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ABSTRACT

This thesis examines the part played by French sermon and devotional literature during the reigns of Henri IV and Louis XIII in providing a model of political and social order. Shortly after the end of the Wars of Religion the French clergy in the seventeenth century rejected the violent rhetoric of the panic preachers of the sixteenth century. These seventeenth-century preachers emphasized social and political obedience as part of the duty of the Christian. Through collaboration with the crown, the ecclesiastical estate was able to assist in the pacification of French society.

This was achieved in the following ways. Throughout the first decades of the seventeenth century works of devotional practices, such as François de Sales’ *Introduction à la Vie Dévote*, were very popular. Not only did these works represent the nature of Bourbon spirituality, these devotional programmes explained that interior reform of the soul would lead to the reform of external behaviour which would be manifested in acceptable social behaviour.

Within the sermon literature a discourse of royal authority developed. This discourse hearkened back to a traditional image of the French monarchs as the most Christian kings, along with new elements which prefigured the absolutist rhetoric of the clergy under Louis XIV. This rhetoric of strong monarchal authority is evident in the religious controversy between the Protestant ministers at Charenton and well placed Catholic figures at the court of Louis XIII. Taking place during the 1610s’, both sides of the confessional divide appealed to the king as the arbiter of religious disputes. This process helped augment the practice of royal authority.
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Chapter I
Introduction

Kings and Princes, Lords and Judges contemplating Jesus Christ seated on the God's throne, given authority by [Christ] to distribute justice, would not wish to commit injustice against their subjects. Subjects in turn will not disobey their Kings and Lords, who are expressly commanded by God to obey and serve.

Les Rois et les Princes, les Seigneurs et les Juges contemplans Jesus Christ assis sur le juste trône de Dieu, ne lui voudront faire injustice en la personne de leurs sujets, ayant le superiorité de lui pour leur distribuer justice. Les sujects aussi ne lui seront desobéissans en leurs Rois et Seigneurs, auxquels ils ont commandement de Dieu si expres d'obéir et servir.1

This statement taken from the *Sermon sur la Paix*, pronounced by the Archbishop of Rheims, Philippe du Bec, in 1600 captures the dual responsibilities of the Christian in early Bourbon France. The first obligation was obedience to God. The second was obedience to the political estate. The interdependence of these two themes became increasingly significant in the efforts of the crown and Church to shape the social and political behaviour of seventeenth-century French people.

An initial reading of this sermon reveals the accepted formulation of the nature of Church and State relations. The monarch, as God's representative, was to rule his people with justice. The people, in turn, render loyalty to the King as part of their Christian duty. However upon closer examination, this formulation is not so straight forward. After all, underpinning the Christian world view was its sense of otherworldliness. “My kingdom is not of this world,” were Jesus Christ’s words when asked if he intended to liberate the Jews from the Romans. The early Church fathers, recognizing the necessity

of secular authority, strenuously maintained the superiority of the Church over all worldly institutions.

Within the context of Christian Europe, the question of dual loyalties to the political and ecclesiastical estates was in theory easily resolved. One obeyed worldly authority insofar it sought to preserve social and political order. Notwithstanding conflicts between the papacy and crown (notably Philippe IV and Boniface VIII), the clerical and political estates enjoyed a relatively close relationship. The Concordat of Bologna (1516) had given François I the right to appoint Bishops throughout the kingdom.\(^2\) In turn, the Church’s sanction of the monarch gave the crown the legitimizing approval of God.

As the Reformation took hold throughout France, and the Valois dynasty proved either unable or unwilling to arrest the spread of Calvinism, the relationship between the clergy and the government became increasingly strained. By the middle of the sixteenth century, the Protestant question had reached its breaking point. The failed Conspiracy of Amboise (1560) had confirmed Catholic suspicions that the Protestants had designs to impose their confession throughout the realm. The January Edict of 1562, preceded by the Colloquy of Poissy (1561) caused even greater alarm among the Catholics as it now seemed that the Most Christian King willingly encouraged the presence of heretics in France.\(^3\) In the aftermath of the failure of Catherine de’ Medici’s policy of toleration, religious wars broke the ties between the clergy and the crown.

The policies of Charles IX and Henri III towards the Protestants, which alternated between toleration and persecution, horrified the clerical estate. In response, they turned


their anger against the king. Many of the most vocal proponents of regicide came from the clergy. In contrast, the seventeenth century witnessed the renegotiation of the boundaries between royal and ecclesiastical authority. The results of the crown and Church's efforts in redefining their relationship are evident in the sermon and devotional literature of early modern France. That the seventeenth century could be classified as devout is not in dispute. Historians have quantified the explosion of religious fervor and popular piety which permeated French society from the melancholic religiosity of Louis XIII to the emotionally charged devotion of the lay elites and commoners alike. Elizabeth Rapley points to the organization of female monastic movements as one component of devotional nature of this period.

Henri-Jean Martin notes the large market for devotional literature which was not limited to the clergy. To prove his point, Martin breaks down the number of texts in the following categories: theology, both moral and scholastic, Patristic writings, scripture, religious controversies, and pastoral writings. His conclusion is that as the seventeenth century progressed, the number of titles steadily increased. Although sermon collections are absent from this statistical overview, my own work in the Bibliothèque Nationale confirms the popularity of religious books.

While it may be impossible to define precisely what devotion meant to everyone, the copious amount of devotional literature reveals certain commonalities. In broad terms, seventeenth-century devotion was predominantly private. As chapter 3 will

---


explain, those who undertook devotional programmes did so on an individual basis, under the aegis of a spiritual director. The authors of these books rejected the rigorous asceticism that had been common in medieval forms of organized devotion.

As I will argue, this less demanding form of devotion reflects the concern of political and ecclesiastical leaders, following so shortly after the Wars of Religion, that extreme display of piety could easily disrupt the social and religious order. In comparison to the regulation of various forms of bodily mortification, seventeenth-century devotion was domesticated. These programmes were aimed at all segments of society, not just those who sought for a religious vocation. The programmes were to be tailored to the daily circumstances of the practitioner. Thus one did not need to leave the world to experience the love of God. Throughout these discussions, the clerical estate was concerned with ordre, or rather the proper functioning of society. The exercises in the devotional programmes of the clergy sought to regulate every aspect of the devout's life. The discipline required by the demands of this inward piety would in turn be manifested through well ordered external behaviour, helping to maintain the social order.\footnote{Sheldon Wolin, \textit{Politics and Vision: Continuity and Innovation in Western Political Thought}. Expanded ed. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004), 141.}

Finally the third chapter will argue that the authors, through their devotional writings tried to instill the idea within the charges that true devotion required the practice of social virtues. In other words, devotional practices, while taking one out of the world through a mystical union with God's love, did not exempt one from their duties to the social and political body. Thus, as devotion was internalized, it would manifest itself in socially and politically accepted actions.
Throughout this thesis I will be using the term political to describe how preachers perceived their relationship with the crown and the non-ecclesiastical estates. Sheldon Wolin's *Politics and Vision* (1960) traces the evolution of political philosophy throughout the history of Western societies. Especially relevant for the present study is his discussion of political philosophy within the Christian framework, where he provides a useful model for examining the nature of the political rhetoric within seventeenth-century French sermon literature. He confronts the question of how the early Christian church was able to resolve the underlying tensions of a non-political movement evolving into a highly structured political organization, which resembled the defunct Roman Empire, once it received official sanction after the fourth century. Wolin argues that as the Christian church came to resemble more closely a political institution, it created tension within Christianity as it attempted to negotiate two conflicting loyalties of the Augustine idea of *civitas Dei* and *civitas terrena*. This problem would not be resolved until the Reformation. The Reformers, beginning with Luther sought to depoliticize the Church by emphasizing the role of the Prince as a member of the priesthood, allowing the Prince to rule both Church and state. With the Prince now a member of the priesthood, there was little need for the Church to interfere with the affairs of state. Citing the process in which the interests of the Church and state diverged in the sixteenth century, Wolin draws the distinction between politics and the "political" as politics being concerned with the mechanics of government. By comparison, the "political" concerns itself with the meaning of the relationship between crown and subject. In the course of researching my selection of preachers it has become evident that they were not concerned

---

with the mechanics of government. They focused on the relationship of the subject to the
crown and church. The primary purpose of devotional literature was to train an
individual in a more austere form of Christianity with emphasis on shaping the social
behaviour of the devout within the context of obedience to both ecclesiastical and secular
authority. Thus the concept of the political within devotional literature is discussed
within the context of social behaviour.

The question I posed as I conducted my research was “how and why did the
religiosity of early Bourbon France differ significantly from the eschatological violence
of the last decades of Valois France.” As John Bossy and Jean Delumeau have argued,
the profound sense of religious devotion was as powerful in the sixteenth century as it
was in the seventeenth, a period Delumeau refers to as the “century of Saints.”11 The vast
historiography of the period of the religious wars has demonstrated that this was a period
of intense religiosity, expressed in ritualistic violence.12 And even though we may not
fully understand the inhuman violence of the Wars of Religion, this religiously motivated
violence was part of a sincere belief system.13

The Wars of Religion ostensibly ended in 1594, but the religious passions which
were unleashed by these wars did not simply dissipate. Delumeau, Jean-Henri Martin
and Pierre Chaunu have demonstrated very persuasively the extent of the religiosity of
seventeenth-century France. They point to the “extraordinary interest” of the French
populace in religious books, ranging from the meditations of mystics such as Teresa of
Avila, Benoît de Canfield and Joseph du Tremblay, to saints’ lives, as well as printed

11 John Bossy, Christianity in the West, 1400-1700. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985), 128; Jean
Delumeau, Catholicism between Luther and Voltaire: A New View of the Counter-Reformation, trans.
12 Natalie Davis, Society and Culture in Early Modern France. (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1975),
152-188.
13 Crouzet, La Genèse de la Réforme Française, 247-8.
sermon collections, leading Delumeau to conclude that "never had there been so many books of spirituality...in circulation."14 This religiosity was also expressed in an increased interest in pursuing monastic vocations and the establishment of sociétés dévots.15

As obvious as it is that the meaning of devotion underwent a significant evolution during the 1590s, less obvious are the explanations for this change. After all, what factors impacted the nature of seventeenth-century devotion? What made it unacceptable for religious fervour to be expressed in terms of sectarian violence? To what extent was the cooling of religious passions the doing of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, and its preachers? To what extent did the crown exert its authority over the Second Estate after the collapse of the Catholic League after the ascension of Henri IV? And what were the implications for royal authority? The traditional historiography regards the triumph of Henri IV over his political and religious opponents as the beginning of royal absolutism which would culminate during the reign of his grandson, Louis XIV.

For the past two decades historians have reassessed this traditional reading of the origins of the Ancien Régime, and have noted that the premise is far too general and simplistic to adequately describe the state of the early Bourbon monarchy. However it is undeniable that by the time Henri IV was assassinated by François Ravaillac in 1610, the monarchy was in a more secure state than when he ascended to the throne nearly twenty years earlier.

Despite the minority who welcomed the news of Henri’s murder, the royal government had the sincere allegiance of the majority of the people. As J. Michael Hayden points out, even with its flaws, the Edict of Nantes had assured the Protestants a place in French society, which the Catholics grudgingly accepted. Furthermore, with the exception of the Prince de Conde who was out of the country at the time, the nobility did not vigorously oppose the Regency government.\textsuperscript{16}

Enjoying a period of good-will the government of Marie de’ Medici acted quickly to appease possible opponents to its stability. The Edict of Nantes was renewed in an effort to cement support from the sizeable Huguenot population. The crown engaged in an expensive policy of buying off a disorganized nobility with some success.\textsuperscript{17} Stuart Carroll argues that while the crown may have been able to stave off war with the Second Estate, they were far from pacified. Instead they redirected their violent energies into other channels, such as the pursuit of private blood feuds.\textsuperscript{18}

This thesis continues in this vein by distinguishing between the rhetoric of royal authority and the practices of that authority. I will demonstrate that within seventeenth-century sermon and devotional literature, there was a growing sensitivity to the new political realities arising from the aftermath of the Wars of Religion. Engaged in the discourse of royal authority, the Bourbons nevertheless recognized their dependence on the powerful First and Second Estates in the practice of that authority. Obedience to the authority of the crown was seen to be one of the greatest social virtues expected of the subjects of France. The crown and its agents promoted a theory of royal power which

\textsuperscript{17} Hayden, \textit{Estates General}, 11.
expected obedience and submission to the royal will. In chapter 6, we will see that many of the early seventeenth-century preachers anticipated Bossuet's divine status of the monarch. Indeed, as William Beik notes, there is little "dispute concerning the theory that the King had absolute authority, that is, authority unchecked by any institutional body."

It was this fact that led Robert Mandrou to argue that the culmination of the absolutist state under Louis XIV was a foregone conclusion because France had "aucune institution représentative de la population." However, when one studies the practice of royal authority, a different picture emerges. While there are numerous artifacts of the theory of monarchical power, such as edicts of pacification, the reality reveals that the crown could do little to enforce its will arbitrarily. Under the reign of Henri IV and Louis XIII, the nobility remained fractious. Even though France did not experience the widespread violence of the religious wars, the first three decades of the 1600s witnessed several assaults on the authority of the crown.

The Prince of Condé's rebellion which culminated at the Siege of La Rochelle in 1629 and the Fronde uprisings of the 1630s and 1640s were direct challenges to the authority of the monarchy. Though the monarchy survived these challenges, in practice it did not resemble a proto-absolutist regime, despite the theorization to the contrary. It is within this cultural milieu that the clerical estate operated, and their sermon and devotional literature reflects one component of the complex civilizing process identified by Nobert Elias. My own research would seem to bear this out. The sermon and

---

devotional literature during the reigns of Henri IV and Louis XIII demonstrate that the clerical estate willingly collaborated with the crown in pacifying French society. It is the contention of this thesis that the clergy contributed to the rhetoric of royal authority. But, it is too much to argue that the subsequent rise of the absolutist state was the “sinister” invention of the clerical estate. My view, however, is that these works emphasize a repressive rather than a positive approach to the role religion played in the ordering of society.

The chronological scope of this thesis covers the reigns of Henri IV and Louis XIII, 1598-1643. I chose this time frame to examine the interplay between the crown and the Church and among their subjects during the formative years of the Bourbon monarchy when the outcome of its development was still unknown. Many aspects of the early Ancien Régime have received much attention from historians of various disciplinary interests. Yet the role of religion and popular religiosity in shaping the policy of the crown and impact of the political and social context on the development of religion and religiosity has remained a relatively understudied topic. This has begun to change with more interest being shown in religious works.

The bias against the historical contextualization of Early Modern religion can be traced to the nineteenth century and the dominance of Whig historiography and its focus on “kings and things.” This bias was coloured also, I believe, by the fact that even though many of the preachers under consideration in this study had achieved a wide popularity during their lifetimes, they fell into obscurity relatively quickly by the latter half of the seventeenth century. One prominent exception was François de Sales, whose

devotional works have remained popular since they were first published. His
canonization in 1665, only 43 years after his death, undoubtedly assisted in ensuring his
lasting popularity.

The nineteenth century saw a renewed interest in the spiritual figures of the
seventeenth century. However, this interest was limited to providing the
hagiographical context of these figures. This is not to denigrate the scholarship of these
biographies. They were written not to situate these personalities within their historical
context, but rather to describe their importance to the Gallican Church. Even de Sales,
who remained well known in Catholic circles, has received little in the way of a
historically contextualized treatment of his life and work.

This began to change in the 1960s, with the rise of social and micro histories
which recognized the value of a broader range of archival material such as trial records,
artifacts, fairy tales, and other forms of “popular” culture. But in an increasingly secular
western society, religious history remained suspect, but by the late 1980s there was a shift
toward examining religious sources within their own historical context. Barbara
Diefendorf’s study of radical city preachers, such as Simon Vigor, and Larissa Taylor’s
work on late medieval and early modern preaching models demonstrate the value of
examining religious material within an historical context.

23 The majority of these works appeared in the second half of the nineteenth century. For example: Emile
Farge, L’Abbé Pierre de Besse: Predicateur du Roi Louis XIII. (Tulle, 1885); Féret, Le Cardinal du Perron.
(Paris, 1877); Georges Grente, Jean Bertaut: Abbé d’Aunay, Premier Aumôner de la Reine, Évêque de
Sézé., 1555-1611. (Paris, 1903); A. Vinet, Histoire de la Prédication parmi les Réformés de France du Dix-
24 There are, of course, a few exceptions. Mino Bergamo’s work looks at de Sales’ mysticism and
devotional programme within the larger context of seventeenth-century spirituality.
25 This state of affairs is all the more surprising considering the immense work done on medieval sermon
literature. The following represents only a cursory list of studies on medieval sermons. I would like to
thank Dr. Marc Cels for his efforts in helping me compile this list.
David L d’Avray, The Preaching of the Friars: Sermons Diffused from Paris before 1300. (Oxford:
Clarendon Press, 1985); Nicole Bériou, L’Avènement des maîtres de la Parole: La prédication à Paris au
This thesis contributes to the historiography by recognizing the value on devotional and sermon literature in the development of the political rhetoric of the Bourbon monarchy. One such example is the Sixteenth-Century French Religious Book Project at St. Andrews. This is to be done, first by recognizing the prominence of sermons in printed form for seventeenth-century people. This is a particularly intriguing aspect of seventeenth-century popular spirituality. Sermons by their very nature are an oral form of communication, and there is little doubt that many preachers were noted for their oratorical abilities.

In many cases, at least according to the prefaces, these sermons were printed almost immediately after their public reception. As Martin, Chaunu, Delumeau, and Elizabeth Eisenstein have shown the market for printed sermon collection was not limited to other ecclesiastics.26 Why print an oral form of communication in the first place? Through the publication of his sermons, the preacher could ensure that his message not only remained present in the minds of his local audience, but that it would reach a potentially larger readership. Eisenstein notes that the Catholic Church was able to use the printed word effectively to ensure the orthodoxy of its members.27 Sermon literature therefore became part of the propaganda campaign of these preachers to ensure the orthodoxy of the laity, and serve as an effective means of transmitting the royalist programme of pacification.

Second, this thesis will provide a critical examination of sermon literature. Apart from de Sales, whose literary output was collected in a critical twenty four volume edition between 1894-1925, almost none of the sermon literature has been subjected to critical editions. The growth of royal authority was not a solely secular process. Indeed, royal authority and western Christianity created a symbiotic relationship, though strained at times, which served to strengthen the institutions of both crown and church. Within the French context, it is almost a truism that the Church needed the crown for protection and the crown needed the Church for legitimacy. The institutions created by the proximity of the crown and Church have been often viewed in a negative context.

A number of studies have examined the question of how the French crown successfully developed and implemented the theory of royal absolutism. Daniel Hickey argues that the origins of absolutism are found in the crown’s struggle to impose tax reform throughout the feudal pays. Hickey examined the taille records for the Dauphiné. He questions the thesis, supported by such historians as J. H. Mariéjol, Gaston Zeller, and Russell J. Major, that the absolute state was imposed from the top down. In contrast, Hickey argues that initiatives for tax reform originated within the estates of the Dauphiné, ironically in order to maintain the privileges of the nobility.28 James Collins argues that despite the notable centralization of the fiscal administration of France during the period of 1360-1660, the financial system never became a willing tool of absolutism. This apparent inability to enforce its decisions was one of the strongest limitations on

absolutism, as local elites maintained a great deal of control over the practical workings of the system.\textsuperscript{29}

Kristen Neuschel's work on sixteenth-century nobility challenges the premise that Bourbon France was a successfully absolutist state by reassessing and redefining the meaning of nobility in sixteenth-century France. In her \textit{Word of Honor}, she argues that the nobility as represented by the \textit{noblesse de l'épée} was not an institution of the state. Rather it was a culture with its own traditions which could work with or against the interests of the crown.\textsuperscript{30} Neuschel concludes that the absolute state did not succeed at the expense of the nobility, but rather it successfully co-opted the Second Estate within the culture of royal authority.\textsuperscript{31} In the same vein Ellery Schalk argued that the medieval conception of the nobility as a military profession instead of a hereditary status limited the growth of royal authority and that it was not until the nobility abandoned its "medieval function" that the absolutist state took form.\textsuperscript{32}

Denis Crouzet and Jean Delumeau have demonstrated the extent to which an eschatological angst informed Western European consciousness in the sixteenth century. They have demonstrated how this angst exploded into religious violence shortly after Luther's break from the Roman Church. While their main thesis was not concerned with the development of royal authority, both Delumeau and Crouzet illustrate how religious violence originally directed against those perceived as the religious other, became conflated with outbursts of anti-monarchism as the French crown proved unable to

\textsuperscript{31} Neuschel, \textit{Word of Honor}, 186-208.
adequately find solutions to the religious schism that tore apart the kingdom. The crown and its agents became the targets of polemical sermons and their violent aftermath when they were suspected of tolerating heresy within the kingdom. Royal authority could only then be reasserted after Henri IV’s promulgation of the Edict of Nantes in 1598.

Ann Ramsey’s work on Leaguer wills echoes the main thesis of Crouzet and Delumeau. Although Ramsey examines the radical elements of sixteenth and seventeenth-century Catholic reformation, her study reveals an ambivalent conclusion to the nature of Catholic reform and the political culture of Bourbon France. Even though the League could be violently anti-monarchist, as evidenced in the 1589 assassination of Henri III, the League as a movement was far from homogeneous. Ramsey points out that Leaguer piety drew not only upon “late medieval traditions of sacral and civic immanence” but also provided “the foundations for...devot and even baroque piety.”

As my own study aims to demonstrate, these very elements became agents of the crown in helping to promote the programme of royal authority.

In her work on the Franciscan order in late sixteenth-century France, Megan Armstrong examines how Franciscan spirituality informed the Franciscan response to the political and social crises during the Wars of Religion, which in turn “informed French political culture.” Armstrong argues that Franciscan opposition to the crown was not just the work of a few malcontents, but the result of the radicalization caused by the religious wars and their alliance with the Catholic League. These elements “became a

---

35 Armstrong, Politics of Piety, 31-2.
critical factor in determining who became king."\textsuperscript{36} To a degree they were successful. Henri IV abjured his Protestantism in order to legitimize his claim to the throne. Armstrong’s study is important because it clearly illustrates the difficulties faced by the early Bourbons, and the need to co-opt the Church to reduce the radicalism that permeated many of its institutions.

While Armstrong’s study focuses on the role individuals played in shaping the development of political and religious institutions, Jotham Parsons’s \textit{Church in the Republic} examines the role played by intellectual movements in France, most notably Gallicanism, and how the efforts of maintaining the French church’s privileges assisted in shaping French political ideology to support the notion of the absolute state.\textsuperscript{37}

My thesis is indebted to Bergin’s model of how social networks operated among the ecclesiastical hierarchy. While his early works examine the life and career of the Cardinals de la Rochefoucauld and Richelieu,\textsuperscript{38} his subsequent work has focused on the French episcopate.\textsuperscript{39} In \textit{The Making of the French Episcopate}, Bergin first notes even with the extensive historiography on the French episcopacy, there has not been a unified approach to this institution.\textsuperscript{40} Bergin’s purpose was to provide a clear idea of the nature of its “contribution to both religious and political life” in Ancien-Régime France. Bergin concludes that the French episcopate had developed by the middle of Louis XIV’s reign into a distinct institution with clearly marked boundaries of membership through subtle

\textsuperscript{36} Armstrong, \textit{Politics of Piety}, 2.
\textsuperscript{40} Bergin, \textit{French Episcopate}, 5-9.
political and social changes. As the following biographical sketches illustrate, many of the preachers under consideration did not constitute a formal *parti*.

One of the most prominent preachers in this study is the French saint, François de Sales. Of all the preachers under consideration, de Sales has received the greatest amount of attention. However, most of the scholarship had been within the hagiographical tradition which focused more on his work as a pastoralist, with little consideration the historical context in which he operated. Born on 21 August 1567 at his ancestral home in Savoy, de Sales expressed a deep interest in theological and devotional pursuits. He began his education under the tutelage of the chaplain of the chateau, Jean Dégé (d. 1610) who would remain de Sales’ constant companion throughout his life. De Sales first attended the Collège de la Roche and the Collège d’Annecy, until his father sent him to Paris to study at the Jesuit Collège de Clermont. De Sales’ time at Clermont would have a major impact on him. It was here that de Sales would have a profound crisis of faith that would impact his future works as a spiritual director and bishop.

As is often the case during these occasions, de Sales’ crisis of faith led him to immerse himself wholeheartedly into a religious vocation. With a heightened sense of religious duty de Sales first undertook theological studies, and it was there that he would be highly influenced by the Jesuits. This is evident throughout his devotional work. Both of his devotional tracts, *Introduction à la Vie Dévote* and the *Traicté sur l’Amour de Dieu*, echo the Jesuit interest in lay spirituality. De Sales’ residency at Clermont lasted

---

four years (1584-88) before he was sent to Padua by his father in 1588 after the outbreak of religious violence in the capital.

The resolution of this crisis led de Sales to recognize the insurmountable distance between humanity and God. Rather than falling into an Augustinian pessimism over the fallen nature of humanity, de Sales focused on the mercy of God in providing a way for a fallen humanity to comprehend God’s love.

Lord, you who hold all in your hand, all your ways are justice and truth... you who are always a just Judge and merciful Father, I will love you, Lord, to the end of this life I will love you.\textsuperscript{45}

This epiphany is reflective of late sixteenth and seventeenth-century notions of devotion, which influenced de Sales’ writing on the subject. In the Salesian formulation, which achieved an immense popularity, God was the Father whose love was so boundless that any of his creations could approach him without the fear that had characterized humanity’s relationship to Deity for centuries.\textsuperscript{46}

As we will see in chapter 3 concerning the social uses of devotional literature, this individualistic conception of one’s relationship to God had to be carefully formulated since the institutional Church viewed these programmes with suspicion because the logical conclusion would be that if one could approach God simply through private devotion, it would challenge the function of the Church as the vehicle of salvation. As Henri-Jean Martin points out, the Counter-Reformation had formulated a new theology and along with this “the renewal of religiosity stimulated the appearance of a new

\textsuperscript{45} Seigneur, vous qui tenez tout dans votre main, dont toutes les voies sont justice et vérité... vous qui êtes un Juge toujours juste et un miséricordieux Père, je vous aimerai, Seigneur, au moins en cette vie. Au moins en cette vie je vous aimerai s’il ne m’est pas donné de vous aimer dans l’éternelle vie. Francois de Sales, \textit{Oeuvres Completes}, (Annecy, 1894). 22: 19-20. Hereafter \textit{Oeuvres}. All subsequent references to de Sales are taken from \textit{Oeuvres} and will be cited by volume number: page number. Translations from \textit{Oeuvres} are mine.

spiritual literature.” However, the Church feared that this new medium of popular devotion would deviate from accepted orthodoxy, and took measures to prevent any deviation from Tridentine orthodoxy; even Loyola’s *Spiritual Exercises* were nearly placed on the Index.\(^{47}\) Thus the French authors of devotional literature had to negotiate carefully an independent-minded spirituality which remained within the space of the Tridentine orthodoxy.

A secondary concern was: it would be difficult to ensure orthodoxy if people were not overseen by the ecclesiastical hierarchy. Thus we will see that the Church quickly took control over the direction of these spiritual programmes, with the support of people like de Sales who had no intention of challenging the authority of the Church so shortly after the religious upheavals of the Reformation and the Wars of Religion.

In 1588, with Paris again in violent upheaval, de Sales was sent to the University of Padua. Here de Sales encountered the Jesuit Antonio Possevino (c. 1534-1611) who would act as de Sales’ sometime spiritual director. De Sales and Possevino would establish a friendship that lasted a lifetime. Possevino’s influence cannot be overstated. While at Padua, Possevino gave de Sales a copy of Laurent Scampoli’s *Combattimento Spirituale* (1589) which would continue to influence de Sales’ devotional work.

The extent of Possevino’s influence over de Sales is evident in a series of letters written by the French saint to his former mentor between the years 1594-1605. In each letter, de Sales humbly addresses himself to Possevino, and asks for his advice on a number of issues. While the protestation of de Sales’ comparative inadequacies may be standard formalities, there is little doubt that de Sales highly regarded Possevino’s opinion. In a letter dated 4 October 1605, de Sales informed the Jesuit of his difficulties

upon his elevation as the titular Bishop of Geneva, and of his concerns over the success of the Protestants in Savoy. He also informed Possevino of his plans to refute a Protestant polemic against the “the honour of the Cross,” which Possevino subsequently recommended to be published as the *Défense de l’Etendard de la sainte Croix*. Shortly after his studies at Padua, de Sales with the support of Henri IV was installed as Titular Bishop of Geneva in 1593. Although de Sales never took up residence in Geneva, his elevation to the See in abstentia was an important posting.

During the second generation of the Reformation, nearly the entire Savoy region had gone over to Protestantism, thus making de Sales' priorities the reconversion of his ancestral lands to Catholicism. His efforts were aided by the Duke of Savoy, Charles-Emmanuel I (1562-1630). As we will see in this thesis, de Sales actively proselytized among his Protestant neighbours, and though he was successful to a minor degree, the region remained firmly within Protestant hands. The important aspect is not the relative lack of success by de Sales in restoring Catholicism to the Savoy, but rather that his proselytizing efforts reflected the new tone of Catholic-Protestant relations.

De Sales was well connected to some of the most powerful people at court, including the Cardinal Jacques Davy du Perron, whom he had met during his efforts to obtain the Bulls of Absolution for Henri IV from Clement VIII. There has been little biographical work done on the Cardinal du Perron. The most comprehensive biography on the Cardinal appeared in 1618 by Thomas Pelletier, entitled, *L'Histoire abrégé de la vie et de la mort de feu l'Ilustrissime Cardinal du Perron*, shortly after his death in 1617.
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De Perron was born in 1556, in St. Lô, Normandy, or in the canton of Béarn.
Though his birthplace is disputed, we know that he was born to Protestant parents, and raised in that confession. While at school, du Perron excelled at humanist studies, especially ancient languages. His writings, both political and religious demonstrate a strong sensibility to classical learning. Of all the preachers studied here, few can compete with du Perron’s encyclopedic knowledge of classical topoi. He partially translated Aristotle’s *Ethics*. He also had an exhaustive knowledge of Biblical *exempla*, which he was able to use to great effect in his controversies with Philippe du Plessis-Mornay over the nature of the Eucharist.

In 1576, du Perron arrived at Paris, and was taken under the patronage of the marechal de Matignon, whom he accompanied to the Estates at Blois in 1576. While under the tutelage of Matignon, de Perron abjured Protestantism and converted to Catholicism, and by 1584, he had joined the court of Henri III. During this period, de Perron had become a strong proponent of royal authority. He had briefly supported the Cardinal of Lorraine’s claim to the throne as Charles X, but when it became apparent that Henri of Navarre had greater support, and even more importantly had indicated that he was willing to convert to Catholicism in order to strengthen his claim to the throne, du Perron threw his support behind Henri. Because of du Perron’s support of Henri’s claim to the throne, he was able to be instrumental in preparing the conversion of Henri IV.

In 1615, du Perron delivered a *Harrangue pour les Tiers Estates* which is a masterful statement on the privileges of the crown and the responsibilities of the Third Estate to the crown. He also became a vocal opponent of his former co-religionists. Du Perron divided his time fulfilling diplomatic missions, and engaging in numerous controversies with many of the Parisian Protestant leadership. Not only was du Perron
successful in aiding with the conversion of Henri IV, he was also able to convert other
Protestants to Catholicism. One of the most notable was Nicolas de Harlay, the
superintendent of Finances, and Henri de Sponde, who would later become the Bishop of
Pamiers. Around 1600 du Perron led a mission in the Savoy region, although his efforts
produced very few results.

While du Perron spent a great deal of his career acting within a political capacity,
he always maintained the supremacy of the papacy. After his education at the Collège de
France in 1608 and following the death of Henri IV in 1610, du Perron was invited by the
Queen Mother into the Regency Council for Louis XIII, who was still in his minority.
Du Perron used his position to attack the Gallican claims put forward by the Sorbonne
and parlementaires in favour of his own ultramontanism. An eloquent defender of the
Roman Church, he along with his allies, such as the Jesuit Jean Arnoulx would find that
the ultramontane position was becoming increasingly tenuous, as both Protestants and
moderate Catholics and parlementaires equated the assertion of papal authority with an
attack on the sovereignty of the French crown. Du Perron’s writing on the subject
demonstrated how sensitive an issue this had become. It also demonstrates the evolving
perception of the authority of the crown after the Religious Wars. Even someone as well
placed as du Perron could not with impunity too vocally defend institutions that could be
perceived as opposed to the interests of the crown.

Like the two historical figures mentioned so far, Jean Bertaut also owed much of
his career to royal favour, and fell into obscurity not long after his death. There is only
one biography dedicated to Bertaut, George Grente’s 1909 Jean Bertaut: Abbé d’Aunay,
Premier Aumônier de la Reine, Évêque de Séez, 1552-1611. Bertaut was born in Donnay,
in Normandy. He was educated at the Collège Du Bois at Caen. Bertaut also was highly
influenced by a humanist education. He learned Greek and Hebrew, along with music and painting.

While at Caen, Bertaut developed a taste for poetry, at which he excelled. Throughout his life he published poetic works and achieved a considerable amount of success. His talents brought him to the attention of Ronsard and the other members of the Pléiade circle, with whom he came into contact after 1570 when he entered court life. Like du Perron, Bertaut sought the patronage of Matignon. Bertaut was chosen by Henri III to be secretary of the cabinet. Although Bertaut originally had artistic ambitions, he sought religious offices as well. Even though Bertaut never entered orders, he was named as abbot at Aunay in Normandy in 1597.

Following a long established tradition, he did not take up residence while abbot. In accepting ecclesiastical offices as honorific titles, Bertaut placed himself in a position for further advancement at court. Bertaut was rewarded shortly after by becoming the Queen’s Aumônier. Bertaut’s success in obtaining religious offices was in large part due to his support of the crown throughout the chaotic 1580s-90s. When Henri III had been assassinated in 1589, Bertaut wisely avoided involvement with the League and complimented Henri IV’s success in various poems. Because of Bertaut’s position at court, and having the same patronage as du Perron, Bertaut was able to play a small role in the conversion of Henri.

Along with the preceding honour, Bertaut was also elevated to the Bishopric of Séez and was consecrated on 1 June 1607. Séez, like Luçon was a poor bishopric in the Poitou region, although it seems that Bertaut was able to make an easier transition to his
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meager appointment than Richelieu. While at Séez, he pronounced a series of sermons
during the principal feast days of the liturgical calendar. These were subsequently
published as *Sermons sur les Principales festes de l’année* in 1613 at Paris.

Within both his poetic and sermon literature is a prominent strain of support for
royal authority. Bertaut had witnessed the assassination of Henri III at St. Cloud and was
just as disturbed by the murder of Henri IV by Ravaillac in 1610. For Bertaut, both
murders were an assault on the very body politic of France. The language of his sermons
and the funeral oration illustrates the connection of the French Church to the crown, and
the Church’s interest in maintaining political and social order. The Parisian preacher,
Pierre de Besse was also concerned over issues of royal authority was concerned.

Born around 1560, de Besse came from a well connected family. Many of his
uncles were lawyers, writers and notaries, which allowed him, as he got older, to take
advantage of these family connections. The de Besse family also counted among their
relations the Arnould family, and Pierre de Besse would become the great uncle of the
great *parlementaire* and opponent of the Jesuits, Antoine Arnould. Because of his
connections, de Besse had been able to secure for himself a prominent position within the
house of Condé. After the assassination of Henri IV, Condé opposed the regency
government of Marie de’ Medici when his dynastic ambitions were not fulfilled. His
father who was a cousin to Henri IV had been among the great Bourbon chiefs.

However, when Henri abjured, the young Condé had largely been shut out of the new
political order. Throughout the 1620s Condé fought an armed resistance against the

---

51 Grente, *Jean Bertaut*, 62. The poverty of the Bishopric was so well known that the locals had composed
a small verse in its honour: *Beati qui habitant urbes/*Exceptis Luçon, Séez et Maillezais.
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Queen Mother, claiming that his actions were in support of the young Louis XIII. Tied up with the Protestant unrest in the face of encroachments on the articles of the Edict of Nantes, Conde’s uprising ended in 1629 with the fall of La Rochelle to Louis XIII’s forces.

De Besse became the tutor to the young prince in 1603. As his tutor, de Besse not only gave the prince a quality humanist education, but also attempted to instill within his pupil a sense of loyalty to the crown. De Besse had witnessed first hand the St. Bartholomew Day Massacre. His own hometown of Hernart had been sacked three times by both Protestant and Ligueur forces. His sermons, which were dedicated to the Prince de Condé are full of royalist rhetoric.

De Besse was also a tireless opponent of clerical corruption. He published two treatises on the responsibilities of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, *Le Royal Prestrise* (1612) and *Le Bon Pasteur* (1632). De Besse displayed a keen interest in the spiritual welfare of those around him. He had published a manual as how to care for the sick and imprisoned (*La Pratique Chrestienne pour Consoler les Malades et Assister les Criminels qui sont condamnés au supplice*, 1635). His other works display his interest in classical learning. Along with his sermons which are replete with classical and historical allusions, he wrote *a Heraclite Chrestien* (1612) and *a Democrite Chrestien* (1615) in which he debated the merits of the contemplative and active life of the Christian within the framework of both Greek philosophers.

Another major figure of this study is the Toulousian preacher, Etienne Molinier. Born in 1580 to a family of magistrates, he was educated by the Jesuits at the University of Toulouse. Under the Jesuits, he studied both law and theology, obtaining doctorates in
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both fields. He also was adept at humanist studies and developed a highly refined rhetorical style.\textsuperscript{55} In 1613 he joined the confraternity of the Black Penitents. Founded in 1488, the Black Penitents assisted and consoled criminals condemned to death. They also accompanied them to the gallows, providing for them religious services and Christian burial. As a member of the order he preached on several occasions to them in the Basilica of St. Severin in Toulouse. In 1618 he visited Paris to preach, and while there encountered François de Sales with whom he developed a friendship.\textsuperscript{56} According to Molinier, he had been unimpressed by the quality of the sermons he had heard throughout his career, and in his reflections on how to improve upon what he considered to be the poor state of French preaching, he took to heart the advice on how to preach given him by de Sales while in Paris.

Although Molinier was a powerful preacher in his own right, his sermons bear little resemblance to the simple prose of Salesian rhetoric. Molinier’s sermons, especially his early ones, are full of literary conceits that seem to stretch the boundaries of good taste, even by the baroque standards of the day. However, as his career progressed, his rhetoric matured to a point that his prose achieved an elegance which does not obscure the central message of his preaching. Not only was Molinier a prolific sermon writer, he also wrote on the factors needed for a Christian polity, governed by the ideal Christian prince in his 1621 \textit{Les Politiques Chrestiennes}.

While de Sales’ devotional literature has survived and remained popular among Christian communities for the last four hundred years, this was not the fate for many other devotional works. Although an obscure figure now, Eustace de St. Paul was an


\textsuperscript{56} \textit{Dictionnaire de Spiritualité Ascétique et Mystique}. (Paris, 1932), s.v., “Molinier, Etienne.”
important writer of devotional tracts in the seventeenth century. Born in Paris in 1573 to
a legal family, he joined the mendicant order of Feuillants in Paris in 1605. The
Feuillants practiced a many forms of asceticism. Eustache de St Paul however
downplays the austerity of his asceticism throughout his devotional works with the result
that it appealed to a wider readership. Shortly after taking his orders, he demonstrated his
literary prodigality. Between the years 1609-1630 he authored four major works. The
first was a *Summa philosophica quadipatira*. We know of at least thirty editions of this
summa testifying to the popularity of this work.

His second work was a three volume *Summa theologiae tripartia*, published
between the years of 1613-1616. Both these works were based on his lectures while
teaching at the Sorbonne. Influenced by Thomas Aquinas’ *Summa Theologiae*,
Eustache de St. Paul discussed what he considered to be the most important elements of a
spiritual life, such as grace, virtues, and the sacraments. But unlike Aquinas, Eustache de
St. Paul did not focus on a scholastic theology. Rather, his devotional works were
influenced by thetic and mystic theology.

Whereas scholastic theology attempted to understand God and the divine
economy by dissecting all the possible components of a given subject, thetic, or positive
theology looked to the scriptures and the Fathers as the source of truth. Mystic theology
was not so much concerned with understanding the minutia of the divine economy.
Instead, it focused on contemplating and understanding the mysterious nature of God
through simple faith. This approach to theology, with its emphasis on the mystical nature
of a contemplative theology was one of the main themes of Eustache de St. Paul’s work.

59 DSAM. s.v. “Eustache de St Paul.”
His last two works were devotional tracts which laid out a programme of spiritual exercises. The first was the *Addresse Spirituelle contenant une facile pratique des moyens de se perfectionner en la voye de salut*, first published at Paris in 1624 or 1625, with a second edition appearing ten years later. The title itself gives a sense of Eustache de St. Paul's conception of seventeenth-century devotion. The programme, though lengthy (the 1624 edition runs into 411 pages), sought to assist or facilitate the seeker of devotion in their endeavor. The “facile pratique” does not suggest that the devotional exercises were “easy” in the modern sense. Though they lacked the complex theology of scholasticism, the practitioner was required to demonstrate a considerable degree of discipline to follow the programme successfully.

His second devotional work was the *Exercise Spirituels contenant plusieurs meditations tres efficaces pour retirer les âmes du peché et les advancer aux vertus Chrestiens* was also published in Paris in 1630. As with his *Addresse Spirituelle*, Eustache de St. Paul presents a simplified programme of spiritual exercises, emphasizing the personal and individual relationship between the Christian soul and God. Both works were highly influenced by Loyola's *Spiritual Exercises*, and by de Sales, whom Eustache de St. Paul had met in Paris prior to de Sales' death in 1622. Though a few of his works were published after Eustache de St. Paul's death in 1640, he remained a relatively unknown figure. It is almost impossible to answer why someone as prolific and important as Eustache de St. Paul fell into obscurity, considering his influence on the development of seventeenth-century spirituality.

This thesis will also examine the work of Jean-Armand du Plessis (1585-1642). The bibliography dedicated to the Cardinal is immense, and the facts of Richelieu’s life
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are so well known that this introduction could not do justice in providing an overview of his life. Until recently, Richelieu's pastoral and devotional efforts have remained a relatively understudied aspect of his life. He wrote two treatises: *Instruction du Chrestien* (1621) and *Traité du Perfection du Chrestien* (1646). Both of these works show a Richelieu who was greatly concerned with the spiritual well being of his parishioners. They also demonstrate a commonality of seventeenth-century devotional literature. Under the careful supervision of a spiritual director, preferably the local Bishop, these spiritual programmes were to reach as wide an audience as possible.

Richelieu’s role in the polemics arising from the Charenton controversy during the first decades of the 1600s will also be examined. Richelieu’s high profile at the court of Louis XIII provided the opportunity to become involved in the controversy, which took place in the years 1616-1620. His contribution to the Charenton controversy was his *Principaux Points de la Foi* (1619), in which he attacked the right of the Protestants to remain in France after of the Edict of Nantes, and provided a justification of papal authority in the Church and the state.

Although Richelieu’s language seems to reflect the ultramontanism of his mentor du Perron, it is not particularly convincing, especially when compared to his later efforts in maintaining the prerogatives of the crown. In his attacks on the Protestant claims of loyalty to the throne, Richelieu demonstrates real rhetorical power. The *Principaux Points de la Foi* is a strong exposition of Catholic doctrine and as the title suggests, leaves little room for debate. Even though Richelieu was Bishop of Luçon for a number of years, and was very active in pastoral work, we have only one unedited sermon of his that survives, making it difficult, but not impossible, to reconstruct his preaching style.
Chapter 2 examines the rhetorical strategies employed by seventeenth-century preachers. The chapter accomplishes two things. First it traces the development of the rhetorical style of preaching from late medieval scholasticism to the humanistically influenced epideictic sermons of the Italian Renaissance to the politically violent and subversive eschatological sermon literature of sixteenth-century city preachers. Tracing this evolution, it becomes apparent that around the late 1580s, preachers rejected the apocalyptic rhetoric of the city preachers and the scholastic methodology of the late medieval era.

The value of examining the rhetorical structure of sermon literature is ably demonstrated by Larissa Taylor, John O’Malley and Peter Bayley. Taylor’s study of late medieval French preaching, *Soldiers of Christ*, provides an excellent model of the structure of scholastic preaching. O’Malley examines the shift from scholastic rhetoric of late medieval sermons to a new rhetorical style arising at the papal court influenced by classical Roman tropes in the *Quattrocento*. His study demonstrates “how rhetoric changed a literary genre from its medieval and thematic form” to something quite different and helped create a distinct religious vision.61

This new religious vision became identified with the revival of the *studia humanitatis* and the rise of Renaissance humanism. The *genus demonstratum* remained predominantly confined to the papal court and Italian urban centres. Although sermon literature in Northern Europe would be influenced by the *studia humanitatis*, continuing the trend away from thematic scholastic sacred oratory, it would not adopt to a large degree the praise and blame, characteristic of the orators of the papal court.

Peter Bayley examines Catholic and Protestant sermon literature of the late sixteenth and seventeenth century. His attention is directed towards the literary nature of the sermon material, and though the historical context is not the central focus, Bayley arrives at some important conclusions. He first notes that French sermon literature oscillated between the thematic scholastic style with its liberal inclusion of past authorities and the humanist rhetorical strategies coming from Renaissance and Tridentine circles. Bayley’s second observation is that there is a strong “illusionary nature of this world,” and that “this is initially a religious (and specifically a Tridentine) theme, springing from a Christian insistence on the reality of the invisible.”

Using O’Malley and Bayley as a springboard, it will be the purpose of this chapter to trace the rhetoric of the sermon literature within its wider historical context. I will argue that the rhetorical strategies of seventeenth-century preachers were part of the overall process of pacification after the Wars of Religion. The more civil rhetorical styles were a reaction against the virulent language of sixteenth-century preaching noted by Diefendorf, Delumeau and Crouzet. Given that much of the violence of the early civil wars came from the city preachers, it is not surprising that the crown would not tolerate similar fiery pulpit oratory. Thus the sermon rhetoric reveals a vision of early modern French Catholicism that is not only Tridentine in nature, but also fundamentally concerned with the establishment of royal authority and social order.

The emphasis on royal authority and social order cannot be fully explained by the confessionalization model described by R. Po-Chia Hsia and Heinze Schilling. A
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useful model in explaining the confessional division of the Holy Roman Empire after 1555, it does not take into account the differences of state formation of France, and how the crown dealt with its religious minority in the seventeenth century. The Edict of Nantes was not the Peace of Augsburg. Protestants were granted places de sécurité throughout the kingdom, but there was no equivalent to the cuius regio, eius religio which underpinned the 1555 Peace of Augsburg.

I argue that post Wars of Religion France followed a pastoral model in establishing a religious peace. Both confessions regarded the king as the pastor of his people. In the discourse of conversion, the Catholics maintained that such efforts were a central responsibility of the crown. Although considered an alien presence in the body social, the Protestants were nonetheless expected to be loyal subjects.

The first aspect of this chapter examines how preachers and devotional writers conceived of the purpose of their writing. Through there were few manuals published during this period, the clerical estate by and large adhered to the Tridentine position on the responsibilities of the preacher, which was to return to the Apostolic simplicity of the early Church. The desire to preach according to the simplicity of the early Apostles led to a discussion on the reform of the Church, as many preachers maintained that it was the Bishop’s responsibility to preach and to ensure that his life fulfilled the requirements of Episcopal purity decreed by Trent.

This chapter will then turn its attention to the kind of sources used by these preachers, and how they were used. Of particular interest is the use of Biblical topoi within the sermon literature. Not only did these Biblical citations provide the orthodox
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underpinnings to the message of the sermons, but they also were used to promote the political agenda of these preachers. This is apparent when comparing the use of Biblical *topoi* from the mid sixteenth century to the early seventeenth century.

As this chapter will argue, the city preachers during the religious wars used Old Testament exempla to attack the authority of the crown and its policies of pacification, while preachers a generation later were able to use many of these same exempla to promote obedience to royal authority. As well, the evolving use of Biblical *exempla* helps trace the nature of seventeenth-century devotion.

Apocalyptic texts, with their theme of the imminent return of Christ had served as justification for political subversion. By the end of the sixteenth century these same texts were used to emphasize the need for inward change. In other words, the eschatological rhetoric of the sixteenth century had largely been replaced with a hopeful rhetoric of inwards conversion and the opportunity to experience the love of God of oneself.

For example, François de Sales, as with most of the subjects under consideration had received a humanist education. For de Sales it was during his time at the University of Padua that he was influenced by humanism, which would become an integral element in the composition of his sermons and devotional writings. His sermons are highly informed by humanist exempla. His sermon for “The Feast of the Assumption,” (1602) relies heavily on both Aristotle’s *De Historia Anima*, and Pliny’s *Natural History*. In an oft-quoted passage from his *Introduction à la Vie Dévote*, de Sales quotes Saint Jerome’s position that classical learning can be employed to great effect in the service of Christianity.

In the third chapter we will see how sermon and devotional literature were used in promoting social and religious pacification. The primary function of the devotional tracts
was to create for the adherent a mystical union with God through the purity of one’s life. But for the authors of this devotional literature, the quest for the union with God, though a private one, was not meant to completely draw people away from the larger Christian community. As this chapter will demonstrate, the conception of “devotion” held a myriad of meanings.

In the atmosphere of spiritual renewal that arose from the Council of Trent, the expression of piety took form in the establishment of new monastic movements. Many of these new orders aggressively sought to reform the world around them. In France, this sense of renewed piety is seen in the formation of the dévot party. A lay movement, the dévots adhered to a narrow reading of Catholic orthodoxy. Because the dévots could be found in just about every segment of French society, the practices of piety took on many meanings. One such meaning was found in their opposition to the crown’s efforts to come to terms with the Protestant princes in France and throughout Europe. This was especially evident in their hostility to Henri IV and Louis XIII’s alliances with heretic powers to contain Catholic Spain’s continental ambitions.

This opposition, along with displays of hyper-piety, brought upon the dévot party the hostility of the crown. It had not forgotten the problems caused by the Catholic League, and viewed any opposition as disloyalty to the king. Sidelined by Richelieu, the dévot party lost much of its political influence and retreated into the practice of strident piety, which would give rise to the Jansensits and Molinists of the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.
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Because the nature of seventeenth-century devotion is so broad, I have chosen to focus on the moderate aspect of devotional practices. Rejecting the rigorous structure of monastic life, and the "obscuriessement des vérités" of the dévots and Jansenists, the devotional programmes were designed for a mainstream audience. They eschewed the austerity that characterized many devotional efforts. Although, physical mortification was still regarded as an important component of pious behaviour, it was increasingly being downplayed in many of the devotional writings of the early seventeenth century. The emphasis was on the interior mortification which came through penitence, overseen by the clergy.

This was an important consideration. The Church viewed with suspicion many of the spontaneous devotional movements that appeared in the wake of the Catholic Reformation. The Church’s concern was that these largely private endeavors would lead to renewed heterodoxy. One fear was the emphasis of private devotion and the individual quest to achieve God’s love would undermine the communal nature of the Catholic Church. Church authorities were also concerned about the lack of clerical oversight. Session six of the Council of Trent addressed the need for reforming the residency of Bishops, and this effort is seen in the control of the clergy over monastic orders, and the central role they played in overseeing private devotional programmes.

The second theme of this chapter examines how this devotional and sermon literature was used in the attempt to pacify French society. Equating pious behaviour
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with appropriate social behaviour, these preachers like Pierre de Besse and Molinier, focused heavily on moral breaches that were most likely to be socially disruptive. In particular, they singled out the sin of ambition, and to a lesser extent, avarice.

Ambition was seen to be especially problematic since it had been the ambition of the nobility that had plunged France into a half century of civil war. Even in the unsettled first decades of the seventeenth century, ambition was seen as the underlying cause for the challenge to the power of the king. Thus these sermons became part of the rhetoric of royal authority. De Besse’s inability to prevent the Prince de Condé from rising up in the 1620s, and the Frond of the 1630s demonstrated the limits of the practice of royal authority, however there is no question that the efforts of the clerical estate helped lay the theoretical groundwork for the later success of royal prerogative.

Chapter 4 examines the relations between the court preachers under examination and the Protestant faction within France. This will be undertaken in two sections. The first subsection will concern itself with the construction of the image of the Protestant within the sermon literature. The second section will examine the centrality of the Eucharist doctrine as part of the Catholic identity. Preachers employed the reality of Christ’s presence to define the fundamental differences between Protestants and Catholics.

Christopher Ellwood has examined the conception of the Eucharist in Protestant theology during the sixteenth century. I will argue that the recentring of the Eucharist into Catholic theology after the Council of Trent became the criterion by which the soundness of one’s orthodoxy could be judged. For Etienne Molinier, for example, the

image of the Protestants stands in contrast to Catholic Eucharist theology. His collection of sermons, *Le Banquet Sacré* takes as its central message the validity of the nature of the transubstantiation of the host. The purpose of these sermons not only clarifies the mechanics of the Mass for his Catholic congregation, but also serves as the basis of his attack on the legitimacy of the Protestant faction.

For Molinier, the Protestants, to whom he refers as *Nouvateurs*, erred in introducing innovations into the established liturgy of the Catholic Mass. The introduction of these innovations occurred because the Protestants had through their innovations ignored the history of the Church which demonstrated the truth of Catholic Eucharist theology. Thus his portrayal of the Protestant faction defines them as being misguided as to the basic tenets of the Christian faith. This made them no less dangerous to the Catholic community than to their own souls, but the implication is that it would be possible to win back those who maintained religious heterodoxy through reasoned arguments on why the Catholics sacraments were the only efficacious means of salvation. This is illustrated in Molinier's second sermon for the Octave de S. Sacrament, where he discusses at great length on the historical precedents, proving that the doctrine of transubstantiation had its origins in the practices of the primitive Church.  

Others, such as Bertaut and de Sales, perceived the image of the Protestants differently. De Sales touched on Eucharistic theology only rarely in his sermons and Bertaut did not even make mention of it. But both preachers portray the Protestant faction as a threat to the social and political stability of the kingdom. Bertaut's political theory is intricately connected to his conception of social discipline in relation to his
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understanding of public and private religiosity. The Protestants according to Bertaut, by removing themselves from the space of orthodox religiosity, threaten both social and political order.

De Sales, of all preachers in this sample, maintained closer proximity to the Protestant community in his role as titular Bishop of Geneva and by his residence in Annecy, putting him on the borders of the Genevan Protestant republic. Not only did de Sales leave behind an extensive body of sermon literature, he also produced a wealth of other source material such as letters, making it relatively easy to reconstruct the French saint’s opinions of the Huguenot population. Like Bertaut, de Sales regarded the Protestants as a threat to the stability of the social and political order. In his polemics with the Protestant minority de Sales is at once more virulent in his criticism (referring to them as heretics, a term absent in both Bertaut and Molinier), while at the same time his sermon literature and in particular his personal correspondence, de Sales avoids calling for the forcible removal of the Protestants. The image of Protestants as a cancer in the body politic of France is not present in any of his writings.

Chapter 5 concerns itself with the controversy over the presence of the Protestant minority in Charenton, a town just outside Paris which took place during the second decade of the seventeenth century. I refer to it as the “Charenton controversy” after the four Protestant ministers located at the Protestant temple at Charenton, Pierre Du Moulin, Jean Mestrezeat, Montigni, and Samuel Durand.

In 1617, the Protestant ministers at Charenton had submitted the Messieurs de l'Eglise Romain, a brief pamphlet outlining the basic doctrinal underpinnings of Calvinist theology. The general content of this pamphlet is not particularly original. The ministers, led by du Moulin, take the standard Calvinist position on such topics as the
Eucharist (it is commemorative only), purgatory (it has no existence in the scriptural text), and papal authority (a tradition established by the Church on misreading the New Testament). Although the pamphlet itself is not that controversial, it elicited a swift and uncompromising response from Louis XIII’s personal confessor, the Jesuit Jean Arnauld, whose response *Confession de la Foi* (1617) initiated a lengthy and extensive literary polemic. In response the Charenton ministers presented a remonstrance before Louis XIII entitled, *Défense de la Confession des Eglises Reformées en France*. This remonstrance maintained, among many things, the Protestant loyalty to the crown, and pled for the liberty to worship unmolested. The controversy also included the Bishop of Luçon, the future Cardinal Richelieu, who in turn responded to the Charenton ministers’ remonstrance with his *Principaux Points de la Foi*, which challenges each of the claims made in the *Défense*. An examination of this controversy provides an important insight into the nature of relations between Protestants and Catholics during the early reign of Louis XIII. It is apparent that despite the tenuous position held by the Protestant in post-Edict of Nantes there was no interest in returning to the homicidal violence that had been the hallmark of the sixteenth century.

Joseph Bergin notes that Richelieu’s pragmatic tolerance of the Protestant party is absent in his *Points de la Foi* where the Cardinal completely rejects the protestations of loyalty by the Protestants. The Protestants still represented a threat to the well-being of the body politic and orthodoxy of the Catholic Church. While the Charenton ministers acknowledge heterodox beliefs in relation to the Catholic majority, they did not represent
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72 Pierre Du Moulin, Jean Mestrezeat, Montigni, and Samuel Durand *Défense de la Confession des Eglises Reformées en France* (Charenton, 1617), n.p.
73 Bergin, *Rise of Richelieu*, 106
a threat to the crown. Rather they go to great lengths to profess their loyalty to the King. They do not invoke the Lutheran theory of just rebellion if their demands were not met.

