency to the divine will which, as we have seen, comports with the natural end of man in union with his creator. The imitation of Christ,<sup>130</sup> the assimilation of counsel to precept, the conflation of the religious with the secular vocation: these are all equivalents for a concept of deification which is rarely associated, at least in Anglophone scholarship, with these *soi-disant* devotees of ‘le premier des Pères latins’.<sup>131</sup> As in Augustine, however, ‘deificari’ is rendered cognate with ‘justificari’.<sup>132</sup> Dean Inge helpfully distinguished this ‘transformative’ version of the concept from the ‘essentialising’ or the ‘substitutionary’ – it is the *progressus ad infinitum* which is the *imitatio Christi*.<sup>133</sup> The rigorist application may risk a confusion between man’s end and his path towards it.<sup>134</sup> But at least it supposes no inherent incongruity between man and the end at which he must arrive. Contrition is the work of the soul returning to God from its captivity in the creature

---

<sup>129</sup> Laporte, *Exposition*, pp. 432-39, quote at p. 436.

<sup>130</sup> Port-Royal produced a number of French editions of à Kempis’ *Imitation of Christ* between 1662 and 1694, and the Port-Royal writers, unsurprisingly, very frequently refer to him; see Chédozeau, *Port-Royal et la Bible*, ch. 14.

<sup>131</sup> Saint-Cyran, quoted Laporte, *Essai*, p. 100.

<sup>132</sup> See esp. *en. in Ps.*, 49.2, and *ib.*, 58 1.7, where participation in Christ’s divinity is connected to his humility.

<sup>133</sup> Inge, *Christian Mysticism*, pp. 31, 91, 365-8; for different views on the theme in Augustine cf. V. Capánaga, ‘La deificación en la soteriología agustiniana’, and Gerhard Labner, ‘St. Augustine’s Conception of the Reformation of Man to the Image of God’, both in *Augustinus Magister*, II, pp. 609-22, 867-78.

<sup>134</sup> Thus Henri de Lubac, *The Mystery of the Supernatural*, tr. Rosemary Sheed (1967), p. 22.

(‘conversio’).<sup>135</sup> As Jean-Louis Quantin remarks, it is thus the link between anti-probabilism and the critique of casuistry, which we examined in part I of this thesis, and the pastoral severity which is the subject of the present part. It is the positive term in that equation, where anti-laxism is the negative: the higher the demand on the disposition of the penitent – here it is a question of the highest demand, an indeclinable contrition – the more rigorous the condition of absolution, and the more intransigent the opposition to indulgence in the confessional.<sup>136</sup>

It has been argued here, then, that the focus on ‘love’ – humble renunciation of self, and submission to God – which dictated a rigorous and austere pastoral programme, has at base a mystical inspiration common to other great products of Bremond’s ‘conquête mystique’. In Bérulle it informed the concepts of ‘adherence’ and ‘servitude’ (in which as we have seen true liberty consists); in François de Sales, ‘le plus mortifiant de tous les saints’, as Jean-Jacques Olier called him, a treatment of the theme which recalls the doctrine of ‘pure’ disinterested love later to be associated with Mme Guyon and Fénelon.<sup>137</sup> For there is no more difference between charity normally understood and the ‘pure love’ of the mystics than one of degree.<sup>138</sup> The ‘effective’ or active mode of love, as de Sales taught, is simply an ‘exercise’ of the affective or contemplative; so that ‘l’oraison’ which nourishes the former,

---

<sup>135</sup> Cf. Arnauld, *Dissertation Théologique sur le Commandement d’aimer Dieu*, in *Œuvres*, t. xxix, p. 32 : ‘nous allons à lui, ou plutôt nous retournons à lui’, quoted from *De civ. Dei*, X.3.

<sup>136</sup> Quantin, *Le rigorisme chrétien*, pp. 18-19; cf. ch. 7, below.

<sup>137</sup> Indeed Pascal has been assimilated to this stream: Roger Parisot, *La doctrine du pur amour. Saint François de Sales, Pascal et Mme Guyon* (Paris, 2008); Pierre Cariou, *Pascal et la casuistique* (Paris, 1993), at pp. 11-12. One thinks of John Wesley’s talk of the ‘religion of the heart, the religion of à Kempis, of Pascal, and of Fénelon’: cited Orcibal, ‘Les spirituels français et espagnols chez John Wesley et ses contemporains’, p. 62; see also Moriarty, *Fallen Nature, Fallen Selves*, pp. 207-17, though it will be evident how far I share the view that this mystical aspiration ought to be set firmly in opposition to an ‘Augustinian pessimism’ (p. 209). On Bérulle see above, pp. 17-18. Olier is quoted in Bremond, *Histoire Littéraire*, I, p. 107, cf. p. 391. On de Sales’s influence on rigorist moral thought see below, ch. 7.

<sup>138</sup> Cf. *ibid.*, II, pp. 597-8, quoting from P. de Caussade, *Instructions spirituelles en forme de dialogues sur les divers états d’oraison, suivant la doctrine de M. Bossuet* (Perpignan, 1741).

and ‘la Théologie mystique’ which describes the latter, ‘ne sont qu’une mesme chose’.<sup>139</sup> The mistrust of mysticism, as Bremond himself illustrates, arises simply from the feeling that it omits or encourages the omission of the most essential degrees of the movement towards God – those which serve to efface the movements of the creature.<sup>140</sup> The active concept of love, tied to contemplation of the eternal good, upon which this ascetic way is built, may even not be so very far from Ignatian spirituality.<sup>141</sup> It is, at any rate, some distance from the crude caricature implicit in the charge of crypto-Calvinism with which we began this chapter.<sup>142</sup>

### *Anti-Calvinism*

The Jansenist understanding of salvation was framed in diametric opposition to that central Reformation concept, ‘simul justus et peccator’. Justification is a process of ordering the rational creature to his natural end. The wretchedness of the state of sin means that this re-ordering can only be effected with the victorious grace of Christ, but the concept of irresistibility implies the co-operation and transformation of the human organism. In fact the theory of the two delectations, one concupiscent to damnation, one celestial to salvation, taken by the enemies of Jansenism to reproduce the double predestination of rigid Calvinist schemes, expresses the fundamental answer which Trent gave to the Reformation.<sup>143</sup> Justification is a process of the transformation of the inner man.<sup>144</sup> This is reflected in the title

---

<sup>139</sup> *Traité de l’Amour de Dieu*, in *Œuvres*, ed. Ravier, bk. 6, ch. 1, at p. 609; cf. Arnauld, *Dissertation Théologique sur le Commandement d’aimer Dieu*, in *Œuvres* (Paris, 1777-79), t. xxix, pp. 26-7, citing de Sales: ‘L’amour [effectif] et l’affection n’étant ... qu’une même chose ...’

<sup>140</sup> Bremond, *Histoire Littéraire*, IV, ch. 11, pp. 543f. Even if the unitive end disappears amid the focus on purgation, there is far more in common here with actual mysticism than the vague idea of artistic inspiration from which Bremond derives its fraternity with literary humanism, in *ibid.*, I, pt. 3, ch. 4.

<sup>141</sup> Cf. *ibid.*, III, pp. 112f., 679-83.

<sup>142</sup> Pascal, *Écrits sur la Grâce*, pp. 969-70 is a definitive repudiation [Mesnard, pp. 797-9].

<sup>143</sup> E.g. de Colona, *Dictionnaire des Livres Jansénistes*, t. 1, p. 123.

<sup>144</sup> Cf. McGrath, *Iustitia Dei*, ch. 7.

of Jansen's *Discours de la réformation de l'homme intérieur*, which echoes the wording of the Tridentine decree on justification, 'non est sola peccatum remissio, sed et sanctificatio et renovatio interioris hominis'.<sup>145</sup> This does not mean the Jansenists were necessarily of one accord with the Tridentine determinations. The doctrine of the two loves implies, between justification and the new loving obedience which is its condition, such an absolute equivalence as the Tridentine separation of the first intellectual persuasion of the Gospel from the infused justice which follows appears to diminish.<sup>146</sup> As will be seen at greater length in chapter 7, this is indicated by the Jansenist refusal of the 'attritionist' theory in regard to the sacrament of penance; the condition of true reformation is the love of God for his own sake.<sup>147</sup> In this sense the Jansenists might agree with contemporary Anglicans who criticised the Tridentine decree on the basis that justifying faith must imply the fulfilment of the condition which is laid down by the Gospel and actuated by baptism.<sup>148</sup>

A true spiritual reformation, Jansen supposes, can only be begun on the basis of the most accurate possible psychological diagnosis – the most honest admission, that is, of the power of concupiscence. John said there is nothing in the world but 'the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the vainglory of life' (I Jo. ii 16): from these flow 'toute l'impureté qui corrompt le corps et l'esprit de l'homme, & tous les crimes qui troublent la société humaine'. Thus they must be sought out and harrowed in 'les replis les plus cachez du cœur de l'homme, & dans les mouvements les plus secrets & les plus imperceptibles des passions':<sup>149</sup>

---

<sup>145</sup> Schroeder, p. 312.

<sup>146</sup> See chs. V-VII of the decree in *ibid.*, pp. 32-5.

<sup>147</sup> Cf. above, pt. I, pp. ; below, ch. 7.

<sup>148</sup> E.g. Thorndike, *Epilogue*, bk. 2, ch. 30, p. 259; below, ch. 5.

<sup>149</sup> Attention has been drawn to the ubiquity of this figure of the heart's 'recesses' in seventeenth-century French writing by Benedetta Papisogli, *Le "fond du cœur": figures de l'espace intérieur au XVIIe siècle* (Paris 2000), though one could wish for a less opaque treatment.

toutes les personnes vertueuses, qui travaillent à purifier leur âme & à renouveler leur esprit selon l'image de celui qui l'a créé, doivent s'étudier à reconnoître la nature & les effets de ces passions, & s'instruire avec soin de l'ordre & des règles, qui sont établies pour les guérir, afin qu'elles puissent recouvrer la pureté qu'elles ont perduë.<sup>150</sup>

Voluptuousness, curiosity, pride: all are opposed to the love of wisdom, whence derives their antagonism to virtue.<sup>151</sup> But each also requires its specific mortification. Since pride is the principle of the creature's departure from order (i.e. of sin), and will flourish even, sometimes especially, when the other two are surmounted, humility is the prerequisite of all re-integration. (True humility, of course, can only exist by relation to the ultimate standard or archetype of humility in Christ.<sup>152</sup>) Likewise, knowledge can only be served by the mortification suitable to the *libido sciendi*: the 'fuite' and 'retraite' so dear to Saint-Cyran.<sup>153</sup> Without this man cannot know what to 'rechercher, ou fuir', cannot appreciate the difference between contemplating 'cette beauté incomparable de la vérité éternelle où réside la connaissance certaine & salutaire de toutes les choses', and 'cette multitude d'images & de phantômes, dont la vanité a rempli nôtre esprit et nôtre cœur ...'<sup>154</sup> Finally, the flesh must be subdued by a condign temperance.<sup>155</sup> This is certainly the *sine qua non* of interior reformation, and in terms of Jansenist psychology, derived from Augustine's analysis of the 'loves' which motivate action, perhaps its most significant element. The influence of concupiscence means the movement to God cannot be purely intellectual:

l'amour de Dieu, qui est la charité, ne commet point de pechez, *parce qu'il ne fait point de mal* [I Cor. xiii] ... Mais vous ne serez jamais délivrez de vos pechez, que lors que

---

<sup>150</sup> Jansen, *Discours*, pp. 32, 14-15, 34-5.

<sup>151</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 39.

<sup>152</sup> *Ib.*, pp. 67f.

<sup>153</sup> Below, ch. 7, pp. 287-8. Cf. the famous fragment on 'diversion' (*Pensées*, 136): 'j'ai dit souvent que tout le malheur des hommes vient d'une seule chose, qui est de ne savoir pas demeurer en repos dans une chambre'.

<sup>154</sup> Jansen, *Discours*, pp. 54-66, at 65-6.

<sup>155</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 35-53.

non-seulement vous sçaurez par la foi ... ou par la doctrine; mais que vous connoîtrez encore par experience, & sentirez par de certains mouvemens d'amour qui procedent du cœur ...<sup>156</sup>

The increase of charity, in proportion with the diminution of *amour-propre*, is therefore indispensably accompanied by the education of the heart, the loves and desires of the whole sensible-rational creature. Common experience suggests that this course will not be easy. Whoever resolves on such cultivation – ‘d’employer tous ses efforts pour s’élever au sommet de la perfection’ – ‘sera forcé de confesser’ that ‘il est plus aisé de ne point user de tous ... plaisirs, bien que légitimes, que d’en user sans commettre beaucoup de fautes’.<sup>157</sup> Like Saint-Cyran, it seems, Jansen was a ‘Carthusian in spirit’: as he said, he wished to talk, ‘non de l’excellence ni de la réformation de la discipline Monastique, mais de la corruption & du renouvellement de l’esprit humain, qui est tout le fruit de la discipline réguliere ...’<sup>158</sup>

It was, therefore, not at all by way of an oblique response to the attacks of Isaac Habert on the *Augustinus* that Arnauld published his treatise on penance and communion in 1643.<sup>159</sup> The Counter-Reformation Church had sought to redefine the cult of saints, circumventing Protestant criticisms of superstition by emphasising, over the implausible thaumaturgism of comforting intimates, the ‘heroic virtue’ of pious models for imitation.<sup>160</sup> The Jansenists, as ever ‘authentic’ interpreters of the Tridentine reforms, rather took this at its word. Why should not all hold themselves to the same standards as the saints, who were men

---

<sup>156</sup> *Ib.*, pp. 116-17; see also *idem*, *Augustinus*, t. III, bk. 3, ch. 8.

<sup>157</sup> Jansen, *Discours*, pp. 52-3.

<sup>158</sup> *Ib.*, pp. 13-14; see above, ch. 1, p. 22.

<sup>159</sup> Pace Abercrombie, *Origins*, p. 201.

<sup>160</sup> Peter Burke, ‘How to be a Counter-Reformation saint’, in his *The historical anthropology of early modern Italy. Essays on perception and communication* (Cambridge, 1987), pp. 48-62; John Bossy, *Christianity in the West, 1400-1700* (Oxford, 1985), pp. 96-7; *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, s.v. *Breviary*; *ibid.*, s.v. *Bollandists*. Note however Simon Ditchfield’s various criticisms of Burke’s argument, e.g. at *Liturgy, sanctity and history in Tridentine Italy. Pietro Mario Campi and the preservation of the particular* (Cambridge, 1995), pp. 117-34; ‘Tridentine Worship and the cult of saints’, in R. Po-Chia Hsia ed., *Cambridge History of Christianity volume VI: Reform and Expansion, 1500-1600* (Cambridge, 2007).

too? In the primitive era, in fact, Christians were so held to the highest standards. When the theological positions traced above were proving so controversial after the appearance of the *Augustinus*, it is no surprise if Arnauld was eager to establish the parallel between their practical implications and an unimpeachably admirable model, the primitive practice witnessed to by the Fathers. The turn to primitive purity as a template for church reform, indeed, is perhaps the analogue of the magnification of Adamic felicity on the theological plane. The true knowledge of doctrine in the former represents the true knowledge of our origin and end in the latter; the right ordering of ritual and organisation corresponds to the right ordering of the passions and the faculties of the soul. On both levels order expresses the true nature of the organism in the pure love of him who substantiates and transcends it. By implication, anyone who blames these recommendations is a slave to self-love and concupiscence. The inner transformation which, as we shall see, Arnauld demanded as a prerequisite of absolution, bears the central weight of the constructive Jansenist project for reform.<sup>161</sup> He merely cast into practical form its basic moral principle, that, as Saint-Cyran put it, ‘la vertu n’est qu’ordre comme le vice n’est que dérèglement’.<sup>162</sup>

To the Jansenists, therefore, Calvinism seemed, by supposing that justice could consist with sinfulness, to overturn the very basis of morality. Arnauld reduced it to a handful of correlated propositions.<sup>163</sup> Faith alone justifies, not as a good act supposing others, but as an instrument by which each individual applies to himself the justice of Christ. God esteems man just on account of this imputed righteousness, not as being so in himself. This justifying faith is 1) inseparable from charity and good works; 2) proper to the elect, and 3) hence always joined to perseverance, so that he whom God has once justified remains so always; 4)

---

<sup>161</sup> Below, ch. 7.

<sup>162</sup> Quote in Taveneaux, *Jansénisme et Réforme catholique*, p. 40; cf. Orcibal, *Saint-Cyran et le jansénisme*, pp. 55-6, 91.

<sup>163</sup> Arnauld, *Le Renversement de la Morale de Jésus Christ Par les Erreurs des Calvinistes Touchant la Justification* (Paris, 1672), bk. 2, ch. 1, pp. 112f.

self-authenticating, either by a ‘certitude of faith’, or by an experimental internal witness equivalent to this certitude. Whoever has justifying faith is assured of it: consequently he is certain of his election, and thus of the grace of perseverance. A justified man may therefore fall into the greatest sins, adultery, incest, homicide, without ceasing to remain just, even while he commits them, since his sins are not imputed to him. There is therefore no relation between external actions and internal states, and no objective distinction between smaller and greater sins, which are only distinguished in the subject, according to the eternal decrees of election and reprobation.

The importance of this objection can hardly be overestimated, since it bears upon Arnauld’s own rejection, as a major weakness of Catholic casuistry, of an extrinsic or legalistic classification of sins.<sup>164</sup> As we have shown, Jansenist moral thought was strongly intellectualist in character: it supposed an eternal and immutable standard of good accessible to reason. Arnauld can talk about the ‘rules’ of God’s ‘justice’.<sup>165</sup> There is a necessary relation between the moral value of human acts and the eternal good: this, indeed, is the relation expressed in the system of ‘petites grâces’, which are the means used by God to ensure the logical congruity of his act of justifying with its object. Hence when Arnauld himself grounds the classification of sins on the internal state or disposition of the subject, he does not intend to sever the relation of the act to its moral value, but to state a causal relationship between a moral disposition and the production of moral acts. A sin is not mortal or venial because it is commissioned by a reprobate or a justified subject; but a just man will not commit mortal sins because he is internally ordered to the immutable form of justice. There exists, moreover, a reciprocal economy between outward and inward – since

---

<sup>164</sup> Ch. 1, above, and Ch. 7, below.

<sup>165</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 115, citing Aquinas’ opinion of the Mahometan view of predestination; cf. bk. 2, ch. 9, p. 183: ‘Il n’y a rien de plus dangereux dans la Morale que de confondre les idées des vertus & des vices, parce que c’est de là que doit dépendre le jugement que l’on fait des bons & des méchants ...’; cf. Orcibal, ‘Thèmes platoniciens dans l’“Augustinus” de Jansénius’, p. 1077.

concupiscence attends our earthly existence – of which neither the voluntarist Calvinist position nor the legalist Catholic one take adequate account.<sup>166</sup>

An obvious inverse relationship obtains, that is, between chastity and adultery, sobriety and ebriosity, and so on, which it is senseless to deny.<sup>167</sup> The Calvinists can only deny it by affirming two contradictory propositions, that all Christian virtues – ‘sainteté’ – are inseparably joined to justifying faith, and that the state of justice, being inalienable, is compatible with ‘les actions les plus vicieuses & les plus abominables’.<sup>168</sup> Where the Jansenists made uncertainty the basis of that humility which is the soul of all the virtues, the Calvinists, they claimed, made a baseless certainty excuse every vice. It is striking that Arnauld quotes Grotius, as ‘un sçavant homme ... élevé parmy ceux qui enseignent ces maximes’, in support of this view. ‘Nullum potuit in christianismum induci dogma perniciosus quam hoc’, that a man either believes he is regenerated, and cannot forfeit divine favour even if he falls into ‘scelera et flagitia’, or he is damned.<sup>169</sup> Indeed where Jansen had praised the Dutch Calvinists for their understanding of grace, Arnauld mined their writings against the Remonstrants for proof that they considered mortal sin compatible with the state of grace.<sup>170</sup>

The term ‘state’ (état), with its personal equivalent, ‘disposition’, is particularly important in Arnauld’s thought. These ‘états’ provide the context in which morality is to be discussed, comprehending even the discrete acts of God from which the Calvinists make morality depend. In Romans v 20 – vii 6 Paul opposes ‘deux estats’, the state ‘where sin abounded’, from which Christ’s death is to liberate us into the state ‘where grace did abound

---

<sup>166</sup> See below, ch. 7, on Arnauld’s moral theology.

<sup>167</sup> Perhaps it is equally senseless to be reminded by the Jansenists’ constant invocation of the theme of contraries – the two loves, ‘wretchedness; greatness’, &c., &c. – of the Socratic idea that things always ‘become from their opposites’: *Phaedo*, 70c-72e.

<sup>168</sup> Arnauld, *Le Renversement de la Morale*, bk. 2, ch. 9.

<sup>169</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 111-12 (incorrectly following p. 112). Arnauld is quoting Grotius’ *Animadversiones pro suis ad Cassandrum notis*, art. *De discrimine peccat. mors. et venial.*

<sup>170</sup> E.g. *ibid.*, bk. 5, ch. 3, pp. 366f. This discrepancy, if it is one, seems to be adequately explained by occasion.

more exceedingly'. The first state is characterised by 'désordres', which 'bring forth fruit unto death', the second by 'sanctification', bringing forth 'fruit unto God'. On Paul's argument, says Arnauld, one cannot be both under the law and under grace, which are opposed as sin to righteousness. There is a real standard to which justice must be related, provable by its 'fruits'.<sup>171</sup> Paul's various lists of the 'unrighteous' who 'shall not inherit the kingdom of God' (I Cor. vi 9-10; Gal. v 19-21; Eph. v 3-5; I Tim. i 8-11) are not intended to intimidate the faithful with 'vaines terreurs', but to warn them that 'ces abominations ... leur fermeroient l'entrée du ciel': that their bodies cannot simultaneously be 'members of Christ, and ... members of a harlot' (I Cor. vi 15), and that whoever defiles his body, the temple of God, 'him shall God destroy' (I Cor. iii 16). For 'they do not remain in Christ, who are not members of Christ; but they are not members of Christ who make themselves members of a harlot'.<sup>172</sup>

Freedom from the law, then, implies 'obedience unto righteousness' (Rom vi 16). So that in the second half of Romans vii Paul cannot, when he says 'what I hate, that I do', be speaking of himself as a regenerate man. The Calvinists explain that a just man wants according to the flesh but not according to the spirit. But since the opposition of flesh and spirit has been tied to sinfulness and righteousness, Paul must here be ventriloquising one still under the law.<sup>173</sup> A man under the law, as Augustine explains, differs from one under grace in that while he combats concupiscence he is defeated and consents to it: the man under grace does not consent.<sup>174</sup> The Calvinist description of the just man falls into the former category.

'Il obeït tant qu'il luy plait aux mauvais désirs de sa chair ... sans qu'il s' imagine que le

---

<sup>171</sup> *Ib.*, bk. 5, ch. 4, pp. 374-80.

<sup>172</sup> 'Non itaque manent in Christo, qui non sunt membra Christi. Non sunt autem membra Christi qui se faciunt membra meretricis': *ibid.*, bk. 2, ch. 5. The quote is from *De civ. Dei*, XXI 25.

<sup>173</sup> Arnauld, *Le Renversement de la Morale*, bk. 5, ch. 3, pp. 359-65.

<sup>174</sup> *Ibid.*, ch. 7, from Augustine's *Expositio quarundam propositionum ex epistola ad Romanos*, XXXV (*PL*, vol. 35, col. 2069). Augustine's position on Romans vii altered over the course of his writing career: in *ib.*, VII-VIII, and in *De diversis quaestionibus ad Simplicianum*, I, q. 1 (*PL*, vol. 40, cols. 103f.) his reading supports Arnauld's (cf., also, *Conf.*, VIII 9); later, as recorded in *Retractationes*, I 23, he came to think Paul's words could also apply to a 'spiritual' man (*PL*, vol. 45, cols. 1031-2).

péché règne en luy'. The tiniest feeling of remorse assures him that God is still with him.<sup>175</sup> Arnauld's objection to this idea of justice can be summed up in the words of Jeremy Taylor. 'Now if this be a state of regeneration, I wonder what is, or can be, a state of reprobation! for though this be the state of Nature, yet it cannot be the state of one redeemed by the Spirit of Christ'.<sup>176</sup>

This fundamental objection to Calvinist soteriology was common to both the Anglicans and the Jansenists; as the former, however, were working in different circumstances and with different, and sometimes opposite motives and intentions, it will now be necessary to show how they, too, arrived at a theory of 'moral rigorism' predicated on the active love of God.

---

<sup>175</sup> Arnauld, *Le Renversement de la Morale*, bk. 5, p. 390.

<sup>176</sup> Jeremy Taylor, 'The Christians Conquest Over the Body of Sin', in *Dekas Embolimaïos A Supplement to the Eniautos* (1673), p. 18; cf. Arnauld, *Le Calvinisme Convaincu de Nouveau de Dogmes Impies: ou la Justification Du Livre Du Renversement de la Morale, par les Erreurs des Calvinistes* (Cologne, 1682); and with Nicole, *L'Impiété de la Morale des Calvinistes, pleinement découverte par le livre de M. Bruguier Ministre de Nismes, approuvé par M. Claude Ministre de Charenton* (Paris, 1675), where the same arguments are rehearsed.

## Chapter 5

### *Anglican 'Anti-Augustinianism' and the Theology of Holy Living*

Mid-seventeenth century episcopalian churchmen liked to attribute the religious and political chaos of these years to the captivity of 'our schools and pulpits' by the fatalistic tenets of predestinarian Calvinism. The doctrines of unconditional election, perseverance and assurance led directly to antinomianism; and they had bred among the populace such a contempt for pious and sober conversation as easily explained, quite apart from the intrinsically subversive political tendency of their Presbyterian vehicle, the enormities of rebellion and regicide.<sup>1</sup> If such churchmen could agree about anything with their former ally Thomas Hobbes, it was the pressing need for a firmly founded 'moral science'.<sup>2</sup> For Hobbes the bishops, emissaries of a principality whose diplomacy undermined the unicity of sovereignty the more insidiously as it did so invisibly, were as culpable as rabble-rousing puritan demagogues.<sup>3</sup> To his episcopalian opponents, Hobbes, protecting the individual from moral responsibility by making the sovereign will the 'common rule of Good and Evil', was part of the problem.<sup>4</sup> Hobbes's arbitrary morality and determinist metaphysics, like predestinarian Calvinism, rendered human effort futile. 'I hate this doctrine from my heart', wrote John Bramhall. It makes 'God Almighty to be the introducer of all evil and sin into the

---

<sup>1</sup> E.g. Taylor, *UN*, pp. 7-9; Henry Hammond, *A Practical Catechisme* (1649), 'To the Reader'; Richard Watson, *Akolouthos, or, A Second Faire Warning to take Heed of the Scottish Discipline* (The Hague, 1651), p. 9. Hammond's *Practical Catechisme* went through numerous editions with considerable enlargements; unless otherwise stated I hereafter cite the 1<sup>st</sup> ed., Oxford, 1645.

<sup>2</sup> Hobbes, *De Corpore*, printed with *The Elements of Law Natural and Politic*, ed. J. C. A. Gaskin (Oxford, 1994), p. 191; *On the Citizen*, ed. and tr. Richard Tuck and Michael Silverstone (Cambridge, 1997), pp. 4-5; *Leviathan*, ed. C. B. MacPherson (Harmondsworth, 1968), e.g. pp. 238-9.

<sup>3</sup> *Leviathan*, ch. 42, at p. 570; *On the Citizen*, p. 81; *Behemoth, Or, The Long Parliament*, ed. F. Tönnies (1990), pp. 6, 95; Noel Malcolm (ed.), *Thomas Hobbes. The Correspondence*, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1994), I, p. 120; W. Molesworth (ed.), *The English Works of Thomas Hobbes of Malmesbury*, 11 vols. (Scientia Aalen, 1962), v, p. 2. Hobbes nevertheless praised the 'moral philosophy' of the Anglicans as 'well worth reading', even if its foundations were insecure: *Behemoth*, p. 47.

<sup>4</sup> *Leviathan*, p. 120.

world’, and ‘men to be but the tennis-balls of destiny’, who, with no liberty to do the good, are either saved through no virtue of their own, or ‘damned of necessity’.<sup>5</sup> ‘I could wish’, echoed Thorndike, ‘that no man that is called a Christian would own it’.<sup>6</sup>

Such criticisms had become commonplace among dissenters from the ‘regnant’ Calvinist orthodoxy of the late-Elizabethan and early-Stuart Church, who have therefore earned from historians the name of ‘anti-Calvinists’ or, from the intellectual kinship of this reaction from Calvinism with that of the Dutch theologian Jacob Arminius (1560-1609), ‘English Arminians’.<sup>7</sup> In this chapter we turn our attention to the heirs of this anti-Calvinist tradition among mid-century apologists for the disestablished episcopal Church. For divines such as Henry Hammond (1605-1660), Jeremy Taylor (1613-1667), Herbert Thorndike (1596/7-1672), and Richard Allestree (1621/2-1681), antagonism towards the Calvinist theology of unconditional predestination was focused by the institutional triumph of its partisans. Willing to admit the ‘abuses, and excesses, and mistakes’ of the past, and eager to ‘use ill times to make us better’, their work was constructive and creative as much as it was

---

<sup>5</sup> A. W. Haddan (ed.), *The Works of the Most Reverend Father in God John Bramhall, D.D.*, 5 vols. (Oxford, 1842-5), v, p. 63; cf. Nicholas D. Jackson, *Hobbes, Bramhall, and the Politics of Liberty and Necessity* (Cambridge, 2007).

<sup>6</sup> *Epilogue*, ii, p. 4.

<sup>7</sup> Quote is Dewey D. Wallace, *Puritans and Predestination. Grace in English Protestant Theology, 1525-1695* (Chapel Hill, 1982), p. 66; Peter Lake, ‘Calvinism and the English Church, 1530-1645’, *Past and Present*, 114 (1987); Nicholas Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists. The Rise of English Arminianism c. 1590-1640* (Oxford, 1987). ‘Calvinism’ is not really an adequate term to cover the breadth of English Protestant theology. Always in the nature of a synthesis, not a system, it owed as much to Strasbourg, Zurich, Berne, and Basle as Geneva. There is often, too, a difference to be put between the theology of Calvin and ‘Calvinism’. Nor were other intellectual traditions absent, such as the synergist Lutheranism which has been connected to the early appearance of English anti-Calvinism. In this chapter we are concerned with a group of writers who clearly differentiated themselves from a theology which they called ‘Calvinist’, and to which they gave a positive content on the basis of the definitions provided by the Synod of Dort in 1618 and the Westminster Assembly in the 1640s. Since their objections to this theology were identical with those of earlier figures identified as anti-Calvinists, it has seemed appropriate to carry on with this language – particularly in view of the fact that ‘Reformed’ is potentially as vague as ‘Calvinist’ may be spuriously precise. On the theological latitude of the post-Reformation English Church a start may be made with Wallace, *Puritans and Predestination*, p. 6f.; Diarmaid MacCulloch, ‘The Latitude of the Church of England’, in K. Fincham and P. Lake (eds.), *Religious Politics in Post-Reformation England* (Woodbridge, 2006); *idem*, *The Later Reformation in England 1547-1603* (Basingstoke, 1990), pp. 65f.; C. M. Dent, *Protestant Reformers in Elizabethan Oxford* (Oxford, 1983), pp. 87-102; Peter White, *Predestination, policy and polemic* (Cambridge, 1992), pp. 82f.; Patrick Collinson, ‘England and International Calvinism, 1558-1640’, printed in his *From Cranmer to Sancroft* (2006); Seán Hughes, ‘The Problem of “Calvinism”: English Theologies of Predestination c. 1580-1630’, in S. Wabuda and C. Litzengerger (eds.), *Belief and Practice in Reformation England* (Aldershot, 1998); R. T. Kendall, *Calvin and English Calvinism to 1649* (Oxford, 1979).

defensive and reactionary.<sup>8</sup> Their writings made explicit and programmatic the divergence of the English anti-Calvinist tradition from those Augustinian presuppositions about predestination, original sin and irresistible grace which underpinned the Calvinist orthodoxy enshrined in the Westminster Standards. This ‘Calvinist Augustinianism’, they argued, destroyed the foundations of Christianity by removing all incentive to moral endeavour. Consequently their theological work cohered around an emphasis upon the moral autonomy of the individual Christian. They developed a theory of justification which, in the context of post-Reformation English theology, was ‘new and strange’.<sup>9</sup> According to this theory justifying faith involved works not by consequence but by definition. On this basis they presented Christianity as ‘the whole duty of man’ (Eccl. xii 13), a rigorous and comprehensive system of private devotion and public observance. This model of piety became hugely influential among restoration churchmen.<sup>10</sup> While the new soteriology did not ‘eclipse’ its Calvinist counterpart, it was taken over wholesale by many younger divines, such as George Bull, who in his controversial *Harmonia Apostolica* of 1669 published a lucid exposition of it.<sup>11</sup> It was the characteristic soteriology, in particular, of those churchmen known as latitudinarians; and, insofar as they captured the ecclesiastical establishment in the wake of the Glorious Revolution, Nicholas Tyacke is justified in regarding Gilbert Burnet’s 1700 work, *An Exposition of the Thirty-Nine Articles*, where the latitudinarian bishop of

---

<sup>8</sup> Henry Hammond, *Of the Power of the Keyes*, sig. A3r.; Gilbert Sheldon, quoted in J. C. Hayward, ‘The *Mores* of Great Tew: Literary, Philosophical and Political Idealism in Falkland’s Circle’ (Unpublished PhD Thesis, Cambridge, 1982), p. 258.

<sup>9</sup> Allison, *The Rise of Moralism*, pp. 73, 190.

<sup>10</sup> Spurr, *The Restoration Church*, chs. 6-7; cf. C. J. Sommerville, *Popular Religion in Restoration England* (Gainesville, 1977), pp. 36-8, 49-51 *et passim*.

<sup>11</sup> G. R. Cragg, *From Puritanism to the Age of Reason* (Cambridge, 1966), ch. 2, for the ‘eclipse of Calvinism’; and for the vitality of the ‘Reformed’ tradition Stephen Hampton, *Anti-Arminians. The Anglican Reformed Tradition from Charles II to George I* (Oxford, 2008).

Salisbury identified himself with the anti-Calvinist theology of human effort, as setting ‘a seal on the new Arminian dispensation’.<sup>12</sup>

\*

Burnet himself described this development in terms of the reputation of Augustine. Seeking to explain why the Thirty-Nine Articles were not generally made the subject of extended commentary, he observed that

it has been ... often suggested, That those Articles seemed to be so plain a Transcript of *S. Austin's* Doctrine, in those much disputed Points, concerning the *Decrees of God*, and the *Efficacy of Grace*, that they were not expounded by our Divines for that very reason; since the far greater Number of them is believed to be now of a different Opinion.<sup>13</sup>

It was from the rigid framework of Augustine's anti-Pelagian theses on the depravity introduced by original sin, and man's consequent dependence for his salvation on an efficacious grace determining him to the good, that the mid-century Anglicans sought to escape.<sup>14</sup> In pursuit of this end it may be said that, with more or less boldness, they willingly reversed the formula by which Cornelius Jansen had condescended to praise Calvin:<sup>15</sup> for, far from thinking that Calvin ought to be congratulated on account of Augustine, Augustine sometimes seemed to them to deserve reproach on account of Calvin. Often they confounded Augustine with their polemical Calvin, so that where the Jansenists proudly claimed

---

<sup>12</sup> Nicholas Tyacke, ‘Religious controversy during the seventeenth century: the case of Oxford’, in his *Aspects of English Protestantism c. 1530-1700* (Manchester, 2001), p. 307; Burnet, *An Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., 1700): see esp. the treatment given to article XI, on justification, and article XVII, on predestination and election; in the Preface, p. vi, Burnet divulged that in this question he followed ‘the doctrine of the *Greek Church*, from which *St. Austin* departed’ – that is, as pp. 147-8 make clear, a doctrine based on free will. Cf. *idem*, *A Discourse of the Pastoral Care* (1692), p. 169.

<sup>13</sup> *Exposition*, Preface, p. i.

<sup>14</sup> See above, Introduction, p. 8, for my use of the term ‘Anglican’.

<sup>15</sup> ‘Should Calvin in some point have given in his judgement with Augustine, Augustine ought not to be held unworthy on Calvin's account, but Calvin ought rather to be congratulated on Augustine's’ – see Chapter 4, n. 12, above.

allegiance with Prosper, Fulgentius, and many another sound disciple of the Doctor of Grace, contemporary Anglicans were capable of owning a more *recherché* and even a more dubious confederacy of allies, from the author of the *Collations*, to those so several metaphysical libertarians among the moderns, Molina, Arminius, and even the arch-heretic Fausto Sozzini.<sup>16</sup> In establishing their major theological point of contrast they were concerned to fix on their opponents a parody of Augustinian thought centred on its pessimistic anthropology and its determinist premises. The distance this puts between their outlook and that of the Jansenists is thus adequately summarised in the judgement of the loyalist clergyman Richard Watson, who at the time of *Cum occasione* in 1653 described the latter as ‘a pack of villains, worse ten times, if possible, than the Puritans’.<sup>17</sup>

Just as in the preceding chapter we were concerned to test this popular parody of Jansenist thought, however, so we are now engaged to investigate the constructive reality which followed behind the polemical Anglican rejection of Calvinist thought. With the Jansenists we posed the problem in terms of ‘rigorism’: how to reconcile a theology which, on the received account, effectively denied nature, with a severe moral scheme that demanded the utmost extension on the part of the human will moving itself? Here the terms of the problem are reversed. In an influential account – reflecting both the vehemence with which the Anglicans asserted their independence of Augustine, and the Calvinist polemics which therefore depicted them as modern-day Pelagians – the new Anglican soteriology is presented as tending effectively to replace grace with a rehabilitated human nature.<sup>18</sup> How to reconcile this with a severe moral scheme predicated on a pronounced pessimism about the infirmity of nature? With the Jansenists we had to ask how a pessimistic anthropology

---

<sup>16</sup> (1539-1604.) Nephew of Lelio, and usually known in the seventeenth century by the Latinized form of his name, Faustus Socinus was a Siense critic both of Catholicism and of Reformed theology, who during the later-sixteenth century formed a group of Anabaptist and anti-trinitarian radicals in Poland into an organised anti-trinitarian church.

<sup>17</sup> *CClarSP*, ii, p. 232.

<sup>18</sup> Below, pp. 231f.

sustained a ‘rigorism’ which implied the necessity of self-improvement; here we have to ask how an optimistic anthropology sustained a ‘moralism’ which implied the necessity of self-effacement.

\*

In the case of the Jansenists we suggested that the solution lay in a fuller account of their Augustinianism than is implied in the usual account of their rigorism, where it is related to a ‘theological pessimism’ which produced a sort of punitive reflex against sinful nature in the form of an excessive discipline.<sup>19</sup> The response to this charge would rest partly on their insistence on the hidden-ness of God, which allowed them to describe grace as resistible and to account for the common experience of contingency; and partly on the Platonist ethical perspective, which, along with his theology of grace, they inherited from Augustine. It was not nature they evacuated of moral potency, but fallen nature. Man is created in the image of God and the vestiges of this likeness remain in fallen nature. Sin is like a veil which obscures nature as it was intended by the creator. To lift this veil, to dispel the shadows of ignorance and concupiscence which cloud the human spirit, is not to extinguish but to liberate nature by revealing the divine image there impressed. Thus are the reason and will of man freed, like the soul’s wings in the *Phaedrus*, to know and love his last end, and thereby to achieve that conformity with the ultimate good which is for the creature to share in the divine life.<sup>20</sup> Man’s ability to know and do the good does not depend on his being effectively determined to that which is alien to his nature, but on the essential congruity between his nature and the source of good, a congruity obscured by the sub-nature in which he is trammelled. Upon the purging of this sub-nature, therefore, his ability to do the good will not appear as the effect of

---

<sup>19</sup> I quote from the entry in the *Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, ed. F. L. Cross & E. A. Livingstone (3<sup>rd</sup> ed. rev., 2005); for this view see also e.g. Doyle, *Jansenism*, p. 35.

<sup>20</sup> *Phaedrus*, 246d, etc.; cf. *Phaedo*, 65e-66a.

an extrinsic cause, but as an expression of intrinsic freedom, since that is free which is able to act in accordance with its own ends.<sup>21</sup>

The Jansenists were therefore left with an interest in what formally constitutes this freedom under the conditions of sin: that is in the psychological question of *how* the will is determined, the prior question of *why* it is effectively determined having been resolved, on the premise of original sin, on the side of efficacious grace. ‘Quand nous soutenons la nécessité de la grâce efficace, nous lui donnons d’autres vertus pour objet ... c’est pour une vertu plus haute ...’<sup>22</sup> Here, remembering Augustine’s psychological account of the power of concupiscence in the *Confessions*, they accentuated the appetites or inclinations arising from the sensible as well as the intellectual affections. Because under sin the harmony which formerly obtained between reason and the sensual appetites no longer exists, the determination of the will cannot be a purely intellectual matter. Man cannot, for example, acquire at a stroke such a knowledge of the good that he can no longer sin. Love and knowledge are in reciprocal relation: only when the heart as well as the understanding is affected to an idea can the soul be involved in an integral movement towards it and produce the conformable actions. Otherwise there is light without heat, and no growth.<sup>23</sup> The formal transformation of the will, then – initial conversion and habitual obedience – takes place for the Jansenists in consequence of the mortification of sinful inclinations, and consists in a loving disposition. Being wedded to a determinist account of its effective transformation, they described the effective divine impulse as an internal or ‘vital act’ in the will, inclining the appetites to the love of God. And, they concluded, because love is by definition free, the will is freely determined, and so forth.

---

<sup>21</sup> Summarised in Pascal, *Écrits sur la grâce*, in Chevalier (ed.), *Œuvres* (Paris, 1954), pp. 980f.

<sup>22</sup> Pascal, *CLP*, p. 79.

<sup>23</sup> There is a useful article on the subject of the affections, by P. Pourrat, in the *Dictionnaire de spiritualité*, dir. Marcel Viller, 17 vols. (Paris, 1937-95), I, cols. 235-40.

This liberation they assigned to the ‘victorious’ grace of Christ, conquering the empire of sin to which man has subjected himself. But they did not argue this way because of a philosophical commitment to determinism. Rather they were concerned to overthrow a doctrine of liberty which, effectively denying the debility superinduced upon it by sin, must inevitably understate the transformation required in order to realise the supernatural end implicit in human nature. To recognise that an efficacious grace is necessary to turn the soul toward its end in God is to acknowledge the condition without which this cannot be, the reversal of a contrary tendency towards the world. Molinism, skewed towards nature, and Calvinism, skewed towards illumination, offered the false security enjoyed by a patient who denies his disease. The Jansenists avoided these counterfeit sorts of certainty and guaranteed the contribution of man to his own reformation by emphasising the inscrutability of God and his purposes. It is not humble to suppose that God’s purposes are conditioned by man’s will, nor presumptuously to assume them upon the bare title of ‘faith’; but humility is a precondition of interior reformation. So ‘toute religion qui ne dit pas que Dieu est caché n’est pas véritable’.<sup>24</sup> The hidden God points to the Incarnation as the foundation of certainty: to Christ in the Gospel, who in his example and precepts demanded a perfection of love from his followers. This concrete and practical emphasis complemented a theological method which preferred, to the deductions of speculative reason, the historical recovery from the best and earliest sources of an authentic interpretation of Christ’s teaching and ministry.<sup>25</sup>

In the case of the English writers now under consideration, we will suggest by way of analogy that, as with our treatment of ‘Jansenist Augustinianism’, a discriminating approach to their ‘anti-Augustinianism’ will shed light on their substantive theological aims. We might imagine the two groups on either side of a wall which represents the determinist Augustine of

---

<sup>24</sup> *Pensées*, 242.

<sup>25</sup> Cf. Quantin, *Le catholicisme classique*, pp. 103f.; Gouhier, ‘La Crise de la Théologie au Temps de Descartes’.

the anti-Pelagian writings. The sun is shining from the side on which the Anglicans stand; consequently the shadow cast by the wall obscures our view of the Jansenists, while the glare reflected from it dazzles our view of the Anglicans. The Anglican rejection of the determinist ‘Calvinist’ (or indeed ‘Jansenist’) Augustine, in other words, can obscure their continued debt to his psychological insights into the state of fallen nature, and to the related Platonic view of morality as an internal ordering to the good.

In the sections which follow a theological programme is traced which, we will suggest, was comparable to that of the Jansenists in three respects. In the first place the mid-century Anglicans insisted that the promise of eternal life tendered in the Gospel is conditional upon obedience. Because salvation does, justification implies in the individual such a faith as includes obedience by definition. The concept of justification had in some way to include the idea of a real transformation from sinfulness to righteousness. In the second place, therefore, these Anglican writers focused on the transformation of the will. If faith is formed by love, no separation can be made between the understanding, whose object is thought, and the will and the appetites, whose object is action. We cannot fulfil the obligation of obedience without loving God, nor can we love God while sinning against him.<sup>26</sup> Christ’s coming to redeem man from the iniquity of sin meant from the whole body of sin. Conversion is not just the reorientation to God of a mind clouded by ignorance, but also of a will weakened and affections depraved by concupiscence. If the soul, or inner disposition, is to be ordered by the love of God, therefore, it must be purged of all sinful affections. No conscious or voluntary sin, or any unchecked affection thereto, can consist with the regenerate state. Hence the new life of loving obedience premised by the Gospel as the condition of salvation is identical with the life of repentance, defined as ‘an effectual

---

<sup>26</sup> It will be observed that these are the Jansenist objections against the casuists and the Calvinists respectively.

conversion from all sin to all holiness'.<sup>27</sup> In the third place, then, we may note that this Anglican school, having made salvation conditional on love, an expansive and directed state of the will, grounded any certainty the Christian could have of his salvation on his own active response to the love of God expressed in the offer of the Gospel and the redemptive work of Christ. This scheme not only underlined the responsibility of the individual to take in hand his own reformation, but demanded, in its identification of the state of regeneration with an effectual repentance, the utmost possible extension on his part. It therefore resulted in a moral and spiritual teaching which, in its consistent severity, has reminded modern commentators of continental 'rigorisme'.<sup>28</sup> Taylor, one of its chief English exponents, encapsulated it more positively in the phrase 'holy living'.<sup>29</sup> Nevertheless, just as the Jansensists are accused of stigmatising the inclinations of nature, so the theoreticians of 'holy living' are charged with encouraging the phenomenon of repression by throwing sinners on their own resources, and demanding of them a standard of perfection so unattainable as to admit only unconscious, that is unwilled, sins.<sup>30</sup>

### *Anti-Calvinism and the Theology of Holy Living*

Episcopalian loyalists of the 1640s and 1650s confronted an enemy which earlier anti-Calvinists and the Laudians had, by identifying Calvinist predestinarian theology with puritan dissidence, in a sense helped to create.<sup>31</sup> Their political opponents were largely united by a

---

<sup>27</sup> This understanding of repentance is shared by all the writers examined in this chapter. The quote however is from Chillingworth, *The Religion of Protestants*, p. 498.

<sup>28</sup> For example Spurr, *The Restoration Church*, p. 306, in re: its tutorism; McAdoo, *Caroline Moral Theology*, pp. 9f.

<sup>29</sup> The title of his 1650 work on *The Rule and Exercises of Holy Living*.

<sup>30</sup> Allison, *The Rise of Moralism*.

