THE MAKING OF MODERN EUROPE, 1648–1780

Geoffrey Treasure

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION TO THE 2003 EDITION

In his collection of the most significant international treaties between 1648 and the year of its publication, 1773, the abbé de Mably offered the view that the treaties between nations had come to be endowed with the same authority as the civil legislation of individual states. Historians of Europe soon learn to be wary of such pronouncements. The abbé's optimism was grounded in a perceived stability in interstate relations. But he was looking at Europe from the French windows of the Enlightenment. Poles, for example, victims of the previous year's partition, would have another perspective. There would soon be a quite different view from the windows of the Jacobin Club in Revolutionary Paris, different again from Napoleon's Malmaison.

Dealing with the same period, starting with the comprehensive peace of Westphalia, ending before the French Revolution brought instability and Napoleon created a new but short-lived European order, *The Making of Modern Europe* appeared in 1985. In the dozen years that I had been working on the book, the background to the teaching of European history had remained relatively stable. Grim though Communist regimes might be, stark the differences between the free world and the countries under Soviet domination, there was a recognizable European order. In retrospect, in the west at least, the clear boundaries epitomized by the Berlin Wall may even have seemed reassuring. People knew where they stood. Except where a policy failed, as did, catastrophically, that of the United States over Vietnam, there was little to shake confidence in traditional humane values. With the creation of new universities in Britain and enlarged departments in the old ones, academic history was plainly a growth area. Historical debate might be keen, even acrimonious, but it took place within the familiar framework. 'Was there a general Crisis?' 'Did Spain decline?'—such questions might be hard to resolve, but few doubted that they were worth asking. There was radical revision in particular areas, notably that of France, with vital contributions from across the Atlantic, and it was undertaken in a spirit of confidence. The work was thought valuable, even essential.

The attitudes of the cold war persisted, though the threat of real war had receded. Germany was indeed divided—and some were thankful that it was. Czechoslovakia, Poland, Romania, Hungary, even Yugoslavia (a law unto itself, bound together under the effective repression of Tito) were barely autonomous satellites in an international system whose ruling ideology was necessarily hostile to nationalism. Yet a British historian teaching the period whose latter half is covered by this book, 'Early Modern' as it is usually described, could point to the formation of 'modern' states and the development of 'modern' ideas and assume that they would be understood by reference to the world around them. Nationhood in Western Europe had reached maturity, and the countries of Eastern Europe had experienced it for long enough for their people to aspire to recover the rights of democratic citizenship.

Also in 1985 Mikhail Gorbachev came to power in Russia. His meeting with President Reagan at Reykjavik in December 1987 saw Gorbachev's remarkable offer of a fifty per

cent reduction in nuclear weapons and, it would transpire, the beginning of the end of the Cold War. The destruction of the Berlin Wall, in November 1989, began the process, completed in December by the downfall of Ceaucescu's regime in Romania, by which that country, following Czechoslovakia, Poland and Hungary before it, achieved their independence. Separate since 1945, East and West Germany were reunited. The evaporation of the Soviet system came apace with the granting of separate status to a series of its component parts. Azerbaijan, Nagorno-Karabakh, Armenia, Chechenya, Georgia, Abkhasia, the Ukraine, Moldavia, Belarus, Estonia, Lithuania, Latvia, Slovenia and, out of the former Yugoslavia, Croatia, Serbia, Bosnia and Macedonia, would figure in a map of Europe in 1992: none of them in 1985. That is the basis of the idea, born of the apparent triumph of liberal-democratic free market capitalism, and expressed in a whimsically provocative book by Francis Fukyama, *The End of History and the Last Man* (1992), that history was dead. It stands alongside the other and superficially more plausible idea, to which Jacques Barzun has lent his great authority, that traditional European culture is dying.

'History will teach us nothing.' Sting's song of that name (1987) in which he found eloquent words for the student mood of the time, confused, cynical yet hopeful, might have been a cue for the weightier pronouncements of the post-modernists, nibbling perversely at the hands that fed them.

As I have been offered the chance to introduce a new edition of *The Making of Modern Europe,* it goes without saying that I do not believe that 'History will teach us nothing' or anticipate its demise. Nor am I convinced by the pessimism of Barzun and his followers. Nor do I find credible, or indeed particularly interesting, the post-modernist theories which question the scientific foundations of the subject, asking not so much 'What is History?' as 'Is it possible to do history at all?' They have proved to have some value, however, in that they have stimulated debate about ways in which we acquire knowledge of the past and so feel our way to understanding it. In the 20th century mankind suffered dreadfully from the use of selective and biased history to justify extreme political attitudes, or to reinforce Fascist or Communist regimes. We may shudder to recall Hitler's grateful tribute to his history teacher, a fervent classroom nationalist. Do we need today to look further than to Ireland or to former Yugoslavia, to be reminded of the burden of the past, each local interpretation coloured by folk memory, deadly in the hands of demagogues—and never more so than when they claim academic credentials? Or to appreciate the fundamental importance of good history, so far as is possible objective, balanced and based on conscientious reading of the evidence? Do we need now to be alerted by the menace of international terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction to the need for sane dialogue, reinforced by scrupulous use of records and precedents? Whether it is the old monster of inherited prejudice, or the new tendency to panic, that threatens the rule of law, there are challenges today to those privileged to teach and write about history, and to those in schools and universities who plan courses and counsel students. They may be tempted to offer a wide menu, with dishes from all over the world. They should surely consider the case for giving priority to British and European history (without losing sight of that of America) where the stories contain so much to instruct and inspire: leading, through all vicissitudes, to the eventual achievement of individual rights on a free society under the rule of law.

It was also in 1985 that Jacques Delors became President of the European Commission, took up the mantle of Maurice Schuman and pressed on with measures to turn the first dream into a working instrument of government. Its four principles, subsidiarity, democracy, efficiency and coherence, were to inform the creation of 'an embryo European government' (within five years, he said in 1990). Meanwhile the Maastricht Treaty (December 1991) was 'to mark a new stage in the process of European integration', moving towards 'a common citizenship', 'common foreign and security policy' and, most controversial, though adopted by most members, economic and monetary union, with 'a single and stable currency'. The conjuncture that we can now recognize and situate in the years following 1985, the new political and cultural patterns now evolving, in particular the tensions within the European ideal between the bureaucratic, even 'enlightened absolutist' values of the *École Nationals d'Administration,* and the values, not just of nation-states but of democracy, pluralism and Common Law, all suggest that history has a crucially important place in a country where more and more young people aspire to 'higher' education. At the same time the demand for 'relevance', so commonly heard, suggests a misunderstanding both of that word, and of the idea of 'modernity' with which it is usually associated.

Every teacher will have a preferred period and be able, no doubt, to show why it should be given time before others. I believe that current concerns about sovereignty, and the imminence of vital decisions concerning Britain's relations with Europe (not to mention the impact that such decisions concerning Britain's relations with Europe will have on the United States), together with the prospect of a greatly enlarged European Union, should lead us to look afresh at a period that saw the evolution, though gradual and uneven, of the modern state, and the unfolding of the Enlightenment. Where freedom of conscience, the rule of law and abolition of torture came generally to be regarded by statesmen as realistic aims, and were mostly achieved, there are lessons of great value. Could there be a more appropriate time—'post-nationalist' if not 'post-modern'—to study the century and a half before the French Revolution, and before the upsurge in nationalism that was to lead to nineteenth century revolutions and twentieth century wars?

There is undoubtedly a boom in popular interest in history. Many want to search records for family origins and stories. A great many Britons have refugee family histories, Fleming for example, Huguenot or Jewish. Some read history for the sheer interest, the encounter with the strange—or unexpectedly familiar—in another age or culture; others for inspiring examples in great lives, or warnings in the revelation of evil. They may wish to understand how men and women coped with the problems of the day—and what messages their struggles send to the contemporary world. The writer of a textbook, aiming to give an overall account of a long period may feel that he can satisfy none of these markets. He is constantly clipping and squeezing, compromising between analysis and the framework of narrative without which the student can so easily flounder. He has to allow, in his language and his references, for the loss of much of the general culture that could once be assumed. The absence, for many students, not only of religious belief but also of any acquaintance with the terms and concerns of Christianity, creates difficulties for those studying a time when Europe could best be defined as Christendom. All the greater the challenge to the teacher in the face of such impoverishment, and all the

greater the potential reward to the student who seeks to venture into the mind of the past.

It is revealing to recall what was available in the way of books about European history fifty years ago, when I was an Oxford undergraduate. My tutor would often refer me to the Cambridge Modern History—the old one. Sweden did not then have its Roberts, Spain its Elliott, Holland its Schama, Austria its Evans, Poland its Davis. To name those giants is only to hint at the range and quality of writing now available, listed and, for this edition, brought up to date, at the end of each of the following chapters.

How eagerly in those days one devoured *The Seventeenth Century,* G.N. Clark's compendium of fascinating detail and shrewd observation, intriguing and drawing one on to further study. That great historian, then Provost of my college, is one of two to whom I owe a special debt. The other is W.A.Pantin, my Mediaeval tutor, from whom generations of Oriel undergraduates 'caught' history. His scholarship was exact and demanding, his enthusiasm and humour were infectious. From him one learned to look beyond the course of events to the very nature of institutions and people. Thanks to him I had a sound foundation for later study and writing. I had learned, tackling a new period, first to look back, and underneath: at the soil before the crop. The vast majority of European men and women of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, as I soon learned, were closer, in most areas of life, to the thirteenth century than they were to the twentieth.

I have long thought it desirable that there should be some bridges, with some middle ground, between the work of the growing army of specialists and the needs of teachers and students. Meanwhile, having made a special study of seventeenth century France, and being, as it were, to borrow medical terms, both consultant and general practitioner, I was grateful to my patient editors at Methuen all those years ago, for sustaining me in the European project. The 'generalist' certainly needs such support for the work is demanding and he is likely to encounter—though not in America—a certain prejudice, as if the endeavour were hardly worthy of the true historian, who works from primary sources. Again I am indebted, now to Routledge, and to Gillian Oliver there, for their faith in proposing the book's inclusion in their series of vintage history books. The company this volume will keep is truly humbling. It includes the name of Trevelyan. What, one wonders, would that great man have to say about the suggestion that 'history is dead'? He had no doubt about its supreme value as part of a humanist education. He would have no truck with the notion that history should be the preserve of specialists, nor that the purpose of a textbook was merely to convey knowledge in the most convenient, and readily digested form. I recall, in a review of an early book, my being called 'a passionate historian'. Then I was taken aback. Now I would not wish to disavow the description. If in any parts of *The Making of Modern Europe* I have succeeded in conveying something of the excitement to be found in past events, the appeal of past ways of living and thinking, and the significance for our times of that formative period, I shall feel well rewarded.

My original dedication was to our daughter Alexandra. I now wish to add Matthew, historian, and their children, Claudia and Thomas. May the world in which they grow up be one in which history is still well taught and truly valued.

PREFACE

Around the middle of the seventeenth century European life was transformed in many areas. In 1640 revolts in Catalonia and Portugal shook the stability of the Spanish state in a way which was to alter the balance of power in Europe. In the decade that followed there were disturbances, conflicts or rebellions in most states. In 1648 the last shots were fired, in Prague, of a war which had started there thirty years before and which had subsumed other conflicts to become the most damaging of European wars, at least until the twentieth century. Revolts caused primarily by the pressures of war mark this book's point of departure. The recovery and subsequent growth of states in a manner largely determined by their military needs provides its central theme.