Building on the arguments of the fifth chapter, chapter 6 examines how the sermon rhetoric of the early seventeenth century fits within the context of the development of the theory of royal authority. This formulation originated in part over questions of papal and secular authority which were becoming more pressing by the 1610s. As the crown began to successfully reassert its authority, it was no longer tenable for the Church to maintain the supremacy of the papacy over the monarch. Thus the sermon literature reflects the growing power of the state. This development is summed up quite well in the following passage

The Church...is differently ruled by two diverse persons, that is by the Pope, and the Civil Prince. Comfortably to the commandment of the Lord, Give unto Caesar the things which are Caesar’s, and to God those that are God’s. For by this, as by a mutual band of love and obligation, the Lord was pleased to knit together the Church and the Civil power; that princes and Churchmen should not quarrel one against another...The Evangelical law hath no other end but everlasting life, and the soul of man for his matter and natural subject. It ought wholly to apply itself about the direction of the inward motions of the conscience, but no ways in any outward force or violence...The Church hath neither territory, nor use of sword, of prison, or of any corporal punishment...The Church hath for her subject the souls of men, not earthly Dominions.  

Returning to an Augustinian reading of the responsibilities of the Church and State, seventeenth-century clerics began to create an image of a proto-absolutist monarch. Several factors inform this rhetoric of royal authority. First of all, the preachers are appealing to a pre-Bossuetian interpretation of scripture that supported a powerful monarchy. It is going too far to say at this point that, like Bossuet, early seventeenth-century preachers argued that Christ “left no power and no force against the public
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power, when they were oppressed with as much injustice and violence as was Christ himself."

However, there is little question that these preachers shared with Bossuet the idea that the spirit of Christianity was that of passive obedience to public power.

The other development to have an impact on the sermon literature was the introduction of neostoicism within French political thought. Originating in the humanist circles at Leiden, the philosophical works of Seneca were brought back into favour through the efforts of Justus Lipsius (1547-1606). It spread rapidly throughout France in the 1560s-80s. In France, neostoicism became the foundation of a school of political thought that placed obedience to the secular authority as the ultimate duty of the subject.

While Michel de Montaigne remains one of the best known proponents of this school of thought, it was Michel de l'Hospital, the Chancellor of France, who would influence the discourse over the nature of royal government in France. Identified with Catherine de'Medici's policies of toleration towards the Huguenot faction, l'Hospital argued that the political order reflected the universal order, and could only be altered by the will of God. Thus for l'Hospital, his political philosophy was a balance of divine justice and a strong temporal monarchy, which itself was divine in origin. As this chapter will argue, it was this understanding of monarchy that informed the sermon literature of the clergy.
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76 Bossuet, Politics, xxxviii.
This will be achieved first by looking at the Biblical and Classical sources used by these preachers. An examination of the sources employed is necessary to determine to what effect both Biblical and classical sources were used. For example, many of the sermons that included references to the Apocalypse of the New Testament and the apocalyptic books of the Old Testament avoid discussing the eschatological framework, which had accompanied these references during the sixteenth-century.

The next section will examine how exactly the relation of subject to the crown was constructed. An examination of the sermon literature thus far reveals a heavy emphasis on the connection between the earthly monarchy of Henri IV and Louis XIII and the Heavenly monarchy of Christ and his Church. The connection between the earthly and heavenly monarchy was important in defining the relationship between the subject and the crown because as the image of the two monarchies became intertwined, obedience to one required obedience to the other. Thus in describing the Church and the Heavenly City in terms similar to the French court, preachers were able to remind their congregations that peaceable subjects of the Heavenly City were in turn peaceable subjects of an earthly kingdom.
Chapter II
Of Banquets and Bouquets: Rhetorical Strategies of Seventeenth-Century Sermon Literature

In 1601, the Parisian preacher, Pierre de Besse delivered a series of sermons to coincide with the Lenten celebration. The published edition of these sermons, known as *Premiers Conceptions Theologique sur la Carême* (1602), addressed some of the following themes: obedience to the spiritual and secular authority; the evils of ambition and avarice (a favourite of his); and the symbolic nature of Mary’s purification rites and its meaning for the contemporary Christian. A prolific writer, de Besse also published a *Conceptions Theologique sur les Quatre Fins de l’Homme* (1605) and a *Conceptions Theologiques sur toutes les Festes des Saints* (1628). The Toulousian preacher, Etienne Molinier, produced a number of sermon collections under such titles as *Le Banquet Sacré de l’Eucharistie* (1635), and *Le Bouquet de Myrre de l’Amante Sacrée* (1643). Each of these titles gives some sense as to the nature of the rhetorical style contained in these editions. François de Sales did not publish his sermons during his life, yet many of the rhetorical structures and characteristics reflect the tastes of seventeenth-century Catholics.

After sifting through hundreds of sermons, a picture begins to emerge of the rhetorical composition and style which seventeenth-century preachers developed to convey their arguments to their congregations. One characteristic is the absence of the scholastic style favoured by medieval clergy. In place of the scholastic method, these sermons were influenced to a considerable degree by humanism. Seventeenth-century sermons employed the tools of *ad fontes*, as opposed to the interpretative *summa* of the Scholastic doctors. Preachers relied heavily on the Biblical text and early Patristic
writers, and were indebted to varying degrees to the classical non-Christian heritage. As
the Biblical text became more prevalent in seventeenth-century preaching, the function of
the scriptural text evolved.

Biblical passages cited in sermons moved away from being read in the traditional
four-fold interpretative way of scholasticism, known as the *Quadriga* (the four divisions).
These were: literal; allegorical; topological; and anagogical.\(^1\) With the advent of
humanism, preachers began to use Biblical examples as more of a proof text, with greater
meaning given to the political interpretations of these citations. A result of this was
preachers’ rejection of an eschatological reality described in the apocalyptic books,
especially those in the Old Testament, Daniel and Ezekiel. Yet, despite the continuity of
seventeenth-century literature with its antecedents, the preaching models which
developed during the early Bourbon monarchy found their own voice. An examination of
the rhetorical structures of these sermons provides valuable insights regarding the
historical and social forces of post-Edict of Nantes France.

To examine the impact the historical and social contexts on sermon rhetoric, this
chapter will examine three main influences on seventeenth-century sermon and
devotional literature. The first influence was the Council of Trent’s decrees on reforming
the quality of preaching and reemphasizing the responsibilities of the Bishop in
overseeing and being involved in the instruction of his diocese. The Paris *parlement*
refused to register the decrees from Trent. The reforms were also opposed by the
proponents of Gallican liberties, such as Charles du Moulin (1500-1566), who regarded

\(^1\) Rudolph Heinze, *Reform and Conflict, Reform and Conflict: From the Medieval World to the Wars of
the decrees as an assault on royal authority.\(^2\) Opposition to Trent did not come alone from the political estate. Many of the lower clergy supported the *parlementaires* against their ecclesiastical superiors.\(^3\) In the face of this opposition, the “clergy” as an estate adopted the Tridentine decrees at the Estates General of 1614.\(^4\) The extent to which these reforms were adopted will be examined throughout this chapter.

Prior to the seventeenth century, preachers and church men had already rejected medieval scholasticism. Marc Fumaroli, John O’Malley, Erika Rummel, and Charles Trinkaus have all traced the shift away from the thematic sermon.\(^5\) Throughout the fifteenth-century, as humanism began to replace the scholastic method of preaching, O’Malley has demonstrated that the preachers at the papal court were imbued with this new pedagogical programme, leading to the rise of the epideictic sermon. This style of preaching was characterized by its imitation of the Ciceronian model of the genus *demonstrativum*, whereby one equally “praised and blamed” their subject.\(^6\) Rejecting the thematic sermon, epideictic rhetoric meant to provide an oratorical monument to the subject under consideration, which would lead the audience to imitate the virtues of the person praised. Epideictic oratory soon came under criticism. Erasmus lambasted the slavish imitation of Cicero, as being not only foreign to the true spirit of Cicero, but also

\(^6\) O’Malley, *Praise and Blame,* 3.
inappropriate "to the spirit that should animate a Christian sermon."\(^7\) The other shortcoming of the genus demonstrativum was that although it did articulate the qualities of a Christian life, it did not focus on a call to repentance.\(^8\)

Erasmus' *Ecclesiastes* was the "culmination of a tradition that can be called *theologia rhetorica," which used Ciceronian rhetoric to provide the "means concentrating on the theological substance of language."\(^9\) In other words, Erasmus was concerned that sacred rhetoric should move the audience to lead Christian lives, as opposed to just demonstrating the oratorical skills of the preacher. This concern is also found in Erasmus' earlier pastoral work, *Enchiridion Militis Christiana*. Published in 1518, the *Enchiridion* "evoked widespread interest in the sixteenth century as a compendium of humanist piety."\(^10\) The value for early Christian humanists like Erasmus was obvious. Humanism "brought a new vigor to calls for an educated, preaching clergy."\(^11\) As a manual of moral teaching, it addressed the need for a purer form of spirituality that had also fuelled the early Reformation. As this chapter progresses, we will see that both Catholics and Protestants were more concerned about moving away from the observance of religious rites to inner piety.

This concern is seen in the criticism directed against the Mass by the Protestant minister, Pierre du Moulin (1568-1658) head of the Huguenot temple at Charenton, a town located outside Paris. Du Moulin argued that because the Catholic Mass was
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conducted in Latin, which almost no one understood, it was an inefficacious practice. The Mass had become a dead ritual. "Let us go to the Mass: We are going to a show, and not instruction." Yet the evidence of the Catholic sermon literature demonstrates that Catholics preachers were just as concerned with inner piety of their flocks as were the reformers. By the seventeenth century, preachers were concerned that despite the utility of humanist techniques, slavish imitation would lead the clergy to be less concerned about the spiritual well being of his flock than displaying their rhetorical abilities.

The final factor under consideration will be the impact of the political climate during the reigns of Henri IV and Louis XIII. Despite radicalized minorities, the general populace of France was willing to put the violence of the religious wars behind them. Henri garnered the support of his subjects did so by pursuing moderate policies. He also wisely sought the support of the politique Parlement in Paris, without whose cooperation, it would have proved extremely difficult to govern effectively. This was despite the several threats the crown still faced from the rebellious nobility. On the religious front, though neither side fully accepted the conditions of the Edict of Nantes, Catholics were content knowing that the Huguenots were to remain a minority, and that France had not gone over to Calvinism. The Protestants, though still persecuted, could with sporadic success experience social advancement at the local and provincial level. The improving social and political situation began to influence Biblical interpretation. Biblical interpretation in sixteenth-century France was predominantly eschatological. But by the seventeenth century, this eschatological angst had largely
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dissipated. One striking example of this evolution away from an eschatological rhetoric is evident in the meaning given to the symbols of the Biblical apocalyptic texts throughout the first half of the seventeenth century. The second chapter of the apocalyptic book of Daniel relates the Babylonian King Nebuchadnezzar's dream of a stone cut from a mountain without hands increasing in size as it rolls down a mountain. As this stone accelerates, it smashes into a golden headed statue with feet of clay, destroying it completely. During the Wars of Religion, the city preachers had allegorized this vision to represent the Valois dynasty. The comparison was not difficult to draw. Charles IX and Catherine de' Medici had allowed the Protestants to remain within the body politic of France. Even worse, they had seemingly encouraged their presence through various edicts of pacification, violating their most important function of protecting the Catholic religion. Thus, for the city preachers of the sixteenth century, the statue with feet of clay mixed with iron had come to represent the court. In turn, the rolling stone represented the right for subjects to rise in just rebellion against an apostate King, led by the clerical estate. However, as the sixteenth century came to a close, the virulent violence that was so often associated with this type of imagery was replaced by a rhetoric that allegorized the apocalyptic texts with greater emphasis on pastoralism and the interior reform of the Christian.

As with the use of Biblical and non-Biblical sources, the imagery employed within these sermons can reveal a great deal about the historical context in which these preachers operated. The image of Louis IX (1215-1270) for many of these preachers was that of an ideal king and a new David. Most preachers pronounced at least once throughout their careers a panegyric commemorating the death of the saint king. Within these panegyrics, the ideal represented by Louis allowed the preachers to proclaim their
denunciation of the world without directly challenging royal authority. One such example is found in Etienne Molinier’s *Panegyrique du Roi S. Louys* (1618).

Behold a bouquet of praises consecrated for the King St. Louis, on the occasion of this solemn festival consecrated. I dare to present this bouquet, since your royal piety gave life to it... He had a rude manner, and was not skilful, but being composed of the rare flowers of virtues of so great a saint, of so just a King...Thus before God, and before your Majesty, the living image of God, the greatest treasures of men are in their wills, their richest presents are in their vows.¹⁵

And further on,

Saint Louis, conforming to this divine prototype and shaping his authority to the rules of eternal truth, reformed the license of his age through his example, rather than by his laws, and showing himself as a living law, banished from himself vice, from his Court dissoluteness, from his kingdom abuses, he ruled himself with virtue, his Court through good order, his kingdom through justice...Keeping nothing of his dignity for himself, only the trouble, responsibility and worry, he consecrated everything to God, and to his people: Riches, pleasures, honour, rest, and his virtue renounced all the license his grandeur gave him.¹⁶

These panegyrics demonstrate that, even as they denounced the evils of the world, their sermons were a far cry from their sixteenth-century predecessors. The panegyric allowed the preachers to turn to subjects of a more general nature and “illustrate their teaching with images designed to instill the lesson rather by delighting than by terrifying their audiences.”¹⁷

¹⁵ Voici un bouquet des louanges du Roi saint Louis, que la celebration solemnelle de sa fête consacre à votre Majesté. Ma petitesse l’ose presenter, puis que votre royale pieté l’a fait naitre.... Il est tissu d’une main grossiere, et peu ingenieuse, mais étant composé des rares fleurs des vertus d’un si grand saint, et d’un si juste Roi...Aussi devant Dieu, et devant votre Majesté, l’image vive de Dieu, le plus grand tresors des hommes est en leur volonté, et leurs plus riches presens sont en leur voeux. Etienne Molinier, *Panegyrique de Roy S. Louys.* (Paris, 1618), 1-2.
¹⁶ Saint Louis se conformant à ce divin prototype et prevant ses mesures des regies de l’eternelle verité, reforme la licence de son siecle par ses exemples plutôt que par ses loix, et se proposant soi-meme comme une loi vivant, bannir de soi le vice, de sa Cour les dissolutions, de son Royaume les abus, reigle soi-meme par la vertu, sa Cour par le bon ordre, son Royaume par la Justice...Ne gardant rien de sa dignité pour soi-meme, que la peine, la charge, et le souci, il consacre tout le reste à Dieu, et a son peuple, Richesses, plaisirs, honneur, repos, et sa vertu renounce à toute la licence que sa grandeur lui donne. Molinier, *Panegyrique*, 20-1.
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This is not to say that preachers did not explain sometimes in lurid terms the results of sinful behaviour. Molinier, whose sermons are full of pastoral imagery, explicitly describes the consequences of an unchristian life.

The Demon of Hypocrisy is a fox which hides in the heart of the hypocrite, as if in a burrow. The Demon of falsehood is another fox for whom the heart of the deceiver serves as a cover. The Demon of avarice is a kite who makes its nest in the spirit of the greedy, cupidity, of the unjust, and of the usurer. The Demon of luxury is a sparrow who hatches the eggs of a thousand indecent desires in the bosom of the voluptuous. The Demon of laziness is a languishing owl, mournful and cold, which hides in the merry making of cowards and the non-devout, and wealthy Christians who, like the owls, flee the frequenting of churches, sermons, divine offices, and the Sacraments in order to maintain their voluptuous flesh, or their melancholic spirit. Is there any difference between the owls who only love the night, and fear [the night] so much that they do not dare to get out of bed before noon? Thus you see how foxes and birds, not of heaven, but of hell, live and nest in the souls of sinners.  

As this chapter will argue, sacred rhetoric of the seventeenth century developed its own distinctive nature. This development was profoundly impacted by the clerical and pedagogical reforms undertaken at the Council of Trent. Even though Trent was regarded with hostility by the Paris Faculty of Theology and the Gallican elements within the French church, it is evident that much of the French clergy followed the Tridentine decrees concerning preaching and pastoral care. Trent was certainly not the only influence on the development of sacred rhetoric, it is an important starting point.

According to Bayley, "very little preaching theory of any substance was produced in

---

18 Le Demon de l'Hypocrisie est un renard qui se musse comme dans une fosse dans le coeur du dissimulé. Le Demon de la tromperie est un autre renard a qui l’aame du trompeur sert de taniere. Le Demon de l’avarice est un Milan qui fait son nid dans l’espirit du cupide, de l’injustice et de l’usurier. Le Demon de la luxe est un passereau qui couve les oeufs de mille desirs impudiques dans la poitrine du voluptueux....Le Demon de la paresse est un Hibou languisitif, morne, et froid, qui se tapit dans la fetardise de ces lasches et indevots, et Chrestiens a gros grain qui comme les hibous fuyent la frequentation des Eglises, des sermons, des offices divins, des prieres, et des Sacremens pour se tenir a l’escart dans l’entretien ou de leur chair voluptueuse, ou de leur esprit melancholique, et ne different des hibous qu’en ce seul point que les hibous n’aiment que la nuit, et ceux ci la craignent tant qu’ils n’osent sortir du lit que le midi ne paroisst? Ainsi vous voyez comme les renards et le oiseaux non du Ciel, mais de l’Enfer habitent et nichent dans les âmes des pecheurs. Etienne Molinier, *Sermons pour tous les Dimanches de l’Année.* (Toulouse, 1635), 548.
France in the first half of the seventeenth century.” It is surprising that the growth of seminary activity during this period did not increase the production of religious educational media. One possible reason is that preachers were for the most part willing to rely on instructional precedents of the later sixteenth century, especially those influenced by the Council of Trent.

This is significant because, right from the time of the apostolic fathers, media discussing the mechanics of preaching were central in the conception of Christianity. Paul’s letter to Timothy is one set of instructions concerned with how the preacher was to best convey the Christian message, along with his pastoral duties. Apart from Paul’s teachings, St. Augustine’s *De Doctrina Christiana* (c. 395-427) was still one of the most influential treatises on sacred rhetoric. Based on Ciceronian and Quintilian rhetorical models anchored within a Christian context, St. Augustine focuses on the interpretation of scripture, defined as the “process of discovering what we need to learn, and the process of presenting what we have learnt.” It is this type of exegesis that preachers must master to instruct properly their flocks, which Augustine explained was their primary duty.

Pope Gregory I’s *Regula Pastoralis* (c. 590) was as influential in the development of preaching manuals as the *De Doctrina Christiana*. Gregory’s main concern was with the spiritual quality of the clergy. Not just concerned with the quality of preaching, Gregory wanted to ensure that the messenger matched the message. These three works would form the basis of the theory of preaching throughout the Middle Ages, which
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21 St. Augustine, *Doctrina Christiana*, 9-11.
witnessed a large number of manuals dedicated to preaching. However, the quantity of preaching manuals was reduced to a trickle by the early 1600s. This might be explained by the success of the reforms of Trent in standardizing religious practices within the Catholic Church. The decrees on preaching and the duties of the clergy, especially the episcopacy, represented a conservative appeal to the functions of preaching. Echoing the Fourth Lateran Council that

Among the various things that are conducive to the salvation of the Christian people, the nourishment of God's word is recognized to be especially necessary, since just as the body is fed with material food so the soul is fed with spiritual food, according to the words, *man lives not by bread alone but by every word that proceeds from the mouth of God*. It often happens that bishops by themselves are not sufficient to minister the word of God to the people, especially in large and scattered dioceses, whether this is because of their many occupations or bodily infirmities or because of incursions of the enemy or for other reasons — let us not say for lack of knowledge, which in bishops is to be altogether condemned and is not to be tolerated in the future. We therefore decree by this general constitution that bishops are to appoint suitable men to carry out with profit this duty of sacred preaching, men who are powerful in word and deed and who will visit with care the peoples entrusted to them in place of the Bishops, since these by themselves are unable to do it, and will build them up by word and example. The bishops shall suitably furnish them with what is necessary, when they are in need of it, lest for want of necessities they are forced to abandon what they have begun. We therefore order that there be appointed in both cathedral and other conventual churches suitable men whom the bishops have as coadjutors and cooperators not only in the office of preaching but in hearing confessions and enjoining penances and in other matters which are conducive to the salvation of souls. If anyone neglects to do this, let him be subject to severe punishment.

The few guides on preaching published after the sixteenth century took the decrees of Trent as their starting point.

One other factor in the development of sacred rhetoric that requires some discussion which is Erasmus’ (1466-1536) *Ecclesiastes, sive De Ratione Concionandi* of 1535. The importance of the *Ecclesiastes* cannot be overstated. John O’Malley has argued Erasmus’ preaching manual was “the great watershed in the history of sacred
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rhetoric." Part of the impact of Erasmus’ manual after its publication was that the medieval thematic sermon “ceased to be advocated in theory...even if some elements of thematic preaching would persist in practice.” So wide was the Ecclesiastes’ influence that after 1535, “treatises on how to preach were indebted directly or indirectly to Erasmus’ great work.” Because the Ecclesiastes anticipated the reform programme undertaken by the Council of Trent, it is necessary to discuss its role in the development of sacred rhetoric in the seventeenth century.

Book I for example, discusses the importance of Bishops choosing qualified pastors to preach in the parish.

Similarly, the bishop whose authority extends far will produce more profit if he devotes himself entirely to putting suitable pastors in charge of each church and to restraining those in office than if he carefully administers one or two churches himself.

Furthermore, Erasmus discusses the five responsibilities of the bishop/priest which are:

“administering the sacraments of the new law, praying for the people, judging, ordaining; and, the greatest, teaching which surpasses even the elevation of the Eucharist.”

In book II Erasmus specifically spells out the duties of the preacher which are first to teach (docere), second to delight (delectare), and third to persuade (flectere). Erasmus then goes on at length concerning the characteristics of this three-fold
responsibility of the preacher which ultimately brings the Christian hearer to reform his or her life.\textsuperscript{30}

Although there were considerably fewer theories on preaching published during the seventeenth century, those that were produced were highly influential on the practice and styles of religious rhetoric. One of the foremost comes from François de Sales. Originally a private letter of 5 October 1604, it was requested by his friend, André Frémiot upon his elevation to the Archbishopric of Bourges. The letter offered advice on effective preaching methods.\textsuperscript{31} The correspondence sets out in a very comprehensive manner what exactly was expected of a preacher. De Sales begins by reiterating the Tridentine position that the duty of the bishop is to preach.

Echoing the Ciceronian tripartite division of rhetoric, de Sales rejected the demonstrative oratory of the Italian model in favour of the persuasive genre. Though his humanist background was extensive, he was selective in what he incorporated from classical sources. His first and only concern was the advancement of the word of God. This avoidance of anything that would detract from that agenda is clear in de Sales’ attitude toward the employment of Ciceronian oratorical models. Citing the first two requirements of oratory, Frémiot was advised that the preacher was to instruct and move, but de Sales noted some concerns with the third part of speech—to delight. Because of his reservation concerning \textit{delectare}, some have thought that de Sales considered pleasing the audience as superfluous to the purpose of preaching.\textsuperscript{32} A more careful reading suggests that de Sales considered the third purpose of speech as important to sacred rhetoric, but was more suited to inward devotion of the

\textsuperscript{30} Hoffmann, \textit{Rhetoric and Theology}, 50.  
\textsuperscript{31} Bayley, \textit{Pulpit Oratory}, 63.  
\textsuperscript{32} H. Sauvage, \textit{Saint François de Sales, Prédicateur}. (Paris, 1874), 241.
individual. The preacher though not rejecting *delectare* out of hand must be careful not to use it
to satisfy his own vanity.

I know that many say that...the preacher must delight; but...I make a distinction,
and say that there is a delectation which ranks after teaching and persuasion. For
what soul is so insensible that it does not receive great pleasure in learning the
way of Heaven, who does not keenly feel the extreme consolation of the love of
God?... There is another sort of delectation that does not depend on teaching and
persuading, but whoever argues this case very often hinders teaching and
persuading. It is a certain tickling of ears, which comes from a certain worldly
elegance, mundane and secular, from certain curiosities...words...which depend
entirely on artifice...it is necessary to leave it to the orators of the world, to the
charlatans and courtesans who amuse themselves. They do not preach Jesus
Christ crucified, but they preach themselves.33

His council to Frémiot also addressed the issue of the best use of rhetorical tropes in the service
of Christianity. This was not solely de Sales' concern.

In 1612, Carlo Reggio, professor of rhetoric at the Roman College, in his *Orator
Christianus* attempted to establish a balance between oratorical art and Christian eloquence.
Like de Sales, Reggio did not reject out of hand *delectare*, claiming that it was not
necessary to "[condamnez] toute rhetorique," but preachers must recognize "Il y a donne une
vraie et une fausse eloquence."34 Thus the pastoralist's main concern was to preach
Christian doctrine in such a manner as to be understood by the "individual Christian."35

Although de Sales and Carlo Reggio had promoted a rhetorical style that was to remain
simple and based on the early apostolic models, many preachers did use their own sermons to

33 Je sais que plusieurs disent qu...le predicateur doit delecter; mais...je distingue, et dis qu'il y a une delectation qui suit
la doctrine et le mouvement. Car qui est cette âme tant insensible qui ne revoie un extreme plaisir d'apprendre bien
et...qui ne ressent une consolation extreme de Parmour de Dieu?... Il y a une autre sorte de delectation qui ne depend
pas de l'enseigner et de l'emouvoir, mais qui fait son cas a part et bien souvent empêché l'enseigner et l'emouvoir.
C'est un certain chatouillement d'oreilles, qui provient d'une certaine elegance seculiere, mondaine et prophane, de
certaines curiosities... des parolles...qui depend entierement de l'artifice.... il la faut laisser aux orateurs du monde, au
charlatans et courisans qui s'y amusent. Ils ne prechent pas Jesus Christ crucifie, mais ils prechent eux memes.
François de Sales, "A Monsieur André Frémiot," 5 Octobre 1604. in *Correspondance: Les Lettres d'Amitié
34 Marc Fumaroli, *L'Age de l'Eloquence: Rhetorique et <<res literaria>> de la Renaissance au sein de l'époque classique.
display their rhetorical prowess. Molinier’s sermons for the feast Sundays of the year are full of richly textured naturalistic imagery and metaphors informed by animal tropes. De Besse and Bertaut, each display a highly developed classicizing influence in their sermons. The Cardinal du Perron’s sermons are also replete with classical allusions. Even de Sales, particularly in his early sermons, could not resist demonstrating the extent of his humanist learning.

Pierre de Besse authored other preaching manuals which have come down to us from this period. Whereas de Sales focused predominantly on the theory of preaching, de Besse was more concerned with the practices of preaching. His two manuals, La Royale Prestise (1610) and Le Bon Pasteur (1639) were popular enough to run into several editions within a period of about thirty years. The Royale Prestise which was dedicated to Nicolas Deheare, Aumônier to the King, set the various qualities of a priest, among which was the duty of the priest to preach. Heavily supported by Biblical and patristic sources, de Besse echoes the Tridentine position on the need for preaching to serve a useful pedagogical purpose.

We must remember that Priests are destined to announce the word of God to the world, and are established as His sentinels over the people...Priests, God says through his oracles, will teach the people the difference between the holy and the profane...[and] because Priests are judges over the conscience they must also be Preachers for the instruction of the people.

Of the points recommended to Timothy by St. Paul of which preaching was of first importance, when he said to him preach the word of God urgently, reprove, pray...with all patience and doctrine...The preacher must preach.\(^{36}\)

\(^{36}\) Il faut inférer que les Prêtres destinez pour annoncer la parole de Dieu au monde, et establi de sa part comme sentinelles sur les peuples,...Les Prestres, disoit Dieu par ses oracles, apprendront à mon peuple la difference qu’il y a entrier la sainte et le profane, [et] que comme les Prêtres sont juges pour le faict de la conscience ils doivent aussi estre Predicateurs pour l'instruction des peuples. Entre les points que S. Paul recommandoit à Timothee, celui de la predication étoit des premiers, quand il lui disoit prêche la parole de Dieu presse importunément, reprends, prie...avec tout patience et doctrine....Le précheur doit prescher... Pierre de Besse, La Royale Prestrise. (Lyons, 1624), 183-4.
This theme is continued in de Besse’s second work on the pedagogical responsibilities of the clerical estate. In the *Bon Pasteur* de Besse continues to define his understanding of the theory of preaching during the seventeenth century. Written nearly twenty years after the *Royale Prestrise*, de Besse’s *Bon Pasteur* was dedicated to the Bishop of Meaux, Dominique Seguier, as a comprehensive statement on the central role of the ecclesiastic in French society. He begins his dedicatory epistle to Seguier, by laying out a conservative statement of the need for proper order in society, and the attendant ills when this order is challenged.\(^{37}\)

The importance of the second estate in the proper functioning of society was explicitly stated.

The Apostles have passed away, the Prophets have ceased, the Evangelists have done their work, all that remains are the Pastors, and the Doctors, who are the successors of all others. They have the power and authority to govern the Church in the same order, disposition and discipline. And the name of Pastors and Doctors, are understood to be Priests, Ministers, and Officers of Jesus Christ, who are elevated to these dignities, are seated on the chair of Saint Peter, commanding the people, having the government and the direction of souls.\(^{38}\)

For de Besse, the government of the people was achieved through the pedagogical efforts of the priests. De Besse, citing the both the Council of Trent, and the Church Fathers, explained that preaching was the responsibility of the clerical estate,\(^{39}\) and wished to

---


\(^{38}\) Les Apostres ont passé, les Prophets ont cessé, les Evangelistes ont achevé, il ne reste plus que les Pasteurs, et les Docteurs successeurs de tous les autres, qui ont la même puissance, et autorité de gouverner l’Église dans le même ordre, disposition et discipline. Et sous ce nom de Pasteurs et Docteurs, sont entendues tous les Prelats, Ministres, et Officiers de Jesus Christ, qui sont élevé aux dignités, sont assis sur la chaire de S. Pierre commandent sur les peuples, et ont le gouvernement, et direction des âmes. de Besse, *Bon Pasteur*, n.p

\(^{39}\) de Besse, *Bon Pasteur*, n.p
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ensure that the Council of Trent’s decrees on the nature of preaching were adopted by the French clergy.

This theme is also found in de Sales’ letter to Frémiot, whom he reminded that the duty to preach was the central function of the bishop. But because preaching was so central, de Sales reminded Frémiot the preacher is not alone, “God specially assists us in this exercise, and it is marvelous how the preaching from Bishops has great power over other preachers.”40 De Sales’ encouragement to his friend was more than moral support; it spoke to the heart of the rhetorical strategies used within seventeenth-century French sermon and devotional literature. First of all, de Sales informs Frémiot that it is not necessary for the preacher to be overly learned (docte), as pedantic learning hinders the quality of the preacher.

As to the doctrine, it is necessary that it is adequate, it is not required that it be excellent. Saint Francis was not learned, and nevertheless was a great and good preacher, and in our age the beloved Cardinal Borromeo had only average knowledge: in all things he performed marvels. 41

According to de Sales, it was not necessary to understand and expound the full mystery of the Trinity, or to spend excessive amounts of energy parsing the meaning of the In principio in the gospel of St. John. As “to the good life, it is required in the way that St. Paul said…that the Bishop must be without reproach.” Rhetoric of studied simplicity

40 Car Dieu en cet exercise nous assiste spécialement; et c’est merveille combien la predication des Évêques a un grand pouvoir au prix de celle des autres predicateurs. De Sales, Correspondance, 332.
41 Quant à la doctrine, il faut qu’elle soit suffisante, et il n’est pas requis qu’elle soit excellente. Saint François n’était pas docte, et néanmoins grand et bon prédicateur, et en notre âge le bienheureux Cardinal Borromée n’avait de science que bien fort médiocrement: toutefois il faisait merveilles. De Sales, Correspondance, 332.
alone was not enough to qualify one for the office of preacher. What a preacher lacked in learnedness, was made up with holiness of life.

In his sermons and devotional literature, de Sales consistently avoided drawn out discussions over obscure theological issues and avoided quoting cumbersome theological writings, "which was customary in such works." After all, according to de Sales, the learned are not interested in such pursuits, and they are wasted on the rest. De Sales' sermons followed this pattern, and although he employed a wide range of Biblical and non-Biblical sources, including a large number of classical sources in his early sermons between the years 1598-1602, many of them were common place and accessible to his congregations.

One such example is the sermon for the "Feast of the Presentation of the Virgin," pronounced in 1619. Taking for his text, St Luke 11.27-8, de Sales focuses on the two themes of these verses; the first, the spontaneous praise of the unnamed woman in regards to Mary's sanctity. Second, Christ's response that those who hear and obey the word of God were more blessed. The first half of the sermon explains why Mary was chosen to be the mother of the Son of God. She was chosen because she was willing to give her whole being into submission to the will of God. The Christian, in following this

---

42 De Sales, Correspondance, 332.
43 Quant à la bonne vie, elle est requise en la façon que dit saint Paul ... que l'Évêque soit sans reproche. De Sales, "A Monsieur André Frémiot," 333. See also Erasmus' Ecclesiastes ASD 54:389-58:497.
46 The editors of the Annecy edition of the collected works of de Sales note that there is some debate over the precise dating of this sermon. There is some evidence that a substantial portion of the sermon was originally preached in 1617, and that it was reworked slightly and pronounced to the Sisters of the Visitation in November 1619.
47 And it came it to pass, as he spake these things, a certain woman of the company lifted up her voice, and said unto him, Blessed is the womb that bare thee, and the paps which thou hast sucked. But he said, Yea rather, blessed are they that hear the word of God, and keep it. All Biblical passages are taken from the KJV (Authorized).
example, showed they were willing to also submit to God’s will through giving up all ungodly desires.

It’s to hold nothing back from God, not even our affections or our desires. And what is it that God demands of us? Listen, I beg you, this sacred Saviour of our souls: My child give me your heart, I will renew it in each one of you.  

De Sales then continues with a brief discussion of the Jewish custom requiring each Jew of all social status to visit Solomon’s temple. Although that requirement was discontinued with the coming Jesus Christ, the Christian still could learn from the example of Mary being presented at the temple. Whereas Mary presented her son, the Christian was to offer up his or her heart, along with their own wills and desires so that they would be capable of following God’s will.  

Even when discussing subjects that would seem to lend themselves to complex theological explanations, such as the Eucharist, the sermons are noteworthy for their lack of complex theological digressions, or even inclusion of theological writings.

As the founder, along with Jeanne de Chantal, of the Order of the Visitation, de Sales spent much of his later years preaching to the Sisters of the Visitation. As is the case with his earlier work, the sermons are phrased in simple rhetoric. De Sales’ purpose was to persuade and move this largely female congregation to pious behaviour. De Sales’ sermon literature reflected a pragmatic Catholicism. In one of his early sermons to the Sisters of the Visitation pronounced for the Fortieth Sunday of Lent, 1621, de Sales discussed the reasons for the Sisters choosing to entering their monastic vocations. The dating of the sermon is significant. In the Catholic liturgical calendar, the last Sunday of

---

48 C’est ne se reserver aucune chose qui ne soit pour Dieu, non pas meme une seule de nos affections ou de nos desires. Et qu’est-ce que Dieu demande de nous? Ecoutez-le, de grace, ce sacre Sauveur de nos âmes: Mon enfant, donne moi ton coeur, va-t-il repetantir à un chacun de nous. De Sales, Oeuvres, 9: 235.
49 De Sales, Oeuvres, 9: 236.
Lent coincided with the feeding of the five thousand with five loaves and two fishes. The exordium of the sermon is based on the John 6.1-15, though de Sales only emphasizes the first three verses, describing Jesus Christ’s journey from Galilee up to the mountain. De Sales sees this event in simple metaphoric terms, he forwent complex theological or allegorical explanations of this passage. “The Sea of Galilee means the world with its worries and storms, where they had trouble hearing our Saviour, that is to say, his inspirations, if they do not go to the mountain and do not retire to the house of God.”

Once de Sales had set out the metaphor, he was then able to discuss the passage within the context of seventeenth-century spirituality. De Sales continues his metaphor by appealing to Gregory the Great who had explained in his Homily XXI that Galilee represented the transmigration of the soul. De Sales reminds the Sisters of the Visitation that all humanity was born into sin, but through the rites of baptism humanity would be transported into a state of grace. This is followed by a lengthy discussion over human nature and the goodness of God in providing the means allowing his creations to come up

---

50 After these things Jesus went over the sea of Galilee, which is the sea of Tiberias. And a great multitude followed him, because they saw his miracles which he did on them that were diseased. And Jesus went up into a mountain, and there he sat with his disciples. And the Passover, a feast of the Jews, was nigh. When Jesus then lifted up his eyes, and saw a great company come unto him, he saith unto Philip, Whence shall we buy bread, that these may eat? And this he said to prove him: for he himself knew what he would do. Philip answered him, Two hundred pennyworth of bread is not sufficient for them, that every one of them may take a little. One of his disciples, Andrew, Simon Peter's brother, saith unto him, There is a lad here, which hath five barley loaves, and two small fishes: but what are they among so many? And Jesus said, Make the men sit down. Now there was much grass in the place. So the men sat down, in number about five thousand. And Jesus took the loaves; and when he had given thanks, he distributed to the disciples, and the disciples to them that were set down; and likewise of the fishes as much as they would. When they were filled, he said unto his disciples, Gather up the fragments that remain, that nothing be lost. Therefore they gathered them together, and filled twelve baskets with the fragments of the five barley loaves, which remained over and above unto them that had eaten. Then those men, when they had seen the miracle that Jesus did, said, This is of a truth that prophet that should come into the world. When Jesus therefore perceived that they would come and take him by force, to make him a king, he departed again into a mountain himself alone.

51 La mer de Galilée signifie le monde avec ses tracas et remuements, où l’on a grande peine à entendre Notre Seigneur, c’est à dire ses inspirations, si l’on ne va sur la montagne et qu’on ne se retire en la maison de Dieu. De Sales, Œuvres, 10: 36.
from the Galilee of sin and into the mansion of God, represented by the mountain.\textsuperscript{52} This passage is representative of de Sales, especially as it relates to his later work. Not only did he speak in the context of a pragmatic spirituality, but as with his work in the \textit{Introduction à la Vie Devote} and the \textit{Traité sur l'Amour de Dieu} de Sales presents a spirituality that is accessible to all who wished to do so, regardless of social standing or capabilities.

Though these later sermons demonstrate de Sales’ maturation of his devotional efforts, his concern with a pragmatic and a noncomplex theological spirituality is also evident in his early sermons. A case in point is his sermon “Dimanche de la Quinquagesime,” 1613. Ostensibly, the sermon is based on St Luke 18:31-3.\textsuperscript{53} However, the body of the text is informed more by one of de Sales’ favorite Biblical \textit{topoi}, the spouse in the Songs of Songs. The imagery conjured by the Old Testament allegorizing Christ’s love for his church allowed de Sales to phrase his conception of inward devotion without a great deal of theological complexity, appealing rather to the emotional nature of seventeenth-century devotion.

\begin{quote}
This spouse, Christian souls, is the Church, it is the devout soul which is in the Church; and how can this be? Through these words which were said by the wise Solomon, it reveals that our Lord, true Husband both of the soul and the Church, is perpetually in their memory, as the most loved of all the lovers, and the most beloved of the beloved.\textsuperscript{54}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{52} De Sales, \textit{Oeuvres}, 10:37.
\textsuperscript{53} Then he took unto him the twelve, and said unto them, Behold, we go to Jerusalem, and all things that are written by the prophets concerning the Son of man shall be accomplished. For he shall be delivered unto the Gentiles, and shall be mocked, and spitefully entreated, and spitted on: And they shall scourge him, and put him to death: and the third day he shall rise again.
\textsuperscript{54} Cette Espouse, âmes chrétiennes, ou c'est l'Eglise, ou c'est l'âme devote qui est en l'Eglise; et comment que ce soit, par ces paroles qu'elle dit par le sage Solomon, elle montre que Notre Seigneur, vrai Espoux et de l'âme et de l'Eglise, lui estoit perpetuellement en memoire, comme le plus aimé de tous les aimés et le plus aimable de tous les aimables. De Sales \textit{Oeuvres}, 7: 232.
De Sales was not the only one to forgo complex theological discussions within their sermon literature. Molinier’s sermons, while more rhetorically elaborate than those of many of his contemporaries, lack the complex theological considerations evident in their medieval precedents. Rather, as with the case of de Sales, Molinier’s sermon rhetoric tends towards the pedagogical, emphasizing the pragmatic aspects of Christian devotion. A prolific writer, Molinier published two large collections of his sermons. The first collection entitled, *Le Sacré Banquet*, published originally in 1635, dealt almost exclusively with the Eucharist. The second collection, entitled *Sermons pour tous les Dimanches de l’Année*, published also in 1635, were sermons first pronounced at St. Severin in Toulouse in 1624.

In the preface to the *Banquet Sacré* Molinier sets out the reason for tackling a subject as theologically complex as the Eucharist. First, he wished to challenge the Protestant formulation that the Eucharistic emblems were only symbolic, and second to expound on the mysterious nature of the Eucharist.

But here I am forced to gather all in one, and confirm the truth of this mystery and to reveal its grandeur, to declare its fruits, and whoso destroys error, and assure faith, and to excite reverence, and whoso inflames devotion. The parallels have their place, the attributes are noted, the figures developed, the contradictions solved, difficulties cleared up...

In the second sermon of this collection, Molinier compares the three-fold purpose of the Eucharist to a three course meal. The metaphor of the sacred banquet was not unique to Molinier since the theological underpinnings of the Eucharist, whereby the substance of the bread and wine became the literal flesh and blood of Christ to be consumed, very

---

55 Mais ici je me suis efforcé de ramasser tout en un, et ce qui confirme la verité du mystere, et ce qui montre sa grandeur, et ce qui declare ses fruits, et ce qui destruit l’erreur, et ce qui asseur la foi, et ce qui excite la reverence, et ce qui enflame la devotion. Les paraelles y ont leur lieu, les attributes y sont marquez, les figures developpees, les contradictions rembarrees, les difficultez eclairies, les merveilles deduites... Etienne Molinier, *Le Banquet Sacré de l’Eucharistie*. (Toulous, 1635) n.p.
easily lent itself to culinary metaphors. And even though the mystical nature of transubstantiation was something that theologians often discussed in obscure terminology, Molinier presented a pragmatic reading of the Eucharist in the lives of his Catholic congregation. Molinier’s discussion of the reasons of the institution of the Sacrament argues that its three principle ends corresponded to the three evils incurred by humanity’s prevarication and disobedience.

The first was forgetting God... The second, the theft which was committed with the forbidden fruit... The third, the corruption of the body, deprived of its immortality for the punishment of this crime ... and the depravation of the soul despoiled of the robe of innocence; and ever since inclined by the pox of concupiscence to all sort of abomination... The Son of God who came to the world to repair what man ruined, instituted the Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist, as a remedy against these three evils, wishing it to be a memorial of his miracles against the omission of God, and a restitution of the disrobed honour to God for the robbery, and a healthful meat against the poison of corruption.

In the above quote Molinier lists all three purposes: memory, restitution and curative, to excite the memory of the faithful by the presence of Jesus Christ contained in the Eucharistic tokens.

Secondly, I will show you in the quality of the non bloody sacrifice of the cross; Christ honoured and glorified God in order to restore him. Finally I will exhibit as a salutary meat, which conserves and augments in the soul the life of grace, against the corruption of concupiscence and which gives to the body the seed of the resurrection, and of immortality. Let’s begin

---

57 Le premier étoit l’oubli de Dieu... Le second, le larrecin qu’il avoit commis et du fruit deffendu ... Le troisieme, la corruption du corps privé pour punition de son crime du don de l’immortalité... et la depravation de l’àme despouille de la robe d’innocence; et depuis incline par le poix de la concupiscence à toute sorte d’abomination... Le Fils de Dieu qui est venu au monde pour reparer ce que l’homme avoit ruiné, a institué le S. Sacrement de l’Eucharistie, comme un remede contre ces trois maux, voulant qu’il fut tout ensemble, et un memorial de ses merveilles contre l’oubli de Dieu, et une restitution de l’honneur disrobe à Dieu contre la rapine, et une viande medicinale contre le venin de la corruption. Molinier, *Banquet Sacré*. 42.
now by the first purpose of his institution which is the memory of the Saviour.\textsuperscript{58}

Thus for Molinier, the pedagogical uses of celebrating the Eucharist took precedence over explaining the theological underpinnings of the Lord’s Supper.

Chapter 4 will examine in greater detail how Molinier defined the meaning of the Eucharist within its confessional context. As divine a mystery as the Eucharist may be, its ultimate purpose was to bring one to greater adoration of Christ as the first step in reforming the interior person.

God himself is in this gift...Thus, o marvel, we possess in this treasure not the gifts of God, but God himself, and in this festival the master of the banquet sets the places of the banqueters, in order to nourish them, not of his goods, but of his body, which surpasses not only speech, but even admiration...\textsuperscript{59}

Molinier was not the only preacher to gloss over the incomprehensible nature of the Eucharist. Jean Bertaut, preaching a few years earlier than Molinier, drew his congregation’s attention to the connection between the Eucharistic host and the Israelites being fed with manna while they wandered in the desert for forty years. Because the sermon was preached on the Day of the Holy Altar, 1611 the subject of the Eucharist was central to the theme of this sermon. At the commencement of the sermon Bertaut first engaged in linguistic exegesis by explaining the meaning of the Latin word for bread (\textit{panis}), which derived its meaning from the Greek παν.\textsuperscript{60} From this Bertaut then provides a brief discussion how the signification of the word panis came to represent the

\textsuperscript{58} Après je vous montrerai comme en qualité de sacrifice non sanglant de la croix, il honore, et glorifie Dieu pour lui ravir. En fin je vous l’exhiberaï comme une viande salutaire, qui conserve, et augmente en l’âme la vie spirituelle, la vie de la grace, contre la corruption de la concupiscence, et qui donne au corps la semence de la resurrection, et de l’immortalité. Commencons maintenant par la premier fin de son institution qui est la memoire du Sauveur. Molinier, \textit{Banquet Sacré}. 43.

\textsuperscript{59} Dieu même en don pour trouver un present egal à sa bien-veillance. Ainsi, o merveille! Nous possessions en ce trésor non plus le dons de Dieu, mais Dieu même; et en ce festin le maitre du banquet s’est faict le mets des banquetans, pour les nourrir non de ses biens, mais de son corps, ce qui surpasse non seulement le discours, mais encore l’admiration.... Molinier, \textit{Banquet Sacré}. 207-8.

“living bread” of heaven. The sermon acknowledged the mystic nature of the Eucharist, just as Molinier, de Sales, de Besse and others did during this period. For Bertaut, emphasizing the mystery of the Eucharist demonstrates the grandeur and power of God. Humanity was misguided in its attempts to understand the divine mystery, whereby the Eucharistic tokens were transubstantiated into the flesh of Jesus Christ. Because the very nature of the Eucharist was not meant to be understood through human agency, the mechanisms of communion were to be taken on faith. The grandeur of the mystery was therefore to bring the Christian to a humble reverence of the Eucharistic miracle. Even though a Christian did not understand how the Eucharist worked, it inspired awe and devotion: due to the fact that God so loved his creation that he was willing to perform the miracle for them on an almost daily basis. This was achieved by using the Eucharist as the focal point of one’s worship. Throughout this sermon Bertaut worked within the context of seventeenth-century preaching models which avoided the complex theological discussions in favour of a more pragmatic pedagogy that appealed to a wide audience and which focused on the reform of the Christian.

To be sure, the Eucharist was by far not the only theological subject that was presented in non-theological terms. Although Molinier published sermons revolving around the entire Sacramental cycle, he was also concerned with the pastoral and clerical reform of the Church. This was one of the prominent themes within his *Sermons pour tous les Dimanches*. This theme is also evident in Bertaut’s sermon collection, and figures prominently within the work of Pierre de Besse. The language of these calls for clerical reform echo Tridentine efforts to restore the spiritual power of the Catholic

---

63 Bertaut, *Principales Festes*, 305.
Church which had been seen to have deteriorated throughout the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.

Why the move away from theology in the rhetoric of the sermon literature of the seventeenth century? Louis Châtellier provides one possibility. He argues that Western Europe in the sixteenth century was still only nominally Christian, which the Council of Trent had set about to remedy. The breach caused by the Reformation had revealed how shallow Christianity had penetrated European society, in the minds of the Catholic authorities. Although addressed by Trent, much of the work of proselytizing was undertaken by religious orders who took it upon themselves to "resume unceasingly [the] work of evangelization in town and country." While this work of evangelization was carried out by the older religious orders who had traditionally proselytized throughout Europe, the sixteenth century saw the establishment of new orders, such as the Jesuits with the express purpose of reconverting Europeans back to Catholicism. Châtellier’s premise is that as Catholic missionaries spread throughout the rural and urban settings of Europe, they discovered a population that was at best nominally Christian.

Châtellier’s argument is persuasive and there is certainly much to be said about the role of proselytizing efforts throughout post-Reformation Europe. For example, Jean Bertaut preaching before his congregation in Séez during the Feast of the Purification of the Virgin draws the connection between the repentant tears of Mary Magdalene and the Publican and the need for regular confession as part of one’s interior reform.

---


For of which satisfaction, ordained for the purification of our spiritual childishness, we should purge from ourselves the interior pollution that our soul has accumulated, not only in the daily conceiving of prodigious vice, even in the same way a woman gives birth, or good works, or worthy intentions replace the imperfection, one for the other.\textsuperscript{66}

The theme of internal spiritual renewal is continued by de Besse.

Remember the parable of the leaven taken by the woman to leaven three measures of dough: Reminding you that it is charity which leavens the love of God, the love of neighbour, within ourselves...Charity is the Queen of virtues, the root of merits, the foundation of faith, the shape of good works: Thus with this beautiful virtue: love your enemies.\textsuperscript{67}

De Sales’ preaching on the Feast of the Archangel Michael in 1617 expanded on the benefits of humility.

And if you have charity and you have no humility, you do not truly have charity, for these two virtues have so great a sympathy and liaison between them that they cannot work without the other. We have charity, we have humility. It is as with the love of God and of neighbour: these are two loves that cannot exist one without the other, and to the extent we love God more, the more we love our neighbour.\textsuperscript{68}

The Cardinal du Perron concludes his sermon for the Day of Pentecost appealing to the Holy Spirit in the following terms.

And you, o holy, high, and glorious Spirit, who gives Kings to the people, and Pastors to the Church, source of all spiritual and temporal

\textsuperscript{66} Car de quelle satisfaction, ordonnée pour la purification de nos enfanteniens spirituels, purgerions nous la pollution intérieure que notre âme aurait accueillie, non seulement en concevant des prodiges de vice, comme elle fait tous les jours, mais même en enfantant des femelles, ou des bonnes œuvres, ou de louables intentions pour l'imperfection qui se trouve tant des unes qu'aux autres. Bertaut, \textit{Principales Festes}, 162-3.

\textsuperscript{67} Resouvenez vous de la parable de levain que prit la femme pour faire lever trois pâtes: Et representez vous que c'est la charité qui fait lever l'amour de Dieu, l'amour du prochain, et celui de soi même...charité est Reine des vertus, la racine des merites, le fondement de la foi, la forme des bonnes œuvres: Ainsi donc ceste belle vertu, aimez vos ennemis. De Besse, \textit{Premiers Conceptions Theologique sur le Caresme.} (Paris, 1602), 68.

\textsuperscript{68} Et si vous avez la charité et que vous n'ayez point d'humilité, vous n'avez pas veritablement la charité; car ces deux vertus ont une si grande sympathie et liaison entre elles que l'une ne va point sans l'autre. Plus nous avons de charité, plus nous avons d'humilité. Il en est comme de l'amour de Dieu et du prochain: ce sont deux amours qui ne vont point l'un sans l'autre, et à mesure que nous aimons plus Dieu, aussi aimons-nous plus le prochain. De Sales, \textit{Oeuvres,} 9: 109-110.
order...Illuminate their souls, purify their hearts, excite their wills, rule their desires, conduct their actions.\textsuperscript{69}

Generally speaking, the congregations of these preachers were composed of various elements of French society. Operating in the hinterlands of Upper Savoy, de Sales’ audience were often made up of the rural poor described by Châtellier. Yet, the language of the sermon literature from this period suggests that these preachers were less concerned about \textit{forming} a Catholic society as they were about \textit{reforming} that society. The preachers expected that those to whom they preached already understood the basic doctrine of Catholicism, and therefore could direct their energies creating a harmonious Christian society through internal reform.

The second explanation for the shift away from theologically informed sacred rhetoric is the incorporation of humanism within these preaching models. It was during this period that Charles VIII’s (1470-1498) Italian Wars served as a catalyst for the origins of the French Renaissance along Italian lines.\textsuperscript{70} In the aftermath of the Italian Wars Francis I (1515-1547) sought to present himself as the ideal Renaissance Prince by importing all things Italian to his court, including a daughter in law. However, the introduction of humanism into the French church had preceded Francis’ Italiaphilia by a couple of decades when the Savoyard Guillaume Fichet (d. 1480) and Robert Gaguin (d. 1501) had introduced Italian humanist thought to the University of Paris.\textsuperscript{71} Italy was not the only locale of importance for French preaching. Preachers looked to developments in


\textsuperscript{71} Augustine Renaudet, “Paris from 1494 to 1517: Church and University, Religious Reforms, Culture and the Humanist Critiques,” in \textit{French Humanism, 1470-1600}, ed. Warner Gundersheimer. (New York, 1985)
the north, especially the development of Christian humanism, of which Erasmus was the chief proponent.\textsuperscript{72}

Humanism had been regarded with hostility by the Faculty of Theology, equating it with Protestantism, especially after Francis’ suppression of the reforming circle at Meaux. By the seventeenth century, the humanist style had almost completely replaced the scholastic thematic sermon.\textsuperscript{73} Yet, it must be noted that these sermons were not strictly humanist, though there are certain obvious elements, such as the appeal to classical sources and rhetorical models provided by Cicero and Quintilian. There also was an emphasis on the \textit{ad fontes} of Christian sources, namely the Bible and patristic sources, with few references to the scholastic doctors. While recognizing the value of humanist techniques, those who wrote on the theory and practice of preaching warned against the slavish adherence to humanist \textit{topoi} which threatened to obscure the real reason for preaching: the reform of the soul. Thus, humanism was subsumed within the reformist currents of late sixteenth and early seventeenth-century France. While humanism maintained its antipathy to the “barbarisms” of the scholastics, it had evolved away from the epideictic oratory of the fifteenth-century papal court.\textsuperscript{74}

It is necessary here to discuss in some detail the purpose and development of preaching at the papal court to demonstrate how by the seventeenth century this had changed in both form and purpose. As O'Malley states:

\begin{quote}
Classical rhetoric was intimately related to civic needs, and, taken in the strict sense, it dealt exclusively with oratory. For oratory, it commonly recognized only three...genera: the genus indicate, the genus deliberativum, and the genus demonstrativum or epideictic...In general [the genus demonstrativum] was
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{72} Taylor, “Influence of Humanism,” 120.
\textsuperscript{73} Taylor, “Influence of Humanism,” 119.
\textsuperscript{74} James Overfield, \textit{Humanism and Scholasticism in Late Medieval Germany}. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984), 66.
intended for a ceremonial occasion, and its purpose was to arouse the sentiments of appreciation or disgust appropriate for some given person, event, or institution.

This epideictic oratory found its basis in the classical rhetoric of Roman authors, but was given a Christian sheen during the Renaissance in order to employ the New Learning in the service of Christianity. However, preachers of the seventeenth century, familiar as they were with the utility of the humanist methodology, rejected epideictic oratory because they felt that epideictic oratory did not serve the needs of pastoral reform. As O'Malley has argued on a number of occasions, the papal preachers imitating the works of Cicero and Quintilian broke with medieval scholastic preaching with its emphasis on Aristotelian logic in order to prove a theological position. Instead, "by the late fourteenth century, there were sacred orations that show the unmistakable impact of the Renaissance revival of classical rhetoric." This revival took on the form of the genus demonstrativum. Sermons based on the genus demonstrativum enabled the orator to display his erudition through his ability to impressively eulogize his subject.

Although papal preachers praised the virtuous lives of their subjects, often the purpose of such oratory was not inward reform, but rather the imitation of the great person's deeds. The orator was more concerned with the outward actions of his flock. Pastoralists also felt that the emphasis on erudition obscured the apostolic simplicity of the word of God. Finally, this form of preaching was generally reserved for the court elites, partly because the laity would not understand the highly classical nature of the epideictic sermon.
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76 John O'Malley, Praise and Blame, 85-6.
77 O'Malley, Praise and Blame, 81.
78 O'Malley, Praise and Blame, 81.

71
The ossifying rhetoric of the genus demonstrativum was not the only focus of preaching to come under criticism. Throughout Europe during the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, both Churchmen and the laity recognized that the quality of preaching and pastoral care in the Church had become unacceptable. Absenteeism, illiteracy, and clerical misbehaviour were responsible for this state of affairs. It is not surprising therefore when the Reformers came promising to clear up clerical abuse and greatly improve the quality of pastoral care, much of the laity responded positively.

