

Durham E-Theses

*Forms and methods of religious controversy in Paris:
with special reference to Pierre du Moulin and his
Catholic opponents*

Sally Anne Wagstaffe

How to cite:

Wagstaffe, Sally Anne (1990) Forms and methods of religious controversy in Paris: with special reference to Pierre du Moulin and his Catholic opponents. Doctoral thesis, Durham University.

Use policy

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

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a <https://etheses.durham.ac.uk/id/eprint/6050/> is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

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

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

ABSTRACT

Forms and methods of religious controversy in Paris (1598–1621), with special reference to Pierre du Moulin and his Catholic opponents by Sally Anne Wagstaffe

This thesis describes some of the most important features of the controversies between Protestants and Catholics in early seventeenth-century Paris. The emphasis is on debate conducted at a local and popular level.

Part I contains three introductory chapters which describe: the social and political setting in which Parisian inter-confessional debate took place (Chapter 1); relevant aspects of the conditions governing printing in the capital and various episodes which reveal developments in censorship during this period (Chapter 2); the forms of religious debate — sermons and letters, informal discussions and conferences — which contributed to the range of religious controversy in print (Chapter 3).

Part II contains a detailed account of du Moulin's career as a controversialist (Chapter 4): Section 1 covers events in his early life (1568–1621); Sections 2 to 5 survey his activities as a controversialist at Paris (1599–1620) and provide detailed descriptions of all his polemical works published during these years; Section 6 outlines his contribution to religious debate during the remainder of his life, spent at Sedan (1621–58).

Part III deals with the careers and publications of eight of du Moulin's Catholic opponents: du Perron, Cayet, Bouju and Coeffeteau (Chapter 5); Coton, Gontéry, Arnoux and Abra de Raconis (Chapter 6).

The Epilogue examines Parisian religious debate in the period 1621–29, with a description of: the 'méthode', originally devised by Gontéry, then elaborated by Véron (Section 1); the reactions of members of the second generation of Protestant ministers at Paris — Mestrezat, Drelincourt and Daillé (Section 2).

The treatment of the fundamental issue of the 'juge des controverses' is studied throughout Parts II and III, particularly as it arose in discussions on the eucharist and on the biblical basis of the Catholic doctrine of purgatory. Particular attention is also paid to developments in conference method and a typical contemporary record of conference proceedings is reproduced in an appendix.

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author.
No quotation from it should be published without
his prior written consent and information derived
from it should be acknowledged.

**Forms and Methods of Religious Controversy
in Paris (1598–1621),
with special reference to Pierre du Moulin
and his Catholic opponents**

by

Sally Anne Wagstaffe

**A Thesis submitted
for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy**

French

**The University of Durham
1990**



17 OCT 1991

To the memory of

JONATHAN

CONTENTS

Declaration	iii
Statement of Copyright	iii
Acknowledgements	iv
Abbreviations	v
Note on Quotations	v
Introduction	1
<i>Notes</i>	4
PART I	
1. Paris, scene of religious debate	6
<i>Notes</i>	48
2. Printing and censorship in Paris	61
<i>Notes</i>	83
3. Forms and methods of religious controversy	89
<i>Notes</i>	126
PART II	
4. Pierre du Moulin (1568–1658)	
1. Education and travels (1568–1599)	138
2. Paris: early encounters (1599–1605)	145
3. Du Moulin v. the Jesuits (1606–1609)	170
4. Religious debate politicized (1610–1616)	190
5. Du Moulin v. the ‘méthodistes’ (1617–1620)	203
6. Sedan and exile (1621–1658)	225
<i>Notes</i>	235

PART III

5. Du Perron and associated controversialists	
1. Jacques Davy du Perron (1556–1618)	251
2. Pierre-Victor Palma Cayet (1545–1610)	265
3. Théophraste Bouju (?–1622)	273
4. Nicolas Coeffeteau (1574–1623)	281
Notes	294
6. Jesuit and ‘méthodiste’ controversialists	
1. Pierre Coton (1564–1626)	301
2. Jean Gontéry (1562–1617)	316
3. Jean Arnoux (1576–1636)	334
4. Charles-François d’Abra de Raconis (1580?–1646)	344
Notes	354
Epilogue: Religious debate in Paris (1621–1629)	
1. François Véron (1575–1649)	363
2. Later Charenton ministers v. the ‘méthodistes’	371
Notes	386
Conclusion	391
Appendix	393
Bibliography	403

Declaration

No part of the material contained in this thesis has previously been submitted for a degree in the University of Durham or any other university.

Statement of Copyright

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author. No quotation from it should be published without her prior written consent and information derived from it should be acknowledged.

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I would like to thank my supervisor, Dr Jennifer Britnell, for advice and encouragement generously given over many years. My thanks are also due to the staff of the University Library in Durham, the British Library and Dr Williams's Library in London, and the Bibliothèque Nationale and Bibliothèque de la Société de l'Histoire du Protestantisme Français in Paris, for facilitating access to many rare and fragile publications consulted in the course of my work. I would also like to thank the staff of the University of Durham Computer Centre for help in mastering the program used to produce this thesis in its final form. Finally, a special 'thank you' goes to my husband, Chris, and daughters, Kate and Jenny, without whom the present thesis might have been completed a little sooner but more probably would never have been written at all.

Abbreviations

BN	Bibliothèque Nationale
CIOR 16	Cioranescu, <i>Bibliographie de la littérature française du seizième siècle</i>
CIOR 17	Cioranescu, <i>Bibliographie de la littérature française du dix-septième siècle</i>
DHGE	<i>Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastique</i>
DS	<i>Dictionnaire de spiritualité</i>
DTC	<i>Dictionnaire de théologie catholique</i>
Haag	<i>La France protestante</i>
ODCC	<i>Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church</i>
REP	Desgraves, <i>Répertoire des ouvrages de controverse entre Catholiques et Protestants en France (1598–1685)</i>

Note on Quotations

Quotations in French throughout this thesis are given with their original spelling, accenting and punctuation except that 'i' and 'j' and 'u' and 'v' have been normalized to modern usage and printers' contractions, such as the ampersand and nunnation mark, have been expanded.

INTRODUCTION

The two decades spent by Pierre du Moulin as a Protestant pastor and controversialist in Paris are central to this thesis: they serve not only to delimit the period chosen for consideration but also to identify the chief lines of enquiry and the overall structure of this study.¹

The years 1598–1629 are well-established as a distinctive period of French Protestant history within the period extending from the promulgation to the revocation of the Edict of Nantes. From the point of view of Parisian Protestantism and inter-confessional debate, du Moulin's presence in the capital, almost of itself, gave a distinctive character to the period 1598–1621, so comprehensively did he dominate the field of religious polemic at a local level during his time in the capital. This is reinforced by events on the political front — the registration of the edict in 1599 and Louis XIII's expedition against the Protestants of Béarn in 1620 — which are, in turn, reflected in the development of the Parisian Protestant church — from its establishment in its first location under the terms of the edict (at Grigny) to the destruction of the Charenton church building in September 1621. The events of the remaining years prior to the Grace of Alès signal the end of this most prolific period in inter-confessional debate in terms of both verbal disputes and printed polemic at a popular level.²

Two inter-related aspects of du Moulin's publications during his time at Paris have provided the subject of this thesis. His books and pamphlets are, firstly, of particular interest as historical documents reflecting the Protestant perspective on the contemporary political and religious situation. It is therefore one of the aims of this thesis to provide a clear account of the setting in which the polemical exchanges between du Moulin and his Catholic opponents took place. Developments in Parisian religious debate during this time were often closely linked with political events and also with the realities of the Protestants' existence as a minority in an ardently Catholic city, most notably the pressures of censorship, persistent challenges from ambitious Catholic controversialists or, on occasions, the active hostility of a Catholic mob. Conversely, it is clear that religious controversy was itself a vital ingredient of the Parisian scene. The journals of Pierre de L'Estoile, recounting the issues raised in everyday conversations and correspondence, show



how fascinating many Parisians found the sermons, conferences, books and pamphlets which fuelled inter-confessional debate. These points are covered in two substantial opening chapters which describe the context in which debates between Protestants and Catholics took place. A third introductory chapter outlines the varied forms assumed by Parisian religious controversy and assesses their relative importance.

The second striking feature of du Moulin's publications is the emphasis on polemical method: in all his works the Protestant controversialist invariably challenged the manner in which his opponents proceeded and justified his own approach to religious disputes. Accordingly, in Chapter 4 of this thesis, du Moulin's works of religious controversy are examined from this perspective. This central section provides a far more detailed description of du Moulin's career as a controversialist and a much closer analysis of his polemical writings than has previously been undertaken. Part 3 complements this central section by analysing the inter-confessional debates in which du Moulin took part from the point of view of his opponents. This detailed study of both sides of the arguments has rarely been attempted by scholars writing on the polemicists of this period and has proved a particularly productive approach for studying both the methods of individual polemicists and developments in religious debate in general.

In the course of Parts 2 and 3 it will become clear that the major theme of these debates was the 'juge des controverses' question – 'ceste Controverse des Controverses', as Jean-Pierre Camus described it — whether the Church or the Bible should be the arbiter of religious truth.³ This issue was closely linked to questions of polemical methodology and recurs throughout Parts 2 and 3. Two themes which pose the 'juge des controverses' question in a particularly striking manner have been highlighted in this study of the works of du Moulin and his opponents: firstly, the interpretation of the key phrase from scripture, 'Ceci est mon corps', and its significance in eucharistic doctrine; secondly, the biblical basis of the Catholic doctrine of purgatory. These two areas of debate were much favoured by Catholic and Protestant polemicists respectively.

In order to convey both the complexities of these arguments and the flavour of polemical debate at this period a large number of extensive quotations and detailed

descriptions of comparatively rare publications by du Moulin and his opponents are included in the relevant chapters and a longer extract, illustrating the syllogistic method used in many formal conferences during the period, has been presented in an appendix.

The aim of this thesis, in providing a detailed picture of Parisian religious debate centred on du Moulin's activities as a controversialist, has been to supplement the work of those modern scholars who have surveyed some of the better-known publications of this period in studies of individual authors or when following a thematic approach.⁴ The need for closer analyses of the surviving literature relating to seventeenth century religious debate has been identified in a recent book by B. Dompnier, who notes that

L'ampleur de ce corpus, comme aussi la difficulté de mettre aujourd'hui la main sur certains titres devenus rarissimes, expliquent pour partie que bien peu d'historiens aient été tentés par une investigation raisonnée dans cette immense littérature. On l'a souvent taxée tout à la fois de pédantisme et de grossièreté; on a insisté aussi sur le caractère répétitif de ces ouvrages. Finalement, beaucoup d'historiens se sont considérés comme dégagés du devoir de les examiner de plus près et se sont contentés d'analyser inlassablement quelques publications de "grands" controversistes, estimant ainsi avoir tiré la substance de ce véritable genre littéraire que fut pourtant la controverse.⁵

It is hoped that the thesis which follows will demonstrate the value of studying the religious controversy of this period through the detailed examination of minor as well as major texts, taking into account the social and political context in which the exchanges were conducted and the arguments marshalled by polemicists of the opposing point of view.

Notes to Introduction

1. The subject of this thesis was suggested by a survey of the collection of French books assembled by Bishop John Cosin (probably during his period of exile in Paris, 1643–60) which now form part of the Cosin collection in the care of Durham University Library. Among approximately 500 books and pamphlets in French dating from the first half of the seventeenth century, works by Pierre du Moulin far outnumber those of any other author. See, Elfrieda Dubois, 'La Bibliothèque de l'évêque Cosin à Durham et sa collection de livres français de théologie et de spiritualité protestantes des XVI^e et XVII^e siècles', *Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire du Protestantisme Français* (1982), pp.173–88; and, S. R. A. Proctor, 'A study of the printed books in French in Bishop Cosin's Library, Durham' (un-published M. A. thesis, University of Durham, 1974).
2. Jacques Pannier's three-part study of the Protestant church in Paris establishes the standard sub-divisions of the period 1598–1629: *L'Eglise Réformée de Paris sous Henri IV* (Paris, 1911); *L'Eglise Réformée de Paris sous Louis XIII (1610–1621)* (Paris, 1922); *L'Eglise Réformée de Paris sous Louis XIII de 1621 à 1629 environ*, 2 vols (Paris, 1931–32). The bibliographical research of Louis Desgraves on seventeenth-century inter-confessional debates confirms the importance of this early period: 'la période la plus riche en ouvrages va de 1598 à 1628 avec 3595 n^{os} représentant près de la moitié des ouvrages recensés' (*Répertoire des ouvrages de controverse entre Catholiques et Protestants en France (1598–1685)*, 2 vols (1984–85), 1, i). So, too, does Émile Kappler's research into verbal disputes throughout the seventeenth century: 'durant la période 1593 à 1630, il s'est tenu 70% du total des conférences' ('Conférences théologiques entre Catholiques et Protestants en France au XVII^e siècle', 2 vols (un-published doctoral thesis, University of Clermont, 1980), 1, 98).
3. Jean-Pierre Camus, *L'Avoisinement des Protestans vers l'Eglise Romaine* (Paris, 1640), REP 4222, p.28.
4. Biographical studies of all the controversialists featured in Chapters 4 to 7 are listed in the notes to the relevant sections. Two of the most substantial works to follow a thematic approach in studying the writings of both Catholic and Protestant controversialists are *Le débat entre protestants et catholiques français de 1598 à 1685*, 4 vols (Paris, 1985) by Jacques Solé and *L'argument de tradition dans la controverse eucharistique entre catholiques et réformés français au XVII^e siècle* (Louvain-Gembloux, 1951) by Rémi Snoeks. Specific themes have been studied in Catholic polemic by Victor Baroni (*La Contre-Réforme devant la Bible* (Lausanne, 1943)) and Gustave Thils (*Les notes de l'Eglise dans l'apologétique Catholique depuis la Réforme* (Gembloux, 1937)); and in Protestant polemic by René Voeltzel (*Vraie et fausse Eglise selon les théologiens protestants du XVII^e siècle* (Paris, 1955)).

5. Bernard Dompnier, *Le venin de l'hérésie. Image du protestantisme et combat catholique au XVII^e siècle* (Paris, 1985), pp.170–71.

PART I

CHAPTER 1

Paris: scene of religious debate

1. The reign of Henri IV (1594–1610)

The triumphal entry of Henri IV into Paris on 22 March 1594 marked a new stage in the life of the capital. The enthusiasm with which the king, a former Protestant, was generally greeted seems all the more remarkable in the light of the events of the previous decade during which Paris had become the capital of the Catholic League.¹

Events of the preceding decade

In these years the League had conducted an intensive propaganda campaign of sermons, processions, posters, books and pamphlets, and had made the French monarchy and Protestantism — in the persons of Henri III and his chosen successor, Henri de Navarre — the objects of fanatical hatred.² In May 1588 Henri III had fled from the city and a group of League extremists ('les Seize') seized power. Little more than a year later (on 31 July 1589) the king was murdered by a Dominican monk Jacques Clément; Parisians rejoiced at the news of the king's death and his assassin was commended throughout the city from pulpits and in print.³ In the summer of 1590 Henri de Navarre laid siege to the capital; Parisians endured four months of famine and disease (May–August) until the arrival of League troops forced the king of Navarre to withdraw and enabled supplies to be brought to the starving population. Then, over the next three years, the power of the Sixteen collapsed and their violent extremism finally led to their removal by the League's military leader, the duc de Mayenne. Thereafter, the death of its candidate for the French throne in May 1591 and internal divisions paralysed the League. By the spring of 1593 indirect negotiations with Henri de Navarre were under way and eventually produced the truce which enabled the new king to enter Paris a year later.⁴

Paris: scene of religious debate

During this same period, 1591–93, Henri de Navarre had made only modest concessions to his fellow Protestants who sought firm guarantees regarding their future religious and civil status. His co-religionists, apprehensive about Henri's commitment to Protestantism, had already begun to look for a new protector when, on 25 July 1593, Henri de Navarre publicly abjured the Protestant faith.⁵ He was crowned king of France at Chartres on 27 February 1594 and royalists within the capital immediately began preparing the way for Henri IV's entry into Paris with their own campaign of propaganda.⁶

The city into which Henri IV rode in the spring of 1594 was therefore one whose recent history was marked by violent insurrection, sectarian hatred and disloyalty to the French monarchy. Among its inhabitants were many who had written, preached, printed and published opinions which had in turn incited thousands of Parisians to violence against those whom they labelled 'royalistes', 'politiques' or 'hérétiques'. On the day of his entry into the city the king had a general amnesty proclaimed and League pamphlets and documents were burned in several public squares in the city.⁷ Four years later in the opening articles of the Edict of Nantes Henri IV declared that the events of the decade prior to his accession should be obliterated from public memory: 'la mémoire de toutes choses passées d'une part et d'autre, depuis le commencement du mois de mars 1585, jusques à notre avènement à la couronne ... demeurera éteinte et assoupie, comme de chose non avenue'.⁸ It was under these terms that the revival of religious debate between Protestants and Catholics in Paris began.

Paris: the physical and social setting

The physical and social setting in which these debates arose is also of importance. The well-known engraving by Mathieu Mérian gives a good impression of the layout of the city of which Henri IV had finally taken possession.⁹ The fortifications which had successfully withstood his attack in the summer of 1590 — stone walls, some six feet thick and twenty-eight feet high, which surrounded the capital — emerge very clearly on Mérian's plan. The fourteen major entrances through these walls were still locked and guarded at night, and at the two points, east and west, where the Seine interrupted the fortifications, twin towers stood on the riverbanks from which heavy chains could be suspended to exclude enemy ships during a siege.¹⁰ The dominant impression of early seventeenth century Paris was thus still the medieval one of a fortified town.¹¹

Within these walls Paris contained the largest population of any city in Europe at this period — probably about 0.5 million.¹² Its functions as a political and ecclesiastical capital and university town meant that the population included a high proportion of educated laymen and clerics; in their turn, the households of those connected with the court, judiciary, royal administration, university and ecclesiastical establishments supported a huge number of merchants, shopkeepers, artisans and servants. At various times, all sections of society figure in the story of religious debate in the capital, from the courtly élite of clerics and nobility and the members of the Paris Parlement to the crowds of Parisian Catholics who gathered at the Porte Saint Antoine to jeer at Protestants on their way to Charenton and the un-educated lay missionaries who took up the new debating method popularised by P. Véron in the 1620s.

O. Ranum, in his evocation of seventeenth century Paris, emphasises the medieval character of the city's social structure, describing it as 'compartmentalized, ... elitist, and above all hierarchical'.¹³ The fortress-like construction of many abbeys and residences reflected the city's social structure, composed of self-contained and exclusive societies. So too, on a larger scale, did the distinct zones within the city which corresponded to the diverse aspects of the city's life.

The title of Mérian's plan identifies the three main areas within Paris: 'la ville' (on the right bank of the Seine), 'l'université' (on the left bank) and 'la cité' (on

the island between the two). Specific parts of these three areas corresponded to one or more of the functions of Paris. The 'ville' on the northern bank contained three major features visible on the plan: to the east, the group of military buildings formed by the Bastille, Arsenal and Temple; to the west, the royal palaces and court; and between them the commercial area extending along the streets between the Porte Saint-Antoine and the Porte Saint-Honoré and the quaysides where all the city's foodstuffs were delivered.¹⁴ The Ile de la Cité similarly divided into two distinct areas: at one end of the island, the Palais, where the Parlement and other courts were housed and the major part of the royal administration conducted; at the other, the cathedral of Notre Dame and the archbishop's palace which marked the city's role as the religious capital of France with a diocese which included nearly sixty parish churches and numerous abbeys, priories, monasteries, chapels and hospitals within the city walls and countless more beyond.¹⁵ The left bank was dominated by the university and figures on the plan as 'un pullulement d'églises, de collèges et de couvents'.¹⁶ Because of their historic association with the university, most of the city's printers and booksellers were also located in this part of Paris.¹⁷ Beyond the city walls on the left bank, facing the Louvre across the river and centred around the abbey of Saint-Germain-des-Prés, was one further area of the city which was of particular importance when considering Paris as the scene of religious debate: the faubourg Saint-Germain where many of the city's Protestants lived, and especially the rue des Marais, to which du Moulin moved in 1603 or 1604 and which d'Aubigné's baron de Fæneste referred to as 'la rue de Marais, que nous appelons le petit Geneve'.¹⁸

These, then, were the key areas of the city as a centre of religious debate: the royal court where, for a few years prior to the Edict of Nantes, Protestants were to meet for worship and where many informal religious debates and discussions took place; the Parlement, centre of Gallican opposition to Rome throughout much of this period; the city-centre churches where the most noted Catholic controversialists preached; the left bank, where a number of du Moulin's opponents studied or taught in the Faculty of Theology and where a major part of the production and sale of French Catholic polemic against the Protestants was concentrated; the faubourg Saint-Germain, home of du Moulin and many other leading Protestants, and location for a number of important conferences during the early part of the century.

The expulsion of the Jesuits

If Henri IV's wish that the years 1584–94 be forgotten was generally observed, one particular group of ardent League supporters did not escape retributive action: the Jesuits. In the months following the king's entry into Paris enemies of the Jesuits in the Parlement and Sorbonne initiated two unsuccessful schemes to secure their removal before the assassination attempt by Jean Chastel on 27 December 1594 finally provided the pretext they had been seeking.¹⁹ Chastel was a former student of a Jesuit college and, in his trial before the Paris Parlement, the prosecution claimed that the Jesuits had inspired his attempt on the king's life. The death sentence pronounced against Chastel was accompanied by the same penalty for one of his Jesuit teachers and the expulsion of the Jesuits from France:

les prestres et escholiers du collège de Clermont et tous autres, soy disans de ladite société, comme corrupteurs de la jeunesse, perturbateurs du repos public, ennemys du Roy et de l'Estat, vuideront, dedans trois jours après la signification du présent arrest, hors de Paris et autres villes et lieux où sont leurs collèges, et quinzaine apres hors du royaume.²⁰

The thirty-seven Jesuits then in Paris left on 8 January 1595.²¹

The University and the Faculty of Theology

The decision to expel the Jesuits held important implications for educational provision in the capital: the success of their Collège de Clermont had been one further factor contributing to the decline of the formerly prestigious University of Paris. Less than a month after the expulsion of the Jesuits, Henri IV informed the University authorities of his intention of initiating thoroughgoing reforms in order to restore the University to its former glory.²²

In 1594 the University of Paris was no longer the flourishing institution of the Middle Ages. Student numbers, and hence the university's income, had fallen dramatically; many colleges were now empty and dilapidated.²³ The Faculty of Theology, formerly the most influential force in the Catholic Church after Rome itself, had shared in the general decline of the University. Preoccupied, during the period of the religious wars, with the production of anti-Protestant polemic,

it had lost its position of pre-eminence in the field of theological scholarship. The most recent developments in theology originated chiefly in Spain, firstly among the Dominicans and then the Jesuits.²⁴ Even the field of religious controversy was dominated by an Italian Jesuit, Robert Bellarmine.²⁵ Early in the century, the noted French Jesuit scholar P. Richeome observed wryly that the need to propagate Bellarmine's arguments in French now took precedence over the translation of the writings of the church fathers.²⁶ The dominance of Catholic theology by Bellarmine and by the theologians of Spain is clearly reflected in the works of du Moulin and other French Protestant polemicists of the early seventeenth century. Although, by 1620, this situation had been redeemed somewhat by the contributions of Jacques Davy du Perron and his friend and disciple Nicolas Coeffeteau, the Faculty of Theology itself played only a minor role in the development of French Catholic theology and religious polemic.²⁷ Despite the decline experienced by the university it remained a powerful presence in Paris and, through its role as censor and its control of twenty-four major Parisian booksellers and associated businesses such as stationers and paper-makers, an important influence on printed religious controversy.²⁸

Re-establishment of Protestant worship and revival of religious debate

A few weeks after the king's entry into Paris in 1594, his sister, Catherine de Bourbon, also arrived there and established her home in the city.²⁹ Thanks to her patronage, Protestant worship was re-established in the very heart of the capital. By February 1595 L'Estoile reported that regular services were taking place at the residence of Catherine de Bourbon on Sundays and at the Louvre on Wednesdays and Fridays, and were attracting congregations of 700–800 people.³⁰ From 1595 onwards these services drew still more worshippers as the continuing peace brought many exiled Protestants back to the city; in the summer of 1598 L'Estoile noted attendances of 2000–3000 at the Louvre and of 4000 'chez Madame'.³¹

During the years prior to the Edict of Nantes, the Protestants' services, rather to the diarist's surprise, provoked no hostility from the crowds of Catholic onlookers who regularly gathered to watch the worshippers arrive. This passive acceptance of the Protestants was destined, however, to be short-lived as later entries

in L'Estoile's journal reveal. The threat of sectarian violence — which had resulted in the death of several thousand Protestants at Paris in 1572 during the St Bartholomew's Day Massacre and which had flared up again periodically during the years under the Sixteen — remained ever-present. The Protestants had to contend with displays of hostility from Parisian Catholics on many occasions during the period 1598–1621. The most serious incident, in September 1621, led to the destruction of the Protestants' church at Charenton and is one of the events which marks this year as the end of an important period in inter-confessional debate.

In the potentially explosive situation which existed within Paris — enclosed, crowded, and with a large population united by the Catholic faith against a Protestant minority of between twelve and fifteen thousand³² — the capacity of the city's Catholic preachers to incite sedition had already been demonstrated in the years preceding Henri IV's arrival in the capital. Preaching on controversial religious issues was therefore forbidden. Conferences — formal disputes between Catholics and Protestants — were also regarded as potential sources of civil strife and only those initiated with the king's approval were allowed to proceed un-hindered. Nevertheless, religious debate between Catholics and Protestants — in print or at the level of individual or small-scale discussions — began to take place within a year or so of the king's arrival in Paris. Two notable Catholic participants were Jacques Davy du Perron and Pierre Cayet, both converts from Protestantism but in other respects strikingly different.³³

Du Perron was to become the dominant figure in French religious controversy in the early seventeenth century. He had instructed Henri de Navarre in the Catholic faith prior to the latter's abjuration and had taken part in a conference at Mantes which was intended to provide further justification for the king's conversion to Catholicism. Nicknamed 'le Grand Convertisseur' by Agrippa d'Aubigné, du Perron was untiring in his efforts to win further distinguished converts.³⁴ The debates in which he engaged and the pamphlets produced during the years prior to the Edict of Nantes marked the beginning of a distinguished career as a polemicist. Pierre Cayet had arrived in Paris as chaplain to Catherine de Bourbon and formally abjured the Protestant faith in November 1595. (Du Perron was instrumental in bringing about his conversion.) Thereafter he published a succession of pamphlets

justifying his decision to join the Catholic Church and appealing to various influential groups and individuals within the French Protestant church. His output typified the more popular brand of religious polemic, in contrast to the more scholarly approach of du Perron.

The Edict of Nantes (1598) and Parisian Protestants

In 1593 the abjuration of the king shortly before the opening of the Protestants' political assembly at Mantes and his refusal to make any firm promises in response to the assembly's *cahier* at the end of the same year had alienated even moderate Protestant opinion. Between 1594 and 1598 their annual assemblies grew in size and duration and the tone of Protestant demands became ever more insistent. Henri IV, still at war with Spain and anxious to conciliate Catholic opinion within France, instructed his representatives not to give any further guarantees to his former co-religionists. Protestant leaders reacted by denying the king military support and threatening to withhold taxes until eventually the king's negotiators agreed to a review of the Protestants' legal and civil status. It was from this review that the Edict of Nantes finally emerged.³⁵

The edict, signed in April 1598, was based to a large extent on the treaties and edicts of pacification of 1562, 1570 and 1577. The settlement was contained in four separate documents: the edict itself, divided into two parts containing 92 general articles and 56 so-called 'secret' articles (which defined the various religious and civil freedoms to be accorded to Protestants), and two accompanying *brevets* (in which financial support for Protestant clergy and for the maintenance of fifty garrisons was promised). By the terms of the edict Protestants were to be allowed freedom of worship but on a carefully restricted basis, had the right to acquire or inherit public office, and to have legal cases in which they were involved dealt with by bi-partisan courts of the regional *parlements*. The edict also covered many sensitive issues between the two religions in France such as ecclesiastical buildings, ceremonies, feast days, funerals and marriages. The fact that the question of financial support was dealt with separately and not in the edict finally registered by the *parlements* was an indication that these provisions were of a more temporary nature and was to prove important many years later. The Protestants' rights under the edict were in fact quite limited but the edict nevertheless exposed Henri IV

to severe criticism from Rome, from the French Catholic clergy and from the *parlements* which led to a number of alterations being made.³⁶

The Edict of Nantes represented a unique solution to the problem which diversity of religion within a country posed at this period and it was a solution of which the king himself was very proud: the English ambassador Carew reported of Henri IV's attitude to his own policy in religious matters that 'he ceaseth not to vaunt and glory much in his faculty and dexterity that way':

he told me once, that for containing subjects of differing religion in peace and unity, *il pouvoit faire leçon à tous les autres Roys*, viz. He might read lecture to all other princes. But yet for all that, the body of those of the reformed religion is a great thorn in his foot,

and Carew went on to describe the ways in which the king 'seeketh gently to supplant them' while maintaining peace by observing the terms of the edict.³⁷ This accords with most recent evaluations of the Edict of Nantes in which historians no longer present the edict as evidence of the king's commitment to religious toleration but emphasise instead the comparatively modest nature of the king's concessions to the Protestants and the fact that they were dictated purely by political considerations.³⁸

The edict remained unregistered for ten months as a result of the Paris Parlement's resistance and was only registered in February 1599 following an uncompromising address from the king in a meeting at the Louvre on 7 January.³⁹ The registration of the edict thus coincided with the end of a particularly privileged period in the life of the Parisian Protestants and also with the arrival of Pierre du Moulin who, at the age of thirty and after almost a decade spent as a student and teacher abroad, finally arrived in Paris to take up the position first offered to him in 1590.

As described above, the Protestants had been able to worship at the Louvre under the patronage of Catherine de Bourbon for over four years, apparently unharassed by the Catholic majority. In the latter half of 1598 however, as resentment about the Edict of Nantes caused popular attitudes to harden, Catholic preachers became increasingly outspoken in their attacks on the Parisian Protestants and 'on murmorait sourdement d'une S.-Berthelemi'.⁴⁰ By the end of 1598, the king

was being besieged on all sides by complaints about the contents of 'l'Edit de ceux de la Religion' and L'Estoile noted how the Protestants' Christmas Day services served as a show of numerical strength and of defiance towards the Catholic clergy:

le jour de Noël, on y célébra la Cène, où il y eust quatre presches, avec si grande affluence de peuple que, par la multitude des communions, on fust contraint la continuer au lendemain: ce qu'on fist exprès, pour montrer qu'on ne se soucioit guères des crieries des curés et prédicateurs de Paris.⁴¹

The marriage of the king's sister to the Catholic duc de Bar, which took place a month later, on 31 January 1599, brought this privileged era to an end. On the same day on which the Paris Parlement finally registered the Edict of Nantes (25 February 1599) the new duchesse de Bar, still resolutely Protestant, left for Lorraine.⁴² Du Moulin had arrived earlier in the same month at Paris and was allowed a single opportunity to preach in the Louvre before accompanying the duchess to Lorraine for several months as her chaplain.

Deprived of Catherine de Bar's protection, the Parisian Protestants now became subject to the general stipulation of Article 14 of the edict: 'Defendons tres expressement de faire aucun exercice de la dite religion en notre cour et suite ... ni aussi en notre ville de Paris, ni a cinq lieues de la dite ville.'⁴³ Du Moulin regretted that Catherine de Bar had not attempted to secure a location for Protestant worship much closer to the city:

Si maditte dame eust demandé au roy un lieu dans la ville ou au faubourg pour faire nostre exercice ordinaire, Sa Majesté luy eust volontiers accordé, pource que nos assemblées au Louvre l'incommodoient; mais elle ne s'avisa pas de faire ceste requeste au roy, et nul ne la pria d'y penser, qui fut une grande faute; car, Madame estant partie de Paris, on mit nostre exercice à Grigny, qui est à cinq lieues de Paris.⁴⁴

Henceforth the Protestants became far more vulnerable to both the verbal attacks of Catholic preachers and to physical attacks from those Catholics who gathered along their route through the city as they travelled to and from Grigny. On 5 September 1599, for example, L'Estoile noted that 'aux Huguenos, revenans du presche de Grigni, furent fait plusieurs affronts, par un tas de populasse ramassée, dont il y en eut quelques-uns d'emprisonnés et aussitost eslargis, pource que n'estoient que paroles'.⁴⁵

Henri IV and the Fontainebleau conference

The king's attitude to his former co-religionists was interpreted in different ways by his Catholic and Protestant subjects. While many Catholics believed that the king's conversion was merely strategic and saw evidence in the Edict of Nantes and in other spheres of his lack of commitment to the Catholic faith, Protestants generally felt themselves poorly recompensed for the support which they had given to Henri de Navarre and which had brought the French crown within his reach. To retain their loyalty, the king was prepared to offer occasional concessions to the Protestants — at the end of 1599, for example, they were given permission to build their church at Ablon, one league nearer to Paris — but his efforts were necessarily directed chiefly towards convincing the majority of his sincere commitment to the Catholic faith.⁴⁶

The encouragement given by the king to several of the major Catholic controversialists who appear in the following chapters tends to confirm his commitment to Catholicism and also to religious debate as an important means of undermining Protestantism. The Fontainebleau conference which took place on 4 May 1600 between Jacques Davy du Perron and Philippe du Plessis Mornay was to provide one of the most striking illustrations of this point.⁴⁷ The issue at stake in this conference was the accuracy and integrity of du Plessis's scholarship in his book on the history of the eucharist and, in the face of du Perron's challenge, du Plessis made a poor showing, as even those Protestants present agreed.⁴⁸ The king's satisfaction at the outcome of the conference was evident in a widely-publicised note to the duc d'Epemon:

Mon ami, le diocese d'Evreux a gagné celui de Saumur; et la douceur dont on y a procedé oste l'occasion à quelque huguenot que ce soit de dire que rien y ayt eu force que la verité ... Certes c'est un des grands coups pour l'Eglise de Dieu qui se soit faict il y a longtemps. Suivant ces erres, nous ramenons, plus de separez de l'Eglise en un an que par une aultre voye en cinquante ...⁴⁹

The Fontainebleau conference confirmed du Perron's pre-eminence in religious debate and served as an inspiration to other Catholic controversialists, producing a spate of conferences or attempts to engage Protestants in debate. The person

whose conversion was most relentlessly pursued was, not surprisingly, the king's sister: L'Estoile described her as 'aiant tousjours M. d'Evreux à ses costés et à ses aureilles, sous un tacite contentement et commandement du Roy'.⁵⁰ Soon after the victory at Fontainebleau du Perron tried unsuccessfully to organise a conference with a group of Protestant ministers (including du Moulin) for the benefit of Catherine de Bar.⁵¹ His efforts failed again in 1601 (in August and October),⁵² while Cayet dedicated numerous pamphlets to 'Madame' in the hope of bringing her into the Catholic church. The pleas of her husband, threats of her brother the king and even a letter from the pope all failed to alter the devotion of the duchess to the Protestant faith during the remaining years of her life.⁵³

Within a few years of his arrival at Paris du Moulin had begun to make a name for himself as a polemicist. Two exchanges initiated by Cayet and Bouju (another of du Perron's converts) with Lobéran de Montigny, senior minister to the Paris Protestants, were taken up and pursued with vigour by du Moulin.⁵⁴ His conference with Cayet in 1602 was widely regarded as a resounding victory. Whereas the elderly Montigny showed little enthusiasm or talent for such encounters, the newest of the Parisian pastors actively sought out opportunities for debate. In the same period he also challenged the Capuchin Suarez de Sainte-Marie verbally and in print on the subject of the biblical basis of purgatory. By 1603, when the return of the Jesuits to Paris was finally agreed, du Moulin was established as the local Protestants' champion in the field of religious debate.⁵⁵

The return of the Jesuits (1603)

At the turn of the century two matters were continually brought to the king's attention by the pope's representative at the French court and via the French ambassador in Rome: the publication of the Council of Trent and the return of the Jesuits to France.⁵⁶ Henri IV had agreed to the reception of the council in France as one of the conditions of his receiving absolution from the pope but strategic delays on his part and the obstruction of various interest groups within France meant that the council remained without formal royal acceptance during his reign.⁵⁷ The return of the Jesuits was, however, a matter which the king contemplated more readily.

The Jesuits had not in fact left the country as the Paris Parlement's decree had ordered but had merely withdrawn to those areas under the jurisdiction of the *parlements* of Toulouse and Bordeaux. During his visit to Metz in April 1603 the king received a visit from a deputation of Jesuits requesting the re-establishment of their order in France. By the early autumn the king was ready to issue an edict permitting their return.

The Edict of Rouen, signed on 1 September 1603, authorised the Jesuits to remain in all those towns where they were already established and, in addition, to found colleges at Lyon, Dijon, and in the royal house of La Flèche in Anjou. The edict also contained important conditions for the return of the Jesuits: all those based in the country were to be French-born; their activities outside their own establishments could only take place with the permission of local bishops and *parlements* and should not be prejudicial to the interests of the clergy or universities of France; and Jesuits should be prepared to take an oath of fidelity, swearing to do nothing contrary to the interests of the king, to disrupt public order or the country's peace.⁵⁸ One further significant condition was that one member of the company, 'suffisamment autorisé parmi eux', should remain with the king as one of the court preachers and be answerable for the activities of his colleagues. This was to be the role fulfilled by P. Coton who thus began his stay in Paris as a kind of hostage or guarantor of his colleagues' good behaviour but quickly became tremendously influential at court.⁵⁹ In 1608, following the death of René Benoist, Coton became the king's confessor and spiritual director to the dauphin. From

the correspondence of the papal nuncio Ubaldini, it is evident that Coton was very useful to Rome through his close contact with Henri IV (and also later with the queen regent and young king Louis XIII).

Hostility to the Jesuits was, however, still prevalent in Parisian society. Their success as teachers had contributed to the decline of the University of Paris and the directors of the university tended to oppose the Jesuits in every way possible. The Jesuits' zealous support for papal power in the temporal as well as the spiritual sphere offended the Gallican sensibilities of many members of the Paris Parlement and, during the regency years, was to lead to many legal battles over Jesuit publications. Finally, their attitude to the Protestants, characterised by frequent attacks from the pulpit on the concept of religious tolerance and by a vigorous pursuit of individual conversions and an equally vigorous involvement in religious debate provoked great animosity amongst Parisian Protestants. Sully observed that 'Si le roy de sa propre autorité n'en eust entrepris le restablissement, jamais les jésuites ne l'eussent obtenu, tant le Parlement, la Sorbonne, l'Université, plusieurs évesques et villes de France y avoient une grande aversion'.⁶⁰ Henri IV recognised the value of the Jesuits as educators and evangelists in general and on many occasions specifically encouraged the participation of P. Coton and P. Gontéry, the two best-known court Jesuits, in religious debate. The events of the following decade may have served only to confirm the suspicions of those who were ill-disposed towards the Society of Jesus but the Jesuits enjoyed the support not only of the king but also of some of the most influential members of the Catholic nobility and the senior clergy at court.

As with the Edict of Nantes the Paris Parlement began by refusing to register the edict permitting the Jesuits' return. On 24 December 1603 the *premier président*, Achille de Harlay, addressed a speech to the king in which he advanced many of the familiar arguments and popular prejudices against the Jesuits: their close links with the pope and with Spain, their implication in the activities of the League, the university's disapproval of their teaching methods, their alleged role as infiltrators and indoctrinators with sinister purposes, their views on the pope's power to depose kings, to release clergymen from their fidelity to the king, and their teaching that kings judged to be tyrannical could legitimately be assassinated. As

with the Edict of Nantes the king responded with great firmness and secured the registration of the edict.⁶¹

P. Coton therefore was the first of the Jesuits to become permanently established at Paris. He was soon joined by several others, including P. Gontéry.⁶² These two men, strikingly different in character (as their participation in religious debate was to show) were to be the dominant figures among the Parisian Jesuits. Their preaching during Lent 1604 brought thousands flocking to hear them.⁶³ Gradually over the years that followed they both became involved in religious debate with du Moulin and other Protestants at Paris but for the first few years the atmosphere was comparatively calm and religious debates appear to have been fewer.⁶⁴

Thus, the period of increased controversial activity at the turn of the century, largely generated by the bishop of Evreux and the challenge represented by the steadfastly Protestant duchesse de Bar, was followed by a slackening of pace in polemical exchanges during the years 1604–6. This was due in part to the fact that du Perron himself was away in Rome and that minor controversialists such as Cayet, Bouju and Suarez had all, for one reason or another, faded from the scene; but also perhaps to a deliberate policy of restraint on the part of the newly-returned Jesuits in order to avoid attracting unfavourable public attention. From 1606 onwards, however, the outcome of events in England (where the Jesuits had been implicated in the Gunpowder Plot of November 1605) was to restore impetus to religious debate in France also and, in the last few years of Henri IV's reign, the atmosphere in which religious debate was conducted became, once again, highly charged.

James I and the Oath of Allegiance (1606–7)

In April 1603 James VI of Scotland succeeded to the English throne following the death of Elizabeth I. The accession of the new king raised the hopes of Catholics (who had suffered harsh persecution under Elizabeth) and also of the Puritans within the Anglican church (who believed James's Presbyterian background might make him sympathetic to their views) but the king's response to the Catholics' petitions made clear his animosity towards Rome and the hopes of the Puritans were similarly dashed by the outcome of the Hampton Court conference.⁶⁵ These events and the diplomatic mission of Sully to the English court in the summer of 1603 were followed with keen interest by Parisians.⁶⁶ The Gunpowder Plot of November 1605 and its aftermath raised French interest in English affairs to a still higher pitch, particularly when it was discovered that a Jesuit confessor had been implicated in the plot to kill the king. The parallel with the assassination attempt of Jean Chastel in 1594 seemed very strong to many enemies of the Society of Jesus.

In England the main outcome of the Gunpowder Plot was the passing of an 'Act for the better discovery and repressing of Popish Recusants' by the Parliament in 1606. The most controversial aspect of the act proved to be the imposition of an oath of allegiance whereby English Catholics were required to 'detest and abjure, as impious and heretical, this damnable doctrine and position that princes may be deposed or murdered by their subjects'. Pope Paul V twice issued breves condemning the oath and Bellarmine wrote on 28 September 1606 to persuade the imprisoned English archpriest George Blackwell to withdraw his instructions to Catholic clergy to agree to take the oath. In late 1607 a reply to these letters appeared under the title *Triplici nodo triplex cuneus*; although published anonymously, the fact that James I himself was its author was widely-known.⁶⁷ The appearance of Latin and French editions of James's book in Paris led to a series of demands by the papal nuncio to have censorship measures enforced.⁶⁸

The problem arose yet again the following year when, in response to Bellarmine's reply to his earlier anonymous pamphlet, James published a new edition of his work, under his own name and with the addition of a lengthy 'Premonition' addressed to 'all most Mightie Monarches, Kings, free Princes and States

of Christendome'.⁶⁹ Copies of the book were sent to all the European heads of state. Most Catholic kings simply refused this gift; Henri IV's acceptance of the book caused consternation in Rome. He claimed however that his intention was to respond in a more constructive manner to the English king's challenge to papal authority. The nuncio would have liked the task of replying to James to have been entrusted to a Jesuit but in the event Nicholas Coeffeteau was chosen.⁷⁰ His reply was greeted with approval by L'Estoile and with grudging acceptance by the nuncio whose campaign to prevent the publication of works relating to this controversy led to a formal warning for du Moulin from the chancellor against publishing a French version of the king's book.⁷¹

The debate over the book by the English king provoked an international storm and proved of absorbing interest to L'Estoile and his friends. The diarist records his success in tracing the various publications, authorised and proscribed, which had been produced in this exchange and notes details of many discussions at home and letters received from abroad dealing with the issues raised.⁷²

Local religious disputes

Parallel with this international controversy, debates of a more strictly theological and Parisian character had also begun to take place between the two Jesuits, Coton and Gontéry, and Pierre du Moulin. The fact that these two experienced controversialists should at last have decided to enter the lists once again may have been partly due to the anti-Jesuit flavour of many discussions on the pope's confrontations with James I (and also with Fra Paolo Sarpi in Venice).⁷³ At a local level, however, the king's accession to Sully's request (made at du Moulin's instigation) that the Protestants be allowed to move their place of worship still nearer to Paris may also have encouraged the Jesuits to adopt a higher profile in the field of local religious debate.⁷⁴

The first service at Charenton, only two leagues distant from the city, took place on Sunday 27 August 1606 and produced fresh displays of dissatisfaction from some Parisians. The king attempted to head off any violence with a show of military strength, as L'Estoile recounts:

En ce mois d'aoust, et le dimanche 27^e d'icelui, on commenca à prescher à Saint-Maurice, près le Pont Charenton: l'exercice de la Religion, qui se souloit faire à Ablon, aiant esté approché de deux lieues et transféré là, sous la permission et commandement de Sa Majesté, qui pour l'auctorizer y envoya des archers et un exempt des Gardes, afin de contenir le peuple en son devoir. L'assemblée estoit de trois mille personnes ou environ. (VIII, 238)

Throughout the following month 'les rumeurs populaires, insolences, injures et outrages, aboutissantes à sédition, furent grandes et piquantes, à Paris, contre ceux qui alloient et venoient au presche à Charenton' but the Protestant church, in its new location, flourished.⁷⁵ Attendances of 5,000 or more were noted by the English traveller Thomas Coryate, and of 8,000 communicants by Sir George Carew, the English ambassador.⁷⁶

The series of published exchanges between du Moulin and the court clergy seems to have been initiated by the Protestant minister himself when, in 1607, he published two works — an *Apologie pour la sainte Cène* and *Trente-deux demandes*.⁷⁷ The first of these books purported to be the product of an unrecorded conference with Gontéry; the second, of written exchanges with Coton. These two publications gave rise to a host of pamphlets and books by Gontéry, Coeffeteau and others. Du Moulin responded with revised editions of both of his works and, having taken part in another conference with Gontéry, published an anonymous account of these proceedings. Further reactions from Gontéry, Coeffeteau, Bérulle and others followed and were greeted with yet more revisions and retorts from the Charenton minister. L'Estoile deplored the increasingly violent tone of most of these exchanges.⁷⁸

Conciliation and confrontation

P. Coton had, to a large extent, stood apart from these acrimonious exchanges. His reply to du Moulin's *Trente-deux demandes* would not appear until 1610 since it was incorporated into a much larger work, commissioned by Henri IV, and entitled *Institution catholique*.⁷⁹ The purpose of this book, as specified by the king himself, was to deal with the controversial issues which divided Catholics and Protestants in a more conciliatory manner. Coton had begun work on this book at a period when there was much talk of church union as another episode in Parisian religious debate, recounted by Agrippa d'Aubigné, reveals.⁸⁰

Upon his arrival at Paris, in December 1607 or early January, d'Aubigné had paid a visit to du Moulin and in a meeting there with other Protestants had been told that 'il estoit venu en un temps où on avoit la teste bien rompuë pour l'accord des Religions'.⁸¹ D'Aubigné shared the view of those present that the initiatives being made on this front were fraudulent and, with their support, he went to the king with an offer to 'réduire toutes les controverses de l'Eglise aux regles qui se trouveroyent avoir esté fermement establies en l'Eglise primitive jusques à la fin du quatriesme siècle et commencement du suivant'. Henri IV sent d'Aubigné to discuss the matter with cardinal du Perron, recently returned from Rome. D'Aubigné said that Protestants were prepared to accept any well-attested Catholic practices 'quand vous nous aurez au prealable accordé l'autorité de l'Evesque de Rome toute telle qu'elle estoit dans la fin du quatriesme siècle'. Du Perron asked that forty more years be added to the period specified;

je repartis qu'il luy en falloir un peu plus de 50 pour le Concile de Calcidoine que je voyois bien qu'il demandoit. Ce Prelat fut esmeu, et me dict en changeant de couleur: *Si cela ne se fait à Romme, il le fault faire à Paris*.⁸²

(D'Aubigné explained to his correspondent that du Perron had, upon his return from Rome, incautiously revealed his ideas 'sur l'election d'un Primat en France'.) Their discussion ended when d'Aubigné told du Perron that he would only make such a concession 'sur le tapis d'une conference'. Asked by the king to explain this remark, d'Aubigné replied that it was 'un petit strategeme du mestier ... c'est que sur le terme de 400, en demander 50 d'alongement, estoit confesser que les quatre premiers siecles estoyent pour nous, et par la naissance, pureté et vraye antiquité,

l'Eglise estre de nostre party'.⁸³ Concluding his letter, d'Aubigné wrote, 'Je puis vous dire avec verité que ce coup rompit entièrement, et fit taire dans la cour, les discours d'accommodement'.

D'Aubigné thus claimed the credit for sabotaging all efforts towards a national church uniting Gallican Catholics and members of the French Reformed Church, but divisions within French Catholicism continued to grow over the remainder of Henri IV's reign. Many Catholics viewed Pope Paul V's interference in England and Venice with alarm and Gallican sentiment in the Paris Parlement was further aroused by the pope's censure, in November 1609, of two works by *parlementaires*.⁸⁴ In the view of V. Martin, this action marked the beginning of open war between the Parlement and Rome.⁸⁵

During the same year, P. Gontéry, in his Lent and Advent sermon series, denounced the toleration shown towards the Protestants in ever more violent terms.⁸⁶ In December, L'Estoile noted that Gontéry and the Capuchin P. Basile were daily making 'des déclamations catilinaires contre ceux de Charanton; et la pluspart de leurs sermons ne sont qu'invectives et philippiques sanglantes contre ceux de la Religion Prét. Réf., contre leurs Édits, contre l'Estat et la personne du Roy mesme'.⁸⁷ The king's initial response to complaints concerning Gontéry's seditious preaching was to ban him from the city pulpits (but not from preaching at court in his presence) but even this limited ban was soon withdrawn.⁸⁸

This incident forms the last in a sequence of episodes which demonstrate Henri IV's support for the activities of the two leading court Jesuits, Coton and Gontéry. Even prior to the Edict of Rouen, in 1600, he had personally authorised Coton to remain in Nîmes following a conference there with the Protestant minister Chamier.⁸⁹ Later, the king had persuaded his sister to attend Coton's sermons in the hope of winning her over to Catholicism and a few years later still he entrusted the Jesuit polemicist with the task of refuting Calvin in as irenic a manner as possible.⁹⁰ During the same period, the king gave well-publicised encouragement to Gontéry's preaching and evangelistic campaign in north-west France while, on the other hand, ordering that du Moulin's reply to Gontéry's account of their conference be suppressed.⁹¹ All these incidents seem to confirm that the king's

belief in the value of religious debate as a peaceful means of weakening the French Protestant church was indeed genuine.

By early 1610 therefore the tone and character of religious debate in Paris had altered dramatically, partly in response to events outside France itself. The conferences and publications at the turn of the century had been much concerned with securing the conversions of individual Protestants and had tended to concentrate on purely theological issues. The key issue of the 'juge des controverses' – the respective roles of scripture and the Church in determining religious truth – had come to the fore and the opposing Catholic and Protestant views were tested out in a number of debates on the doctrines of purgatory and of the real presence. In the lull which followed in the years 1604–6, P. Gontéry had begun to develop his new approach to the conduct of conferences, reflected in many of his works of the years 1606–9 but, overshadowed by the international uproar provoked by the publications of the king of England, Gontéry's works passed largely unnoticed in Paris. Such questions as the scope of the pope's power in the temporal sphere and of the Jesuits' influence on political affairs had moved to the top of the agenda and the assassination of Henri IV by a man allegedly connected with the Jesuits ensured that those same issues remained paramount.

2. The regency of Marie de Médicis (1610–1617)

The assassination of Henri IV and its aftermath

On the afternoon of 14 May 1610 Henri IV was being driven from the Louvre to the Arsenal accompanied by only a handful of noblemen and servants when the royal coach was brought to a halt in the narrow and busy rue de la Ferronnerie by traffic congestion. A man leapt up to the window of the stationary vehicle and stabbed the king twice in the chest. The attacker, Ravallac, made no attempt to escape and was immediately arrested while the coach returned rapidly to the palace. There it was discovered that the king was dead.⁹²

Acting without delay in order to forestall the civil disturbances which all seemed to believe were imminent, the Parlement, joined by representatives of the nobles, declared the queen, Marie de Médicis, regent until her son, the nine-year-old heir to the throne should reach his majority. The following day the young king Louis XIII confirmed this decree before the Parlement.⁹³ The angry riots which L'Estoile anticipated in such a city as Paris, 'remplie d'infinis vagabonds, voleurs, traïstres, Ligueurs, et autres mal affectionnés à cest Estat', did not materialise. The diarist noted with relief the reactions of two influential groups to the crisis: the nobles, setting aside their many differences, joined forces with the Parlement and offered the new king and regent sound advice, particularly of the need to confirm the edict of pacification; almost as importantly, the Catholic preachers throughout the city (and du Moulin at Charenton) urged their congregations to seek 'la paix, l'union et concorde fraternele' with those 'de contraire religion'.⁹⁴

In the first few days following the king's death L'Estoile's chief fear was for the outbreak of sectarian violence and, hostile as ever to the Jesuits, he twice mentions alleged attempts by P. Coton to implicate the Protestants in the king's assassination.⁹⁵ On the following Sunday the Charenton service was poorly attended as many Protestants 'quelque assurance qu'on leur donnast, aimèrent mieux garder leurs maisons que de prendre le hazard d'y aller'.⁹⁶ It was at this period that the noted Protestant scholar Isaac Casaubon finally decided to accept an invitation from James I to take up residence in England.⁹⁷

In the months that followed, the Jesuits, as in 1594, became a focus of popular suspicion and hostility. L'Estoile, in his account of the day of the king's assassination, did not fail to recall Jesuit views on tyrannicide and he continued to note what he believed were small but telling details in their conduct which revealed a lack of respect and regret for the dead king.⁹⁸ The trial of Ravallac which opened on Wednesday 19 May revealed only two slight connections with the Society of Jesus and throughout his trial, despite threats to the lives of his family and frequent interrogation under torture, Ravallac continued to assert that his action was motivated solely by his own personal convictions.⁹⁹ There was no hard evidence of Ravallac's having been incited by individual Jesuits or influenced by Jesuit writings but nevertheless the opinions of two Jesuit authors, Becanus and Mariana, were condemned from Parisian pulpits on the following Sunday.¹⁰⁰ (Ravallac was sentenced to death on 27 May and his execution was witnessed by a ferocious mob of Parisians, 'cruellement animé et acharné contre ce meschant parricide'.)¹⁰¹

The attacks on the Jesuits from pulpits and in print continued and on 8 June, after receiving a submission from the Sorbonne, the Paris Parlement condemned Juan de Mariana's *De rege et regis institutione* as 'impie, heretique, mal parlant de l'auctorité des rois, et pernicieux a cest Estat'.¹⁰² Copies of the book were burned by the public executioner. On 30 June a deputation of Jesuits, led by P. Coton, asked the *procureur général* for permission to publish an apology in defence of the Society against 'des calomnies toutes apparentes dont on avait chargé et chargeoit-on tous les jours leur Compagnie' which the Jesuits wished to be accompanied by 'commandement et inhibition expresse à toutes personnes, de quelque qualité qu'elles fussent, de les contredire et impugner, ou y faire response en façon que ce fust'.¹⁰³ This request was refused and the proposed apology therefore appeared a few days later without the guarantee of silence imposed on the Jesuits' adversaries. Coton's pamphlet, entitled *Lettre déclaratoire de la doctrine des Peres jesuites*, was purchased by L'Estoile on 5 July.¹⁰⁴

As the Jesuits had feared, the *Lettre declaratoire* attracted many replies. One of the two which L'Estoile judged to be the most cogently argued was entitled *Anticoton, ou refutation de la 'Lettre declaratoire' du P. Coton*.¹⁰⁵ Published anonymously, du Moulin was widely suspected of being the author of the *Anticoton*, a

belief which his son confirmed in his biography published in England some fifty years later.¹⁰⁶

The Jesuits, under attack from various quarters, nevertheless enjoyed strong support from those in power. The new king confirmed all his father's edicts in their favour. The bishop of Paris affirmed the value of the Society and both he and the nuncio protested at the burning of Mariana's books.¹⁰⁷ The strength of the support given to the Jesuits was one indication of the increased influence of those with ultramontane sympathies under Marie de Médicis. Although the idea of a secret council composed of P. Coton, the nuncio Ubaldini, and the Spanish ambassador is now discredited, these men, in company with the five French cardinals (and du Perron in particular) were able to exert considerable influence on the government and were thus very important to Rome during the episodes to be described below.¹⁰⁸ Another foreign influence in French affairs which begins to figure increasingly in L'Estoile's diary at this period was that of the Concinis, Léonora Galigaï, the regent's lady-in-waiting and her husband, Carlo Concini. For the diarist, the Florentine couple represented the most notable examples of a tendency whereby foreigners and newcomers were taking power while 'nos bons François et vieux conseillers' were being excluded.¹⁰⁹

While ultramontane influence on French affairs seemed to be growing that of the Protestants was considerably weakened by Sully's removal from the royal council in early 1611. Scholars have recently claimed that these changes in the regency government have been overstated; that French foreign policy, for example, and the government's attitude towards the Protestants, continued unchanged.¹¹⁰ But the Protestants clearly did feel that there had been a noticeable change in the climate of opinion, despite the confirmation of the Edict of Nantes (3 June 1610) and the granting of permission to hold a general assembly in 1611. In the summer of 1610 L'Estoile recounts several incidents as evidence of deliberate attempts to de-stabilise the city and stir up violence against the Protestants:

les bruits ... couroient partout d'une S.-Berthélemi prochaine, semés et apostés à dessein par quelques brouillons d'Estat ... , qui taschoient par de tels artifices d'y porter le peuple, mais le quel, ... ne vouloit point mordre à l'appast, estant fait sage par les exemples du passé.¹¹¹

P. Gontéry continued his pulpit attacks on the Protestants and on Catholic 'politiques' virtually unchecked, despite complaints from one of the Protestants' representatives at the court.¹¹²

The Protestants' general assembly held at Saumur in the summer of 1611 attempted to force the regent into granting some of the concessions and guarantees sought in the Protestants' *cahier* by retaining their deputies at court and staying in session awaiting a reply. They met with an unbending response from the regent who demanded the immediate dissolution of their assembly and conceded virtually none of their requests. Soon after the end of the assembly details were released of the newly-agreed mutual defence treaty and double marriage alliance with Spain which had until then been kept secret to forestall the protests of the Protestant assembly.¹¹³

L'Estoile and the changing character of religious debate

The privileged view of Parisian society afforded by the *Mémoires-journaux* is brought to an end in 1611 by L'Estoile's death in October of that year.¹¹⁴ His account of the first year of the regency reveals the forces at work in the capital and also provides some indications for the pattern of events as they were to unfold throughout the period 1610–1617: the Jesuits and others of ultramontane sympathies exercised considerable influence at court; the prince of Condé (next in line to the throne after Louis XIII and his younger brother) and other powerful nobles, failing to gain the influential role in the conduct of affairs to which they believed themselves entitled, became increasingly restive; the Paris Parlement, supported in many instances by the Sorbonne and leading Protestants, campaigned against the Jesuits who epitomised for them the malign influence of Rome and Spain on French affairs.

The death of L'Estoile also brings to an end the special insights into Parisian religious controversy which his journals contain. Many fascinating details emerge from the diarist's records of the ways in which ideas were exchanged and of the manner in which those in positions of authority attempted to control or suppress religious debate. Although many of these features remained largely unchanged in the years which followed, there was a significant change in the overall character

of religious debate in the regency period which is reflected both in the activities of writers covered in the following chapters and in the bibliographies of printed material surviving from these years. Essentially *religious* debate in the period 1610–1617 was preoccupied with one issue of enormous *political* significance: the nature of papal power and its implications for France and the French monarchy. Virtually all the major debates and publications of the period have strong political overtones. Debate of a purely theological nature, discussing eucharistic doctrine for example, or arguing about the basis on which religious debate should proceed, becomes far less frequent and of secondary importance in this period. The effort to achieve individual conversions was also reduced. In marked contrast to the periods before and after the regency, no records survive of any conferences taking place at Paris for the entire period of Marie de Médicis's regency.