'The making of modern Europe' is no empty phrase. In those years, out of the ferment of ideas that characterized the seventeenth century, European man emerged in some ways recognizably 'modern', and with him, the leading states which, to an increasing extent, controlled his life. The intellectual revolution, which engendered a critical attitude towards traditional authority, was responsible also for the confident assertion of a new kind of authority. Essentially secular, it derived its strength from faith in reason and research: from the scientists' methods, which could guide men towards a better understanding of the material universe and of their place in it, and from statesmen who sought a more humane and efficient use of power for the good of their peoples. Some consciously adopted the role of enlightened autocrat. Sovereigns like Frederick the Great of Prussia, Joseph II of Austria, Catherine the Great of Russia, Charles III of Spain, Stanislaus of Poland and Leopold of Tuscany, and statesmen like Pombal of Portugal, Struensee of Denmark and Tanucci of Naples carried out reforms whose range is no more remarkable than the apparent unanimity of aim, method, even style which earned for the last decades of the *ancien régime* the title 'enlightened despotism'. I think it more appropriate to speak of 'enlightened absolutism': it conveys both the vitality of an aristocratic culture which affected most rulers in one way or another, and also the culmination of the prevailing trend towards the concentration of authority in the person of the ruler, embodying as he or she did the ever-increasing powers of the state. Even then it can be misleading as a concept, though not without value, if it be assumed to represent an ideology and if the record of the reforming sovereigns is judged outside the context of the history of their states. I have chosen to stress continuity, as for example within the Hohenzollern lands from the Great Elector to Frederick the Great, rather than to isolate one group of rulers for comparative treatment. I believe that history presented as the story of particular states, each with its distinctive traditions and institutions, has an essential part to play in complementing analysis of society and institutions: it provides a manageable framework within which the student can discover how statesmen ruled, and how their rule affected their subjects.

The author of a general history of Europe covering 140 years is faced with painful choices. Readers will find little here about art or music, except where, as in the case of

Holland or Austria, a particularly rich achievement offers essential clues to the nature of the parent society. I urge the reader who wishes to know and understand Europe in the age of the baroque to listen to its music, look at its works of art and then perhaps to read the books of those who know more than I do about their technical aspects. Though I believe that another interesting history of Europe could be compiled from the experience of those peoples—Belgians, Swiss, the inhabitants of the smaller German and Italian states and of the Balkan lands under the Turks—where there was lacking (perhaps fortunately for them) the independence, unity or weight to count for much in diplomacy or war, I have reluctantly left them out of the reckoning in what is, in the main, a study of the major powers. At the same time I have sought to convey something of the spirit of the age in chapters about the orders of society, about people's faith and knowledge and the activities which reveal so much about their life: agriculture or trade, diplomacy or war.

This book has been long in the making. What it has lost to the diverse occupations of the schoolmaster it may have gained in the continuing experience of teaching: in years of trying to meet the needs of students, who naturally want things to be clear and orderly; and in having to restrain my own inclination to pursue what is curious and exceptional, which can so easily lead to a blurring of the outlines. I am grateful too for the delights of exploring the work of the many talented writers whose books are mentioned in the lists of recommended reading at the end of each chapter, and for the patience and helpfulness of those at Methuen and at home who made it all possible.

3
GOD AND MAN

Faith and Doubt

The language, values and conduct of the men and women of seventeenth-century Europe expressed an unquestioning belief in God. There still existed a coherent view of the world as the scene of a constant struggle between good and evil forces, as personified by God and the devil. The personal God, a loving but stern father, was the unseen but all-seeing witness of the acts and thoughts of every day. Kings were God's lieutenants; indeed all authority was God-given. For king and peasant, kingdom or village, the idea of divine retribution had a sobering power. 'Our nation was insolent and unruly,' wrote Mme de Maintenon in 1710, after defeats in war and a harsh winter; 'God wishes to punish it and enlighten it.' From baptism to extreme unction, or whatever consoling rite a Protestant might practise, men lived under the sign of the cross. The afterlife was still portrayed in the traditional way. Though baroque artists came to pay more attention to the joys of heaven than to the pains of hell, both were still envisaged as physical states and were correspondingly vivid in the popular mind. Those who feared damnation feared unending physical torment. Grace and redemption may have been words of imprecise meaning to the ordinary Christian but they conveyed awesome possibilities. When theologians sought to define them and to catch their essence they were assured of a large audience. Theology was more than an intellectual game, profoundly affected though it was in methods and style by the current rationalism. There might well be political and worldly implications, as in the controversy between Jesuits and Jansenists, or that between relatively liberal Arminians and orthodox Calvinists. But the eager attention given to the issues suggests that they were a central concern of the educated world. With wider opportunities for education came not, at first, a greater detachment but a more earnest quest for the truth.

When some enlightened thinkers came to equate Christianity with superstition there was sufficient evidence to give credence to their jibes. Clergy were usually better educated than in the past. By 1700 most Catholic priests had been trained in seminaries and most Protestant ministers had attended universities. But they ministered in the main to illiterate people, living simple lives, close to nature, trusting and literal in their response; prompted more by instinct than by reason and more readily influenced by signs than by doctrines. The Church still had to accommodate the survivals of paganism. Christian rites and festivals overlay but did not replace the older magic of an animist universe: wells and wishing stones were sanctified, dubious saints were venerated for their miraculous powers. The credulous faith that Dr Levi found in 1935, in the south Italian countryside beyond Eboli, 'where Christ stopped', preserved by its exceptional isolation, would have been commonplace in the towns and villages of Europe in 1700.

When priest and people were at one in assuming that God played an active part in the functioning of His universe, the priest was expected to be the mediator, in the recurring miracle of the Mass or through interpretation of the Holy Book in which all truth and wisdom were contained. God and His saints were invoked to aid the farmer and to cure the sick. For the lives of some of the saints, the authenticity of their relics or their efficacy, history could offer little evidence. But that did not diminish their appeal to men who craved their intervention to redress the harsh laws of nature, and who might echo the words of the mathematician Gassendi in 1640: 'Men would no longer feel any admiration or veneration for God if He did not surpass them, and if they could boast that they were as clever as He.'

Everywhere people appear to have accepted religious ideas that did not conflict with their reading of the material world. Men like François de Sales (1567–1622), author of popular manuals of devotion, canonized unusually soon after his death, and John Bunyan (1628–88), the English shoemaker and author of *Pilgrim's Progress,* influenced succeeding generations by their writings because they stood on common ground with their readers. In matters of belief there was still no significant gap between the cultures of the learned and the illiterate. It was, moreover, because they agreed in their acceptance of fundamental articles of faith that educated Christians fought so vehemently over details of interpretation, and simple folk could be roused to fight against rival communities and households whose errors could only mean that Antichrist was at work. There was still no lack of believers who could respond to the call of Calvin (it might as well have been Ignatius) to have such ardour for the honour of God that when it was wounded they should feel anguish that burnt inside. 1648 was indeed a significant date: the treaty of Westphalia marked the end of the confessional wars and the bankruptcy of the time-stained principle that it was right for Christians to fight for the church that embodied their understanding of spiritual truth. But its significance would surely have been less clear to contemporaries than it was to become with the growth of scientific materialism and the corresponding search, among educated Christians, for new ground on which to base a reasonable faith.

God guided man on his precarious course through the world, which was but one stage in an eternal journey. The devil sought to waylay and divert him. Belief in witchcraft was losing its hold upon educated men in the seventeenth century, but less evidently so among the masses, who continued to reflect the view of so many educated men of the Renaissance period that there existed a complete alternative religion, a deadly menace to the Christian. There was indeed nothing comparable, after about 1640, to the witch holocaust of south Germany and the Rhineland in the early decades of the century. The prince bishop of Bamburg (1623–33), Johann von Dornheim, had found 600 witches to burn in his modest estate. Just as the earlier purges followed the recovery of Catholicism during the early years of the Thirty Years War, so the outbreak of witch-burning in Sweden coincided with the postwar return to rigorous orthodoxy in the Lutheran churches. By then, however, the intellectual climate was altering. Why there should have been a falling off in the persecution of poor people, sometimes beggars, usually women, for alleged complicity with Satan and the powers of darkness, is still a matter for debate, as is the extent to which the prevalence of persecution in the previous century reflects conflicts over religious doctrine or the oppressive poverty of rural communities, further

distressed by war; its causes lie in a dark area of collective psychology upon which the historian must hesitate to pronounce. It is notable however that the decline coincided with the general imposition of stricter discipline at the parish level, with firmer leadership from educated clergy. It is interesting too that the witch craze never affected Spain or Italy where extensive monastic charity alleviated the plight of the poor and heresy was controlled by the Inquisition. Most important surely was the scrutiny of magistrates and the revulsion of educated men. It found legislative expression in the French edict of 1682 which defined magic and witchcraft as crimes, but crimes only of deception. By the eighteenth century everywhere, trials were rare and executions isolated, bizarre events.

The Reformation had torn apart the 'seamless robe' of institutional Christianity. For many Protestants the fabric of a Church-ordered society had gone beyond recall. For the Catholic majority, however, the supremacy of the Pope, the hierarchy of saints, the cult of the Virgin Mary, the necessity of seven sacraments, the doctrines of transubstantiation and the real presence, the practice of Communion in one kind, together with the expectation of purgatory, the efficacy of relics and benefits of pilgrimage, were more clearly known and more cherished than ever. For the Catholic, faith seems to have consisted less in a personal sense of God's mercy; rather in acceptance of the truth as revealed by God and as presented and interpreted by the Church. By 1660 the dividing lines between the confessions had become permanent and were to change remarkably little thereafter. They had come to represent more than different interpretations of Christian doctrine and practice. There were now clearer lines, as if the war of movement had given way to a phase of entrenchment in which the process of attrition was only tempered by the indifference of one commander or a rare switch of allegiance in another. At the level of parish and congregation differences could bear fruit in communal zeal and personal devotion. But at more rarified levels, where new perceptions in science and philosophy were beginning to affect modes of belief, the continued failure of Christians to agree about what appeared to be fundamental articles of faith could not fail to be damaging.[1]

The prolonged efforts of Christian apologists, like Jacques-Bénigne Bossuet (1627–1704) and Gottfried Wilhelm von Leibnitz (1646–1716), to find a basis for reunion were unsuccessful. Leibnitz believed that the Lutheran church should negotiate reunion as a body and managed to persuade some Lutherans in Hanover to sign articles of reconciliation which began by recognizing the Pope's claim to be head of the Church. Bossuet with whom he corresponded did not share the common Catholic assumption that Protestant heresy sprang from human malice or the devil's machinations and his *Exposition de la doctrine catholique* was so moderate that he was charged with watering down Roman doctrines to appeal to heretics. But he would not give way on the issue of papal authority. Each man stood for much that was good in his respective position. The way in which the world of ideas was changing is reflected in the bishop's experience. Court preacher and tutor, historian, political theorist and theologian, Bossuet expounded, notably in his *Politique tirée de l'écriture sainte* and *Discours sur l'histoire universelle,* a view of the world and its history that was based upon his reading of the Old Testament:

---

1 For further discussion of changing religious and philosophical views in the context of the Enlightenment, see also pp. 123ff.

he regarded it as verbally inspired, the laws, prophets and patriarchs there described evincing God's purpose, as did the subsequent experience of the Christian centuries. He believed in the unity of knowledge, as so many branches from the one tree of Christian truth; therefore, in the unity of history. The theme of his *Histoire des variations* was that the Protestant churches were discredited by their differences, severed branches from the tree, and so cut off from the truth in unity. The compelling logic and magisterial writing had a profound influence upon his contemporaries. But their shakiness became apparent as men began to test the hypotheses and find them wanting.