The first systematic efforts at reforming the clergy took place in the principalities of the Holy Roman Empire. Peter Blickle’s study of the German towns demonstrates the extent to which the civic leadership determined the course of pastoral reform. He notes many of the city ordinances setting the qualifications a pastor had to meet to be hired. The most important of these requirements was that his preaching was in accordance with the scriptures. When therefore the town of Mulhouse decreed in 1523, that all preachers were to use only the “Old and New Testaments and...shall in no way accept to adopt any other doctrines, arguments...that are not in keeping with the true godly Scripture,” the concern was to ensure that only the true gospel was preached. The emphasis on God’s word says a great deal about the changing perception of the use of religious instruction among the laity. In the early sixteenth century, preaching “rather than the mass moved to the centre of popularity piety.” This unprecedented change in the mind of Christendom, as Blickle puts it, came about as the laity no longer wanted to

---

81 Blickle, Communal Reformation, 124.
see Christ’s body through the Eucharistic rituals of Catholicism, but now wanted to hear the word of God.

This shift from ocular to aural forms of religious instruction was not confined to the Protestants. Because of the centrality of the Eucharist within the Catholic liturgy, the clergy was not about to remove the Mass as the centre of the Church’s liturgical cycle. Yet, by the 1530s, the same social forces that were driving the development of Protestant sermons, also influenced Catholic preaching, as the sermon took on greater importance within the celebration of the Mass during the 1520-30s. The sermon was now employed to explain and reinstruct the laity on the function of Church practice.

As the sixteenth century wore on, the homiletic and pastoral context of preaching became more pronounced. The Swiss reformer, Ulrich Zwingli, (1484-1531) in a sermon entitled The Shepherd, preached before the magistrate and ministers at the Disputation of October 1523 outlined two central factors of the office of minister: preaching of the Bible and the purity of living. This would influence Calvin’s own thought on the structure and function of sermons, and remain the prominent strain in Protestant preaching theory until the seventeenth century when the humanist model was replaced by a return to speculative theology.

The reformist tendencies within seventeenth-century sermon literature are quite evident in the work of Pierre de Besse. De Besse preached regularly at St. Severin in the Latin Quarter, not far from Notre Dame. De Besse was also attached to the Condé

84 Taylor, Heresy and Orthodoxy, 173.
86 Bruce Gordon, “Preaching and Reform of the Clergy in the Swiss Reformation,” in Reformation of the Parishes, 66.
family, and his sermon collection, *Les Premiers Conceptions Theologiques* (1602) was dedicated to the young Prince de Conde.

De Besse’s rhetoric at times appears to exhibit greater complexity than many of his contemporaries, in part because of his extensive classicizing. In his preface to Conde, de Besse maintains that theology was to act as a school to form the behaviour of the laity, and in particular the monarch. “It is the school where the great must study in the cradle, the Princes exercise here, Monarchs devote themselves to the mastery of letters here.”\(^{88}\) The significance being that without a basic understanding of theology, which according to de Besse is the alphabet of angels, it is impossible to be a great king or noble since without theology it is almost impossible to be a good Christian. De Besse cites Solomon as an example of why it is important for the Prince to be versed in theological matters. “Solomon, a great Prince, in other times taught this beautiful lesson to the Princes, if you take pleasure in carrying scepters, sitting on Royal thrones, love wisdom, cherish wisdom; you who command peoples, embrace Theology.”\(^{89}\) De Besse also encourages the Prince to read the scriptures often in order to learn his duty toward his people.\(^{90}\) Despite the complexity of de Besse’s rhetoric he recognized that the theology was only useful if it was put to pragmatic uses. For example, in the sermon pronounced on the First Tuesday of Lent, de Besse chose for his theme the vices of avarice and ambition. Very quickly, the sermon becomes a powerful denunciation of clerical abuse within the Church.

---


\(^{89}\) Salomon, un grand Prince, faisait autrefois cette belle leçon aux Princes, si vous prenez plaisir à porter des sceptres, et à seoir sur des thrones Royaux aimez la sapience, cherissez la sapience, vous qui commandez aux peuples, en un mot embrassez la Theologie. de Besse, *Premiers Conceptions* n.p.

O here is the sin of simony: this sin is in the Church, the others are outside. Jesus Christ cannot endure it patiently...Remember the zeal of Moses who made such carnage, seeing the people turn to idolatry, remember the furor of Elias who killed four hundred false prophets, seeing God despised, and idols honoured. Remember, and do not find it strange to see Jesus in anger, throwing the merchants out of the temple: and you Prelates, chastise these simonies, these vices, these scandals which are in your Churches.

O lost souls, abominable merchants. Do you not fear God? Do you not fear the judgments of God? Do you not see that you are damned?...That you are rendered infamous, incapable, incompetent to minister in the Church?...He punished all the other sins through procurements, through the Angels, through the creatures...Souls lost to ambition, ranged about with avarice...The house of the Lord will not be profaned with commerce.

In keeping with the requirement that preachers focus on the instruction of their flocks, these writings on the theory of preaching addressed which sources were to be used by the preacher.

In de Sales’ instruction to André Frémiot he touched upon the question of what ought to be considered appropriate source material for preachers. First of all, the preacher must appeal to the Biblical text, citing Paul’s advice to his protégé, Timothy, that a Bishop must preach only the Word. Secondly, the preacher should employ the writings of the Church fathers. Even though the writings of the Patristic authors are of secondary importance, they helped clarify the hidden meaning of obscure Biblical

---

91 O c’est ici un péché de simonie: ce péché se fait dans l’Église, les autres au dehors, Jesus Christ ne le peut endurer en patience...Resouvenez-vous du zèle de Moyse qui fait tant de carnage, voyant le peuple idolater, resouvenez-vous de la fureur d’Helie qui fait mourir quatre cens faux prophètes, voyant Dieu mépriser, et honorer les idoles. Resouvenez vous de cela, et vous ne trouvez pas estrange, de voir Jesus tout en choler dans la temple renverser les merchandises: et vous Prelats, apprenez à chastier ces simonies, ses vices, ces scandals qui se sont dans vos Églises. De Besse, Premiers Conceptions, 157.


93 De Sales, Correspondance, 335.
passages. Finally de Sales addresses the utility of “histoires profanes.” Echoing Jerome, de Sales takes the standard position that non-scriptural sources could be of use to the preacher, provided they are used with caution.95

The danger of over use of classical *topoi* was two fold. Regardless of how useful these *histoires profanes* could be, they were still secular. They were not Christian in nature despite the efforts to put a veneer of Christianity on Plato, Aristotle and others. The second concern for those like de Sales was that too much reliance on secular topoi would open the preacher to the temptation of preaching to show off his rhetorical skill, and not to preach the Christian message. De Sales made this warning very clear to Frémiot that although a preacher must of course please his audience, he must not lose sight of why. This echoes St. Augustine who had explained in his Confessions that excessive eloquence led to pride and the satisfaction of one’s own vanity.96 For Augustine the act of preaching was to use the technology of words. If the preacher was not careful in ensuring that his sermon led one to God, they ran the risk only temporarily amusing their congregation.97

Pastoral reform, though hardly a new concept by the seventeenth century, had shifted away from doctrinal reform and favoured an emphasis on the practical side of religious life. In the opinion of some pastors throughout France, the laity could not understand doctrinal issues. This is evident in the way the ecclesiastical hierarchy constructed the laity, as
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94 De Sales, *Correspondance*, 335.
95 De Sales, *Correspondance*, 336.
96 Augustine, *Confessions*. 4.2.2.
seen in Louis Richeome's *Catechisme Royal*, where he looked on his readers as small children, prone to yawn over bare and dry doctrine.\(^98\)

As has been discussed earlier in this chapter, de Sales was a beneficiary of humanist training. Placing his training in context with the purpose of preaching it becomes readily apparent that the humanism employed by de Sales had also metamorphosed from the original purpose of classical *topoi*. Although de Sales employed classicist tropes within his sermons and encouraged other preachers to do the same, the sermons of the seventeenth century had very little in common with the original classicizing sermons of the Quattrocento. De Sales does not so much represent a radical break with the past, rather he represents the coherent conclusion of a programme of religious reform that had its origins in early Catholic reformers such as François le Picart.

Of the humanist techniques incorporated within seventeenth-century sermon literature, the use of Biblical imagery had particular resonance within the scope of this thesis. The significance of the Biblical *exempla* extends beyond illuminating the Christian message. How these *topoi* were used, and the meaning they were given reflects the changing political climate of early Bourbon France. As Crouzet, Delumeau, Diefendorf, Taylor and others have discussed at great length, preachers in the sixteenth century were highly effective in politicizing Biblical exegesis in order to implicitly or explicitly attack royal authority.

As the sixteenth century came to a close, and the Wars of Religion subsided, the political meaning of the Biblical text evolved away from the incendiary rhetoric of the 1560s-1580s. Although the politicization of Biblical exegesis had a long tradition within sermon literature, by the reign of Henri IV, it was no longer tenable to direct Biblical *topoi* against the interests of the

---

crown. This is a change from the past, especially in the context of French preaching where there was a long history of French pulpit oratory dedicated to criticizing the King.\textsuperscript{99} Always prevalent during the medieval era, the anti-monarchist rhetoric hit a fevered pitch by the 1580s. It should be noted that even as preachers thundered their denunciations against the supposed evils of the Valois dynasty, their monarchomachist rhetoric was aimed at the person of the King and not the office of monarchy. They separated the monarch from the office of monarchy, which was constituted by God to defend true Christian orthodoxy.\textsuperscript{100}

Even under the rule of strong monarchs, such as Louis XI (1423-1483), preachers felt the need to remind the monarch of the superiority of the spiritual sword over that of the temporal. With the untimely death of Henri II in a jousting accident in 1559, France was faced with two crises; the succession of a line of weak child kings; and the success of the Protestants. The combination of both factors would eventually lead to the disastrous religious wars. Faced with these two threats, and the sporadic royalist policy of pacification, the clergy became militant in their defense of Catholicism.\textsuperscript{101} Indeed, much of the uncompromising rhetoric against the crown came from the extreme Catholic factions. The fact that many of the calls for the deposing of Charles IX and Henri III came from the Catholic clergy, would be use to great effect by the Protestant leadership during the reign of Louis XIII, as we will see in chapter 5.

From the beginning of the Reformation, the Bible was the central text of Protestant preaching. As God’s word, the prophecies and teachings of the Old and New Testaments were an everlasting source of truth in the transmission of Christ’s message.\textsuperscript{102} The Biblical text was a mirror in which the preacher could display the virtues and vices of those whom he was addressing.

\textsuperscript{101} Taylor, “Comme un Chien,” 166.
After all, if the scriptural text was God's unchanging word, its messages would also be unchanging. The logical conclusion to this equation was the same rewards and punishments catalogued in the holy writ were applicable to contemporary behaviour. The Old Testament was of particular import to the Calvinists since it could easily be mined for stories of godly and ungodly kings, and the consequences of their actions. This has led some to conclude that Protestant congregations were more familiar with the Biblical text than their Catholic counterparts. The conclusion is not born out by the evidence. Catholic sermons throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries increasingly employed Biblical passages in a variety of contexts. This shows that there was a sense of continuity between the two confessions, as the rhetorical strategies employed with the exegetical reading of the Biblical text encouraging or criticizing political authority.

With the ascension of Henri IV and a return to a relative stability throughout the kingdom, preachers found that certain references were no longer politically expedient. A prominent example of this was the popularity of the Israelite king Ahab and his wife, Jezebel. Few Israelite monarchs had achieved the notoriety of Ahab and Jezebel. Shortly after her marriage to Ahab, Jezebel introduced into Israel idol worship in the form of the cult of Baal, a Phoenician sun cult. Not only did Ahab tolerate the introduction of idolatry, he was guilty of unlawfully taking the private property of his subjects. Of particular note was Naboth's vineyard. With the help of his Queen, Ahab had Naboth murdered and took possession of the vineyard. (1 Kings 21). Prior to the Reformation this example had been used to criticize unchristian behaviour of the king. But as the French kingdom suffered under the succession of unpopular minority Regencies and the
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104 Bradshaw, “David or Josiah?,” 78.
105 Larissa Taylor, “Dangerous Vocations: Preaching in France in the Late Middle Ages and Reformations,” in Preachers and People, 94.
inroads made by the Protestants, the story of Ahab and Jezebel took on even stronger allegorical resonances. The city preachers were able to quickly draw the connection between the historical figure and the current Valois monarchy. Charles IX and his mother Catherine de' Medici were equated with Ahab and Jezebel, not only because the crown had not done enough to remove the Protestant heresy, but seemed to be actively supporting the Protestants through Catherine’s various edicts of pacification.

The comparison did not end there. Ahab and Jezebel’s criminal behaviour led to a popular rebellion, led by the prophet Elijah, which resulted in the deposing of both king and queen. For the city preachers, the parallels could not have been any clearer. Because Charles and Catherine had not done enough to remove the Protestant threat, they could be legitimately deposed by popular revolt.

However, by 1598, this stock figure had largely disappeared in the sermon literature. Rather, Ahab was replaced by Josiah, who represented the image of the ideal king, whose dedication to restoring orthodoxy in Israel was successful. Among English Protestants, Josiah achieved great popularity under the reign of Edward VI, who was encouraged by his subjects to establish the Protestant reform programme.¹⁰⁶ In France, the image of Josiah was given a Catholic sheen as the reforming king, who in the persons of Henri IV and Louis XIII, would reform France by expelling the Protestants from the Kingdom.

As the violence of the religious wars subsided and the crown began the process of reasserting its authority over the factious kingdom, the eschatological meaning given the Biblical topos evolved as well. One example that demonstrates the evolving exegesis of the Biblical text is found in the use of apocalyptic texts of Daniel, Ezekiel and the Revelation of St. John. One of the

prominent stock images was the dream of the Babylonian king Nebuchadnezzar in which a golden
headed statue, with feet of clay was smashed by a rock cut without hands (Daniel 2. 31-35). For
Molinier, the stone is allegorized as the triumph of Christ and by extension his Church.

The prophet Daniel in his visions had a revelation of the future Jesus
Christ under this enigma, or the mysterious representation of a stone cut
from the mountain without the hand of man, to signify he who was
without human work was born of the Virgin. This stone, began small in
its origin, but it became as a large as a mountain, even as the one from
which it originated, it covered with its entire mass the face of the earth. It
represented him who was small through lowliness of his birth, of his life,
and his death and of his Church. 107

This interpretation of the second chapter of Daniel was not unique to Molinier. The
Rouenais preacher François d'Eudemare also employed very similar imagery. Eudemare was a
vocal proponent of the privileges of the Church. Among his sermon collections, he had written a
book entitled, Le Promenoir Sacredotal sur les Commencemens et Origins de la Gloire et
Accroissement des Regne Universel de l'Eglise de Dieu, 1618, tracing the ultimate triumph
of the Catholic Church and the papacy. In this work, d'Eudemere cited the same passage and
explained that Nebuchadnezzar’s vision

Where it says, that a small stone cut from the rock without hands, coming
to smash against this statue, and reducing it to pieces, and the stone grew
to the size of a mountain of such size, filling up all the face of the earth:
Signifying the universal reign of the Church of God.108
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107 Le Prophete Daniel en ses visions eut revelation de Jesus Christ futur sous l’enigme, ou répresentation
mysterieuse d’une pierre coupée d’une montagne sans main d’homme, pour signifier celui qui sans œuvre
humaine devoit naître de la Vierge. Cette pierre paroissait petite en son origine, mais depuis ayant pris
accroissement, et devenue plus grande que la montagne mene qui l’avait enfanté, elle avoit couvert, et
rempli de sa masse toute la face de la terre, pour figurer celui qui petit en son commencement par l’humilité
de sa naissance, de sa vie, et de sa mort. Molinier, Pour tous les Dimanches, 162.
108 Où il dit, qu’une petite pierre sortie du roc sans ouvrage de main, venant à frapper contre cette statue,
l’abbatist, et la reduisist par pieces, et se transmua après ne la hauteur d’une montagne de telle amplitude,
que sa masse occupoit toute la face de la terre; Ce qui signifie le regne universel de l’Eglise de Dieu.
François d’Eudamere, Le Promenoir Sacredotal sur les Commencemens et Origins de la Gloire et
Bertaut gives a more elaborate reading of this same passage. In his sermon for the “Day of the Circumcision,” Bertaut explains that, originally the removal of the foreskin was to be done with a stone knife. For Christians, circumcision had become a symbol of the circumcision of the heart. The stone knife was further compared to the stone cut without hands. The statue with feet of clay represented the “children of the Babylonians,” or the illicit desires and affections of the heart which were crushed by this stone.\(^\text{109}\)

The apocalyptic nature of the second chapter of Daniel is also nearly non-existent in de Sales, where in a 1595 sermon he gave the following explanation of the stone cut without hands.

> The stone of Daniel which destroys the statue, is Christ and Peter. Gamaliel: If this work is of men, it will end. Those that God has united, man cannot separate. Your head is like Carmel. The meaning of the mountain from which the stone was detached: the mountain is Christ, head of the Church; the stone, Saint Peter.\(^\text{110}\)

It becomes apparent then that the rhetoric of the seventeenth century surrounding the apocalyptic texts favoured a less radicalized interpretation than was acceptable during the sixteenth century.

The duty of the subject to the King was also addressed. The image of King David was one of obedience to the political will under all circumstances. In his sermon “For Palm Sunday,” de Sales cited the revolt and subsequent death of David’s son Absalom (2 Samuel 15-18) as a cautionary tale of the risks of challenging legitimate political authority.\(^\text{111}\) This is an important theme in de Sales’ writing. In his Introduction, he again addresses the image of David as representative of the obligation a good Christian had towards even a wicked king. David refused

\(^{109}\) Bertaut, Principales Festes, 140-141.
\(^{110}\) De Sales, Oeuvres, 9: 161.
to take up arms against Saul, despite the injustice of Saul's designs upon him. Though justified, David placed the stability of the kingdom above his own interests. ¹¹²

An examination of the rhetorical structures of seventeenth-century sermon literature reveals on one hand it had returned to a conservative tone that rejected the fiery radicalization of its sixteenth-century predecessors. It had also evolved into a style unique to early Bourbon France. Many of the preachers had adopted an interest in humanist topoi in favour of what was considered the dry scholasticisms of the medieval Church. It is evident that many of the preachers under consideration took seriously the Tridentine demands that preaching must be concerned foremost on pedagogy in order to reform the lives of Catholics throughout Europe. The sermon literature of the seventeenth century thus reflects the changing social and political environment of post Edict of Nantes France which favoured co-operation between the crown and the clerical estate.

Chapter III
The Social Perfection of the Christian: Sermon and Devotional Literature as Means of Social Discipline

Almost all those who have hitherto written about devotion have been concerned with instructing persons wholly withdrawn from the world or have at least taught a kind of devotion that leads to such complete retirement. My purpose is to instruct those who live in town, within families, or at court, and by their state of life are obliged to live an ordinary life as to outward appearances.¹

The seventeenth century has been described as a period of great devotion.² The expression of spirituality in France under the early Bourbons took a number of forms. One of the more conspicuous displays of piety was the creation of new monastic orders, which began to take place in the sixteenth century. Arising from the context of the Catholic Reformation, these new orders were aggressive in spreading a renewed Catholicism. Orders such as the Jesuits and Capuchins did not retreat from the world. They regarded it as the central purpose to their existence to engage directly with the world which needed reforming. The objectives of combating heresy and reeducating Catholics could not be accomplished in the cloister. The Jesuits, though resembling medieval mendicant orders, rejected the recitation of the liturgical Hours and focused on the education of their members and those among whom they laboured.³ As first and foremost preachers of the word, these sixteenth-century orders regarded the world as their cloister.⁴ Other orders like the Ursulines and the Sisters of the Visitation founded by Jeanne de Chantal and François de Sales, focused on the religious instruction of children.

Initially a non-cloistered order, the Sisters of the Visitation worked in the towns as teachers to the children of the rising bourgeois class.\(^5\)

In response to the failings of clergy, a substantial number of the laity took it upon themselves to undertake part of the work of the Church.\(^6\) Initially applied to anyone who wished to practice a more heightened religious experience, the term dévot encompassed those who used their religious sensibilities within the political context.\(^7\) The more strident segment of the dévots represented a hyper-orthodoxy which was the heir of the religiosity of the Catholic League. They were appalled by the pragmatic policies of Henri III, Henri IV, Louis XIII, and Richelieu in regards to the Protestant princes throughout France and Europe. The political influence of the dévot party ended with Richelieu’s success during the Day of Dupes in 1630. With the loss of political influence the dévots withdrew themselves from mainstream society. Adopting a severe form of piety, they became the self appointed critics of society at large.\(^8\)

The other development of seventeenth-century spirituality, which is of interest to the argument of this chapter, is the devotional practices that sought a middle way between the renewed monastic movements and the excessive piety of the dévots. This moderate form of devotion is summed up in the opening quote. Devotion was no longer to be the purview of the holy few, it was meant for all the laity. Because the question of the position of devotional practices as part of the religious experience of seventeenth-century France is so broad, this chapter will focus on one narrow aspect of this question. The contention of this chapter is that the devotional literature of the clergy represents an


\(^7\) Rapley, *The Dévotes*, 75.

\(^8\) Rapley, *The Dévotes*, 75.
attempt to reduce the potential for heterodoxy sometimes associated with spontaneous devotional movements, and a means of pacifying the social behaviour of the French.

To explain how devotional literature attempted to discipline the social behaviour of the French, this chapter will focus on François de Sales’ two highly important and popular works, the *Introduction à la Vie Dèvote* and the *Traité de l’Amour de Dieu*. This chapter will also examine two devotional works written by Richelieu, the *Instruction du Chrestien* and the *Traité de la Perfection du Chrestien*, while he was Bishop of Luçon and published in 1636 and 1646 respectively.

Richelieu’s devotional tracts elucidate the role played by devotional literature in pacifying French society. Because studies on the nature of seventeenth-century devotion have concentrated on the major figures of French spirituality, such as de Sales, Carlo Borromeo, Vincent de Paul and Bossuet, they have tended to overlook the contributions made by those like Richelieu, whose other works have overshadowed their contributions to the development of French spirituality. I intend, by examining Richelieu’s devotional work, to illuminate an understudied facet of his work. This chapter will also examine the devotional works of Eustache de Saint Paul, whose tracts, *Adresse Spirituelle* and *Exercises Spirituels* were published in 1636 and 1640, respectively.

These devotional tracts were published during a period of intense Catholic reform, and much of this literature represents a clear approach to the practices of devotion. Set out with clear guidelines, they promoted a devotional programme centred on the practices
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9 In recent years historians have begun to acknowledge Richelieu’s contributions to seventeenth-century French devotion. W. F. Church discusses in some detail Richelieu’s devotional writings, and though Church rightly notes the sincerity of Richelieu’s religious profession, he emphasizes that the Instruction and Traité are more revealing of the Cardinal’s political ideas on the authoritarian nature of the State. W.F Church, *Richelieu and Reason of State* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1972), 83-91. Joseph Bergin’s *The Rise of Richelieu* gives more consideration of Richelieu’s religious devotion outside the context of his politics, however only a small section is dedicated to a discussion of the Cardinal’s spiritual writings. Joseph Bergin, *The Rise of Richelieu* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1991).
of the Church, such as the sacraments and confession. Church authorities viewed these tracts with suspicion. They were concerned that any popular movement might challenge accepted orthodoxy. Thus the authors of devotional literature negotiated a balance between a spiritual programme, focused on the private commitment and pursuit of devotion, and not offending the sensibilities of the ecclesiastical institutions that emphasized the communal nature of the Christian Church. On one hand, devotion is a private and individual pursuit, yet individualism within the context of Catholicism was discouraged in the strongest possible way, especially when it concerned the subject’s relation to the crown and church.

As will be demonstrated, the authors of devotional literature went to great lengths to ensure that the devotional programme did not in fact challenge Church authority, but rather attempted to reinforce its authority. Until recently, devotional literature has been an underutilized source in the study of religion in early Bourbon France. Even those concerned with representations of religion of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth-centuries have largely ignored the genre of devotional literature. Studies of this genre more often than not focus on their importance as contemporary devotional literature. These works often published on Catholic presses, especially in the late nineteenth-century, were laudatory in nature. They were not concerned with providing the critical analysis of their historical significance, or of the social and intellectual milieu in which these devotional tracts were written, apart from noting these works as evidence of the authors’ saintliness especially in the case of de Sales and Eustache de Saint Paul. This is especially true for seventeenth-century devotional work. The popularity of de Sales’ work was not unique. Others including Eustache de Saint Paul and Richelieu also
authored important devotional tracts that were received with a great success by a literate public.\textsuperscript{10}

In recent years however, as the nature of seventeenth-century religious practices has been became of more interest to historians, there has been a growing acknowledgement of the value of devotional literature as a historical source.\textsuperscript{11} In his study, \textit{The Rise of Richelieu}, Joseph Bergin briefly discusses the nature of Richelieu’s devotional writings, largely ignored in the many biographies of the Cardinal which have justifiably centred in his political role as a powerful minister under Louis XIII.\textsuperscript{12} Another encouraging development in the study of French spirituality is the efforts of the Sixteenth-Century French Religious Book Project.

Centred at St. Andrews, the SCFRBP concentrates on how the French religious book in all its forms delineates confessional boundaries and how the religious book helped create confessional identity.\textsuperscript{13} Although focused on the sixteenth century, many

\textsuperscript{10} Even discounting the hyperbole in the Avertissement au Lecture in Richelieu’s \textit{Instruction du Chrestien}, there is no denying the success of Richelieu’s devotional writings.


of the questions and models provided by this project are highly pertinent to the religious
books of the seventeenth century. Thus it is the purpose of this chapter to add the
historiographical discussion concerning the nature of seventeenth-century devotion.

An important aspect to seventeenth-century devotion was the function of
mysticism within these writings. The primary function of the devotional programmes
was to create for the practitioner a personal and interior relationship with God. These
efforts would be considered a success once one achieved a mystical union with the
Divine. Mysticism in this context simply means the spiritual and emotional connection to
God, independent of rational thought. To achieve this state, the process was divided into
three components: the interior or contemplative life, the exterior or active life, and once
these were reached the devout would then enter into the perfect life, capped by feeling the
full expression of God's love.

This tripartite division was highly influenced by Benoit de Canfield's (1562-
1610) *Rule of Perfection* (1593) where he explains the necessity of this three-fold
division for a devout life.

In order to make easier this rule and discourse, and to make better
understood what we shall say in the three parts of this treatise, it seems
necessary here to make a division of the will of God, not as the
scholastics, who following St. John Damascene distinguish it into the
precedent and subsequent will, nor as some others, into precepts,
prohibitions, and counsels, nor finally as others, into the efficacious
and permissive will, and the will of good pleasure. I do not intend (I
say) to divide it by these scholastic distinctions, but to distinguish by a
mystical division the "exterior, interior, and essential" will of God. The
exterior will of God is a light and rule to lead us in the active life.
The interior will of God is similarly a brightness that rules and lifts up
our soul in the contemplative life.
The essential will of God is a splendor that governs and perfects our
spirit in the supereminent life. The first is active, the second
contemplative, and the third supereminent. The first disposes to the
second, the second to the third. The first is for beginners, the second
for the proficient, the third for the perfect.

---

impacted the first two generations of the Reformation. Jean - François Gilmont, *La Réforme et le Livre:

89
This threefold mystical division of the will of God is not novel or without foundation, but is supported by the doctrine of St. Paul, seeming to be his division rather than ours. When writing to the Romans he says, "Discern what is the good and acceptable and perfect will of God" (Romans 12:2). Concerning these words Nicholas of Lyra says that this will "is good for beginners, pleasing for the proficient, and perfect for the perfect." Accordingly, the will of God which we call exterior or active is that which St. Paul calls 'good', since beginners practice it. The will of God which we name interior or contemplative is that which he calls acceptable or pleasing, since the proficient practice it. The will of God which we call supereminent or essential is that which he names perfect, since the perfect labor in it. Although taken in themselves essentially as they are in God these three are but one will and God himself; they are divided here for the better and more perfect understanding of those who strive for perfection. 

Here Canfield draws upon the Pauline conception of devotion which requires faith without knowledge. God can only be known through the senses rather than by reason. The downplaying of the intellectual pursuit of truth is given further elaboration in de Sales' *Traité de l'Amour de Dieu*. Introducing his discussion of the role of mysticism within devotional efforts, de Sales distinguishes between “speculative” and “mystical” theology.

What do we discuss in prayer? What is the subject of our conference? Theotimus, in prayer we speak only of God. Whom can we love discuss and speak of except the beloved? Hence, prayer and mystical theology are the same thing. It is called theology because just as speculative theology has God as its object, so also prayer speaks only of God. However, there are the three following differences: 1. Speculative theology treats God as God, while mystical theology speaks of him as supremely worthy of love. That is, the first regards the divinity of the supreme goodness, and the second regards the supreme goodness of the divinity. 2. Speculative theology treats God as dealing with men and among men; mystical theology speaks of God with God and in God himself. 3. Speculative theology strives for knowledge of God, and mystical theology for love of God. Therefore, the first makes its students wise and learned men, that is, theologians; but the second makes its students ardent, affectionate lovers of God, each of them a Philotheus or Theophilus. 

---

15 Mais de quoi devisons-nous en l'oraison? Quel est le sujet de notre entretien? Theotime, on n'y parle que de Dieu; car, de qui pourrait de viser et s'entretenir l'amour que du bienaimé? Et pour cela, l'oraison et la théologie mystique ne sont qu'une même chose. Elle s'appelle théologie, parce que, comme la théologie speculative a Dieu son object, celle ci aussi ne parle que de Dieu, mais avec trois differences: car, 1. celle la traite de Dieu entant qu'il est Dieu, et celle ci en parle entant qu'il est souverainement aimable;
Richelieu also adopts the Canfieldian division of the mystical union with God. As he argues in the *Traité de la Perfection du Chrestien*, the way to perfection or completion of the Christian is a three step process. However, the Bishop of Luçon’s description focuses on the pragmatic aspect of mysticism.

The first, which is the purgative life, is nothing else than the diligent care of the Christian to relinquish sin and gain the grace of God. The second, which is the illuminative life, consists in the particular diligence the Christian exercises to get rid of the encumbrances of the senses to such a point that his understanding may more clearly contemplate, through mental prayer, the mysteries of his salvation. Whence it follows that his enlightened will which is proposed to his understanding, will go with such ardor in the exercise of virtues...

The third is the unitive life, which is no other than the Christian cleaned from sin through the purgative life, cleared and excited by the illuminative [life], takes to unite with God through perfect charity. 16

This structure is also taken up by Eustache de Saint Paul. Divided into three parts, Eustache de Saint Paul provides a series of mental exercises. In the first part, the devout was to consider the corruption of the body and the eventual redemption of the soul in order to be purged of sin. This was followed by the second set of meditative topics directed to considerations of the goodness of God, and the need for internal submission to

---

16 Le premier, est celui de la vie purgative, qui a proprement parler, n’est autre chose qu’un soin diligent que le Chrestien a de se dessaire du peché, et d’acquerir la grace de son Dieu. Le second, est celui de la vie illuminative, qui consiste en la diligence particulière que le Chrestien apporte à se dépestrer de l’embarras de ses sens, jusques tel point que son entendement puisse plus clairement contempler par l’oraison mentale, les mysteres de son salut. D’où s’ensuit que sa volonté esclairée d’une plus grande lumiere, embrasse plus ardemment l’objet que son entendement lui propose, et se porte avec telle ardeur à l’exercice des vertus.... Le troisieme est la vie unitive; qui n’est autre chose que le soin que le Chrestien nettoyé du peché par la vie purgative, éclairé et échauffé par l’illuminative, prend de s’unir à Dieu par une parfaite charité. Richelieu, *Traité de la Perfection du Chrestien*. (Paris, 1646), 50-1.
his will. Once this illuminative life had been achieved, the devout then moved to
the final set of meditations, which if practiced properly would lead to unity with God.\textsuperscript{17}

Although devotional writers like de Sales, Richelieu, and Eustache de Saint Paul
were influenced by Canfield, there are some striking differences. Canfield’s mysticism
required the complete hypostasis of the individual, what Mino Bergamo calls “fusion
totale, liquefaction complete.”\textsuperscript{18} De Sales and Richelieu on the other hand do not go as
far as Canfield. The purpose of these devotional programmes was of course unity with
God, but they did not require the annihilation of the self during the process.

Bergamo argues that de Sales also promoted the deconstruction of the self. Citing
the following passage from \textit{the Traité de l’Amour de Dieu}, Bergamo maintains that de
Sales displayed a “semantique de la liquidité.”\textsuperscript{19}

How does this sacred outpouring of the soul into its beloved take place? A
lover’s great complacence in the thing loved produces a certain spiritual
weakness which make the soul feel unable to remain any longer within
itself. For this reason, it is melted balm that is no longer firm or solid, and
lets itself go out and flow into what it loves. It does not spring out of itself
by a sudden leap, nor does it close up by way of union. It flows out gently
like something liquid and fluid into God whom it loves. We see how
clouds condensed by the south wind dissolve and turn into rain. They
cannot contain themselves but fall and flow downwards and mingle so
completely with the earth they moisten as to become one with it. So too
the soul which, though loving, still remained within itself, issues forth by
this sacred outflow and holy fluidity. It leaves itself not only to be united
to its beloved but also to be completely mingled and steeped in him.
Therefore, you can see clearly, Theotimus, that the outflowing of a soul
into its God is actually a true ecstasy in which the soul is completely
beyond the limits of its natural condition, wholly mingled with, absorbed
into, and engulfed in God.\textsuperscript{20}

\textsuperscript{17} Eustache de Saint Paul, \textit{Exercices Spirituels, Contants Plusieurs Meditations tres-efficaces pour retirer
les âmes du Peché, et les avancer aux vertus Chrestiennes et Religieuses, et à la parfaite union d’amour
\textsuperscript{18} Mino Bergamo, \textit{La Science des Saints: Le Discours Mystique au XVIf siècle en France.} (Grenoble: Jean
Millon, 1992), 20.
\textsuperscript{19} Bergamo, \textit{La Science des Saints}, 56.
\textsuperscript{20} Mais comme se fait cet écoulement sacré de l’âme en son Bien-Aimé? Une extreme complaisance de
l’amant en la chose aimée produit une certaine impuissance spirituelle qui fait que l’âme ne sent plus aucun
pouvoir de demeurer en soi-même; c’est pourquoi, comme un baume fondu, qui n’a plus de fermeté ni de
The case is overstated. It is true that de Sales' language discusses the malleability of the soul in its quest for the love of God. Yet, when de Sales wrote that all could pursue devotional efforts and it was heresy to banish devotion from daily life he meant the mystical union with God could be achieved within the context of social activity. This is an important distinction as the Church imposed greater uniformity, it became more involved in these private devotional efforts. Although de Sales downplayed the annihilation of the self, private forms of devotion could still lead to behaviour that the Church found to be a problem.

With the popularity of these works on private spirituality, the Church wanted to ensure that these devotional efforts did not veer off into heterodoxy. Because these programmes drew upon an understanding of mysticism that was personal and internal, the Church viewed them with some suspicion. As a private form of piety, those who undertook these efforts were seen to be operating outside the established space of the Church. There was a perceived danger that ecclesiastical authorities could lose control of the members of the corpus of the Church. After all, if one could claim to achieve unity with God through their own efforts, what role was left for the rituals and hierarchy of Church authority?

This fear was not unfounded. Early and medieval Christian conception of mystical thought incorporated a highly pronounced renunciation of the world. The

solidité, elle se laisse aller et écouter en ce qu'elle aime; elle ne se jette pas par maniere d'union, mais elle se va doucement coolant, comme une chose fluide et liquide, dedans la Divinité qu'elle aime. Et comme nous voyons que les nuées épaisse par le vent de en elles-mêmes, ainsitombent et s'écoulent en bas, se mêlant si intimentement avec la terre qu'elles détrempent qu'elles ne sont plus qu'une même chose avec icelle, ainsi l'âme laquelle, quoique amante, demeurait encore en elle-même, sort par cet écoulement sacré et fluidité sainte, et se quitte soi-même toute et se détremer avec lui. Vous voyez donc bien, Théotime, que l'écoulement d'une âme en son Dieu n'est autre chose qu'une veritable extase, par laquelle l'âme est toute hors des bornes de son maintien naturel, toute mêlée, absorbée et engloutie en son Dieu. De Sales, Oeuvres, 4: 345-7.
hermitages and ascetic movements of the eastern Christians during the first century of
Christianity were expressions of a mysticism requiring one’s removal from the world in
order to seek unity with God. Denis Crouzet and Jean Delumeau both argue that the
severe expressions of Christian mystical devotion were responses to an eschatological
angst informed by the linear history of Christianity beginning with the creation and
ending with the divinely ordained destruction of the world and return of Jesus Christ.
This angst was most intense during periods of social disruption.21 The earliest anchorite
movements occurred during the severest persecution of Christians under the Roman
Emperors. Although the eastern forms of asceticism did not take hold in western
Christianity, medieval Western Europe witnessed the rapid growth of the great monastic
houses during the fifth to tenth centuries.

Those entering the monastic life sought a closer relationship with God through the
physical removal from the corruption of the world, based on a “deep pessimism” caused
by an aversion to the evils of the world.22 This mentality underpinned the belief that only
through the separation of the body from the world could one truly achieve the necessary
merit to ensure passage into the heavenly City. Examples of these popular movements
include the “Great Alleluia,” appearing in the Italian cities as the plague ravaged Europe
tapping into the eschatological mentality described by Crouzet and Delumeau, expressing
itself in extreme displays of mortifying the flesh.23

21 Denis Crouzet, Les Guerriers de Dieu: la violence au temps des troubles de religion, vers 1525 - vers
1610. (Seyssel, 1990); La Genèse de la Réforme Française, 1520-1562. (Paris, 1996); Jean Delumeau, Sin
and Fear: The Emergence of a Western Guilt Culture 13th-18th Centuries. Trans Eric Nicholson. (New
22 Delumeau, Between Luther and Voltaire, 34.
23 Delumeau, Between Luther and Voltaire, 91; Ronald Weissman has traced the establishment of Italian
flagellant confraternities during the Quattrocento. He argues that these confraternities arose during times of
war and social upheaval, as opposed to being spontaneous reactions to a perceived crisis of spirituality.
While these ascetic movements were popular with the laity who admired the rigid discipline and dedication required for such a life, they often were met with resistance by the ecclesiastical hierarchy. Those involved were condemned by Church authorities as practicing an extreme form of religious expression. They were also seen as outright threats to the Church, since mysticism as practiced by such ascetics was completely independent and sometimes in direct conflict to the structure of the ecclesiastical leadership, which made it difficult to control.

The *Devotio Moderna* ran into much of the same criticism. Despite the communal undercurrents in the *Devotio Moderna*, its adherents did not fully remove themselves from the world in the way anchorites did. Yet they were still considered a threat to the ordered well being of both Church and Society.

Mysticism represented a tension within Christian Europe. On one hand, religious mysticism sought to personalize and intensify the religious experience while at the same time it threatened the hierarchical order of the Church, because the personalization of the religious experience made redundant the role of the priest. Personal mysticism was seen to operate outside the established space of the Church and accepted forms of religious practice. This concern was well placed. The Jansenist movement which came out of the private spirituality of *dévots* was condemned because both the Church and government regarded as heretical and politically schismatic.\(^\text{24}\) Thus while promoting the private and domestic nature of inner piety, de Sales, Eustache de Saint Paul and others made sure their charges remained within the orthodox space of the Church by requiring the devout to be overseen by the Bishop or local clergy.

Because of the chaos of the religious wars, the second task at hand was to restore order among French society. The irrational violence that was unleashed during the last half of the sixteenth century had negative consequences on more than just the population. Church buildings had been severely damaged, and the religious lives of the French were disrupted by these religious wars. Once the wars were over, both the state and Church were faced with the daunting task of restoring order. One of the ways the Church could do this was by reinforcing the meaning of religious and civic duty. This explains why these devotional programmes were concerned with equating devotional behaviour with appropriate social behaviour. It is true that Canfield's Rule of Perfection was highly influential, but his work does not deal with external behaviour to any great extent. Whereas, for writers like de Sales, religious and social order were of tantamount concern.

It is easy to regard this devotional literature as an expression of a baroque Catholicism, with its appeal to the emotional aspect of religious observance. However, the devotional literature reflects a strong sense of moralism within religious behaviour. So, whereas, Canfield was esoteric, seventeenth-century devotional writers focused on more practical aspects. To live a devout life, one needed more than an otherworldly sense of God's love. Thus many of these writings condemn actions such as gaming; dancing; hunting; and any other activity that distracted one from a religious life.

For others, like Richelieu, a devout life was impossible without respect to the proper ranking of the social order. But the relationship between the social ranks was reciprocal. Nobles should expect proper deferment from their inferiors, but in return, they were to treat the members of their household with respect. Along with this was the emphasis of those sins which struck at the foundation of society, in particular ambition and avarice. Directed chiefly at the nobility, preachers warned that of all the sins, these
were the most dangerous, since these two that had fuelled the religious wars in the first place.

While moral reformers may have preached against the evils of gaming, hunting and other pastimes of the nobility, very few seriously considered giving up such activities. Indeed, as the bourgeois’ social standing improved, they were keen to adopt the trappings of noble status, including their pastimes. Although France was no longer wracked by the religious wars, the seventeenth century was still a violent period. As Carroll suggests, the nobility did not become any less violent. The fact that there were no major civil wars is a testament more to the crown’s skill in diverting the violent passions of the Second Estate into more productive channels. The popularity of these works, along with the institutional Church’s call for greater involvement of the clergy in the lives of their flocks suggests that there was an appetite for a more puritan form of religious practice.

As the religious wars came to an end in the last decades of the sixteenth century, and the slow process of reasserting royal authority took hold throughout France, extreme displays of mysticism, with its emphasis on the mortification of the flesh, subsided. Even though flagellation continued throughout the sixteenth century and into the seventeenth, as seen in Châtellier’s work on the Marian congregations, it was increasingly proscribed by Church authorities. And even when flagellation was recommended as a means to achieve a more intense spirituality, its proponents such as Loyola, were careful to make it clear such actions were only intended for the truly prepared. De Sales himself did not

---

remove flagellation from his devotional programme, but it was only to be undertaken under the proper supervision and within moderation, and it was certainly not the focus of his conception of mysticism.  

A clearer sense of how de Sales conceived the meaning of mysticism is found in his *Introduction*. In a chapter entitled “Humility Causes Us to Love our Own Abjection,” de Sales takes the position that it is through the humiliation of oneself that the flesh is truly mortified, which is central in the process of becoming devout. In order to achieve this abject humility one needs to submit to the shame of the world. Thus “a young gentleman or a young lady who refuses to join the dissipated conduct of a debauched group or to talk, play, dance, drink or dress like the rest will be scorned and criticized by others and their modesty will be called fanaticism or prudery. To love this is to love our own abjection.” Furthermore, true abjection comes from the correcting of improper behaviour, especially within the social sphere, “although we love the abjection that follows an evil, we must not forget to correct by just and lawful means the evil that caused it, especially when it is serious.” The inclusion of “just and lawful” demonstrated that de Sales was concerned that his programme not be taken out of context, and that the devout under his care were not to disrupt the social order, which in part may explain why de Sales was not censured for his reliance on the part played by mysticism for the devout to experience the love of God for oneself.

Eustache de Saint Paul picks up this theme in his *Adresse Spirituelle*. He advises those following his devotional programme, when considering the sacrifice of

---

28 De Sales, *Oeuvres*, 3: 152.
Jesus Christ on the cross to remember that his last words were directed to those around him.

The first for his enemies, Father, forgive them, they know not what they do. The second for his friend, the good thief: truly I say to you, today you will be with me in Paradise. The third for his kin, He said to St. John, Behold your mother, and to his mother, behold your son.30

Once one has put these words in mind, the ‘devout’ was then expected to imitate Christ’s love toward even his enemies, ensuring the smooth functioning of the social order. This mental contemplation was one of the most important hallmarks of seventeenth-century devotion.

The act of prayer (oraion) was central to the meaning of seventeenth-century devotion. Prayer for the authors of devotional literature meant more than just the act of communicating with the Divine. It was a component of the discussion over the humanist tropes of the vita contemplativa and the vita activa. Prayer was the central pillar in the question of what was the most perfect way of life.

In the context of seventeenth-century devotion, the humanist topoi of the vita contemplativa and vita activa formed an important element of what a religious life entailed. Richelieu’s Traité de la Perfection du Chrestien clearly makes this point. Basing his position on the Aristotelian philosophical search for the best life,31 Richelieu continues by citing the Augustinian position of a middle way based on an allegorical

31 And because among some men there are those who are particularly pleased with contemplation, and others who carry themselves to action; which is to say everyone who wants to serve exteriorly serve to maintain their society, human life is divided between contemplation and action.

Et parce qu’entre les hommes il s’en trouve quelque-uns qui se plaisent particulièrement à la contemplation, et d’autres qui se portent d’eux-mêmes à l’action; c’est à dire, à tout ce qui peut servir
extérieurement au maintien de leur société; la vie humaine est divisée en la contemplation et en l’active.
reading of the Biblical figures of Mary and Martha. Luke 10.38-42, recounts how Martha, concerned with her domestic responsibilities complained that her sister Mary, who was listening to Jesus Christ, was not doing her share of the work. Jesus Christ’s response was that while the work done by Martha was necessary, Mary’s attentiveness to him was greater since she had chosen to listen to the words of life. This leads Richelieu to the following conclusion:

Saint Augustine compared these two lives, these two sisters Martha and Mary, the first occupied the Ministry, and bodily care of the Son of God and his Apostles. The second, attached to the feet of the same Son of God, attentive to his inspirations, and receiving from him the nourishment of his soul. Both are good, he added, but the second is the best.32

Prayer is able to produce the activity that leads to a comprehension of God’s love precisely because it is contemplative. For true devotion, prayer is more than just the expression of an economic relationship with the Divine, whereby the petitioner demands God’s favour. Rather prayer becomes a highly meditative exercise that is wholly centred on the interiority of the soul. Echoing St Bonaventure’s (1221-1274) definition of the purpose of prayer, de Sales explains that

Prayer, generally speaking, comprehends all the acts of contemplation; or like St Gregory of Nissia, who teaches that a “prayer is a conference or conversation of the soul with God,” or again like St John Chrysostome, who asserts that “prayer is discussion with the divine majesty,” or finally like Saint Augustine and St John Damascene, who says that “prayer is an ascent or elevation of the mind to God.” If prayer is a colloquy, a discussion, or a conversation of the soul with God, then by prayer we speak to God and God in turn speaks to us. We aspire to him and live in him; he reciprocally inspires us and revives us.33

---

32 Saint Augustine compare ces deux mêmes vies, aux deux sœurs Marthe et Marie, la première occupée au Ministre, et à repaistre le Fils de Dieu et ses Apôtres corporellement; la second attachée aux pieds du même Fils de Dieu, attentive à ses inspirations, et recevant de lui la nourriture de son âme. Toutes deux sont bonnes, adjoust-t-il, mais la seconde est la meilleure. Richelieu, Perfection du Chrestien, 377.
33 L’oraison, à parler généralement, comprend tous les actes de contemplation, ou comme saint Gregoire Nissene, quand il enseignoit que “l’oraison est un entretient et conversation de l’âme avec Dieu;” ou bien comme saint Chrysostome, quand il asseuré que “l’oraison est in devis avec la divine Majesté;” ou
Thus the devout engaged in a private and personal relationship with God within the interior space of the soul. Prayer also takes on a further significance within the context of the contemplative nature of seventeenth-century devotion. According to Eustache de Saint Paul prayer does more than just allow one to communicate with God, it also permits the supplicant to purify him or herself. Eustache de Saint Paul argues that when the supplicant prays for the extirpation of the vices and imperfections of the soul, he or she is preparing for its reformation. However, before the soul is ready for this interior reformation, the supplicant must first undertake:

Continual study and knowingly practice mortification to tame and curb all the unruly movements and passions of your interior; for the soul that gives itself up to prayer, without the practice of mortification resembles those who madly erect a large and massive building on a foundation of sand.³⁴

Because of the potential of veering off into heterodoxy or breaking away from the body of the Church, ecclesiastical authorities made efforts to keep the proliferation of monastic movements and devotional programmes under tight control. Some of these efforts can be seen in the papacy’s dealings with the Jesuits.

Following the basic template of devotional writings, Ignatius Loyola defined the spiritual journey within the framework of the movement from purgation to enlightenment to perfection. The correctness of this path would be confirmed by the “consolation” of the heart, leading to a personal knowledge of God. Church authorities feared the

---

emphasis on consolation of the heart would return to the Alumbrados and other heresies.\textsuperscript{35}

The anxiety of Church authorities over the potential of heresy was also felt in the newly founded monastic movements. In the twenty-fifth session of the Council of Trent, the authorities sought to impose a standardized reform upon the monastic orders. Such requirements included restoring the vow of poverty and complete obedience to the superior. Female orders were to restore clausura, and all orders were to receive regular canonical visits, all displaying the Church's efforts in controlling and directing supra-institutional expressions of piety.\textsuperscript{36}

Of particular interest is the Sisters of the Visitation. Co-founding the order with Jeanne de Chantal, François de Sales had originally envisioned the Sisters of the Visitation as a non cloistered order to facilitate the pedagogical responsibilities of the sisters. However, shortly after the order's creation, the Archbishop of Lyon, Denis de Marquemort, demanded that the Sisters be cloistered.\textsuperscript{37} De Sales for his part argued that clausura only started under the pontificate of Boniface VIII. But in the new atmosphere of orthodoxy following the Council of Trent, any form of innovation could be considered heretical.\textsuperscript{38}

It was therefore necessary to address those concerns by demonstrating that those private devotional programmes fell within the boundaries of Tridentine orthodoxy. Thus the role of the spiritual director became central in these private devotional efforts. Richelieu makes this point very clear in his \textit{Instruction du Chrestien},

\textsuperscript{36} Delumeau, \textit{Luther and Voltaire}, 22.
\textsuperscript{37} Rapley, \textit{The D\'évotes}, 115.
\textsuperscript{38} Rapley, \textit{The D\'évotes}, 168-9.
My dear souls, learning from the sovereign Pastor of Pastors, that the principal office of the Pastor is the care of his flock. The charge which has pleased God to give me in this Diocese, and the tender love with which I wish your salvation, has caused me to acquit myself usefully towards you in this point. For this cause, knowing that spiritual care is to instruct the spirit of man of the will of his Creator, and to incite him to follow his will, I have undertaken to make you see he desires this for all Christians, and to dispose you to do it.39

De Sales employed similar language in his *Introduction* maintaining that the episcopate must concern itself with leading the practitioner in his or her spiritual exercises. “I tell you that it is primarily the duty of bishops to lead souls to perfection, since their order is as supreme among men as that of the seraphim among angels.”40

While de Sales and Richelieu distinctly place the responsibilities of directing these devotional programmes at the feet of the Bishop, Eustache de Saint Paul extended the responsibility to the personal confessor. For Eustache de Saint Paul, the role of the confessor was central to his devotional efforts.41 This tapped into a sentiment explicitly expressed during the Council of Trent. Trent forcefully defined the duty of the Episcopate as taking responsibility for the spiritual direction of their flocks. “Since this is the chief duty of Bishops, archbishops, primates and all other prelates of the churches are bound personally to preach the holy Gospel of Jesus Christ.”42 This charge was reiterated in the twenty fourth session, “that the office of preaching, which belongs chiefly to Bishops, be exercised as often as possible for the welfare of the faithful, the

---

39 Mes cheres Ames, apprenant du souverain Pasteur des Pasteurs, que le principal office du Pasteur est de paitre son troupeau: la charge quil a pleu à Dieu me donner en ce Diocese, et l'amour tender avec lequel je souhaitte votre salut, m'ont porté a vouloir paître utilement envers vous, de ce à quoi je me suis oblige en ce point. Pour cet effet sachant que paître spirituellement, n'est autre chose qu'instruire l'esprit de l'homme des volontez de son Createur, et l'inciter à les suivre, j'ai entrepris de vous faire voir particulierement ce qu'il desire de tout Chrestien, et par ce moyen vous disposer à le faire. Richelieu, *Instruction du Chrestien*. (Paris, 1636), n.p.
40 Je te dis qu'il appartient principalement aux Évêques de perfectionner les âmes, d'autant que leur ordre est le supreme entre les hommes, comme celui des Seraphins entre les Anges, si que leur loisir ne peut être mieux destiné qu'a cela. De Sales, *Oeuvres*, 3: 9.
42 *Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent. Sess. IV ch. 2*
holy council decrees that they themselves shall personally...announce the Sacred Scripture...”43

By emphasizing the role of the Episcopate in the direction of these devotional programmes, de Sales and others were able to balance the need for a tighter control over practices of devotion while at the same time to promote a form of devotion that was independent in nature. They were able to demonstrate their adherence to Tridentine orthodoxy by putting in place a devotional programme which was focused on the independent search for God’s love within the boundaries of the Church, demonstrated through normative social behaviour. This would be a form of devotion that would eschew the hyper-orthodoxy of the dévot party, as well as the revolutionary zeal of the League, which under the rubric of orthodoxy opposed the crown’s efforts to restore social order through a pragmatic tolerance of the Protestant confession.

As noted earlier, the clergy played an active part in the devotional pursuits of their adherents. While the French clergy were slow to adopt the reforms of clerical abuses during the seventeenth century based on the sermon literature of de Besse and Etienne Molinier, many bishops took seriously their role as shepherds of their flocks. This acknowledgement of the Bishops’ role is explicitly laid out by de Sales

It is my belief that it is God’s will that I, a bishop, should paint on men’s hearts not only the ordinary virtues but also God’s dearest and most beloved devotion. I willingly undertake to do this both to obey him and do my duty and also in the hope that by engraving devotion on the minds of others my own mind will be filled with a holy love.44

43 Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent. Sess. XXIV ch. 4
44 Il m’est advis qu'étant Évêque, Dieu, veut que je peigne sur les coeurs des personnes non seulement les vertus communes, mais encore sa treschere et bien aimée devotion; et moi je l’entreprens volontier, tant pour obeir et faire mon devoir, que pour l’esperance que j’ai qu’en la gravant dans l’esprit des autres, le mien a l’adventure en deviendras saintement amoureux. De Sales, Oeuvres, 3: 11.
While there can be little doubt as to the sincerity of de Sales’ statement, it also speaks to another element for having a devotional programme directed by the clergy, regardless of the extra burden it would place on that clergy. In the first chapter of the *Introduction* in which he sets out the meaning of devotion, de Sales explains the necessity of clerical oversight.

There is only one true devotion but there are many that are false and empty. If you are unable to recognize which kind is true, you can easily be deceived and led astray by following one that is offensive and superstitious... A man given to fasting thinks himself very devout if he fasts, although his heart may be filled with hatred. Much concerned with sobriety, he doesn’t dare wet his tongue with wine or even water but he won’t hesitate to drink deep of his neighbour’s blood by detraction and calumny. Another man thinks himself devout because he daily recites a vast number of prayers, but after saying them he utters the most disagreeable, arrogant, and harmful words at home and among his neighbours. Another gladly takes a coin out of his purse and gives it to the poor, but he cannot extract kindness from his heart and forgive his enemies... many persons clothe themselves with certain outward actions connected with holy devotion and the world believes that they are truly devout and spiritual whereas they are in fact nothing but simulacra and phantoms of devotion.\(^{45}\)

De Sales acknowledges that without proper guidance the devout runs the risk of falling into hypocrisy, making the devout worse off than if she had not undertaken such a programme. The implication here is, of course, that the laity could not be trusted to

---

\(^{45}\) Il faut avant toutes choses que vous scachies que c'est que la vertu de devotion; car, d'autant qu'il n'y en à qu’une vraie, et qu’il en a une grande quantité de fausse et vaines, si vous ne connoissies quelle est la vraie, vous pourriez vous tromper et vous amuser à suivre quelque devotion impertinente et superstitieuse. Celui qui est adonné au jeûne se tiendra pour bien devot pourveu qu'il jeûne, quoi que son coeur soit plein de rancunes; et n'osant point tremper sa langue dedans le vin ni même dans l'eau, par sobriété, ne se feindra point de la plonger dedans le sang du prochain par la mesdisance et calomnie. Un autre s'estimera devot parce qu'il dit une grande multitude d'oraisons tous les jours, quoi qu'après cela sa langue se fonde toute en paroles fascheuses, arrogantes et injurieuses parmi ses domestiques et voisins. L'autre tire fort volontier l'aumône de sa bourse pour la donner aux pauvres, mais il ne peut tirer la douceur de son coeur pour pardonner a ses enemies; l'autre pardonnera à ses enemies, mais de tenir raison a ses creanciers... ainsi beaucoup de personnes se souvrent de certaines actions extérieurs apartenantes à la sainte devotion, et le monde croit que ce soient gens vraientement devots et spirituels; mais en verité ce ne sont que des statues et fantosmes de devotion. De Sales, *Oeuvres*, 3: 14. (trans. John Ryan)
recognize the difference between true and false devotion on their own, resulting in an “offensive and superstitious” devotion betrayed by the devout’s social hypocrisy.