<sup>31</sup> Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists*, pp. 7-8, 70-71, 102-3, 166-7, 186-92, 225-6; Milton, *Catholic and Reformed*, pp. 46-8, 90-91, 118-19, 319-20, 521-2; Peter Lake, "'The Anglican Moment'?", in Platten (ed.), *Anglicanism*, pp. 90-

commitment to Calvinist doctrine. Defeat, moreover, rendered the whole range of more or less indifferent matters along which the Laudians had prosecuted their agenda materially insignificant. Episcopacy itself was abolished by parliamentary ordinance in October 1646. For the mid-century Anglicans, therefore, the case against their Presbyterian and Independent enemies came to focus more systematically on their Calvinist theology. And the case against Calvinism turned on the issue of justification. Here, to their minds, its soteriological imbalance between grace and free will and its determinist metaphysics were resolved into the most pressing consequence: for the question at stake was whether Christians were to be saved by ‘a good life’ or merely by ‘faith in the special promises’.<sup>32</sup> The Anglican divines answered resoundingly that man cannot be acceptable to God without a good life. Calvin may have held that ‘Christ justifies no one whom he does not at the same time sanctify’, but the Calvinist doctrine of justification, they argued, in fact demolished the foundations of holiness.<sup>33</sup> The development of genuinely antinomian doctrines among the radical sects and even within the ranks of orthodox Calvinists lent force to this case and encouraged boldness in its exposition.<sup>34</sup>

The question of justification concerns, as Thorndike put it, ‘from whence it comes, and what it is, that renders Christians acceptable to God ... who, as men, are his enemies by sinne here, and objects of his wrath in the world to come’.<sup>35</sup> On the Calvinist theory as synthesised in the Westminster Confession, justification is tied directly to the eternal decree of predestination. Since the elect are fixed from all eternity, so was their justification through the merits of Christ. It is a single, judicial act by which God decided that a portion of the

---

121; *idem*, ‘Avant-garde Conformity at the Court of James I’, in L. Peck (ed.), *The Mental World of the Jacobean Court* (Cambridge, 1991).

<sup>32</sup> Taylor, *UN*, p. 11.

<sup>33</sup> *Institutes*, ed. J. T. McNeil, 2 vols. (1961), III, 16.1.

<sup>34</sup> Wallace, *Puritans and Predestination*, ch. 4; relevant material in Christopher Hill, *The World Turned Upside Down* (Harmondsworth, 1975), index s.v. ‘antinomianism’; and for further background David Como, *Blown by the Spirit* (Stanford, CA, 2004).

<sup>35</sup> *Epilogue*, ii, p. 2.

sinful mass will be forgiven and held just on account of Christ. From man's perspective it is again instantaneous, being the moment one of the elect is moved by the Holy Spirit to perceive by faith that Christ died for him personally. The elect who are determined by grace willingly to believe and obey the Gospel are then by God freely made righteous for Christ's sake: this means he pardons their sins and accepts them as righteous. He does not infuse actual righteousness into them, nor does he accept their works as if they were righteous. He imputes the righteousness of Christ to them, so that their faith in Christ, given to them by God, is the sole instrument of their own justification. Thus 'the exact justice, and rich grace of God' is 'glorified by the justification of sinners'. As a consequence of justification the elect are adopted to be heirs of salvation, and given the grace of sanctification to grow in actual holiness, mortifying and overcoming the corruption natural to the flesh. Sometimes, as Paul describes in Romans vii, the mind will be willing but the flesh weak; but with the sanctifying grace of Christ the spirit will gradually subdue the flesh. Thus a sincere and comprehensive repentance is a grace offered to justified sinners. Their good works are 'fruits and evidences of a true and lively faith'. Having been effectually called, justified and sanctified they must always persevere in the state of grace and can never totally or finally fall away from it. The 'inward evidence' of these graces, or testimony of the Spirit witnessing to the spirit, added to the infallible truth of the Gospel promises, produces in the elect saint an 'infallible assurance' of grace and salvation. This is the crown of the sanctified life on earth and must be striven for by all believers.<sup>36</sup>

The Anglicans raised three interrelated objections to this theory of justification and its place in the *ordo salutis*. The most immediate problem was, as Hammond observed, that it 'is apt to have an ill-influence on practice'. The timorous, those unable or unwilling to identify

---

<sup>36</sup> *The Confession of Faith and the Larger and Shorter Catechisms, First agreed upon by the Assembly of Divines at Westminster* (Amsterdam, 1649), pp. 1-28. An excellent overview of the background against which the special features of this theory become apparent is Berndt Hamm, 'What was the Reformation Doctrine of Justification?', in C. Scott Dixon (ed.), *The German Reformation* (Oxford, 1999), pp. 56-90.

in themselves the movements of the Spirit, will be cast into despair. But the carnal, the presumptuous, the slothful, will draw the antinomian inference: ‘why may I not be confident for all my sins, since the imputation of Christ’s righteousness is that by which I shall be justified?’; ‘if the righteousness that was in him by never sinning, be reckoned to me, what need I any other initial imperfect righteousness or holiness of my own?’ So the Calvinist theory, according to the Anglicans, will not produce the character it nevertheless attributes to the man who is saved – viz., one who is sincerely repentant, conquers the law of sin in his members, and grows in good works and sanctification.<sup>37</sup>

Secondly, then, they objected to the forensic character of a theory whose dominant notes were the concepts of guilt and satisfaction.<sup>38</sup> The pardon of sins, insofar as it preceded sanctification, was divorced from repentance for and conversion from them. But, wrote Hammond, Christ ‘gave himself not that absolutely or presently we might be acquitted, but that he might redeem us from all iniquity, from the reigning power, as well as the guilt ...’.<sup>39</sup> If, as the Calvinists agreed, the spirit must subdue the flesh in the man who is acceptable to God, it could not be that a justified man remains a slave to sin. Thus these writers were all convinced, like Arminius (and Arnauld), that the words of Paul in Romans vii could not be those of a regenerate man.<sup>40</sup> They rejected the *justus peccator* of Reformation theology on the same grounds as the Tridentine Church, namely that the remission of sins supposes, as well as a judicial pardon, the renovation and sanctification of the *hominis interioris*, ‘the hidden man of the heart’, in Taylor’s words.<sup>41</sup> The Calvinist theory, they argued, contained an

---

<sup>37</sup> UN, p. 11; Hammond, *Practical Catechisme*, p. 36.

<sup>38</sup> Here there was an analogy with legalistic Catholic casuistry, which similarly neglected the moral personality or interior disposition; cf. ch. 3, above.

<sup>39</sup> *Practical Catechisme*, p. 35; Richard Allestree, *Whole Duty*, p. 8.

<sup>40</sup> See Carl Bangs, *Arminius. A Study in the Dutch Reformation* (Nashville, 1971), ch. 13; Hammond, *Practical Catechisme*, p. 97; *idem*, *A Paraphrase and Annotations upon all the books of the New Testament* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., 1659), p. 467; Jeremy Taylor, ‘The Christians Conquest Over the Body of Sin’, in *Dekas Embolimaios*, p. 18; Thorndike, *Epilogue*, ii, pp. 277-8; Allestree, *Forty Sermons*, pp. 134-5; George Bull, *Harmonia Apostolica* (Oxford, 1842), pp. 97-117.

<sup>41</sup> Taylor, *Dekas Embolimaios*, p. 7.

insufficient account of ‘what it is’ to be justified – of the form justification takes in the individual believer.

Therefore in the third place they rejected the Calvinist account of how it is, from the point of view of man, that we are justified. It cannot be the sudden epiphany that we are pardoned, because justification implies more than a bare pardon. The Calvinist theory, then, was excessively speculative. To believe in the promise that through Christ we may become acceptable to God is, as Hammond put it, to believe that through him we may be redeemed from the iniquity of sin: that is, that, under a certain condition, we may qualify for the promise. This condition implies an actual, inherent, intrinsic change, from bondage to sin to the service of God. To believe that the promise appertains ‘to any but those who are so qualified’ is ‘to believe a lie; no piece of faith, but a phansy or a vain conceit, which sure will never advantage, but betray any that depends upon it’.<sup>42</sup>

In publishing a ‘practical’ catechism Hammond was not opposing to this speculative faith of the Calvinists merely a sort of common-sense, pastorally-oriented piety; rather, as his epigraph indicated (‘*theologia est scientia affectiva non speculativa*’), he intended a technical opposition between a speculative and an affective approach to theology.<sup>43</sup> Because justification involves the transformation of the inner disposition, it must involve the heart as well as the mind, the affections which move the soul towards the loved object and must be fixed on God. Since the object of the will and appetites is action, justification cannot simply

---

<sup>42</sup> Hammond, *Practical Catechisme*, pp. 55-6; against a speculative faith cf. Thorndike, *Epilogue*, ii, pp. 35-8, 42-3, iii, p. 56; Taylor, *Dekas Embolimaios*, p. 43; *idem*, *The Great Exemplar of Sanctity and Holy Life ... in the History of the Life and Death of the Ever-Blessed Jesus Christ, the Saviour of the World*, in *Works*, II, pp. 546-56; Allestree, *Whole Duty*, pp. 5-21; Bull, *Harmonia Apostolica*, diss. 1, ch. 4, and on later writers cf. Isabel Rivers, *Reason, Grace and Sentiment*, 2 vols. (Cambridge, 1991-2000), i, pp. 54-5.

<sup>43</sup> Hammond attributed the quote to Jean Gerson. Pertinent to our theme is Mark Burrows, *Jean Gerson and De Consolatione Theologiae (1418)* (Tübingen, 1991), pp. 132-48.

be apprehended by the intellect; it must also be manifested in the will, the seat of action.<sup>44</sup> ‘Virtue consist[s] in the affection of the will, not in the perfection of the understanding’.<sup>45</sup> The Calvinist theory gave an insufficient account of what is involved in being made righteous, and a barely speculative account of the accessory part of man. Thus it could not translate into the state of new life premised by the Gospel as the condition of salvation.

In order to carry a new theory of justification which would meet these objections, the Anglicans developed a particular reading of the Gospel. Within the puritan tradition the pastoral difficulties indicated by Hammond had been met by the development of an ‘experimental’, works-based piety, and a language of covenants emphasising the two-sided nature of the relationship between man and God.<sup>46</sup> The Anglicans appropriated this language of covenants in order to describe the Gospel as a promise of reward tendered in return for obedience.<sup>47</sup>

God established his first covenant with man by the creation. He gave Adam a law – a positive obligation not to eat the fruit, and the moral law written in his heart – and the knowledge and strength to live by it. On condition that Adam used his gifts and performed a perfect un-sinning obedience, God undertook to provide continuance of his light and strength, and to crown his exact obedience with eternal felicity. By the fall man excluded himself from

---

<sup>44</sup> It is only fair to point out that Calvin emphasised ‘the heart’ quite as much in discussing faith (e.g. *Inst.*, III 2.7; III 2.36). The ‘Calvinism’ we are discussing here, once more, is constituted by the perceptions of our writers, and not necessarily by the contents of Calvin’s theology.

<sup>45</sup> Thorndike, *Epilogue*, ii, p. 35.

<sup>46</sup> Perry Miller, *Errand into the Wilderness* (Cambridge, MA, 1956), pp. 50-98; H. C. Porter, *Reformation and Reaction in Tudor Cambridge* (Cambridge, 1958), ch. 12; Kendall, *Calvin and English Calvinism*, pp. 1-66; Michael P. Winship, ‘Weak Christians, Backsliders and Carnal Gospellers: Assurance of Salvation and the Pastoral Origins of Puritan Practical Divinity in the 1580s’, *Church History*, 70, 3 (2001); Michael McGiffert, ‘Grace and works: the rise and division of covenant divinity in Elizabethan puritanism’, *Harvard Theological Review*, 75 (1982), pp. 463-502; *idem*, ‘From Moses to Adam: the making of the covenant of works’, *Sixteenth Century Journal*, 19 (1988), pp. 131-56; *idem*, ‘The Perkinsian moment of federal theology’, *Calvin Theological Journal*, 29 (1994), pp. 117-48.

<sup>47</sup> Cf. *idem*, ‘Henry Hammond and covenant theology: from Puritan to Anglican’, *Church History*, 74 (2005), pp. 255-85; *idem*, ‘Herbert Thorndike and the Covenant of Grace’, *JEH*, 58, 3 (2007), pp. 440-60; Neil Lettinga, ‘Covenant Theology Turned Upside Down: Henry Hammond and Caroline Anglican Moralism: 1643-1660’, *Sixteenth Century Journal*, 24, 3 (1993), pp. 653-69.

this covenant; having lost his special gifts, he could never perform perfect obedience. So God, in the promise made to the woman's seed in Genesis iii, made a second covenant with mankind. He promised to give Christ to become a second Adam and die to satisfy for the sin of the first, undertaking thereby to pardon man's unrighteousness, sin and iniquity upon terms that could be fulfilled despite the forfeit of the light and strength given to Adam.

These terms are revealed by Christ. The Christian must become a whole new creature, giving up his whole heart to Christ. He must repent past sins, give, to the degree that God enables him, a sincere, honest and faithful obedience to the whole Gospel, labour sincerely to mortify every sin, and at each fall repent and reform. On condition that man uses the assistances afforded him and lives up to these terms, God undertakes to give him more grace and finally to crown his faith and obedience with glory. Under the Mosaic law, which ostensibly demanded the condition of the first covenant from those with no power to perform it, this covenant operated in a veiled way. Those who were saved under the law were saved by it, and the law in its insufficiency pointed towards the revelation of the covenant of grace in Christ, which it prefigured in sacrifices and other rites.

Under the new covenant the condition of pardon and salvation is clear: 'a constellation and conjuncture of all those Gospel graces, faith, hope, charity, self-denial, repentance, etc., every one of them truly and sincerely rooted in the Christian heart, though mixed with much weakness and imperfections and perhaps with many sins'. This is a condition fallen man can hope to fulfil, because it does not demand an un-sinning obedience to which nature is inadequate.<sup>48</sup> The good news thus consists in the 'glad tidings' brought by Christ of 'ease and remission' from the stringency of the law, and gives assurance that sinners

---

<sup>48</sup> This scheme originated, among the Anglicans, in Hammond's *Practical Catechisme*, pp. 4-15, 35f., quote at p. 13; it is replicated very fully in *UN*, ch. 1; Allestree, *Whole Duty*, Preface §§ 12-24; *idem*, *Forty Sermons*, pp. 236-7; and see Thorndike, *Epilogue*, i, p. 81, ii, ch. 3, pp. 35-43, chs. 8, 9; Bull, *Harmonia Apostolica*, diss. 2, chs. 5, 7-10, 13.

can hope to return to God through repentance and amendment. Taylor habitually referred to the new dispensation as the ‘covenant of repentance’. This

admission of us to repentance, is the great verification of [God’s] justice, and the greatest expression of his mercy ... springing from the fountains of grace, purchas’d by the blood of the Holy Lamb, the Eternal sacrifice, promised from the beginning, always ministred to mans need in the secret Economy of God, but proclaim’d to all the world at the revelation of *God incarnate*.<sup>49</sup>

Justification, the pardon of man’s sins and the acceptance of him as righteous, logically operates under the same conditions which qualify the salvation promised in the Gospel. Neither faith nor works are effective or meritorious as causes of justification, whether directly or indirectly (‘instrumentally’): ‘neither is it imaginable [they] should, it being a worke of God’s upon us, without us, concerning us, but not within us at all’. But they are conditions *sine qua non*, ‘morall instruments’, as Hammond called them, ‘without which we shall not be justified’.<sup>50</sup> The condign merit for which some Catholics contended was, in Bull’s words, a ‘dreadful error’, for ‘the satisfaction of Christ’ is the only meritorious cause of justification, and God through that satisfaction the only effective cause. But the death of Christ purchased the ‘free grace’ of God ‘to pardon and accept us on such poore conditions’ as our faith and repentance.<sup>51</sup>

---

<sup>49</sup> *UN*, ch. 1, I.13, ch. 2, II *passim*.

<sup>50</sup> *Practical Catechisme*, pp. 112-13; identical language is used by Taylor, *Dekas Embolimaios*, p. 7; Bull, *Harmonia Apostolica*, diss. 1, ch. 2.

<sup>51</sup> Bull, *Harmonia Apostolica*, p. 195; Hammond, *Practical Catechisme*, pp. 59, 112-13; *UN*, ch. 1.III; cf. Alister McGrath, ‘The Emergence of the Anglican Tradition on Justification 1600-1700’, *Churchman*, 98, 1 (1983), pp. 28-43. Hampton, *Anti-Arminianism*, pp. 45f., is too bullish with respect to this condition *sine qua non*, asserting that the identification (by Allison, *The Rise of Moralism*, *passim*, followed by Spurr, *Restoration Church*, p. 299) of the formal cause as the centre of the disagreement is a red herring. Even were the evidence not on his side, Allison would not be incorrect so to speak, for the Calvinists asserted that justification is formally Christ’s righteousness imputed to man, and the Anglicans that it is man’s sincere and faithful obedience imputed to him as righteousness. This sincere obedience they sometimes called the formal cause, sometimes a cause *sine qua non*: in any case they assumed both that it is indispensable and that it is not the effective cause.

Hence justification is not from man's perspective the instantaneous apprehension of an immutable judicial act, but a process correlated with the extent to which, with the preventing and assisting grace won by Christ, he has fulfilled the condition of pardon. It is therefore in some sense parallel with sanctification: some measure of sanctification must precede justification, for to be justified is to be within the terms of the covenant, 'the death of *Christ* not justifying any who hath not his part in his Resurrection'.<sup>52</sup>

This obviously diverged from the Calvinist theory, where Christ's death purchases the free justification of the irretrievably wicked, not only on account of his passive righteousness, but by his active righteousness. The Anglicans, naturally, agreed that there exists a disparity between the commandments of God and the ability of mankind to fulfil them. But they refused to account for this wholly by the depravity introduced with sin. Taylor's remarks here are typical of the ambidextrous handling among the Anglicans of Augustine's authority in this area. To blame man exclusively, he argued, is really to suggest that, *mutatis mutandis*, 'a man might keep the whole law, and then might be justified by the whole law, and should not need a Saviour'. In other words, if Augustine followed out his logic on original sin, he would be 'worse than' Pelagian on salvation. On the theory of total depravity, implied Taylor, the idea of sin becomes a legal abstraction; whereas the whole Gospel is framed around the existential reality of sin in those it nevertheless promises to redeem.<sup>53</sup>

Were there no infirmity in nature, the incentive offered in the Gospel would be more than sufficient motive to constant obedience. But taking our infirmity into account, it is impossible. The resolution lay, for these writers, in the sense in which God exacts the law he imposes. He exacts just what is 'morally', not what is 'naturally' possible: that is, the utmost of our endeavour in the face of our infirmity. The Gospel requires simply that we 'love God

---

<sup>52</sup> Hammond, *Practical Catechisme*, pp. 112-19, 38.

<sup>53</sup> *UN*, pp. 30-31; cf. Hammond, *Practical Catechisme*, pp. 36-7.

with all our soul, that is ... love him as much as we can love him'. This sincerity, a quality of the will, must then produce an actual obedience.<sup>54</sup>

The reason God imposes 'what in his justice he does not exact' is, Taylor said, to set a benchmark: not just to rescue sinners, but to keep returning sinners growing in grace all the days of their lives. Hammond described the 'use' of the new covenant in similar terms. By prescribing the condition it sets the bar. On the one hand it shows the indispensable necessity of sincere obedience, thus shutting the door against 'carnal security, sloth, presumption, hypocrisy, partial obedience, and habitual sin'. On the other it shows how possible it is to perform this obedience with Christ's grace, stirring men up to diligent endeavour by showing them the true grounds of hope.<sup>55</sup>

### *Moralism*

In this way, the Anglicans conceived, they had corrected the flaws of Calvinist soteriology, while following the thread of Christian orthodoxy along the precipice flanked by Manicheism and Pelagianism.<sup>56</sup> They protected man's part in salvation by including, in their account of 'what it is' to be justified, a concept of inherent righteousness which, without falling into the pitfall of condign merit, obliged the object of God's act to contribute his own efforts. They avoided the fatalism that renders human effort futile by downplaying the idea that justification is fixed by eternal decree, describing it instead as part of the ongoing *process* by which humans are turned from sin and become acceptable to God. On the other

---

<sup>54</sup> UN, pp. 32-56; Hammond, *Practical Catechisme*, pp. 74-81; Allestree, *Whole Duty*, pp. 13-17; Thorndike, *Epilogue*, ii, pp. 38-9.

<sup>55</sup> UN, p. 35; *Practical Catechisme*, pp. 15-16; see also Thorndike, *Epilogue*, ii, p. 279.

<sup>56</sup> Cf. Bull, *Harmonia Apostolica*, p. 217.

hand they were clear that conversion and a good life cannot be produced by nature alone. Man is saved by Christ. But to save, they insisted, is to redeem from sin; and to redeem from sin means, not only reconciling us to God by obtaining pardon, but mortifying the sinful desires and habits of the old, natural, carnal man, and ‘implanting a new principle of holiness in the heart’.<sup>57</sup> For the Anglicans as for their opponents the essence of the Gospel was the great antithesis between man’s wretchedness without God and his greatness in God, the sin of Adam and the sacrifice of Christ, death in sin and new life in grace. The problem with Calvinist soteriology, they claimed, was simply that it did not articulate Christ’s conquest over sin.

To their Calvinist opponents, of course, this assessment would have appeared excessively generous. The balancing act attempted by the Anglicans, according to their critics, was a failure which toppled them straight into the defile of Pelagianism. From the Calvinist or Reformed perspective, the forensic theory of gratuitous justification followed necessarily from a true appreciation of sinfulness as the existential condition of mankind. The emphasis on human effort in the new Anglican soteriology could only be achieved at the expense of God’s free grace. Hence Presbyterian and Independent controversialists, feeling increasingly pressurised in the 1650s and afterwards by the mounting theological critique of Calvinism, were eager to fix on the Anglicans a charge of heretical naturalism.<sup>58</sup> Sometimes the latter were flatly convicted of Pelagianism;<sup>59</sup> more often the charge was translated into contemporary polemical terms as one of ‘popery’, Arminianism, or Socinianism.

---

<sup>57</sup> And, of course, ‘perfecting these beginnings at the end of this life in heaven’: Hammond, *Practical Catechisme*, pp. 17-20.

<sup>58</sup> Cf. Wallace, *Puritans and Predestination*, pp. 122f.

<sup>59</sup> See for example the controversy between Thomas Pierce and William Barlee, treated *ib.*, pp. 123-5, and by F. J. Trott, ‘Prelude to Restoration. Laudians, Conformists and the Struggle for “Anglicanism” in the 1650s’ (Unpublished Ph.D., London, 1992), ch. 4. Pierce argued against ‘*Absolute Predestinarians*’, who included ‘as well *Dominicans* and *Jansenians* of the Church of Rome, as *Presbyterians* here in England’: *The divine philanthropie defended* (1657), n. p.

These labels were a function of the argument which mid-century episcopalian writers inherited from their conformist predecessors, and a little background is needed here. Earlier apologists, notably Richard Hooker (1544-1600), had defended the outward structure and life of the English Church against a case for further reformation predicated on robustly Reformed assumptions about the depravity of fallen nature and the priority of the invisible church of the elect. The Presbyterians grounded their arguments in the omniscient authority of scripture, for man is wholly dependent on the sovereign will of God as expressed imperatively in his Word, the ordinary means of receiving faith. Hooker therefore defended the polity of the English Church by broadening the concept of law, along lines laid down by Aquinas.<sup>60</sup> Revelation is one source of law, but it complements reason by which men as understanding creatures share in the eternal law or wisdom directing everything in God's creation to its proper end. This law implanted in nature gives man some general premises from which he can work out, without the aid of revelation, how to organise his activity in accordance with the eternal reason or plan of God. Humans can frame laws whose consonance with right reason shows they derive from the eternal law.<sup>61</sup> Revelation is required over and above natural law and human law because human destiny lies beyond nature, but even here revelation presupposes what we know by reason, including the divine authority of Scripture.<sup>62</sup> Having truth for its object, faith is properly 'an intellectual habit', so that natural motives, so long as reason is not distorted by vicious inclinations, can only reinforce what we are persuaded of by faith.<sup>63</sup>

---

<sup>60</sup> McAdoo, *Spirit of Anglicanism*, pp. 6-9; *idem*, *Caroline Moral Theology*, pp. 18-26; Gunnar Hillerdal, *Reason and Revelation in Richard Hooker* (Lund, 1962); Nigel Voak, *Richard Hooker and Reformed Theology: A Study of Reason, Will and Grace* (Oxford, 2003); cf. J. K. Ryan, 'The Reputation of St. Thomas Aquinas Among English Protestant Thinkers of the Seventeenth Century', *The New Scholasticism*, 22, 1 (1948).

<sup>61</sup> Richard Hooker, *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, 2 vols. (1907), i, bk. 1, II-X; Aquinas, *ST*, IaIIae, qq. 91, 93.

<sup>62</sup> Hooker, *Laws*, bk. 1, XIV, esp. §§ 1 & 5.

<sup>63</sup> *Ib.*, bk. 5, LXIII, § 2; cf. Aquinas, *ST*, IIaIIae, qq. 1-6.

Hooker, then, rejected the view that man should or could expect an infallible certainty by direct divine authority regarding every aspect of his earthly pilgrimage.<sup>64</sup> For Hooker man has his own prerogatives: he is a voluntary, rational agent capable of ordering his affairs in accordance with the purposes of God. This did not sit easily with a predestinarian theology, and it has been argued that Hooker was led by his concern to protect the relative autonomy of human activity to the view that free will consists in a liberty of indifference.<sup>65</sup> The idea that man's response to the offer of grace is not irresistibly determined also suited Hooker's defence of the liturgy and ceremonies of the established Church, which he sought to invest with a positive devotional content. His vision of a Christian community bound up with Christ by its corporate participation in the sacraments and public worship of the Church suggested an understanding of grace as universal in scope, available to the whole baptized community and depending for its efficacy on the nature of their response.<sup>66</sup>

Although Hooker worked from within the inheritance of Calvin's theology, his arguments clearly tended against some of its organising principles.<sup>67</sup> Men are voluntary agents whose choices, as proceeding from reason, have some inherent value; the human will is free to do or not to do good or bad; and God's offer of grace is universal and mediated through the sacraments. Taken together these positions amounted to a withdrawal from the

---

<sup>64</sup> Cf. M. E. C. Perrot, 'Richard Hooker and the Problem of Authority in the Elizabethan Church', *JEH*, 49, 1 (1998), pp. 29-60.

<sup>65</sup> Voak, *Richard Hooker*, pp. 51-60, 269-70, 296f. Hooker resorted to a theory of divine foreknowledge which closely resembled that of Molina, and may have derived directly from the *Concordia*, in order to argue that the decrees of election and reprobation reflect a knowledge of hypothetical future contingents rather than a will to determine them in a particular way. God can have definite knowledge of future sinfulness or righteousness without having foreordained it by an act of will. See Voak, 'English Molinism in the Late 1590s: Richard Hooker on Free Will, Predestination, and Divine Foreknowledge', *Journal of Theological Studies*, NS, 60, 1 (2009), pp. 130-177.

<sup>66</sup> Peter Lake, *Anglicans and Puritans? Presbyterianism and English Conformist Thought from Whitgift to Hooker* (1988), pp. 145-230; Ramie Targoff, 'Performing Prayers in Hooker's *Lawes*: The Efficacy of Set Forms', in A. S. McGrade (ed.), *Richard Hooker and the Construction of the Christian Community* (Tempe, AZ, 1997).

<sup>67</sup> Cf. Peter Lake, 'Business as Usual? The Immediate Reception of Hooker's *Ecclesiastical Polity*', *JEH*, 52, 3 (2001), pp. 456-86.

infallible certainty guaranteed by the ‘golden chain’ of predestination.<sup>68</sup> Reason, however fallible, has some value in judging religious questions; among some Hookerian thinkers in Caroline England, sometimes called the ‘Oxford rational theologians’, this methodological assumption became the basis of an influential form of ‘mitigated scepticism’, designed to outflank both puritan claims to inspiration and Catholic pretensions to infallibility.<sup>69</sup> There must be some reason for any belief, whether in the authority of Scripture or the infallibility of the Church; assent can only attend the best arguments.<sup>70</sup> This confidence in critical reason – rightly formed by faith and piety and aware of its limits – as the ‘negative measure’ in any question, in Taylor’s words, promoted an intellectual freedom and tolerance which was deeply suspicious to those who identified the essence of the Church with a narrowly defined concept of true doctrine.<sup>71</sup>

Such suspicions were intensified by the apparent affinities between this developing anti-Calvinist position and continental currents of thought; for English anti-Calvinists were involved in a widespread debate about the theology of grace in European Protestant Christianity that mirrored the disputes *de auxiliis divinae gratiae* from which the *Augustinus* emerged.<sup>72</sup> In Holland the Arminians were involved in a similar reaction from a theology centred on the eternal and immutable decrees. Like Hooker, Arminius drew on Molina to

---

<sup>68</sup> As in William Perkins, *Armilla aurea* (1590). Hence one is tempted to relate the emergence of English anti-Calvinism to a wider *crise pyrthonienne* in late-sixteenth and early-seventeenth century Europe, cf. Richard H. Popkin, *The History of Scepticism from Erasmus to Spinoza* (1979); Hugh Trevor-Roper, ‘The Great Tew Circle’, in his *Catholics, Anglicans and Puritans* (1987), pp. 166-230.

<sup>69</sup> H. J. McLachlan, *Socinianism in Seventeenth-Century England* (Oxford, 1951), chs. 4 & 5; Tulloch, *Rational Theology*, vol. 1; Ryan, ‘The Reputation of St. Thomas’, pp. 140f.; Van Leeuwen, *The Problem of Certainty*, ch. 2; Shapiro, *Probability and Certainty*, ch. 3; Daston, ‘Probability and evidence’, pp. 1117-19; Robert R. Orr, *Reason and Authority. The Thought of William Chillingworth* (Oxford, 1967).

<sup>70</sup> Chillingworth, *The Religion of Protestants*, Ans. 2, at §§ 25f.; a succinct exposition is Lucius Cary, Viscount Falkland, *Of the Infallibilitie of the Church of Rome* (Oxford, 1645).

<sup>71</sup> Cf. Trevor-Roper, ‘The Great Tew Circle’; Taylor, *Ductor*, i, p. 51. Taylor’s *Liberty of Prophesying* of 1647 is perhaps the best known expression of this liberal spirit, although its argument for tolerance also reflected the political reality confronting the royalist party: cf. Anthony Milton, ‘Anglicanism and Royalism in the 1640s’, in John Adamson (ed.), *The English Civil War. Conflicts and Contexts* (Basingstoke, 2009) p. 74.

<sup>72</sup> Cf. Hughes, ‘The Problem of “Calvinism”’.

develop the theory of a divine foreknowledge which does not determine future contingents.<sup>73</sup> Arminius and his successors held that free will was not lost by the fall; that a sufficient grace is offered to all; that predestination is conditional on the individual's response to this offer; and that grace is amissible.<sup>74</sup> Whatever importance one attributes to early links between the two groups, English anti-Calvinists who argued in this way can therefore usefully be regarded as English Arminians.<sup>75</sup> From the 1630s onwards they openly read and admired Remonstrant thinkers like Grotius and Simon Episcopius, who likewise, seeking to reassert a sense of human responsibility in salvation, emphasised the value of man's moral faculties.<sup>76</sup> The end of theology, as Episcopius asserted after Arminius, is practical, not speculative; and it is the individual's responsibility to make use of his moral faculties in responding to the data of salvation.<sup>77</sup> This ethical focus was complemented by a minimalist attitude to dogma and an advocacy of free enquiry in non-essentials: a point of material significance for the Remonstrants, who suffered from the intolerance of their Calvinist enemies at the Synod of Dort.

A potent charge thrown at Remonstrant theologians from early on was that of Socinianism, for this unorthodox tendency shared an apparently similar set of methodological assumptions and theological priorities. Compounded of Anabaptist and anti-trinitarian

---

<sup>73</sup> Eef Dekker, 'Was Arminius a Molinist?', *Sixteenth Century Journal*, 27, 2 (1996), pp. 337-52; Richard A. Muller, *God, Creation, and Providence in the Thought of Jacob Arminius* (Grand Rapids, 1991), pp. 154-66; on the concept of 'middle knowledge' in later Remonstrant thought cf. *idem*, *Dictionary of Latin and Greek Theological Terms* (Grand Rapids, 1985), s.v. 'scientia media'; Hampton, *Anti-Arminians*, pp. 209f.

<sup>74</sup> On Arminius see Bangs, *Arminius*; Muller, *God, Creation, and Providence*. Arminius's partisans published a *Remonstrance* in 1610, from which the party took its name, where five points were established which formed the basis of the famous fivefold anti-Remonstrant assertion of the Synod of Dort in 1618, concerning total depravity, unconditional election, limited atonement, irresistible grace, and the perseverance of the saints. See also the *Arminian Confession* of 1621, mostly the work of Episcopius: there is a modern tr. by Mark A. Ellis (Princeton, 2005).

<sup>75</sup> White, *Predestination, Policy, and Polemic*, takes unnecessary pains to discount the direct influence of Arminius in England.

<sup>76</sup> Trevor-Roper, 'The Great Tew Circle', p. 192; Nicholas Tyacke, 'Arminianism and the Restoration Church', in his *Aspects*, pp. 320-36; for Hammond see Sarah Mortimer, *Reason and Religion in the English Revolution. The Challenge of Socinianism* (Cambridge, 2009), pp. 83-4; for Taylor, Reginald Heber, 'Life', in Taylor's *Works*, I, pp. lxxxix, xlvi-vii; see also Rosemary Colie, *Light and Enlightenment: a Study of the Cambridge Platonists and the Dutch Arminians* (Cambridge, 1957).

<sup>77</sup> *Arminian Confession*, Preface, pp. 22, 23.

radicals, the Socinians' outlook was based on a New Testament-oriented scripturalism, and they advocated freedom of conscience. The authority, meaning, and application of scripture, however, must all, in their view, be decided by reason.<sup>78</sup> This rational principle, in combination with a marked ethical focus, informed certain dogmatic peculiarities. The Trinity was rejected as incomprehensible: Christ was not divine according to nature, but by the office invested in him to reveal the divine will. The idea of a vicarious satisfaction for sin through the atoning sacrifice of an innocent, moreover, was neither reasonable nor just. Individuals must be responsible for their own vice or virtue, and cannot have been rendered inadequate to forgiveness by original sin. Hence Socinus had no need for an inward or effective grace. By his preaching and example Christ provided sufficient means and incentive for men to strive after eternal life.<sup>79</sup>

To emphasise the value of reason, and man's moral capacity and responsibility, or to be cautious about dogmatic intolerance of intellectual differences, was therefore to open oneself, by a polemical extension into Socinianism, to the suspicion of reasoning away the supernatural in Christianity, and preaching a graceless Pelagianism at odds with the principle of justification by faith.<sup>80</sup> To paraphrase Hyde's remarks on Falkland's alleged Socinianism, these broad principles cannot, apart from their heretical applications, be made the distinguishing marks of a Socinian, or 'the party will be very strong in all Churches'.<sup>81</sup> But this fact did not forestall a morbid fear of the onward march of Socinian rationalism among opponents of English anti-Calvinists.

---

<sup>78</sup> *The Racovian Catechism*, tr. Thomas Rees (1818), p. 15.

<sup>79</sup> On Socinianism see esp. G. H. Williams, *The Radical Reformation* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed., Ann Arbor, 2000), pp. 978f., 1162f.; also McLachlan, *Socinianism in England*, pp. 5-21; Mortimer, *Reason and Religion*, chs. 1&2.

<sup>80</sup> The Remonstrants' *Confession* of 1621 therefore insisted that original sin renders man inadequate to salvation by his own means; he stands in need of the preventing, co-operating, and following grace won by the atoning work of Christ. See esp. §§ 7.1, 7.4, 7.8, 7.10. 8.1, 8.2, 9.2, 17.6.

<sup>81</sup> Edward Hyde, Earl of Clarendon, *Animadversions Upon a Book, Intituled: Fanaticism Fanatically Imputed* (1673), p. 187; cf. Trevor-Roper, 'The Great Tew Circle', p. 188, who sensibly distinguished Socinianism in the 'wide' and in the 'strict' sense.

It will be evident from this brief survey that none of the complaints lodged against the holy living theologians – that of popery, signifying, as it related to doctrine, the reversion to a theology of works;<sup>82</sup> that of Arminianism, importing a theology of free will and conditional predestination; and that of Socinianism, signifying a theology which esteemed nature so highly that it had no room for grace – was without some basis in the theological approach of the mid-century Anglicans. Each derived its polemical force, on the other hand, from an implied extension into heresy: idolatry in the case of popery; an extreme rationalism and a form of Christological unorthodoxy in the case of the Socinians and later Remonstrants; and behind both Pelagianism.

This double-pronged attack was almost unanswerable, since it was basically inconsistent. The charge of ‘popish’ works-righteousness assumed that the Anglicans made the grace of justification into an internal principle in the believer, operating in relation with the human will. The Anglicans could absorb this criticism, *secundum quid*. They refused the idea that justification involves an infusion of actual righteousness. But they did talk about the ‘infusion’ of grace which assists man to break the fetters of sin, and asserted that justification involves human righteousness in the sense that God graciously accepts an imperfect righteousness for a perfect.<sup>83</sup> Thorndike candidly suggested that this was hard to distinguish from the Catholic theory of congruous merit.<sup>84</sup>

The charge of rationalist neo-Pelagianism, on the other hand, depended on the claim that the Anglicans made grace into a purely external assistance of which man can freely choose to avail himself. They did want to show, against the fatalistic determinism attributed to Calvinism, that justification does not exclude but supposes man’s voluntary contribution.

---

<sup>82</sup> It may be artificial to separate this from the much more wide-ranging set of religious and political associations which gave the charge in general such force

<sup>83</sup> E.g. Hammond, *Practical Catechisme*, p. 114.

<sup>84</sup> Thorndike, *Epilogue*, ii, pp. 260-62; cf. Burnet, *Exposition*, p. 125.

The Christian revelation presents man with a choice, and his assent and submission are valuable because they issue from the exercise of his own moral faculties. But the Anglicans insisted that human choice does not prevent grace; against the Pelagian implications of their more liberal attitude to man's role in salvation they were clear that his response to the Gospel depends on an inward and preventing grace moving the will.<sup>85</sup> It would be curious if they had meant to reduce faith to optional assent to a set of propositions: it was precisely their objection against the Calvinist understanding of faith that it was barely speculative, and not a question of a voluntary response of the whole man. Of course faith supposes 'a collection of propositions', as Taylor, one of the most forthright advocates of the value of reason, wrote. But, since he was engaged in arguing that 'the faith of a Christian hath more in it of the will than the understanding', he held that assent would be impossible without a prior conversion.<sup>86</sup>

Whether polemicists took the 'popish' or the 'Socinian' line, the conclusion was still Pelagian self-sufficiency. Despite the evident lack of critical clarity which such an impasse imports, however, it has been very nearly reproduced in modern scholarship.

According to one strand of criticism, wearing its confessional bias in plain sight, any attempt to condition justification by human righteousness – whether considered so properly, or else by some form of metonymy – involves 'possible Pelagianism'. By demanding a sincere though necessarily imperfect obedience as the qualification for and the obligation contracted by entry into the new covenant, argued Allison, the Anglicans both placed an unbearable burden on the un-regenerate, and transformed the new life of grace into an anaemic ethical account-keeping. This represented a 'moralism' which privileged human works over

---

<sup>85</sup> Hammond, *Practical Catechisme*, p. 107; Allestree, *Forty Sermons*, p. 240; Bull, *Harmonia Apostolica*, p. 215; for Thorndike see ch. 6, below, p. 274.

<sup>86</sup> Taylor, *Ductor*, i, p. 9; cf. *ib.*, pp. 43f. ('obedite et intelligetis'); *idem*, *Great Exemplar*, pt. 2, disc. vii, at p. 23; *idem*, *Liberty of Prophesying*, ch. 2, §§ 8-10; *idem*, *Dekas Embolimaios*, pp. 26-7, 39; and see also Hammond, *Of the Reasonableness of Christian Religion* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed., 1650), ch. 3, § 4.

the grace of the Gospel, thus attenuating in large part the doctrinal foundations of Christian ethics.<sup>87</sup>

More recent scholarship has reinforced this conclusion from the other direction, emphasising the influence of heterodox Protestant arguments which were undeniably naturalistic, namely those of the Socinians. In Socinian writings, and in Remonstrant authors such as Episcopius and Grotius who assimilated Socinian points of view into their own theological synthesis, Anglicans found a congenial emphasis on the individual's responsibility for his own voluntary conversion. The suggestion is that, by incorporating Socinian lines of argument into their own anti-Calvinist project, Anglican thinkers began to move down the same path of logical connections that shaped Socinian thought, where an ethical account of Christianity was achieved by excluding the idea that the salvation of mankind depends on the remission of an infinite debt by the atoning sacrifice of a divine redeemer.<sup>88</sup>

The key idea here, argues Sarah Mortimer, was Socinus's distinction, in order to emphasise the voluntary nature of Christian profession, between nature, as what is by definition not freely chosen, and revealed Christianity. This distinction was potentially useful to royalists, who set the higher law of Christ against parliamentary arguments based on an immutable divine law, capable, as expressed in the Old Testament, of justifying resistance. According to Mortimer it was also so sympathetic to the ethical interest of Anglicans like Hammond that it became the foundation of their new theology of holy living.<sup>89</sup>

Since the Socinians denied the eternal divinity of Christ, the emphasis of their teaching fell on the prophetic office he fulfilled on earth by revealing the way to eternal life.

---

<sup>87</sup> Allison, *The Rise of Moralism*, p. 190 *et passim*.

<sup>88</sup> Mortimer, *Reason and Religion*. In contrast to Allison's perspective, the Anglicans are here being appropriated to a positive narrative of liberation from the narrow dogmatism of orthodox Christianity.

<sup>89</sup> *Ib.*, chs. 4 & 5.

This devalued any moral law antecedent to or independent of the Christian revelation, for to Christ alone was imparted the secret knowledge by which men can win eternal life. The Socinians therefore stressed the unique character of the moral precepts laid down by Christ as the condition of salvation.<sup>90</sup> The virtue of professing Christianity derived from the fact that, having reasonably accepted the Gospel as a divine revelation, individuals should freely choose to live by a code of ethics above that to which nature obliges them.<sup>91</sup>

Like the Tridentine fathers, the Anglicans, fearing the spectre of antinomianism, insisted that Christ was a lawgiver to obey as well as a redeemer in whom to trust.<sup>92</sup> They emphasised the distinctive nature of his law. It is spiritual where the old law was carnal, and it supplies the imperfections of the old law: ‘ye have heard that it was said ... but I say unto you ...’ (Mt. v 17f.). It is accompanied by promises and sanctions, and reward or punishment will crown the decision to follow it or not.<sup>93</sup> In Mortimer’s view this emphasis on Christ’s moral teaching and man’s free response encouraged a purely propositional idea of Christianity, based on the commands communicated by the historical Christ.<sup>94</sup> This, she concludes by way of analogy with Socinian logic, left little room for the doctrine of the atonement, the Holy Spirit, or even the divinity of Christ.<sup>95</sup> Like Allison, therefore, Mortimer regards the theology of holy living as an important source of a stream of thought in which grace and moral virtue intermingled to the point when, in the ‘reasonable’ Christianity by

---

<sup>90</sup> *The Racovian Catechism*, pp. 168-348.

<sup>91</sup> Mortimer, *Reason and Religion*, pp. 15f.

<sup>92</sup> Schroeder, p. 44.

<sup>93</sup> Hammond, pp. 27, 53-4, 157; Allestree, *Whole Duty*, p. 3; Taylor, *Great Exemplar*, pt. 2, XII, disc. 10-11; *idem*, *Ductor*, ii, pp. 319-23; Bull, *Harmonia Apostolica*, diss. 2, chs. 7-8, 14.

<sup>94</sup> The same approach is taken in Noel Malcolm, ‘Thomas Hobbes and Voluntarist Theology’ (Unpublished Cambridge PhD, 1982), pp. 241f.

<sup>95</sup> Mortimer, *Reason and Religion*, p. 128.

which later apologists sought to outflank deist or free-thinking arguments, they became virtually indistinguishable.<sup>96</sup>

As we have already noted, English anti-Calvinists shared certain characteristics with the Socinian position – their respect for rational enquiry, their ethical priorities, and so on – which are too general to infer a necessary relationship with the Socinians’ distinctive presuppositions. The same point applies in relation to their understanding of the new law given by Christ. When the Anglicans opposed the new law to the old, as the spiritual and eternal to the temporal and carnal, and when they asserted that Christ’s law included new precepts, was more perfect and, in a spiritual sense, more demanding than the old, they said nothing that was not taught by Aquinas, and for that matter by Paul in the letter to the Romans, and by Christ himself on the Mount.<sup>97</sup> What distinguished the same points in Socinian authors was their foundation in peculiar assumptions about the nature and work of Christ. They insisted on the insufficiency of the old law without the added precepts of Christ, and could not reconcile the law of Christ with an eternal moral law, because they held that Christ’s divinity consisted in the office bestowed upon Jesus to reveal the only way to eternal life. From this principle it follows that man does not stand in need of redemption by the sacrifice of a divine person, since salvation depends only on obedience to the divine will revealed by Christ.

To induce the latter positions from the Anglicans’ statements about the new law of Christ is to postulate a relationship of cause and effect. It is precisely this logical relationship

---

<sup>96</sup> See also Cragg, *From Puritanism to the Age of Reason*, ch. 4; *idem*, *The Church and the Age of Reason 1648-1789* (Harmondsworth, 1960), pp. 68-75; Rivers, *Reason, Grace and Sentiment*, i, 63-77; N. H. Keeble, *The Restoration. England in the 1660s* (Oxford, 2002), p. 128; Griffin, *Latitudinarianism*, *passim*. More cautious notes about the tendency of the ‘rational religion’ of restoration Anglican apologetics are sounded by John Spurr, “‘Rational Religion’ in Restoration England”, *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 49, 4 (1988), esp. pp. 579-80; W. M. Spellman, *The Latitudinarians and the Church of England, 1660-1700* (Athens, GA-London, 1993); McAdoo, *Spirit of Anglicanism*, chs. 5&6; Sykes, *Sheldon to Secker*, pp. 149, 161, 180-87.

<sup>97</sup> These positions are attributed to Socinian sources by Hampton, *Anti-Arminianism*, pp. 73-5; Mortimer, *Reason and Religion*, pp. 121f. See Aquinas, *ST*, IaIIae, qq. 98, 106-8; Rom. iii-iv; Mt. v-vii.

that concludes against the inference. If the Anglicans held that Christ is fully divine and co-eternal with the father, it would follow that they could not have considered the precepts imparted during his earthly ministry to be in tension with the Mosaic law or the law of nature. It is possible, of course, that they were very inconsistent; but the evidence does not suggest this was the case. Taylor, for example, if he was engaged, as Mortimer claims, in a ‘rewriting of Socinus’ in this area, rewrote him to the extent that he maintained the opposite principle. The moral law, whose end is the ‘noble and immortal condition’ to which God created man, is ‘eternal and unalterable’.<sup>98</sup> It is sin that prevents man seeing it clearly and following it, and puts him in need of a positive declaration of its content. This was provided, after the world fell into idolatry, by the first and second table of the decalogue, summarised in turn by Christ as ‘love the lord with all thy heart and thy neighbour as thyself’. The Mosaic law restrained man from transgressing the natural law, but it was insufficient in that it was particular to one nation and did not fully elucidate the spiritual obligations implicit in the natural law. But it fulfilled a propaedeutic purpose, preparing its subjects for and prefiguring the new dispensation of the Gospel. The covenant of grace, moreover, operated beneath and behind it.<sup>99</sup> As Paul explains in Romans iii and illustrates by discussing the ‘father of the faithful’, Abraham, in the next chapter, those who are counted righteous before the coming of Christ are saved by an implicit faith in the redeemer.<sup>100</sup> The insufficiencies of the law were supplied by this ‘Sun of Righteousness’ (Mal. iv 2), who illuminated the world with a full and perfect explication of the eternal law. ‘The Christian law’ is, therefore, ‘for the substance of it,

---

<sup>98</sup> Mortimer, *Reason and Religion*, p. 143; the following paragraph draws on Taylor’s lengthy Preface to his *Great Exemplar*.