Scholarly criticism of the Bible, notably by the Oratorian Richard Simon (1638–1712), author of *Histoire critique du vieux testament* (1678), attempts of Christian rationalists like Nicholas Malebranche (1638–1715) to create a new synthesis to combat the pantheism of Spinoza, and the quest of Fénelon and others for a religion of the heart sapped the traditional theology. From outside the theologian's world, travellers' accounts of other civilizations which apparently owed nothing to Judaism or Christianity, and the evidence of the geologist's trowel for a much older world than that supposed by Bossuet to have been created in 4004 BC posed more questions than they answered. Perhaps most damaging in the long run was the sensationalist psychology of John Locke for whom there were no innate ideas, so that *all* religion could have had its origin in the early experience of man. Locke was influential upon his correspondent Pierre Bayle (1647–1706), the exiled Huguenot, who found such a wide audience for his two great undertakings, the *Nouvelles de la république des lettres* and the *Dictionnaire historique et critique.* In the controversy with his dogmatic fellow Huguenot, Pierre Jurieu, he did lasting damage to the accepted procedure, that of argument from texts, when he asserted that no isolated statement could be valid against the general sense of the Gospels and natural decency. His *Pensées diverses sur la cométe (1*683) scrutinized the superstitious belief that comets were divine warnings of disasters to come. Was there good reason to rely upon tradition when there was no historical or scientific evidence to support it? Why should men suppose that God should concern Himself directly, immediately, in man's affairs? The questions were baffling to Bossuet, a lonely giant at the centre of this 'crisis of the European conscience' which was really a crisis *within* Christianity. He ended his days fighting his 'great battle' for the Church with untiring pen, but with a rancour which betrays, perhaps, his awareness of the disintegration of a system.

Mathematician, jurist and philosopher, encyclopedic in his knowledge and interests in the world of ideas, surely the most influential German between Luther and Goethe, Leibnitz fashioned out of his own struggle between the requirements of rational method and the prompting of his Lutheran conscience a coherent system of belief in which God remained pre-eminent and still a free agent, presiding over a harmonious world in which there was no necessity for doctrinal conflict. In Leibnitz can be seen the benevolence that characterizes the new theology, liberated as it was from dogma and tradition. 'You are right,' he wrote in 1691, 'to call me a Catholic at heart; I am even one openly…. But the essence of Catholicity is not external communion with Rome. The true and essential communion, which makes us members of Jesus Christ, is charity.' There was also the optimistic assurance that a loving God had created the best possible world whose inherent goodness could even be demonstrated, through contrast, by the existence of evil. Leibnitz's thought was subtle, constantly evolving, never summarized in a

comprehensive work; known therefore only to his correspondents and disciples among whom Christian Wolff (1674–1754), the leading rationalist of his generation of German intellectuals, was most influential. He made a system out of Leibnitz's random writings and in the process altered their spirit. Wolff, rather than Leibnitz, whom he misrepresented as a cool and bland logician, was responsible for the complacent message, so acceptable to those in authority, but ridiculed by Voltaire, that 'all was for the best in the best of all possible worlds'.

The efforts of Bossuet to shore up the old, those of Leibnitz to provide the foundations for a new building, might sustain and inspire men of like spirit. But by 1700, some of the more daring or merely fashionable of the educated world, while continuing to live off the inherited capital of the Christian centuries, were beginning to doubt the worth of their inheritance. There may have been reassurance to men troubled by intellectual doubts but there was little to inspire devotion, in the formulations of the English 'latitudinarian' school, for example, who sought to reduce theological differences to insignificance by applying to faith the sole test of reasonableness. For subscribers to the undemanding, undogmatic faith of *Christianity not Mysterious* (the title of John Toland's work of 1696), emotional certainty was suspect, 'enthusiasm' was positively dangerous. But the critical spirit was not thus easily contained; the doubt which had been the Cartesians' point of departure was not to be stilled by the process of reduction to an uncontroversial minimum. From seeing God as the creator of a mechanistic universe which thereafter, because it embodied His perfection, could, indeed should, function without His further intervention, it was but a short step to doubting His existence altogether. For all the efforts of the synthesizers, science and philosophy became detached from theology; the religious spirit became perceptibly less influential in the small but dominant world of intellect, power and fashion which prided itself on being 'enlightened'.

There was, however, a time-lag in the transmission of new ideas, which was neither so sudden nor so dramatic as is conveyed by Paul Hazard's celebrated aphorism: 'one day the French were thinking like Bossuet; all of a sudden they began to think like Voltaire'. Paradoxes and inconsistencies abounded, showing something of the agonized reluctance with which the most thoughtful and sensitive abandoned old ideas and their yearning for a true understanding of God. Simon believed, perhaps rightly, that he was strengthening true religion by his scholarly perusal of texts. Locke denied toleration to the atheists. Bayle believed that his elimination of the possibility of miracles led to an enhanced view of 'God's infinite greatness' in the maintenance of laws which He himself established.

Schooling was still limited, and relatively few, even among the literate, were at first exposed to the new ideas. Only in Lutheran Sweden did the ideal of a school in every parish approximate to the reality. The masses of Europe continued to be illiterate, but the vitality of Christian belief was not confined to the less privileged areas of society. The persistent conservatism of this family-based culture should not be overlooked. Christians held on everywhere to what they learned at the fireside. If they went to school they were likely to be taught by clerics, more firmly than ever under ecclesiastical control. Most of the tasks carried out today by secular authorities, starting with registration, were then the responsibility of the Church. When men went to church they probably heard orthodox doctrine with an emphasis on the duty of obedience. The reforms of the previous century had their effect in tighter parochial discipline, more efficient clergy, more devoted

pastoral care. Everywhere the evidence of the eighteenth century tells of a more active church life; more regular communions in Catholic parishes, the growing influence of Pietism in Germany and Scandinavia, more Bibles, breviaries and pious works distributed and read; less superstition and more faithful rendering of Christian doctrine. Nor should music, conveying awe and joy to many whom words might not reach, be forgotten. Much of the finest baroque music, especially in Germany, where the tradition of the chorale was particularly strong, was composed for singing in churches. The seventeenth may have been the last Christian century, the last that is when the Christian faith commanded the intellectual heights, unchallenged in essentials: when to be sceptical was to be eccentric. The eighteenth century was above all the age of popular piety, before the development of an industrial society, with concurrent shifts of population and the appearance of a new popular culture whose materialism reflected some of the cruder and more negative aspects of 'advanced' science and philosophy. Before that transformation of society, even in the most sophisticated circles, there were always influential voices to remind men of the uncompromising standards of Christianity. Meanwhile, among those for whom reason proved a barren guide to life's complexities, 'enthusiasm' appeared in a series of movements, like that of Pietism in Germany and Methodism in England, which showed that men were still hungry for an authentic Christian message. The most notable effect of the Enlightenment was upon that ground where Church leaders met the 'philosophers' and gave an inadequate account of themselves, where the traditional clerical position was exposed to destructive criticism. In this new climate, so favourable to the growth of one species or another of the genus 'natural religion', the Church was coming to look more like a man-made institution, less like the body of Christ. Locke saw it as 'a voluntary society of men, joining together of their own accord to the publick worshipping of God'. Where the leadership of the Church was blind or unresponsive to the need to adapt, where it was excessively privileged, there can be seen most clearly the nature of that crisis of authority which threatened to destroy the traditional structure entirely; during the French Revolution, in France at least, it did so. Everywhere in the eighteenth century the churches were losing their influence on politics. Nowhere is that to be seen more plainly than in the condition of the papacy which embodied a single authority, unique and sanctioned by God.

The Papacy

Queen Christina of Sweden was one of a number of prominent Protestants who led a trend to Roman Catholicism in the middle years of the seventeenth century. Better-educated clergy, expanding missionary work, resplendent churches, witnessed to the vitality of the Church. Yet it is beyond question that the authority of the popes was already declining. 'Who now fears the Pope?' wrote Rome's most distinguished convert in her copy of Machiavelli's *Prince*. 'Here are statues, obelisks and palaces, but of men there are none.' The papacy entered the eighteenth century ill-equipped to meet the intellectual or political challenges of an increasingly secular age. It would have needed an exceptional man and a long period of office to have arrested the decline. The institution lacked continuity as each pope came to serve out the last dozen years or so of a life spent

most probably in diplomacy and administration.

If we look at the promotion of cardinals we find that there are interests to be satisfied that had little to do with the well-being of the Church. Louis XIV, for example, insisted upon the elevation of Forbes Jansen, whose main achievement had been to persuade the Turks to go to war with the Emperor. Cardinals, whatever their background, tended to range themselves in parties, Italian, Spanish or French, and to respond to political pressures. When they came to elect a pope they looked usually for a safe man, acceptable to the majority, ageing, preferably with an understanding of the complex machinery of papal government and experience of the Curia or diplomacy; amiable manners, literary and artistic interests would weigh more than a record of radical reforms or profound theology. A pope elected on these terms sought to survive without yielding too much to rulers who wanted virtual independence for their churches, or to doctrinal pressure groups, like the Jansenists, who sought his support for their cause. The man might grow with the office. Clement XI (1700–21), canon lawyer and administrator, was not ordained priest until 1700 and celebrated his first Mass two days before the opening of the conclave that elected him. The pope of *Unigenitus* (1713) and the pitiless campaign against the Jansenists showed that he was ready to fall in with the wishes of a strong ruler. He was a better man, however, than is suggested by the famous remark of Victor Amadeus, that he would always have been esteemed worthy of the papacy if he had never obtained it. He showed a special interest in the training of priests for the mission field.

To adjust to a changing world, to keep on terms with Erastian princes, to embellish the churches and squares of the Eternal City, to live without scandal and to make necessary reforms in the government of the Papal States, were more typical aims of the popes in an age which began with a pope vainly condemning the peace of Westphalia and ended with the suppression of the Jesuit order in 1773 at the behest of the Catholic powers. Innocent X (1644–55) was among the weakest of them, dominated in practical affairs by his sister-in-law Olympia Maidalchini, who dispensed patronage more generously than wisely. Innocent XI (1676–89), reformer of monasteries, zealous crusader, patron of schemes of reunion and conversion (but not of Louis XIV's onslaught upon the Huguenots) would by contrast be impressive in any company. With an austere and proud manner that recalls the great medieval popes went sufficient toughness and skill to stand up to Louis XIV at his most formidable. The struggle over Gallicanism brought out his combative spirit but diverted his energies from more fruitful business.

The history of two eighteenth-century popes reveals problems of a different sort. Benedict XIII (1724–30) had been a Dominican friar. He was too unworldly to prevent government from falling into the hands of a clique who left an unsavoury reputation for corruption. His successor, Clement XII, from the Curia, began by imprisoning Benedict's aide, Cardinal Coscio, but could not maintain the impetus of reform.

In 1648 Nuncio Chigi could do no more than protest against the Westphalia peace settlements. Thirteen years later, at the Pyrenees negotiations, the same Chigi, now Alexander VII (1655–67), mathematician and patron of Bernini and other baroque artists, was not even represented. At the treaty of Utrecht, the papal fiefs of Sicily and Sardinia were disposed of as if the papacy had not existed. At a time when power was measured by the size of a prince's army, the Pope was being treated as a territorial prince of no greater significance, for all the traditions of his office, than any other of comparable

wealth and lands: more than Lorraine, but perhaps less than Venice. The advance of the Protestant states, England, Holland and Brandenburg, was partly responsible for this. Equally significant in this process of devaluation was the aggressive conduct of the greatest Catholic sovereign, Louis XIV.

Established churches were also political agencies. It was not only in Lutheran Sweden or nominally Calvinist Brandenburg for example that the clergyman was a necessary link in the chain of government: without his voice and his practical services, not least as registrar, it would be difficult to bring the masses to accept the state and to pay its dues. But that clergyman, even in those countries, like England, where the sovereign was head of the church, belonged to an organization in some degree separate and independent. The fact that bishoprics, deaneries, abbacies were commonly in the gift of the state provided a means of influence. In Catholic countries papal confirmation was required; their rulers were as keen as Lutherans to keep control of appointments and so to reinforce the official body while ensuring that it remained theirs to command. The close identification of Church and state in Spain is exemplified by the fact that the Inquisition, that effective instrument of censorship and surveillance, was under royal rather than under papal control. 'What could exist without a dominant religion?' asked the devout Maria Theresa. It is a moot question whether France would have remained officially Catholic if Francis I had not gained the powers he required by the concordat of Bologna in 1516, the year before Luther posted his fateful theses, or if he had been blocked, as Henry VIII was over his divorce question, in some equally vital matter of state. Behind the sovereign's rights over the appointment of bishops lay the potent principles of absolute sovereignty: that kings had their authority direct from God and had all property at their disposal. Even in its most extreme form absolutism was not in theory incompatible with the spiritual claims of the Church. 'Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's and unto God the things that are God's'; the text was not neglected. But in practice there was ground for conflict when it came to deciding what, among the endowments of the Church, did belong to Caesar. The possibility of schism continued to cast a shadow over the calculations of the Vatican, whether it was dealing with the traditional Gallicanism of Louis XIV or the radical anticlericalism of the Emperor Joseph II.