The only notable exception to this general change in religious debate was perhaps P. Jean Gontéry who, in the last years of his life, continued to perfect his method of conducting conferences (although not in Paris itself). He engaged in debates in Germany and at Sedan in 1613 and at Bordeaux in 1614, which formed the basis for expositions of his new approach. He died in 1617 but his method had by then already been taken up by another, younger, Jesuit, P. François Véron, who published his first work giving an account of a conference at Amiens using the Gontéry method in 1615.¹¹⁵ This method, which attracted comparatively little attention during these years, was destined to be of major importance for the development of religious debate after 1617.

All the other controversialists studied in the following chapters and active at this period confirm the political emphasis of religious debate. Cardinal du Perron and P. Coton were in any case, through their influential positions at court, deeply involved in the country's political affairs, and neither of them published any major works of religious controversy during these years. They both appear however at crucial points, advocating the registration of the Council of Trent, putting Rome's case and opposing the activities of the Parlement, the Sorbonne and the Protestants.

Parlement and Protestants against the Jesuits

After the condemnation of Mariana's book, the Paris Parlement mounted its next major offensive in late 1610 against the recently-published book by Cardinal Robert Bellarmine entitled *Tractatus de potestate summi pontificis*, in which the author restated his theory of the pope's indirect power over temporal rulers and which was intended as a defence of papal authority against the challenge of James I in particular but also of the Venetians and the Gallicans.¹¹⁶ The Parlement condemned the book unequivocally, forbidding anyone to handle, print, or sell the book, or to teach, discuss or write about its contents 'sur peine de crime de lèse majesté', but this decree was quickly suspended by the regent after the nuncio had brought considerable pressure to bear both on Marie de Médicis herself and on her ministers.¹¹⁷

The Parlement had, in addition, asked Edmond Richer, syndic of the faculty of theology, to reply to Bellarmine's book with an authoritative statement of the Sorbonne's position on this subject. Despite the government's suppression of the decree against Bellarmine's book, Richer went ahead with his reply: the *Libellus de ecclesiastica et politica potestate* was presented to the Parlement in the summer of 1611 and published the following year.¹¹⁸ According to Mousnier, this book outlined a theory which 'complétait ... le gallicanisme politique du Parlement par un gallicanisme religieux qui refuse au Pape le pouvoir de gouverner souverainement l'Eglise'.¹¹⁹

Richer's book met with the full approval of James I but in France the implications of his views roused the hostility of churchmen and of the government. The most active campaigner against Richer's book was cardinal du Perron who convinced the *conseil du roy* and the bishops that the limitations set by Richer on papal power would invalidate the annulment of Henri IV's first marriage (and thus cast doubt on the legitimacy of Louis XIII and strengthen Condé's claim to the throne) and would also render all appointments to bishoprics invalid.¹²⁰ In the face of government hostility towards Richer's views and pressure from several opposing groups within the Faculty of Theology, it was decided that Richer should be replaced; a new syndic was elected on 1 September 1612. The following year Rome placed Richer's book on the Index. Despite this defeat Richer's doctrines survived

and were to provide the inspiration for the article formulated by the Third Estate at the Estates-General in 1614–15.¹²¹

Parallel with the Parlement's attacks on Jesuit authors in these first few years following the death of the king, Pierre du Moulin and Philippe du Plessis-Mornay led the Protestant offensive against the pope's pretensions to power in the temporal sphere. At the time of the king's assassination du Moulin had been preparing a refutation of Coeffeteau's reply to James I. Recognising the relevance of his work, which opened with a denunciation of the Jesuits and the pope's involvement in secular affairs, du Moulin quickly published the first two parts of his still incomplete work under the title *Défense de la foy catholique contenue au livre du roy Jacques I contre la response de Coeffeteau*.¹²² (Part 3, entitled *De l'accomplissement des propheties*, in which he pursued James's identification of the pope with the Antichrist, appeared in 1612.)¹²³ Du Plessis-Mornay's contribution was a history of the papacy under the title *Le Mystere d'Iniquité* of which both Latin and French editions appeared in the summer of 1611 (dedicated respectively to James I and Louis XIII).¹²⁴ In his dedicatory epistle addressed to the French king, which L'Estoile found 'bien faite, mais merueilleusement libre et hardie, que je ne die plus, pour ce temps', du Plessis-Mornay attacked the Jesuits and urged the king not to be afraid of the pope.¹²⁵ He concluded with the claim that

Pour moi, Sire, outre le gré que m'en sçaura, un jour, mort ou vif, Vostre Majesté, d'avoir publié ceste verité pour mon dernier service, je suis asseuré que j'en aurai d'abondant la bénédiction de plusieurs Catholiques Romains, vos bons et fideles sujets, auxquels j'aurai servi de truchement, qui en croient certes et en jugent non autrement que moi, mais, plus prudens qu'ils sont, ne vous l'osent dire.¹²⁶

Du Plessis-Mornay's remarks highlight the unusual situation of the Protestants in these early years of the regency when, as a result of the assassination of Henri IV and the widespread belief that the Jesuits were implicated, the Protestants were able to ally themselves with the Gallicans in the Parlement and Sorbonne in challenging the ultramontane influence and attacking the Jesuits far more forcefully than would otherwise have been conceivable. As will be described in Chapter 2, various authorities in Paris attempted to suppress these two Protestant works but without great success.

The main focus of religious debate in Paris continued to be the Parlement which came into conflict with Rome once again in mid-1614 when it condemned the book by the influential Spanish Jesuit Francisco Suarez, published under a title which recalled du Moulin's *Defense de la foy catholique* of 1610: *Defensio fidei catholicae et apostolicae adversus anglicanae sectae errores*.¹²⁷

Pierre Blet, in his article on the links between the debate over this book and that which developed at the end of the year in the Estates General, portrays the affair as part of a virtual conspiracy against the Jesuits:

huguenots ... politiques des milieux parlementaires ... docteurs et régents de l'Université ... semblaient conjurés depuis plusieurs années pour ne pas leur laisser un moment de répit.¹²⁸

Ubal dini's dispatch of 5 June 1614, warning the pope's secretary of state that Suarez's book had reached Paris, lends support to this view for he notes that Protestant booksellers were responsible for bringing the book back from the Frankfurt bookfair — 'sans doute à la demande de quelque envieu et ennemi de la compagnie pour exciter contre elle quelque nouvelle tempête'.¹²⁹ Three weeks later, on 26 June, the Parlement condemned the book by Suarez. During the months which followed Rome enlisted the help of the French cardinals in applying pressure on the regent and finally succeeded in having the decree nullified.¹³⁰

After six months of diplomatic tension between Rome and Paris the matter seemed closed. A circular letter by P. Armand, addressed to all the other provinces of the Society of Jesus, described the events and the outcome of the episode concerning Suarez's book and emphasized the perilous position in which the French Jesuits found themselves — 'à la merci des imprudences de plume d'un confrère étranger' —

qu'un seul [Jesuit] conçoive à l'avenir un semblable dessein, nous voici de nouveau et cette fois, je crains, pour tousjours, expulsés de France ... C'est pourquoi j'espère que vous interdirez absolument que semblable livre soit désormais publié dans vos provinces.¹³¹

Despite the French provincial's efforts however the Gallican campaign against the pope's involvement in secular affairs and against the Jesuits in particular was about

to re-emerge in a different form in the article placed at the head of the *cahier* of the Third Estate.

The Estates General and 'l'article du Tiers'

The meeting of the Estates General — a concession granted in May 1614 to Condé in the treaty which (temporarily) brought hostilities between the government and the nobles to an end — opened in Paris on 27 October.¹³² While Condé and the nobility (the Second Estate) hoped that the Estates General would provide the means of furthering their claims to power, the clergy of the First Estate were eager to use this opportunity to secure the reception of the Council of Trent in France. Ultimately the Estates General failed to produce the desired outcome in these and most other respects but at the turn of the year its proceedings became the object of tremendous public interest as the content of the article which was intended to appear at the head of the Third Estate's *cahier* became known.

The 'premier article du Tiers' represented yet another attempt to counteract the pope's claim to authority in the temporal domain and called upon the king to incorporate the concept of the sovereignty and inviolability of the French monarch as a fundamental law of the land:

que comme il est reconnu souverain en son Estat, ne tenant sa Couronne que de Dieu seul, il n'y a puissance en terre quelle qu'elle soit, spirituelle ou temporelle, qui ait aucun droit sur son Royaume pour en priver les personnes sacrées de nos Rois ni dispenser ou absoudre leurs sujets de la fidélité et obéissance qu'ils lui doivent pour quelque cause ou prétexte que ce soit.¹³³

The article proposed that all deputies, all holders of royal appointments, lay and ecclesiastical, should be obliged to formally subscribe to this law and that all scholars, preachers and teachers should be obliged to teach and commend this view. Those holding the opposite view — 'qu'il soit loisible de tuer et déposer nos rois' — and, in particular, those publishing books containing such views should be regarded as guilty of *lèse-majesté*.

Several alterations were made to the article as originally formulated to make it more general in application but even in its final form, it is clear that the article was

chiefly directed against the Jesuits.¹³⁴ The following passage from the article is a barely concealed reference to the recent publications of Jesuits such as Mariana, Bellarmine and Suarez:

s'il se trouve aucun livre ou discours écrit par étrangers, ecclésiastiques ou d'autre qualité, qui contienne proposition contraire à ladite loi, directement ou indirectement, seront les ecclésiastiques du même ordre établi en France obligés d'y répondre, les impugner et contredire incessamment, sans respect, ambiguité ni equivocation.

When the clergy of the First Estate finally succeeded in obtaining a copy of the article, they declared it heretical and chose Cardinal du Perron to address the Third Estate and explain why the article should be suppressed. Du Perron's speech on 2 January 1615, lasting two and a half hours, swayed a number of deputies from their support for the article but at the end of the session the voting remained in favour of its inclusion. (The Parlement chose this very day to respond to the suspension of its *arrêt* against Suarez's book by renewing various decrees of the previous fifty years against the Jesuits and their publications, and expressed its approval of the provisions contained in the First Article of the Third Estate.)¹³⁵

Over the next fortnight the clergy, urged on by messages from the pope to the five French cardinals, addressed frequent complaints to the king and the queen mother until they succeeded in having the article evoked in mid-January. Further discussion of the matter in the Parlement was forbidden and the printer who had published the Parlement's unsigned *arrêt* was imprisoned.¹³⁶

In Paris the controversy over the First Article of the Third Estate provoked lively debate and a large number of books and pamphlets, including a reply from King James to comments made by Cardinal du Perron in his speech of 2 January (which had been published soon after).¹³⁷ With the help of Pierre du Moulin, then spending several months at the English court at the invitation of the king, James retorted in French with a declaration 'Pour le Droit des Rois & Indépendance de leurs Couronnes'.¹³⁸

Political upheaval; the assassination of Concini

The Estates General closed at the end of March 1615 having failed to agree on a programme of reforms or to elicit a positive response from the government and during the remaining two years of the regency, the power-struggle between the nobles (led by Condé) and Concini and his allies intensified.

Having failed to gain support in the Estates General for giving greater power to the French nobility, Condé was at the head of a further rebellion which began to gather strength in the summer of 1615. (The decision of the southern Protestants to join the revolt in an attempt to prevent the imminent Spanish marriages was to prove significant for it confirmed the young king's view of them as a continual threat to the country's peace.)¹³⁹ The marriage ceremonies went ahead despite the unrest and the following year Condé achieved a very favourable settlement in a treaty signed in May 1616 which accorded him a seat on the *conseil du roy*. His arrival in Paris soon forced the withdrawal of the increasingly powerful Concini (now maréchal d'Ancre) from the city and for a few months Condé enjoyed great popular support, partly as a consequence of the capital's hatred for Concini. But in September, advised of the danger this popularity posed for the crown, Marie de Médicis had Condé imprisoned.¹⁴⁰ Concini then returned to the capital and finally took control of the government, removing the last of Henri IV's ministers and creating a 'Concini ministry' which soon included Richelieu as secretary of state with special responsibilities in foreign and military affairs.¹⁴¹ The new government was on the point of taking strong action against the rebellious nobles (who had taken up arms once again following the imprisonment of Condé), when the situation was dramatically changed by the intervention of the young king whom Concini had long antagonised by his arrogance, his abuses of power and finally by the removal of the ministers of Louis's father.¹⁴²

On 24 April 1617, Louis XIII, encouraged by his favourite Luynes, had Concini arrested and shot. The *coup d'état* proved a complete success. There was public rejoicing in Paris at the news of the death of Concini; the rebel princes laid down their arms; Louis recalled his father's ministers while the queen mother, kept away from the king for over a week, resigned herself to leaving court. Richelieu, hoping for a reconciliation between mother and son, allied himself with Marie de Médicis

Paris: scene of religious debate

and negotiated the conditions of her departure to Blois on 3 May 1617 before himself withdrawing to his bishopric of Luçon.¹⁴³

3. Louis XIII (1617–1621)

This period extends from the beginning of the personal reign of Louis XIII in April 1617 until 1621, the year which began with du Moulin's exile from France and which ended with the death of Luynes soon after an abortive siege on the Protestants' stronghold of Montauban.

The undoubted keynote of this period was 'Catholicism on the offensive'. Louis XIII had been brought up as an extremely devout Catholic; both he and Luynes looked upon the Protestants as a threat to the country's peace and to its standing in Europe.¹⁴⁴ With the assumption of power by Louis XIII, the Parisian Jesuits entered a period in which their missionary efforts enjoyed royal support to a still more marked degree. Throughout these years they were active in promoting the cause of the eradication of heresy and towards the end of the period conducted their missionary campaigns in parallel with the king's military action against his Protestant subjects.

The replacement of P. Coton by P. Arnoux proved to be symptomatic of the new spirit.¹⁴⁵ The chief reason for the removal of P. Coton was his long association with the queen mother which made him suspect in the eyes of Luynes, but the replacement of the comparatively irenic Coton with a man closer in spirit to the outspoken and combative P. Gontéry was to prove very significant for religious debate in the capital.

Arnoux's Fontainebleau sermon and the Protestant counter-attack

On 25 June 1617 Arnoux preached a sermon before the king at Fontainebleau which seemed to set the tone for the new government in religious matters. Adopting Gontéry's characteristic line of argument, Arnoux attacked the Protestants' confession of faith, claiming that the scripture references included in the margins alongside most of the forty articles did not provide satisfactory proof of the doctrines they accompanied and were intended to confirm.

Details of Arnoux's sermon reached the Charenton ministers and du Moulin composed a reply on their behalf which was quickly published under the title *Défense de la confession de foy des Eglises Réformées de France*.¹⁴⁶ This pamphlet, addressed directly to Louis XIII without his permission and in which the ministers boldly described themselves as 'pasteurs de l'Eglise Reformée de Paris' and attacked the Jesuits, scandalised Catholic opinion in the capital. All copies of the book were ordered to be seized and destroyed. For several weeks various courts vied for the privilege of taking action against the four ministers. They ultimately escaped with no more than a severe reprimand from the king's council.

At the king's wish, Arnoux published an account of his sermon under the title *La confession de foy de messieurs les ministres convaincue de nullité par leurs propres Bibles*.¹⁴⁷ In his dedicatory epistle to the king, Arnoux warned of the damage which 'le diffame du meslange en matiere de foy' caused to the country's standing in Europe. Arnoux's book went through numerous editions during 1617 and 1618. A number of other Catholic replies appeared including one by Richelieu who, exiled in his bishopric, had followed the events of the summer with interest and finally decided to publish a reply to the ministers' letter:

parce que je ne voyois point que de la part de l'Eglise il fût apporté aucun remède au mal qui se glissoit dans les âmes par la lecture de ce livre pernicieux, dont les huguenots faisoient leur coryphée, se vantant que les catholiques ne s'en pouvoient défendre, j'employai le loisir de ma solitude à y répondre, et le long temps qu'il y avoit que j'étois diverti de l'exercice de ma profession m'y fait travailler avec tant d'ardeur et de courage que dans six semaines j'achevai cet ouvrage.¹⁴⁸

Richelieu's pamphlet, entitled *Les principaux points de la foi de l'Eglise catholique*

deffendus contre l'escrit adressé au Roy par les quatre ministres de Charenton, appeared in early November and was well-received.¹⁴⁹ Another notable reply followed soon after by the Sorbonne doctor Charles-François Abra de Raconis who was to make a name for himself over the next few years with his adaptation of Gontéry's method.¹⁵⁰ The following year du Moulin replied to Arnoux's book with a further work entitled *Bouclier de la foy, ou Defense de la Confession de foy des Eglises reformees du royaume de France*.¹⁵¹ This in turn provoked a number of Catholic replies.

In fact Arnoux's sermon and the ministers' letter composed by du Moulin marked the beginning of a revival of interest in religious debate similar to that seen in the early years of the century. P. François Véron, Gontéry's disciple, was active in promoting his improved version of this method publishing numerous small pamphlets bearing such titles as *Bref et facile moyen* or *Abbrégé de la methode*, all of which were manuals containing slight variations on the basic work.¹⁵²

Since Gontéry's method was essentially a way of conducting verbal disputes with Protestants these years also saw an increase in the number of conferences. 'Depuis ce temps', remarked du Moulin in his autobiography, 'j'ay esté fort traversé de disputes contre les adversaires'.¹⁵³ The most interesting accounts of a conference in which a variation of the Gontéry method was employed appeared in 1618 following a conference between du Moulin and Abra de Raconis. Largely as a result of his enthusiastic crusade against Protestantism, Raconis was chosen soon afterwards as one of the *prédicateurs du roi*. Arnoux, Véron and Abra de Raconis all dedicated most of their works to the king, confident in the knowledge that their efforts enjoyed his approval. Another of du Moulin's opponents in these final years of his time in Paris was the bishop of Geneva, François de Sales, who chose a favourite subject of the 'méthodistes' (as those employing the Gontéry approach were soon called) — the real presence — for their discussion at the home of a dying Protestant noblewoman. No published account of this conference appeared at the time but references in the bishop's personal papers and in du Moulin's autobiography suggest that the Protestant carried the day.¹⁵⁴

Henceforth the Protestants were to find themselves cast in the defensive role. During the regency of Marie de Médicis, public attention had been focused to a

great extent on the Jesuits while the Protestants had been able to ally themselves with the Gallicans within the Parlement and the Faculty of Theology in asserting their loyalty to the French crown in the face of ultramontane influences acting, or so they alleged, against the interests of France. From 1617 onwards the ultramontane party appeared to have gained the upper hand entirely and the Protestants became the principal target.

The French response to events in Bohemia

The commitment of the king and Luynes to the Catholic fight against heresy was evident not only in the encouragement given to controversialists such as Véron and Abra de Raconis but also in the government's attitude to certain important matters of foreign policy and to the Protestants of southern France.

French involvement in the struggle taking place throughout much of this period for the elective kingship of Bohemia provides an important example of the way in which Louis XIII was influenced by religious considerations.¹⁵⁵ France had at first maintained an uncommitted stance as the threat of confrontation developed between the Catholic Emperor Ferdinand (the initial choice as future king of Bohemia in the election of 1617) and the Protestant Elector Palatine Frederick V (who had been chosen in a second election conducted by Bohemian Protestant insurgents in 1619). France's uncommitted position was challenged in late 1619 when Ferdinand sent an ambassador to Louis XIII to ask for military assistance. Louis was in effect being asked to turn against his country's traditional allies (the German Protestant princes of the Evangelical Union) and side with the Habsburgs and the Catholic League and thus bolster the power of France's long-standing enemy, Spain. The king's ministers were against such a course, preferring diplomatic intervention, but on Christmas Day, P. Arnoux 'prêchant devant le jeune roi, lui fit un devoir de conscience de soutenir l'Empereur contre les hérétiques', and on the evening of the same day the king promised Ferdinand's ambassador that he would send troops in the spring.¹⁵⁶ This ill-advised promise was later retracted by the French government, and a diplomatic mission was sent instead to assess the situation. France thus succeeded in antagonising both parties: the Protestants by openly siding with the emperor; the emperor, by promising help and then failing to honour this undertaking. In the event the special envoys played an important part

Paris: scene of religious debate

in securing settlement between the opposing sides, concluded with the treaty of Ulm on 3 July 1620. But far from ending the hostilities this freed several Catholic protagonists for attacks on the state of their Protestant opponent, culminating in the defeat of the Protestants in November 1620.

The struggle over the kingship of Bohemia was also important for religious debate in the capital because it led, indirectly, to du Moulin's exile from France in early 1621. In his autobiography du Moulin claimed that he was asked by the English ambassador, Lord Herbert of Cherbury, to write to James I and urge him to intervene on behalf of his own son-in-law, the Elector Palatine, in the dispute over the Bohemian crown. A copy of this letter, written shortly before du Moulin left Paris to attend the synod of Alès in September 1620 soon reached the French government which immediately decided that du Moulin should be arrested for having incited a foreign king to act on behalf of the Protestants.¹⁵⁷ Warned of the danger he was in, du Moulin made his way secretly to Paris. There the English ambassador and the Charenton elders agreed that he should leave France at once and so du Moulin sought refuge at Sedan in early January 1621. At first du Moulin regarded his stay there as only temporary and awaited an opportunity to return to Paris but eventually it became clear that the king would not allow him to return and so he settled down to a new life as a teacher in the Protestant academy at Sedan and a pastor of the local church.¹⁵⁸ From Sedan he watched anxiously as the French Protestants drew nearer to a confrontation with their sovereign following his action against the Protestants of Béarn.

The king takes action against the Protestants of Béarn and Navarre

Very early in his personal reign Louis XIII had raised the question of the rights of the Catholic Church in Béarn. The restoration of Catholic worship there had been another of the conditions of Henri IV's absolution by the pope which still remained unfulfilled. On 25 July 1617 (the same day on which Arnoux preached against the Protestants' confession of faith), in response to a request from the clergy assembly, Louis XIII ordered the restitution of ecclesiastical possessions in Béarn. 'Cette mesure', writes Tapié, 'en apparence secondaire allait bientôt réveiller les guerres de religion'.¹⁵⁹

In the summer of 1618 news of the Protestant rebellion in Bohemia and of a fairly minor disturbance in Pau, the capital of Béarn, reached the king at about the same time, once again confirming his view of the Protestants as a threat. In 1619 and the first half of 1620 Louis XIII's attention was turned towards the threatened revolt led by the queen mother and certain powerful nobles, but in August 1620, when the signing of the treaty of Angers had brought the second of these rebellions to an end, the king decided to continue south with his army to Béarn (where the edict of restitution had still had not been promulgated) and deal with Protestant resistance there. This plan met with enthusiastic support from the *dévo*t party (including Pierre de Bérulle).¹⁶⁰ Louis entered Pau on 14 November and Navarreins a few days later; on 19 October he proclaimed the annexation of Béarn and Lower Navarre to the French crown; Catholic worship was re-established, church property restored and the bishops took up their places on the supreme council of Pau. P. Arnoux, who had accompanied the king on this expedition, wrote to Richelieu in exultant terms:

C'est le jubilé. ... Il y a justement cinquante ans qu'à tel jour, qu'aujourd'hui 18 octobre, le sieur de Montgomery fit son entrée en ce lieu par le commandement de la reine Jeanne et en bannit la messe. Toute l'armée est en fête, toute la cour remplie d'admiration et la plupart des huguenots disposés à se rendre catholique, n'étant sortis de l'Eglise que par contrainte et pure tyrannie. Demain deux de nos pères vont à Navarreins où il y a cinquante ans qu'aucun prestre n'a été. Nous dirons dans peu la messe dans les églises, ou le prêche était établi. Bref, Dieu étant en ce lieu, le Roi sera le maître.¹⁶¹

In early November the king returned to Paris in triumph after this show of strength.

The religious wars of Louis XIII

The French Protestants were dismayed by this turn of events as also by news of the cruel reprisals Ferdinand had permitted against his Protestant subjects in Bohemia.¹⁶² A general assembly at La Rochelle was summoned without the king's permission and opened on Christmas Day 1620. The assembly dismissed the plea from du Moulin, contained in an open letter, not to jeopardise the Protestants' future in France by disloyalty to the king and went ahead with plans for the defence of their strongholds in all parts of the country.¹⁶³ In the meantime a Protestant uprising in southern France which had forced provincial governors to muster troops in order to recapture towns and reinforce the garrisons left in Béarn marked the beginning of 'les guerres de religion de Louis XIII'.¹⁶⁴ These were to continue, although interrupted by several long intervals of peace, until the Grace of Alès in 1629.

In Tapié's view, the king himself only wished to ensure the loyalty and obedience of his subjects and not the elimination of Protestantism but the *dévo*t faction hoped to see Catholicism triumph in a much more conclusive way.¹⁶⁵ The following passage gives the English ambassador's view of the situation in early 1621:

Monsieur de Luines continuing still the King's Favorite, advised him to War against his Subjects of the reform'd Religion in France, saying he would neither be a great Prince as long as he suffered so Puissant a Party to remaine within his Dominions, nor could justly stile himself the most Christian King, as long as he permitted such Hereticks to be in that great number they were, or to hold strong Places which by publick Edict were assigned to them, and therefore that he should extirpate them as the Spaniards Had done the Moors, who are all banished into other Countreys as we may find in their Histories; This Counsell though approved by the Young King was yet disliked by other Grave and Wise Persons about him, and particularly by the Chancellor Sillery and the President Jannin, who thought better to have a Peace which had two Religions than a War which had none. Howbeit the Designe of Luines was applauded not only by the Jesuit party in France, but by some Princes and other Martial Persons ...¹⁶⁶

While Herbert of Cherbury, in accordance with his instructions from James I,

used all his powers of persuasion to prevent war, the pope wrote to P. Arnoux, urging him 'au nom du Seigneur, de persuader à Sa Majesté qu'elle doit, dans l'intérêt de son royaume, faire la guerre aux hérétiques'.¹⁶⁷ 'The War now went on with much fervour', commented the English ambassador, aptly characterising the crusading spirit in which this campaign was undertaken.¹⁶⁸

In the spring of 1621 the king re-established the office of *connétable* (commander-in-chief) and conferred it upon Luynes. They embarked on their first campaign in April, first removing du Plessis-Mornay from his governorship of Saumur, then successfully laying siege to Saint-Jean-d'Angély and taking the town of Clérac. At Montauban, the Protestants' leader, Rohan, stood firm. The king deployed all the forces available to him in besieging the town but without success.¹⁶⁹ In September 1621, news of the death of the Catholic military leader Mayenne reached Paris and produced a violent reaction: an outbreak of rioting culminated in attacks on the city's Protestants as they returned from Sunday worship and the burning-down of their church at Charenton. In the days and weeks that followed, many Parisian Protestants decided to leave the city; quite a number found refuge, like du Moulin, at Sedan.¹⁷⁰

After the royal armies had unsuccessfully besieged Montauban for several months, Luynes decided to negotiate a peace with Rohan. The *dévots* were enraged at this development.¹⁷¹ As early as June 1621, P. Arnoux had in fact expressed the hope that Richelieu would eventually be able to displace the king's favourite, but in November, Luynes, aware that Arnoux was trying to turn the king against him, was still able to exert enough influence on Louis to obtain Arnoux's removal.¹⁷² Then, as the royal army had begun to make its way home via Toulouse, Luynes contracted purple fever and died at Monheyr on 15 December 1621.

The years 1622–1629

The Catholic offensive against heresy was to continue on both a military and a missionary front during the years which followed. The king led a further campaign against the French Protestant forces in 1622 which ended in October with the peace of Montpellier, prescribing the dismantling of all but three of the Protestants' military strongholds.¹⁷³ In the same year, the new pope, Gregory XV, founded the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith to promote mission overseas and the eradication of heresy closer to home. One of the congregation's earliest actions was to authorise twelve members of the Capuchin order at Paris to study heretical publications with a view to refuting them.¹⁷⁴ Both the Capuchins and the Jesuits were to intensify their evangelistic efforts from this point onwards. Most notably, the endeavours of P. François Véron were greeted with approval by the king, the pope and successive clergy assemblies during these years.

In 1625, the occupation of the Ile de Ré by Protestant forces marked the beginning of another period of war between the king and his Protestant subjects. When the stronghold of La Rochelle finally fell in October 1628, after a fourteen-month siege, the king was in a position to dictate the terms of peace in the Grace of Alès. Advised by Richelieu, he acted leniently, confirming the Edict of Nantes but revoking the supplementary articles; the Protestants' role as a political and military force in the country was effectively at an end.

During these same years, the church at Charenton had been rebuilt, — Protestant worship was resumed in the capital in 1624 — and a new ministerial team of younger pastors, with close links with the more forward-looking academy of Saumur, was assembled. Confronted with the new method of Véron and his disciples, Protestant pastors in Paris (as elsewhere) were no longer prepared to engage in debates which, from their point of view, were futile, and religious controversy at a popular level, as described below in the Epilogue, played a far less significant role in Parisian life than it had during du Moulin's time.

Notes to Chapter 1

1. Pierre de L'Estoile, *Mémoires-Journaux*, edited by G. Brunet and others, 12 vols (Paris, 1875–96), VI, 185–90. These diaries provide an invaluable source of information on many aspects of Parisian life during these years and will be cited on many occasions in the following pages.

Pierre de L'Estoile (1564–1611) belonged to the Parisian *noblesse de robe* and, following his legal studies at Bourges, returned to the capital and purchased the office of *grand audencier de la chancellerie* which he retained until 1601 when, having received a substantial inheritance, he decided to retire and therefore sold his post. He had remained at Paris throughout the years under the Sixteen and generally managed to keep his own opposition to the League a secret. He was however briefly imprisoned for circulating a royalist pamphlet and in 1591 figured on a hit-list which was not acted upon. A devout Catholic but with strong Gallican sympathies, L'Estoile conceived an intense dislike for the Jesuits, admired the Gallican *parlementaire* and historian J. A. de Thou, and applauded the Parlement's resistance to growing ultramontane influence from 1610 onwards. He was very interested in ideas on church union and wrote of the desirability of such a union between the Catholic and Protestant churches, having once rendered 'la Catholique bien reformée, et la Reformée catholique'. He died in early October 1611. (XII, iii-xvi)

2. D. Pallier, *Recherches sur l'imprimerie à Paris pendant la Ligue* (Geneva, 1975), p.57, calculates that the League's printing presses produced more than a thousand titles at Paris over the ten-year period. Pierre de L'Estoile managed to collect 400 (III, 279).
3. Mark Greengrass, *France in the Age of Henri IV: the Struggle for Stability* (London, 1984), p.50.
4. Greengrass, pp.54–58.
5. Greengrass, pp.69–73.
6. Pallier, pp.94–96.
7. L'Estoile, VI, 187; Pallier, p.55 and p.96, n.244.
8. The full text of the Edict of Nantes is reproduced by Roland Mousnier in *L'Assassinat d'Henri IV* (Paris, 1964), pp.294–334.
9. Orest Ranum, *Paris in the Age of Absolutism* (New York, 1968), pp.6–7.
10. Ranum, pp.3–4.
11. Ranum, p.3; Roland Mousnier, *Paris au XVII^e siècle*, Les cours de Sorbonne (Paris, 1961), I, 45.

12. H.-J. Martin, *Le livre, pouvoirs et société à Paris au XVII^e siècle*, 2 vols (Geneva, 1969), I, 45.
13. Ranum, pp.25–26.
14. Mousnier, *Paris au XVII^e siècle*, p.12.
15. Ranum, p.10.
16. Mousnier, *Paris au XVII^e siècle*, p.10.
17. David Thomas Pottinger, *The French Book Trade in the Ancien Regime, 1500–1791* (Cambridge, Mass., 1958), p.150.
18. Jacques Pannier, *L'Eglise ... sous Henri IV*, pp.16–19; Théodore-Agrippa d'Aubigné, *Les aventures du baron de Fænesté*, Book 3, Chapter 12, in *Œuvres*, edited by H. Weber (Paris, 1969), p.744. The road was re-named rue Visconti in the nineteenth century (Pannier, p.18).
19. Mousnier, *L'Assassinat*, pp.201–2.
20. Mousnier, *L'Assassinat*, p.207.
21. L'Estoile, VII, 7.
22. Charles M. G. Bréchillet-Jourdain, *Histoire de l'Université de Paris au XVII^e et au XVIII^e siècle*, 2 parts (Paris, 1862–66), I, 4.
23. Bréchillet-Jourdain, I, 7; H.-J. Martin, I, 38.
24. H.-J. Martin, I, 14–15, 39.
25. Despite the numerical importance of Spanish theologians and controversialists the Catholic author who dominated religious debate on an international scale at the turn of the century was the Italian Jesuit Robert Bellarmine (1542–1621) who became professor of controversial theology at the newly-founded Collegium Romanum in 1576. His most famous work was the series of *Disputationes de controversiis christianae fidei adversus huius temporis haereticos*, published in three volumes at Ingolstadt in 1586 and regularly reprinted thereafter. These disputations formed the single most important and authoritative Catholic work of religious controversy during the first two decades of the seventeenth century, both as a source for other Catholic controversialists and as a target for the attacks of Protestant writers. Major French Catholic polemicists of the period 1598–1621 all testify to the importance of Bellarmine's disputations: du Perron had them translated into French; François de Sales based his own *Controverses* on them; the Jesuit P. Coton spoke in the following terms of Bellarmine's authority: 'De meme qu'aux premiers siècles professer la foi d'Athanase équivalait à professer la foi catholique, aujourd'hui la doctrine de Bellarmin se confond avec celle de l'Eglise' (all cited by J.-B. Couderc, in *Le vénérable Cardinal Bellarmin*, 2 vols (Paris, 1893) 1, 111–130). (Other sources:

ODCC, 152–53, DHGE, 7, 799–824.)

26. Letter from Fronton du Duc to Bérulle (6 April 1601), cited by Wilfrid Dubé in 'Bérulle et les protestants (1593–1610)', 2 vols (un-published doctoral thesis, Paris, 1986), 1, 68.
27. Among the Catholic opponents of du Moulin featured in Chapters 5 and 6, Cayet (5.2) and Coeffeteau (5.4) were both doctors of the Faculty of Theology; Abra de Raconis (6.4) taught at the Collège de Navarre.
28. Bréchillet-Jourdain, I, 6; Pottinger, pp.60, 114–15.
29. L'Estoile, VI, 205 (13 April 1594).
30. L'Estoile, VII, 18–19.
31. L'Estoile, VII, 117–18, 126.
32. Dompnier, p.15; E. G. Léonard, *Histoire générale du protestantisme*, 3 vols (1961–64), 2, 313.
33. For du Perron, see below, Chapter 5, Section 1; for Cayet, Chapter 5, Section 2.
34. Théodore-Agrippa d'Aubigné, *Confession Catholique du sieur de Sancy*, in *Œuvres*, p.576.
35. Greengrass, pp.74–76.
36. Greengrass, pp.76–78; George A. Rothrock, 'Some aspects of early Bourbon policy toward the Huguenots', in *Church History*, XXIX (1960), 17–24, (pp.17–19).
37. Sir George Carew, 'A relation of the State of France, with the Characters of Henry IV. and the principal Persons of that Court, drawn up by Sir George Carew, upon his Return from his Embassy there in 1609, and addressed to King James I.' in *An Historical View of the Negotiations between the Courts of England, France and Brussels, From the Year 1592 to 1617*, edited by T. Birch (London, 1749), pp.413–528 (pp.441–42).
38. Greengrass, p.79; Rothrock, pp.18, 23; D. Ligou, *Protestantisme en France de 1598 à 1715* (Paris, 1968), pp.20–22.
39. Greengrass, p.79.
40. L'Estoile, VII, 156.
41. L'Estoile, VII, 157.
42. L'Estoile, VII, 177–78.
43. Mousnier, *L'Assassinat*, p.300.

44. 'Autobiographie de Pierre du Moulin', in *Bulletin de l'histoire du protestantisme français* (1858), pp.170-182, 333-344, 465-477 (p.339). When the duchesse de Bar returned to Paris from time to time services were still organised in her home 'près les Filles repenties' and occasionally at the Louvre although, according to L'Estoile, the king discouraged her use of the palace (VII, 306).
45. L'Estoile, VII, 195.
46. Pannier, *L'Eglise ... sous Henri IV*, pp.99-101.
47. Philippe du Plessis-Mornay (1549-1623), trusted counsellor to Henri de Navarre from 1582 until the latter's abjuration in 1593, was appointed governor of Saumur in 1589 and founded a Protestant academy there in 1599 which was to be very influential in seventeenth-century Protestant theology. He wrote several important works of religious controversy between 1578 and 1611, making extensive use of historical argument, but was not skilled, like du Moulin, in conference technique. He played an important role in the affairs of the Protestant church in France and worked both for a union of all Protestant churches and for *rapprochement* with Gallican Catholics, maintaining links with many other European Protestants and with Gallicans such as de Thou. (Sources: Haag, 7, 512-42; DHGE, 14, 1136-41; Raoul Patry, *Philippe du Plessis-Mornay, un huguenot homme d'Etat (1549-1623)* (Paris, 1933).)
48. Full title: *De l'Institution, usage et doctrine du Sainct Sacrement de l'Eucharistie, en l'Eglise ancienne. Ensemble, comment, quand et par quels degrez la Messe s'est introduite en sa place* (La Rochelle, 1598), REP 38. Patry, p.391.

One of the two Protestant arbitrators selected by Henri IV was the Genevan-born Isaac Casaubon (1559-1614), a noted classical scholar and authority on early church history, appointed royal librarian by the king. As his diaries reveal, he was the target of frequent but unsuccessful attempts to win him over to Catholicism (by du Perron and P. Coton in particular). His diaries also contain important details regarding religious debate in the reign of Henri IV and concerning his strained relationship with Pierre du Moulin which stemmed largely from their very different attitudes to the testimony of the early church fathers. In 1598, du Moulin had been sent by the Parisian Protestant church in an effort to dissuade Casaubon from accepting the role of arbitrator. (Sources: Haag, 3, 230-38; M. Pattison, *Isaac Casaubon*, second edition, edited by H. Nettleship (Oxford, 1892).)
49. Patry, p.393.
50. L'Estoile, VII, 318.
51. See below, Chapter 3, pp.106-07 and Chapter 5, pp.255-57.

52. L'Estoile, VII, 308–9, 318.

53. L'Estoile, VII, 215–22, 318–19.

54. For Bouju see below, Chapter 5, Section 3.

François de Lobéran, sieur de Montigny (1539–1619), shared the leadership of the Protestants' church at Paris with Antoine de La Faye prior to the arrival of du Moulin. He died in 1619 and his place was filled by Charles Drelincourt. (Sources: Haag, 6, 420–32; Pannier, *L'Eglise ... sous Henri IV*, pp.121–32.)

Antoine de La Faye (?–1609), like Lobéran de Montigny, was at least sixty by the time du Moulin came to Paris. He had been *aumônier* to Henri de Navarre prior to the latter's abjuration and had then served Catherine de Bourbon in a similar capacity. He spent some time in London as a refugee during the wars of religion and there heard the young du Moulin preach. Recognising du Moulin's potential, La Faye offered him financial assistance to allow him to continue his studies in return for a commitment to join the staff of the Protestants' church in Paris at a later date. La Faye was described rather sourly by L'Estoile at the time of his death in March 1609 as 'le plus vieil ministre de Charanton, le plus riche et avare, mais le moins suffisant' (IX, 237). (Sources: Haag, 6, 188; Pannier, *L'Eglise ... sous Henri IV*, pp.132–36.)

55. Jacques Suarez de Sainte-Marie, Portuguese Capuchin (1551–1614). Educated at Paris and Louvain, Suarez returned to France from Portugal in the 1590s. He became a noted preacher in Paris, and was eventually appointed *prédicateur* and *conseiller du roi* then, in 1612, bishop of Séez. (Source: DTC, 14, 728–30.)

56. *Lettres de Henri IV concernant les relations du Saint Siège et de la France (1595–1609)*, edited by Bernard Barbiche (Vatican City, 1968), pp.36, 39, 50.

57. Victor Martin, *Le Gallicanisme et la réforme catholique* (Paris, 1919), pp.303–43. The registration of the Council of Trent became a live issue again during the Estates General of 1614–15 but the clergy had ultimately to be content with a formal undertaking on the part of their own general assembly of 1615 to conform to the council's stipulations as far as possible (V. Martin, p.385).

58. J.-H. Mariéjol, *Henri IV et Louis XIII*, Volume 6, Part 2 of the *Histoire de la France illustrée*, edited by E. Lavissee, 9 vols (Paris, 1911), pp.95–96.

59. For Coton, see below, Chapter 6, Section 1.

60. Sully, *Mémoires*, in *Nouvelle collection des mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de France*, edited by Michaud and Poujoulat, 2 vols (Paris, 1837) I, cxxix.

61. Mousnier reproduces the texts of both speeches (*L'Assassinat*, pp.338–39; 339–43).

62. For Gontéry, see below, Chapter 6, Section 2.

63. L'Estoile, VIII, 124-25.
64. This is reflected in the careers and publications of the major Parisian controversialists and also confirmed by the chronological listing of pamphlets surviving from this period by Desgraves. His *Répertoire* lists only 70 (or fewer) titles and editions for each of these years, compared with an average of 120 per annum.
65. Peter Milward, *Religious Controversies of the Jacobean Age: A Survey of Printed Sources* (London, 1978), pp.1-4, 72-3. Du Plessis-Mornay had held high hopes of James I at the time of his accession as 'celui qui semble né et eslevé pour unir et assoupir les différends ès choses de la religion de toutes les Eglises reformées de l'Europe' (*Mémoires et correspondance*, 12 vols (Paris, 1824-25), IX, 538 (26 March 1604), but in later years confessed his disappointment (X, 239 (1 August 1608); XI, 376 (2 January 1612)).
66. Pierre-Victor Palma Cayet, *Chronologie septenaire, contenant l'histoire de la paix entre les roys de France et d'Espagne, et les choses les plus memorables advenues depuis la paix faicte à Vervins, le 2 de mai 1598, jusques à la fin de l'an 1604*, in *Nouvelle collection des mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de France*, edited by Michaud and Poujoulat (Paris, 1838), pp.252-5, 259-60, 301-5.
67. Full title: *Triplici nodo, triplex cuneus or An Apologie for the Oath of Allegiance, Against the two Breves of Pope Paulus Quintus, and the late Letter of Cardinal Bellarmine to G. Blackwel the Arch-Priest. 'Auctoritate Regia.'* (London, 1607). It also appeared soon afterwards in Latin (1607) and French (1608) translations.
68. L'Estoile, IX, 69-70 (28 April 1608); IX, 100 (2 July 1608).
69. Milward, *Religious Controversies of the Jacobean Age*, pp.91-2. Full title: *An Apologie for the Oath of Allegiance. First set foorth without a name; and now acknowledged by the Authour, the Right High, and Mightie Prince, James, by the grace of God, King of Great Britaine, France and Ireland; Defender of the Faith, &c. Together with a Premonition of his Majesties, to all most Mightie Monarches, Kings, free Princes and States of Christendome.* (London, 1609).
70. J.-M. Prat, *Recherches historiques et critiques sur la Compagnie de Jésus en France du temps du Père Coton (1564-1626)*, 5 vols (Lyon, 1876-78), 3, 150, 154. For Coeffeteau, see below, Chapter 5, Section 4.
71. L'Estoile, X, 99 (31 December 1609). Ubaldini's dispatch of 4 August 1609 (Prat, 3, 149-50). James's insistence on referring to himself as 'king of France' (see full title of his book in note 69 above) was a further reason for suppressing the book in France. This claim was a continuing source of antagonism between the two countries: 'as long as the title of France is retained in the stile of England, there can be no assured friendship between these two crowns', wrote Carew upon his return to England (p.522).

72. L'Estoile, IX, 285, 305–07, 327, 338, 387; X, 13–14, 72, 99, 108, 114, 129, 142–3.
73. In 1604 and 1605 the government of Venice promulgated two laws (concerning the erection of religious buildings and the sale and donation of secular property to the church) which constituted attacks on ecclesiastical immunities and liberties. When Paul V's demand that the laws be repealed was ignored, he excommunicated the Venetian senate and placed the city under an interdict. In the controversy which followed Fra Paolo Sarpi, the Servite monk appointed by Venice as its theological consultant, argued against the church's entitlement to temporal power and privileges while the pope's position was defended by Bellarmine and Baronius.
74. Du Moulin, 'Autobiographie', p.341.
75. L'Estoile, VIII, 248. The Parisian Protestants made their way to Charenton east along the right bank of the Seine, leaving the city by the Porte Saint-Antoine. It was at this gate that the Catholic crowds gathered. The journey was made on foot, by boat or in the carriages of the wealthier worshippers. Casaubon's diary contains many references to arduous and occasionally dangerous day-long expeditions to both Ablon and Charenton (Pattison, pp.208–10).
76. Thomas Coryate, *Crudities Hastily gobbled up in five Moneths travells in France, Savoy, Italy, Rhetia ... , Helvetia ... , some parts of high Germany, and the Netherlands* (London, 1611): 'Peter Molinus a most famous and learned Protestant preacheth usually every second Sunday at a place called Charenton about four miles from Paris, where he hath a very great Audience, sometimes at the least five thousand people' (pp.36–37). Carew speaks of 'sometimes eight or ten thousand communicants', a number swollen by 'those, whome their business draweth to the court, or to Paris' (p.444).
77. Full titles: *Apologie pour la sainte Cène du Seigneur, Contre la presence charnelle et transsubstantiation* (La Rochelle, 1607), REP 775; *Trente-deux demandes proposées par le P. Cotton, avec les solutions adjoustées au bout de chaque demande. Item soixante-quatre demandes proposées en contre-eschange.* (La Rochelle, 1607), REP 777.
78. These verbal and printed exchanges are all described more fully in Parts 2 and 3. L'Estoile, IX, 252, 261.
79. Full title: *Institution catholique, où est déclarée et confirmée la Verité de la foy. Contre les heresies et superstitions de tout ce temps. Divisée en quatre livres qui servent d'antidote aux quatre de l'"Institution" de J. Calvin* (Paris, 1610), REP 1091.
80. The main source for d'Aubigné's account of this episode is an un-dated letter reproduced in *Œuvres complètes*, edited by E. Réaume and F. de Caussade, 6 vols (1873–92), 1, 386–89; this provides the basis for the account in *Sa vie à*

ses enfans, in *Œuvres*, pp.437–39.

81. *Œuvres*, p.438.
82. *Œuvres complètes*, 1, 388.
83. *Œuvres complètes*, 1, 389.
84. V. Martin, p.350. 85. V. Martin, p. 350.
86. L'Estoile, IX, 242; X, 100–01.
87. L'Estoile, X, 100.
88. L'Estoile, X, 133 (January 1610).
89. See below, Chapter 6, pp.302–03. Daniel Chamier (1565–1620), minister of Montélimar, then Montauban, was a noted controversialist and also, like du Plessis-Mornay and du Moulin, an influential member of the French Protestant Church in political terms. His most important work was entitled *Panstratiae catholicae sive controversiarum de religione adversus pontificios corpus* (Geneva, 1626), REP 3416 and has been described as 'le système de polémique le plus complet qui existe'. (Source: Haag, 3, 317–23.)
90. Peter du Moulin, 'The Author's Life', in the prefatory material of his translation of his father's *Nouveauté du Papisme: The Novelty of popery, opposed to the antiquity of true Christianity. Against the book of Cardinal du Perron, entitled, A reply to the answer of ... James King of Great Britain* (London, 1664), ff.**3 recto–*****3 recto.
91. See below, Chapter 2, p.71, Chapter 4, pp.172–73, Chapter 6, p.323.
92. L'Estoile's detailed description of the events of 14 May (X, 218–31) provides the basis for most modern accounts.
93. L'Estoile, X, 221, 235–6.
94. L'Estoile, X, 222, 241–42.
95. L'Estoile, X, 227, 252.
96. L'Estoile, X, 241.
97. Pattison, pp.270–73. Casaubon and his family had continued to be the subjects of vigorous efforts to convert them. Casaubon's eldest son, John, was won over by the Jesuits in August 1610. Casaubon spent the remaining years of his life in England and was commissioned by King James to write a refutation of the *Annales Ecclesiastici* of Baronius which was completed shortly before the scholar's death in 1614.
98. L'Estoile, X, 239–40.
99. L'Estoile's account of Ravallac's trial and execution (X, 250–1, 255–61).

Casaubon, like L'Estoile, remained convinced that the Jesuits were to blame and believed that the judges had failed in their duty of unearthing evidence to prove this (Pattison, p.270).

100. L'Estoile, X, 254.
101. L'Estoile, X, 257–60.
102. First published in 1599. The revised edition of 1605 was attacked from the pulpit by Suarez and thus brought to the king's attention. L'Estoile, recounting the Parlement's decision against Mariana's book in 1610, explained that two versions were being circulated in the city: one praised Henri III's assassin, Jacques Clément, as 'æternum Galliae decus' and in the other this phrase was omitted (X, 271–2).
103. L'Estoile, X, 299–300.
104. L'Estoile, X, 321–2. L'Estoile pronounced Coton's apology 'artificieuse, douce et sucrée par dessus, mais platte et molle comme Coton'. Full title: *Lettre déclaratoire de la doctrine des Pères Jésuites, conforme aux décrets du Concile de Constance, adressée à la Royne mere du Roy, Regente en France* (Paris, 1610) REP 1092–93.
105. L'Estoile, XI, 26. Full title: *Anticoton, ou Refutation de la lettre déclaratoire du P. Coton, livre où est prouvé que les jésuites sont coupables et auteurs du parricide exécrationnel commis en la personne du roy tres-chrestien Henri IV d'heureuse mémoire* (n.p., n.d.,), REP 1110–11.
106. Peter du Moulin, 'The Author's Life', f.***4 recto; but, see below, Chapter 4, pp.194–96.
107. L'Estoile, X, 272.
108. The secret council is described in *The New Cambridge Modern History*, vol IV, edited by J. P. Cooper (Cambridge, 1970) (p.481) but discounted by J. Michael Hayden, in *France and the Estates General of 1614* (London, 1974) (p.13), and by Robin Briggs, in *Early Modern France, 1560–1715* (Oxford, 1977), who describes it as a 'tenacious but ill-founded legend' (p.87).
109. L'Estoile, X, 306.
110. See for example the articles by J. Michael Hayden, 'Continuity in the France of Henri IV and Louis XIII: French foreign policy, 1598–1615', in *Journal of Modern History*, XLV (1973), pp.1–23, and George A. Rothrock (see above, note 36).
111. L'Estoile, X, 327–8 (July 1610). Casaubon's diaries (July–September 1610) also contain many references to the atmosphere of unrest in the capital, to the fears of the Protestants and to the ascendancy of the Jesuits (Pattison, pp.268, 270–71).

112. L'Estoile, XI, 104–05 (April 1611).
113. Mariéjol, pp.150–53.
114. L'Estoile, XII, xvi. The final entry in L'Estoile's journal is dated 28 September 1611. The date of his death is unknown but his burial is recorded as having taken place on 8 October 1611.
115. For Véron, see below, Epilogue, Section 1.
116. Mousnier, *L'Assassinat*, p.240. L'Estoile, XI, 27–8 (26 November 1610); 30–32. Full title: *Tractatus de Potestate Summi Pontificis in rebus temporalibus adversus Gulielmum Barclaium ...* (Rome, 1610), REP 1075.
117. L'Estoile, XI, 32; V. Martin, pp.353–57.
118. Mousnier, *L'Assassinat*, pp.240–42.
119. Mousnier, *L'Assassinat*, p.242; V. Martin, p.363.
120. S. Préclin, 'Edmond Richer', *Revue d'Histoire moderne et contemporaine* (1930), pp.329–31.
121. Mousnier, *L'Assassinat*, p.242.
122. Full title: *Defense de la foy catholique, contenue au livre de ... Jacques I. Roy de la Grand'Bretagne et d'Irlande, ... contenue en trois livres ... Contre la Response de F. N. Coeffeteau, ...* (Geneva, 1610), REP 1116.
123. Full title: *De l'Accomplissement des prophéties, où est monsté que les prophéties de saint Paul, de l'Apocalypse et de Daniel touchant les combats de l'Eglise sont accomplies* (La Rochelle, 1612), REP 1383.
124. Full title of French edition: *Le Mystère d'Iniquité c'est à dire l'Histoire de la Papauté, par quels progrez elle est montée à ce comble, et quelles oppositions les gens de bien lui ont faict de temps en temps. Où sont aussi défendus les droicts des Empereurs, Rois et Princes Chrestiens contre les Assertions des Cardinaux Bellarmin et Baronius* (Saumur, 1611), REP 1290.
125. L'Estoile, XI, 133–34 (31 July 1611).
126. L'Estoile, XI, 134.
127. Francisco Suarez, *Defensio fidei catholicae et apostolicae adversus anglicanae sectae errores, cum responsio ad apologiam pro juramento fidelitatis et praefatione monitoriam ... Jacobi magnae Britanniae regis* (Cologne, 1614).
128. Pierre Blet, 'L'article du Tiers aux Etats généraux de 1614', *Revue d'Histoire moderne et contemporaine*, II (April–June 1985), pp.81–106 (p.83).
129. Blet, 'L'article du Tiers', p.83.
130. Blet, 'L'article du Tiers', p.90.

131. Blet, 'L'article du Tiers', p.86.
132. Hayden, *France and the Estates General*, p.99.
133. Blet, 'L'article du Tiers', pp.92–93, gives the full text of the article.
134. Blet, 'L'article du Tiers', pp.93–5, examines the various changes made.
135. Hayden, *France and the Estates General*, p.139–41.
136. Blet, 'L'article du Tiers', pp.101–3; Hayden, *France and the Estates General*, pp.144–46.
137. *Harangue faicte de la part de la Chambre ecclésiastique, en celle du Tiers Estat, sur l'Article du Serment, prononcée devant le tiers aux États généraux de 1614* (Paris, 1615).
138. *Déclaration du Sérénissime Roy Jacques I. Roy de la Grand'Bretagne France et Irlande, Défenseur de la Foy. Pour le Droit des Rois et Indépendance de leurs Couronnes, Contre la Harangue de l'Illustrissime Cardinal du Perron prononcée en la chambre du Tiers Estat le XV de Janvier 1615* (London, 1615), REP 1758. English editions were published in 1615 and 1616 and a Latin version in 1616.
139. Briggs, p.88.
140. Victor L. Tapié, *La France de Louis XIII et de Richelieu* (Paris, 1967), p.79.
141. Hayden, *France and the Estates General*, p.172.
142. Mariéjol, pp.185–87; Tapié, pp.79–80.
143. Mariéjol, pp.190–93.
144. Mariéjol, p.213.
145. For Arnoux, see below, Chapter 6, Section 3.
146. Du Moulin, 'Autobiographie', p.344, 465–66. Full title: *Défense de la confession de foy des Eglises Réformées de France, contre les accusations du sieur Arnould Jesuite, deduites en son Sermon fait en la presence du roy à Fontaine-Bleau, par lesquelles il soustient que les passages cottez en marge de nostre confession sont faux et inutiles* (Charenton, 1617), REP 2010–13.
147. Full title: *La confession de foy de Messieurs les Ministres convaincuë de nullité par leurs propres Bibles: avec la réplique à l'escrit concerté, signé et publié par les quatre Ministres de Charenton. Le tout en suite du discours fait à Fontaine-bleau le 25. de Juin en la presence de sa Majesté* (Paris, Lyon, Poitiers, Rouen, 1617), REP 1930–38.
148. *Mémoires du cardinal de Richelieu*, 10 vols (Paris, 1907–31), 2, 255.
149. (Poitiers, 1617), REP 2102–3.

150. Charles-François d'Abra de Raconis, *Response à l'epistre des quatre ministres de Charenton, ensemble deux autres escrites de Pierre du Moulin. L'une de la puissance de Dieu et de sa volonté. L'autre, de sa juste providence* (Paris, 1617), REP 1926. For Abra de Raconis, see below, Chapter 6, Section 4.
151. Full title: *Bouclier de la foy, ou Defense de la Confession de foy des Eglises reformees du royaume de France. Contre les objections du Sr. Jehan Arnoux Rionnois Jesuite. Livre auquel sont decidees toutes les principales controverses entre les Eglises reformees, et l'Eglise romaine* (Charenton, 1618), REP 2182. The second part of this work, often listed in bibliographies as a separate work, concentrates on attacking Arnoux's method and was entitled *Fuites et evasions du sieur Arnoux Jesuite. Traicté auquel sont examinées les causes pour lesquelles il refuse de respondre aux dix sept demandes des pasteurs de l'Eglise de Paris. Où aussi est examiné le traicté des cinq evasions, qu'il a adjousté à l'examen de nostre Confession* (Charenton, 1618), REP 2184–85.
152. Desgraves's listing contains on average two hundred titles for each of the remaining years of our chosen period, 1617–1621. For Véron, see below, Epilogue, Section 1.
153. Du Moulin, 'Autobiographie', p.344.
154. See below, Chapter 4, pp.205–06.
155. See Tapié for an explanation of the importance of the person elected as king of Bohemia for Habsburg policy (pp.100–1), and an account of the events of 1617–20 in this region (pp.104–11).
156. Mariéjol, pp.210–11.
157. Du Moulin, 'Autobiographie', p.471. While some have speculated that du Moulin was betrayed by Buckingham (Rimbault, p.78), Herbert of Cherbury's coded correspondence suggests that du Moulin was himself to blame — 'either by his owne carelesnes, or perchance vanitie' — for allowing copies of his letter to be made (see Mario M. Rossi, *La Vita, le Opere, i Tempi di Edoardo Herbert di Chirbury*, 3 vols (Florence, 1947) 2, 177–80).
158. The French Protestant church sent a deputation to the king in 1623 (and again in 1626) to obtain permission for du Moulin to return but this was always refused (Pannier, *L'Eglise ... sous Louis XIII (1621–29)*, pp.136–40). When Sedan eventually came under French rule, no action was taken against du Moulin; this confirmed, according to Peter du Moulin, that the original episode 'was but a pickt quarrel to remove him from Paris' (f.*****4 recto).
159. Tapié, p.95.
160. Tapié, pp.105, 113–14.
161. Tapié, p.115.

162. Tapié, pp.111, 116.
163. Du Moulin's letter is reproduced in his autobiography (pp.472-73).
164. Tapié, p.116, explains that this phrase was coined by the king's official historiographer.
165. Tapié, p.117.
166. *The Life of Edward, First Lord Herbert of Cherbury*, edited by J. M. Shuttleworth (London, 1976), p.104. Lord Herbert of Cherbury was sent as ambassador to France by James I in May 1619. Instructed by the king to persist in his efforts to mediate a peace between Louis XIII and his Protestant subjects, Herbert followed the army to Saint-Jean-d'Angély, where he was involved in a sharp exchange with Luynes. A deputation was sent to London to accuse Herbert of insulting the French commander-in-chief and Herbert was recalled to England but he soon returned to France again (after the death of Luynes in December 1621) and remained there until April 1624 (*Life*, pp.105-10).
167. Henri Fouquieray, *Histoire de la Compagnie de Jésus en France des origines à la suppression (1528-1762)* 5 vols (Paris, 1910-25), 3, 463 (papal breve dated March 1621).
168. Herbert of Cherbury, p.105.
169. Mariéjol, pp.214-15.
170. Pannier, *L'Eglise ... sous Louis XIII (1621-29)*, pp.136-40. The reconstruction of the Charenton church was begun on 23 June 1623. The building, designed by Salomon de Brosse, was completed the following year; it was demolished in October 1685, soon after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes.
171. Mariéjol, p.215.
172. See Eugène Griselle, *Louis XIII et Richelieu: Lettres et pièces diplomatiques* (Paris, 1911), pp.16-23.
173. Léonard, 2, 328-29.
174. Raoul de Sceaux, *Histoire des Frères Mineurs Capucins de la Province de Paris (1601-1660)*, vol 1 (Blois, 1965), pp.544-45. It was also in 1622 that Richelieu was appointed cardinal and his contribution to the intellectual battle against Protestantism — as the author of a book against the Charenton ministers and the founder of a chair of controversial theology in the University — was specifically mentioned (p.567).