<sup>99</sup> Cf. *UN*, ch. 1.

<sup>100</sup> Cf. Heb. xi 13. For the Socinians they could not have been justified by the grace of Christ, although God might freely have chosen to save any virtuous person. Mortimer, *Reason and Religion*, p. 85, claims that Hammond gave ‘no sense of any covenant of grace prior to the advent of Christ’. This is hard to square with Hammond’s statement that ‘every man that ever was, or shall be saved from the beginning of the world, was, and is, and shall be saved by this second Covenant [of grace]’. Hammond followed Rom. iii-iv in his explanation of Abraham’s faith, who was not saved by his own virtue but by his belief ‘against hope’ in God’s promise, a faith which was counted for righteousness on account of the redemption that is in Christ (*Practical Catechisme*, pp. 14, 43f.); the *Arminian Confession* of 1621 contained the same teaching, see §§ 7.1, 7.8. See also Thorndike, *Epilogue*, iii, pp. 63-4, ii, ch. 9.

nothing but the restitution and perfection of the law of nature'.<sup>101</sup> The congruity of the Christian law and the Mosaic law is determined by the immutability of the eternal law of which both are expressions. Christianity is the more perfect expression; its greatness can be summarised in Paul's famous 'appellative of the law of nature', it too being 'a law written on our hearts'.

When the Anglicans opposed the law of Christ to nature it was to fallen nature.<sup>102</sup> It is sin that prevents men perceiving the eternal law, and, as Taylor complained, makes them think of Christianity as an unreasonable, excessively otherworldly creed. 'But', said Taylor, 'no mistake can be greater'.<sup>103</sup> It was fundamental to the anti-Calvinist argument that there exists an objective and immutable standard of morality accessible to man by cause of a natural congruity. It is precisely the function of the doctrine and the self-sacrifice of Christ to demonstrate clearly to man that what appears irrational and averse to the fallen reason and appetites is truly reasonable: that it is the way to the true good to which God has eternally designed mankind.<sup>104</sup>

To impute to Anglican thinkers the consequences of Socinian principles on the basis of non-specific similarities is to argue in a circle, for it is the principles that are in question, and can constitute the only robust test by which to distinguish the respective arguments. This is not to discount the influence of Socinian arguments, for in many respects they were

---

<sup>101</sup> Mortimer, *Reason and Religion*, p. 144, expounds Taylor as teaching that Christ 'altered the content of the law'. Taylor did not think so, because, the natural law 'being eternal and unalterable ... it was not imaginable that the body of any law should make a new morality, new rules'. Christ (Mt. v 17f.) did not come to destroy the law but to fulfil it.

<sup>102</sup> See e.g. Taylor, *Dekas Embolimaios*, pp. 1-2, 19; *Great Exemplar*, Preface, §39, pp. 276f., pt. 2 disc. XI; Hammond, *Practical Catechisme*, pp. 51-2.

<sup>103</sup> Taylor, *The Great Exemplar*, Preface.

<sup>104</sup> It seems more reasonable to understand the *Great Exemplar* in terms of this Platonic idea of conformity than to force Taylor's sense into a Pelagian or Socinian idea of Christ's work, which he always explicitly repudiated. Human nature is 'perfected' when man returns from the *regio dissimilitudinis*, the 'state of separation in the dark', in Taylor's words, into the 'state of conjunction' or 'participation of the Divine nature and perfections', by 'transcrib[ing] copies of those excellent emanations from [God's] Holiness, whereby as he communicates himself to us in his mercies, so he propounds himself imitable by us in his graces': *ib.*, ep.ded., p. 41; cf. Hammond, *Reasonableness*, ch. 3.

sympathetic to the Anglicans' own theological ambitions. But it is to credit the latter with an ability to distinguish between the accidental features of an argument and its informing principles. They were sensitive to the fact that a rational account of faith, and an ethical focus that assumed man's natural moral potential, exposed them to the charge of Pelagianism. They were aware that some guarantee was required for the necessity of an inward grace and an institutional Church. They were also aware that the key Socinian assumption which corroded these ideas was the denial that Christ had to die in order to redeem the infinite debt contracted in Adam.

The Anglicans insisted that Christianity makes no sense without the doctrine of original sin. They denied that man was thereby totally depraved and deprived of freedom, for they feared the antinomian implications of the exaggerated notion of vicarious satisfaction which the Calvinists erected on this tenet.<sup>105</sup> But they recognised that Socinus reached this position by denying 'the grounds upon which [Christ's] suffering and obedience are said to win satisfaction for sins and merit grace to man, that is the divinity of Christ in the Godhead from all time'.<sup>106</sup> As Thorndike observed, the Socinian argument therefore failed on its own terms, since it is not agreeable to reason that Christ should have had to die on the cross if he was sent only to publish the Gospel and not to redeem sin. Why, asked Thorndike, should man accept the 'hard remedy' of the Gospel, on condition of sanctions, unless he believes he is punishable? Christianity is incomprehensible without original sin: so Paul 'had care to set it forth [in Romans] as the grounds of Christianity'; and 'both Pelagius and Socinus are carried out of the way of Christianity, because they will not acknowledge the decay of mankind by the fall of Adam, and the coming of Christ to repair it'.<sup>107</sup>

---

<sup>105</sup> For a fuller discussion see ch. 6, below.

<sup>106</sup> Thorndike, *Epilogue*, ii, p. 4.

<sup>107</sup> *Ibid.*, 143-8.

The decay of nature means that a purely optional religion could never bring men to salvation. They stand in need of grace, to heal the wounds of sin and assist them to live well despite their disordered inclinations. As Christ is the mediator between God and humanity, so is his Church the mediator of his grace. She administers the sacraments without which humanity cannot be reborn into a state of new life. Our writers all agreed that the ‘inward spirituall grace’ of baptism is necessary to take off ‘the guilt and punishment of sin’.<sup>108</sup> Without baptism men would be incapable of the obedience required of them under the new covenant. By their enrolment into this covenant through baptism they promise to perform the necessary condition to which they are thereby enabled. By making good use of the benefits vouchsafed him, man can qualify himself for the promise of eternal life by throwing off the dominion of sin.<sup>109</sup> This new life of participation in the spirit of Christ is both symbolized and reinforced in the eucharist. To participate in the eucharist is to share in the benefits of Christ’s sacrifice, since it supposes the inward renewal of the communicant made possible by grace. It is thus a

*mutuall confederation* betwixt us, and the crucified Saviour, on our parts an acknowledging of him for our God, and worshipping of him, and on his part the making over to us all the benefits of his *death, grace and pardon, to sanctifie, and to justifie* us.

In order to fulfil our part in this confederation, we must manifest a sincere repentance for the sins to which we are always inclined by nature, and especially those to which we deliberately consent. Such a repentance will not be possible unless we submit ourselves to that ‘engine of meer necessary charity’, the power of the keys. If we are to realise our good resolutions and really participate in that union with Christ which is celebrated in the eucharist, we must make use of the humiliations recommended to us in scripture and administered by the trustees of

---

<sup>108</sup> Hammond, *Large Additions to the Practicall Catechisme* (1646), p. 33.

<sup>109</sup> *Ib.*, pp. 33-7; Thorndike, *Epilogue*, i, pp. 55-7, 61-4, ii, pp. 7-11, 18-23; Allestree, *Whole Duty*, pp. 58f.; for Taylor’s views see below, ch. 6, pp. 261-2 & nn. 36-7.

the keys.<sup>110</sup> The holy life without which we cannot be saved cannot, except in the most unlikely hypothesis, be attained outside the context of the Church.

### *Rigorism*

The Anglicans thus contained the individualist tendency implicit in their ethically-oriented programme by insisting on the doctrine of original sin and the consequent necessity of baptism and of participation in the sacramental and para-sacramental life of the Church. Their understanding of the effects of sin and their remedy in turn determined the moral theological application of the new soteriology, since it predicated the priority of a voluntary conversion from love of the world to the love of God. This transformation of concupiscence into charity involves the whole man, for the effects of sin are ignorance in the mind, weakness in the will, and depravity in the affections.<sup>111</sup> If the condition of pardon is to be fulfilled by the choice and performance of the service of Christ, the will must be ordered by the love of God, for love seeks to please its object and to rest in it.<sup>112</sup> And if the will is to be rightly oriented, the whole man must be affected to God and not to sin. Our authors acknowledged that the infirmity of nature precludes a sinless obedience on earth; but they denied that any deliberate sin is consistent with a Godward orientation, and stated that the incidence of those involuntary sins natural to fallen man can be reduced by the education of his appetites. This discipline they described as the indispensable accompaniment, fruit and

---

<sup>110</sup> Hammond, *Of the Power of the Keyes*, sig. A2r.; cf. Thorndike, *Epilogue*, I, chs. 9&10; Allestree, *Whole Duty*, pp. 132f., 167f., 67-97; for Taylor see below, ch. 7.

<sup>111</sup> Allestree, *Whole Duty*, Preface, § 11.

<sup>112</sup> *Ib.*, p. 17.

proof of the ‘sincere’ faith which God, for Christ’s sake, accepts in place of actual human righteousness as the condition of the covenant of grace.<sup>113</sup>

This ‘sincerity’, a key term in the new soteriology since it circumvented the Catholic error of attributing actual righteousness to the justified sinner, thus had a specific doctrinal bearing in relation to the Anglican rejection of Calvinist thought. It was a symptom of their substitution, for a supposedly speculative faith, of an integrated, affective understanding of conversion. In this sense it underwrote their ethical presentation of Christianity, for sincerity, as a quality of the will, must be verified in action. As much as Eccl. xii 13 (‘fear God and keep his commandments; for this is the whole duty of man’), Jo. xiv 15, ‘if ye love me, ye will keep my commandments’, was the scriptural standard for this theological approach.<sup>114</sup> Hammond concluded from this text that ‘loving him and obeying him, love and [evangelical] workes, are taken for the same thing in Scripture’.<sup>115</sup> This reciprocity is essential to the nature of love, which is both rational and sensitive. Thus when Christ promises the vision of God to the pure in heart, he implies a corresponding outward discipline, the heart signifying ‘especially that practical part [of man], a principle of action’, the will.<sup>116</sup>

This conclusion rested on an Augustinian doctrine of love which we will recall from our discussion of Jansenist thought. ‘The special and essential property of Charity is the sincerity of it, as against a divided love, or having any competitor in our hearts’.<sup>117</sup> Like the Jansenists, the Anglicans often reminded readers that, in Paul’s words quoted by Augustine, one cannot be ‘both a member of Christ and a member of a harlot’. Love ‘cannot be

---

<sup>113</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 17, 27, 123-4, 126f., 261-2; Hammond, *Practical Catechisme*, pp. 46f.; *UN*, pp. 72-3; Bull, *Harmonia Apostolica*, pp. 208f.

<sup>114</sup> E.g. Hammond, *Practical Catechisme*, p. 75; Taylor, *Dekas Embolimaïos*, p. 41. Hence Hobbes’s criticisms of the episcopal divines, despite their preaching up obedience: if fear without material sanction was not as ‘coactive’ a motive as could be desired, it was certainly less unreliable than love.

<sup>115</sup> *Practical Catechisme*, p. 75.

<sup>116</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 140.

<sup>117</sup> *Ib.*, pp. 75-6; Allestree, *Whole Duty*, pp. 126f., 261-2; Thorndike, *Epilogue*, ii, pp. 38-9; for Taylor see ch. 7, below.

divided'.<sup>118</sup> Again, like Jansen, they pointed to the opening chapters of the first epistle of John, where the nature of saving love is put in terms of the same stark opposition: 'Whosoever abideth in him sinneth not: whosoever sinneth hath not seen him, neither known him'. In order to detach oneself from 'all that is in the world', all that is 'not of the Father, but of the world', John suggests we must mortify 'the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the vainglory of life'. If the appetites are fixed elsewhere than God, love is divided, and the will cannot be sincerely turned to God. Therefore Christ enjoins us (Lk. x 27) to love God with the affections, the will, the power of action, and the reason together.<sup>119</sup>

A sincere love thus supposes the integration of the appetites, both rational and sensitive, by man's proper end. Exponents of the 'holy living' soteriology all taught that no conscious sin or affection to sin is compatible with the love required of man under the Gospel. Our captivity in the flesh means we will always commit involuntary, unforeseen sins; but consciously to entertain any sin is to exclude oneself from the body of Christ.<sup>120</sup> 'Every act of love to a sin, is a perfect enemy to the love of God', for 'malicious thoughts' engender 'grosser acts', fixing the will on the goods of the world.<sup>121</sup>

The words of Romans vii, 'what I hate, that I do', if they intend a 'captivity' (v. 23) to sin, must therefore refer to a carnal man. The love of God implies the cultivation of the appetites, 'the actual appetition or fastening our affections on God'.<sup>122</sup> If the will is disordered through the commission of deliberate sin, or through any unchecked affection to sin, order must be restored by the discipline of repentance. 'Mortification is the one half of Christianity

---

<sup>118</sup> I Cor. vi 15; *De civ. Dei*, XXI 25; cited Taylor, *Dekas Embolimaios*, p. 44, see also pp. 4, 8-9, 21, 36, 38; Hammond, *Practical Catechisme*, p. 83. Mt. vi 24, 'no man can serve two masters', was also frequently pointed to.

<sup>119</sup> Hammond, *Practical Catechisme*, pp. 97, 76.

<sup>120</sup> See n. 113, above.

<sup>121</sup> See ch. 7, below, on Taylor; Allestree, *Whole Duty*, pp. 17-18, 201-2.

<sup>122</sup> Hammond, *Practical Catechisme*, pp. 76-7.

... a denying of the will and all its natural desires'.<sup>123</sup> This is the only way voluntary sin can consist with the regenerate estate, for it is the only way to preserve the loving condition of the will which sin disorders. Keenly aware that under sin ignorance and depravity will always incline the will to lower ends, the holy living theologians declared that this discipline of repentance must be 'daily' and lifelong: for to repent is to convert, to convert is to love sincerely, and to love sincerely is to purge all affection to the world. 'Carnality' – actual sin – and 'hypocrisie' – affection to sin – must be 'daily purged out'.<sup>124</sup> There is no such thing as deathbed repentance for a life of sin, because the love required of God's children supposes a habitual disposition of the moral faculties.<sup>125</sup>

The 'sincere' faith which the Anglicans postulated as the condition of salvation therefore comprehended a rigorous regime of moral hygiene. A fuller discussion of this ascetic *morale* is reserved to chapter seven, where we consider the thought of Taylor concerning its central moment in the eucharist, the ultimate expression of humanity's conformity with the divine. A few of its salient features may, however, be mentioned here. In the first place the foundation and principle of the pure love we owe God is humility. As the spirit of submission to God's will and wisdom, and as the acknowledgement 'that the best of our works are corrupt and impure', that our reason and strength are inadequate in themselves, it is the soul of a true and lifelong conversion to God.<sup>126</sup> The 'particular' parts of the life of repentance, which the Anglicans considered, insofar as they are conditions *sine qua non* of the sincere love of God, to be 'morally' or psychologically necessary, they generally enumerated under the tripartite scheme by which Catholics explained the sacrament of penance. First we must experience a heartfelt sorrow for sin. This contrition, the Anglicans

---

<sup>123</sup> Taylor, *Great Exemplar*, p. 198.

<sup>124</sup> Hammond, *Practical Catechisme*, p. 142; Allestree, *Whole Duty*, pp. 127f.; Bull, *Harmonia*, p. 215; see ch. 7 on Taylor.

<sup>125</sup> Ch. 7, below, p. 297; Allestree, *Whole Duty*, p. 128; Hammond, *Practical Catechisme*, pp. 73-4; see also e.g. Stillingfleet, *A Rational Account*, pp. 614-16.

<sup>126</sup> Allestree, *Whole Duty*, pp. 34f., at 36; Hammond, *Practical Catechisme*, pp. 62f. 107; Taylor, e.g. *Holy Living [and Dying]* (1883), ch. 2, § 4.

specified, must arise out of love for God, who hates sin, not out of fear of punishment. The Tridentine doctrine that mere attrition is supplied by the priestly absolution was ‘a most ridiculous conceite of soules’.<sup>127</sup> Secondly comes confession, not only to God, but also to a priest, since its end is not just the acknowledgement of guilt but the application of a cure.<sup>128</sup> Finally, then, come acts of satisfaction, the actual performance of our good ‘resolutions’, both to abandon sin and to take up the contrary virtues. These satisfactions, according to the Anglicans, ‘must be proportioned to the fault’.<sup>129</sup> Prayer, fasting and alms-giving, as recommended in the New Testament, were enjoined as the most efficacious means of inculcating a loving disposition.<sup>130</sup> In prayer we depend on God and nourish that humility which is the soul of all moral renewal; in fasting, and indeed in any ‘self-denial of the body’, we educate the sensitive appetites by mortifying the sinful desires of the flesh;<sup>131</sup> and in alms-giving we give expression to our love of God by loving his image in man, in so doing simultaneously proving the authenticity of our love, and fortifying it against the diversions incident to fallen nature. The Anglicans expected that such a regime of holy living should structure the daily life of every Christian.<sup>132</sup>

In the view of Allison the ‘sincere endeavour’ demanded by the architects of the holy living soteriology was at once too demanding for the un-regenerate, and too pallid for the regenerate.<sup>133</sup> The Anglicans, however, did not make this distinction. The love of which God requires a beginning in the un-regenerate and a growth and perfection in the regenerate is the

---

<sup>127</sup> Hammond, *Practical Catechisme*, pp. 83-9; Allestree, *Whole Duty*, pp. 75-80; Thorndike, *Epilogue*, ii, pp. 251-2; Bull, *Harmonia*, p. 204; Stillingfleet, *A discourse concerning...idolatry*, pp. 179-81; below, ch. 7, p. .

<sup>128</sup> Hammond, *Practical Catechisme*, p. 88; Allestree, *Whole Duty*, pp. 86-9; Taylor, ch. 7, below.

<sup>129</sup> Allestree, *Whole Duty*, p. 230.

<sup>130</sup> *Ib.*, partitions 5, 6, 16, 17; Hammond, *Practical Catechisme*, pp. 259f., 236-58, 288-305; Taylor, *Great Exemplar*, pt. 1, VIII & IX, pt. 2, XII, disc. 11-13.

<sup>131</sup> One category of self-mortification, the embracing of afflictions, was particularly dear to these theologians of a persecuted church. All agreed that the un-divided love required of every Christian means a renunciation of the world to the point, if necessary, of martyrdom.

<sup>132</sup> Cf. Spurr, *Restoration Church*, chs. 6-7; below, ch. 7, n. 152.

<sup>133</sup> *The Rise of Moralism*, esp. pp. 190f.

same love. The state of regeneration is identical with the state of repentance.<sup>134</sup> It is a turning from the world to God, a real transformation from sin to righteousness. Far from reducing the life of faith to a ledger of moral pluses and minuses, this definition of ‘sincere’ love, being governed by man’s relationship to God, expanded into eternity. The love required of man under the new covenant is not a finite love, but a love answerable to that from which God created mankind in his image, and afterwards sent a redeemer in the form of his only son. The effects of our love, explained Allestree, illustrate this conformity with the love of Christ which produces them. For they are the same: ‘purifying souls here, and imparting eternal felicity there’.<sup>135</sup> The voluntary conversion required by Christ, according to the Anglicans, answered the injunction to ‘be perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect’ (Mt. v 48). It is ‘becoming like to God’, by a ‘God-like life’ purifying the heart in preparation for the vision of which ‘onely the *pure* are capable’.<sup>136</sup>

We have already encountered this understanding of deification, where it is essentially equivalent to justification, in the thought of the Jansenists. It assumes that, with the grace of Christ, man can liberate himself from the weight of sin that prevents him attaining the supernatural end to which he was created. It is ironic that critics such as Allison should accuse the new soteriology of creating, by a complacent trust in man’s own ability to attain a modest standard of virtue, a separation between doctrine and ethics.<sup>137</sup> This is precisely what the Anglicans thought Calvinist soteriology achieved by resolving man’s duty into a speculative faith. If that was an injustice, it is not to be redressed by visiting the same injustice upon the Anglicans. Replacing the doctrine of forensic justification with their allusive doctrine of the love of God, they aimed to fuse ethics and doctrine together, by

---

<sup>134</sup> Hammond, *Practical Catechisme*, p. 82; *UN*, pp. 44-5; Thorndike, *Epilogue*, ii, pp. 40-43.

<sup>135</sup> Allestree, *Whole Duty*, p. 329.

<sup>136</sup> Hammond, *Practical Catechisme*, pp. 143-4; Taylor, *Dekas Embolimaios*, pp. 2, 7, 10; Allestree, *Whole Duty*, pp. 261-2.

<sup>137</sup> *The Rise of Moralism*, esp. pp. 206f.

means of the most powerful adhesive known to man, that divine charity which binds together the whole body of Christ's Church.

## *Chapter 6*

### *Two Case Studies*

We have now suggested some reasons for supposing that the anti-Calvinism of the mid-century Anglican theologians should not so readily be identified with the wholesale rejection of an ‘Augustinian’ scheme of salvation. Central to that scheme was a doctrine of original sin which denied man any freedom to do the good. The thought of Jeremy Taylor and Herbert Thorndike on these topics has been associated with positions antithetical to those occupied by Augustine. A closer examination, we will suggest, argues in both cases that a somewhat less polarised attitude towards the theological points at stake will result in a more sensitive understanding of the Anglican project.

#### *Jeremy Taylor on Augustine and Original Sin*

In his *Unum Necessarium* of 1655 Taylor included a chapter on original sin, considering its implications basic to the doctrine of repentance which formed the centrepiece of his theological work. He aimed to show that original sin is not equivalent to a personal sin in each individual. That would imply a sin for which no repentance can avail. To admit such a sin would be to remove the motive of remedial action. Followed to its logical extreme, the notion was a charter for antinomianism. It was incompatible with the reading of the Gospel developed by the holy living theologians: if men are hopelessly and helplessly damned, what is the point of a covenant in which Christ offers the chance of salvation upon condition of repentance?

Taylor's treatment of the doctrine drew complaints from his own episcopalian colleagues. Brian Duppa voiced misgivings about it while the work was in press, telling a friend that Taylor was steering close to Pelagianism and its modern equivalents, Socinianism and Anabaptism.<sup>1</sup> John Warner engaged Taylor in a scholastic correspondence, seeking to bring him to a sense of his incaution.<sup>2</sup> Hammond wrote to Gilbert Sheldon that Taylor's doctrine of original sin was 'disliked by every one', and Sheldon, fruitlessly, asked Taylor to recant.<sup>3</sup> Later Thorndike would point out where Taylor had gone astray.<sup>4</sup> Besides his correspondence with Warner, Taylor defended his ideas in a 'further explication' which subsequently became chapter seven of *Unum Necessarium*, and *Deus Justificatus*, a short disquisition in the form of a letter to the dowager Countess of Devonshire.<sup>5</sup>

The object of Taylor's criticism was the Augustinian doctrine of original sin as entrenched in extreme form by the sixteenth-century reformers. According to this interpretation, canonised at the Synod of Dort and by the Westminster divines, the doctrine rests on five tenets:

- 1) Adam had such an original righteousness in the state of innocence that the fall and its effects represented the worst possible disaster;
- 2) the punishment of Adam's sin is due to all his posterity, the guilt being imputed to them by cause of seminal identity with the original parents, and transmitted by natural generation;

---

<sup>1</sup> Bodl. MS Tanner 52, fol. 94r-v, cited in William Poole, *Milton and the Idea of the Fall* (Cambridge, 2005), p. 43.

<sup>2</sup> Printed in *Works*, ed. Heber & Eden, vii, pp. 541-70.

<sup>3</sup> Poole, *Milton and the Idea of the Fall*, pp. 43-4.

<sup>4</sup> Thorndike, *Epilogue*, ii, pp. 159-61.

<sup>5</sup> *Deus Justificatus, or a vindication of the glory of the divine attributes in the question of original sin; against the Presbyterian way of understanding it* (1656), printed in *Works*, vii. Taylor carried on his defence while a prisoner of the parliamentary forces at Chepstow, where he was taken on his way from London to Carmarthenshire in April of 1655: see F. L. Huntley, *Jeremy Taylor and the Great Rebellion. A Study of His Mind and Temper in Controversy* (Ann Arbor, 1970), pp. 61-2.

- 3) the effect of this sin is an utter disability of doing good, leaving man ‘wholly inclined to all evil’;
- 4) this natural corruption is both in itself and in ‘all the motions thereof ... truly and properly sin’, even though it is pardoned through Christ in the regenerate;
- 5) it therefore renders the sinner personally guilty, and subject to eternal punishment.<sup>6</sup>

That the ninth of the Church of England’s Articles of Religion represented a terse composition of these points indicates the difficulties Taylor faced in handling them critically. In doing so he made bold statements which emphasised the distance he put between his own doctrine and that of Augustine and Augustine’s Protestant epigones. But Taylor scorned convention.

I will not be tied to him [i.e., Augustine] that speaks contrary things to himself, and contrary to them that went before him; and though he was a rare person, yet he was as fallible as any of my brethren at this day. He was followed by many ignorant ages, and all the world knows by what accidental advantages he acquired a great reputation: but he who made no scruple of deserting all his predecessors, must give me leave upon the strength of his own reasons to quit his authority.<sup>7</sup>

This frank approach, feared Taylor’s colleagues, would simply corroborate Calvinist polemics against the Arminian theology of holy living, which associated it, as a latter-day Pelagianism, with Catholic works-righteousness, or, what was worse, the rational theology of the Socinian heresiarchs.<sup>8</sup> To undermine original sin, moreover, was to undermine baptism and thus the institutional structure of the Anglican argument. Doubtless Sarah Mortimer is

---

<sup>6</sup> *Deus Justificatus*, p. 502. These points are enumerated in the sixth chapter of the Westminster Assembly’s *Confession of Faith*, pp. 11-12.

<sup>7</sup> *Correspondence with Warner*, *Works*, vii, p. 567; cf. Grotius, *Annales et Historiae* (Amsterdam, 1658), pp. 551-2.

<sup>8</sup> See e.g. the splenetic correspondence with which the Presbyterian minister Henry Jeanes plagued Taylor, printed in *Works*, vii, pp. 572f.

right, therefore, to attribute Hammond's unease to such considerations. But did the charge of Socinianism laid on Taylor by a fearful colleague therefore indicate the substantial existence of this form of heresy in the thought of the future bishop of Down and Connor?<sup>9</sup>

Such a conclusion cannot be documented from Taylor's own teaching. He was independent-minded, certainly; but in this he exemplified that more comprehensive approach to Augustine's thought among mid-seventeenth century Anglicans which their one-sided rejection of his determinism can sometimes obscure. Taylor did not reject Augustine, but an Augustine whose anti-Pelagian themes had been made the ruling principle of all his thought.

They may as well press me with his authority in the article of the damnation of infants dying unbaptized, or of absolute predestination: in which article S. Austin's words are equally urged by the Jansenists and Molinists, by the remonstrants and contra-remonstrants; and they can serve both, and therefore cannot determine me ... And yet if those who object S. Austin's authority to my doctrine, will be content to be subject to all that he says, I am content they should follow him in this too; provided that they will give me my liberty ...<sup>10</sup>

Mortimer rightly places Taylor's doctrine in the context of his theology of holy living, which focused on the concept of repentance as simultaneously the offer extended and the condition demanded by Christ in the new covenant. He was therefore more interested in the life of Christ, 'the great exemplar', as a template for obedience, than in the death of Christ as a substitutionary atonement – for it was precisely the exaggerated Calvinist idea of Christ's vicarious satisfaction which, on the argument Taylor shared with the other Anglican 'moralists', destroyed the Gospel by destroying morality. If in *The Great Exemplar* he dwelt

---

<sup>9</sup> Mortimer, *Reason and Religion*, pp. 141-2; our arguments against this conclusion will comprehend *a fortiori* those of Poole, *Milton and the Idea of the Fall*, ch. 3, who takes the polemic of the radical Robert Everard at face value.

<sup>10</sup> *Correspondence with Warner, Works*, vii, pp. 566-7.

rather on the ‘hatred of sin’ demonstrated in God by so incredible an act as the sacrifice of his only son, than on ‘notions of expiation or atonement’, it was because he was more concerned to inculcate the idea of sin as a present reality which Christ calls us to leave, than of Christ’s sacrifice as an historical event by which our present sin is acquitted.<sup>11</sup> Whether this means Taylor was more interested in the ‘educational’ than the ‘sacrificial’ work of Christ is a question which must be reserved to another place: it is my view that for Taylor the one contains the other, as we shall find when we examine his thought on the eucharist, which he described as a sacrificial rite and as the ‘extension of the incarnation’.<sup>12</sup> It is a greater leap, however, to suggest as Mortimer does, not only that Taylor ‘viewed Christ as primarily a moral teacher’, but that he therefore did not believe ‘that Christ had needed to save or redeem men from any natural sin or guilt which they inherited from Adam’.<sup>13</sup> In fact for Mortimer Taylor ‘rejected’ original sin, teaching that ‘human beings started off with a clean slate’, and ‘were not born fallen and in need of redemption through Christ’. We may agree that such a view would ‘relegate the Church to the position of a useful but unnecessary adjunct to the Christian life’; as with the assumption that, if it was Taylor’s, it is something remarkable.<sup>14</sup>

\*

Taylor argued towards the following position:

---

<sup>11</sup> Mortimer, *Reason and Religion*, p. 140; Taylor commenced *The Great Exemplar* (pp. 38f.), by clarifying that, while the imitation of Christ would be impossible without the grace won by his atoning sacrifice, neither is its necessity thereby obviated; and see pp. 706f.

<sup>12</sup> Ch. 7, below.

<sup>13</sup> Mortimer, *Reason and Religion*, p. 140n., cites from Taylor’s *Deus Justificatus* (1656), pp. 78-9, ‘a paragraph summary of the work of Christ which in no sense implied that his death atoned for human sin’. There we find that although Taylor did deny that the defects bequeathed by Adam’s sin are ‘direct sins to us’, he held nevertheless that ‘they are proper and inherent miseries and principles of sin to us’, from which nothing ‘derived to us from Adam by our natural generation’ could deliver us. ‘But from this state Christ came to redeem us all by His grace and by His spirit, by His life and by His death, by His doctrine and by His sacraments, by His promise and by His revelation, by His resurrection and by His ascension, by His interceding for us and judging of us’. ‘He came to give us a supernatural birth’. ‘He came to bring us grace, life, and spirit’. The passage is in *Works*, vii, pp. 516-17.

<sup>14</sup> Mortimer, *Reason and Religion*, pp. 141-2.

If after the fall of Adam it be not by God permitted to us to choose or refuse, there is nothing left whereby man can serve God, or offer Him a sacrifice. It is no service, it is not rewardable, if it could not be avoided, nor the omission punishable if it could not be done.<sup>15</sup>

His main thrust was then against the Augustinian view of the fall, maintained by the Calvinists and the Jansenists, as being from a ‘natural’ state of original righteousness in which the reason and will were free to know the good and do it, to a ‘sub-natural’ state in which the debility of the natural faculties precludes this freedom.<sup>16</sup> His first quarrel was thus with the first tenet of the Westminster divines, concerning man’s un-fallen state. If the knowledge and strength of Adam were not so ‘rare’ as this view states, the scale of the punishment it posits would not be plausible.<sup>17</sup> So Taylor argued that the natural constitution of humanity was not altered by the fall. Un-fallen man was naturally subject to mortality, and evidently even to some infirmity or inclination to sin, since he was unable to subordinate his appetite to a contrary injunction.<sup>18</sup> Both these arguments were made by the Pelagians. The first, which seems to contradict Paul’s statement in Romans v 12 that death entered into the world by the sin of Adam, was condemned at the council of Carthage in 417.<sup>19</sup> The hypothesis of original ‘concupiscence’ formed a part of Julian of Eclanum’s criticisms of Augustine’s pessimistic account of the fall; Augustine, in turn, was outraged by this ‘paradisus Pelagianorum’, which in denying evil to be evil denies the necessity of a cure. It authors sin on God and implies that the grace of Christ is given to mortify what God

---

<sup>15</sup> *Unum Necessarium*, in *Works*, vii, p. 282.

<sup>16</sup> As we argued in ch. 4 the Jansenists did not go so far as the total depravity of Luther and Calvin, maintaining with Augustine the essential nobility of man in the remaining ‘spark’ of the divine likeness, the premise of their ascetical moral theory. For Augustine on the essential goodness of nature see e.g. *de natura et gratia*, c. 3 (*PL*, vol. 44, col. 249); *contra secundam Juliani responsionem imperfectum opus*, III.190 (*PL*, vol. 45, col. 1330); cf. J. N. D. Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines* (5<sup>th</sup> ed., 1977), p. 364; useful on Luther and Calvin is Peter Harrison, *The Fall of Man and the Foundations of Science* (Cambridge, 2007), pp. 54-66.

<sup>17</sup> *Unum Necessarium*, pp. 254-5.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 251-2.

<sup>19</sup> Henry Bettenson (ed.), *Documents of the Christian Church* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., 1963), pp. 83-4.

created.<sup>20</sup> Taylor, however, had not intended to deny the force of Paul's words, affirming that Adam's sin was punished with a certainty of dying, making his natural mortality 'actual and penal'.<sup>21</sup> Like Augustine in *de Genesi ad litteram*, he attributed the 'grace of immortality' to the tree of life.<sup>22</sup> In general Taylor maintained the Augustinian tension between nature and grace by transposing it, like Aquinas, into the terms of a distinction between natural and supernatural.<sup>23</sup> In the state of innocence man was the recipient of certain 'supernatural gifts' without which the supernatural end to which he was ordained would not have been obtainable.<sup>24</sup> As Thorndike charitably suggested, the direction of Taylor's argument on the un-fallen state had led him into an ambiguity of language. To say that the difference between the disorder which fallen man experiences in his appetites and the infirmity which caused Adam to sin is only one of degree, is to say that God both gave man a certain end, and created him with a disability that would prevent him from attaining it. If, instead of trying to equate concupiscence after the fall with Adam's nature before it, Taylor had simply affirmed that the sensual appetites are a part of created nature, whereas concupiscence is the disorder contracted in them by sin, he might have avoided his difficulties. As it is, the confusion of concupiscence with the sensual appetites introduces confusion into the definition of the effects of the fall.<sup>25</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup> See *con. Jul. imp. op.*, III.154 (*PL*, vol. 45, col. 1310); cf. Thorndike, *Epilogue*, ii, p. 156; Peter Brown, *Augustine of Hippo. A Biography* (Berkeley, 1967), pp. 387-91. Augustine however did consider a 'defect' in man's nature, intending by this a falling away of the will to its own ends, necessary to explain the commission of the first sin – *de civ. Dei*, XIV.11.

<sup>21</sup> *Unum Necessarium*, pp. 250-51.

<sup>22</sup> *Ib.*, p. 250; *de Gen. ad litt.*, VI 25.36 (*PL*, vol. 34, col. 354). Curiously, Aquinas considered this impossible, since the tree, being a material thing, must itself have a finite existence: *ST*, Ia, q. 97, a. 4.

<sup>23</sup> Cf. Williams, *The Ideas of The Fall and of Original Sin*, pp. 400-401.

<sup>24</sup> *Unum Necessarium*, pp. 309f., 244, 275-6, 286, 290; for Aquinas *ST*, Ia, q. 95. Again, one may say that this is compatible with Augustine's assertion, in *de civ. Dei*, XIII.1, that the immortality of un-fallen man was conditional on his 'perfect obedience'.

<sup>25</sup> Thorndike, *Epilogue*, ii, pp. 155-60: 'If this Doctor had said, or could have said; That concupiscence, being a naturall consequence of man's composition, was prevented of coming to act and effect, by eating the fruit of the tree of life, ordained to that purpose; That the leaves thereof were, in this regard, *healing to the nations*; And that the grace of Christ was dispensed by that meanes, in that estate, as now by the Sacrament of the Eucharist; I might say, this were a novelty among divines, but I could not say that it were destructive to the Faith'.

On the substantial effects of the fall, however, Taylor's position is virtually that of Aquinas.<sup>26</sup> He sees the effect of Adam's sin as, formally, privative. It was a fall from a state of supernatural endowment, which he is content, for the sake of argument, to call 'original righteousness', to one of 'pure naturals', 'pura naturalia' as Aquinas says. This state is one of mortality and infirmity, implicit in Adam's constitution, but after his sin 'actual and penal'.<sup>27</sup> The removal of the supernatural graces which had hindered these defects was a punishment for Adam's sin, and since the defects are transmitted by heredity, it is a punishment in which his posterity shares. Taylor differentiates himself from the Westminster divines (points 2 and 5 above) by denying the 'reatus' of forensic 'original guilt' based on this identity with Adam, which was strongly asserted by Augustine and stated in a modified form by Aquinas.<sup>28</sup> He identifies a disjunction between Augustine's acknowledgement that 'there can be no sin that is not voluntary' and his theory of identity with Adam.<sup>29</sup> It is contradictory to include each individual free will in Adam's free will. Therefore Adam's sin cannot derive a proper, inherent guilt to his descendants, requiring punishment, because it is not properly their sin.<sup>30</sup> On the *vitium* ('vitiosity'), or psychological reality of original sin, however, Taylor is as strong as he is weak on the *reatus*.<sup>31</sup> 'We can do nothing without the miracle of grace. Our spirit is hindered by the body, and cannot rise up whither it properly tends, with those great weights upon it'.<sup>32</sup> The imperfection potential in Adam by reason of his sensual appetites became by his sin an actual 'corruption'. His descendants did not personally contract this debt by a voluntary act, but they inherit it as his heirs. Therefore Taylor (against point 4 of the Westminster tenets) follows Aquinas in modifying the Augustinian view of concupiscence as

---

<sup>26</sup> In *ST*, Ia, qq. 94, 95.

<sup>27</sup> *UN*, pp. 263, 255-6, 251.

<sup>28</sup> Augustine, *de peccatorum meritis et remissione*, II. 22.36 (*PL*, vol. 44, col. 173): 'sic est autem hoc peccatum, ut sit poena peccati'; Aquinas, *ST*, IaIIae, q. 81. *Reatus*: state or condition of being an accused person.

<sup>29</sup> *De vera religione*, 14.27, quoted above, ch. 4, n. 79; cf. Aquinas, *ST*, IaIIae, q. 71, a. 6: 'peccatum nihil aliud est quam actus humanus malus', and 'quod ... aliquis actus sit humanus, habet ex hoc quod est voluntarius'.

<sup>30</sup> *UN*, pp. 258-9.

<sup>31</sup> *Ib.*, p. 248; see also pp. 284f., 244, 275-6, 290. Taylor (p. 289) cites Augustine for the distinction of 'vitium' from 'reatus' or 'actus'.

<sup>32</sup> *UN*, pp. 286-7.

intrinsically evil and deserving of punishment.<sup>33</sup> Concupiscence consists in a natural inclination which can only be said to have moral value insofar as it is restrained or consented to in accordance with or in contradiction of some precept. It is a ‘stain and reproach’ to nature, a ‘curse’ and an ‘evil’ in which we naturally share, but is only an actual personal sin when consented to.<sup>34</sup> As Taylor points out, Augustine shares this understanding of concupiscence, calling it sin only ‘because it is made worse by sin, and makes us guilty of sin when consented to’.<sup>35</sup>

Like Augustine, Taylor therefore regards concupiscence as a positive impairment. This positive debility is proved by the necessity of infant baptism.<sup>36</sup> The great consequence of original sin is the necessity of redemption, that is of ‘supernatural promises and assistances to obtain heaven’; it is therefore ‘the great ἀθροεντία’ [authority] of infant baptism, since children must be admitted to these felicities,

not only to improve their present good, as the Pelagians affirmed, but to take off that evil state of things whither by occasion of the fall of Adam they were devolved, and to give them ... the seeds of a new nature, so to become heirs of the promises, who in their mere naturals did inherit from Adam nothing but misery and imperfection and death.<sup>37</sup>

---

<sup>33</sup> *Ib.*, pp. 309f., citing Aquinas in support p. 329. See *ST*, IaIIae, q. 81, a.3-5, q. 82.

<sup>34</sup> *UN*, pp. 269, 289, 309, 312-13, 339; cf. *ST*, IaIIae, q. 75, a. 1-2. ‘Non omnes motus interiores sunt de substantia peccati, quod consistit principaliter in actu voluntatis ...’; also *ib.*, q. 81, a. 1-2.

<sup>35</sup> *UN*, p. 289; Taylor cites Augustine, *de nuptiis et concupiscentia*, I.23 (*PL*, vol. 44, col. 428): ‘modo quodam loquendi peccatum vocatur, quod et peccato facta est, et peccatum, si vicerit, facit’; and *contra Julianum*, II 10 (*PL*, vol. 44, col. 696): ‘quantum [enim] ad nos attinet, sine peccato semper essemus, donec sanaretur hoc malum, si ei nunquam consentiremus ad malum’ (cited again by Taylor, p. 311).

<sup>36</sup> Infant baptism is for Augustine a clinching proof against the Pelagian arguments, see e.g. *contra Julianum*, VI 3 (*PL*, vol. 44, cols. 824-5); *con. Jul. imp. op.*, I.53 (*PL*, vol. 45, cols. 1075-6). Origen too connected the corruption inherited from Adam with the practice of infant baptism. Kelly points out that this is not necessarily inconsistent with his notion of a pre-cosmic fall (*Early Christian Doctrines*, p. 181), but it may be worth noting that Taylor, whose circle was specially interested in Origen – his friend George Rust is generally taken to be the author of the *Letter Defending Origen*, and John Evelyn, to whom Taylor, on the death of his son, spoke of the child’s ‘rejoic[ing] in his little orb’, once wrote a curious ‘Lamentation of Origen After His Fall’ (Taylor, *Works*, i, p. liii; Evelyn’s piece is BL Add. MS 78365) – never entertained, like Rust and Henry More, the pre-existence of souls.

<sup>37</sup> *UN*, p. 259, cf. pp. 244, 275-6, 286, 290. Incidentally Taylor’s views had not changed since 1647, when on the grounds that ‘Adam left us an imperfect nature that tends to sin and death’ he affirmed that ‘besides the

Taylor thus affirms the Thomist understanding of concupiscence as ‘fomes peccati’ (tinder of sin), ‘the effect of one sin and the cause of many’.<sup>38</sup> Although it is an infirmity only, not an act but a disordered inclination, it is ‘after a certain manner called sin, it “hath the nature of sin”’ as the Church of England article says, and the primitive Church called it sin ‘by metonymy’.<sup>39</sup> Man’s slate is cleansed of the guilt of original sin if he is baptized; but he still labours under ‘the weight of it in loads of temporal infelicities and proclivities to sin’.<sup>40</sup>

The mode of transmission of ‘original sin’ so defined is natural descent, because the inheritance consists in ‘pure naturals’ only.<sup>41</sup> Taylor seeks to soften the Augustinian tradition whereby we are identified with Adam as having properly sinned ‘in’ him. He speaks of Adam as a ‘bad example’, suggesting that we ‘write after Adam’s copy’. He claims that, since for a long period under the law men wanted the eternal promises which could motivate them to subordinate the inferior faculties, customs of sinning were progressively superinduced on nature.<sup>42</sup> But Taylor definitely considers a *vitium* to have been transmitted by natural heredity. His discussion of custom and the self-propagating nature of sin is premised upon the antecedent circumstance of this ‘curse’ of infirmity, and in this form can be found in Aquinas.<sup>43</sup>

---

natural birth of infants, there must be something added’, that is a ‘supernatural birth’ which is done ordinarily in baptism, ‘the font or laver of regeneration’: *A Discourse of the Liberty of Prophesying*, in *Works*, v, p. 567; cf. too *The Great Exemplar*, pt. 1, sec. ix, disc. vi, ii; *Deus Justificatus*, p. 523, where Taylor affirms the necessity of baptism ‘in opposition to the Pelagian heresy ... because nature is insufficient and baptism is the great channel of grace’. The ‘laver of regeneration’, from Titus iii 5 (διὰ λουτροῦ παλιγγενεσίας), was the phrase used in the canons pronounced against Pelagianism at Carthage in 417, see Bettenson, *Documents of the Christian Church*, p. 83.

<sup>38</sup> *UN*, pp. 249, 327; cf. Augustine, *de nupt. et conc.*, in n. 35, above; *ST*, IaIIae, q. 75, a. 1-2, q. 81, a. 3, q. 82; Williams, *The Ideas of the Fall*, pp. 400f.

<sup>39</sup> *UN*, p. 289.

<sup>40</sup> Taylor, *Holy Dying*, p. 495. It is a little curious that Taylor’s doctrine of original sin occasioned no such protest in 1650 as it did in 1655, since *Holy Dying* contains the same arguments, although they are scattered through the work (esp. pp. 349-52).

<sup>41</sup> Cf. Aquinas, *ST*, IaIIae, q. 83.

<sup>42</sup> *UN*, pp. 288-9; but Taylor cites Tertullian, *de patientia* 5, where Tertullian discusses the history of evil (*PL*, vol. 1, cols. 1256A-1259B).

<sup>43</sup> *ST*, IaIIae, qq. 84-85; the emphasis on Adam’s bad example is also predominant in Origen’s exposition of Rom. xii-xix, see Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines*, pp. 181-2.

Viewing original sin as, formally, a privation of supernatural endowments, and materially as concupiscence exacerbated by consent, Taylor sees the state of fallen nature, like Aquinas, as un-corrupted in its ‘naturals’.<sup>44</sup> The ‘reasonable soul’ remains, ‘fitted to the actions of life and reason, but not to anything supernatural’. We do not deserve damnation simply by being born, nor are our natural faculties totally depraved, as the Protestant Augustinian tradition affirmed.<sup>45</sup> The idea that we have a necessity of sinning is a false interpretation of human iniquity based on a failure to distinguish between custom and necessity. We can bring a ‘necessity’ of sinning on ourselves by custom, which becomes a ‘chain’ as Augustine himself observed, but it is not a law of nature, and this is how, granted that the words are those of a regenerate man (which Taylor does not), Paul is to be interpreted in Romans vii.<sup>46</sup> Adam’s sin leaves man in a state of imperfection and insufficiency, but not of ‘enmity and direct opposition to God. In this state he cannot get to heaven; but neither will that alone bear him to hell’.<sup>47</sup> Taylor is perhaps furthest from contemporary Reformed orthodoxy in his insistence that fallen man is not deprived of freedom. He is free to choose good or evil, and there could be neither transgression against nor service of God without this voluntary choice. Taylor calls the will the ‘noblest faculty’ of the soul, syllogising that, since a will which cannot choose is dead, those who posit the bondage of the will contradict the immortality of the soul.<sup>48</sup> This, however, only makes it even more crucial that ‘we should understand the state of our own infirmity’, which Taylor represents in the strongest possible

---

<sup>44</sup> For this formal/material distinction see Aquinas, *Quaestiones disputatae de malo*, q. 4, a. 2.

<sup>45</sup> *UN*, p. 307, & pp. 243, 262; cf. *ST*, Ia, qq. 94-95; IaIIae, q. 85, a. 2.

<sup>46</sup> *UN*, p. 268; Augustine, *Confessions*, VIII 5.10.

<sup>47</sup> *UN*, p. 269. Taylor avoids the implied necessity of postulating a limbo by stating that God does not leave men in this state, either prompting them to be spiritual, or leaving them to be carnal by choice. A third state for those dying in original but not actual sin (i.e., un-baptized infants) is undoubtedly envisaged, however, and although Taylor does not commit to such a theory, the goodness of God suggests this state will be more pleasant than not, a position he considers Augustine unjustly to have slandered as ‘Pelagian’: *ib.*, pp. 317-18, 327-8. On the ‘limbus puerorum’ in Aquinas cf. Williams, *The Ideas of the Fall*, pp. 405-8.