To secure the independence of the French church and to fortify his own authority Louis XIV did not shrink from damaging the papacy. The affair of the Corsican Guards (1662–4), when a quarrel over the rights of the French ambassador at Rome was used by Louis to win a well-publicized diplomatic victory, was but the opening cannonade before the serious battle over the *régale:* that issue was extended until the whole relationship of king and pope was involved. The *régale* was an old right of the French monarchy, in respect of its original lands, by which, during the vacancy of a see, the king could appoint to benefices within its gift and receive its revenue. In 1673 Louis issued an edict extending the right, which had been understood to pertain only to the original provinces of the kingdom, to the whole of France. Innocent XI stood firm while dioceses fell vacant and were left unfilled (thirty by the end of his life) and a stream of propaganda washed about, publicizing the feud.

The king looked to the Assembly of Clergy for support against the Pope, and a committee of the Assembly produced the Four Articles affirming the king's independence in temporal matters (1682). The Pope protested; and the Assembly retorted:

'The Gallican church governs itself by its own laws.' When Louis bid for the leadership of Catholic Europe by revoking the edict of Nantes (1685) and thereby irreparably damaged the schemes of reunion in which Innocent was interested, the latter was not impressed. He confirmed the appointment of Clement of Bavaria to the archbishopric of Cologne, at the expense of Louis's candidate; in 1688 Louis seized Avignon, the Pope's possession in the south of France, while his foreign minister issued a manifesto stating his grievances against the Pope as a 'Jansenist, Quietist and supporter of the heretic William of Orange'. Catholicism presented anything but the united front to which Bossuet attached such importance in controversy with the Huguenots. By the time a settlement was patched up by the rigidly orthodox Innocent XII (1691–1700), upon the basis of acceptance of the Gallican Articles coupled with an understanding that they would not be enforced, the damage had been done. Nor was it repaired by the entente of Louis's last years, as he returned to orthodoxy and sought papal aid against the Jansenists. The Curia may, however, have derived a wry satisfaction from the difficulties in which Louis then found himself when he tried to win from *parlement* approval, and registration, of the bull *Unigenitus* and was confronted by those very Gallican principles which he had formerly espoused.

The Gallican quarrel illustrates a trend which is noticeable before the full impact of 'enlightened' ideas and secular notions of sovereignty made itself felt. Spain, where the Inquisition came under royal and not papal control, had what amounted to a state church long before the severe concordat of 1753. The Emperor would sometimes treat Rome as an Italian principality in league with his enemies; the nuncio was expelled from Vienna in 1705 and imperial troops later violated Roman territories. When they expelled the Jesuits in 1759 the Portuguese precipitated a crisis in the Vatican which was not finally to be resolved until the abolition of the Society in 1773. Elections exposed the prevailing attitude. There was bargaining like that which preceded the election of a king of Poland. At the conclave of 1700, the French cardinals agreed to the election of Albani (Clement XI) only after sounding the views of their ambassador. The great sovereigns still behaved as if Catholic Christendom needed the Pope; but even such an able and enlightened pope as Benedict XIV (1740–58) had to make concessions which weakened his authority.

The most constructive challenge to that authority came from the ideas of von Hontheim, an official of the elector of Trier, who wrote under the pseudonym Febronius. He proposed in his book *Concerning the Condition of the Church and the Legitimate Power of the Pope* (1763) that the Pope, being fallible, should be subordinate to the Church; appeals from his decisions should be carried to a general council. The Church should be decentralized and the Pope be merely primate among bishops. In every country, authority should be exercised by national or provincial synods. It is striking that these ideas, essentially a new version of ideas current in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, should have emanated from a Catholic stronghold and that they attracted widespread support. The radical assault of the Emperor Joseph II upon the Church, its lands, monasteries, schools and rites, culminating in the patent of toleration (1781) demonstrates how vulnerable the papacy had become even before the Revolution came to pose problems of a new and larger dimension. In 1782 Pope Pius VI took the unprecedented step of travelling to Vienna to recall the Emperor to his Catholic duty. He was received with cold formality and came away with no concessions. Joseph made it

plain that he intended nothing less than personal control of the Church in his lands, and he used it to reorganize dioceses, to reform seminaries and to endow hospitals. The peasants, who loved their painted churches, relics and pilgrimages, resented the interference of Joseph and his bureaucrats, and greeted the Pope rapturously. In their devotion, Pius may have seen what was to be the true strength of the papacy in the future. His successor Pius VII underwent another chastening experience when he went to Paris (1804) to seal the concordat and crown Napoleon. It was the beginning of a struggle during the course of which he was bullied, deprived of power, actually imprisoned. But he contributed, by his staunch resistance, to the downfall of the Emperor and to the revival of clerical influence in Europe. The papacy survived its crisis.

Jansenism

Further tensions and other challenges to authority arose from the differences between those religious attitudes which were in some way absolute, intense or demanding—or, as the eighteenth-century Englishman might call them, 'enthusiastic'—and those which were more formal, reflecting one or other of the compromises which most Christians found it necessary to make with the world they lived in. The history of Jansenism in France provides an example of Christians who set themselves the highest standards, rejected compromise, and attracted, like the Huguenots, though for different reasons, the unfriendly attention of the government.

   Several strands went into the making of the Jansenist movement. Puritan, legalistic, exclusive and perfectionist, they were disciples in the first place of Cornelius Jansen (1583–1638), the Flemish bishop, scholar and anti-French propagandist, and St Cyran (1581–1643), mystic, experienced confessor and a *dévôt* of the most extreme kind. They saw themselves variously as reformers in a corrupt society, pioneers seeking to rediscover the vitality of the early Church, rationalists, seeking truth by adherence to the rules of Descartes, and guardians of true doctrine against the lax standards and moral compromises of churchmen who were so intent upon winning souls that they became cynical about the methods they employed. Their conspiratorial airs, the connections with those *dévôts* who opposed his foreign policy, had aroused Richelieu's suspicion. He may have seen in St Cyran another Calvin, a threat to orthodoxy and a source of schism. Theologically, notably in their view of God's grace, Jansenists were close to Calvin: they held that the majority whom grace did not touch were irrevocably damned. In their attitudes towards the Church they inclined towards an extreme Gallicanism. Their condemnation of dancing and gambling offended Richelieu, patron of music and ballet, as it did Louis XIV, the master of a sumptuous court. Not all Jansenists followed St Cyran in his morbid extravagance of language, but strains of hysteria did persist. Pierre Nicole (1625–95) illustrates what could come from a pessimistic temperament dwelling on the consequences of the Fall in a world where man was denied free will. Writing in his *Crainte de Dieu* of the justice of God which 'plunges men into the abyss of eternal torture', he went on: 'We pass our days in this spiritual carnage…. The world by which we are carried along is a river of blood; to perish one merely has to allow oneself to be carried along.' Happily Jansenism had a nobler, less negative character than such words

would suggest.

The home of Jansenism was Port Royal: two institutions but one in spirit. Both the Paris convent in the Faubourg Saint-Jacques, where Jacqueline and Agnes Arnauld reformed the discipline according to the precepts of their confessor St Cyran, and the male community of Port Royal des Champs, a house of retreat for devout laymen, were dominated by a few families. Six Arnauld girls had entered the convent by 1640; one, Mme de Maître, was a widow; with her were her four daughters. Three of her sons were solitaries; a younger brother, Antoine, kept closely in touch. When he wrote *De la fréquente Communion* he was not merely presenting the Jansenist case to his own world of the sophisticated bourgeoisie and that in a year, 1643, when the whole political structure of France was in jeopardy after the deaths of Richelieu and Louis XIII. He was also following a family tradition in attacking the Jesuits for his father had led the opposition in *parlement* to the return of the Jesuits to France in Henry IV's reign. The argument of the book was that the Jesuits debased the sacraments by allowing easy penance and encouraged the idea of salvation on cheap terms; in the Jansenist view that was the natural consequence of a mistaken view of divine grace. The Jesuits attacked the book as an indictment of their methods and a threat to their existence. The battle, so evidently fascinating to contemporaries, centred on five propositions, alleged by the syndic of the Sorbonne to be contained in Jansen's *Augustinus* and to be heretical, and condemned as such by bull of Pope Innocent X in 1653. The Jansenist defence was based upon questioning the *fact* that the propositions were contained in the original work; thus they hoped to avoid questioning the *right* of the Church to condemn them.

The quarrel was raised to a higher level by the intervention of the mathematician. Blaise Pascal on behalf of Antoine. His *Lettres provinciales,* the first of which appeared in January 1656, the month in which his friend was formally censured by the Sorbonne, were printed anonymously by different presses; they purported to be letters from a country gentleman, staying in Paris, to a friend. Pascal's weapons were intimate knowledge of the doctrinal issues and of the character of the Jesuit order, a sharp understanding of the power of ridicule and, above all, a mastery of style which makes the *Lettres* a landmark in the development of French literature. Though scrupulous about facts, Pascal did not hesitate to play on bourgeois xenophobia. His view of the Jesuits is a distorted one because he concentrated upon their methods in this domestic affair, in particular upon their use of moral case law. Yet the merit of the Jansenist position, their scorn for any form of intellectual chicanery, was never more finely expressed. The combativeness and exclusive pride of Port Royal can also be discerned. Pascal wrote in the confidence of his new-found faith and did not stop to think of the damage he was doing to the Church. No wonder that Voltaire enjoyed the letters. He said that the early ones were as witty as Molière, the latter as grand as Bossuet. Pascal helped to create the climate of public opinion in which, after protracted negotiations, the conscience-saving formulary of 1669 was devised and the Jansenist nuns who accepted it were left to enjoy the 'Peace of the Church': they signed 'purely and simply' instead of 'sincerely'. The true significance of the affair lies in the attitudes: extreme, dramatic, but authentic expressions of contrasting Christian values. The Church would have been less active as a force for good in the world if the crusading Jesuit order had been denied scope for its work in missions and schools; the world would have been poorer without the Jansenists'

single-minded affirmation of Christian standards. The argument, like the attitudes, was perpetual. It did not need the support of notorious *frondeurs,* like the duchesse de Longueville, to keep Port Royal on the government's agenda. Pascal and Arnauld had ensured that the Jesuits would return to the attack.

Jansenism made significant converts, with some ardent sympathizers, like Pavilion and Caulet among the bishops, and acquired a certain respectability, losing in the process some of its air of unworldliness. The movement remained a small one, if judged by the number of avowed supporters of Port Royal and exponents of Augustinian theology. But it became increasingly influential through the Oratory, with its seminaries for the training of priests upon the fashionable Cartesian principles, as adopted notably by Pierre Nicole (1625–95), author of a book on logic for Jansenist schools. Jansenists of his generation were busy, practical men, concerned with teaching, converting Huguenots, translating for their Bible of Mons, working on reform of the liturgy, looking for salvation from lives of practical goodness. Persecution was resumed under Harlay, archbishop of Paris; the disgrace of Pomponne, the Jansenist foreign minister in 1679, removed a powerful protector. The truculence of their foremost protagonist, Pasquier Quesnel, and his challenging work, *Réflexions morales sur le Nouveau Testament* (1678), invited aggression. Harlay's successor, Noailles, elected in 1695, tried to protect them, but the Jesuits found support at Versailles and at Rome. At court, Mme de Maintenon was the embodiment of pious conformity while Pope Clement XI (1700–21), having secured a settlement of the Gallican question, was anxious to sustain the orthodoxy of the king. Louis XIV could not, however, look so easily to Rome for support. His *volte face* invited opposition from *parlement,* where Gallican and antipapal sentiments had hitherto been encouraged; his drive against the Huguenots was visibly failing; meanwhile the quietist affair presented the disturbing spectacle of the two most famous churchmen in the country, Bossuet and Fénelon, in public dispute.