CHAPTER 2

Printing and censorship in Paris (1598–1621)

The purpose of this chapter is to give a brief outline of the printing and selling of religious controversy in the capital during the years 1598–1621 and of the ways in which successive governments tried to prevent the circulation of certain controversial publications and to bring the Parisian book trade more firmly under control.

The first three sections cover aspects of printing which were relevant to both Catholic and Protestant religious controversy such as the size, location and activities of the city's book trade, regulations which governed the trade, and official procedures for censoring material before and after publication. The second half of the chapter describes important developments in censorship and the control of the book trade during the period, based on examples drawn chiefly from the field of religious debate. The emphasis throughout will tend to be on the Protestant side of the debate since the production and sale of Protestant works in and near the capital has not previously been described in detail and since the city's censoring authorities necessarily directed their attention more frequently towards those works which challenged Catholic beliefs and assumptions and were often produced illegally.¹

Although the Edict of Nantes marked the beginning of an era in which religious debate took place with comparative freedom, Protestant controversialists were still far from being in a position to conduct their side of the argument on equal terms with their Catholic opponents at Paris, and one of the major reasons for this was to be found in the Parisian book trade and the regulations which governed it.

In the staunchly Catholic city of Paris the printers and booksellers represented a group with an exceptionally solid opposition to Protestantism. During the decade 1585–94 one hundred and twenty Parisian printers and booksellers had been involved in publishing League propaganda while their regulations repeatedly emphasised the importance of preventing the production of Protestant books and pamphlets in the city: the chief task of the syndic and his four elected assistants

was described in 1586 as to 'regarder et tenir la main à ce qu'il ne s'imprime en nostre ditte ville de Paris aucun livre ou libelle diffamatoire ou hérétique et contre la Sainte Eglise Catholique, Apostolique et Romaine'.² The Edict of Nantes did not provide for any change in this situation:

Ne pourront les livres concernans ladite religion pretendue reformée, être imprimez et vendus publiquement, qu'ès villes et lieux où l'exercice public de ladite religion est permise.³

Public Protestant worship was not permitted in Paris and Protestant books could not be openly printed or sold in the city but Protestant religious controversy *was* nevertheless produced in the capital and sold either at Charenton or 'sous le manteau' on the streets or in customers' homes despite periodic attempts by the censoring authorities to suppress particular works.

Once again the *Mémoires-Journaux* of Pierre de L'Estoile provide an invaluable perspective on numerous censorship episodes during the years 1598–1611 as viewed by the printers and readers themselves. They reveal the disparity between the legislation and censorship measures enacted by the authorities and the actual situation in which printers, authors and readers collaborated to evade all efforts to control the circulation of printed material. The dispatches of two papal representatives — Del Bufalo and Ubaldini — confirm this picture from the standpoint of those who would have liked to see the system of control and censorship functioning more efficiently.⁴ The first-hand accounts of L'Estoile and others are used here, with internal evidence from the printed debates themselves, to build up a picture of printing and censorship in Paris which follows the outline provided by Martin's survey of printing in seventeenth-century Paris and is supplemented by the recent researches of Soman, Pallier and others.⁵

The three distinct phases in the development of censorship and legislation concerning the book trade, as identified by H.-J. Martin, were produced by two important political events: the assassination of Henri IV in May 1610 and the sudden seizing of power by the young Louis XIII in April 1617. These same events, described in Chapter 1, also resulted in noticeable changes in the forms and content of printed religious controversy. Censorship measures, indeed, may be regarded as one further aspect of the political climate in which religious debate was conducted

and, since censorship was most frequently enforced against Protestant books, it provides an important indication of the government's attitude to the Protestants and of the difficulties under which the Protestant side of the debate was sustained.

The first stage in the development of Parisian printing and censorship — under Henri IV — is characterised as a period of 'libéralisme intellectuel' during which the book trade grew in size, flouted the existing legislation with ease and was only rarely subject to interventions from the king or the courts.⁶ This was followed during the regency by disorder on several fronts resulting from the confrontations between Gallican and ultramontane groups which were expressed through a series of retaliatory censorship measures, the increasing confusion and acrimony within the book trade between rich and poor printers, and finally, the first explosion of seventeenth-century political propaganda in pamphlet form at the time of the 1614–1615 Estates General.⁷ Reforms aimed at stemming the tide of anti-Jesuit pamphlets had been attempted in late 1610 but eventually abandoned and it was not until the young king's favourite, Luynes, became the target of hostile polemic in 1618 that the decision was finally taken to impose major reforms on the book trade, chiefly by the letters patent of that year which were accompanied by a number of harsh sentences against offenders.⁸

It is important to emphasise that while censorship measures might well hinder the circulation of proscribed books they rarely succeeded in suppressing them completely and often served simply to increase demand (and prices). In June 1611, for example, L'Estoile noted that *La monarchie aristodemocratique* by Turquet de Mayerne had been 'saisi, supprimé et deffendu', and the author apologised to L'Estoile for his inability to present him with a copy: 'il ne lui en estoit demeuré aucun exemplaire pour en donner à ses amis. Tout avoit esté saisi, et le reste se vendant à discretion, quatre francs, cent sols, et deux escus'. But L'Estoile was still able to purchase copies on two separate occasions and at prices somewhat lower than those mentioned by Turquet.⁹ Two works by du Moulin — his *Response aux lettres du sieur Gontery* (banned by Henri IV in 1609) and the *Défense de la confession des églises reformées* (banned by Louis XIII in 1617) — also provide evidence of the ineffectiveness of attempts to suppress works, for both survive in an unusually large number of different editions produced in the relevant years.¹⁰

The Parisian book trade c.1600

In the sixteenth century the Parisian book trade had existed chiefly as a subsidiary of the University with twenty-four 'libraires jurés' based in the University quarter and supervised by its rector.¹¹ By 1600 those close ties had already begun to loosen as the civil government gradually took over responsibility for supervising printing and bookselling and as the industry itself expanded. By the turn of the century there were a further sixty printers in Paris, based not only in the Latin quarter but also in the Enclos du Palais, near certain churches and on some of the city's bridges.¹² There were in addition 'libraires étalants', selling books from stalls on the bridges and quaysides and a large number of 'colporteurs' who sold edicts, almanachs and other small books in the Palais and in the streets or called on customers in their own homes. The activities of these traders were extremely difficult to police and they were the source of many of L'Estoile's purchases of pamphlets which would not otherwise have been on sale in Paris, including some Protestant works.

Despite the prohibitions mentioned in the previous section, there are several examples of printers producing Protestant publications within the University quarter (from premises in the rue S. Jacques or nearby).¹³ The most important of the early printers of Protestant books seems to have been Pierre Le Bret who is mentioned for the first time by L'Estoile in the summer of 1603 as the printer of the bishop of Paris's censure of a Catholic work, *La fournaise ardente* (written by Cayet in reply to du Moulin's *Eaux de Siloé*):

laquelle Censure ceux de la Religion ayans recouverte, firent imprimer en un placard, par P. le Bret, qu'on appelloit "l'imprimeur d'Ablon", où il en porta quantité, dont il eust bonne dépesche: et les vendoit et crioit à l'entree du Presche, comme font les contreporteurs de Paris leurs bagatelles et denrées aux avenues du Palais.¹⁴

L'Estoile's later dealings with Le Bret suggest the covert nature of many of this printer's activities: in November 1606, for example, Le Bret sold the diarist an English edict against the Jesuits 'qui se vendoit secrettement' and, in September 1608, a book produced under a false imprint:

P. Le Bret m'a apporté de Charanton une *Conference entre le ministre Gigord et le Pere Cotton, Jesuite*, imprimée nouvellement à Montpellier (*hoc est* à Paris), et par lui-mesme, pour response à celle qui se vendoit et crioit à Paris, de la part des Catholiques.¹⁵

The production of non-Catholic books and pamphlets was often a risky undertaking and only two months after his first reference to Le Bret, L'Estoile describes the printer's unexpected release from prison:

le samedi 9e de ce mois, Du Carroy et son fils, avec P. le Bret, furent mis hors prison, où ils estoient détenus pour avoir imprimé à Paris la *Confession du Roy d'Angleterre*; d'où ils n'eussent jamais esté eslargis que pour estre pendus, sans l'adveu et l'intercession de l'Ambassadeur: tant ceste *confession*, qui appelloit la messe abominable, estoit descritee et en horreur envers le peuple.¹⁶

The career of Jean Du Carroy, le Bret's associate in this episode, illustrates still more strikingly the risks involved.¹⁷ In 1586 he had been banished for ten years for printing a book written by François le Breton. According to L'Estoile, Du Carroy had narrowly escaped sharing the fate of the author (who was hanged) and yet, following his return to the city, resumed his involvement in this dangerous branch of printing. In December 1610, as will be described below, he suffered harsh treatment at the hands of the *lieutenant criminel* as one of the printers of the *Anticoton* and other similar anti-Jesuit pamphlets. L'Estoile concluded that Du Carroy was driven chiefly by necessity to undertake such ventures:

Quant à l'imprimeur, les morsures de la nécessité sont merveilleusement aspres ... Je l'attribue plustost à cela qu'à autre chose, et au peu de sens et jugement de cest homme, qui, pour gangner une piece d'argent, s'est voulu mettre la corde au col pour la seconde fois, l'ayant à peine eschappé du temps du Breton.¹⁸

The printing of Protestant religious controversy in Paris in the early years of du Moulin's career at Paris seems to have been restricted to smaller pamphlets such as those already mentioned, which were often the result of local disputes. As regards du Moulin's own books, the list of surviving editions in Desgraves indicates that right up until 1617 his longer books tended to be printed at La Rochelle, Geneva or Sedan and then brought to Paris. His early important works were printed

by the Haultin family at La Rochelle (1603–9) and then, from 1609 onwards, a number of major works were printed at Geneva, by Esaie le Preux at first (1608–10) and later by Pierre Aubert (1610–14).¹⁹ The smaller pamphlets concerning du Moulin's debates with Cayet and Gontéry, however, may well have been printed locally for the various editions which still exist were all published without the required inclusion of their printers' names (or with apparently fictitious names) on the title-page, which suggests that the printers concerned were based in Paris and feared repressive action by the city authorities.²⁰

It seems likely that many of the printers producing and selling Protestant pamphlets were not themselves Protestants. Among those printers active during the reign of Henri IV only Jean Jannon, a former apprentice to Robert Estienne, was definitely a Protestant. Others — including P. Le Bret, Jean Berjon and Nicholas Bourdin — may well have been Catholics catering for a readership typified by L'Estoile whose Gallican sympathies and hostility towards the Jesuits gave him an interest in the arguments marshalled by their opponents, whether Catholic or Protestant. (These three men also called on him fairly regularly with the latest publications concerning the Venetian and English controversies in the years 1606 and 1607.)

From the details of L'Estoile's dealings with these printers a picture emerges of the co-operation between authors, printers and readers which largely accounts for the authorities' difficulties in suppressing undesirable publications. The three printers Le Bret, Berjon and Bourdin supplied L'Estoile with many books and pamphlets which were particularly scarce or being sold clandestinely and in return L'Estoile and other readers used their influence to obtain *privileges*, offered opinions on new projects or warned of impending action by the police against certain books.²¹ Dealings were therefore based to some degree on a shared interest in the religious and political issues involved rather than on a purely business relationship. This collusion between printers and book purchasers in order to outwit the authorities, when added to the widespread practice of secretly circulating proscribed books or handwritten extracts from them, made the task of enforcing censorship extremely difficult.

In the early years of the seventeenth century, therefore, the Parisian book trade was expanding beyond the control of the University while the printing and selling of Protestant books and pamphlets was gradually developing, with a combination of anonymously-printed pamphlets (probably produced in Paris) and books imported from the major Protestant printing centres of La Rochelle, Geneva and Sedan. The distribution of Protestant literature represented a high-risk area of printing but Protestant books and pamphlets were nevertheless obtainable from various sources in and around the city by those, like L'Estoile, who were interested in following both sides of certain religious disputes.

Censorship before and after publication

The practice of requiring most material intended for publication to be issued with a *privilège* beforehand provided the main opportunity for exercising 'censure préventive'. The *privilège* was a document which represented a form of copyright, allowing the printer a monopoly on the printing of a particular work for a specified number of years. Theoretically *privilèges* could only be obtained once the contents of the submitted work had been examined and approved — by the staff of the chancellor's office (which issued the majority of *privilèges*) or, in the case of Catholic theological works, by representatives of the Sorbonne. The system should therefore have allowed the government and the faculty of theology to exercise a strong measure of control over printed matter. In practice this was far from being the case.

Although the chancellor's *privilège* was normally required for most books, it was in fact neither a comprehensive nor a rigorously-applied system of monitoring books printed or put on sale in Paris. Certain categories of printed material were excluded (most notably pamphlets with fewer than forty-eight pages), *privilèges* for small books were available from other sources (the courts of Le Châtelet or the Parlement, for example) and the prior requirement of a Sorbonne *approbation* was easily abused. (L'Estoile managed to obtain both *approbation* and *privilège* on behalf of a printer friend for a book written under a pseudonym by a Protestant minister.)²² When it is also considered that many printers quite simply flouted the law, publishing books and pamphlets without obtaining permission to print and without their names on the title page — a requirement reiterated in all new

legislation concerning the book trade but frequently ignored — and that there was in addition no effective control over books imported from the provinces or abroad, it is hardly surprising that the *privilège* was inefficient as a method of preliminary censorship.²³

Since 'censure préventive' was rarely successful, measures to suppress printed material ('censure répressive') and to penalise printers and authors were then brought into effect, although once again not enforced systematically or successfully in many instances. There does not seem to have been any single channel for formally censuring books and pamphlets. The episodes mentioned in L'Estoile refer particularly to the commands of the king or to complaints from the nuncio (whose role in initiating censorship measures was a very important feature of this period), but official pronouncements of disapproval against books were also made by the bishops of Paris, the courts of Le Châtelet and the Parlement, and the Faculty of Theology. Legal proceedings against offenders passed through the courts, and the city's police or representatives of the book trade were normally charged with the task of seizing proscribed material.

Measures taken against books and pamphlets ranged from a request to amend unsatisfactory passages and publish a revised edition (as, for example, in the case of De Thou's *Histoire universelle*, in late 1603) to the seizure and sometimes the formal burning of the offending works by the executioner.²⁴ In the case of Protestant works, which provide most of the examples to be cited below, penalties were imposed on printers rather than authors, who thus bore not only the financial losses resulting from impounded stock but might also be fined, ordered to make an *amende honorable*, imprisoned, or, very infrequently, sentenced to more severe punishments such as banishment or death.

Although Protestant works naturally yield the largest number of examples of censorship in the years prior to 1610, there were also cases of Catholic books being publicly censored. The censure of Cayet's *La fournaise ardente*, already mentioned in connection with the printer Le Bret, seems to have been the most notorious.²⁵ The same author's *Chronologie septenaire* and a book by another of du Moulin's opponents, Suarez de Sainte-Marie, provide the only examples of Sorbonne censures of French Catholic books in the first half of the period.²⁶

Public censure was also occasionally exercised by the Protestant church leaders at Charanton as two incidents described by L'Estoile reveal. In April 1609 the church's ministers censured a book by Marsan on church union, entitled *La tradition catholique*: 'Elle a esté défendue et censurée, à Charanton, par les ministres dudit lieu (horsmis de M. Durant)', wrote L'Estoile.²⁷ In January of the following year the consistory took disciplinary action against the printer Jean Jannon, guilty of printing a Catholic pamphlet by Pelletier against James I:

Messieurs ses maistres de Charanton . . . après l'avoir mandé au Consistoire et admonesté de sa faute, lui ont interdit à temps l'usage de la Cène, avec deffenses de ne plus vendre de livres à Charanton, comme il y avoit accoustumé.²⁸

Books available in Paris were therefore subject to a wide variety of forms of censure and censorship. The remaining three sections of this chapter describe some of the most notable episodes in the development of censorship during the reign of Henri IV, the regency of Marie de Médicis

Censorship under Henri IV

'Étant donné que la liberté de conscience règne ici, non seulement on lit, mais on imprime chaque jour des livres pleins d'hérésies; il n'est pas possible de porter remède à cette situation, puisque le prince l'autorise', wrote the papal nuncio Innocenzo del Bufalo in a letter dated 31 March 1602.²⁹ Successive papal representatives in Paris took a similar view of the situation in the city and L'Estoile's diaries confirm that 'livres et libelles diffamatoires et hérétiques' were fairly readily available in the city. Modern historians of the Parisian book trade all seem to agree in characterising the régime of Henri IV as very liberal in its attitude towards the book trade and cite the small number of interventions by the king himself and by other authorities such as Le Châtelet and the Parlement as evidence of this.³⁰ The nuncio's claim that the king 'authorised' this state of affairs is however debatable as several incidents described below will show.

The period under consideration opened with an important episode in the history of censorship when the controversy surrounding the registration of the Edict of Nantes in turn fuelled demands for the suppression of a work by du Plessis-Mornay,

De l'Institution, usage et doctrine de l'Eucharistie, which became available in Paris at the same period. In August 1598, L'Estoile recounted how

le livre de M. du Plessis Mornay, imprimé à La Rochelle, in-4^o, traictant du Saint-Sacrement de l'Eucharistie contre la Messe, commença de se faire voir à Paris et se vendre, nonobstant les défenses et empeschemens qu'on y voulust donner, qui le firent davantage publier et rechercher, suivant la coustume ordinaire de nostre France.³¹

Whatever the nature of these 'défenses et empeschemens', the book obviously continued to reach interested readers for when the edict was finally and reluctantly registered by the Parlement in February 1599 du Plessis-Mornay's book was still being attacked from at least one city pulpit. In early March the Capuchin preacher, P. Bruslart, dismissed a warning by the *lieutenant civil* to moderate the tone of his preaching against the Protestants (and against du Plessis-Mornay's book in particular). A few days later the king decided to go and hear P. Bruslart preach. According to L'Estoile, the Capuchin

ne cria jamais tant, principalement contre le livre Du Plessis, qu'il dist estre le plus meschant et abominable livre de tous les livres, maintenant de faux les passages des Pères qui y estoient allégués, et exhortant le Roy, là présent, de le faire brusler publiquement à la Grève.³²

Bruslart argued that the Protestants were being given an unfair degree of latitude if allowed to publish such opinions without fear of prosecution. The king appeared impressed by his arguments for 'au sortir du sermon le Roy dit qu'il vouloit qu'on dist à Monsieur de Paris qu'on eust à défendre ce livre et qu'on ne le vendist plus'. Several weeks later, and despite warnings from influential friends, a number of booksellers had their stocks of the book seized and were forbidden to sell any more in the future.³³ The king's decision on this occasion may well have been prompted chiefly by a desire to make a gesture of good faith towards Parisian Catholics and it is interesting to note that, in the spring of the following year, the same book was to provide him with a still more striking opportunity to demonstrate his zeal for the Catholic faith by giving rise to the Fontainebleau conference.

The king's support for the activities of the Jesuit controversialists Coton and Gontéry was noted in Chapter 1; from 1605 onwards several royal interventions

indicate his concern to suppress criticism of the Jesuits. In 1605, the king ordered the case against a Jesuit book to be dropped while the publisher Berjon was imprisoned for five weeks merely on suspicion of having published an anti-Jesuit pamphlet.³⁴ In May 1609 du Moulin's reply to Gontéry's account of their conference was suppressed at the king's command although a deliberate delay on the part of the Protestants' deputy at court appears to have allowed many copies to be sold before the ban could be enforced:

Ce jour, M. le Chancelier envoya quérir M. de Villarnou, député de ceux de la Religion, auquel il enchargea, de la part de Sa Majesté, d'aviser et donner ordre que la réplique Du Moulin au Père Gontier ne se vendist point; et mesmes, dimanche, à Charanton, où on la devoit crier et vendre. De fait, il s'y transporta, ce jour, et en fit faire les défenses à Bourdin l'imprimeur, qui les y vendoit; mais il en avoit desjà débité et vendu un bon nombre, quand ledit Villarnou y arriva, pource qu'il y vinst tard. Ce qu'on croioit avoit esté fait à la main, et tout exprès.³⁵

In a number of other instances the king and the chancellor were clearly responding to pressure from the papal nuncio. The controversy which arose concerning the two versions of James I's apology in favour of the imposition of an oath of fidelity illustrates the important role played by the papal representative in initiating investigations against books and pamphlets offensive to the pope and to the Catholic Church.

On 28 April 1608 L'Estoile bought a copy of James's *Triplici nodo triplex cuneus* from Périer. The nuncio succeeded in having a ban placed on this book the same day but the diarist merely commented on its counter-productive effect:

Je luy [A. Périer] en ay païé demi quart d'escu; et n'y avoit pas deux heures qu'à l'instance du Nonce du Pape on leur avoit à tous fait défense d'en vendre: qui est un bon moien pour en avoir prompte expédition.³⁶

In July the nuncio had all the copies of a French translation of the king's apology seized but a week later L'Estoile bought another translation from the printer Le Bret.³⁷ In July of the following year du Moulin was summoned before the chancellor following a complaint by the nuncio to Henri IV:

Le Ministre Du Moulin, mandé par M. le Chancelier, sur ce que le Nonce

du Pape avoit fait plainte au Roy et donné à entendre que ledit Du Moulin traduisoit en françois l'Apologie du Roy d'Angleterre, et qu'on eust a lui faire défense de passer oultre, fist response qu'il n'y avoit pas seulement pensé, ni sçavoit que c'estoit, et que telles traductions n'estoient de sa profession. De quoi M. le Chancelier se contenta.³⁸

Tourval, the man who was in fact preparing a translation published his version soon after; it was put on sale at Charenton and then in the Palais 'nonobstant les défenses du Roy, instances du Nonce du Pape, remonstrances et crieries des Jésuites'.³⁹

The nuncio's actions in the case of the English king's books indicate his importance in setting the censorship process in motion and also the limited success that such efforts produced. It was to remain a significant aspect of his work in the years that lay ahead and, by his own account, a thankless task in view of the scale of the problem and the attitude of government ministers:

As for obtaining the prohibition of the books which are constantly being published against his Holiness, I do everything in my power, and I have also spoken to the king. I get some results, but his ministers excuse themselves for not doing more, on the grounds that there are too many private presses, that there is a tradition of freedom in the book trade, and that Paris is too populous a city. In truth, I have seen some things in print which attacked the state and the person of the king himself: and although they are prohibited, the bookdealers still sell them secretly.⁴⁰

The nuncio was not alone in attempting to bring pressure to bear on the government regarding printed material on sale in the capital; it was no doubt part of every ambassador's brief to attempt similar interventions in support of their own country's interests. Several instances of successive English ambassadors exerting their influence arise in the years covered by L'Estoile. In 1603, for example, the ambassador's intervention led to the release of the printers Le Bret and Du Carroy and son.⁴¹ In 1605 Parry succeeded in having a history censored which contained unfavourable references to Elizabeth I.⁴² The published controversy generated by James's apology brought his ambassador into open conflict with the nuncio when, in late 1609, his protests delayed the appearance of Coeffeteau's reply to the 'advertissement' of James's second edition.⁴³ (The book was not long delayed however for L'Estoile was able to buy a copy ten days later.)⁴⁴ A year after the assassination

of Henri IV the English ambassador was to be more successful in countermanding repressive action against du Moulin's reply to this book.⁴⁵

Under Henri IV therefore the book trade had not been subject to very strict controls prior to publication and censorship measures against books once published were comparatively infrequent. Nevertheless, the range of episodes mentioned above indicates the king's use of censorship, as expressed by his personal commands and by the action of the chancellor, as a means of making political and diplomatic concessions and also of protecting the Jesuits whose activities he keenly promoted.

Censorship under Marie de Médicis

Following the assassination of Henri IV there was a gradual hardening of the government's attitude to polemic against the Jesuits. The *Anticoton* represented one of the most powerful and notorious of the pamphlets directed against the Jesuits and two contrasting examples of action taken against printers of this anonymous work, separated by a few days, seem to pinpoint the period at which the balance tipped decisively in the Jesuits' favour and against their Gallican and Protestant opponents.⁴⁶

The obstructions which P. Coton encountered in his efforts to publish an apology on behalf of the Jesuits were described in Chapter 1.⁴⁷ The *Lettre declaratoire* was eventually published in July 1610; the *Anticoton* appeared two months later.⁴⁸ In early November L'Estoile observed that the foregoing months had witnessed the appearance of 'infinis petits livrets et libelles diffamatoires, tant d'une part que d'autre, qui coururent et trottèrent assez librement partout' but, a few weeks later, the situation which had allowed these pamphlets to circulate fairly freely changed rapidly as a result of the confrontation which developed between the Parlement and the regent.⁴⁹

During November the Jesuits twice obtained postponements of the University's legal case against them (which opposed the planned re-opening of their collège de

Clermont).⁵⁰ The University and the Parlement were eager to begin the proceedings, convinced that the current climate of opinion was in their favour: 'tous les meilleurs et plus gens de bien de la Cour favorisent la cause de l'Université', wrote L'Estoile, 'mais la Roine est pour les Jésuistes'.⁵¹ The support of Marie de Médicis was to prove the crucial factor for, on the day the trial was finally due to open (26 November 1610), 'la Roine Régente, de plaine autorité et puissance absolue, empescha que la cause des Jésuistes ne fust plaidée, mettant à néant, pour ce regard, la délibération et résolution de la Cour' (that is, the Parlement). The Parlement retaliated by ordering the suppression of Bellarmine's *Tractatus de potestate summi pontificis* — 'pour ne demeurer oisive [the Parlement] censura et donna un Arrest notable contre un nouveau livre du Cardinal Bellarmin' — then, anticipating moves to block this decision by the nuncio and others, the *premier président* had the decree quickly printed and put on sale by the following evening.⁵²

The regent, following indignant representations from the nuncio, and from senior clergy and Jesuits, summoned the Parlement's *premier président* on 30 November. Achille de Harlay defended the Parlement's action and refused to withdraw the *arrêt* and so, later the same day, the *conseil d'état* ordered the indefinite suspension of the *arrêt*.⁵³ The nuncio immediately had copies of the council's decision printed but they were confiscated by the *procureur général* who, in answer to the nuncio's claims that 'il en vouloit envoyer aux Pays Bas, en Savoie, en Portugal, et partout', replied that 'c'estoit en partie la raison pour laquelle il les avoit fait saisir'.⁵⁴

This weekend in late November seems to mark the turning point in relations between the regent and the Parlement. At the heart of their dispute were issues of censorship — the regent had overruled and attempted to suppress the decisions of the supreme court and the Parlement counter-attacked by banning a book by one of the most revered figures in the Catholic Church at Rome. The important role played by the printing press in this confrontation in publicising the decisions of the two sides is also evident.

It is in the context of these events that the bookseller Jean-Anthoine Joallin had his sentence lifted by the Parlement:

Ung libraire, nommé Joualin, pris, en ce mois, à Paris, pour lui avoir esté trouvé des *Anticotons*, fust condamné par sentence du Chastelet à faire amende honorable. Mais, en aiant apelé à la Cour [the Parlement], fust renvoyé absous, au rapport de M. Mesnard, homme de bien et bon François; par conséquent, mauvais Jésuite.⁵⁵

The details of Le Châtelet's judgement against Joallin were nevertheless published in December by the Jesuits in their *Response apologetique à l'Anticoton*.⁵⁶ Its contents do not appear to have been noted previously but they provide further confirmation of this court's attempt to introduce more precise regulations for the book trade at this period. The sentence contained not only the decision against Joallin himself but a general statement of the regulations relating particularly to the printing and sale of pamphlets, some of which were already in force while others appear to foreshadow the major additions included in the letters patent of 1618. The obligations to obtain a *privilège* and to feature the author's and printer's names on the title page were reiterated; the restrictions on the activities of *colporteurs* were stated very precisely as also the obligation to have all consignments of imported books examined by representatives of the book trade before they were put on sale. H.-J. Martin notes that in November 1610 the court of Le Châtelet attempted to impose more stringent controls in order to stem the tide of pamphlet literature but, encountering resistance from the printers and booksellers and also from the University, the proposed reforms were set aside and only brought into effect in the years 1617–1619.⁵⁷

In the meantime the city authorities made clear their determination to clamp down on the publication of opinions hostile to the Jesuits at one important location: 'Défense, ce jour, à ceux de Charenton, de vendre plus, audit Charenton, aucuns livres ni d'Estat ni d'autres', wrote L'Estoile on 2 December, 'Mais ils les vendoient sous le manteau'.⁵⁸ Two days later, on 4 December, harsh measures were taken against the printer Du Carroy which were in stark contrast to the treatment received by Joallin a few days earlier:

Le samedi 4^o, M.le Lieutenant-criminel saisist, en l'imprimerie du Carroi (qui aiant ouï le vent, s'estoit absenté), tous ces petits libelles diffamatoires qui couroient; entre autres: l'*Anticoton*, le *Tocsain*, la *Copie d'une lettre du Pays-Bas* [*contre les Jesuites*], qui n'estoit encores achevée d'imprimer, et autres semblables fadèzes. Il laissa garnison en la maison de ce pauvre

homme, aagé de près de quatre-vingts ans, qui estoit suffisante de ruiner en peu de jours une famille necessiteuse, comme la sienne. Après, il le fist trompeter, lui et son fils, par la ville; et leur fist ledit Lieutenant du pis qu'il peust, nonobstant les prières et sollicitations de beaucoup d'honnestes gens qui s'en meslèrent pour eux ⁵⁹

L'Estoile concluded of this episode that, although the pamphlets concerned were not as offensive as others seen during the League, they had a particularly powerful enemy: 'les Jésuistes, desquels les libelles diffamatoires sembloient estre auctorizés, n'estans point tant subjects à la recherche que ceux qu'on escrivoit contre eux'.⁶⁰ Having secured by the prohibition of any bookselling at Charenton and the exemplary punishment of du Carroy, at least a temporary reduction in hostile polemic, the Jesuits set about distributing their reply to the *Anticoton* (which, in L'Estoile's view, 'les travailloit et pinsoit fort, quelque bonne mine qu'ils en fissent').⁶¹ Their *Response apologetique à l'Anticoton* was soon to be censured by the Faculty of Theology; L'Estoile judged it to be 'une vraie cigalle qui estoit fort maigre et crioit fort hault' but it was, nevertheless, 'bien receu et plus auctorizé qu'un bon livre'.⁶² In the same month the nuncio's confiscated copies of the *conseil d'état's* decision against the Parlement were restored to him following protests directly from Rome, and he was given permission to print an unlimited number of additional copies.⁶³

Finally, in the early spring of 1611, the retiring *premier président* of the Parlement was replaced by Nicolas Verdun, a man whose candidacy was supported by the pope, and in preference to the Gallican de Thou, de Harlay's own chosen successor.⁶⁴ The new president asserted his intention of protecting the Protestants and, in answer to the complaints of du Moulin and the other Charenton ministers, promised to prevent the *colporteurs* of the Palais selling anti-Protestant pamphlets.⁶⁵ But L'Estoile remarked that he gave P. Gontery, once again the subject of complaints for his seditious preaching, only the mildest of rebukes and the pope's secretary of state noted that Verdun had 'already given strict orders against the printing of any work whatsoever against the Roman Church and against the Pope — a clear sign that he is a good Catholic'.⁶⁶ The change in the balance of power, begun on 27 November, thus seemed complete.

The nuncio Ubaldini continued his efforts to have publications hostile to Rome suppressed, and although his letters to Cardinal Borghese bemoaned his lack of suc-

cess, he did manage to make life extremely difficult for several Protestant authors and booksellers. Following his efforts to have *La Monarchie aristodemocratique* by Turquet de Mayerne suppressed in June, he turned his attention to du Plessis-Mornay's *Mystere d'iniquité*.⁶⁷ The book's publisher, Berjon, was imprisoned in early July,⁶⁸ but Ubaldini feared that his efforts to have the book suppressed were likely to be ineffectual once again:

since I saw that little or nothing was done about the book by Turquet, which ... deserved to be burned together with its author ..., I fear that nothing will be done except ... to ban [Mornay's] book; which was done as soon as some copies began to circulate here, although the Huguenot printer who was selling them was held prisoner for many days.⁶⁹

At the end of the month a consignment of du Plessis's book was stopped at the customs post. 'Le Nonce du Pape crie à ce qu'ils soient deffendus', wrote L'Estoile, but the books were returned on condition that they were not sold in Paris.⁷⁰ A few days earlier the intervention of the English ambassador had reversed a decision to seize du Moulin's *Defense de la foy catholique*:

Le livre du Moulin, pour le Roy d'Angleterre, saisy à la boutique de Berion. Sur requeste répondue du Chancelier, le Premier Président en fit bailler main levée, à l'instance de l'Ambassadeur d'Angleterre. Ce fut le samedi 20^e de ce mois. Le Chancelier apelle Du Moulin homme de bien, et le prie de continuer ses presches modestement.⁷¹

The nuncio was clearly very active in attempting to secure the suppression of works hostile to the pope and enjoyed a measure of success in making certain books and pamphlets unobtainable except by clandestine means and therefore unlikely to fall into the hands of the casual Catholic reader. Sometimes however his interventions could produce the reverse of the desired effect: L'Estoile notes several examples of searches initiated by the nuncio fuelling public interest in the proscribed books. Finally, several episodes — such as those concerning the copies of the decision against the Paris Parlement or du Plessis-Mornay's book — show that he also had to contend with unco-operative behaviour from senior officials in the capital, no doubt resentful of this interference in Parisian affairs by the pope's representative. His judgement on Coeffeteau's reply to James I of 1609 (which he had originally hoped would be undertaken by one of the Paris Jesuits) also shows

the extent to which he was forced to make concessions to Gallican sensibilities for, according to Coeffeteau's biographer, 'le nonce, vu les circonstances, le trouva suffisamment *romain*, quoiqu'il contînt, disait-il, certaines maximes peu favorables au pouvoir du Pape sur le temporel'.⁷²

Thanks to L'Estoile's detailed record of his acquisitions and of various actions taken against books and printers, it is possible to reconstruct the development of censorship until the late summer of 1611 with quite a large amount of detail. Evidence of censorship measures becomes much scarcer after the end of his *Mémoires-Journaux*. As mentioned in Chapter 1, there was in any case a comparative lull in Parisian religious debate at the level of personal exchanges between Protestant and Catholic controversialists, partly as a result of the measures taken by the court of Le Châtelet outlined above and partly due to the fact that many of the most noted contributors, both Catholic and Protestant, had turned their attention to political issues.

Gallican opposition to ultramontane views continued to surface — in Richer's book against Bellarmine and the Parlement's *arrêt* against Suarez's *Defensio fidei catholicae* — but these efforts to resist government censorship or to use censorship against their opponents were ultimately unsuccessful: Richer was ousted from his university post, his book was censured by the Sorbonne and placed on the Index; the decision against Suarez was reversed.⁷³

While details of other specific censorship measures against works of religious controversy become much scarcer after 1614, it is at this point that the production of political propaganda in pamphlet form began to develop dramatically. The pamphlet war of the years 1614 and 1615 centred on the Estates General and generated as many pamphlets in two years as the League had produced in a decade.⁷⁴ This explosion in printed political propaganda ultimately led to the imposition of far more comprehensive and precise regulations on the Parisian book trade.

Censorship under Louis XIII (1617–1621)

The controversy which arose from P. Arnoux's sermon in June 1617 (two months after the young king's *coup d'état*) seems to have provided both the stimulus for a revival in religious debate and a clear indication of Louis XIII's standpoint in such matters.

Arnoux's Fontainebleau sermon brought the arguments of Gontéry's method to the public's attention, although it was probably the temerity of the Charenton ministers' reaction which gave further publicity to the contents of Arnoux's sermon. Du Moulin, author of the *Défense de la confession des églises réformées*, may well have thought that the Protestants should state their case firmly to the newly-powerful king. His open letter addressed to Louis XIII appears to have had the backing of the Parisian Protestant community as a whole: the *Défense de la confession* was signed by all four ministers, printed openly by six local printers — Joallin, Le Bret, Bourdin, Melchior Mondiere, Samuel Petit and Pierre Auvray — and apparently presented formally to the king by the duc de Rohan.⁷⁵

In the light of the king's attitude to the Protestants as it later emerged, the decision to present the views of the city's Protestants so forcefully was seriously misjudged. The tone of the Protestants' letter was judged presumptuous and provoked outrage in all quarters: the clergy's assembly protested to the king (with whom the nuncio also raised the matter); the *chambre de l'Edit* and the *grand chambre* vied for the right to deal with the case; the city authorities took prompt action to suppress the book; the Sorbonne pronounced the four ministers anathema.⁷⁶ Finally, in early August, the Charenton ministers were summoned before the *conseil du roi*:

Les ministres furent ouïs et admonestez de leur faute, et très expresses défenses leur furent faites de faire imprimer ou publier aucune chose à l'advenir avec adrese à Sa Majesté sans sa permission précédente, leur dernier escrit demeurant supprimé, avec défenses à toutes personnes de l'avoir et de le lire.⁷⁷

The large number of copies and different editions which have survived suggest that the ban was once again only moderately successful.⁷⁸ Richelieu's remarks in his

memoirs also suggest that the ministers' pamphlet was either readily available or its contents were widely known.⁷⁹

It is conceivable that this important episode in the censorship of Protestant works, which caused such a furore in the summer of 1617, may have contributed to the king's determination to tighten the controls on pamphlet production in the city. A year later, however, the king's favourite, Luynes, became the target of pamphleteers and this provided the chief motive for the king's decision to bring the printing industry more firmly under control.⁸⁰

The letters patent of 1618 (registered by the Parlement on 9 July 1618) effectively created a guild charged with the task of regulating and supervising the activities not only of printers and booksellers but also of *colporteurs* and those importing books into the city.⁸¹ The king's wish to halt the production of pamphlets against Luynes accorded well with the ambitions of the well-established printers to reduce the overall number of printers active in the city for it was usually the smaller printing concerns who were responsible for publishing the offending *libelles*. A large proportion of the articles in the letters patent were therefore devoted to subjects such as the number of apprentices and presses allowed to each printer and the requirements for admission as a master printer, all with the intention of reducing the number of printers capable of setting up business on their own.⁸²

These regulations tended to strengthen still further the oligarchical character of the Parisian printing industry but the need for such restrictions was argued on the basis of 'les abus, désordres et confusions qui naissaient journellement par l'impression d'infinis livres scandaleux, libelles diffamatoires, sans nom d'auteur, ny d'imprimeur ny du lieu ou ils sont imprimés à cause du grand nombre des libraires, imprimeurs et relieurs'.⁸³ The chief task of the syndic and his assistants remained essentially that of 1586: 'de veiller à ce qu'aucun livre hostile au gouvernement ou contraire à la religion ne soit imprimé ou débité à Paris'.⁸⁴ Ten days after these letters patent were registered by the Parlement the *conseil d'état* condemned three pamphleteers to be 'roués ou pendus'; the sentence was carried out that very day.⁸⁵

Details of the situation of the Protestants' printers under the new régime are extremely scarce. In the years 1617 and 1618 du Moulin's major works were apparently sent to be printed at La Rochelle once again.⁸⁶ Abra de Raconis was

sceptical about the authenticity of the La Rochelle imprint on du Moulin's account of their conference (which took place in early January 1618):

qui croira que depuis Mardy 23. Janvier que de ma part les actes de nostre pourparler fut achevé et mis en public jusques au Dimanche suivant, vingt septiesme dudit mois, le sieur du Moulin aye composé la réponse, l'ayt envoyée à la Rochelle, là elle ayt esté imprimée, de là rapportée à Paris, et de Paris à Charanton pour y estre débitée.⁸⁷

The time scale of this published exchange may well indicate that a local printer was involved. It is certainly the case that for the remaining three years of du Moulin's time at Charenton his *Bouclier de la foy* was printed openly at Charenton for the printer and bookseller Abraham Pacard whose shop was in the rue S. Jacques. No evidence has come to light suggesting that this work, of which Pacard produced three editions in the years 1618–1620, was subject to censorship measures.⁸⁸ Pacard himself does not appear to have been hampered by the stricter régime: he is mentioned by Martin as the second most important exporter of books (after Sebastien Cramoisy) to the Frankfurt bookfair.⁸⁹

The years 1619–1622 witnessed a second period of frenetic pamphleteering which emanated from several sources: the wars between Marie de Médicis and her son, personal attacks on Luynes and the religious wars which soon followed the king's expedition into Béarn.⁹⁰ The king, at Luynes's request, ordered city officials to take prompt action against those printing and selling scurrilous pamphlets and measures against offenders were strengthened.⁹¹ In January 1620 two printers of Protestant books, Samuel Petit and Jean Berjon, were found guilty of selling *libelles*; Berjon was ordered to remove a printing press he had installed at Charenton within twenty-four hours.⁹²

The progress towards firmer government control of printing was to continue under Richelieu and became, in the words of Barbiche, 'l'un des aspects essentiels des efforts déployés par la monarchie pour instaurer un régime absolu et centralisé'.⁹³ Despite the fact that Protestant books and pamphlets could not be openly printed or sold in Paris throughout the years 1598–1621, they were still available in the city at least as early as 1601. Quite a number of printers in the city broke the law

Printing and censorship in Paris

and produced Protestant pamphlets, selling them not only outside the Protestants' churches at Ablon and later Charenton but also to customers in the city. In spite of the government's increasingly firm hold on the Parisian printing industry and in spite of recurrent attempts to suppress Protestant works, the publications of du Moulin and his fellow Protestant controversialists did generally succeed, as both the journals of L'Estoile and the listings by Desgraves testify, in escaping censorship, reaching interested readers and provoking further replies from their Catholic opponents.

Notes to Chapter 2

1. Martin deals with Paris in the early seventeenth century as, above all, a printing centre for the Counter-Reformation (see I, 99–189) and barely refers to the printing and selling of Protestant books in and near the city (I, 462, 464). Pannier brings together a number of episodes involving Protestant publications but without drawing any conclusions regarding the development of Protestant printing and bookselling in Paris or the authorities' censorship policies. He also assumes, probably incorrectly, that all those printing for the Protestants were themselves Protestants (*L'Eglise ... sous Henri IV*, pp.533–541; *L'Eglise ... sous Louis XIII (1610–21)*, pp.136–41).
2. Pallier, pp.110, 130; H.-J. Martin, I, 53 (Letters patent of 12 October 1586).
3. Mousnier, *L'Assassinat*, p.301.
4. *Correspondance du nonce en France Innocenzo del Bufalo (1601–1604)*, edited by B. Barbiche (Rome and Paris, 1964). Ubaldini's dispatches as cited by Prat, Urbain and Soman (see following note).
5. Alfred Soman, 'Press, pulpit, and censorship in France before Richelieu', *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, CXX (1976) pp.439–463; Pallier; Bernard Barbiche, 'Le régime de l'édition' and Roger Chartier, 'Pamphlets et gazettes' in *Histoire de l'édition française*, edited by H.-J. Martin, Roger Chartier and Jean-Pierre Viret, 4 vols (Paris, 1982–86) (I, 367–77 and 405–25).
6. Barbiche, p.367.
7. Barbiche, p.367; Chartier, p.407.
8. H.-J. Martin, I, 54, 463.
9. L'Estoile, XI, 126, 131, 133 (June–July 1611).
10. Du Moulin, Pierre, *Response du sieur du Moulin aux lettres du sieur Gontier, escrites au Roy sur le sujet de la conference tenue le 18. d'avril 1609* (n.p., 1609), REP 973–76, 982; *Defense de la confession des Eglises reformées de France* (see above, Chapter 1, n.146, for full title) REP 2010–16. Desgraves's chronological listing of extant editions provides another helpful means of assessing the effectiveness of attempts to suppress certain books and for identifying patterns in the publication of works of religious controversy at Paris and elsewhere.
11. Pallier, pp.18–21; Barbiche, p.368.
12. Barbiche, p.368.
13. Casaubon, writing from Paris in November 1601, mentions that there are 'un ou deux marchands qui tiennent des livres de nostre religion' (Pannier, *L'Eglise ... sous Henri IV*, p.534).

14. L'Estoile, VIII, 85–86 (June 1603). Pierre Le Bret's print-shop was close to the rue S. Jacques: 'Rue S. Jean de Latran, à l'enseigne de la grosse Ecritoire', according to Philippe Renouard (*Répertoire des imprimeurs parisiens, libraires, fondeurs de caractères et correcteurs d'imprimerie depuis l'introduction de l'Imprimerie à Paris (1470) jusqu'à la fin du seizième siècle* (Paris, 1965), p.250). Full titles: *La fournaise ardente et le four de reverbere, pour évaporer les prétendues eaux de Siloé et pour corroborer le Purgatoire, contre les hérésies, erreurs, calomnies, faussetez et cavillations ineptes du prétendu ministre Du Moulin* (Paris, 1603) REP 487; *Eaux de Siloé. Pour esteindre le feu du Purgatoire. Contre les raisons et allégations d'un Cordelier portugays qui a presché le Purgatoire ce Caresme dernier à S. Jacques de la Boucherie* (La Rochelle, 1603) REP 499.
15. L'Estoile, VIII, 251 (14 November 1606); IX, 127 (8 September 1608).
16. L'Estoile, VIII, 89 (9 August 1603).
17. Address: 'au mont S. Hilaire au college de Coqueret' (Renouard, p.124).
18. L'Estoile, XI, 38–39 (4 December 1610).
19. Louis Desgraves, *Les Haultin (1571–1623)* (Geneva, 1960): the Haultin family were descended from former Parisian printers who, following their conversion to Protestantism, were eventually forced to leave the capital; they printed several of du Plessis-Mornay's major works as well as up to sixteen books by du Moulin (pp.xxv–xxvi and catalogue). Pallier describes the harassment suffered by Parisian Protestant printers and their gradual exodus in the years up to 1572 (when a number of Protestant printers were killed during the St. Bartholomew's Day Massacre in the city) (pp.7–9).
20. REP 371, 401, 468; 973–76; 978–82. Seven out of these nine editions were published without the printer's name or place of publication. Those two giving Paris as their place of publication may well have been assigned to fictitious printers — Isaac Burlot and Daniel Landry.
21. L'Estoile, VIII, 270, 284 (January–March 1607); VIII, 343 (September 1609); VII, 185 (6 April 1599).
22. L'Estoile, VIII, 270, 284–85 (20 January 1607 and 27 March 1607).
23. H.-J. Martin, pp.460–61; Barbiche, pp.369–370.
24. Barbiche, p.472: 'l'auteur, coupable d'une trop grande objectivité dans les pages de son livre consacrée aux papes de la Renaissance, dut corriger ses premières éditions ... et, s'il échappa en France aux poursuites, les appuis qu'il avait jusque dans le Sacré Collège ne purent empêcher l'inscription de son livre à l'*Index librorum prohibitorum* le 9 novembre 1609'. This particular incident provoked outrage in the Paris Parlement, but the inclusion of other French books does not seem to have affected their availability in Paris.

25. L'Estoile, VIII, 85–86: '*la Fournaise ardente*, de notre maistre Cayer ... soit qu'elle fust trop eschauffée ou autrement, fust rejetée de Messieurs nos Maistres, comme infectée d'hérésie, prosnée par les Curés, du commandement de l'Evesque de Paris, qui la censura ...'. See also Del Bufalo to Aldobrandini, 15 and 28 December 1603, 22 March 1604 in *Correspondance*, edited by Barbiche (pp.620–21, 629, 690).
26. H.-J. Martin, I, 461, n.53: C. Duplessis d'Argentré's *Collectio judiciorum de novis erroribus* (vol 2) notes only these two works for the years 1600 to the death of Henri IV (pp.542–43, 545–467).
27. L'Estoile, IX, 243 (April 1609).
28. L'Estoile, X, 115 (January 1610). This incident led to Jannon's departure from Paris. He established himself at Sedan where a decade later he was to print many of du Moulin's books.
29. *Correspondance*, p.461.
30. H.-J. Martin, p.461.
31. L'Estoile, VII, 133–34.
32. L'Estoile, VII, 180–81 (10 and 14 March 1599).
33. L'Estoile, VII, 185 (6 April 1599).
34. H.-J. Martin, p.461; L'Estoile, VIII, 182.
35. L'Estoile, IX, 262 (8 May 1609). L'Estoile had been given a copy on 7 May (p.261).
36. L'Estoile, IX, 69–70 (28 April 1608).
37. L'Estoile, XI, 100 (2 July 1608); IX, 103 (9 July).
38. L'Estoile, IX, 306–7 (25 July 1609).
39. L'Estoile, X, 13–14 (12 September 1609).
40. Ubaldini to Borghese (5 February 1608), cited by Soman, p.457, who also notes the secretary of state's reply: 'Even if all our efforts come to naught, our consciences will be at ease, knowing that we have done our duty' (n.80).
41. L'Estoile, VIII, 89 (9 August 1603).
42. Pierre Matthieu's *Histoire de France ... durant sept années de paix* (1605) was published in a second amended edition (Barbiche, pp.370, 373).
43. Ubaldini's dispatch of 20 December 1609, cited by Charles Urbain, in *Nicolas Coeffeteau ... Un des fondateurs de la Prose française (1574–1623)* (Paris, 1894), p.165, n.2.

44. L'Estoile, X, 98–99 (31 December 1609).
45. L'Estoile, XI, 137 (August 1611).
46. L'Estoile, XI, 32 (30 November 1610); XI, 38 (4 December 1610).
47. See above, Chapter 1, p.128, and L'Estoile, XI, 299 (30 June 1610).
48. L'Estoile, X, 321 (5 July 1610); 'Le douzieme de Septembre on fit voir le jour à ceste grande Satyre contre les Jesuistes, appelée l'Anticoton, sans nom d'Autheur et d'Imprimeur' (*Le Mercure françois, ou la suite de l'histoire de la paix. Comménçant l'an M. DC. V. pour suite du Septenaire du P. Cayer, et finissant au Sacre du Tres-Chrestien Roy de France et de Navarre Louys XIII.* (Paris, 1611), 1, 499 verso–500 recto).
49. L'Estoile, XI, 26 (November 1610).
50. L'Estoile, XI, 25–27 (18–26 November 1610).
51. L'Estoile, XI, 25.
52. L'Estoile, XI, 27 (26 November 1610).
53. L'Estoile, XI, 30–32 (30 November 1610).
54. L'Estoile, XI, 32.
55. L'Estoile, XI, 32.
56. *Response apologetique a l'Anticoton et a ceux de sa suite. Presentee a la royne mere du roy, regente de France. Ou il est monstre, que les autheurs anonymes de ces libelles diffamatoires sont atteints des crimes d'herezie, leze majeste, perfidie, sacrilege, et tres-enorme imposture.* (Paris, 1610), REP 1094–94, pp.301–12: 'Sentence de condamnation contre Jean Antoine Joalin'.
57. H.-J. Martin, I, 54 (20 November 1610).
58. L'Estoile, XI, 38 (2 December 1610).
59. L'Estoile, XI, 38 (4 December 1610).
60. L'Estoile, XI, 39.
61. L'Estoile, XI, 41–42 (27 December 1610).
62. H.-J. Martin, I, 462; L'Estoile, XI, 42.
63. Fouquieray, 3, 263, cites a letter from Ubaldini to the nuncio in Venice (13 December 1610).
64. L'Estoile, XI, 90–96 (March 1611).
65. L'Estoile, XI, 101–2 (14 April 1611): '[Verdun] leur promist les maintenir en l'observation entière et inviolable de leur Édit. Et, sur ce qu'un d'entre eux lui fist plainte de tout plain de singeries et libelles diffamatoires que ces contreporteux de devant le Palais crioient (lesquels, bien que ce ne fussent

que fadèzes et calomnies, ne laissoient d'esmouvoir le peuple et l'inciter contre eux), il les remercia de l'advis qu'ils lui avoient donné; qu'il y pourvoiroit et donneroit ordre; qu'ils ne crierioient plus que des Édits et des Almanachs.'

66. L'Estoile, XI, 104–5 (17 April 1611); Soman, p.467, n.81.
67. See above, p.33.
68. L'Estoile, XI, 130 (19 July 1611).
69. Ubaldini to Borghese (19 July 1611), cited by Soman, p.456, n.76.
70. L'Estoile, XI, 139 (31 August 1611).
71. L'Estoile, XI, 137 (20 August 1611).
72. Urbain, p.165, n.2.
73. See above, pp.32–34.
74. In the years 1585–94 approximately 1000 League pamphlets were produced in Paris (of which 870 survive); for the years 1614–15 858 titles have been assembled from European and American library catalogues (in a total of 1425 editions) (Chartier, p.407).
75. REP 2010–16; Peter du Moulin, 'The Author's Life', p.**** verso.
76. Pannier, *L'Eglise ... sous Louis XIII (1610–21)*, pp.394–97.
77. Pannier, *L'Eglise ... sous Louis XIII (1610–21)*, p.396.
78. See above, n.75. Twenty-three surviving copies are listed.
79. See above, Chapter 1, p.40.
80. H.-J. Martin, I, 463.
81. H.-J. Martin, I, 54.
82. H.-J. Martin, I, 54–56.
83. H.-J. Martin, I, 55.
84. H.-J. Martin, I, 56.
85. H.-J. Martin, I, 463.
86. REP 2015–19, 2021, 2023–24; 2188–89; *Les Haultin*, pp.151–53, lists the publications of 1618.
87. C. F. d'Abra de Raconis, *Le Triomphe de la verité forçant le sieur du Moulin de confesser sa fuitte en la conférence qu'il a eu avec le Sieur de Raconis, Licencie et Professeur en Theologie* (Paris, 1618), REP 2122, pp.11–12.
88. REP 2182–85; 2372–73; 2546. Renouard gives Pacard's address as 'Rue S. Jacques,

au Sacrifice d'Abraham' (1606 and 1618) and 'à l'Estoile d'or' (1614 and 1615) (pp.331-32).

89. H.-J. Martin, I, 328-29.

90. Chartier, p.410.

91. H.-J. Martin, I, 463.

92. H.-J. Martin, I, 464. In the same month the court of Le Châtelet condemned d'Aubigné's *Histoire universelle* to be burned by the public executioner (Pannier, *L'Eglise ... sous Louis XIII (1610-21)*, p.498).

93. Barbiche, p.367.

CHAPTER 3

Forms of religious debate in Paris

The purpose of this third chapter is to survey the different forms of religious debate seen in Paris in the early seventeenth century, as represented in printed religious controversy and as described in the diaries, memoirs and correspondence of the period. Some of these debates were conducted solely in print — that between du Moulin and Coeffeteau on eucharistic doctrine is the most notable example — but a large proportion of the printed output arose from other forms of debate or argument. A major part of this chapter is devoted to a detailed analysis of the formal theological debate or conference which was one of the most striking features of popular religious debate at this period. The conventions by which such debates proceeded are significant because they played an important part in developing the polemical strategies and arguments of du Moulin and his opponents. This extended treatment of conference conventions is preceded by a briefer account of the part played by sermons, letters and informal discussions.

Printed contributions to religious debate in these years were inevitably extremely varied in quality and purpose, ranging from scholarly treatises presented in handsome folio volumes by the best printers of the rue S. Jacques to single sheets of scurrilous verse, often very poorly-printed by backstreet printers and sold by *colporteurs* and others traders for a few pence. The majority of the new books and pamphlets on religious issues which became available in Paris were, however, small books or pamphlets (*libelles*), usually published in octavo format with paper covers (or occasionally bound in vellum) and with, on average, forty to fifty pages. It is in this form that most of the evidence of popular religious debate survives. L'Estoile referred disparagingly to these books as 'fadèzes, fariboles, drolleries, bouffonneries, amuse-badauds, entre-batteries de Rome et de Charenton, huguenotes ou jésuitiques' but he was nevertheless an avid collector of such ephemera.¹ The efforts of the king, the city and university authorities as well as those engaged in these exchanges of polemic — both Protestant and Catholic — to secure the suppression of numerous works of religious controversy of this type con-

firm that such pamphlets were widely regarded as a potent and dangerous medium for influencing the reading public.

When considering the various forms of Parisian religious controversy, it is important to keep in mind the pressures which often affected the conduct of these exchanges. Censorship, as described in the previous chapter, represented a major source of pressure which applied to all forms of printed religious debate and could affect the lines along which an exchange developed. Pressure was also liable to be brought to bear by those in authority on anyone preaching on controversial issues or engaging in verbal disputes if it seemed likely that civil unrest might result. But the pressure of time, of simply getting a pamphlet into print quickly, was probably the most important consideration, affecting virtually all the different forms of religious debate and influencing the structure of many published works significantly. The writer's desire to secure the advantage of publishing first or of reacting promptly to his opponent's publication coincided with the printer's wish to capitalise on the public interest already aroused with the result that much religious polemic was written and printed very hurriedly.

The speed of reaction in local Parisian controversies was measured in days and weeks, and only occasionally in months. In the case of du Moulin's conference with P. Jean Gontéry, for example, which took place on Saturday 11 April 1609, L'Estoile bought du Moulin's account of the discussion a week later (18 April) and Gontéry's refutation eleven days after that (29 April). On Thursday 7 May L'Estoile was given a copy of du Moulin's reply and on that same day the chancellor charged one of the Protestants' deputies at court with the task of preventing all sales of the pamphlet at Charenton and elsewhere.² In 1607 Coeffeteau appears to have written an eight-hundred-page refutation of du Moulin's *Apologie pour la sainte Cène* in six weeks; he then replied to du Moulin's revised edition of 1609 in three weeks.³ Du Moulin's conference with Abra de Raconis, broken off on 9 January 1618, provides a final example of the rapidity of these exchanges. Raconis writes that his account of the proceedings was put on sale on Tuesday 23 January and that du Moulin's was available at Charenton on the following Sunday; Raconis's response, entitled *Le Triomphe de la vérité*, was given the necessary authorisations from the Sorbonne and the chancellor on 13 and 17 February.⁴

The pressure to publish quickly inevitably affected both the structure and the arguments of printed religious debate. Many authors favoured a 'dossier' style of presentation — assembling letters, transcriptions of conference proceedings, texts of challenges and lists of questions and then publishing these with an explanatory preface, conclusion and marginal comments. It was a method which possessed the double virtues of maximum authenticity and minimal preparation prior to printing. When it was a question of refuting a printed work the usual approach was simply to begin with page one of the opponent's book and work through to the end, making objections and pointing out errors as and when the occasion arose. Du Perron reveals that his refutation of a work by Tilenus was sent to the printer's section by section — '*ce labeur ... s'imprimoit à mesure que je le composois*'⁵ — and such an expedient was perfectly possible using the standard approach to refuting an opponent's book since the author did not need to concern himself with developing a coherent or structured argument of his own. However, as a consequence of this undeniably thorough method, a writer's arguments often became fragmented, repetitive and long-winded. To the author of the work which attracted such refutations the '*édition revue et augmentée*' offered a convenient and rapid means of making a reply. Additional evidence, clarification of the argument, replies to points made by various opponents could be incorporated into the original work, often without changing its structure (while errors noted by the opponents could be amended — without acknowledgement — and awkward objections quietly ignored). The revised edition was much favoured by du Moulin and virtually all his works of religious controversy from this period were re-issued at least once in this way. It was not only a rapid method of responding to his Catholic critics but one in which the Protestant case remained intact and often more effectively argued. When he temporarily abandoned this approach during the long-running exchange with Coeffeteau the result was a very unattractive catalogue of his opponent's alleged historical, grammatical and philosophical errors.⁶

When considering the forms and methods of printed religious debate therefore, the pressure of time is an important factor and one which frequently affected the quality of the debate adversely. The contrasting methods and arguments of du Moulin and the later generation of Charenton pastors (who had generally withdrawn from the field of verbal disputes and rapid published exchanges) can be accounted for in part by the absence of this pressure on the later writers.

Forms of religious debate

The account in Chapter 1 of the most important episodes in religious debate in Paris during this period will have suggested how varied were the situations in which controversial religious issues arose and were discussed, ranging from royal palaces and law-courts to city-centre churches and private homes. The forms of religious debate also varied according to the situation from the formal sermon, address or conference to the informal discussion or exchange of correspondence. All of these forms of debate figure in the surviving published material alongside those discussions which were conducted solely in print, although not always to a degree which reflects their importance as part of the contemporary religious scene.