<sup>48</sup> *UN*, pp. 279f., 313f., quote at 280.

terms, ending with piteous prayers emphasising man's state of utter wretchedness and dependence on God.<sup>49</sup>

This insistence on personal responsibility was, as we have seen, the central characteristic of English Arminianism. In this instance it has been traced directly to the influence of Episcopius, and through him to Socinus.<sup>50</sup> That Taylor drew on Remonstrant sources is more than likely, since he revered Episcopius and cited 'the incomparable Grotius' in support of his argument. However it may be that here the attribution is otiose. Taylor also names as his authorities 'the great Erasmus', Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples, Zwingli,<sup>51</sup> and the 'Ethiopic testament' which his Oxford contemporary and friend, the orientalist Dudley Loftus, contributed to Walton's polyglot, as well as Chrysostom, Theodoret, and various ante-Nicene fathers.<sup>52</sup> The identification of Episcopius as Taylor's source rests on his interpretation of Romans v 12, *in quo omnes peccaverunt*, to mean [death passed unto all men] 'inasmuch as all men have sinned', rather than 'in whom all men have sinned'. Both men grounded this exegesis on the Greek text, but Taylor does not give the Latin *quatenus omnes peccaverunt* as Mortimer implies.<sup>53</sup> Erasmus's paraphrase on the New Testament, which Taylor presumably meant to indicate by his reference, contained a commentary on the text 'Wherefore, as by one man syn entred in the worlde, and death by the meanes of syn: even so death also went ouer al men, insomuche as all men synned'.<sup>54</sup> This was the option chosen by the translators of the

---

<sup>49</sup> *Ib.*, pp. 284f.

<sup>50</sup> Mortimer, *Reason and Religion*, pp. 142-3.

<sup>51</sup> Presumably in regard to Zwingli's merciful opinion concerning the fate of un-baptized infants, in *de providentia dei*, 182.15-183.6.

<sup>52</sup> *UN*, pp. 330f.; cf. pp. 304f. For Taylor and Loftus, a colleague in the hierarchy of the restoration Church of Ireland during the 1660s, see F. R. Bolton, *The Caroline Tradition of the Church of Ireland* (1958), pp. 27-42. The Latin translation of the Ethiopic version runs, from verse 12: 'Et propterea, quemadmodum per iniquitatem unius hominis peccatum in mundum introit, et per illud peccatum advenit mors super omnes homines, eo quod omnibus hominibus imputatur illud peccatum, etiam non cognoscentibus quid illud peccatum sit', Brian Walton (ed.), *Novum D. N. Jesu Christi Testamentum juxta editionem Bibliorum polyglot[tam]* (1698), p. 649. Presumably this signified to Taylor that the legal impurity or 'debt' is imputed to Adam's posterity, rather than the sin taken to have been actually committed by them.

<sup>53</sup> *Reason and Religion*, p. 142 – Taylor, *UN*, p. 244, gives in English 'inasmuch as all men have sinned'.

<sup>54</sup> *The second tome or volume of the Paraphrase of Erasmus upon the newe testament (cum privilegio, 1549)*, fol. vii r.

Authorised Version, who gave ‘for that all men have sinned’. Hammond, two years before Taylor published, had paraphrased the verse (reading ‘for that’) as showing that mortality was a consequence of the first sin, a defect naturally transmitted by Adam, ‘that was now a sinner, and had begotten no childe in his innocence’, to his posterity.<sup>55</sup> In any case Taylor, who normally referred to the Greek in support of his own readings, had perfectly good authority to interpret ἐφ’ ᾧ πάντες ἠμαρτον, for which the Vulgate gives *in quo omnes peccaverunt*, as implying a condition.<sup>56</sup> So the Greek fathers understood it.<sup>57</sup> Theodoret, who Taylor mentions, wrote that ‘it is not because of the sin of the first parent but because of their own that each person is liable to ... death’.<sup>58</sup>

To emphasise the condition of sin under which death entered the world is to accentuate Christ’s victory over sin and death.<sup>59</sup> Erasmus’s exposition of the passage focused on the comparison which Paul erects between the first and second Adam in order to emphasise the glory of Christ’s redemptive work: like Erasmus Taylor stressed the inequality of the comparison.<sup>60</sup> The sin of Adam cannot be of equal weight with the redemption effected by Christ, yet in Taylor’s eyes his opponents, by stressing the perdition of the mass and the awfulness of concupiscence as a positive penalty even in the regenerate, made Adam’s sin far

---

<sup>55</sup> Henry Hammond, *A Paraphrase and Annotations upon all the books of the New Testament briefly explaining all the difficult places thereof* (1659 ed., originally 1653), p. 461.

<sup>56</sup> See Taylor’s philological arguments at *UN*, p. 245; and cf. Williams, *The Ideas of the Fall*, pp. 308f.

<sup>57</sup> David Weaver, ‘The Exegesis of Romans 5:12 Among the Greek Fathers and its Implications for the Doctrine of Original Sin: The 5<sup>th</sup> to 12<sup>th</sup> Centuries’, *St. Vladimir’s Theological Quarterly*, 29 (1985). Cf. S. Lyonnet, ‘Le sens de ἐφ’ ᾧ en Rom v.12 et l’exégèse des pères grecs’, *Biblica*, 36 (1955), pp. 436-57; *id.*, ‘Le péché originel en Rom v. 12-14’, *Revue des Sciences Religieuses*, 44 (1956), pp. 63-85; *id.*, ‘Le péché originel en Rom v.12. L’exégèse des pères grecs et les décrets du Concile de Trente’, *Biblica*, 41 (1960), pp. 325-55.

<sup>58</sup> Robert C. Hill, ‘Theodoret wrestling with Romans’, in M. F. Wiles and E. J. Yarnold (eds.), *Studia Patristica*, 34 (Louvain, 2001), p. 352 & n.; a modern reading which agrees with Taylor in seeing both possible antecedents of the relative pronoun, ‘death’ or ‘one man’, as less plausible than the translation ‘because’, or *ea conditione*, ‘by that cause’, as Taylor construes it, is C. E. B. Cranfield, *Romans. A Shorter Commentary* (Guildford, 1985), p. 113.

<sup>59</sup> Cf. Hill, ‘Theodoret wrestling with Romans’, p. 352.

<sup>60</sup> Erasmus, *The second tome or volume of the Paraphrase*, fol. vii r-v.

more powerful than Christ's redemptive work; whereas this is the opposite of Paul's intention in the comparison.<sup>61</sup>

Attempting to construct a religion for an un-churched demographic, Taylor set a premium on holy living. It is no surprise if he therefore made common cause with other enemies to the Calvinist idea of the fall, for as he saw it 'the tenet is chargeable with libertinism; it is a licentious doctrine, and opens a gap to the greatest profaneness; for it takes away all conscience of sin, all repentance of it for time past'. 'How will man do good, if he can excuse all sin upon his nature?'<sup>62</sup> But it is hard to see how Socinus should be considered the principal source for Taylor's thought in this area.<sup>63</sup> The one thing Taylor did not intend by his arguments was an apology for nature. On the contrary, they underwrote a doctrine of repentance premised on a highly pronounced view of human infirmity. Indeed, he argued that the notion of total depravity, by removing the responsibility to ameliorate it, underlined this infirmity less effectively. If he could not accept an original sin which automatically entails the guilt of actual sin and whose penal ramifications therefore extend beyond baptism, still less could he countenance one which failed to account for the weight of concupiscence and therefore neglected the channels of grace through which man could hope to overcome it. It is the very infirmity of nature, says Taylor, which explains why his contemporaries, leaping on a dubious raft of arguments despite the polemical distortions which plainly affect them, are so eager to exalt the authority of Augustine. 'Truth is, we intend by laying load upon [Adam] to excuse ourselves, and, which is worse, to entertain our sins infallibly, and never to part with them upon pretence that they are natural, and irresistible'.<sup>64</sup> Taylor refused to truckle under the authority of Augustine, confuter of the Pelagians, because in that necessary task 'he took

---

<sup>61</sup> See Romans v 14-15.

<sup>62</sup> *Certain Letters of Henry Jeanes and Dr Jeremy Taylor*, p. 585; *Deus Justificatus*, p. 521.

<sup>63</sup> Indeed for Taylor the Socinians descend from Pelagius, the Albigensians and the Anabaptists in a genealogy of heretics who deny original sin, *UN*, p. 328.

<sup>64</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 282, cf. pp. 292-5.

in too much, and confuted more than he should', and his arguments were distorted.<sup>65</sup> But, we may say, this was only the more keenly to accentuate the insights of Augustine, the psychologist of conversion, and Augustine the theologian of love. He wanted to magnify the present reality of concupiscence in order to underline the real meaning of conversion from sin to charity, the true 'unum necessarium'.<sup>66</sup> His object was not a bare moralism, but a profound asceticism: thus in the place of the determinist Augustine he put that 'good and holy man', Cassian. He 'became the great rule of Monastines', wrote Taylor self-consciously, 'yet because he spake reason in his exhortations to piety, and justified God, and blamed man, he is called Pelagian'.<sup>67</sup>

#### *Herbert Thorndike on Jansen and Liberty*

Thorndike was not the least original among a creative generation of Anglican theologians, who responded to the ruin of their Church as to a God-given opportunity for self-improvement. Where Taylor saw a potent spur to the inward renewal of her individual members, Thorndike sensed an opportunity to right her reformation: to correct those flaws, engendered in the course of her thralldom to Calvinism, which it would have been unseasonable to expose so long as a practical unity bound her members together. Now, as he wrote in his *Epilogue to the Tragedy of the Church of England of 1659*,

---

<sup>65</sup> *Ib.*, pp. 327-8.

<sup>66</sup> Cf. ch. 7, below.

<sup>67</sup> *UN*, p. 328.

when the Unity that is lost may as well be obtained by the primitive Truth and Order of the Catholick Church, as by that which served the turn in the Church of *England* ... I should offend good Christians, to think that they will stand offended at it.<sup>68</sup>

Thorndike's bland assumption that 'the tragedy of the Church of England' meant a blank slate upon which to draw up better plans must have discomfited those who had spent more than a decade denying claims that the Church had disappeared.<sup>69</sup> It is perhaps this broad scope and design, together with a sometimes excessive subtlety, that explains his relative neglect by modern scholars, although his *Epilogue* is a more systematic work than most produced by Anglicans of the period.<sup>70</sup> The content and framework of his inquiry was determined by a concern for the unity of Western Christendom which meant he deliberately sought to transcend the limits of English Protestant debate.

Thorndike's concern with consensus, taking the form of a pronounced interest in the content of tradition, excited the admiration of the Tractarians.<sup>71</sup> In fact it demonstrates, as Miller has shown, the continuity of his methodological principles with those of the so-called rational theologians of Great Tew, and behind them with Hooker. Common consent, verifiable by scholarly means, can provide a rational basis for belief and practice, while avoiding the circularity of arguments for authority that rely on an infallible and self-authenticating guide, whether scripture or the Church.<sup>72</sup> Thorndike's self-conscious ecumenism was also tactically advantageous. By framing his discussion of controversial topics within the context of Western theology as a whole, Thorndike could throw his own

---

<sup>68</sup> *Epilogue*, Preface.

<sup>69</sup> E.g. Edward Hyde: A. W. Haddan, 'Life of Herbert Thorndike', in Thorndike, *Theological Works*, ed. Haddan, 7 vols. in 6 (1844-56), vi, pp. 219-20.

<sup>70</sup> But see importantly Ernest Charles Miller, 'The Doctrine of the Church in the Thought of Herbert Thorndike (1598-1672)' (Unpublished Oxford D.Phil., 1990); also T. A. Lacey, *Herbert Thorndike, 1598-1672* (1929).

<sup>71</sup> *ODNB*, s. n. 'Thorndike'.

<sup>72</sup> Miller, 'The Doctrine of the Church', esp. chs. 1 & 2.

‘mean opinion’ into a more favourable contrast than the narrower terms of English Protestant debate allowed.

This was how Thorndike approached the subject of human liberty and divine concurrence, setting up two Catholic accounts, the Thomist and the Jansenist, as the background to his discussion of the relationship between grace and free will.<sup>73</sup> According to the Thomist theory of predetermination, rejected by Jansen, God must effectively determine all second causes, like a hand moving a knife.<sup>74</sup> Some among those ‘who reject Arminius’, says Thorndike, for example the prolocutor of the Westminster Assembly, William Twisse, adopt this position.<sup>75</sup> Others look more like Jansen, who defines free will according to its formal nature, action upon desire, rather than its effective determination by God’s ‘vital act’ in the will.<sup>76</sup> Thorndike, then, presented Jansen as a less straightforward determinist than the Thomists or neo-Thomists. By conducting a surprisingly sympathetic but ultimately negative inquiry into his system as an ‘ingenious’ attempt to reconcile determinism with freedom, Thorndike was able to reject *a fortiori* the Calvinist account of freedom and therefore of justification, which suffered by comparison with the redeeming features he identified in Jansen’s.<sup>77</sup> This process of theological differentiation was facilitated by Thorndike’s treatment of Jansen as a faithful historian of Pelagianism and Semi-Pelagianism – ‘I do respect the learning of ... Jansenius’ – in which he foreshadowed Burnet, who would praise Jansen’s ‘great Industry, and ... equal fidelity’ as an exegete of Augustine.<sup>78</sup> If Jansen was a true ‘disciple of St. Augustine’, a convincing presentation of his inadequacies would distance

---

<sup>73</sup> This was due, he claimed, to the failure of the Synod of Dort to treat the matter satisfactorily – *Epilogue*, ii, p. 165.

<sup>74</sup> Jansen, *Augustinus*, t. II, *De statu naturae innocentis*, ch. 20, cols. 181-4. Thorndike does not enquire whether this ‘physical premotion’ of the neo-Thomists necessarily follows from Aquinas’s doctrine of God, the first mover. In favour one could point at *ST*, Ia, q. 83, a.2; *ib.* IaIIae, q. 10, a. 4, q. 109, a. 1; *Questiones disputatae de potentia*, q. 3, a. 7.

<sup>75</sup> This identity with Dominican theology was happily owned by some Calvinists, e.g. Gale: see *The Court of the Gentiles*, pt. iv, bk. 3, pp. 123-5.

<sup>76</sup> Thorndike, *Epilogue*, ii, pp. 163-5; ch. 4, above.

<sup>77</sup> *Epilogue*, ii, p. 163.

<sup>78</sup> *Ib.*, p. 193; Burnet, *Exposition*, p. 150.

Thorndike's position even more emphatically from the exaggerated versions of Augustine's teaching on predestination, original sin and irresistible grace which supposedly characterised the position he wished to undermine.

The second book of Thorndike's *Epilogue*, the *Covenant of Grace*, was aimed especially against the Socinians. While he sympathised with their desire to assert human moral responsibility against predestinarian Calvinism, Thorndike pointed out that their denial of original sin and of the grace of Christ as the meritorious cause of salvation destroyed the premise of Christianity.<sup>79</sup> Hence he could be charitable about Taylor's doctrine of original sin, since despite his ambiguity Taylor had amply upheld the only 'mater of faith' in the question, 'the corruption of nature' upon which 'the necessity of Christ's coming' is grounded. 'If the coming of Christ be not to reparaire the fall of the first *Adam*, I cannot see how the Faith is secure':<sup>80</sup> the Socinian denial of the eternal divinity of the Son, claimed Thorndike, was a logical corollary of their erroneous conclusion from human responsibility against the grace of Christ.<sup>81</sup>

Thus Thorndike was intent upon demonstrating the necessity of grace 'from the beginning to the end of the work of Christianity'.<sup>82</sup> There was a difficulty involved, however, with this idea of Christianity as a 'work'. Thorndike had established original sin as an essential premise of Christianity, since it consists in that concupiscence or 'decay' which Christ offers man the opportunity to reverse.<sup>83</sup> Now he had to face about and explain how the free choice of the will should impinge upon the effect of this offer, since the corruption of sin entails the necessity of divine assistance from the beginning to the end of the journey to God. Because his account of 'justifying faith' or repentance, and of the indispensability of baptism

---

<sup>79</sup> *Epilogue*, ii, pp. 1-4, 143-8.

<sup>80</sup> Cf. above, p. 259, n. 25; *Epilogue*, ii, pp. 161, 160.

<sup>81</sup> *Ib.*, pp. 1-4, 143-4. This rather generous formulation of the Socinian argument, which really followed the other way, indicates the extent to which Thorndike was unable to see past 'Calvinism' as *the* theological enemy.

<sup>82</sup> *Ib.*, p. 137.

<sup>83</sup> *Ib.*, ch. 10, pp. 144-62; cf. ch. 5, above, pp. 244-5.

and the Church, hinged upon the effects of original sin and their remedy, Thorndike could not depict the will as simply indifferent in respect of good and evil. The will after original sin is inclined to evil by concupiscence. Only with the assistance of grace can this inclination be reversed.<sup>84</sup> But his premises also demanded that the will be free from necessity: it has to be free to do or not to do, to fulfil the terms of the covenant of grace or not, or its acts have no moral value. The acts of the will, ‘redounding to every mans account at the generall judgement’, must be personally imputable.<sup>85</sup> Hence Thorndike had to keep in tension two concepts of freedom which, as we saw in chapter 4, seemed to the Jansenists mutually exclusive.

On the one hand there is the freedom ‘which stands in opposition to the bondage and servitude of sin’: this is that conformity with the true good of which the increase and perfection constitute the moral life of the Christian on earth and the blessed life of the saints in heaven. On the other there is the freedom ‘which stands in opposition to necessity’: this is that freedom of choice without which the offer of the new covenant makes no sense, since reward or punishment suppose the freedom to act or abstain.<sup>86</sup> For Thorndike both these concepts of freedom are essential to an authentic account of Christianity – an account that establishes man’s responsibility to contribute to his own affective conversion by transforming the disordered inclinations which divert the will from the divinely intended trajectory proper to his created nature.<sup>87</sup>

The Jansenists, equally committed to such an account, held that it is precluded by any concession to nature in the form of an indifferent free choice: an indifferent will under sin

---

<sup>84</sup> *Epilogue*, ii, ch. 20, p. 168.

<sup>85</sup> *Ib.*, chs. 21-2, quote p. 169.

<sup>86</sup> *Epilogue*, ii, p. 163.

<sup>87</sup> That ‘Adam was created to supernatural happiness, and therefore endowed with those graces which might make him capable of it’ is argued, against the opinion of Grotius, at *Epilogue*, ii, pp. 155f. In his *Annotata ad Consultationem Cassandri* of 1641, publ. in his *Via ad pacem ecclesiasticam* (Amsterdam, 1642), p. 4, Grotius argued that Adam was created to a natural beatitude. He had argued differently in *De veritate*, bk. 1.

must incline to evil. The servitude of the will to sin, they argued, concludes its lack of freedom from necessity. Their task was therefore to explain how the necessarily effectual determination of the will by grace supposes human co-operation.

To Thorndike, writing in a reverse polemical context, the greatest stumbling block to an authentic account of Christianity seemed to be any form of determinism, since a determined will cannot be responsible for the acts it produces. His task was therefore to explain how an indifferent will under sin should choose the good without being determined by the grace without which such a choice is impossible. How does grace attain its end in God's providential design without that predetermination which nullifies the Gospel and makes God the author of evil?

\*

Jansen's argument, in Thorndike's view, has two major virtues. In the first place it demonstrates, insofar as it is designed to establish freedom, that Jansen 'ground[s] ... salvation upon the Covenant of Grace which supposeth it'. Jansen wants to show why Christians are 'obliged, to apply their utmost endeavours to the fulfilling of' the new covenant.<sup>88</sup> Secondly, Jansen's account of how the will is determined under sin has merit. The will acts according to the good it apprehends, and this depends on the good proposed to it. Disordered by concupiscence, the sensual appetites or inclinations, rendering 'the coherence of true good with the utmost happiness of mankind so darke', and 'the coherence of counterfeit good with his utmost misery so remote', bring strong reasons for the world. Jansen's argument therefore succeeds in establishing the necessity of a grace sufficiently powerful to determine the will in the face of the disordered inclinations, and to ensure the transformation of those inclinations by a habitual discipline. Nor is Jansen wrong, so far as it

---

<sup>88</sup> *Epilogue*, ii, p. 225.

goes, to say that the form of this grace is the disposition that brings forth the good act, i.e., the right motive that determines the will, or love; and that man is therefore freely saved, because love is free.<sup>89</sup>

These points give Jansen the preference over ‘those of the Reformation’ (specifically ‘our Presbyterians ... in the Westminster Confession’), ‘because, not requiring that voluntary conversion of the will of [to?] God, for the condition of the Covenant of Grace’, they do not even feel obliged to explain how free will and grace relate in the justification of man.<sup>90</sup>

There are, however, two related problems with Jansen’s argument. Since he allows only one true liberty, ‘slavery to righteousness’, he cannot admit as sufficient to liberty any grace which is not also efficacious. The imaginary freedom that is bondage to sin is therefore determined by the privation of efficacious grace. The system, concludes Thorndike, authors sin on God, implying, as a scholastic Calvinist like Gale would say, his ‘predeterminative concurrence to the substrate matter of sin’.<sup>91</sup> This difficulty relates to a more basic philosophical one. It is well and good to define freedom formally in terms of desire, but if desire is irreducible to action there is no effective freedom. If Jansen says that, under sin, man can deliberate freely about potential goods, he is right; if he says that, without grace, man will never act contrary to the counterfeit good, he effectively destroys freedom. What Jansen is confused about, in other words, is not deliberation – how the will is determined in each particular instance, or the formal cause of the act – where there *is* a sharp distinction between conditions before and after the fall; but choice – why the will in general is determined, or the effective cause of the act.<sup>92</sup> There is always the choice to do one thing or the other until through deliberation a good is apprehended which determines the will thereunto. The act is

---

<sup>89</sup> *Ib.*, pp. 167f., 208, quote at 168.

<sup>90</sup> *Ib.*, pp. 225-6, 256f.

<sup>91</sup> Thorndike, *Epilogue*, ii, pp. 164-6; Gale, *Court of the Gentiles*, iv, bk. 3, pp. 125-7, praises the Jansenists on this score.

<sup>92</sup> Thorndike, *Epilogue*, ii, ch. 22.

always contingent until the will is determined one way or the other. When it is determined one can talk about necessity, in the sense that whatever is necessarily is. Thus, for example, one could say that under sin deliberation will be so addled by the apparent good of the world that, if there is no apprehension of a higher good, it will always terminate in the wrong choice. This determination of the will is necessary as soon as it is. But, Thorndike will argue, this ‘necessity of supposition’ logically depends on a prior contingency in the will.<sup>93</sup>

Thorndike, then, endorsed Jansen’s position on the formal transformation of the will. Here we need a preventing grace to convert and then an assisting grace to change habitually. And it is Pelagian, says Thorndike, to argue as Molina does that mere nature can act out of the love of God for his own sake, or that God is obliged to grant assistance to those *facientibus quod in se est*. Nature is inadequate to its proper end, and Jansen is therefore right to identify true freedom as freedom to good.<sup>94</sup>

The problem is, according to Thorndike, that this idea of freedom is incompatible with determinism. If God is made its effective cause, there is no freedom of choice, and therefore man’s freedom from sin cannot actually be imputed to him. The illusory ‘power of contraries’ by which Jansen protects liberty under sin must, therefore, in fact be a real indifference, a real power to do or not to do one thing or another.

Jansen has a limited understanding of this power because, in his view, under sin the appetites will always deceive reason about the good: therefore God must effectively incline the appetites to the true good. Thorndike makes it a real freedom by removing the problem, just as Molina had, from the sphere of history to that of cosmology. The problem of human freedom, he argues, is first a question about providence generally, then about predestination

---

<sup>93</sup> *Ib.*, pp. 166-7.

<sup>94</sup> *Ibid.*, chs. 23 & 25, esp. pp. 208f.

and grace.<sup>95</sup> Thorndike's grasp of Molina might have been mediated through Arminius – he is eager throughout his exposition to identify Arminius's position with the common sense of the Church, from which, he argues, determinists depart – and he claims that his position does not come from the Jesuits, but resembles most that of Durandus.<sup>96</sup> He made, in any case, the same argument as Molina about future contingents, though with the reservations noted above concerning Molina's views on the act of faith. Divine omniscience can comprehend hypothetical future contingents without thereby determining them because of 'the infinite capacity of Gods understanding', giving him a profound insight into the behaviour of free will under any given circumstances.<sup>97</sup> Thus by virtue of willing a certain configuration of circumstances into being God can foreknow how man will act without having determined the immediate cause of the act, man's free will.<sup>98</sup> In this sense divine foreknowledge 'supposes' human freedom, because the coming to pass of an event depends on the behaviour of free will in circumstances which God in his general providence brings about. Jansen's understanding of liberty as an ordination to the good, argues Thorndike, therefore also depends on this freedom from necessity, since it is supposed in God's effectual providence.<sup>99</sup>

If grace is only an aspect of this general providence, it must operate according to the same rules: it must, that is, consist in some pre-established circumstance or set of circumstances in which God knows that the un-determined will will act in such a way as to throw off its bondage to sin. Thorndike went very far along this extrinsicist road, reducing grace in many instances to those reasons which the Gospel presents to the will for

---

<sup>95</sup> *Ib.*, pp. 176f.

<sup>96</sup> *Ib.*, p. 232. Guillaume Durand of Saint-Pourçain, OP (c. 1270/75-1334), denied that God 'agat immediate in omni actione Creaturae', on the grounds that this authors sin on God and destroys human liberty: see his *Commentaria in 4 ll. Sententiarum*, l. 2, dist. 1, q. 5. However Thorndike does use Molina's illustrative case of David at Keila (I Sam. xxiii 11-13), *Epilogue*, ii, p. 194.

<sup>97</sup> *Epilogue*, ii, pp. 197-8: Thorndike admits, though with a footling distinction, that this 'is now called in the Schools Gods *middle knowledge*'.

<sup>98</sup> On Thorndike's 'Molinism' cf. McGiffert, 'Herbert Thorndike and the Covenant of Grace', pp. 452-8. An identical teaching is found in Burnet, *Exposition*, pp. 161-2.

<sup>99</sup> Thorndike, *Epilogue*, ii, chs. 22 & 24, quote at p. 201.

deliberation and choice.<sup>100</sup> He was aware, however, that grace could not be barely rational or propositional. This would make the Church an ‘arbitrary’ or optional society, whose communion and sacraments signified only the agreement of so many individual wills. To reduce Christianity to a set of propositions would be to trust in fallen man’s natural power to choose the good, and this, Thorndike thinks, would be to prepare for failure.<sup>101</sup> Thus to the publication of the Gospel Thorndike added many other ‘helps’ ordained by providence to assist the will in its choice of the good.<sup>102</sup> Foremost among these is the circumstance of having been born into the Church and formally enrolled by baptism. The Church provides the context wherein God providentially disposes circumstances in such a way that man can live in a manner to which nature alone could not attain.<sup>103</sup> So the grace of the Gospel can be defined as an ‘actual’ or ‘effectual help’, since the circumstances which will effectually determine man to convert to a new obedience are fixed by providence. ‘Natural means’, having a ‘supernatural cause’, can produce a ‘supernatural effect’.<sup>104</sup>

Unlike Socinus, for whom Christians are not even religious before they have made a reasoned choice to accept the truth of revelation, Thorndike’s Christians are members of the Church, where the essential ‘helps’ of Christ’s grace are found, before they are individual Christians.<sup>105</sup> These ‘helps’ are whatever renders the message of the Gospel acceptable to the will. The Gospel communicates an offer of salvation on fulfilment of a condition. By baptism Christians are tied to this condition, having entered a covenanted ‘corporation’ whose function is to maintain it.<sup>106</sup> Since the fulfilment of the condition is predicated on that love which produces actual obedience, the function of the Church is to nourish a loving

---

<sup>100</sup> See e.g. *ib.*, pp. 148, 168, 175, ch. 25; cf. Burnet’s ‘hypothesis’ of inward grace as something ‘imprinted deep upon our Brain’, *Exposition*, p. 120.

<sup>101</sup> *Ib.*, pp. 3, 144-62.

<sup>102</sup> On this see also McGiffert, ‘Herbert Thorndike and the Covenant of Grace’, pp. 448f.

<sup>103</sup> Thorndike, *Epilogue*, ii, pp. 6-11, chs. 30f.

<sup>104</sup> *Ibid.*, ch. 25, at pp. 203-6; cf. pp. 155-6.

<sup>105</sup> *Ib.*, p. 1.

<sup>106</sup> *Ib.*, chs. 2-4.

disposition in her members.<sup>107</sup> Her ministry of love begins in baptism, continues in the ministry of repentance when love is broken by sin, and is consummated in the eucharist. The most significant sphere in which God's 'helps' are effectual is therefore the repentance by which sinners can recover the state of grace and of communion with Christ.<sup>108</sup> Works of humiliation and penance are necessary to this end, for the proper 'disposition [is not] produced, but by frequenting such actions of humiliation, as may settle the impression of it upon a mans Spirit'. Consequently

those actions by which this disposition is wrought, are justly counted satisfaction to God, because they fulfill that which he desireth of a sinner, to qualify him for the remission of sinnes.<sup>109</sup>

It is instructive that Thorndike's final objection against Jansen is that he ignores this process of conversion, making God prevent man with such a clear vision of the good that suddenly he cannot but follow it. This is not, says Thorndike, how God has ordained the new covenant, 'which proposeth a reward to them, who are led by the motives thereof, notwithstanding the difficulties to the contrary'.<sup>110</sup> This indeed implies the habitual assistance of grace in him who actually overcomes the world; and Thorndike recognised that Jansen had tried to incorporate the element of struggle into his system, distinguishing the effects of Christ's grace so that it does not always overcome.<sup>111</sup> In fact, as we argued above, the gradual conversion of the will from concupiscence, only to be accomplished by grace but never without man's own contribution, is the focus of Jansenist moral thought.<sup>112</sup> Thorndike's criticism of Jansen did not concern the formal nature of this conversion – when we are

---

<sup>107</sup> *Ib.*, chs. 32-3.

<sup>108</sup> Cf. Miller, 'The Doctrine of the Church', chs. 5 & 6. Why else, asks Thorndike (*Epilogue*, ii, p. 283), did the primitive Church bar Christians from communion on condition of completing great penances? Cf. ch. 7, below.

<sup>109</sup> *Epilogue*, ii, pp. 301-2.

<sup>110</sup> *Ib.*, pp. 204f., at 205.

<sup>111</sup> Jansen, *Augustinus*, t. III, bk. 2, ch. 27, col. 210; also *ib.*, bk. 3, chs. 13-17, and bk. 8, ch. 2, cited by Thorndike.

<sup>112</sup> Ch. 4, above, cf. ch. 7, below.

actually converted it is with the grace of Christ assisting us – but its immediate effective cause, which, against determinist Calvinists and Hobbists, Thorndike felt must be asserted to inhere in the will itself.

As far as Jansen's effective account of the determination of the will went, then, Thorndike saw him as an equivalent of these domestic bugbears. But equally central to this domestic struggle, against opponents who removed an eternal standard of good and made morality and salvation depend on an arbitrary sovereign will, was an account of the human will's formal conversion, as a condition of salvation, from sin to charity, of its re-ordering to the eternal and immutable good. And central to such an account was an historical emphasis on the actual state of the will under sin, since this state, which renders 'indifference' meaningless, determines the steps which must be taken in order to an effectual conversion.

Thorndike's discussion of liberty, on our analysis, exemplifies the ambivalent Anglican attitude to the Augustinian legacy of the reformers. His overriding preoccupation was to expose the fatalism of a determinist doctrine which his opponents pinned on the authority of Augustine. But he was resolved to do so without falling into the error of other thinkers with the same libertarian agenda, such as the Molinists or the Socinians, whose confidence in nature caused them effectively to reject, alongside Augustine's determinism, his psychological insights into the effects of sin and consequently the nature of conversion. To qualify the doctrine of original sin was to undermine the ethical force of Christianity just as effectively as the Calvinists did by exaggerating it.<sup>113</sup> Nor would Thorndike abandon the Platonic ethical perspective which complemented Augustine's conception of liberty, since it was fundamental to the case against Calvinism that morality was not merely an accident of the absolute divine will, but derived from the congruity of the reasonable creature with his ultimate good in the creator. Thus Thorndike wanted to hold in tension two concepts of

---

<sup>113</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 143, 148.

liberty, liberty from necessity and liberty as ordination to the true good, which an effective account of the divine concurrence such as Jansen's rendered mutually exclusive. Like Taylor Thorndike praised a former exponent of this precarious balancing act between free will and grace, John Cassian. 'Those of Marseilles', according to Thorndike, were right to say that conversion and obedience issue from free will, and are rewarded by following graces. It was heretical of them to suppose that God is obliged by the act of free will, and illogical, since they maintained original sin, to suppose that the grace of Christ consists merely in a message and an example proposed to man's free choice. But this error, issuing as it did in a rigorous asceticism such as Cassian recommends, was at least an error on the 'safe side'; and 'the worse divines they appear, must needs justify them to be so much the better Christians'. 'It is therefore', concluded Thorndike, 'a commendable thing, to excuse the writings of that excellent person *John Cassian*, so farre as the common Faith will give leave'.<sup>114</sup> Cassian was aware that true freedom is engraced obedience, but he did not absolve man's free will from the responsibility to strive thereafter.<sup>115</sup>

\*

Reviewing the background of the disputes about grace and predestination which divided seventeenth-century Protestants, Burnet too reserved some praise for the 'Middle Doctrine' of Cassian, despite Cassian's denial of 'preventing-grace'. Although Augustine's doctrine prevailed in the West,

and the Credit of his Books went far, yet no Book was more read in the following Ages, than *Cassian's Collations*. There was in them a clear Thread of good Sense, and a very high Strain of Piety that run through them; and they were thought the best institutions

---

<sup>114</sup> *Epilogue*, ii, pp. 148-9. Thorndike cited the Remonstrant Vossius's *Historia Pelagiana*. Vossius gave a positive account of Cassian's and the Massilians' non-Pelagian views on grace, *Historiae, De controversiis, Quas Pelagius eiusque reliquae moverunt* (Leiden, 1618), bk. 4, pt. 1, thesis 1. Thorndike's almost indifferent use of Vossius and Jansen as historians of Pelagianism is a little remarkable.

<sup>115</sup> On Cassian cf. McGrath, *Iustitia Dei*, p. 73; Owen Chadwick, *John Cassian* (Cambridge, 1968), ch. 4.

for a Monk to form his Mind, by reading them attentively: So they still carried down among those who read them, deep Impressions of the Doctrine of the *Greek Church*.<sup>116</sup>

Burnet's connection of a doctrine based on free will with monastic asceticism suggests the nature of the imbalance which the holy living theologians felt had affected English Protestantism. This sentiment was not so uncommon. It is noteworthy that Richard Watson, who, in continental exile, had been so adversely struck by the predestinarian Jansenists ('a pack of villains ...'), was affected very differently by his exposure to monastic piety. To William Edgeman, Hyde's secretary, he wrote that, although 'there is much in the monastic rule to which they ought not to submit', Roman Catholics 'have opportunities to serve God in more purity'; and he would 'never excuse the Church of England (whatsoever the Puritans preach against vows) for the want of such happy diversions'.<sup>117</sup> The theology of holy living, as we shall now see, attempted to translate such vague yearnings into concrete reality. Historians have rightly identified the 'practical' character of this project, but it should be borne in mind that this does not necessarily import a non-doctrinal or narrowly ethical focus. In our thinkers it was a symptom of their self-consciously affective approach to the doctrine of salvation. Ascetic discipline, founded on the love of God, was the means of the soul's re-ordering to the eternal and immutable good. It provided an objective, empirical measure of man's spiritual progress against the standard declared by Christ. In this way it resolved the Anglicans' major objections against a Calvinist theology that made morality an arbitrary function of the un-knowable sovereign will, and laid claim to a self-authenticating, subjective and speculative certainty of salvation. Where, in their view, the Calvinists encouraged a dangerous security based on the forensic concept of pardon, the Anglicans aimed at an objective certainty grounded on a true liberation from sin.

---

<sup>116</sup> *Exposition*, pp. 148-9.

<sup>117</sup> *CClarSP*, ii, p. 128.

## *Chapter 7*

### *A Popular Asceticism: Antoine Arnauld's Fréquente Communion and Jeremy Taylor's Doctrine of Repentance*

In previous chapters we have been preoccupied with the processes of negative differentiation which assisted the writers we are choosing to regard as Jansenists and as 'holy living' Anglicans to define their own religious outlooks. The Jansenists criticised, as their principal targets, the formalism of probabilist casuistry and the naturalism of Molinist soteriology, on the grounds that they under-estimated the process of transformation supposed in the redemption of sinful humanity by the grace of Christ. Both Molinism and probabilism therefore furnished an analogy with Calvinism, the Jansenists' secondary target, whose theory of justification also seemed, by way of an all-sufficient faith that acquits of but does not liberate man from sin, to circumvent the problem of moral renewal. The Anglicans, for their part, principally abhorred the same caricature of a determinist Calvinism tending inevitably to antinomianism, which excused the Christian from moral responsibility by denying his capacity for self-improvement; and there was a ready analogy to be found in an easy Catholic works-righteousness, which indulged the sensual man without having the decency to deny him. Implicit in these criticisms was the antithesis of sinfulness and righteousness, an opposition which, argued both Jansenists and Anglicans, their Calvinist and Catholic opponents confounded in maintaining the paradox of simultaneous justice and criminality – either in the just man who commits mortal sins, or in the one absolved, by the manipulation of the law, of sins he has never abandoned. In each case the moral condition of the individual, his standing in relation to God, is guaranteed by an adventitious and self-authenticating rule which is effective in and of itself. The assurance that flows from faith

alone, and the security of the conscience that rests on the doctrine of probable opinions, both offer a counterfeit certainty which is really a form of scepticism, a denial of the reality that man, with the knowledge he has by nature and receives by grace, can and must order himself to the moral law. For our writers certainty had to be proportionate to an apprehension of the truth. In their view both Calvinism and the anthropocentric theology expressed in Molinism and probabilism effectively protected the individual from his responsibility to truth, the one in virtue of its extreme pessimism about the capacity of nature, the other in virtue of its eagerness to accommodate nature's frailty. As a result both fixed certainty where it cannot be found, in the inscrutable decrees of God, or in the *ipse dixit* of a fallible human oracle. But there is an argument that concludes in certainty without deducing it from an unverifiable or arbitrary rule; it is the equation, made in the heart of each individual, between his knowledge of the truth and his knowledge of his own conformity thereunto.

There was nothing obscure in this 'religion of the heart'. There may have existed, among both sets of thinkers, a mystical yearning for the unitive way at which the process of purgation and spiritual growth ought to arrive. They were not content to allow the sinner lower expectations than the saint. But, to alternatives they held to be inadequate to such a transformation, both opposed an approach that was practical and empirical. For a nature bent out of shape by the weight of sin to be re-aligned to its true rule, is for the inordinate love which drags it downwards to be replaced by the ordered love which draws it up to God as to its last end. To love is for the will to incline towards the loved object; and thus to incline is for the will to produce the corresponding acts. Just as both groups, therefore, not unaffected by the scientific and philosophical currents of the day, placed a great deal of weight on the scholarship by which a verifiable set of data about the content of the divine standard can be established, so, in respect to that conversion of the will which is a *sine qua non* of salvation, they privileged the observable or actual evidence it produces in the form of a holy life.

This reciprocal economy between the inward and the outward is defined by an absolute integrity. If the will is to be rightly disposed, ordered, and directed, the sensual appetites, in whose disorder consists the chief misery of man under sin, must be educated. If the lower appetites love wrongly the will is disoriented, and produces bad actions which in turn fix the appetites more strongly on the wrong objects. An actual regime, as we will see presently, is thus essential to the education of the appetites, and functions as a rough but reliable guide to the disposition of the inner man. ‘C’est ... par les œuvres, que l’on doit estimer les désirs et les résolutions’.<sup>1</sup> ‘The best witnesses are eye-witnesses’.<sup>2</sup> On this theory the Calvinists under-emphasised the outward side of the equation, maintaining that an individual may be ‘spiritual’ even when the law of sin rules in his members. The Catholic casuists, meanwhile, over-emphasised it, considering moral actions only in their material relation to the law (a pliable rule in their hands), rather than as signifiers of an inward spiritual condition. These misconceptions, as Jansenist and Anglican would equally have argued, are connected to that false certainty which follows from understanding righteousness in terms of an *event* – forensic justification, priestly absolution – rather than of a *process*, ‘state’, or disposition.

Both groups thus developed a notion of certainty which was fixed in the self and tied directly to the use each individual makes of his moral faculties. But there was a tension here, between this individualist conception of man’s moral responsibilities, and the prerogatives of the institution in whose context they must be discharged. We turn now to the thought of two representative writers, Taylor and Arnauld, in an area where this relationship was potentially especially ambiguous, namely that of penance. Both writers emphasised the interior transformation of the penitent to such a degree that they seemed to contract the claims of the

---

<sup>1</sup> *FC*, pp. 502-4.

<sup>2</sup> Jeremy Taylor, [*The*] *W[orthy] C[ommunicant] Or A Discourse of the Nature, Effects, and Blessings consequent to the worthy receiving of the LORDS SUPPER* (1660), p. 157.

Church's ministry. Our subject thus also allows us to examine in greater depth the practical ramifications of the moral and theological ideas analysed in previous chapters. If these ideas contained a tension between the individual and the ecclesial sensibility – implying, as Krumenacker writes of Bérulle, ‘une hiérarchie d’amour qui ne coïncide pas avec la hiérarchie d’autorité’<sup>3</sup> – it was reflected in an analogous tension between this democratic or popular aspiration to comprehend every Christian in the same terms, and its highly elitist corollary, to demand of all the same, that is the highest standards. In both cases, in other words, a sect-type mentality – which, indeed, we should expect to correspond to the religio-political circumstances of either group in the mid-seventeenth century – was emerging through the framework of notably hieratic and sacramental ecclesiological commitments. We have generally regarded this peculiarity, up to now, as a function of a broadly theological development, and this is not the place to argue the relative explanatory priority of intellectual against social or other factors in such cases. But there is no doubt that the difficult circumstances afflicting both groups were highly conducive to an individualist and elitist form of piety, and capable of encouraging, as is pre-eminently the case with Taylor among the English writers under discussion, incaution in following out their premises.

\*

In his most significant expository work of the Interregnum, the *Unum Necessarium, or Doctrine and Practice of Repentance* of 1655, Taylor referred to the treatise *De la fréquente communion* by Arnauld, first published in Paris in 1643.<sup>4</sup> ‘Monsieur Arnauld of the Sorbon hath appeared publicly in reproof of a frequent and easy communion, without the just

---

<sup>3</sup> Krumenacker, *L'école française*, p. 204; on this aspect of Bérulle's thought cf. Kolakowski, *Chrétiens sans l'Église*, pp. 389-435; Varden, *Redeeming Freedom*, Afterword.

<sup>4</sup> My ed. is the fifth of the original text, publ. 1646. The full title is *De la fréquente communion, où les sentiments des Pères, des Papes et des Conciles, touchant l'usage des Sacrements de Pénitence & d'Eucharistie, sont fidèlement exposés: Pour servir d'adresse aux personnes qui pensent sérieusement à se convertir à Dieu: & aux Pasteurs & Confesseurs zélés pour le bien des âmes.*

and long preparation of repentance, and its proper ministry’, he wrote. ‘Petavius the Jesuit hath opposed him; the one cries “the present church”, the other, “the ancient church”; and as Petavius is too hard for his adversary in the present authority, so monsieur Arnauld hath the clearest advantage in the pretensions of antiquity and the arguments of truth’.<sup>5</sup>

At this time Taylor was meditating precisely the same subject, in response to a situation where, as his friend Evelyn despaired, ‘the daily sacrifice [was] ceasing’, and access to the ministries of the Church of England limited and illicit.<sup>6</sup> Taylor’s solution was to emphasise the responsibilities of the individual, and it was to this end that he produced the *Unum Necessarium*, a *Guide for the Penitent*, the *Worthy Communicant*, his own liturgy, and other works during the 1650s. ‘Public or private is all one’, he told Evelyn,

and if every person that can, will but consider concerning the essentials of religion, and retain them severely, and immure them as well as he can with the same or equivalent ceremonies, I know no difference in the thing, but that he shall have the exercise, and consequently the reward, of other graces, for which, if he lives and dies in prosperous days, he shall never be crowned.<sup>7</sup>

Arnauld’s argument tended to support this line of thinking. Starting from the premise that there can be no effective participation in the eucharist without a right disposition in the communicant, Arnauld evolved the argument of his director, Saint-Cyran, that absolution and therefore admission to communion should be withheld during a period of penitential cleansing and spiritual *renouvellement*. Arnauld presented his readers with a stark choice, between this deeper worshipping life and a superficial ‘*dévotion aisée*’, supposedly promoted by the Jesuits. Adroitly deploying ‘interminable quotations’, he made it appear that the early

---

<sup>5</sup> Taylor, *UN*, in *Works*, vii, pp. 14-15. On Petavius (Denis Petau, SJ, 1583-1652), an opponent of Arnauld on penance, see below.

<sup>6</sup> The ‘daily’ sacrifice presumably intends that of prayer, but implies *a fortiori* the celebration of the eucharist.

<sup>7</sup> Bray (ed.), *Correspondence*, iii, pp. 66-8, letter of 18<sup>th</sup> March, 1655.

Church (and her authentic legatees) considered the significance of the eucharistic sacrament to consist as much in the penitential preparation by which men are fitted to it as in the participation itself.<sup>8</sup> ‘Ces œuvres de pénitence’, indeed, ‘sont des dispositions à la Justification’.<sup>9</sup>

Unlike French Catholics, Taylor’s audience had no choice in the matter: they had been forcefully un-churched. If Arnauld’s thesis was applicable, however, they might perhaps be brought, not merely to reconcile themselves to this state of affairs, comforting themselves that in a case of ‘utmost necessity’ a ‘spiritual manducation can be made, with a living faith’;<sup>10</sup> but even to embrace it as a providential affliction, a set of conditions uniquely favourable to the cultivation, by means of ‘holy living’, of the ‘dispositions to justification’. Having during the 1650s ‘amassed together divers ... papers useful to the work’, Taylor therefore brought out in 1660 a tract, *The Worthy Communicant*, in which he assimilated much of Arnauld’s case into the theology of holy living which he had been elaborating since the late 1640s.<sup>11</sup>

### *The Fréquente Communion and the Psychology of Penance*

The immediate occasion of the *Fréquente communion* was a short ‘Instruction’ upon the usage of the sacraments provided by Saint-Cyran for the Princesse de Guéméné, converted to his vision in 1639. The abbot’s ideas on penance and the eucharist had excited

---

<sup>8</sup> Mischievous quote is Knox, *Enthusiasm*, p. 215.

<sup>9</sup> *FC*, pp. 627f.

<sup>10</sup> *WC*, pp. 574-6. Among John Evelyn’s papers is a form composed by him for this ‘mental communion’: BL, Add. MS 78389.