Louis paid dearly for condemnation of the Jansenists—an indication of how seriously he took them.[1] Port Royal refused to accept a bull cancelling the compromise solution of 1669, and in 1710 the two houses were suppressed; the remaining nineteen nuns were sent to other houses. Jansenist doctrines, however, remained intact; indeed, persecution strengthened their influence. In 1713 the bull *Unigenitus* anathematized 101 propositions extracted from Quesnel's book. Gallicans lined up in the Sorbonne and *parlement* to fight under the leadership of Noailles, and with the support of several ministers. Louis, who had already been concerned about the democratic character of some Jansenist ideas, now faced a general resistance for the first time. He accepted the bull on behalf of the nation—but *parlement* did not register it until 1720, five years after his death. In the later history of the movement, the excesses of some of its wilder supporters, like the convulsionaries who claimed miracles and danced around the tomb of the saintly deacon Paris at St Medard, and the apocalyptic tendencies of those who began 'to look for a sign', should be distinguished from the persistent underground of resistance: a demoralizing factor in Church life that was nourished by Jansenist-minded priests and lawyers. A constant irritant was provided by the *billets de confession* which bishops required before a man might attend the sacraments, testifying to his having confessed to an orthodox priest. Eventually, in 1756 Pope Benedict XIV disallowed them.

It is easy to see how Jansenist ideas merged in this situation with the growing

resentment of the lower clergy, usually, after the middle of the seventeenth century, seminary-trained, more open to the cultural influences of the Enlightenment and more critical of the wealth and privileges of aristocratic bishops and abbots. The 'Jansenism' of the eighteenth century, significant in its contribution to the Enlightenment, and so to the Revolution, was for *parlement* a new version of Gallicanism, while the continuing struggle provided its leaders with practice in the techniques of resistance, taking advantage of procedure gambits, drafting pleas and speeches in a carefully orchestrated campaign. The effect was to damage the institutional support for faith which the Jansenists desired to save from the ungodly.

Jansenism had originated in the Netherlands and there alone had kept its early theological character. When the Dutch Catholics refused to accept the bull *Unigenitus,* the Pope refused to invest their bishops and pronounced them schismatical. Venice, where the antipapal tradition was strong, also refused the bull. Even in the southern Netherlands draconian measures against the Louvain theological faculty were withdrawn before they could be imposed in 1730. In Spain Jansenism provided precedents and arguments for anticlericals and opponents of Jesuits and the Inquisition. German Jansenism illustrates another aspect of this wide-ranging movement; there it took name and colour from Febronius, a pupil of the Flemish jurist van Espen and author of *The Present State of the Church and the Legitimate Power of the Roman Pontiff* (1763). Febronians advocated the elevation of the ruler's authority above that of the Church and looked forward to the accession of Joseph to the Habsburg empire where the power of the Church was so strong, so well endowed through its schools, so influential in society. Jansenism, contributing everywhere to the anticlericalism of the Enlightenment, had altered almost beyond recognition from the earlier movement of the pioneers of Port Royal. But one feature remained constant: hostility to the Jesuits. The downfall of the Jesuits and the progressive policies of Catholic sovereigns in the late eighteenth century meant that theological Jansenism faded away everywhere, except in France, where it continued to be influential at parish level. Even there, however, it was in the main a revival of the teaching of Edmond Richer who had claimed that the government of the Church belonged to its own pastors. The radical *curé* of the *cahiers* of 1789 cared more about his fair share of tithe and a say in the running of his church than about rival doctrines of grace and will. He came into his inheritance with the Civil Constitution of the Clergy of 1790, providing for a state-controlled and salaried church, with elective bishops: a radical departure indeed from Catholic tradition.

1 See also pp. 291–5 and pp. 315–19 for the political significance of Jansenism in Louis XIV's and Louis XV's reigns.

Quietism

Jansenism, in its theological character, was a harking back to the spirit of the sixteenth-century reformers: a revulsion from the conservative definitions of the council of Trent (ended in 1564). The same process can be seen in the devotional sphere. Reformers had protested against the emptiness of institutional religion and insisted upon the right of every individual to seek a direct way to his God. The Church, after Trent, frowned upon enthusiasm and sought to insure against future aberrations of thought and devotion. No effort should be spared, no adornment of art or architecture was superfluous in the enhancement of worship. Spreading from Rome, its spiritual home, the baroque style celebrated the victory of Rome and the dogmatic certainties of the Tridentine decrees. Figures of the saints, reliquaries, rere-doses and baldachinos witnessed, with the poetry of movement that was the special feature of the style, to the efficacy of prayers to the dead, the mediation of saints and the mystery of transubstantiation. Intellectual acceptance is assumed; passion, awe and mystery are the more confidently evoked. The Jesuits were leading patrons of the baroque: the *Gesù* in Rome is a sublime expression of their outward-looking, adventurous spirit, grounded as it was upon a stern inner discipline. Like a sermon by Bossuet, or a composition by Vivaldi, the exuberant flourishes of the great baroque artists carry conviction because they embellish structures that are strictly classical in design.

Aids to devotion alone could not satisfy those ardent few who, as in all ages, looked for a mystical experience of the reality of God. The Church was always on its guard against those who claimed that it was possible to find a private way, by some exercise of mind or imagination. The dangers were plain: mystics might feel that they had no need of the ministrations of the Church, they might even hold themselves absolved from normal restraints upon conduct. It was hard to draw the line between the authentic mystical experience that is the aspiration of the saint, and self-delusion. Validity was best judged in the context of the person's whole life and friends. St Theresa and St John of the Cross, the greatest of the Spanish school of mystics, had been accepted and canonized. The Illuminists of Seville and Cadiz, 7000 of them, who claimed that mental prayer alone was necessary for salvation and that they could thus be perfected, were condemned by the Inquisition in 1623. The case alarmed the orthodox, and suited the authoritarian. (It helps explain Richelieu's wary attitude towards Bérulle and the Oratory, Spanish in Christo-centric theology, as in political sympathy.) St Ignatius, founder of the Jesuits, author of the *Exercitia spiritualia,* had taught that the soul, by psychological effort, could be trained to see itself in the light of eternity. Some mystics thought that this methodical approach was unnecessary since they were called by divine voice to the 'prayer of quiet' in which God required the subject to adhere to Him. One such was Miguel Molinos, Spanish priest, condemned by the Inquisition in 1687. Judgement of such a man, holy man, charlatan, whatever he may have been, is necessarily subjective, now as then. Groups of quietists in Italy, Spain and France regarded him as their leader. When he was arrested he had 12,000 letters from devotees. The most famous of them was Mme Guyon, though she came to her own 'peace of God' in eccentric fashion. Her fame derives largely

from the support of archbishop Fénelon (1651–1715) and from the battle he fought, against Bishop Bossuet, for the validity of her sort of mystical experience.

The problem that Mme Guyon posed to those who had to examine her was formidable. Bossuet, rational and orthodox, for whom mysticism was 'essentially a lamentable extravagance, a kind of spiritual failing tempting the odder saints', noted that she sat opposite her friends in complete silence, acting as a reservoir through which grace flowed into them. In her writing she seems to relate herself in a literal and sensuous way to God. In Fénelon's sympathy there was no doubt much of his own longing for a richer spiritual life than his duties at Versailles allowed. His brave partisanship should be set in the context of a more far-reaching protest—against what he and his friends saw as the perversion by a militarist and despotic regime of the proper role of the king: the defence of the interests of Church and people. Unfortunately Fénelon became so entangled in the affair as to become politically ineffective at a time when his voice should have been heard. In 1695 the Articles of Issy defined the limits beyond which the mystic must not go, disallowing any claim that extraordinary states of prayer were the only way to perfection. In 1699 Fénelon's *Maximes,* setting out what he held to be the authentic tradition of Christian mysticism, were condemned by the Pope. Ultimately, after long controversy, Fénelon was censured, though in mild terms. Bossuet had fought to save Church (and state) from what he saw as one insidious element in a general challenge to authority. Fénelon—more narrowly, or more imaginatively, according to one's point of view—had fought for the purity of faith.

Pietism

The movement of Pietism in Germany provides another example of the search for a religion of the heart. The aftermath of the Thirty Years War found the German Lutheran and Calvinist churches in disarray. Changes of prince and creed had induced bewilderment; political solutions to problems of spiritual allegiance had been discredited. The formula *cuius regio, eius religio* suited the constitution of a country minutely divided into over 300 sovereign units but it did little for the development of an active spiritual life. Catholicism retained the initiative. One notable conversion was that of Augustus the Strong of Saxony, though his Lutheran subjects were generally left in peace. However, in the Palatinate, 'Catholic' with the accession of Philip William in 1697, the largely Protestant population was subjected to intensive missionary work by the Jesuits. Everywhere the church was dependent on the ruler. Lutheran theology, with its notion of the 'Godly prince', tended to produce oppressive conditions. The Saxon system, in which the church was run by 'superintendents', instead of bishops, under the ruler operating as 'high magistrate', was widely imitated. In effect, ministers were subservient, laymen were allowed little part in church life and the ruler was encouraged to play the pope. Von Herder remarked of Prussia: 'A minister is only entitled to exist now, under state control, and by authority of the prince, as a moral teacher, a farmer, a list-maker, a secret agent of the police.' Von Herder was typical, however, of the better sort of minister, often university-trained. As in England, Holland and Scandinavia, there were devout and learned men to be found in the poorest parishes. The system rendered such men less

effective than they might have been. Fear of witchcraft, and antisemitism kept their hold on the peasants; thought was contained in rigid patterns, teaching was often pedantic. More was heard of the civil advantages of a well-regulated clergy than of the unpredictable working of the Holy Spirit. The *Landeskirchen* (state churches) 'resembled a series of inland pools, stagnant save for exceptional inundations' (Drummond). Some refreshing dew came, however, from the movement of Pietism.

Pietism was not wholly new. There had been influential mystics, like Jacob Boehme, to keep alive the spirit of Luther. It was to the founding principles of the latter that P.J.Spener, author of *Pia desidera* (1675), appealed. He declared that the aim of true religion must be the transformation of personality. He urged pastors to preach the gospel and abandon controversy. To disseminate the word of God he set up *collegia pietatis,* centres where ministers and laymen could work together in fellowship. In 1694 the University of Halle was founded to serve as the centre of the rapidly growing movement. It was surrounded by a cluster of useful institutions: an orphanage, a printing press and a hospital; there were associated schools. The heart of the place was the theological faculty through which, at the height of its fame, over a thousand students passed every year. The flourishing life of Halle shows an unfamiliar side of the age of reason, and another, vital, Germany apart from the princes and their petty courts. One function of the University was indeed to supply the Prussian state with a flow of well-trained officials; but its hallmark was Christian philanthropy. Lutherans became more active in missionary work: Spener's successor, A.H.Franke, sponsored a mission to south India and sent Mühlenberg to America to organize Lutheran churches there. J.A. Bengel, a biblical scholar, of Württemberg saw the danger of pietists shrinking from corporate responsibility and taught that Christians must be active in their communities.

The challenge of rationalism nevertheless remained strong. Halle, for example, was also the home of Christian Wolff, professor of mathematics, who expounded a 'natural religion'. Frederick II of Prussia, imbued with the secular spirit of the Enlightenment, despised the values of the Christian gospel. For him the Pietists were 'protestant Jansenists'. In Scandinavia, notably in Denmark under King Christian VI (1730–46), Sabbatarianism and censorship were indeed the keynotes of an austere regime. But there was a generosity of spirit about German Pietists which challenges Frederick's assessment. Their teaching of the gospel reached the neglected poor. They strengthened the popular tradition of church music. They contributed to the revival of the German language and with it a degree of patriotic awareness, an influence whose importance becomes clearer in the age of Napoleon.