The examples cited by de Sales reinforce the concern that he and others had in meshing religion with normative social behaviour. De Sales reiterates the idea that true devotion can only be achieved in the interior space of the soul; that all the outward displays of piety meant nothing if they were not supported by a sincere interior devotion. By placing themselves under the direction of the clergy, the devout remained within the boundaries of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, easing the tension caused by the independent nature of mystical devotion. The clergy, in a position to direct the devout, were able to ensure that the outward signs of piety mirrored the piety of the soul.

True devotion therefore not only presupposed the love of God, it led to accepted social behaviour since devotion not only inspired religious sentiment, it manifested itself in an active life of good works. De Sales further explains how devotion was useful in maintaining social order.

No Philothea, true devotion does us no harm whatsoever. But instead perfects all things. When it goes contrary to a man’s lawful vocation, it is undoubtedly false...[Devotion] not only does no injury to one’s vocation or occupation, but on the contrary adorns and beautifies it...every vocation becomes more agreeable when united with devotion. Care of one’s family is rendered more peaceable, love of husband and wife more sincere, service to one’s prince more faithful, and every type of employment more pleasant and agreeable.47

This is further extended with the need for these programmes to be subject to ecclesiastical oversight. As noted earlier, de Sales explicitly stated that one of the duties

46 De Sales, Oeuvres, 3: 15.
47 Non, Philothee, la devotion ne gaste rien quand elle est vraie, ains elle perfectionne tout, et l’hors qu’elle se rend contraire à la legitime vacation de quelqu’un, elle est sans doute fausse...[la vocation] devient plus agreable quand conjoiné à la devotion: le soin de famille en est rendu paisible, l’amour de mari et de la femme plus sincere, le service du prince plus fidelle, et toutes sortes d’occupations plus suaves et amiables. De Sales, Oeuvres, 3: 20.
of the episcopate was the Soverseeing of the efforts of the devout, and to ensure that these efforts remained within an acceptable orthodoxy. This was not unique to de Sales. Richelieu also explicitly explains the role of the Clergy in ensuring that the devout did not stray far from an acceptable form of Catholicism.

My brothers, the desire I have to fulfill my charge, and to give you the way to satisfy your charge to the advantage of the salvation of the souls which are commissioned to you, have made me draw up this present Instruction du Chrestien. In order to forget nothing of what I may, I urge the people to receive you as they must, and I exhort you to deal with them with care and charity, for thus are you obliged.48

Richelieu continues in very clear terms to set out the organization of this programme. The exercises were to be carried out every Sunday, the clergy were to assess whether or not the particular lesson was either too long or too difficult for the practitioner, and then adopt it to the readiness of their charge. Then once they had finished the lessons, they were to start again. This further demonstrates the standardizing process that devotion underwent during the seventeenth-century. The emphasis on obedience as a necessary aspect of seventeenth century mysticism is further developed by de Sales in one very telling paragraph,

In order to learn to obey your superiors with ease, adapt yourself easily to the will of your equals by giving in to their opinions in what is not sinful and by not being contentious or obstinate. Accommodate yourself cheerfully to your inferiors' wishes as far as reason permits and do not exercise imperious authority over them so long as they are good. It is an illusion for us to think that if only we were members of some religious community we would obey readily although we are slow and stubborn in obeying those God has placed over us.49

48 Mes frères, le désir que j’ai de m’acquitter de ma charge, et de vous donner moyen de satisfaire à la vôtre, à l’avantage du salut des âmes qui nous sont commises, m’a fait dresser ceste presente Instruction du Chrestien. Pour n’oublier rien de ce que je puis, j’ai conjuré le peuple de la recevoir de vous comme il doit: et je vous exhorté à la leur departir avec soin et charité, ainsi que vous y etes obligez. Richelieu, Perfection du Chrestien, n.p.
49 Pour apprendre aisément à obéir à vos supérieurs, condescendés aisément à la volonté de vos semblables, cédant à leurs opinions en ce qui n’est pas mauvais, sans être contentieuse ni revesche; accommodez-vous
First, it acknowledges that devotion, based on what de Sales refers to as mystical theology does not have to take place only within the monastic community. Second, it emphasized the importance of obedience as a social virtue. But more importantly for this discussion is the need for the devout to place oneself under the direction of a superior to ensure that the devotional programme is being followed correctly.

This emphasis on obedience to a spiritual advisor, not only in de Sales’ writings, but from others, suggest that the French church in the seventeenth century was greatly concerned with resolving the tension between the laity’s desire to experience, in a personal way the love of God, and the risk brought about by regarding the institutional hierarchy of the church as an obstacle standing in the way of that enlightenment. It was encouraged that one should follow a devotional programme, just so long as it was contained within the sphere of the orthodox boundaries of the church hierarchy.

Another interesting characteristic of devotional literature is its pedagogical makeup. Unlike the complex and esoteric mysticism of Canfield, or the highly regimented spiritual exercises of Loyola, many of the devotional programmes were presented in the simplest manner possible. With titles such as Introduction à la Vie Dévote, and Instruction du Chrestien, these books were the primer texts of seventeenth-century spirituality. Richelieu’s statement concerning the goals of his Instruction speaks to the heart of the matter.

Knowing that it is the first spiritual nourishment of Christians, as the milk one gives to infants without any other seasoning, just that of its own taste, I have conceived this Instruction in the most simple terms as possible. Recognizing that their minds, like stomachs digest so much better

volontier aux desirs de vos inferieurs autant que la raison le permettre, sans exercer aucune autorité imperieuse sur eux tandis qu’ils sont bons. C’est un abus de croire que si on etoit religieux ou religieuse ou obeiroit aisement, si l’on se trouve difficile et revesche a rendre obeissance à ceux que Dieu a mis sur nous. De Sales, Oeuvres, 3: 174.
necessary foods... I have reduced this spiritual nourishment to half of its quantity, weeding out that which I esteem as unnecessary.\textsuperscript{50}

It should be noted that there are some similarities between the religious instruction of the Catholic authors and the Protestant ABC books of the sixteenth century. Like their Catholic counterparts, these texts had titles such as \textit{Alphabet ou Instruction Chrestienne}, \textit{Instructions des Chrestiennes}, and \textit{Familière et Ample Instructions en la Doctrine Chrestien}. Ostensibly polemical in nature, these Protestant texts were primarily concerned with instructing their adherents in a standardized form of doctrinal understanding.\textsuperscript{51} This demonstrates a certain continuity between Catholic and Protestant religious instruction. The Catholic texts, though more mystical than their Protestant counterparts, recognized the need to reinstruct their flock in the rudiments of Catholic doctrine. This explains why it was necessary for the Church authorities to ensure these devotional programmes were anchored to the orthodoxy of Tridentine Catholicism.

Anchoring the devotional programme to the establishment of the hierarchy of the church authority was part of a larger purpose of devotional literature, which was to promote social discipline. One of the hallmarks of this devotional literature was the emphasis on free will. The devotional literature aimed to shape behaviour in such a way that true interior devotion would be expressed through appropriate social behaviour. This understanding that true devotion led to a proper sense of one's duty to social relations, is evident in a passage from the \textit{Introduction}. "It is an error, or rather a heresy, to wish to

\textsuperscript{50} Sachant qu'il est de la première nourriture spirituelle des Chrestiens, comme du lait qu'on donne aux enfants sans autre assaisonnement que celui de sa douceur propre, j'ai conceu cette \textit{Instruction} en termes les plus simples qu'il m'a été possible. Cognoissant en outre qu'il est des esprits, comme des estomacs qui digèrent d'autant mieux les aliments nécessaires ... j'ai réduit cette nourriture spirituelle a la moindre quantité qu'il m'a été possible en l'épurant de tout ce que j'ai estimé de superflu. Richelieu, \textit{Perfection du Chrestien}, n.p.
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banish the devout life from the regiment of soldiers, the mechanic’s shop, the court of princes, or the home of married people.”

The fact that a large variety of professions are listed here suggests that because devotion can be practiced outside the cloister by the soldier or the mechanic or prince, that devotion would have a profound impact on the behaviour of those living in the day to day world.

An examination of the devotional and sermon literature complicates the picture of seventeenth-century Catholicism. During the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, the Gallican church underwent a profound process of reform, which encompassed the entirety of the French Church. As with almost all reform movements, it quickly splintered into various reformist strains. Some of those strains became the extreme militancy of the Catholic League of the last decades of the sixteenth century and the Jansenists of the seventeenth century. Other strains followed a more moderate and accommodating understanding of religion. It is within this unsettled atmosphere of religious reform that these preachers developed their sermon literature.

Many preachers found the stridency of parties like the Catholic League unacceptable. The Catholic League’s uncompromising adherence to an extreme reading of Catholicism that had led to the assassination of two kings whose allegiance to Catholicism had been brought into question, and had prolonged the civil wars, not only between Protestant and Catholic factions, but also among elements within the Catholic camp itself as the debate over what reform meant became increasingly virulent and violent.

---

52 C’est un erreur, ains une heresie, de vouloir bannir la vie devote de la compagnie des soldats, de la boutique des artisans, de la cour des princes, du mesnage des gens maries. De Sales, Oeuvres, 3: 20-1.
This is not to say that the preachers under examination formed a coherent faction, even though within their writings, even over a span of some fifty years, there are a number of commonalities. The common themes in the devotional literature and sermon literature represent the problems faced by the preachers by the challenges to Catholic reform. As Ann Ramsey argues, “Catholic militancy was thus a difficult subject for the clergy because, particularly during the League, it entailed “effervescent” behaviors that conflicted with reformist religious ideals.”

This is not to say that we can neatly compartmentalize these preachers together under the rubric of moderates. Even though this sermon literature and devotional literature reject the militancy of the radical elements within the Catholic reform movements, coming down on the side of royal authority and social order, they had little patience for those who would challenge the well ordered running of both the ecclesiastical and political spheres.

The reason for including sermon literature in a discussion of devotional literature is that while not all preachers wrote devotional tracts, the concept of religion as being a means to discipline the social behaviour of the congregation is explicit throughout these sermons. Also, whereas the devotional literature focused on the interior person, sermon literature focused on the exterior behaviour. We should not think that this falls within neatly delineated categories of sermon literature = exterior; devotional literature = interior, as there are elements of both within each genre.

That the strength of one’s personal religiosity could be determined through the external display of social behaviour should come as no surprise. All religious institutions regardless of their theological underpinnings seek to control the social environment in

---

33 Ramsey, Catholic League, 21.
which they exist. The efficacy of a religious belief system to shape its social environment increases with the development of complex institutions to channel that belief. The church, synagogue and mosque become the engines that drive social transformation.

One of the most common ways that the devotional and sermon literature represent the desire to discipline the social body through the individual body was its emphasis on social virtues. Despite the promulgation of the Edict of Nantes in 1598, officially drawing the Wars of Religion to a close, and Henri IV’s efforts to pacify the fractious parties within the Kingdom, the peace enjoyed by the populace was still extremely fragile.

The stability of France was not only threatened by confessional factions, but also between factions within French Catholicism. Ann Ramsey describes in great detail the competing vision of authority between the Catholic League and the politique party. She argues that the criticism of the Catholic League from the most prominent members of the politique circle-Pierre-Victor Palma de Cayet, Estienne Pasquier, and Pierre de L’Estoile-arose in the late sixteenth-century as a new tradition of rationalism that was “openly hostile to religious enthusiasm” matured. Ramsey argues further that this rationalism did not preclude the holding of religious sensibilities, since the politiques remained faithful to the Catholic Church. Rather the politiques had created a boundary between the sacred and the profane that sought to compartmentalize religious and political life into the

55 An example of this is Pierre de Besse’s *La Pratique Chrestien pour Consoler les Malades*. This is an instructional manual for the clergy on the duties to the sick and imprisoned. The overall theme is one encouraging the repentance of the criminal, with an eye to restoring them back to the proper social order. Pierre de Besse, *La Pratique Chrestien pour Consoler les Malades*. 2 vols. (Paris, 1637).
expression of a raison d'état. Ramsey's argument is compelling for many reasons, not least because of social, political and religious pressures, late sixteenth-century and early seventeenth-century French society became increasingly suspicious of extreme forms of religious behaviour.

While Ramsey focuses on the politiques' reaction to the League, this was not the only group to be concerned with the social instability brought about by a half century of civil war. The preachers under consideration here, though never explicitly criticizing the League or other factions, were highly critical of their excesses. Whereas the politiques separated the boundaries of the secular and sacred, these preachers sought to circumscribe the sphere of the secular within the space of the sacred. Late sixteenth and early seventeenth-century political theory focused on the triumph of the homo politicus and the subsequent defeat of the "culture of sacred immanence." Although decrying the excesses of religious devotion, these preachers were not interested in creating a homo politicus, nor were they interested in separating the two spheres, rather they sought the creation of homo devotius. This creature would at once be at ease in both the space of the sacred and the profane.

De Sales' Introduction provides a clear example of the duty a devout Christian had to the proper functioning of the social order. As de Sales began his pastoral efforts, Henri IV had "encouraged and urged the saint in his work of instructing the people in their religion." Thus with this close connection to the French king, de Sales could not have been unaware of Henri's desire to pursue a course of religious toleration, designed to maintain the social order. This was the beginning of a process defined by Phillips as

56 Ramsey, Catholic League, chapter 4.
57 Ramsey, Catholic League, 57.
“the socialization of religious practices [meaning] in effect that religious difference were perceived...in social terms.”

The socialization of religious practices allowed de Sales to operate within a religious space while at the same time arguing that religious schism of any kind was disruptive to the socio-political system. This explains the continued presence of a confrontational tone in de Sales’ work couching secular concerns in devotional language. De Sales was able to emphasize the role that the devout life played in maintaining harmony and order in the world. In his injunction on patience, the devout is instructed to bear the verbal or physical assaults of their enemies, and even friends to avoid the evils of outward strife. “Yet it often happens that two good men, both with good intentions, because of conflicting ideas stir up great persecutions and attacks on one another.”

Preaching was a political act, “serving the commonweal.” Preaching was a political act, “serving the commonweal.” It has been discussed throughout this chapter that de Sales was more concerned with the inward piety of the laity than the outward show of that piety. This was, in part, due to his definition of true devotion, which helped maintain the social order.

Using Phillips’ terminology, the interior space of devotion is reflected in a person’s behaviour within the exteriority of the socio-political space. Thus social behaviour was emphasized as a part of true devotion. The pastoralists of the early seventeenth century sought therefore a private religiosity that was portable; it could be

---

60 Et cela néanmoins arrive fort souvent, que deux hommes de bien ayant tous deux bonne intention, sur la diversité de leurs opinions, se font de grandes persécutions et contradictions l’un à l’autre. De Sales, Introduction, 139.
practiced anywhere, by anyone, at anytime, once again demonstrating the parallel with the Jesuits, who believed that in terms of religiosity, "no space was uninhabitable."\textsuperscript{62}

Though preaching to the same milieu, the pastoralists of the first half of the seventeenth century opposed the exclusively interior religiosity of the Jansenists, who were seen as separate from the socio-political order, reflecting an "incompatibility with the new socio-political demands of the Church."\textsuperscript{63} Hence the example of Saul and David in the first chapter of the \textit{Introduction} can be read as a metaphor of the socio-political behaviour of the devout. Even though David was unjustly pursued by Saul, he refused to take up arms against the Israelite king, thus demonstrating that not only did David preserve the social harmony, he also refused to take advantage of the moral high ground and rebel against the legitimate royal authority.\textsuperscript{64} Preachers were able to blur the lines between the sacred and secular through their discussion of sin and its impact on the social body.

One of the most prevalent themes within the sermon literature was the sins of ambition and avarice. For preachers like de Besse and Etienne Molinier, ambition was one of the worst vices a Christian could possess. The seriousness of it comes from not only the damage it did to one's soul, but also the damage it did to the social body.

For de Besse, the insidious nature of ambition and avarice corrupted everything they touched. It was ambition that caused the Angels to rebel. The loss of earthly paradise was a direct result of this vice. It ruined people and led to betrayal of even God.

\textsuperscript{62}Phillips, \textit{Church and Culture}, 311.
\textsuperscript{64}Phillips, \textit{Church and Culture}, 321.
Ultimately there was nothing more dangerous to a nation or the Church than avarice. De Besse’s sermons demonstrate a highly nuanced understanding of Biblical sources. He takes his knowledge of Biblical *topoi* to further his point on the social evils of ambition. He cites the example of the two Israelite spies who find refuge with the prostitute Rahab (Joshua 2). They were to scout out the city of Jericho prior to the razing of the city by the Israelite army. De Besse allegorizes this to claim explicitly that avarice and its companion ambition are destructive forces in the world. “Two spies lodged in the home of the prostitute Rahab caused the ruin and destruction of Jericho; avarice and ambition are two spies of Satan, which lodge in the whore house of the world, and have ruined half of the world.” Even more damaging is ambition’s impact on the Church.

These are the plagues which are embedded in so many simonies, drag out so many villainies, cause so much destruction, produce so much corruption and consequently so many evils in the Church. Satan carries Jesus Christ to the cliffs and pinnacles of the Temple to make him fall. Ambition is this Satan that hoists souls on the cliffs, I say to the Bishops and dignitaries of the Church, to push them down into misery... O Agrippina do not represent yourself naively as the overly ambitious soul, not fearing of damning itself.

---


Avarice and ambition are the elements and beginnings of all vices. It is especially true of ambition: it dragged out the first corruption of the world, it made the Angels fall; it has ruined men, profaned heaven, it pillaged the earthly paradise immediately after creation. And what can be said of avarice? It hanged Judas, it led to loss of the rich man’s soul. Without doubt there is nothing so dangerous among republics, but above all nothing more perilous in the Church. Pierre de Besse. *Premiers Conceptions Theologiques sur le Caresme.* (Paris, 1602), 148


67 Ce sont ces deux pestes qui enfentent tant de simonies, traînent tant de vilenies, qui causent tant destruction, produisent tant de corruption, et partant tant de malheures en l’Eglise. Satan porter Jesus Christ sur les clochers et penacles du temple pour le faire precipter. L’ambition est ce Satan que guide les âmes sur les clochers, je dis aux Evechez, et dignitez Ecclésiastiques, pour delà les precipter miserables... O [Agrippina] ne nous represente-toi pas naivement l’âme trop ambitieuse, qui n’appregende point de se damner. De Besse, *Premiers Conceptions*, 149.
A few important insights arise from this quote. First of all, this passage demonstrates de Besse’s concern that the Gallican church had not gone far enough in its reforms even after the Council of Trent. Throughout his sermons given during the Lent cycle, de Besse often criticizes the prelates for failing to correct the abuses of simony which he claimed were still rampart among the clergy. Furthermore, Nero’s mother served as a metaphor for the consequences of unbridled ambition. As with other preachers, Nero figures prominently within the sermon and devotional literature as the foremost villain in Christian history. As will be seen in the following chapter, the image of Nero often served as the symbol of the tyrannical King, but in this case Nero and his mother, who appears frequently throughout this collection of sermons, came to personify the worst excesses of ambition.

Ambition, personified in the figures of Agrippina and Nero, destroys familial obligation, which strikes at the underpinnings of an ordered society. So blinded by ambition and lust for the Roman Empire, Agrippina willfully ignored the Oracle’s warning of the consequences to her once Nero ascended to the Imperial throne. “You resemble the Imperial Agrippina, mother of Nero, who full of ambition, and living only for the grandeur of her son, consults the Oracles to know if he would succeed to the Empire, the Oracle assured her that he would, but that he would kill his mother. Drunken with ambition, and blinded by vanity she responded “Occidet modo imperet.” Yes, let him redden his hands with maternal blood provided that he wears the crown.”

68 Vous ressemblez à ceste Imperatrice Agrippina mère de Neron laquelle pleine d’ambition, et ne respirant que la grandeur de son fils, consulter les Oracles pour savoir s’il parviendront a l’Empire, l’Oracle l’assurea, mais qu’il tue son mère en son Empire, elle enivrée d’ambition, et aveugle de vanité répondit tout aussitot, Occidet modo imperet, Oui, qu’il face rougir ses mains dans le sang maternel, pourueu qu’il porte des coronnes. De Besse, Premiers Conceptions, 17.
The figure of Nero as both persecuter of the Christian sect and representation of unchecked political ambition was commonplace in seventeenth-century sermon and devotional literature. De Besse’s reference to the Roman Emperor I believe takes on greater significance given that this collection of sermons was dedicated to the Prince of Condé. As the cousin of one of Henri IV’s trusted advisors and a prince of the Blood, Condé expected advancement at court. When his ambitions were frustrated by Henri’s conversion to Catholicism, and more importantly by the regency of Louis XIII, he took up arms against the Queen Mother and her advisors.

In the Dedicatory Epistle, de Besse explains that these sermons were to instruct the young Prince in his duty. While the Dedicatory Epistle is full of the expected flattery, de Besse clearly states what exactly his patron was to learn from these sermons. Condé, as “Premier Prince du Sang,” had the responsibility to govern his people in a manner pleasing to God. De Besse compares Condé to the Israelite king, Josiah. This was more than just flattery. During his reign, Josiah had reformed Jewish worship and had restored proper observance of Mosaic law. Throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, he figured heavily in discourses on the nature of the good King, and de Besse’s injunction to imitate Josiah’s example was a pointed reminder that Condé had the responsibility to help maintain orthodoxy in the Church.

Taken together with the Dedicatory epistle, de Besse’s use of Nero can be seen as more than just a display of his humanist education: it was a warning. After all it was the Condé family that had led the Protestant forces during the Wars of Religion, thus becoming heretical schismatics as well as rebels against the crown. Therefore de Besse’s emphasis on the evils associated with ambition not only served as a caution to his

69 De Besse, Premiers Conceptions, n.p.
congregation, but a pointed reminder to the Prince of the result of unfettered political ambition, which had fuelled the civil wars.

De Besse was not alone in decrying the social disruption caused by ambition.

Etienne Molinier also forcefully attacks ambition and its attendant sins.

You have faith, but if with this faith there is only impurity, iniquity in your hands, evil speaking in your speech, dissolutions in your mouths, lasciviousness in your eyes, envy and grudges in your hearts, avarice in your souls, ambition in your minds, lust in your bodies, luxury in your habits, corruption in all your senses, disorder in your thoughts, desires, words and works. If among you, enmity is without end, thefts and common frauds, frequent adultery, fornication, drunkenness and debaucheries common among you as among the infidels. If simonies, secrets, ambition, avarice, luxury, the multiplication of accusations, and a deplorable negligence of their duties, rule over the Ecclesiastics, injustice over the Justices, contempt of God in the Nobility, the embezzlement of Finances, prostitutions, the disordering of order. If the sermons only serve to please the ear and curiosity, exterior devotion as a cloak of vice, the frequenting of the sacraments to cover abominable crimes. If many among you lead a life of a Sybarite, of a Epicurian under the name of a Christian, carry a pagan soul in baptized body, if among you there is contempt of sacred things and come into the Churches, come in front of the altar, in the house of God, in his presence, before his face in the celebration of his mysteries which the Angels fear. You brought only vain chatter, indecency, lewdness, profanities, sacrilege and testifying of greater irreverence than the Turk.70

70 Vous avez la foi, mais si avec cette foi il n’y a qu’impureté en votre vie qu’iniquité en vos mains, que médisance en vos langues, que dissolutions en vos bouches, que lascivité en vos yeux, qu’envie, et rancune en vos coeurs, qu’avarice en vos âmes, qu’ambition en vos esprits, que luxure en vos corps, que luxe en vos habits, que corruption en tous vos sens, que désordre en vos pensees, desirs, paroles et oeuvres; Si parmi vous les inimitiez sont immortelles, les larrecins ordinaires, les fraudes communes, les adulteres frequens, les fornications, les ivrogneries, les debauches en usage comme parmi les infidels; si les simonies, les confidences, l’ambition, l’avarice, la luxe, la multiplication des charges, et une negligence desplorable de leur devoir regnent des Ecclésiastiques, les injustices en la Justice, les mespris de Dieu en la Noblesse, les malversations des Finances, les tromperies au trafic, le dereglement de tous ordres; si les Sermons ne servent plus qu’a pâtre l’oreille, et la curiosité, la devotion exterieure que de manteau au vice, la frequentation des sacremens, qu’a couvrir les crimes abominables: si plusieurs d’entre vous menent une vie de Sybarite, ou d’Epicure sous un nom de Chrestien, et portent une âme Payenne dans un corps baptizé, si parmi vous le mespris des choses sacrees est passé jusques là, que dans les Églises, devant les Autels, en la maison de Dieu, en sa presence, a sa face, en la celebration de ses mysteres qui sont trembler les Anges, vous n’y apportez que babil, impudence, lubricité, profanation, sacrilege, et y témoignez beaucoup plus d’irreverence que ne feroient les Turcs.

Molinier is speaking to an important facet in seventeenth-century discussion of ambition. Like de Besse, he too sees ambition as one of the primary factors in the disruption of the political order. But for Molinier, ambition was also more than just the cause of political and social discord, it threatened one's soul. Here Molinier is picking up on the theme that ran through seventeenth-century French spirituality, that of the need of the interior being to affect the behaviour of the exterior being.

For Molinier it is not enough to claim to have faith. Christian faith must lead to corresponding behaviour. The truly devout avoided vulgar language and lying. True devotion would remove ambition and avarice from the soul. Molinier, and others, were not concerned with obtuse allegorical interpretation of sin and devotion. For them it was of the utmost importance to discuss sin in a more pragmatic way. The examples from the preceding list were specifically cited for their propensity to cause social disorder.

Preaching nearly thirty years after de Besse, it is not surprising that Molinier touches on many of the same themes. After all, the clergy, despite their failings (at least as de Sales, de Besse, Molinier and others saw it) regarded their responsibility to preach in order to instruct their congregations in true Catholic worship.

For Molinier ambition and avarice in part prevents social justice, and in his attack is not sparing of any segment of French society, which once again centres on the rhetoric of the internalization of devotional behaviour. Without the process of internalization, external actions have no benefit, and in fact makes the devout worse off than a non-Christian, since exterior piety, according to Molinier serves only to cover the impiety of the soul. This irreligion affects ecclesiastics and magistrates who do not dispense proper justice. In a criticism that echoes previous concerns that a preacher not use his position as a preacher as an opportunity to show off his oratorical skills. If a sermon does nothing
more than please the ear of their congregations, then it only serves to cover up the sins that are to be removed through true devotion.

Later in his sermon cycle, Molinier offers suggestions as to how one can avoid the sins of ambition and avarice, and more fully fills out the image of avarice as a social sin in seventeenth-century Catholicism. In his sermon, “Pour le Dimanche de la Quagesime,” Molinier, referring to Jupiter’s trident, allegorizes this image to represent the three main temptations existent in human nature which the devil appealed to most often, “are the three general roots of all the sins in the world, the temptation of voluptuous, the temptation of pride and the temptation of avarice.” Molinier continues, saying that these three temptations are evident in the New Testament as Jesus Christ was tempted by the devil. Even though the devil presented each temptation in the form of gluttony, vain glory and cupidity, Matthew records Jesus Christ’s successful resistance to each of these temptations. Molinier then carries this account further. “Our Saviour who surmounted all three of these combats, gives us the courage to resist [the devil] by his example, and the assurance to vanquish [the devil] through his grace, if we imitate his virtue.” Again, Molinier brings his discussion of avarice to the need of an interior devotion. The only way to defeat the temptations of avarice is through the internal combat, allegorized by Jesus’ temptation by the devil.

This suggests a couple of things. First the conception of avarice was fluid throughout the seventeenth century and could be employed by a preacher to address a specific historical context. De Besse infused his discussion with a political element in

\[71\] qui sont les trois racines generales de tous les pechez du monde, la tentation de la volupté, la tentation de la superbe, et la tentation de l’avarice. Molinier, Dimanches de l’Année, 449.

\[72\] notre Seigneur qui le surmonte en tous ces trois combats, nous donne le courage de lui resister par son exemple, et l’asseurance de le vaincre par sa grace, si nous imitons sa vertu. Molinier, Dimanches de l’Année 449
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order to encourage the Prince of Condé, whose family had fought against the crown during the Wars of Religion with the Protestants. Molinier's discussion of ambition lacks the political element, but rather focuses on the necessity of an interior spirituality to combat this sin, which during the seventeenth century became the foremost deadly sin. This can be explained by noting that when de Besse published his sermons in 1602, the kingdom though in the process of being pacified, was still threatened with civil war from various factions within France.

Even though France would be convulsed through the 1620 and 1630s by Protestant uprisings in the north and at La Rochelle, civil war did not become endemic throughout France. Granted that civil strife was still a potential threat, this was by no means as imminent as it had been at the turn of the century. Thus Molinier and other preachers were able to turn their attention away from the political implications of sin and instead focus on the social impact and the need to first conquer the interior soul, which would in turn lead to social virtue. This demonstrates that the understanding of seventeenth-century French spirituality, given explicit expression by de Sales was common throughout the Gallican church. It also demonstrates that even as the threat of social upheaval subsided, preachers still engaged in the pacification of the laity. This process carried on from efforts as early as the 1590s.

Although the role of ambition and avarice was not as prevalent throughout the sermon literature of de Sales, he too drew the connection between sin and social disorder. The last decades of the sixteenth century had witnessed some of the worst violence of the Wars of Religion, and the conclusion to those wars. It was into this highly charged environment that de Sales was installed by Henri IV as titular Bishop of Geneva in 1593. Prior to his elevation to the Bishopric of Geneva, de Sales worked closely with Henri IV,
and had been instrumental, along with the Cardinal du Perron, in Henri’s abjuration of Protestantism. Thus it is not surprising that de Sales emphasized the need for the proper ordering of French society in connection with the crown’s pacification efforts of the Kingdom. This would have especially relevant with de Sales taking up residence in Savoy, which had predominantly gone over to the Protestants.

But in his efforts to socially discipline his audience, de Sales cites a facet of daily life that his congregation would have been all too familiar with. “My brothers, war is a scourge from God, during which we are chastised, we need to believe that it is for our sins.”

Here de Sales uses the term “war” in two senses. The first is a blunt reference to the recent Wars of Religion. Despite residing in a Protestant stronghold, de Sales forgoes placing the blame squarely on the shoulders of the schismatics, though he will find plenty of opportunity to do so elsewhere. Rather, the wars were a scourge from God resulting from the sins of his fellow Catholics. This idea was certainly not new, as preachers throughout the sixteenth century had argued that the civil wars were punishments sent from God because the crown failed to expel the Protestant heresy from the Kingdom. But it is in this point that de Sales differs from his predecessors, the image of the Protestants as the primary cause of civil discord is absent from de Sales’ considerations. De Sales is specific in stating the origin of the scourge of civil war. The last generation of violence was a direct result of the impenitence of the Catholics. “The fundamental sin that keeps us at war is impenitence.”

73 Mes Frères, la guerre est un fleau de Dieu, et pendant que nous en sommes chastisés, il nous faut croire que c’est pour nos pechés. De Sales, Oeuvres, 7:22.
75 Le peché fondemental qui nous entretient en guerre, c’est l’impenitence. De Sales, Oeuvres, 7: 23.
Furthermore France would forever be troubled by civil strife until Catholics became penitent. "God will never cease to chastise us, until we cease from sinning..." The remedy de Sales proposes is for people to stop blaming others, which would include their Protestant neighbours, but to realize that as individuals, each impenitent is responsible for the state in which they were living.

And this impenitence comes from a certain courtesy that each has towards themselves. Each flatters one's self, each is ready to justify his sinful excuses, each places the cause of our misfortunes on the sins of others, and not our own as we should.77 This then leads de Sales into his discussion of the second sense of the term war as a condition of one's soul. "It is necessary to banish sin from us. We must have peace with God, and we will have peace on earth soon enough."78

De Sales forcefully establishes a discourse of the issues surrounding social disorder. Being impenitent causes more than just internal spiritual conflict, because it is the cause of real wars, made all too apparent throughout the previous thirty years, and threatens to invert the social order. Continuing with this theme de Sales draws a comparison between himself and the biblical prophet Jonah. "I am like a small Jonah, commanded by God to praise him through good conversation."79 This example is relevant because by comparing himself to Jonah, who had the responsibility to preach repentance to Nineveh, de Sales lays claim to the same responsibility. The comparison is not difficult to see, since de Sales had

76 Jamais Dieu ne cesserade nous chastier, jusque a ce que nous cessions de pecher...De Sales, Oeuvres, 7:23.
77 Et ceste impenitence vient d'une certaine courtoisie que chacun a envers soi meme; que chacun se flatte, chacun est pret ad excusandas excusationes in peccatis, chacun rejette la cause de nos maux sur le pech d'autrui, et non sur les siens, comme l'on devroit. De Sales, Oeuvres, 7:23.
78 Il faut bannir le peche de nous; il nous faut faire la paix avec Dieu, et nous aurons bien tost apres la paix en la terre. De Sales, Oeuvres, 7:23.
79 Je suis comme un petit Jonas, commandé de Dieu de le louer par bonne conversation. De Sales, Oeuvres, 7: 25.
been sent to Savoy as part of a proselytizing campaign to win back the Protestants and to ensure the orthodoxy of the Catholic population.

As a new Jonah, de Sales took this duty seriously, in concluding his discussion, he reiterates the theme that social harmony can only come through an interior religiosity based on acceptable social interaction. “Messieurs, I exhort you to friendship and benevolence between you, and peace between all. For if we have charity between us, we will have peace, we will have the Holy Spirit.”

The link between social harmony and interior devotion is forcefully displayed in Richelieu’s *Instruction du Chrestien*. Originally written in 1618, prior to Richelieu’s career as minister under Louis XIII, and establishing himself as one of the most powerful political figures of the day, the *Introduction* provides valuable insights to the Bishop of Luçon’s thinking on matters of spirituality. First, his devotional writings show a man greatly concerned with the state of the souls under his charge. It also shows just how tightly Richelieu connected proper devotion to normative social behaviour. Richelieu dedicates a large portion of his *Introduction* to a discussion of the Decalogue, where each chapter is devoted to a discussion of each of the ten commandments. His discussion of the fifth and seventh commandments is of particular interest. In explaining the proper observance of honouring one’s parents, Richelieu commences by explaining why it is important for children to obey this commandment.

By this word of honour, God commands us to love and respect our fathers and mothers, to obey and support them in their needs. Certainly, that there is no true honour without love, without obedience, without service, then we
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80 Messieurs, je vous exhorte à l’amitié et à la bienveuillance entre vous, et à la paix entre tous; car si nous avions la charité entre nous, nous aurions la paix, nous aurions le Saint Esprit. De Sales, *Oeuvres*, 7: 25.
love whom we truly honour and we obey and we voluntarily serve whom we sincerely love.\textsuperscript{81}

This sincerity, according to Richelieu is based on honouring one’s parents within the internal space of the soul, which would result in the exterior actions of displaying the extent to which a child honours his parents. Richelieu then explains why the penalty of dishonouring one’s parents is so severe. “God commands us to honour our fathers and mothers on pain of death, and not being happy here because it is quite reasonable that he who is an ingrate towards the author of his life cannot happily possess it long.”\textsuperscript{82}

Richelieu further explains that the meaning of the fifth commandment also encompasses position of parents vis à vis their children. While children were commanded to render obedience to their parents, parents in turn were to honour their children. Fathers were not to be brutal to their offspring, but instead love them.

This commandment not only obliges children towards their fathers, it obliges fathers towards their children insofar as love must be reciprocated. God in commanding children to love and honour their parents, has tacitly enjoined parents to love their children, and it is not necessary for more explicit terms, since it is expected that the love fathers have towards their children is so natural, that to oblige them to render it, it was sufficient that this love was written on their hearts only.\textsuperscript{83}

However, parents must be careful, because excessive indulgence of their children’s behaviour could lead their children to sinful actions, if not corrected.

\textsuperscript{81} Par ce mot d’honneur, Dieu nous commande d’aimer et respecter nos pères et nos mères, leur obéir et les secourir en leurs nécessitez. Etans certain que le vrai honneur n’est point sans amour, sans quelque obéissance et quelque service, puis qu’on aime celui qu’on honore vraiment, et qu’on obéir, et sert on volontiers celui qu’on aime avec sincérité. Richelieu, \textit{Instruction}, 202-3.

\textsuperscript{82} Dieu nous commande d’honner nos pères et nos mères sur peine de n’estre pas long-temps sur la terre, et de n’y estre pas heureux parce qu’il est bien raisonnable, que celui qui est ingrat envers l’auteur de sa vie, ne la possede ni longtemps ni herueusement. Richelieu, \textit{Instruction}, 204.

\textsuperscript{83} Ce commandement n’oblige pas seulement les enfans envers les pères, mais en outre les pères envers leurs enfans, en tant que l’amour doit estre reciproque. Ce qui fait que Dieu commandant aux enfans s’aimer et honorer leurs parents, il enjoint tacitement aux pères d’aimer leur enfans, et n’est point besoin qu’il le face en termes expres, attendu que l’amour des pères envers leurs enfans, est si naturel, que pour les obliger a le rendre, la loi qu’ils ont écrite dans leurs coeurs, et sans aucune autre suffisante. Richelieu, \textit{Instruction}, 204-5.
properly, Richelieu then expands the commandment to include all social relations, not just familial ones. He argues that this commandment also enjoins obedience to the prelates, because of their spiritual authority, symbolically making them fathers of their people, whose responsibility it is to lead their people to a more excellent life. This commandment also includes obedience to the magistrates, the marriage relationship, the elderly, artisan masters; essentially all social relations are placed under the rubric of honouring one's parents. Richelieu then describes what happens when this commandment is violated. Not only are parents dishonoured, but the entire social order is threatened.

They also violate this precept by defaming the Ecclesiastics, and condemn their lives, who do not obey the ordinances and constitutions of the Church, who do not respect Kings and Magistrates who hold their authority from God, and do not keep the laws that are made for the good of the Republic. Wives who do not please their husbands in just demands, but reject and despise them and anger them equally contravene this precept. Servants who are not careful in serving their masters, thus neglecting their work, murmuring against them, speaking ill of them, giving them cause for anger, contravene [the proper order]. Fathers who use too much severity towards their children, who beat them without cause, or who they marry off to people they cannot love, who they put in religious orders against their will, certainly contravene this precept. Those who overly indulge their children, who do not reprove or correct them when they do wrong, who give them the opportunity to carry on in vice, who have more concern to amass wealth, than to instruct them in the fear of God, transgress this precept. The nobles who crush their subjects by taxes or cruel and excessive dues, who use too much rigour towards them again contravene this precept. Magistrates who do not reprove and punish those who commit crimes, but to the contrary neglect their responsibilities, giving them license, fail to observe they are obligated by this precept. The same are husbands who abuse their authority given them by God over their wives, that they deprive them of an honest liberty and the necessities of life, and use scornful and outrageous words which are unworthy of conjugal society, or are always absent from wives.

84 Richelieu, Instruction, 212-3.
85 Ceux aussi violent ce precepte qui diffament les Ecclesiastiques, et descrient leurs vies: qui n'obéissent pas aux ordonnances et constitutions de l'Eglise: qui ne reverent pas les Rois et les Magistrats qui ont leur puissance de Dieu, et ne gardent pas les lois qu'ils font pour le bien de la Republique. Les femmes qui ne complaisent pas a leur maris en choses justes, mais les desdaignent, les méprisent et leur donnent subject de fâcherie, contrviennent pareillement à ce precepte.
For his discussion of the seventh commandment, "Thou shalt not kill," Richelieu draws a distinction between justifiable killing which is not a violation of the commandment, and unjustifiable killing. The soldier who, under orders from his captain, kills the enemy in a just war is not guilty of murder, or those who kill in order to defend themselves. To further distinguish his argument, he describes two scenarios.

In the first, a merchant who while on the second floor accidentally drops a stone on a person below and killing him, is not guilty of murder, but in the second case, someone who beats a pregnant woman, causing her to lose the unborn child "is not only guilty of the outrage committed on the person of the woman, but moreover of the death of the infant." This suggests a differentiation between intent and accident. But violation of the injunction against murder is not limited only to actively taking the life of someone. Any form of injustice falls under this heading. "The Judge who condemns the innocent or even the guilty without taking all the required formalities commits a serious breach of this precept."
But of even greater interest is Richelieu’s attack on dueling as a violation of this
commandment. Not only are the participants guilty of this crime, but also the Magistrates
who tolerate dueling in their jurisdictions. “Magistrates, who tolerate detestable duels
before God and before men, who do not punish murders, homicides, and other serious
transgressions of this precept, violate it themselves, their tolerance being esteemed as the
cause of the death of those having malice toward others take life.”

For Richelieu, and indeed almost all Gallican churchmen, dueling was an assault
on the social order. Dueling, as Richelieu posits was a violation of the divine command
against killing. To take the life of another in a private exchange of vengeance, one
“encroaches on the divine prerogative of vengeance, which God has expressly ‘reserved’
for himself.” Even though not all churchmen opposed the duel in principle, the practice
came under increasing pressure, first from the Church and then from the State. While
the duel may have been permitted and even encouraged as a form of royal justice under
the reigns of François I and Henri II, and to a lesser extent Henri III, by the turn of the
seventeenth century, the crown regarded the duel as an affront to the sovereign authority
of the King. As early as 1602, Henri IV began passing edicts banning dueling as a
crime of lèse-majesté.

However, the rhetoric of royal authority did not translate into successfully ending
the practice of private vengeance. One of the problems that the crown and Church faced
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88 Les Magistrats, qui tolerent les duels detestables devant Dieu et devant les hommes, qui ne punissent pas
les meurtres, les homicides, et autres notables transgressions de ce precepte, le violent eux-même, leur
tolerance estant estimee cause de la mort de ceux a qui la malice des autres ooste la vie. Richelieu,
Instruction, 227-8.
89 François Billacois, The Duel: Its Rise and Fall in Early Modern France, trans., ed. Trista Silous. (New
90 Billacois, The Duel, 19.
92 Billacois, The Duel, 100.
93 Billacois, The Duel, 97.
in legislating and preaching against the duel was the ingrained sense of noble honour. Every aspect of the duel, whether it were challenging the opponent, accepting the challenge, winning, and even dying, all revolved around notions of honour which could not permit retreating once the challenge had been issued. As Carroll argues, this was a culture that was not about to relinquish its right to private feuds because of royal edicts or the admonitions of the Church.

As we can see, there were several conflicting currents in the development of a rhetoric of social discipline in the sermon and devotional literature of the seventeenth century. On one hand, there is no question as to the popularity of devotional works. Books of personal piety were the best sellers of their day, and the laity’s appetite for such religious works seemed to be insatiable. Because of the popularity of these private forms of devotion, the authors of these works had to navigate a fine line between the independent nature of seeking a mystical union with God, and remaining within the space of the orthodox institutions and doctrine of the Tridentine Church. And yet, despite the popularity of many forms of religious media, preachers who sought to provide a model of an ordered society for the laity through sermons and devotional exercises often fell short of their goals. Sermon rhetoric which often paralleled the design of royal authority seems to have little immediate impact. Denunciations of gaming, dueling, ambition, and other socially disruptive forms of behaviour were ignored. But what is important to keep in mind is not the relative success of preachers in reforming society. Rather the importance of their effort lies in the extent to which their writings and preaching help define the
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increasingly explicit theory of royal authority, even if the practice of that authority was still sporadic.
Chapter IV
Controversy and Compromise

As the central pillar of Christianity, the Eucharist was fundamental to the identity of Catholics and Protestants. Because one's salvation depended upon the proper observance of communion, any deviation from the prescribed orthodoxy represented the ultimate threat to the individual soul and society at large. Heresy was "a conscious defiance of the moral order willed by God."¹ François I's policy towards the new sect vacillated between benign neglect and repression. In the absence of a coherent strategy to deal with the challenges to Catholicism, the clergy and members of the Parliaments advised taking a hard line. In 1526, the first wave of iconoclasm in Paris angered the King, who led a procession "to expiate la profanation de la Vierge."²

With emotions still running high, the parlementaire Pierre Lizet, in his efforts to influence royal policy, spoke of the Reformers as "this poisonous sect...the source of all these scandals and evils...", and that the only course of action was "to cut off all the branches and toxic fruit...there is no other way than to exterminate and uproot [the evil] from this kingdom, otherwise...it will be beyond control."³ The violence in the wake of the political failure of the January Edict of 1562 was motivated by the image of Protestantism as a contagion within the social body. Thus the violence of the religious wars was seen as the only way to purify France from the pollution of heterodoxy.⁴

Michel de Montaigne's quip that more blood had been shed over the meaning of the word

³ Lizet speech, 8 juin 1526, AN x⁴ 1531, transcribed by Henri Bordier in Bibliotheque de la societe de l'histoire du protestanisme francaise. 487, 1, fols. 308-312, in Roelker, 202.
hoc speaks to the violence engendered by the debate over the nature of the Eucharist.⁵ According to Denis Crouzet, this violence was seen as the only way to purify France from the contagion of heresy.

However, by the 1590s, it became increasingly unacceptable to call for the extermination of the Protestants. This change is evident within the sermon literature dealing with the doctrine of the Eucharist. The rhetoric of my sample of preachers suggests that while on one hand the Edict of Nantes did not effect a reconciliation among the parties, the call for elimination of the Protestant party became one concerning the space of belief and not the space of the state. In other words, these preachers were not interested in the physical removal of the heretic body from the state, but rather their belief system.

So how do we explain this significant shift away from earlier views of the Calvinists as a contagion that had to be physically destroyed? Part of the answer is found in the evolving nature of millennialism within western European thought. Because Christianity anticipates the end of the world, millennialism has always been present within the Christian cosmology. During periods of crisis, the eschatological angst associated with waiting for the end of the world becomes prevalent. When it became obvious that the rupture of Christendom caused by Luther’s break from the Church was not going to heal, it was seen as proof that the Last Judgment had finally arrived.⁶ Given the instability of France in the sixteenth century it is not surprising that this period was “[steeped] in prophecy and astrological prediction, eschatological preaching, and a
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penitential consciousness in preparation for the approaching end of time and the Last
Judgment."

Denis Crouzet argues that the religious wars were a direct result of what he refers
to as "les violences mystiques," based on the millennial train of thought evident in
Parisian city preachers such as Simon Vigor. In sixteenth-century French polemics,
Biblical passages concerning the coming of the anti-Christ preceding the second coming
of Christ, were used to justify political violence. As Claude Dubois maintains, in the
eyearly modern period the anti-Christ was seen to be real and historical, thus making it
possible for the radical city preachers to identify those at the French court as the anti-
Christ because "the most Christian King" had not done enough to destroy the Protestant
heresy. Therefore the religious wars were sent as a punishment from God, leading to
the imminent violent end of the world. This attitude was not confined to the clergy.
Many members of the civic government in the towns of France refused to register edicts
of pacification in direct opposition to the king’s wishes.

Part of the eschatology of the sixteenth century can be blamed on the schism of
Catholic Europe, but more importantly for our purposes, we need to look at the “panic
preachers” use of the Old Testament. The city preachers in sixteenth-century Paris used
the Old Testament predominantly in their sermons and harangues and most especially the
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7 Ann W. Ramsey, Liturgy, Politics, and Salvation: The Catholic League in Paris and the Nature of
Catholic Reform, 1540-1630. (Rochester: University of Rochester Press, 1999), 160.
8 Denis Crouzet, Les Guerriers de Dieu. vol. 2, 75.
9 Claude Dubois, "The Erosion of the Eschatological Myth (1597-1610),” in Phillip Desan, Humanism in
apocalyptic texts, such as the book of Daniel, which they read as literal, as opposed to the medieval tradition of viewing such prophecies as allegorical.\textsuperscript{12}

However, by the close of the sixteenth century, in part due to the work at the Council of Trent, the eschatological angst dissipated in part because there was a return “to the traditional, medieval notion of the Anti-Christ.”\textsuperscript{13} Also during this time preachers moved away from the apocalyptic books of the Old Testament, and focused more on the New Testament, with its emphasis that God could be known personally through private devotion. Thus whereas in Barbara Diefendorf’s study of radical preachers of the 1560-70s viewed God as the vengeful judge of the Old Testament,\textsuperscript{14} preachers of the seventeenth century viewed God as a loving Father and that true devotion “prèsuppose l’armour de Dieu.”\textsuperscript{15} In the tradition of baroque pastoralism, God was love, and true religious devotion came from an understanding of this divine love.

There are a few factors responsible for the change in the nature of religious discourse after the 1580s. One of these factors was the changing nature of French society. Both Crouzet and Diefendorf have correctly seen the role played by the radical preachers within the context of the Catholic League. While the League was a political response to the conciliatory policies of Henri III and Henri IV, many who participated in the League did so as an expression of religious conviction as opposed to political considerations.\textsuperscript{16} But as the power of the League weakened, so too did the power of the Parisian and provincial demagogues. Robin Briggs points out that the execution of the

\textsuperscript{12}Crouzet, \textit{Guerriers de Dieu}, 419; Dubois, “Erosion of Eschatological Myth,” 212.
\textsuperscript{13}Dubois, “Erosion of Eschatological Myth,” 215.
\textsuperscript{15}De Sales, \textit{Introduction}, 14.
"premier president" and two "conseillers" of the Paris "parlement" for collusion with the royalist party permanently weakened the position of the League. The fall of the League marginalized many of the panic preachers as little more than "religious fanatics and political careerists."17 However this chapter will argue that the representation of the religious other, even in their virulent polemics, did not call for the forcible extermination of the Protestant factions.

The hostility towards the extreme Catholic groups does not fully explain the shift in the attitude toward the Calvinists. For one thing, the League clashed with the reassertion of royal authority, which constrained the liberties in which their groups had operated during the chaos of the 1580s-1590s. Preachers throughout this period, though no longer calling for the extermination of the heretics, remained unflinching in their criticisms of Protestant doctrine. It was considered a heresy that was fundamentally a threat to the well being of the state and to the souls of all those who adhered to Reformist doctrines.

Even François de Sales, whose reputation for moderation was well established, could express intolerance towards the Calvinists.18 Arriving in 1594 in the Chablais region, his efforts to convert the Protestants were met with some success.19 Henri IV supported his efforts, and Pope Clement VIII (r. 1592-1605) provided important backing. The pontiff considered de Sales' proselytizing efforts as one element in his wider

ambition of a Catholic alliance to remove the Protestants. In a letter to the Duke of Savoy, Charles-Emmanuel I, de Sales recommended that if the Huguenots did not convert of their own volition

That all his subjects having made profession of the Catholic faith, and taking the oath within two months from the hands of those who will be assigned, or to be expelled from their estates, with the intent to sell their goods. Many, by this way, will avoid banishment from Paradise...; the others, who will be few in number, are those of such quality that Your Highness will win many in losing them, people of whom their affection is already perverted and who follow Huguenotism more as a party than as a religion. The holy effect of the edict that I propose will render still more admirable to all true Catholic religion and greatness of courage of Your Highness, and his gentleness will force all his adversaries to recognize in him clemency, even after all that to propose the instruction of this people.\textsuperscript{21}

De Sales' intolerance is not just directed against the Calvinist religious position. The Huguenots represented a political faction directly challenging the legitimate authority of the Duke of Savoy. Even still, de Sales was not advocating the judicial execution of the Calvinist faction. He was first concerned about their conversion, and if that could not be accomplished, they were to be expelled from the region, although they could dispose of their possessions. The shifting image of the body of the Protestants is summed up in J. Marcel's Preface to his Triomphe de la Foi Catholique (1625), where he maintains that his criticism of the Protestants should not be construed as hatred for them; instead his


\textsuperscript{21} Que tous ses sujets ayent à faire profession de la foi catholique, et en prêter le serment dans deux mois des mains de ceux qui seront députés, ou de vider ses états, avec mission de vendre leurs biens. Plusieurs, par ce moyen, éviteront le bannissement du Paradis ...; les autres, qui seront fort peu en nombre, sont de telle qualité, que Votre Altesse gagnera beaucoup en les perdant, gens desquels l'affection est des-ja pervertie et qui suivent le huguenotisme plus comme un parti que comme une religion. Le saint effet de l'édit que je propose rendre tous-jours plus admirable à tous les vrais Catholiques la religion et grandeur de courage de Vostre Altesse, et la douceur d'icelui forcerà tous ses adversaires d'en reconnoistre la clémence, même après tant de soin qu'ell'a eu de faire proposer les instructions peuple. Au Duc de Savoie, Charles-Emmanuel I. Oct 1601. De Sales, Oeuvres, 12: 78.
only purpose is to refute doctrinal error for the well being of the souls of both Catholics and Protestants.22

The evolving view of the Calvinists within Catholic sermon literature arose out of a set of historical contexts. The impetus for civic harmony came from two directions. The first came from the state, as Henri IV sent royal commissioners throughout the countryside to enforce the articles of the Edict of Nantes. The second came from members of both confessions themselves. Although relations remained strained among Catholic and Protestant neighbours, they recognized that to avoid the violence of the last decades, they would need to reach an accommodation with each other.23 It must be noted that neither the Edict of Nantes nor localized confessional accommodation resolved the tension of religious conflict. These tensions were evident through Henri’s reign, and became highly disruptive in the sporadic violence of the 1620-1630s. The Edict of Nantes, though a powerful statement of the theory of royal authority, fell short of its purpose of bringing an end to religious strife.24 That France did not collapse into widespread religious war, despite the violence of the early decades of Louis XIII’s reign

22 All that I do... is without hate and animosity against du Moulin; nor against those of his Sect. To the contrary, I protest before all the Angels and blessed spirits, that I am ready to shed all my blood for the salvation of the least of these, if and when there will be need. Tout ce que je fais... est sans haine et animosité contre du Moulin, ni contre aucun de ceux de sa Secte. Au contraire je proteste devant tous les Anges et bien heureux esprits, que je suis prêt d’épandre mon sang pour le salut du moindre d’eux, lors et quand il en seroit de besoin.


is a testament to the success of religious accommodation. It is within this context that seventeenth-century preachers operated.

Seventeenth century sermon rhetoric reflects the process of negotiating the new confessional boundaries in the aftermath of the religious wars. Because many of the preachers I am examining were closely connected to the crown, they co-operated with the King’s efforts to pacify the kingdom. This included toleration of the presence of the Huguenot party. To be sure, toleration did not mean the acceptance of the Calvinists. Indeed, even though religious rhetoric no longer called for violence against the Protestants, it still identified them as a religious other, which was to be feared and hated. Thus using the Eucharist as the key rallying point to define and set the boundaries of confessional space, they could “differentiate [themselves] from the other, and impose more orthodox standard beliefs and observance.”

There has always been debate regarding the function and meaning of the Lord’s Supper. The early Church fathers could not agree whether the sacrament was literally Christ’s body and blood, or symbolic of his sacrifice. Matters were not helped by the fact that the New Testament accounts of the Last Supper, written in the common Greek dialect koiné, lacked the connective verb. This rendered Christ’s direction as “This my body.” It would not be until the translation of the Latin Vulgate that the connective verb

---

25 Luria, Sacred Boundaries, xxx.
would be added. This did not resolve the issue, as theologians continued to debate the
definition of "is."  

The debate over the nature of the Eucharist continued to rage throughout the
Middle Ages. The issue posed two core questions: What is Communion? And what is the
nature of Christ's presence in the Eucharist? The first question dealt with concerns over
the efficacy of the communion in the life of the Christian. For example, how did it act as
a vehicle of grace, and what made it a sacred act? The second question addressed the
thorny issue of the physical nature of Christ. If Christ was present in the host, claimed
Berenger of Tours, how could he be simultaneously on the right hand of God the Father?
But if Christ was not present in the Eucharistic tokens, would the act of communion still
be a sacred and penitential act?

By 1215, the issue had come to a head. In order to address it, Pope Innocent III
(r. 1198-1216) called the Fourth Lateran Council to set down the definitive orthodoxy of
the Eucharist. The result was a clear and definitive statement on the nature of Christ's
presence in the Eucharist.

There is indeed one universal church of the faithful, outside of which
nobody at all is saved, in which Jesus Christ is both priest and sacrifice. His
body and blood are truly contained in the sacrament of the altar under the
forms of bread and wine, the bread and wine having been changed in
substance, by God's power, into his body and blood, so that in order to
achieve this mystery of unity we receive from God what he received from
us. Nobody can effect this sacrament except a priest who has been
properly ordained according to the church's keys, which Jesus Christ
himself gave to the apostles and their successors.

Armed with the humanist tool of *ad fontes*, the Reformers turned their attention to the original Biblical texts. The question of what was meant by Christ’s body took on increased poignancy. What was the body the Christ, and how did it effect salvation, were some of the questions that proliferated throughout the sixteenth century.\(^{33}\)

The Lutherans attacked the Eucharist on two main points. They argued in the Augsburg Confession (1530) that there was no scriptural justification in denying the laity the sacrament in both kinds.\(^{34}\) The second argument undermined the function of the Eucharist in the Catholic liturgy. For the Lutherans, Christ’s death on the cross was the only sacrifice for sin. For the Catholics to claim that the Eucharist was part of the process by which sins could be forgiven completely denigrated Jesus’ sacrifice, which had to be repeated each time the priest consecrated the host. In so doing, the Lutherans sought to remove the penitential efficacy of the Sacrament. Without its power to effect forgiveness of sin, communion lost its role in the purification of the soul. The Eucharist for the Lutherans served only to commemorate Christ’s one-time sacrifice for sin.\(^{35}\)

As the Reformation began to take on the shape a national movement in France, it looked to the Swiss reformers for inspiration. Guillaume Farel (1489-1565), who would later invite Calvin to Geneva, “promoted the Zwinglian or sacramentarian doctrine of the Eucharist.”\(^{36}\) Going further than Luther, the Swiss reformers rejected completely the real presence, in favor of a spiritual presence. Attempting to combat the Protestants on their own doctrinal ground, Pope Paul III (r. 1534-1549) called the Council of Trent, ostensibly to heal the rift between Reformers and the Catholics by setting out a doctrinal
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\(^{35}\) Noll, *Confession*, 102-3.