This is particularly true of the sermon form which, in terms of the numbers of people reached, was potentially the most powerful medium in which to deal with the controversial issues between Catholics and Protestants and is yet very poorly represented in surviving printed religious debate. In the next section the evidence for the importance of preaching in religious controversy is considered, while the following two sections outline the ways in which informal exchanges — letters and conversations — played a part in the development of inter-confessional debate. The second half of this chapter provides a rather more detailed description of the conference, a form of religious discussion with its own well-established conventions and one which was particularly prevalent in the early years of the Edict of Nantes.

Sermons

In Chapter 1 the power of many Catholic preachers to stir the emotions and influence the political and religious opinions of their listeners was mentioned on several occasions. There are numerous instances of Parisian curés sympathetic to the League stirring their congregations to violence and '[fanning] the fires of revolt and sedition in the hearts of the people' with their anti-royalist and anti-Protestant polemic during the decade prior to Henri IV's accession.⁷ But even after the Edict of Nantes which forbade 'à tous précheurs, lecteurs, et autres qui parlent en public, d'user d'aucunes paroles, discours, et propos tendans à exciter le peuple à sedition', there were a number of instances of Catholic preachers in the city attacking the Protestants in their sermons in a manner judged likely to lead to sedition.⁸ It was for this reason that the Capuchin P. Bruslart, who had attacked du Plessis-Mornay's book in his sermons of February 1599, was 'deported to Italy at the request of the king and on the orders of the pope' a few months later while two other preachers were excluded from the city's pulpits for six months.⁹ The outspoken Jesuit P. Gontéry is frequently mentioned by L'Estoile as a preacher of sedition; and his sermon on Christmas Day 1609 almost led to his exclusion from the pulpit as the English ambassador here recounts:

the King had sent for Gontier and reprehended him for itt; . . . the Chauncellor had done the like, and . . . they had caused his Provinciall to reprove him for it, and had it not beene for scandalising the people with whome he hath great credit, they would have forbidden him to preache any more.¹⁰

Preachers did not hesitate therefore to try to influence public opinion on both religious and political issues and could even exert pressure on the king himself: the sermons of Bruslart in 1599 and Suarez de Sainte-Marie in 1605, for example, alerted Henri IV to the dangers posed by two books (by du Plessis-Mornay and Juan de Mariana) and led to efforts to suppress those works;¹¹ more importantly, Arnoux's sermons in the years 1617-18, urging the young king Louis XIII to take up the fight against heresy, appear to have had a very direct bearing on decisions taken soon afterwards.¹²

These examples serve to suggest the influence exerted by certain Catholic preachers in Paris on their congregations (who would often have numbered many

hundreds and, occasionally, thousands) and on the climate in which religious debate took place but there are also several instances of preachers attempting to discuss controversial religious issues in a more comprehensive and informative manner: du Perron's sermons at S. Médéric in 1597, for example, or Gontéry's series at Caen in 1606, or those of Abra de Raconis and P. Coton in the period immediately after Louis XIII took power. Sermons on controversial issues could also spark off a printed debate, as happened in 1602 with Suarez's sermons on the biblical basis of purgatory and again in 1617 when P. Arnoux attacked the Protestants' confession of faith. The sermon was also used by P. Gontéry and P. Véron, when conducting missionary campaigns in the French provinces, as an opportunity both to attack Protestant doctrine and to issue challenges to local Protestant ministers to take part in conferences to refute their allegations.

In all these ways, therefore, preaching made an extremely important contribution to religious debate, influencing the climate of opinion in which religious controversy was conducted and also contributing directly to its development. Despite this, sermons do not feature heavily among the printed works which survive from this period. Not one of the examples mentioned above has been preserved in its entirety in its original form. The only extracts which remain are the opening of du Perron's sermon series of 1597 and what appears to be a summary of Gontéry's Christmas sermon.¹³ Furthermore, the controversialists studied in the following chapters, of whom the majority were noted preachers, are very poorly represented in Peter Bayley's recent survey of surviving printed pulpit oratory in the first half of the seventeenth century.¹⁴ Coeffeteau (a preacher much admired by L'Estoile), Gontéry, Véron and Arnoux are all missing from Bayley's catalogue despite numerous contemporary references to the impact of their sermons while du Perron, Coton, Suarez de Sainte-Marie and Abra de Raconis are included on the basis of little more than one or two funeral orations.

On the Protestant side, neither du Moulin (whose preaching, according to his son, drew even Catholic listeners to Charenton) nor his colleagues appear to have had any of their sermons published prior to 1623.¹⁵ The development of the printing of sermons preached at Charenton from this date (which marked the resumption of Protestant worship following the destruction of the church in 1621) suggests that it was a consequence of the French Protestants' reduced political status, their

withdrawal from religious disputes (which were dominated at this period by Véron and his followers) and also perhaps the improved controls on printing in the capital. All of these factors are likely to have contributed to the marked reduction in the printing of Protestant religious controversy and, in this context, the sermons may then have offered the Charenton printers — Bourdin, Petit, Auvray and Mondiere — a substitute source of saleable material in place of the books and pamphlets on controversial issues of the years 1598 to 1621.

In general, sermons on controversial subjects did not readily make the transition into print in their original form and cannot therefore be studied in detail as a distinctive form of dealing with the issues which divided Catholics and Protestants. Recognition of the importance of sermons in the sphere of religious debate is based largely on the accounts of such observers of the contemporary scene as L'Estoile and Casaubon and also on a number of books, by Gontéry, Abra de Raconis and others, which were clearly based on sermons or sermon series dealing with controversial issues.¹⁶

Letters

As L'Estoile's diaries once again reveal, letters were of tremendous importance during this period as a channel for exchanging news and ideas on all subjects, including religious controversy. During the years 1609–11, for example, his *Mémoires-Journaux* contain many details regarding the religious affairs of Venice and England gleaned from letters from abroad, addressed to L'Estoile himself or to his friends. He incorporates long extracts from the letters of Fra Paolo Sarpi and others in his journal, giving their opinions on James I's apology, for example, and on rumours that P. Coton was engaged on a book 'pour la réunion en matière de Religion'.¹⁷ A friend sent him transcriptions of passages from Bellarmine's new book against the English king which the sender thought likely to prove contentious; L'Estoile had these copied into his journal as well.¹⁸

Private correspondence was often widely circulated and copied in this way and thus enjoyed a much larger readership than might be expected. Some of these letters eventually found their way into print, as in the case of du Perron's correspondence with Isaac Casaubon following the latter's departure to England. In Septem-

ber 1611 L'Estoile was given 'une lettre du Cardinal Du Perron, à Casaubon, pour la réduction du Roy d'Angleterre à la Religion Catholique. Elle contient cinq à six grands feuillets d'écriture à la main'.¹⁹ This letter was almost certainly that of 15 July 1611 which was published soon afterwards and reprinted in 1612 by printers in Rouen and Bordeaux as well as Paris.²⁰

Some of the letters on controversial subjects which appeared in print had originally formed part of a genuine correspondence (as in the case of the letters between du Perron and Casaubon, and also those between du Moulin and Guez de Balzac in 1633) but in other instances the letter form was probably deliberately adopted as a method of presenting the details of a conference or a conversion in an informal and persuasive manner.²¹ The published accounts of Coton's conferences with Chamier in 1600 and Gigord in 1608, for example, were both presented in the form of long letters written by witnesses.²² Similarly, the conversions to Catholicism of Pierre Cayet (in 1595) and of the baronne de Courville (in 1617) — as also of a number of other individuals — were publicised by the printing of letters in which the converts justified their decision to abjure to family or friends.²³

The letter form is also put to a wide variety of other uses in the printed religious controversy of the early seventeenth century. A number of important contributions to religious debate during these early years took the form of open letters addressed to the sovereign: to Henri IV (by Gontéry in 1609), to Marie de Médicis (by P. Coton in 1610) or to Louis XIII (by the four Charenton ministers in 1617) and the dedicatory epistles of other works often functioned in a similar way, publicly enlisting the support of the dedicatee or asserting the author's loyalty to king and country.²⁴ The prefatory letters addressed to various sections of a book's anticipated readership which featured in many works of this period contain some of the most significant statements of principle and method: du Moulin's 'Lettre à Messieurs de l'Eglise romaine', for example, from the prefatory material of his *Bouclier de la foy* of 1618, was judged sufficiently important to be published the same years as a separate work in its own right.²⁵

Letters from those involved in conferences as participants or witnesses were often included in a dossier-style presentation, documenting the various stages of the

encounter. This was an approach particularly favoured by Pierre Cayet, as seen in the two-part pamphlet concerning his conference with du Moulin in 1602.²⁶ Abra de Raconis's description of his conference with du Moulin was similarly substantiated by the inclusion of a number of letters and challenges exchanged between the two participants.²⁷

Finally the letter form also appeared in the context of 'conférences par écrit': written exchanges between controversialists on religious issues. Théophraste Bouju's written debates with Lobéran de Montigny and then du Moulin in 1603 provide a good example of this method of debate. The letters were published first by the Catholic correspondent and later by du Moulin.²⁸ In 1613, P. Gontéry's exchange of correspondence with the governor of Sedan was eventually published by the town's Protestants while, on another occasion, Gontéry himself had his letters published for the benefit of a wider readership.²⁹

The letter form was thus widely used in printed religious debate. This was partly a reflection of the important role played by personal correspondence in the exchange and development of views on controversial issues and also of the fact that the epistolary form lent itself particularly well to the purposes of popular religious debate: it allowed ideas to be presented in a direct and readable way and, bearing in mind the pressure to publish quickly which applied to many of the instances cited, the loose structure and informal style appropriate to personal correspondence (as also the unsuitability of excessive marginal notes and references) were additional aids to rapid composition.

Informal discussions

Controversial religious issues were a natural subject not only for private correspondence but also for everyday conversation in a city where Isaac Casaubon lamented the amount of time lost to his studies in the continual round of visits to and from friends and acquaintances: 'The greater part of my day is wasted upon wretched nothings in this busy capital', he wrote, 'busy because all the men have nothing to do'.³⁰ Although such conversations did not contribute directly to the stock of printed controversy they nevertheless provided the context for many other discussions which were eventually published.

Informal discussions on religious issues were also being initiated constantly by such experts in controversy as du Perron with a view to bringing about the conversion of Protestant acquaintances. The way in which du Perron persistently tried to discuss controversial questions with the king's sister and with Isaac Casaubon was mentioned in Chapter 1.³¹ His conversations with Nicholas Harlay de Sancy met with more success, leading to the conversion of this Protestant noble. A printed record of the discussion survives from notes made by du Perron's disciple, Bouju.³² It was almost certainly the way in which the bishop effected many of the conversions with which he is credited in the early years of the century. The Jesuits too had a reputation for continually tackling distinguished Protestants at court. Following du Perron's departure to Rome for several years, Coton, Gontéry and Fronton du Duc took up the assault on various members of the Casaubon family and eventually persuaded Casaubon's eldest son, John, to abjure Protestantism.³³ The Jesuits were often accused by their opponents in debate of organising conferences once they were certain, on the basis of such informal discussions, that the Protestant concerned was prepared to abjure his or her faith. The outcome of the conference was thus, in one important sense, a foregone conclusion and served to publicise the Catholic victory much more widely. (Both Basnage and du Moulin in their conferences with Gontéry claimed that their opponent had used this technique.)³⁴

These constant informal challenges appear to have been a major hazard of court life for distinguished Protestant men and women. The examples of Catherine de Bourbon and Isaac Casaubon have already been mentioned; the *surintendant*

des finances Sully represented another attractive target for zealous Catholic theologians although, unlike other firmly-committed Protestants, he appears to have relished such discussions: Carew, the English ambassador, described him as 'not void of learning, both of knowledge of Latin, and other studies of humanity; but chiefly in arguing points of religion, wherein he is very ready and confident'.³⁵ Panrier notes one occasion when Sully summoned du Moulin and asked for 'quelques passages des Pères contre la transsubstantiation' for use in future discussions; du Moulin supplied him with twenty-five.³⁶

Informal encounters were also a regular occurrence for the Protestant ministers of Paris and most frequently for du Moulin. As the most talented controversialist in the ministerial team, requests from Parisian Protestants to take part in informal discussions on their behalf appear to have made great demands on his time. In a city with such a strong ecclesiastical presence, du Moulin and his colleagues were hopelessly out-numbered when it came to such individual encounters, and in an effort to overcome this difficulty, du Moulin devised lists of questions or Bible passages which he gave to Protestants requesting his presence at informal meetings or to Catholic challengers as the need arose. A Protestant lady calling on du Moulin at his home in the hope of arranging a meeting between the minister and Abra de Raconis was plainly indignant at being issued with such a questionnaire:

au lieu d'esclaircir les doutes que je luy proposois, il m'en propose quatorze coucheés dans un papier tiré d'entre plusieurs, qu'il donne à tout le monde, pour subtilement se delivrer, de la peine où sa charge l'oblige, d'instruire son troupeau, et départir à ses ouailles le pain de la doctrine.³⁷

Gontéry, writing in 1607 under the pseudonym Philothée, cited a letter from du Moulin which reveals that the minister was sending a copy of his *Trente-deux demandes* to a Protestant lady as a substitute for engaging in a conference on her behalf.³⁸ Other works by du Moulin such as his *Oppositions de la parole de Dieu* or *Nouvelles briques pour le bastiment de Babel* may well have been used in this way.³⁹ These printed lists of questions and texts are an important feature of religious controversy during this period which does not appear to have been previously noted.

Du Moulin did nevertheless take part in a large number of informal encounters

with Catholic controversialists: 'If I would relate all his Conferences', wrote his son, 'they might fill a great volume. Scarce was he a week without one, while he lived at Paris, and some of them were very long'.⁴⁰ No record survives of many of these meetings while a number of others are described only in the diaries, memoirs or correspondence of those present: these include his discussions with the abbé de Champvallon in September 1609 and with François de Sales in 1619.⁴¹ A few however became the subject of a printed exchange and thereby tended to assume the character of formal conferences. His 1609 meeting with Gontéry, for example, was later described as a conference but, according to du Moulin's account, had begun simply as an invitation to discuss religious questions with a small group of Catholic and Protestant noblewomen. It was only when Gontéry arrived laden with books that du Moulin realised that he had been inveigled into participating in a 'dispute non réglée'.⁴² Coton's encounter with Gigord the previous year had arisen in much the same way. These informal discussions between Protestant and Catholic theologians often proceeded along very similar lines to properly organised debates and both of these meetings will be discussed in the following section.

As the testimonies of L'Estoile, Casaubon and du Moulin indicate, these few published examples of informal debates reflect a much more widespread involvement in the discussion of religious issues by theologians and laypeople of both religions. This in turn explains the tremendous interest shown by the public in the comparatively small number of 'conférences' or formal debates which took place in the city during these years and which form the subject of the remainder of this chapter.

Conferences

The Fontainebleau conference of 4 May 1600 was the most influential example of a form of religious debate which became much more widespread from 1598 onwards. Printed records survive for about thirty conferences which took place at Paris or involved controversialists normally based in the capital in the years prior to 1621. This group is sufficiently large and the overall pattern of the chronological distribution of these debates is sufficiently striking to provide an important confirmation of developments in religious debate in general during the early seventeenth century.

The period opened with a group of conferences in the years around 1600 with du Perron as a major protagonist (and source of inspiration to other controversialists) and the king's sister as the prime target for their endeavours; a further burst of activity followed during the years 1606–1609, generated chiefly by the two Jesuit controversialists, Pierre Coton and Jean Gontéry. The regency period (during which religious controversy acquired a much more avowedly political character) is notable for the apparent disappearance of theological conferences from the capital, but the dramatic seizing of power by Louis XIII in April 1617 was followed by a marked resurgence in conference activity, based this time on the new approach first devised by P. Gontéry and now developed, vigorously practised and publicised by P. Francois Véron, and adopted by many other controversialists, Jesuit and non-Jesuit. Practitioners of the new method were to dominate the field of theological conferences until the late 1620s when formal religious disputes became a much less frequent occurrence.

The change in the Catholic approach to theological conferences evident between the two groups of conferences belonging to the reigns of Henri IV and Louis XIII, which was, broadly, from an egalitarian scholarly approach to a more aggressive, polemical style, and the absence of conferences during the years 1610–1617 closely reflect changes in the political climate and trends in religious controversy as a whole.

Theological conferences throughout the entire seventeenth century have been studied by Emile Kappler in his thesis entitled 'Conférences théologiques entre catholiques

et protestants en France au XVII^e siècle'.⁴³ This thesis brings together details of over two hundred conferences held during the period of the Edict of Nantes and describes some of the most important features of these verbal disputes. Kappler's treatment of the many hundreds of texts relating to these conferences is extremely thorough and productive but the wide geographical and chronological range of his subject necessarily precludes any detailed analysis of conferences in relation to the prevailing political situation, to other forms of religious argument or to conference participants' activities in other spheres of religious controversy such as preaching or written debates. These are all aspects of formal debates which are relevant to the present study, set within the far narrower limits of Paris in the first twenty-three years of the Edict of Nantes.

Kappler's findings however point very clearly to the importance of this early period as regards conference activity: over half (108) of the conferences assembled by him belong to these years and 70% took place before 1630 from which he concludes that 'le premier tiers du XVII^e siècle est la grande époque de la polémique verbale, ... son déclin est sensible dès la 4^e décade du siècle'.⁴⁴ Similarly Kappler's statistical analysis of conference locations and participants also confirms the importance of Paris as the scene of a large number of verbal disputes and of Parisian-based controversialists as major contributors. The capital witnessed a sixth of the total number of those conferences taking place in France throughout the seventeenth century for which Kappler has found some record.⁴⁵ Pierre du Moulin heads the list of Protestant pastors who participated most frequently in conferences with ten recorded encounters, followed by Daniel Chamier of Montpellier and Jean Mestrezat (who joined the Charenton ministerial team in 1614).⁴⁶ On the Catholic side the Jesuits dominate the list of controversialists. They seem to have been far more active in verbal debate than any other religious order (or the secular clergy as a whole) and were involved in sixty-four of Kappler's two hundred recorded disputes.⁴⁷ François Véron (listed with the Jesuits although he later left the order and became curé at Charenton) accounts for a quarter of this total, followed by three other important figures in Parisian religious debate: Jean Gontéry, Alexandre Regourd and Pierre Coton.⁴⁸ Jacques Davy du Perron similarly dominates the list of members of the secular clergy.⁴⁹

Kappler's analysis thus yields results which confirm the importance of Parisian religious debate during du Moulin's time there. To some degree the evidence is weighted in favour of the capital by the broadness of Kappler's definition of a theological conference as

toute rencontre publique ou privée, qui a fait l'objet d'une discussion verbale entre deux théologiens de religion opposée, sur des points controversés de doctrine ou de pratique ⁵⁰

and by the fact that many conferences are included solely on the basis of secondary sources (letters and memoirs). The result of these two factors is that many of the conferences listed might be more accurately described as informal discussions. Since a disproportionate number of letters and memoirs surviving from the period belong to writers based in the capital, an unusually high proportion of such informal encounters appear among the list of Parisian conferences and, on this basis, quite a number of other discussions and conferences might be added to Kappler's list.⁵¹ But even if the analysis were to be restricted to properly organised debates ('disputes réglées') or to those for which detailed accounts were published soon afterwards by participants or witnesses, Paris and Parisian theologians would still retain their preeminence, as indeed might be expected in a city which brought together many of the most skilful and ambitious Catholic controversialists and the most influential adherents of Protestantism (who formed particularly attractive targets for those same controversialists).

The purpose of the sections which follow is to outline some of the conventions which governed the conduct of those conferences of a more formal nature, and it is based on a group of debates which fall within Kappler's definition of a theological conference but which also meet the following criteria: firstly, that they took place in front of witnesses, however few in number, and secondly, that they displayed some degree of formality, whether in the conduct of the debate as a whole or simply in the presentation of the arguments. Many of the discussions in which du Moulin and the major Catholic controversialists were involved would not be described as conferences in this stricter sense: only two of the ten conferences which Kappler ascribes to du Moulin, for example, would qualify as 'disputes

reglées'. The following selection of eight well-attested conferences involving major Parisian controversialists will furnish most of the illustrations of important features of conferences belonging to this period:

1597	du Perron	<i>v.</i>	Tilenus	(Paris)
1600	du Perron	<i>v.</i>	du Plessis-Mornay	(Fontainebleau)
1600	Coton	<i>v.</i>	Chamier	(Nîmes)
1602	Cayet	<i>v.</i>	du Moulin	(Paris)
1606	Gontéry	<i>v.</i>	Basnage	(Caen)
1608	Coton	<i>v.</i>	Gigord	(Fontainebleau)
1609	Gontéry	<i>v.</i>	du Moulin	(Paris)
1618	Abra de Raconis	<i>v.</i>	du Moulin	(Paris)

Six of these conferences are drawn from the sixteen encounters listed by Kappler which took place at Paris or at Fontainebleau in the period prior to 1621 and a further two illustrate the provincial disputes in which the Jesuits Coton and Gontéry also engaged during these years. Detailed accounts of all these conferences were published shortly after they took place and in every case both Catholic and Protestant versions survive, making possible a comparison of the claims made by the opposing sides.⁵²

There is some evidence in Gontéry's conferences included here that he was not very successful in debates conducted within the formal procedures of the traditional conference style and this is likely to have been an important factor in his development of a new conference method which to a large extent sought to undermine that to be described in this section. Gontéry's method and its impact on conferences will be discussed in detail in Part 3 (and the refinements introduced by P. François Véron in the Epilogue.⁵³ Here we will describe only some of the common conventions governing the traditional conferences in the early seventeenth century.

'Je viens au Narré que j'ay promis', wrote Timothée Duchat in 1619, 'lequel je déduiray en toute verité, dequoy me seront tesmoins les actes escrits de part et d'autre, et les personnes qui y ont assisté, et qui en sçavent les particularitez,

l'occasion et motif, l'entree, le progres et la fin'.⁵⁴ Duchat's avowed aim of providing a complete, orderly and truthful account of his 1619 conference with Véron is one to which all those describing conferences chosen for this section would have claimed to adhere. Most of them make similar protestations, and yet in some cases the degree of conformity between Catholic and Protestant versions of the same events is very small. (The expectation that an opponent would manipulate the official record was so firmly established that when Abra de Raconis discovered that both he and du Moulin had published the proceedings of their 1618 conference in a virtually identical form he concluded that the strength of his own case was not sufficiently obvious from these official 'actes' and published a further book setting out his arguments at greater length.)⁵⁵ In describing the various stages of the theological conference therefore, following Duchat's convenient subdivisions — 'l'occasion et motif, l'entrée, le progres et la fin' — the accuracy and importance of certain details, added or omitted, contradicted or given a different interpretation in one or other of each pair of accounts need to be assessed carefully.

'L'occasion et motif'

Conferences were almost invariably initiated by the Catholic party to the dispute with the purpose of winning converts to Catholicism.⁵⁶ The challenge to debate might be issued in a variety of ways: during an informal meeting, by a personal visit to the Protestant minister's home, by letter or by the sending of a formal challenge (or 'cartel de deffy'). Most recorded challenges are found in the publications of François Véron but the following challenge to renew a conference broken off two months earlier was sent by Abra de Raconis to du Moulin in March 1618:

Je m'oblige de me trouver en lieu raisonnable, avec mon Oncle Ange Raconis Prédicateur Capucin, pour conférer amiablement, privément, sans esclat et sans préjudice des Edits de sa Majesté, avec le sieur du Moulin et tel Ministre qu'il voudra prendre et là luy faire désavouer son dernier escrit, qu'il a intitulé *Narré veritable*.⁵⁷

(Kappler notes only a handful of conferences resulting from a Protestant challenge and the Protestants involved were usually laymen rather than ministers.)⁵⁸

The sharp increase in the number of conferences which occurred after the registration of the Edict of Nantes seems to have prompted the French Reformed Church to consider the terms on which its ministers might engage in such disputes. In 1601 the national synod of Jargeau published the following article, to be incorporated in the 'Discipline des Eglise Reformées':

Les disputes de la Religion avec les Adversaires seront réglées en telle sorte, que les nostres ne serons point agresseurs: et s'ils sont engagez en dispute verbale ils ne le feront qu'avec la règle de l'Ecriture Sainte, ne donnant lieu aux escrits des Anciens docteurs, pour le jugement et décision de la Doctrine. N'entreront en dispute réglée que par escrits respectivement baillez et signez. Et quant à la dispute publique, n'y entreront que par l'avis de leur consistoire et de quelque nombre de pasteurs, qui pour cet effect seront choisis par les Colloques ou Synodes Provinciaux. N'entreront en aucune dispute ou conférence generale sans l'avis de toutes les Eglise assemblées au Synode Nationale, à peine aux Ministres qui y entreront autrement d'estre declarez Apostats et deserteurs de l'union de l'Eglise.⁵⁹

Not only does the article preclude any Protestant initiative leading to a conference or other type of dispute but it also specifies that conferences must be conducted only on a scriptural basis (and thus forbade disputes similar to the 1597 debate between Tilenus and du Perron where discussion of the early church fathers had featured strongly). The precautions demanded to ensure that conference proceedings were carefully recorded and authenticated and that major debates were authorised by local church leaders (or by the entire church in the case of a 'dispute ou conférence generale') indicate the seriousness with which conferences were viewed.

The unfavourable outcome of the Fontainebleau conference may well have been in the church representatives' minds as this article was drafted. The cautious attitude adopted by Parisian ministers in late 1601 during negotiations with du Perron, the Catholic victor at Fontainebleau, was certainly influenced by that episode.⁶⁰ When challenged by du Perron to a conference for the benefit of Catherine de Bar the four ministers stipulated the basis on which they were prepared to engage in debate with extreme care. Every stage of the debate was to be recorded and signed, for example, and the audience was to be strictly limited to five representatives from each religion. To this du Perron objected that such a condition was unnecessary since the purpose of the conference was 'l'instruction particuliere' of the king's

sister and not 'une dispute generale entre l'un et l'autre Religion'; the ministers replied with a clear reference to the way in which the Fontainebleau conference had arisen: 'la qualité de Madame, et l'experience du passé, leur fait craindre qu'il trouvera assez d'artifice et d'ayde pour faire passer les choses particulieres en publiques s'il pense y avoir de l'avantage' (p.14). When the two parties failed to agree on the conditions for a conference, du Perron decided to publish the correspondence which had passed between them as evidence, in his view, of the Protestants' bad faith, but the letters of the four ministers serve equally well to reveal their determination not to be drawn into another Fontainebleau on unfavourable terms.

The distinction which both du Perron and the Protestant ministers make between private and public disputes whereby 'l'instruction particuliere' of Catherine de Bar nevertheless envisaged an audience of ten explains the need for some qualification of Kappler's description of the conference as any meeting between theologians, public or private, when applied to these early conferences. For the crucial feature of these debates, whether conducted before an audience of two hundred at the palace of Fontainebleau or in a private home with only a small group of people present, was that they took place in front of witnesses and were to that extent 'public' encounters.⁶¹ Private conversations between theologians, such as that between du Moulin and Daniel Bourguignon in 1617, with no other purpose than the clarification of theological issues for their own benefit do not reflect the usual conditions in which conferences were held.⁶² However restricted the audience the typical conference of this period was intended for the benefit of those witnessing the discussion and not for the participants. While a 'conférence réglée' was normally organised for a specific Protestant individual or individuals, others took the form of a public test of one opponent's scholarship — as in the du Perron-du Plessis-Mornay and Coton-Chamier debates of 1600 — but the success of both types of disputes was still measured in terms of their actual or likely effect in bringing about conversions.

The presence of witnesses was also important if the events of the conference were to be published later for the benefit of a still wider audience. Even when an official record of the conference had been made, each participant often chose to present his version of events under the name of one of the observers, a device which made possible the addition of various incidents and anecdotes, audience reactions

or the listeners' impressions of the performances of the opponents, accompanied by an assurance that all those present would vouch for the accuracy of this narration. The Protestant Adair's description of his editorial role in presenting an account of the Cayet-du Moulin conference is typical in this respect:

Quant a la forme de la narration je l'ai fait la plus courte et simple que j'ai peu, et ai laissé toutes les disputes sur la forme des argumens, m'estant contenté de deduire les matieres: lesquelles encores j'ai deschargé de paroles et n'y ai laissé que les os et les nerfs . . . Puis outre les choses dictees j'ai adjoint les choses dites: divers incidens qui meritent d'estre cogneus: ne craignant point d'estre accusé de fausseté, y ayant tant de tesmoings: et ne rapportant en cest escrit aucune absurdité ou impiété dite par Cayer, que je ne lui aye moi-mesmes représenté en pleine ruë devant plus de cent tesmoins, et qu'il ne m'ait advoüé.⁶³

The main aim of a conference therefore required that the discussion be conducted in public since it was intended for the benefit of those observing in the first instance and also relied on the presence of witnesses to authenticate the discussion and its outcome in the event of publication.

Conferences were held in a great variety of locations. Two of the eight conferences under consideration took place in the royal palace of Fontainebleau and two others in the homes of senior clergymen (that of 1597 at the home of du Perron and the Nîmes conference in the home of cardinal de Sourdis); the four remaining debates took place in Protestant residences. Du Moulin's debate with Abra de Raconis was held in the minister's own home where, it appears, not only Abra de Raconis but a number of other Catholic theologians came to engage du Moulin in debate.⁶⁴ In the middle years of the seventeenth century the majority of Paris conferences, particularly those involving Véron, took place in the home of one or other of the Charenton pastors.

The numbers attending conferences could range from a handful of listeners to many hundreds. The Fontainebleau conference was attended by well over two hundred observers and that of Nîmes took place before the assembled clergy, nobility and magistrates of the locality.⁶⁵ The number attending du Moulin's conference with Pierre Cayet is not given but was evidently quite large as their Protestant host

apparently grew concerned that the floor of the upper room where the debate was being held might give way. By contrast the 1597 conference between du Perron and Tilenus took place before two Protestant ladies and 'plusieurs personnes de qualité de leur Religion'.⁶⁶ Where it was possible to specify the numbers of those in the audience beforehand, equal numbers of Protestants and Catholics were demanded with the probable intention of obtaining a fair hearing for the two opponents and minimising the risk of sedition, a major concern for the civil authorities where conferences were concerned, as will be described below. It was not, however, always possible to ensure such a balanced attendance: Abra de Raconis describes his conference with du Moulin as being conducted in a room where Protestants far outnumbered those Catholics present and where he felt his personal safety was in jeopardy; du Moulin adamantly refused to continue the conference in the Collège de Navarre where he would have felt similarly at risk.⁶⁷

The members of the audience were usually described as 'personnes de qualité' although the Catholic account of Coton's debate with Chamier claims that, whenever it was the Jesuit's turn to speak, the doors were opened to admit the rabble outside in order to disrupt the proceedings.⁶⁸ Basnage's list of conditions agreed for his debate with Gontéry (featured below) is interesting in this context: Article 4 specified 'Que la conference se fera en présence de pareil nombre de personnes de l'un et de l'autre parti, gents capables de juger de la solidité, ou futilité d'une raison, qui donneront silence au dits conferants'.

'L'entrée'

Once the opponents and audience were assembled the conference would often begin with prayer, with the two parties praying separately (the Catholics in Latin, the Protestants in French), and would then proceed to the agreement of the conditions for the dispute and the appointment of officials.⁶⁹ The following list of conditions was agreed for the conference between Basnage and Gontéry on 29 March 1606 and provides a convenient summary of areas commonly dealt with:

- I Que pour autoriser la dispute, Monseigneur de Sainte Marie, à la sollicitation et par le commandement duquel elle s'entrepren, sera prié d'y assister, et advoüer ces conditions par son signe.
 - II Que pour le point de la question, on remet à la volonté de mondit seigneur de le choisir, et seront tenus lesdits conferants, de bailler reciproquement leur creance par escrit sur ladicte question.
 - III Que tant les raisons, que les responces qui seront proposees, seront fondees sur tesmoignages manifestes de l'escriture, soit en termes expres, soit par consequence necessaire.
 - IIII Que la conference se fera en presence de pareil nombre de personnes de l'un et de l'autre parti, gents capables de juger de la solidité, ou futilité d'une raison, qui donneront silence au dits conferants.
 - V Que de chaque Religion, il y a aura un scribe, qui redigera par escrit tant les objections, que les responses qui seront mises en avant de part et d'autre, que lesdits conferants seront obligez de signer, à mesure qu'elles seront proposees.
 - VI Qu'en l'allegation des raisons, on usera de la plus grande briefveté qui sera possible, sans s'estendre en de longs discours, de peur d'extravaguer, et embrouiller les matieres, et en ce forme de Dialectique.
 - VII Que lesdits conferants se tiendront aux conditions susdites, sans s'en departir, et le contrevenant sera jugé par l'assistance, non recevable à la conference.
 - VIII Que le resultat de cette conference selon les articles d'icelle, sera imprimé par l'autorité de mondit seigneur, pour l'edification commune.
- [signed] Sainte-marie. Basnage. Gontery.⁷⁰

The first important feature of these conditions seems to be an emphasis (particularly in this conference) on the role of the president: it is by his authority that the

conference is held and the official proceedings later to be published, and the choice of subjects for debate is his. The conditions for debate also reveal a concern to ensure an orderly dispute and a reliable record of the opponents' statements and, finally, they attempt to establish the basis for discussion — scripture, 'soit en termes expres, soit par consequences necessaires' — and the method of presenting the arguments — as briefly as possible and in syllogisms ('en ce forme de Dialectique').

The officials in a 'dispute réglée' could include a president or moderators, 'commissaires' and 'vérificateurs de texte', but the only essential requirement for such disputes seems to have been the two scribes, one Protestant and one Catholic, whose transcriptions of the proceedings were intended to be collated at the end of the debate to provide the official 'actes' of the conference.⁷¹ In practice a complete and unbiased record of the discussion rarely reached the reading public — some conferences were broken off with unresolved disputes concerning the transcription still outstanding while in many other instances the opponents preferred to present accounts in which the 'actes' were either absorbed into a narrative which contained additional material, summarised or presented with substantial marginal notes.⁷² The official record was thus only rarely published in its entirety or free of editorial comment. In addition to these officials, the main opponents might also be supported by one or more colleagues whose degree of involvement varied greatly from one dispute to the next. Perhaps the most remarkable example of interventions from supporting theologians is seen in Cayet's debate with du Moulin. The former Protestant was evidently under close supervision by the Sorbonne and at different sessions was variously supported by two Carmelite doctors, other university graduates and Henry Constable, du Moulin's former host during his stay in England: all these men contributed substantially to the debate, occasionally to the exasperation of Cayet himself.

The choice of subjects in individual debates and the way in which each participant argued his case will be examined in Part 2, but one general point which emerges from this small group of conferences is the predominance of two major areas of debate. Eucharistic doctrine was at issue in the majority of these discussions. In the two conferences of 1600, for example, the subject of the book under scrutiny was eucharistic doctrine and at Nîmes the debate developed into a general discussion on this question. The eucharist was the main issue in the

conferences of 1602, 1608 and 1609 and provided the second question on which Abra de Raconis planned to challenge du Moulin, had their debate continued.⁷³ The other main area of debate concerned the 'juge des controverses' — the basis on which religious truth, particularly in controversial matters, was to be determined. In his 1606 conference with Basnage, the three questions put forward by Gontéry (at the president's request) were:

I. Si le texte de l'écriture sainte est le juge des controverses en matiere de religion.

II. Si les ministres ont vocation legitime.

III. Si l'Eglise Catholique Romaine est le vray juge en matiere de Religion'.⁷⁴

In du Perron's conference with Tilenus in 1597 this question arose in the form of the competing claims of scripture and tradition, while in the 1609 and 1618 conferences, Gontéry and Abra de Raconis framed arguments which challenged the Protestants' claim to be based solely on scripture. In an important sense, however, this was the question underlying virtually all these debates, as will be seen in Parts 2 and 3.

The predominance of these two areas of debate in theological conferences is confirmed on a far wider scale by Kappler's study of conferences throughout the century.⁷⁵ It also suggests that the attention of controversialists of the early part of the century was not generally dispersed over as wide a variety of issues as Rébelliau and a number of other scholars have suggested.⁷⁶ To catalogue the errors and abuses of the opposing faith was largely no more than a polemical tactic; the number of issues discussed regularly and in detail was comparatively small.

'Le progres'

The dispute proper was conducted along the lines of a scholastic dispute as taught in both Protestant and Catholic educational establishments and was based on the exchange of syllogisms. This method and the terminology associated with it were a frequent source of bafflement to lay Catholics and Protestants attending conferences. Théophraste Bouju, in an early work against du Moulin and Lobéran de Montigny, offered the following description of a syllogism to the ex-Protestant layman who had initiated the exchanges with the two ministers:

[Le syllogisme] est un certain discours, ratiocination, ou argumentation, consistant en trois propositions, desquelles la dernière resulte et s'ensuit des deux premières ... De ces trois propositions desquelles le syllogisme est composé, la coutume de l'escole est d'appeler la première majeure: la seconde, mineure: Et la troisième conclusion. Et quant c'est quelque argument ou les deux propositions sont comme confondues en une, ou qu'il n'y en a qu'une simplement, dequoy l'autre s'ensuit: On appelle la première partie antecedent: et la seconde, consequent.⁷⁷

The virtue of this style of debate, according to Bouju, was that 'on peut rapporter en trois lignes les nerfs et la force de toute une grande quantité de langage, qui cache ordinairement la vérité, et l'obscurcit' (pp.31-32).

It was the custom among Catholic controversialists to claim that Protestants were poorly-versed in logical argument. In 1602, Cayet, replying to du Moulin's request that the points made in a written conference be presented in syllogistic form, wrote scathingly of the abilities of Protestant ministers in this respect:

je puis dire que de tous tant qu'il y a de Ministres pretendus, il n'y en a pas trois qui aient jamais veu la Dialectique, sinon par les rhapsodies et abrezes, qu'aucuns d'entr'eux en ont compilez⁷⁸

(A few months later, however, in the course of their verbal debate, Cayet was forced to concede that du Moulin *was* well-versed in such matters.)⁷⁹ P. Pierre Coton, in a passage cited below, took a similar view.⁸⁰ His informal encounter with Gigord in 1608 contains passages which show that the syllogistic style of presenting arguments was so firmly established that it was often used quite naturally and without any prior agreement:

Coton: Croire au Fils de Dieu et faire la cene — une même chose? Gigord: . . .
Oui. Coton: Croire au fils de Dieu, selon vous, c'est faire la cene; or maintenant vous croyez au Fils de Dieu; — donc maintenant vous faites la cene.⁸¹

(It was Coton's mastery of this approach which, according to the Catholic version of events, gave him victory over his Protestant opponent in this encounter.) Pierre du Moulin, however, unlike the older generation of Protestant ministers, had gained an exceptionally thorough grounding in syllogistic debate during his years spent teaching logic at Leiden and was more than equal to his Catholic opponents in this respect.

The debate between Abra de Raconis and du Moulin in 1618 provides a good example of the manner in which syllogistic debate proceeded and part of the official record of their dispute has been reproduced in an appendix.⁸² This shows how the debate opened with the first of the propositions contained in Raconis's original challenge being presented in syllogistic form (ll.29–38). In reply to du Moulin's objections to the minor premiss of this argument and his requests for clarification, a second syllogism was formulated (ll.72–76). Du Moulin asked for further explanations regarding this second formulation and the morning's debate concluded with the recording of a third syllogism, incorporating all the amendments made by Raconis in the light of his opponent's objections (ll.109–119). Lines 28–163 of the appendix text thus represent the dictated record of an entire morning's discussion. The two participants had, however, agreed to allow additional explanations which were not recorded: 'afin que l'action ne fut point languissante, fut convenu qu'avant ou apres avoir dicté, on pourroit s'esclaircir en paroles, et amplifier ce qui seroit escrit'.⁸³ This combination of dictated and unrecorded statements seems to have been frequently adopted as the most satisfactory approach from the point of view of both audience and opponents: dictation was extremely boring for the former; the latter were usually eager to deploy their rhetorical skills in support of their case.

Nevertheless, during the second session, the debate still slowed down dramatically: as the number of points being discussed multiplied and as philosophical terminology and authoritative references from the Bible and other sources were brought into play, the length of the dictated statements increased. Only those

points relating to one of the three issues raised in Raconis's fourth syllogism have been reproduced in the appendix text but they still occupy far more space than the first morning's proceedings. The extract from the second day's proceedings thus illustrates the shortcomings of syllogistic debate in terms of presenting the participants' views clearly and persuasively to their listeners. All too often those present, despite their eagerness to attend, found the method of debate tedious and incomprehensible and the audience's assessment of the outcome was as likely to be based on a superficial impression of the participants' rhetorical skills or use of technical jargon than on the solidity of their arguments. Thus it was that Adair omitted discussions concerning the framing of syllogisms from his account of the du Moulin-Cayet conference and that Catherine de Bourbon gave the unintelligibility of syllogistic debate as her reason for calling a halt to a conference organised for her benefit.⁸⁴

Conference sessions normally lasted three to four hours and there was rarely any prior agreement on the number of meetings which the conference would comprise. For various reasons most of the conferences under consideration lasted for only one or two sessions but those between Coton and Chamier (1600) and du Moulin and Cayet (1602) each continued over a fortnight (for seven and eight sessions respectively). Conferences could therefore make substantial demands on the time of participants and listeners.

One other aspect of these formal disputes which needs to be mentioned was that, theoretically at least, each of the participants was to be allowed an equal opportunity to challenge the opinions of his opponent; the conditions envisaged an exchange of the roles of defender and attacker at a particular point in the proceedings. In two instances among these eight conferences the Protestant was allowed to take the initial offensive role which was generally viewed as the most favourable. In 1597 Tilenus does not seem to have been able to capitalise on this advantage but du Moulin, in his debate with Cayet, mounted an extremely effective attack on Catholic doctrine and Cayet's meek acceptance of the defensive role exasperated many Catholics present.⁸⁵ But since the vast majority of conferences were initiated by the Catholic protagonist, it is not surprising to find that they usually claimed the offensive role at the outset. This applied particularly to those surprise conferences where the Protestant was drawn unawares into a debate. Du

Moulin, however, was well able to counter-attack even when in the unfavourable defensive role: his conferences with Abra de Raconis and Gontéry both show his skill in continually linking criticisms of Catholic doctrine to his defence of the Protestant position. Incidents from the years 1602 and 1618 suggest that his opponents were extremely reluctant to allow him to take up the offensive role at the appointed time. Soon after his conference with Cayet, as his son recounts, du Moulin was challenged to another conference by the Sorbonne: 'They were to oppose three days upon what points they thought best: And Du Moulin was to oppose three days also, and choose what points he pleased'. On the evening of the third day, however, 'a man in a Priest's habit' attempted to force his way into du Moulin's study then made his escape before the minister could summon help. 'We suppose, upon probable ground', wrote du Moulin's son,

that the man was come to kill him before he presented himself to be Opponent, according to the Covenants of the Conference; which the Adversaries would by no means suffer him to be, as it appeared the next morrow; for when he went to the appointed place, he met with a prohibition from the King to continue that Conference any longer.⁸⁶

In 1618 du Moulin's conference with Abra de Raconis was also broken off when the Protestant was due to take up the attacking role. Du Moulin pointed out 'l'avantage que le Sieur de Raconis a eu en m'attaquant sur tel point de ma Religion qu'il a voulu. Et puis rompant quand mon tour est venu d'attaquer la sienne'. The breaking-off of the debate at this juncture tends to confirm du Moulin's claim that Abra de Raconis was responsible: 'Car aussi quelle apparence d'entrer en un combat auquel jamais personne de sa Religion n'a osé entrer, me laissant prendre la Religion Romaine par ou je voudrois'.⁸⁷

'La fin'

Kappler's remark that most conferences 's'achèvent normalement' is not borne out by the group of debates examined here: only du Perron's conference with Tilenus seems to have ended when each participant had had an equal opportunity to attack the views of his opponent; in all other instances the conference was broken off in some way or, in the case of informal encounters, did not proceed to the formal dispute in which both parties claimed to be ready to participate.⁸⁸ The 1600 Fontainebleau conference was abandoned after the first session when du Plessis-Mornay became too ill to continue; that between du Moulin and Abra de Raconis foundered following some alleged confusion regarding a change of venue. In this case as in du Moulin's debate with Gontéry and that between Gigord and Coton, attempts to negotiate further discussion failed. Most interestingly however, three of the eight conferences were broken off at least in part because of an alleged threat of sedition.

Chamier's conference with Coton at Nîmes in the autumn of 1600 had begun as an examination of alleged historical errors in Coton's book on the eucharist but in the course of the seven sessions had developed into a general debate on eucharistic doctrine. When du Fresne-Canaye, the president of the local *chambre de l'Edit*, arrived in the town and learned of the conference proceedings, he decided that the debate should be suspended immediately and told the two opponents that he believed this to be in accordance with the king's own views. His explanation, as related by Chamier, contains several interesting details concerning the king's attitude to conferences in general and to the Fontainebleau conference (at which du Fresne-Canaye had been one of the Protestant arbitrators) in particular:

il scavoit l'intention du Roi estre que les disputes touchant la doctrine de la Religion ne soyent point permises en son royaume: encore qu'il trouve bon, qu'on face paroistre ceux qu'en soustenant leur parti on pensera s'estre portés en mauvaise conscience; comme il avoit permis ce qui se passa à Fontainebleau entre les sieurs du Plessis et d'Evreux. Qu'il pensoit suivant cela, que si nous nous fussions contenus dans les termes de la matiere, pour laquelle nous nous estions assemblés, qui estoit l'accusation de faux en quelques allegations, il se fust peu faire, que ce qui estoit commence se fust achevé. Mais que nous estans jettés en des lieux communs de la doctrine débatue dès si long temps, sur laquelle, quoi que nous nous

portissions fort modestement, tant y a que les assistans se passionnoyent, de sorte qu'il en estoit à craindre quelque chose de pis: il ne pouvoit moins faire, en passant par le lieu, que de nous inhiber la continuation de ladite dispute, nous laissant toutesfois la liberté de recourir à S. M. qui pourroit y pourvoir, sur les requestes qui luy en seroyent présentées. Qu'autrement faisant, il craignoit d'en avoir des reproches de sadite Majesté.⁸⁹

The two opponents were therefore formally forbidden to continue the conference in order to 'pourvoir aux querelles, differents et desordres, qui naissent et pourroyent avoir accroissement a l'occasion de [cette] conference publicque entre maistre Pierre Coton, et Daniel Chamier'.⁹⁰

Two other conferences — at Paris in 1602 and at Caen in 1606 — were not terminated solely on the basis of the threat of sedition as at Nîmes but fears on this subject nevertheless featured strongly in decisions not to prolong the debates. In du Moulin's conference with Cayet, the latter's supporters claimed on a number of occasions that the debate was likely to lead to violence and finally took their complaints to the Paris Parlement:

du Moulin fut adverti que Messieurs les Docteurs de la faculté estoyent venus trouver en corps Messieurs les Advocats du Roi en la Cour de Parlement, et leur avoyent parlé de ceste Conference avec plainte, comme de chose pernicieuse et tendante a sedition.⁹¹

When du Moulin arrived for the next session at the usual meeting place, the owner, M. de Guerault, had already received an anonymous letter in which he was threatened with imprisonment if he allowed the conference to continue in his home. Since no other venue could be found and the two opponents failed to agree on conditions for continuing the debate in writing, the conference was therefore abandoned. In 1606 the conference between Basnage and Gontéry ended after only one session, chiefly because Gontéry had failed in his attempt to impose his method on his Protestant opponents but also because the ministers themselves and others present were concerned that the debate would displease the king and was likely to lead to disturbances. The baron de Courtomer warned the conference's president of

le danger qu'il y avoit que sa Majeste ne s'offençast de telles assemblees, qui ne pouvoient apporter que de la rumeur, et du tumulte, en un lieu public,

nottamment tel que celui auquel on estoit, ou il y avoit a craindre que toute la noblesse de l'un et de l'autre Religion, meue de curiosite (comme c'est l'ordinaire) ne se ramassast a la file, si seulement la dispute continuoit par deux ou trois seances.⁹²

The possibility of sedition was therefore a recurrent concern for those organising and taking part in theological conferences. The Protestants were particularly anxious to avoid being accused of inciting violence and often referred to the provisions contained in the royal edicts of pacification as a reason for not engaging in public disputes. (In later years Véron was to obtain letters patent from Louis XIII which allowed him to circumvent this particular argument.)

The outcome of these conferences is very difficult to assess since they rarely ended with a declaration of victory by the adjudicators or admission of defeat by one of the participants. One important measure of the success of a conference was, of course, whether it resulted in conversions (almost invariably, at this period, from Protestantism to Catholicism). The results of the 1608 and 1618 conferences in this respect are not recorded but some success is claimed in all the other encounters. Du Perron claimed that his debate with Tilenus resulted in the conversion of the two Protestant ladies concerned and seventeen other members of their households while the bishop's conference with du Plessis-Mornay was judged by Henri IV as likely to be extremely productive in terms of converts to Catholicism.⁹³ Coton's debate with Chamier which, like the Fontainebleau debate, was intended chiefly as a public test of scholarly integrity, allegedly resulted in thirty-five conversions.⁹⁴ In Gontéry's two conferences examined here the ladies in question abjured their Protestant faith soon afterwards but both Basnage and du Moulin were adamant that the women had already deserted the Protestant church and had promised to abjure beforehand.⁹⁵ Du Moulin's conference with Cayet ended with both sides claiming some success: Cayet and Maucouvent claimed that M. and Mme. Millet had become Catholics; Adair maintained that several conversions to Protestantism had been the result.⁹⁶

Public opinion did not always reflect the claimed result in terms of conversions: du Moulin's conference with Cayet was generally viewed as a victory for the Protestants and Chamier appears to have held his own at Nîmes. Striking similarities in

the Protestant versions of Gontéry's two debates tend to reinforce the impression that the Jesuit did not perform well in traditional scholastic debates, despite his claimed success in securing conversions.⁹⁷ The conference at Fontainebleau was generally regarded as a sweeping victory for du Perron and those of 1597 and 1608 also seem to have been Catholic successes. In assessing the outcome of these disputes, it has to be remembered that the Catholics enjoyed the advantage of easier access to publication and usually produced more pamphlets concerning each of these debates than their Protestant opponents. Adair's comment of 1602 that 'en ceste ville nos adversaires ont plus de trompettes que nous n'avons de soldats' was echoed by du Moulin in 1618: 'vous avez la multitude, les Imprimeurs, les cris par la ville de vostre costé', he told one of Abra de Raconis's supporters following their conference.⁹⁸ The Charenton minister was prepared to argue his case vigorously — 'si Monsieur de Raconis se met à publier chose contre la verité, j'ay une plume pour me defendre' — but nevertheless in this exchange as in many others the Catholic participant was to claim the final word.⁹⁹

Contemporary attitudes to conferences

Despite the fact that the capital was the scene of a large proportion of the most important debates for which some record survives, conferences were comparatively rare events and became major public attractions, drawing large crowds whenever a debate continued for a number of sessions. The 1602 conference between du Moulin and Cayet drew progressively larger attendances and, at the 1629 conference involving P. Alexandre Regourd and Jean Mestrezat, the number of those present, according to Isaac d'Huisseau, reached several thousands.¹⁰⁰ For this reason, as seen above, Protestant church leaders and the civil authorities viewed conferences with considerable caution.

There were however no regulations governing the involvement of the Catholic clergy in theological disputes comparable to those of 1601 which were added to the Protestant Church's 'Discipline'. There is evidence of P. Cayet seeking permission from his bishop and superiors at the university before challenging the city's Protestant ministers to debate but most of the other Catholic participants were senior clergymen or religious who do not seem to have needed to seek any authorisation before challenging Protestants to debate, and the prevailing attitude

among Catholic controversialists was that conferences were a very desirable field of activity in which to be involved.¹⁰¹

The Fontainebleau conference seems to have been the main reason for the interest shown in verbal disputes by Catholic theologians. Leading Protestants present at the conferences at Nîmes and Caen appear to have believed that the king was not favourable to theological conferences but the wide circulation achieved by the king's letter to d'Épernon, in which he gleefully reported a victory for Catholicism in the Fontainebleau debate and which was printed and sold throughout France reinforced the opposite view much more strongly.¹⁰² There is evidence, too, that many of the Catholic controversialists studied in Part 3 — du Perron, Coton and Gontéry (under Henri IV) and Arnoux, Véron and Abra de Raconis (under Louis XIII) — enjoyed considerable royal support for their endeavours in this field. It is not surprising therefore that conference involvement seems to have been regarded as a valuable means both of waging war against heresy and of acquiring a reputation.¹⁰³ Many of the polemicists just mentioned, in dedicating published works to Henri IV or Louis XIII, invoked the names of du Perron and Fontainebleau and offered their services to take part in a similar public dispute.

In France therefore the general attitude of the monarch and Catholic theologians towards conferences reveals some disparity with the official view of the Catholic Church whose Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith (in 1625) forbade public disputes with heretics 'parce que trop souvent, à cause de leur faconde ou de leur audace, ou encore des entrainements de l'auditoire, l'erreur a d'ordinaire l'avantage contre la vérité'.¹⁰⁴ The terms of this proscription (which was repeated in 1631, 1644, 1645 and 1662) are in marked contrast to the enthusiastic claims of success in conferences being made by Véron and others at this very period. It was to be several years before Véron himself reduced his involvement in public disputes and theological debates continued to take place throughout the period of the Edict of Nantes.¹⁰⁵

The attitudes of individual controversialists to the traditional conference method described in this section tend to reflect their own success and abilities in syllogistic debate.

On the Catholic side, P. Gontéry underlined the difficulties of this method which 'ne pouvoit donner aucune edification a un cavalier, lequel n'estudia jamais les subtilitez de la dialectique; et quand il auroit esté le plus sçavant du monde, quelle profanation seroit-ce de reduire le jugement de la religion et des volontez aux formes de la logique'.¹⁰⁶ P. Coton, on the other hand, was strongly in favour of verbal disputes as the following passage, addressed to Protestant theologians, makes clear

Vous autres ne redoutez rien tant que la dispute. La dispute est la pierre de touche qui fait paraitre votre bas or et le mauvais aloi de vos opinions. Le papier endure tout, la plume couche tout, la feuille porte tout; la lettre ne rougit pas; on batit, on demolit, on mue, sur une table, la plume a la main ce qu'on veut: on combat son adversaire, on dissimule les objections, on deguise les propositions; on renverse les conclusions; on gagne pays devant que la reponse vienne [...]

Au contraire, en la dispute de vive-voix on repartit sur le champ ... on vous contraint de demeurer pied-coi, ferme dans le pourpris de raison, de logique, de syllogisme ... La enfin, on parait tel qu'on est.¹⁰⁷

On the Protestant side, Lobéran de Montigny opposed the use of Aristotelian logic in theological debate which he described as an innovation belonging to the twelfth century. He claimed that there was no evidence in the New Testament or in the early church fathers of the use of syllogistic logic and cited the following remark by Tertullian:

Aristote (dit Tertullian, parlant des heretiques) leur dresse la Dialectique, artificieuse pour construire, et cauteleuse pour destruire, concise en ses sentences, fascheuse a elle-mesme, retractant toutes choses, a fin de paroistre n'avoir rien dit.¹⁰⁸

But du Moulin, as will be shown in Part 2, was emphatically in favour of this style of logical argument, and he took an equally positive view, at least in the early stages of his career, of the potential of theological conferences, as Adair, describing du Moulin's conference with Cayet in 1602, recounts:

en ceste conference, qui a duré 15. jours, les choses se sont passees avec une paix et douceur des assistans plus grande qu'on n'eust osé esperer: et a on recogneu par ceste espreuve, que ces entreveües servent plustost à

se familiariser et recognoistre, qu'à enaigrir les esprits. Et du Moulin m'a souvent dit que si par la permission du Magistrat un lieu estoit ottroyé pour conferer ordinairement et avec les seuretez requises, que ce seroit le moyen de mettre bas les aigreurs mutuelles, et faire recognoistre la verité: et de sa part il disoit qu'il le desireroit infiniment, encores que ceux de l'Eglise Romaine ayent pour eux le peuple, le Magistrat, le nombre de Docteurs, et la commodité de livres.¹⁰⁹

The established procedures of the scholastic dispute as seen in these 'disputes réglées' deserve to be described in some detail for they played an important part in shaping the arguments and methods of religious controversy more generally.

On the Protestant side, du Moulin's reputation as a controversialist was probably based on his skill in verbal disputes and his extensive experience in this sphere inevitably affected his choice and presentation of arguments in written debate also, whether against Catholic polemicists or fellow Protestants (during several internal controversies which arose in the French Reformed Church). The opposition which developed between du Moulin and some of the later generation of pastors at Charenton (most notably Jean Daillé) was in large measure a consequence of this. The contrast frequently drawn by recent commentators between du Moulin — the doctrinaire Calvinist scholastic theologian — and those ministers associated with Saumur — more scholarly, liberal and historically-based in their approach — was to a significant degree a contrast resulting from du Moulin's many years of active involvement in controversy with Catholic polemicists. In the middle years of the century most of the younger Protestant ministers at Paris were not subject to the same pressures and had not been forced to develop a comparable commitment to religious debate at a popular level.

On the Catholic side, the traditional conference method was to be challenged by Gontéry, Véron and others who deplored the egalitarian aspect of these disputes and also the way in which logical argument was used to resolve religious issues. Their new method will be described in later chapters. Here, it is sufficient to note that the 'méthodistes' abandoned any pretence at allowing Protestant opponents an equal opportunity to present their case; the Protestant was always cast in the defensive role and discussion of Catholic doctrine was to be avoided

wherever possible. Furthermore, Gontéry and his disciples maintained that logic was so complex that it was inappropriate for dealing with religious questions; the process of logical argument was therefore restricted to simply demonstrating that the articles of the Protestants' confession of faith were not scripturally-based in the most extreme and literal sense of the term. Catholic attempts to impose this method on their opponents on a large scale in the years 1617–1624 eventually resulted in a refusal on the part of the Protestants to engage in verbal disputes and the consequent evolution in Protestant writing on controversial issues mentioned above. Thus it was that important developments in religious debate in general were closely linked to the fate of the traditional scholastic style of conference.

* * *

The number of books and pamphlets generated by conferences during the years 1598–1621 was quite significant and these publications along with conversion accounts have been presented by Desgraves in his *Répertoire* as the two categories of religious debate which, when added to those debates conducted solely in print, make up the totality of printed religious controversy.¹¹⁰ In this chapter a more detailed picture has been given of the way in which the various methods of communicating and exchanging religious ideas and opinions — formal and informal, verbal and written — contributed to the range of religious controversy in print.

The published works which resulted tended to be small books aimed at a popular readership and of only ephemeral interest, rarely running to a second edition, but they were nevertheless widely read and regarded by many as an important influence on public opinion. Their place in the development of religious debate has often been neglected by those scholars attempting to provide broad surveys of the period and thus concentrating on the major works of the main controversialists. Their importance is derived not merely from the sheer quantity of such pamphlets, although the continual appearance of these minor contributions to debate undoubtedly sustained public interest in the religious issues involved, but also from the fact that such works provided the opportunity for major controversialists like du Perron, Coton, Gontéry, and du Moulin to test and develop arguments which they would later present in works of a more comprehensive and substantial

Forms of religious debate

nature which are generally regarded by commentators as more characteristic of the period.