<sup>11</sup> Bray, *Correspondence*, pp. 69-70. C. J. Stranks noticed the allusion to Arnauld in *UN*, but dealt with it briefly as evidence of ‘the continuing breadth’ of Taylor’s reading: *The Life and Writings of Jeremy Taylor* (1952), p. 144.

public debate, and when this ‘Instruction’ fell into the hands of a Jesuit, Fr. de Sesmaisons, he undertook to refute them in a letter to the princess.<sup>12</sup> His letter, urging the curative efficacy of holy communion, even and especially with respect to lukewarm participants, was communicated to Port-Royal.<sup>13</sup> This was an opportunity to defend some of the Port-Royalists’ reformist proposals without falling foul of the ban on discussions *De auxiliis divinae gratiae*, recently renewed by Urban VIII on August 1<sup>st</sup> 1641, and endorsed by the archbishop of Paris in 1642.<sup>14</sup> Before his death in October 1643, Saint-Cyran made a significant critical and editorial contribution to the *Fréquente communion*.<sup>15</sup> He had already disseminated the basic message in letters of spiritual counsel written from prison. These compose an instructive introduction to Arnauld’s arguments. Many were addressed to religious, and they demonstrate clearly the animating impulse behind the Jansenist assault on contemporary morality. It was to shape worldly conduct after the image of the cloister. ‘Car M. de S. Cyran’, as his editor recorded,

ne propose pas une idée d’une souveraine perfection qui puisse plus en ce temps être admirée qu’imitée: Mais il donne des conseils généraux et particuliers, qui sont faciles à exécuter avec la grâce de Dieu, sans laquelle nous ne pouvons rien, et qui peuvent servir à purifier, voire à sanctifier une personne séculière qui les accomplit avec soin et avec uniformité.<sup>16</sup>

Saint-Cyran recurred constantly to the themes of ‘fuite’ and ‘retraite’. This does not mean all must enter religion: ‘il n’y a point de si petit métier dans lequel l’homme ne se puisse sanctifier’.<sup>17</sup> But without a certain aloofness, without some element of withdrawal, it

---

<sup>12</sup> Cagnet, *Le jansénisme*, pp. 42-3.

<sup>13</sup> It is reported point by point, in controversial style, in the *Fréquente communion*.

<sup>14</sup> Although Arnauld already had his *Première Apologie* for Jansenius well in hand.

<sup>15</sup> Orcibal, *Saint-Cyran et le jansénisme*, p. 41-3, 46-50.

<sup>16</sup> Saint-Cyran, *Lettres Chrétiennes et Spirituelles*, t. I., sig. o(v), r. On the importance of the concept of ‘uniformity’, cf. below, this chapter.

<sup>17</sup> On this see esp. Cagnet, ‘Le mépris du monde à Port-Royal’.

will be impossible, in the dubious and dangerous confusion of our daily lives, to form the interior disposition which God requires of his penitent children. When we have fallen by cause of sin, it is not enough to rush to a priest and grasp at the facile formula of absolution. Self-examination, conducted in a spirit of ‘profond abaissement intérieur et secret formé dans un humble silence’, must first result in an authentic sorrow, springing wholly from love of the one who is offended. Not just this contrite spirit of penitence, but works of penitence themselves must also be realised, before we are ready to ask pardon of God. Only then ought we to confess to a priest.<sup>18</sup> Such a confession must be general and comprehensive, its end being a general and comprehensive transformation of life.<sup>19</sup> Without such a preparatory repentance it is unthinkable that the eucharist should be approached, than which ‘il n’y a rien de si grand en ce monde’; which is ‘tout ce qu’il y a de plus grand sur la terre’, ‘toute la perfection des mystères de Jésus-Christ’. How can one desire in this world any other thing than the sovereign good ‘enfermé dans l’Eucharistie’? And how can one desire something, without doing everything possible to enjoy it? Therefore all Christians, both the just and the penitent sinners, must prepare themselves to receive it by a life of true repentance.<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, t. II, Letter XCI; t. 1, p. 152.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, t. I, Letter XVI. There was nothing remarkable in this. The Tridentine decree on penance (Schroeder, pp. 92-4) stated the traditional position that all mortal sins must be confessed ‘specifically and one by one’, but that venial sins may be omitted without guilt. Arnould, for example, thought the truly penitent would confess venial and even mental sins (*FC*, pp. 625-6, 207), but this was not an issue. As is well known, the Jesuits advocated a full and comprehensive confession based on an intense and thorough self-examination, even of one’s entire life. The problem was, as John Bossy puts it, the suspicion that ‘the Jesuit recipe of devout self-awareness concealed a conspiracy with the laity to trivialise the sacrament’ by rendering satisfactions superfluous. Such suspicions were not allayed by attempts to accommodate weak or scrupulous penitents – such as allowing a general for a particular confession, the omission of aggravating circumstances, the reporting of habitual sins as single ones, or the resort to multiple confessors – which were pounced on by rigorist critics. Quote is Bossy, *Christianity in the West*, p. 133. Cf. Tentler, *Sin and Confession*, pp. 108f.; Philippe Rouillard, *Histoire de la pénitence des origines à nos jours* (Paris, 1996), ch. 6; on early modern France Robin Briggs, ‘The sins of the people. Auricular confession and the imposition of social norms’, in his *Communities of Belief*, pp. 277-338; on the Jesuits O’Malley, *The First Jesuits*, pp. 138-52; Louis Chatellier, *The Europe of the Devout*, tr. Jean Birrell (Cambridge, 1987), pp. 35, 138-40.

<sup>20</sup> *Lettres Chrésiennes et Spirituelles*, t. III, Letter CXLV.

Such a life consists in the sincere imitation of Christ. ‘Je ne prétends pas qu’on soit entièrement parfait pour aller à la sainte Eucharistie, mais seulement qu’on ait désir de l’être, & qu’on travaille pour le devenir’. The eucharist is the sacrament of perfection, the supreme realisation of the mystical co-inherence of God and man; so must our desire for it be ‘perfect’, that is, untainted by any affection for the creature.<sup>21</sup>

The necessary disposition, then, consists in the pure love of God: it is ‘le culte principal de la Religion qu’on ne doit qu’à luy’, and consists in ‘l’aimer luy seul de tout nôtre cœur, sans le diviser ny partager avec les plus grandes, ou les moindres des créatures’.<sup>22</sup> Interior love has its synonym in the exterior charity by which it is manifested. This is pre-eminently how we achieve the imitation of Christ’s life.<sup>23</sup> Active charity, in its many manifestations, from alms-giving to the rearing and education of children, is the most important theme of Saint-Cyran’s letters: it is the most powerful witness men have of the grace of God, who merely follow the movements which God forms in their hearts, ‘pour produire aux dehors des effets merveilleux de Grâce et Charité’. In fact – far greater than those which amaze the senses – ‘les plus grands miracles que Dieu fait dans l’Eglise sont les œuvres de Charité’.<sup>24</sup>

In the *Fréquente communion* Arnauld cast these ideas into the form of a systematic historical polemic. With its voluminous citation of early patristic witnesses and the canons and decrees of church councils, especially those of Trent as implemented by St. Carlo Borromeo, an advocate of the use of delayed absolution, in his Milan diocese, the credentials of Arnauld’s book were hard to question.<sup>25</sup> At Rome it was backed by Cardinal Capponi, a

---

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 284-5.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, t. II, Letter LXXIV, p. 15; cf. Letter XCIII, pp. 257f; t. III, Letter CLI.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, t. II, Letter XCVI, pp. 416-18.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, t. II, Letter LXXIV, pp. 25-31 *et passim*; cf. t. I, Letter XXXVI, t. II, Letter XCVI.

<sup>25</sup> For Borromeo see *Instructions de S. Charles Borromée aux Confesseurs de sa Ville et de son Diocèse* (Besançon, 1839 [ed. of 1656/7]), pp. 43-57; cf. M. Bernos, ‘Saint Charles Borromée et ses “Instructions aux

disciple of Borromeo, and even by the Jesuit Cardinal Lugo; by the fifth edition it was adorned with the signed approbations of twenty-seven bishops and archbishops, and twenty-four doctors of theology.<sup>26</sup>

The book contributed to a debate over frequent communion and worthy reception that had occupied Catholic reformers since the sixteenth century. Frequent participation in the sacrament was encouraged, especially by the Jesuits, as the best means to emphasise and reinforce the unity of the faithful. Arnauld was not in reaction against this aspiration: so far as it was joined to a focus on the correct interior disposition towards reception, it was an ideal. In several leading Jesuits it was. The Society's rules of 1594 were cautious, directing that weekly communion at most be permitted the laity. Tolet even insisted that worthy communicants be free of all affection to venial sin, a teaching in which he was followed by François de Sales, and which, aside from corporal mortifications, really represents the utmost severity of Arnauld's doctrine. De Sesmaison's letter, however, exemplified a contrary tendency, which had made advances in Spain under the influence of Molina, and emphasised the importance of frequent communion without a corresponding insistence on the purity of the communicant.<sup>27</sup>

---

Confesseurs": une lecture rigoriste par le clergé français', in Groupe de la Bussière, *Pratiques de la Confession. Des Pères du désert à Vatican II* (Paris, 1983), pp. 185-200; Quantin, 'De la rigueur au rigorisme', pp. 195-251; M. Venard, 'The Influence of Carlo Borromeo on the Church of France', in J. M. Headley and J. B. Tomaro (eds.), *San Carlo Borromeo: Catholic reform and ecclesiastical politics in the second half of the sixteenth century* (Washington, 1988), pp. 208-27; Broutin, *La Réforme Pastorale*, ii, pp. 379-98; Wietse de Boer, *The Conquest of the Soul: Confession, Discipline and Public Order in Counter-Reformation Milan* (Leiden, 2000), esp. ch. 2; John Bossy, 'The Social History of Confession in the Age of Reformation', *Transactions of the Royal History Society*, 5<sup>th</sup> ser., 25 (1975).

<sup>26</sup> Orcibal, *Le Premier Port-Royal*, p. 25; the approbations at *FC*, pp. 153-79.

<sup>27</sup> Orcibal, *Le Premier Port-Royal*, pp. 17-18; Bergin, *Church, Society and Religious Change in France*, pp. 258-68; *idem*, *Cardinal de la Rochefoucauld* (New Haven-London, 1987), pp. 97-8, 116-17. Chatellier, *The Europe of the Devout*, pp. 138-9; important on Jesuit spirituality is Michel de Certeau, 'Crise sociale et réformisme spirituel au début du XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle: Une "Nouvelle Spiritualité" chez les Jésuites français', *Revue d'Ascétique et de Mystique*, 41 (1965), pp. 339-86; François de Sales, *Introduction*, in *Œuvres*, pp. 116-19, pp. 43-5. For details on Tolet see Appendix.

In Arnauld's view this was merely sending communicants to eat and drink their own damnation.<sup>28</sup> If the inner man is not united to Christ by love, but separated from him by the disorder of sin, outward participation in the sacrament of unity is not only an empty show but a special violation of the body of Christ.<sup>29</sup> Arnauld's subject was therefore penance, 'la préparation à l'Eucharistie', which is in turn 'le but et la perfection de la pénitence'.<sup>30</sup> Penance should be, in the words of the Tridentine fathers, a second, 'laborious baptism', which heals the rupture caused between the baptized Christian and God by sin, and allows him to enter again into that union enacted in the eucharist.<sup>31</sup> The modern conception of the sacrament of penance, according to Arnauld, undermined this basic purpose. 'Les nouveaux casuistes' and the confessors who followed them, he argued, had effectively collapsed penance into confession and absolution alone. This was the culmination of a general 'relâchement' traceable to canon 21 of Lateran IV. As auricular confession became the keynote of the sacrament, a whole technical literature grew up around hearing and making confession, tending to drown out the connected idea of expiating sins by laborious penances.<sup>32</sup> By the seventeenth-century, claimed Arnauld, the three material parts of the sacrament had been emptied of all meaning. The priestly absolution, according to the Tridentine decrees, could supply an imperfect contrition;<sup>33</sup> confession was debased by sleights and equivocations designed for the convenience of the penitent;<sup>34</sup> and satisfaction, besides being reduced to the most paltry degree, was deprived of any operative virtue by its

<sup>28</sup> I Cor. xi 29.

<sup>29</sup> *FC*, pp. 80, 82, 208, 400, 461.

<sup>30</sup> *Ib.*, pp. 347f., at 348.

<sup>31</sup> 'Un Baptême laborieux': *ib.*, pp. 271, 351, 354, 459, 461. See Schroeder, pp. 90, 366n: 'laboriosus ... baptismus'. Gregory Nazianzen and John of Damascus are cited.

<sup>32</sup> *FC*, pp. 448f., 234f. Cf. Bernhard Poschmann, *Penance and the Anointing of the Sick*, tr. F. Courtney (1963), pp. 138-45; Rouillard, *Histoire*, ch. 5; and on the 'not impressive' [John Bossy, 'Practices of Satisfaction, 1215-1700', *Studies in Church History*, 40 (Woodbridge, 2004), p.107] history of sacramental satisfaction, Quantin, *Le rigorisme chrétien*, pp. 35f.; N. Bériou, 'Autour de Latran IV (1215): La naissance de la confession moderne et sa diffusion', in Groupe de la Bussière, *Pratiques de la Confession*, pp. 73-93, where the persistence of a more elite strain of discourse, with penance envisaged as involving an all-encompassing conversion, is nevertheless emphasised.

<sup>33</sup> Canon 5 of the decree on penance, Schroeder, pp. 91-2, 102: in reality this simply evaded a definitive formulation, cf. Poschmann, *Penance and the Anointing of the Sick*, p. 199.

<sup>34</sup> Cf. n. 19, above.

relegation to a consequent of absolution.<sup>35</sup> Potentially a school of virtue, confession was reduced to a petty tribunal.

These shortcomings, argued Arnauld, reflected an inadequate and superficial understanding of sin. For the casuists sin is a question of discrete acts, to be enumerated, classified into mortal and venial, and expiated according to a legal tariff. This is to misapprehend the psychological reality of sin. Sin is an absence of psychic harmony, what Arnauld calls '[un] esprit ... plein de dérèglements', and opposes to 'le règlement [sic] et l'uniformité de toute la vie'.<sup>36</sup> In Saint-Cyran's words, 'la vertu n'est qu'ordre comme le vice n'est que dérèglement'.<sup>37</sup> Sin, that is, is a *state*, a disordered disposition of the moral personality. The very necessity of repentance derives from the wounds of ignorance, weakness and depravity which afflict the understanding, the will and the affections in consequence of the fall. When the faith, hope and love with which these wounds are dressed at baptism are disordered by the commission of sins, it is futile to suppose that the problem can be engaged merely through the external symptoms of this disorder. Since all sin is contrary to God, any sin evidences some imbalance in the moral disposition, and it is this which must be addressed.<sup>38</sup>

As Taylor recognised, Arnauld was thus concerned to reject any distinction between sacramental *pénitence* and repentance as such. There is only one 'repentance towards God': it comprehends whatever is effective of interior renewal, and excludes whatever is not.<sup>39</sup> There was no room, in this perspective, for the legal distinctions of technical moral theology, especially that between mortal and venial sins. All sins are either mortal in the sense that they

---

<sup>35</sup> *FC*, pp. 383f., 468-71, 511f., 626f.; these criticisms are echoed by Denis de la Barde, the bishop of Saint-Brieuc (1641-75), *ib.*, p. 160.

<sup>36</sup> *Ib.*, pp. 81-3.

<sup>37</sup> Cited Taveneaux, *Jansénisme et Réforme catholique*, p. 40; cf. Orcibal, *Saint-Cyran et le jansénisme*, pp. 55-6, 91.

<sup>38</sup> *FC*, e.g. pp. 356-7.

<sup>39</sup> *UN*, p. 15.

testify the psychic disharmony of one who has fallen from the state of baptismal innocence, or venial in the sense that they can and must be repented of.<sup>40</sup> In the case of those lesser sins which do not destroy the grace of baptism at one stroke, and which we commit involuntarily on account of our hereditary weakness, the distinction is to be put between the sins themselves and the ‘affection’ to such sins. We may not be able to rid ourselves of the sins, but we can purge all affection to them. Penitents must achieve ‘une très grande pureté’, ensuring they are ‘non seulement entièrement éloigné[s] de toute sorte de péché mortel; mais détaché[s] même de toute affection au péché véniel’.<sup>41</sup> Arnauld adopted this doctrine from François de Sales’s *Introduction à la vie dévote*, a book of ascetical theology which assists a soul already purged of evil inclinations to grow in devotion along the illuminative path.<sup>42</sup> The *Fréquente communion*, in other words, a work consecrated to sinners, did not recognise a difference between moral and ascetical theology.

The emphasis on the affections is the key to Arnauld’s argument. He was impressed above all with the influence the affections have into the will. The inclinations of the flesh, the impulse to serve the creature and not the creator, can be the most potent and actuating elements in the moral personality.<sup>43</sup> Since concupiscence means that these inclinations will always have the potential to divert the will from its true end to some temporal good, Arnauld, in the spirit of Aquinas, is primarily concerned with the process of moral acculturation by which we can acquire a disposition to act well.<sup>44</sup> This is a question of discipline; the will must

---

<sup>40</sup> *FC*, pp. 404f., 238f., 292-302, 489-90. This is arguably how Aquinas thinks of them, *ST*, IaIIae, q. 72, esp. a. 5: ‘differentia autem peccati venialis et mortalis consequitur diversitatem inordinationis, quae complet rationem peccati’.

<sup>41</sup> *FC*, pp. 238f., at 241.

<sup>42</sup> De Sales, *Introduction*, pp. 43-5, 72-4; cf. p. 35: ‘Regardant donc en tout ceci une âme qui, par le désir de la dévotion, aspire à l’amour de Dieu’. See *FC*, pp. 520-24, for a fascinating ‘parallèle de S. Charles et de M. de Genève’.

<sup>43</sup> Cf. ch. 4, above, pp. 191-2, 195-6.

<sup>44</sup> *ST*, IaIIae, esp. qq. 49f. on dispositions.

be strengthened by mortifying those sinful affections which can occlude our rational goal.<sup>45</sup> As Pascal put it, ‘les pénitences extérieures disposent à l’intérieure, comme les humiliations à l’humilité’.<sup>46</sup> Without discipline, conversely, we risk acting badly; and in acting badly, we risk contracting a vicious habit. If love is turned away from God and towards the self, it quickly forms a habitual disposition, which steadily hardens into a ‘chaîne de fer’, as Augustine calls it in the *Confessions*, ‘une seconde concupiscence ... qui est fondue dans la première’.<sup>47</sup> This ‘iron chain’ had struck François de Sales strongly; Saint-Cyran too insisted upon those passages in which Augustine depicts the corrupt affections engendering acts, then customs, and finally necessity and the captivity of the will.<sup>48</sup>

The desires incident to the human condition have, as Augustine taught, two possible objects, the self, and God. Either must be loved infinitely, according to the end to which God appointed human desire. ‘As one loves, so one is’.<sup>49</sup> For Arnauld, then, the Christian is always on a trajectory, either Godward or selfward. The love of God is, so to speak, an impermeable category. All the elements of the personality must be moving in the same direction, or the tendency of the whole is distorted. The description of this trajectory is charity, in contradistinction to cupidity, so that charity is the comprehensive virtue, inclusive of all others.<sup>50</sup> If misdirected love disorders the inner disposition, we pull away from Christ, and cannot by definition participate in him at the eucharist.

---

<sup>45</sup> This acculturation is required by Plato, where the principle of virtue is likewise that of psychic harmony. Cf. *Republic*, 441e-442a. An interesting case has been made, by T. C. Brickhouse and N. D. Smith, *Socratic Moral Psychology* (Cambridge, 2010), esp. ch. 5, that Socrates should be understood in comparable terms.

<sup>46</sup> *Pensées*, 936.

<sup>47</sup> *FC*, pp. 463, 238f.; *Conf.*, bks. VII-VIII, at VIII 5.10. I (*PL*, vol. 32, col. 753). Augustine talks of being bound by his own ‘ferrea voluntate’; of ‘duae voluntates meae, una vetus, alia nova, illa carnalis, illa spiritualis’. The ‘catena’ is made of a perverse will engendering lust, indulged lust engendering custom, and custom engendering necessity.

<sup>48</sup> See Pierre Courcelle, *Les Confessions de Saint Augustin dans la tradition littéraire. Antécédents et Postérité* (Paris, 1963), ch. 8, at pp. 386-7, 398.

<sup>49</sup> Augustine, *de civ. Dei*, XIV 28; *In epistolam Joannis ad Parthos tractatus*, 2.14.

<sup>50</sup> Again this recalls de Sales in the *Traité de l’amour de Dieu*.

Of the highest importance, therefore, is the culture of the affections and the will, the determinants of love. If that sincere contrition which alone can obviate the continual diverting potential of the affections is to be inculcated, a regime of penitential exercises is necessary.<sup>51</sup> It is a matter of psychological necessity to use those ‘means’ which tradition shows are most productive of interior *renouvellement*.<sup>52</sup> These ‘servent à ruiner les habitudes des vices par les actions contraires’: to replace one disposition with another.<sup>53</sup> Separation from communion, for example, teaches penitents the virtue of retreat from the corrupt and corrupting world of men; alms ‘leur enseignent la charité qu’ils doivent exercer envers les pauvres pour mériter le Paradis’; fasting teaches them to resist the lusting of the flesh; prayers that ‘la vie d’un Chrétien doit être une prière continuelle’. The stringency of penitential satisfactions in the primitive era, underlined Arnauld, bespeaks the radical transformation they were supposed to effect.<sup>54</sup>

For Arnauld the ‘Calvinists’, placing the entire emphasis on the faith of the elect, ignore this crucial acculturation of the personality as a whole.<sup>55</sup> The free-will theology of the Jesuit casuists, on the other hand, ought to place a premium on the process. But instead of recommending means – prayers, fasts, alms, and any other mortification fitted to a particular sin or sinful inclination – to strengthen the will against the concupiscible inclinations and fix it in charity, they adjust the law to suit the frailty of the will, for this reason divorcing virtue from the inward spiritual state, and relating it entirely to the non-transgression of the law.

---

<sup>51</sup> The insistence on ‘sincerity’ constitutes the soft part of Arnauld’s argument, in acknowledging that we can never avoid sins of infirmity – see *FC*, pp. 92-100.

<sup>52</sup> Namely prayers, fasts and alms-giving (Mt. vi), to which Arnauld frequently adds ‘gémissements’, ‘larmes’, ‘soumissions’, ‘austérités’ (including ‘le cilice’), ‘veilles’, and ‘toutes sortes de bonnes œuvres’.

<sup>53</sup> *FC*, pp. 462f. The Tridentine decree on penance stated that ‘by acts of the opposite virtues’ satisfactions ‘destroy habits acquired by evil living’: Schroeder, p. 97.

<sup>54</sup> Arnauld reminded readers that favoured witnesses such as Cyprian or Ambrose actually represent the indulgent strand of a debate in which the Novationists occupied the rigorist position, and argued forcefully for the return of public penance for public sins, a principle re-affirmed at Trent (Schroeder, pp. 188-9): *FC*, pp. 418f., 471-2, 484f., 528.

<sup>55</sup> Cf. ch. 4, above, pp. 203f.; Jean Laporte, *La Doctrine de Port-Royal*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1923), t. i, *La Morale (d’après Arnauld)*, pp. 7-24.

Neither of these theories are adequate to the kind of wholesale conversion – repentance, *μετάνοια*, in the comprehensive sense it carries in the gospels – which leads to salvation. The positive obligation to live righteously affects the individual where the negative requirement of legal innocence does not, along the interface between the lower loves and the will, the crucible in which the disposition, or moral personality, is forged.

Arnauld's enlarged idea of *pénitence* as the conversion of the inner man, a process in which the discipline of the outer man is indispensable, led him to idiosyncratic positions. He maintained, for example, that absolution depended more upon the state of a man's repentance than upon the sentence of the priest. It is like the finishing touch, the final line or dab of colour, to a painting which has already been completed.<sup>56</sup> True contrition, that is a will directed by the love of God, is necessary to pardon: attrition with the priestly absolution is not sufficient.<sup>57</sup> Deathbed repentance is a contradiction in terms.<sup>58</sup> Repentance is a life-long process, implying both a spiritual disposition and a physical discipline accessory to it.

### *The Worthy Communicant and the Discipline of Repentance*

Arnauld, reacting against a formalist and legalist concept of repentance, sought to emphasise the psychological reality which the sacrament of penance indicates and addresses. Taylor too wished to give an enlarged, and indeed a comprehensive account of repentance. In

---

<sup>56</sup> See Schroeder, p. 103, for the condemnation of this 'declarative' conception in the ninth canon on penance. *FC*, pp. 348, 368f., 98. Arnauld often talks about *pénitence* in terms of the living out of baptism (e.g. pp. 366f., 583). He forestalls the suspicion of Protestant heresy which must consequently attach to him by denying that he has heightened the power of penance so far as to diminish that of the priest, who exercises the ministry of Christ and speaks '[la] parole de grâce'. But what is special about this grace of absolution? 'C'est qu'étant reçue dans un sujet, lequel a été si bien disposé par les pénitences précédentes, il faut nécessairement qu'elle soit très-grande' (pp. 96-8)!

<sup>57</sup> *FC*, pp. 96-8, 347-50, 368f; cf. Schroeder, pp. 91-2.

<sup>58</sup> *FC*, pp. 416-28.

a Protestant atmosphere where, in his view, repentance was conceived in purely psychological terms, as a mere resolution to amendment of life following the gratuitous gift of faith, Taylor's singularity consisted in his emphasis on a formal, outward discipline.

As we have seen, for Taylor the covenant of the Gospel involves man in an obligation to keep the commandments. He is under a precept of perfection. Its mercy consists in the opportunity offered him under this covenant to repent if he fails of his duty. The precept of perfection is therefore to be understood as a precept continually to strive after perfection through obedience and repentance. In order to do so in the face of our natural infirmity it is necessary that we experience an unalloyed love of God and his commandments: only this sincere state of love will excuse our inevitable failings and keep us moving onwards in spite of them. Every duty of man thus follows from and is resolved into charity, which in order to sustain its definition can only be extended. Repentance therefore involves the conversion of the whole man from sin to charity.<sup>59</sup> Because we are subject to infirmity this requires strenuous effort, and not a mere mental resolution.<sup>60</sup> Since the relation of the individual to God depends on the state of his spiritual health, absolution is merely a seal of approval on an already-accomplished transformation of the inner man,<sup>61</sup> and deathbed conversion is a nonsense.<sup>62</sup>

The Christian life, on Taylor's view, is the process of incorporation into Christ by means of imitating him. To this end he wrote what is generally considered the first English life of Christ, *The Great Exemplar* of 1649, and carried the argument through succeeding

---

<sup>59</sup> *UN*, chs. 1-2.

<sup>60</sup> *Ib.*, chs. 10 & 8.

<sup>61</sup> See *ibid.*, pp. 453f.; *Holy Dying*, in *Holy Living and Dying* (1883), pp. 477f.; *The second dissuasive from popery* (1667), pp. 268-9; *idem*, *A collection of offices or forms of prayer in cases ordinary and extraordinary* (1657/8), pp. 26-7; *A Guide for the Penitent*, in *A Choice Manual...for the Use of the Devout* (1677), p. 188. The 'ambassadorial' role thus accorded the priest is scriptural (see II Cor. v 20), and representative of Taylor's contemporaries. A somewhat more positive understanding of the power of the keys, however, may be discovered in e.g. Lancelot Andrewes, *Ninety-Six Sermons*, ed. J. P. Parkinson and J. P. Wilson, 5 vols. (Oxford, 1841-54), v, pp. 89-103; Hammond, *Of the Power of the Keyes* (1651), pp. 62f., 121, 126-36, 143-7.

<sup>62</sup> *Holy Living*, in *Holy Living and Dying*, p. 240; *Holy Dying*, *ib.*, pp. 292f., 424-7, 485; *UN*, pp. 221-9.

works such as *Holy Living* and *Holy Dying*, *Unum Necessarium* and *The Worthy Communicant*.<sup>63</sup> The gift Christ gave us is ‘the promise of repentance’: the assurance that our sins may be remitted upon terms we can hope to fulfil. By his death he purchased entrance to this new covenant for us; in his life he taught us by precept and example how to fulfil its terms. The sacrifice of Christ is thus at the centre of all Taylor’s thought. Christ worked to the same end upon the cross as he did upon the earth, the redemption of mankind. His ‘death was the consummation of the work begun in his incarnation’, and ‘thus the fathers call’ the sacrament of the eucharist ‘the extension of the incarnation’.<sup>64</sup> Upon the cross Christ demonstrated in the highest degree that obedience which is required under the covenant he thereby purchased for us. As Aquinas puts it, his suffering is the proper cause of our deliverance from sin because it provokes love in us, and by love we obtain pardon for sin.<sup>65</sup> Taylor can thus speak in a standard way of Christ’s obtaining the remission of our sins by sacrificing himself in the place of sinful man. It is by his spirit, apprehended through faith, that we are justified.<sup>66</sup>

It follows that, as this self-sacrifice was the pitch of Christ’s work, the eucharistic sacrament, wherein it is ‘commemorated’ and ‘exhibited’ for our benefit, is the apex of the Christian life. ‘It is a great declaration of the death of Christ ... the most clear publication of the great word of salvation won by that death’. It is the sacrament of baptism, where we are washed clean and admitted to the promise of forgiveness for repentance, ‘repeated to us for our comfort’, and ‘accommodated by natural analogies to our natural’ understanding. As such it cannot be separated from ‘matters of duty and inquiries practical’, for the covenant of repentance is ‘a covenant of strict obedience’. The eucharist, that is to say, as an expression

---

<sup>63</sup> On the *Great Exemplar* see H. R. McAdoo, *First of its kind: Jeremy Taylor’s Life of Christ. A Study in the functioning of a Moral Theology* (Norwich, 1994).

<sup>64</sup> On this cf. Morgan Dix, ‘The Basis of the Sacramental System’ in *idem*, *The Sacramental System Considered as an Extension of the Incarnation* (New York, 1893).

<sup>65</sup> *ST*, IIIa, q. 49, a. 1.

<sup>66</sup> *WC*, pp. 41, 43.

of our participation in the promise obtained by Christ, and as, symbolically, the moment when that union of his members to their head is peculiarly expressed, presupposes that those who partake of it are ordered to God and not to sin.<sup>67</sup>

Taylor's eucharistic theology then, perhaps surprisingly in this 'protégé of Laud', is robustly Protestant – Calvinist, indeed – in its symbolic understanding of the nature and efficacy of the sacrament.<sup>68</sup> Christ's body is in heaven, not on earth. It is truly present in the sacrament in a 'spiritual and mystical', not in a 'natural' sense, only to be apprehended 'by faith, the intellectual mouth'. As spiritual sustenance it cannot feed those who are fleshly. They alone are spiritual who have faith. But this faith, for Taylor, comprehends obedience.<sup>69</sup> It is 'the parent of charity'.<sup>70</sup> We are spiritual by living according to the laws, not of this world, but of another and a spiritual one – by living obediently to the precepts of the Gospel. Since 'Christ's body is in heaven, we must live heavenly on earth to apprehend it'. On such as can apprehend it, it can have its effect, 'nourish[ing] us in this life of grace in which we live and move and have our spiritual being'. But those who are not spiritual, those who have not conquered the flesh by holy living, who remain in thrall to the phantasms which attend the fallen condition, cannot receive the nourishment which the sacrament conveys. If they defile the sacrament by coming to it in this unworthy condition, they may take the bread and wine, 'to damnation', as the apostle says; '*but the food itself never*'. There are 'two manducations: the sacramental, and the spiritual, and the sacramental is but a declaration, symbol, and one part or exercise of the spiritual'. As an 'exercise' of the spiritual participation of Christ it has a real efficacy in that moral progression which leads us towards pardon in heaven, towards the assurance of it in this life. Taylor is firm, therefore, 'that the

---

<sup>67</sup> WC, pp. 43f., 12.

<sup>68</sup> Cf. John Spurr, in *ODNB* s. n. *Taylor*. Taylor's eucharistic theory is most fully developed in *The real presence and spirituall of Christ in the blessed sacrament proved against the doctrine of transubstantion* (1653). See also H. R. McAdoo, *The Eucharistic Theology of Jeremy Taylor Today* (Norwich, 1988).

<sup>69</sup> WC, pp. 23-7.

<sup>70</sup> *Holy Living*, p. 162; cf. p. 164, the best sign of faith is that of St James, 'show me thy faith by thy works' (Jas. ii 18).

changing all into spirituality' is 'far from being a diminution of the glorious mystery of our communion'.

By receiving his spirit we receive ... not his liveless body, but his flesh with life in it, that is, his doctrine and spirit to imprint it, so to beget a living faith ... And the other sacraments are but particular instances of this general mystery and communion with Christ.<sup>71</sup>

Baptism buries us into the effects of Christ's death, into the conditional covenant of repentance, which we therein promise to perform; just so is the eucharist 'a representation of Christ's passion, a partaking of it, and an affirmation of our presence within this covenant of new life'. Like the Gospel as a whole, it is the 'ministry of the death of Christ', and operates to the remission of sins in the same way, by 'calling to mind' the merciful covenant, that we might perform our part. This does not, asserts Taylor, render the sacrament superfluous. 'By whatsoever ways Christ is taken *out of the sacrament*, by the same he is taken *in the sacrament*; and by some ways more in the latter'. For 'as the sacrament operates only by virtue of the spirit of God; so the spirit ordinarily works by the instrumentality of the sacraments'.<sup>72</sup> Holy living and participation in the institutional Church are exponentially related:

We may as well say, that faith is not by hearing, as that grace is not by the sacraments; for as without the spirit, the word is but a dead letter; so with the spirit, the sacrament is the means of life and grace; for justification and sanctification are continued acts: like the issue of a fountain into its receptacle; God always giving, we always receiving.<sup>73</sup>

---

<sup>71</sup> WC, pp. 27-37.

<sup>72</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 60.

<sup>73</sup> *Ib.*

To receive worthily is to engage in a ‘conjugation’ of the ‘holy actions’ by which Taylor insists that the moral character must be cultivated if it is to receive pardon: a part of ‘repentance’, then, but ‘the best indeed and the noblest’. It is the food of the spiritual man, and man does not live without food.<sup>74</sup>

\*

To place the efficacy of the sacrament in the worthy disposition of the receiver, then, is for Taylor to exalt it, both as it is instrumental to and indicative of the state in which we are, as it were, living out the sacrament by imitating Christ in his incarnation and sacrifice. Some such idea perhaps animates Taylor’s insistence on the sacrificial aspect of the eucharistic rite, which has been seen to sit oddly beside his spiritual depiction of the real presence.<sup>75</sup> Just as Christ in heaven as a ‘High Priest continually ... offers still the same one perfect Sacrifice ... in order to perpetual and never failing events’, so ‘also his ministers do on earth’, offering ‘up the same ... Sacrifice of the Cross by prayers, and a commemorating rite’. And ‘the celebration of this Sacrifice’ is ‘in its proportion an instrument of applying the proper Sacrifice to all the purposes which it first designed’.<sup>76</sup> That is, the parties to the celebration of Christ’s sacrifice participate in its effect by that act among all the others of their lifelong sacrifice of repentance – a ‘living sacrifice’ as Evelyn called it in his office for mental communion (cf. Rom. xii 1-2).<sup>77</sup> ‘The true sacrifice’, in Augustine’s words, ‘is offered in every act which is designed to unite us to God in a holy fellowship, every act, that is, which is directed to that final good which makes possible our true felicity’.<sup>78</sup>

---

<sup>74</sup> *Ib.*, pp. 61-70, 123.

<sup>75</sup> E.g. Stranks, *The Life and Writings of Jeremy Taylor*, p. 285; Dugmore, *Eucharistic Doctrine*, pp. 90-102, attributes the changing emphases to Taylor’s association with William Nicholson at the school which they ran with William Wyatt in Carmarthenshire from the mid-1640s.

<sup>76</sup> Taylor, *The Great Exemplar...* in *Works*, II, pp. 642f.; *WC*, pp. 74f.

<sup>77</sup> BL, Add. MS 78389, f. 72v.

<sup>78</sup> *de civ. Dei*, X.6, tr. Henry Bettenson (1972); quoted by Aquinas, *ST*, IIIa, q. 48, a. 3.

Taylor's central point, 'the matter of faith' at which he aimed, as Thorndike would have said, was the reverence with which this 'fullnesse of all the mysteriousnesse of our religion' ought to be viewed, and the consequent 'returns of duty' which it requires.<sup>79</sup> 'The Lord's supper, or communion' is 'the most sacred, mysterious and useful conjugation of secret and holy things and duties in the Religion'. Naturally, therefore, Taylor was vehement, as the Prayer Book and the Elizabethan homilies are vehement, against the 'the great peril of ... unworthy receiving'.<sup>80</sup> But he felt, like Arnauld, that such warnings went unheeded. If the laity were negligent in this respect, neither were the ministers of religion sufficiently conscientious of the responsibility with which they were invested as administrators of the keys. He had therefore to issue some instruction as to the proper definition of a 'worthy communicant' – which he stated in the most rigorous terms:

There is nothing which can fit us for so holy a mystery, but which can prepare us to dye; and therefore let us be every day about this work, since we may dye every day. And till we have thus prepared ourselves to it by Repentance, we can never pray aright; for we pray ineffectually, because our repentance is not sound, and our repentance is unsound, because we do not zealously strive against sin, and till all this be reformed, we must expect no fruit by the communion; but are to be reckoned among the unworthy receivers.<sup>81</sup>

The communion is the fruit, the nourishment, and the seal of the life of repentance. The ideal is therefore to communicate, as the apostles are said to have done (in Acts ii), every day – to progress, that is to say, to the corresponding degree of repentance, or, in Arnauld's words, of 'maturité intérieure'. For, as both writers pointed out, '[the apostles] were already

---

<sup>79</sup> Taylor, *WC*, p. 22; *idem*, *Clerus Domini; or, A discourse of the divine institution, necessity, sacredness, and separation of the office ministerial* (1651), pp. 28f.; cf. McAdoo, *Taylor's Eucharistic Theology Today and idem, First of its kind*, emphasising Taylor's use of the language of mystery.

<sup>80</sup> See the exhortations in the Communion Service, and the Homily of Worthy Receiving in John Griffiths (ed.), *The Two Books of Homilies appointed to be Read in Churches* (Oxford, 1859), pp. 439-52.

<sup>81</sup> BL Add MS 78364, fol. 45r.: a sermon given at a private house in London, Sept. 6<sup>th</sup> 1657.

wholly enflamed with those holy fires [and] filled with Christ's fresh love', 'tout brûlants encore de ce feu que Jésus Christ venait d'envoyer du ciel', 'their spirits separate from the affections of the world ...', 'si détachés de toutes les choses du monde'. This, then, 'is no invitation to come for the lukewarm', who 'may derive caution, but not confidence from the example of the apostles'. 'Cet exemple ne doit être imité que de ceux qui imitent la ferveur et la sainteté de ces premiers Chrétiens'.<sup>82</sup>

In the *Worthy Communicant* Taylor gave a set of recommendations by which both penitents and ministers could safely regulate participation at the eucharist. The essence of the case is that, for those individuals who have subjected themselves to the necessity of repentance, there must be no admission to communion – no ministerial pronouncement in the shape of a pardon or absolution qualifying them thereunto – until a period of time has been spent in penitential works, effective of the necessary reformation.<sup>83</sup> 'To absolve as soon as the sinner confesses', he wrote, 'and leave him to amend afterwards if he please is to give him confidence and carelessness, but not absolution'. This, as he observed,

is the doctrine properly of the Roman schools, yet it is their and our practice too. We sin with greediness, and repent at leisure, and to confess and absolve is all the method of our modern repentance, even when it is most severe.

As long as the argument is conducted on false principles – on the premise that wicked acts can consist with a life towards God, whether in the justified sinner, or in the Catholic

---

<sup>82</sup> *WC*, pp. 432-3; *De la fréq. comm.*, pp. 97, 186-92, quotes at 191, 188.

<sup>83</sup> Here he differs from the standards of the Church of England as they were contained in the Prayer Book and the Homilies. There, although communicants were required to be in charity, and thus to make restitution to or effect reconciliation with their neighbours before receiving, the primary focus in respect to the disposition necessary for reception was purely noetic. Participants must have recognised their sin, and confessed it to God (not a priest) 'with full *purpose* of amendment of life'. They are required 'to come in a sure faith' grounded on a clear, Protestant understanding of the sacrament and the work of Christ it represents. Preparation consists in uprooting 'all distrust in God's promises'. 'Newness', 'pureness' or 'holiness of life', amendment and works, are unfailingly seen as fruits of this faithful disposition, rather than as constituents thereof, 'to succeed' rather than to precede reception of the sacrament. Griffiths (ed.), *The Two Books of Homilies*, pp. 439-52 on Worthy Receiving, and the three-part Homily on Repentance, pp. 525-49.

absolved by the words of the priest – it ‘shall never from thence find out the entire truth’. Taylor’s object, then, was to detach moral theology from its ‘very weak, and very false moorings’ by giving a true analysis of sin and its remedy.<sup>84</sup>

Like Arnauld, Taylor thought the casuists shallow psychologists. This was pre-eminently exemplified in the distinction of mortal and venial sins, which Taylor too regarded merely as an elaborate excuse to sin. Having distinguished a class of sins which can be committed without danger, men naturally proceed to ‘call what they please venial, and appoint what expiation they fancy’. But the real question is not what is and what is not mortal or venial; but what is and what is not lawful. And all sin is of its nature unlawful, because it is disobedience to God, who commands obedience. All sins, as ‘equally prevarications of the divine commandment, are an equal disobedience and recession from the rule’. Therefore every sin, however small, is ‘punishable as God pleases, even with the highest expression of his anger’.<sup>85</sup>

The essence and sum of the obedience we owe to God is ‘the heart; that is, our love and choice’: the measure by which God judges our ‘sacrifice’, our obedience, is ‘therefore the degrees of love or hatred within us. For by this it is that little sins become great, and great sins become little’.<sup>86</sup> This state of intention is something only God can know absolutely, which we ourselves, whose ‘hearts deceive us’, whose ‘purposes’ are ‘complicated’, can only know obscurely. ‘He alone can tell the affections, and all that which had secret influence into the event’. In this case the only practicable course can be the safest possible: ‘it is evident that the smallest sin must be strenuously avoided’. For in every sin it is cupidity which has ruled the affections: ‘even the smallest sin is against charity, which is the end of the

---

<sup>84</sup> *UN*, pp. 419, 154, 15; cf. *Ductor*, Preface; *Dissuasive from Popery*, pp. 127-44.

<sup>85</sup> *UN*, ch. 3, qus. at pp. 83, 84, 87.

<sup>86</sup> Cf. *FC*, p. 277: ‘toute la Religion Chrétienne ayant son fondement dans le cœur ...’

commandment'.<sup>87</sup> And so every smallest sin, like a leak in a vessel, propounds its end. Each is 'a turning from God and a conversion to the creature ... it is certain that no sin is towards God, and that which is not with him is against him' (Mt. xii 30).<sup>88</sup>

Thus for Taylor as for Arnauld the state of sin, and conversely that of holiness, is fundamentally vectorial. Again, the direction in which we tend is powerfully determined by the orientation of the affections, the will being 'the region both of choice and passions'.<sup>89</sup> Man, says Taylor, is a creature of habit, and we can conquer nature, either to bad ends, when we accustom ourselves to unnatural vices, or to good, when we overcome what is imperfect or vicious in nature by regularity and custom. 'Till habits supervene, we are of a middle constitution, divided between good and evil; and all our good or bad is but a disposition towards either'. This does not mean that we are not 'vicious and ill-disposed by nature'; but that, 'if we let our evil appetites prevail', the will becomes conditioned by concupiscence. We 'bring in evil customs on top of our' vicious nature, a 'new concupiscence' – citing Augustine's *Confessions*, VIII.5 & 7 – which disposes us towards evil to an increasingly irrecoverable extent, since 'by a habit sin seizes upon the will and all the affections; and the very principles of motion towards virtue are almost broken in pieces'.<sup>90</sup> Since man is always subject to cognitive error (he may see the good and not follow it), passion must be acknowledged for the fundamental catalyst which, as Taylor writes, 'sets nature on work'.<sup>91</sup> It is love which must be enlisted in order to the formation of character – love, by definition directed and progressive, which must transform the whole disposition by transforming all

---

<sup>87</sup> One recalls Herbert, in *Sinne (II)*, 'Sinne is flat opposite to th' Almighty'.

<sup>88</sup> *Ib.*, pp. 86, 111, 91, 97, 121, 98-9; BL Add MS 78364, fol. 32v: a sermon preached in ?Jan. 1654 in London.

<sup>89</sup> *UN*, pp. 499-500.

<sup>90</sup> *Ib.*, ch. 5, at pp. 166f.

<sup>91</sup> *Ib.*, p. 152.

those sensible and affective elements that determine the will and hence the moral character. So ‘it is of no consequence to think and purpose well, unless we add deeds too’.<sup>92</sup>

For the will is the ‘formality of sin’: sin is turning from God ‘to the creature by love and adhesion’.<sup>93</sup> Since acts are seated in the will, and the will is shaped and formed by the affections, Taylor teaches like Arnauld that ‘all affection to sin is perfectly inconsistent with the love of God’, as subverting the general tendency of the ‘whole body’ of the psyche: ‘every act of love to a sin, is a perfect enemy to the love of God’. ‘No man can love sin and love God at the same time’.<sup>94</sup> Hence, as Taylor preached to a tiny London congregation in 1657, we ‘must leave no remnant affection in us to sin for the future’.<sup>95</sup> No remnant affection to sin is compatible with the truly returning state, lest it might ‘spring up and bear the apples of Sodom’. Furthermore, though sins may come in involuntarily, the affections may be cultivated by use. To fail thus to educate the affections is negligent and therefore voluntary. Omission is thus in a sense ‘the parent of sin’.<sup>96</sup>

This is the point where Taylor’s doctrine reached the height of its severity. It is not enough to live without sin, but all affection to venial, that is involuntary, sin, must be thoroughly deracinated. Since this will involve some internal contradiction in respect of our natural inclination to sin, it calls for the exercise of certain measures or mortifications in

---

<sup>92</sup> *Ib.*, p. 168. Appeal is made to Augustine’s distinction (*Conf.*, VIII 8.19-20) between a ‘weak’ will, and a ‘momentous’ one which cannot consist with the non-accomplishment of the thing willed.

<sup>93</sup> *Ib.*, pp. 107-8, 374f.; cf. Aquinas, *ST*, IaIIae, q. 74. The analysis of sin and virtue as essentially voluntary, incidentally, inherited as it is from Augustine and Aquinas, need not be derived from the writings of Grotius, Episcopius, or Socinus.

<sup>94</sup> *Holy Living*, pp. 176-8; *UN*, pp. 371, 107.

<sup>95</sup> BL Add. MS 78364, f. 45r.; cf. a sermon of April 1656, f. 34r. The extent to which interregnum Anglicanism resembles the structural inversion of Caroline puritanism is always striking. Here Taylor, on the basis of a fully developed theology of covenants, preaches ascetical doctrine to an illegal conventicle, which must be composed of saints if their lives are to answer his exhortations.

<sup>96</sup> *UN*, ch. 8, at pp. 370f.; & pp. 418, 27-8.

restraint and re-ordering of our affections. And since nature itself does not change, neither can these mortifications, ‘this constant striving, with utmost vigilance’, ever cease.<sup>97</sup>

The first premise of repentance is a heartfelt sorrow for our sins, and a ‘sharp, painful hunger’ after obedience. True desire implies real want: humility is thus the end of self-examination.<sup>98</sup> We may manage to ‘control the passions, purify the intentions, direct and sanctify the lusts and affections’, but since in this life we are always travelling, and can never arrive, we must recognise the disparity between our desires and our achievements. This humility, joined with a contrite sorrow for sin, will produce the first ‘proper act and introduction to repentance’, the practice of confession.<sup>99</sup> The sinner must confess to God, and to his neighbour if he has done a social injury; but Taylor departs from the more common view – as expressed, for example, in the Elizabethan homily on repentance, in which discussion of these two genres of confession is followed by a broadside against auricular confession<sup>100</sup> – in advising confession to a priest, in his eyes a criminally neglected resource.<sup>101</sup> This Taylor does not insist upon, but makes necessary by consequence. The ‘reason is pressing’: for if confession ‘is done in order to pardon of sins, so it must be done in front of the publisher and dispenser of that pardon, the minister of reconciliation.’ Since the minister holds the keys of life and death in the administration of the sacraments, ‘it were well if he did know whether the person presented were fit to communicate or no; and if he be not, it is charity to reject him and charity to assist him that he may be fitted’. It is in this faculty of adjudication that a spiritual guide becomes a necessity: hence Taylor’s obsession with

---

<sup>97</sup> *UN*, p. 387.