\(^{36}\) Roelker, *One King*, 193.
programme of reform that could answer the criticisms of the Protestants in the hopes of ending the confessional schism.\textsuperscript{37}

The beginnings of the Council of Trent were not auspicious. Not only did the objections within the Catholic Church to Trent suggest that the reform programme would be still born, once Trent began, the Protestant leadership by and large boycotted it. This left the delegates the task of reforming Church policy and doctrine without the input of their most vocal critics.\textsuperscript{38} The end result in regards to the debate on the nature of the Eucharist was a reassertion of the Lateran position on the Eucharist.

First of all, the holy council teaches and openly and plainly professes that after the consecration of bread and wine, our Lord Jesus Christ, true God and true man, is truly, really and substantially contained in the august sacrament of the Holy Eucharist under the appearance of those sensible things. For there is no repugnance in this that our Savior sits always at the right hand of the Father in heaven according to the natural mode of existing, and yet is in many other places sacramentally present to us in His own substance by a manner of existence which, though we can scarcely express in words, yet with our understanding illumined by faith, we can conceive and ought most firmly to believe is possible to God. For thus all our forefathers, as many as were in the true Church of Christ and who treated of this most holy sacrament, have most openly professed that our Redeemer instituted this wonderful sacrament at the last supper, when, after blessing the bread and wine, He testified in clear and definite words that He gives them His own body and His own blood. Since these words, recorded by the holy Evangelists and afterwards repeated by St. Paul, embody that proper and clearest meaning in which they were understood by the Fathers, it is a most contemptible action on the part of some contentious and wicked men to twist them into fictitious and imaginary tropes by which the truth of the flesh and blood of Christ is denied, contrary to the universal sense of the Church, which, as the pillar and ground of truth, recognizing with a mind ever grateful and unforgetting this most excellent favor of Christ, has detested as satanic these untruths devised by impious men.\textsuperscript{39}

\textsuperscript{38} O'Malley, \textit{Trent and all That}, 18.
The sermon literature of the seventeenth century demonstrates the extent of the Council of Trent's success in establishing a standardized orthodoxy, despite reservations over ultramontane interference in the affairs of the Gallican Church. The Eucharist, as the central tenet of Christianity, allowed one to lay claim on the grace of Christ, ensuring the salvation of the soul through the participation of the Sacrement. The Eucharistic ritual whereby Christ was made flesh and blood took on added importance during the early seventeenth century to the point where it replaced other forms of "pious behaviour."  

Not only was the Eucharist the focal point of Catholic worship, it also acted as the ritual by which people could differentiate between orthodox (Catholic) identity and heterodox (Protestant) identity. But as this section will demonstrate, the Eucharist ritual became the litmus test to determine the strength of one's orthodoxy within the space of Catholic belief itself, defining the Protestants as an "other" existing outside the boundaries of Christianity. Thus a discussion of the theological position of the Eucharist in seventeenth-century sermon literature illustrates how the image of the Protestants was represented.

The object of Catholic efforts to define the doctrinal boundaries of heresy and orthodoxy focused, in particular, on Calvin's formulation of Eucharist theology. In his *Short Treatise on the Holy Supper of the Lord Jesus Christ*, Calvin attempted to heal the rift between the Swiss reformers and the Lutherans.  

---

participation of the Eucharist from a physical experience to a spiritual one. Because Christ’s sacrifice was for the expiation of sin, it only needed to be performed once. To suggest that Christ’s real presence was contained in the Eucharist was to maintain the blasphemous notion that Christ’s death on the cross was not enough and that Christ must continually re-enact his sacrifice. Despite the abhorrence at the thought that God could be ingested, Calvin could not free himself from speaking of the symbolic nature of the Eucharist in the gastronomical terminology that was employed in any discussion of the Eucharist. For Calvin, the sacrament represented a spiritual banquet “wherein Christ attests himself to be the life giving bread, upon which our souls feed unto true and blessed immortality.” Calvin then further explains:

First, the signs are bread and wine, which represent for us the invisible food that we receive from the flesh and blood of Christ. For as in baptism, God, regenerating us, engrafts us into the society of his church and makes us his own by adoption, so we have said, that he discharges the function of a provident householder in continually supplying to us the food to sustain and preserve us in that life into which he has begotten us by his Word. Now Christ is the only food of our soul, and therefore our Heavenly Father invites us to Christ, that, refreshed by partaking of him, we may repeatedly gather strength until we shall have reached heavenly immortality.

As the debate over the nature of the Eucharist coalesced around the issue of Christ’s real presence, Catholic preachers were able to firm up the doctrinal boundaries within the space of orthodox belief. One of the results of this delineation of these boundaries was the acceptance that the Protestants were now a de facto permanent party in France. The extermination of the Protestants was no longer seen as a practical, or for that matter, a desirable course of action. The move away from expressions of popular
violence to a more measured tone among Catholic polemics is evident in the shape the
debate over the Eucharist took at the end of the sixteenth century.

Disputes between Catholicism and the various forms of Protestantism had a long
history, but there are significant differences in the controversies of de Sales from those in
the past which demonstrate the shape of the new world of French preaching. One such
difference is seen in the discourse of conversion. Catholic preachers appealed to the
Apostles and early saints to justify the legitimacy of the Catholic Church as opposed to
the novelty of the Protestants.

Claims of legitimacy were highly important. To be seen as the legitimate
expression of Christianity was to accept the fact that the Church had not deviated from its
original source. The Catholic Church claimed its legitimacy as the continuation of
Christ’s original Church. The Protestants argued that their legitimacy came precisely
because they had removed themselves from the Catholic Church; that they were, in fact,
returning to the original form of Christianity found in the New Testament. In these
claims of legitimacy, the figure of St. Peter took on a heightened importance.

Peter became the focal point of the debate in the later half of the sixteenth and
early part of the seventeenth century. To counter Catholicism’s claim to a direct and
unbroken line of authority from Peter, the Protestant reformers, “took great pains to
emphasize Peter’s subordinate position to Christ.”46 Catholics responded to this by
maintaining Peter’s special relationship to Christ. They argued Christ’s statement that;
“Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church” (Matthew 16.18) justified the
papal claim of authority. The English Catholic polemist Richard Bristow, in response to

46Karen Bruhn, “Reforming St Peter: Protestant Construction of St Peter the Apostle in Early Modern
Protestant criticisms wrote: “And so we do not invoke Arius, nor Hus, nor Luther, nor Calvin nor any other false named Saints or Heretics, but after God invoke Christ the man our Lord, and his most glorious mother Our Lade, and Saint Peter, Saint Paule, with the rest of the Catholicke Saints.”\(^{47}\)

Writing twenty years later, de Sales employed the same method, albeit there is very little in the way of polemic or scathing attacks on his opponents. Rather his arguments read as a very well reasoned and well thought out position. After establishing that one of the signs of the true Church is its unity and that only one person at a time can lead it, de Sales strikes at the proliferation of Protestant sects: “Our Lord, leaving this world, to leave his Church in complete unity, left one single governor and lieutenant general, to whom we have recourse to in all necessities.”\(^{48}\) De Sales further explains why Peter was given the keys of the Kingdom.

Our Saviour, departing corporally his Church left a lieutenant and visible vicar general and that was Saint Peter, thus it could be visible... You say to me, but our Lord is not dead, and bound with the Church, he is still with his Church, why therefore did he leave you a vicar? I respond, that not being dead, there is no successor, just a vicar, and moreover, he truly assists his Church in all and by all through his invisible favour, but in order not to make a visible body without a visible head, he still wished to assist it in the person of a visible lieutenant through the way of which, apart from the invisible favours, he perpetually administers his Church in manner and form suitable to the sweetness of his disposition.\(^{49}\)


\(^{48}\)Notre Seigneur partant de ce monde, afin de laisser unie toute son Église, il laissa un seul gouverneur et lieutenant general, auquel on doit avoir recours en toutes nécessités. De Sales, *Oeuvres*, 1: 86-7.

\(^{49}\)Notre Seigneur abandonnant son Église quand à son estre corporel et visible, il laissa un lieutenant et vicaire general visible, et celui ci c'est saint Pierre, Vous me direz, oui, mais Notre Seigneur n'est pas mort, et d'abondant il est toujours avec son Église, pourquoi donc lui bailles vous un vicaire? Je vous resons que n'étant pas mort il n'a point de successeur, mais seulement un vicaire, et s'abondant, qu'il assiste vraiment à son Église en tout et par tout de sa faveur invisible, mais, affin de ne faire pas un corps visible sans un chef visible, il lui a encore voulu assister en la personne d'un lieutenant visible, par le moyen duquel, outre les faveurs invisibles, il administre perpetuellement son Église en manière et [forme] convenable à la suavité de sa disposition. De Sales, *Oeuvres*, 1: 88.
The militant imagery in these passages was designed to demonstrate the Catholic Church was in fact the continuation of the organization put in place by Christ. After Christ’s Ascension, Peter was designated as his “lieutenant general” over the body of the Church. Not only was this based on scripture “Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church,” (Matthew 16.18) the Church Fathers attested to this as well. Though Peter and his successors were the temporal guardians of the Church, they served under Christ who had not abandoned his position as head of the Church. The significance was that any schism from the Church represented rebellion against Christ’s authorized servants.

Furthermore, de Sales chose to attack the Protestants on one of the very points that the reformers had accused the Catholics which was the question over the validity of the scriptures. All through his writings, the centrality of the Biblical text is evident. De Sales argues that far from having a proper understanding of God’s word, the Protestants have done more to sow confusion among the various confessional sects.

You do not have the same canon of Scriptures; Luther did not want the Epistle of Saint James that you use. Calvin holds it to be contrary to Scripture that there is one head of the Church; the English hold a contrary opinion. French Huguenots maintain that according to the word of God, priests are not lesser than the Bishops; the English have Bishops who command the priests, and between them themselves, two Archbishops, thus the one is called the Primate, a name on which Calvin wishes so great an evil.50

Whereas the Protestant were divided among themselves, the “Catholic Church has only one language to speak throughout all the world.”51 Even in his personal correspondence,

50 Vous n’avez pas une même canon des Écritures; Luther n’y veut pas l’Epistre de saint Jaques, que vous recevez. Calvin tient estre contraire à l’Écriture qu’il [y] aye un chef en l’Église: les Anglois tiennent le contraire. Les Huguenots français tiennent que selon la Parole de Dieu les prêtres ne sont pas moindres que les Évêques; les Anglois ont des Évêques qui commandent aux prêtres, et entre eux, deux Archévêques, dont l’un est appelé Primat, nom auquel Calvin veut si grand mal. De Sales, Œuvres, 1: 95.
51 Église Catholique n’a qu’un langage un même parler par toute la terre. De Sales, Œuvres, 1: 94.
the integral position of scripture is emphasized. In a politely worded letter to an anonymous Calvinist, de Sales contended that an examination of the Church Fathers and the scriptural text proved that the Catholic Church had still preserved the essential doctrine of the Primitive Church.\footnote{A un Calviniste, Mai 1604. De Sales, \textit{Oeuvres}, 12: 274-5.}

What is striking about these arguments is not their originality—de Sales here is simply continuing many of the same arguments that had been put forward since the beginning of the Reformation—rather it is the way that he relates to the Protestants. For one thing, there is greater stress on a reasoned, rational argument opposing Protestant beliefs which suggests that by the seventeenth century most clergy acknowledged the permanence of religious schism. This realization altered the discourse Catholics employed in proselytization efforts. Preachers aimed not only for the hearts of the people, but their minds as well. By focusing on the legitimacy of the Catholic Church as opposed to that of the Protestant sects, preachers like de Sales demonstrated in a logical manner the benefits of staying within the Catholic fold.

Protestants counteracted the Catholic arguments by focusing on the inward spirituality of the laity. It was the Catholic Church that had introduced novelty, as they had moved away from the original doctrines of the early Church, becoming more concerned with outward displays of wealth and glory than with the salvation of the laity.

\begin{quote}
The honours of the world are snares....You value this ceremonial pomp which heightens the appearance of your Religion, but you find among us the truth you have only its shadow. You have chapels for your Saints, and we have souls for God: you have images with which you adorn your material Temples, and us, Christian virtues with which we adorn our spiritual Temples.\footnote{Les honneurs du monde sont des pièges...Vous prisez cette pompe de ceremonies qui rehausse quant à l'apparence votre Religion, mais vous trouverez parmi nous la vérité n'avez que les ombres. Vous avez des chapelles pour vos Saints, & nous des âmes pour Dieu: vous avez des images dont vous parez vos}
\end{quote}
For French Protestants by this time, appealing to Peter was not enough to legitimize one’s position; rather it was the ornamentation of one’s life with Christian virtues that was a sign of legitimate religion. But it is evident from this passage that religious controversies had taken a more moderate tone in contrast to the polemics and massacres of the 1560s-1580s. Instead, as is apparent in Eustache de Saint Paul’s sermon the emphasis is on inward piety seen in the comparison between the outside materials of the Catholic Church versus that of the inward spirituality of the Protestant Temple. In other words, the Church had lost its true religious calling by focusing on the maintenance of religious appearances through the trappings of tangible materials, whereas the Protestants, based on the reading of 1 Corinthians 3.16, maintained that members of Christ’s church were the temple of God, emphasizing inward piety needed for the adoption of Christian virtues.

Although this religious controversy took on a more civil tone during the first decades of the seventeenth century, there continued to be a real sense that the Protestants were heretics and posed a threat to society, but violent means of conversion were no longer seen to be appropriate. This is born out by a letter from de Sales to Antonio Possevino, arguing for the need to have access to Protestant works to better refute their arguments. Though he refers to both Calvin and Beza as “imposteurs et blasphemateurs,” the letter displays a desire for engagement with his Protestant opponents. It is necessary, he argues, to familiarize himself with Calvin’s works so as to better counteract their claims. His aim is not to exterminate the Calvinists, but rather to expose their errors and

prevent their works from falling into the hands of simple people who are more likely to fall into heretical errors. The religious polemics, as abusive as they sound to our ear now, were no longer so inflammatory as to cause wide scale violence.\textsuperscript{54} Indeed de Sales' policy of engagement led him years later as titular bishop of Geneva to meet with Beza frequently for discussions in the hope of effecting a reconciliation.\textsuperscript{55}

Different factors were responsible for the cooling down of the rhetoric between the religious camps. The changing social climate of France caused by the ascension of Henri IV curtailed much of the hostility between the religious camps, as he undertook a concerted effort to establish royal authority throughout the kingdom. After nearly three decades of civil war, the royal party's paramount concern was in establishing the power of the crown over all rebellious segments of society. This applied to the nobles who, under the guise of religious conviction, attempted to gain power at the expense of the royal court, or over the Gallican Church which had provided much of the impetus to religious violence that the protagonists easily associated with subversive political violence. This interest in promoting social order was incorporated into the rhetoric of seventeenth-century preachers. It would not be fair to say that the Church became the creature of the crown, or that the Bourbon dynasty actively sought to weaken the position of the Catholic Church. But as the centralized authority of the crown was established, religious schism that threatened the social order would not be tolerated.

Unlike the "panic preachers," who attacked the social elites,\textsuperscript{56} de Sales worked hard to encompass the social elites into his reformist programme. The irenic tone that became commonplace during the seventeenth century appealed to the nascent

\textsuperscript{56}Diefendorf, \textit{Beneath the Cross}, 157.
bourgeois. The newly rising middling sort was more likely to seek a less extremist expression of religious discourse. This reflects new trends in French political and philosophical thought, which were also found in the sermon literature of the early Bourbons.

The shift away from violent polemics is not only apparent within the discourse of proselytization of the early seventeenth century, it is also found in the doctrinal debates between Catholic and Protestant factions. As the fundamental element in the Christian framework, the nature of the Eucharist served as the flashpoint for much of the religiously informed violence during the sixteenth century. Natalie Davis' study on the rites of violence during the Wars of Religion argued that violence against one's confessional opponent imitated rites of worship, with the celebration of the Eucharist as one of the most common events that would touch off a wave of religiously motivated violence. As much of the active violence of the religious wars subsided, the period of the 1590s witnessed a change in the way the doctrinal discourse over the nature of the Eucharist was carried out.

The discourse of the Eucharist revolved around two purposes. The first was to define the meaning of the Eucharist within the context of Catholic orthodoxy after the Council of Trent. The second purpose of the Eucharistic discourse was to reinforce the confessional distinctions between Catholics and Protestants. It was hoped that once this divide had been defined the Protestants could then be brought back into the bosom of the Universal Church.

57 Phillips, Church and Culture, 17.
The Cardinal du Perron wrote several works on the Eucharist as part of his doctrinal controversies with the Protestants. In 1597, du Perron wrote a *Bref Traité de l'Eucharistie* in order to respond "distinctement à toutes les objections tirées de la même Sainte Escriture, par les adversaires de l'Eglise," as well as for the conversion of the Superintendent of Finance, Monsieur de Sancy.  

Throughout this tract, du Perron downplays the errors of the Protestant party, focusing instead on the theological and historical precedents justifying the real presence within the Eucharistic elements. The Cardinal's criticisms of the Protestants rest on the charge that they have not properly understood the scriptural text, either through unintentional ignorance, "that their profession of faith is manifestly feint and false, and is contrary to their intention," or through malicious intent.  

What becomes evident from an examination of the literature regarding Catholics' use of the Eucharist to define the Protestant party in France is how the confessional divide had solidified around identifiable boundaries, and how they could negotiate the acceptance of the Protestant body within a Catholic state. This is in part evident in the sermon literature of the Toulousian preacher Etienne Molinier. The sermons contained in *Le Banquet Sacrée de l'Eucharistie* provide fascinating insights as to how the Protestants were represented among Catholics and how the Eucharist defined the space of orthodoxy within Catholicism itself. For Molinier, the sermons served a two-fold purpose; he first attacked the Protestants' claim that the Eucharist was only a memorial of Christ's sacrifice as heretical. Secondly, by discussing the marvels of the

---


Eucharist, Molinier’s congregation would come to a better understanding of what precisely the orthodox doctrine of the Eucharist was.\textsuperscript{63}

This suggests a couple of things. First, that relevance of the controversy over the Eucharist still was a central point in the conflict between the Catholics and Protestants. There is no question that Molinier was critical of the Protestant heresy and desired to see an end to the schism and took great pains to demonstrate how the Protestants had erred doctrinally. Molinier’s criticism of the Protestant position on the Eucharist is at times quite virulent and intolerant. Because the Eucharist represented the central pillar in the economy of salvation, there can be no compromise on the very ritual that acts as the salvatory medium between layperson and God. Despite all the evidence that pointed to the reality of Christ’s presence, the Catholic Church had been under assault from “Hell and from the heretics since the time of the Apostles until our day.”\textsuperscript{64} The first assaults on the Eucharist began under the Capharnite heresy.\textsuperscript{65} To combat properly the heresies that challenged the real presence, the good Catholic had to properly understand the meaning of the Eucharist as the central pillar in the economy of salvation. Once the good Catholic understood the nature of the Eucharist, then it would not matter, “If the enemies of the

\textsuperscript{63} Some others have stopped everything to fight the Heretics, and defended the reality against their signs and images. But here I have tried hard to gather all in one, and to confirm the truth of the mystery, and show its grandeur, and declare its fruits, and destroy error, to reassure faith and excite reverence and inflame devotion... and to explain to you my design in a word I exhibit to you an assorted Banquet of all the parts which can contribute to its magnificence, or to its fame, here you have before you hors d’oeuvres, three course, three services and desert. The hors d’oeuvres are the figures in the state of innocence, in the law of nature, and in the written law as the prelude of the great mystery.

Quelques autres se sont arrestez du tout à combattre contre les Herétiques, et defendre la realite contre leurs signes, ou images. Mais ici je me suis efforce de ramasser tout en un, et ce qui confirme la verité du mystere, & ce qui montre sa grandeur, & ce qui declare ses fruits, et ce qui destruit l'erreur, et ce qui asseure la foi, et ce qui excite la reverence, et ce qui enflamme la devotion...Et pour t'expliquer mon dessein en un mot, je t'exhibe un Banquet assorti de toutes les parties, qui peuvent contribuer à sa magnificence, ou à sa celebrité, ou tu as les avant-mets, trois services, et le desert. Les avant-mets sont les figures qui en l'état d'innocence, en la loi de nature, et en la loi ecrite ont este comme le prelude de ce grand mystere.


\textsuperscript{64} l'Enfer, et des herétiques depuis le temps des Apostres jusques nôtre. Molinier, \textit{Banquet Sacrée}, 163.

\textsuperscript{65} Molinier, \textit{Banquet Sacrée}, 184.
Church seem powerful and numerous, and have the strength to assault and attack its truths and its mysteries,\textsuperscript{66} because:

The Church is still stronger, and better armed to sustain and defend its truths, and the offensive arms that Hell has put in the hands of our adversaries are not enough...For the providence of God has stocked and replenished [his Church] with impenetrable shields and impregnable ramparts, that when the instruments of Satan's malice attacks [the Church] it is only necessary to turn him back by putting in the front line the Prophets, figures, promises, which since the beginning of the world have marched before in order to confirm all the articles that the Church administers in its conduct and to police its ceremonies.\textsuperscript{67}

But Molinier also provides a more nuanced reading of the relationship between the two confessions. The martial imagery notwithstanding, one is left with the impression that this is a battle that is spiritual and not physical in nature. Indeed, the only way to combat the Protestant heresy is with the metaphysical arms represented by all the historical and ecclesiastical proofs of the reality of Christ's presence and not with actual physical violence. Unlike the sermon rhetoric of the sixteenth century, Molinier speaks of the Protestant as a human being, misguided, and condemned to hell, but the Protestant is not dehumanized, as Natalie Davis noted in her study of the ritualistic violence aimed at purifying the social body.\textsuperscript{68} In Molinier, this aspect of religious purity is absent.

The only result of trying to forcibly excise the Protestants from France had been nearly two generations of civil war and a social and political order that had been seemingly irretrievably shattered. As Henri IV successfully, albeit sporadically, imposed

\textsuperscript{67}L'Eglise est bien encore plus forte, et mieux armee pour les soustenir et les defendre, et les armes offensives que l'Enfer a mis des mains de ses adversaires, ne sont pas de la bonté...Car la providence de Dieu l'a garnie, et remparée de tant de preservatives, boucliers impenetrables, et boulevarts inexpugnables, que quand les instruments de la malice de Satan l'ont attaquée, il ne lui a falu pour rabbatre les coups que proposer, et mettre en avant, en premier lieu les Propheties, figures, promesses, qui depuis le commencement du monde ont marché devant pour confirmation de tous les articles qu'elle administre, de toute la conduite et police de ses ceremonies. Molinier, \textit{Banquet Sacré}, 163-4.
\textsuperscript{68}Davis, \textit{Society and Culture}, 180.
the authority of the crown throughout the kingdom, he had little patience for any factions that threatened this fragile order through religious conflicts. Thus Molinier’s sermons represent this interest in maintaining the prerogatives of royal authority. By focusing the attacks on the beliefs and not on the body of the Protestants, Catholic preachers sought to remove the Protestant heresy, not by the removal of the body, but of the belief.

As has been amply demonstrated by historians of this period, toleration did not mean acceptance, nor did it suggest that the Protestant presence would be tolerated to exist perpetually. The Protestants were still a threat to the faithful through false teachings, which had to be addressed through the preaching efforts of the clergy to the Catholic population. While Catholic preachers were interested in removing the Protestant presence from France, the language of the sermon literature lacked the incendiary rhetoric that would incite mob behaviour and popular movements against their Protestant neighbours as was the case in the sixteenth century.

This also illustrates the Biblical texts’ role in the construction of seventeenth-century Catholicism. Luther in conjunction with the humanists had challenged the authority of Roman doctrines as lacking basis in the original textual record. For Luther and other Protestant leaders right up to Calvin, the Roman Church had been corrupted by non-Biblical traditions. For the Protestants, *sola scriptura* was the hallmark of the validity of any Christian doctrine. However, as is evident in the debate over the nature of the Eucharist, Catholic preachers and theologians would use the tool of *sola scriptura* to great effect against their Protestant opponents. The Eucharist controversy also demonstrates how the preachers were interested in ensuring that a standardized understanding of Catholic doctrine was transmitted to the laity, which was part of the
process of socially disciplining the French population as the Church acted increasingly as an agent of royal authority.

The sticking point for Molinier was the question of the real presence of Christ’s body. This is of course not surprising since the entire question of the Eucharist rests on whether or not the bread and wine are transformed into the actual body and blood of Christ. Molinier quite clearly states that to suggest the elements of the Eucharist are only symbols is a novelty which has no basis in the scriptural text. The actuality of the real presence was prefigured long before the Last Supper according to the Old Testament.

God in the Old Testament gave to men through his servant Moses the bread of proposition, the bread of the first fruits, the Paschal Lamb, the blood of the covenant, the Manna sent by the hands of the Angels, images and figure of the body and blood of his Son Jesus Christ, he also wished to give us the law of grace.  

In this regard, the Calvinists were in agreement with their Catholic counterparts. Both confessions agreed that the mystery of the salutary power of Christ’s sacrifice was too great for humanity to be even partially comprehended. Catholics and Calvinists also agreed that because the mystery of Christ’s sacrifice was too great for human understanding, it had to be explained in the rhetoric of figures and signs. “Since, however, this mystery of Christ’s secret union with the devout is by nature incomprehensible, he shows its figure and image in visible signs best adapted to our small capacity.” But where the Calvinists diverged from the Catholics was in maintaining that even the Eucharistic tokens were themselves only figures and signs of Christ’s sacrifice, “The Innovators say instead of

69 Dieu en l'ancien Testament a donné aux hommes par son serviteur Moïse le pain, de proposition, le pain des premices, l'Aigneau Paschal, le sang de l'alliance, la Manne paitrie par les mains des Anges, images, et figures du corps, & du sang de son Fils Jesus-Christ, qu'il nous vouloit donner en la loi de grace. Molinier, Banquet Sacré, 21.

70 Jean Bertaut, Sermons sur les Principales Festes de l'Année. (Paris, 1613) 300.

71 Calvin, Institutes, vol. II. 1361.
leaving his real blood and his real body, he only left a sign, a figure and a symbol of his
blood. For Catholic preachers this was a theologically unacceptable. Although the denial
of the real presence was a heresy that needed to be eradicated, the Catholics were in part
responsible for its re-emergence in the sixteenth century.

The quibbling of the Scholastic theologians over the nature of transubstantiation had
provided the Calvinists the necessary ammunition with which to attack the Catholic
Eucharist.

They claim to show the contradictions and uncertainties of the
Transubstantiation, because the Scholastics could not agree among themselves,
whether Christ’s body entered the mouth, whether it descended into the
stomach, whether it is in heaven. Then whether it is in the Eucharist, grace is
contained essentially in the sacraments.

With the Council of Trent definitively stating the Catholic position on the real
presence, Catholic preachers throughout the early decades of the seventeenth century were
able to confront the Calvinist challenge directly. Jean Bertaut, in his sermon “Pour le Jour de
l’Autel,” made reference to the seventeenth chapter of Calvin’s *Institutes* to attack the idea
that when worshippers ingest the Eucharist, they do so only in faith.

Calvin and Beza, the one in Book 4 which comes to the alleged Latin
institution in these terms...*Sicut simbola accipiuntur solo ore corporis, ita
corpus Christi solo ore fidei* as symbols taken only by the mouth of the body,
thus the body of Christ is taken only with the mouth of faith.

However, as Bertaut explains, even though faith is a quality inherent to the soul, the
consumption of the Eucharist is accomplished, not through faith alone, but through the

---

72 les Novateurs disent qu’au lieu d’y laisser son vrai sang, et son vrai corps, il n’y a laissé qu’un signe, qu’une
73 Quand il allege, pour montrer les contrarietez & incertitudes de la Transubstantiation, que les Scholastiques ne
s’accordent pas entre-eux, si le corps de Christ entre en la bouche, s’il descend en l’estomach, s’il est au Ciel, lors qu’il
I. 113.
74 Calvin et Beze, l’un au 4. livre que viens d'alléger de l’institution Latine, en ces propres termes... *Sicut
simbola accipiuntur solo ore corporis, ita corpus Christi solo ore fidei*, comme les symboles se prennent de la
seule bouche du corps, ainsi le corps de Christ se prend avec la seule bouche de la Foi. Bertaut, *Principales
Festes*, 301.
physical act of ingestion, which required the physical presence of Christ within the Eucharist tokens.\textsuperscript{75}

For Molinier, the belief that the bread and wine only represent symbolically Christ’s sacrifice would suggest that

God has played with us, and treated us with mockery and like a laughing stock, if having already given us by his servant Moses the images promised to us through Jesus Christ, some other image and some other portrait.\textsuperscript{76}

This idea is an absurdity according to Molinier, since the logical conclusion of such a position is that God had created something—in this case—the prefiguration of Christ’s sacrifice in vain.\textsuperscript{77}

In his second sermon “Pour l’Octave du Saint Sacrament,” Molinier further explains the necessity in accepting the real presence of Christ’s body. After a lengthy discussion of some of the figures of Christ’s sacrifice, such as the selling of Joseph into Egypt and other prophecies, Molinier reiterates that the real presence is the fulfillment of these figures and prophecies. Also the sacrament was instituted by the Church to ensure the proper worship of God.\textsuperscript{78} Whereas the Catholic Church was obedient to Christ’s intention that the real presence be celebrated in the Eucharist, the Protestants were disobedient to the divine will, displaying a profound misunderstanding of the scriptural text. To further provide evidence that the doctrine of the real presence is correct, Molinier refers back to the position of the primitive Church.

\begin{itemize}
\item From the beginning, during the persecutions, living among the infidels, and among enemies, she [the Church] had been slightly hidden in secret
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{75}Bertaut, \textit{Principales Festes}, 306.
\textsuperscript{76}Dieu s’est joué de nous, & nous a traités avec irraison, & mocquerie, si nous ayant déjà donné par son serviteur Moyse les images qui nous promettaient la chose Jesus-Christ qu’une autre image, et qu’un autre pourtrait Molinier, \textit{Banquet Sacrée}, 21-22.
\textsuperscript{77}Molinier, \textit{Banquet Sacrée}, 22.
\textsuperscript{78}Molinier, \textit{Banquet Sacrée}, 58.
and in the shadows of this mystery, and its worship; if the rumour of the adoration that she rendered secretly to Jesus Christ, under the species of the bread and wine came up to the ears of the Pagans, who this occasion called the Christians worshippers of Ceres, and of Bacchus, according to the witness of Saint Augustine, who testifies of the practice of the primitive Church that we imitate in this received worship, not directly under the species of the bread and wine, as thought by the ill informed Pagans.\textsuperscript{79}

This passage touches on a couple of issues. First, it reinforces the antiquity of the belief of the real presence. But more importantly, it serves as an implicit attack on the Protestants. Throughout the sermon literature, Molinier draws comparisons between the Protestants of the seventeenth-century and the pagan and heretical opponents of the primitive Church. Equating the Protestants to the pagans who were “mal informez” as to the nature of Christian worship, Molinier arrived at the same conclusion about the Calvinists. Like the early pagans, the Calvinists were not properly informed as to the proper nature of Christian worship. Second it also demonstrates that the practice was original to the primitive Church, thus proving that as the unbroken continuation of the primitive Church, the Catholic position is in fact the correct position on the doctrine of the Eucharist.

As has been mentioned earlier, the purpose for Molinier’s sermons was two fold. First it was to confound the heresy of the Calvinists and teach Catholics the proper uses of the Eucharist ceremony. According to Molinier, one of the principal reasons for the institution of the Eucharist was to allow humanity to return to God the honour that

\textsuperscript{79} Et quoi que des premiers temps durant les persecutions, vivant parmi les infideles, et parmi les ennemies, elle ait caché tant qu'elle a peu dans le secret et dans les tenebres ce mystere, et son culte; si est-ce que le bruit de l'adoration qu'elle rendoit secretement à Jesus Christ, sous les especes du pain, et du vin eclata jusqu'aux oreilles des Payens, qui pour ceste occasion appellerent les Chrestiens adorateurs de Ceres, et de Bacchus, selon le temoinage de Saint Augustine, Nos propter panem, et calicem, Cererem, et Liberum colere existimant, ce qui temoigne la pratique de l'Eglise primitive que nous imitons en ce culte rendu, non directement aux especes du pain et du vin, comme pensoient les Payens mal informez de notre doctrine. 
Molinier, \textit{Banquet Sacré}, 58.
humanity’s sinfulness from the loss of paradise to the current era had robbed from Him.

In rejecting the real presence in the Eucharist, the Calvinists were not only in error, but were pawns used by the devil in an attempt to continue to rob God of his honour that had commenced at the beginning of the world.

But the Devil... has made his efforts in our era and employed the blindness or malice of the heretics to take from the Church the prize that she has applied every day in order to acquit our obligations and to God by the continual sacrifice which glorifies him. The Innovators injure themselves more in that they do not think the earth, and Heaven, religion, and God want to leave the earth without Altars, and Heaven without honour, and striving to snatch from sacrifice Religion, from God the supreme worship owed to his Divinity. Thus to confound their error, in order to teach our faith, excite our reverence and enflame our devotion towards so sacred a mystery; I desire to propose to you in two sermons the truth, excellence, and the fruits of the sacrifice of the Mass, taking for as our head firstly the light of natural reason, then the authority of the scriptures, the figures, the Prophets, the promises, the institution of the holy Sacrifice, the witness of the Fathers and the practice of the primitive Church. 80

If the Protestants were to get their way, they would remove the need to sacrifice for religious observance. As the sermon progressed, Molinier expanded on the theological impossibility of such a position. As it is, to remove sacrifice is to pervert the worship of God. Within the Christian context it would seem that to deny the worship of God itself be seen as not only heretical, but outright blasphemous. Again, as has been pointed out, Molinier may tolerate the Protestant presence in France, but he does not tolerate the doctrine of the Protestant confession. And yet even though he is quite comfortable to claim that the Calvinists are the

80 Mais le Diable... a fait son effort en notre siècle, et employé l’aveuglement, ou malice des heretiques, pour oster à l’Eglise ce prix qu’elle appliquè tous les jours pour l’acquit de nos obligations, et à Dieu ce sacrifice continuil qui le glorifie. En quoi les Novateurs sont plus d’injure qu’ils ne pensent à la terre, et au Ciel, à la religion, et à Dieu, voulant laisser la terre sans Autels, et le Ciel sans honneur, et s’efforçant de ravir à la Religion le sacrifice, à Dieu le culte supreme due à sa Divinité. C’est pourquoi tant pour confondre leur erreur, que pour instruire notre foi, excite notre reverence, et enflammer notre devotion envers en si sacré mystere, je desine de vous proposer en deux Sermons la verité, l’excellence, et les fruits, du sacrifice de la Messe, prenant pour notre conduite premièremènt la lumiere de la raison naturelle, puis l’autorité de l’Ecriture, les figures, les Propheties, les promesses, l’institution de ce S. Sacrifice, le temoinage des anciens Pères, et la pratique de l’Eglise primitive. Molinier, Banquet Sacré, 87.
servants of the devil, his purpose in these sermons is not to incite his congregation to destroy the Protestant population, but rather to refute their position through an appeal to Biblical text and the history of the primitive Church.

The first point Molinier brings up to refute the Protestant position is his claim that the Protestants would do away with sacrifice. To counteract this claim, Molinier engages in what we could call a cultural anthropological approach to the question. He begins his discussion by stating that never in the history of the world had there been a religion that had not required sacrifice. This was because natural law taught all peoples that there must be an exterior sacrifice recognizing the existence of the divine. Citing Plutarch and Tacitus, Molinier continues, regardless of what kind of political system was in place; their religious devotions required some sort of sacrifice. However, Molinier is quick to point out that just recognizing the need alone was not enough. It may be true that natural law instructs all people to ensure the inclusion of sacrifice with religious observance, but natural law had been corrupted once Adam and Eve had been cast out of Paradise. Thus although there was nothing wrong with the building of pagan temples and sacrificing to gods, the problem was, according to Saint Paul, that they were false gods and demons, thereby not worshipping the true God.

In the third sermon, Molinier makes much of the notion of the connection between sacrifice and religion. He compares the nature of Pagan sacrifice to that practiced by those who prefigured the Eucharist.

Cain and Abel, the first two children of Adam, began to recognize and worship the true God, beginning soon to sacrifice to him, the one the fruits of the earth, the other the first born of his flock, here you see that true piety, not superstition, that first invented sacrifice. After the Flood, the true Religion

81 Molinier, Banquet Sacré, 88.
was renewed with the world, sacrifice was renewed at the same time, for Genesis remarks that hardly had Noah left the ark and stepped foot on the earth that he applied his care to build an Altar to God on which he sacrificed one of each of all the birds and all the animals. Here we see how the true Religion, and sacrifice are inseparably joined, and that true Religion was born with the world, sacrifice born with it, and when the world was renewed, sacrifice was renewed together with it. All the just and friends of God who conserved true Religion also continued sacrifice: Abraham, Melchizedek, Job, Isaac, Jacob, and all their descendents until the written law, as it was remarked in the sacred history. Those who lost the true Religion, and were led astray from the knowledge and from the worship of the true God, retained nevertheless sacrifice that they presented to their Idols, each in his own way in all quarters of the earth. Thus the Idolatries of the Pagans took its origins from superstition, but all their sacrifices, except human sacrifice, which the cruel Demons and enemies of men are the authors, have their source in true Religion. Natural reason, and divine inspiration have taught men the true God, the true Religion, and sacrifice, but since the corruption and blindness of Nature caused the evil to stumble into Idolatry, in order to consecrate to demons that which needs to be offered to God. The worship of the true God firstly had invented sacrifice, but the subsequent Idolatries had perverted its usage.82

While there is a great amount of allegorical interpretation within his sermon literature,

Molinier cites the various Biblical exempla as historical truths and as evidence that sacrifice always accompanies religion. The actual act of sacrifice is more than a demonstration of Molinier’s keen interest in historical source material. By appealing to the antiquity of the

82 Cain et Abel, les deux premiers enfants d’Adam, commencent de reconnoistre et adorer le vrai Dieu, commencèrent aussi tot de lui sacrifier, celui-là des fruits de la terre, celui-ci des premiers nais de son troupeau, d’où vous voyez que c’est la vraie piété qui à premierement inventé le sacrifice, non pas la superstition. Après le Deluge la vraie Religion se renouvelant avec le monde, le sacrifice en meme temps se renouvella; car la Genèse remarque qu’a peine Noé sortant de l’Arche eut mis le pied sur la terre, qu’aussi tot il appliqua son soin a dresser un Autel à Dieu, sur lequel il sacrifia de tous les oiseaux, et de tous les animaux: d’où nous voyons combien la vraie Religion, et le sacrifice sont joints inseparablement; puis que la vraie Religion naissent avec le monde, le sacrifice naquit avec elle, et se renouvellement du monde, le sacrifice tout ensemble se renouvela. Tous les justes, et amis de Dieu qui conservèrent depuis la vraie Religion, continuèrent aussi le sacrifice; un Abraham, un Melchisedech, un Job, un Isaac, un Jacob, et tous leurs descendans, jusqu’a la Loi écrite, comme is aisé de remarquer en la suite de l’Histoire sacrée. Ceux qui perdirent la vraie Religion, et se souvoyèrent de la connoissance, et du culte du vrai Dieu, retinrent neanmoins le sacrifice qu’ils présentaient aux Idoles chacun à sa façon par tous les endroits de la terre. Ainsi l’Idolatrie des Payens print son origine de la superstition, mais tous leurs sacrifices, exceptez ceux des corps humains, dont les Demons cruels, et ennemis des hommes firent les auteurs, avoient leur source en la vraie Religion. La raison naturelle, et l’inspiration divine avoit enseigné premierement aux hommes les vrai Dieu, la vraie Religion, et le sacrifice; mais depuis la corruption, et l’aveuglement de la Nature, fist tresbucher les meschans dans l’Idolatrie, pour consacrer aux Demons ce qu’il ne falloit offrir qu’a Dieu; si bien que le culte du vrai Dieu a premierement inventé le sacrifice, mais en suite l’Idolatrie en a perverti l’usage. Molinier, Banquet Sacré, 90-2.
prefiguration of the Eucharist, Molinier continues to draw the distinction between the Catholics and Protestants. Within the context of Catholicism, the validity of the real presence is based precisely on the claim that since the creation of the world, true religion required a physical sacrifice. The Protestants on the other hand, were not correct in their claim that the Eucharist is only symbolic, or in the words of Molinier a "figure of a figure," there was no historical basis for such a position. Given this, it is interesting to note the measured tone of the attacks. During the sixteenth century, the charge of introducing novelty could be a death sentence for anyone unfortunate enough to be perceived as a heretic. The language in these sermons is not that of the panic preachers. Even with so central a doctrine as the Eucharist, it is evident that Catholic preachers accepted the existence of a Protestant population. But these preachers made efforts to avoid inciting violent behaviour that would prove difficult to control. In fact, even as abusive as Molinier could be in his sermons in regards to his opponents, he taught that the Protestant heresy was something that could be overcome through proper instruction.

I speak thus to this cursed heresiarch, and to all his supporting Ministers: but to you...who are enveloped by him, not through your malice, but through your weakness, I pray for you and supplicate for you with the bowels of Christian charity...and invite you by the desire that you must have for your own salvation, I urge you and press you in the name of Jesus Christ our common master, and if you wish, for it is up to you, our common meat of the Sacrament and our common sacrifice of the Altar. I plead with you, and urge you by his love, and by his mercy; open a little your eyes to consider if you hold to the correct path. Weigh well, without the spirit of contradiction, all these cited reasons. After that from the depths of my heart I say a prayer to God, that he will give you grace of recognition and come out of the shadows...To have been there without thought, engaged by ignorance, excuses you in part, and brings upon you the mercy of God, as the Apostle himself said after his conversion, but to remain in error through obstinacy after instructions and illumination, leaves you without excuse.83

83 Je parle ainsi à ce mal-heureux heresiarche, et à tous les Ministres ses supportes: mais à vous...qui estes enveloppez en son egalemant non par votre malice, mais par votre malheur; je vous prie, et vous supplie avec les entrailles de la charité Chrestienne... Et vous invite par le desir que vous devez avoir de votre propre salut, je
Molinier also addresses Protestant accusations of the illegitimacy of the real presence through a small yet significant statement. Reemphasizing that even pagans understood the connection between sacrifice and worship, Molinier states that even though their beliefs led to superstitions and not true religion, they had their origins in religion, except those that practiced human sacrifice. This qualification is important. One of the criticisms leveled against the real presence was that if it were true that Christ’s actual presence was contained in the bread and wine, then to eat to the Eucharist was in fact to cannibalize the Son of God. This was a sensitive issue, as the Catholics found it difficult to fully provide a convincing counter argument that the Eucharist was not in fact cannibalism of the divine. Molinier does not address this issue specifically. By stating that only demons and enemies of humanity would demand such a sacrifice, he puts distance between the idea of human sacrifice and the validity of the real presence which is not a form of human sacrifice.

Continuing with his attack on the Calvinist position, Molinier also speaks to an important element of seventeenth-century French devotion; the relationship between the interiority and exteriority of religious practice. The following chapter will discuss in detail the importance of the interiorization of devotion during the reigns of Henri IV and Louis XIII, but Molinier’s discussion merits some attention here.

Vous conjure, et vous pressez au nom de Jesus Christ notre commun maître, et si vous voulez, car il ne tient qu’a vous, notre commune viande au Sacrement, et notre commun holocaust au sacrifice de l’autel, je vous adoure, et vous conjure par son amour, et par sa miséricorde; ouvrez un peu les yeux pour considerer si vous tenez le vrai chemin; Pesez bien, sans esprit de contradiction, toutes ces raisons allegees: Et après cela du plus profond de mon coeur je fait une prières à Dieu, qu’il vous fasse la grace de vous reconnoistre, et sortir des tenebres...D’y avoir esté sans y penser, engagez par ignorance, cela vous excuse en quelque sorte, et attire sur vous la misericorde de Dieu pour vous en retirer, comme l’Apostre disoit de soi-meme après sa conversion...mais d’y preseverer par obstinations après les instruction, et les lumieres, c’est ce qui vous rendoit inexcusables.Molinier, Banquet Sacrée,146-7

To unmask the fallacy of Calvin, Molinier discusses the nature of the Eucharist within the context of the exterior/interior dichotomy of the religious experience. Whereas de Sales, Eustace de Saint Paul, Richelieu and others emphasized the superiority of interior devotion over exterior actions, since a true internalized devotion within the space of the soul would by extension lead to correct behaviour in the exteriority of the world, Molinier puts his emphasis on the external. The Mosaic Law was instrumental to his position. God, Molinier claims, was not content only with the internal sacrifice of the heart or other forms of devotion, such as prayers and good works. The animal sacrifices introduced by Moses were meant in part to remind the people of their dependence on God. “Exterior sacrifice is a true tribute to God.”\(^{85}\) Thus the exterior actions of consecrating the host and then eating it led to the interior change necessary to claim God’s favour. By only focusing on the internal nature of a Eucharist that was only symbolic, the Calvinists would introduce into the world “a new monster, unheard of abomination, a church without religion, a religion without worship, a service without sacrifice.”\(^{86}\) It is not only the Calvinists Molinier singles out for an inappropriate understanding of the Eucharist. Molinier is as strident toward his fellow Catholics. The Eucharist served no purpose if it did not change the interior person. Here Molinier is transmitting the Tridentine position on the Eucharist, which was to restore the solemn nature of communion, also to have the Eucharist serve as a means of disciplining the social body.

There is no question as to the pedagogical nature of these sermons, which served more than just to condemn heterodox doctrines of the Protestant confession. They also served to ensure that heterodoxy was removed from the Catholic congregation by reteaching

---

\(^{85}\) Le sacrifice exterieur est le vrai tribut à Dieu. Molinier, *Banquet Sacrée*, 95.

a standardized conception of Catholic doctrine arising from the Council of Trent. This would suggest that instead of a process of Christianization within Catholicism during the after-math of Trent, there was a prominent strain of Augustinian conservatism that sought to restore Catholic practices to their original form. This explains in part Molinier’s comprehensive inclusion of Biblical and non Biblical historical exempla. This allowed Molinier not only to condemn the novelty of the Calvinist position on the Eucharist, but also to remind his congregation that Catholic practices were valid precisely because they had historical precedent.

The Eucharist also became a tool in the process of social disciplining and at the same time reemphasizing the institutional power of the Church within society.

If you enter the Louvre to offer a present to the King, do you dare stretch out your hand and turn to speak with the valets, and do you not fear...to offend him by irreverence? You come to the Church which is [God’s] throne, you are present at the divine sacrifice of the Mass, which is the tribute and homage to the Church renders to him, your hand joins the hand of the Priest to present him this gift...the prize of souls, the treasure of the soul, the joy of heaven...and however your heart does not follow your embrace, your affection does not accompany your offering of the spirit, adoring from the lips, you offend the soul, to see lips follow ordinarily your heart, your tongue runs after your foolish imagination, you speak, you chatter, you laugh with your companion. Or your companions, troubling the Priests who celebrate, scandalize the people who assist, offending the Angels who are present.87

87 Si tu entrois dans le Louvre pour offrir un present au Roy, ozerois-tu en lui tendant ta main en detourner ta face pour parler avec les valets, & ne craindrois-tu pas...l’offenser par l’irreverence? Tu viens à l’Église qui est son throne, tu es present au divine sacrifice de la Messe, qui est le tribut et l’hommage que l’Église lui rend, ta main se joint à la main du Prestre pour lui presenter un don...le prix des âmes, le thresor de la terre, la joie du ciel...et cependant ton coeur ne suit pas ton estreine, ton affection n’accompagne pas ton offrande de l’esprit, l’adorant des levres tu l’offenses de l’ame, voire levres suivent ordinairement ton coeur, ta langue court après tes folles imaginations, tu parles, tu caquetes, tu ris avec tes compagnions. Ou tes compagnons; troublant les Prêtres qui celebre, scandalisant le peuple qui assisté, offensant les Anges qui sont presens. Molinier, Banquet Sacré, 116-7.
Furthermore if one's behaviour was not in keeping with the solemn nature of the Eucharist, one ran the risk of bringing the Eucharist into disrepute among the heretics. One of the interesting images of the Protestant is found in the fifth sermon of this collection.

Breaking from a tradition of rhetoric that regarded Protestants as a scourge from God to punish the sins of the faithful, Molinier claims that the presence of the Calvinists around Toulouse aided Catholics in understanding their own doctrine. They served to illustrate to Catholics the results of refusing to believe in the real presence. Through the rejection of the real presence, the Calvinists have forced the Catholics to better understand the mystery of the Eucharist. Also, the Calvinist presence around Toulouse was a tangible proof of the validity of Catholic doctrine, since persecution was a sign of the forces of evil seeking to destroy the righteous.

The role the Eucharist played in the relations between the Catholics and the Protestants was central in de Sales' thinking on the Eucharist. De Sales' early sermons on the Eucharist, dating from 1594 to the 1610s, form part of the doctrinal controversy over the nature of Christ's real presence. His first sermon on the subject, "Sur la Transsubstitution et le Sacrifice de la Messe," sets out to answer the two central questions concerning the Eucharist. The first whether or not the Eucharistic tokens were the real body and blood of Christ. If this was in fact the case, then the second question was whether the sacrifice was proper and real. The context of this sermon suggests that it was addressed specifically to the Calvinist population of de Sales' diocese in Savoy. The editor of de Sales' *Oeuvres*, Dom Mackay only included the summary of the sermon in

---

88 Molinier, *Banquet Sacré*, 118.
89 Molinier, *Banquet Sacré*, 165-6.
90 De Sales *Oeuvres*, 7: 223.
this collection, while the entire sermon was included in the Process. Gebenn (II), tome V, which made up the dossier during the canonization process after de Sales’ death. However, even though the Oeuvres Complete only contains the summary of that sermon, there is much evidence from de Sales, as well his close friend, René Favre de la Valbonne whom de Sales had help edit the sermon, that the summary of this sermon, “Sacrifice de la Messe” was in fact preached in its current form at the end of October 1594. While the title of the summary acknowledges that the subject is concerned with the reality of the transubstantiation of the host and wine, the full title included in de Sales’ dossier reveals the larger purpose of this sermon: “A dissertation against the heretics, on the reality of Jesus Christ in the Eucharist.” Indeed, the text of the sermon, ostensibly directed to a Catholic audience, challenged the Calvinist understanding of the Eucharist as only symbolic of Christ’s sacrifice on behalf of humanity, but also aimed to persuade the Calvinists how such an understanding was false, and by extension once a symbolic or figurative Eucharist was discredited, the Calvinists would be willing to return to the bosom of the Universal Church. Like Molinier after him, de Sales is interested in the conversion of the Calvinist population. His sermons do not contain any of the polemical language that would incite within the congregation a violent reaction against their Protestant neighbours. Rather, de Sales acknowledges that it is difficult to fully understand the real presence, thus this sermon is meant to help counter argue the Calvinist position through explaining to his congregation the meaning of the real presence.

91 De Sales, Oeuvres, 7: 223.
92 d’une dissertation contre les hérétiques, de la réalité de Jesus Christ dans l’Eucharistie. De Sales, Oeuvres, 7:223
The sermon begins with an explanation of Christ’s dual nature. The body is at the same time real and physical, and also spiritual evidenced by Christ’s appearance, after the resurrection, to his disciples in a closed room. De Sales then explains that there is a dual nature to spirit as well. The first nature is explained as “spirituellement et reellement.” This is explained through the Pauline explanation of the resurrection, which is the spirit is incorruptible, and will in turn inhabit an incorruptible body.

The second nature de Sales refers to is “spirituellement et intelligement,” which finds its explanation in St Paul’s first epistle to the Corinthians, “And did all eat the same spiritual meat. And did all drink the same spiritual drink; for they drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them: and that Rock was Christ.” (1 Corinthians 10. 3-4). The ancients only ate and drank Christ’s blood and flesh in a spiritual manner, through faith, since Christ had not yet descended from heaven. It was thus impossible for his presence to exist in the sacramental tokens.

After this introduction, de Sales acknowledges to his congregation that this passage could easily be misconstrued.

This being proposed, behold the size of our difficulty; for our adversaries wish to say that we take in the Holy Supper the spiritual body of our Lord, that is to say, by faith, and in apprehension or will or intelligence as when someone says: I always have my spouse in my heart, it is spiritually but not physically. And when the Catholic Church holds that our Lord is received really and spiritually, and that as he entered the room with closed doors, thus he entered into our bodies, but as he entered into the room in the fashion of a spirit, without opening the doors, without being seen or perceived until he was in the midst of the Apostles, thus he enters in us in

---

93 For example: when our Lord entered the room where the Disciples were, the doors were closed, his body entered and passed really in the midst of them; but not naturally, but supernaturally, nevertheless in reality.

Exemple: quand Notre Seigneur entra en la salle où les disciples étoient, les portes fermées, son corps entra et passa reellement au milieu d'eux; mais non pas naturellement mais surnaturellement et spirituellement, neanmoins très reellement. De Sales, Oeuvres, 7: 223.
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the fashion of spirit without taking up space, being neither seen or perceived. 94

The charge that the Eucharist could only serve as sign and figure of the Christ's sacrifice, and not as its substance can be deflected by noting that while Christ's appearance to his disciples was on one hand spiritual, it was in fact Christ's physical body that was present, symbolically representing the presence of Christ in the heart of the devout, through the consumption of the Eucharist. Thus for de Sales, the problem with the Calvinist position is that they have misunderstood the scriptural text. Although the Calvinist misunderstanding of the scriptural text had lead them to a great number of heresies, these could be corrected, and once corrected, they would recognize the error of their ways. This sentiment is further developed throughout the sermon.

The sermon lacks the eloquence that is the hallmark of much of de Sales' writings. This is not to say that the sermon lacks rhetorical power. The structure of the sermon is part of de Sales' rhetorical strategy. Lacking the fiery rhetoric that was employed to emotionally move his congregation, de Sales instead focused on highlighting the academic underpinnings of Eucharist theology. After addressing the initial question at the outset of this sermon, de Sales provides a comprehensive catalogue of New Testament passages defending the validity of the real presence. There is little in the way of interpretation of these passages; they are essentially listed one after another, highlighting the academic nature of this debate. First of all the Biblical quotes are in

94 Ceci étant propose, voici le gros de nôtre difficulté; car nos adversaires veulent dire que nous prenons en la Cène le praetieux Corps de Nôtre Seigneur, spirituel, c'est à dire par foi, et en apprehension ou volonté ou intelligence; comme qui diroit : j'ai toujours mon espoux en mon cœur, l'y auroit spirituellement mais non réellement. Et quand a l'Église Catholique, elle tient que Nôtre Seigneur est receu réellement et spirituellement, et que comme réellement il entra en la salle les portes fermées, ainsi entre il dans nostre corps; mais comme il entra en la salle en façon d'esprit, sans ouverture des portes, sans être veu ni apperceu jusques à tant qu'il fut au milieu des Apostres, ainsi il entre en nous en façon d'esprit sans occuper place, être veu ni apperceu. De Sales, Oeuvres, 7: 224.
Latin. This is not in and of itself unique, as Latin quotations interspersed throughout sermon literature served to demonstrate the scholarly qualifications of the preacher. The Latin *locus classicus* allowed de Sales to challenge the Calvinists on their own intellectual territory of *sola scriptura*. De Sales does not question the validity of non-scriptural traditions as part of the orthodoxy of the Church, but by referring only to the Biblical text, de Sales demonstrated his well established understanding of Tridentine orthodoxy, while striking at the foundations of Calvinist theology. After all, if Calvin and others Reformers were mistaken in their interpretation of the text, they had no scriptural basis for a non substantive presence in the Eucharist.

De Sales further developed these themes in the following year in a sermon on Old Testament precedents of the real presence in the Eucharist. Again, de Sales was not solely preaching to a Catholic congregation. He had the conversion of the Calvinist population very much on his mind. De Sales appealed directly to the Calvinist leadership to give up their heresy. This appeal is couched in rational and tolerant terms.

And you others, Messieurs, who follow the contrary party, I adjure you by your salvation and the blood of the Saviour that you come to hear the reasons of the Catholic Church, in order that you can not say that have been condemned without having heard them. And leave behind all sort of human passion, neither regard the familiarity that you have with one party or another, but only where the scripture, reason and true theology beats[?]. And...declare for the good party. 95
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95 Et vous autres, Messieurs, qui suivez le parti contraire, je vous adjure par votre salut et le sang-du Sauveur, que vous veniez ouir les raisons de l’Église Catholique, afin qu’on ne puisse dire de vous que vous l’avez condamnée sans l’avoir ouye. Et laissez en arrière toute sorte de passion humaine en ceci; ne regardez à la familiarité que vous avez en l’un parti ou en l’autre, mais seulement de l’Ecriture, la raison et la vraie théologie battra. Et...declarer pour le bon parti. De Sales, Oeuvres, 7: 270.
In fact, according to letter written to André Favre after the sermon, de Sales noted the success he had in converting a number of Calvinists back into the Catholic fold.  