Notes to Chapter 3

1. Cited by Pannier, *L'Eglise ... sous Henri IV*, p.537.
2. See above, Chapter 2, p.71.
3. Urbain, pp.153, 159.
4. Raconis, *Le Triomphe de la verité*, pp.11–12. Raconis's account of the conference was entitled *Les actes de la conference du sieur de Raconis professeur en Theologie. Et du sieur du Moulin Ministre de Charenton, en la maison dudict Sieur du Moulin. Signez de part et d'autre* (Paris, 1618), REP 2114 and du Moulin's account, *Veritable narré de la conference entre les sieurs du Moulin et de Raconis professeur en Theologie. Et de la forme de la rupture* (La Rochelle, 1618), REP 2188–89.
5. Du Perron, *Réfutation de l'ecrit de Maistre Daniel Tilenus contre le discours de Monsieur l'evesque d'Evreux, touchant les traditions apostoliques* (Evreux, 1601), REP 306, f.a.iii.recto.
6. Du Moulin, *Anatomie du livre du sieur Coeffeteau intitulé Réfutation des faussetés contenues en la deuxième édition de l'Apologie de la Cène du Ministre du Moulin* (Sedan and Geneva, 1610), REP 1108–09.
7. Cited by Soman, p.448. See, for example, L'Estoile, III, 63 (September 1587) and 118 (18 January 1588). Greengrass notes that Lent and Advent were seasons when civil disturbances were anticipated 'partly because they were traditionally times of great Catholic preaching' (p.4).
8. Article 17. Mousnier, *L'Assassinat*, p.300.
9. Soman, p.449.
10. Soman, p.449.
11. See above, Chapter 1, p.28 and Chapter 2, p.70.
12. See above, Chapter 1, pp.42, 44.
13. Du Perron, 'Commencement du premier sermon faict à saint Mederic', in *Les diverses œuvres de l'Illustrissime Cardinal du Perron...* (Paris, 1622) pp.709–13; Gontéry, 'Copie du sermon du jésuite Gontier faict à Saint-Gervais, collationnée sur l'original tombé de sa poche chez M. de Roquelaure' in Mousnier, *L'Assassinat*, pp.343–46.
14. Peter Bayley, *French Pulpit Oratory, 1598–1650: a study in themes and styles, with a descriptive catalogue of printed texts* (Cambridge, 1980).
15. Peter du Moulin, f.***4 recto.
16. Gontéry, *La Vraye procedure pour terminer le différent en matiere de religion*

- extraict des sermons faits à Caen par le R. P. Gontery de la Compagnie de Jesus* (Caen, 1606), REP 709; Abra de Raconis, *Response a l'epistre des quatre ministres de Charenton*; Arnoux, *La Confession de foy ...* (see above, Chapter 1, n.147, for full title); Coton, *Sermons sur les principales matieres de la foy faicts par le R. P. Pierre Coton ... reduicts par luy mesme en forme de meditations* (Paris, 1617), REP 1993.
17. L'Estoile, IX, 305–6 (24 July 1609); X, 71–72 (5 November 1609); X, 141–143 (12 February 1610).
 18. L'Estoile, X, 108–9 (11 January 1610).
 19. L'Estoile, XI, 141 (12 September 1611).
 20. Du Perron, *Lettre ... envoyée au sieur Casaubon en Angleterre* (Paris, 1611), REP 1256; (Paris, 1612), REP 1387–95; Casaubon, *Responce du Sieur Casaubon à la Lettre de l'Illustrissime Cardinal Du Perron* (n.p., 1612), REP 1363; three Latin editions, REP 1364–66.
 21. See below, Chapter 4, pp.226–27 and n.143.
 22. *Discours envoyé à Monseigneur l'Illustriss. Cardinal de Sourdis, archevesque de Bourdeaux et primat d'Aquitaine, contenant succinctement et au vray le narré de la conférence commencée à Nîmes, dans la maison du Roy le 26. septembre, et finie par ordonnance de la Cour le 3. d'octobre, mil six cens, entre le R. Pere Coton de la Compagnie de Jésus et M. Chamier Ministre* (Avignon, 1600), REP 190 (reproduced in full by Prat, 5, 96–140); *Pourparlé entre le R. P. Coton, predicateur du Roy, de la Compagnie de Jésus, et le Sieur Gigord, ministre de la religion pretendue reformée à Montpellier. Declaré par une lettre missive du sieur d'Angenoud, seigneur d'Araans* (Lyon, 1608), REP 863.
 23. Cayet, *Copie d'une lettre de maistre Victor-Palma Cayet, contenant les causes et les raisons de sa conversion a l'eglise catholique* (Paris, 1595); Anne de Fromentieres, baronne de Courville, *Lettre de Madame la baronne de Courville, escrite a Madame de Montigny sa mere, sur le sujet de sa conversion. Où est fidelement rapporté ce qui se passa, tant au logis de Monsieur du Moulin, qu'en sa maison, entre Monsieur de Raconis bachelier et professeur en theologie, et Monsieur de la Miltière advocat en Parlement, au refus, et sur la fuite du Sieur du Moulin* (Paris, 1617), REP 1994.
 24. Gontéry, *Copie d'une lettre escrite au Roy, par le R. P. Gonthery de la Compagnie de Jesus, sur la Conversion d'une dame de la religion pretendue reformee a la foy catholique. En ceste lettre se voit la veritable relation d'une Conference qu'a eu le dict R. P. avec le sieur du Moulin Ministre, auquel on a faict quitter la sainte Escriture de la traduction mesme de Geneve. De ce mesme escrit on peut descouvrir l'imposture et la calomnie d'un libelle diffamatoire sans Auteur sous le tiltre pretendu d'un veritable Narré* (Paris, 1609),

- REP 994; Coton, *Lettre declaratoire de la doctrine des Peres Jesuites* (for full title, see above, Chapter 1, n.104); Montigny et al, *Defense de la confession des Eglises reformees de France, contre les accusations du Sieur Arnould Jesuite, deduites en un sermon fait en la presence du Roy a Fontaine-Bleau, par lesquelles il soutient que les passages cottes en la marge de nostre Confession sont faux et inutiles* (Charenton, 1617), REP 2010–13.
25. Du Moulin, *Lettre a Messieurs de l'Eglise romaine...* (Saumur, 1618), REP 2186.
 26. Antoine de Maucouvent and Pierre-Victor Palma Cayet, *Le Sommaire veritable des questions proposees en la conference advenue entre le Dr Cayet et un Ministre dit Du Moulin, avec la Responce dudit Dr Cayer a l'escrit plein de calomnie que ledit pretendu ministre dit Du Moulin a fait publier* (Paris, 1602), REP 384, 429.
 27. Abra de Raconis, *Les Actes de la conference du sieur de Raconis* (for full title, see above, n.4).
 28. Bouju, *Destruction des faux arguments et sophismes du sieur de Montigny, premier ministre de la pretendue Eglise reformee de Paris. Par lesquels il veut prouver sa confession de foy du sacrament de l'Eucharistie, defendre les contradictions, dont elle se destruit elle-mesme, et reprouver la croyance des Catholiques. Plus les lettres de refus du sieur du Moulin second Ministre, n'osant venir a la conference, selon lesquelles, ou il est convaincu en sa confession de foy, ou il la renonce ... Le tout suyvant les escrits signez d'une part et d'autre* (Paris, 1603) REP 476; du Moulin, *Cartel de deffy du sieur de Bouju, surnommé de Beaulieu, envoyé au sieur Du Moulin. Avec les responses et repliques de part et d'autre. Sur le point de la Cene, et des Marques de la vraie Eglise* (Paris, 1603), REP 475.
 29. *Lettres du Pere Gontery Jesuite a Monsieur le Conte gouverneur de Sedan. Avec les responses* (Sedan, 1613), REP 1520; Gontéry, *La Response du P. J. Gontery ... a la demande d'un gentilhomme de la religion pretendue reformee, touchant l'usage des images, avec une coppie de la lettre que le roy a envoyee au dit P. Gontery, afin de continuer ses predications en sa ville de Dieppe* (Lyon, 1608), REP 884.
 30. Pattison, pp.154–55. See L'Estoile's account of his visits to Suarez and Casaubon following the former's sermon on purgatory in April 1603 (VIII, 68–71).
 31. See above, Chapter 1, pp.16–17 and n.48.
 32. *Discours recueilly par le sieur de Beaulieu des propos que M. l'evesque d'Evreux tint a M. De Sancy sur l'autorite et necessite des traditions apostoliques* (Evreux, 1601), REP 307.

33. Pattison, pp.176, 188–91, 214–15. Isaac Casaubon was told of his son's abjuration on 14 August 1610.
34. *Simple et Veritable Discours de ce qui s'est passé en la Conference encomencee à Caen, entre le Jesuite Gonteri, accompagné d'un Docteur Jacobin et les Ministres de Caen, et de Sainte-Mere Eglise* (n.p., 1606), REP 690; du Moulin, *Veritable narré de la conference entre les Sieurs Du Moulin et Gontier, seconde par Madame la Baronne de Salignac. Le samedy onziesme d'avril 1609.* (n.p., 1609), REP 978. All quotations are from the Geneva 1625 edition, REP 3333. See du Moulin, *Response ... aux lettres du P. Gontier* (1625 ed), p.29: 'Quant aux deffis, et menaces duu sieur Gontier, toutes et quantesfois qu'on a voulu entrer en lice sous conditions justes, et egales nous n'avons jamais reculé. Mais ces gens veulent une surprise en un coin pour publier puis apres le contraire, sur tout quand ils ont en main quelque personne ja subvertie, et qui avant le combat a promis de se rendre.'
35. Carew, p.481.
36. Pannier, *L'Eglise ... sous Henri IV*, p.518.
37. *Lettres de Madame la baronne de Courville*, pp.10–11. For full title, see above, n.23.
38. For full title, see above, Chapter 1, n.77 ; Prat, 2, 644.
39. *Oppositions de la parole de Dieu avec la doctrine de l'Eglise Romaine. Plus les matieres tenues en icelle Eglise Romaine que l'on cache à ceux qu'on y veur attirer* (n.p., 1609), REP 1024; (Sedan, 1624) REP 3218; *Nouvelles Briques pour le Bastiment de Babel, c'est-a-dire erreurs de l'Eglise romaine, nouvellement forgez pour establir la grandeur de l'Eglise de Rome. Dediez a M. Bouju, sieur de Beaulieu, se vantant d'avoir pour soi le consentement universel de l'antiquite ...* (La Rochelle, 1604), REP 579.
40. Peter du Moulin, f.**** verso.
41. L'Estoile, X, 16–17 (September 1609); du Moulin, 'Autobiographie', pp.467–68; 'Note écrite de la main de S. François de Sales au sujet de la dispute qu'il avoit eue avec le fameux ministre Dumoulin sur l'Eucharistie', in *Nouvelles lettres inédites de S. François de Sales*, 2 vols (Paris, 1835), 2, 373 (cited by Pannier, *L'Eglise ... sous Louis XIII (1610–21)*, p.429).
42. Du Moulin, *Veritable narré de la conference entre les Sieurs Du Moulin et Gontier*, pp.3–4.
43. Volume 2 contains a 'répertoire analytique et chronologique' outlining the proceedings of over two hundred conferences and giving full bibliographical details of published works resulting from or referring to each conference; volume one provides an 'étude circonstancielle, thématique et méthodologique' based on the conferences individually analysed in volume two. The statistical analyses

in Chapters 3 and 4 are particularly revealing with regard to the subject of the present study.

44. Kappler, 1, 99.
45. Kappler, 1, 104–5. Paris was the scene for 36 conferences but those three which were held at Fontainebleau might reasonably be added to this total since the palace there was essentially an extension of the court's life in the capital.
46. Kappler, 1, 131. Chamier took part in eight conferences; Mestrezat in six. For Mestrezat, see below, Epilogue, Section 2.
47. Kappler, 1, 132–33.
48. Francois Véron was involved in sixteen recorded conferences; Gontéry and Regourd in seven; Coton in four.

Alexandre Regourd (1585–1635) took part in conferences with Chamier in 1618 and Mestrezat in 1629 (see below, Epilogue, pp.373–75. (Source: DTC, 13, 2125–26.)
49. Kappler, 131–34. Du Perron participated in six conferences between 1593 and 1607. Members of the secular clergy were involved in only twenty-six encounters in total.
50. Kappler, 1, 5.
51. Among the Parisian debates and discussions in the period 1598–1621 to which reference is made in contemporary documents, the following would meet Kappler's criteria: (i) in 1602 François de Sales spent some time in Paris, and, according to his biographer, 's'aperçut à ses dépens qu'il ignorait les méthodes nouvelles de la controverse. Un jour il resta court dans une discussion avec un hérétique. Lui-même en fait l'aveu,' (Strowski, *S. François de Sales* (Paris, 1898), p.131 (cited by Pannier, *L'Eglise ... sous Henri IV*, p.295); (ii) in late 1606 or early 1607 du Moulin was involved in a debate with P. Gontéry which resulted in du Moulin's *Apologie pour la sainte Cène*; (iii) in 1607 he took part in a conference with an un-named Jesuit which led to the conversion of Dr. Monginot from the Catholic to the Protestant faith (Peter du Moulin, f.****2 recto); (iv) since Kappler also includes a number of conferences involving laymen such as du Plessis-Mornay and Agrippa d'Aubigné, Isaac Casaubon's numerous discussions with du Perron and later with various Jesuit controversialists (which are all described in the Protestant scholar's diaries) might also be added to this list.
52. The following titles are generally the earliest publications resulting from each conference and those containing the most detailed accounts of the proceedings. Kappler provides more comprehensive bibliographies of works relating to individual conferences, including subsequent editions and the locations of surviving copies; his bibliography of the Fontainebleau conference of 1600 is

particularly extensive.

- a) Du Perron v. Tilenus (Paris, April 1597) (Kappler 2, 8–10): Daniel Tilenus, *Traicte du Sieur du Perron, Evesque d'Evreux, De l'Insuffisance de l'Ecriture Saincte et de la Necessite et Authorite des Traditions non ecrites* (La Rochelle, 1598), REP 25; also, *Response a un traicte du sieur du Perron, Evesque d'Evreux, Touchant l'Insuffisance et imperfection de l'Ecriture Saincte et la Necessite et Authorite des Traditions non ecrites* (La Rochelle, 1598), REP 58; Jacques Davy du Perron, *Refutation de l'ecrit de Maistre Daniel Tilenus* (for full title, see above, n.5); du Perron's own version of his discussions with Sancy is included as Part 2 of this work under the title, 'Discours recueillis par le sieur de Beaulieu des propos que Monsieur l'Evesque d'Evreux tint a Monsieur de Sancy, sur l'autorite et necessite des Traditions apostoliques'.
- b) Du Perron v. du Plessis-Mornay (Fontainebleau, 4 May 1600) (Kappler, 2, 25–39): Jacques Davy du Perron, *Response de Monsieur L'Evesque d'Evreux a la sommation du Sieur du Plessis. Avec une lettre escrete au roy par ledict Sieur Evesque* (Evreux, 1600), REP 206; Philippe du Plessis-Mornay, *Discours veritable de la Conference tenue a Fontainebleau, le quatrieme May 1600. Entre le sieur du Plessis et l'Evesque d'Evreux* (Montpellier, 1600), REP 233; du Perron, *Actes de la conference tenue entre le Sieur Evesque d'Evreux et le Sieur du Plessis, en presence du roy a Fontaine-Bleau le 4. de May 1600. . . Avec La Refutation du faux discours de la mesme Conference* (Evreux, 1601) REP 304; du Plessis-Mornay, *Response au livre publie par le Sieur Evesque d'Evreux sur la conference tenue a Fontaine-Bleau le quatreisme de May, 1600 . . . En laquelle sont incidemment traictees les principales matieres controverses en ce temps* (Saumur, 1602), REP 333.
- c) Coton v. Chamier (Nîmes, September 1600) (Kappler, 2, 43–48): Demezat, *Discours envoye a l'illustrissime Cardinal de Sourdis . . . contenant succinctement et au vray le narre de la conference commencee a Nimes. . .* (for full title, see above, n.22.); Daniel Chamier, *Les Actes de la conference tenue a Nismes, entre Daniel Chamier, Ministre du Sainct Evangile, Pasteur de l'Eglise du Montelimar et Pierre Coton Jesuite, predicateur audit Nismes. Publiez maintenant par ledit Chamier, pour faire voir les faussetez de ceux que Coton a fait imprimer a Lyon par Estienne Tantillon, sous le nom de P. Demezat* (Geneva, 1601), REP 268.
- d) Cayet v. du Moulin (Paris, May–June 1602) (Kappler, 2, 52–56): Archibald Adair, *Narré de la Conference verbale et par escrit, tenue entre Monsieur du Moulin et Monsieur Cayet* (n.p., 1602) REP 371; Antoine de Maucouvent and Pierre Cayet, *Le Sommaire veritable* (for full title, see above, n.26).

- e) Gontéry v. Basnage (Caen, March 1606) (Kappler, 2, 64–68): *Simple et veritable discours de ce qui s'est passe en la conference encommencee a Caen* (for full title, see above, n.34); two pamphlets attributed to Gontéry by the author of the foregoing Protestant account — ‘ces deux libelles que le Jesuite a publiés à deux diverses fois, sur les actes de cette conference’ (p.5) — have not survived, but the following Catholic account in a more satirical vein is in existence: *Dialogue de quelques ministres de Normandie, ou le Pronostic (compose par le Sieur Almanach dit de Billy* (n.p., 1606), REP 687.
 - f) Coton v. Gigord (Fontainebleau, June 1608) (Kappler, 2, 85–89): Nicolas D’Angenoust, seigneur d’Arans, *Pourparle entre le R. Pere Coton ... et le S. Gigord* (for full title, see above, n.22); Gigord, *Pourparler entre Jean Gigord, Ministre de la Parole de Dieu en l’Eglise reformee de Montpellier et Pierre Coton, de la compagnie de ceux qui se disent Jesuites* (Montpellier, 1608), REP 882 (but according to L’Estoile, actually by Le Bret at Paris, see above, Chapter 2, p.65.
 - g) Gontéry v. du Moulin (Paris, April 1609) (Kappler, 2, 93–98): du Moulin, *Veritable narre de la conference entre les Sieurs Du Moulin et Gontier* (for full title, see above, n.34; Gontéry, *Coppie... d’une lettre escrite au Roy* (for full title, see above, n.24); du Moulin, *Reponse ... aux lettres du Sieur Gontier* (for full title, see above, Chapter 2, n.10).
 - h) Abra de Raconis v. du Moulin (Paris, January 1618) (Kappler, 2, 164–69): Abra de Raconis, *Les Actes de la Conference du Sieur de Raconis ... et du Sieur du Moulin* (for full title, see above, n.4; du Moulin, *Veritable narre de la Conference entre les Sieurs Du Moulin, et de Raconis* (for full title, see above, n.4); Abra de Raconis, *Le Triomphe de la Verité* (for full title, see above, Chapter 2, n.87).
- 53. See below, Chapter 6, Section 2 and Epilogue, Section 1.
 - 54. Timothée Duchat, *Recit veritable de la conference entre les sieurs Duchat Ministre de la Parole de Dieu, et Veron Jesuite. Contre les faussetez de la Conference pretendue entre les susdits, que ledit Sieur Veron a nouvellement mis au jour à son avantage* (Charenton, 1619), REP 2368, p.14.
 - 55. Abra de Raconis, *Le Triomphe de la Verité*, p.19.
 - 56. Du Perron’s 1597 conference was organised for the benefit of two Protestant ladies; du Moulin’s 1602 conference with Cayet was for Madame Millet — ‘une honneste Dame, flotant entre les deux religions’ (Adair, p.7); and that between Gontéry and Basnage in 1606 for Madame de S. Pierre, a Protestant lady who ‘vacilloit en sa creance’ (*Simple et veritable discours de ce qui s’est passe en la conference encommencee a Caen*, p.30). Du Moulin’s debate with Gontéry allegedly led to the conversion of madame de Mazencourt while his

conference with Abra de Raconis was organised for a Protestant gentleman. Kappler notes that conferences were organised equally often for named men as for women (who provide most of the examples cited here) (1, 29 and n.4). Conversions from Catholicism to Protestantism as a result of a conference — as in the case of Dr. Monginot above — were very rare at this date.

57. Abra de Raconis, *Lettre amiable envoyee par le sieur de Raconis, au sieur du Moulin, sur le refus par escrit qu'il a fait des justes et honnestes offres à luy proposées par ledict sieur de Raconis, afin d'entrer en une nouvelle conference particuliere* (Paris, 1618), REP 2117, p.6.
58. Kappler, 1, 29.
59. Isaac d'Huisseau, *La Discipline des Eglise Reformées* (Geneva, 1666), p.122 (cited by Kappler, 1, 19–20).
60. Du Perron, *Articles des Ministres et autres appelez par Madame pour la Conference proposée entre eux et Monsieur l'Evesque d'Evreux. Avec les Réponses et Repliques des uns et des autres* (Paris, 1601), REP 305. The ministers involved were Tilenus, du Moulin, F. Gordon and de Beaulieu.
61. The judgement terminating the conference at Nîmes in 1600 which forbade the two opponents to continue their conference 'en public, ni en particulier avec assemblée' confirms that even private disputes were rarely without witnesses (Chamier, *Les Actes de la conference tenue à Nismes*, pp.215–16).
62. Kappler, 2, 154–55.
63. Adair, p.5 (for title, see above, n.52, conference (d)).
64. Chamier's conference with Coton was held 'au logis du roy, nommé la Thrésorerie, qui avoit esté baillé par Messieurs les Consuls audit sieur Cardinal [the Cardinal de Sourdis]' (Chamier, *Les Actes de la conference tenue à Nismes*, p.16). Du Moulin's 1602 conference with Cayet was held in 'une chambre proche de l'hostel de Madame' (Adair, p.7) which, as it later appears, belonged to a 'Monsieur Guerault valet de chambre de la feue Royne mere du roy deffunct' (p.156). His 1609 encounter with Gontéry took place in the home of Monsieur de Liembrune in the 'rue des Marets' (du Moulin, *Veritable narré de la conference entre les sieurs Du Moulin et Gontier* (1625 ed) p.3).
65. Maucouvent, p.29 (for title, see above, n.52, conference (d)).
66. Du Perron, *Refutation de l'ecrit de Maistre Daniel Tilenus*, f.a.ii.verso.
67. Abra de Raconis, *Les Actes de la Conference du Sieur de Raconis ... et du Sieur du Moulin*, pp.39, 43; du Moulin, *Veritable Narré de la Conference entre les Sieurs Du Moulin et de Raconis*, (for full title, see above, n.52) (1631 ed), p.72: 'Qui croira que je suis si perclus de sens que de m'offrir à aller disputer en un College parmi de petits escholiers avec risée et avec peril?'

68. In 1602, for example, du Moulin and Cayet debated before 'bon nombre de personnes de qualité de l'une et de l'autre religion, tellement que la chambre ne pouvoit contenir la foule' (Adair, p.8). The meeting between Basnage and Gontéry took place before 'cinquante ou soixante personnes de qualité' (*Simple et veritable discours de ce qui s'est passé en la conference encommencee à Caen*, p.33).
69. Maucouvent, p.29; Adair, p.9. Chamier's request to be allowed to pray publicly at the Nîmes conference was refused ; it was finally agreed that 'chacun feroit sa prière à par soy et secrettement' (Chamier, *Les Actes de la Conference tenue à Nîmes*, p.17).
70. *Simple et veritable discours de ce qui s'est passé en la conference encommencee à Caen*, pp.10–11.
71. Kappler, 1, 39–44.
72. See above, p.108. Chamier, for example, presented his account of the Nîmes conference as transcribed 'mot à mot, selon qu'il est dans l'original' but 'y entrelassant toutesfois plusieurs particularitez des faits qui se passerent, ou a l'entree, ou a la sortie de chacune seance' (*Les Actes de la Conference tenue à Nîmes*, p.19). Where no official record was made, participants' accounts were even less likely to faithfully record the arguments: du Moulin commented of Gontéry's description of their 1609 meeting that the Jesuit had 'reduit la conference a une douzaine de lignes' (*Veritable narré de la conference entre les sieurs Du Moulin et Gontier* (1625 ed), p.24). (For full title, see above, n.52.)
73. The three subjects chosen by Cayet for discussion were 'le Sacrifice de la Messe, de l'Adoration du Pape, et de la veneration des saints Images' (Adair, p.9). The doctrine of the real presence of Christ in the eucharist was the main subject of debate in Coton and Gigord's meeting and also figured, with the two issues of the vocation of Protestant ministers and the Mass as sacrifice in the 1609 encounter between Gontéry and du Moulin. The four statements on which Abra de Raconis wished to challenge du Moulin were: 'I. Que la Religion Pretendue n'a point de reigle asseuree. II. La Cene des Pretendus reformes ne peut se montrer dans l'Ecriture. III. Le Dieu de Calvin est auteur du peche. IIII. La religion de Calvin, qui se dit reformee n'est point religion mais atheisme.' (du Moulin, *Veritable narré de la conference tenue entre les sieurs du Moulin et de Raconis* [1631 ed.] p.53.
74. *Simple et veritable discours de ce qui s'est passé en la conference encommencee à Caen*, p.12.
75. Kappler, 1, 149.
76. Alfred Rébelliau, *Bossuet, historien du protestantisme. Etude sur l'"Histoire des Variations" et sur la controverse au dix-septieme siècle*, third edition (Paris, 1909), pp.4–7. 'Pendant le premier quart du dix-septième siècle, la

controverse garde le même caractère encyclopédique, et c'est toujours sur tous les points de la religion qu'elle se disperse' (p.7).

77. Théophraste Bouju, *Destruction des faux arguments et sophismes du sieur du Montigny*, p.32 (for full title, see above, n.28).
78. Cayet, *La Conference des ministres accordée, et puis refusée par eux*, p.78.
79. Adair, pp.140–41.
80. See below, p.122.
81. Fouqueray, 3, 64.
82. See below, pp.393–402.
83. Du Moulin, *Veritable narré de la conference tenue entre les sieurs du Moulin et de Raconis* [1631 ed.] pp.54–55.
84. Cayet, *Chronologie septenaire*, p.45.
85. Maucouvent, p.43.
86. Peter du Moulin, f.***3 recto-verso.
87. Du Moulin, *Veritable Narré de la Conference entre les Sieurs Du Moulin et de Raconis*, p.87.
88. Kappler writes: 'La plupart du temps les conférences s'achèvent normalement, le sujet étant épuisé, ou parce que tout le monde, disputants et assistants, estime en avoir assez dit et entendu, parfois aussi sur décision du président ou des modérateurs' (1, 58).
89. Chamier, *Les Actes de la Conference tenue à Nismes*, p.178.
90. Chamier, *Les Actes de la Conference tenue à Nismes*, pp.215–16.
91. Adair, p.155.
92. *Simple et veritable discours de ce qui s'est passé en la conference encommencee à Caen*, p.32.
93. Du Perron, *Refutation de l'ecrit de Maistre Daniel Tilenus*, f.a.iii.recto; for the king's letter to the duc d'Epéron, see above, Chapter 1, page 16.
94. Fouqueray, 3, 584.
95. *Simple et veritable discours de ce qui s'est passé en la conference encommencee à Caen*, pp.30–31; du Moulin, *Response ... aux lettres du Sieur Gontery*, p.21.
96. Cayet, *La Victoire de la Verité, contre l'heresie par la refutation de toutes ses erreurs* (Paris, 1603), REP 489, fourth page; Adair, pp.158–59.
97. The similarities between the two Protestant accounts of Gontéry's behaviour

include (i) the fact that the two Protestant ministers were tricked into taking part in a debate with Gontéry — Basnage was invited to discuss religious questions with Mademoiselle de S. Pierre 'mais il n'y fut pas si tost entré, qu'on en fist advertir le Jesuite qui s'y coula tout incontinent, par une porte de derriere' (pp.7-8); (ii) on both occasions Gontéry arrived equipped with large quantities of books but did not seem to be familiar with their contents: he was suspected of weaknesses in Greek and Hebrew at Caen, at Paris he was unable to find a crucial Bible text; (iii) in both conferences he gradually lapsed into silence, leaving Madame de S. Pierre or Madame de Salignac to continue the debate; (iv) in both cases the conferences were followed by conversions to Catholicism which the opponents claimed had been agreed beforehand, the ladies concerned having in any case ceased to be practising Protestants; (v) finally, both Protestant accounts cite Catholic witnesses and public opinion generally as confirmation of their descriptions of his poor performances.

98. Adair, p.4.
99. Du Moulin, *Veritable narré de la Conference entre les Sieurs Du Moulin et de Raconis*, p.87.
100. Pannier, *L'Eglise ... sous Louis XIII (1621-29)*, 1, 540. See below, Epilogue, pp.373-75.
101. Cayet, *La Conference des ministres accordée, et puis refusée par eux*, pp.75-76: 'A ceste occasion le Docteur Cayer apres en avoir comuniqué aux chefs de la faculté: Et encores aux Prelats plus superieurs, pour ne rien faire sans congé: Et d'abondant avoir adverty Monseigneur le Reverendissime Evesque d'Evreux, afin qu'advenant au point du beson, il le representast à sa Majesté pour obviar à tout inconvenient.' His eventual participation in a conference with du Moulin in 1602 was not, according to Cayet, similarly authorised and this was his reason for refusing to sign the official record of the proceedings.
102. Du Plessis-Mornay, *Discours veritable de la Conference tenue à Fontainebleau* (for full title, see above, n.52, conference (b)), p.63: the king's letter had been 'imprimée et publiée, par tout, leuë és Prosnes; distribuée par toutes les Paroisses de ce Royaume'.
103. See, for example, Cardinal de Retz, *Mémoires* in *Œuvres* edited by Marie-Thérèse Hipp and Michel Pernot, Bibliothèque de la Pléiade (Paris, 1984), p.159.
104. DTC, 'La Controverse', 3, 1694-1748 (1734-35).
105. Kappler, 1, 92-97, lists conferences throughout the next sixty years. One of the most renowned of the later conferences was that between Claude and Bossuet in 1678 at Paris.
106. Gontéry, *Les consequences ausquelles a esté reduite la religion pretendue Re-*

formée après avoir recogneu qu'elle n'avoit aucun fondement en la sainte Es-criture, voire apres y avoir renoncé. Deduites par le Reverend Pere Gonteri, de la Compagnie de Jésus. Sur la Conference permise par le roy, entre ledit Pere et les Ministres de Dieppe, en faveur de Monsieur de Saint Cere (Rouen, 1609), REP 992, p.17.

107. Coton, *Apologétique quatriesme* (Avignon, 1600), p.465 (cited by Kappler, 1, 64).
108. Bouju, *Destruction des faux argumens*, pp.399–401.
109. Adair, p.91.
110. Desgraves, *Répertoire*, pp.I–III.

PART II

CHAPTER 4

Pierre du Moulin, Protestant controversialist (1568–1658)

4.1 Education and travels (1568–1598)

In common with so many French Protestants of his generation, du Moulin's early years were over-shadowed by the wars of religion. Born in October 1568, the third child of Joachim du Moulin, a Protestant minister serving in the Soissons area, Pierre du Moulin's birthplace was Buhi in Normandy where his family had finally found refuge at the home of the elder brother of Philippe du Plessis-Mornay after being forced to leave their home at the outbreak of the third religious war in the early autumn of that year.¹ From Buhi the family made their way to Sedan, an independent Protestant principality on the northern border of France, where many other members of the French Reformed Church were to seek refuge during the next twenty-five years.² In 1570, following the peace of S. Germain, Joachim du Moulin returned to his work at Soissons and was later joined by his family but within two years the violent aftermath of the St Bartholomew's Day Massacre forced them to take flight once again. The children, separated from their parents, and concealed by a Catholic woman, narrowly escaped death at the hands of the *massacreurs*. Pierre's father, with his wife and daughter, made the long journey once more to Sedan; his three small sons were brought there in early January 1573. 'Peu après nostre arrivée', wrote Pierre in his autobiography, 'ma mère, rompue de tant de courses et afflictions, mourut à Sedan, le 13 février 1573'.³ For another decade Joachim du Moulin attempted to continue his ministry at Soissons, returning to Sedan whenever the level of Catholic violence against the Protestants increased sharply (as in 1577–78 and 1580) but in 1584 he was forced to leave his church definitively. He returned to Sedan with his second wife and young family and was to remain there until 1595 when he returned to France as minister to the Protestants of Orléans.⁴

Throughout this time Pierre and his two brothers had remained at Sedan and, from 1578 onwards, were educated in the newly-founded college.⁵ In the year 1588.

4.1 *Du Moulin (1568–98)*

Du Moulin being twenty years old was sent by his Father to the Universities of England', states Peter du Moulin, rather grandly. The reality, as described by his father, was very different for it was the family's poverty which forced Pierre's departure and his father's original plan had been that Pierre should look for work in Paris.⁶ The two of them made the difficult and dangerous journey to the capital across country occupied by League forces. Pierre remained alone at Paris amidst mounting sectarian violence. The Day of the Barricades followed soon after and many Protestants were imprisoned including a close friend of the du Moulin family. Joachim returned to the city, managed to secure his friend's release and to leave the city without being identified as a Protestant. Only when Pierre took leave of his father for a second time on the road outside Paris, did he finally decide to make his way to England.⁷

The first twenty years of du Moulin's life were thus dominated by the effects of Catholic hostility towards the Protestants: Catholic violence forced the du Moulin family into exile, reduced the family to penury — Joachim was disinherited by his widowed mother 'en haine de la religion' — and caused the deaths of Pierre's mother, grandfather and, a few years later, his younger brother.⁸ These experiences of physical and financial hardship and of bereavement undoubtedly played a part in forming the character and attitudes of du Moulin and, once again, provide a point of contrast with the younger generation of Charenton ministers who were to grow up under the relatively secure and peaceful régime of the Edict of Nantes.

Once in London du Moulin made contact with other French Protestant refugees through their church in the city, and in particular with René Bochart who, seven or eight years senior to du Moulin, was preparing in the London church to take up a position as pastor at Dieppe.⁹ Bochart found du Moulin work — 'une honneste condition' — with an Englishman called Henry Constable. Du Moulin wrote of Constable that 'combien qu'il fust papiste, comme il est paru depuis, [il] ne laissoit pas de m'aimer et me vouloir de bien'. Soon afterwards however Constable left England with the 4000 troops sent by Elizabeth I to assist Henri IV. Once in France he declared himself a Catholic and did not return to England. He and du Moulin were to meet again in Paris some twelve years later when Constable had become a close friend of Jacques Davy du Perron.¹⁰ For a while du Moulin remained in England without any financial resources until Constable recommended him to

4.1 *Du Moulin (1568–98)*

the duchess of Rutland who chose du Moulin as a companion for her son, then studying at Cambridge. This new position offered du Moulin a valued opportunity for further study: 'cela me donna commodité de continuer mes estudes et d'estre auditeur des leçons du docteur Wictakers, homme de grand sçavoir'.¹¹

William Whitaker (1548–95) was almost certainly giving his lectures on the controversial issues dividing Catholics and Protestants during du Moulin's time at Cambridge. These were chiefly intended as a reply to Bellarmine's lectures on similar themes which had been circulating in manuscript form in the early 1580s and finally appeared in print in 1586.¹² In the latter part of the sixteenth century he was highly regarded as the main adversary of Bellarmine (who apparently respected his abilities more than those of any other Protestant opponent) and continued to be cited and refuted in scholarly Protestant and Catholic works well into the following century.¹³ D'Aubigné, in his memoirs, describes how he was on the point of yielding to the apparent force of Bellarmine's arguments and becoming a convert to Catholicism, but then changed his mind after reading Whitaker's refutation.¹⁴

Whitaker seems to have been an important influence on du Moulin's own career. When Jean Hotman wrote many years later that du Moulin had 'appris sa meilleure théologie en Angleterre' he was almost certainly referring to his time spent at Cambridge following the lectures of Whitaker.¹⁵ There are strong similarities between the polemical methods and theological standpoints of Whitaker and du Moulin. Both were convinced opponents of Arminianism, both argued pre-eminently in a scholastic manner, featuring rational deductions made from scripture much more strongly than historical arguments and both advocated scripture as the sole source of doctrinal truth to a degree which was regarded by certain other notable contemporary Protestant theologians as detrimental to the standing of the early church fathers.¹⁶

During this same period René Bochart again played an important part in determining du Moulin's future when he persuaded him to preach before the consistory of the French church in London. It was thus that, in 1591, Antoine de La Faye, minister of the French Reformed Church at Paris, and taking temporary refuge in London, heard du Moulin and immediately asked him to consider serving the

4.1 Du Moulin (1568–98)

Parisian church. The discussion which followed proceeded along very pragmatic lines:

Alors Monsieur de la Faye, ministre de l'Eglise de Paris, estoit à Londres, lequel m'ayant ouy en proposition, m'appella et me demanda si je voulois servir l'Eglise de Paris. Je luy respondis qu'il n'y avoit nulle apparence de servir une Eglise qui n'estoit point et qui n'avoit le moyen de m'entretenir. Il me respondist qu'il avoit le moyen, parce qu'il estoit dispensateur de certains deniers que le général Portail luy avoit laissés en mourant, pour les dispenser pour le bien et le soustien de l'Eglise de Paris, de laquelle il espéroit en bref le restablissement. J'acceptay cette condition, et Monsieur de la Faye me promit par an cinquante escus, qui estoit une somme suffisante pour vivre honnestement; car je ne payois pour ma table, à Cambridge, que trente sols par semaine. Alors, je quittay le service du comte de Rutland, où je me desplaisois.¹⁷

A year later du Moulin decided to leave England and go to the university of Leiden in order to study under Franciscus Junius, the newly-appointed professor of theology there, and so his period in England ended almost exactly four years after his arrival in August 1588. These four years were to have an important influence on du Moulin's future, chiefly because it was in London that he was first approached by a representative of the Parisian Protestants, but also because these years had familiarised du Moulin with the English language and with the Anglican Church and had allowed him to spend several years following the lectures of one of the foremost Protestant controversialists of the period.

Du Moulin left England in early September 1592 and made his way to Leiden via The Hague where he made his first contact with the French ambassador Buzenval who was to prove a valuable friend over the next six years.¹⁸ Du Moulin's name appears on the list of students following the lectures of Justus Lipsius in early October 1592.¹⁹ After two months' stay he was once again obliged to look for work to supplement his fifty *écus* from the Parisian church and worked for a time as a *correcteur* in the college at Leiden. The following year du Moulin decided to apply for the post of professor of philosophy in the academy of Leiden, which had become vacant with the death of the Scottish teacher, Ramsay. With the support of M. de Buzenval and the princess of Orange and after a series of *épreuves* du Moulin was

4.1 Du Moulin (1568–98)

chosen, at the age of twenty-four, as the new professor of philosophy.²⁰

In this post, which he was to occupy for five and a quarter years, du Moulin taught Aristotle in the academy (as well as undertaking a certain amount of private teaching):

J'enseignois en public l'Organe d'Aristote grec et les Physiques, et les livres de *Coelo* et de *Generatione*, et les livres de l'Ame et les météores; mon auditoire estoit fort fréquenté.²¹

As well as lecturing du Moulin presided over many of the disputations which took place every one to two weeks.²² The experience gained over these five years, as his son remarks, stood du Moulin in good stead for his involvement in Parisian religious debate:

This exercise for five or six years was his Fencing-School, whereby he was enabled for the many Encounters and Conferences which he had afterwards upon the greatest stage of *Europe*. As indeed of all his intellectual abilities, the most eminent was his skill in Dispute, having, besides the art of disputing, confirmed by long use, a rare vigour and readiness of wit, matched with a stayed, cool and judicious temper, never confounded with passion, the ordinary dissolver of Conferences.²³

In August 1596 du Moulin was given permission by the academy's authorities to visit his family in France. After a stay of several weeks at his father's home du Moulin visited Paris on his return journey and there met with the pastor Lobéran de Montigny and some of the church elders who urged him to take up his work in the city immediately. Du Moulin promised to write to them upon his return to Leiden with a clear statement of his intentions. On his way home du Moulin visited M. de Buzenval at the Hague. The French ambassador tried to dissuade du Moulin from going to Paris —

Il me représentoit la pauvreté annexée à cette condition, le travail continuel, les dangers, l'inimitié du clergé romain, surtout à Paris, qui est un haut théâtre, où j'avois beaucoup de besogne taillée

— and secured an attractive diplomatic appointment for him which du Moulin was on the point of accepting. But when a change of plan on the part of the

4.1 Du Moulin (1568–98)

French king led to the withdrawal of this offer, du Moulin became convinced that he should take up the work at Paris: 'Dieu ne voulait pas que j'employasse à une autre vocation qu'à celle à laquelle je m'estoit consacré, et m'affermis en cette resolution'.²⁴

Having resolved to leave Leiden, du Moulin decided to publish his own logic textbook, setting out the method he had used during his five years of philosophy teaching. His *Elementa logices*, published at Leiden in 1596, were to prove very popular over the next twenty years and went through thirteen editions. Du Moulin's manual was still being recommended by Sorel in the mid-1660s.²⁵ Burgersdijk, in the survey of contemporary teaching of logic which appeared in the preface to his *Institutiones logices* of 1626 placed du Moulin firmly in the category of those teaching Aristotelian logic, rather than Ramus's method or a blend of the two, but nevertheless singled him out for commendation:

Parmis les manuels de logique aristotélicienne, il en est un qui pour Burgersdijk échappe au reproche de servilité excessive, celui de Du Moulin qui a élagué le superflu, comblé les lacunes et surtout s'est attaché à la rigueur du plan.²⁶

While closely based on Aristotle, du Moulin's logic was not 'simply a condensation of Aristotle's *Organon*' as one of his modern critics has claimed.²⁷

Two years were to elapse before du Moulin finally left Leiden. The university authorities were making arrangements for his replacement in February 1598 but it was not until late September, after another dangerous journey by sea then across France on foot, that du Moulin reached his father's home at Jargeau.²⁸

Reviewing the events of this decade spent abroad some fifty years later, du Moulin chose to remark upon the good health which he had enjoyed during this time — 'tout le temps de ma demeure en pais étrangers a esté de dix ans, en tout lequel temps Dieu m'a fait la grâce de n'estre point malade de maladie qui m'ait tenu au lict plus de trois jours' — but, more importantly for the subject of this thesis, the decade had also equipped him exceptionally well for his future activities as a polemicist. Du Moulin's time at Leiden added further to his contacts with influential Protestants outside France and he remained in close touch with events there throughout the rest of his life but, above all, as his son pointed out,

4.1 Du Moulin (1568–98)

du Moulin's teaching duties at the academy had provided him with an unusually thorough grounding in syllogistic logic which was to prove extremely useful in the numerous debates in which he was to participate on 'the greatest stage of Europe'.

4.2 Paris: early encounters (1599–1605)

Du Moulin was ordained into the French Reformed Church shortly before Christmas 1598 and, after serving a brief apprenticeship with the church at Blois, went to Paris. He arrived there on the last day of February just as the Edict of Nantes had finally been registered by the Paris Parlement and just as the king's sister, newly-married to the Catholic duc de Bar, was preparing to leave for her husband's estates in Lorraine. Du Moulin spent only a few days in Paris: he preached his first sermon in the home of 'Madame' and the following day preached and conducted a marriage ceremony in the Louvre. He then left for a three-month stay in Lorraine as chaplain to the new duchesse de Bar.²⁹ Her departure, as noted above in Chapter 1, marked the end of a period of five years during which the Parisian Protestants had been able to worship in the heart of the city. Following her marriage, apart from occasional services in her Paris home, Protestant worship was relegated to Grigny, five leagues outside the city.³⁰

At the Parisian home of the duchess and in the royal court du Moulin was soon to meet Jacques Davy du Perron. Du Moulin makes mocking references in several early pamphlets to the 'grains bénits' which du Perron had brought back from Rome and which had provided the subject of an exchange between the two men at the home of 'Madame'. It seems likely that this encounter, as described here by Peter du Moulin in his translation of his father's *Nouveauté du Papisme* of 1627, provided the Parisian pastor with the title of one of his earliest books, *Eaux de Siloé*:

the Pope ... gave to M. du Perron some bags full of little crosses, and blessed grains to bestow among the people of *France*, with this indulgence, that every Frenchman that should have some of these grains in his beads, should get a hundred years of pardon every time that he should kiss them. ... I had some speech with M. du Perron about that subject, and told him, that it was not credible that a man of such excellent wit as he, should believe that by kissing those grains, he might get a hundred years of pardon, and that he had little care of his reputation, when he brought such wares out of *Italy*. Upon this he grew angry, saying that I accused him of Atheism: Then he alleadged the example of Christ, who sent the leprous to the pool of *Siloam* to make them clean, although he could have cleansed them without that; That the Pope also without these means could forgive sins, but it pleased him to make use of these means. But upon further conference,

4.2 *Du Moulin (1599–1605)*

I could not get from him any command of God, for that practise, nor any example of the Apostles, nor of their Disciples, nor of any Ancient Doctor.³¹

Peter du Moulin briefly describes another meeting between the two men in which du Perron was allegedly defeated but neither episode provides sufficient evidence upon which to base an analysis of their methods of argument. The main exchanges between them were to be in print and were concerned with the controversies aroused by James I of England from 1606 onwards.

It is not until late 1601 that du Moulin's name appears in the printed evidence of local Parisian religious debates. In the early years following Henri IV's arrival in Paris, Daniel Tilenus was probably the best-known Protestant theologian resident in the city — as a result of his conferences with du Perron in 1597 and with Duval in 1599 — and it is Tilenus who heads the list of Protestant pastors with whom du Perron began negotiating the terms of a conference in late 1601. Du Moulin's name appears in print for the first time as one of the three other signatories to the letters sent to du Perron.³²

The conditions for this debate were never agreed but in the same month du Moulin also exchanged several letters with a former Protestant which eventually led to du Moulin's first major conference. His opponent was Pierre Cayet, one of du Perron's converts to Catholicism, and the conference, which took place in the early summer of 1602, brought du Moulin to the attention of other Catholic polemicists (and of Henri IV). A challenge to debate with members of the Faculty of Theology immediately followed his debate with Cayet, but this second conference, as mentioned in the previous chapter, was abandoned at the half-way point: having survived an assassination attempt, du Moulin set out to attend the fourth session but 'met with a prohibition from the King to continue that conference any longer'.³³ (Du Moulin's son describes four other attempts on his father's life during his time at Paris and two occasions when their home was unsuccessfully 'besieged by a rabble of people come to destroy him and his Family'. 'These many attempts', wrote Peter du Moulin, 'made his Friends to desire him that he should never go abroad unattended, nor be at home without defence. He hearkened to their counsel, and got two stout servants, that had been Souldiers, that attended him with their swords'.³⁴)

4.2 Du Moulin (1599–1605)

In October of the same year (1602) du Moulin exchanged letters with Théophraste Bouju, sieur de Beaulieu, another convert to Catholicism and, like Cayet, a disciple of du Perron. Bouju had been involved in a 'conférence par écrit' with du Moulin's elderly colleague Montigny for several months when he was encouraged by reports of du Moulin's ability to suggest a written debate with the younger Protestant instead:

on a voulu donner à entendre à mondict Seigneur le Comte [de Soissons], que vous m'eussiez bien plustost expédié et réduit au silence, si on se fust adressé à vous, non seulement à cause de la doctrine qu'ils disent estre en vous, et de la promptitude de vostre esprit, mais aussi parce que vous estes en la vigueur de vostre aage plus proportionné au mien, avec davantage de loisir, et prest de conferer fort volontiers par escrit (*Cartel de deffy*, pp.6–7)

Du Moulin's edition of the correspondence which subsequently passed between Bouju and himself was his first publication in his own right.

In the spring of the following year he published a pamphlet against the Portuguese Capuchin friar, Suarez de Sainte-Marie, attacking his claim to prove the scriptural basis of purgatory. This book, *Eaux de Siloé*,³⁵ in turn provoked three Catholic pamphlets to which du Moulin replied with an *Accroissement des Eaux de Siloé*.³⁶

Du Moulin's final publication of this early period was a short pamphlet directed against a new work by Théophraste Bouju. *Nouvelles briques pour le bastiment de Babel* provides a good example of the printed lists of controversial questions which du Moulin and other controversialists of this period often gave to opponents or enquirers.³⁷

Correspondence with Choart (1601)

The earliest evidence of du Moulin's individual participation in Parisian religious disputes is provided by the letters he exchanged with the former Protestant M. Choart. These were edited and published by P. Cayet in April 1602.³⁸

Choart had sent du Moulin two lists of texts: the first containing extracts from the Centuries of Magdeburg with the purpose of demonstrating that the Roman Catholic Church 'enseignast aujourd'huy la mesme doctrine qui estoit enseignee dans les trois à quatre cents ans de nostre Seigneur' (p.2) and a second consisting of thirty-five biblical quotations whereby 'nous sommes asseurez de croire que l'Eglise Catholique, Apostolique et Romaine, en laquelle nous avons esté baptizez, est la vraye Eglise, et qu'estant separé d'icelle on ne peut obtenir son salut' (pp.11-12).³⁹ Du Moulin's initial reply, quoted here in full, crisply summed up his view of the Catholic Church and its use of biblical and historical evidence:

Je certiffie que M.C. m'a apporté cest escrit Lundy 5. de Novembre 1601.

Auquel escrit il veut prouver que l'Eglise Romaine est la vraye Eglise: Mais il ne prouve point, que en ceste Eglise Romaine, la verité soit enseignée.

Item tous les privileges que l'Ecriture Saincte donne à l'Eglise, elle les donnent à l'Eglise Universelle, non point à la Romaine, qui n'est point l'Eglise Universelle, mais une particuliere corrompue: Comme si l'Eglise Grecque (qui est un membre de l'Eglise) vient à se dévoyer au fondement de la foy: c'est à chacun de se retirer d'un membre corrompu à un membre pur. Il est donc question de sçavoir si l'Eglise Romaine est pure.

Quant aux Traditions, dont parle S. Paul, donnees par parole, ou ce sont ces mesmes choses qui sont escrites, ou ce sont choses qui appartiennent seulement à l'ordre de l'Eglise: car quand à ce qui est de l'essence de la foy, l'Ecriture Saincte est suffisante à salut. Comme dit S. Paul, 2. Tim.3. qu'elle nous peut rendre sages à salut.

Au surplus pas une de ces raisons, n'est redigée en forme d'argument.

[signed] (Du Moulin.)

This reply contains the essential points of du Moulin's view of the central question underlying all the controversial issues to be raised throughout his career, that is, the 'juge des controverses' question, whether scripture or the Church should be the judge of religious issues. In reply to Choart's attempt to prove that the Roman

4.2 Du Moulin (1599–1605)

Catholic Church was the true church (and thus possessed the authority to determine religious questions), du Moulin asserted that only continuity in teaching ‘la vérité’, by which he meant untainted scriptural truth, was of any importance. The Roman Catholic Church, despite its claim to be the true and universal Church, was, according to du Moulin, no more than a single corrupt limb of the Christian church. On the question of the validity of tradition, du Moulin stated categorically that it was of only secondary importance: scripture was the sole basis on which doctrinal debates should be resolved — the testimony of the early church merely confirmed this or added details on less crucial questions. (Du Moulin’s final comment, demanding that Choart’s arguments be presented in the standard syllogistic form, reveals his concern to observe the traditional methods of debate.)

The question of the ‘juge des controverses’ was inevitably to reappear throughout du Moulin’s involvement in religious debate. The fundamental difference between Catholic and Protestant controversialists arose from their different views on the role of scripture: Catholics regarded the Bible as only one portion of God’s law — ‘la parole écrite’ — to be supplemented by other authoritative documents and long-established beliefs and practices — ‘la tradition’ or ‘la parole non-écrite’ — and to be subject to the Catholic Church as its only authorised and reliable interpreter; Protestants regarded scripture itself as the supreme authority and arbiter of all religious questions to which the Church itself should be subject. The official Catholic view of scripture’s role was readily available in Bellarmine’s disputation entitled *De verbo Dei* and major French controversialists such as du Perron did not deviate from this line. There is however evidence in du Perron’s exchanges with Tilenus and in du Moulin’s disputes during these early years that Catholic controversialists were very sensitive to the accusation that they scorned scripture. All of du Moulin’s earliest opponents made a special point of claiming that they intended to base their arguments on scriptural evidence.

Conference with Cayet (1602)

Two months after Cayet had published Choart's letters accompanied by the claim that du Moulin had evaded a public debate, the Protestant minister, on his return from Lorraine, agreed to a conference with Cayet, which opened on 28 May 1602 and continued over a fortnight with a total of eight sessions.⁴⁰ Cayet was supported in this encounter by two Carmelite doctors, occasionally by other Sorbonne graduates and also by Henry Constable, du Moulin's host for part of his time in England. Du Moulin appeared alone on the Protestant side but Maucouvent, author of the main Catholic account, claimed that after each session the Protestant minister met with other members of his church to prepare his strategy for the following day.

Cayet appeared supremely confident, boasted of his abilities and his connections and apparently spoke without notes or preparation: '[il] proposoit et respondoit sur le champ de son chef'. Du Moulin, twenty-three years junior to Cayet and described by Maucouvent as 'ce pauvre jeune du Moulin', proceeded with tremendous caution and 'dictoit tout par escrit de mot à mot', occasionally to the exasperation of Catholics in the audience:

Est à noter que sur ce que ledit Cayer avoit dictée en une heure le premier jour, ledit sieur du Moulin y demeura trois jours entiers, dictant tousjours de son mémoire, dequoy plusieurs Catholiques murmuroient, ains ledit sieur Cayer leur dist qu'il n'importoit, et que cela monstroît que c'estoit par un consentement d'eux tous [i.e. the Protestants] (Maucouvent, pp.11-12)

The main subject of debate was the eucharist, the first of three subjects proposed by Cayet, all of which he promised at the outset to prove solely 'par le texte de l'Ecriture Sainte':

Cayer se submit volontairement à prouver lesdites matieres par le texte de l'Ecriture sainte, et de s'assujétir aux Originaux Hebrieux, Grecs et Latins (car il conte la version Latine de l'Eglise Romaine entre les Originaux)... (Adair, p.9)

Du Moulin professed surprise at this standpoint and claimed that the official Catholic view of scripture was very different:

4.2 Du Moulin (1599–1605)

il [du Moulin] s'esbahissoit comment il [Cayet] osoit se departir des maximes ordinaires, tenuës en l'Eglise Romaine, en recevant l'escriture sainte pour juge: n'y ayant rien plus ordinaire entre-eux que d'appeler l'Ecriture sainte une reigle douteuse, une piece de reigle, une espee à toutes mains: et de dire que le dessein de Dieu n'a pas esté d'instruire le monde par l'Ecriture, et que la plus part de la verité revelee ne fut jamais toute escrite; que l'Ecriture sainte n'est ni ne peut estre la derniere reigle et le souverain juge de la doctrine: (Adair, p.9)

Du Moulin went on to cite Bellarmine, Charron and then du Perron: 'Monsieur d'Evreux ... en son livre des Traditions ... maintient que les traditions, et la parole non escrite est de mesme autorité que l'Ecriture sainte'. Cayet nevertheless persisted in his claim that 'il n'y avoit rien en l'Eglise Romaine qu'il ne monstrast en l'Ecriture sainte par commandement ou par exemple' (Adair, p.10).

Rather surprisingly, du Moulin was permitted to adopt the role of 'attaquant'; he opened the debate with the following syllogism:

Tout sacrifice propitiatoire pour les vivans et pour les morts, qui n'a point esté institué de Jesus Christ, qui est contraire à la nature du sacrifice, qui deroge à la perfection du sacrifice de Jesus Christ, et qui se celebre avec beaucoup d'autres erreurs, doit estre rejetté en l'Eglise.

Le Sacrifice de la Messe est tel.

Donc le sacrifice de la Messe doit estre rejetté en l'Eglise. (Adair, p.12)

To this Cayet made six objections which he then attempted to prove by a long unprepared statement characterised, according to Adair, by 'les embassemens et entortillemens affectez, et l'irregularité des Syllogismes' (p.23). Adair's account quotes most of Cayet's syllogisms in full, and emphasises that 'ces entortillemens' were Cayet's very words, cited directly from the official record. In support of his dictated arguments Cayet is described as 'adjoustant de bouche des amplifications qui firent rire partie des assistans, et estonner les autres: car il disoit que Melchisedech avoit dit la Messe: ... Que mesmes la messe se disoit devant le Deluge ...' (pp.19-20). Adair records, as an example, this interjection by du Moulin during one of Cayet's final arguments:

sur le dernier argument auquel Cayer dit que la Messe est appelee la mort du Seigneur, à cause que c'est l'annonciation de la mort du Seigneur, [du

4.2 Du Moulin (1599-1605)

Moulin] lui demanda si l'annonciation d'une bataille gaignee estoit une bataille, A quoy Cayer ayant respondu qu'oui: toute la compagnie se prit à rire en sorte qu'on eut peine à l'appaiser. (p.23)

When du Moulin's turn to reply came, his cautious approach was rewarded. Dealing with each syllogism in turn, he was able to demonstrate in many cases that Cayet's arguments were faultily constructed. He used scriptural statements, presented in syllogistic form, to prove the reverse of many of Cayet's assertions but did not hesitate to produce evidence from other Catholic sources which also contradicted Cayet. When one of Cayet's supporters objected to the use of evidence other than from scripture, du Moulin retorted that 'il n'alleguoit point ces passages comme des Peres, mais comme Canons approuvez, en l'Eglise Romaine: et egalez aux Escritures Canoniques' (Adair, p.31). Similarly, du Moulin did not adhere strictly to the matters under discussion, adding observations on the attitude of Catholic universities to scripture (Adair, p.32) or straying into issues related to the doctrine of purgatory and supporting these with a formidable array of quotations drawn from papal statements, from Bellarmine or from Catholic devotional works. For example, Cayet's syllogism stating that 'les Apostres estoient Sacrificateurs, pource que Jesus Christ estoit Sacrificateur Eternel, et que Jesus Christ les a establis en la mesme qualite qu'il a' was dismissed by du Moulin as 'blasphematoire':

à ce conte les Apostres seront Sacrificateurs Eternels: Mesmes puis que Jesus Christ est nostre Redempteur, ils seront aussi nos Redempteurs, comme aussi Bellarmin Cardinal et Jesuite dit franchement, que les Saints sont en quelque façon nos redempteurs: au premier livre des Indulgences chapitre quatriesme, et fut le livre produit par du Moulin: et en outre le Psaultier de la Vierge Marie nouvellement imprimé à Paris avec privilege de la Cour, et approbation de la faculté de Theologie: où la Vierge Marie est appelle la premiere cause de nostre Salut ... et mille tels blasphemes, dont cest escrit est orné comme de fleurs de Rhetorique (Adair, pp.38-39)

This remark then led to a lengthy discussion on issues quite separate from the eucharist which were to resurface yet again towards the end of the conference and which provided du Moulin with an opportunity to air his detailed knowledge of the variations between different editions and translations of the Bible:

4.2 Du Moulin (1599–1605)

Quant au passage du Genese chap. 3. où Cayer dit qu'il y a, *ipsa conteret caput tuum*, du Moulin produisit les originaux Hebreux, notamment la Bible de Robert Estienne imprimee à Paris, où on trouva le contraire de ce que Cayer disoit: car on y trouva [...] *ipsum semen*, et non [...] *ipsa mulier*: et monstra quant et quant la version de Pagnin moine: le plus docte des Hespagnols, en la langue Hebraique qui tourne de mesmes, et attribue cela à Jesus Christ, et non à la Vierge Marie: et se pleignit grandement de ce qu'en la Bible de l'Eglise Romaine le premier et le principal passage de l'Ecriture Sainte auquel est contenu le sommaire de l'Evangile annoncée des le commencement du monde estoit si vilainement corrompu, que de transporter à la Vierge Marie ce qui estoit dit de Jesus Christ: Cayer n'eut response que celle que la necessité et le desespoir fournit, et dit que ceste Bible Hebraique avoit esté imprimee à la sollicitation des Huguenots, mais qu'en la Bible de Venise il y avoit [...] *ipsa*: du Moulin respondist que pour le moins il ne pouvoit dire que Pagnin moine Hespagnol eust interpreté *Ipsum* à leur sollicitation: et que toutes les Bibles avoyent ainsi mesmes celle de Venise qu'il alleguoit, et de fait le lendemain ayant apporté la Bible de Venise il rendit ledit Cayer confus; (Adair, p.71).