<sup>98</sup> Taylor’s prayers of humble abasement are not therefore a ‘contradiction’ of his theology of justification, as C. F. Allison maintained (*The Rise of Moralism*, ch. 4): they represent a phase in amendment, which retains its priority in the *ordo salutis*.

<sup>99</sup> *WC*, ch. 2; *UN*, pp. 439f., 478f.; *Holy Dying*, pp. 465f. Taylor’s discussion of self-examination is reminiscent of de Sales (*Introduction*, in *Œuvres*, pp. 65f.); Taylor similarly echoes the Ignatian method, recommending a ‘general’ confession comprehending one’s entire life.

<sup>100</sup> Griffiths (ed.), *The Two Books of Homilies*, pp. 537-41; although cf. the Homily on the Resurrection; the Order for the Visitation of the Sick, the Form for Ordering of Priests, and the rubrics on ministerial counsel in the Communion Service in the BCP; and the 113<sup>th</sup> canon of 1604, which all imply the use of private confession.

<sup>101</sup> *UN*, pp. 8-14; cf. *Ductor*, p. i.

rescuing casuistry from the false premises of its Catholic exponents, and presenting it on a grand scale for an Anglophone audience. Sinners, perpetually liable to cognitive error, are not best suited to prosecute their own case; therefore every man ought ‘to consult with a spiritual guide to help him, whether or not he think it necessary’.<sup>102</sup> Like Arnauld Taylor invests the confessor with tremendous responsibility, which he is expected to exercise with the utmost rigour.<sup>103</sup>

The spiritual guide essays that hazardous equation of the outward signs of repentance with the inward state which God alone can judge. It is to him too as a minister of religion to apply those remedies which the Church has developed against post-baptismal sin. For that reason sinners ought not only to confess to a priest, but to make their confession ‘full and comprehensive and particular’: ‘in our repentance a general survey will not suffice, we must make a particular scrutiny of our actions, and words, nay of our very thoughts, if possible’. Only such a ‘particular and enumerative’ confession will enable the guide to apply ‘more particular and effectual remedies’: for it is by the application of the contrary habit of holiness that the habitual evil implied in every particular sin is purged.<sup>104</sup>

The rule of proportionality must therefore govern this process of psychic re-ordering.<sup>105</sup> The ‘degrees of penitentiary sorrow’, preached Taylor in 1655, ‘must be as proportionable to our sin, as we can make it’. Like Arnauld, he quotes Cyprian’s rule, ‘according to the greatness of the sin, so must be the greatness of the sorrow’, as the best

---

<sup>102</sup> *UN*, pp. 479-85.

<sup>103</sup> Representative statements at e.g. *UN*, pp. 419-20, 488; *idem*, *Ductor*, p. xvii; *FC*, pp. 96-100, index s.v. ‘Prêtres, Directeurs, direction’.

<sup>104</sup> *UN*, pp. 446f.; *Holy Dying*, pp. 467-75; cf. Eric Josef Carlson, ‘Confession and Absolution in Caroline Cambridge: the 1637 Crisis in Context’, *Studies in Church History*, 40 (2004), pp. 180-93, for context on particular confession.

<sup>105</sup> Taylor, like the Jansenists, uses the image of a pair of scales, which must be adjusted by the addition of the virtues contrary to vices. See e.g. *UN*, p. 179; cf. ch. 4, above, p. 194. On proportionality see *FC*, pp. 237, 389, 462.

guide.<sup>106</sup> ‘Satisfaction’ does not mean, Taylor clarifies, and did not in the primitive era mean ‘a legal payment to the divine justice’: this supposes that sins have some objective value that can be met, leaving man in no need of divine pardon. Penance or satisfaction rather ‘signifies the deprecation’ of, the seeking to avert or ward off ‘our fault by the exercises of repentance’. Since it is a work of time and effort to reverse a man’s spiritual trajectory, ‘the bishops in the primitive church would never give pardon till the satisfactions were performed’. They deferred absolution, or admission to holy communion, for such a period as was necessary for the penitent to achieve the conversion of the whole man – ‘till they could see he was really contrite’. For the penances which they undertook during this period are what Taylor calls ‘the material and formal part’ of the ‘graces’ requisite to a Godward disposition. To confess and regret their sins, submit themselves to punishment, and ‘to do actions contrary to their former sins, this was their amends and satisfaction; and this ought to be ours’. These are psychological apparatuses provided by the Church of which we ought to take advantage. And because ‘mortifying our sins, is the best we can do, it is true that the most laborious repentance is the best, for it takes off the softness of the flesh’. Penance is ‘the plank after the shipwreck, to preserve men from sinking in an ocean of impiety’. When therefore ‘they are taken away by the declension of the primitive discipline, there is a great way made for the destruction of souls, but nothing for the advantage of holiness, or becoming like to God’.<sup>107</sup>

Thus, though of course Taylor does not call acts of satisfaction meritoriously necessary, he does consider them to be so psychologically. Prayers, corporal austerities, especially fasting on which Taylor was very keen, and charity, including alms-giving, forgiveness of injuries, and restitution, are ‘the fruits of repentance, which are grown in paradise ... For these are a just deletery to the state of sin, they oppose a good against an evil;

---

<sup>106</sup> BL Add. MS 78364, fo. 34r.; *UN*, pp. 142-3; *FC*, p. 373n.; the reference is to Cyprian, *Liber de Lapsis* (*PL*, vol. 4, col. 492B): ‘quam magna deliquimus, tam granditer defleamus’.

<sup>107</sup> *UN*, pp. 453-68; *B. Taylor’s Opuscula* (1678), pp. 92-3; *A Dissuasive from popery*, p. 171.

against every evil ...'.<sup>108</sup> They are instruments, parts, exercises, and acts of turning from sin. As such they must be practised, never forgetting that they *are* signs and instruments of that which must provide their context, the whole state of repentance. For holy life is 'like the sun, which darts his rays in every portion of the air; and the smallest atom that dances in that air is tied to a little thread of light, which by equal emanation fills all the capacities of every region'.<sup>109</sup>

This thread of light is the indispensable, the necessary, and the sufficient condition of pardon: it is that true contrition, or love of God for his own sake, which implies all the other actions of repentance besides. It is neither a mere change of heart, nor can it be artificially confected out of attrition. It is a state of being, 'not the work of an instant': it partakes of the form of charity, one of the two absolute states that may govern a man, whose definitions are self-expansive.<sup>110</sup> The early liturgies clearly demonstrate this, argues Taylor with Arnauld. The liturgical absolution was not 'judicial' (indicative), but purely precatory (optative). The priest laid on hands and prayed over penitents, that their repentance might render them worthy. These were merely 'rites preparatory' to the 'main end and effect' of absolution, which was the 'giving of communion'. For 'either the sinner hath repented worthily or he hath not. If he hath, God hath pardoned him already, by virtue of all the promises evangelical; if not the priest cannot, ought not to absolve him'. The primitives, in other words, clearly saw that the essential question is that of how to secure a worthy repentance. If they suspected an individual's repentance to be insufficient, they erred on the side of caution. Therefore, as to the Protestant idea of contrition, it is evident that 'a resolution is no resolution unless it be reduced to act where it can'; and as to the Catholic, 'that one who fears hell, but does not love God, has affection to sin still remaining', which immediately disqualifies him from the class

---

<sup>108</sup> See esp. *Holy Living*, ch. 4; *Holy Dying*, pp. 343-5, and *passim* on prayer; *WC*, chs. 4-6; *UN*, pp. 463f., quote at 471.

<sup>109</sup> *Ib.*, p. 478.

<sup>110</sup> *UN*, pp. 117, 424f.

of the worthily repentant.<sup>111</sup> Attrition, though ‘the gate and entrance’, is not enough: contrition ‘is necessary to communicate with Christ’.<sup>112</sup> To love God, as Taylor and his ideological *confrères* constantly remarked, is to keep his commandments, obedience being ‘the proper effect of love’; and in this sense contrition, or charity, could equally well as repentance have figured as Taylor’s *Unum Necessarium*. The work’s frontispiece is a striking engraving, done by the celebrated French engraver Pierre Lombart, of those eminent penitents SS. Peter and Mary Magdalene holding up a heart pierced by a crown of thorns, over the legend *Cor contritum et humiliatum Deus non despiciet* (Ps. 51). The reference to the passion, and the visceral impact of the image, underline the message that contrition is no mere inward resolution, but an expansive transcendent which runs through all topics.

### *A Primitive Template*

Since the eucharist is the focus of the life lived according to the Gospel covenant, eucharistic preparation is a special spur to the general duty, a season peculiarly ordained by God for cleansing and reformation, ‘a great boon in a world of distractions’. For ‘it is easy to say a man must repent before he communicates; so must he before he prays, dies, or goes a journey’: ‘no man is fit to communicate, but he that is fit to die; that is, who is not in the state of grace. He must have trimmed his lamp, he must stand ready prepared by a state of repentance’.<sup>113</sup>

---

<sup>111</sup> *Ib.*, pp. 444f.

<sup>112</sup> *WC*, pp. 401f.

<sup>113</sup> *WC*, pp. 361, 367-8, 401; Spurr, *The Restoration Church*, pp. 341-53, surveys what may be regarded as the after-history of Taylor’s teaching.

The great holiness of the eucharist, ‘l’extrême pureté de cette Victime sainte’, demands a corresponding holiness in those who approach it, ‘une pureté qui soit en quelque sorte proportionnée à la sienne’. ‘When Christ is efformed in us, we must be as pure as he is’.<sup>114</sup> Therefore ‘we must consider whether our body be free from uncleanness, and our soul from vile affection’, for where food benefits a healthy constitution, drinking on a bad liver, for example, can kill us.<sup>115</sup> Communion can only benefit the truly penitent, ‘and so the early church considered it unlawful for impenitent, impure men to come: any who comes in a state of sin pretends worship and secretly hates God’.<sup>116</sup> ‘These cautions’, Taylor asserts, are ‘nothing else but what was directly the sentiment of all the best, most severe, religious and devoutest ages of the church’.<sup>117</sup> Just as the interest behind the *Mystery of Jesuitism* series had seen how effective the Jansenists’ satirical attack was in undermining the Jesuits, Taylor learned something from the success with which Arnauld castigated the modern church through the example of the old. An historical account of the primitive discipline could only serve to accentuate by contrast the shortcomings which he identified in the present state of affairs.

Having established that ‘those who broke bread and shared prayer with the apostles persevered in the doctrine of the apostles, a doctrine which signified a life most exactly Christian’,<sup>118</sup> both writers went on to quote an important passage from the third chapter of the *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy* of the Pseudo-Dionysius, which witnesses that the early Church ‘therefore ... denied those for whom the sacrifice was too sublime and elevated’, ‘trop sublime et trop élevé’.<sup>119</sup> The passage describes the *synaxis*, or assembly of the faithful

---

<sup>114</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 358; Arnauld, *FC*, p. 394, echoing the canon of the mass, ‘hostiam puram, hostiam sanctam, hostiam immaculatam’. The word ‘efform’, to shape or fashion, is suggestive of Taylor’s friendship with Henry More: the *OED* gives a reference to More’s *Ψυχωδία Platonica* of 1642.

<sup>115</sup> *WC*, pp. 358-61; *FC*, pp. 87-8.

<sup>116</sup> *WC*, pp. 367-8.

<sup>117</sup> *Ib.*, p. 432.

<sup>118</sup> *Ib.*; *FC*, pp. 186-91.

<sup>119</sup> *WC*, pp. 433f.; *FC*, pp. 194f.

where, in the context of this discussion, the psalms were chanted, holy writ read, and the eucharistic mystery celebrated. Pseudo-Dionysius identifies certain classes of persons who after the psalmody and the scripture reading could ‘not join in the ensuing sacred acts and in the contemplation reserved for the perfected sight of the perfect’.<sup>120</sup> These classes were sent out of the church by the deacon at intervals, each according to his condition. Both Arnauld and Taylor extract four such classes from the words of Pseudo-Dionysius. In the first place are ‘those not yet instructed’, ‘ceux qui n’ont pas encore été instruits’, that is the catechumens. Secondly are ‘ceux qui sont tombés de l’état d’une vie sainte et chrétienne’, ‘those who are fallen from the holy and Christian state’, or the apostates. Thirdly, ‘they who are possessed with evil spirits’, that is the energumens. ‘And lastly, those who indeed have begun to retire from sin to a good life, but ... are not yet purified from the phantasms and images of their passed inordinations, by a Divine habitude and love, with purity and without mixture’: they who are ‘not yet perfectly united to God alone ... who are not entirely inculpable’, not ‘entièrement parfaits, et entièrement irréprochables’ – the penitents.<sup>121</sup> This scheme both Taylor and Arnauld take to establish that putative communicants must be absolutely ‘spotless’ and ‘united to God’, in the acceptation which both have given to this precept in their doctrines of repentance, that is of having mortified all affection for sin and of being in train to change the nature of the whole man from human to divine by living in the divine example.

However, as the Jesuit Denis Petau (Petavius) pointed out in his refutation of Arnauld, *De la pénitence publique* (where Taylor considered him to have been worsted by Arnauld on the grounds of the primitive Church), this represents a strained reading of the *Ecclesiastical*

---

<sup>120</sup> Pseudo-Dionysius, *The Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*, tr. Colm Liubheid, in *The Complete Works* (The Classics of Western Spirituality, New Jersey, 1987), III.6.

<sup>121</sup> WC, pp. 433-5; *De la fréq. comm.*, pp. 192f.: both writers are quoting Pseudo-Dionysius, which accounts for their identical language, although it is possible that Taylor was simply translating from Arnauld’s French (see below).

*Hierarchy*. Its author identifies five, not four classes of persons: the catechumens; the lapsed; the energumens; ‘following these ... the people who have abandoned the opposing life but who are not yet purified of empty imaginings because they have not yet acquired as something permanent the undiluted yearning for God’; and ‘*lastly* ... those who are not yet altogether one-like [uniform] but who, in the words of the Law, are neither completely unblemished nor completely unstained’.<sup>122</sup> Arnauld, on Petavius’ view, has (as does Taylor) conflated the final two categories in order to heighten the rigour with which Pseudo-Dionysius seems to define the state of penitence. Petavius claims that the two last categories refer to two stages of penitence, one less and one more perfect, and that these correspond to the degrees of ecclesiastical discipline in that the fourth class, the newer penitents, ‘were called “*Auditors*”, who went out immediately after the Catechumens’, while the fifth class went out last, ‘having prostrated themselves, and been prayed over and touched by the bishop and his clergy’. In other words, Petavius claims that the fifth class, those who are practically perfect, though not absolutely spotless, have completed their penance, receiving the absolution of the church that they might henceforth participate in the mysteries at which they could not on that occasion assist.<sup>123</sup> Arnauld and Taylor, on the other hand, by eliding this distinction, make it appear that, in the primitive era, anyone ‘who is not yet perfectly united to God alone’ remained in the state of the penitent, and unworthy to communicate.<sup>124</sup>

This elision, however, although seemingly against the sense of Pseudo-Dionysius, is supposedly less unwarrantable than the translation ‘united to God alone’, ‘*unis à Dieu seul*’ which both writers give. This, says Petavius, is a rather free translation of the original, which

---

<sup>122</sup> *The Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*, tr. Liubheid, III.7, 436B, my emphasis.

<sup>123</sup> Denys Petau, *De la Pénitence Publique, et de la Préparation à la Communion* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed., Paris, 1645), bk. 3, ch. xv [Ch. Ch. Lib., Allestree S. 1. 16].

<sup>124</sup> A characteristic example, perhaps, of the ‘guérilla patristique des jansénistes’ described by Quantin, *Le catholicisme classique*, pp. 125-56, quote at p. 155.

he asserts talks only of those ‘not yet *uniform*’ (*uniforme*) to God, rather than ‘united’.<sup>125</sup> The Greek word, ἐνοειδής, is rare, coming, apparently, from εἷς, a single one, one alone, and εἶδος, that which is seen, form, shape, sort, species. Pseudo-Dionysius uses the word elsewhere, in the *De divinis nominibus*, to mean ‘of single form, one only’, but it is also used by Athanasius in the sense of ‘indicating unity’.<sup>126</sup> It does not appear in the lexicon of unusual words compiled by Hesychius of Alexandria, which Taylor had with him in Wales.<sup>127</sup> The Latin edition of the *opera* of Dionysius published in France in 1644 (translated by Balthasar Cordier), and used by Migne, gives ‘omnino uniforme’, ‘altogether uniform’.<sup>128</sup> Thus, while Taylor could certainly have arrived at the translation independently, his decision to give ‘united’ for ἐνοειδής is of some interest, and raises the possibility that he was here actually following Arnauld.<sup>129</sup>

This impression is strengthened by the shape of Taylor’s argument. He goes on, as does Arnauld, to explain ‘the severity of what’ the primitives ‘demanded as evidence of contrition and amend’ by reference to the epistles of Basil to Amphilochius.<sup>130</sup> Basil tells us that this was done ‘with a view to testing the fruits of repentance’. For ‘I do not decide such matters absolutely by time, but I give heed to the manner of repentance’.<sup>131</sup> The same purpose was served by the great penitentials of the Western church. The penances related to repentance as

<sup>125</sup> Petau, *De la Pénitence Publique*, bk. 3, p. 113. Liubheid chooses ‘one-like’.

<sup>126</sup> G. W. H. Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* (Oxford, 1961), s.v. ἐνοειδής.

<sup>127</sup> Bodl., MS Bodley 878, fol. 20r.; Moritz Schmidt (ed.), *Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon* (1867) [p. 543].

<sup>128</sup> Denys l’Aréopagite, *S. Dionysii Areopagitae Opera omnia, Georgii Pachymerae paraphrasi continenter illustrate*, tr. Balthasar Cordierii, *Patrologiae Graecae, Latine tantum editae*, t. II (1856), p. 290; the online *Patrologiae Latinae*, vol. 122, cols. 1084D-1085A has ‘omnimodo uniforme’. Richard Allestree possessed a Greek edition published in Paris in 1562, Ch. Ch., Oxf., Allestree T.4.9, the relevant section being pp. 149-50.

<sup>129</sup> Certain other small suggestions incline me to think that he was translating out of Arnauld rather than the Greek: the word ‘habitude’ for habit, for example. Perhaps it could, if rather tenuously, be added that, for a friend of Henry More, *uniform* might have made a more attractive translation.

<sup>130</sup> i.e., in many cases, several years of separation from the altar with penances. They are printed in English in Henry Wace and Philip Schaff, eds., *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ser., vol. 8 (Oxford, 1895), the three epistles on canonical questions being nos. clxxxviii, cxcix, ccxvii – Arnauld has in mind the third.

<sup>131</sup> *Ib.*, ep. ccxvii, p. 258: the Greek is μετανοίας.

signs, and were thus not inflexible, but could be lifted or increased at the discretion of the bishop.<sup>132</sup>

Continuing in the vein of Arnauld, Taylor emphasised that ‘to admit lapsed persons before they have brought forth fruits worthy of repentance’ is death to them: ‘such an admission’, both theologians go on, quoting the identical passage from Cyprian’s *De lapsis*, ‘is to them as hail to the young fruits, as a blasting wind to the trees, as the murren to the cattle ...’<sup>133</sup> Therefore the primitive church required ‘holiness and purity’, that ‘he who comes should not only be clean of all impurity of flesh and spirit; but should demonstrate that death of him who died and rose for us, by being dead unto sin, to the world, and to himself’.

In fine, it is the general doctrine of the holy Fathers, and the public practice of the primitive Church, that no impenitent person should come to these divine mysteries; and they that are truly penitent should practice deep humility, and undergo many humiliations, and live in a state of repentance, till little by little, they have received the holiness they had lost, and must for a long time live upon the Word of God, before they approach to the Holy Table to be nourished by his body.<sup>134</sup>

While these recommendations happened to suit rather well the circumstances of Anglicans under puritan rule, it is not, as both Arnauld and Taylor insist, a doctrine designed to keep Christians from the communion, but rather the contrary.<sup>135</sup> The more we desire to communicate, the more perfect must be our repentance; the more it is, the more closely we correspond to that state to which the Gospel promises pardon, and hence the more comfort

---

<sup>132</sup> WC, p. 435; FC, pp. 198f., quoting the same passage on p. 199.

<sup>133</sup> WC, pp. 437-8; *De la fréq. comm.*, pp. 399-400; the passage is Cyprian, *Liber de Lapsis*, PL, vol. 4, col. 479A-B. On the importance of this work in the seventeenth-century Gallican ‘retour aux sources’ see Quantin, *Le catholicisme classique*, p. 520.

<sup>134</sup> WC, pp. 440-1.

<sup>135</sup> See *De la fréq. comm.*, pp. 88-9. It cannot be emphasised enough that, in demanding a rigorous preparation of some weeks or even months before approaching the altar, Arnauld was envisaging a more frequent communion for the laity than was practised by the generality. Cf. Taveneaux, *Le Catholicisme dans la France classique*, t. 2, pp. 342-7; Bergin, *Church, Society and Religious Change*, pp. 258-9.

can be drawn by men, who can only judge by outward signs. Both writers thus quote the work, often attributed to Augustine, *De Ecclesiasticis Dogmatibus*, by Gennadius of Marseilles, in which he ‘persuade[s] and exhort[s] Christians to receive the Communion every Sunday; but so, that if their mind be free from all affection of sinning’.<sup>136</sup> If an individual is not free from all affection to sin, ‘he must make amends’ by ‘penance, and being reconciled by the priests and bishops, then let him communicate’. That is, he must so condition his will that his moral character subsists in charity: ‘this must be done’, according to Taylor’s psychology, ‘by changing the course of his life, by a profound study of religion, by a daily and perpetual mourning and contrition’.

It will be noticed that in this discussion of penance the distinction between ‘mortal’ and ‘venial’ sins is blurred: since ‘every sin, even the smallest, is against charity, which is the end of the commandment’, and thus deserves death.<sup>137</sup> Cyprian tells us that tender consciences often used public penance for thoughts alone.<sup>138</sup> Crying sins, however, certainly must be expiated by means of public penance, as Gennadius records, and no conversion will otherwise be effected. ‘Grievous sins may doubtless be satisfied by private satisfactions’, but it is ‘much more difficult there, without the church’s help’. Such is the condition of man. ‘These people therefore, Gennadius advises to enter into religion, that is into solitude, and retirement, and renunciation of the world, that by attending to the severities and purities of a religious life, they may by such strictures and constant piety be fitted for the Communion’.<sup>139</sup>

Like Arnauld, Taylor lamented the ‘desuetude’ of public penance after the primitive age. Both writers outlined a story of steady *relâchement*, tracing the evanescence of the spirit

---

<sup>136</sup> From ch. 53 of Gennadius’ work. *WC*, pp. 441-3; *De la fréq. comm.*, pt. 1, ch. xvi is dedicated to exploding the ‘abuse’ to which Arnauld’s opponent, the Jesuit de Sesmaisons, had subjected this passage by citing it as evidence in favour of frequent communion *without* the corresponding state of preparation.

<sup>137</sup> *UN*, pp. 96-7.

<sup>138</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 116. Arnauld makes the same observation about this passage (Cyprian, *De Lapsis*, *PL*, vol. 4, col. 465B), *FC*, p. 207n.

<sup>139</sup> *WC*, p. 443.

of penance from the early centuries, through the middle ages, and the increasing prevalence of private over public forms, to Lateran IV, and thence to modern times and the corruption of manners which testifies its general absence.<sup>140</sup> Seeing the examples which could be drawn from ‘the purest channels of the primitive church’, Taylor ‘endeavoured to represent the severity of the primitive church, their rigid doctrines and austere discipline, the degrees of easiness and complying that came in by negligence’.<sup>141</sup>

In Cyprian’s time, Taylor records, ‘they began to remit of’ the excessive severity under which certain post-baptismal sins could not be absolved, so that great criminals were admitted to repentance, though but once only. But even so they only ministered this ‘gentleness’ to those with health and time to profit: the dissolute who repented at the end were ‘utterly’ refused. ‘This was severe, if we judge of it by the manners and propositions of the present age’. Nevertheless, ‘iniquity’ was so ubiquitous that ‘even’ this severity was intolerable, so that by Augustine’s time not only were death-bed penitents accepted, and penances imposed as if they might perform them, but they were even reconciled after a wicked life, if with little hope, or rather with fear.<sup>142</sup> ‘This was the most dangerous indulgence and easiness of doctrine that had yet entered the church; but now it was tumbling, and therefore could not stop here, but presently down went all severity’. Now ‘all sinners, – and at all times, – and as often as they would, – might be admitted to repentance and pardon, whether they could or could not perform the stations and injunctions of the penitents’. This ‘took off the edge of public and ecclesiastical repentance ... and because this was a recession from the old discipline, and of itself an abuse, or but the relics of discipline at best ... this also is in some places laid aside [being interpreted, in the English Church], in others too

---

<sup>140</sup> For Arnould see *FC*, pp. 149-52, 234f. Arnould’s pessimism is offset by a history of God’s providential solicitude for the spirit of penance, evident in the new mendicant orders established after Lateran IV, in the diocesan reforms of S. Carlo Borromeo after Trent, and, it is to be inferred, in his own book.

<sup>141</sup> *Holy Dying*, p. 298; *UN*, p. 15.

<sup>142</sup> *UN*, pp. 221f., ch. 9. The same evidence is arrayed by Arnould, *FC*, pp. 416f., both writers quoting Augustine, *Sermones ad populum* (*PL*, vol. 39, col. 1714), no. 393, *de poenitentibus*: ‘Poenitentiam dare possum, securitatem dare non possum’. Cf. Rouillard, *Histoire*, ch. 2.

much abused [being interpreted, in the Roman]’.<sup>143</sup> ‘It may yet be done in private, under the hand of a spiritual guide’; but ‘manners are ... corrupted, the doctrines ... are made ... easy’; and ‘it is very rare to see them who have sinned grievously repent’. But these ‘therefore can never be worthy communicants, for no impenitent can partake of Christ the “prince of penance”’, *princeps poenitentiae et caput eorum qui salvantur per poenitentiam*, in the phrase of Jerome, in his commentary on Isaiah, quoted by both writers.<sup>144</sup> As Taylor concluded, ‘it is hard to say whither’ the spirit of penance ‘is gone now’.<sup>145</sup> Yet he had evidently discovered it living and breathing among a party of serious-minded Catholic contemporaries.

\*

In this chapter we have seen how an enlarged and comprehensive account of repentance was central to the theological projects of Taylor and Arnauld. It supplied the defects they identified in Catholic casuistry and Calvinist theology respectively, by substantiating both the indispensable necessity of a true inward contrition, and the concomitant necessity of a severe outward discipline. This did not, of course, necessarily reflect the real flaws in their antagonists. Leaving aside the injustice of imputing antinomianism indiscriminately to any form of Protestant predestinarianism, one may remark in the ‘English Calvinist’ tradition a comparable development towards an ‘experimental’ piety, which increasingly privileged the fruits worthy of repentance as the source of Christian assurance.<sup>146</sup> And there was a category error involved in reproaching the casuists with a failure effectively to communicate the injunction to ‘be perfect as your heavenly Father is perfect’ (Mt. v 48). Their advice was concerned precisely with the imperfect. In demanding

---

<sup>143</sup> *UN*, pp. 395-8.

<sup>144</sup> *Ibid.*; *FC*, p. 234. Ch. 3 in Jerome’s commentary.

<sup>145</sup> *WC*, p. 444.

<sup>146</sup> Kendall, *Calvin and English Calvinism to 1649*; Wallace, *Shapers of English Calvinism*, pp. 17-19.

of the same constituency the standards proper to the Philotheas of this world, both Taylor and Arnauld dissolved any technical distinction of moral from ascetical theology. Whether this represents a sort of heroism or a sort of perversity – for every Sainte-Beuve there is a Bremond, for every Bishop McAdoo a C. F. Allison<sup>147</sup> – it was an outlook determined, not only by religio-political circumstances that encouraged both to think in terms of martyrdom,<sup>148</sup> but also by their intellectual presuppositions.

Once the good has been clearly apprehended it must effectively constrain desire; and in the Gospel is clearly proposed, with the means of obtaining it in the obedience of Christ, our highest good in God. Any distinction of precept and counsel cannot really hold up in the terms of this, essentially Platonic, psychology; the choice of a lesser good must issue from appetites not governed as they ought to be by reason.<sup>149</sup> That would be to aim at a lower end, but for these writers the end of moral theology, as of all theology, is the highest: ‘l’union avec Dieu’, the ‘becoming like to God’. It is ‘passing from passion to reason ... from sense to spirit, from considering ourselves to an union with God’. This is what it is ‘DE VIVRE CHRÉTIENNEMENT’ – to fit ourselves for the beatific vision.<sup>150</sup> If we examine the recommendations of Taylor and Arnauld, indeed, we will find them to correspond to the tripartite structure of mystical theology, bringing the sinner through a purgative stage, to an illuminative stage of growth, to the union summed up in the eucharist. The originality of both writers lies in their conviction that this is a path along which all must

---

<sup>147</sup> For Henry McAdoo, in *The Structure of Caroline Moral Theology*, the attempt to reunite moral and ascetic theology is the signal achievement of Taylor and his contemporaries; for Allison, in *The Rise of Moralism*, it represents a principle of repression which nullifies Luther’s insight into the ‘noumenal’ guilt of mankind under sin. On its social significance cf. remarks of Briggs, *Communities of Belief*, pp. 361-2, 372-3.

<sup>148</sup> Already in 1643 Arnauld presented himself as defending a truth for which he would give ‘même mon sang et ma vie’. Taylor everywhere compares the travails of his Church with the early Christians under persecution. See e.g. *Holy Living*, p. xiii, and at pp. 180-81 the issue: ‘The least love that is ... must exclude all affection to sin, and all inordinate affection to the world ... and must be love for love’s sake; and of this love martyrdom is the highest instance ... the greatest love God requires of man. And yet he that is most imperfect must have this love also’.

<sup>149</sup> ‘To man nothing is miserable unless it is unreasonable’, Taylor, *Holy Living*, p. 95.

<sup>150</sup> *FC*, p. 578; Taylor, *A Dissuasive from popery*, p. 171; *Holy Living*, pp. 175, 289; *Dekas Embolimaaios*, pp. 2, 7, 10. Cf. McAdoo, *Caroline Moral Theology*, esp. ch. 6.

be led, that it is, indeed, ‘practical’. It hardly makes sense to speak of their work in terms of mysticism, but perhaps it can adequately be described as a form of ‘popular asceticism’.

This popular asceticism is another indication of the individualist shape of their thought, which pushed against the institutional structure that must contain and order the Christian life. But just as they dissolved the distinction between moral and ascetical theology, precept and counsel, so they recognised no difference of quality between the secular and the sacred. The individual is responsible for the essentially ethical regime of repentance to which both writers attached the assurance of justification, but this is only to say that his entire existence is to be subsumed within the river of grace that flows from baptism and the eucharist back up to his source and end. At every moment and in every sphere of life he must be living out his baptism and aiming at that communion with Christ which is his eternal felicity.<sup>151</sup> Thus, while the scope of Arnauld’s and Taylor’s work was popular, it was elitist in content; and perhaps the potential incongruity between Arnauld’s soteriological commitments and his moral thought was mitigated somewhat by the reflection, common in Taylor’s mouth, that ‘narrow is the gate, and straitened the way that leadeth unto life, and few be they that find it’ (Mt vii 14).<sup>152</sup> If this was not comforting, it was at least uncompromising.

---

<sup>151</sup> Cf. Cognet, ‘Le mépris de monde’.

<sup>152</sup> There is a question as to how realistic all this was, for only so much can be concluded from the clerical ideals contained in the writings of churchmen like Taylor, and where sufficient evidence of personal devotion exists it is likely to derive from members of an atypical minority. John Evelyn, for example, certainly internalised Taylor’s teaching – for him the Christian life consisted in the practice of virtues and austerities to a quite inconvenient degree (see BL Add. MS 78367), and the multiple offices he composed for private use throughout the year reflect this. (These include ‘An Eucharisticall Office’ subtitled ‘The Trimming of the Lamp’, BL Add. MS 78374; see also MSS 78389, 78385, 78378.) The persistence of this demanding ideal (with some modifications), however – documented by Spurr, *The Restoration Church*, ch. 7 – does at least suggest it was not wholly implausible.

## *Conclusion*

In ‘The Cupri-Cosmits’, his portrait of the spirit of latitudinarianism – ‘Catholic and general, not Topical or confined to opinions and Sects’ – Joseph Glanvill included an encomium upon ‘that Famous and Incomparable Loryta Bp. of Wendo’, or Jeremy Taylor.

This was a Subject on which ’twas difficult to speake Hyperboles; it could not be reach’t by any Expressions. For he was none of Gods Ordinary Works, but his Endowments were so many and so great, as really made him a Miracle.

Glanvill explained that, although Taylor was of an older generation, his character belonged among those of the other ‘Cupri-Cosmits’

because he was of the same Spirit with [them], and one, who by his most learned writings contributed greatly to the Rise and Advancement of it.<sup>1</sup>

This acknowledgement of Taylor’s influence may be a little surprising to those who consider him more of a *littérateur* than a theologian, a writer whose flights of inspiration led him into doctrinal confusion on the eucharist or original sin, and resulted in his underwhelming preferment to an Irish see.<sup>2</sup> In fact Taylor was highly regarded by the generation whose early experience was formed by the Commonwealth period.<sup>3</sup> Such admiration, of course, is perfectly consistent with what historians understand by the ‘latitudinarian’ temper delineated by Glanvill. A friend of Henry More, Taylor was a disciple of that enlightened reason which illuminates the essential harmony between revealed Christianity and the proper nature of

---

<sup>1</sup> Cope, “‘The Cupri-Cosmits’”, pp. 271, 277-8.

<sup>2</sup> Samuel Taylor Coleridge notably encouraged this impression, punctuating his lavish praises of Taylor’s style with suspicious remarks concerning Taylor’s ‘Pelagian’ theology: see esp. *Notes on English Divines*, ed. Derwent Coleridge, 2 vols. (1853), i, pp. 169-329, e.g. at 274-5.

<sup>3</sup> See e.g. Glanvill, *The Way of Happiness* (1670), p. 84; Stillingfleet, *Idolatry*, pp. 183-4; Simon Patrick, *An Appendix to the Third Part of the Friendly Debate, Being a Letter of the Conformist to the Non-Conformist* (1670), pp. 11, 186, 209; Thomas Tenison, *The Creed of Mr. Hobbes Examined* (1670), pp. 107, 153; Edward Fowler, *Libertas Evangelica* (1680), pp. 222, 296.

man. An apostle of toleration, his was ‘the most gracious voice then to be heard in England’.<sup>4</sup> The necessary truths, he held, are few and transparent to the understanding; and so he helped to pioneer that characteristically latitudinarian vision of Christianity as primarily a religion of plain and comprehensible duties, a framework for the good life in which the happiness of man consists.

This ‘practical’ outlook, built upon the soteriological foundations of the holy living theology, was clearly Taylor’s most substantial legacy to his latitudinarian successors. Along with their commitment to a rational method, inherited from Hooker and Chillingworth and from the Cambridge Platonists, it formed one half of their theological identity. The characteristic premises of the holy living theology continued to inform the teaching and preaching of divines such as Stillingfleet, Patrick, Barrow, Burnet, Tillotson, Tenison and others. They all described the life of repentance required of every Christian as being oriented by the ‘sincere’ or undivided love of God, inconsistent, therefore, with the commission of voluntary sin or with the indulgence of affection to sin, and simultaneously sustained and evidenced by a life of good works done in the spirit of charity.<sup>5</sup>

Although, as I have argued, these principles expressed the central doctrinal assumptions of Hammond, Taylor, and others, they are frequently taken as evidence of a preference for preaching up moral duty over difficult doctrine. This ‘ethical’ orientation is related to the impulse to accommodate Christian teaching to the temper of an age in which

---

<sup>4</sup> Edmund Gosse, *Jeremy Taylor* (1903), p. 68.

<sup>5</sup> See Stillingfleet, *Fifty Sermons*, esp. pp. 256, 262-3, 416-23, 474-5, 477-8, 480-87, 490-91, 509-12, 567-70, 583-4, 665-7, 675-8; Simon Patrick, *Mensa Mystica* (1660), pp. 165-7, 183, 280-86, 343-8, 427-49; *idem*, *The Witnesses to Christianity* (1678), pp. 105, 312, 549-50, 598-604; *idem*, *A Treatise of Repentance and of Fasting* (1686), pp. 8-34, 67-83; Isaac Barrow, *Works*, ed T. S. Hughes, 7 vols. (1830-31), ii, sermons 23-24 on the love of God, esp. pp. 136-8; Burnet, *Discourse on the Memory of ... Sir Robert Fletcher* (Edinburgh, 1665), pp. 69-84; *idem*, *A Sermon ... 1680* (London, 1680), p. 13; *idem*, *Of Charity to the Houshold of Faith* (1698), p. 16; *idem*, *Exposition*, pp. 130, 133-7, 139-44; John Tillotson, *Of Sincerity and Constancy in the Faith and Profession of the True Religion* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed., 1700), pp. 1-38, esp. 27f., & pp. 363-89, esp. 379-83; *idem*, *Fifty four Sermons and Discourses* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., 1699), pp. 80-89, 111-18, 159-71, 213-18; Thomas Tenison, *A Friendly Debate Between a Roman Catholick and a Protestant* (1688), p. 40; *A Sermon Concerning the Wandring of the Mind in God’s Service* (1691), pp. 12-14; *A Sermon Concerning Holy Resolution* (1695); [Tenison], *The Guide of a Christian* (1696), pp. 25-32, 62-4, 89-91.

the rise of the new philosophy, with its critical-rational method and preponderating interest in, to invoke Descartes's elliptical euphemism, the sphere of secondary causes, had given a new value to the ends of human nature considered as a self-sufficient whole. In responding to this challenge the divines marshalled their theological resources to produce a rational picture of Christianity, its doctrines more notable for their harmony with a human nature which they perfect, than for their contradiction of the vicious inclinations which, to a Jansenist or a traditional Calvinist, for example, constituted the most pressing reality about nature under sin. To a society whose intellectual advances were bringing to fruition the confidence of the Renaissance in humanity's natural potential, they reflected back a theological optimism which, while constructed out of traditional resources, was too congenial to the times for Christianity to retain its distinctive intellectual position.<sup>6</sup> To the age of reason 'they set forth the religion of common sense', and the more they emphasised the congruity of Christian and natural morality, the more did grace and revelation fade from the picture.<sup>7</sup> The institutional triumph of the latitudinarians under William III was appropriate enough, for among all the clergymen in the newly pluralist religious landscape, their presentation of Christianity as a system of duties voluntarily undertaken by free, rational agents did most to promote the idea of religion as a matter of individual choice. Thus the rising secularism and indifferentism of the eighteenth century must in part be chalked up to their account; the torch of true spiritual religion was henceforth to be carried outside the established Church.<sup>8</sup>

As we have seen, this tension between the claims of the individual and the claims of the Church was a major implication of the anti-Calvinist soteriology developed during the middle of the century, a development which, in turn, provided the doctrinal foundation of the

---

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Paul Hazard, in *La crise de la conscience européenne* (Paris, 1935), tr. by J. Lewis May as *The European Mind 1680-1715* (1953).

<sup>7</sup> Cragg, *Puritanism to the Age of Reason*, chs. 3-4, at p. 86.

<sup>8</sup> For this view see e.g. *ibid.*; Allison, *Rise of Moralism*; Horton Davies, *Worship and Theology in England*, 3 vols. (Grand Rapids, MI, 1996), II, v. 3, chs. 3-6.

moral religion of restoration preachers. It has been suggested here, however, that the theological presuppositions involved in this argument are not so easily reconciled with the easy, optimistic religion they are said to have promoted. The ‘popular asceticism’ at which Taylor arrived on the strength of these theological premises was not an optional system of life recommended in eudaimonist terms, but a necessary undertaking to which all men are obliged by eternal motives. Naturally such an undertaking, being oriented by the true good, confers on man the only true happiness he can enjoy in this life; ‘prudent’ behaviour, in this sense, retained its properly theological signification as, in Augustine’s words, that ‘duly ordered agreement of cognition and action’ which is ‘the peace of the rational soul’.<sup>9</sup> If the argument contained an individualist tendency, it was not because it sought to liberate man to pursue his legitimate natural ends, but because it sought to invest him more fully with the responsibility to attain the freedom which describes his conformity with his eternal end.

In the course of establishing these conclusions we have suggested that there is a certain sense in which the project of the holy living theologians can be related to the work of the Jansenists of Port-Royal. Despite the intellectual gulf which, in many respects, lay between these groups, they evolved comparable answers to the theological problems of the day. The ‘rigorism’ of the Jansenists, as we have argued, implied a similar set of tensions between what Jean-Louis Quantin has characterised as ‘la logique d’intériorisation et la logique de discipline, le travail d’approfondissement et le travail d’extension’.<sup>10</sup> Dismissing in turn the illusory assurances provided by the casuists’ empty notion of authority or the Calvinists’ subjective appeal to the Spirit, the Jansenists pointed individuals to their empirical experience of the transformative work of grace. Alongside this highly individualist notion of

---

<sup>9</sup> *De civ. Dei*, XIX. 13, tr. Bettenson; see e.g. Stillingfleet, *A Sermon ... 1678/9*: it is prudent to seek happiness, since God did not create us to be miserable. To act simply and prudently is to act ‘sincerely’ – for example to die rather than engage in idolatrous worship.

<sup>10</sup> ‘Le rêve de la communauté pure: sur le rigorisme comme phénomène européen’, in Cottret (dir.), *Jansénisme et puritanisme*, p. 194.

the Christian's self-responsibility for his own moral transformation, however, the Port-Royal writers retained their hope in the universal renewal which ought to grow from such a seed. The rigorism of these writers amounted to a quasi-mystical conception of the individual's ascetic journey to God, but it was a path along which they were convinced that all must strive to travel.

If, therefore, it does seem fair to attribute to the Jansenist outlook an inescapably individualist tendency, it is to be doubted whether this is best regarded as an adumbration of the sort of freedom dear to enlightened modernity. On the one hand one will have to acknowledge how far it was a product of their self-consciously backward-looking theological method: from the 'rational', or better, intellectualist tradition of Aquinas and Augustine, they drew a necessarily affective and existential approach, since the apprehension of the good depends upon the right ordering of the faculties of the soul. On the other hand, and somewhat paradoxically, the more up-to-date aspects of their intellectual outlook – that concern for empirically verifiable proofs upon which to erect a clear and incontestable theological structure, which reflected, at different times and in different combinations, the increasingly historical nature of post-reformation controversy, the development of evidence-based science, and the aspirations of 'rational' philosophy – also pushed them towards an affective and experiential, which is to say, an empirical and testable account of grace and the moral life. In this sense one might say that, to the extent that they shared in the seventeenth-century 'rational' outlook, it encouraged that rigorist focus on a living penance which some critics have seen as harsh and anachronistic; while to the extent that they received medieval rational theology, it encouraged that quasi-mystical asceticism in which other critics have seen some faint foreshadowing of modern, self-sufficient selfhood.

An observation of Schopenhauer's, taken a little out of context, is interesting here:

the Jansenists are Augustinian and their doctrine may well be the most genuine form of Christianity. For, by rejecting celibacy and asceticism in general, together with the saints, who are the representatives of asceticism, Protestantism has become a truncated, or rather decapitated Christianity whose apex is missing.<sup>11</sup>

The ‘basic character of Christianity’, says Schopenhauer, is pessimistic; without the doctrine of original sin, upon which asceticism is predicated, there can only be a regression ‘back to crude and shallow ... optimism’. On my reading of the theology of holy living, it appears to share more theological common ground with the rigorism of the Jansenists than the ‘Pelagianism’ or ‘Rationalism’ which Schopenhauer equates with a crude and un-Christian optimism. Like the Jansenists the Anglican theologians scorned the ‘enthusiasm’ of mystics or sectaries; but they sought to restore the ‘apex’ to Christianity by an authentically ascetic moral teaching. The problem with the casuists’ sceptical retreat behind human, and the Calvinists’ presumption upon divine authority, was their analogous failure to provide a convincing rationale for this necessary discipline. They offered a false assurance which, under the conditions of sin, was only a guarantee of failure. The Anglican writers examined here argued that the true interior reformation, produced by grace, can be measured and authenticated in a life of sincere moral endeavour. That a similar movement towards an affective religious experience can be discerned in various shades of puritanism in this period, and later among the Pietists, the Methodists and others, suggests that the problems with which the Anglicans and the Jansenists were grappling were not exclusive to any one branch of European Christianity.<sup>12</sup>

The individualist shape of the Anglican argument did import a certain tension with their comprehensive aspirations as theologians of a national Church; but their demanding version

---

<sup>11</sup> *Essays and Aphorisms*, tr. R. J. Hollingsdale (2004), p. 194.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. an interesting work by Ted A. Campbell, *The Religion of the Heart* (Columbia, SC, 1991).

of the moral life expected of all showed that they, like the Jansenists, refused to choose between ‘une responsabilisation de la conscience individuelle, et une action de discipline autoritaire’.<sup>13</sup> It is understandable that the excessively rigorous form into which Taylor, especially, cast this moral teaching appears to have been diluted in the teaching of the ‘mere moral-men’ who succeeded his generation. But, insofar as there was a recognisable continuity of theological premises, this development cannot be attributed to a defect of theological substance. Indeed, one will find the same soteriological assumptions and the same (logically consequent) teaching on the ascetic requirements of Christian perfection in the ‘heart-religion’ espoused by William Law or John Wesley in the next century.<sup>14</sup> If the latitudinarians did squander the legacy of spiritual religion, then, there were at least some notable beneficiaries of their profligacy.

---

<sup>13</sup> Quantin, as in n. 10.

<sup>14</sup> William Law, *A Practical Treatise Upon Christian Perfection* (1726), pp. 19-20, 24-6, 43-51, 165-81, 516-20; *idem*, *A Serious Call to a Devout and Holy Life* (1905), pp. 14-37, 255-71, 401-16; John Wesley, *Predestination Calmly Considered* (1752, my ed. the 5<sup>th</sup>, 1776), from pp. 10f.; *idem*, *A Plain Account of Christian Perfection* (Bristol, 1766), pp. 1-8 *et passim*; among the sermons see particularly ‘The Circumcision of the Heart’; ‘The Marks of the New Birth’; ‘The Repentance of Believers’; ‘Self-Denial’: respectively 17, 18, 14, 48 in the numbering of Thomas Jackson (ed.), *The Works of John Wesley*, 14 vols. (1872); and cf. Rivers, *Reason, Grace and Sentiment*, i, ch. 5.

## Appendix

### 'Lax' casuists mentioned in the text<sup>15</sup>

**AMICIUS/AMICUS/L'AMY: Amico**, Francesco, SJ

1578-1651

*Cursus theologicus*, tome 5, *De Iure et Iustitia*, Douai, 1642, Antwerp, 1650

**AZORIUS, Azor**, Jean, SJ

1535-1603

*Institutiones morales, in quibus universae quaestiones ad conscientiam recte, aut prave factorum pertinentes, breviter tractantur*, 3 pts., Rome, 1600-1611

**BASILIUS**, Ponce, Basil, Spanish Augustinian Canon, prof. at Alcalá

1569-1629

Judgement concerning the holding and teaching of the doctrines of Thomas and Augustine at Salamanca, 1627/8

*De sacramento matrimonii*

*De impedimenti matrimonii*

*De sacramento confirmationis*

**BAUNY**, Étienne, SJ

1564-1649

*Theologia moralis*, Paris, 1640-45

*Somme des péchés qui se commettent en tous états; de leurs conditions et qualités, et en quelles occurrences ils sont mortels ou véniels, et en quelle façon le confesseur doit interroger son pénitent*, Paris, 1630<sup>16</sup>, 1633, 1635, 1636, 1639, Paris, 1643, Rouen, 1643, Lyon, 1646

**BECANUS: Verbeeck/Van der Beeck**, Martin, SJ

1561-1624

*Theologi Opusculorum Theologorum*, 5 tomes, 1610-1621

*Opuscula*, 3 vols., Paris, 1617; 4 vols., Lyon, 1620

*Summa Theologiae Scholasticae*, 3 vols., Paris, 1615

*Manuale controversarium huius temporis in quinque libros*, 1623

---

<sup>15</sup> From Carlos Sommervogel (ed.), *Bibliothèque de la Compagnie de Jésus*, 12 vols. (Brussels, 1890-1932, re-issued Louvain, 1960) and Hugo von Hurter, *Nomenclator literarius theologiae Catholicae*, 5 vols. (3<sup>rd</sup> ed., 1903-13).