Taking for his exordium, 1 Corinthians 10. 16, de Sales notes the differences between the Catholic and Calvinist position on the Eucharist. The initial problem arose when the Calvinists attempted to rely on their own understanding as opposed to the established word of God, to resolve the many doctrinal differences between the two confessions, they

Consist of the principle sticking point between the Catholic Church and those who separated from it. For if one demands what is the bread we break? The separated respond: Not the real Christ, but only a figure of speaking. And the Catholic Church, contrarily, I respond: It is really Christ. And in as much the principal reason that the adversaries pretend to have left the Church lies in this difference, I propose to demonstrate to you as best I can that the reasons of the Church; I will do this with such [order] that your mind will be unable to resist them...

This is the central issue over which the Calvinists had removed themselves from the Universal Church. Appealing to precedents of the real presence in the Old Testament de Sales proves the validity of the Christ's real presence in the sacramental tokens.

First, I will prove by figures and by predictions; Second, by the promise made by our Lord in John 6. 3. By the institution of the Holy Sacrament; Fourth, by other passages, by the antiquity and the miracles and reasons, in all sort of witnesses. Fifthly, I will show that the Sacrament is not only Sacrament, but Sacrifice; sixthly, I will show the suitability, and will respond to the contrary reasons, and will go pursuing according as God will give me the means.

97 consiste le principal point du different qui est entre l’Eglise Catholique et, ceux qui s’en sont separees. Car si on demande: *Panis quern frangimus?* Les separees respondent: Non est, sed figura. Et l’Eglise Catholique, par advis tout contraire, je respond: *Est; Ego enim accept a Domino.* Et pour autant que la principale raison que les adversaires praetendent avoir pour abandonner l’Eglise gist en ce different, je me suis propose de vous montrer le mieux qu’il me sera possible les raisons de l’Eglise; ce que je ferai avec tel ordre que votre esprit ne sera pas beaucoup empesche à les retenir.... De Sales, *Oeuvres*, 7: 269.
98 Car, 1. je le preuveray par les figures et par les praedictions ; 2. par la promesse qu’en a fait Notre Seigneur en saint Jan 6; 3. par l’institution du Saint Sacrement; 4. par des autres passages, par l’antiquité et les miracles et les raisons, et toute sorte de tesmoins. Cinquiesmement, je montrerai que ce Sacrement est
Unlike Molinier, de Sales confines himself to Old Testament precedents. His discussion does not include references to Aristotelian conceptions of natural law, nor does he extensively use historical sources, even though de Sales’ other sermons and devotional literature were highly influenced by historical examples. This is explained by the fact that the 1590s represent de Sales’ early career as titular Bishop, but even later in his career de Sales’ formulation of Eucharist doctrine is not theologically complex. In this brief sermon, de Sales touched on some of the common place defenses of the Eucharist.

The Old Testament, as the shadow of the New Testament, contains all the figures that served as precursors to the Christ’s real presence. Acknowledging that there are thousands of examples of the prefiguration of the Eucharist, de Sales only incorporates a few. The first example is the reference to the Paschal Lamb. Both confessions acknowledge that the Paschal Lamb represents Christ; however where the Calvinists fall into error is over the meaning of the Paschal Lamb. Using language similar to Molinier, de Sales argues that the Pashcal Lamb is more than its signification.  

De Sales returns to this theme in a sermon preached in April of 1596. Again, de Sales takes issue with the premise that Christ is not present in the host and wine. Restating the Catholic doctrine, “And what’s more, faith, hope and charity are glorified by the Eucharist.” Lacking the theological complexity which is evident in the formulations of his contemporaries on either side of the confession divide, de Sales’ thinking on the Eucharist is more concerned about the role of the Eucharist as the centrepiece of one’s devotional programme.

non seulement Sacrement, mais Sacrifice; sixiesmement, je montrerai la convenance, et respondrai aux raisons contraires, et irai poursuyvant selon que Dieu me donnera les moyens. De Sales, Oeuvres, 7: 269.

99 De Sales, Oeuvres, 7: 272.

100 De plus, la foi, l’esperance, la charité et tous les Sacraments sont glorifiés par l'Eucharistie. De Sales, Oeuvres, 7: 288.

174
As seen in the case of Molinier and his contemporaries, de Sales did not simply regard the Eucharist as one element in the doctrinal debates of the seventeenth century, but as the central pillar in the life of the devout. De Sales’ conception of the Eucharist as part of one’s devotional programme is given a fuller treatment in his *Introduction à la Vie Devote*. In part 2 of the *Introduction* de Sales addresses the question of frequent communion. While de Sales expresses some ambivalence towards daily communion, he counsels the devout to receive the communion no less than once a week. De Sales cites the example of the Persian king, Mithridates. This king had been known to have administered small doses of poison to himself to build up immunity against those who would attempt to assassinate him. Not insensitive to the irony, de Sales concludes by noting in his efforts to escape the Romans the poison Mithridates took had no effect due to the immunity he had built up. The purpose of this digression was to emphasize the curative properties of frequent communion. Thus, just as Christ lives forever because of his sacrifice, those that participate in that sacrifice through communion would spiritually live forever.

The frequent participation of communion acts as a preservative of the devout’s heart and provides a defense against the risk of spiritual death.

Therefore whoever turns to it frequently and devoutly so effectively builds up his soul’s health that it is almost impossible for him to be poisoned by evil affection of any kind. We cannot be nourished by this flesh of life and live on the affections of death.... If fruits that are tenderest and most subject to decay, such as cherries, apricots, and strawberries, can be easily preserved for a whole year with sugar or honey, it is no wonder if our hearts, no matter how frail and weak, are preserved from the corruption of sin when sweetened by the incorruptible flesh and blood of the Son of God. Philothea, those Christians who will be damned will stand without any defense when the just Judge shows them their crime in suffering spiritual death. It was easy for them to have kept themselves in life and health by eating his body, which he left them for that purpose. "Wretched men," he
will say, "why did you die when you had the fruit and the meat of life at
your command?"\textsuperscript{101}

Throughout this discussion, de Sales reinforces the mystic nature of the Eucharist,
which is continued through a series of sermons pronounced for the Sisters of the
Visitation between 1613 and 1620. Throughout these sermons de Sales does not make
reference to the theological underpinnings of the Eucharist, nor is he concerned with
using these sermons to attack the Calvinist heresy.

Preaching on 24 December 1613, de Sales again employs the culinary imagery
that he used in his \textit{Introduction}. Referring to the manna which fell from heaven, the
congregation’s attention is drawn to the symbolic nutritive value of this celestial food.
As a sign of God’s compassion towards his children, the manna did more than satisfy
the Israelites’ hunger for bread, it served as a prefiguration of Christ’s sacrifice.

Explaining the mystic nature of the manna de Sales noted that it was composed of three
separate substances; namely flour, honey and oil. These three substances could be
identified with the three mystic substances within the Christ child and which would
achieve full expression in his sacrifice on the Cross. De Sales explains that the flour:

\begin{quote}
Which still occurs in the manna, represents this other part of the very holy
humanity of our Lord, his adorable body, which being milled on the tree
of the Cross, was made into a most precious bread which nourishes us for
eternal life. Oh savoury bread, whoever will worthily eat will live
eternally and can never die an eternal death. Oh this bread has a taste
incomparably delectable to the souls who eat it worthily.\textsuperscript{102}
\end{quote}

The honey in turn;

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{101} De Sales, \textit{Introduction to the Devout Life}, 94-5.
\textsuperscript{102} qui se rencontrait encore en la manne représente cette autre partie de la très sainte humanité de Nôtre
Seigneur, son corps adorable, lequel ayant été moulu sur l'arbre de la Croix, a été fait un pain tres précieux qui
nous nourrit pour la vie éternelle. Ô pain savoureux, quiconque vous mangera dignement vivra éternellement et
ne pourra jamais mourir de la mort éternelle. Ô que ce pain à un goût incomparablement delectable pour les
âmes qui le mangent dignement! Quelle délectation, je vous prie, de se nourrir du pain descendu du ciel, du pain
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Is a heavenly liqueur; for if the bees gather honey from the flowers, they do not pull away the essence of the flowers, however, thus they gather and pick up with their little tongues the honey which descends from heaven with the dew and only during a certain time of the year. In the same way, the divine nature of our Lord came and descended from heaven at the hour of his Incarnation on this beautiful flower of the Holy Virgin....

And finally the oil;

represents the nature of the very holy soul of our Lord. What is this other thing, his blessed soul ‘an oil, a balm, a widely know odour which infinitely consoles the odor of all those who approach it through the consideration of his excellence?....Oh what acts of charity, of profound humility produces in this same instant of this sacred and incomparable union with the eternal Word at the hour of the Incarnation. And for us others, what perfume, what odour, what scent of an incomparable sweetness to incite us to the imitation of its perfections.

The tripartite nature of Christ explained through the allegorical significance of the manna’s three elements is more fully developed in a subsequent sermon, when de Sales returns to this subject in 1620. In the sermon “Pour la Veille de Noel,” the theological underpinnings of the allegorical relationship between the manna and the Eucharist are more fully fleshed out.

Referring to the meaning of the Incarnation, de Sales defined it as the hypostatic union of human nature with the divine, and that in the case of the infant Christ, the union of both the human and divine nature created the unified reality of the holy child. De Sales then drew a more explicit comparison between the incarnation of the
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103 est une liqueur celeste; car si bien les abeilles cueillent le miel de sur les fleurs, elles ne tirent pourtant pas le suc des fleurs, ains cueillent et ramassent avec leur petite bouchette le miel qui descend du del avec la rosee, et seulement en un certain temps de l’annee. De meme, la nature divine de Nôtre Seigneur vint et descendit du Ciel a l’heure meme de son Incarnation sur cette benite fleur de la tres sainte Vierge Nôtre Dame.... De Sales, Oeuvres, 9: 7.

104 représente la nature de la tres sainte âme de Nôtre Seigneur. Qu’est-ce autre chose sa tres benite âme qu’une huile, un baume, une odeur resplendue qui console infiniment l’odorat de tous ceux qui s’en approchent par la consideration de son excellence... O quels actes de parfaite charité, de profonde humiliété ne produisit-elle pas en ce meme instant de cette sacrée et incomparable union qu’elle eut avec le Verbe etemel à l’heure meme de l’Incarnation! Et pour nous autres, quel parfum, quelle odeur, quelle senteur d’une suavité incomparable n’a-t-elle pas ressoud pour nous inciter à la suite et à l’imitation de ses perfections! De Sales, Oeuvres, 9: 7.

105 De Sales, Oeuvres, 9: 449.
Word and the Eucharist. However, there is a difference between the incarnation and the Eucharist, which speak to how de Sales perceived the meaning of the Eucharist. As de Sales explains, "However, between this mystery and that of the Incarnation, there is only this difference, in the Nativity one sees God incarnated in his own person, and in the Eucharist we see him in a form more hidden and in a manner more obscure." The unknowable qualities of the real presence should draw the Christian mind and heart into greater unity with God. Just as the manna from heaven nourished the Israelites in the desert, the Eucharist host nourishes the soul. The mystery of the Eucharist was prefigured in the manna which;

fell during the night as small grains of almonds, they being made in the air by the ministrations of the Angels, as also where, as other believe, that God made it himself without the aid of any other creature, the one and the other opinion can be applied to the mystery of the Incarnation; for in this God had the Angel Gabriel announce this mystery to Our Lady, and the other part the Angels were not those did this admirable work, but only the Holy Trinity, without the assistance of any other creature. 

This sermon illustrates the maturation of de Sales’ thinking on the Eucharist. The reason for Christ’s advent was that without the corporal body, the Divine Majesty would have remained unknown, but since the Divine Majesty wished to be known by his creations, the divine essence was joined with the “cloak of humanity.” Echoing Molinier’s historical interpretation of how God was known to the pagan peoples of antiquity, and yet unrecognized, de Sales claimed that the divinity of God had been
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106 De Sales, Oeuvres, 9: 449.
107 De Sales, Oeuvres, 9: 450.
known, but "was so obscured that he did not merit being called by this name...If therefore Our Lord was not incarnated, he would have remained hidden in the bosom of his eternal Father, and remained unknown to men."\textsuperscript{109}

Three weeks later (17 January 1621) de Sales took up the theme of explaining to the Sisters of the Visitation the meaning of the mystery of not only the Incarnation of Christ, but in a more comprehensive manner, the meaning of the mystery of the Eucharist. He begins by citing the example of the Egyptian depiction of divinity as a serpent eating its tail to represent the eternal nature of the Divine. From this, he discusses the creation of Adam, focusing on the transformation of his flesh from the earth; this physical transformation is then compared to the changing of water into wine at the marriage of Cana, which was to manifest the glory of God. From this, de Sales then argues that it ought not to be difficult to accept that if water can be transformed into wine, then wine can be transformed into blood. Thus the wedding feast at Cana prefigured the Eucharist, which is to transform the corruptness of our humanity into perfection in Christ.\textsuperscript{110}

The Cana marriage imagery is developed even further. The water transformed into wine is recognized as the prefiguration of the salutary effects of the transubstantiation of bread into flesh. Added to this discussion is Mary’s role as intercessor between her son and the penitent. De Sales explains Mary’s statement that there was no more wine for the wedding guests as a plea on behalf of those guests for Christ’s mercy.

\textsuperscript{109} \textit{esta si obscure qu’elle ne meritoit pas d’estre appelee de ce nom...Si donc Notre Seigneur ne se fut incarne, il eut toujours demeure cache dans le sein de son Pere etemel et partant fut reste inconnu des hommes. De Sales, \textit{Oeuvres}, 9: 451-2.}

\textsuperscript{110} \textit{De Sales, \textit{Oeuvres}, 10: 4-6.}
My Lord and my Son, these people here are poor...These good people whom you have invited are going to fall into great ignominy if you do not succour them; but I know that you are all powerful, that you can provide for their needs and prevent them such shame and abjection. What’s more, I do not doubt your charity and mercy; remember the hospitality that you have offered us at this banquet, and grant, please, all that they need.

The allegorical significance of the wedding of Cana within the discourse of the Eucharist would not have been lost on de Sales’ congregation. As Sisters of the Visitation, they had proclaimed themselves brides of Christ, through their vows of chastity. Thus the imagery of the wedding would have been relevant to those attending and in keeping with his interest in the mystic relationship between humanity and God.

The Eucharist is one more element in the process one undergoes to achieve true inner devotion. Because of their disagreement with the centrality of the Eucharist in the process of one’s seeking union with the love of God, the Calvinists represented a particular danger to the faithful. The Calvinist theology of the Eucharist sought to rupture the mystic union between humanity and God.

What made the Calvinists particularly insidious was their use of sophistry to confuse the faithful. De Sales’ sermon “Pour la Fête du Saint Sacrement” sets out to express the sophist errors of the Calvinists. The language of this sermon is more virulent than de Sales’ earlier preaching. He compares the Calvinists to demons who confuse humanity with half truths and sophistry. Quoting Rupert’s Comment in Genesis, the Calvinists are also compared to the serpent that will use even the truth to confuse humanity. “I recall [from our adversaries] a clear exposition of their opinion; it is the custom of the demon to use circumlocutions. Rupert said quite well ‘the serpent is a

— Mon Seigneur et mon Fils, ces gens ici sont pauvres...Ces bonnes gens qui vous ont invité s’en vont tomber en une grande ignominie si vous ne les secourez ; mais je sais que vous estes tout puissant, que vous pour-voirez a leur necessite et empescherez qu’ils ne recoivent une telle honte et abjection. De plus, je ne doute point de votre charité et misericorde; souvenez-vous de l’hospitalite qu’ils nous ont faite de nous convier a leur banquet, et fournissez, s’il vous plait, ce qui leur manque. De Sales, Œuvres, 10: 9.
mocker: his responses are vague, he who allows himself to support him is he who will truly say that the word of God is accomplished."

Continuing with this metaphor, de Sales further draws the connection between the serpent and the Calvinists. The serpent by corrupting paradise sought to be like God, but such a claim was more than misguided, it was outright blasphemy. The Calvinists continued this blasphemy by denying the real presence. It is only the Catholics who truly understand the scriptural text, and because they have not properly understood, the Calvinists have deluded themselves with their own sophistries.

Now it is always through pure sophisms that our adversaries treat this mystery. It is present by faith, by figure, etc: and when you insist on his presence, you recognize that they have positively denied this presence. But for us, here is our faith, the Eucharist contains the body of the Lord, the same which rested on the altar of the Cross. In what manner he resides there, I have nothing to say now.\(^\text{113}\)

The results of this sophistry are best seen in the division among the Protestant sects. While the Catholics have a uniform stand on the real presence, the Protestants had been unable to come to a consensus. Whereas Calvin and Peter Martyr maintained the Eucharist can only function as a memorial, that the transubstantiation of the host and wine into the real presence was a popish superstition.\(^\text{114}\)

As was seen in Molinier’s sermons, de Sales equated Protestant heresies regarding the Eucharist with the heretical groups of the early Christian period. Identifying the Protestant sects with the two thieves crucified beside Christ, de Sales, citing Tertullian,

\(^{112}\) Je reclame [de nos adversaires] un exposé net de leur opinion; c’est la coutume du démon de se servir d’ambages. Rupert dit très bien ‘le serpent est moqueur: ses réponses sont vagues, ce qui lui permet de soutenir qu’il a dit vrai alors même que la parole de Dieu s’est accompli. De Sales, Oeuvres, 7: 289.

\(^{113}\) Or, c’est toujours par de purs sophismes que nos adversaires traitent de ce mystère. Il est présent par la foi, en figure, etc: et pendant que vous insistez sur sa présence, vous vous apercevez qu’ils nient positivement cette présence. Quant à nous, voici notre foi sans détour” l’Eucharistie contient le corps du Seigneur, le même absolument qui reposa sur l’autel de la Croix. De quelle manière il y réside, je n’en dis rien maintenant. De Sales, Oeuvres, 7: 290.

\(^{114}\) De Sales, Oeuvres, 7: 335.
argued that all heretics habitually seek out doctrinal extremes.\footnote{De Sales, \textit{Oeuvres}, 7: 21-22.} The disagreement among the Protestant sects was noticed by other preachers, who also used the inability of the Protestant sects to come to a conclusion on the nature of the Eucharist to great effect. De Sales echoes Jean Bertaut's attack on the Protestant conception of the Eucharist.\footnote{Bertaut, \textit{Principales Festes}, 260.}

The heretics of the sixteenth and seventeenth century, when presented with two seemingly contrary truths are unable to accept both simultaneously. Thus in Eucharist theology, either Christ is in the heavens and therefore not in the bread and wine of the Eucharist, or he is in the host and wine and not in heaven, which is an absurdity. De Sales in contrast argues that the Catholic Church is able to hold two seemingly contradictory truths at the same time, based on both the scriptural text and the traditions of the church which helps clarify those contradictions.\footnote{De Sales, \textit{Oeuvres}, 7: 22-3.} Thus by invalidating the importance of non-scriptural traditions, the Protestants have made it impossible to recognize orthodox doctrine.

In the complex interplay between the confessions, the image of the Protestant party among Catholic preachers shifted away from being seen as a cancer within the social and religious body of France that needed to be cut out literally. With the Edict of Nantes making the Protestant party a de facto permanent presence within the kingdom, Catholic preachers presented to their congregations an image of the Protestants, not as a dangerous cancer in the body politic, but as misguided neighbours, duped by the deliberate efforts of the Protestant leadership. As demonstrated by the sermon literature, Protestant heresy was seen as a threat that required immediate attention, but in order to neutralize this threat the Protestant population needed to be exposed to Catholic
orthodoxy, and once exposed to this orthodoxy, they would naturally return to the Catholic Church. It is to this effect that the rhetoric of seventeenth-century sermon literature lacked the virulent language that had been the hallmark of the sermon of the sixteenth century.

The rehumanization of the Protestant faction is evident in this sermon literature. There is no question that Catholic preachers would not accept the doctrinal innovations of the Protestants, especially in regards to the Eucharist, but they took pains to attack Protestant dogma without inciting their congregations to popular expressions of violence. The evolving relationship between the Catholic and Protestant hierarchies will be discussed in greater detail in the following chapter which will examine the position of the Protestant within France through the Charenton controversy.
Chapter V
“God Reigning Through You, Reigns With You:” The Charenton Controversy

In the last chapter we examined the controversy over the nature of the Eucharist within a theological context. Along with the reaffirmation of the real presence in the Eucharistic emblems, the Council of Trent provided the framework in which Catholic preachers negotiated the boundaries of belief between the Catholic and Protestant confessions. In France, this negotiation was complicated by the Gallican suspicion of Ultramontane influence on Gallican privileges. Despite these reservations, Tridentine Catholicism made major inroads throughout France, in part assisted by Henri IV’s enlisting the newly reintroduced Jesuits as his personal confessors, a policy continued by his son Louis XIII and grandson Louis XIV.¹ The process of negotiating the space of belief between Catholic and Protestant confessions can be traced through the literary controversies that raged during the first half of the seventeenth century. This period witnessed an immense number of publications of controversial literature in the form of pamphlets and books.²

This chapter will examine one of these polemical exchanges between the Protestant ministers located at Charenton and the Catholic faction at the court of Louis XIII. Charenton became a Protestant stronghold after the Edict of Nantes, through the so-called Secret articles, permitted towns already under the control of the Protestants to be

retained. Charenton became a place of refuge since the Edict explicitly stated that Protestants were not allowed to worship within “five Leagues” of Paris (Art. 14). Though now a suburb near Paris, Charenton was the required distance from the capital at the beginning of the seventeenth century. An important work on the role of literary polemics in the negotiation between the religious and political spheres is Jeffery Sawyer’s *Printed Poison* which examines pamphlet production during the period of 1614-1617 arising from the political conflict between the Prince de Condé and Marie de Medici.\(^3\) His aim is to provide a convincing “examination of the concrete purposes and functions of pamphlet literature, which he argues was “fundamental to the political process in France, [in order] to influence the personal policies of royal government.”\(^4\) His examination of the pamphlets published during the first decades of the seventeenth century persuasively demonstrates that these pamphlets “rationalized the use of royal power in more secular and pragmatic terms” while continuing to emphasize “that political obedience was a traditional moral and Christian value.”\(^5\) This chapter argues that the negotiation of the space of belief between the Catholic and Protestant through the literary polemics of the early seventeenth century was part of the political process of establishing royal authority. It will be further argued that as the Catholic and Protestant factions negotiated this space of belief, they both took great pains to reject the monarchomachist rhetoric of the sixteenth century.

This chapter will examine specifically the Charenton controversy which dominated Catholic and Protestant elites around Paris for nearly a decade from 1617-1625. While the Charenton controversy was only one of the many controversies that
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5 Sawyer, *Printed Poison*, 143.
raged throughout the seventeenth century, a close reading of the issues arising from the controversy offers important insights into the evolving relationship between Catholics and Protestants in post Edict of Nantes France. The complexity of the relationship of the Protestant faction within France is in part illustrated by the debate that raged between the ministers of the Protestant temple at Charenton, outside of Paris, and some of the best placed figures of the French church under the reign of Louis XIII.

The controversy was initiated early in 1617 with the publication of an open letter to the Catholic leadership in Paris by Pierre du Moulin, the leader of the Protestant temple at Charenton, a town outside of Paris. The *Lettre à Messieurs de l’Église Romaine*, published at Saumur, provided a brief overview of the main Calvinist doctrines, such as the symbolic nature of the Eucharist, the need for a vernacular Bible, the unsustainable papal claims to supremacy over both the ecclesiastical and secular estates. Although the rhetoric of this pamphlet is non-confrontational, and was written to assist good Christians to recognize the true Christian belief, despite the persecution heaped upon the Protestants for their efforts.\(^6\) The letter elicited a rapid and strong reaction from the confessor to Louis XIII, the Jesuit Jean Arnoux, who in response to du Moulin’s *Lettre* published *Confession de la Foi* in 1617. The *Confession*, ostensibly written to influence Louis XIII’s policy in regards to the Protestant presence, was also part of the wider polemical debate concerning the position of the Protestants in post Edict of Nantes France.

Publishing their polemics, the four ministers of Charenton, Pierre du Moulin, Jean Metstrezat, Samuel Durand and M. Montigni, sought to reach as wide an audience as possible to secure their existence as religious minority. Yet, despite the stridency of the

polemical rhetoric, especially as evident in the Cardinal Richelieu’s response to the Charenton ministers’ *Défense de la Confession de la Foi* in 1617, these tracts were not designed to incite popular violence against their religious opponents. The evident religious hostility between the confessions is contained within the measured rhetoric of an academic debate. The Charenton controversy also demonstrated the increasing authority of the French crown, as each side of the confessional divide demonstrated their loyalty to the court of Louis XIII, rushing to portray Louis as a contemporary Solomon.

This was especially true for the Charenton ministers, who went to great lengths to prove to the King that their doctrinal heterodoxy did not threaten the well being of the realm. This would become a sensitive issue for the Catholic participants, especially their support of the Jesuits in France, since their presence had been problematic. Henri III had welcomed the Jesuits into France as an expression of his intense displays of piety. But when well placed Jesuits, such as Edmond Auger and Claudio Aquaviva, began to interfere in affairs of state, Henri threatened to expel the entire order.⁷

And even though the Jesuits would retain their position as confessors to the King members of the Gallican Church regarded them as a Fifth column which represented a threat to the integrity of the crown. This suspicion seemed to be confirmed by the Jesuit reaction to the Henri IV’s assassination at the hands of Ravaillac.⁸ The hostility towards the Jesuits would remain a sensitive issue for Arnoulx, who as a Jesuit had to negotiate carefully the conflicting claims of Papal authority and the rights of the French crown. The Gallican church’s suspicions also arose from the well founded belief that the Society
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of Jesus represented the vanguard of Ultramontane interests in opposition to the liberties of the Gallican Church.⁹

As we will see in this chapter, the Protestants were able to effectively illuminate the apparent contradiction of professing loyalty to the crown and the papacy at the same time. The controversy also reveals the tensions within the Catholic party over the presence of the Jesuits and papal claims of authority over the temporal estate. Criticisms came from such quarters as the parlementaire, Antoine Arnauld. The Charenton controversy also demonstrates that at least prior to the uprising and submission of the Protestants at the siege of La Rochelle in 1628, the Edict of Nantes quite successfully established a religious co-existence within France. The authority of the crown greatly benefited from this polemical exchange as both confessions regarded the crown as the natural arbiter of religious dispute. The controversy reveals a nascent French nationalism as the Catholics had to negotiate their loyalty to the French throne and the papal see.

The Charenton controversy represented the new reality of post Edict of Nantes France. To be sure, the passions which had influenced the confessional violence during the Wars of Religion did not suddenly dissipate with the publication of the Edict. Megan Armstrong notes the difficulty the crown faced in its attempts to bring into submission the rebellious Catholic factions within the Kingdom, in particular the Faculty of Theology which in 1587 had approved the forcible dethroning of a heretic king. After receiving word of the Faculty’s opinion, Henri III angrily summoned the members of the Faculty to the Louvre and “made it clear to the Theologians that he would not

accept any preaching that criticized matters of state.” However within a matter of days, the same Theologians swore an oath of allegiance to the Catholic League.  

Even after his abjuration of his Protestantism and subsequent absolution from Clement VIII on 17 December 1595, Henri IV still faced violent opposition to his rule from extreme elements within the Catholic camp. Though these threats had seemed to have dissipated throughout the early seventeenth century, Henri was assassinated by Ravaillac in 1610. However, even during the reign of Henri III, and despite his failure to bring to heel the radical factions challenging royal authority and which had prolonged the nightmare of the Religious Wars, there was growing pressure to direct these passions into channels which were politically and socially acceptable. This pressure did not solely originate from the crown. In 1589, a book entitled *Examen Pacifique de la Doctrine des Huguenots* was anonymously published in Paris. The primary intention of the unknown author was to demonstrate to moderate Catholics that the Protestants ought not to be condemned as heretics or even as seditious since many Catholics had fallen into the same errors. 

The pressure became even more pronounced after the promulgation of the Edict of Nantes, as the crown began to reassert its authority throughout France. It became particularly acute during the crisis arising from the assassination of Henri IV when there were real concerns that France would again be plunged into a cycle of fratricidal civil war. Henri’s untimely death had left the throne in the hands of the child Louis XIII, with
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12 *Examen Pacifique de la Doctrine des Huguenots provant contre les Catholiques Rigoureux de Notre Temps.* (Paris, 1589). The Bibliothèque Nationale lists the author of this work as the Cardinal Jacques du Perron, though there is no name attached to this edition. Given du Perron’s well known anti-Protestant polemics throughout his career, it is unlikely that the Cardinal would have in fact authored this work.
his mother, Marie de’ Medici and her allies from the powerful Guise faction, which did not bode well for the future stability for the crown.

Henri did not leave the institutions of the crown in a strong position. Despite the tenuous state of the crown throughout the 1610s and 1620s, the prestige of the monarchy had been restored to such a degree that the religious and political forces that had nearly destroyed the kingdom could be effectively contained within the literary polemics of the seventeenth century. The issue surrounding the Charenton controversy was the Protestant translation into the vernacular of the Biblical texts, particularly in regards to the publication of the Geneva edition and its central role in forming Protestant understanding of Christianity.

This question is tied up in the issue over who is authorized to interpret scripture. Responding to the often well deserved criticism over the clerical monopoly of interpreting scriptural texts, the Council of Trent addressed these concerns by restating that the Latin Vulgate was the only authentic scriptural text because it had “been tested in the Church by long use…” and should therefore “be kept as the authentic text in public readings, debates, sermons and explanation; and no one is to dare or presume on any pretext to reject it.”

To reject the role of the cleric in interpreting scriptures only resulted in doctrinal error. It is this concern that Arnoulx touches upon to great effect. Arnoulx claims that the clerical responsibility for interpreting the scripture fulfills the apostolic commandment and that Paul had formally condemned private interpretation of the word of God.
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14 Arnoulx, Confession, 42-3.
Initially preaching a brief sermon for Louis XIII in the early part of 1617, Jean Arnoulx developed his theme in greater detail which was published in Paris later that same year as *Confession de la Foi*. Citing the zeal of Louis XIII for the spiritual well-being of his subjects and reunion of the Protestants again with the Catholic Church,\(^\text{15}\) Arnoulx set for himself the task of proving in a systematic manner that the Protestant doctrine found no support within the Biblical text. "All their Church, which they say to be understood as new, is founded on a void that the pretended religion has neither resource, nor support on the words of God: in short that inside the State of their religion, there is nothing there to affirm it by the Holy Scripture."\(^\text{16}\) Furthermore;

The confession of faith which the ministers ordinarily attach to their Bibles, as being the summary of all they teach is composed of three sorts of articles, the first are pure and clean of leaven, because they conform to the belief of the Catholic Church: the others because they are full of error and contradictions: between the first and second, there are others which are equivocal and of double meaning because they cover the mysteries of heresy under the guise of truth.\(^\text{17}\)

This idea was continued by the Catholic controversialist, Honnorat de Meynsier (1570-1638). Operating under the patronage of the Cardinal de Rez, Meynsier authored several pamphlets against the Charenton ministers.\(^\text{18}\) In his *Confession du Sieur du Moulin*

\(^{15}\) Jean Arnoulx, *Confession de la Foi*. (Paris, 1617), 22.

\(^{16}\) tout leur Église, qu'ils dissent être dressé de nouveau, est fondée sur le vuide: que la religion pretendu n'a aucune resource, ni appui dans la paroles de Dieu: bref que dedans l'État de leur profession, il n'y a du tout rien d'affermi par l'Écriture sainte. Arnoulx, *Confession*, 23.

\(^{17}\) Que la confession de foi des ministres qu'ils attachent ordinairement à leurs Bibles, comme étant le sommaire de tout ce qu'ils enseignent, est composée de trois sortes d'articles, dont les uns sont purs, et nets du levain, par ce qu'ils sont conformes à la créance de l'Église Catholique: les autres parce qu'ils sont plein d'erreurs, du tout contraires: entre les premiers et seconds, il y en à d'autre qui sont equivoques, et à double sens; par ce qu'ils couvrent, et couvent les mystères de l'hérésie, sous les terms de vérité. Arnoulx, *Confession*, 27-8.

(1618), dedicated to the Cardinal de Rez, Meynsier argues that the Protestant translation from the Greek to the French was highly inaccurate, thus invalidating the entire foundation of Protestant doctrine.

In the Defense of the Confession of Faith, pg. 23, du Moulin confesses that the Testament which the Churches Supposedly Reformed translated into French does not agree with the Greek New Testament, which the same Churches teach, being the true and pure text the Apostles taught as the word of God...Now you confess that your testaments, put by you into French, do not agree with the Greek New Testament that you hold as holy scripture. Therefore, your French Testaments cannot be maintained by you as holy scripture...All the Churches Supposedly Reformed teach lies as the Word of God (namely the French Testament) which disagrees with the true Greek text, which contains the truth...Therefore all the Churches Supposedly Reformed are false and evil.19

In response to these accusations, the Protestant ministers published the Défense de la Confession de la Foi at Charenton in 1617. This was followed up a few years later with the more comprehensive Bouclier de la Foi in 1625, published at Geneva. The Protestant response elicited in turn a sharp reaction from the Catholic ecclesiastical hierarchy both within and without the court of Louis XIII; the ensuing controversy would include some of the best placed ecclesiastical figures of the Gallican Church, including the young Bishop of Luçon, Jean Armand du Plessis.

Around 1616, Jean Arnoulx became confessor to the young Louis XIII. Arnold’s prominence at the court can be explained by his connections to the Queen

19 En la deffense de la Confession de Foi, p. 23 du Moulin confesse que le Testament que les Églises pretendues Reformées ont traduit en François ne s’accorde pas avec le Nouveau Testament Grec, que les mêmes Églises enseignent être le vrai et pur texte que les Apostres ont enseigné pour parole de Dieu...Or vous confesses que vos Testaments, par vous mis en François, ne sont point conformes au Testament Grec que vous tenez pour écriture sainte. Donc vos Testaments par vous mis en Français, ne peuvent être tenus de vous pour écriture sainte...Toutes les Églises pretendues reformées enseignent que le mensonge est parole de Dieu (à savoir leur Testaments Français) qui est discordant du vrai Texte Grec, qui contient le verité...Donc toutes les Églises pretendues reformées sont fausses et mauvaises. Meynier, Confession du Sieur du Moulin. (Paris, 1618), n.p.
Mother, and the Guise family to whom Arnoulx had long standing ties.\textsuperscript{20} The ultraorthodox Catholicism of the Guise faction appealed to Arnoulx who took advantage of his position at court to initiate needed reform of the French episcopate, especially in regards to the nomination process for vacantbishoprics. Placed as he was as Louis XIII’s personal confessor and supported by the Guises, Arnoulx used the opportunity to shape royalist policy concerning the Protestant presence within France.\textsuperscript{21}

The results of Arnoulx’s influence at court can be seen in the Béarn affair. Situated in the Pyrenees on the Spanish border, Béarn had been a part of the Bourbon patrimony, and had been reluctantly brought into the Protestant camp by its sovereigns, most notably Jeanne d’Albert who had converted to Calvinism in 1560. In 1569, she had abolished Catholicism in Béarn, and by the early 1570s confiscated Catholic property to pay the salaries of Huguenot pastors and professors.\textsuperscript{22} By the early seventeenth century, the tiny kingdom was populated by a substantial Calvinist population.\textsuperscript{23} Henri IV to overcome the reservations that greeted the promulgation of the Edict of Nantes promised that he would restore Catholic worship in Béarn.\textsuperscript{24} Despite the king’s efforts, the parlement in Pau, the Béarnese capital, had refused to restore confiscated property to the Catholic minority.\textsuperscript{25} It was not until 1617 that the crown was able to turn its attention to the matter, and in 1620 Louis XIII led an army to forcibly enforce the provisions of the Edict of Nantes and return Béarn to Catholicism.

\textsuperscript{24} Strayer, \textit{Huguenots and Camisards}, 46.
Ostensibly the Béarn affair had been about religion. One of the main driving forces behind the campaign was François le Clerc du Tremblay (15776-1638), known within religious circles as Joseph de Paris. Entering the Capucins in 1599, Père Joseph was enlisted by Richelieu for his religious fervour as well as his extensive knowledge of European affairs. Père Joseph carried out much of the military planning along with the Cardinal du Perron who viewed the campaign as an opportunity to return Béarn to Catholic worship. But a closer inspection suggests that religion played a secondary role in the annexation of Béarn into France. Louis considered his campaign in the south as an opportunity to unite his ancestral holdings with the larger Kingdom. Also the refusal of the Béarnese council to register various articles of the Edict of Nantes was seen not only as the prolongation of religious schism, but defiance of royal authority. As it turns out, the Béarnese campaign had gone remarkably smoothly as most cities, including Pau, opened their gates to Louis and his armies. The King promised that he would respect the rights of the Protestant population, but he reduced the sovereign council into a parlement, suggesting that Louis’ purpose was more politically motivated than it was about religion.

Even though the architects behind Louis’ policy towards Béarn were unapologetically anti-Protestant, their involvement in the Béarn affair highlighted the complex relationship between the Catholics and Protestant camps, and it is this complexity that informs the Charenton controversy. On one hand, Arnoulx, as a Jesuit, and connected as he was with some of the most prominent figures of Catholic reform of the seventeenth century regarded any form of heterodoxy, within or without the
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26 Tapie, France in the Age of Louis XIII, 104.
institutional church with an inflexible distrust. Yet, even within the Catholic reform movements of the seventeenth century there were moderate elements which avoided the more radicalizing aspects of Catholic renewal seen in the devotional work of Père Joseph and the subsequent emergence of the Dévot party centered around Port Royal. While Arnoulx’s jubilant reaction to the annexation of Béarn can be seen as part of Arnoulx’s larger agenda of breaking the back of the Protestant party, his controversial writings directed against the Protestants, most notably the Protestant population located around Paris displayed his inflexible rhetoric directed towards Protestant heresy. Yet the rhetoric reflects the realities of post Edict of Nantes France: that the Protestant party had become a de facto permanent presence in the Kingdom. The conversion of the Protestants was one of Louis’ ongoing concerns, yet the crown would not countenance anything that would threaten the hard won and still somewhat tenuous political and social stability achieved through the Edict of Nantes.

The complexity of these anti-Protestant polemics is further demonstrated through Richelieu’s contribution to the controversy, the Principaux Points de la Foi in 1618. During his tenure as Bishop of Luçon (1606-1623), Richelieu had shown a profound sensitivity to the Protestants of his diocese who made up a sizable portion of the population. Yet the Principaux Points de la Foi demonstrated little of that openness. As we will see, Richelieu regarded the Protestant party as deserving of the “hate” they encountered from the crown and the Catholic population. Even still the virulence had been circumscribed within a formalized rhetoric which refrained from personal slander and calls for popular expressions of religious violence against the Protestant party. Furthermore, the Principaux Points de la Foi was not an unqualified reiteration of
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Arnoulx's arguments. Richelieu's attitude by this time had become ambivalent towards the Jesuits. Richelieu was uncomfortable with the Jesuits' support of Papal claims that the will of the Vicar of Christ could supersede royal authority, because it offended Richelieu's understanding of the supremacy of the crown over that of the papacy. Regardless, he was quite willing to support Arnoulx's bid to annex Béarn. Thus Richelieu found himself not only defending Catholic doctrine against Protestant attacks, but also in the unenviable position of countering Protestant accusations that the Catholic party, in particular the Jesuits were the greater threat to the crown.\textsuperscript{29} This accusation gave Richelieu the greatest trouble as Pierre du Moulin reminded his readership with great effect that two Catholic kings of France had been murdered not by Protestants, but by their fellow Catholics.

Much of what Arnoulx wrote in his \textit{Confession} was not particularly innovative. Unsurprisingly, he promoted the Tridentine position on such issues as the canonical makeup of the Bible, the real presence in the Eucharist, and the spiritual authority of the Pope; he addresses the question concerning the need of a professional clerical class, while maintaining that the Protestant misunderstanding of the Biblical text had led to their errors in regards to the doctrines of Christianity. The \textit{Confession} also treads a well worn path in equating Protestant heresy with political schism. The importance of Arnoulx's work within the context of the Charenton controversy is how the Jesuit undertook to combat the Protestants in the environs of Paris. As strident as Arnoulx was in dealing with the Protestants, his writings reflect a growing trend in the confessional polemics of the seventeenth century to move away from the virulent rhetoric used to demonize one's religious opponents. As Crouzet, Davis, Delumeau, and Diefendorf have argued the

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{29} Bergin, \textit{The Rise of Richelieu}, 104-5.}
vitriolic religious rhetoric of the sixteenth century called for the extermination of those holding heterodox beliefs. The published attacks that emanated from both Catholic and Protestant controversialists lacked the incendiary language that had been the hallmark of religious polemics in the sixteenth century. Instead of destroying the body of heretics, seventeenth-century Catholic religious rhetoric attacked the confessional identity of the Protestants. This rhetoric focused on the conversion, and not the physical destruction of the heretics.

The seventeenth century has been noted for the increase in religious fervour. Indeed, it is one of the central contentions of this thesis that the seventeenth century witnessed a profound sense of religious renewal that permeated throughout all aspects of daily life. Pierre Chaunu and Henri-Jean Martin have quantified the extent of religious fervour in the seventeenth century by charting the number of publications dedicated to religious subjects. They argue that in spite of the explosive orgy of religious sentiment in the sixteenth century, Bourbon France had a more heightened sense of religious devotion.

The historiography dedicated to exploring the many factors impacted by issues of religiosity of the sixteenth century is immense. It is not the purpose of this discussion to examine all the social and political implications of the first two generations of the
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30 Chaunu, La Civilization de l’Europe Classique, op. cit.
French Reformation, but it is important to touch on a few of the elements that underpinned the polemics of the sixteenth century in order to trace the shift away from the violent eschatological rhetoric to a more tolerant and formalized rhetoric of toleration.

There were several common themes running throughout the religious polemics of the sixteenth century. One of which was the failure of the crown to eradicate the Protestant heresy. Many Catholic preachers regarded the crown, not just as passive observers as the Protestant gained theological and territorial ground, but as actively aiding the process of establishing a permanent Protestant presence within France. The Peace of Monsieur (Peace of Beaulieu) of 1576 had led many Catholics to come to the conclusion that the crown was either unable or unwilling to defend Catholicism which led to the ascendancy of the due de Guise as head of a radicalized Catholic party and precursor to the Catholic League, which were part of the dynastic struggles of the 1570s-1580s. Although the leaders of the League had dynastic ambitions, there can be no question that those involved with the League and the other factions of the ultra Catholic party considered these organizations as positive outlets for a religiosity that was shaped in the eschatological imagination. The initial outrage unleashed against the Protestant population quickly turned against the monarchy which was perceived as abetting the advance of a cancer in the body politic. So while the duc de Guise, though undoubtedly sincere in his orthodoxy, still benefited politically from a weakened Valois dynasty, many members of the League and other radicalized Catholic groups turned their anger against Charles IX, and later Henri III to purify the kingdom from heresy and those who those who would support heresy.

33 Crouzet, Les Guerriers de Dieu, 211-16.
The sixteenth century also marked a period of active reform within the Church. Though the final pronouncements of the Council of Trent were met with mixed reaction throughout the French Church, many of the French episcopate adopted the principles of Catholic reform, such as the Cardinal of Reims whose efforts to implement reform within his diocese seems to have "encouraged a genuine revival of Catholic piety." This was in part responsible for the increase of religiously motivated violence as it intensified expressions of popular fervour that concerned itself not just with Catholic renewal and the welfare of the Church, but also the expiration of Protestantism.

The Edict of Nantes in part explains the shift in the rhetorical tone of religious polemics between the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. With this edict of pacification, Henri IV attempted to strike a balance between Protestant demands for unmolested worship and Catholic fears that Protestant autonomy would lead to the eventual overthrow of Catholicism turning France into a Protestant nation. Another factor in the shift in the nature of rhetorical strategies was the renunciation of radicalized Catholicism. The murder of Henri III had horrified much of the country, and in the case of the League, the populace of Paris turned against it after the murder of three Parisian anti-League parlementaires. But the question remains how to explain the changing nature of the confessional polemics. As stated previously, the seventeenth century witnessed a profound interest in personal devotion, and certainly the Edict of Nantes did not put an end to Catholic designs to remove the Protestant party from France. As the Bourbon dynasty sought to restore royal authority, it co-opted the Gallican Church to assist in the promotion of royalist policy. In connection with this, preachers equated devotion with

34 Konnert, Local Politics, 105
proper civic and domestic behaviour.\textsuperscript{37} Thus both crown and Church became increasingly intolerant of threats to the hard won and still very fragile peace that characterized post Edict of Nantes France. Thus the Charenton controversy provides valuable insights into the extent to which the crown’s policies of pacifying the radical elements within the Kingdom were successful.

It is within this context that Arnoulx engaged his Protestant opponents. To be sure, the Charenton controversy was not by far the only religious controversy. Arnoulx’s colleague, the Cardinal du Perron spent a considerable amount of his career engaged in polemics with various Protestant leaders, most notably Philippe du Plessis-Mornay. From the Protestant side, the Charenton ministers submitted a written remonstrance before Louis XIII at Fontainebleau, entitled \textit{Défense de la Confession des Eglises Reformées} in 1617. Published and sold at Charenton, the \textit{Défense} was initially submitted to Louis in order to denounce the “injustice” of Arnoulx’s accusations against Protestant doctrine. The ministers set four points which would prove that Arnoulx’s accusations were groundless. They maintained that Arnoulx’s criticisms of Protestant doctrines were based on a deliberate misreading of the scriptural basis of those doctrines. The Charenton ministers were not solely concerned with defending Protestant doctrine against the accusations of their Catholic opponents. They were keenly aware of the need to profess their continued loyalty to the Crown which was not incompatible with heterodox beliefs.

God who has given you France through his blessing, will preserve you by his providence, and will affirm your scepter in your hands, serving for the establishment of the Kingdom of his son, who is the King of Kings. Just as God reigns through you, reigns also in you, and thus finally you reign

\textsuperscript{37} Sawyer, \textit{Printed Poison}, 143.
with him. If the contrary suggestions hinder our humble prayers from being received by your Majesty with the success we would hope, so allow us, inasmuch as God will give us life to instruct your people to obedience and faithfulness towards your Majesty and we will pray God for the conservation of your person and the prosperity of your Kingdom.38

In response to this remonstrance, Richelieu while still Bishop of Luçon wrote his *Principaux Points de la Foi*, published at Poitiers, to combat the position taken by the Charenton ministers. However, the controversy would not end there. Du Moulin would expand on the initial arguments made in the *Défense* with the publication of the *Bouclier de la Foi* in 1618-9, at Geneva. The *Bouclier* is one of the clearest expositions of Protestantism since John Calvin’s *Institutes of the Christian Religion*. In response to du Moulin’s *Bouclier*, the Bishop of Arles, Jean-Jaubert Barrault published his own *Bouclier de la Foi*. In 1621 Jean Marcel, a Religious of the Congrégation de la Doctrine Chrestien published his *Triomphe de la Foi Catholique* at Lyon. The rapid publication of these religious polemics, often running into several hundred pages and into several editions39 confirms that the distrust between the religious parties had not lessened in intensity, but that this intensity was now being diverted into more constructive channels, which eschewed popular expressions of religious violence. Each of the printed responses ran into several editions.

38 Dieu qui vous a donné à la France en sa bénédiction, vous conservera par sa providence, et affermira votre sceptre en vos mains, le faisant servir à l’establissement du royaume de son fils, qui est le Roi des Rois. En sorte que Dieu reignant par vous, reigne aussi en vous, afin que finalement vous reignez avec lui. Que si les suggestions contraires, empêchent que nos humbles priers ne soient reçues de vôtre Majesté avec le succez que nous espirons, si ne laisserons-nous tant que Dieu nous donnera vie, d’instruire vos peuples à obéissance et fidélité envers vôtre Majesté, et prierons Dieu pour la conservation de vôtre personne et prosperité de vôtre Royaume. Du Moulin, *Défense*, 12.

39 Du Moulin’s *Bouclier* still had a healthy publishing life into the 1630s, well after the initial controversy began.
While the issues arising from Charenton controversy have been touched upon recently, there has been little in depth examination of the controversy.\textsuperscript{40} This is unfortunate considering that the Charenton debate yields a wealth of insight into the nature of Catholic and Protestant relations and the perceptions each confession maintained of their opponents in post Edict of Nantes. The Charenton debate encompassed both the political and doctrinal elements of Catholic-Protestant relations.

For Arnoulx, the central theme which informed his attacks on Protestant dogma was the centrality of the Biblical text. As his title explains, Arnoulx set out to prove the doctrinal bankruptcy of the Protestant faith through the Genevan edition of the Bible. Therefore, Arnoulx begins the \textit{Confession} by citing the Protestant rejection of the books of the Apocrypha.

Echoing Calvin's contention that the scriptural authority of the Apocrypha was at best suspect, the Charenton ministers argued that Trent's reassertion of the canonical value of those books lacked scriptural authority, since there were no proofs within the original texts citing their canonical legitimacy, nor was there any evidence that the primitive Church had accepted the authority of the Apocryphal texts.\textsuperscript{41} Arnoulx begins his response by citing both Old and New Testament verses condemning those who would alter the contents of the Biblical text. Although Arnoulx concedes that the Apocryphal texts exist outside the "formal text of the holy scriptures," they must still be included alongside the canonical texts.\textsuperscript{42} He continues that the Church of God was a fusion of the earlier Judaic traditions, and the establishment of Christianity, which supplanted Judaism.


\textsuperscript{41} Arnoulx, \textit{Confession}, 38.

\textsuperscript{42} Arnoulx, \textit{Confession}, 39-40.
This fusion of Judaic and Christian traditions is represented in the acceptance of both the authorized Biblical texts and the Apocrypha.

In response, du Moulin argues that Arnoulx misrepresented the Protestant position on the Canonical legitimacy of the Biblical texts. In du Moulin’s formulation, the inclusion of the Apocryphal books rests solely on Church tradition, and he calls into question the Catholic’s claim to be able to pronounce authoritatively on matters of orthodoxy. It is true, du Moulin agrees, that the Protestants only recognize the canonical texts of the Old and New Testament. However, Arnoulx was incorrect when he claimed that the Protestants were unjustified in rejecting the Apocryphal books. First of all, the Protestants did not reject the “testimony of the church” regarding the composition of the Old and New Testaments. Their rejection of the non-canonical texts was in fact based on the testimony of the early Christian church which made no reference to the authenticity of any other scriptural outside the books composing the Old and New Testaments. The strength of du Moulin’s position rests on an historical argument. The Protestants rejected the non-canonical texts because “the people of God under the Old Testament did not recognize them as such since they are not in the Hebrew Bible, which is the original Bible, and which only was raised publicly in the Judean Church by the Priests and Scribes, this Canon of the Hebrews was followed and approved by the Christian Church of the first centuries.”

The appeal to the historical precedent was important to both Catholic and Protestant confessions. Each staked their legitimacy on the fact that each respective confession was the heir to primitive Christianity. Therefore to accept the

---

43 Du Moulin, Défense, 20.
44 le peuple de Dieu sous l’ancien Testament ne les a point reconnues pour tels, comme de fait ils ne sont point en la Bible Hébraique qui est le Bible originelle, et celle qui seule était levée publiquement en l’Église de Judée par les Sacrificateurs et Scribes, lequel Canon des Hebreux a été suivi et approuvé par l’Église Chrétienne des premiers siècles. Du Moulin, Défense, 21.
legitimacy of the Apocrypha against the judgment of those living under the Old Law, as well as that of the primitive Christians who had accepted the composition of the Old Testament from the “Sacrificateurs et Scribes,” was to reject the authority of the original Church.

The debate over which books constituted the Bible was more than an academic exercise. The very legitimacy of confessional dogma was dependent on how one understood the Biblical text. Thus to question the Catholic Church’s claim that the Apocrypha should be included among the canonical texts would cast doubt on all other Catholic dogmas. Richelieu recognized this danger in his response to the Défense. The Principaux Points de la Foi was written almost immediately after the publication of Charenton ministers’ pamphlet in 1617. As the title suggests, the Principaux Points was written as a definitive statement of seventeenth-century Catholicism.

The rhetorical style adopted by Richelieu is extremely adversarial. But even still, Richelieu maintains that it is not his purpose to persecute or to incite personal hatred of the Protestants. Rather, it is their doctrines which deserved to be hated. Richelieu by distinguishing between the person and doctrine of the Protestants rehumanizes the heretic. After all, if one can separate the person from the real cause of hatred (in this case the Protestant belief system), the body of the heretic can be redeemed without the ritualistic dehumanizing violence that had informed medieval approaches to punishment of heterodox persons, and had plagued the sixteenth century. Although Richelieu’s work

---

45 Seeing that heresy is like a poison which affects the hearts, the Ministers have particularly addressed their writings to Your Majesty which is the heart which gives life to all this great State.
Voyant qu’outre que l’hérésie est comme le poison qui de sa nature tient à saisir le coeurs, les Ministres ont particulièrement adressé leur écrit à V.M qui est le coeur qui donne la vie à tout ce grand État.
Richelieu, Principaux Points, n.p.
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lacks the academic sophistication evident in other authors involved in this controversy, it is in keeping within the context of the rehumanization of the Protestant.

Richelieu is not so concerned to address the specific question of the validity of the Apocrypha. Rather he is more interested in the doctrinal implications of the Protestant position. Richelieu cites twelve different doctrines that the Protestants have erred on because they have contradicted the scriptural text. Richelieu continues his attacks on the Charenton ministers by developing further the idea that the Biblical text cannot support the doctrinal position of the Protestant party.

In their remonstrance to Louis XIII, the Charenton ministers pleaded to the King that they were unfairly hated because of their claim that they properly understood the scriptural text, and this understanding was based only on the text, and not on clerical interpretation and non-scriptural traditions. Richelieu took great issue with these claims. He acknowledges that the Protestants were in fact hated, because they attacked “the principle points of the Catholic Religion under the pretext of preserving God’s honour in its entirety.” It is with this argument that Richelieu co-opts the historical basis of Protestant doctrine.

Du Moulin citing John Wycliffe’s attacks on the privileges and doctrines of the Roman Church demonstrated the inability of the Church to prove the historical basis of such doctrines as purgatory, the cult of saints, and the sale of indulgences. Du Moulin also looked to medieval political thinkers such as Marsilius of Padua and Dante. The question was over the invalidity of papal claims of authority which were superior to the authority of the temporal estate.

46 Richelieu, Principaux Points, 9-14.
47 les principaux points de la Religion Catholique sous le pretexte de conserver à Dieu un honneur plus entier. Richelieu, Principaux Points, 26.
As we saw in the previous chapter; the arguments defending the real presence within the Eucharist were not solely Biblical or theological; the validity of the real presence was also to be found within historical precedent. Du Moulin throughout his writing during the controversy uses his knowledge of the history of the primitive Church in attacking many of the Catholic Church's practices to great effect. Richelieu for his part argues that the only historical precedent the Protestants share with the primitive Church is with the early heretical movements that afflicted the Catholic Church throughout the first centuries of its existence.\(^{48}\)

The Charenton controversy reveals a great deal about the nature of the doctrinal conflict which raged between the Charenton ministers and their Catholic opponents. As we have seen above, much of the Charenton controversy was caught up in appealing to the authority to the Biblical text, as well as the historical precedents that could be marshaled to support the relative position of each side. The other focal point of this controversy centred on the authority of the Pope. As this chapter will further explain, the question of Papal authority was tied up as much with the political considerations in this debate as it was concerned with the theological underpinnings of each confession. Unsurprisingly, it was du Moulin's and the other Charenton ministers' stated position to reject the claims of papal primacy.

Prior to his controversy with Jean Arnoulx, du Moulin had already spent much of his early career attacking the claims of Papal authority. These early criticisms were dedicated to James I. Two of the more important tracts, translated into English, were *A Defense of the Catholicke Faith*, published at London in 1610, and *The Jesuites' Shifts and Evasions* also published at London in 1624. The *Defense* was published first to

counteract the accusations of the Dominican preacher, Nicholas Coeffeteau (1574-1623), who had written many books favouring Papal claims of authority over temporal princes. Many of the arguments that appeared later in the *Defense de la Confession de la Foi* and the *Bouclier de la Foi*, were developed and first put forward in the Defense of the Catholic Faith. In the fifth chapter, du Moulin catalogues eight propositions set out by Boniface VIII in *De Constitutionibus*.

1. The Apostles said to Jesus Christ, *Here are two swords*, and Jesus Christ did not answer, that is too much, *but that is enough*: Therefore the Pope hath the Spirituall and the Temporall Sword...

3. S. Paul, Rom 13. Saith that *there is no power but is ordained of God*. It must needes then be that the Temporall sword be subject to the spiritual.

4. God sending the Prophet Jeremy to preach and prophesie to divers people and nations, saith unto him, cap 1. *I have set thee this day over people and Nations*. This is a prophesie (if wee beleve this Boniface) which giveth to the Pope power over the Temporality of Kings...

6. Jesus Christ said to S. Peter, *what soever thou shalt binde in earth, shall be bound in heaven*. Therefore the Pope is cheefe over the Temporalitie...

8. That there can be but one beginning, and one cheefe Souveraigne, because Moses saith in the beginning of Genesis, not, *In the beginnings*, but in the *beginning* God created the heaven and the earth.