When the discussion eventually returned to the Catholic eucharist, du Moulin's long discourse on 'les absurditez et contradictions de la Transsubstantiation' and on the 'cautèles de la Messe' — the rules governing the administration of the Mass — finally drove an exasperated Catholic listener to challenge du Moulin on an issue where scripture appeared to support Catholic doctrine more strongly than Protestant teaching:

un honneste personnage d'entre les assistans, fasché (comme il est vray semblable) que Cayer et ses compagnons estoient mols à respondre ... objecta les paroles de Jesus Christ, *Hoc est corpus meum*, Ceci est mon corps: comme prouvantes la Transsubstantiation, qui fust cause que du Moulin à la premiere occasion s'efforça de satisfaire à la compagnie là dessus: et dit que nul ne devoit trouver estrange si en ces paroles J. Christ avoit parlé figurément, veu que en la ligne suivante il y a une figure beaucoup plus sure, *Ce Calice est la nouvelle alliance*, car on sçait qu'un calice ne peut estre l'alliance de Dieu, mais n'en est que le signe: (Adair, p.84)

This incident shows that particular arguments were familiar to many ordinary Catholics as well as to their controversialists. This key phrase was to reappear constantly in du Moulin's disputes and became a major point in P. Jean Gontéry's method. The reply which du Moulin gave on this occasion, based on the context in

4.2 Du Moulin (1599–1605)

which Christ's statement occurred, was to be more fully explained in his *Apologie pour la sainte Cène* published a few years later.⁴¹

The conference was finally broken off when Cayet refused to sign the official record; rumours circulated that the church authorities had forbidden him to do so. Disagreements broke out between Cayet and those assisting him and there were complaints from Catholics present regarding Cayet's performance. In general the accounts of Cayet and Maucouvent, published in response to the version of events given by Archibald Adair, attempt to mitigate Adair's allegations rather than to deny them. It seems that news of the conference quickly reached Protestants in the provinces and it was regarded as a victory for du Moulin and for Protestantism.⁴²

Cartel de deffy du sieur de Bouju (1603)

Later that same year (1602) du Moulin became briefly involved in a correspondence with Théophraste Bouju, sieur de Beaulieu. Once again the proposed subject of debate was an aspect of eucharistic doctrine: the Protestants' belief in 'manducation par foi' (in opposition to the Catholics' belief in transsubstantiation). Once again du Moulin's opponent claimed to base his arguments solely on scripture as he asserted that

on ne pouvoit prouver par l'Ecriture ce point de la creance de la prétenduë Eglise reformee, Que par foi en la sainte Cene du Seigneur on mange le vrai corps de Jesus Christ, et boit son sang, et que l'ame est nourrie de leur substance: ni reprouver par la mesme Ecriture celle des Catholiques: à sçavoir, Que le corps et le sang de Jesus Christ sont presents, vrayement, reellement, et substantiellement, au Sacrement de l'Eucharistie, sous les especes du pain, et du vin, et receuz par la bouche corporelle en la communion. (p.5)⁴³

Du Moulin's letters in reply were distinctly hostile and unpleasant. His first reaction was to refuse to take part in an exchange for frivolous reasons:

aussi ne faut-il point se mettre aux champs de gayeté de cœur sans apparence de profit et sans qu'aucun veuille recevoir instruction: cela seroit transformer le glaive de l'Evangile en fleurets, et s'en servir pour joüer, ou pour contenter la curiosité des premiers venus, ou pour servir à leurs desseins domestiques (p.14)

4.2 Du Moulin (1599–1605)

He produced a list of Catholic practices for which he challenged Bouju to demonstrate the scriptural basis (pp.10–11) and condemned the latter's use of the technical terms associated with syllogistic debate:

ne pouvant mordre aux matieres, vous vous accrochez aux formes, afin d'estaller quelques menus termes de Logique, qui font force bruit, mais point de fruct: et vous remparez contre le jugement du Lecteur avec une obscurité affectee, et avec des entortillemens qui embrouilleront quelques uns, mais n'enseigneront personne. (p.12)

Du Moulin's concluding remark on this subject introduces a guiding principle of his approach to religious debate: 'La verité veut estre nuë, ses ornemens sont naturels, le mensonge est cousin germain de l'obscurité' (p.12).

Bouju replied with the remarkable claim that, once the conference was under way,

je m'asseure de faire bien tost paroistre clairement, avec la grace de Dieu, qu'aucun des points de vostre croyance contraire à la doctrine de l'Eglise Catholique, Apostolique, et Romaine, n'est fondée en l'Ecriture ... et tout à l'opposite que tous les points de doctrine de l'Eglise Catholique, Apostolique, Romaine, qui est seule vraye Eglise de Christ, sont paroles de Dieu et fondees en la sainte Ecriture. (p.20)

In a second letter du Moulin continued to portray Bouju as an ambitious dilettante, accusing him of wishing merely to 'acquérir reputation de sçavant en parlant avec beaucoup de hardiesse, et ce pour des raisons autres que de Theologie' (pp.21–22), and remarking that

quatre ou cinq annees esquelles vous avez hanté la Court sont suffisantes pour pollir un esprit et le rendre propre à discourir de toutes choses, mesmes de celles qu'il n'entend pas, principalement en ce temps si admirable, auquel un habit, et un benefice sans office, rendent un homme sçavant en un moment, et grand Theologien. (p.23)

Du Moulin repeated his list of issues but amplified his twelfth point, giving thirty examples of alleged 'blasphemes du Pape'.

At this point Bouju sent a final letter, accusing du Moulin of deliberately adopting a hostile manner in order to evade the proposed 'conférence par écrit',

4.2 Du Moulin (1599–1605)

and then published his correspondence with Montigny and du Moulin (taking care to omit du Moulin's two lists of proposed points for debate).⁴⁴ This pamphlet concluded with a 'discours' in which Bouju claimed that du Moulin's exposition of Protestant doctrine on the subject which he had proposed was at variance with that of Calvin, the Colloquy of Poissy and the French Protestant Churches' confession of faith.

Du Moulin responded quickly with his own edition of the correspondence exchanged between Bouju and himself under the title *Cartel de deffy du sieur de Bouju*. In this he restored the two lists omitted by Bouju, added a reply to his opponent's third letter, and a lengthy response to his 'discours'. This final section, making up two-thirds of du Moulin's book, contains a detailed rebuttal of the accusation of erroneous teaching. His statement concerning the authority of Calvin is particularly interesting in the light of modern criticisms of du Moulin's attitude towards the founder of French Protestantism:

Reste à parler de Calvin, qui appelle sa doctrine ceste nourriture de nos ames par la foi en Jesus-Christ, et ceste union par laquelle nous sommes faicts une substance et un corps avec Jesus-Christ: il appelle cela voirement sa doctrine: et imite en cela l'Apostre S. Paul qui appelle ce qu'il preschoit, son Evangile. Comme en l'Epistre aux Rom. 2. *Dieu jugera les secrets des hommes par Jesus-Christ selon mon Evangile*, et 2. Timoth. 2. *Aye souvenance que Jesus Christ est resuscité des morts, estant de la semence de David, selon mon Evangile*. Est-ce pour ce qu'il avoit inventé l'Evangile? nullement, mais pource qu'il l'annonçoit, Ainsi est-il de Calvin: Jesus-Christ par sa parole, lui avoit enseigné ceste doctrine: il l'annonçoit: c'estoit donc aussi sa doctrine ...

Mais qu'a faict Calvin plus qu'un autre, pourquoi il doive estre traité plus rigoureusement? pourquoi sera-il appelé nostre Apostre? veu qu'il y en a eu tant d'autres entre nous qui ont combatu les abus, et le trafic de Rome autant que lui, et devant lui? Posons le cas que ce bon homme ait failli, que le sçavoir lui ait manqué en quelques endroicts, la memoire en d'autres, que fait cela à nos differents? sommes nous appris en nos Eglises de lire soigneusement ses escrits, ou de nous en rapporter à lui? lui-mesmes veut-il estre creu en tout? et ne nous renvoye-il pas tousjours à l'escriture sainte, en laquelle ce qui est clair (comme dit S. Augustin)^a contient suffisamment tout ce qui concerne la foi, et la reigle de bien vivre? Ja n'advienne que nous recevions un homme pour juge en la cause de Dieu: et les choses veritables que dict Calvin nous ne les croyons pas pource qu'il les dit, mais pource qu'elles sont en la parole de Dieu. Pourtant combien

que Calvin soit accusé à tort, si ne sommes nous pas obligez de le deffendre: que nos adversaires pensent de lui ce qu'il leur plaist, cependant nous nous tiendrons à la parole de Dieu. [in margin: *a. Lib.2.de Doctrina Christi, cap.9.*]

Mais c'est au Sieur de Beaulieu de defendre les erreurs et blasphemés des Papes, puis qu'on tient en l'Eglise Romaine que le Pape ne peut errer en la foy: que ses ^aEpistres Decretales sont contees entre les livres Canoniques, et esgales à l'Ecriture sainte.^b Que le Pape par plenitude de puissance Apostolique peut dispenser du droit et qu'il est par dessus le droit. Et que^c c'est une heresie de dire que le Pape ne peut faire des nouveaux articles de foi, duquel aussi les Decrets sont appelez des Oracles, c'est à dire, responses de Dieu, Comme aussi il veut estre adoré, et se nomme Dieu, et la Majesté divine, ainsi que j'ay monsté en ma deuxiesme lettre. [in margin: *a. Dist.19.Can.in Canonicis. b. De concess.Preb.Tit.8.Can.proposuit. c. Bulla, Exurge in calce Concilii Lateran. sub Leone X.*] (pp.100–103)

Du Moulin's alleged lack of regard for Calvin was to become a source of criticism from the Saumur-educated pastors at Charenton some years later and also from some modern critics, but it is clear from this passage (and many others in his polemical works) that the Protestant standpoint on biblical authority required such statements. Du Moulin could not attack the Catholic Church for allowing successive popes and theologians to corrupt Christian truth, if his opponents could similarly force him to concede that Protestant doctrine was determined by Calvin rather than by scripture. It is important to note also that in this instance as also in later works, du Moulin *did* attempt to defend Calvin's statements by demonstrating that they had precedents in scripture. Typically also du Moulin contrasted the Protestants' attitude to Calvin with that demanded by the Catholics' understanding of the authority of their church and pope, supported by a two-page annotated catalogue of the alleged heresies and 'impietez' of former popes.

Having refuted Bouju's allegation that Protestant doctrine was founded on human rather than biblical authority, du Moulin went on to dismiss Bouju's claim to argue in favour of Catholic doctrine solely on the basis of scripture as untenable, pointing out that the opposite view had been clearly expressed by some of the Catholic Church's most distinguished scholars:

nul bon Advocat du Pape ne peut demander estre jugé par l'Ecriture Sainte sans se mocquer, veu que les Docteurs de l'Eglise Romaine tiennent

et maintiennent que l'Escriture Sainte n'est point la juge souveraine de nos differents, mais que cet honneur est deu à l'Eglise Romaine: (p.105)

The marginal references cite the same three authorities which du Moulin had used in his conference with Cayet — Charron, Bellarmine and du Perron — and the same phrases from their works recur:

Item que l'Escriture sainte ne contient qu'une partie des choses qui sont necessaires à salut, que ce n'est qu'une piece de reigle, et que le but de Dieu n'a pas esté de faire des Chrestiens par l'Escriture, que l'Escriture est authorisee par l'Eglise, et n'a force, poids, ni autorité qu'entant que l'Eglise lui donne: que c'est une espee à toute-mains, et un livre d'heretiques. (p.105)

Du Moulin notes that 'quand nous venons à disputer avec nos adversaires, ils recusent tousjours l'Escriture comme juge incompetente', and concludes:

Si donc le Sieur de Beaulieu veut se servir de l'Escriture sainte, il a de la besogne taillee, et des matieres que je lui ai proposees en ma premiere lettre, je me contenterai sur chacun de ces douze poincts d'un seul passage de l'Escriture ...

These comments are drawn from the closing sections of du Moulin's reply to Bouju's final 'discours'. In the foregoing exposition of Protestant doctrine on the proposed issue of 'manducation par foi', he had cited a number of early church authorities but concentrated on the scholastic arguments established by the Catholic Church in support of transsubstantiation and their basis in medieval philosophy. Indeed du Moulin suggested that this issue had been deliberately chosen by Bouju because of its complexity and obscurity: 'Peut-estre ... vous avez jugé que cette question estoit embrouillée et propre à s'escrimer d'ambiguité, et estaller quelque peu de Philosophie', du Moulin commented, whereas the issues which he had put forward for discussion 'estoyent un champ trop ouvert, et que les idiots mesme en peuvent juger' (p.44). This alleged contrast between the artificially and erroneously constructed rationalism of scholastic theology and that of Protestant theology, based on a lucid and rigorous application of natural logical principles, was one which du Moulin was to draw on many occasions in his polemical writing (and also in the French version of his own textbook on Aristotelian logic).

4.2 Du Moulin (1599–1605)

This *Cartel de deffy* was du Moulin's first substantial work published on his own account and contains a vigorous defence of Protestant doctrine, invariably coupled with an attack on Catholic beliefs, and often expressed in an aggressive manner. It illustrates the acerbic tone of much of his writing (for which he was occasionally reproached), his mastery of scholastic terminology and his sparing use of historical argument.

Eaux de Siloé (1603)

The written debate with Bouju was to be taken up again a year or so later but for the moment du Moulin turned his attention to another area of debate raised in a sermon preached by 'le cordelier Portugois', Suarez de Sainte-Marie: the Catholic doctrine of purgatory. Suarez had asserted in his sermon that the doctrine of purgatory was clearly evident in scripture. Hearing reports of this, Du Moulin took the exceptional step of initiating a discussion with the Capuchin preacher. Few details of their meeting are known, but in the course of it Suarez ventured several scripture passages which he claimed provided the basis for Catholic teaching on purgatory, and later sent du Moulin a further set of references. Suarez's sermon provided du Moulin with an opportunity to attack one of the favourite targets of all Protestant controversialists: purgatory was described in the Reformed Church's confession of faith as an 'illusion procédée de la boutique de Satan'.⁴⁵ It was also an issue to which he had turned very readily in his conference with Cayet and in his exchanges with Bouju. His pamphlet entitled *Eaux de Siloé* appeared about two months after Suarez's sermon.⁴⁵

The new work was divided into three sections: in the first of these du Moulin gave a detailed description, based on Catholic theologians, of hell, purgatory and limbo; in the second he listed thirty-two scripture references which confirmed that 'ce Purgatoire est contraire à la parole de Dieu'; finally, in Section III, he refuted the passages used by Suarez in support of purgatory. The basis of du Moulin's refutation was thus unequivocally scriptural: 'la parole de Dieu est un fleuve plus que suffisant pour esteindre ce feu tant profitable au Pape', he claimed (p.13).

Du Moulin's account of the various subterranean regions described by Catholic writers consisted largely of anecdotes and details which struck him as particularly

offensive or ridiculous, and offered scope for a heavily satirical presentation. He noted, for example, the huge quantities of pardons available in selected churches in Rome —

En celle de Sainte Praxede il y a douze mille ans de vray pardon chasque jour, et autant de quaranteine de jours, et la remission du tiers des pechez. En sorte qu'en visitant ceste Eglise trois jours consecutifs, on gaigne plein pardon de tout peché: et trente six mille ans par dessus de provision sans compter les quaranteines. (p.5)

— and described the unique situation of the Carmelite friars who, as he had recently learned from a public disputation given at the Sorbonne, were only held in purgatory until the Saturday following their death: 'C'est pourquoy on ne dit gueres de Messes pour leurs ames principalement s'ils meurent un Vendredy' (p.10). He concluded his description of purgatory with this comment:

Telle est l'histoire du Purgatoire propre à faire rire, si n'y avoit plus de sujet de s'attrister en voyant la religion changée en fables, et l'unique purgation de nos pechez qui est le sang de Jesus-Christ, estre comme dégradée et ravallée pour servir au gain de ceux qui ont redressé les tables des changeurs au Temple jadis renversées par Jesus-Christ. (p.10)

Du Moulin then briefly described 'le limbe des petits enfans' (for children who had died without being baptised) and 'le limbe des Peres et des Meres' (where the Old Testament patriarchs and matriarchs — Adam and Eve, Noah, Abraham, and others — had been held until liberated by Christ on the day of his resurrection). This section concluded with a mocking reference to Bellarmine, 'qui escrit nouvellement à Rome, et comme au sein du Pape, avec approbation, et louange de toute l'Eglise Romaine'. Du Moulin credited Bellarmine with the introduction of a fifth subterranean region — 'un pré clair et diapré de fleurs odoriferantes, lequel il fait estre une dependance du Purgatoire, et comme une arriere chambre en laquelle sont ceux qui sont traittez plus doucement,' — and commented that the Catholic author's description was based on 'l'autorité du venerable Beda, et de Denis le Chartreux autheur de grande autorité, farcy de relations fantastiques' (pp.12-13).

Du Moulin's *Eaux de Siloé* presents within a small compass a very convincing refutation of purgatory at a popular level. His account of Catholic doctrine is

4.2 Du Moulin (1599–1605)

based on major Catholic authorities — chiefly Pope Gregory I (whose writings provide the source for many graphic details in the portrayal of hell and purgatory) and Robert Bellarmine;⁴⁶ his refutation is emphatically scriptural; finally, his use of rhetorical devices skilfully reinforces his arguments. The following short passage shows how du Moulin could use analogy, antithesis, and stylistic contrasts in the choice of words, to strengthen an assertion:⁴⁷

comme coudre une piece de gros drap gris à un habit de Satin est chose ridicule, aussi est-ce chose mal accordante, de joindre nos satisfactions, nos jeusnes, nos battures, un sac, une corde, un capuchon, une rotisserie d'ames, avec la passion du fils unique de Dieu, pour faire le total du rachat de nos ames et de la satisfaction envers Dieu: (p.33)

Accroissement des Eaux de Siloé (1604)

Eaux de Siloé provoked three Catholic replies over the summer — from Suarez himself, from Pierre Cayet and from another Sorbonne doctor, André Duval. To these du Moulin replied with an *Accroissement des Eaux de Siloé*. This new book, which is usually treated as a separate work, is in fact a new edition of his *Eaux de Siloé*, revised, and as the title suggests, substantially longer: fifty-five pages have been expanded to two hundred and sixty. The three sections of the earlier work have become five in this new edition and the two additional chapters show how du Moulin's approach has been slightly modified. The new section II clarifies the basis on which the discussion should proceed — 'en ce different comme en tout autre concernant la foy, l'escriture Sainte doit estre juge' — but section V nevertheless adds a large amount of additional evidence from the church fathers, under the heading 'Ce que les Docteurs des quatre premiers siecles après Jesus Christ ont creu et tenu sur ceste matiere, et qu'ils n'ont point creu le Purgatoire'.

This substantial chapter of new evidence is preceded by an exposition of the contrasting methods of dealing with controversial issues used by Catholic and Protestant theologians which opens as follows:

Nos differens ne consistent pas seulement en contrariété d'opinions, mais aussi en diversité de moyens de chercher la verité. Nos adversaires veulent qu'on juge de la verité par l'ancienneté: nous voulons qu'on juge de l'ancienneté par la verité. Ils taschent de monstrier l'ancienneté de leur

doctrine par tesmoignages humains, nous prouvons la verité de la nostre par tesmoignages divins tirez des saintes Escritures. L'ancienneté qu'ils pretendent requiert infinis passages de divers auteurs: la verité que nous maintenons se peut defendre par un seul passage de l'Escriture. Le chemin que nous suivons est d'autant plus court et plus asseuré, que les raisons en dispute valent mieux que les anneés, et l'autorité de Dieu que le tesmoignage des hommes. (p.205)

This classic statement of the Protestant perspective on the 'juge des controverses' question is followed by an analysis of the shortcomings of the writings of the church fathers. They are, says du Moulin, frequently contradictory, unreliable (because of alterations introduced inadvertently or deliberately during the transcription of manuscripts) and inaccessible to the vast majority of Catholics. All these characteristics make the church fathers untrustworthy as authorities when determining religious truth but an ideal source for controversialists defending questionable views:

entre tant d'auteurs ... il est aisé de trouver ou de tordre quelque chose à son avantage sans estre descouvert, pource que peu ont ces livres: et de ceux qui les ont peu les lisent, et de ceux qui les lisent peu les entendent. (p.207)

Du Moulin has then to justify his inclusion of material from these early writers. This he does by claiming to come to their defence (and in the same terms which he had used regarding Calvin):

Toutesfois apres protestation que je n'allegue point les Peres pour appuyer sur eux la verité de ma cause, mais pour monstrier que nos adversaires en abusent et leur font dire choses esloignées de leur opinion: Je ne les prens pas pour advocats de ma cause, mais je suis avocat de la leur. Car Jesus Christ nous dit qu'il ne demande point de tesmoignage des hommes, ni donc sa parole ne demande point des tesmoignages humains. La verité que ces bons personnages ont dite nous la croyons non pource qu'ils l'ont dite, mais pource que cela mesmes se trouve en la parole de Dieu. Et c'est pourquoi j'ai reservé ce traitté à la fin, de peur de mesler l'autorité divine avec les humaines. C'est un chapitre plustost non superflu que necessaire lequel nous donnons non à la necessité de la matiere, mais à la dreté du siecle auquel l'Escriture Sainte est suspecte, et qui ouvre les oreilles quand on parle d'Origene ou d'Ambroise, ou de Tertullian, mais les ferme quand on parle des escrits des Prophetes et Apostres, c'est (disent-ils) un

4.2 Du Moulin (1599–1605)

livre d'heretiques, une espee à toutes mains, une piece de reigle, une forest de fourragement, mesmes dit l'auteur des trois veritez, on en devient Atheiste. (pp.209-10)

Justifications of his use of historical evidence were to appear in almost identical terms in du Moulin's *Apologie pour la sainte Cène* in 1607 and also in the prefatory material of his *Nouveauté du Papisme* twenty years later. These changes and additions made to the second edition affirm scripture's role as 'juge des controverses' but also reveal du Moulin's decision to challenge the Catholics on a selected portion of their own ground – the testimony of the church fathers of the first five hundred years.

Accroissement des Eaux de Siloé also establishes du Moulin's favoured method of replying to the attacks of his adversaries: a new edition of the original work, revised and expanded. Typically this was preceded by a preface in which du Moulin satirised his opponents and commented on their procedures. In the 'preface au lecteur' of this work, du Moulin considered the reaction of his three opponents to his original pamphlet:

il appert que ce traité les a picquez jusqu'au vif, puis qu'ils l'assaillent avec un si grand concert: De fait le fiel et les injures qu'ils degorgent montrent que l'emotion a esté vehemente. Ils m'appellent beste, fol, sot, imposteur, heretique, impie, nigaut, execrable, impudent, etc. ils m'envoyent tout vif aux enfers: bref les mots leur faillent plustost que l'animosité: ils sont marris que nostre langue est si povre en injures . . . Or Dieu veuille que ce vomissement leur puisse servir de purgation, et qu'ils ne soyent jugez de Dieu avec autant de rigueur qu'ils nous jugent avec temerité. C'est toute la vengeance que j'en desire: car quel autre interest avons nous en ceste cause que la gloire de Dieu, et le salut de ceux qui nous haissent? (p.4)

In such passages du Moulin contrived to portray himself as a model of Christian charity and restraint, while using analogy and humorous allusions to ridicule his opponents. He then went on to mock the bizarre titles chosen for the three works and slyly alluded to Cayet's reputation as a dabbler in alchemy:

A ces livres si pleins de civilité, ces venerables Docteurs ont donné des tiltres capricieux, comme on met des tableaux ridicules au front d'un logis dans lequel on joue quelque plaisanterie: ou comme on taille des Cyclopes ou Satyres au frontispice d'un bastiment. Voicy le tiltre du livre de Cayer:

4.2 Du Moulin (1599–1605)

La fournaise ardente et le four de reverbere etc. Et en son livre il ne parle que d'Alambiquer, fixer, evaporer, recalciner etc tous termes de son mestier. De tout cela il fait un amalgame, où il y a plus de Lune que de Soleil. (p.6)

Again, in his analysis of his opponents' methods of refuting his work, du Moulin accused them of ignoring or distorting his arguments and erecting 'men of straw':

ils se forgent des objections autres que les miennes, et leur rabbatent la pointe en les proposant autrement que je n'ay fait, puis s'escarmouchent et s'esgayent à se respondre à eux mesmes: Semblables aux taureaux de l'Amphitheatre, devant lesquels on mettoit des hommes de paille, contre lesquels ces animaux irritez deschargeoyent leur cholere, ... (p.16)

These passages exemplify du Moulin's talent as a satirist and his taste for comic or grotesque analogies — in other works he was to picture opponents as cocks strutting on dung-heaps or grasshoppers leaping hither and thither (instead of dealing systematically with his arguments). In general these attacks on his opponents seem inspired by a rough wit whereas the epithets assigned to him by Suarez, Cayet and others constitute personal abuse of a far more direct but less effective kind. He was nevertheless portrayed by some of his opponents as a particularly coarse and satirical writer.⁴⁸

Du Moulin's use of this bull-fighting analogy arises in his description of the proper manner of refuting an opponent's work and thus introduces one final aspect of du Moulin's introduction to his revised edition which is of interest when considering future works. In *Accroissement des Eaux de Siloé* du Moulin, not surprisingly, claimed that his arguments had not been adequately dealt with by his three opponents:

ils ne font nulle conscience de falsifier mon escrit. Car voici comme ils me traittent. Ils ne produisent point mes paroles: ils renversent l'ordre de mes propos: ils grapillent et picquottent par ci par la mon discours, et commençans l'un par la fin, l'autre par le milieu: si je dis quelque chose de plus pressant, ils le passent honnestement sous silence: ils objectent ce à quoy je respons, et taisent mes responses. (p.15)

Du Moulin claimed however that 'Celuy qui cherche la verité doit produire les propres paroles de son adversaire, le suivre pas à pas, n'en rien deguiser ni tronquer

ni dissimuler' (pp.15–16):

j'estimeroy qu'on m'aura satisfait, quand je verray mon escrit tout entier dans l'escrit de mon adversaire, et la response adjoustee article à article, raison apres raison, sans en rien defalquer, et sans changer mes paroles, ni l'ordre de mon discours. (p.17)

He issued a challenge to his opponents to refute his new work in this systematic manner and concluded with a particularly striking image:

Si le desir de faire paroistre la verité ne vous defaut non plus que le loisir, les moyens, les livres, le nombre, le support, nous verrons bien tost (quoi que toutes ces choses nous defaillent) qui de nous a pour soi la parole de Dieu, et du choc de nos raisons equitablement rapportees sortiront les estincelles de la verité. (p.17)

(The terms of his challenge also hint at the difficulties which du Moulin felt he endured as a Protestant controversialist based in Paris, particularly the lack of access to vital theological works.)

The ideal which du Moulin presented here was one which was rarely adopted by his opponents and it is unlikely that any Catholic work which did incorporate Protestant arguments in the manner du Moulin suggested would have been passed by the Faculty of Theology's censors. This is almost certainly the reason why Bouju omitted du Moulin's lists of issues when he published the letters exchanged between them. Similarly, in 1610, Coeffeteau would not have dared to reproduce the views of James I in his refutation when the original work had been proscribed; but du Moulin, replying to Coeffeteau, chose to regard this as evidence of the Catholic writer's bad faith:

[Coeffeteau] confesse clairement sa foiblesse en ce qu'il ne produit jamais le texte mesme du livre du Roi; mais seulement en rapporte le sens deguisé et affoibli, afin de se donner quarriere plus libre: Et se forge des chimeres pour les combattre.⁴⁹

In marked contrast to Coeffeteau's method of proceeding, du Moulin was to use his own defence of the English king's book as an opportunity to reproduce extensive passages from the original apology as well as quoting at length from Coeffeteau's

refutation. In general, he observed his own maxims concerning the proper method of refuting an opponent's arguments rather more faithfully than any of his Catholic adversaries.

***Nouvelles briques pour le bastiment de Babel* (1604)**

In the intervening period between the two versions of du Moulin's *Eaux de Siloé*, Bouju had published a substantial work entitled *Methode de convaincre par la sainte esriture tous schismatiques et heretiques*.⁵⁰ Du Moulin responded to some of Bouju's arguments in his *Accroissement des Eaux de Siloé* but now published a small pamphlet specifically in reply to Bouju's book. The brevity of *Nouvelles briques*, only twenty-three pages long, was perhaps intended as a calculated contrast to Bouju's 800-page volume.⁵¹ It is presented as simply a 'liste des erreurs de l'Eglise Romaine' which du Moulin claimed to have used on many other occasions:

laquelle ayant souvent représenté aux plus signalez Docteurs de l'Eglise Romaine, qui se vantent tous d'avoir pour eux le consentement universel de l'antiquité, je n'ay encores peu tirer aucune preuve de ces articles par tesmoignages des Peres: Non que les Peres soyent juges suffisans en ceste cause: Mais nous ne pouvons souffrir qu'un tel tort soit fait à ces bons Docteurs Anciens, que de persuader au peuple qu'ils ayent creu choses si impies et Extravagantes. (fifth and sixth pages, un-numbered)

As this quotation makes clear, du Moulin's new pamphlet, like the major part of the additions in the revised *Eaux de Siloé*, sought to add the testimony of the early Christian Church, typically the first 400 or 500 years, to that of scripture in order to challenge Catholic doctrine on its own ground.

Nouvelles briques is in fact made up of not one, but two lists. The first consists of Catholic teachings and practices for which, according to du Moulin, there is no evidence in the church fathers of the first four hundred years of the Christian Church; the second, headed 'Que le Pape n'est point successeur de S. Pierre', catalogues the titles, power and attributes claimed by the Pope and points out the marked contrast this offers with the ministry of the apostle Peter.

It is a pamphlet which seems to have been rather hurriedly or carelessly composed. In Part 1 in particular, du Moulin presents his list of alleged abuses in no

4.2 Du Moulin (1599–1605)

discernible order: he begins carefully itemising innovations and providing references to Bellarmine and to the canons and services of the Catholic church, but the structure breaks down towards the end and he quickly concludes with four paragraphs bringing together ‘un amas infini d’abus et de superstitions’. The second list is however more thoroughly annotated and corresponds quite closely to that used in the earlier *Cartel de deffy*.

It is interesting to note that du Moulin refers on several occasions to the way in which papal pretensions damage the prestige of secular monarchs and in particular the French king:

XI. Il donne et oste les Royaumes, et absoud les sujets du serment de fidelité presté à leurs Princes et de tout vœu et jurement. (p.41)

XXI. Il donne sa pantoufle à baiser aux Roys et Empereurs, et leur fait tenir la bride de son cheval. (p.43)

XXIV. Quant à Saint Pierre il preschoit l’Evangile, avec beaucoup d’humilité, de patience, de zele. Mais le Pape ne presche point. Peut-estre qu’il chante Messe une ou deux fois en son Papat, ayant la mitre en teste. Et c’est lors que les Roys de France ont un excellent privilege, pour recompense de tous les biens que le Pape tient en Italie, qui luy ont esté donnez par nos Roys, à sçavoir que s’ils sont à Rome, ils servent le Pape chantant Messe, en qualité de Sous-diacre ou de novice, comme fit Charles VIII à Alexandre VI. (pp.43–4)

Such remarks were to become a far more dominant feature of du Moulin’s writing from 1606 onwards as Jesuit controversialists became more active in local Parisian debate and as the aftermath of the Gunpowder Plot drew attention to the Jesuits’ role in advocating the pope’s secular authority in their sermons, books and (allegedly) in direct political action.

The title and main argument of du Moulin’s pamphlet show him attempting to turn one of the major criticisms laid against the Protestant Churches by their opponents — ‘novelty’ or innovation – against the Roman Catholic Church. Du Moulin concluded his first list with a challenge to Catholic theologians, asking them to provide two examples from each of the first four centuries confirming current Catholic beliefs and practices, or alternatively, choosing a single Church Father and demonstrating the conformity between his doctrine and that of the modern

4.2 Du Moulin (1599–1605)

Catholic Church: 'maintenons que jamais ils ne monstrent qu'un seul des Peres ait eu une religion, je ne dis point toute telle, mais seulement approchante de la religion Romaine d'aujourd'huy' (p.36). (This challenge was to reappear in an identical form in several later works by du Moulin.) In the second part he claimed to demonstrate 'la nouveauté de la charge et autorité que le Pape s'usurpe sous couleur de succession de S. Pierre' and his challenge was 'qu'on nous monstre ... ceste succession et convenance de Doctrine avec S. Pierre et les Apostres' (pp.37, 44).

Nouvelles briques was to be followed over the years by similar published collections of controversial issues: *Trente-deux demandes proposées par le P. Coton* (1607) and *Oppositions de la parole de Dieu avec la doctrine de l'Eglise Romaine* (1609), for example, both use the same concise method of presenting issues and evidence and were apparently often distributed by du Moulin to Catholic challengers and those wavering in their religious commitment.⁵² These pamphlets can be regarded as the forerunners of the more polished and widely-used book by Charles Drelincourt, *Abbrégé des controverses*, which was first published in 1624.⁵³

Du Moulin's initiation into Parisian religious debate in the opening years of the century thus took place in encounters with du Perron (although poorly-documented) and with a group of lesser controversialists loosely associated with him — Cayet, Bouju and Suarez de Sainte-Marie. His publications during this period reveal the range of forms of religious debate described in Chapter 3, verbal and written, formal and informal, and although occasionally uneven in quality, show his attributes as a controversialist: robust in tone, popular in presentation, well-versed in scholastic argument, emphasising scriptural evidence above all but soon laying claim to the first five hundred years of church history as well. These early pamphlets also make clear du Moulin's position on the fundamental issue of the 'juge des controverses': scripture was the sole basis and supreme authority for formulating doctrine and resolving religious disputes. When his Catholic opponents attempted to argue on the basis of scripture du Moulin treated their efforts as fraudulent and cited the views of Bellarmine, Charron and du Perron. Future opponents were to focus attention on the method whereby Protestant doctrine was based on scripture but

4.2 Du Moulin (1599–1605)

Cayet, Bouju and Suarez do not appear to have made use of this line of argument. Similarly, future opponents were to cite the French Protestants' confession of faith as a body of authoritative doctrine which du Moulin was obliged to defend, whereas, in his early encounter with Bouju, du Moulin had no difficulty in resisting his Catholic opponent's attempt to use Calvin as an authority to which every Protestant should defer. Du Moulin's earliest publications also establish his favoured areas of debate: Catholic eucharistic doctrine, the secularization of the papacy and the doctrine of purgatory as a bastion of the pope's power in both the secular and the spiritual spheres. These were to remain the dominant themes of his attacks on the Catholic church.

Du Moulin arrived in Paris well-equipped by his years of study in England and of teaching in Leiden for participation in religious debate. In every confrontation he adopted a fairly aggressive stance and this, combined with his thorough grasp of the syllogistic method of argument and of the evidence available to Protestant controversialists, seems to have given him the edge in his encounters with the three minor polemicists, Cayet, Bouju and Suarez. (According to his son, du Perron was also impressed by du Moulin's abilities.)⁵⁴ During the first five years of his time at Paris therefore du Moulin had begun to make a name for himself as an author and conference participant in fairly favourable circumstances. From 1606 onwards however he was to engage in debate with a far more skilled and vigorous group of Jesuit controversialists, headed by P. Coton and P. Gontéry, and also with Nicholas Coeffeteau, the most distinguished and erudite of du Perron's disciples.

4.3 Du Moulin v. the Jesuits (1606–1609)

The lull in religious debate, mentioned in Chapter 1, was partly attributable to the absence of du Perron and to the cautious re-establishment of the Jesuits in Paris but also to the way in which the Protestants found themselves more thoroughly marginalised at Ablon following the death of the king's sister in February 1604. In August 1605 however du Moulin persuaded the French Protestants' political assembly to entrust Sully with the task of approaching the king with a request for a site closer to the city for Protestant worship. A few months later the king agreed to this request and in 1606 'nostre exercice, par la volonté du roy, fut mis a Charenton-Saint-Maurice, à une demie lieue de Paris'.⁵⁵ As noted above, the establishment of the Protestants at Charenton contravened the Edict of Nantes and when services began to be held there in August 1606 they provoked rowdy Catholic protests.⁵⁶ The king's decision in favour of the Protestants may well have prompted the Jesuits to finally become more involved in local religious debate. Certainly it is at this period that the encounters between the two experienced controversialists, P. Coton and P. Gontéry, and Pierre du Moulin began to give rise to printed exchanges.

It was an indirect exchange between du Moulin and Coton which produced du Moulin's first publication for some time when the Protestant minister decided to reply in print to a series of 'demandes' circulated by P. Coton (and similar in type to those which du Moulin had himself formulated in his correspondence with Bouju).⁵⁷ Coton, like du Perron on other occasions, chose to remain aloof from the pamphlet war which developed; according to P. Prat, it was P. Jean Gontéry who replied to du Moulin on Coton's behalf, first under his own name with a *Correction fraternelle* and then with its continuation under a pseudonym.⁵⁸

Gontéry may well have been prompted to write in support of Coton on this occasion because of his own recent verbal encounter with du Moulin. On the evidence of the 'advertissement au lecteur' of du Moulin's next book, *Apologie pour la sainte Cène*,⁵⁹ the Protestant minister had met Gontéry some five months earlier, probably in the spring of 1607:

J'eus il y a cinq mois quelque rencontre sur le fait de l'Eucharistie avec un Docteur Jesuite qu'on nomme le Pere Gonteri, en laquelle ledit Docteur

4.3 Du Moulin (1606–1609)

après avoir receu quelques estocades franches, et quitté le combat, neantmoins a fait imprimer un narré de la conference, auquel il n'a rien fait de bien sinon qu'il a esté honteux d'y mettre son nom. La seule lecture conveinct le livre de faux; car il parle tousjours, et me fait seulement auditeur de contes. Et combien que la conference ait duré quatre heures, toutesfois à peine me fait il dire une douzaine de lignes. ('Advertissement au Lecteur')

Du Moulin's new book was bought by L'Estoile in September 1607:

Le samedi 15^e de ce mois, j'ay acheté l'*Apologie pour la Cene*, faite par le ministre Du Moulin, imprimée depuis peu de temps, in-8^o, dont beaucoup d'hommes doctes font estat, mais principalement tous ceux de la Religion, qui me l'ont fait acheter (VIII, 340).

Two months later a reply to du Moulin was published by one of du Perron's disciples, Nicholas Coeffeteau, a Dominican monk and Sorbonne doctor.⁶⁰ (Du Moulin published a second revised edition of his work in reply to Coeffeteau in 1609 and a final one in 1610.)⁶¹

A further break in the evidence of du Moulin's involvement in controversy occurs from the autumn of 1607 until September 1608 when both du Moulin and Pierre de Bérulle were involved in a conference which took place at Sézanne. The main protagonists were the Jesuit P. Séguiran and the Protestant minister Richer. The nature of Bérulle's involvement is unclear but he may have composed one of the anonymous 'discours' in the surviving documentation of the debate. Du Moulin seems to have taken part only in the later stages of the debate but his intransigence is blamed for the breaking-off of discussions.⁶² The encounter reveals more of du Moulin's character than of his method but also explains Bérulle's intervention in the printed exchanges between du Moulin and Gontéry which were to follow a second conference between the two men some six months later.

This conference marked the beginning of a year of mounting tension between Catholics and Protestants in the city and of fairly intense controversial activity for du Moulin which brought him to the king's attention on at least two occasions. The encounter between the minister and Gontéry took place on Saturday 11 April 1609, the day before Palm Sunday, and in the wake of a Lenten sermon series by the Jesuit which had been judged seditious even by many Catholics. The dispute arose

following an apparently casual invitation by a neighbour of du Moulin's to call on his family and discuss religious issues. Du Moulin found himself in a roomful of ladies who had clearly been primed by Gontéry to question him on a particularly contentious issue. Their initial challenge to defend Article 31 of his confession of faith was closely followed by the arrival of Gontéry himself, with two companions and 'force livres'. Several hours of heated debate on the priestly vocation and on the eucharist were the outcome. Du Moulin responded with vigour to the Jesuit's challenge and on the evidence of his own version of events (combined with an uncharacteristic reluctance on Gontéry's part to describe the encounter in detail) seems to have won the argument. The debate was nevertheless followed a week later by the formal abjuration of Protestantism by Madame de Mazencourt, one of the ladies present at the conference, and du Moulin no doubt timed the appearance of his (anonymous) account of the meeting to coincide with this event.⁶³ A letter from Gontéry to the king, announcing his success in this conference and the resulting abjuration of Mme. de Mazencourt, was published soon afterwards.⁶⁴

Du Moulin immediately composed a vigorous reply to Gontéry's letter, claiming that Madame de Mazencourt had ceased to be a Protestant at least twelve years earlier, describing once again Gontéry's lame performance in the debate and the disillusionment of Catholic listeners, and charging Gontéry with failing to deal with the conference issues in his letters.⁶⁵ With a passing reference to Gontéry's recent sermons, du Moulin concluded his reply with comments of a more general and political nature, claiming that the king

n'approuve pas les prescheurs seditieux, lesquels declament maintenant en leurs sermons en presence de sa Majesté que nous haïssons toute domination, et mesprisons la Royauté. Car sa Majesté sçait bien que tant s'en faut que cela soit veritable, qu'au contraire c'est la principale cause pour laquelle nous sommes hays, ascavoir pource que nous n'avons serment de fidelité à aucun homme qu'au Roi. Pource que nous disons que le Pape ne peut donner ni oster les Royaumes, ni dispenser les subjects du serment de fidelité: Pource que nous enseignons qu'il n'y doit avoir autres loix, autres juges, autres prisons que celles du roi: Pource que nous representons que son Royaume s'espuise d'argent, qui passe en Italie par annates, dates, dispenses, absolutions, affaires matrimoniales, etc. Et que le trafic et tyrannie s'establit sous ombre de religion. Bref pource que nous nous plaignons que le Pape fait baisser ses pieds aux Rois, et foule aux pieds leurs Couronnes. ... Y a'il personne qui puisse accuser les Eglises reformées de

4.3 Du Moulin (1606–1609)

rebellion ou attentat contre nos Rois; avons nous jamais porté le couteau sur nos Rois, ou voulu les faire voler avec de la poudre à canon? Et encores oser prescher cela en presence de sa Majesté, dont le seul regard et les espreuves de nostre fidelité qu'il a senties refutent ceste calomnie? Car que les Jesuites entreprenent lui persuader que nous lui sommes ou rebelles ou mal affectionnez, est tout ainsi que si Cayphe vouloit defendre Jesus Christ contre les Apostres; ou comme si Catilina accusoit Ciceron de sedition. (pp.27–28)

It was almost certainly these outspoken remarks which prompted Henri IV to order the suppression of du Moulin's pamphlet in early May.⁶⁶ By the end of the month Pierre de Bérulle had published a reply to du Moulin's original account of the conference which was presented by P. Coton to the king and to du Perron and, according to Coton, widely acclaimed.⁶⁷ Gontéry himself began work on a book attacking du Moulin and which was to reveal his debating method still in the process of development.⁶⁸

The summer of 1609 was a period of considerable activity in terms of religious controversy. King James's new edition of his apology was published and copies sent to European heads of state. In Paris the papal nuncio took steps to prevent the circulation of James's book whether in English, Latin or French; du Moulin was brought to the king's attention once again when the nuncio complained to Henri IV that he believed the Protestant minister was working on a translation of James's book; du Moulin denied this allegation when summoned before the chancellor.⁶⁹ In July du Moulin's revised edition of his *Apologie pour la sainte Cène* was published; Coeffeteau quickly replied before turning to work on his response to king James's apology.⁷⁰

In the same year du Moulin also published two short works, *Théophile* and *Héraclite*, which, according to the *Dictionnaire de Spiritualité*, represent the earliest examples of French Protestant devotional literature.⁷¹ *Oppositions de la parole de Dieu d'avec la doctrine de l'Eglise Romaine* was another short pamphlet in the same vein as *Nouvelles briques* and *Trente-deux demandes* which also seems to have been first published in 1609.⁷² Finally, the last few months of the year saw du Moulin taking part in another conference (with the abbé de Champvallon). Unlike du Moulin's other recorded encounters in 1608 and 1609 however this exchange appears to have been an exceptionally restrained and scholarly affair.⁷³ The end of

4.3 *Du Moulin (1606–1609)*

the year saw the publication of replies by Coeffeteau and Pelletier to king James, and another series of seditious sermons from P. Gontéry.⁷⁴ If du Moulin is to be believed, he immediately began work in early 1610 on a refutation of Coeffeteau's book.

The exchanges between du Moulin and Gontéry in 1609 and the continuing efforts by the nuncio to stifle debate on the pope's role in the secular sphere show how religious controversy had gradually become both more political and more acrimonious over the last few years of Henri IV's reign. Whereas, in the early years of the Edict of Nantes, with all references to France's earlier religious strife forbidden, preaching and religious controversy had been obliged to concentrate on purely religious issues, by 1609 events on the wider European stage — relations between the Pope and England and Venice, and between Protestants, Anglicans and Gallicans — had provided a fresh set of political and religious issues for debate in pulpits and pamphlets. In this context the following episode related by Peter du Moulin, which apparently belongs to April 1610 and which reveals the king's concern about religious debate as a potential source of civil strife in his absence, seems very plausible:

A little before he was stabbed in the midst of his preparations for an Expedition into Flanders, [the king] called an old Protestant, his trusty Servant, called La Chesnaye, and spoke thus to him; 'La Chesnaye, I am preparing for a great journey, and have used my best care that all may be quiet in my Kingdom in my absence. Two sorts of stirring wits I consider apt to cause disturbance, Jesuits and young Ministers. For Jesuits, I have imployed fit Agents to deal with them. For Ministers you must be one of my Agents. When I am gone, go to Du Moulin, Tell him that I remember his good services to my sister, That I desire him to pray for the prosperity of my person and journey, and to be quiet in my absence, sending no challenges and receiving none.' After the King's death, which was very few days after, La Chesnaye delivered the message from the king to Du Moulin, and presented him with the purse. Du Moulin never inquired what was in it, but refused it. ('The Author's Life', f. *** 4 recto)

The assassination of Henri IV, as described in Chapter 1, was in fact to fuel still more hostile exchanges between the 'stirring wits' of du Moulin and his Jesuit opponents before various political and censorship measures were gradually brought to bear by the regency government.

4.3 Du Moulin (1606–1609)

The years 1606 to 1610 thus show du Moulin once again heavily involved in religious debate. His most important work was undoubtedly the *Apologie pour la sainte Cène* but the two short pamphlets *Trente-deux demandes* and *Oppositions de la parole de Dieu* emphasise once again that his commitment to religious polemic at a popular level was a consequence of his position as a Parisian pastor. His debate with P. Gontéry provides further insights into his conference technique as he encountered the ‘méthodiste’ style of argument in its early stages of development.

Trente-deux demandes proposées par le P. Cotton (1607)

Trente-deux demandes was du Moulin’s reply to the most recent of many lists of alleged Protestant beliefs which Cotton had circulated and which, as du Moulin explained, had led to informal written exchanges between the two men:

[Coton] ayant par plusieurs fois desployé sa dexterité en questions subtilement limees, ceux à qui il les avoit proposees, me les ont apportees, me prians d’y respondre. J’y ai tousjours satisfaits. Mais luy supprimant mes responses, a continué à faire des nouvelles questions, se contentant de la charge d’inquisiteur. Suivant donc ces brisees ordinaires il a depuis peu mis en main à quelques Seigneurs de qualité trente deux questions qu’il estimoit insolubles. J’y ai promptement respondu. (pp.3–4)⁷⁵

In this printed reply du Moulin listed Cotton’s ‘demandes’ in full and then dealt with each in turn, proclaiming his intention of using scripture to deal with his opponent’s objections: ‘nous coupons avec le glaive de l’Evangile ces nœuds de questions entortillees, tissües expres pour envelopper les esprits’ (p.3). He claimed however that ‘de ces 32. demandes il n’y en a que le quart qui represente au vray nostre croyance, et y en a vingt-quatre calomnieuses’ (p.9). In the course of the pamphlet du Moulin pointed out many instances in which Cotton had formulated articles of faith for Protestants which were simply negations of Catholic beliefs: ‘Qu’il n’est loisible de faire le signe de la croix’ (Article 4), ‘Que l’on ne peut benir l’eau et qu’on n’en doit user estant benite’ (Article 5), ‘Qu’il ne faut point recevoir les traditions’ (Article 8). Du Moulin pointed out in each case that such assertions were ‘calomnies’ then briefly presented the Protestant case supported with biblical references. The pamphlet ended with a list of sixty-four demands for Cotton to deal with in his turn.

4.3 Du Moulin (1606–1609)

In contrast to the preface, where du Moulin described Coton's conduct in satirical terms, the tone of the pamphlet itself is generally moderate and impersonal but du Moulin was not averse to occasional attacks on the Jesuit order to which his opponent belonged: when Coton claimed, for example, that Protestants believed that the monastic vows of obedience, poverty and chastity could be broken, du Moulin observed that 'La pauvreté des Jesuites est plus abondante que la richesse des autres' (p.16). Similarly, in reply to Coton's Article 11, 'Que l'estat de mariage est plus agreable à Dieu que le celibat', he used evidence from the Jesuit Bellarmine to good effect:

Response. Celle-ci est une des plus calomnieuses: car au contraire nous recognoissons que le celibat chaste et continent a des avantages par dessus le mariage. Seulement nous disons que le mariage chaste est plus agreable à Dieu que le celibat incontinent et paillard: et renvoyons les personnes à Rome, et aux cloistres d'hommes et femmes, pour recognoistre les fruicts du celibat Romain. Car nous qui avons la reigle de la parole de Dieu, qu'il ne faut point faire mal afin que bien en advienne, ne pouvons aucunement approuver l'excuse du Cardinal Bellarmin, lequel ne pouvant nier qu'à Rome le Pere Tressainct souffre les bourdeaux publics, les defend et dit, que le Magistrat peut permettre un moindre mal pour en empescher un plus grand: et monstre que Dieu peut justement souffrir le peché au monde; par l'exemple des Magistrats qui donnent aux putains quelque quartier en la ville. Pouvoit-on trouver une plus honneste comparaison, pour nous représenter la justice de Dieu, que l'exemple des Magistrats establisants les bordeaux? (pp.16–17)

This pamphlet by du Moulin was revised and reprinted on a number of occasions during his time in Paris (1608, 1612, 1616 and 1617) and seems to have been used by him (and possibly by other Protestants also) as a convenient response to Catholic challenges. A letter cited by Gontéry in 1607 reveals him using the book in precisely this way:

Je vous envoie des questions que j'ay proposé au Jésuite Coton, qui ont rendu tous ces messieurs muets comme poissons. Lisez-les, et puis les leur donnez pour y satisfaire; s'ils ne peuvent, reconnaissez leur fuite.⁷⁶

Oppositions de la parole de Dieu (1609)

Oppositions de la parole de Dieu is likely to have been used by du Moulin in much the same way as his *Trente-deux demandes*. It is made up of thirty-eight articles in support of an opening declaration, 'Je ne puis me renger à l'Eglise Romaine, pource qu'elle enseigne choses discordantes avec la Parole de Dieu, contenuë és saintes Escritures'. Each article generally takes the form of a statement drawn from scripture, with relevant references in the margin, followed by a list of various Catholic doctrines which 'oppose' the biblical standpoint:

Dieu deffend de rien diminuer ou oster en sa Parole. [marginal reference: *Deut.ch.4.vers.2.*] Au contraire en l'Eglise Romaine on a rayé des Messels et Breviaires le second commandement de Dieu, auquel est defendu de faire aucune ressemblance des choses qui sont au Ciel et en la terre, et de s'y encliner. Avec mesme hardiesse on a osté de la Bible ces paroles, Que la semence de la Femme (c'est à dire Jesus-Christ) briserait la teste du Serpent; [*Genes.ch.3.vers.15.*] et on y a mis, Que la femme briserait la teste du serpent: transportant à la Vierge Marie l'honneur deub à nostre Seigneur Jesus. (Article II, p.4) ⁷⁷

The 'oppositions' are followed by a list of 'matieres tenues en l'Eglise Romaine, qu'on cache à ceux qu'on veut attirer' (pp.19-24) which reiterates many of the points made in the main section.

This short pamphlet was clearly intended to equip lay members of the Protestant church with the means of defending themselves against Catholic proselytisers. Its length, method of presenting the arguments, choice of Catholic sources — the missal and popular devotional works in current use rather than historical or scholarly works — and particularly the opening declaration all confirm this impression. The preface given by an anonymous English translator to his version in 1610 emphasises the value of the pamphlet in precisely these terms (as well as providing an interesting sidelight on du Moulin's reputation in England):

Gentle Reader, both the Argument of this short Treatise (the better part of which consisteth in Oppositions, which the more plainly they bee set downe, the more clearly they appeare) and the purpose of the Author (who made it for the un-learned) hath made me to abstaine from the flowers of Rhetorique in the translation thereof... The name of the Author is a sufficient patronage for the booke, who is so acute, and subtile in

4.3 Du Moulin (1606–1609)

controversies of Religion, that he never disputeth, but withall he refuteth. Many bookes have been written of this Subject, but none as yet so fitted to the capacitie of the vulgar, neither comprehended in so fewe leaves. Here are no nice distinctions to distract the ignorant, but onely those Papisticall errors are here shewed, which are repugnant to the written verity... ⁷⁸

Apologie pour la sainte Cène (1607)

Du Moulin's major work of this period, his *Apologie pour la sainte Cène*, is much less an 'apology' for the Lord's Supper of the Protestants than an attack on the Mass of Roman Catholicism (and particularly the doctrines of transsubstantiation and of the real presence). Du Moulin's approach to this issue is based largely on his perception of the contrast between 'la brieveté et clarté de nostre doctrine' and 'l'embarassement et perplexité de celle de nos adversaires' (p.8). In support of this view he does not confine himself to arguments from scripture but makes extensive use of rational and historical evidence as well, convinced that all sources of evidence support the Protestant case:

en ce point de l'Eucharistie nous avons de nostre costé, non seulement la parole de Dieu, la raison, le sens, l'experience, la déposition des anciens, mais mesmes le tesmoignage de nos adversaires: lesquels en ceste matiere semblent avoir peur d'estre creuz, et ne s'entendent pas eux mesmes. Es autres controverses ils errent, ou pour ne respecter pas assez l'Ecriture Sainte, ou pour ne la vouloir entendre: Mais en celle-cy ils errent d'abondant pour n'entendre pas ce qu'eux mesmes disent. Es autres points la foy leur manque, icy la foy et le sens commun ... (ff.9 verso–10 recto) ⁷⁹

Du Moulin traces the historical development of the doctrine of transsubstantiation and emphasises its roots in medieval scholasticism. He characterises the medieval period as one in which 'les meilleurs esprits ... n'ayans ny Hebreu, ny Grec, ny aucunes delices d'eloquence, ni aucun vray goust de la langue Latine, se sont ruez sur des ergoteries oyseuses, et sur une Philosophie barbarement subtile' (ff.31 verso–32 recto):

c'est és escholes de ces Docteurs scholastiques que s'est formé ce monstre de Transsubstantiation: c'est de leurs escrits qu'on puise les termes et les distinctions dont on se sert aujourd'huy. On tasche d'y apporter quelque

4.3 *Du Moulin (1606–1609)*

polissure, mais le fonds et le corps de la doctrine est de leur invention.
(f.32 verso)

The result, according to du Moulin, was that ‘une fausse Theologie nous a esclos en un siecle Barbare une mauvaise Philosophie’ (f.23 verso). At the Council of Trent ‘les facteurs de sa Saincteté ont tellement haussé et magnifié ceste Transsubstantiation qu’elle est devenue la livrée et escharpe du Papisme et le Palladium de la Babilone’ (f.31 recto). The connection made by du Moulin between ‘fausse Theologie’ and ‘mauvaise Philosophie’ provides him with the basis for many of his arguments against Catholic eucharistic doctrine. Catholic doctrine ‘s’enveloppe d’infinies contradictions’, claims du Moulin and, like most Protestant controversialists, he concentrates to a large extent on those seemingly illogical or offensive consequences which the Catholic doctrine of the eucharist might give rise to.

Although the main thrust of du Moulin’s argument is against the ‘labirinthe d’absurditez’ of which, he claims, Catholic eucharistic doctrine is composed, he does also provide substantial evidence — making up about a fifth of the 1610 edition — from the writings of the early church fathers. As in earlier works, he insists strongly on their role of confirming rather than supplementing scripture and stresses the difficulties of arriving at a reliable record of their views and practices (ff.27 verso, 184 verso).

The emphasis still remains however on rational argument and this brings him, in Chapter 6, to examine the relative roles of scripture and reason in arriving at religious truth (ff.49 verso-62 verso). Du Moulin acknowledges that eucharistic doctrine is an area in which Catholic controversialists often chose to challenge Protestant claims regarding the supremacy of scripture but presents this as merely evidence of Catholic inconsistency and bad faith. ‘La parole de Dieu contenüe es saintes Escritures est juge souveraine des differens de la religion’, says du Moulin, but this is a view generally rejected by Catholics (except on this particular issue):

nos adversaires qui és autres controverses s’appuyent sur les traditions, et s’embusquent dans les tenebres d’une parole non escrite, changent icy d’escrime: car estans en ce point extraordinairement conscientieux, ils feignent de vouloir se tenir de pres aux mots de l’Evangile...

La cause de ceste procedure extraordinaire est, pource qu’ils recognoissent que leur propre sens et leur raison leur est totalement contraire...

4.3 Du Moulin (1606–1609)

ces Messieurs qui ès autres controverses employent leur raison contre l'Ecriture, en celle-ci employent l'Ecriture contre la raison. (ff.50 recto-verso)

In the following chapter he sets out to demonstrate that 'L'Ecriture ne leur favorise non plus que la raison', but first he defends the role of reason. 'Tous recognoissent voirement que la raison humaine est juge incompetente ès choses divines', concedes du Moulin, but he then goes on to claim that he is using only those 'maximes de la raison naturelle' which are accepted as incontrovertible by his opponents and then to assert that reason does have a legitimate role in dealing with issues of faith:

Aussi ne faut-il pas penser que la pieté soit contraire à la raison: elle n'est point son ennemie, mais sa maistresse: La religion nous enseigne à renger nostre raison, mais non à la perdre: l'Eglise est une eschole de docilité et non de brutalité, où nous apprenons à estre Chrestiens, mais non à n'estre plus hommes: (ff.51 recto-verso)

This was a standpoint which du Moulin was to be forced to elaborate much more clearly in later years when younger exponents of Gontéry's method grew more numerous and vociferous. In the face of their attack on the Protestant approach to scripture as both individualistic and rationalistic du Moulin was to be obliged to defend the role of reason in interpreting scripture and in matters of faith generally.

The key phrase 'Ceci est mon corps' as the starting-point for eucharistic debate, was widely used by Catholic controversialists, offering as it seemed both a concise scriptural proof in favour of the doctrines of the real presence and of transsubstantiation and a refutation of Protestant theological method and eucharistic doctrine. It reappears continually in du Moulin's written and verbal debates throughout the period. In his *Apologie pour la sainte Cène* du Moulin deals with this argument at length. The following long extract shows how du Moulin's exposition of Christ's statement is based on an examination of the scriptural accounts phrase by phrase, emphasising the context of this crucial phrase:

Maintenant suivons le fil de l'Evangile. Saint Matthieu adjouste,

Il print du pain et le rompit, et le donna à ses disciples.

Pouvoit-il dire plus clairement que Jesus Christ donna du pain à ses disciples? Neantmoins contre des paroles si expresses l'Eglise Romaine

tient que le Prestre ne donne point du pain. Qui a-il de plus opposé? Ne sert de dire qu'il est appelé pain avant la consecration, Car on ne donne point le Sacrement aux communians qu'apres la consecration: comme aussi il se fait en la Messe: et comme Jesus Christ a fait. Comme aussi le Pape Innocent le recognoist, disant, *Non est credibile quod Christus prius dederit quam consecrerit. Il n'est pas croyable que Christ ait donné avant que de consacrer.* Voici donc mon argument, auquel Coeffeteau ne respnd nullement, ains respond à ce que je ne dis pas.

Ce que Jesus Christ a donné aux Apostres estoit du pain.

Or ç'a esté apres la consecration que Jesus Christ a donné à ses Apostres.

Donc apres la consecration c'estoit du pain.

La premiere proposition est de l'Evangile, *Il print du pain et le donna.* La seconde est avouée par le Pape Innocent et par toute l'Eglise Romaine, et ainsi est-il pratiqué en la Messe. Dont aussi naist un pareil argument.