<sup>16</sup> *CLP*, p. 56n., says Sommervogel is in error and gives Paris, 1634 for the first edition.

**CARAMUEL-LOBKOWITZ**, John, O. Cist.

1606-1682

*Theologia Moralis Ad Prima Eaque Clarissima Principia Reducta*, Lugd., 1645

*Theologiae moralis fundamentalis, decalogica, canonica, civilis, praeterintentionalis, sacramentalis, regularis, militaris*, Lugd., 1657 (1<sup>st</sup> ed. 4 vols., Frankfurt, 1651<sup>17</sup>)

**CAUSSIN**, Nicolas, SJ

1583-1651

*La Cour Sainte*, 3 tomes, Paris, 1624-31

*Réponse au libelle intitulé La théologie morale des Jésuites*, Paris, 1644

**CELLOT**, Louis, SJ

1588-1658

*De Hierarchia et Hierarchis Libri IX*, 1641

**COMITOLUS: Comitoli**, Paul, SJ

1544-1626

*Responsa moralia*, 7 bks., Lyon, 1609, Crémone, 1611, Rouen, 1709

**CONINCK**, Gilles de, SJ

1571-1633

*De moralitate, natura, et effectibus actuum supernaturalium in genere. Et fide, spe, ac caritate, speciatim. Libri quator*, Antwerp, Lugd., 1623

*Responsio ad Dissertationem impugnantem absolutionem moribundi sensibus destitute: Addita explicatione duorum dutionum, circa minstrum Sacrementi Matrimonii, et dissolutionem eiusdem per conversionem alterius conjugis ad fidem*, Antwerp, 1625

**DIANA**, Antonino, Theatine

d. 1663

*Resolutionum moralium partes duodecim*, 12t., Lugd., 1629-59 (9 pts.), Venice, 1652, 1655 (pts. 10 & 11), Rome, 1656 (pt. 12)

Cf. Martin de Acolea, *Antoninus Diana coordinates*, Lyon, 1667

**DICASTILLUS, Dicastillo**, Jean de, SJ

*De Iustitia et Iure*, Anvers, 1641

**ESCOBAR y Mendoza**, Antoine de, SJ

1589-1669

---

<sup>17</sup> CLP, p. 102n., says 2 vols., Frankfurt, 1652-53.

*Examen de Confessores y practica de Penitentes, en todas las materias de la Theologia Moral*, Madrid, 1647, Paris, 1665

*Liber theologiae moralis viginti-quator Societatis Jesu Doctoribus reservatus quem R. P. Antonius de Escobar et Mendoza in Examen Confessariorum digessit*, Lyon, 1644, Pascal's ed. Brussels, 1651<sup>18</sup> [Escobar's digest]

*Universae Theologiae moralis receptiores absque lite sententiae nec non problematicae disquisitiones*, 7 vols., Lyons, 1652-1663

**FILLIUTIUS, Filiuci**, Vincent, SJ

1566-1622

*Moralium Quaestionum de Christianis officiis et casibus conscientiae, ad formam cursus, qui praelegi solet in Collegio Romano Societatis Jesu*, 2 vols., Lyon, 1622-3, re-issued 1633<sup>19</sup>

*Compendium quaestionum moralium*, 3 pts., Rome, 1626 [also *Synopsis Universae theologiae moralis, de christiani videlicet officiis, et casibus conscientiae*, Paris, 1630]

From it: *Brevis instruction pro Confessoribus excipiendis, cum adjunct interrogatio pro confessoribus longoris temporis*, Ravenspurgis, 1626

**GARASSE**, François, SJ

1584-1631

*La somme théologique des véritez capitales de la religion chrestienne*, Paris, 1625

**HURTADO**, Gaspar, SJ

1575-1646

*Tractatus de Matrimonio et Censuris*, 1627

*Tractatus de Sacramentis*, 1629

*Tractatus de Beatitudine, Actibus, Bonitate et Malitia, habitibus, virtutibus, et peccatis*, 1630

*Tractatus de Fide, Spe, et Charitate*, 1632

*De Iustitia et Jure*, 1637

**HURTADO de Mendoza**, Petrus, SJ

1578-1651

*Scholasticae, et Morales Disputationes de tribus virtutibus Theologicis*, 2 vols., 1599, Salamanca, 1631

**LAYMANN**, Paul, SJ

1574-1635

*Theologia moralis in quinque libros partita*, Munich, 1625

**LE MOYNE**, Pierre, SJ

---

<sup>18</sup> *CLP*, p. 80n.

<sup>19</sup> *Ib.*, p. 82n.

1602-1671

*La Dévotion aisée*, Paris, 1652

**LESSIUS**, Leonard, SJ

1554-1623

*De Iustitia et Iure Caeterisque Virtutibus Libri Quator*, Louvain, 1605

**MASCARENHAS**, Emmanuel, SJ

1604-1654

*Tractatus de Sacramentis in genere*, 1656

**MILHARD**, Pierre, OSB

d. 1604

*La grande guide des curez*, Lugd., 1604

**PIROT**, Georges, SJ

1599-1659

*Apologie pour les Casuistes contre les calomnies des Jansénistes*, Cologne, 1657

**PONTIUS**, see **BASILIUS**

**REBELLUS**, Ferd., SJ

d. 1608

*De obligationibus iustitiae, religionis et caritatis*, Lugd., 1608, Venice, 1610

**REGINALDUS**: **Regnauld**, Valère, SJ

1545-1623

*De prudential et caeteris in confessario requisitis ...*, 1610

*Praxis Fori Pœnitentialis ad directionem Confessarii, in usu sacri sui muneris*, 2 vols., Lyon, 1616, 1620, Cologne, 1622

*Compendiaria praxis difficiliorum casuum conscientiae, in administratione Sacramenti Poenitentiae crebro occurrentium*, 3 pts., Mayence, 1619, Douai, 1628

*Tractatus de officio poenitentis in usu Sacramenti Poenitentiae*, Venice, 1619

**SA**, Emmanuel, SJ (Manoël de Saa)

1530-1596

*Aphorismi confessariorum*, best edition after corrections Lugd., 1612

**SANCHEZ**, Thomas, SJ

1550-1610

*De Sancto Matrimonii Sacramento Disputationum libri*, 3 vols., Madrid, 1605

*Opus morale in praecepta decalogi, sive Summa casuum conscientiae*, in fol., Paris, 1615

*Consilia, seu Opuscula morali duobus Tomis contenta*, 1625

**SUAREZ**, Francis, SJ

1548-1617

*Tractatus de Legibus et de Deo Legislatore* (Coimbra, 1612)

*Defensio Fidei Catholicae et Apostolicae Adversus Anglicanae Sectae Errores* (Coimbra, 1613)

**SIRMOND**, Antoine, SJ

1591-1641

*La deffense de la vertu*, Paris, 1641

**TAMBURINI**, Thomas, SJ

1591-1675

*Naturalis et Ecclesiastici Moralis Expositio* (Venice, 1662)

*Methodus Expedite Confessionis* (Rome, 1647)

*Explicatio Decalogi* (Venice, 1654)

**TANNERUS**, **Tanner**, Adam, SJ

1572-1653

*Theologia scolastica*, 3 vols., Ingolstadt, 1621-27

*De Iustitia et Jure*

**TOLET**, François (Francisco Toledo), SJ

1523-1596

*Summa casuum conscientiae absolutissima*, Douai, 1633

**TURRIANUS**, **Torres**, Luis de

1562-1635

*Selectae disputationes in theologiam*, Lyon, 1634

**VALENTIA**, Grégoire de, SJ

1551-1603

*De discernenda humanorum contractuum Iustitia et Iniustitia*, Ingolstadt, 1577

*De iustitia in iudiciis servanda*, 1579

*De Poenitentiae Sacramento*, 1585

*Disputatio de Indulgentiis*, 1587

*Commentariorum Theologicorum Tomi quator. In quibus omnes materiae, quae continentur in Summa Divi Thomae Aquinatis explicantur*, 5 vols., Lyon, 1591-97

**VASQUEZ**, Gabriel, SJ

c.1549-1604

*Commentaria in II-II Summa Theologia Sancti Thomae Aquinatis*

## **BIBLIOGRAPHY**

### ***Manuscript and Archive***

**Bodleian Library, Oxford**, Rawlinson MS D. 878, f. 54v.: 'A Catalogue of the bookes of Dr Isaac Barrow sent to S. S. by Mr Isaac Newton Fellow of Trin: Coll: Cambr July 14. 1677'

MS Bodley 878, fol. 20r.: 'a list of books which Dr. Taylor took with him'

**British Library**, Add. MS 78364: John Evelyn, 'A briefe Account of divers Sermons recollecte at my after Retirement, and begun, Anno Do[mi]ni, MDCL'

Add. MS 78367: Evelyn, 'A rationall Account of the true Religion'

Add. MS 78632 : John Evelyn's library catalogue, 1687

Add. MS 78365: Evelyn, 'The Lamentation of Origen After His Fall'

Add. MSS 78374, 78378, 78385, 78389: Various offices and devotions composed by Evelyn

Add. MS 15948: Letters from Evelyn to Sir Richard Browne, 1647-1649

Add. MS 34702: Letters to and from Sir Richard Browne

Add. MS 78683: Letter of Basire to Claude

Add. MS 38015: Letters of Sir Robert Southwell

S.C.295(2): *A Catalogue of the Library of the Honourable Rich. Arundel Bealing Esq... Which will be Sold by Auction at his late Dwelling House... on Tuesday the 20<sup>th</sup> of this Instant April...* (London, 1725)

C.150, n.12: [Antoine Arnauld and François Hallier], *La Théologie Morale des Jésuites* (1643)

**Ch. Ch. Lib., Oxford**, Allestree S.1.25: 'Tracts relating to controversies in the Church of France 1661'

Allestree S.2.14: *La Théologie Morale des Iésuites, et Nouveaux Casuistes: Représentée par leur Pratique, et par leurs livres...* (Cologne, 1666)

Allestree S.4.10: Saint-Cyran, *Lettres Chrétiennes et Spirituelles* (below)

Allestree I.1.1: *Petri Aurelii Theologi Opera* (below)

Allestree S.2.4: Arnauld, *De la fréquente communion* (below)

Allestree S.1.11: Arnauld, *Lettre... à une personne de condition* (below)

Allestree S.4.21: Arnauld, *La Créance de l'Eglise Grecque...* (below)

Allestree S.1.16: Petau, *De la Pénitence Publique* (below)

*Print*

**Primary**<sup>20</sup>

'A. H.', *The Jesuits Catechism, according to St Ignatius Loyola* (London, 1679);

ALLESTREE, Richard, *The Practice of Christian graces, or, The Whole Duty of man* (London, 1658)

\_\_\_\_ *The Causes of the Decay of Christian Piety. Or An Impartial Survey Of the Ruines of Christian Religion, Undermin'd by Unchristian Practice* (London, 1667)

\_\_\_\_ *Forty Sermons* (Oxford-London, 1684)

AMES, William, *Conscience with the Power and Cases Thereof* (Leyden-London, 1639)

ANON., *Naissance du Ianssenisme, découverte à Monseigneur le Chancelier par le Sieur de Preville* (Louvain, 1654)

\_\_\_\_ *Les Provinciales: or The Mystery of Jesuitisme, discover'd in certain letters, written upon occasion of the present differences at Sorbonne, between the Jansenists and the Molinists, from January 1656. to March 1657. S. N. Displaying the corrupt maximes and politicks of that society. Faithfully rendered into English* (London, 1657)

\_\_\_\_ *A further Discovery of the Mystery of Jesuitism in a Collection of severall pieces representing the Humours, Designs, and Practices of those who call themselves the Society of Jesus* (London, 1658)

\_\_\_\_ *The Policy of the Jesuits, Their Insinuation into the Courts of Princes, And most of the noble Families of Europe, Discovered* (London, 1658)

\_\_\_\_ *A Discovery of the Society In relation to their Politicks. Written Originally, By A Well-Wisher to the Jesuits* (London, 1658)

\_\_\_\_ *The new heresie of the Jesuits: publicly maintain'd at Paris in the Colledge of Clermont, by conclusions, printed 12. Decemb. 1661. Denounced to all the bishops of France. Translated out of the French original* (London, 1662)

\_\_\_\_ *Pyrotechnica Loyolana, Ignatian fire-works, or, the fiery Jesuits temper and behaviour* (London, 1667)

\_\_\_\_ *Fair Warning to take heed of Popery* (London, 1674)

\_\_\_\_ [CARE, Henry], *The character of a turbulent, pragmatical Jesuit and factious Romish priest* (London, 1678)

---

<sup>20</sup> Where otherwise unobtainable early modern English works accessed through EEBO and ECCO; French through GALLICA or Google Books.

- \_\_\_\_\_ *Autokatakritoi, Or The Jesuits Condemned by their Own Witness* (London, 1679)
- \_\_\_\_\_ *The Cabinet of the Jesuits Secrets Opened* (London, 1679)
- \_\_\_\_\_ *The Roman Wonder. Being Truth Confest by Papists. Wherein the Clergy of the Church of England in their Charge of Heretical and Damnable Doctrines upon the Jesuits are fully and fairly Justified* (London, 1679)
- \_\_\_\_\_ *A Decree Made At Rome, The Second of March, 1676. Condemning Some Opinions of the Jesuits And other Casuists* (London, 1679)
- \_\_\_\_\_ *The Jesuits Morals Condemned In Sixty-Five of their professed Maxims or Tenents* (London, 1680)
- \_\_\_\_\_ *A Truth Known to Very Few: viz., That the Jesuites are down-right compleat Atheists* (London, 1680)
- \_\_\_\_\_ *The character of a Jesuit* (London, 1681)
- \_\_\_\_\_ *The Discourses of Cleander and Eudoxe upon the Provincial Letters. To which is Added, An Answer to the Apology for the Provincial Letters* (London, 1704)
- ANDREWES, Lancelot, *Ninety-Six Sermons*, ed. J. P. Parkinson and J. P. Wilson, 5 vols. (Oxford, 1841-54)
- ANNAT, François and NOUET, Jacques, *An Answer to the Provinciall Letters published by the Jansenists under the Name of Lewis Montalt against the Doctrine of the Jesuits and School Divines made by some Fathers of the Society in France*, tr. Martin Grene (Paris, 1659)
- ARNAULD, Antoine, *Œuvres de Messire Antoine Arnauld, Docteur de la Maison et Société de Sorbonne*, 43v. in 38 (Paris, 1775-83), ed. Gabriel Du Pac de Bellegarde and Jean Hauteffage
- \_\_\_\_\_ *Apologie de Monsieur Iansenius Evesque d'Ipre et de la Doctrine de S. Augustin, expliquée dans son liure, intitulé, Augustinus*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1643-44)
- \_\_\_\_\_ *Apologie pour les Saints Pères de l'Eglise, Défenseurs de la Grâce de Jésus-Christ* (Paris, 1651)
- \_\_\_\_\_ *Seconde Lettre à un duc et pair de France*, 3rd ed. (Paris, 1657 [1st ed. 1655]) [Allestree S.1.11 (1)]
- \_\_\_\_\_ *Le Renversement de la Morale de Jésus Christ Par les Erreurs des Calvinistes Touchant la Justification* (Paris, 1672)
- \_\_\_\_\_ *La Créance de L'Eglise Grecque Touchant la Transubstantion* (Paris, 1672) [Allestree S. 4.21]
- \_\_\_\_\_ *Calvinisme Convaincu de Nouveau de Dogmes Impies: ou la Justification Du Livre Du Renversement de la Morale, par les Erreurs des Calvinistes* (Cologne, 1682)
- \_\_\_\_\_ *Phantosme du Jansénisme, ou Justification des Pretendus Jansénistes par le livre mesme d'une Savoiard Docteur de Sorbonne leur nouvel accusateur; intitulé Les Préjugez légitimes contre le Jansénisme* (Cologne, 1686)

- \_\_\_\_\_ *Instructions Sur la Grâce Selon L'Écriture et les Pères* (Cologne, 1700)
- \_\_\_\_\_ with NICOLE, Pierre, *La Logique ou L'Art de Penser* (Paris, 1662)
- \_\_\_\_\_ *La Perpetuité de la Foy de l'Eglise Catholique touchant l'Eucharistie. Avec la Réfutation de l'écrit d'un Ministre contre ce Traité* (4<sup>th</sup> ed., Paris, 1666)
- \_\_\_\_\_ *L'Impiété de la Morale des Calvinistes, pleinement découverte par le livre de M. Bruguier Ministre de Nismes, approuvé par M. Claude Ministre de Charenton* (Paris, 1675)
- \_\_\_\_\_ with OTHERS, *La Théologie Morale des Jésuites, et Nouveaux Casuistes: Représentée par leur Pratique, et par leurs Livres* (Cologne, 1667) [Ch. Ch. Lib., Oxf., Allestree S.]
- AYMON, Jean, *Monumens authentiques de la religion des grecs et de la fausseté de plusieurs confessions de foi des chrétiens orientaux* (La Haye, 1708)
- BAKER, Thomas, *Reflections Upon Learning, Wherein is shewn the Insufficiency Thereof, in its several Particular. In order to evince the Usefulness and Necessity of Revelation* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., London, 1700)
- BARLOW, Thomas, *Popery, or, The principles and positions approved by the Church of Rome (when really believ'd and practis'd) are very dangerous to all* (London, 1679)
- \_\_\_\_\_ *Autoschediasmata, De studio theologiae, or, Directions for the choice of books in the study of divinity* (Oxford, 1699)
- BARLOW, William, *An Answer to a Catholike English-Man* (London, 1609)
- BARROW, Isaac, *The Works of Dr. Isaac Barrow. With Some Account of His Life, Summary of Each Discourse, Notes, &c.*, ed. T. S. Hughes, 7 vols. (London, 1830-31)
- BAYLE, Pierre, *Dictionnaire Historique et Critique*, 4 vols. (5<sup>th</sup> edition, Amsterdam-Leiden-La Haye-Utrecht, 1740)
- BAXTER, Richard, *A Key for Catholicks, To open the Jugling of the Jesuits* (London, 1659)
- \_\_\_\_\_ *A Christian Directory: Or, A Summ of Practical Theologie and Cases of Conscience* (London, 1673)
- \_\_\_\_\_ *The true history of councils* (London, 1682)
- BEER, E. S. de (ed.), *The Diary of John Evelyn*, 6 vols. (Oxford, 1955)
- BELL, Thomas, *The Anatomie of Popish Tyrannie* (London, 1603)
- BETTENSON, Henry, *Documents of the Christian Church* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., London, 1963)
- BIRCH, Thomas, *A collection of the state papers of John Thurloe, Esq; secretary, first, to the Council of State, and afterwards to the two Protectors, Oliver and Richard Cromwell*, 7 vols. (London, 1742)
- BLOUNT, Thomas, *Glossographia, or, A dictionary interpreting all such hard words of whatsoever language now used in our refined English tongue* (London, 1661)
- BORROMEO, Carlo, St., *Instructions de S. Charles Borromée* (Besançon, 1839)

- BRAMHALL, John, *A just vindication of the Church of England, from the unjust aspersion of criminal schisme...* (London, 1654)
- \_\_\_\_\_ *Schisme guarded and beaten back...* (The Hague, 1658)
- \_\_\_\_\_ *The Works of the Most Reverend Father in God John Bramhall, D.D.*, ed. A. W. Haddan, 5 vols. (Oxford, 1842-5)
- BRAY, William (ed.), *Diary and Correspondence of John Evelyn, F. R. S.*, 4 vols. (London, 1859-62)
- BULL, George, *Harmonia Apostolica* (Oxford, 1842)
- BURNET, Gilbert, *A Discourse on the Memory of that Rare and truely Virtuous Person Sir Robert Fletcher of Saltoun* (Edinburgh, 1665)
- \_\_\_\_\_ *A Modest and Free Conference Betwixt a Conformist and a Non-conformist, about the present distempers of Scotland* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., Edinburgh?, 1669)
- \_\_\_\_\_ *A relation of a conference held about religion at London, the third of April, 1676 by Edw. Stillingfleet...and Gilbert Burnet, with some gentlemen of the Church of Rome* (London, 1676)
- \_\_\_\_\_ *A Sermon Preached ... at Bow-Church, September 2. 1680* (London, 1680)
- \_\_\_\_\_ *Sermon preached before the Aldermen of the city of London* (n.p., 1681)
- \_\_\_\_\_ *The letter writ by the last Assembly General of the Clergy of France...translated into English, and examined* (London, 1683)
- \_\_\_\_\_ *A Sermon Preached at the Funeral of the Honourable Robert Boyle: At St Martin's in the Fields, January 7 1691/2* (London, 1692)
- \_\_\_\_\_ *A Discourse of the Pastoral Care* (London, 1692)
- \_\_\_\_\_ *Of Charity to the Houshold of Faith, A Sermon* (London, 1698)
- \_\_\_\_\_ *An Exposition of the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., London, 1700)
- \_\_\_\_\_ *Bishops Burnet's History of His Own Time*, 2 vols. (London, 1724-34)
- \_\_\_\_\_ *Bibliotheca Burnetiana: being a catalogue of the intire library of His Excellency William Burnet Esq.* (London, 1730?)
- BUTLER, Joseph, *The Analogy of Religion*, ed. G. R. Crooks (New York, 1860)
- CALVIN, John, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, ed. John T. McNeil, 2 vols. (London, 1961)
- CARAMUEL, Jean-Lobkowitz, *Theologiae moralis fundamentalis* (Louvain, 1657)
- CARPENTER, Richard, *A New Play Call'd The Pragmatical Jesuit New-leven'd. A comedy* (London, 1665)
- CARY, Lucius, Viscount, *Of the Infallibilitie of the Church of Rome* (Oxford, 1645)

CEYSSSENS, Lucien, *La première bulle contre Jansénius: sources relatives à son histoire, 1644-1653*, 2 vols. (Brussels, 1961)

\_\_\_\_\_ *La fin de la première période du Jansénisme. Sources des années 1654-1660*, 2 vols. (Brussels, 1963-65)

CHILLINGWORTH, William, *The Religion of Protestants A Safe Way to Salvation* (London, 1870)

CLARKSON, David, *The Practical Divinity of the Papists Discovered to be Destructive of Christianity and Men's Souls* (London, 1676)

COLONA, Dominique de, *Dictionnaire des Livres Jansénistes, ou qui favorisent le Jansénisme*, 4 vols. (Anvers, 1752)

COOKE, Edward, *A True Narrative of the Inhumane Positions and Practices of the Jesuites and Papists towards all Protestants...especially as to the points of Murther and Treason* (London, 1680)

CRESSY, Serenus, *Exomologesis, or, A faithfull narration of the occasion and motives of the conversion unto Catholique unity of Hugh-Paulin Cressy* (Paris, 1647)

\_\_\_\_\_ *Fanaticism Fanatically imputed to the Catholick Church by Doctour Stillingfleet: And The Imputation refuted and retorted by S.C. a Catholic O.S.B.* (n.p., 1672)

DODWELL, Henry, *Two Short Discourses Against the Romanists* (London, 1676)

DONNE, John, *Biathanatos* (London, 1644)

\_\_\_\_\_ *Fifty Sermons* (London, 1649)

\_\_\_\_\_ *Essayes in Divinity* (London, 1651)

\_\_\_\_\_ *Paradoxes, Problemes, essayes, characters* (London, 1652)

'E. G.', *The horrid, direful, prodigious and diabolical practice of the Jesuits discovered* (London, 1679)

ELLIS, Mark A., *The Arminian Confession of 1621* (Princeton, 2005)

ERASMUS, Desiderius, *The second tome or volume of the Paraphrase of Erasmus upon the newe testament: conteyning the Epistles of S. Paul, and other the Apostles. Wherunto is added a paraphrase upon the Revelation of St. John* (London, cum privilegio, 1549)

EVELYN, John, *Μυστήριον της Ανομίας, That is, Another Part of the Mystery of Jesuitism: or, The New Heresie of the Jesuits, Publickly maintained at Paris...Together with The Imaginary Heresie, in three Letters* (London, 1664)

\_\_\_\_\_ *The Pernicious Consequences of the New Heresie of the Jesuits against the King and the State. By an Advocate of Parliament* (London, 1666)

FLECKNOE, Richard, *Enigmaticall Characters, all taken to the life from severall persons, humours, and dispositions* (London, 1658), pp. 100-102

- FOWLER, Edward, *Libertas Evangelica: Or A Discourse of Christian Liberty. Being a farther Pursuance of the Argument of The Design of Christianity* (London, 1680)
- GALE, Theophilus, *The True Idea of Jansenisme, both Historick and Dogmatick* (London, 1669)
- \_\_\_\_\_ *The Court of the Gentiles*, pt. iv, bk. 3 (London, 1678)
- GARASSE, François, *Somme théologique des Véritez capitales de la Religion chrestienne* (Paris, 1625)
- GAUDEN, John, *Ecclesiae Anglicanae Suspiria. The Tears, Sighs, Complaints, and Prayers of the Church of England* (London, 1659)
- GENET, François, *Théologie morale ou résolutions des cas de conscience selon l'Ecriture Sainte, les Canons et les Saints Pères* (Paris, 1670)
- GIBBON, Edward, *Memoirs of My Life*, ed. Betty Radice (London, 1990)
- GLANVILL, Joseph, *The Way of happiness: Represented in its Difficulties and Incouragements, And Cleared from many Popular and Dangerous Mistakes* (London, 1670)
- GRENE, Martin, *Account of the Jesuites Life and Doctrine* (London, 1661)
- GRES-GAYER, Jacques M., *Jansénisme en Sorbonne, 1643-1656* (Paris, 1996)
- \_\_\_\_\_ *En Sorbonne, Autour des Provinciales. Edition critique des Mémoires de l'Abbé de Beaubrun 1655-1656* (Paris, 1997)
- GRIFFITHS, John (ed.), *The Two Books of Homilies appointed to be Read in Churches* (Oxford, 1859)
- GROTIUS, Hugo, *Via ad pacem ecclesiasticam* (Amsterdam, 1642)
- \_\_\_\_\_ *Annales et Historiae* (Amsterdam, 1658)
- HALL, Joseph, *Epistles. The third and last volume* (London, 1611)
- \_\_\_\_\_ *Christian Moderation* (London, 1640)
- \_\_\_\_\_ *Cases of Conscience Practically Resolved: Containing a Decision of the principall Cases of Conscience, of daily Concernment, and continual Use amongst Men* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed., London, 1654)
- \_\_\_\_\_ *The Contemplations upon the History of the New Testament, now complete. The second Tome. Together with Divers Treatises reduced to the greater Volume* (London, 1661)
- HAMMOND, Henry, *A Practicall Catechisme* (Oxford, 1645)
- \_\_\_\_\_ *Large Additions to the Practicall Catechisme* (London, 1646)
- \_\_\_\_\_ *Of the Power of the Keys: Or, Of Binding and Loosing* (London, 1647)
- \_\_\_\_\_ *Of the Reasonableness of Christian Religion* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed., London, 1650)

\_\_\_\_\_ *A Paraphrase and Annotations upon all the books of the New Testament briefly explaining all the difficult places thereof* (London, 1659 ed., originally 1653)

HERMANT, Godefroi, *Mémoires*, ed. A. Gazier, 6 vols. (Paris, 1905-1910)

HOBBS, Thomas, *The Elements of Law Natural and Politic*, ed. J. C. A. Gaskin (Oxford, 1994)

\_\_\_\_\_ *On the Citizen*, ed. and tr. Richard Tuck and Michael Silverstone (Cambridge, 1997)

\_\_\_\_\_ *Leviathan, Or the Matter, Forme, & Power of a Common-Wealth Ecclesiastical and Civill*, ed. C. B. MacPherson (Harmondsworth, 1968)

\_\_\_\_\_ *Behemoth, Or, The Long Parliament*, ed. F. Tönnies (London, 1990)

HOLDEN, Henry, *The analysis of divine faith, or, Two treatises of the resolution of Christian belief with an appendix of schism* (Paris, 1658)

\_\_\_\_\_ [?] *A Journall of all Proceedings between the Jansenists, and the Jesuits: From the first coming abroad of the Provincial Letters to the Publication of the Censures of the Clergy of France, and Theologal Faculty of Paris passed upon a book entituled An Apology for the Casuists. Together with the Censure itself of the said Faculty. Publish'd by a Well-wisher to the distressed Church of England* (London, 1659)

\_\_\_\_\_ *A letter written by Mr Henry Holden, Doctor of the faculty at Paris, touching the prohibition at Rome of Mr Blacklow's book, intituled, Tabulae Suffragiales* (Douai?, 1657/8)

\_\_\_\_\_ *Check: Or Inquiry, into the Late Act of the Roman Inquisition: Busily, and pressingly disperst over all England by the Jesuits* (London, 1662)

HUNTER, Michael, et al (eds.), *The Correspondence of Robert Boyle*, 6 vols. (London, 2001)

HYDE, Edward, Earl of Clarendon, *Animadversions Upon a Book, Intituled: Fanaticism Fanatically Imputed* (London, 1673)

\_\_\_\_\_ *The Life of Edward Earl of Clarendon...Written by Himself*, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1857)

ISHAM, Gyles (ed.), *The Correspondence of Bishop Brian Duppa and Sir Justinian Isham, 1640-1660* (Northamptonshire Record Society, xlv, 1955)

JANSEN, Cornelius, *Cornelii Iansenii Episcopi Iprensis Augustinus seu doctrina S. Augustini de humanae naturae sanitate, aegritudine, medicina adversus Pelagianos & Massilienses* (Louvain, 1640)

\_\_\_\_\_ *Discours de la réformation de l'homme intérieur, prononcé par un S. evesque. Avec des extraits de M. Hamon et D. le Nain de la Trape*, tr. Robert Arnauld d'Andilly (n.p., n.d. [1644])

JURIEU, Pierre, *La politique du clergé de France* (n.p., 1681)

KENNET, Basil, *Pastoral Instructions and Meditations...Recommended to the Clergy of His Diocese by Antony Godeau, Bishop of Grasse and Vence* (London, 1700)

LAW, William, *A Practical Treatise Upon Christian Perfection* (London, 1726)

\_\_\_\_\_ *A Serious Call to a Devout and Holy Life* (London, 1905)

LLOYD, William, *A Sermon at the Funeral of Sr. Edmund Bury-Godfrey, one of his Majesties Justices of the Peace, who was barbarously murdered* (London, 1678)

LONDON, William, *A catalogue of the most vendible books in England orderly and alphabetically digested...* (London, 1657)

MATTHEWS, A. G., *Walker Revised: being a revision of John Walker's Sufferings of the Clergy during the Grand Rebellion, 1642-60* (new ed., Oxford, 1988)+

MOLINA, Luis de, *Liberi Arbitrii cum Gratiae Donis, Divina Praescientia, Providentia, Praedestinatione et Reprobatione Concordia*, ed. J. Rabenek (Oniae, Collegium Maximum, S.I., 1953)

MONTAGU, Richard, *Appello Caesarem. A Just Appeal From Two Unjust Informers* (London, 1625)

MORERI, Louis, *Le Grand Dictionnaire Historique, ou le mélange curieux de l'histoire sacrée et profane*, 10 vols. (20<sup>th</sup> ed., Paris, 1759)

MORTON, Thomas, *A Preamble unto an Incounter with P.R. the Author of the deceitful Treatise of Mitigation: Concerning the Romish doctrine both in question of Rebellion and Aequivocation* (London, 1608)

NICOLE, Pierre, 'William Wendrock', *Ludovici Montalti Litterae provinciales de Morali et Politica Jesuitarum, e gallico latinae versae cum notis per Guglielmum Wendrockium* (Cologne, 1658)

\_\_\_\_ tr. JONCOUX, Mlle de, *Les Provinciales, ou Lettres Ecrites par Louis de Montalte. Avec les notes de G. Wendrock*, 3t. (n.p., 1699)

\_\_\_\_ *Réfutation des Principales Erreurs des Quietistes* (Paris, 1695)

OATES, Titus, *An exact discovery of the mystery of iniquity as it is now in practice among the Jesuits and other their emissaries* (London 1679)

OGLE, Octavius, et al (eds.) *Calendar of the Clarendon State Papers*, 5 vols. (Oxford, 1869-1970)

OWTRAM, William, *Twenty Sermons* (London, 1682)

'P. B.', *Relation of the Country of Jansenia* (London, 1668)

PARIS, Anselme de, *La Créance de l'Eglise Grecque Touchant la Transubstantiation, défendue contre la Réponse du Ministre Claude au livre de Monsieur Arnaud* (Paris, 1672)

PASCAL, Blaise, *Les Provinciales ou Les Lettres écrites par Louis de Montalte à un provincial de ses amis et aux RR. PP. Jésuites*, ed. Louis Cognet, rev. Gérard Ferreyrolles (Paris, 1992)

\_\_\_\_ *Pensées*, ed. Louis Lafuma, 2 vols. (Paris, 1958)

\_\_\_\_ *Pensées*, tr. A. J. Krailsheimer (London, 1966)

\_\_\_\_ *Œuvres complètes*, ed. Jacques Chevalier (Paris, 1954)

\_\_\_\_ *Œuvres Complètes*, ed. Jean Mesnard, 4 vols. (Paris, 1964-92)

PATRICK, Simon, *Mensa Mystica; Or A Discourse Concerning the Sacrament of the Lords Supper* (London, 1660)

\_\_\_\_\_ *An Appendix to the Third Part of the Friendly Debate, Being a Letter of the Conformist to the Non-Conformist* (London, 1670)

\_\_\_\_\_ *The Witnesses to Christianity; Or, The Certainty of our Faith and Hope: In a Discourse upon I S. John V.11* (London, 1678)

\_\_\_\_\_ *A Treatise of Repentance and of Fasting, Especially of the Lent-Fast* (London, 1686)

PERKINS, William, *The whole treatise of the cases of conscience distinguished into three bookes: the first whereof is revised and corrected in sundrie places, and the other two annexed* (Cambridge, 1606)

PETAU, Denis, *De la Pénitence Publique, et de la Préparation à la Communion* (Paris, 1645)

PIERCE, Thomas, *The divine philanthropie defended...in vindication of some notes concerning Gods decrees, especially of reprobation* (London, 1657)

\_\_\_\_\_ *A Decade of Caveats to the People of England, Of General Use in All Times, but most seasonable in These* (London, 1679)

PIROT, Georges, *Apologie pour les Casuistes contre les calomnies des Jansénistes* (Paris, 1657)

PSEUDO-DIONYSIUS, *The Complete Works* (The Classics of Western Spirituality, New Jersey, 1987)

PUGH, Robert, *Blacklo's Cabal* [1680], ed. T. A. Birrell (Farnborough, 1970)

RACINE, Jean, *Abrégé de l'Histoire de Port-Royal* (Paris, 1767)

RAPIN, René, *Histoire du jansénisme depuis son origine jusqu'en 1644*, ed. Abbé Domenech (Paris, n.d.)

RÉCALDE, I. de, *Écrits des Curés de Paris Contre les Jésuites* (Paris, 1921)

REES, Thomas, tr., *The Racovian Catechism* (London, 1818)

RUYSBROECK, Jan van, *The Adornment of the Spiritual Marriage, The Sparkling Stone, The Book of Supreme Truth*, tr. C. A. Wynschenk (London, 1916)

SACY, Louis-Isaac Lemaistre de, *Le Nouveau Testament de Nostre Seigneur Jésus Christ, Traduit en François Selon l'édition Vulgate, avec les différences du Grec* (Mons [Amsterdam], 1667)

SAINT-AMOUR, Louis Gorin de, *The Journal of Monsr. de Saint Amour Doctor of Sorbonne*, tr. 'G. Havers' (London, 1664)

SAINTE-BEUVE, Jacques de, *Résolutions de plusieurs cas de conscience touchant la morale et la discipline de l'Eglise* (Lyon, 1702)

SAINT-CYRAN, Jean Duvergier de Hauranne, abbé de, *Somme des fautes et faussetez capitales contenües dans la Somme théologique de P. Garasse*, 4t. (Paris, 1626)

\_\_\_\_\_ *Petri Aureli Theologi Opera*, 3t. (Paris, 1646) [Ch. Ch. Lib., Oxf., Allestree I.1.1]

\_\_\_\_ [Society of Jesus,] *Les Reliques du Messire Iean du Verger de Hauranne, Abbé de Saint-Cyran, Extraites des ouvrages qu'il a composez & donnez au public* (Louvain, 1646)

\_\_\_\_ *Théologie Familière, avec divers autres petits traitez de dévotion* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., Paris, 1669)

\_\_\_\_ *Lettres Chrétiennes et Spirituelles, de L'Abbé de S. Cyran. Nouvelle Edition, Augmentée d'un Traité de la Pauvreté de Jésus-Christ, du même Auteur*, 3t. (Lyon, 1674)

SALES, François de, St., *Œuvres*, ed. A. Ravier and Roger Devos (Paris, 1969)

SANDERSON, Robert, *De Iuramento. Seven Lectures Concerning the Obligation of Promissory Oathes* (London, 1655)

\_\_\_\_ *Ten Lectures On the Obligation of Humane Conscience. Read in the Divinity School at Oxford, in the Year, 1647* (London, 1660)

\_\_\_\_ *Nine Cases of Conscience Occasionally Determined by Robert Sanderson* (London, 1679)

SCHOPENHAUER, Arthur, *Essays and Aphorisms*, tr. R. J. Hollingsdale (London, 2004)

SERGEANT, John, *Reflexions upon the Oathes of Supremacy and Allegiance. By a Catholick Gentleman, an Obedient Son of the Church, and Loyal Subject of His Majesty* (n.p., 1661)

\_\_\_\_ *A Discovery of the Groundlesness and Insincerity Of my Ld. of Down's Dissuasive. Being the Fourth Appendix to Sure-Footing* (London, 1665)

\_\_\_\_ *The Jesuits Gospel, According to Saint Ignatius Loiola Wherein Their Impious Doctrines against the Christian Faith, Their Pernituous Maxims against Christian Princes, and Their Unjust Practices destructive to all Humane Society, Contrary to the Sacred Scriptures, The Laws of God, and Right Reason, are declared* (London, 1679)

\_\_\_\_ *An account of the chapter erected by William, titular bishop of Chalcedon and ordinary of England and Scotland*, ed. W. Turnbull (London, 1853)

\_\_\_\_ *The Method to Science* (London, 1696)

SÉVIGNÉ, Mme de, *Lettres*, ed. E. Gérard-Gailly, 3 vols. (Paris, 1953-57)

SHERLOCK, William, *The Second Part of the Preservative Against Popery. Shewing how Contrary Popery is to the True Ends of the Christian Religion. Fitted for the Instruction of Unlearned Protestants* (London, 1688)

SINGER, Samuel Weller (ed.), *The Correspondence of Henry Hyde, Earl of Clarendon*, 2 vols. (London, 1828)

SOUTH, Robert, *Twelve Sermons Preached upon Several Occasions. The Second Volume* (London, 1694)

STILLINGFLEET, Edward, *A Rational Account of the Grounds of Protestant Religion* (London, 1665)

\_\_\_\_ *A discourse concerning the idolatry practised in the Church of Rome* (London, 1671)

\_\_\_\_\_ *An Answer to Several late Treatises, Occasioned by a Book entituled A Discourse Concerning the Idolatry Practised in the Church of Rome, and the Hazard of Salvation in the Communion of it* (London, 1673)

\_\_\_\_\_ *A Sermon preached before the King...March 7, 1679* (London, 1679)

\_\_\_\_\_ *The Unreasonableness of Separation, or, An impartial Account of the History, Nature, and Pleas of the Present Separation from the Communion of the Church of England* (London, 1681)

\_\_\_\_\_ *The Doctrines and Practices of the Church of Rome Truly Represented; In Answer to a Book Intituled, A Papist Misrepresented, and Represented, &c.* (London, 1686)

\_\_\_\_\_ *The Council of Trent examin'd and disprov'd by Catholick tradition* (London, 1688)

\_\_\_\_\_ *Fifty Sermons Preached Upon Several Occasions. By the Right Reverend Father in God, Edward Stillingfleet, Late Lord Bishop of Worcester* (London, 1707)

STOPFORD, Joshua, *The Wayes and Methods of Romes Advancement* (n.p., 1672)

TAYLOR, Jeremy, *A sermon preached in Saint Maries Church in Oxford. Upon the anniversary of the Gunpowder-Treason* (Oxford, 1638)

\_\_\_\_\_ *Clerus Domini; or, A discourse of the divine institution, necessity, sacredness, and separation of the office ministerial* (London, 1651)

\_\_\_\_\_ *The real presence and spirituall of Christ in the blessed sacrament proved against the doctrine of transubstantion* (London, 1653)

\_\_\_\_\_ *A collection of offices or forms of prayer in cases ordinary and extraordinary* (London, 1657/8)

\_\_\_\_\_ *The Worthy Communicant Or A Discourse of the Nature, Effects, and Blessings consequent to the worthy receiving of the LORDS SUPPER And of all the duties required in order to a worthy preparation. Together With the Cases of Conscience occurring in the duty of him that Ministers and of him that Communicates. To which are added Devotions fitted to every part of the Ministrations* (London, 1660)

\_\_\_\_\_ *Ductor Dubitantium, Or The Rule of Conscience In all her generall measures: Serving as a great Instrument for the determination of Cases of Conscience. In Four Books* (London, 1660)

\_\_\_\_\_ *A Dissuasive from Popery to the people of Ireland* (London, 1664)

\_\_\_\_\_ *The Second Part of the Dissuasive from Popery* (London, 1667)

\_\_\_\_\_ *Dekas Embolimaios A Supplement to the Eniautos, Or Course of Sermons for the Whole Year : Being Eleven Sermons Explaining the Nature of Faith, and Obedience, in relation to God, and the Ecclesiastical and Secular Powers respectively* (London, 1673)

\_\_\_\_\_ *B. Taylor's Opuscula* (London, 1678)

\_\_\_\_\_ *The Whole Works of the Right Reverend Jeremy Taylor, D. D.*, ed. Reginald Heber, rev. and corrected in 10 vols. Charles Page Eden (London, 1850-54)

\_\_\_\_\_ *Holy Living and Holy Dying* (London, 1887)

TENISON, Thomas, *The Creed of Mr. Hobbes Examined* (London, 1670)

\_\_\_\_\_ *A Defence of Dr. Tenison's Sermon of Discretion in Giving Alms* (London, 1688)

\_\_\_\_\_ *A Friendly Debate Between a Roman Catholick and a Protestant, Concerning the Doctrine of Transubstantiation* (London, 1688)

\_\_\_\_\_ *A Sermon Concerning the Wandring of the Mind in God's Service* (London, 1691)

\_\_\_\_\_ *A Sermon Concerning Holy Resolution* (London, 1695)

\_\_\_\_\_ [Anon.], *The Guide of a Christian* (London, 1696)

THOMASON, George, *A Catalogue of the pamphlets, books, newspapers and manuscripts collected by George Thomason*, 2 vols. (London, 1908)

THOMPSON, William M. (ed.), *Bérulle and the French School: Selected Writings* (New York, 1989)

THORNDIKE, Herbert, *An Epilogue to the Tragedy of the Church of England, being A Necessary Consideration and brief Resolution of the chief Controversies in Religion that divide The Western Church: Occasioned by the present Calamity of the Church of England* (London, 1659)

\_\_\_\_\_ *Theological Works*, ed. A. W. Haddan, 7 vols. in 6 (1844-56)

TILLOTSON, John, *Bibliotheca Tillotsoniana: Or a Catalogue Of the Curious Library of Dr. John Tillotson Late Archbishop of Canterbury* (1695)

\_\_\_\_\_ *The Works of the Most Reverend Dr. John Tillotson, Late Lord Archbishop of Canterbury: Containing Fifty four Sermons and Discourses on Several Occasions. Together with The Rule of Faith* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., London, 1699)

\_\_\_\_\_ *Of Sincerity and Constancy in the Faith and Profession of the True Religion, In Fifteen Sermons* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed., London, 1700)

TONGE, Israel, *The Jesuits Morals collected by a Doctor of the Colledge of Sorbon in Paris* (London, 1670)

\_\_\_\_\_ *Jesuitical Aphorisms* (London, 1679)

VOLTAIRE, *Lettres Philosophiques*, ed. F. A. Taylor (Oxford, 1970)

VOSSIUS, Gerard, *Historiae, De controversiis, Quas Pelagius eiusque reliquae moverunt* (Leiden, 1618)

WAKE, William, *The Missionarie's Arts Discovered, or, An Account of their Ways of Insimulation, their Artifices and Several Methods of which they serve themselves in making Converts* (n. p., 1688)

\_\_\_\_\_ *Sermons and Discourses Upon Several Occasions* (London, 1690)

WALTON, Brian (ed.), *Novum D. N Jesu Christi Testamentum juxta editionem Bibliorum polyglot.* (London, 1698)

WATSON, Richard, *Akolouthos, or, A Second Faire Warning to take Heed of the Scotish Discipline* (The Hague, 1651)

WESLEY, John, *A Plain Account of Christian Perfection, As Believed and Taught By the Rev. Mr. John Wesley, From the Year 1725, to the Year 1765* (Bristol, 1766)

\_\_\_\_\_ *The Works of John Wesley*, ed. Thomas Jackson, 14 vols. (1872)

WESTMINSTER ASSEMBLY, *The Confession of Faith and the Larger and Shorter Catechisms, First agreed upon by the Assembly of Divines at Westminster* (Amsterdam, 1649)

WHITE, Newport J. D. (ed.), *A Catalogue of Books in the French Language, Printed in or before A.D. 1715, Remaining in Archbishop Marsh's Library, Dublin, with an Appendix, relating to the Cashel Diocesan Library* (Dublin, 1918)

WHITE, Thomas, *Tabulae Suffragiales De terminandis Fidei litibus, ab Ecclesia Catholica fixae* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., London, 1655)

\_\_\_\_\_ *Sonus Buccinae: Sive Tres Tractatus de Virtutibus Fidei & Theologiae, De Principiis earundem, & de Erroribus Oppositis. Quibus accesserunt Quaestio Theologica, de Gratia & Libero Arbitrio. Mens Augustini de Gratia Adam, & Ratio Villicationis de Medio Animarum Statu* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Cologne, 1659)

\_\_\_\_\_ *A Catechism of Christian doctrin* [sic] (Paris, 1659)

\_\_\_\_\_ *A letter to a person of Honour: written by Mr. Thomas White, In Vindication of himself and his doctrine* (1659)

\_\_\_\_\_ *Religion and Reason Mutually corresponding and assisting each other* (Paris, 1660)

\_\_\_\_\_ *Devotion and Reason* (Paris, 1661)

WILKINS, John, *Of the Principles and Duties of Natural Religion* (London, 1675)

WILSON, John, *The Cheats* (London, 1664)

WOOD, Anthony à, *Athenae Oxonienses. An exact history of all the writers and bishops who have had their education in the...University of Oxford, from...1500, to the author's death in November 1695*, 2 vols. (London, 1691-92)

\_\_\_\_\_ *The Life and Times of Anthony Wood, antiquary, of Oxford, 1632-1695*, ed. Andrew Clark, 5 vols. (Oxford, 1891-1900)

WOODHEAD, Abraham, *The Greeks opinion touching the Eucharist misrepresented by Monsieur Claude in his answer to M. Nicole* (London?, 1686)

## Secondary

ABERCROMBIE, Nigel, *The Origins of Jansenism* (Oxford, 1936)