Turning to the history of the early Christian Fathers, du Moulin reminds his readers that many of the early Roman emperors were heretics, and then rhetorically asks what the response of the early Christian leadership was. The answer according to du Moulin was that unlike their contemporary successors, the ecclesiastical leadership did not instruct their followers to disobey the imperial authority.

Did S. Ambrose or the Bishop of Rome command the people to obey Maximus and rebel against Valentinian? Nothing lesse: nay rather Valentinian by the helpe of Theodosius and the Orthodoxes, was re-established in his authority, which greatly servede to set him in the right way. To be short, we finde in the auncient Church many Bishops

---

banished and chastised by Emperours, but never any Emperours
dispossessed of his Empire by the Bishops of Rome. 51

Drawing upon a historical commonplace in many discussions over the relationship
between the Papacy and the State, du Moulin cites the Canon Alius which deposed
Childeric III in favour of the Carolingian, Pepin the Short, due not to heresy, but rather
the incompetence of the last Merovingian. Subsequent popes argued that they could
depose incompetent kings in the cases of Julius II and Louis XII and John of Navarre, or
Sixtus V and Henri III. Even though none these kings were guilty of heresy, the popes
“thundered Bulles [which] declared [the kings] to have been fallen from their
Kingdoms.” 52

Drawing upon Francois Hotman’s (1520-1594) Francogallia (c. 1573), du Moulin
addresses the standard Huguenot position concerning the differences between elective
and hereditary kingship. He argues that when the King is elected, as is the case in
Germany, then the nobles have a responsibility to ensure the candidate is not “an Infidell
or an Idolater. But in the case where the “King who is a lawful inheritor and to whom,
over and above [and] his subjects have taken the Oath of Allegiance…subjects are at no
hand to endure [the King] that is an heretick or an Infidell doth not follow upon good
consequence.” 53 Du Moulin explains why it is not expedient for a Christian subject to
rebel against even a heretical King.

It is not expedient that subjects should shake off the yoke of their Prince
which is of a different Religion: for this were the next way to estrange
Princes and Monarchs from Christian Religion, and to make them have it
in detestation, as that which counselleth and perswadeth to rebellion, and
maketh piety the cause of mutiny. Moreover the question here is not of
the danger, but of the duty, nor yet what may arrive, but what ought to be

51 Du Moulin, Defense of the Catholicke Religion, 72.
52 Du Moulin, Defense of the Catholicke Religion, 68.
done; we must not do evil that good may come of it. Many things are lawful which are not expedient, but there is nothing expedient which is not lawful.\textsuperscript{54}

Du Moulin's \textit{Jesuite's Shiftes and Evasions} specifically addresses his recent polemical exchange with Jean Arnoulx. Originally written in French, as a supplement to the \textit{Bouclier de la Foi}, the brief pamphlet was translated into English for the express purpose of exposing the widely perceived Jesuit conspiracy to depose James I.\textsuperscript{55} Although the scope of this chapter is primarily focused on the controversy which took place around Paris, it is important to note here that even though the controversy was highly localized, it also adopted an international character.

In the \textit{Shiftes and Evasions} as du Moulin continues with a theme he originally developed in the \textit{Bouclier}, which was the claim that the Roman Church had authority over the temporal estate based on scriptural injunction was completely unsupportable.\textsuperscript{56} The problem arose because the Roman Church had rejected the original Hebrew and Greek Biblical texts in favour of Jerome's Vulgate. Du Moulin then demonstrates that the textual corruption of the Vulgate was so well known that the Papal Librarian, Sixtus Sevensis acknowledged that "the vulgar edition...in many things differeth from the truth of the Greek."\textsuperscript{57} Furthermore, du Moulin undermines Arnoulx's argument by demonstrating that not all the Patristic Fathers accepted the legitimacy of the Vulgate.

Whereas Master Arnoulx saith, that the vulgar translation hath been received of all the Fathers, hee sheweth, that hee never looked into the Fathers, for in Saint Augustine there are two thousand places of the holy scriptures allledged in other words than they are set down in the vulgar translation. And Tertullian useth a different translation from all the rest; and in Hierome we have divers places of the old Testament, by him truely translated according to the Hebrew; and Bellarmine in the tenth chapter of

\textsuperscript{54} Du Moulin, \textit{Defense of the Catholicke Religion}, 69
\textsuperscript{56} Du Moulin, \textit{Jesuites' Shiftes and Evasions}, 16.
\textsuperscript{57} Du Moulin, \textit{Jesuites' Shiftes and Evasions}, 28.
his second booke de Verbe Dei, saith, that the vulgar translation began to be received in the Church of Rome, in the time of Gregory I, that is, sixe hundred yeares after Jesus Christ. And Saint Augustine acknowledgeth, that in his times, the diversity of Latine translations were infininite, in the seconde Booke of Christian Doctrine, Chapter II.58

This theme is taken up again by du Moulin in the Défense. According to du Moulin, the Catholics have purposely misrepresented the scriptural text to justify papal authority within both the temporal and spiritual estates.59 Du Moulin then lists a series of seventeen questions demanding where the scriptural precedent for the claims of the papacy can be found, ranging from the veneration of the Saints to the power to depose or install Kings at will.60

These seventeen questions receive a greater comprehensive treatment in the Bouclier de la Foi. Unlike the Défense, the Bouclier is not a cursory overview of Protestant doctrine. At nearly 900 pages, it discusses just about every aspect of Protestant doctrine. The Bouclier was written specifically to confront the accusations leveled against the Protestants by Jean Arnoulx. As in the case of many of the religious controversies of the early seventeenth century it follows the standard template of quoting the offending passage of one’s opponents, and then providing the response in way of rebuttal. Despite the personal nature of his rebuttals of Arnoulx’s accusations, du Moulin avoided shrill polemic. Rather, the Bouclier demonstrates the extent of du Moulin’s scholarship. In his response, du Moulin draws upon a wide range of Biblical, Patristic and classic topoi to support his position. Each reference is carefully noted in the margins.

The Charenton controversy was not solely concerned with the doctrinal debates between the Catholic and Protestant confessions. It also addresses many of the political

58 Du Moulin, Jesuits’ Shiftes and Evasions, 29.
60 Du Moulin, Defense, 41-2.
realities existing under the reign of Louis XIII, and it is within its political context that the controversy worked in the favour of the crown. Each side took great pains to demonstrate their loyalty to royal authority as part and parcel of true devotion. On the surface this is hardly surprising, especially coming from the Protestant camp, given that the Protestants needed the support of the King to maintain their limited privileges. However upon further examination of what would seem to be perfunctory declarations of loyalty reveals that at least among the French Protestant leadership, the nature of their relationship to the crown was undergoing an evolution. The first aspect of this is seen in the description of the nature of Kingship itself. In Pierre du Moulin’s writing, the republican strains that were common in Protestant writings are replaced with a discourse that favoured strong monarchical authority.

The second aspect of this evolution is seen as du Moulin pitted the claims of papal authority against the French crown. This encompassed more than just the rhetoric of the pope being the anti-Christ and responsible for the decayed state of Christianity in general, though this kind of language is not far from du Moulin’s discussion. In this regard, du Moulin tapped into a long tradition of medieval political theorists opposing papal claims over the secular estate. Du Moulin’s arguments were strongly influenced by Marsilius of Padua, whose *Defender of the Peace* had been written as in response to Pope John XXII’s deposition of Louis of Bavaria.61

Du Moulin’s accusations were also influenced by the parlementaire tradition in French political thought which maintained that the King was “a sovereign power in

---

Church and State. The question over the nature of the relationship between the monarch and the Pope was not confined to Protestant diatribes against the abuses of papal authority. For example, the parlementaire Antoine Arnoult was an ardent opponent of the Jesuit presence in France. He regarded them as a fifth column, who as agents of the Papal see, claimed the right to depose Kings at will. In a letter addressed to Henri IV, dated in 1603 Arnoult warned the king that the Jesuits supported regicide, after all according to Arnoult, the Jesuit Jean Guignant had praised Jacques Clement’s assassination of Henri III as heroically removing a modern day Nero from the throne.

Although Arnoult strongly opposed the Protestant party, he was also critical of the ultra orthodoxy of the Sorbonne theologians who sided with the Jesuits on this issue. Arnoult reminded Henri that it was the King’s right to install Bishops and other ecclesiastical offices, and that the Papacy had no authority to free the King’s subjects from the oath of loyalty. These factors complicated the Catholic response to du Moulin, especially for Richelieu in particular as he attempted to maintain the supremacy of the Pope in spiritual matters while at the same time maintaining that within the temporal sphere the King was sovereign.

As important to the Charenton controversy as the discourse of political authority was, equally central to this debate was the doctrinal discourse. Pursuing an agenda of expelling the Protestants from France, the Jesuit Jean Arnoult had published an attack on the Charenton entitled Confession de Foi (1617). Employing the Protestant edition of the Bible, Arnold claimed to demonstrate the spiritual bankruptcy of Protestant doctrine. The

63 Antoine Arnould, Discours au Roi Henri IV sur l’Utilité ou les Inconviens de la Nouvelle Secte ou Espece d’ordre Religieus des Jesuits. (Laon, 1603), 9.
64 Arnould, Discours, 3.
ensuing literary contributions to the debate from both the Protestant and Catholic factions focused on their fundamental positions, such as the nature of the Eucharist, the meaning and efficacy of grace, papal authority, and the existence of purgatory.

Arnoux, du Moulin, Richelieu and others did not assert the rightness of their position on mystic or esoteric appeals to the inherent truth, but rather each employed a barrage of scholarly apparatus, citing biblical, patristic, and various historical sources that are marshaled to the defense of a particular position. The conscientious attention to the academic tools in the books, along with their length, with each running into the hundreds of pages suggest that they were not intended for a popular audience. Despite the passionate attacks and defense of the confessional doctrines, the language remains academic; they are not calls for popular responses of violence. By and large the Charenton debate remained an academic exercise.

From the commencement of this controversy, both sides took great pains to demonstrate their loyalty to the crown. The Protestants found their protestations of loyalty to the crown difficult to defend given the long history of Catholic polemic which equated Protestantism with political schism.65 However, as the Charenton ministers argued effectively, the Protestants were not alone in formulating the theory of just rebellion. While the Protestants were the first to propose the right to resist “the monarchy in defense of true religion,”66 the Catholic League under Guisard leadership quickly developed their own monarchomach rhetoric towards the French crown if it refused to preserve the orthodoxy of the state. When the Wars of Religion ended, the theory of just rebellion had become highly developed. In part the development of the resistance

66 Baumgartner, Radical Reactionaries, 15.
theory took place while the prestige of the crown had deteriorated after the death of Henri II and under the minorities of François II and Charles IX, and the inept reign of Henri III. Catherine de Medici, though acting as regent for her two sons, and wielding a great deal of influence over Henri III, also proved to be a liability to the authority of the crown. As an Italian, she was distrusted as a foreigner. And as the moving force behind the policy of reconciling the Protestant and Catholic factions in the interests of maintaining the stability of the kingdom she had angered both the Catholic nobility and ecclesiastical estate.

The theories of resistance did not go unchallenged. The emergence of the *Politique* party under Michel de l'Hopital and Catherine de’ Medici pursued a policy of religious toleration as the central pillar of a stable France. Henri of Navarre’s claim to the throne was supported by the *Politiques* notwithstanding his heterodoxy and apparent lack of commitment after his abjuration. Once on the throne Henri continued to seek a pragmatic solution to the religious and political crises of the era. One such solution is evident in Henri’s religious policies. Henri’s first appointments to vacant sees came from *Politique* circles, such as Jean Bertaut who had supported Henri during his bid for the crown.67 Although not directly nominated by Henri, the future Cardinal Richelieu benefited from the support his father had given to Henri of Navarre after the assassination of Henri III at St. Cloud.68

This policy continued under Louis XIII. Even though the rhetorical stridency of the Episcopate would continue throughout the seventeenth century, the crown was very careful in its selection of those nominated to any Episcopal see to ensure the loyalty of

---

the French clergy. Thus by the second decade of the 1600s, the crown had charted a course accepting the Protestant presence within France, and expecting the clergy to avoid the incendiary rhetoric that had served to incite the popular revolts of the sixteenth century. It is within this context that Jean Arnoulx initiated the Charenton debate by attacking the central tenets of the Protestant confession in print, dedicating his *Confession* to Louis XIII. Though the ensuing controversy suggests that while the Edict of Nantes and other edicts of pacification had limited success in pacifying the religious conflict within France, the edicts of pacification may not have been as unsuccessful as is sometimes maintained. Brian Strayer is correct to note the Bourbon monarchs’ overriding concern was to achieve religious unity by returning the Protestants back into the Catholic fold.70

There is no question that from its initial promulgation, the Edict of Nantes met with stiff resistance. By 1599, a year after the publication of the Edict of Nantes, the Parlement of Paris had still refused to register the Edict. Paris’ refusal to the register the Edict emboldened the other Parlements to follow suit. They feared that the Edict’s provisions guaranteeing the Protestant places of surety meant a de facto division of the kingdom.71 It was not until Henri IV personally intervened in favour of the Edict and convoked an assembly of those opposed to the Edict at the Louvre and explained why the Edict of Nantes was good for France

That which I have to say to you is that I pray you to register the edict which I have accorded to them of the [Protestant] religion. What I have done is for peace... You must obey, since there is no other consideration than of my quality and of the obligation all my subjects have to me, and

69 Strayer, *Huguenots and Camisards*, 47.
especially you, my Parlement. Do not cite the Catholic religion against me [in opposition to the Edict of Nantes]. I love it more than you, I am more Catholic than you: I am the good son of the Church.\textsuperscript{72}

While the Edict of Nantes was also opposed by the Gallican church; this opposition was more circumspect. The ecclesiastical leadership understood that the complete eradication of the Protestants was unrealistic. They recognized the value of religious toleration within the context of the larger goal of folding the Protestant population back into the space of orthodoxy, thereby making them again good Christians and subjects of the crown.

It is true the Protestants remained a persecuted minority within France, yet the Edict succeeded in two very important aspects. It reduced the institutionally sanctioned violence that had plagued the last half of the sixteenth century, and second the position of the crown was strengthened, allowing it to explicitly impose its authority on the political and religious institutions of the kingdom. This is not to say that the crown’s position was unassailable in the first decades of post Edict of Nantes France, indeed royal authority under Henri IV and the early reign of Louis XIII was still quite weak, but that there were no large scale outbreaks of confessional violence until the Protestant uprisings in the 1620s demonstrate that the Edict of Nantes, flawed as it was, proved to be a successful compromise.

The rhetorical tone arising out of the Charenton controversy in both its political and religious contexts is traditional and conservative. Throughout the Défense and Bouclier du Moulin rejected the language of resistance popularized in Protestant tracts

\textsuperscript{72} Ce que j’ai à vous dire est que je vous prie de vérifier l’édit que j’ai accordé à ceux de la Religion. Ce que j’en ai fait est pour le bien de la paix. Je l’ai faite au-dehors, je la veux au-dedans. Vous me devez obéir, quand il n’y aurait autre considération que de ma qualité et de l’obligation que m’ont tous mes sujets, et particulièrement vous tous de mon Parlement... Ne m’alleguez point la religion catholique. Je t’aime plus que vous, je suis plus catholique que vous: je suis fils aîné de l’Église. In Garrisson, \textit{L’Edict de Nantes}, 24.
such as Francois Hotman's *Franco-Gallia* (1574). He echoes Calvin’s position as formulated in the *Institutes* that all subjects owe allegiance and obedience to the sovereign magistrate.\(^73\) Du Moulin then goes one step further. He not only maintains the virtue of the subject’s loyalty to the King, but argues in favour of the absolute monarch, though this is not explicitly stated in the text. The context of this is found in his discussion of the abuses of papal claims of the right to depose and install the prince at will.\(^74\)

The Catholic agents also took great pains to demonstrate their loyalty to the crown. Appealing to Louis XIII’s piety and sincere devotion to a conservative Catholicism, Arnoulx, Richelieu and others maintained the well established position that any heterodoxy threatened the political body of France. Richelieu in particular cites the instances when the Protestants demonstrated their disloyalty to royal authority dating to the reign of Francois I. Granted, Richelieu maintained that religious heterodoxy was politically schismatic, yet he does not recommend concrete action to remove this perceived threat to the well being of the kingdom. This is not to say that the Protestants did not face institutionalized repression from the state.\(^75\) But this repression lacked the violent undercurrents that had accompanied previous attacks on the Huguenots.

Throughout the Dedicatory Epistle, du Moulin acknowledges the precarious state of existence the Protestants find themselves and lists a series of grievances to this effect. The Protestant faction he claims is hated (*haïr*) for their claim to possess the true meaning of salvation, the doctrine of grace and the rejection of the real presence. Yet


\(^{74}\) Pierre Du Moulin, *Le Bouclier de la Foi*. (Geneva, 1630), Chapter CLXXXII, passim.

\(^{75}\) Mentzer, Benedict, Hoffman, etc.
despite all this, du Moulin positions the Protestant faction as truly loyal to the crown.\textsuperscript{76}

Du Moulin continues to remind Louis XIII that it was the Protestants who had protected his father Henri IV “durant ses affections,” and by so doing had demonstrated that it was they, not the Catholics who had the interests of the kingdom at heart. Furthermore, the Protestants had shown themselves to be loyal subjects in opposing Spanish involvement in the affairs of the Kingdom.\textsuperscript{77} It is within this context of protestations of loyalty to the crown that the Charenton ministers first attack the privileges of the Papacy. In addressing the threat posed by Spain to France, du Moulin positions his criticism of papal claims of temporal power on “the question being asked if the Pope can depose our Kings, and if it is within the power of the Pope to depose your crown.”\textsuperscript{78}

Furthermore, du Moulin argued that, not only had the Pope illegitimately claimed the power to depose of duly anointed monarchs, but the Catholic Church had become nothing more than a front for the temporal ambitions of the see of Rome.

Hoping that one day, God will open your eyes in order to recognize that under the special name of the Roman Church, the Pope has established for himself a temporal monarchy on earth. Already he has in his power a third of your land and has removed from your obedience a fifth of your subjects, meaning the Ecclesiastics, who say they are not your subjects, and who are not accountable before your justice, and have even for their temporal lord and souverain outside the Kingdom...In other words, that [the Pope] can take your life and the crown on which it rests, except for the fact that your Kingdom is a fief of the Papal see, and that you live and reign at his discretion.\textsuperscript{79}

\textsuperscript{76} Pierre du Moulin, \textit{Défense de la Confession des Eglises Reformées} (Charenton, 1617), 3-4. \\
\textsuperscript{77} Du Moulin, \textit{Défense}, 6. \\
\textsuperscript{78} la question a été agité si le Pape peut déposer nos Rois, et s’il est en la puissance des Papes de disposer de votre Couronne. Du Moulin, \textit{Défense}. 6 \\
\textsuperscript{79} Espérons qu’un jour Dieu vous ouvrira les yeux pour appercevoir que sous ce nom specieux d’Eglise Romaine, le Pape s’establit une Monarchie temporelle en terre. Déjà il a en sa puissance le tier de votre terre, et à soubstrait de votre obeissance le quint de vos subjects, à savoir les Ecclésiastiques, qui se disent n’être point vos subjects, et qui ne sont pas justiciables devant vôtre justice, et ont, même pour leur temporel, un autre souveraine hors du Royaume...à savoir qu’il peut vous oster la vie et la Couronne que reste-il Sire, sinon que vôtre Royaume est un fief du siege Papal, et que vous ne vivez et ne regnez qu’à sa discretion. Du Moulin, \textit{Défense}. 7.
On the other hand, the French Protestants, along with a sizable portion of the Catholic population, had always maintained the dignity and rights of the crown, which du Moulin suggests are held by the monarch through divine right. “A thing that we as well as many of your Catholic subjects would never suffer, knowing that we owe our lives and our means to the defense of the dignity of your crown: Above all to the defense of the right God gives you, and which is founded on his word.”

Du Moulin develops his theme by claiming that one of the reasons that the papacy throughout the ages had been successful in encroaching upon the authority of the monarch is because people have been ignorant of the scriptures. “It was to no other end, Sire, that the Pope for centuries had hindered the Kings, your predecessors from seeing the Holy Scripture, so that his Empire is founded on ignorance of the word of God.” If people, including the Magistrate, had been allowed to examine the scriptural text for themselves, then they would have understood the divine nature of Kingship which finds its legitimacy, not from Rome, but from Jesus Christ.

God who gave you France in his blessing, preserves you by his providence, and has strengthened your scepter in your hands, making it serve for the establishment of the Kingdom of his Son, who is the King of Kings. In such a way that God reigning through you, reigns with you.

These ideas are developed to their full extent in du Moulin’s Bouclier de la Foi, where du Moulin again picks up on the theme of the abuses of papal authority and its encroachment on the privileges of the temporal estate.

---

80 Chose que nous comme aussi plusieurs Catholiques Romains de vos subjects, ne souffrions jamais, sachans que nous devons nos vies et nos moyens, à la défense de la dignité de votre Couronne: Sur tout à la défense d’un droit que Dieu vous donne, et qui est fondé en sa parole. Du Moulin, Défense. 7.
81 Ce n’est à autre fin (Sire) que le Pape depuis quelques siècles a empêché que les Rois vos predecessors ne vissent l’Écriture sainte, si non pource que son Empire est fondé sur l’ignorance de la parole de Dieu. Du Moulin, Défense. 10.
82 Dieu qui vous a donné à la France en sa benédiction, vous conservera par sa providence, et affirmera votre sceptre entre vos mains, le faisant servir à l’établissement du Royaume de son fils, qui est le Roi des Rois. En sorte que Dieu reignant par vous, reigne avec lui. Du Moulin, Défense. 11.
Three chapters are dedicated to the issue of papal and royal authority. The first chapter concerns itself with the power of the Pope over the crown and lives of the kings. The second chapter discusses how these papal claims are contrary to the word of God, and the third chapter examines if the power of the Kings exists through divine right. Du Moulin first sets the context for his argument against papal claims as temporal lords. Throughout the discourse, he displays a highly developed sensitivity to the historical record. He begins by noting that “The Popes for some 550 years have attributed to themselves the power to depose Emperors and Kings, and to have this power not only over the spiritual, but also over the temporal.”

From there du Moulin lists all the various examples of when Popes arrogated this power to themselves, beginning with the Investiture Contest between Gregory VII and Henry IV. In 1212, King John was deposed by Innocent III who gave England to Philippe Augustus, which turned out not to be a gift, but rather a charge to conquer England at Philippe Augustus’ own expense and peril.

Innocent III finally absolved John, only after John agreed to hand over the kingdom as a fief of Rome, along with an indemnity of 1000 silver marks. Three years this action was justified later at the Fourth Lateran Council which “gave the Popes power to absolve subjects from the fidelity sworn to their Lord, and to give his lands to other Catholic lords” Citing the Council of Lyons in 1245 when Innocent IV deposed Frederick II, du Moulin describes the full implications arising from such claims. “And since Gregory VII until Albert of Bavaria who was completely deprived of the dignity of the Empire, for the period of 260 years, they not only removed, excommunicated, and

83 Les Papes depuis quelques cinq cens cinquante ans se sont attribué la puissance de déposséder les Empereurs et Rois, et de dispenser leurs subjects de leur garder la fidelité jurée, et d'avoir puissance non seulement sur le spirituel, mais aussi sur le temporel. Du Moulin, Bouclier de la Foi. 114.
84 donne au Pape puissance d'absoudre les subjects de la fidelité jurée à leur Seigneur, et de donner ses terres à d'autres Seigneurs Catholiques. Du Moulin, Bouclier de la Foi. 775.
deposed Emperors, but maintained this by force, thus are brought about bloody wars, more than an hundred battles, and cities without number taken and sacked.\textsuperscript{85}

Warming up to his subject, du Moulin includes the conflict between Boniface VIII and Philippe IV. Philippe IV’s defiance of Boniface over the granting of benefices had earned the King the ire of the Pontiff, who deposed Philippe, and gave the German emperor Albert I the charge to conquer France. Referring to contemporary events, du Moulin includes Pius V’s deposition of Elizabeth I and the subsequent Irish rebellion; Henri III’s assassination by Jacques Clement was the direct result of Sixtus V’s excommunication of the King. “With equal injustice Henri III our King, being deposed and excommunicated by Sixtus V, was shortly thereafter killed by Jacques Clement.”\textsuperscript{86}

Gregory XIV had declared Henri of Navarre as incapable of claiming the French throne in 1592, which had in du Moulin’s opinion prolonged the violence of the religious wars. What is striking about the comprehensive historical review of papal claims of secular authority is that du Moulin does not limit himself to only Protestant magistrates who ran afoul of the Vicar of Christ.

If we reply that in suffering a heretic King, the Catholic religion incurs a grave danger: I will respond that the Pope often deposes Kings who are of his religion. Was it for heresy that Henri III was deposed? Was it for heresy that John Albert, King of Navarre was deposed and deprived of his Kingdom by Julius II? It is the same with the Emperors Henri IV and Frederick II, and of Philippe the Fair and John, King of England, and of many other.\textsuperscript{87}

\textsuperscript{85} Et depuis Gregoire VII jusques à Louis de Baviere auquel est entierement descheue la dignite de l’Empire, par l’espace de 260 ans, on ne void qu’Empereurs excommuniez et deposez, mais qui se maintiennent par force, dont sont advenues infinites guerres sanglantes, plus de cent batailles, et villes sans nombre prises et saccages. Du Moulin, Bouclier de la Foi. 775.

\textsuperscript{86} Avec pareille injustice Henri III nòtre Roi, ayant été depose par Sixte Vet excommunie, fut peu après tué par Jacques Clement. Du Moulin, Bouclier de la Foi. 776.

\textsuperscript{87} Si on replique qu’en souffrant un Roi hérétique, la religion Catholique encourt un grand danger: Je respondrai que le Pape depose souvent les Rois qui sont de sa religion. A ce est pour heresie que nòtre Roi Henri III a été depose? A ce etre pour heresie que Jehan d’Albret Roi de Navarre a été depossedé et prive de son Royaume par Jules II? Il est le même de Henry IV et de Frederic II Empereurs, et de Philippe le Bel, et de Jehan Roi d’Angleterre, et de plusieurs autres. Du Moulin, Bouclier de la Foi. 788-9.
The Pontiff had also challenged the authority of orthodox magistrates. This betrayed the moral and intellectual bankruptcy of papal claims of authority. The exercise of these claims betrayed the agenda of the papacy.

The Pope claims the power to depose souverain Princes for heresy such as Queen Elisabeth, and the late Henri IV. Or being supportive of heresy like Henri III. Or for incapacity and weakness of spirit: Thus Pope Zachary in the Canon *Alius* in cause 15 quest 6. claimed to depose Chilperic for incapacity, and gave his Kingdom to Pepin...Or for the collation of prebends and benefices, which is the cause for which Boniface VIII struck at King Philippe the Fair, and gave his Kingdom to the Emperor Albert. 88

The naked pursuit of wealth and power was not the only resulting evil which arose from papal claims of authority. The excessive use of excommunication provided the necessary defense for the abominable crime of regicide. “From the excommunications and depredations of Kings are born enterprises against their lives. This fulmination thrown against Elisabeth, Queen of England was followed by many conspiracies against her life. From the deposition of Henri III by Sixtus V followed the parricide committed by Jacques Clement, for which the Pope is said to have rendered to God thanks…” 89

After all this du Moulin then cites numerous examples of where the papacy had been at the mercy of the magistrate. The purpose of cataloguing these events is to first demonstrate that the theory of papal authority within the space of the State was a novelty initiated by overweening pontiffs, and second, it illustrates that ultimately the pontiffs,

---

88 Le Pape pretend pouvoir déposer les Princes souverains, pour hérésie, comme la Reine Elisabeth, et le feu Roi Henri IV. Ou pour estre fauteurs d’hérétiques, comme le Roi Henri III. Ou pour incapacité et tardiveté d’esprit: ainsi le Pape Zacharie au Canon *Alius* en la Cause 15 quest 6. se vante d’avoir deposé Chilperic pour incapacité, et transporte son Royaume à Pepin...Ou pour s’estre attribué la collation des prebends et benefices, qui est la cause pour laquelle Boniface VIII foudroya le Roi Philippe le Bel, et donna son Royaume à Albert Empereur. Du Moulin, *Bouclier de la Foi*. 776-7.

89 De ces excommunications et degradations de Rois naissent les entreprises contre leur vie. La fulmination jetée contre la Reine d’Angleterre Elisabeth a été suivie de plusieurs conspirations contre sa vie. De la déposition de Henri III par Sixte V s’est ensuivis le parricide commis par Jaques Clement, pour lequel le susdit Pape rendit graces ... Du Moulin, *Bouclier de la Foi*. 778-9.
and by extension, any ecclesiastical authority are subjected to the Magistrate. After employing the historical record to challenge papal claims, du Moulin then turns to scriptural basis for his position. Addressing himself to Jean Arnoulx, the Italian Jesuit Robert Bellarmine (1542-1621) and Cardinal du Perron, he cites the Catholic scriptural defense of the Church’s power to depose the Magistrate. Among the various Biblical sources he notes in particular Peter’s comment concerning the two swords, and Jesus’ comment in the twelfth chapter of John that after his ascension, all things will be in his hands, meaning, according to the Papists, temporal authority.

However, in the following chapter, du Moulin employs the scriptural record to undermine the claims of the likes of Bellarmine, Arnoulx and du Perron. He pointed out that there are many references requiring the subject to be obedient to his earthly lord. Du Moulin noted that throughout Israelite history many of the Kings had been idolaters and yet none of the prophets had pronounced that their subjects were free from their obligation, neither had they the right to kill their rightful king. Even Nero could not be justly deposed by his subjects, despite his being a monster. “Nero, being a monster in nature, the shame of the human race, and the first Emperor who began to persecute the Church. However, the Apostle Saint Paul, Romans 13, speaking of the Power which then was in state, said that it was ordained of God, and that whoever resisted him, resisted the ordinances of God.” Indeed

It is also beyond all absurdity to imagine that S. Peter and the Bishops of Rome after him had the power to depose the Emperor Nero, or Domitian. Without doubt these Emperors did not even know there was a Christian bishop in Rome, so these Bishops, being poor and weak, are excused not

90 Du Moulin, Bouclier de la Foi. 777.
having recognized and honoured these Bishops as their superiors in temporal things, and who could overthrow the Empire.\textsuperscript{92}

Jesus Christ himself had commanded that people were to render unto Caesar, those things that belonged to Caesar, who for the Jews represented a pagan Emperor, and yet the Popes claimed that they were authorized to incite rebellion among Christian princes.

To further drive his point home, du Moulin cites early Church history. After the persecutions, a sizable number of Christians had populated much of the military and political structures of the Roman Empire under the reign of Julian the Apostate, to such an extent, that if the Christian elements in the Empire had decided to revolt, there was a serious possibility that Julian would have been defeated. Yet “The Bishop of Rome did not advise deposing [the Emperor] of the Empire.”\textsuperscript{93} In the course of this discourse, du Moulin defends the principle of a strong central monarchy. It is too much at this point to suggest that he favours an absolute monarch, but there is no question that within the sphere of the state, the King is sole master. Du Moulin, referring back to the conversion of Clovis argues that just Clovis’ crowning by the Pope had not reduced the King of the Franks power

It is less believable that if a pagan Prince converted to the Christian faith, as did Clovis King of France, he must become less King than he was as a Pagan, and that his conversion to the faith must mean the diminution of his power. That’s nevertheless the opinion of the Pope and Jesuits. For it is beyond doubt that Clovis being a Pagan did not recognize the Bishop of Rome as his superior, and that there was no Bishop either in or out of his Kingdom who could depose of his crown. Now if the Pope could dispose and degrade Christian kings, it follows that the crown of Clovis on the day of his conversion was deprived of its splendour and sovereign

\textsuperscript{92} Ceci aussi passe toute absurdité de s’imaginer que S. Pierre et les Évêques de Rome après lui aient eu puissance de déposer l’Empereur Neron, ou Domitian. Sans doute ces Empereurs, qui ne savoient pas seulement qu’il y eust un Évêque Christien à Rome, tant ces Évêques estoient poveres et chetifs, sont excusables de n’avoir recogneu et honore ces Évêques comme leurs Superieurs des choses temporelles, et qui pouvoient les culebuter de l’Empire. Du Moulin, Boucher de la Foi. 789.
\textsuperscript{93} l’Évêque de Rome ne s’advisa point de la déposer de l’Empire. Du Moulin, Boucher de la Foi. 790.
independence, and commenced then to recognize a superior in temporal things, that which is more sovereign. Through the doctrine it is unlikely a pagan Prince could be induced to be a Christian.\footnote{N’est non plus croyable que si un Prince Payen se converti à la foi Chrestien, comme fit Clovis Roi de France, il doive être moins Roi qu’il n’estoit lors qu’il étoit encore Payen, et que sa conversion à la foi doive tourner à la diminution de sa puissance. C’est la néanmoins l’opinion du Pape et des Jesuites. Car il est hors de doute que Clovis étant Payen ne reconnoissoit point l’Évêque de Rome pour son supérieur, et qu’il n’y avoir Évêque que ni dedans ni dehors son Royaume qui peut disposer de sa couronne. Que si le Pape peut déposer et degrader les Rois Chrestiens, il s’ensuivra que la couronne de Clovis au jour de sa conversion est descheue de sa splendeur et independance souveraine, et a commencé lors a reconnoistre un supérieur des choses temporelles, qui est n’être plus souverain. Par cette doctrine il est malaise qu’un Prince Payen puisse estre induit à se faire Chrestien. Du Moulin, \textit{Bouclier de la Foi.} 791-2.}

The Protestants on the other hand “had never spoken of deposing our Kings, and do not believe that any man in the world could depose the King, or release his subjects from their oaths of fealty.”\footnote{jamais parlé de déposer nos Rois, et ne croyons point qu’aucun homme au monde puisse déposer le Roi, ou dispenser ses subjects du serment de fidelité. Du Moulin, \textit{Bouclier de la Foi.} 793.} All throughout this discussion, du Moulin fails to mention fellow French Protestant political thinkers such as Hotman, Beza and others who had argued almost the exact opposite. In this discourse, du Moulin not only advanced a theory of monarchy that was not beholden to papal interests, he also presented an image of monarchy which was becoming increasingly secular and independent of its traditional anchors. In du Moulin’s formulation, the King was still the protector and defender of the faith, but by decentring the institution of the monarchy from its traditional relationships with the Catholic Church, secularizes the monarch and without saying it explicitly engages in a discourse of the separation of the Church and State. It also creates an impersonal conception of the crown. If the Magistrate is no longer dependant on the orthodoxy of those who hold the office, and thereby the loyalty of the subject to the Magistrate is no longer directly tied to the person of the King, then loyalty becomes centred on the institution independent of the person holding the office.

As stated by du Moulin the involvement of Spain in French affairs was evidence enough that the true threat to royal authority were the Catholics. Even more threatening...
to the authority of the crown was the existence of the Jesuits in France. The Jesuits were a threat, first of all because, according to du Moulin, the General of the order was in the employ of the Spanish King, and secondly the Jesuits had been condemned by the Parlements throughout France as "ennemies de l’Etat, et de la vie des Rois, et corrupteurs de la jeunesse." Even more damning was the fact that the Jesuits taught that the Pope had power over the monarch and, hearkening back to the days of Gregory VII and Innocent III, that the Pope could depose and install the monarch at will. The Jesuits also used the confession to incite rebellion against the crown. Du Moulin tapped into more than just anti-Jesuit sentiment, he was expressing a conception of monarchy which appealed to the crown. Scholars have correctly discussed the republican strains in the political theory of the Protestants, but these strains are absent here. Rather what is apparent, even taking into consideration the expected flattery, is a conception of Kingship that was elevated above the power of the Church, and yet maintained its historical role as protector of the Christian faith, regardless of confession.

Richelieu's contribution to the controversy is in itself fascinating. Written prior to his elevation to the cardinal's hat, his *Principaux Points de la Foi* (1617), reveals a complex image of the man who would one day become Louis XIII's most powerful minister. Although the *Principaux Points de la Foi* addresses the political implications of the Charenton ministers' Calvinism, it is not simply a political document. Rather, it reveals to a great extent how Richelieu perceived his role as a Bishop within the context of seventeenth-century devotion and Catholic Reform, and the extent to which he had

---

96 Du Moulin, Défense. 7.
been influenced by the figures of the devotional currents in the early seventeenth century.\footnote{Levi, \textit{Cardinal Richelieu}, 4.}

Not only had Richelieu been influenced by the Ultramontanism of Jean Arnoux, he also had been highly influenced by the Cardinal du Perron who was an ardent opponent of Gallican privileges. In 1612, Richelieu preached a sermon (the text of which has been subsequently lost) while attending the Council of Sens, in which he denounced the “forthright Gallicanism of Edmond Richer...who was aggressively determined to extend the claims of the French church to autonomy from Rome.”\footnote{Levi, \textit{Cardinal Richelieu}, 38.} Although Richelieu in his early career respected the authority of the Pope in religious matters,\footnote{Levi, \textit{Cardinal Richelieu}, 110.} the \textit{Principaux Points de la Foi} demonstrates that he recognized the need to negotiate carefully the political realities of Bourbon France. Despite his efforts to negotiate the political realities of Bourbon France, the \textit{Principaux Points de la Foi} demonstrates that Richelieu favoured the Ultramontane position that the Pope alone was the sovereign able to judge religious controversies.

Engaging with du Moulin’s claim that the Protestants had been promised by Henri II toleration after presenting their petition, Richelieu sarcastically points out the uselessness of the Protestants in addressing their grievances to the late Henri II. They were just as mistaken in addressing their complaints to Louis XIII because it was a “pure fallacy to convince the King to recognize different religions.”\footnote{Pure fallacie de convier le Roy à cognoistre des differents de la religion. Richelieu, \textit{Principaux Points de la Foi} (Poitiers, 1617), 205.} Furthermore, based on Theodore Beza’s \textit{Confessions}, Protestants had rejected presenting their grievances to the King since he was not authorized to adjudicate in religious matters.

\footnotesize

\begin{itemize}
\item \footnote{Levi, \textit{Cardinal Richelieu}, 4.}
\item \footnote{Levi, \textit{Cardinal Richelieu}, 38.}
\item \footnote{Levi, \textit{Cardinal Richelieu}, 110.}
\item \footnote{Pure fallacie de convier le Roy à cognoistre des differents de la religion. Richelieu, \textit{Principaux Points de la Foi} (Poitiers, 1617), 205.}
\end{itemize}
The Prince, says Beza, assists with Synods, not to rule, but to serve, not to make laws, but to propose those laws which according to the word of God will be explained by the mouth of the Ministers, to be kept by them and the people. The Prince, says Junius, does not recognize, neither could recognize in virtue of his charge, the meaning of faith. We say, says Witakerus, that the different Ecclesiastics must be removed by the ministers by virtue of the law. And in another place, I respond that Martin defers to the Church the judgments touching the points of doctrine, and he does not attribute this to the Emperor, and it is denied these judgments belong to the Bishops.  

Even though this was a dangerous position to maintain, given the hostility to Rome’s interference in France’s affairs, Richelieu stakes the middle ground by claiming the early Christian kings had willingly given up their claims to judge on matters of religion.  

Thus when Richelieu wrote the *Principaux Points de la Foi* in response to the Charenton ministers’ accusations, he began on safe ground. He reminds the Charenton ministers that the protested loyalty of the Protestants was not evident under the reigns of François I and Henri II as they disobeyed the will of the early Valois by not returning to Catholicism. But even more seriously, Richelieu reminds the ministers, as well as his readership that this disobedience under François I and Henri II became all out rebellion under François II and Charles IX, citing the battles of Dreux, S. Denis, Jarnac and Moncontour. And as far as the claim of protecting Henri IV during “ses afflictions,” Richelieu reminds his readership that at the time Henri himself was a heretic, and his Protestant followers had rebelled against Henri III. And now that Henri IV had adjured

---

101 Les Princes, dit Beze, assistent aux Synodes, non pour regner, mais pour servir, non pour faire des lois, mais pour proposer celles qui selon la parole de Dieu seront expliquées par la bouche des Ministres, afin d’être gardées par eux et par le peuple. Le Prince dit Junius, ne coignoit, ni ne peut coignoir en vertu de sa charge, du sens de la foi. Nous disons, dit Witakerus, que les differentes Eclesiastiques doivent être videz par le Ministre en vertu de la Loi. Et en un autre endroit, Je respons que Martin defere a l’Eglise le jugemens touchant les points de doctrine, et qu’il ne l’attribue point a l’Empereur: et qui est-ce nie que ce jugemens apparienne aux Eveques. Richelieu, Principaux Points de la Foi, 205-6.

102 Richelieu, Principaux Points de la Foi, 211.

103 Richelieu, Principaux Points de la Foi, 17-8.
Protestantism and had returned to the Catholic fold, he was opposed by his Protestant subjects.\textsuperscript{104}

It seems that your predecessors served the great Henri, but it goes badly for you, it seems that all together they served him, not as King, but as leader of their sect, for their services anticipated his succession to the Crown, then he favoured them openly, at which time they could not legitimately assist him against their King; and then when the royal scepter fell into his hand, which was the time they should have died for him because he was their King, having embraced the Catholic faith, he did not show himself in matters of Religion a promoter of their cause, their fire turned to ice, thus as he himself said, felt that coldness at the siege of Amiens.\textsuperscript{105}

Richelieu continued his attack on the Protestant claims of loyalty by maintaining that the praises sung by Protestants only serve “to hide under beautiful appearances the serpent which kills souls.”\textsuperscript{106}

Richelieu then sets out the tone which subtly belies the seemingly intolerant rhetoric that informs the entire Principaux Points de la Foi. Unlike Henry VIII who attempted to silence Luther for his heresies, Louis XIII’s policies toward the Protestant would be more moderated.\textsuperscript{107} However, Richelieu’s intention was not. First and foremost, he desired the conversion of the Protestants, not through violence, but rather “the passionate desire and hope which I have of your conversion obliges me to treat you

\textsuperscript{104} Richelieu, Principaux Points de la Foi, 22.
\textsuperscript{105} Par la il paroit que vos predecesseurs ont servi la grand Henry, mais le mal est pour vous, qu’il paroist tout ensemble qu’ils l’ont servi non comme Roi, mais comme fauteur de leur secte, puis que leurs services previnrent son advenement à la Couronne, lors qu’il les favorisoit ouvertement, auquel temps ils ne pouvoient legitiment l’assiter contre leur Roi, et que de puis que le sceptre royal lui fust tombé en main, qui estoit le temps auquel ils devoient mourir pour lui, parce que bien qu’il fut leur Roi, ayant embrassé la foi Catholique, il ne se rendoit pas en matiere de Religion promoteur de leur cause, leur feu se convertit en glace, dont il tesoigna de sa propre bouche sentir la froideur au siege d’Amiens. Richelieu, Points de la Foi, 18-9.
\textsuperscript{106} Coucher sous de belles apparances le serpent qui tue les âmes. Richelieu, Principaux Points de la Foi, 2.
\textsuperscript{107} Richelieu, Principaux Points de la Foi. 3.
gently: It suffices me to inform him of your artifices which consist in thinking to please him in all things, in order to please him in this point this is where you dissemble."  

While the subsequent arguments throughout the *Principaux Points de la Foi* seem anything but soft, this statement does speak to Richelieu’s view of the relationship between the Catholic and Protestant factions. Despite the harshness of the rhetoric, Richelieu is true to his word. Nowhere does he suggest violence against the Protestant faction, although the claims of being reasonable are strained at times. Richelieu’s passionate desire and hope for the peaceful conversion of the Calvinist party did not prevent the Bishop of Luçon from uncompromisingly rejecting all of du Moulin’s claims. Whereas the first fourteen chapters of the *Principaux Points de la Foi*, are dedicated to refuting, point by point the doctrinal position described in the Charenton ministers’ *Défense*, the last chapters (15-19) contain some of Richelieu’s most hostile language employed against the Protestants.

In chapters 15 and 16, Richelieu compares the Protestants of his day to the heretics that challenged the early Christian Church. In the fifteenth chapter, the Protestants are compared to the Donatist sect who had also separated themselves from the Church. Throughout his discussion, Richelieu relies heavily on the Fathers to support his attack. Richelieu buttresses his argument by claiming all the Fathers argued that the Catholic Church was the church established by Christ when he gave Peter the keys of the Kingdom. Richelieu frames his argument in the following terms:

The principle of which the Fathers drew their argument, was the pastoral authority, and the seat of St. Peter, and not the doctrinal authority, it would

---

108 Le désir passioné et l’espérance que j’ai de votre conversion m’obligeant à vous traiter plus doucement: il me suffit de lui découvrir vos artifices qui consistent à penser lui plaire en toutes choses, pour lui plaire en ce point, et c’est ou j’en demeure. Richelieu, *Principaux Points de la Foi*, 3.
110 Richelieu, *Principaux Points de la Foi*, 223.
seem in the reasoning of St Cyprian, and because the seat of St. Peter is the foundation, on which the Church is built and from which the Sacredotal unity is derived. This from St. Optat, that in this single seat of St. Peter, the unity of the Church is kept... St Augustine says, the succession of Priests descend from the seat of St Peter maintained in the Catholic Church, and this succession is the stone against which the gates of hell have no power.  

Chapter 6 continued this theme by arguing that the Protestant had renewed ancient heresies. The first of these heresies was the rejection of the salvatory nature of good works. According to Richelieu, this heresy first appeared under Simon Magus, who was condemned by Saints Irene and Theodoret. The second heresy renewed by the Protestants was that infants without baptism could be saved, which was originally held by the Pelagians. This heresy had been successfully combated by Saint Augustine. The final heresy reintroduced was the position that the true Church was simply a community of believers. This doctrine first appeared with the Donatists who were condemned by Augustine. The problems with this were self evident for Richelieu, and goes to considerable lengths to prove the falseness of the Protestant claims, citing a number of Church Fathers.

Richelieu concludes that the ancient heresies reintroduced by the Protestant had already been condemned by the early Christian Church, and were shown to be unsustainable based on the Biblical text and Patristic writers. As the violence of the civil wars receded after the promulgation of the Edict of Nantes, the image of the Protestant as...
represented in Catholic sermon literature moved away from the rhetoric of violent attacks on the body of the Protestant to a more tolerant discourse, at least within the context of the seventeenth century, reflecting the emphasis the crown placed on the pacification of French society
Chapter VI

Political Rhetoric in Seventeenth-Century Sermon Literature

In the chapter concerning the Charenton controversy we examined how Catholic and Protestants appealed to the authority of the King, and how this affected the development of royal authority. It is argued that the religious polemics of the seventeenth century, specifically within the context of the Charenton controversy gave rise to a form of political discourse which placed submission to the crown at the centre of the debate between the Catholic and Protestant factions. This chapter continues this theme of political discourse within a confessional context. The co-operation between the crown and Church reveals a great deal about the nature of the development of religious rhetoric and practices of royal authority during early Bourbon monarchy. First of all, this discussion reveals the deep divisions within the French church over the question of the power of the monarch.

During and after the Wars of Religion, the radicalized elements of the Catholic Church opposed Henri IV’s claim to the throne and threw their support behind papal policies in regards to France. The moderate factions, mostly coming from within the ecclesiastical leadership, not only backed Henri after his conversion, but also opposed papal interference in the affairs of state and its encroachment upon Gallican liberties.\(^1\) Although there still remained proponents of the ultramontane position among prominent members of the French Church, such as the Cardinal du Perron, even supporters of papal

---

authority found it expedient to qualify their support of Rome with protestations that such loyalty could be held parallel to their loyalty to the sovereign.

The proximity of the Gallican church and the Bourbon court was an indication that the crown was again turning to what it considered its natural ally in the functioning of royal power. Despite the rupture during the religious wars, the crown could confidently rely on the support of the clergy. However, as we will see in this chapter, the co-opting of the Church under the early Bourbons was not a return to the traditional allegiance between the secular and ecclesiastical estates.

As the clergy preached in favour of royal authority, they created within their sermons a new image of the French monarch. This new image on one hand hearkened to the traditional understanding of the role of the King. On the other hand, the image presented by the clergy anticipates the absolutist rhetoric of divine monarchy of the Ancien Régime. While these sermons prefigure Bossuet’s King as Christ on earth, the crown was limited in its ability to put into practice its discourse of royal authority. The limitation in part came from the general disorder caused by nearly forty years of civil war. The Church was a willing facet in the crown’s strategy of bringing to heel the nobility. Sermon literature reinforced the idea that a good Christian subject was obedient to the political estate, even in the case of a heretic king.

There are many examples of this. Pierre de Besse’s sermon collection, entitled *Premiers Conceptions Theologiques* was dedicated to the Prince de Condé, wherein he reminded the young prince of his obligation to the crown. We have also seen in François de Sales’ political rhetoric the emphasis on obedience to the secular authority.

---

Etienne Molinier’s sermons speak to the responsibility Christians had to the crown. In addition to his sermon collections, he wrote *Les Politiques Chrestiens*, in which he discusses the ideal Christian society. This society would be ruled by a strong monarch, under the direction of God.  

An examination of sermon literature also illuminates the tension among various factions within the Gallican church. The violence of the religious wars in the sixteenth century had originated from the radical elements within the Catholic party. These radical elements had created a rhetoric of resistance directed against the King who failed to protect France from the cancerous heresy of the Calvinists. This resistance discourse also challenged the liberties of the Gallican church in favour of papal interference in both the Church and the state of France. The crown certainly was not ignorant of the threat posed by a radicalized Catholicism. Even though both Henri III and Henri IV had spent most of their reigns trying to control and suppress expressions of Catholic resistance they were ultimately felled by an assassin’s blade.

During Louis XIII’s reign ecclesiastical support for the papacy became problematic. As we saw in the case of the Charenton controversy, the Protestants were able with great effect to accuse the Catholics of political sedition based on the fact that the papacy and the Jesuits of France claimed sovereignty over both the Church and State. Du Moulin framed the question within the context of international politics; support for the papacy was seen as a challenge to the interests of France. Proponents of papal authority found it necessary to defend carefully their position against both the Protestants, and the moderate elements among their fellow Catholics.

---

As theories of papal and political authority diverged and competed with each other, proponents of an increasingly strengthened monarchy gained the upper hand. This came about because of other developments within French political thought during the Wars of Religion and its aftermath. The revival of neostoicism in the late sixteenth century and early seventeenth centuries influenced political discourse decidedly in favour of monarchical power. As a counterpoint to the monarchomachs, the politiques and clerical estates adopted neostoic ideals which dictated that even in the face of tyranny the subject had a duty to the sovereign. And if this duty became too onerous, then one had the responsibility to withdraw from active political life, and quietly tolerate the situation.\(^6\)

The neostoic concern with submission to political authority fit in well with the French conception of kingship. Since Clovis' baptism in 493, the French monarch was imbued with a sacral nature.\(^7\) In response to the threats to royal authority coming out of the religious wars, political theorists sought to restore the sacral nature of the French king. Jean Bodin maintained that the king was the image of God on earth.\(^8\) The divine sanction granted to the king as God’s representative augmented the majesty of the monarch.\(^9\) Bodin opposed the idea that if the king fell into heresy, he became a “simple sinner” who could be deposed by the will of the people.\(^10\) Fearing that any form of popularity sovereignty would lead to anarchy, Bodin stated that “the tyrant is nonetheless

---
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a sovereign, just as the violent possession of a robber is true and natural possession even if against the law, and those who previously had are dispossessed."\textsuperscript{11}

For his part, Pierre Charron (1541-1603) argued that even in the case of a wicked and tyrannical monarch, the subject was duty bound by the word of God to obey that sovereign.

\begin{quote}
We have an express commandment to obey Kings directed to all in general...let every soul be subject unto the higher powers [Romans 13]...There is no power but of God, and the power is ordained of God, therefore he that resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God [Romans 13]...To allege the tyranny, wickedness, insufficiency, negligence of Kings, 'tis to say they are wicked, but it hinders them not from being true Kings. Now we ought to obey them, not because they are good, but because they are true, that is lawful.\textsuperscript{12}
\end{quote}

This rhetoric of royal authority found its way into the sermon literature of the seventeenth century. To a great extent, the clergy did not divorce this political language from its religious and theological framework. Rather, they laid the groundwork for the language of the divine monarchy of Louis XIV by focusing on the sacred nature of the King. As already noted, the clerics of the first half of the seventeenth century may have prefigured Bossuet, but they stopped short of claiming that kings were Gods on earth.\textsuperscript{13}

The clergy is hearkening to a traditional understanding of kingship as defender of Catholic orthodoxy, while at the same time, reinforcing the sacred nature of the monarch to such an extent that there is no just cause for rebellion against even a heretical king.

To avoid risk of overstating the case, it must be remembered that the Bourbon monarchy was by no means secure. Henri IV had achieved some success in bringing to heel the various factions within the kingdom, and by 1610 Henri had to a large extent pacified France. His assassination by Ravaillac, however had threatened to plunge

\textsuperscript{11} Bodin, \textit{On Sovereignty}, 6.
France back into civil war as factions at the court took advantage of an opportunity to claim the throne, because Henri's son, Louis XIII was still a child.

Even as Louis achieved his majority, and put in place many of Richelieu's policies designed to augment the position of the crown, there was no guarantee that the Bourbon monarchy would survive. The fact that it did is a testament in part to the political skill of Richelieu. After all, it was not only the radicalized city preachers who provided religious sanction for rebellion against the crown. Moderate members of the French episcopate could also be tempted to turn against royal authority. During the later religious wars there were pronounced divisions within the episcopate, between the ligueur factions and the moderate royalist party. The position of the Politique party within the episcopate was severely challenged by the assassination of Henri III, as it was now apparent that the still Protestant Henri of Navarre would assume the throne as Henri IV. The fear of a Protestant king of France sent many of the episcopate into the arms of the Catholic League to prevent such a situation. Pope Gregory XIV renewed Henri's excommunication and even sent papal troops into France to support the League, and it would not be until the pontificate of Clement VIII before Henri was reinstated in the church. Henri IV spent a considerable amount of his reign restoring the episcopate's loyalty through the channels of royal patronage. Some of the preachers under consideration within this chapter, such as Jean Bertaut received their Bishoprics from the

patronage of Henri IV,\textsuperscript{18} and their sermon literature reflects the success of the networks of royal patronage as a means of ensuring the loyalty of the Bishops of France.

Sermon literature proved to be an effective means of transmitting the royalist policy of pacification for many reasons. First, published editions of sermons found a wide audience during the seventeenth century. In many cases these sermon collections ran into several editions within a short period after their initial print run.\textsuperscript{19} The popularity of these collections also suggests that the intended audience extended beyond other preachers who would have used the sermons of their colleagues for topoi in their own sermons. For example, though François de Sales was greatly influenced by the Cardinal du Perron, there is no evidence that de Sales ever cited du Perron within his own sermons. Furthermore, each sermon collection includes a preface setting out the theme and purposes of the publication, again suggesting that these printed collections were intended for a wider distribution outside clerical circles.

We can see this process of the theory of royal authority as well as some of its limits in Cardinal du Perron's *Harrangue fait de la part de la Chambre Ecclesiastique en celle du Tiers Estat* (1613). The occasion for the Harrangue was the Estates General of 1614. As it was preparing its cahier for the King, the Third Estate became involved in a debate over "the relative powers of the Pope and King."\textsuperscript{20} Entering the Chamber where the commons were meeting, du Perron was followed by members of the First and Second estates.

\textsuperscript{18} Bergin, *French Episcopate*, 217.
\textsuperscript{19} For example, both of Estienne Molinier's sermon collections, *Le Banquet Sacré* and *Sermons pour tous les Dimanches* ran into three editions within a period of ten and six years respectively from the years of 1631-1645. Jean Bertaut's *Sermons sur les Principaux Festes de l'Anneé*, had a healthy publishing life of about twenty years, from 1611- c. 1630.
The Harrangue is a fascinating piece of religio-political theatre. It begins with a prosaic statement regarding the Third estate's traditional role as guardians of justice. And because of this the Second estate was to remember their oath of loyalty to the young Louis XIII. Within this discussion the refrain that matters of religion belong properly to the ecclesiastical estate was ever present. Du Perron went to great lengths to protest that the Church had no other concern than the well-being of the King. “We equally work with you in this zeal and passion, and condemn equally...the parricidal perfidy of the monsters who assault the sacred persons of our Kings.” Du Perron furthermore claimed that no other estate was more willing to fulfill their political obligations than the clerical estate. 

Du Perron commenced his harangue by flattering the members of the Third Estate, and emphasizing the historic role fulfilled by the Third Estate as the King’s consultative body, but the Cardinal is quick to remind the members of the Chamber that though the King was to consult with them, they were subservient to the will of the monarch. In fact du Perron uses this opportunity to define the role of each Estate. Du Perron’s formulation of the role played by the Second and Third Estates hearkens back to their medieval functions. The nobility was to fight to preserve the authority of the crown, “for the other orders come to their charge, and their honours and dignities of this kingdom; one, the Nobility through the costliest price they could pay, by the price of their blood and at the risk of their lives.”