Where Pietists failed was in providing for future growth in church and cultural life by keeping a balance between spiritual ardour and intellectual vitality. There was a recurring mystical strain in German religion, prominent after times of prolonged misfortune, such as the Black Death or the Thirty Years War. 'Love may reach God but not knowing.' The spirit of *The Cloud of Unknowing* was reanimated in the extraordinary life and teaching of Count Lewis von Zinzendorf. He was a pupil of Franke at Halle but no system or training can account for his vision and style. Committed from childhood to Christian evangelism, influenced by the Bohemian Brethren for whom, in 1722, he provided a sanctuary on his Saxon estates, he devoted his life to the communities of brethren, Moravians, as they were called, through whose efforts he hoped to regenerate, and

ultimately to unite, the churches of the world. He preached, and practised, a religion of love. Zinzendorf was apparently sincere in his plea for a childlike faith, and both practical and tough in his direction of a movement which could easily have degenerated into anarchy. The ideal of *Hernhut* (the name means 'Lord's protection'), and the Moravian settlements which were established elsewhere, was that of a disciplined, self-supporting fellowship in which men might come to a deeper experience of Christian love. He guarded it severely against lapses into-hysteria, though he could not prevent—indeed perhaps contributed to—a cloyingly sentimental tone. Both the earnestness and the mawkishness anticipate the style of nineteenth-century evangelism.

Zinzendorf stood firmly against those who wanted to found a new church. Personal mission was what he held important, and the Moravians were the greatest Protestant missionaries of their time. In Greenland and Labrador they organized their native converts into Christian communities similar to those of the Jesuits in Paraguay. Like the Jesuits they encountered the hostility of established bodies in church and state. As it seemed to one Prussian cleric: 'Their leaders are gradually sapping the foundation of the civil government of any country they may settle in, and establishing an Empire within an Empire.' Moravians were to be important in the melting pot of the New World. But the most important contact was undoubtedly that with John Wesley, which changed Wesley's life and inspired his evangelical mission. The defence of individual rights, the example of men of gentle spirit, above all perhaps the concern for the poor and outcasts, were more significant than the infantile tendencies of some Moravians. But Zinzendorf limited the ground he worked on, and the prospects of his movement, by placing the main emphasis upon feeling as thus: 'He who wishes to comprehend God with his mind becomes an atheist.'

Intolerance: the Huguenot Case

When Louis XIV revoked his grandfather's edict of Nantes in October 1685 he embarked on the last stage of a policy of coercion which appears in retrospect to have been wholly misguided. Occupying a uniquely strong position he had allowed himself to be swayed by the vehemence of his Catholic subjects, represented by activists in the Church: devout, ambitious or simply conventional, they were not, as he was, in a position to judge the political consequences. His policy represented a fateful departure from the *politique* tradition epitomized in Richelieu's comment after the fall of La Rochelle in 1628: 'the conversion of the Reformed is a work we must await from heaven'. Unless the large reduction in the number of Protestants living in France be counted a gain, the policy must be judged a failure. The *intendant* Daguesseau may well have voiced the misgivings of many officials when he wrote that 'both Catholicism and the state will feel the consequences of this more keenly in the future than either has yet experienced'.[1] The central issue was one of authority and Louis's assertion of the rights of a ruler to dictate his subjects' religion stimulated debate wherever men pondered the issues of belief and freedom. Some 200,000 exiles were a powerful, far from silent witness for the case for toleration: as presented by Locke and his correspondent, the Huguenot exile Pierre Bayle, the case was better founded, intellectually and empirically, than at any time since the time

of Erasmus, before the era of religious wars. There is substance therefore in the traditional idea that 1685 was a turning point in the history of Europe, whether it be seen from the standpoint of diplomacy, religion or political philosophy. But to go from there to assert that Louis was merely bigoted or blind is to misrepresent the case.

The peace of Westphalia had left Protestants and Roman Catholics in rough equilibrium in Germany. In the first decades after the war rulers seemed to be more realistic, shocked by losses and aware of limited resources. The Emperor Ferdinand III was more moderate than his father or his son. Louis XIV publically acknowledged the loyalty of Huguenots after the Fronde and at first adopted a conciliatory tone towards them. But old attitudes died hard and even then there were few signs of a positive spirit of toleration. Milton's *Areopagitica,* that fine defence of freedom of speech, specifically excluded popery from such freedom. It was a Huguenot, Benoît, who wrote that 'differences of religion disfigure a state'. It was normally assumed that the existence of a dissident minority was a cause of weakness. France was the only country in western Europe to have constitutionally guaranteed toleration of a religious minority. The tendency everywhere towards an Erastian submission of the church to the authority of the state and its God-ordained ruler, together with the movement in Catholic countries towards semi-independent national churches, were actually strengthening pressures for conformity. At the same time there was evidence that Rome was gaining ground again, the Protestant confessions were faltering and introspective. Queen Christina of Sweden, though she was notably eccentric and had already decided to abdicate, was perhaps the most celebrated among individual converts to Rome. The Emperor Ferdinand II had failed to win for Rome and Austria the triumphs for which he had prayed and schemed; but Bohemia at least had been recovered for the faith, the Jesuits completing what the soldiers had begun. In 1685 the accession of Philip of Neuburg, Catholic and father-in-law of the Emperor Leopold, to the Palatinate, together with that of James II to the English throne, suggested a significant shift in the balance as Louis pondered the feasibility of the final solution. A series of measures had already sapped the strength of the Huguenots and, it seemed, the will of the remnant to hold out. In 1679 the *chambres de l'édit* had been abolished; in 1680 all marriages between Huguenots and Catholics were declared invalid. Between 1679 and 1683 Huguenots were debarred from one public profession after another. Their 'temples' were being closed. The promulgation, in 1682, of the Gallican articles, reaffirming the crown's rights in and over the church in France had clarified the issue of authority. At the end of 1684 a jury of theologians informed the scrupulous king that he could legitimately revoke his grandfather's 'perpetual and irrevocable' edict. The misgivings of Protestants had already been seen in timid declarations of submissiveness to the secular ruler or, in the case of the Lutherans, in a new interest in schemes of reunion.

1 See also pp. 291–2 for the revocation in the context of Louis XIV's government.

There was a positive ideal and honourable tradition stretching back to the early years of the century, to Comenius, Althusius and Grotius, behind the ecumenical efforts of these years. Bishop Bossuet took seriously the ideas about reunion put forward by Paul Ferry, Lutheran pastor of Metz. Bishop Rojas y Spinola, who was also concerned, at the Pope's behest, with rallying support for the Emperor against the Turks, was travelling round Europe between 1678 and 1683 seeking backing for a fresh approach to the Lutheran question; he envisaged the meeting of a general council and a dialogue starting, at least, from the premise that Lutherans were not heretical. After the revocation such budding schemes were checked before they could bear fruit. It is likely, however, that Catholic insistence on the validity of the doctrines defined by the council of Trent would in any case have prevented reunion, even between Lutheran and Catholic. Leibnitz came to see them as an impassable obstacle even though he went so far towards the Catholic position that he was suspected of a secret conversion. Looking back from the present position in the unceasing quest for reunion, not entirely unlike that of the 1680s, we may be more surprised at the optimism of the ecumenical pioneers of 300 years ago than at the dogmatic attitudes of those who then sought not to compromise but to coerce. Daniel Jablonski (1660–1741) laboured in the congenial climate of Berlin to effect a union of Calvinist and Lutheran on the basis of common acceptance of a German translation of the English prayer book. In the short term greater weight was attached to those who, like Samuel Pufendorf (1632–94), the German jurist, argued for liberty of belief on the ground that the magistrate should have no authority over faith and opinion: 'it is no part of a prince's duty to prosecute those who differ from him in religion.' By 1660, wrote W.K. Jordan, summarizing the work of the liberal Calvinists of Holland, the Latitudinarians of England and the colonial pioneers of America, 'the theory of religious toleration stood substantially complete'. The theory had now been further tested in the times of persecution to such effect that the princes were ready to follow where philosophers pointed the way.

There was a strident conflict within Calvinism, as purists fought a rearguard action, for Calvin's own view of predestination for example, against the liberalism which they thought was fatally weakening the church. For orthodox Dutch Calvinists the problem was compounded by the pervasive influence of rationalist and Erastian ideas in a free society which attracted dissidents from stricter or alien regimes. Some, like the émigré Pierre Jurieu, held that it was such views that had weakened Huguenotism to the point at which Louis XIV felt that it was safe to attack it. Others however had come to Holland in anticipation of finding the religious freedom they had been denied in France. They might find, as Temple wrote of the years immediately preceding the war against France, that no man could complain 'of pressure in his conscience, of being forced to any public profession of his private faith; of being restrained from his own manner of worship in his house, or obliged to any other abroad'. But against the background of war and the recent Huguenot immigration theological debate became acrimonious. As always there were political influences. Orthodox zealots looked to the house of Orange for support against ministers who, like Koelman of Sluis, dismissed by the states-general in 1675, appeared to place a higher value on personal religious experience than on the authorized forms of service, or like the rationalist Bekker who was deposed by his synod for writing sceptically about the interpretation of comets as messengers of God. William III,

embattled against Louis XIV, took the authoritarian view and did nothing to help the unfortunate Van Waken, who had supported Bekker and who died in prison, three years after being first charged with blasphemy. His case fulfilled the prediction of Bayle who had written in 1686: 'God preserve us from the Protestant inquisition! Another five or six years and it will have become so terrible that people will be longing to have the Roman one back again!' In Charles II's England a similar trend can be seen, as the exclusive character of the Church of England was fortified by repressive legislation against dissenters. Ironically it was not the lax and sceptical Charles but his brother James II, the Roman Catholic, who was committed to the principle of toleration, in which, however, his enemies saw only his designs for undermining the Church of England and promoting his own faith. The vicious anti-popery mobs, their exploitation for political ends and the murderous injustice of the 'Plot' trials of 1679–80 played an important part in preparing French Catholic opinion for the repression of the Huguenots. Meanwhile on the other side of Europe, after the relief of Vienna in 1683, the Emperor Leopold was advancing into Hungary and imposing his faith on the Calvinist nobles. The century ended there with the banning of all Protestant public worship; the religion of peasants henceforward depended on their lords.

It does not seem therefore that Louis XIV was exceptional in his concern for uniformity nor in his willingness to act to enforce it. His was not the world of Leibnitz or Locke but of Bishop Bossuet, who was to acclaim the revocation as 'the miracle of our times', and of Fénelon, for whom unity was 'the sacred bond which alone can hold the allegiance of souls'. Unity was a key word in the vocabulary of French absolutism, denoting the essential alternative to the separatism and disorder which had produced such bitterness in communities throughout the land. It was not confined to churchmen. Transcending matters of theology and law it expressed the *politique* conviction that religious differences sapped the vitality of the state. Gallican bishops, anxious to prove their doctrinal orthodoxy, officials who wanted to impress the king, and the king himself, in whom *dévôt* and *politique* were uneasily balanced, all subscribed to the ideal. Numbering about 1.5 million, the Huguenots were a small part of the population in 1660 and had been loyal since 1629; but their contentious past mattered more than their present condition. To seek rational grounds for Louis's policy of repression is unprofitable: his pronouncements and actions were inconsistent; his attitudes, like those of his subjects, were formed by ancestral memories of religious war. Characteristic of such wars is the alternation in times of weakness between concession and rigour: the resolve to have the last word in the argument hardens throughout the whole frustrating process. Now church and state were strong as never before. The ex-Huguenot Henry IV, for whom conversion had been a political necessity, had again been merely realistic when in 1598, by his edict of Nantes, he conceded to the Huguenots the right of public worship in their existing 'temples' and complete civil rights, together with special privileges, such as representation on the *chambres de l'édit* which were added to some *parlements,* the right to hold assemblies, even to fortify certain towns. There was no active spirit of toleration. The edict, like other diplomatic 'solutions', had reflected the military situation: in 1598 it was one of stalemate. After further risings Richelieu acted with decisive force. After the successful siege of La Rochelle, his Grace of Alais (1629) deprived the Huguenots of their military privileges, but it offended the *dévôts* because he conceded freedom of

worship.