ABERNATHY, G. R., Jr., 'Clarendon and the Declaration of Indulgence', *JEH*, 11, 1 (1960), pp. 55-73

ADAM, Antoine, *Du mysticisme à la révolte. Les jansénistes du XVIIe siècle* (Paris, 1968)

ALLISON, Anthony F., 'An English Gallican: Henry Holden (1596/7-1662), Part I (To 1648)', *RH*, 22 (1995)

\_\_\_\_\_ 'Richard Smith's Gallican Backers and Jesuit Opponents': 'Part I: Some of the Issues Raised by Kellison's *Treatise of the Hierarchie*', *RH*, 18 (1986); 'Part II: Smith at Paris as Protégé of Richelieu 1631-c. 1642', *ibid.*, 19 (1988); 'Part III: Continuation of the Controversy 1631-c. 1643', *ibid.*, 20 (1990)

ALLISON, C. F., *The Rise of Moralism. The Proclamation of the Gospel from Hooker to Baxter* (London, 1966)

ARMOGATHE, J-R. (dir.), *Le Grand Siècle et la Bible* (Paris, 1989)

\_\_\_\_\_ 'Le *Chapelet Secret*' de Mère Agnès Arnauld', *XVIIe siècle*, 170 (1991)

ASCOLI, Georges, *La Grande-Bretagne devant l'opinion française au XVIIe siècle*, 2 vols. in 1 (Geneva, 1971)

BACHELET, Xavier-Marie le, *Prédestination et Grâce Efficace. Controverses dans la Compagnie de Jésus au temps d'Aquaviva (1610-1613)*, 2 vols. (Louvain, 1931)

BACKUS, Irena (ed.), *The Reception of the Church Fathers in the West. From the Carolingians to the Maurists* (2 vols., Leiden-New York-Köln, 1997)

BANGS, Carl, *Arminius. A Study in the Dutch Reformation* (Nashville, 1971)

BARKER, John, *Strange Contrarieties. Pascal in England during the Age of Reason* (Montreal-London, 1975)

BASTIDE, Charles, *The Anglo-French Entente in the Seventeenth Century* (London-New York-Toronto, 1914)

BAUDIN, Emile, *Études historiques et critiques sur la philosophie de Pascal*, 3 vols. (Neuchâtel, 1947)

BERGIN, Joseph, *Cardinal de la Rochefoucauld. Leadership and Reform in the French Church* (New Haven-London, 1987)

\_\_\_\_\_ *Church, Society and Religious Change in France, 1580-1730* (New Haven-London, 2009)

BETTS, C. J., *Early Deism in France. From the so-called 'déistes' of Lyon (1564) to Voltaire's Lettres philosophiques (1734)* (The Hague, 1984)

BIRRELL, T. A., 'English Catholics without a Bishop 1655-1672', *RH*, 4, 4 (1957-8)

BOER, Wietse de, *The Conquest of the Soul: Confession, Discipline and Public Order in Counter-Reformation Milan* (Leiden, 2000)

BOLTON, F. R., *The Caroline Tradition of the Church of Ireland* (London, 1958)

- BOSHER, Robert M., *The Making of the Restoration Settlement: The Influence of the Laudians, 1649-1662* (London, 1951)
- BOSSY, John, *The English Catholic Community 1750* (London, 1975)
- \_\_\_\_\_ 'The Social History of Confession in the Age of Reformation', *Transactions of the Royal History Society*, 5<sup>th</sup> ser., 25 (1975)
- \_\_\_\_\_ *Christianity in the West, 1400-1700* (Oxford, 1985)
- \_\_\_\_\_ 'Practices of Satisfaction, 1215-1700', *Studies in Church History*, 40 (Woodbridge, 2004)
- BRADLEY, Robert I., 'Blacklo and the Counter-Reformation: An Inquiry into the Strange Death of Catholic England', in Charles H. Carter (ed.), *From the Renaissance to the Counter-Reformation* (London, 1966)
- BREMOND, Henri, *Histoire Littéraire du sentiment religieux en France depuis la fin des guerres de religion jusqu'à nos jours*, 12 vols. (Paris, 1916-36)
- BRIGGS, Robin, *Communities of Belief* (Oxford, 1989)
- BROCKLISS, L. W., 'The *Lettres Provinciales* as a Jansenist Calumny: Pascal and Moral Theology in Mid-Seventeenth Century France', *Seventeenth Century French Studies*, 8 (1986), pp. 5-22
- BROUTIN, Paul, *La Réforme Pastorale en France au XVIIe Siècle*, 2 vols. (Tournai, 1956)
- BROWN, Meg Lota, *Donne and the Politics of Conscience in Early Modern England* (Leiden, 1995)
- BROWN, Peter, *Augustine of Hippo. A Biography* (Berkeley, 1967)
- BURROWS, Mark, *Jean Gerson and De Consolatione Theologiae (1418)* (Tübingen, 1991)
- BUSSIÈRE, Groupe de la, *Pratiques de la Confession. Des Pères du désert à Vatican II* (Paris, 1983)
- BYRNE, Edmund F., 'Situation et probabilité chez Saint Thomas d'Aquin', *Revue Philosophique de Louvain*, 64, 84 (1966), pp. 525-49
- \_\_\_\_\_ *Probability and Opinion: A study in the late-medieval presuppositions of post-medieval theories of probability* (The Hague, 1968)
- CABROL, F., 'Bossuet, ses relations avec l'Angleterre', *Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique*, 27, 3 (1931)
- CAMPBELL, Ted A., *The Religion of the Heart. A Study of European Religious Life in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries* (Columbia, SC, 1991)
- CARIOU, Pierre, *Pascal et la casuistique* (Paris, 1993)
- CAROLL, Robert Todd, *The Common-Sense Philosophy of Religion of Edward Stillingfleet 1635-1699* (The Hague, 1975)
- CERTEAU, Michel de, 'Crise sociale et réformisme spirituel au début du XVIIe siècle: Une "Nouvelle Spiritualité" chez les Jésuites français', *Revue d'Ascétique et de Mystique*, 41 (1965), pp. 339-86

CEYSSENS, Lucien, 'Le Jansénisme. Considérations Historiques Préliminaires à Sa Notion', in *Nuove Ricerche Storiche Sul Giansenismo* (Analecta Gregoriana, 71, Rome, 1953), pp. 3-32

CHADWICK, Owen, *John Cassian* (Cambridge, 1968)

CHATELLIER, Louis, *The Europe of the Devout*, tr. Jean Birrell (Cambridge, 1987)

CHÉDOZEAU, Bernard, 'La formation du clergé à Alet pendant l'épiscopat de Nicolas Pavillon (1639-1677)', *CPR*, 32 (1983)

\_\_\_\_\_ 'La Publication de L'Écriture par Port-Royal: Première Partie: 1653-1669', *CPR*, 33 (1984)

\_\_\_\_\_ 'La Publication de L'Écriture par Port-Royal: Deuxième Partie: L'Ancien Testament de la "Bible de Sacy" – 1672-1693', *CPR*, 35 (1986)

*La Bible et la Liturgie en Français. L'Église tridentine et les traductions bibliques et liturgiques* (Paris, 1990)

\_\_\_\_\_ 'La faculté de théologie de Paris au XVIIe siècle: un lieu privilégié des conflits entre gallicans et ultramontains (1600-1720)', *Mélanges de la Bibliothèque de la Sorbonne*, 10 (1991), pp. 39-102

\_\_\_\_\_ *Port-Royal et la Bible. Un siècle d'or de la Bible en France 1650-1708* (Paris, 2007)

CLANCY, Thomas, 'The Jesuits and the Independents: 1647', *Archivum historicum Societatis Iesu*, 40 (1971), pp. 67-90

CLARK, Ruth, *Strangers and Sojourners at Port-Royal* (1932, repr. New York, 1972)

CLIFTON, Robin, 'The Popular Fear of Catholics During the English Revolution', *Past and Present*, 52 (1971)

COGNET, Louis, 'Le Chapelet secret du Saint-Sacrement', *Bulletin de la Société des Amis de Port-Royal*, 1951, pp. 3-14

\_\_\_\_\_ *Le jansénisme* (Paris, 1961)

\_\_\_\_\_ 'Le mépris du monde à Port-Royal et dans le jansénisme', *Revue Ascétique et de Mystique*, 41 (1965)

COLERIDGE, Samuel Taylor, *Notes on English Divines*, ed. Derwent Coleridge, 2 vols. (1853)

COLIE, Rosemary L., *Light and Enlightenment: a Study of the Cambridge Platonists and the Dutch Arminians* (Cambridge, 1957)

COLLINSON, Patrick, *From Cranmer to Sancroft* (London, 2006)

COMO, David, *Blown by the Spirit* (Stanford, CA, 2004)

COPE, Jackson I., "'The Cupri-Cosmits': Glanvill on Latitudinarian Anti-Enthusiasm', *Huntingdon Library Quarterly*, 17, 3 (1954), pp. 269-86

COTTRET, Bernard, et al (eds.), *Jansénisme et puritanisme* (Paris, 2002)

- COURCELLES, Pierre, *Les Confessions de Saint Augustin dans la tradition littéraire. Antécédents et Postérité* (Paris, 1963)
- CRAGG, G. R., *From Puritanism to the Age of Reason. A Study of Changes in Religious Thought within the Church of England 1660-1700* (Cambridge, 1966)
- \_\_\_\_\_ *The Church and the Age of Reason 1648-1789* (Harmondsworth, 1960)
- CRANFIELD, C. E. B., *Romans. A Shorter Commentary* (Guildford, 1985), p. 113
- CREIGHTON, Anne, 'The Remonstrance of December 1661 and Catholic Politics in Restoration Ireland', *Irish Historical Studies*, 34, 133 (2004), pp. 16-41
- DAGENS, Jean, *Bérulle et les Origines de la Restauration Catholique (1575-1611)* (Brussels, 1952)
- DASTON, Lorraine, 'Probability and evidence', in D. Garber and M. Ayers (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Seventeenth-century Philosophy* (Cambridge, 2012)
- DAVIES, Horton, *Worship and Theology in England*, 3 vols. (Grand Rapids, MI, 1996)
- DEGERT, A., 'Réaction des "Provinciales" sur la Théologie Morale en France', *Bulletin de Littérature Ecclésiastique de Toulouse*, 5<sup>th</sup> ser., 5 (1913), pp. 400-20
- DEKKER, Eef, 'Was Arminius a Molinist?', *Sixteenth Century Journal*, 27, 2 (1996), pp. 337-52
- DELFORGE, Frédéric, *Les Petites Ecoles de Port-Royal 1637-1660* (Paris, 1985)
- \_\_\_\_\_ *La Bible en France et dans la Francophonie. Histoire, Traduction, Diffusion* (Paris, 1991)
- DELUMEAU, Jean, *Le Catholicisme entre Luther et Voltaire* (6<sup>th</sup> ed., Paris, 1996)
- \_\_\_\_\_ *Le péché et la peur. La culpabilisation en Occident (XIIIe-XVIIIe siècles)* (Paris, 1983)
- DENT, C. M., *Protestant Reformers in Elizabethan Oxford* (Oxford, 1983)
- DEYOUNG, Rebecca, *Aquinas's Ethics: Metaphysical Foundations, Moral Theory, and Theological Context* (Notre Dame, 2009)
- DITCHFIELD, Simon, *Liturgy, sanctity and history in Tridentine Italy. Pietro Mario Campi and the preservation of the particular* (Cambridge, 1995)
- DIX, 'The Basis of the Sacramental System' in *idem, The Sacramental System Considered as an Extension of the Incarnation* (New York, 1893)
- DOYLE, A. I., 'John Cosin (1595-1672) as a Library-Maker', *The Book Collector*, 40, 3 (1991), pp. 335-57
- \_\_\_\_\_ 'Gallican and Anglican: Henry Holden and John Cosin', *RH*, 30, 1 (2010), pp. 67-70
- DOYLE, William, *Jansenism. Catholic Resistance to Authority from the Reformation to the French Revolution* (Basingstoke, 2000)

DUBOIS, E. T., 'La bibliothèque de l'évêque Cosin à Durham et sa collection de livres français de théologie et de spiritualité protestantes des XVIe et XVIIe siècles', *Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire du Protestantisme français*, 128 (1982), pp. 173-88

DUCHÊNE, Roger, *L'Imposture littéraire dans les Provinciales de Pascal* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., Paris, 1985)

DUFFY, Eamon, 'A rubb-up for old soares; Jesuits, Jansenists, and the English Secular Clergy, 1705-1715', *JEH*, 28, 3 (1977), pp. 291-317

DUGMORE, C. W., *Eucharistic Doctrine in England from Hooker to Waterland* (London, 1942)

FERREYROLLES, Gerard, *Blaise Pascal: Les Provinciales* (Paris, 1984)

FINCHAM, Kenneth (ed.), *The Early Stuart Church, 1603-1642* (Basingstoke, 1993)

\_\_\_\_\_ and TYACKE, Nicholas, *Altars Restored. The Changing Face of English Religious Worship, 1547-c.1700* (Oxford, 2007)

FORRESTAL, Alison, *Fathers, pastors and kings. Visions of episcopacy in seventeenth-century France* (Manchester-New York, 2004)

FRANCESCHI, Sylvio Hermann de, *Entre saint Augustin et saint Thomas. Les jansénistes et le refuge thomiste (1653-1663): à propos des 1<sup>re</sup>·2<sup>e</sup> et 18<sup>e</sup> Provinciales* (Paris, 2009)

FRANKLIN, James, *The Science of Conjecture. Evidence and Probability Before Pascal* (Baltimore, 2001)

GARBER D. and AYERS, M. (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Seventeenth-century Philosophy* (Cambridge, 2012)

GARDIEL, A., 'La "Certitude Probable"', *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques*, 5 (1911), pp. 441-85

GAY, Jean-Pascal, *Morales en conflit. Théologie et polémique au Grand Siècle (1640-1700)* (Paris, 2011)

GILSON, Etienne, 'Regio Dissimilitudinis de Platon à Saint Bernard de Clairvaux', *Medieval Studies*, 9 (1947), pp. 108-30

GORCE, M-M., 'Le sens du mot probable et les origines du probabilisme', *Revue des Sciences Religieuses*, 10 (1930), pp. 460-64

GLICKMAN, Gabriel, *The English Catholic Community 1688-1745: Politics, Culture and Ideology* (Woodbridge, 2009)

\_\_\_\_\_ 'Christian Reunion, the Anglo-French Alliance and the English Catholic Imagination, 1660-72', *English Historical Review*, 128, 531 (2013), pp. 263-91

GOLDEN, Richard M., 'The mentality of opposition: The Jansenism of the Parisian curés during the Religious Fronde', *Catholic Historical Review*, 64, 1 (1978), pp. 565-80

\_\_\_\_\_ *The godly rebellion: Parisian curés and the religious Fronde, 1652-1662* (Chapel Hill, 1981)

- GOLDMANN, Lucien, *The Hidden God: a study of tragic vision in the 'Pensées' of Pascal and the tragedies of Racine* (London, 1964)
- GOSSE, Edmund, *Jeremy Taylor* (London, 1903)
- GOUHIER, Henri, *La Pensée Religieuse de Descartes* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., Paris, 1972)
- \_\_\_\_\_ *Cartésianisme et Augustinisme au XVIIe Siècle* (Paris, 1978)
- GUION, Béatrice, *Pierre Nicole moraliste* (Paris, 2002)
- GREEN, I. M., *The Re-establishment of the Church of England 1660-1663* (Oxford, 1978)
- GRIFFIN, Martin I. J. *Latitudinarianism in the Seventeenth-Century Church of England* (rev. ed., Leiden-New York, 1992)
- HACKING, Ian, *The Emergence of Probability. A Philosophical Study of Early Ideas About Probability, Induction, and Statistical Inference* (new ed., Cambridge, 2006)
- HAMM, Berndt, 'What was the Reformation Doctrine of Justification?', in C. Scott Dixon (ed.), *The German Reformation* (Oxford, 1999), pp. 56-90
- HAMPTON, Stephen, *Anti-Arminians. The Anglican Reformed Tradition from Charles II to George I* (Oxford, 2008)
- HARDACRE, P. H., 'The Royalists in Exile during the Puritan Revolution, 1642-1660', *Huntingdon Library Quarterly*, 16, 4 (1953)
- HÄRING, Bernard, and VEREECKE, Louis, 'La Théologie Morale de S. Thomas d'Aquin à S. Alphonse de Liguori', *Nouvelle Revue Théologique*, 87e année, 7 (1955), pp. 673-92
- HARRIS, Francis and HUNTER, Michael (eds.), *John Evelyn and his Milieu* (London, 2003)
- HARRISON, Peter, *The Fall of Man and the Foundations of Science* (Cambridge, 2007)
- HAYWARD, J. C., 'New Directions in Studies of the Falkland Circle', *The Seventeenth Century*, 2 (1987)
- HAZARD, Paul, *La crise de la conscience européenne* (Paris, 1935)
- HILL, Christopher, *The World Turned Upside Down* (Harmondsworth, 1975)
- HILL, Robert C., 'Theodoret wrestling with Romans', in M. F. Wiles and E. J. Yarnold (eds.), *Studia Patristica*, 34 (Louvain, 2001)
- HILLERDAL, Gunnar, *Reason and Revelation in Richard Hooker* (Lund, 1962)
- HOOK, David, 'John Davies of Kidwelly. A Neglected Literary Figure of the Seventeenth Century', *The Antiquary*, 11 (1975)
- HUGHES, Seán, 'The Problem of "Calvinism": English Theologies of Predestination c. 1580-1630', in S. Wabuda and C. Litzenberger (eds.), *Belief and Practice in Reformation England* (Aldershot, 1998)

- HUNTLEY, F. L., *Jeremy Taylor and the Great Rebellion. A Study of His Mind and Temper in Controversy* (Ann Arbor, 1970)
- HUTTON, Ronald, *The Restoration. A Political and Religious History of England and Wales 1658-1667* (Oxford, 1986)
- \_\_\_\_\_ *Charles the Second. King of England, Scotland, and Ireland* (Oxford, 1989)
- INGE, William Ralph, *Christian Mysticism* (4<sup>th</sup> ed., London, 1918)
- JANSEN, Paule, *De Blaise Pascal à Henry Hammond. Les Provinciales en Angleterre* (Paris, 1954)
- JEDIN, Hubert, and DOLAN, John (eds.), *History of the Church*, 10 vols. (London, 1965-81)
- JONSEN, A., and TOULMIN, S., *The Abuse of Casuistry. A History of Moral Reasoning* (London-Berkeley, 1988)
- JOPPIN, Gabriel, *Une Querelle Autour De L'Amour Pur. Jean-Pierre Camus, Évêque de Belley* (Paris, 1938)
- JORDY, A de and FLETCHER, F., "'A Library for Younger Schollers' Compiled by an English Scholar-Priest about 1655", *Illinois Studies in Language and Literature*, 48 (1961)
- KEEBLE, N. H., *The Restoration. England in the 1660s* (Oxford, 2002)
- KELLY, J. N. D., *Early Christian Doctrines* (5<sup>th</sup> ed., London, 1977)
- KENDALL, R. T., *Calvin and English Calvinism to 1649* (Oxford, 1979)
- KENYON, John, *The Popish Plot* (London, 1972)
- KEYNES, Geoffrey, *John Evelyn. A Study in Bibliophily with A Bibliography of his Writings* (Oxford, 1968)
- KIRK, Kenneth E., *Conscience and Its Problems. An Introduction to Casuistry* (London, 1927)
- KNOX, Ronald A., *Enthusiasm. A Chapter in the History of Religion with Special Reference to the XVII and XVIII Centuries* (Oxford, 1950)
- KOLAKOWSKI, Leszek, *Chrétiens sans l'Église. La Conscience religieuse et le lieu confessionnel au XVIIe siècle*, tr. Anna Posner (Paris, 1969)
- \_\_\_\_\_ *God Owes Us Nothing. A Brief Remark on Pascal's Religion and on the Spirit of Jansenism* (Chicago-London, 1995).
- KRABBENHOFT, K., 'Pascal contre Caramuel', *XVIIe Siècle*, 133 (1981), pp. 435-42
- KRUMENACKER, Yves, *L'école française de spiritualité. Des mystiques, des fondateurs, des courants et leurs interprètes* (Paris, 1998)
- LACEY, T. A., *Herbert Thorndike, 1598-1672* (London, 1929)
- LAKE, Peter, *Anglicans and Puritans? Presbyterianism and English Conformist Thought from Whitgift to Hooker* (London, 1988)

- \_\_\_\_\_ ‘Calvinism and the English Church, 1530-1645’, *Past and Present*, 114 (1987)
- \_\_\_\_\_ ‘Lancelot Andrewes, John Buckeridge, and Avant-garde Conformity at the Court of James I’, in L. L. Peck (ed.), *The Mental World of the Jacobean Court* (Cambridge, 1991)
- \_\_\_\_\_ ‘Defining Puritanism – again?’, in Francis J. Bremer (ed.), *Puritanism. Transatlantic Perspectives on a Seventeenth-Century Anglo-American Faith* (Boston, 1993), pp. 3-29
- \_\_\_\_\_ ‘Business as Usual? The Immediate Reception of Hooker’s *Ecclesiastical Polity*’, *JEH*, 52, 3 (2001), pp. 456-86
- \_\_\_\_\_ “‘The Anglican Moment’? Richard Hooker and the Ideological Watershed of the 1590s’, in Stephen Platten (ed.), *Anglicanism and the Western Christian Tradition* (Norwich, 2003)
- LAMONT, William, *Richard Baxter and the Millennium. Protestant Imperialism and the English Revolution* (London, 1979)
- \_\_\_\_\_ *Marginal Prynne, 1600-1669* (London, 1983)
- LANSON, Gustave, ‘Les Provinciales et le livre de la théologie morale des Jésuites’, *Revue d’Histoire littéraire de la France* (1900), No. 2, pp. 169-95
- LAPORTE, Jean, *La Doctrine de Port-Royal*, 2 vols. [of projected 3] (Paris, 1923)
- \_\_\_\_\_ *Le cœur et la raison selon Pascal* (Paris, 1950)
- LYONNET, S., ‘Le sens de ἐφ’ ᾧ en Rom v.12 et l’exégèse des pères grecs’, *Biblica*, 36 (1955), pp. 436-57; *id.*, ‘Le péché originel en Rom v. 12-14’, *Revue des Sciences Religieuses*, 44 (1956), pp. 63-85
- \_\_\_\_\_ ‘Le péché originel en Rom v.12. L’exégèse des pères grecs et les décrets du Concile de Trente’, *Biblica*, 41 (1960), pp. 325-55
- LEA, Henry Charles, *A History of Auricular Confession and Indulgences in the Latin Church*, 3 vols. (London, 1896)
- \_\_\_\_\_ ‘Philosophical Sin’, *International Journal of Ethics*, 5, 3 (1895), pp. 324-39
- LEEUWEN, Henry G. van, *The Problem of Certainty in English Thought 1630-1690* (The Hague, 1963)
- LEITES, Edmund (ed.), *Conscience and Casuistry in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, 1988)
- LETTINGA, Neil, ‘Covenant Theology Turned Upside Down: Henry Hammond and Caroline Anglican Moralism: 1643-1660’, *Sixteenth Century Journal*, 24, 3 (1993), pp. 653-69
- LISTER, T. H., *Life and Administration of Edward, First Earl of Clarendon*, 3 vols. (London, 1838)
- LOUTH, Andrew, *The Origins of the Christian Mystical Tradition: From Plato to Denys* (Oxford, 2007)
- LUALDI, K. and THAYER, A. T., *Penitence in the Age of Reformations* (Aldershot, 2000)
- LUBAC, Henri de, *Surnaturel: études historiques* (Paris, 1946)

- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Mystery of the Supernatural*, tr. Rosemary Sheed (London, 1967)
- MACCULLOCH, Diarmaid, *The Later Reformation in England 1547-1603* (Basingstoke, 1990)
- \_\_\_\_\_. 'The Latitude of the Church of England', in K. Fincham and P. Lake (eds.), *Religious Politics in Post-Reformation England* (Woodbridge, 2006)
- MADISON, R. E. W., 'Robert Boyle and the Irish Bible', *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, 41, 1 (1958), pp. 81-101
- MAHONEY, John, *The Making of Moral Theology. A Study in Roman Catholic Tradition* (Oxford, 1987)
- MAIRE, Catherine-Laurence, *De la cause de Dieu à la cause de la nation: le jansénisme au XVIIIe siècle* (Paris, 1998)
- MALLOCH, A. E., 'John Donne and the Casuists', *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*, 2, 1 (1962)
- MALTBY, Judith, *Prayer Book and People in Elizabethan and Early Stuart England* (Cambridge, 1998)
- \_\_\_\_\_. 'From Temple to Synagogue: "Old" Conformity in the 1640s-1650s and the Case of Christopher Harvey', in P. Lake and M. Questier (eds.), *Conformity and Orthodoxy in the English Church, c. 1560- c. 1660* (Woodbridge, 2000)
- \_\_\_\_\_. 'Suffering and Surviving: the Civil Wars, the Commonwealth, and the Formation of "Anglicanism"', in S. Platten (ed.), *Anglicanism and the Western Tradition* (Norwich, 2003)
- MARROU, Henri Irénée, *Saint Augustin et l'augustinisme* (Paris, 1955)
- McADOO, H. R., *The Structure of Caroline Moral Theology* (London, 1949)
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Spirit of Anglicanism. A Survey of Anglican Theological Method in the Seventeenth Century* (London, 1965)
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Eucharistic Theology of Jeremy Taylor Today* (Norwich, 1988)
- \_\_\_\_\_. *First of its kind: Jeremy Taylor's Life of Christ. A Study in the functioning of a Moral Theology* (Norwich, 1994)
- McGIFFERT, Michael, 'Grace and works: the rise and division of covenant divinity in Elizabethan puritanism', *Harvard Theological Review*, 75 (1982), pp. 463-502
- \_\_\_\_\_. 'From Moses to Adam: the making of the covenant of works', *Sixteenth Century Journal*, 19 (1988), pp. 131-56
- \_\_\_\_\_. 'The Perkinsian moment of federal theology', *Calvin Theological Journal*, 29 (1994), pp. 117-48
- \_\_\_\_\_. 'Henry Hammond and covenant theology: from Puritan to Anglican', *Church History*, 74 (2005), pp. 255-85
- \_\_\_\_\_. 'Herbert Thorndike and the Covenant of Grace', *JEH*, 58, 3 (2007), pp. 440-60

- McGINN, Bernard, 'Love, Knowledge, and Mystical Union in Western Christianity: Twelfth to Sixteenth Centuries', *Church History*, 56, 1 (1987), pp. 7-24
- McGRADE, A. S. (ed.), *Richard Hooker and the Construction of the Christian Community* (Tempe, AZ, 1997)
- McGRATH, Alister, 'The Emergence of the Anglican Tradition on Justification 1600-1700', *Churchman*, 98, 1 (1983), pp. 28-43
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Iustitia Dei. A History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., Cambridge, 1998)
- McLACHLAN, *Socinianism in Seventeenth-Century England* (Oxford, 1951)
- MESNARD, Jean, 'Pascal et le problème moral', *L'Information littéraire*, 1 (1966)
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'La collaboration des Ecrivains de Port-Royal aux censures contre l'Apologie pour les Casuistes (1658-1659)', *Chroniques de Port-Royal*, 32 (1983), pp. 3-20
- MEYER, A. O., *England and the Catholic Church under Queen Elizabeth*, tr. J. R. McKee (London, 1916)
- MICHON, Hélène, *L'Ordre du Cœur. Philosophie, Théologie et Mystique dans les Pensées de Pascal* (Paris, 1996)
- MIEL, Jan, *Pascal and Theology* (Baltimore-London, 1969)
- MILLER, John, *Popery and Politics in England, 1660-1688* (Cambridge, 1973)
- MILLER, Perry, *Errand into the Wilderness* (Cambridge, MA, 1956)
- MILTON, Anthony, *Catholic and Reformed. The Roman and Protestant Churches in English Protestant Thought 1600-1640* (Cambridge, 1995)
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'Anglicanism and Royalism in the 1640s', in John Adamson (ed.), *The English Civil War. Conflicts and Contexts* (Basingstoke, 2009)
- MORIARTY, Michael, *Fallen Nature, Fallen Selves* (Oxford, 2006)
- MORERI, Louis, *Le Grand Dictionnaire Historique, ou le mélange curieux de l'histoire sacrée et profane*, 10 vols. (20<sup>th</sup> ed., Paris, 1759)
- MORGAN, H. T., *Port-Royal and Other Studies* (London, 1914)
- MORRILL, John (ed.), *Reactions to the English Civil War 1642-1649* (Basingstoke, 1982)
- \_\_\_\_\_, 'The Attack on the Church in the Long Parliament, 1640-42', in D. Beales and G. Best (eds.), *History, Society and the Churches* (Cambridge, 1985), pp. 105-24
- MORTIMER, Sarah, *Reason and Religion in the English Revolution. The Challenge of Socinianism* (Cambridge, 2009)
- MOSSE, George L., *The Holy Pretence* (Oxford, 1957)
- MULLER, Richard, *Dictionary of Latin and Greek Theological Terms* (Grand Rapids, 1985)

- \_\_\_\_\_. *God, Creation, and Providence in the Thought of Jacob Arminius* (Grand Rapids, 1991)
- NADLER, Steven M., 'Cartesianism and Port-Royal', *The Monist*, 71, 4 (1988), pp. 573-84
- NEALE, J. M., *A History of the so-called Jansenist Church of Holland* (1904, repr. New York, 2007)
- NÉDONCELLES, Maurice, *Trois Aspects du Problème Anglo-Catholique au XVIIe Siècle. Avec une analyse des XXXIX articles d'après Chr. Davenport et J. H. Newman* (Strasbourg, 1951)
- NEVEU, Bruno, *Erudition et Religion aux XVIIe et XVIIIe siècles* (Paris, 1994), pp. 223-4
- \_\_\_\_\_. 'A la recherche de l'*aptum* théologique au XVIIe siècle: Davenport, White, Holden, Sergeant', in Christian Mouchel and Colette Nativel (eds.), *République des Lettres, République des Arts. Mélanges offerts à Marc Fumaroli* (Geneva, 2008), pp. 581-99
- OLLARD, Richard, *Clarendon and his Friends* (London, 1987)
- O'CONNOR, Thomas, *Irish Jansenists 1600-70: religion and politics in Flanders, France, Ireland and Rome* (Dublin, 2008)
- O'MALLEY, John W., *The First Jesuits* (Cambridge, MA, 1993)
- ORCIBAL, Jean, *Les origines du Jansénisme*, 5 vols. (1946-62)
- \_\_\_\_\_. 'Les spirituels français et espagnols chez John Wesley et ses contemporains', *Revue de l'histoire des religions*, 139, 1 (1951), pp. 50-109
- \_\_\_\_\_. 'Qu'est-ce que le Jansénisme?', *Cahiers de l'Association internationale des études françaises*, 3-5 (1953), pp. 39-53
- \_\_\_\_\_. 'Néo-Platonisme et Jansénisme: Du *De Libertate* du P. Gibieuf à *L'Augustinus*', in *Nuove Ricerche Storiche Sul Giansenismo* (Analecta Gregoriana, 71, 1953), pp. 33-57
- \_\_\_\_\_. 'Thèmes platoniciens dans l'"Augustinus" de Jansénius', in *Augustinus Magister: Congrès international Augustinien*, 3 vols. (Paris, 1954), vol. II
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Le Premier Port-Royal – Réforme ou Contre-Réforme* (Paris, 1957)
- \_\_\_\_\_. 'L'originalité théologique de John Wesley et les spiritualités du continent', *Revue Historique*, 222, 1 (1959), pp. 51-80
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Saint-Cyran et le jansénisme* (Paris, 1961)
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Le Cardinal de Bérulle, évolution d'une spiritualité* (Paris, 1965)
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Saint Jean de la Croix et les Mystiques Rhéno-flamands* (Brussels, 1966)
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Jansénius d'Ypres (1585-1638)* (Paris, 1989)
- ORR, Robert R., *Reason and Authority. The Thought of William Chillingworth* (Oxford, 1967)
- OSMOND, Percy H., *Isaac Barrow. His Life and Times* (London, 1944)
- PACKER, J. W., *The Transformation of Anglicanism 1643-1660* (Manchester, 1969)

- PAPASOGLI, Benedetta, *Le "fond du cœur": figures de l'espace intérieur au XVIIe siècle* (Paris 2000)
- PARISH, Richard, *Pascal's Lettres Provinciales. A Study in Polemic* (Oxford, 1989)
- \_\_\_\_\_ 'Le Père Étienne Bauny. SJ: La *Somme des péchés qui se commettent en tous états* face aux *Lettres Provinciales*', *French Studies*, 63, 4 (2009), pp. 385-98
- \_\_\_\_\_ *Catholic Particularity in Seventeenth-Century French Writing* (Oxford, 2011)
- PARISOT, Roger, *La doctrine du pur amour. Saint François de Sales, Pascal et Mme Guyon* (Paris, 2008)
- PARRY, Graham, *Glory, Laud and Honour: The Arts of the Anglican Counter-Reformation* (Woodbridge, 2006)
- PATTERSON, W. B., *King James VI and I and the Reunion of Christendom* (Cambridge, 1997)
- PEROUAS, L., 'La Pastorale Liturgique au XVIIe siècle', *Mélanges de Science Religieuse*, 23, 1 (1966)
- PERROT, M. E. C., 'Richard Hooker and the Problem of Authority in the Elizabethan Church', *JEH*, 49, 1 (1998), pp. 29-60
- PINTARD, René, *Le libertinage érudit dans la première moitié du XVIIe siècle* (Geneva, 1983)
- POOLE, William, *Milton and the Idea of the Fall* (Cambridge, 2005)
- POPKIN, Richard H., 'The Philosophy of Bishop Stillingfleet', *Journal of the History of Philosophy*, 9 (1971), pp. 303-19
- \_\_\_\_\_ *The History of Scepticism From Savonarola to Bayle* (rev. ed., Oxford, 2003)
- PORTALIÉ, Eugène, *A Guide to the Thought of Saint Augustine*, tr. Ralph J. Bastian (London, 1960)
- PORTER, H. C., *Reformation and Reaction in Tudor Cambridge* (Cambridge, 1958)
- POSCHMANN, Bernhard, *Penance and the Anointing of the Sick*, tr. F. Courtney (London, 1963)
- PURCELL, Mark, "'Useful Weapons for the Defence of That Cause": Richard Allestree, John Fell, and the Foundation of the Allestree Library', *The Library*, 21, 2 (1999)
- QUANTIN, Jean-Louis, *Le catholicisme classique et les Pères de l'Église. Un retour aux sources (1669-1713)* (Paris, 1999)
- \_\_\_\_\_ *Le rigorisme chrétien* (Paris, 2001)
- \_\_\_\_\_ 'Le rigorisme: sur le basculement de la théologie morale catholique au XVIIe siècle', *Revue d'Histoire de l'Église de France*, 89, 222 (2003), pp. 23-43
- \_\_\_\_\_ 'De la rigueur au rigorisme. Les *Avvertenze ai Confessori* de Charles Borromée dans la France du XVIIe siècle', *Studia Borromaica*, 20 (2006), pp. 195-251

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Church of England and Christian Antiquity. The construction of a confessional identity in the 17<sup>th</sup> century* (Oxford, 2009)

QUESTIER, Michael, 'Loyalty, Religion and State Power in Early Modern England: English Romanism and the Jacobean Oath of Allegiance', *The Historical Journal*, 40, 2 (1997), pp. 311-29

\_\_\_\_\_. (ed.) *Newsletters from the Archpresbyterate of George Birkhead* (Camden Soc., 5<sup>th</sup> series, 12, 1998)

\_\_\_\_\_. (ed.) *Newsletters from the Caroline Court, 1631-1638: Catholicism and the Politics of Personal Rule* (Camden Soc., 5<sup>th</sup> series, 26, 2005)

\_\_\_\_\_. 'Catholic Loyalism in Early Stuart England', *English Historical Review*, 123, 504 (2008), pp. 1132-65

RIVERS, Isabel, *Reason, Grace and Sentiment: A Study of the Language of Religion and Ethics in England, 1660-1780*, 2 vols. (Cambridge, 1991-2000)

RODIS-LEWIS, Geneviève, 'Augustinisme et cartésianisme à Port-Royal', in E. J. Dijksterhuis et al. (eds.), *Descartes et le cartésianisme hollandais* (Paris, 1950)

ROSE, Elliot, *Cases of Conscience: Alternatives Open to Recusants and Puritans Under Elizabeth I and James I* (London, 1975)

ROUILLARD, Philippe, *Histoire de la pénitence des origines à nos jours* (Paris, 1996)

ROUTLEDGE, F. J., 'The Negotiations between Charles II and the Cardinal de Retz, 1658-1659', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 5<sup>th</sup> Series, 6 (1956), pp. 49-68

RYAN, J. K., 'The Reputation of St. Thomas Aquinas Among English Protestant Thinkers of the Seventeenth Century', *The New Scholasticism*, 22, 1 (1948)

SAILLY, L. de, *Étude Bibliographique du Nouveau Testament de Port-Royal, dit de Mons et des impressions du Libraire Migeot de 1664 à 1703*, Société des Bibliophiles Belges, no. 36 (Mons, 1926)

SAINTE-BEUVE, C. A., *Port-Royal*, 3 vols. (Paris, 1953-55 [originally 1840-48])

SALMON, J.H. M., 'Catholic resistance theory, Ultramontanism, and the royalist response, 1580-1620', in J. H. Burns and Mark Goldie (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Political Thought 1450-1700* (Cambridge, 1991), pp. 219-53

SCHMALTZ, Tad M., 'What Has Cartesianism to Do with Jansenism?', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 60, 1 (1999), pp. 37-56

SCOTT, Eva, *The King in Exile. The Wandering of Charles II from June 1646 to July 1654* (1905)

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Travels of the King. Charles II in Germany and Flanders 1654-1660* (1907)

SEAWARD, Paul, *The Cavalier Parliament and the Reconstruction of the Old Regime, 1661-1667* (Cambridge, 1989)

SEDGWICK, Alexander, *Jansenism in Seventeenth-Century France* (Charlottesville, 1977)

SELLIER, Philippe, *Pascal et Saint Augustin* (Paris, 1970)

- SHAPIRO, Barbara, *Probability and Certainty in Seventeenth-Century England* (Princeton, 1983)
- SHAW, W. A., *A History of the English Church During the Civil Wars and Under the Commonwealth 1640-1660*, 2 vols. (London, 1900)
- SLIGHTS, Camille Well, 'Ingenious Piety: Anglican Casuistry of the Seventeenth Century', *The Harvard Theological Review*, 63, 3 (1970), pp. 409-32
- \_\_\_\_\_*The Casuistical Tradition in Shakespeare, Donne, Herbert, and Milton* (Princeton, 1981), chs. 1&2
- SMITH, Geoffrey, *The Cavaliers in Exile, 1640-1660* (Basingstoke, 2003)
- SOMMERVILLE, C. J., *Popular Religion in Restoration England* (Gainesville, 1977)
- SOUTHGATE, Beverley C., "'White's Disciple": John Sergeant and Blackloism', *RH*, 24, 4 (1991), pp. 431-6
- \_\_\_\_\_'Cauterising the tumor of Pyrrhonism": Blackloism versus Skepticism', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 53, 4 (1992), pp. 631-45
- \_\_\_\_\_'Covetous of Truth'. *The Life and Works of Thomas White, 1593-1676* (Dordrecht-Boston-London, 1993)
- \_\_\_\_\_'Blackloism and Tradition: From Theological Certainty to Historiographical Doubt', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 61, 1 (2000), pp. 97-114
- SPELLMAN, W. M., *The Latitudinarians and the Church of England, 1660-1700* (Athens, GA-London, 1993)
- SPINK, J. S., *French Free Thought from Gassendi to Voltaire* (London, 1960)
- SPURR, John, "'Rational Religion" in Restoration England', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 49, 4 (1988)
- \_\_\_\_\_*The Restoration Church of England 1646-1689* (New Haven-London, 1991)
- STOYE, John, *English Travellers Abroad 1604-1667. Their Influence in English Society and Politics* (rev. ed., New Haven-London, 1989)
- STRANKS, C. J., *The Life and Writings of Jeremy Taylor* (London, 1952)
- SYKES, Norman, *From Sheldon to Secker. Aspects of English Church History 1660-1768* (Cambridge, 1959)
- TAVARD, G. H., *The Seventeenth-Century Tradition: A Study in Recusant Thought* (Leiden, 1978)
- TAVENEUX, René, *Jansénisme et Politique* (Paris, 1965)
- \_\_\_\_\_*Le Catholicisme dans la France Classique 1610-1715*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1980)
- \_\_\_\_\_*Jansénisme et Réforme catholique* (Nancy, 1992)
- TENTLER, Thomas N., *Sin and Confession on the Eve of the Reformation* (Princeton, 1977)

- THACKRAY, Ian Y., 'Zion Undermined: the Protestant Belief in a Popish Plot during the English Interregnum', *History Workshop*, 18 (1984), pp. 28-52
- THOMAS, Keith, 'Cases of Conscience in Seventeenth-Century England', in J. Morrill, P. Slack and D. Woolf (eds.), *Public Duty and Private Conscience in Seventeenth-Century England* (Oxford, 1993)
- TIERNEY, M. A., *Dodd's Church History of England*, 5 vols. (Farnborough, 1971 repr.)
- TREVOR-ROPER, Hugh, *Archbishop Laud 1573-1645* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., London, 1962)
- \_\_\_\_\_ *Catholics, Anglicans and Puritans* (London, 1987)
- TULLOCH, John, *Rational Theology and Christian Philosophy in England in the 17<sup>th</sup> Century*, 2 vols. (Hildesheim, 1966 [1874])
- TUTINO, Stefiana, *Thomas White and the Blackloists. Between Politics and Theology during the English Civil War* (Aldershot, 2008)
- TYACKE, Nicholas, 'Puritanism, Arminianism and Counter-Revolution', in C. Russell (ed.), *The Origins of the English Civil War* (Basingstoke, 1973), pp. 119-43
- \_\_\_\_\_ *Anti-Calvinists. The Rise of English Arminianism c. 1590-1640* (Oxford, 1987)
- \_\_\_\_\_ *Aspects of English Protestantism c. 1530-1700* (Manchester, 2001)
- VARDEN, Erik, *Redeeming Freedom: The Principle of Servitude in Bérulle* (Rome, 2011)
- VENARD, Marc, 'The Influence of Carlo Borromeo on the Church of France', in J. M. Headley and J. B. Tomaro (eds.), *San Carlo Borromeo: Catholic reform and ecclesiastical politics in the second half of the sixteenth century* (Washington, 1988), pp. 208-27
- VOAK, Nigel, *Richard Hooker and Reformed Theology: A Study of Reason, Will and Grace* (Oxford, 2003)
- \_\_\_\_\_ 'English Molinism in the Late 1590s: Richard Hooker on Free Will, Predestination, and Divine Foreknowledge', *Journal of Theological Studies*, NS, 60, 1 (2009), pp. 130-177
- WALLACE, Dewey D., *Puritans and Predestination. Grace in English Protestant Theology, 1525-1695* (Chapel Hill, 1982)
- \_\_\_\_\_ *Shapers of English Calvinism, 1660-1714. Variety, Persistence, and Transformation* (Oxford, 2011)
- WALSHAM, Alexandra, *Church Papists* (Woodbridge, 1993)
- WEAVER, David, 'The Exegesis of Romans 5:12 Among the Greek Fathers and its Implications for the Doctrine of Original Sin: The 5<sup>th</sup> to 12<sup>th</sup> Centuries', *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly*, 29 (1985)
- WEAVER, Ellen F., 'Scripture and Liturgy for the Laity: The Jansenist Case for Translation', *Worship*, 59 (1985), pp. 510-21
- \_\_\_\_\_ 'Contribution des Port-Royalistes aux Liturgies Néo-Gallicanes', *CPR*, 35 (1986)

- \_\_\_\_\_ ‘The Neo-Gallican Liturgies Revisited’, *Studia Liturgica*, 16, 314 (1986/87), pp. 54-72
- \_\_\_\_\_ ‘Liturgy for the Laity: The Jansenist Case for Popular Participation in Worship in the seventeenth and eighteenth Centuries’, *Studia Liturgica*, 19, 1 (1989), pp. 46-59
- \_\_\_\_\_ ‘The Bible and Port-Royal’, *Citeaux*, 41, 1-2 (1990), pp. 66-100
- WETSEL, David, *Pascal and Disbelief. Catechesis and Conversion in the Pensées* (Catholic University of America, 1994)
- WHITE, Peter, *Predestination, policy and polemic* (Cambridge, 1992)
- WILLIAMS, N. P., *The Ideas of The Fall and of Original Sin. A Historical and Critical Study* (London, 1927)
- WINSHIP, Michael P., ‘Weak Christians, Backsliders and Carnal Gospellers: Assurance of Salvation and the Pastoral Origins of Puritan Practical Divinity in the 1580s’, *Church History*, 70, 3 (2001)
- WOOD, David, *English Casuistical Divinity during the Seventeenth Century. With Special Reference to Jeremy Taylor* (London, 1952)
- WRIGHT, A. D., *The Divisions of French Catholicism, 1629-1645* (Farnham, 2011)
- ZAGORIN, Perez, *Ways of Lying: Dissimulation, Persecution and Conformity in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge, MA, 1990)

## Reference Works

- CABROL, F. (ed.), *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et liturgie*, 15 vols. in 30 (Paris, 1907-53)
- CROSS, F. L. and LIVINGSTONE, E. A. (eds.), *Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, (3<sup>rd</sup> ed. rev., London, 2005)
- DENZINGER, Henricus (ed.), *Enchiridion symbolorum definitionum et declarationum de rebus fidei et morum* (33<sup>rd</sup> ed., Freiburg-Rome, 1965)
- FITZGERALD, Alan D., *Augustine through the Ages. An Encyclopedia* (Grand Rapids, MI-Cambridge, 1999)
- HURTER, Hugo von, *Nomenclator literarius theologiae Catholicae*, 5 vols. (3<sup>rd</sup> ed., 1903-13)
- LACOSTE, Jean-Yves, *Dictionnaire Critique de Théologie* (Paris, 1998)
- LAMPE, G. W. H., *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* (Oxford, 1961)
- Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*
- SCHROEDER, H. J., *Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent* (London, 1960)

RUSSELL, C. W. and PRENDERGAST, J. P., *The Carte Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library* (London, 1871)

SOMMERVOGEL, Carlos (ed.), *Bibliothèque de la Compagnie de Jésus*, 12 vols. (Brussels, 1890-1932, re-issued Louvain, 1960)

TANNER, Norman (ed.), *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, 2 vols. (London, 1990)

VACANT, A. (dir.), *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique*, 15 vols. (Paris, 1889-1950)

VILLER, Marcel (dir.), *Dictionnaire de spiritualité: ascétique et mystique: doctrine et histoire*, 17 vols. (Paris, 1937-95)

### **Unpublished Works**

BRENNAN, Colin, 'The Life and Times of Isaac Basire' (Unpublished Durham Ph.D., 1987)

HAYWARD, J. C., 'The *Mores* of Great Tew: Literary, Philosophical and Political Idealism in Falkland's Circle' (Unpublished PhD Thesis, Cambridge, 1982)

HIBBITS, J. B., 'Henry Hammond (1605-1660) and English New Testament Exposition' (Unpublished Oxford D. Phil, 1951)

MALCOLM, Noel, 'Thomas Hobbes and Voluntarist Theology' (Unpublished Cambridge PhD, 1982)

MILLER, Ernest Charles, 'The Doctrine of the Church in the Thought of Herbert Thorndike (1598-1672)' (Unpublished Oxford D.Phil., 1990)

TROTT, F. J., 'Prelude to Restoration. Laudians, Conformists and the Struggle for "Anglicanism" in the 1650s' (Unpublished Ph.D., London, 1992)