Ce que le Seigneur a donné estoit du pain, comme dit l'Evangile.

Or les Apostres ont mangé ce que le Seigneur leur a donné.

Donc les Apostres ont mangé du pain.

Comme aussi S. Paul le dit trois fois tout de suite. I. Corinth. II. *Toutes et quantes fois que vous mangerez de ce pain, etc.* Ces arguments sont si forts que Coëffeteau n'a osé en nier aucune des propositions, ni toucher à ces Syllogismes.

Maintenant je croy qu'il n'est pas malaisé à recognoistre, pourquoy Messieurs nos Maistres ne proposent jamais au peuple ces mots de l'Evangile qui tesmoignent que Jesus Christ *a pris du pain, l'a rompu et l'a donné à ses disciples*, ains les coulent doucement sous le tapis, comme contraires à leur Transsubstantiation, et sur lesquelles ils s'enferment eux-mesmes de mille contradictions.

Avec pareille fraude lors que nous leur proposons ces mots, incontinent pour esquiver et nous divertir de là, ils nous opposent les mots suivans *Ceci est mon corps*: Car les mots qui suivent ne desmentent point les precedens. Ains comme il est vray que ce qu'il leur donnoit estoit son corps, aussi est il vray qu'il a rompu du pain, et qu'il leur a donné du pain. Ne valoit il pas beaucoup mieux produire au peuple le propos entier, et regarder comment ces deux choses peuvent estre veritables ensemble, à sçavoir que ce soit du pain que Jesus Christ leur a donné, et que ce soit son corps, plustost que se servir des mots suivans pour renverser les precedens, ou les tordre par figures inusitees et par explications violentes? Or comment ces deux choses sont veritables ensemble et s'accordent aisément, nous en parlerons en ce

chapitre, outre ce qui en a esté dit au deuxiesme. (ff.69 verso–70 verso)

This passage, from the revised edition of 1610, shows how du Moulin employs syllogisms to draw out the meaning of the passage, even incorporating a statement by Pope Innocent as the minor premiss of his first syllogism. Here, and in the pages which follow, he responds to Coeffeteau's objections (or silences) as he proceeds. As he goes on to discuss the significance of the two words, 'Prenez, mangez', he enumerates the points at which the Catholic Mass fails to follow Christ's example at the Last Supper. He uses analogies to emphasise that certain differences are crucial and undermine the theory of transsubstantiation:

Est aussi fort considerable, qu'au Canon de la Messe en cet endroit le prestre ne parle point en sa personne, ains seulement recite que Jesus Christ a dit, prenez, mangez en tous, et qu'il a dit que c'estoit son corps. Là dessus je dis qu'autre chose est faire, autre chose reciter ce que quelqu'un a fait: autre chose donner une bataille, et faire le recit d'une bataille: autre chose donc de reciter les mots de Jesus Christ par lesquels il a consacré, autre chose de consacrer. Ainsi si je dis que Dieu a dit que la lumiere soit et ainsi a fait la lumiere, s'ensuit-il qu'en recitant ces mesmes mots je produise la lumiere? Et si j'accordoys à nos adversaires que Jesus Christ disant *Ceci est mon corps*, eust transsubstantié le pain en son corps, s'ensuivroit-il pour cela que reciter que Jesus Christ a dit *Ceci est mon corps*, soit faire une pareille Transsubstantiation? (ff.71 recto–verso)

Du Moulin then sets the contentious phrase in its context for examination and places a strong emphasis on the contrast between an apparently unforced interpretation (adopted by Protestants) and the scholastic jargon employed in the Catholic explanation of this phrase:

Jesus Christ adjouste,

Prenez, mangez, Ceci est mon corps.

L'intelligence de ces mots depend principalement de l'explication de ce pronom demonstratif [CECI]. Nous disons que par ce mot *Ceci*, Jesus Christ entendoit ce qu'il tenoit, Or nous sommes d'accord avec nos adversaires qu'il tenoit du pain lors qu'il prononçoit ce mot CECI: car ils tiennent que la Transsubstantiation n'estoit encores faite. C'estoit donc encores du pain. Et par consequent ce mot CECI signifie *ce pain* que je tiens: Et ces mots *Ceci est mon corps*, valent autant que *Ce pain est mon corps*.

4.3 Du Moulin (1606–1609)

Nos adversaires expliquent ce mot autrement et disent que ce mot CECI signifie *sous ceci* ou *sous ces accidens*, et que ces mots *Ceci est mon corps* signifient *Sous ces accidens est mon corps*. Et là dessus je somme les consciences les plus obstinees, de juger icy quelle explication est moins forcee et plus naturelle: ou la nostre, que *Ceci signifie ce que Jesus Christ tenoit*, ou celle de nos adversaires qui veulent que *Ceci signifie sous ceci* ou *sous ces especes*. Pour le moins si ces quatre petits mots leur fussent demeurez entiers pour soustien à une cause desesperee, combatuë par la parole de Dieu, par l'analogie de la foy, par l'exemple des Apostres, par leur propre sens et raison! Et qui escouteront-ils s'ils n'escoutent ni Dieu ni eux-mesmes? Ils nous accordent que le sens et la raison sont pour nous, feignans de se vouloir tenir aux mots de l'Evangile: lesquels neantmoins ils gehennent et tordent par des explications violentes, et sans exemple. Car feuilletez toute l'Ecriture sainte, voire tous les escrits profanes si jamais vous trouverez que CECI signifie *Sous ces especes ou accidens*. Et Coëffeteau avec toute sa subtilité n'en a sceu produire un seul exemple. Ainsi se tiennent ces messieurs à l'Ecriture Sainte. (ff.72 recto-verso)

The substance of these pages was to reappear some ten years later in his *Bouclier de la foy*.

The long extract reproduced above shows not only how du Moulin deals with the vital question of the interpretation of the phrase 'Cecy est mon corps' but also illustrates the attractions of his style and method. Despite the complexity of the subject, du Moulin's argument, based on scriptural and rational evidence, and the informal but clear manner in which he presents this to his reader, enlivened by rhetorical questions and analogies, make this a particularly accessible account of the Protestant position on eucharistic doctrine. Although a certain amount of historical argument is included in the work and references to Bellarmine and others are included in the margins, du Moulin's intention once again seems to have been to produce a readable and persuasive work opposing Catholic doctrine rather than to advance historical scholarship on this issue.

Snoeks's assessment of *Apologie pour la sainte Cène* in his major work on the seventeenth-century eucharistic debate, *L'argument de tradition*, thus seems to criticise du Moulin for failing to meet criteria which the minister would almost certainly not have had in mind. Comparing du Moulin's work with that of du Plessis-Mornay, whose book had concentrated on the historical development of eucharistic doctrine, Snoeks concludes that the younger author lacked scholarly

4.3 Du Moulin (1606–1609)

objectivity — '[il] ne put se résigner, ... à examiner avec sérénité les témoignages de la tradition' —

Comparé à son collègue, il fait plutôt figure de retardataire, eu égard surtout à l'orientation qu'allait prendre la controverse dans la suite, sous l'impulsion même de ses successeurs. La pauvreté de son érudition ne s'explique d'ailleurs pas seulement par la répugnance que lui inspirait alors le recours aux Pères. Elle tient aussi à son goût excessif pour la spéculation ou même pour les discussions stériles et inspirées davantage par le désir de confondre l'adversaire que par celui de faire avancer la science...

... les divers traités publiés à ce moment par du Moulin ne constituent qu'une bien faible contribution à la controverse historique... Il n'est donc pas possible de voir en lui, du moins au cours de cette période-ci de son activité, un véritable continuateur de du Plessis-Mornay. (pp.57–58)

Snoeks's analysis has led many modern commentators on the religious controversies of this period to dismiss du Moulin's contribution as immoderate and unscholarly. The terms of his criticism however clearly fail to take account of du Moulin's own situation and his purpose. The nature of du Plessis-Mornay's involvement in religious debate was entirely different to that of du Moulin (as the former's lack of shrewdness in agreeing to the Fontainebleau conference perhaps shows). Du Moulin's circumstances, as he often complained, did not permit him to dedicate his time to theological work at a scholarly level but *did* require him to engage in popular debate on virtually a daily basis. As has already been suggested on a number of occasions, changes in the socio-political situation of Parisian Protestantism after 1621 played a large part in allowing the Charenton pastors of the later period to develop Protestant scholarship in ecclesiastical history.

Conference with Gontéry (1609)

Du Moulin's second conference with P. Gontéry, as described above, began as an invitation to discuss religious issues informally with a group of neighbours. The Protestant minister was immediately challenged, upon entering the room, to defend Article 31 of the French Protestant Churches' confession of faith. This article, concerning the vocation of Protestant ministers, was to be one of the four articles from this confession on which Gontéry centred his 'méthodiste' arguments, and stated that:

Nous croyons^a que nul ne se doit ingerer de son autorité propre pour gouverner l'Eglise; mais que cela se doit faire par election, en tant qu'il est possible, et que Dieu le permet. Laquelle exception nous y adjoustons notamment, pource qu'il a falu quelquefois, et mesme de nostre temps (auquel l'estat de l'Eglise estoit interrompu) que Dieu ait suscité gens d'une façon extraordinaire, pour dresser l'Eglise de nouveau, qui estoit en ruine et desolation. Mais quoi qu'il en soit, nous croyons qu'il se faut tousjours conformer à ceste reigle.^b Que tous Pasteurs, Surveillans et Diacres ayent tesmoignage d'estre appelés à leur office. [marginal references: a *Matt.12, 10.18 marc 19.13, jean 15.16. act.1.21. rom.10.15. tii.1.5.* b *Gala.1.15. 1 tim.3.7.8.9.10.15.*]⁸⁰

It appears that Gontéry arrived soon after du Moulin and attempted to pursue the argument on this issue. Du Moulin, however, immediately forced Gontéry onto the defensive, demanding that the Jesuit first prove the basis of *his* vocation. The following passage from du Moulin's own record of the discussion suggests that the tone which he adopted towards his Jesuit opponent was extremely forceful throughout:

Sur ces propos voici entrer le Sieur Gontier avec deux autres qui avoyent force livres.

Gontier demande en entrant, Qu'est-ce? Que dit-on ici? Du Moulin respond, Madame que voila me demande raison de ma mission. Et je lui disois qu'elle vous devoit avoir demandé raison de la vostre.

GONT. Cela est une fuite pour eschapper.

DU MOUL. Ce n'est point une fuite: car quiconques s'ingere de demander à autrui raison de sa vocation, s'oblige à rendre premierement raison de la

4.3 *Du Moulin (1606–1609)*

sienne. Que si vous voulez confesser que vous ne pouvez defendre la vostre: Je m'offre à defendre dez maintenant la mienne.

GONT. Ne vous mettez point en cholere: Je vous nie que cela soit.

DU MOULIN. Je ne dis rien qui ne soit clair: et vous vai prouver que vous n'avez nulle vocation.

GONT. Qui vous a donné charge de parler ainsi à vos supérieurs?

DU MOUL. Vous n'estes point mon superieur, ains je maintiens que vous n'avez nulle charge. (pp.4–5)⁸¹

Retaining the offensive advantage which he had acquired, du Moulin went on to demand scriptural proof for the ceremony whereby a Catholic priest is made a 'sacrificateur'. Gontéry, unable to find a particular passage by Paul, sent for his concordance. Du Moulin eventually located the passage for him but denied that it demonstrated the desired point, and commented on this shameful admission of unfamiliarity with scripture. Gontéry offered to prove instead that the apostles were instituted as 'sacrificateurs'; du Moulin permits this change of subject but then challenges the logic of Gontéry's proofs:

GONT. Gontier prend la plume, et escrit ce qui s'ensuit: Le mot de sacrifier en sa primeraine signification signifie faire une chose sacree. Les Apostres estoient establis pour faire une chose sacree. Donc ils estoient establis pour sacrifier.

DU MOUL. Il ne s'agit point icy d'Etymologies, mais du sens auquel se prend le mot de Sacrifier en l'Eglise Romaine, à sçavoir pour offrir à Dieu reellement le corps de Jesus Christ en sacrifice propitiatoire pour les vivans et pour les morts. Prier Dieu est faire une chose sacree, et toutesfois toute personne qui prie n'est pas pour cela Sacrificateur en ce sens. Dont s'ensuit que la conclusion n'est à propos, puis qu'elle prend le mot de sacrifier en autre sens qu'en celui dont il s'agit ici.

GONT. J'ai monstré ce qu'il falloir monstrier.

DU MOUL. Je le nie: cela n'est à propos: vous vous attachez au mot pour fuir la chose. (pp.7–8)

Similarly,

GONT. En saint Matthieu 26. Le sang de Jesus Christ est respandu pour

la remission des pechez. Or où le sang de Jesus Christ est respandu, là il est sacrifié. Et tout ce qui sert à la remission des pechez est sacrifice.

DU MOUL. Je le nie: si cela estoit le Baptesme seroit un sacrifice, veu qu'il sert à la remission des pechez. Aussi est-il faux que où le sang est respandu pour la remission des pechez là soit un sacrifice, si ce n'est que ce sang soit offert à Dieu, car il n'y a point de sacrifice sans offrir à Dieu.⁸²

One of the ladies present then changes the subject under debate by asking for clarification of the phrase 'Ceci est mon corps'; du Moulin immediately affirms the truth of this statement but then goes on to argue that its meaning can only be fully understood by a comparison of all the scriptural accounts:

NOUVELLE MATIERE PROPOSEE.

L'une doncques de ces Dames requist qu'on esclairecist ces mots de Jesus-Christ, *Ceci est mon corps*.

DU MOUL. Du Moulin prend la parole, et dit: Que nul ne doute de la verité de ces mots. Item qu'il faut croire l'Ecriture selon les expositions qu'elle apportoit à elle mesme: Que ces paroles, *Ceci est mon corps*, sont ainsi exposees par l'Apostre saint Paul 1. Corinth. 10. vers. 16. *Le pain que nous rompons est la communion au corps de Christ*. Exposition que l'Eglise Romaine rejette, ne croyant pas que ce soit du pain, ni que nous rompions du pain. Ni que ce pain rompu soit la communion au corps de Christ, puis que c'estoit le corps mesme de Jesus-Christ. Joint que les Evangelistes d'un accord tesmoignent que Jesus-Christ a rompu et donné du pain. *Il print du pain et le rompit, et le donna*. Ce que l'Eglise Romaine nie, ne croyant pas qu'il ait donné du pain. Qui plus est nie ces paroles *Ceci est mon corps*. Car puisque ce mot CECI signifie CE QUE JE DONNE, et puis qu'il a donné du pain, le sens de ces mots *Ceci est mon corps*, est, *Ce pain est mon corps*: Ce que l'Eglise Romaine nie.

GONT. Gontier au contraire oppose à cela que saint Paul avoit dit en l'Eucharistie que le corps du Seigneur est rompu pour nous. Que le pain dont il parle, disant, *Le pain que nous rompons est sa chair*, comme il est dit en saint Jean 6. *Le pain que je donneray c'est ma chair*.

DU MOUL. Du Moulin repart et dit, qu'en cela Gontier contredit à l'Eglise Romaine, laquelle ne croit pas que le corps du Seigneur soit rompu en l'Eucharistie, et demande à Gontier s'il vouloit souscrire cela, Que l'Eglise Romaine croit que le corps du Seigneur est rompu en l'Eucharistie. [Marginal note: *L'Eglise Romaine croit que le corps demeure entier. Et que*

4.3 Du Moulin (1606–1609)

les seuls accidens (qu'ils appellent especes) se rompent.] Que Gontier par ce mot de *pain* entendant le *corps de Christ*, rendoit ridicules les paroles de saint Paul, lui faisant dire que *Le corps de Christ que nous rompons est la communion au corps de Christ*. Qu'en ce passage de S. Jean il ne parle point de l'Eucharistie, mais promet de se donner en la mort, comme il appert par les mots qu'il adjouste, *Le pain que je donnerai c'est ma chair, laquelle je donnerai pour la vie du monde*. Or il ne s'est donné pour la vie du monde qu'en sa mort.

GONT. A cela Gontier ne respond rien sinon que ce mot *Je donnerai* estant repeté par deux fois se prenoit en deux diverses significations. Puis estant requis de soubsigner que l'Eglise Romaine croit que le corps du Seigneur est rompu en l'Eucharistie, il prent un papier où il escrit, *Jesus-Christ en l'Eucharistie a rompu son corps, S. Paul 1. Cor. 11. vers. 14.* qui n'estoit pas ce qu'on luy demandoit. Là dessus requis de dire franchement si l'Apostre saint Paul disoit la verité en disant que nous rompons du pain, respondit franchement qu'il ne respondroit là dessus. Ce qui meut un des assistans nommé Monsieur Poupar, arrivé sur la fin de la conference de lui dire, Nous avons apporté nos oreilles, mais vous n'avez point de bouche.

Cela fait Gontier pressé derechef de prouver que Jesus-Christ ait offert son sang à Dieu en l'Eucharistie quitte le combat, et se retire en un coin de la chambre honteux et desconfit, se met à escrire tout seul ce qu'il voulut en un papier à part, lequel apres avoir monstré sur la table, puis apres le deschira, l'ayant retiré des mains de Madame de Liembrune qui le vouloit garder.

Ayant donc ainsi quitté la place, Madame la Baronne de Salignac prend la place.⁸³

This passage, if it is indeed an accurate account of du Moulin's arguments, shows that he was aware of the standard Catholic strategy on this issue — to claim that Protestants rejected the clear testimony of scripture — and his closely-argued response concentrates on multiplying the biblical references under scrutiny and emphasising as often as possible the degree to which Roman Catholic doctrine does not accord with scripture or reason.

The discussion in this conference between du Moulin and Gontéry ranged over several issues but dealt chiefly with the priestly vocation and eucharistic doctrine, particularly the Catholic priest's role as 'sacrificateur' and the significance of the phrase 'Cecy est mon corps'. The ladies appear to have been primed to ask the questions which should have placed the Protestant minister on the defensive but du

4.3 *Du Moulin (1606–1609)*

Moulin refuses to accept this role. His account of the discussions, which Gontéry does not really deny in his subsequent letter to the king, portrays du Moulin in the role of questioner and reads rather like the record of an interrogation. He demolishes Gontéry's syllogisms, ridicules his inability to trace biblical texts, and despite the fact that the ladies present attempted to assist the Jesuit by claiming that the discussion had become too obscure or venturing new subjects for debate, it was Gontéry who eventually withdrew from the debate.

Du Moulin's account of this conference shows that he was aware of the strategy which Gontéry would have liked^d to employ — the issues presented for discussion and the challenge to prove the scriptural basis of Protestant doctrine were at the heart of the new method — but du Moulin, both through skilful, well-documented argument and also, apparently, through sheer belligerence, managed to evade Gontéry's attempt to place him on the defensive.

Du Moulin's participation in religious controversy in the final years of the reign of Henri IV shows that he had become well-established as a polemicist at a popular level and above all a formidable opponent, as much through force of character as through his undoubted skill and erudition. As the Parisian Jesuits had become more fully involved in day-to-day exchanges and as events at home and abroad added a political dimension to the arguments, religious debate had become increasingly bitter. The exchanges between du Moulin and Gontéry clearly reveal the depths of the hostility which existed between Jesuits and Protestants. The range of du Moulin's publications and exchanges during these years (and on until 1611) reflect his determination to defend his church and faith vigorously even to the extent of addressing criticisms of the king's favourite preacher to Henri IV himself. Du Moulin's activities throughout the regency period which followed, both in the internal affairs of French Protestantism and on a wider international stage, were to add still further to his reputation as a vigorous and influential defender of the Protestant cause.

4.4 Religious debate politicized (1610–1616)

'Le 10 may 1610, à quatre heures apres midi, le roi Henri IV a esté tué à Paris par Ravailac, en son carrosse, pres du cimetière Saint-Innocent'. Du Moulin thus briefly noted the assassination of Henri IV in his autobiography and made no reference to the controversy which this event caused.⁸⁴ The efforts of the authorities to suppress the numerous anti-Jesuit pamphlets which appeared after the king's death were described in Chapters 1 and 2. Du Moulin may have played his part in attacking the Jesuits as the possible author of the *Anticoton* but this anonymous pamphlet, if it was indeed by du Moulin, was to be his only contribution to religious polemic at a local level throughout the regency period.

Most of du Moulin's publications during these years arose from his association with James I. It was in defence of the English king's apology that du Moulin wrote his major work of this period, *Defense de la foy catholique*; the first two volumes appeared in 1610, the third in 1612 and a Latin version in 1614.⁸⁵ The main Catholic work which du Moulin undertook to refute in his *Defense de la foy catholique* was by Nicolas Coeffeteau and his long-running dispute with this controversialist was thus transferred to the international stage. Written or verbal exchanges with other Parisian controversialists, however, seem to have effectively ceased during this period.

Much of du Moulin's energy was, however, to be absorbed by the internal controversies of the French Protestant church or of continental Protestantism. In 1611, for example, du Moulin was engaged in a correspondence with representatives of the academy of Leiden who wished him to take up a teaching post there. The conflict between partisans of Gomar and Arminius had caused deep divisions in the academy; the authorities hoped that du Moulin might act as a counter-weight to the Arminian Vorstius and introduce "un esprit de paix et de tranquillité et empescher que la robbe de nostre Seigneur Jesus Christ ne soit déchirée".⁸⁶ Despite this responsibility, du Moulin's reply of 6 May makes it clear that he found the offer very inviting:

J'ay receü vos lettres et veü les offres et conditions que vous et Messieurs vos collègues m'offrés. Elles sont telles que j'ay tout sujet de m'en contenter. Ce neantmoins, j'oseray vous dire que ce ne seront jamais les profits ou

4.4 *Du Moulin (1610–1616)*

avantages qui me feront changer de condition. J'ay d'autres raisons plus fortes qui me poussent à condescendre à vostre desir et à me donner à vostre academie. Le repos, la seureté, l'honneur de vostre amitié, le redressement de mes estudes qui se dissipent et surtout le desir que j'ay de servir l'église de Dieu avec plus de fruict que je ne fais icy, sont les causes qui me touchent le plus, ... (pp.293–94)

Despite du Moulin's readiness to leave Paris, neither the efforts of university and state authorities nor the personal intervention of Louise de Coligny and of Prince Maurice could persuade the Paris consistory to allow du Moulin to leave. His congregation, as du Moulin wrote again to van der Mijle, were dismayed at the idea of his departure. Their arguments, set alongside du Moulin's own longing for a more peaceful and studious existence, suggest the daily pressures to which he was subject as pastor to the Parisian Protestants:

Plusieurs sont venus former de grosses plaintes contre mes compagnons et contre les Anciens, comme desirieux de me chasser ou peu soigneux du bien de l'église, disants que l'église n'en recevrait point un autre en ma place; que j'avois peur; que vous me corrompriez par argent; que les Jesuites seroient desormais intollerables et se vanteroient de m'avoir chassé; que le Synode n'y a pas consenti; que toutes les eglises de France y ont interest; que mon pere en mourra de tristesse et plusieurs choses semblables que peut suggerer une affection indiscrete d'un peuple qui ne juge de la necessité de l'église que par ce qu'il voit devant ses yeux. (p.294)

(The Charenton church's final decision to refuse to part with du Moulin was made on 11 September 1611 (p.295).)

The year 1611 also gave rise to controversy within the French Protestant Church when Daniel Tilenus, following the views of Piscator, accused the church of veering towards the heresy of ubiquity, 'qui abolit la nature humaine en Jésus-Christ, la déifiant et lui attribuant les propriétés incommunicables de la Divine'. The issue became the source of personal antagonism when du Moulin offered to discuss the question privately with Tilenus. A conference eventually took place at Paris, "avec scandale et murmure de l'Eglise, et risée des adversaires", according to du Moulin.⁸⁷ Thereafter, in defiance of the French church's confirmation that du Moulin had correctly represented its standpoint on this issue, Tilenus continued to circulate his opinions in a document entitled 'Examen doctrinae Molinaei

4.4 Du Moulin (1610–1616)

de unione hypostatica'. The affair was not brought to an end until James I became personally involved; his ambassador was issued with letters and instructions to persuade the parties to suppress the controversy. The details of this internal dispute were to reach a far wider audience when the editor of *Le Mercure françois* obtained and published du Moulin's version of events (contained in a 'Lettre aux Ministres de France', dated 25 February 1613).

The early years of the regency government had seen a marked change in the balance of political power as those with ultramontane sympathies prevailed over Gallicans and Protestants (as represented by the Paris Parlement and by Sully, the Protestant *surintendant des finances*). The progressive hardening of the government's attitude towards the Protestants was described in Chapter 1 and, in Chapter 2, the increasingly effective measures taken against religious and political propaganda hostile to the pope. In this situation, du Moulin appears to have turned his attention to consolidating the French Protestants' position by taking a firm stand on doctrinal orthodoxy and by promoting solidarity with other European Protestant churches.

In the autumn of 1613, for example, du Plessis-Mornay's correspondence reveals that du Moulin had discussed with him the idea of forming a union with other European Reformed churches: 'nous avons discoureu ensemble, M. Dumoulin et moi, sur la proposition de la réunion de toutes les Eglises réformées, à laquelle j'ai de long temps travaillé et loue Dieu qu'elle se remette sus. J'approuve fort les moyens qu'il en a tracés'.⁸⁸ On du Moulin's advice, du Plessis-Mornay wrote to the English ambassador, Thomas Edmondes, with a view to securing the English king's support for this initiative:

M. Dumoulin nous estant venu voir en ces quartiers, m'a faict sentir que ce grand roy, vostre souverain, vouloit embrasser ceste œuvre nécessaire, ... et m'a communiqué certain projet, qu'il a dressé, des moyens de le conduire à une bonne fin, lesquels procedés d'ung si saint zele et d'ung si excellent esprit, je ne puis que grandement louer et approuver.⁸⁹

In May of the following year (1614) a discussion document entitled 'Expedients que l'on propose pour réunir les Eglises chrétiennes qui ont secoué le joug du Pape' was put before the national synod of Tonneins. Rimbault's researches have shown that

4.4 *Du Moulin (1610–1616)*

this was based on the outline which du Moulin had shown to du Plessis-Mornay the previous October.⁹⁰ The English king expressed his support by sending David Home to the synod with a letter commending the project.

In the spring of 1615 du Moulin's role as champion of King James in France was marked with an invitation to visit the English court. The Charenton church, as in 1611, was anxious not to lose one of its ministers, as du Moulin recounts:

L'an 1615, au mois de février, Monsieur de Mayerne, premier medicin de Jacques, roy de la Grande Bretagne, arriva à Paris, et me fit entendre le désir que Sa Majesté avoit de me voir. Dèsja il m'avoit envoyé deux milles livres, pour un livre que j'avoit fait, en deffense de la confession de foy que ledit roy avoit publiée. Je me résolus de faire ce voyage; mais nostre Consistoire s'y opposa; car on luy avoit persuadé que si j'y allois, je ne reviendrois plus. Mais je leur ostay cette persuasion, par la promesse et serment que je fis en public à Charenton de retourner en bref. Ainsi je partis de Paris avec Monsieur de Mayerne au commencement de mars 1615. ('Autobiographie', p.342)

Du Moulin's stay in England was to last three months. He was invited by the king to preach (in French) at Greenwich, taken to Cambridge to receive an honorary doctorate and to Canterbury to be made a prebendary. In return, James enlisted du Moulin's help in the composition of a reply to the 'harangue' which du Perron had delivered to France's Third Estate in early January 1615 on the subject of their proposed oath of fidelity.⁹¹ The cardinal's speech contained several critical references to James; the king's response took the form of a declaration 'pour le droit des rois et independance de leurs couronnes'. At the end of the book, du Moulin added an 'advertissement' in which he modestly described his role as merely that of a stylistic consultant to the king:

il luy a pleu me la communiquer, et me commander de donner quelque polissure au langage Francois, se deffiant en cela de soy mesme, quoy que nostre langue luy soit fort familiere. ... il a voulu que ce peu d'aide que je luy ay presté fust cogneu à tous; Et m'a commandé d'ajouter à la fin de son livre ceste présente declaration, qui servira à faire cognoistre à tous la candeur et sincerité de son naturel, comme son ouvrage fait foy de son scavoir exquis, et de la vigueur de son esprit incomparable.⁹²

Du Moulin's autobiography, however, casts some doubt on the candour and sin-

4.4 Du Moulin (1610–1616)

cerity of both parties since he stated plainly there that the reply to du Perron's speech was all his own work: 'Sa Majesté me commanda d'y faire response; ce que je fis: je lui [ay] présenté ma response, laquelle est imprimée sous son nom' ('Autobiographie', p.343).

The political troubles besetting France in the wake of the Estates General were quickly brought home to du Moulin when he returned at the end of the summer: upon his arrival at Boulogne he and his brother were seized and imprisoned by the town's governor on suspicion of having visited England to seek military aid for the prince of Condé. They were released two days later. In his autobiography du Moulin immediately passes to the summer of 1617 and the *Defense de la confession de foy des eglises reformées*. The remaining two years under Marie de Médicis do not appear to have yielded any further publications.

Authorship of the *Anticoton*

Since the appearance of Rimbault's study of du Moulin it has been widely accepted that du Moulin was indeed the author of the *Anticoton*. Rimbault cites the evidence of 'The Author's Life' written by du Moulin's son as conclusive proof that du Moulin wrote this pamphlet:

Upon the murder of that great King, du Moulin put forth that famous Book called *Anticoton*, in which he proved, that the Jesuits were Authors of that horrible parricide. Though he put not his name to it, the Jesuits soon knew that it was his work, and made an answer directed unto him.
(f.***4 recto)

The tone of Peter du Moulin's account suggests that he regarded authorship of the *Anticoton* as a fact which would redound to his father's credit and he goes on to describe in some detail the satirical epigrams circulated by the Jesuits as if these provided important evidence that du Moulin had indeed written the pamphlet. It is certainly true that the Jesuits did profess to believe that du Moulin was the author but this was also a view which it was politically convenient for them to uphold and accorded with P. Coton's own attempts to implicate the Protestants in the assassination of the king.⁹³ Although du Moulin made no secret of his hostility towards the Jesuits and there are aspects of the *Anticoton* which are

4.4 Du Moulin (1610–1616)

compatible with a Protestant author, most of the internal evidence points more strongly towards Gallican authorship.

The controversy concerning the identity of the *Anticoton*'s author centres on the identity of P.D.C. whose initials appear at the end of the dedicatory epistle addressed to the queen regent. The belief in du Moulin's authorship led to these letters being taken to stand for 'Pasteur De Charenton' and afforded other satirical possibilities such as 'Punaise de Charenton' to writers hostile to the pamphlet's supposed author.⁹⁴ The antagonism which existed between du Moulin and the Jesuit controversialists Coton and Gontéry was well-known in Paris; at this very period Coton was distributing his *Institution catholique* (containing a reply to the minister's *Trente-deux demandes*) to 'maint auditeur assidu de Du Moulin'.⁹⁵ The fact that one of the printers prosecuted for producing copies of the *Anticoton*, Joallin, had also been at Charenton the previous summer selling copies of du Moulin's pamphlet against P. Gontéry is another small detail which might seem to confirm du Moulin as author of the later work but, nevertheless, internal evidence generally seems to militate against this.

The author of the *Anticoton* explains his decision to conceal his identity in the following terms:

Le Lecteur ne s'estonnera point si l'Auteur ne se nomme pas: Cela doit estre imputé au temps, auquel il est mal-aisé de dire la verité, sans se faire des ennemis. Toutesfois s'il se trouve personne qui puisse respondre de point en point à ce Livre (ce que j'estime impossible, tant la verité y est evidente) l'Auteur promet d'escire derechef sur le mesme sujet, et dire son nom. Car il a, et assez de courage, et assez de credit pour se maintenir contre la malveillance des ennemis, et perturbateurs du repos public. (p.6)

The author's milieu is revealed to some extent by his familiarity with court life and his references to Gontéry, Coeffeteau, Suarez and du Perron: these were all Catholic controversialists well-known to du Moulin but the terms in which they are referred to do not reflect his dealings with them. The writer also mentions the Protestants, Isaac Casaubon, Sully and M. des Bordes de Grigny, but this again is a detail which would tend to disprove du Moulin's authorship: would he have implicated members of his congregation in the composition of the *Anticoton* when he was not prepared to put his own name to it? Again, despite the fact that several pages

4.4 Du Moulin (1610–1616)

were devoted to refuting the claim (made by Coton in his *Lettre declaratoire*) that the Protestants advocated regicide, the author is generally at pains to dissociate himself from the Protestants: 'ce que je dis, Madame, n'est pas suggeré par les Heretiques: mais c'est la voix de vos Parlements, de la pluspart de vostre Clergé, mesme de la sacrée Faculté de Theologie; c'est la clameur universelle de tout vostre peuple' (p.4). Would du Moulin have practised a deceit which required him to refer to the Protestants as 'heretics' (and also as 'ceux de la religion pretendue reformee' — a phrase against which he had protested so violently at the Sézanne conference) while also promising to reveal his identity at a later date? In general the remarks made against the Jesuits, the Pope, Rome or Spain are equally likely to have come from a patriotic Catholic and certain passages — such as that condemning the way in which the Jesuits' educational projects in Paris were damaging the fortunes of the Sorbonne — seem to indicate Gallican authorship much more strongly.

As was shown in Chapters 1 and 2, the *Anticoton* was regarded at the time as a particularly powerful and dangerous example of anti-Jesuit propaganda. Even now it still stands up well as a piece of polemical writing. In the course of some seventy pages, the author presents evidence from Jesuit writings and from the events of recent history in support of his claims that the Jesuits were responsible for the assassination of Henri IV, that their activities and aims were not compatible with France's own interests and welfare and in reply to the question, 's'il est utile pour le bien de l'Estat, que le Pere Cotton soit près de la personne du Roy ou de la Royne Regente, et si les Jesuistes doivent estre soufferts' (p.67). Such a significant pamphlet would seem a very creditable addition to the list of du Moulin's publications and it is not surprising therefore that, fifty years later, Peter du Moulin should assign authorship of this work to his father and that Rimbault should accept this claim so readily. The realities of the political situation however and the evidence of the pamphlet itself tend to suggest that, rather than revealing a family secret in ascribing authorship to his father, Peter du Moulin was simply relating a tenacious rumour upheld and publicized by the Jesuits in 1610 and used by them as further justification for action against Protestant or independent printers and booksellers.

Defense de la foy catholique (1610–1612)

While du Moulin's authorship of the *Anticoton* ought therefore to remain open to question, his chief contribution to the political debate in the early years of the regency remains his *Defense de la foy catholique*. This was written in support of James I whose new apology for the English oath of fidelity had appeared in the summer of 1609 and also in reply to a book by Coeffeteau, specially commissioned by Henri IV, which had appeared at the end of the year. This work provided du Moulin with the opportunity to write in support of Protestant values in a wider context (and to allude on many occasions to the situation in France) while continuing his exchanges with the main opponent of his *Apologie pour la sainte Cène*. (L'Estoile reveals that du Moulin had been sent a copy of James's book by the king himself and the Protestant minister may also therefore have been anxious to repay this compliment by writing in James's defence.)⁹⁶ Du Moulin had probably decided to reply to Coeffeteau's refutation soon after its appearance and the work was apparently well-advanced at the time of the assassination of Henri IV in May 1610 for, recognising the 'actualité' of certain passages in his work, he decided to publish the first two books immediately. He abruptly concluded Book 2 with a paragraph in which he claimed that 'la mort soudaine de nostre Roi, semblable à un grand esclat de tonnerre, nous engourdit la main d'estonnement, et nous trouble l'esprit par la douleur'.⁹⁷

Despite its title, du Moulin's *Defense de la foy catholique* is in fact a defence of the whole of James's new preface to his apology and not simply of the confession of faith included there. The three books of du Moulin's work correspond to each of the main areas developed in the king's 'ample advertisement': this opened with a historical survey of relations between the Pope and English sovereigns, gave an outline of the articles of his faith and ended with a long section in which he used scripture to prove the Pope's identity as the Antichrist. The three projected books of du Moulin's refutation were accordingly entitled 'Des usurpations des Papes sur les Rois', 'Defense de la confession de Jacques I. Roy de la Grand'Bretagne', and 'De l'accomplissement des Propheties'. Book 1 thus allowed du Moulin to review the activities of the Jesuits in France as well as England and many of his remarks bear a strong resemblance to earlier comments made in his *Response ... aux lettres du P. Gontery*.

4.4 *Du Moulin (1610–1616)*

In the dedication to James I, dated 20 January 1610, du Moulin made common cause with the English king on political as well as theological grounds in a passage whose prophetic overtones would have seemed far more convincing had the book appeared prior to the assassination of the French king:

la cause de nos Rois est jointe avec la vostre. Desquels nous voyons la couronne souillée et la vie en peril à faute de considerer les choses que vostre Majesté propose en son livre. Et Dieu vueille que vos advertissemens ne soyent point propheties: Et que nostre bon Roi, clement et victorieux, autant florissant en paix que redoutable en guerre, doué d'une vigueur admirable et de corps et d'esprit, nous soit longuement conservé. (p.5)

Whereas Book 1 reviewed the question of the Pope's role in secular affairs and particularly the activities and publications of his ardent supporters, the Jesuits, Book 2 examined Coeffeteau's reply to James's detailed statement of belief. Du Moulin quoted extensively from James's own book (which, according to the nuncio, was very rare in Paris) but his defence of James's beliefs inevitably became an attack on Catholic doctrine.⁹⁸ Those articles relating to the eucharist, to purgatory and to the primacy of the Pope — subjects on which he had already written extensively — received far more detailed treatment than other issues. The arguments, examples, analogies and the ordering of the evidence can often be traced directly back to earlier works like *Eaux de Siloé* and *Apologie pour la sainte Cène*. Similarly, the 'dix-sept demandes' which had been appended to du Moulin's reply to Gontéry also reappear with the same challenge to prove that these Catholic teachings and practices were based on the Christianity of the early church fathers. They are prefaced with a revealing comment concerning du Moulin's own experiences of religious disputes:

entre nous et nos adversaires il y a deux sortes de controverses. Il y en a sur lesquelles nos adversaires produisent quelques passages. Mais passages ou faux, ou tronqués, ou inutiles, ou pris à contresens. Estant l'ordinaire de ces Messieurs de donner la gehenne aux Anciens pour les faire parler en faveur du mensonge. Telle est la question de la Transsubstantiation, de la priere pour les morts, du Purgatoire, et du Sacrifice de la Messe. Mais il y en a d'autres non moins importants et en plus grand nombre sur lesquelles ils sont destituez de toute autorité de l'ancienne Eglise, et sur lesquelles estans interrogez ils respondent à autre chose, et changeans la question, taschent de prouver ce qu'on ne leur demande pas. (p.134)

4.4 Du Moulin (1610–1616)

(The seventeen issues included in his list naturally belong to this second category.)

Book 3, when it finally appeared in 1612, dealt chiefly with the sensitive question of the identity of the Antichrist. The claim that the Pope was in fact the Antichrist was not foreign to the French Protestants (and had at one stage been included in their confession of faith until Henri IV demanded its removal). In stating the aim of his book, du Moulin followed the English king, claiming to find numerous parallels between the present-day Catholic Church and biblical passages dealing with the apocalypse:

Je ne dispute point ici quel doit estre l'Antechrist, ni si le Pape doit estre ainsi appellé, et m'en abstiens pour deux raisons. L'une, pource que je ne conteste pas volontiers sur les mots et m'attache aux choses. Car puisque tous les Peres et tous nos adversaires sont d'accord avec nous, qu'au deuxieme chapitre de la deuxieme aux Thessaloniens, et au 13. de l'Apocalypse, et en d'autres lieux il est parlé de l'Antechrist, il suffira de chercher le sens de ces chapitres. Car s'il se trouve qu'ils parlent du Pape, la difficulté touchant le nom sera ostee. Nous ferons les propositions, en tirera qui voudra la conclusion. L'autre raison est, pource que ce nom effarouche les ignorans: qui l'estimans une parole outrageuse, condamnent le livre dès le tiltre. Ils estiment que les autres controverses picquent sa Sainteté à la gorge, mais que celle-ci lui coupe le sifflet: au degoust et delicatesses impatientes desquels je veux ici m'accommoder, content de monstrier le sens des sacrees propheties, et appuyer mon exposition de preuves: lesquelles j'espere bailler si claires et si accordantes, que je m'asseure que celui qui s'est resolu de n'en rien croire, neantmoins s'esbahira par quel hazard s'est peu faire que tant de choses predites par Daniel, par S. Paul, et par S. Jehan, se rencontrent toutes sur un seul homme: Ou comment ils ont peu tirer un pourtrait si approchant du Pape, sans penser à lui. (pp.13–14)

Du Moulin's *Defense de la foy catholique* was, according to his son, 'most welcome to the King, and to the English Clergy', and 'his Majesty made most Royal and bountiful expressions of his acceptance' (f.***4 recto). In his autobiography du Moulin records that James sent him two thousand pounds for this book; it seems that the accompanying letter may also have contained some criticism of the author's attitude to the testimony of the early church.⁹⁹ Throughout his career thus far du Moulin had been at pains to point out that the evidence of the beliefs of the church fathers was both questionable (since the texts were frequently corrupted) and also served only to confirm scripture. In his sections on the authority of

4.4 Du Moulin (1610–1616)

the church fathers collectively and individually (Articles 2 and 3) du Moulin does indeed seem to have exceeded the bounds suggested by James's statements. The king wrote, for example, that

Je rends un tel respect aux Peres, qu'eux mesmes n'en eussent point désiré un plus grand. ... tout ce qu'ils ont unanimement tenu estre necessaire à salut és premiers quatre cens ans apres Jesus Christ, ou je le tiens avec eux, ou je me retiens la dessus en un silence modeste. En tout cas je n'ose les reprendre. (p.129)

Du Moulin however, far from maintaining a discreet silence, immediately gave two examples of beliefs widely held in the early church and now rejected by *both* Catholics and Protestants (p.129). Then, on the basis of the king's passing reference to mistaken and contradictory beliefs held by certain church fathers, du Moulin embarked with enthusiasm on a catalogue of over twenty examples of erroneous beliefs and of disputes between such revered theologians as Jerome, Augustine, Chrysostom and Epiphanius:

Car tous ces bons serviteurs de Dieu estoient sujets à faillir, et ont des vices comme des vertues en un beau visage, afin qu'en les lisant on ait tousjours en main le compas de l'Ecriture Saincte et la reigle de la parole de Dieu. ... S'ils errent en quelque chose l'ancienneté n'autorise point un erreur (p.132)

As already noted, this tendency to downgrade the testimony of the early church is a characteristic feature of du Moulin's books. It is tempting to speculate that Isaac Casaubon, newly-arrived in England, may have prompted James to venture this criticism of du Moulin's book. In his journal the Genevan scholar had noted how du Moulin's sermons asserting the unique role of the Bible as 'juge des controverses' had grieved him, and in a final meeting between the two men before Casaubon's departure in October 1610, the latter had felt obliged to criticise du Moulin for his tendency to 'condamner si librement et sans motif les anciens auteurs'.¹⁰⁰

Du Moulin may have drawn a rebuke from James on this general question of the authority of the church fathers, but on the potentially awkward issue of the Anglican episcopate he seems to have succeeded in minimising the theological

4.4 Du Moulin (1610–1616)

divergence between the Anglican and French Reformed churches. For, although du Moulin had claimed in his dedication to king James that 'la religion que vous defendez est aussi la nostre', on the concept of episcopacy the two churches were at odds with each other. When King James claimed that 'avoir des Evesques en l'Eglise est une institution Apostolique, et venuë de Dieu', du Moulin was content to note that there was, in all institutions, 'une police naturelle et une espece de superiorité' and to conclude that any deeper examination of this question was not relevant:

si on demande combien il y doit avoir de differences de degrez, ou si un homme doit avoir la superiorite sur un seul troupeau ou sur plusieurs, c'est une matiere à part, et qui ne fait rien au but que le Roi se propose ici, qui est de combattre la Monarchie d'un homme sur toute l'Eglise universelle. (pp.387–88)

Reviewing du Moulin's book a year later however, *Le Mercure françois* was quick to note the evasive way in which the Charenton minister had handled this issue.¹⁰¹ A few years later, when du Moulin published his book *De la vocation des pasteurs*, the controversy between the two churches on this question was to be aired much more thoroughly.

The changes in religious controversy during the regency period are thus plainly reflected in du Moulin's own activity during these years. The assassination of Henri IV had accentuated a trend towards religious controversy with strong political overtones. The Jesuits, concentrating their efforts on maintaining their influential position at court, seem to have suspended their campaign to convert individual Protestants by conferences, informal discussions and pamphleteering in favour of political action to stifle hostile polemic. No record survives of any conferences in Paris during the regency period. Religious debate in print, as mentioned in Chapter 1, thus tended to concentrate on political rather than purely theological issues. At a local level the decisions of the Paris Parlement and of the Third Estate during the Estates General of 1614–15 provided the focus for controversy. The contributions of Protestant authors such as du Plessis-Mornay and du Moulin became peripheral to the Gallican attack on ultramontane influence. The middle years of du Moulin's time at Paris were thus given over to religious controversy with a strong political

4.4 Du Moulin (1610–1616)

bias and to the internal affairs of the French Reformed Church as they affected its coherence and political standing. His contacts with the English king appear to have affected all aspects of du Moulin's activity during these years. This more political phase in du Moulin's religious polemic could be said to have opened in the year leading up to Henri IV's assassination with his *Response ... aux lettres du P. Gontery* in which he had openly attacked the Jesuits and the Pope's claim to secular power. The various books written in support or on behalf of James were to follow in 1610, 1612 and 1615. It was brought to an end only six months after Louis XIII seized power with the new régime's hostile reaction to the *Defense de la confession de foy des Eglises Reformées de France*.

4.5 Du Moulin v. the 'méthodistes' (1617–1620)

Whereas religious polemic in print during the regency period had been dominated by political events of national and international importance, the year 1617, as noted above, marked the revival of controversy conducted at a more local and individual level and relating to theological rather than political issues. The sermon by Arnoux in June 1617 and the Charenton ministers' reply seems to have marked the turning point between these two phases.¹⁰²

In the years 1617 to 1619 du Moulin became the focus of Parisian Catholic polemicists to an unprecedented degree, not only as the best-known of the four ministers who put their names to the *Defense de la confession de foy* but also in his own right. After a break of several years du Moulin was to publish, in 1617, two short treatises entitled *De la toute puissance de Dieu et de sa volonté*¹⁰³ and *De la juste providence de Dieu*.¹⁰⁴ In the first of these he challenged Catholic theologians' inevitable recourse to the concept of God's omnipotence when discussing eucharistic doctrine, and particularly transsubstantiation. In the second he defended Calvin against the charge that his theology rendered God 'auteur de péché'. He refuted the notion of Calvin's infallibility in terms which recall statements made eleven years earlier in his exchanges with Bouju:

quant à Calvin nous ne sommes pas obligez de le defendre, lequel nous sçavons avoir esté homme sujet à faillir, et lequel n'est point en hauteur, ny ses escrits reigle de nostre religion, laquelle est fondee sur la seule parole de Dieu contenuë és saintes Escritures, esquelles ce qu'il y a de clair, et n'ayant besoing d'interpretation, est suffisant pour nostre salut . . . (p.4)

But du Moulin nevertheless set out to exonerate Calvin and concluded that

s'il estoit eschappé à Calvin d'avoir en quelques passages usé de paroles mal digerées, cela devoit estre imputé à la difficulté de la matiere, en laquelle les plus habiles se trouvent fort empeschés. Et falloit regarder si Calvin parle tousjours ainsi: et on eust trouver qu'il s'expose clairement ailleurs et que ce bon homme n'a rien plus en horreur que faire Dieu auteur de peché. (pp.25–6)

The following year du Moulin published two further important works: *De la vocation des pasteurs*¹⁰⁵ and *Bouclier de la foy*.¹⁰⁶ Both of these works were written

in response to the arguments of the 'méthodistes'; the *Bouchier* is of particular interest in this respect for the short treatise it includes under the title *Fuites et evasions du sieur Arnoux Jesuite*.¹⁰⁷

All of these books provoked a host of Catholic replies. Desgraves's bibliography reveals that, in 1617 and 1618, half of all new works of French religious polemic published at Paris — that is, more than twenty titles per year — referred specifically to du Moulin or the Charenton ministers in their titles.¹⁰⁸ A group of local controversialists — Brisset, Frizon, Meynier, Ange de Raconis and his nephew Abra de Raconis — attacked du Moulin in innumerable small pamphlets from 1617 onwards, but most received no reply from the Charenton pastor.

It was also to be a period during which conferences, after disappearing from the Parisian scene during the regency years, made a noticeable reappearance. 'Depuis ce tems j'ay esté fort traversé de disputes contre les adversaires', remarked du Moulin of his remaining time in Paris.¹⁰⁹

In 1617, for example, Daniel Bourguignon, a Protestant minister and relative of du Moulin, records an apparently stormy encounter with the Charenton pastor in one of several pamphlets which he published following his own abjuration that same year.¹¹⁰ Bourguignon accused du Moulin of debating with him in terms which he described as 'remplis de boutades et impetuosité, mal seans à un homme de lettres' (p.7) and placed du Moulin's works — full of 'mots picquants, satyriques, gausseurs' — in a direct line of descent from 'les escrits virulents, diffamatoires de Luther et Calvin', 'les vilainies de Rabelais' and 'les poësies lubriques de vostre prophete Marot' (pp.4–5). (This theme was to reappear in the polemic against du Moulin published by the Jesuit François Garasse in 1619: *Le Rabelais réformé par les Ministres*.)¹¹¹ Another dispute which took place in 1617, between du Moulin and an un-named Jesuit, resulted — very unusually at this period — in a conversion from Catholicism. At the end of this conference, according to du Moulin, Monsieur de Monginot, 'médecin célèbre à Paris', 'renonça au papisme et embrassa notre religion, dont il a fait un livre'.¹¹² Catholic polemicists surmised, probably correctly, that this was in fact the work of du Moulin himself. In January 1618 du Moulin took part in a particularly well-documented conference (with Charles-François Abra de Raconis) which will be examined in more detail below.

4.5 Du Moulin (1617–1620)

One further encounter, between du Moulin and François de Sales, deserves to be mentioned here, although the details of this meeting survive only in the personal papers of the two participants.¹¹³ The impromptu debate took place in May 1619 at the home of the Protestant *maréchale* de Fervacques. The *maréchale*, believed to be close to death, had summoned du Moulin to attend her; the bishop of Geneva arrived shortly afterwards, sent by the king's sister 'pour exhorter la malade à mourir en la religion catholique-romaine', but was refused admission to the sick woman's room. Some time later, du Moulin was called away from her side by a request from distinguished visitors to the house: 'M. Dumoulin, il y a là-bas des princesses et dames qui désirent vous voir conférer avec M. l'évesque'. As on so many other occasions, the topic chosen by those present was the interpretation of Christ's words, 'Ceci est mon corps'. In the course of their debate, the bishop referred to one of Paul's descriptions of the Last Supper; du Moulin produced one of his favourite arguments regarding the translation of this passage in the Vulgate:

je dis à l'évêque que je m'esbahissois, comme il m'osoit alléguer un passage corrompu et falsifié; car, en la 1^{re} aux Corinthiens, chap. X, verset 24, saint Paul récite exactement comme Jésus-Christ a institué la sainte Cène. "Ayant rendu grâces, il dit: Prenés, mangés, ceci est mon corps, qui se rompt pour vous." Mais l'Eglise romaine, en sa version, a mis "qui sera livré pour vous," ayant osté ce mot de rompre, de peur qu'on ne reconnoisse qu'il parle d'un corps qui peut estre rompu au sacrement, ce qui ne convient pas au vray corps de Christ. Sur cela, l'évesque me dit que j'estoit un calomniateur, et qu'on trouvera que le mot *qui est rompu* se trouvera en la version vulgate. Bibles furent produites, et fut trouvé que je disois la verité, dont l'évesque fut confus; et là-dessus la conférence fut rompue. Madame de Longueville me tira à part et me dit qu'elle avoit desja ouy parler de moy; mais que maintenant, m'ayant veu et ouy, ce luy seroit un comble de joye si je me rendis catholique. ... Je remonstay vers la malade, laquelle peu après rendit l'esprit ('Autobiographie', p.468).

A manuscript note, later published in a collection of the bishop's letters, seems to confirm that du Moulin had caused his opponent some discomfiture:

M. de Genève m'a dit qu'il ne voudroit pour chose quelconque nier la vérité de ses manquements, et qu'il est donc vray qu'au rencontre qu'il eut chez Madame la marquise de Fervacq, il commit un deffaut de mémoire, ne trouvant pas en l'ancienne version latine de la Bible un mot où il pensoit le trouver, bien qu'il soit plusieurs fois ailleurs en la même version et pour

4.5 Du Moulin (1617–1620)

le même sujet; et quoyque ce ne soit qu'une simple faute de mémoire, si est-il marry qu'il lui soit arrivé, craignant que les esprits foibles n'en soient troublés, ne pouvant croire toutesfois que M. Dumoulin se vante de rien pour ce rencontre, fait sans ordre ni règlement. ... ¹¹⁴

The fact that du Moulin recounts this episode in such detail in his autobiography (which generally contains very little information about his involvement in religious controversy) suggests that he was particularly gratified by his performance in this exchange with one of the major figures of the Counter-Reformation.

A contemporary Catholic work makes it clear that du Moulin was involved in many other debates and challenges for which no detailed records survive.¹¹⁵ This increase in verbal disputes seems to have been closely related to P. Véron's success in publicising his improved version of the Gontéry method. As noted in Chapter 1, Véron's rise to prominence coincided with the beginning of Louis XIII's personal reign; his *Bref et facile moyen* appeared in 1617.¹¹⁶ It was to be followed in the years 1620–21 by several works challenging or refuting du Moulin but, despite his determined efforts, Véron was unsuccessful in his efforts to confront du Moulin in a verbal dispute. In a letter to a Protestant colleague, du Moulin reveals his contempt for Véron and his new method.¹¹⁷ In common with most other Protestant pastors who had any experience of the procedures of the 'méthodistes', du Moulin refused to engage in formal debates with them and ignored the pamphlets published by Véron and his followers. His definitive response to the 'méthodistes' is contained in the *Bouclier de la foy*; this was to be elaborated by Daillé, Drelincourt and others in the period which followed du Moulin's departure in 1620, but no further works of anti-Catholic controversy were published by du Moulin during his last few years at Paris.¹¹⁸

As noted in an earlier section of this chapter, du Moulin had been concerned, since 1611, with the controversy caused within the Protestant churches of France and Holland by the divergences between Arminians and Gomarists. Now, six years later, he was chosen as one of the four representatives of the French Reformed Church at a meeting intended by the Dutch Reformed Church to put an end to their long-running dispute.¹¹⁹ The synod of Dordrecht opened on 13 November 1618 and closed the following year on 9 May. Du Moulin, however, was not among those present:

4.5 Du Moulin (1617–1620)

Desja je faisois mon paquet pour me rendre à Dordrecht, quand un huissier du Conseil du roy me fut envoyé, qui me fit deffence, sur peine de ma vie, de sortir du royaume, falut obéir' ('Autobiographie', p.470).

Unable to contribute to the debate in person, du Moulin sent the manuscript of a new work entitled *Anatome Arminianismi* to Dordrecht; in return 'Messeigneurs des Estats m'envoyèrent leur médaille et deux cens escus'.¹²⁰ The presence of the foreign deputies at the synod of Dordrecht had been intended, according to Léonard, merely to give 'une autorité universelle à ce qui devait être la tâche principale de l'assemblée, la condamnation de l'arminianisme et la destitution de ses ministres'.¹²¹ The synod dealt severely with the Arminian pastors but many of the member states rejected its canons and the quarrel was to continue until 1645. In France, however, the national synod held at Alès in 1620 formulated a statement approving the doctrine of the Synod of Dordrecht. This acceptance of the Dordrecht canons constituted a personal success for the president of the French synod — Pierre du Moulin — but only a few months later he was to find himself exiled in Sedan, far removed from the position he had established for himself at the centre of the affairs of the French Reformed Church and of inter-confessional debate in Paris.

Defense de la confession de foy (1617)

The attack on the Reformed Church's confession of faith launched by P. Jean Arnoux in his sermon in June 1617 may well have called to Protestant minds the situation which prevailed in the latter half of Henri IV's reign when L'Estoile regularly reported that P. Gontéry, another favourite royal preacher, was inciting Parisian Catholics to sedition by his pulpit attacks on Protestantism. Certainly Arnoux's central thesis was precisely that of Gontéry's later publications: that the Protestants' claim to base all their doctrines solely on scripture was unfounded because 'les textes cotez à la marge de leur confession de foy, en preuve des pointcs que nous disputons aujourd'huy, n'estoient ny expres, ny formels, pour appuyer le contenu des articles d'erreur'. After the sermon, as Arnoux himself later recounted, he agreed to give his sermon notes to a Protestant listener at Fontainebleau; these were then passed to the Parisian pastors who decided to make a strong and united protest in reply. Du Moulin was chosen by his colleagues to compose their response

which soon appeared in the form of a pamphlet entitled *Defense de la confession de foy des Eglises Reformées de France*.¹²²

The main part of the pamphlet examined in turn each of the thirteen articles from the Protestants' confession of faith to which Arnoux had referred in his sermon and set out to demonstrate that these statements were clearly confirmed by the biblical references printed alongside them. The following example is the first proof presented in the *Defense de la confession de foy* and shows how the question of the vocation of Protestant ministers (which was to become a dominant issue during these years through the activities of 'méthodiste' controversialists) was dealt with:

Monsieur le Jesuite produit en premier lieu le 31. article de nostre Confession où se trouvent ces mots: *Il a fallu quelquesfois, mesmes de nostre temps (auquel l'Estat de l'Eglise estoit interrompu) que Dieu ait suscité gens d'une façon extraordinaire pour dresser de nouveau l'Eglise.*

Sur ces mots, le sieur Arnould dit que la cote du 1. chap. des Galates vers. 15. n'est à propos, et ne peut servir à prouver ces mots de nostre Confession.

Nous respondons que le passage du premier des Galates n'est point cotté en marge pour prouver les mots de nostre Confession, produits par M. le Jesuite. Mais ce passage est mis pour prouver ce qui est adjousté peu apres au mesme article, sçavoir: *Que tous Pasteurs doivent avoir tesmoignage d'estre appellés à leur office.* Or saint Paul au 1. chap. aux Galates vers. 15. et 16. dit que *Dieu l'a appelé par sa grace, lui ayant revelé son Fils, afin de l'evangeliser entre les Gentils.* L'Apostre donc avoit tesmoignage d'estre appelé en son office: Ce qui n'est allegué que pour servir d'exemple en une chose où nous sommes d'accord avec nos adversaires, à sçavoir, que les Pasteurs doivent estre appelé à leur charge.

Quant à ce que nous disons, que Dieu de nostre temps a suscité gens d'une façon extraordinaire pour redresser l'Eglise, nostre Confession ne cote là dessus aucun passage, pource que nous prouvons par passages de l'Ecriture les poincts de nostre croyance et doctrine: mais non les evenemens arrivez en France de nostre temps: qui sont poincts d'histoire moderne et non articles de foy.

Cependant le Lecteur remarquera que ce sont les Eglises de France qui parlent; et qui par consequent par le redressement de l'Eglise entendent parler seulement du restablissement et reformation que Dieu a faite en France en nos temps, et des moyens dont Dieu s'est servi pour ce faire. Pour lequel œuvre Dieu a tellement suscité des personnes d'une façon extraordinaire,

4.5 Du Moulin (1617-1620)

que cependant ces mesmes personnes ne laissez d'avoir la vocation qui lors estoit ordinaire, et ont suivi les moyens qui sont ordinaires et necessaires és maux extraordinaires.

After examining all the articles referred to by Arnoux in a similar fashion, the pamphlet then went on to challenge the scriptural basis of Catholic doctrine.

voyons si ces Messieurs peuvent defendre leur cause aussi bien que nous defendons la nostre, et s'ils peuvent excuser de fausseté et de moquerie evidente les allegations de l'Escriture Sainte que leurs Papes et Conciles produisent pour la defense de leur cause.