The Huguenots had made no attempt to exploit the crown's difficulties during the Fronde. Should the state then accept the loyalty and overlook the heresy? To Mazarin, most diplomatic, least dogmatic of men, that was the politic way. But as the reign of Louis XIV proceeded an alternative policy took shape. Ascendancy in war and diplomacy added a touch of chauvinism to conventional preaching about conformity. The mere existence of the Huguenots was a sort of *lèse-majesté:* it was the duty of the good subject to conform. In 1668 France's most admired soldier, the Huguenots' natural leader, Turenne bowed before the logic of politics and found theology to support his painful decision to renounce Protestantism ʼin which every individual wishes to found a faith after his own inclinations'. With the defection of many of the nobles, protectors of Huguenot communities in more turbulent times, leadership devolved upon bourgeois. In spirit, as in structure, Huguenotism had been a revolutionary movement, radical and missionary; since 1598, more obviously since 1629, it had become conservative and introspective; its seminaries were not immune from the general European crisis of Calvinism.

Calvinism's intellectual appeal lay in its compelling logic, its spiritual strength largely in stress on the individual, his rights and responsibilities. Followers of Arminius (1550–1609), Remonstrants as they were called in Holland, gave up predestination and accepted the right of the state to control religion, so modifying Calvin's essential tenet of the single and absolute nature of God's sovereignty. While theologians compromised, pastors tended to preach submission: remote indeed from Calvin was Basnage de Beauval, who in 1684, in his *Tolérances des Réligions,* defended the principle of toleration on the grounds that men cannot be so sure of the whole truth that they can persecute others for their views; or Pastor Merlat who declared in the year of the revocation that 'sovereigns have no other law but their own will'. Such teaching might have had a less damaging effect on Huguenot morale if there had existed a great French Bible, such as that which nourished English Protestantism. A dry and unpoetic translation was no substitute for the rich literary inheritance of Catholics. The church in France exhibited moreover an inspiring range of intellect and achievement: from the didactic talent of Bishop Bossuet, one of whose chief concerns was the reunion of the Lutheran and Catholic churches, to the subtle genius of Fénelon, sympathetic to mysticism and to the religion of the heart, to the pastoral zeal of Le Camus who, after 1685, was leader among the bishops who denounced the persecution of the Huguenots for its degrading effect upon worship. Such men were worthy successors to the spiritual leadership of a previous generation, Bérulle, founder of the Oratory, François de Sales, author of moving devotional works and most popular of French saints, and Vincent de Paul, who had done more than any man to rouse Christian consciences to the needs of 'our lords the poor' and whose charitable order, the *Filles de Charité,* was a living advertisement of the virtues of French Catholicism.

The Jesuits too contributed to the vitality of the church in this age, through their missionary work and their successful schools: at their college at Clermont there were 2000 pupils in 1651, nearly 3000 in 1675. Their damaging battle with the Jansenists was important to Huguenots because it revealed how little separated them on the questions of divine grace and human will when Dominican friars, Jansenists and Calvinists could all interpret St Augustine in similar fashion. So Jansenism, the puritan pressure group that

remained obstinately Catholic, offered a bridge to uneasy Huguenots. Pellisson, author of the imaginative plan to 'compensate' Huguenot converts in the 1670s, was himself a former Huguenot; so was Mme de Maintenon. Jansenist efforts to instruct the *nouveaux convertis* in the faith by the distribution of prayer books in French were helpfully broad-minded. But the members of Port Royal and their sympathizers were a tiny majority— and predominantly Parisian. The average French Catholic saw the Huguenot problem in the light of his own community and its inherited grievances over schools, burial grounds and belfries—commonly too over land and jobs. He welcomed the successive edicts which stripped the Huguenot of his rights and debarred him from the professions. He expected his leaders to find means of destroying them altogether. From hungry peasants and militant priests, especially in the south, welled up resentments that gave credibility to episcopal rhetoric. Bishops at the church assembly were traditionally outspoken about these 'rebellious slaves' in their 'synagogues of Satan'. Theology provided more subtle support to the advocates of repression. The view of St Augustine was widely quoted in the 1680s: that since error was a tyrannical oppression of feeble souls it was legitimate to appeal to the civil authority to free those souls. In 1682 the saint's letter to a Donatist bishop, justifying the use of force, was specially published, with royal approval. Bossuet pointed out that the Protestants had accepted the same principle in their dealings with the Anabaptists.

When in October 1685, by the edict of Fontainebleau, Louis XIV revoked his grandfather's edict, the issues had become relatively simple. The argument was mainly about timing, cost, particularly of Pellisson's *fund,* administrative convenience and diplomatic relations. The chief difficulty Louis had to overcome in the end was that of honour: how could he renege on his grandfather's pledge? For that his Jesuit confessor La Chaise, who alone, as Bayle pointed out, 'could inform the King of what he could answer for in his conduct', could offer the argument of the greater good. That the cause was good few doubted, though some might have misgivings about feasibility or scruples about the use of force. Louis had called a halt in 1681 to the first *dragonnades,* billeting of troops on Huguenot households, because of reports of atrocities and their effect on foreign opinion. But when in 1685 his *intendants* reported conversions in droves, it was easy to believe that the sect was disintegrating. Louis could not doubt 'but that it is the Divine Will that I should be His instrument in bringing back to His ways all those who are subject to me'. He was conscientiously aware of his responsibility as one who sat on 'the throne of God', that God who, in Bossuet's words, 'established kings as His ministers and reigns by them'. Those who resisted were simply 'bad subjects'. Another glimpse into a world of exalted, self-deceiving idealism is afforded by Mme de Maintenon, since 1683 the king's wife in all but public recognition, and her master's voice on matters of conscience: 'I well believe that many of these conversions are insincere but God avails Himself of all ways to bring heretics to Him.' On the fringe of that world, Mme de Sévigné expressed her sense of the achievement in phrases that leave the reader wondering how much was irony or mere naivete, or indeed the delight of the natural writer at having such momentous matters to record.

> Many people have been converted without knowing why. He [Père Bourdalue]
> will explain it to them and make them good Catholics. Up till now the dragoons

have been good missionaries. The preachers that are being sent out will
complete the work.

It turned out to be harder than that.

Besides the waverers and those who made what public accommodation was required of
them, there was left a hard core of resisters, perhaps half a million. Government,
committed to a tidy and final solution, saw it differently from churchmen, themselves far
from unanimous: some were content to accept the implications of clause 12 of the edict
which stated: 'on condition that they do not practise their religion Huguenots may live in
the realm without abjuring until it pleases God to enlighten them.' The fact that the Pope
was unimpressed by the whole operation and was sceptical about the motives of the king,
who was still defying him over the Gallican question, made it harder for priests to decide
upon right courses of action. Bishop Le Camus, who characteristically laid stress upon
penitence and humility, produced a daring formula for the remaining Huguenots of his
diocese, was challenged by the Jesuit Robert, denounced at Rome for his indifference to
images and relics, and at once vindicated by the Pope. The limits of what could be
achieved can be seen in the work of Fénelon in the Saintonge, where he found unhappy
consequences of the use of force. The typical Huguenot, he believed, was bound to his
faith less by conviction than by habit; rather than arouse his spirit by argument or prod
him with the bayonet, the priest should 'explain the gospel'. One third of the ministers in
his area were converted and it remained peaceful during the revolt in the Cevennes.
Another approach was that of Bâville, *intendant* in Languedoc, where Huguenot
communities were traditionally resolute: with the support of the local bishops he mounted
an operation which made large numbers of 'converts' in such ways as to harden the
resistance of the rest. Within months of the edict of Fontainebleau all semblance of unity
had gone. The Jansenists, who had taken issue with the Jesuits over the mechanical
treatment of the sacraments, revived old prejudices about their Huguenot sympathies
when they denounced *dragonnades;* Archbishop Harlay responded by banning Le
Tourneau's translation of the service book. Such protests and quarrels were excellent
ammunition for Huguenot apologists, already well supplied with tales of cruelty and
living evidence in the shape of the Huguenot émigrés, 65,000 of them in the United
Provinces alone.

As early as 1685 Le Camus complained about the entry into France of Jurieu's
Pastorales that they undid 'in a day the work of months'. Jurieu, who operated a spy ring
and sustained the morale of his fellow Huguenots by prophecies foretelling the end of the
reign of Antichrist and the victory of the true church, set the tone for propaganda that
found avid readers, not only in France. Echoes of his apocalyptic style can be detected in
the frenzied outpourings of the *illuminés* of the Cevennes, where the revolt of the
Camisards (1702–5) was provoked mainly by militant *curés;* they could not, said Villars,
the general entrusted with the major task of repressing it, 'lose their habit of browbeating
their parishes'. The fires lit in the wooded mountains and valleys of the Cevennes warmed
the hearts of Huguenots everywhere. As in other resistance movements, it was less a
matter of achievement than example. The government had destroyed the institutional
framework of French Calvinism, and with it respect, in the persecuted remnant, for the
authority of the king which they had hitherto shown. It had hardened the resolve to

remain intact and separate, to have nothing to do with reunion. It had revived the consciousness of special mission: Huguenots had been punished by God for their backslidings; now purged and stripped, a leaner body, they stood for the right of the individual, with his Bible, to reach his God direct, without aid of priest or sacrament. They hoped that they would be given new status, on the insistence of the English and Dutch at the treaties of 1713 and 1714. They were disappointed, but not for long. In March 1715 Louis XIV accepted the facts in an edict whose bland words failed to conceal the defeat of a policy and of an ideal: 'The Huguenots' long stay in France was sufficient proof that they had embraced the Catholic religion, without which they would have been neither suffered nor tolerated.' In August of that year Antoine Court presided over a provincial synod, the first for thirty years.

The Jesuits: Originality, Heroism and Disaster

The downfall of the Jesuits in the eighteenth century, leading to their expulsion from one Catholic country after another, and to their eventual dissolution by Clement XIV in 1773, illustrates further aspects of religion in the age of reason. It may appear strange that the Society of Jesus, the modernists of the Counter-Reformation, its most disciplined apologists and effective teachers, so notable for their readiness to enter the world and to use its methods, should be the chief victims of the Enlightenment. But old prejudices, as well as valid principles, were now fortified by new fashions of thought. The Jesuits, who were trained theologically to go further than other Catholics in a liberal view of man's efforts to attain salvation, had always offended puritan defenders of 'single-standard' Christianity by their compromising methods. To catch many fish they had spread their net wide, using tempting bait. Beyond doubt they had been successful. Successive Bourbon and Habsburg princes had been guided by Jesuit confessors. They had a near monopoly of education in provincial France. At the end of the sixteenth century they had won Poland for Rome; they had been the chief agents in the imposition of Catholic orthodoxy in Bohemia after the revolt of 1618. In those countries, however, critics would say that their dominance was unhealthy, that they worked too deferentially within the social system and taught men to be good Catholics rather than useful citizens. They became obnoxious to a pragmatic generation of rulers determined to extend secular authority over every area of life. While it was the Jesuits' apparent independence that made them unpopular both at Rome and in the Catholic countries, paradoxically it was their dependence in the last resort upon the secular power that made them vulnerable. They were allegedly too powerful and ambiguous in loyalty for a man like Pombal, the commercially minded and radical dictator of Portugal (1750–77). They were too papal for the Bourbon autocrats. They suffered moreover for their efforts to touch the hearts of plain men. *The History of the People of God* (1753) by Berruyer, a popular interpretation of the Bible, was placed on the Index: it was alleged 'to have overthrown morality and discipline to accommodate the passions of men'. The Jesuits were too daring for the Church authorities while at the same time accused of being too conservative by the Enlightenment. For anticlerical forces everywhere they served as a cheap sacrifice to the god of reason. They had already been weakened by the factious and unimaginative

bureaucracy of Rome. In their hour of need they were abandoned by the Pope himself.