---

21 Du Perron, Oeuvres, 94-6.
22 Nous conspirons donc également, en ce zèle et en cette passion, avec vous, et condamnons également...la perfidie parricidiale des monstres qui attentent contre les sacrées personnes de nos Rois. Du Perron, Oeuvres, 597.
23 Du Perron, Oeuvres, 597.
24 car les autres ordres viennent aux charges, et aux honneurs et dignitez de ce Royaume; les uns, comme la Noblesse, par le prix le plus cher, qui se puisse payer, savoir par le prix de leur sang et du peril de leur vie. Du Perron, Les Oeuvres Complete. (Paris, 1625), 597.
As for the Third Estate, their function was to provide the economic support for maintaining the monarchy and the First and Second Estate. At this point, du Perron turns his attention to the Ecclesiastical order, whose existence rests on the will of the King.

But we, we arrive here through the pure and only grace and goodness of our Kings...moreover we cannot, naked and unarmed as we are, subsist or enjoy our repose or our commodities, except under the shade of peace, and the prosperity of the affairs of the King, being otherwise exposed and a prey to all sorts of injuries and outrages.

The crown was not unaware of how the Church had challenged royal authority during the Wars of Religion, and was thus just as interested in pacifying the Church as it was in pacifying the Nobility and the commons. Thus we see in this sermon literature diverging discourses of royal authority. With these preliminary statements out of the way, du Perron got to the heart of the matter. After reading the proposed articles of the Third Estate, the cardinal listed three essential points of disagreement between the First and Third estates. For our discussion the first and last points are the most relevant. First, du Perron addressed the possibility of the King becoming a heretic, and attempting to force his subjects to follow his heresy. In this case, the cardinal argued that the subjects were free from their oaths of loyalty, but they did not have the right to take up arms against the monarch.

The final point was addressed to the Third Estate efforts to grant the crown greater authority. Du Perron responded that any augmentation of royal authority without

---

26 Mais nous, nous y arrivons par la seule et pure grace et bonte de nos Rois...d'ailleurs ne pouvons, nus et desarmez que nous sommes, subsister ni jouir de notre repos ni de nos commoditez, sinon sous l'ombre de la paix, et de la prosperite des affaires du Roi, etans autrement, exposez en proie, a toutes sortes d'injures et d'outrages. Du Perron, *Oeuvres*, 597.
the approval of the Church or Pope would be considered schismatic, since it threatened to put the King above the spiritual jurisdiction of the papacy.\textsuperscript{28} This was a difficult position to advance given that the murder of two kings by religious fanatics, had been lauded by the ecclesiastical leadership.\textsuperscript{29} Du Perron continued to reinforce the position of the King by reminding the members of the Third Estate of the three fundamental pillars underpinning the relationship between the Third Estate and the monarch.

The first concern is security of the person of the Kings; and here, we are in complete agreement, and offer to sign it, not with ink, but our blood. Understand…it is not permitted to assassinate Kings: and not only do we detest with David the Amalchite who bragged having put his hand on Saul, even though he was rejected and deposed by God through the Oracle of Samuel. But we even cry with a loud voice with the sacred Council of Constance against the murderers of Kings…Anathema to those who assassinate Kings: Eternal curses on those who assassinate Kings. The second point is on the dignity and temporal sovereignty of the Kings of France. And here we are also in agreement. For we believe that our Kings are sovereign in all regards in their kingdom, and are feudatories of either the Pope, as those who have received their crowns with this condition, or of any other Prince…The Kings depend entirely on God, and do not recognize any other power under them. These two points therefore we hold for certain and indubitable, but in different kinds of certitude. Namely, the first with divine and theological certitude; and the second with human and historical certainty. For Pope Innocent III affirmed that the King of France would recognize no other temporal superior, and the historical testimony affirms this.\textsuperscript{30}

\textsuperscript{28} Du Perron, \textit{Oeuvres}, 635.
\textsuperscript{29} Du Perron, \textit{Oeuvres}, 597.
\textsuperscript{30} Le premier concerne la seurete de la personne des Rois: Et de cestui-la , nous en sommes tous d'accord, et offrons de le signer, non de n'otre encre, mais de n'otre sang; savoir...il n'est permis d'assassiner les Rois: et non seulement detestons avec David, l'Amalchite, qui se vanta d'avoir mis la main sur Saul, encore qu'il eut esté rejette et deposed de Dieu, par l'Oracle de Samuel; mais meme crions a haut voix, avec le sacré Concile de Constance, contre les meurtriers des Rois...Anathème à quiconque assassine les Rois: Malediction eternelle, à quiconque assassine les Rois: Damnation eternelle, à quiconque assassine les Rois. Le second point est de la dignite et souveraineté temporelle des Rois de France: Et cestui-la, nous en sommes aussi d'accord. Car nous croyons que nos Rois sont souverains, de toute sorte de souveraineté temporelle en leur Royaume; et ne sont feudataires, ni du Pape, comme ceux qui ont receu ou obligé leurs couronnes, à ceste condition, ni d'aucune Prince...[les Rois] dependent immédiatement de Dieu, et ne reconnaissent aucune puissance par dessus eux, que la siéne. Ces deux points donc, nous les tenons pour certains et indubitable, mais de diverses sortes de certitude; savoir, le premier, de certitude divine et theologique; et le second, de certitude humaine et historique. Car ce que le Pape Innocent III affirme que le Roi de France ne reconnoist aucune superieur au temporel, c'est par forme de temoignange historique, qu'il affirme. Du Perron, \textit{Oeuvres}, 599.
Du Perron reminds the members of the Chamber that the Church, both Roman and Gallican are in complete agreement that the King holds absolute sovereignty within his kingdom. Innocent III had recognized that there was no power greater than that of the King of France. Du Perron then comes to the third pillar which concerns the responsibility of the Third Estate should the King fall into heresy. This was obviously more than just an academic question, since there had been a real possibility that a Protestant would have ascended to the throne of France.

Now the third point, if the Princes, having made, they or their predecessors, an oath to God and to their people, to live and die in the Christian and Catholic religion, and declare open war, that is to say, come not only to fall into manifest heresy or apostasy from the Christian religion, but even attempt to force their subjects in their consciences and undertake to plant Arianism or Mahometism or any other similar infidelity in their States, and destroy and exterminate Christianity; their subjects are absolved from the oaths they made...\(^{31}\)

Du Perron then goes on to make the tenuous claim, that until the arrival of Calvinism, the Catholic Church never sought the life of a King who had rejected the Church, nor subjects released from their oath of loyalty to their monarch. Noting that he had been permitted to speak to before the members of the Third Estate, du Perron explains why it was important that the sanctity of the King’s person remain inviolable even if he became an enemy of the Church.

Of the four “inconveniences” that arose from rebellion, the two that were of greatest concern were, first, if one claimed for himself to have ecclesiastical sanction for

\(^{31}\)Reste le troisieme point, qui est, savoir si les Princes, ayants fait, ou eux ou leurs predecesseurs, serment à Dieu et à leurs peuples, de vivre etmourir en la religion Chrestienne et Catholique, et à lui declarer la guerre ouverte; c’est à dire, viennent non seulement à tomber en manifeste profession d’hérésie, ou d’apostasie de la religion Chrestienne, mais même passent jusques à forcer leurs subjects, en leurs consciences, et entreprennent de planter à Arainisme ou le Mahometisme, ou autre semblable infidélité, en leurs Estats, et y destruire et exterminer le Christianisme; leurs subjects absous de serment de fidelité qu’ils leur ont fait... Du Perron, Oeuvres, 599-600.
the forcible deposition of an anointed monarch, it opened the door to all sorts of heresy, since the subject acted without the guidance of ecclesiastical authority. And the second danger was the social and civil disorder that followed after the assassination of the monarch, which freed the factions within the Kingdom to pursue their political ambitions at the expense of the well being of the Kingdom.32

It must be noted here that even though du Perron goes to great lengths to reinforce the sanctity of the French crown, he is careful to remind the Third Estate that ultimately the authority of the King exists under the auspices of the ecclesiastical order. The question for du Perron was not whether a subject has the right to rebel against his monarch, but whether the Church has the authority to excommunicate the monarch, and if it does, what that means for the subjects of an excommunicated King. Throughout his harangue du Perron treads carefully. As with the case of the Charenton controversy, a too strong defense of papal authority, would have left du Perron open to accusations of supporting regicide. Rather, du Perron seeks a middle way. The entire harangue is replete with historical examples of when the Popes had legitimately excommunicated the Princes of Europe for their heretical behaviour.

As du Perron runs through this catalogue he reminds the Chamber that even though the Pope is authorized to excommunicate monarchs as he sees fit. The French are bound by dual loyalties to the secular and ecclesiastical estates. In du Perron’s formulation, the Church has first claim upon the loyalty of the Christian.

And here Monsieurs I will not wear you out with either reasons, or arguments, but I will pass over the exhortations and the prayers, and will remind you that you are Frenchmen, but that you are also Christians and Catholics; and that in negotiating the well being of Kings, you must not only cast your eyes to the ground, but also raise them to Heaven; and must

not in remedying your physical country, which is France, destroy the spiritual, which is the Church. The Pope is tolerant and patient for the well being of the Ecclesiastical peace.\textsuperscript{33}

For du Perron, the legitimacy of the King rested on his adherence to Catholic orthodoxy.

Du Perron’s Harrangue reflected a traditional understanding of the medieval function of the monarch as the representative of Christ, whose duty it was to protect the Church. But even though du Perron’s understanding of Kingship has medieval overtones, there are some nuances which demonstrated the evolving nature of French kingship.

The sacredness surrounding the King arose from the support he received from ecclesiastical laws, and du Perron was quick to state that while these ecclesiastical laws put certain constraints on the King, his authority could not be challenged. Du Perron rejected in its entirety the theory of just rebellion against the King, even if the King was regarded as having broken with the Catholic Church. Du Perron argues that ecclesiastical law would never require the deposition of the legitimate King. To claim otherwise was seen as a perversion of religion.

From the experience we can only too well appreciate, that these evils which proceed from a perverse and corrupt imagination of religion, cannot be sufficiently remedied by human laws, and apprehensions of temporal punishment alone. The laws of the conscience are necessary which act on the soul and intimidate them with the fear of eternal torment. Those who undertake these detestable parricides, under a false religious persuasion, are not restrained by any fear of corporal torments. They bathe in these torments, they think they are running to the crowns of martyrdom; they flatter themselves with a false application of this sentence of our Saviour: “And fear not them who kill the body, but rather fear him who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell.”\textsuperscript{34}

\textsuperscript{33} Et ici, Messieurs, je n'userai plus avec vous, de raisons, ni d'arguments; mais passerai aux exhortations et aux priers, et vous conjurera de vous ressouvenir que vous estes Francois, mais que vous etes aussi Chrestiens et Catholiques; et qu'en traitent de la seurety des Rois, vous ne devez pas seulement jitter les yeux sur la terre, mais aussi les élever au Ciel; et ne devez pas remedier a leur vêtre patrie corporelle, qui est la France, en destruissant la spiritualité, qui l'Eglise. La Pape tolere et patiente, pour le bien de la paix Ecclesiastique. Du Perron, \textit{Oeuvres}, 640.

\textsuperscript{34} Car l'experience ne nous a que trop appris, qu'à ces maux qui procedent d'une perverse et corrompue imagination de religion, les seules lois humaines, et apprehensions des peines temporelles, ne peuvent servir de suffisant remede. Il faut des lois de conscience, et qui agissent sur les âmes, et les intimident par
Du Perron's work demonstrates the complexity in attempting to define the relationship between the crown and Church. By the first decades of the seventeenth century the claim of papal supremacy over the crown was becoming the minority position.

While du Perron represented the minority position, other elements within the French church unapologetically promoted the superiority of the sovereign over all elements of French society, including the Church. Pierre de Besse in his sermon pronounced for the "Jour des Rois" (1628) appropriately took for his theme the role of the monarch as the representative of God on earth.

I say furthermore that Kings are called the images of God on earth...Kings are not only the divine images raised on the grand theatre of the world: But they are held in God's own hand, and are by him raised up, and it is from him that they hold their Scepters and Crowns...35

De Besse further informs his congregation that because the King holds his authority from God, his sovereignty is not dependent on the will of the people.36 The divine sanction of the King was also addressed by Molinier in his *Politiques Chrestiens*. In the third chapter of Book II, Molinier argues that the King is inspired by God and therefore governs both state and church, independent of all other authority.37 Bossuet would later give full expression to this sentiment claiming that the "person of the King is sacred, and that to

---

35 Pour moi je dis bien davantage, que les Rois sont appelées les images de Dieu en terre...Ce n'est pas tout les Rois ne sont pas seulement des images divines dressées sur le grand théâtre du monde: ains tirées de la propre main de Dieu, et par lui érigées: et c'est de lui qu'ils tiennent les Sceptres et les Couronnes... Pierre de Besse, *Conceptions Theologiques sur toutes les Festes des Saints*. (Rouen, 1628), 63-4.
36 De Besse, *Festes des Saints*, 64-5.
37 Molinier, *Politiques Chrestiens*, 110-142.
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attempt anything against him is a sacrilege," even if the "King should be an infidel...one should have respect for the ordination of God."38

The sermons of Jean Bertaut demonstrate of the earliest shifts in the conception of the French monarchy. While at the court of Henri III, Bertaut refused to join the Catholic League, rejecting the revolutionary rhetoric associated with the extreme elements of the Catholic Church. His religious writings display a greater interest in maintaining the supremacy of religion as the yardstick against which royal policy was to be judged.

In his religious writings, Bertaut formulated the nature of the relationship of the Christian’s duty to royal rulership. Bertaut's funeral oration published in 1610 for Henri IV is a clear statement on the evils of regicide. From the onset, Bertaut refers to Ravaillac as “vil,” “mechant,” and as a “charongne enragé.”39 His outrage does not end there. Ravaillac attacked both the King’s body, and the divinely sanctioned institution of the monarchy, “donner traidreusement la mort aux plus grands Monarque de la terre, et ce que la condition humaine peut avoir plus venerable entre les homes, tant par l’Institution de Dieu.”40 The Christian obligation to obey the King was a social duty. In other words, religious devotion did not free one from the obligations of proper moral social behaviour. Ravaillac’s murder of Henri IV therefore was dangerous to the body politic, not because Ravaillac attacked some medieval conception of the corpus mysticum, but because he had assassinated the institution which guaranteed both social and religious order through the person of Henri IV.

As the nature of the King evolved away from its medieval foundation, royal authority came to rest less and less in the person of the King and more and more in the

38 Bossuet, Politics Drawn from the Holy Scriptures, 58-61.
39 Jean Bertaut, Discours Funèbre sur la Mort du Feu Roy. n.d. 351.
40 Bertaut, Discours, 351-2.
impersonal institution of the monarchy. This strengthened the authority of the crown, especially under the Bourbons, since they become identified in an increasing degree as the embodiment of the institution of the monarchy.41 This process decreased the vulnerability of the King’s body. As the person of the King became increasingly identified with the State, any assault on the King was an attack on the well ordered running of the society, and for the court preachers, with their interest in maintaining social order as a form of devotion, such behaviour could not be tolerated. It is with this in mind that Bertaut compared Ravaillac to Cain.

...But in the frenzy of the most abject and contemptible vagabond who hides himself in the scum of the mob; provided for only through evil persuasions, or cursed illusions of the mind, he would have been carried to this impious resolution, wishing to give his life in order to take that of a great Potentate.42

Cain, as with Ravaillac, had allowed himself to be persuaded by evil designs to murder his brother. For this act, Cain was cursed to wander the earth as a vagabond. His punishment, his exile from society symbolized the gravity of the offence. Because he had willfully shed the blood of his brother, Cain had violated the fundamental bonds that were meant to maintain social order, and could no longer remain a part of that society.

By comparing Ravaillac’s murder of Henri IV to Cain’s murder of Abel, Bertaut continued to strengthen the connection between the two murderers. Thus where Cain struck at the social order through the murder of his brother, Ravaillac’s assassination of Henri IV weakened the fundamental basis of the social order of France.

42 ...Mais à la frenaisie du plus abject et contemtpible vagabond qui se cache en la lie de la commune; pourveu seulement que par de mechantes persuasions, ou par de maudites illusions d’esprit, il soit porté jusques à c’este impie resolution, que de vouloir donner sa vie pour ravir celle d’un grand Potentat. Bertaut, *Sermons*, 352.
Henri IV’s assassination is then compared to Henri III’s assassination twenty years earlier. Like Henri IV, Henri III was murdered by one who wore the clothing of a religious, however neither act was justifiable. The fact that Ravaillac hid himself, gave lie to the position that Henri IV’s murder was God’s will for not supporting the radical elements within the Church. The funeral oration expressed no sympathy for those who under the guise of religious duty would engage in regicide, which not only affronted God in the person of the King, but also threatened the well being of the state.

Throughout the funeral oration Bertaut continues the theme of the Christian’s duty to the political order that is evident in his sermons. Thus in speaking of Ravaillac’s crime, the distinction is drawn between the body of the King, and the body of legitimate authority. Both assassinations were crimes against government, and by extension, the social order protected by the functioning of the monarchy. Jean Bertaut’s royalist rhetoric resulted from his experience at court. His elevation to the Bishopric of Séez was a reward for his loyalty to Henri IV.

Bertaut’s loyalty was well known. He began his early career at the court of Henri III as the librarian (bibliothécaire) and secretary of the King’s chamber. He was also “Conseiller du Roy, en don Conseil d’Estat et Privé et premier Aumônier de la Reyene.” As “Conseiller du Roy” and Aumônier de la Reyene,” Bertaut was in a strong position to understand and promote the royalist policy of soothing religious factions in the interests of the State. His position as bibliothécaire instilled within Bertaut a strong sense of loyalty to the crown. Bertaut’s loyalty to the crown superseded the highly charged atmosphere of late sixteenth and early seventeenth-century confessional politics.

---

43 Monod, Power of Kings, 34-5.
Although Bertaut’s orthodoxy never came into question, he did not tolerate the hyper-orthodoxy that served as the foundation of resistance to royal authority. Because of this, Bertaut opposed the Catholic League, and more specifically was highly critical of the role played by the Duc de Guise in the religious wars of the 1580s. For Bertaut, Guise’s actions were not about concerns over the orthodoxy of Henri III, as much as it was an attempt to satisfy his political ambitions by deposing Henri.\textsuperscript{45} An epigraph composed by Bertaut for the Duc de Guise shortly after his assassination displays little pity over his fate.

\begin{quote}
This famous duc de Guise, to whom all of France
Seemed to have given the same obedience
That rendered in times of yore under the empire of laws
To the most puffed up mayors of the palace of our kings
He is no more, caused by six mortal wounds
Which despoiled his life, and the Prince of his fears
Having fallen in the dirt, where his broken body
Reddens the floor of the royal chamber.
His brother, the purple circling his head
Struck with lightening from the same tempest
In following the trail and closely pursued his steps
In the bloody way which conducted his trespass.\textsuperscript{46}
\end{quote}

Even after the death of Henri IV, Bertaut remained close to the court. Prior to his elevation as Bishop of the diocese of Sées, in 1606, Bertaut’s poetic works had commonly addressed the importance of royal authority as one its themes. Bertaut’s work

\textsuperscript{45} Grente, Jean Bertaut, 116-7.
\textsuperscript{46} Ce fameux duc de Guise, à qui toute la France
Semblait devoir prêter la même obéissance
Qu'elle rendait jadis sous l'empire des lois
Aux maires plus vantés du palais de nos rois,
Il n'est plus, c'en est fait: six mortelles atteintes,
Le dépouillant de vie, et son Prince de craintes,
L'ont fait choir sur la poudre, où son corps détaché
De la chambre royale a rougi le planché.
Son frère, à qui la pourpre environnait la tête,
Foudroyé des éclats de la même tempête,
En a suivi la trace, et talonné ses pas
Dans le sanglant chemin qui conduit au trépas.
Jean Bertaut, Discours Funèbre sur la Mort de la Reine Mère. n.d. 152.
had brought him to the attention of Cardinal du Perron, who would throughout his career act as a patron for the future Bishop.\textsuperscript{47} The patronage of du Perron combined with Bertaut’s family connections at court had helped him maintain the favour of Henri IV. It also put him in a position where he was instrumental, along with François de Sales, in achieving the abjuration of Henri of Navarre prior to his ascension to the throne. Because of these connections and his prominent role in the abjuration, Henri rewarded Bertaut with the Bishopric of Sées, west of Paris in Normandy.

The location of Bertaut’s elevation to Bishop was important, as the Bishopric had within its boundaries a sizable and assertive Protestant population.\textsuperscript{48} Because of his well known loyalty to the crown, and his well documented adherence to the moderate elements within the Gallican church, he was regarded as a good candidate to help impose religious and political orthodoxy on the Protestant population.

Two years after his death, Jean Bertaut’s collection of sermons was published in 1613 in Paris, with the King’s privilege and the approval of the Faculty of Theology.\textsuperscript{49} This series of sermons was given on the occasion of Bertaut’s installment to the Bishopric in Sées, December 1606 by Henri IV, replacing Claude de Morenne, M. de Sées, who had been a “predicateur ordinaire”\textsuperscript{50} under Henri III, and who had been instrumental in the conversion of Henri IV.\textsuperscript{51} Jean Bertaut’s \textit{Sermons sur les Principles Festes de l’Annee} are a fascinating case study of early Bourbon sermon literature.

\textsuperscript{47} Bergin, \textit{French Episcopate}, 574.
\textsuperscript{48} Bergin, \textit{French Episcopate}, 283.
\textsuperscript{49} Although the 1613 edition does not include the Faculty of Theology’s approbation, the sermons were reviewed and approved by the Faculty. Grente included the approval in one of the appendixes of his biography
\textsuperscript{50} Claude-Privas de Morenne, \textit{Oraison funèbre faite sur le trespas de Henry trios}. (Lyon, 1595), n.p.
\textsuperscript{51} Grente, \textit{Jean Bertaut}, 61.
Because of his earlier literary efforts as a part of the Pléiad circle, his sermons display a profound sensitivity to the beauty of language, which is at once dramatic and appealing.

As with de Sales, Bertaut received a humanist education. As a young man, he was a student at the college of Blois and the University of Caen. It was during these years that Bertaut developed his taste and talent for poetry. He was particularly attracted to the Pléiade poets, and especially to Ronsard.\textsuperscript{52} Aware of their utility, a great number of Bertaut’s sermons employ classical \textit{exempla}. Not only do these citations aid in the presenting of the pastoral message, they, to a great degree, shape the nature of the political rhetoric within the sermon literature. For example, Bertaut draws the comparison between the Greek lawgiver, Solon, and Jesus Christ. Christ as the “nouveau maistre et Legislateur,” illuminates how the sovereign good can be achieved, whereas all other attempts at the sovereign good, though worthwhile were like groping in the shadows.\textsuperscript{53}

The political in de Sales’ early sermons is not quite as developed as it is in Bertaut. De Sales’ sermons from the 1580s-90s are replete with allusions to Imperial Roman history to better underpin the position he takes in favour of the authority of the crown and the obedience owed it by its subjects. One such example is found in sermon, “Pour la Fête de Saint Pierre” of 1593. While criticizing the neighbouring Huguenots who rejected Papal succession from Peter, de Sales turned his attention to Peter’s journey to Rome to shore up the fledging church, and where he governed the church for twenty years. De Sales continued that Nero’s persecution of the Church had been caused by Peter’s presence in Rome.

\textsuperscript{52} Grente, \textit{Jean Bertaut}, 9.
\textsuperscript{53} Bertaut, \textit{Sermons}, 4.
De Sales then equates Rome with Babylon because of the idolatries maintained by Nero that existed in the city.

Yes, truly, because the idolatry reigning during the time of Rome bathed in the blood of the Martyrs through the tyranny of Nero, this city deserved to be called Neronian or Babylonian, and not Christian.\textsuperscript{54}

De Sales continued that Nero’s hatred of Christians extended personally to Peter, whom he wanted dead, yet for whose life the Christian population had pleaded.

Saint Peter, after governing the Church for nearly twenty five years, and disputing with Simon Magus, Nero wished to kill him. But the Christians prayed for him that he would be saved as very necessary for the Church, which could not lose its chef without falling into disarray...\textsuperscript{55}

De Sales without explicitly making the connection made it clear that the Roman pagans' bloody campaign against the early Christians was supported by Nero himself.

Unlike the city preachers of the 1560s-1580s de Sales avoided drawing any contemporary allusions between the state-sponsored persecutions of the Christians in ancient Rome and the situation in France. By the early 1590s, the civil wars that had been raging were finally subsiding, but the hostility between the various factions was never far from the surface, and violence could break out at any time. Also the Edict of Nantes had not yet been promulgated, thus it was not out of the realm of possibility for de Sales to take advantage of this opportunity to launch into a violent polemic against the Huguenot population or even the French crown for not doing enough to eradicate the Protestants. After all, the earlier generation of city preachers had blamed the Valois

\textsuperscript{54}Oui, vraiment, car l’idolatrie regnant en ce temps là a Rome qui estoit baignée du sang des Martyrs par la tyrannie de Neron, c’est ville devoit ester appelée neronienne ou Babylone, et non pas chrestienne. De Sales, \textit{Oeuvres}, 7: 42.

\textsuperscript{55}Saint Pierre done etant a Rome et disputant contre Simon magicien, après avoir gouverné l’Église environ vingt cinq ans, Neron le voulut faire mourir. Mais étant prié par les Chrestiens qu’il se conservast, comme tres necessaire à l’Église, laquelle ne peut perdre son chef sans recevoir quelque desarroi... De Sales, \textit{Oeuvres}, 7: 42.
monarchy for allowing heresy to gain a foothold in the Kingdom. Citing Old Testament monarchs that had either introduced or failed to expedite the destruction of heretical elements in Israelite society, the city preachers, equated these wicked kings with royal policies which sought a rapprochement with the Huguenot factions. Their sermons quite clearly made use of Old Testament exempla to justify rebellion against the crown. This is absent in de Sales preaching thus far.

While the political estate as represented by Nero actively attempted to exterminate the Christian sect, de Sales avoids making the allusion that Bourbon France was imitative of Nero’s Rome. The source material of his sermons from the last decades of the sixteenth-century is predominantly Biblical. There is no reference to any classical political philosophers, nor is there any reference made to Patristic theory on the role of the state such as Ambrose’s exchange with the emperor Theodosius I or Augustine’s City of God.

Both de Sales’ and Bertaut’s sermons are replete with historical allusions, each of which were designed to support their pastoral message. De Sales is a little less comfortable with the wholesale use of secular history. He was aware of the dangers inherent to the faithful if they relied too much on secular wisdom. In a letter to André Frémyot, the Archevêque de Bourges he echoes early Patristic opinions that pagan or secular sources could be used, but only within a Christian context.

Bertaut displays no such concern. Nearly half of his sermons open with references to the Roman past, which displays an antiquarian’s interest the political nature between the pagan Empire and a sovereign Christian monarchy. The interest in Roman cultural practices is expressed at the commencement of the “Sermon pour le jour de la Purification de la Vierge.” The month of February had traditionally been accepted by the
Church as the duration of the Purification of the Mary which, under Mosaic Law, was a ritual cleansing a woman underwent after the birth of her first born son. But February was also important to the ancient Romans, as it was the month in which they also performed their ritual cleansings.

...the festival [we] celebrate among ourselves, the Purification of the blessed mother of God, reminds us even of the time that the ancient Romans consecrated their yearly expiations and purgations, which they called in the Sabine language *Febura*, from where comes the word February, *Mensis Februarius*, as one could say, the month of purifications...  

The connection between Mary’s purification and the purification rituals of ancient Rome which gave the month of February its name further continues Bertaut’s political rhetoric. The link between the two purification rituals, though subtle, reinforces the idea of the Christian monarchy that Bertaut has been promoting throughout his sermon literature.

The Romans had been masters of the ancient world, but this was now replaced by the *pax Christiana* as evidenced by the fact that the original pagan celebrations were replaced by Christian ones.

Bertaut continues to demonstrate the continuity between the Roman Empire and the emergence of a Christian sovereignty. In his “Sermon pour le jour de la Circoncision,” Bertaut begins by announcing the arrival of spring, evidenced by the lengthening of the days. Instead of expounding on the Christological symbolism of the lengthening spring days, Bertaut shifts rhetorical gears and provides an account of an ancient Roman tradition, in which all levels of society participated in the exchange of small gifts.

56 ...la fête qui [nous] celebre entre nous la Purification de la bien-heurese mere de Dieu, se recontre au même temps que les antiques Romains consacroient à leurs expiations et purgations annuelles qu’ils appelloient en langue Sabine *Febura*, d’où vient le mot Fevrier, *Mensis Februarius*, comme qui dirait, le mois des purifications... Bertaut, *Sermons*, 151.

It is an ancient custom, and practiced for a long time, even by the Roman Emperors, that this day one gives and receives mutually small presents which we call constraints: The Emperor Caligula made it known that he would receive them in person on the first day of the following year from the hands of the Roman people, and all those who presented them, as in this time, the people gave them to their primates, also maintaining friends and parents, giving them to each other as a symbol of friendship.

Over time this ritual gift giving increased in political significance. As noted by Bertaut, the Roman emperors also participated in the tradition, and Bertaut singles out Caligula’s contribution, which is then compared to Bishops receiving their benefices, thus maintaining the continuity between the political estate of the imperial Rome and ecclesiastical authority that replaced the political and secular structure of the now defunct empire.

De Sales also employed classical exempla to great effect in his sermons.

Preaching to the same congregation a few days later, and still on the same theme of Peter’s primacy as the chief apostle, de Sales continues this theme of the Church’s primacy vis à vis the state.

And if the ancient Romans solemnized the first day to the honour of their Emperor Augustus, whose name was even given to this month, does it not seem reasonable that changing the bodily to the spiritual and the worldly to Christian, the festival is changed for the honour of God, under the name of his lieutenant general, the true Emperor of the Church militant, very august, most holy, and great Prince of the Apostles, and by the grace of God and patron of this our pastoral Church?

59 C’est une coutume ancienne, et de long temps pratiquée, même par les Empereurs Romains, qu’a ce jour on donne et reçoit mutuellement des petits présents qu’on appelle estreines: l’Empereur Caligula fist publier qu’il les receuroit lui même en personne, le premier jour de l’année ensuivant, des mains du peuple Romain, et de tous ceux qui les lui presenteroient, comme en ce temps là les peoples les donnaient à leurs primates, aussi bien que maintenant les amis et les parens se les donnent les uns aux autres en symbole d’amitié. Bertaut, Sermons, 109.

59 Et si les Romains anciens solemnisoyent ce premier jour a l’honneur de leur Empereur Auguste, duquel le nom même fut donné à ce mois, ne vous semble il pas raisonnable que changeant le corporel au spiritual et le mondain au Christianisme, au lieu de le fête à l’honneur de Dieu, sous le nom son de lieutenant general, vrai Empereur de l’Église militante, tres auguste, tresainct et tres grand Prince des Apôtres, et par la grace de Dieu protecteur et patron de c’est e nôtre Église pastoral? De Sales, Oeuvres, 7: 56.
This passage contains a number of important elements of de Sales' formulation of his political thought. First of all the date of 1 August for this sermon itself serves an important function. De Sales noted that the pagan population of Rome had solemnized the first day of August in honour of the Roman Emperor, and argues that since Peter was the head of the Church of Rome it would be appropriate to use the day to honour, not the Roman Emperor, but instead the "vrai Empereur de l'Eglise militante." On one level this is certainly a clever mnemonic device to remind the congregation why this particular day is important in the Petrine sermon cycle.

But even more profound is the comparison of Peter to the Roman Emperor. This had a two-fold purpose. First of all, it would remind the congregation that the Catholic Church supersedes all temporal authority and this supersession is dramatically made by co-opting a day that had traditionally been used to honour the political head in order to honour the first head of the Christian Church.

Secondly, the language used to describe Peter's role as the head of the Christian Church is overtly political. He is referred to as "Empereur," "tres auguste," and the "grand Prince." All terms that had historically been reserved for the Roman Emperors.

More important in the formulation of the political than pagan and historical sources were the Biblical exempla that served as the basis for the discourse of the political in the sermon literature. Interestingly enough de Sales more effectively marshals his knowledge of Biblical sources to argue in favour of royal authority and Christian obedience to that authority.

In concluding "Pour la Fête de Saint Pierre," de Sales acknowledged the social upheavals of his times, especially war and its attendant poverty, but maintained that good subjects were not to blame the political estate for those ills. De Sales makes the
distinction between the bad thief on the cross and the crucifixion of Peter. The suffering that the congregation may endure from the fallout of the Wars of Religion is self-imposed, and not imposed by the state.\(^{60}\) Thus one was to maintain their fealty to the crown, as evidenced by de Sales’ use of the Israelite Queen Jezebel’s persecution of the prophet Elijah. Jezebel and her husband Ahab had been favourite stock figures sermon literature as Biblical precedents for what happens when the crown supported heretical factions during the 1560s-80s. As well, it provided Biblical authority to underpin the city preachers’ call for revolution against the royal court. For de Sales, this tension between the ecclesiastical and secular polities was not as problematic as it was for others. At the end of the sermon de Sales reminded his congregation that Jesus, during the last hours of his life, had been bounced back and forth between Herod and Pilate. He reminded them that first Jesus was sent to Herod and then sent to Pilate, who sent him back to Herod, who in turn returned him back to Pilate. De Sales explicitly referred to the fact that as the governor of Judea, sending Jesus to be tried by Pilate was the equivalent of sending him to the Roman Emperors “...il faut...l’Empereur romain.”\(^ {61}\) For de Sales, even though the political estate as defined by the Roman Empire was responsible for the death of Jesus Christ, the state was only fulfilling God’s purposes. The reason that Jesus Christ had to be condemned under Roman law and subsequently for Peter to face martyrdom in Rome itself was symbolic that the Church was to be established in Rome instead of Judea.\(^ {62}\)

Herod’s hatred of the early church came as a result of his fear that he would lose his kingdom to Jesus Christ, an animosity stretching back to Christ’s birth.\(^ {63}\) This passage certainly has the potential of serving as the basis for the justification for political

\(^{60}\) De Sales, \textit{Oeuvres}, 7: 53.
\(^{61}\) De Sales, \textit{Oeuvres}, 7: 60.
\(^{62}\) De Sales, \textit{Oeuvres}, 7: 60
\(^{63}\) De Sales, \textit{Oeuvres}, 7: 62.
rebellion. But rather than pursuing this particular path, de Sales addresses any misconception of how a Christian should behave towards the secular Prince. Herod was not the legitimate king of Judea since he did not descend from the royal line, rather he had been imposed upon the kingdom by his Roman masters, and his persecution was founded as much on his desire to placate his Jewish subjects as it was out of a concern for his throne.\footnote{De Sales, \textit{Oeuvres}, 7: 64.}

However, de Sales does superficially touch upon the role of the Crown regarding the current state of the Catholic Church in France.

The great Christian philosopher, Justin Martyr, in the \textit{Apology for Anthony}, rejected the error of the ancients who wanted to believe that the Church wished to rise against the secular magistrate, and under this pretext, persecuted it. Now that is still the reason for persecution now: certain reason of State. In France: no one wishes the grandeur of the Church now, we wish to put it under the bushel, but our Saviour will never permit it.\footnote{Le grand philosophe chrétien, Justin le Martyr, en l'Apologia à Antonin, rejette l'erreur d'anciens qui se faisoient acroire que l'Eglise vouloit lever le magistrat seculier, et sous ce pretexte, la persecutoient. C'est ce qui la faict encore persecuter maintenant: certaine raison d'État. Je m'en rapporte à la France: personne ne veut la grandeur [de] l'Église maintenant, on la mettroit volontier sub modio; mais Notre Seigneur ne le permettra jamais. De Sales, \textit{Oeuvres}, 7: 62.}

De Sales' association of the ecclesiastical and secular polity is more sophistically developed. The sermons following his sermon “Pour la Fête de Saint Pierre des Liens,” from the last half of 1593 until February of 1594 contain little in the way of political discourse. However, in his “Pour le Dimanche de la Septuagèsime,” the growing maturity of de Sales’ thought is evident.

De Sales refers to Moses’ confrontation with Pharaoh as he attempted to free the Hebrews from Egyptian bondage. Moses is described as a governor of the people and is an important figure, in that he was seen as more than just the spiritual leader of the exiled Israelites, he also took on the role of King and Judge of the people.
Moses, this great captain of righteousness, being called of God, out when he grazed the sheep of his father in law Jethro on the mountain Oreb, to the charge of leading and general government of Israel in order to deliver them from the hands of Pharaoh, the majesty of God appeared to him in a burning bush, he practiced all the true ways and demanded God all the true qualities, marks and conditions with which it was necessary to undertake to speak on behalf of God and be governor of a people.  

By March 20 1594, de Sales’ political language becomes increasingly explicit. His sermon Pour la Quatrième Dimanche de Carême is one of his most polemical. Though not specifically calling for the physical extermination of the Huguenot faction, de Sales systematically condemned their heresies. In this sermon, the rhetoric reaches a fervent pitch. He opens the sermon with the example of Elijah destroying the priests of Baal. It is not long before de Sales equates the priests of Baal with the Huguenots. De Sales quickly then switches to Jesus Christ’s encounter with the Samaritans, leading into a brief retelling of the history of the origins of the Samaritans. In the course of this account of Biblical history de Sales did not resist comparing the Huguenots to the schismatics of the Northern Kingdom of Israel. Because of their heresies, they are invaded and carried off by the Assyrian armies, who in turn repopulate the area with a loyal client population. Apart from religious heresy, the Ten Tribes of Israel were scattered also because they refused to recognize their legitimate king, Rehoboam. De Sales again equates religious schism with political rebellion.  

For his sermon, “Pour le Dimanche des Rameaux,” de Sales for the first time clearly refers to the Wars of Religion, and its impact on the realm. De Sales employed the example of Job to argue that life is a constant warfare between the forces of good and...
evil, which is also reflected in the physical world as evidenced by the host of social ills that arose from this warfare.

They do not present any other choice, except for this horrible and disgusting Fury, war, it is the common ruin of republics, it is the loss of the State...Thieving, pillaging, sacking, assassinations with impunity, mocking the pains of the poor man as we despoil the king with all sort of liberty, without fear of justice, which reinforces the evil of our miserable age, and is weak in all times, but principally in times of war.\footnote{Bertaut also uses his Biblical sources to great effect, especially within his sermon on the Beatitudes. In the structure of the sermon, Bertaut maintains that the Beatitudes present pas autre chose, sinon que c’est horrible et affreuse Megere, la guerre, c’est ruine commune des republiques, c’est perte de l’État...Volant, pillant, saccageant, assassinant impunément, s’y joignant aux d’espines du pauvre homme, comme l’on feroit au roi despouillé, avec toute sorte de liberté, sans crainte de la justice, laquelle se ressentant fort de sa vieillesse en nôtre miserable age, est fort foible en tout temps, mais principalement en tout temps de guerre. De Sales, \textit{Oeuvres}, 7: 159.}

De Sales continues to equate the wars tearing apart France and the warfare between the spirit and the flesh.

In order to fight this spiritual war, de Sales lists four conditions that will bring victory to the Spirit. First of all, the good Christian must fight his or her sensual appetites and affections. Second, they must deny themselves. Third, they must put their trust in Jesus Christ, and finally they must serve the Lord with all diligence with the means given them by the Lord.\footnote{De Sales, \textit{Oeuvres}, 7: 159.} De Sales argued that Not only will following these four principles bring inner peace, it will also bring peace to the Kingdom. For de Sales, the wars plaguing France were not the necessarily the fault of the monarch, rather as with other preachers, they were a result of the sins of Christians. This idea in and of itself was not original to de Sales, but the conception of the role played by the monarch had changed. De Sales cites Absalom’s rebellion against his father David as a cautionary tale as to what happens when one rebels against the legitimate political authority.\footnote{De Sales, \textit{Oeuvres}, 7: 161; Carroll, \textit{Blood and Violence}, 330-333.}
represent a blueprint for a Christian living, with each Beatitude representing a different social virtue. As Bertaut continues with his beatific theme, he poses the following question to his congregation; “How exactly does one define being blessed?” He answers the question by stating that if the majority of the world was asked; “What is necessary to be happy?”, the response would be one would be considered blessed if he or she had dignity, was respected by their peers, and generally leading a comfortable life. He goes on to state that those who voluntarily chose poverty find their blessed happiness in self-denial and pursuing an aesthetic lifestyle.

Although comparing the merits of each respective position, Bertaut draws his own conclusion; that neither position is entirely accurate. True, Bertaut acknowledges that it is easier to get a camel through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of heaven. But he felt that one can also sin in pursuing too extreme a hermetic life.

But our Lord, has not so openly declared war against wealth: no, for although he says otherwise that it is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter the Kingdom of Heaven, he says afterwards that that which is impossible to men is easy with God.

One can follow the beatific injunction of being poor in spirit by seeking the sovereign good. Riches alone do not disqualify one from the kingdom of God. Indeed many of the greatest patriarchs of the Old Testament possessed great wealth. Job, after proving his dedication to God in spite of his severe trials was rewarded with greater possessions than he had before God permitted Satan to take them away.

71 Bertaut, Sermons, 7.
72 Mais notre Seigneur n’a pas si ouverrement déclaré la guerre aux biens de la fortune: non, car encore qu’il die ailleurs qu’il est plus facile qu’un chable entre par le pertuis d’une aiguille, qu’un riche entre au Royaume des cieux, si dit-il après, que cela quand aux hommes est impossible, mais facile quand à Dieu. Bertaut, Sermons, 9.
Bertaut compared the piety and material wealth of the great St. Louis and King David.\textsuperscript{73} While this may not be directly connected to the political rhetoric of Bertaut’s sermons, there are a few interesting things worth pointing out. The extent to which one incorporates the Beatitudes into their life is expressed through their social behaviour. Bertaut refused to explicitly condemn riches, this is important because the audience to whom these sermons were directed would have been members of the elites of French court life. This then is suggestive of how close Bertaut was to the governing party, and that such closeness aided him in promoting the royalist policy of imposing social order.

The concept that the Beatitudes should form the foundation of one’s social behaviour becomes more explicit as the sermon progresses. Referring to the fourth Beatitude, Bertaut explains that to hunger and thirst for justice is a metaphor signifying the ardent desire one should have in living a good life.\textsuperscript{74} Thus to hunger and thirst for justice is expressed by living in harmony with both God and one’s neighbour. While this is certainly not an original interpretation of the fourth Beatitude, the emphasis on social harmony is important to note.

The Wars of Religion which had decimated France for nearly thirty years, were not solely fought between two diametrically opposed sides consisting of the Catholics and Huguenots, they had also been fought among the moderate and extremist elements within the same religious camps. The formation of the Catholic League and the Seize and the subsequent murder of Henri III and Henri IV put in stark relief the violent and unstable condition of the Catholic position in post Edict of Nantes France. Thus employing the Beatitudes to promote social harmony was as pragmatic as it was to

\textsuperscript{73} Bertaut, \textit{Sermons}, 10.
\textsuperscript{74} Bertaut, \textit{Sermons}, 13.
promote a religious way of life. This subversion of the violent tendencies of the French nobility of course also became urgent since Henri IV had been assassinated in 1610, only three years previous to the publication of these sermons. While Bertaut does not refer to this event in his sermons, (though, this collection does contain his funeral oration for the late King) there can be little doubt that the threat of another round of civil war was real. Hence, in the rhetoric of Bertaut, those that maintain the peace are the children of God, and he equates those threatening the social order established by the crown as children of Satan.

The peacemakers, for they are called his children: and truly it is reasonable that in order to see God face to face, we have the heart purged of all vice...and with these peacemakers, it is not necessary to find it strange that they are called the children of God, he is the God of peace and concord, and if the children must hold to their father, as to the contrary those who sow quarrels and discords among men, are truly children of Satan.  

The political rhetoric in Bertaut's work is more subtle than that of de Sales. Despite this, it becomes apparent that the image of God is not that dissimilar from that of the French monarch. This is especially evident in his “Sermon pour le jour de la Nativité de nostre Seigneur.” In this sermon, the Christian’s duty is equated to his or her duty to obey God in the same terms of a loyal subject’s duty to obey the king, and that this disobedience is equivalent with the crime of lèse majeste. Indeed, as the sermon progresses, the image of the monarch of France and the “monarch de l’univers”77 is further continued.

---

75 Les pacifiques, car ils seront appeliez ses enfans: et veritablement il est bien raisonnable que pour voir Dieu face à face, nous ayons le cœur repurgé de tout vice...et quand aux pacifiques, il ne faut point trouver estrange s'ils sont appellez enfans de Dieu, puis qu'il est le Dieu de paix et de concorde, et que les enfans doivent tenir de leur père, comme au contraire ceux qui sement les querelles et discordes parmi les hommes, sont vraiment enfans de Satan. Bertaut, Sermons, 21.
76 Bertaut, Sermons, 82.
77 Bertaut, Sermons, 60.
Seated as Judge of Heaven and Earth, on the throne of God his Father... he rules the universe through the laws of his incomparable wisdom... he throws the thunderbolts of his Father against impenitent sinners, and in brief at the same time we take him as a poor Carpenter... The magnificence of a great King is not measured by base and vile actions, the nature of his Empire is measured by the wisdom of his conduct, through the marvel of his victories and conquests, by the richness of his treasures, by the splendour of his liberality.  

Despite the comparison, Bertaut takes pains to ensure that it is understood that even though Jesus Christ resembles the Bourbon dynasty, that true sovereignty lies with God.  

Indeed, this sentiment becomes highly explicit in the “Sermon pour le jour de la Pentecoste.”  

The authority of Magistrates through making contrary laws and through the exquisite punishments against who expand over the earth, resists him. Princes, Kings, Emperors, stir up their own disbelief, or through the persuasion of the Priests of paganism, have furiously combated against him, but in the end that it comes to this... The great Potentates of the world have cast down their crowns and their scepters at the feet of the Crucifix... absolute Princes of the Provinces and Monarchies which bend before their obedience. And when paganism surrenders at the hour on all the world, you see now in what state it is reduced under the glorious Empire of our Saviour.  

The agenda of establishing the connection between the French king and the royal status of Christ is taken up again in the “Sermon pour le jour de la Circoncision.” Throughout the sermon Bertaut’s discussion of Christ is clothed in the language of royal authority.

---

78 Il se sied comme Juge du Ciel et de la Terre, au throne de Dieu son père... il dispose de l’univers par les lois de son incomparable sapience... il lance les foudres de son Père contre les pécheurs impenitens, et bref au même temps qu’on le tient pour le fils d'un pauvre Charpentier... La magnificence d’un grand Roi ne se mesure pas aux actions basses et viles, que la nature de son Empire, à la sagesse de sa conduite, à la merveille de ses victoires et conquêtes, à la richesse de ses thresors, à la splendour de sa liberalité. Bertaut, 

Sermons, 92.

79 Bertaut, Sermons, 102.

80 L’authorité des Magistrats lui fait toute sorte de résistance, ou par des loix contraires, ou par des supplices exquis et recherchez contre ceux qui l’espeandoyent sur la terre; les Princes, les Rois, les Empereurs, suscitez ou leur incredulite proper, ou de la persuasion des Prestres du paganisme, ont furieusement combatu contre lui... Les plus grands Potentats du monde de ont jetté leurs couronnes et leurs sceptres aux pieds de ce Crucifix... que Princes absolus des Provinces et Monarchies qui flechissent devant leur obeyssance. Et quand au paganisme qui renoit à l’heure Presque sur tout le monde, vous voyez maintenant en quell état il est reduit sous le glorieux Empire de nôtre Sauveur. Bertaut, Sermons, 262-3.
This terminology is in part biblical, but in Bertaut’s preaching, the language of royal authority is particularly emphasized.\textsuperscript{81} Preachers such as de Sales and Bertaut drew strong comparisons between Henri IV and Louis XIII using both Biblical and non-biblical \textit{exempla} to promote a policy of obedience of the subject to the crown. By comparing the early Bourbons alternately to the Hebrew Kings in the Old Testament and the Emperors of Rome, these preachers presented a clear statement that the Christian was obligated to their sovereign.

This chapter has attempted to demonstrate that the clerical estate provided the framework for the discourse of royal authority which would find its full expression during the reign of Louis XIV. This rhetoric of royal authority in seventeenth-century sermon literature reflected developments in French political thought which took place during the religious wars. Just as with the \textit{politiques}, the clerical estate incorporated the neostoicism that became prevalent during the last half of the sixteenth century. This political philosophy rejected the discourse of just rebellion against properly constituted authority.\textsuperscript{82} They emphasized obedience to the sovereign regardless of the relative orthodoxy of that sovereign. This came about in part because of changes in the relationship between the state and church.

Although there were those such as the Cardinal du Perron who argued that the crown was subordinate to papal authority, this position was becoming overtaken by ecclesiastics who placed royal authority over the interests of the Pope. As the crown attempted to put into practice the theory of royal authority, the Gallican Church co-

\textsuperscript{81} Bertaut, \textit{Sermons}, 111-2.
operated with the crown. The image of the king was evolving from just guardian of the Christian weal to becoming a God on earth.
Conclusion

The conversion and ascension of Henri of Navarre as Henri IV to the throne of France in 1589 marked the end of the Wars of Religion. However, France was far from a peaceful society. Forty years of civil war had broken many of the social, religious and political bounds that held the kingdom together. The confessional divisions which had exacerbated the violence of the sixteenth century were made permanent by the Edict of Nantes. The prestige and authority of the crown had reached its nadir under the reign of Henri III, whose assassination in 1589 was met with widespread approval. Henri IV spent a considerable amount of time in combating the opposition from radicalized groups such as the Catholic League and the Sixteen.

Henri’s assassination in 1610 by Ravaillac was almost universally condemned. It also left his son, Louis XIII who had not yet achieved his majority, as heir to the throne. France faced the terrifying prospect of being plunged again into a series of civil wars as factions of the nobility fought for the regency over the young king. Although the kingdom was spared a return to the civil wars of the sixteenth century, France was far from a stable society. The Protestants fearing the violations and encroachments upon the terms of the Edict of Nantes presaged a large scale persecution rose up in rebellion under the leadership of the Prince de Condé. Precipitated by the failure of the Estates General of 1614 to enshrine further the rights of the minority Huguenot party, the rebellion lasted throughout the most of the 1620s, ending only with victory of Louis XIII’s forces at the Siege of La Rochelle.

Louis also faced challenges from his Catholic subjects. The Frondes of the 1630-40s were a direct threat to the authority of the crown. Only after some difficulty, were
they suppressed. But they did demonstrate the vulnerability and the limits of the crown’s authority. Royal policy was attacked by the dévot party, which was openly hostile to the Louis’ policy of making alliances with the Protestant princes against the growing power the Spanish Hapsburgs. Until Richelieu undermined their political influence after the Day of Dupes, the dévot party was effective in opposing many of the crown’s policies it deemed to be against the interests of the Catholic Church. After Richelieu brooked the dévot party as a political force at court, they retreated to Port Royal and became interested in severe displays of personal piety. During the second half of the seventeenth century the Jansenists, the spiritual heirs of the dévots, were regarded with much suspicion by Louis XIV for their “republican” sympathies.¹

Although the crown was often curtailed in the practice of royal authority, the seventeenth century produced a wealth of rhetoric regarding royal authority. The crown, circumscribed in the use of its authority, nevertheless claimed the right to the unfettered exercise of the royal prerogative. This sentiment is blatant in the language employed in the edicts originating from the court in trying to control the unruly nobility. Jurists, looking to classical sources, argued that the King’s authority, though bound by God’s law, could not justly be challenged.² These treatises fell short of claiming absolute authority for the King, but they did lay the foundations for more explicit justifications for the absolutism of Louis XIV.

It is within the milieu of these crosscurrents of newly developing theories of the nature of kingship, and the practical limits of the exercise of royal authority that the French clergy operated. This thesis has demonstrated that within seventeenth-century

² For example, Charles Loyseau, A Treatise of Orders and Plain Dignities. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994).
sermon and devotional literature, there was a growing sensitivity to the new political realities arising from the aftermath of the Wars of Religion. Engaged in the discourse of royal authority, the Bourbons nevertheless recognized their dependence on the powerful First and Second Estates in the practice of that authority. Obedience to the authority of the crown was seen to be one of the greatest social virtues expected of the subjects of France.

The Second Estate was not alone in being co-opted within the discourse of royal authority. The Church was a willing partner with the crown in promoting a programme of pacification throughout France. It has been my intention to demonstrate the extent to which the Church rallied around the crown after the ascension of Henri IV. The political rhetoric within the sermon and devotional literature is evidence that the clergy, by embracing the pacification programme, became a part of the apparatus of royal authority. To be sure, the Church did not consider itself an instrument of the will of the King. As we have seen, there were elements within the French church which sought to maintain its independence, while supporting the claims of royal authority.

In this discussion of the establishment of authority and power, it is necessary to recognize the debt to Michel Foucault's work concerning the relationship of between the pastor and his flock. While Foucault's conclusions are excessively abstract and ahistorical, his Tanner Lecture "Omes et Singulatim," provides a useful model on which to base the discourse of power. As members of the clerical estate, the preachers under consideration regarded it as their duty to shape their flock to a new model of political obedience based on Tridentine orthodoxy. Looking to St. Augustine, these preachers

---

were able to instruct their flock that because political and social order was a Christian virtue, they bore the responsibility to create a society based on order and obedience to royal authority. This concern for order also informed their rejection of the extreme forms of religious fervour that had characterized the sixteenth century, and which were present during the seventeenth century.

Devotional authors were sensitive to the concern of the Tridentine Church that private displays of religiosity could threaten the orthodoxy of the Church. They ensured that their practitioners remained within the confines of the accepted religious practice. They demanded that all devotional programmes be overseen by the Bishop or approved cleric, satisfying the requirement of Trent. This concern was not confined to religious concerns. Although the central purpose of this devotional literature was to bring one to a mystical union with God, it could not be divorced from the responsibilities of the devotee to the social body. As we saw Richelieu's writings emphasize the social duties of the Christian. The last half of the *Perfection du Chrestien* is dedicated to the reciprocal duties of the social strata. Lords were to treat their vassals with justice, and in return vassals were to obey their lords. Family structure was to mirror the social structure of France. Children and wives were to obey their fathers and husbands. In return fathers were not to be rule tyrannically over their families. Richelieu also attacked the practice of dueling, as a threat to the well being of the social structure.

In the sermon literature of the period, preachers railed against those sins which proved most damaging to royal authority. Of particular concern was the ambition of the nobility. Often connected with avarice, the ambition of the nobility was especially dangerous because it had proven, at least in the minds of the ecclesiastical authorities, to be the most disruptive of the functioning of the social order. "Ambition is the root of
injustice, provokes envy, origin of hypocrisy, and the source of all the troubles which spring up in the states of the great monarchies and Republics."^4

It is true that the power of the monarch was limited by the willingness of the aristocracy to co-operate with the crown.\(^5\) But the slow coalescence of royal authority during the reign of Louis XIII is apparent in the literary polemics between the Protestant Ministers at Charenton and the court of Louis XIII, led by Louis’ confessor, Jean Arnoulx. The controversy was initiated by Arnoulx. Originally preaching a sermon against the Protestant presence around Paris, it was shortly expanded and published as an attempt to influence royal policy against the Protestants. The Charenton ministers, led by Pierre du Moulin, responded with a brief \(Défense de la Confession de la Foi\) in which they defended their doctrines and by putting their case before the king anticipated his judgment on the matter. What began as a polemical exchange over confessional differences and the relative threat they posed to the body social of France quickly evolved into a protestation of loyalty, with each side claiming true allegiance to the authority of the crown. The Charenton controversy reinforces the argument that the expansion of royal authority was not imposed solely from the crown. By appealing to the crown, the participants involved in the controversy not only help augment the authority of the crown, they also set the confines of the exercise of that royal power.

Finally, developments within French political thought that favoured the increased authority of the crown also influence the rhetoric of sermon literature. The rediscovery of Seneca and the rise of neostoicism provided the philosophical foundations for the

---


discourse of the concentration of power into the institution of the monarch. In the sermon literature, the language of royal authority was anchored to its Christian context. What arises from the sermon literature is a constantly evolving image of the nature of French kingship. On one hand, the image of the king within these sermons hearkens to a traditional understanding of the king as God’s representative on earth, who role is to protect the interests of the Church. Yet, the political rhetoric in the sermons seems to prefigure the divine king of Bossuet. Although this idea is not fully developed during the reigns of Henri IV and Louis XIII, the clergy consciously claim that the king’s authority is not to be challenged by anyone, including the Church. Thus, we see that many elements within the Gallican church became a vocal supporter of the rhetoric of royal authority, even if the crown could not always exercise that authority.

This thesis has explored the political rhetoric of a sample of some of the most prominent figures of the seventeenth-century French church along with prolific, but now unknown preachers. Their writings show that at the beginning of Bourbon dynasty they were engaged in an intense dialogue over the nature of order, discipline and obedience. Seen by their contemporaries as the jewel of Bourbon era religious literature, these sermon collections also represent a vibrant source of the development of the theory of royal authority. They illuminate how an important segment of French society thought about the structure of authority, and how the reform of the interior of the individual would in turn order society. For after all, “the first foundation the Christian must build in his heart is faith in a God, who is the first being, sovereign, independent, to whom we must submit and obey.”

6 le premier fondement que le Chrestien doit bâtir en son coeur, c’est la foi d’un Dieu, qui est le premier être, souverain, independent, a qui nous devons tous la subjection, et l’obeissance. Etienne Molinier, *Les Douze Fondements de la Cité de Dieu.* (Toulouse, 1635), 56.
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