In France, Jansenism, by principles and by force of circumstances antiJesuit and Gallican, had won supporters in *parlement* and in the *salons*. The Jesuits were associated with those ultramontane policies which, it was urged, had damaged the country; with the harrying of the Jansenists upon minute points of theology; with the court camarilla responsible for Louis XIV's assault upon the Huguenots. They had never recovered the middle ground of intellectual opinion which they had lost under the assault of Pascal, and which was their reputation in the world of the *salons,* where *bienpensants* considered the works of Montesquieu and Voltaire. In the *Lettres provinciales* (1656), Pascal had criticized their moral theology, their casuistry and their 'easy devotion', with exquisite skill and without compassion, and the charges had stuck: intellectually they cheated, spiritually they bent the rules! The Jesuit missionary operations in South America and the Far East, so heroic and optimistic, looked very different to the theologians of the Sorbonne and the Vatican; and different again to sceptics who doubted whether it was necessary or right to convert men of another civilization.

Ironically, it was Jesuit missionaries in the Far East and their accounts of the inhabitants, their culture and morals, that encouraged the idea that the Christian civilization did not have the monopoly of wisdom. At a time when discoveries in geology and the physical sciences were throwing doubt upon the traditional Christian account of creation and the evolution of man, it was unsettling to be assured by the Jesuits that the morality of the Chinese was in many respects superior to that of the westerner! Idealized types begin to appear: 'the noble savage', 'the Chinese philosopher'. In the hands of the encyclopedist Bayle, travellers' observations became ammunition for his gospel of doubt. We can see how theologians' minds worked when we read in La Bruyère, usually a faithful reporter of trends: 'some complete their demoralization by extensive travel and lose whatever shreds of religion remain to them. Every day they see a new religion, new customs, new rites.' Truth to the Catholic theologian was not relative but absolute. It was dangerous to introduce the idea that practices thought to be grounded upon reason and revelation had no higher authority than that of custom.

To the handful of Jesuits working in China, the issues were more local; but the stakes were large. They made encouraging progress and had won the confidence of the Emperor Kang-Hsi (1661–1722), who valued their knowledge of geography and astronomy. The Jesuit fathers believed that they could so preach Christianity as to make it acceptable to the intellectual élite, the mandarins, and so to the nation. But there needed to be some compromise. Language made no barrier, for Chinese terms could be 'baptized' for Christian use: conversions in the pagan Europe of the Dark Ages provided precedents for that. Confucius could be accepted for the great ethical teacher he undoubtedly was. It was possible to claim that the Confucian rites which were so dear to the Chinese were social rather than religious in character. Since the Emperor himself avowed that the veneration of ancestors was only a civil custom, it was surely unwise to condemn the Jesuits for allowing it to their converts. In all there was nothing specifically anti-Christian about Chinese culture. The Jesuits were working on the frontier, far from the hothouses of western theology in which the devout were engaged upon disputes over grace and free will, or over what was or was not valid in the way of meditation. A few concessions, they argued, might win many souls. The Dominicans held a stricter view. After intense study

and fierce controversy at the Vatican and Sorbonne, fuelled by the jealous reports of rival orders in the missionary field, Rome spoke unequivocally. In a series of verdicts, the last of them in 1715, Clement XIII condemned the Jesuit concessions in China and Malabar. Two successive legates, sent to conciliate and define, succeeded only in antagonizing the Jesuit fathers. The latter may have been too optimistic in their assessment: undoubtedly the papal policy spoiled what chance existed of converting China. The Emperor felt that he had been betrayed; the handful of converts was now persecuted. Either a bubble of self-deception had been pricked, and truth had prevailed; or a momentous opportunity to extend Christ's kingdom had been lost.

The Portuguese were strongest in denunciation of Jesuit practices since they were held to be contravening Portuguese colonial rights. In 1750 a boundary treaty between Spain and Portugal delivered a large area of Paraguay to Portuguese rule. It was here that the Jesuits had their most famous mission. In land hitherto unclaimed, where Indians had voluntarily submitted to Spanish rule, the Jesuits had created self-sufficient communities from which outsiders were excluded. Each of these 'reductions' as they were called, about forty in number, was a model township, built round a square, with the homes and gardens of the Indians on three sides and on the fourth the church, school and infirmary. The town planning is interesting but more important was the system of race relations. Every aspect of the community's life was meticulously controlled by the two resident priests. The Jesuits' enemies said that they exploited the Indians who made the commodities by which the work was financed. Modern critics might condemn an excessive paternalism, but admit that there was also a fine concern for the natives' well-being. The Jesuits tried to stop their Indians from trading on their own behalf; but they also defended them against wholesale eviction at the hands of the Portuguese. A native revolt was attributed to the Jesuits. Pombal made capital out of the situation and his *Brief Relation* (1758) presented the Jesuits as tyrants, aiming at world domination. Benedict XIV invested Saldanda, archbishop of Lisbon, with powers of visitation and reform. It was unfortunate for the Jesuits that their great preacher, Malagrida, should have chosen the disaster of the Lisbon earthquake as a pretext for a sermon upon the iniquities of the Portuguese government. His name was mentioned, with other Jesuits, in connection with the attempted assassination of Joseph I.Pombal demanded that suspects be tried by a state court; but Pope Clement XII demurred at such an invasion of clerical prerogative.

On 3 September 1759, a year to the day after the alleged attempt on Joseph I, Pombal expelled the Jesuits from Portugal. As it was, in 1764 Louis XV, not without embarrassment, bowed to the clamour in *parlement*. Three years later Charles III of Spain followed suit. Secular-minded absolutists could claim a victory for statecraft; others might think that it was a blow to religion. They contributed to their own downfall. Lavallette, superior of the Jesuit mission in French Martinique, having incurred debts in the course of unwise business dealings, appealed for justice to *parlement,* guardian of the anti-clerical tradition. In France Ricci, general of the Society might have saved the Order by conceding that his authority could be exercised by a vicar-general resident there, so meeting the Gallican objection to a foreign body. Of all the Christian bodies, the Jesuits were best qualified to find a means of reconciling traditional authority with eighteenth-century thinking. Their suppression was damaging to Catholic missionary enterprise, and to those whom missionaries served.

In 1750 there were altogether 273 Jesuit missions overseas. The subsequent unhappy history of the Indians throughout the American continent puts the Jesuits' originality and humanitarian enterprise into their true perspective. Meanwhile the Jesuit example continued to have a powerful indirect influence on the life of the Church. Devotions, such as that of the Sacred Heart which they had encouraged, but which their critics disliked because of its emotional character, remained popular. Orders like the Passionists and Redemptionists continued intact, and strong for a future when the Church was able to shake off state controls and the Jesuits were to come into their own again.

Further Reading

An excellent general survey is that of G.R.Cragg, *The Church and the Age of Reason, 1648–1789* (Harmondsworth, 1960). Essential background is provided by the works of A.G.Dickens: *Reformation and Society in Sixteenth Century Europe* (London, 1966), and *The Counter-Reformation* (London, 1969). P.Janelle, *The Counter-Reformation* (Milwaukee, 1949), H.Daniel-Rops, *The Catholic Reformation* (trans. London, 1962), and H.O.Evenett, ed. J.Bossy, *The Spirit of the Counter-Reformation* (Cambridge, 1968), all in different ways go beyond the traditional idea of the Counter-Reformation as simply Rome's counter-attack against Protestantism. See also J.Bossy, 'The Counter-Reformation and the people of Catholic Europe', *Past and Present,* 47 (1970). For a summary of the main issues, some of them still contentious, M.Mullett's *The Counter-Reformation* (London, 1984) is helpful. J.Delumeau, *Catholicism between Luther and Voltaire* (Tunbridge Wells, 1977), is a balanced, modern account. The standard history of missions in this period is K.S.Latourette, *A History of the Expansion of Christianity,* vol. 3 (Exeter, 1971). A good general book on Protestantism is that of E.G.Leonard, *Protestantism* (English trans. 1964). Pietism is well described in K.S.Pinson, *Pietism as a Factor in the Rise of German Nationalism* (1934). For Orthodoxy and the Old Believers in particular, see R.O.Crummey, *The Old Believers and the World of Anti-Christ* (London, 1970). J.McManners, *French Ecclesiastical Society under the Ancien Régime* (Manchester, 1960), a study of Angers, is masterly and entertaining. Though most of his evidence is drawn from England, K.Thomas's *Religion and the Decline of Magic* (Harmondsworth, 1973) is essential reading for mentalities in general, the decline of witchcraft in particular. See also R.Mandrou, *Magistrats et sorciers en France au XVIIe siècle* (1968).

Many aspects of Church life are surveyed in the series *Histoire de l'Eglise,* ed. A.Fliche and V.Martin; vol. 19, by E.Préclin and E.Jarry, *Les Luttes politiques et doctrinales aux XVIIe et XVIIIe siècles* (1955), is helpful towards understanding the conflicts that overshadow Church life in the period. For the one conflict, see particularly J.Orcibal, *Louis XIV et les Protestants* (1951). For another, *Gallicanism,* see A.G.Martimort, 'Comment les Français voyaient le Pape', *Bulletin de la Societé d' Etudes au XVIIe siècle,* 24 (1955). A good concise survey of Jansenism is that of L.Cognet, *Le Jansénisme* (1961). N.Abercrombie, *The Origins of Jansenism* (1936), will help those who wish to master a subject of far-reaching importance which they can also pursue in D.van Kley, *The Jansenists and the Expulsion of the Jesuits from France 1757–*

65 (London, 1975). Jansenism is a major topic in R.A.Knox's *Enthusiasm* (1950)—subjective, entertaining, full of insights; another is quietism, the subject also of Michael Bedoyère, *The Archbishop and the Lady* (1956), a more serious study than the title would suggest. There is a good selection, in translation, of Fénelon's letters, ed. J.McEuen (1960). For Gallicanism, see A.G.Martimort, *Le Gallicanisme de Bossuet* (1927). The life of another great churchman is the subject of H.Daniel-Rops, *Monsieur Vincent* (1966).

The Jesuits' principal chronicler is J.Broderick, in *The Origin of the Jesuits* (London, 1947) and *The Progress of the Jesuits* (1957). See also R.Fulop-Miller, *The Power and Secret of the Jesuits* (1957). H.Graef, *The Story of Mysticism* (1966), gives an introduction to an important subject. H.Kamen's *Spanish Inquisition* (New York, 1977) is a standard work on that much misunderstood organization. By contrast, he is also the author of *The Rise of Toleration* (1967). The subject of P.Hazard's stimulating study of changing ideas at the turn of the century is better conveyed by the French title, *La Crise de la conscience européenne, 1680–1715,* than by the title of the English translation, *The European Mind* (1953). R.R.Palmer, *Catholics and Unbelievers in Eighteenth Century France* (1939), deals with some of its effects.

Additional Further Reading for the Reissued Edition

Henry Phillips, *Church and Culture in Seventeenth Century France* (Cambridge, 1997) explores the Catholic Reform movement and its effects. Huguenot history has been enriched by *Strangers and Citizens,* ed. R.Vigne and C.Lyttleton (Sussex, 2001), with articles ranging more widely around Huguenot immigration into Britain than the title suggests. Several essays in *Huguenots in Britain and their French Background,* ed. I.Scouloudi (London, 1987) are important for the French experience. R.Briggs, *Communities of Belief* (Oxford, 1989) is a typically perceptive collection of essays, revealing aspects of Jansenism, of popular religion, and attitudes towards witchcraft. Also valuable is *Popular Religion in Germany and Central Europe, 1400–1800,* eds R.W.Scribner and T.Johnson (London, 1996).