As in du Moulin's *Defense de la foy catholique* two distinct groups of controversial issues are identified: Catholic polemicists were prepared to attempt to demonstrate the scriptural basis of some aspects of Catholic doctrine — regarding the eucharist, for example, or purgatory, or papal infallibility (pp.39-41) — but, claimed the pamphlet, there were far more questions for which they are unable to offer any scriptural confirmation, and seventeen 'demandes' were listed for which Arnoux was challenged to provide scriptural proof (pp.42-48).

Far more important at the time, however, than this reply to Arnoux's use of Gontéry's arguments was the long letter which preceded the 'défense' proper and which occupied almost two-fifths of the ministers' pamphlet. In the course of these first nineteen pages the pastors described the reasons for their decision to address a letter of complaint to the king. They stressed the loyalty of the Protestants to the French monarchy and particularly to the present king's father, Henri IV. Referring to the Edict of Nantes, they even dared to suggest that the Protestants had not received an adequate recompense for their loyalty:

le fruit que nous en recevons est, que nous sommes contraints d'aller servir Dieu bien loing des villes; Que l'entrée aux Estats nous est rendue, pour la pluspart, impossible ou pleine de difficulté. Que nos enfants nouveaux-nez qu'on porte bien loing au Baptisme sont exposez à la rigueur du temps, dont plusieurs en meurent: et que leur instruction nous est empeschée. Et ce qui nous est le plus grief est que nostre religion est diffamée et noircie de calomnies en vostre presence, sans qu'il nous soit permis de nous purger de ces blasmes en presence de V.M. (p.5)

The pastors then outlined five reasons for Catholic hatred of the Protestants:

4.5 *Du Moulin (1617–1620)*

their scriptural basis; their commitment to making the Christian gospel accessible to all; their assurance of eternal life (thus dispensing with the doctrine of purgatory and consequent abuses such as the traffic in indulgences); their celebration of the eucharist in a form based closely on scripture (without additional and unnecessary observances). All the above, claimed the pastors, were offensive to the Catholic hierarchy because they represented a challenge to the power, influence and wealth of the Pope and his clergy but the Protestants were hated and persecuted above all because of their patriotism: 'nous maintenons la dignité de vostre Couronne, contre les usurpations estrangeres, qui la souillent et depriment, et reduisent en captivité' (p.9). As evidence of the lack of Catholic loyalty to the French crown they cited the debate which had arisen eighteen months earlier regarding the proposed oath of fidelity:

ès Estats nouvellement tenus à Paris, la question a esté agitée si le Pape peut déposer nos Rois, et s'il est en la puissance des Papes de disposer de vostre Couronne; ... par la faction des Ecclesiastiques qui entraîna une partie de la Noblesse, vous y avez perdu vostre procez. Dont le Pape leur en a escrit des lettres triomphantes

and the Jesuits' association with Spain:

vous avez en vostre Royaume une faction d'hommes qui se qualifient compagnons de Jesus ... qui ont serment d'obeissance aveugle et sans exception au chef de leur ordre, qui est et à tousjours sujet du Roy d'Espagne; lesquels ont esté condamnez par vos Cours de Parlement comme ennemis de l'Estat et de la vie des Rois, et corrupteurs de la jeunesse (p.11)

'Ce sont ceux-la (SIRE) qui pour avancer leurs desseins particuliers esmeuvent des tumultes et scandales contre nous', claimed the pastors, and it is in this context of contrasting Protestant loyalty and Jesuit disloyalty that they finally reached the real reason for their letter:

Or ce qui nous a donné sujet (SIRE) de vous représenter ces humbles plaintes, a esté l'action dernière du Sieur Arnould Jesuite, lequel [s'est] vanté en plein sermon, en vostre presence, qu'il monstreroit que tous les passages cottez en nostre confession de foy sont faussement alleguez ... (pp.12–13)

4.5 Du Moulin (1617-1620)

The letter concluded with an exhortation to the king not to allow the representatives of foreign powers to succeed in their aim of debasing the Christian gospel by making it subject to their own greed for wealth and power (p.17), and a final profession of loyalty to the king on the part of the Protestants:

ne laisserons-nous tant que Dieu nous donnera vie, d'instruire nos peuples à obeissance et fidelité envers vostre Majesté, et priérons Dieu pour la conservation de vostre personne et prosperité de vostre Royaume. (pp.18-19)

This letter, signed by all four Charenton pastors — Montigny, du Moulin, Durand and Mestrezat — was undoubtedly the reason why the pamphlet caused such a furore in the capital. The clear references to the events of the League years were in contravention of the Edict of Nantes and the suggestion that, because of the Protestants' support for Henri IV, the young king was in their debt was particularly offensive. The portrayal of the Protestants and Louis XIII as joint victims of the machinations of those most closely associated with Rome and Spain was also extremely ill-judged. The book was immediately suppressed, all unsold copies seized and its printers penalised, but the ministers themselves, because of the long dispute between various courts for the right to deal with their case, ultimately escaped with only a reprimand:

La Chambre de l'Edit voulut prendre connoissance de cette affaire; mais la grand'Chambre s'y opposa, pretendant qu'à la grande Chambre appartenait le jugement des crimes de lèse-majesté. Cette contestation dura trois semaines, au bout desquelles cette impetuosité s'estant attiedie, les ministres de l'Eglise de Paris furent appelés pour comparoistre devant le conseil d'Estat privé. Là nous furent faites de graves remontrances par Monsieur le chancelier Bruslard avec grieves menaces.¹²³

This letter, in which du Moulin and his colleagues attempted to assert the rights of French Protestants by attacking the Catholic church, its teachings and the activities of the Jesuits, can only have reinforced the king's hostility towards them. It is the last of du Moulin's overtly political writings but nevertheless there is evidence that the king and his government were kept informed of his activities and when an opportunity finally arose to take action against him it was quickly seized.

Conference with Abra de Raconis (January 1618)

The pamphlets relating to du Moulin's conference in January 1618 with Abra de Raconis, a teacher at the Collège de Navarre, contain the fullest and most reliable account of any of the Protestant minister's verbal encounters throughout his career. Two meetings, each lasting four hours, were held at du Moulin's own home on 5 and 8 January; the conference was then broken off following an alleged misunderstanding concerning a change of venue. The text of the conference proceedings published by Raconis has been reproduced in an appendix and differs in only a few minor details from that published by du Moulin a few weeks later.¹²⁴ Their accounts of the preliminary arrangements for the conference and of the events following the breaking-off of discussions were, however, very different: each of the participants alleged that his opponent had evaded further debate and therefore claimed victory for himself. The text of this encounter has already been referred to in Chapter 3 as an example of some of the conventions of conference procedure in general and the evidence it contains regarding Abra de Raconis's approach to verbal debate will be examined in Chapter 6.¹²⁵ For du Moulin's part, the conference proceedings reveal both his skill as a conference participant and his response to the 'méthodiste' arguments which he encountered in this debate with Abra de Raconis.

Articles IV and V of the 'regles convenues entre les parties', in which du Moulin proposed that 'la vraye religion est fondée sur la parole de Dieu' and that 'l'Eglise est sujete à la parole de Dieu', show how he wasted no opportunity in attempting to gain an advantage over his opponent (ll.14–15, 19–20). Not surprisingly, however, he did not succeed in extracting an unwitting concession of these crucial points at the outset (ll.15–18, 21–23).

The syllogism with which Raconis opened the debate was one which summed up the 'méthodiste' stance (ll.32–38). As a statement of the Protestants' own view of scripture as their rule of faith du Moulin would probably have found Raconis's minor premiss unexceptionable in a Protestant context but in a debate conducted along 'méthodiste' lines he was obviously aware that this statement would soon lead to a challenge to present absolutely literal biblical proofs of Protestant doctrine. He therefore set out to establish all the details of the Protestant perspective on this

4.5 *Du Moulin (1617–1620)*

issue, pointing out the precise Protestant understanding of ‘interpretations’ and restricting the application of Raconis’s statement to ‘choses necessaires à salut’ (ll.39–47, 53–59). In reply to Raconis’s second syllogism, which incorporated these amendments (ll.72–76), du Moulin demanded further clarifications regarding the role of ‘principes naturels de la raison’ and ‘conséquences necessaires’ (ll.79–87). These queries forced Raconis to define the sceptical standpoint with regard to human reason which the method demanded (ll.93–99): Raconis denied that rational deductions were genuinely admissible in matters of faith but conceded du Moulin’s demands on this issue for the immediate purposes of their debate (ll.109–19).

In reply, du Moulin challenged Raconis to explain his position with regard to the use of logical deductions in religious debate (ll.127–36), then stated his own view — that logical procedures were tools ‘pour manier toute sorte de cognoissance’, not part of the rule of faith itself (ll.125–27) — and cited Bellarmine in support of his claims regarding the accepted role of ‘conséquences’ in establishing doctrine (ll.143–48). He concluded by denying the minor premiss of Raconis’s third syllogism which stated that ‘la seule parole de Dieu’, even with all the accompanying amendments which du Moulin had thus far negotiated, was still not an adequate rule of faith (ll.149–52). Throughout this final reply of the first session du Moulin proved his skill in verbal dispute as, despite his defensive role, he attacked the Catholic position, not only through his major line of questioning concerning the role of reason but also in little asides regarding the infallibility of the Catholic church’s councils (ll.140–42) or the fact that lay Catholics were denied access to their church’s authoritative texts (ll.150–52).

Raconis opened the second session with a robust and comprehensive reply to all the points raised by du Moulin. (The latter, by the marginal note added in his version of the text pointing out that his opponent had had three days in which to prepare this statement, seems to acknowledge the quality of Raconis’s response (l.164, footnote).) Du Moulin’s challenge of the previous session had nevertheless forced Raconis to state clearly his view that the use of logic in discussing theological issues was quite distinct from its role in formulating Christian doctrine (ll.172–85) and, furthermore, that doctrine need not be defensible in purely rational terms (ll.197–203). In support of his third syllogism Raconis then advanced three specific issues for which he challenged du Moulin to provide appropriate scriptural evidence

4.5 *Du Moulin (1617–1620)*

(ll.216–27). In reply du Moulin reasserted both his original contention concerning natural reason and logical deductions and his own understanding of Bellarmine's statement (ll.229–36) then went on to present the scriptural evidence in favour of each of the issues listed by Raconis. Once again he concluded his statement with a challenge to Raconis, this time regarding the conclusions of the Catholic church's own councils and their use of 'conséquences' (ll.252–57). Raconis, in his response, accepted much of du Moulin's evidence and also allowed himself to be drawn into defending the ecumenical councils' decisions (ll.295–300). His comments on this issue draw attention to the fideistic basis on which he accepted the authority of the Catholic Church: the method is thus shown to combine a sceptical stance with regard to scripture and human reason with an unquestioning acceptance of the authority and infallibility of the institutions and teachings of Catholicism. It was to this issue du Moulin immediately turned in the reply which he was to add to his own version of events and on which he would no doubt have elaborated when his turn came to propose a statement for Abra de Raconis to defend.

The conference was, however, broken off at this point: du Moulin claimed that Abra de Raconis did not appear at the agreed place of meeting; Abra de Raconis claimed that the meeting place had been changed without notifying him. Du Moulin refused to renew the debate at the Collège de Navarre, claiming that it would be too dangerous; Raconis continued to challenge du Moulin to further conferences, with different conditions and issues, but was not prepared to take up the original debate at the point at which it had been abandoned. Du Moulin claimed that he was not surprised that the conference had been broken off at this juncture:

Car aussi quelle apparence d'entrer en un combat auquel jamais personne de sa Religion n'a osé entrer, me laissant prendre la Religion Romaine par où je voudrois. Car les Docteurs de l'Eglise Romaine jamais ne veulent conferer que sur ce qu'ils trouvent à redire en nostre religion. Mais jamais ne veulent s'obliger à defendre leur Religion. Et c'est l'avantage que le Sieur de Raconis a eu en m'attaquant sur tel point de ma Religion qu'il a voulu. Et puis rompant quand mon tour est venu d'attaquer la sienne.¹²⁶

Du Moulin's method of proceeding in this conference reveals his skill as a conference participant — characterised chiefly by the same determination to place his

4.5 Du Moulin (1617–1620)

opponent on the defensive which had been evident in his encounter with Gontéry in 1609 — and also his awareness of ‘méthodiste’ strategy. To this he responded with a ready supply of biblical evidence in support of the articles of faith which were the preferred targets of the new method and with an unequivocal endorsement of the role of reason in both theology and religious debate. His definitive work on the question of the rule of faith, the treatise *Du Juge des controverses*, published in 1630, shows that his standpoint on this issue was to remain un-changed.¹²⁷

De la vocation des pasteurs (1618)

Although du Moulin preferred, wherever possible, to avoid fruitless debate with the most ardent exponents of the new method, the two remaining works published during his time at Paris show that he could not ignore the thrust of their arguments. The first of these two books was entitled *De la vocation des pasteurs*. In his preface addressed to ‘les Pasteurs des Eglises reformees de France’ du Moulin acknowledged that the subject of this book was one of those most frequently raised by Catholic opponents and stated his purpose as to ‘monstrer la validité de nostre vocation, et la nullité et corruption de la leur’ (f. a.vi.recto).

The vocation of Protestant ministers had been the question on which Gontéry and the group of ladies present at the 1609 conference had tried to challenge du Moulin and, as the Jesuit had clarified his method in later works, Article 31 of the Protestants’ confession of faith which dealt with this issue had become one of the four articles on which he concentrated his attack.¹²⁸ The following passage from a Catholic response to *De la vocation des pasteurs* shows how persistently du Moulin had been challenged on the interpretation of this article:

Du Moulin, ayant vu sa religion prétendue attaquée sur ce point ... par une infinité d’écrits ... par autant de disputes contre ses confrères et lui-même, ne fait nulle mention en tout son livre nouveau de cette question ... Il ne peut nier d’avoir au moins vu le livre que ... du Perron a fait il y a plus de vingt ans sur ce sujet, moins celui de M. de Bérulle, puisqu’il est fait contre lui directement, sur la conversion de Mme. de Mazencourt, pour laquelle empêcher ou du moins retarder, il avait disputé contre le P. Gontéry sur ce même point; et beaucoup moins encore doit-il ignorer le traité fait sur la conversion de Mlle. de l’Isle l’Epicelière, pource qu’il avait conféré devant elle fort peu auparavant sur ce même article, et l’avait

4.5 Du Moulin (1617–1620)

si mal soutenu qu'il en perdit trois brebis de son troupeau à la fois — ledit traité n'est autre chose qu'un bref écrit de ladite conférence, lequel même lui fut envoyé ... avec très instantes prières d'y répondre: ce qu'il refusa de faire. Il ne peut pas ignorer aussi que la conversion de Mme. la Baronne de Plancy ne soit arrivée, à faute d'avoir pu soutenir lui-même cet article, comme elle l'en fut prier, accompagnée de Mme. de Courville, qui bientôt après se convertit ... et de fraîche mémoire, il scait bien que la conversion du sieur de Blécourt n'a été faite (lors même que du Moulin travaillait à ce dernier livre) qu'après qu'il a refusé de soutenir ledit article ... Mais au lieu que ledit du Moulin (ayant vu les fréquentes et ruineuses attaques que son parti reçoit par cette brèche) la devait réparer en soutenant cet article ... Il passe le tout sous silence.¹²⁹

Rimbault's book on du Moulin is in fact centred around this particular work and, in Part 2, he provides a detailed analysis of its contents (pp.156–68), of the reactions of Parisian Catholic polemicists (pp.169–75) and Anglicans (pp.175–83) and of its repercussions within the French Reformed Church (pp.183–87). Rimbault's account of the reasons which led du Moulin to undertake this work at this particular date shows, however, that he is unaware of the fact that Article 31 was one of the three or four key articles on which not only Arnoux but all those applying Gontéry's new method concentrated their attack.

The two most important points which emerge from Rimbault's commentary on *De la vocation des pasteurs* are, first of all, that du Moulin found the contents of this article particularly difficult to defend because it required justification which extended beyond the simple presentation of biblical texts. (Later, in a letter to Lancelot Andrewes, he confessed that he had undertaken this work unwillingly and under pressure from his church.)¹³⁰ In the passage from *Defense de la confession de foy* cited above, du Moulin had asserted that this article did not require scriptural proof and again, in his last work of the period, *Bouclier de la foy*, he was to offer a similar explanation. In *De la vocation des pasteurs*, it appears that, wherever possible, du Moulin avoided quoting from or referring in detail to Article 31, despite the fact that it was precisely this formulation that his colleagues needed to be able to defend (Rimbault, p.165).

The second point of interest is closely related to the first and concerns the unconventional interpretation to which du Moulin resorted in discussing the vocation of Protestant ministers, whereby he restricted the application of the article solely

4.5 Du Moulin (1617–1620)

to the reformation of the church within France rather than to the Reformation in its wider sense (which was the meaning usually attributed to the article by both the French Reformed Church itself and its Catholic opponents). At least one Catholic polemicist accused du Moulin of having invented a 'nouvelle hérésie'.

De la vocation des pasteurs was, furthermore, ill-received by the Anglican church. His attacks on the priestly calling as exemplified by the clergy of the Catholic church had led him to make several intemperate remarks concerning the role of bishops; these comments, brought to the attention of James I, gave rise to an exchange of letters between the French pastor and bishop Andrewes which was later published.¹³¹

Bouclier de la foy (1618)

The last anti-Catholic work to be produced by du Moulin during his time at Paris, his *Bouclier de la foy*, was given a much warmer reception by his fellow Protestants and was to be regularly reprinted over the next few years. The *Bouclier* was written in response to the published version of Arnoux's Fontainebleau sermon and in it du Moulin examined the French Protestants' confession, article by article, giving the text of each statement in full and refuting Arnoux's objections. (Despite its title, the Charenton ministers' *Defense de la confession de foy* of 1617 had been far more a defence of the French Protestant church itself than of its confession.)

The sections on purgatory and the eucharist in the *Bouclier de la foy* allow comparisons with earlier works devoted to these issues. On the question of purgatory, for example, du Moulin has discarded many details used in his *Eaux de Siloé* and gives a strong emphasis in his opening pages on the subject to the contention that Catholic teachings concerning purgatory are 'traditions humaines inventées pour le gain, et pour l'ambition'.¹³² He bases his comments on two Jesuit works — Coton's *Institution catholique* and Basile's *Catechisme des Controverses* — and lists fourteen points against the Catholic doctrine of purgatory, chiefly related to the cruelty and injustice of the way in which this teaching was applied, and concluding with the remark that 'le Clergé par là succe la substance des laics, vivant en la frayeur ignorante du povre peuple' (p.286). Du Moulin does not labour such points as the 'limbe des petits enfans', the flowery fields envisaged by Bellarmine

or the accommodation arrangements for Carmelite monks as in his earlier work but goes on to provide fourteen scripture passages refuting purgatory (pp.288–292) before dealing briefly with biblical texts used to support the existence of purgatory (pp.292–92). (Later editions contain another two sections of evidence from the writings of the early church fathers which, according to du Moulin, conflicted with the modern Catholic church's concept of purgatory.)

In his treatment of eucharistic controversy du Moulin once again highlights the phrase 'Ceci est mon corps' as an important issue, providing a section entitled 'Briefve et certaine exposition de ces paroles, "Ceci est mon corps"' in which he gives a clear account of the Protestants' understanding of this phrase, and which is essentially a shorter version of that given in his *Apologie pour la sainte Cène* (2, 169–71). As before he emphasises the contrasting simplicity and complexity of Protestant and Catholic interpretations, continuing with a section in which he purports to demonstrate 'Avec quelle licence nos adversaires forgent des figures, et tordent les paroles de Jesus Christ et des Apostres' (pp.171–73). Du Moulin lists nine points demonstrating the intricacies of the Catholic interpretation of this same phrase. Point one, for example, explains that

En ces mots *Ceci est mon corps* ils veulent que par *Ceci* on entende *Sous ces especes*, et que *Ceci* soit un individu vague, qui n'est rien de certain, et dont le sens est en suspens jusqu'apres les paroles achevées (2, 176)

Du Moulin is thereby attempting to destroy the well-used argument of his opponents that the Catholics adhere strictly to the literal sense of this phrase whereas Protestants are forced to describe it as merely a figurative expression: 'Où sont maintenant ces gens si ennemis des figures, et qui se collent si scrupuleusement à la lettre?' (2, 173).

Du Moulin's *Bouclier* represented a very solid and clear response to the new emphasis given to religious controversy by those Catholic polemicists who followed Gontéry's method. Over the next few years the book was revised and reprinted several times and indices were added — of Bible references, references to patristic writings and to more recent Catholic works — which suggests that the book had become a standard sourcebook. An English translator described the *Buckler of Faith* as 'a Booke ... most necessary and profitable in these disputing times'.¹³³

‘Fuites et evasions du sieur Arnoux, jesuite’ (1618)

The same translator introduced his version of ‘Fuites et evasions du sieur Arnoux, jesuite’, the treatise with which the *Bouclier* ends (and which is often regarded as a separate work), as ‘a light Sword to offend our common Adversaries, the more readily in lighter skirmishes, either joyntly with, or severally without the Buckler, which is fit to defend us in our strongest Incounters with them’. This short but fascinating treatise opens with du Moulin’s examination of Arnoux’s reasons for refusing to reply to the seventeen questions put forward in the ministers’ letter, then goes on to give a mordant analysis of the new method of argument being used by Arnoux and the new breed of controversialists.

In his pamphlet, Arnoux had rejected the ministers’ challenge to defend various Catholic doctrines with scriptural evidence with the claim that ‘ce n’est pas à eux de m’enquerir de ma creance, parce que je suis en possession, et personne ne les a pourvus de commission pour arracher de mes mains le titre de l’heritage que je tiens’. This argument, Tertullian’s prescriptive argument, was dismissed by du Moulin:

N’est à propose de dire, *il y a desja long temps que je suis en possession de ceste doctrine*, car les Payens et les Juifs, et les Turcs en peuvent dire autant, desquels la religion est plus ancienne que le Papisme. Nous ne disputons point par annees, mais par preuves. L’Eglise est en pays de droict escrit, et non en pays de coustume. Il n’y a point de prescription contre la verité celeste: laquelle est tousjours la plus ancienne, pource que le mensonge n’est qu’une corruption de la verité: Une opinion ancienne a esté autresfois nouvelle: . . . Il faut donc revenir à la source et à l’institution contenuë en la parole de Dieu. (p.10)

In place of the previous list of issues du Moulin offered another seventeen ‘demandes’ — identical to those used against Gontéry and in his *Defense de la foy catholique* — itemising Catholic teachings for which he challenged Arnoux to provide evidence from the writings of the early Church (pp.23–26).

In Chapters 3 to 8, du Moulin turned his attention to ‘les cinq voyes d’evasions remarquees par le Sieur Arnoux pour confondre les Ministres’. He opened with the following observations on the appearance of these new controversialists:

4.5 Du Moulin (1617-1620)

La lecture soigneuse de la sainte Escriture, et des anciens Docteurs: le scavoir és langues Latine, Grecque et Hebraique, la cognoissance des histoires et de la Philosophie, sont pieces requises à un Theologien. La seule intelligence des Escritures devroit suffire si nous estions tous sages et bien d'accord, mais la maladie du siecle, et les cachettes que l'erreur s'est cavé, sont la cause que plusieurs autres choses sont necessaires à un Theologien. Le Pere Gonteri defunct recognoissant cela, et se sentant destitué de beaucoup d'aides necessaires, notamment de la cognoissance des langues Grecque et Hebraique, et neantmoins desireux d'acquérir de la reputation, a inventé des moyens par lesquels un homme ignorant et destitué de toute science peut soustenir une dispute; et en a publié divers petits escrits qui servent à former la posture de ceux qui voudront nous attaquer en conference, ausquels il donne ces deux conseils.

Le premier est de ne se rendre jamais respondant, et de ne s'obliger jamais à defendre la religion Romaine; ains de tousjours attaquer, et nous obliger à la defense de nostre confession. ...

L'autre conseil qu'il donne est que quand nous viendrons à faire des objections, et produire nos preuves, ne recevoir rien de tous ce que nous dirons si nous ne le monstons en l'Escriture en autant de mots et de syllabes: et si nous faisons un argument dont les deux propositions soyent en l'Escriture, nier estre obligé à recevoir la conclusion, pource que les reigles d'Aristote n'obligent point la foy. (pp.26-28)

'Il n'y a savatier qui ne puisse en un quart d'heure devenir Theologien, s'il suffit d'interroger tousjours sans jamais respondre', concludes du Moulin (p.28).

Du Moulin's contempt for the new method leads him to make full use of those 'mots picquants, satyriques, gausseurs' for which Bourguignon had reproached him: he describes the new style of debate as 'une menuë rutine de chicanerie pedantesque' and as a 'chestive brouillerie qui n'est bonne que pour des petits acarias-tres et malicieux broüillons'. According to du Moulin, 'ce raffineur de finesses' — P. Gontéry — 'ne s'est jamais bien trouvé de ces procedures':

car à la premiere rencontre du moindre des Ministres il seignoit du nez, et toute ceste impetuosité s'esvanouissoit comme une foudre destournee par le vent d'un chapeau: et se retirant comme un argoulet demonté, s'en alloit en une autre ville pour y estre pareillement traité. (pp.28-29)

P. Arnoux is castigated in a similar fashion:

4.5 Du Moulin (1617-1620)

Le Sieur Arnoux suit ceste instruction, comme propre pour un homme legerement pourveu, et se parant des plumes d'autrui a redigé en art ces finesses, et les a digéré en cinq chefs, et a intitulé son discours VOYES D'EVASION. Ou sous ombre de descouvrir nos finesses, il estalle les siennes, et bastit une discipline de menues ruses, tendantes non à instruire mais à arrester la dispute (p.29)

Thus du Moulin characterised the method and its practitioners before proceeding, in Chapters 4 to 8, to reply briefly to each of the five headings under which Arnoux had presented the chief 'méthodiste' arguments. The first four of these concern the Protestants' method of interpreting scripture: the practice of using other texts to interpret specific biblical texts or to provide comparisons which aid interpretation (1 and 3), the use of rational deductions (2) and the charge of employing circular logic (4). Du Moulin's replies to these accusations echo many of the points made earlier in his conference with Abra de Raconis. With regard to Arnoux's first 'voie d'évasion', du Moulin replied that

si l'interpretation que nous donnons à un passage de l'Ecriture est tiree de l'Ecriture mesme, ce ne sommes pas nous qui sommes interpretes, mais que Dieu mesme s'interprete. Pour exemple, quand pour avoir l'intelligence de ces mots, *Ceci est mon corps*, nous exposons ce mot CECI par le *pain que je romps*, et ces mots *mon corps* par *la commemoration de mon corps*, nous ne sommes pas interpretes, mais l'Apostre S. Paul et Jesus Christ mesme qui apportent ceste exposition. (p.30)

Concerning the use of 'conséquences' in the alleged absence of a 'texte formel', du Moulin claimed that a text from which the meaning was deduced by a 'conséquence nécessaire' remained 'formel':

un passage dont on deduit une consequence ne laisse d'estre formel, quand la consequence est claire et necessaire. Si l'Ecriture dit qu'il *n'y a homme qui ne peche*, 2. Chron. 6. vers. 36. n'est-ce pas un passage formel pour prouver que les Apostres ont peché, puis qu'ils estoient hommes? Quand la Loy de Dieu dit, *Tu ne paillarderas point*, n'est-ce pas un passage formel pour monstrier que le Pape fait mal de permettre la paillardise? et toutesfois cela se deduit par consequence. (p.32)

Du Moulin went on to cite the same passage from Bellarmine which he had used in his debate with Raconis and also to claim that syllogisms cannot be dismissed

as ‘de l’invention d’Aristote’:

Les paysans mesme se servent de ces reigles sans y penser, y estans poussez insensiblement par la force de la raison. Quiconque ne veut pas qu’on deduise aucune consequence, abolit tout le sens commun, et tout usage de raison, laquelle ne consiste qu’en cela. Les reigles de Logique ne sont pas articles de foy, mais outils pour manier toute cognoissance avec ordre et certitude, et par consequent aussi les matieres de Theologie. (pp.34–35)

In reply to Arnoux’s claim that the Protestants employed circular logic — ‘que nous prouvons que celles-là sont les Escritures par nostre esprit particulier, et prouvons cet esprit particulier par l’Escriture’ — du Moulin argued that ‘nul de nous ne se rend juge de l’Escriture’ and that the accusation could be more accurately levelled against ‘nos adversaires’:

Car ils fondent l’autorité de l’Escriture sur le tesmoignage de l’Eglise: et neantmoins fondent l’autorité de l’Eglise sur des tesmoignages de l’Escriture . . . Nous leur demandons, Comment sçavez-vous qu’il faut croire aux livres du Nouveau Testament? Ils respondent, Pource que l’Eglise le dit et ordonne: Mais comment sçavez-vous qu’il faut croire à l’Eglise? pource (disent-ils) que les livres du Nouveau Testament le disent et ordonnent, car là il est escrit, *Di-le à l’Eglise etc.* (p.36)

Arnoux’s fourth point concerned the practice of comparing ‘divers passages l’un avec l’autre, dont l’un serve à interpreter l’autre’ and the example cited was, once again, that key phrase in the eucharistic debate, ‘Ceci est mon corps’:

[Arnoux] dit que nous expliquons ces mots, *Ceci est mon corps*, par cet autre passage, *Je suis la vigne*. En quoy il nous calomnie: Nous sçavons bien que ces mots *Je suis la vigne* ne sont pas l’exposition de ces mots *Ceci est mon corps*. Nous employons ces passages, *Je suis la vigne*, *Je suis la porte des brebis*, *Ce calice est l’alliance*, *La pierre estoit Christ*, non pour interpreter ces paroles *Ceci est mon corps*, mais pour monstrier que qui voudroit prendre tousjours les paroles de la sainte Escriture à la lettre, et laisser les interpretations par lesquelles l’Escriture s’esclaircit elle mesme, tomberoit souvent en des grandes absurditez: et pour monstrier qu’ordinairement l’Escriture nomme les signes et Sacremens du nom de ce qu’ils representent. (p.39)

Whereas the first four ‘évasions’ with which Arnoux had charged Protestant theologians had all concerned the role of reason in interpreting scripture, section

4.5 Du Moulin (1617–1620)

five consisted of a range of unrelated accusations; du Moulin largely dismissed this section as ‘un chaos de calomnies confuses’ unworthy of his attention (p.40). The chief conclusion which he drew from this fifth section was that Arnoux, in common with other Catholic controversialists, had deliberately distorted and falsified Protestant belief. (In later editions this claim was reinforced by a detailed examination, very similar to his earlier *Trente-deux demandes*, of the twenty-eight articles of belief which P. Coton had attributed to the Protestants in his *Institution catholique*; ^{du Moulin} then noted that the bishop of Luçon had, in like fashion, summed-up the Protestant faith in twelve articles ‘qu’il a forgez sur quelques passages de nos auteurs qu’il a tronquez, et qui au bout ne disent pas ce qu’il veut’.) Du Moulin concluded his analysis of Arnoux’s presentation of the new method by associating it with more conventional methods of attacking (fabricated) versions of the Protestant faith, and claimed to regard such assaults as a vindication of Protestantism: ‘Ceux qui escrivent ou preschent contre nous, nous noircissent de calomnies, et nous bastissent une autre confession’,

Ce que nous prenons pour une justification de nostre cause, puis que personne ne nous ose rencontrer de front, ni venir droit à nous, mais tous gauchissent et prennent un biais à costé, et deschargent leur cholere, non contre nostre religion, mais contre un’autre qu’ils ont forgée à leur plaisir. (p.55)

Du Moulin’s *Bouclier de la foy* contains both a comprehensive defence of the Protestants’ confession of faith and a refutation of the Gontéry method which came to dominate religious polemic at a popular level during the last years of his ministry in Paris. As noted above, this was to be the last work published by du Moulin during his time in the capital. With its combination of an accessible apologetic method, based on scripture interpreted by reason and with only limited recourse to historical evidence; a vigorous defence of reason in the face of the sceptical objections of the ‘méthodistes’; and a fluent writing style, free of theological jargon but often spiced with acerbic wit at the expense of his adversaries, the *Bouclier de la foy* seems to sum up du Moulin’s distinctive contribution to Parisian religious debate. His continuing involvement in religious controversy from

4.5 Du Moulin (1617–1620)

his new base at Sedan shows that his approach was to change comparatively little over the next third of a century.

4.6 Sedan and exile (1621–1658)

In September 1620 du Moulin travelled to Alès for the national synod of the French Reformed Church. Shortly before his departure, as described in Chapter 1, he had been asked by the English ambassador in Paris, to write to James I, urging the latter to intervene on behalf of the king of Bohemia. This letter found its way, however, to the French king's council who immediately agreed that du Moulin should be arrested for having incited a foreign king to act on behalf of Protestants.¹³⁴ Forewarned by a letter from his colleague Drelincourt of the danger awaiting him in Paris, du Moulin made his way secretly to the capital. The English ambassador and the elders of the Charenton church agreed that he should leave the city immediately and so du Moulin left for Sedan. He arrived there on 5 January 1621.

During this first year in Sedan du Moulin watched events in France anxiously and hoped for a return to his church in Paris.¹³⁵ When, in September 1621, hostility against the Charenton Protestants culminated in the burning-down of their church, du Moulin wrote in a letter to a member of his Paris congregation: 'Je regarde comme d'un port mes freres que je vois en peril de naufrage'.¹³⁶ The following year, he dedicated a new work, *Du combat chrestien: ou des afflictions*, to 'l'Eglise de Dieu qui est à Paris'.¹³⁷ In the dedicatory epistle du Moulin still seemed to regard his absence as only temporary and described the episode which had forced his departure as an example of divine providence:

[Dieu,] sçachant ma demeure au milieu de vous en un temps si perilleux seroit une allumette de la haine des adversaires, et serviroit à attirer le trouble et la persecution sur le troupeau, à fait naistre une occasion particuliere, pour laquelle mes compagnons en l'oeuvre du Seigneur ont jugé que je devois ceder à la necessité presente, et en m'absentant pour un temps, pourvoir à vostre repos et à ma seureté.¹³⁸

Characteristically, the five 'conseils utiles à la perseverance en temps de persecution' which du Moulin recommended in this work included not only prayer and virtuous conduct but also the contemplation of the errors of Catholicism:

C'est aussi un conseil qui aide fort à la perseverance de bien considerer la grandeur de l'erreur et des tenebres de la Papauté, d'avoir un abrégé et

4.6 Du Moulin (1621–1658)

comme un tableau racourci qui nous represente au vrai la face de l'Eglise Romaine (pp.94–95)

The 'abbrégé' which followed this advice closely resembles those questionnaires and lists which du Moulin had habitually carried with him when in Paris, ready to present to any Catholic challenger or faltering Protestant.

In the spring of 1624 du Moulin went to England at the invitation of James I and was commissioned to compose a reply to du Perron's *Réplique à la Response du serenissime Roy de la Grand Bretagne*, which had been published post-humously in 1620.¹³⁹ Soon however, both du Moulin and his patron fell gravely ill. The king died a year later in March 1625. Du Moulin remained in England, struggling to work on the book, but eventually returned to Sedan before it was completed. His *Nouveauté du Papisme* was finally published in 1627.¹⁴⁰ This was to be one of the three best-known anti-Catholic works published by du Moulin during his time at Sedan and will be examined in more detail in the second half of this section. The remaining two major publications were to be a four-part work on the 'juge des controverses' question (published in 1630–31)¹⁴¹ and a two-volume study of the Catholic mass (published in 1636/39).¹⁴²

During the 1630s and 1640s the rate at which du Moulin published his works of religious polemic gradually slackened but, when the opportunity arose, he was still prepared to venture forthright opinions on political, religious and even literary matters. In 1632, for example, in reply to a complimentary copy of Guez de Balzac's *Le Prince*, du Moulin wrote to the author, regretting certain remarks concerning the country's Protestants, but praising Balzac's style: 'Vous avez atteint l'art de bien dire, et tirant la planche apres vous, avez avec admiration laissé le desespoir à la posterité'.¹⁴³ Balzac, flattered by du Moulin's letter and ignoring his friend Chapelain's warning concerning 'l'esprit "de satyre" du pasteur',¹⁴⁴ replied at considerable length in 'une grande lettre politique':

je vous [du Moulin] regarde il y a longtemps dans le party Huguenot, comme un excellent Pilote, qui brave toute une flotte dans un brigantin. Nous avons le droict et l'autorité; mais vous avez l'adresse et les stratagemes et ne vous assurez pas moins en vostre esprit, que nous nous fions à nostre cause. Il est certain que par là vous pourriez donner à une sedition l'apparence d'une juste guerre; et à une multitude de mutins la face d'une

4.6 Du Moulin (1621–1658)

armée bien disciplinée. Par là, vous rendés agreable à beaucoup de gens, une opinion qui a perdu la grace de la nouveauté; quoy qu'elle a encore des attraits et de la couleur dans vos ecrits, et que jamais homme n'a couvert plus finement la foiblesse, ny soustenu des ruines avec tant de force.

Du Moulin responded with vigour to Balzac's letter, rejecting suggestions that the Protestant church was in decline or had lost its 'novelty' — 'notre religion est le pur et ancien Christianisme, seulement nouvelle en un point, à sçavoir en ce qu'elle rejette toute nouveauté' — and attacking the Jesuits, those offering financial incentives to Protestants prepared to abandon their faith and the decadence of the papal court. He concluded with the same claim which he had made in 1609 and 1617, that the Protestants were hated because of their loyalty to their sovereigns:

Bref j'oze dire, que la principale cause de la haine qu'on nous porte, est parce que nous defendons par la parole de Dieu les droicts de nos Roys, contre les usurpations des Papes, qui leur font baiser leurs pantoufles ...

The terms in which du Moulin, in this second letter, dismissed Balzac's remarks in praise of his writing give an important insight into his approach:

je n'ay jamais faict mestier de bien dire. Il me suffit d'estre entendu, mon but en mes ecrits n'est pas de chatoüiller l'oreille, mais de poindre la conscience ... Car comme les fleurs rouges et bleues parmy les bleds recréent la veue, mais endommagent la moisson; Ainsi les ornemens parmy les bonnes doctrines diminuent le fruict des enseignements, et font qu'au lieu de gouter les matieres on s'arreste aux mots, et pese les periodes.

It is interesting to note that similar remarks had already appeared in the foreword of du Moulin's *De la vocation des pasteurs* of 1618 and were to be made again in the dedicatory epistle of one of his volumes of sermons published many years later.¹⁴⁵

In the mid-1630s du Moulin once again became preoccupied with doctrinal differences within the Reformed Church, precipitated by the publication in 1634 of Moïse Amyraut's *Brief Traitté de la predestination et de ses principales dependances*.¹⁴⁶ Du Moulin's opposition to both Arminianism and Amyraldism has formed the subject of several recent studies of his writings by modern scholars and his position has generally been condemned as illiberal, dogmatic and

4.6 Du Moulin (1621–1658)

un-scholarly.¹⁴⁷ In his defence, however, it should be noted to what extent du Moulin's standpoint on the issues was the product of his long involvement in religious polemic. The most striking feature of du Moulin's objections to the new trend in Reformed theology, exemplified by teachers at the Saumur academy and supported by several of the younger generation of pastors now at Charenton, was his claim that Amyraut and others, by their moves towards a more sophisticated language and method for Protestant theology and by their interest in doctrinal areas which had previously been little discussed, were destroying the simple and direct appeal of the gospel message:

comme ceste doctrine est nouvelle, aussi ils la revestent de nouveaux termes et inusitez en nos Eglises, et esloignez du stile de l'Escriture Sainte ... le langage de l'Esprit de Dieu leur est un langage fade et trop bas, ils ont revestu la Theologie d'un plus bel habit.¹⁴⁸

The idea that truth should be simple and accessible could be regarded as the keynote of du Moulin's approach, whether to questions of preaching or writing style or to the discussion of disputed doctrinal issues with Catholic opponents or within the French Reformed Church. The brevity and unadorned nature of truth were qualities which he frequently emphasised in all these contexts. Modern critics, such as Armstrong, who condemn du Moulin for his use of the scholastic style of argument, his emphasis on the role of rational argument in resolving doctrinal issues and his apparently dismissive attitude towards Calvin, underestimate the importance of the context in which Protestant theologians of this period were working, continually subject to the scrutiny (and the attacks) of Catholic polemicists.¹⁴⁹ Indeed, Armstrong's negative view of rational argument and his determination to contrast the approaches of du Moulin and Amyraut forces him into the difficult position of regarding Amyraut's response to the 'méthodistes' (against whom, like du Moulin, he affirmed the role of human reason in religious matters) as a 'problem'.¹⁵⁰ In fact, Amyraut (in common with Mestrezat and Daillé at Charenton) was to take precisely the same line against Véron and his followers which du Moulin had adopted in his own dealings with 'méthodiste' controversialists during the latter half of his time at Paris.¹⁵¹ The divergences between the theologians of Sedan and Saumur are not significant in this sphere of their activities.

4.6 Du Moulin (1621–1658)

Throughout these years du Moulin had continued to play an active part in the teaching and administration of the academy and in Sedan's church life. In 1636, the Protestants found themselves faced with a threat to their sheltered and privileged existence in the principality when the duc de Bouillon, Frédéric-Maurice de la Tour, abjured Protestantism and was admitted to the Catholic church.¹⁵² In the years which followed the revenues and entitlements of church and academy were progressively reduced, and a group of Capuchin monks established themselves in the city.¹⁵³ A number of pamphlets which du Moulin published against them in the years 1640–41 reveal that, even in his seventies, he still relished the opportunity to engage in religious debate at a local level.¹⁵⁴ His last major publication, *La vie et religion de deux bons papes*, was published in 1650, eight years before his death, at the age of 90, on 10 March 1658.¹⁵⁵

Nouveauté du Papisme (1627)

The *Nouveauté du Papisme* is by far the most substantial of du Moulin's works, not only in the scope of its subject and choice of arguments, but also in its actual format and length: over one thousand folio pages.¹⁵⁶ This provides a marked contrast to the octavo editions in which his previous works of controversy had appeared and is an important indication of the fact that this book represented a new departure for du Moulin. In his *Nouveauté du Papisme* he made a far more sustained attempt to present the historical evidence against the Roman Catholic church than he had ever previously attempted. This more academic approach was largely dictated by the publication which he was required to refute and, in his preface, du Moulin acknowledged his opponent's abilities and the quality of his work:

je ne puis refuser à la memoire de ce Cardinal ceste louange, que ce livre est basti avec un grand artifice, et qu'il y a bandé tous ses sens . . . il est certain que nul de ceux qui en France ont broüillé le papier en faveur du Pape ne lui peut estre comparé. Et que ce seroit lui faire tort, je ne dis point d'esgaler, mais mesmes de nommer apres lui certains menus broüillons et esprits acariastres, ignorants au dernier degré, comme un Pere Gontier, un Pere Veron, et un Pere Regourd, ausquels l'impudence et la cholere injurieuse a disloqué le cerveau. (ff.d.iii.verso–d.iv.recto)

The *Nouveauté du Papisme* is divided into two parts: Part 1 contains six books providing a historical survey of the papacy in the first five centuries; Part 2 consists

4.6 Du Moulin (1621–1658)

of a series of ‘controverses’ which, expanded in later editions, eventually dealt with fourteen controversial issues. Whereas the ground covered in the second part had been tackled by du Moulin on many previous occasions, the first part represented a new subject. ‘[Pour] suivre les pas du Cardinal’, explained du Moulin, ‘m’a fallu fouïller les escrits des Peres des cinq premiers siecles’, and he then hastened to justify this reliance on historical evidence:

Non pas pour deroger en rien à la perfection de l’Ecriture Saincte, laquelle seule peut et doit decider des doutes de la foy, et qui és choses necessaires à salut est si claire qu’il n’ayt besoin d’interpretation: Mais pour arracher aux adversaires ce masque d’antiquité, et monstrier que nostre religion est de tout temps, et à pour soi les Anciens. Afin aussi de defendre l’honneur des Peres, ausquels on donne la gehenne pour les faire deposer contre la verité, et parler contre leur intention: Et pour monstrier au doigt la source des erreurs et les occasions du Papisme (f.f.iii recto)

The terms in which du Moulin explained his use of historical arguments are thus virtually the same as those with which he had introduced the evidence from the church fathers which he had added in the *Accroissement des Eaux de Siloé* in 1604.

In his four-part preface, du Moulin constantly took issue with du Perron’s use of historical rather than scriptural arguments, accusing his opponent of nursing ‘une haine secrette de l’Ecriture Saincte’. He summarised the difficulties attached to the use of the church fathers as an authoritative source and remarked, ‘Tout ce tourment que se donne ce Cardinal provient de ne vouloir s’arrester à l’Ecriture saincte, et de chercher d’autres juges que la parole de Dieu’ (f.b.iv.recto). The essence of du Moulin’s objections to the Catholic church’s claim to fulfil the role of ‘juge des controverses’ was that it defied reason:

le Cardinal s’enveloppe et se contredit à soi-mesme, voulant que le peuple s’adresse à l’Eglise pour avoir la vraye decision des doutes de la foy, avant que de sçavoir si l’Eglise à laquelle on l’adresse est bonne, et enseigne la vraye doctrine. Car comment le povre peuple auroit-il ceste cognoissance? seroit-ce par l’Ecriture Saincte? mais c’est un livre dont la lecture n’est point permise au peuple, et M. du Perron dit que par ce moyen on ne peut sortir de difficulté, ni trouver une certaine instruction. Sera-ce par les Peres? mais ils sont encore plus obscurs que l’Ecriture, et d’une longueur infinie, et discordent entr’eux, et ce sont livres Grecs et Latins ou le peuple n’entend rien. Sera-ce par la coustume, ou par la naissance, ou par

4.6 Du Moulin (1621–1658)

le conseil de ses voisins? Mais par ce moyen chacun suivra la religion de son pays. Sera-ce par l'autorité de l'Eglise? mais il y a plusieurs Eglises discordantes. Que s'il faut absolument et sans aucune enquete croire que l'Eglise Romaine est la meilleure, pource qu'elle se dit elle-mesme estre la meilleure, elle sera juge en sa cause, et le fondement de la foy Chrestienne sera qu'il faut croire le Pape pource que le Pape le veut, et suivre l'Eglise Romaine pource que l'Eglise Romaine l'ordonne. Et és question où il s'agit du devoir de l'Eglise, l'Eglise mesme sera juge. Et en la question si l'Eglise Romaine est juge infaillible, il faudra que l'Eglise Romaine soit juge infaillible. Et en la question si l'Eglise Romaine peut errer, l'Eglise Romaine jugera sans pouvoir errer. (f.c.ii verso–iii recto)

Despite the apparent commitment in his *Nouveauté du Papisme* to the more scholarly, objective and historically-based trend in religious debate, du Moulin retained precisely the same view of the competing claims of scripture and the church to fulfil the role of 'juge des controverses' which he had always upheld in his works of popular polemic: that only the Bible provided ordinary Christians with a concise, accessible, understandable and rationally defensible account of their faith.

The *Nouveauté du Papisme* was du Moulin's first major work since leaving Paris and may have been intended to signal his return to the field of inter-confessional debate in a resounding way. In fact, this final episode in the exchanges between du Perron, James I and the champion of his views in France — in marked contrast to the cross-channel debates of the years 1607–1615 — seems to have excited little interest. It seems instead to reinforce the impression that du Moulin, by his move to Sedan, had been relegated to the margins of French religious debate in more than one sense. Two potential refutations, mentioned in contemporary correspondence, never materialised.¹⁵⁸ There are also suggestions that, even in French Protestant circles, du Moulin's work had not found favour.¹⁵⁹

***Du juge des controverses* (1630–31) and *Anatomie de la Messe* (1636–39)**

In 1630, du Moulin published the first part of a book which specifically addressed the fundamental point at issue between Protestants and Catholics and was accordingly entitled *Du juge des controverses*. As he observed in his dedicatory epistle, ‘toutes les disputes se reduisent aujourd’huy à disputer comment il faut disputer, et si l’Eglise doit estre juge, ou bien l’Ecriture’.¹⁶⁰ The three treatises which form the first volume of this work dealt in turn with (i) the thesis that ‘ni l’Eglise en general, ni l’Eglise Romaine en particulier, ne peut estre juge souverain et infailible des doutes et controverses de la religion’; (ii) the interpretation of scripture; and (iii) the author’s claim that ‘nos adversaires, par l’Eglise qu’ils disent estre juge, n’entendent pas les escrits des Peres ni les Conciles’. The fourth treatise, in which du Moulin discussed Catholic traditions and affirmed ‘la perfection de l’Ecriture Sainte’, was published separately the following year.

The arguments and the evidence marshalled by du Moulin in these treatises remained virtually the same as those used in earlier works written during his time in Paris. Most notably, in the second and fourth treatises, he reiterated the arguments assembled in his *Bouclier de la foy* against the ‘méthodistes’ and in favour of reason and logical procedures.¹⁶¹ The chief difference between the works written before and after 1621 lies in the extent to which du Moulin supplemented the later works with documentary evidence from a range of Catholic sources. In *Du Juge des Controverses*, for example, the first treatise was preceded by over forty pages of quotations from individual Catholic authors and papal statements while Part 4 ended with a catalogue of Catholic traditions listed over 126 closely-printed pages. According to the author, this list offered ‘comme en un tableau raccourci tout ce grand corps du Papisme, bigarré de cent mille couleurs’ and he concluded with the revealing comment that ‘le seul dénombrement sert de refutation’.¹⁶²

Similarly, du Moulin’s *Anatomie de la Messe*, published in 1636/1639, differed from the *Apologie pour la sainte Cène* of 1607 in the matter of organisation rather than content. The second volume, in which the full text of the Mass was reproduced, provided the documentary evidence on which the first was based. In this work du Moulin again showed his preference for confronting the Catholic case with scriptural and rational objections. It is interesting to note that, on the question

4.6 Du Moulin (1621–1658)

of historical evidence against the doctrine of transsubstantiation, he referred the reader not only to his own *Nouveauté du Papisme* but also to the writings of two of the new pastoral team at Charenton: 'Messieurs le Faucheur et Aubertin ont travaillé tout de nouveau sur ce sujet avec une diligence tres exacte, et pleine de grand sçavoir'.¹⁶³ (This generous acknowledgement of the scholarship of younger Saumur-educated pastors is all the more striking in view of the fact that it was at precisely this period that du Moulin was most active in attacking the content and method of theological teaching at their academy.)

These three major works produced during du Moulin's time at Sedan are those on which scholars of this century have almost invariably formed their judgements concerning du Moulin's contribution to religious debate. The works differ from those produced during the years 1598–1621 only in the matter of length and in the fact that they address questions in general terms rather than as raised in published exchanges or encounters with specific Parisian Catholic opponents. The style, method and content of du Moulin's writing on controversial religious issues had therefore been developed during his time at Paris where he had engaged in debate not as an academic theologian but as a pastor intent on safeguarding his flock from marauding Catholic clerics and in an often actively hostile social setting. On the basis of these later works du Moulin's publications have frequently, and unfairly, been characterised as tedious, encyclopaedic or academic. Only in his *Nouveauté du Papisme* could du Moulin be said to have aspired to produce a contribution to religious debate at a scholarly level comparable to the later publications of opponents such as du Perron, Coeffeteau or Coton or to the works of Protestant contemporaries such as du Plessis-Mornay and Rivet; the remainder of his works are, in fact, by the standards of his own time, intended to be accessible to a wide readership. It is important to note also that throughout du Moulin's time at Sedan his early works continued to be reprinted at Geneva, particularly in the years 1624–5, 1630–2 and 1635–6.¹⁶⁴ The following extract from a letter sent to du Moulin by Conrart during this period emphasises precisely the qualities which made the minister's works so popular:

bien que j'admire en vous, Monsieur, les traces de la Nature et les trésors

4.6 *Du Moulin (1621–1658)*

que l'estude et les sciences vous ont fait acquerir, je mets toutesfois ces biens-là au dessous de ceux que vous avez receus immédiatement du Ciel. La Philosophie et l'Eloquence ne sont que des Instruments dont vous vous servez pour mettre en œuvre les pierres précieuses de la Théologie. Vous avez joint la subtilité d'Aristote, l'élégance de Cicéron et la briefveté de Sénèque avec la doctrine de Saint Paul et avez arraché, par la force et la netteté de votre stile, les épines de la scholastique, qui rendoyent les plus sublimes mystères de nostre foy si ardu et si difficiles à comprendre.¹⁶⁵

The homage paid by Conrart (as also by Balzac) to du Moulin's skill as a lucid and persuasive writer provides a useful counter-balance to the picture of the minister as 'archibouffon', created by a generation of exasperated opponents and sustained in many of the major studies of this period written by Catholic scholars over the last century.

Even after his death in 1658, editions of du Moulin's early works continued to be reprinted.¹⁶⁶ In 1666, a Protestant pastor was to write that du Moulin's works were still more widely-read by ordinary members of his congregation than those of Daillé, one of the new generation of scholarly controversialists based at Charenton.¹⁶⁷ Whereas modern theologians and literary historians have tended to criticise du Moulin's contribution to religious debate on the grounds that, by the standards of later controversialists, he appears dogmatic, reactionary or lacking in commitment to scholarly ideals of objectivity or detailed research, his books and pamphlets in fact deserve to be assessed in quite different terms as works which were the product of almost half a century of participation in countless polemical exchanges at a local level and which enjoyed a durable, popular appeal extending over more than seventy years.

Notes to Chapter 4

1. Sources for biography: there are two main sources of information on du Moulin's life. The first is an autobiography written for his family when du Moulin was in his eighties. A printed version of this, based on a seventeenth century MS not in du Moulin's own hand, appeared in the *Bulletin de l'histoire du protestantisme français* in 1858 (see above, Chapter 1, n.44). The second is a biography by du Moulin's eldest son, Pierre (or Peter, since he eventually lived permanently in England). This appeared as 'The Author's Life' in Peter du Moulin's English version of his father's *Nouveauté du Papisme* in 1664 (see above, Chapter 1, n.90). The first of these accounts consists chiefly of family details and various episodes which, in his son's words '[record] the great mercies of God to him, and the signal experiences of his assistance and providence' while '[passing] by those actions and passages which have got him [du Moulin] most credit' (f.**3 recto). 'The Author's Life' provides much fuller information on du Moulin's activities as a controversialist. Gédéon Gory's *Pierre du Moulin: Essai sur sa vie, sa controverse et sa polémique* (Paris, 1888) cites several interesting passages from unpublished MS letters held by the Bibliothèque de la Société de l'Histoire du Protestantisme Français (see, for example, pp.65, 69–72). An article by Jacques Pannier — 'Un pasteur de Paris, chanoine à Canterbury et recteur dans le Pays de Galles. P. Du Moulin (1615–1625)', *Proceedings of the Huguenot Society*, XIII (1925), pp.173–81 — reports on his research into du Moulin's contacts and activities in England. The only substantial study of recent years is Lucien Rimbault's *Pierre du Moulin, 1568–1658, un pasteur classique à l'âge classique: Étude de théologie pastorale, sur des documents inédits* (Paris, 1966) which includes a complete French version of Peter du Moulin's biography. As the sub-title suggests, a substantial part of this work is devoted to the theme of the Protestant ministerial vocation as it is presented in du Moulin's publications. Although the vast majority of du Moulin's published works were polemical in purpose, Rimbault examines them chiefly in terms of pastoral theology.

Du Moulin's date of birth: 16 October, according to his 'Autobiographie' (p.172); 18 October, according to 'The Author's Life' (f.** verso).

2. As an independent principality just beyond the French border whose ruling family, even prior to becoming Protestant, was known to be favourable to religious reform, Sedan became the most accessible place of refuge for the Protestants of northern France. (See Pierre Congar, Jean Lecaillon, Jacques Rousseau, *Sedan et le pays sedanais — vingt siècles d'histoire* (Paris, 1969), pp.180–81.)
3. 'Autobiographie', p.173.
4. The eldest of Joachim du Moulin's children from his second marriage, Marie, eventually married the noted French Protestant scholar André Rivet. (See

Haag 8, 444–49.)

5. Another distinguished Protestant, the Hebrew scholar Jacques Cappel (also an opponent in religious debate of Pierre Coton and Jean Gontéry), was among du Moulin's contemporaries at Sedan (see Haag, 3, 198–201). Peter du Moulin records that 'Both made in that Colledge a great Proficiency, and came out together from the first Classis; Du Moulin being publicly honoured with the first prize (after the custom of the French schools) and Capellus with the second' ('The Author's Life', f.**4 recto). (For the founding and development of Sedan's college and academy, see Congar, Lecaillon and Rousseau, *Sedan et le pays sedanais*, pp.219–33; also, Pierre Congar, 'Les caractères propres de l'Académie protestante de Sedan (1602–1681)', *Histoire de l'enseignement de 1610 à nos jours. Actes du 95^e Congrès des sociétés savantes* (Reims, 1970), vol 1, pp.537–49.)
6. 'The Author's Life', f.**4 recto; 'Autobiographie', p.176.
7. 'Autobiographie', pp.176–77.
8. 'Autobiographie', pp.171–73, 178–79.
9. Bochart later became minister at Rouen. He married du Moulin's sister, Ester; both his son, Samuel, and son-in-law, Maximilien de l'Angle, eventually joined the ministerial team of the Rouen church. (See Haag, 2, 318–22.)
10. 'Autobiographie', p.178. G. A. Wickes, *Henry Constable, Poet and Courtier, 1562–1613*, in *Biographical Studies, 1534–1820*, vol 2, no 4 (1954), pp.272–300: 'In 1597 Atilio Amalteo speaks of Constable as 'molto intimo di Monsignore di Perone' and from Constable's funeral oration we learn not only that the two remained intimate friends throughout life but that it was du Perron who obtained a pension for Constable at the French court' (p.281).
11. 'Autobiographie', p.179.
12. The first of Whitaker's refutations based on his Cambridge lectures was published in 1588: *Disputatio de Sacra Scriptura, contra huius temporis Papistas, in primis Robertum Bellarminum ... et Thomam Stapletonum ...*. Two more works were prepared for publication after his death by John Allenson: *De ecclesia* appeared in 1599 and *De conciliis* in 1600. (See Peter Milward, *Religious Controversies of the Elizabethan Age: A Survey of Printed Sources* (London, 1977), pp.149–50, 154–55.)
13. *A Disputation on Holy Scripture, against the Papists, especially Bellarmine and Stapleton*, translated and edited by William Fitzgerald (Cambridge, 1849), p.x. See, for example, the lists of Protestant authors cited in Coeffeteau's *Œuvres* and by Richelieu in his *Traité qui contient la methode la plus facile et la plus asseurée pour convertir ceux qui se sont separez de l'Eglise* (Paris, 1651), REP 4953.

14. *Sa Vie à ses enfans*, in *Œuvres*, p.424.
15. Pattison, p.405 (cited from Burney MSS 367, p.23).
16. See Georges H. Tavard, *Holy Writ or Holy Church: The Crisis of the Protestant Reformation* (London, 1959), pp.238–40.
17. 'Autobiographie', pp.178–80.
18. 'Autobiographie', p.180. Peter du Moulin explains: 'At his first coming into *Holland*, he got the acquaintance of the French Embassadour *Monsieur de Busanval*; for King *Henry* the Fourth in those dayes sent Protestant Embassadors to the Protestant Princes and States' (f.**4 verso).
19. Gustave Cohen, *Écrivains français en Hollande dans la première moitié du XVII^e siècle* (Paris, 1920), p.227.
20. 'Autobiographie', pp.181–82.
21. 'Autobiographie', p.181.
22. Paul Dibon, *La philosophie néerlandaise au siècle d'or*, vol 1: *L'enseignement philosophique dans les universités à l'époque précartésienne (1575–1650)* (Amsterdam, 1954), p.39.
23. 'The Author's Life', f.**4 verso. Elsewhere Peter du Moulin describes Paris as 'the great resort, not only of all France, but of all Europe' (f.***3 verso). Other writers show a similar awareness of the prestige of Paris: 'Theatre public est bien la ville de Paris', wrote Pierre Cayet, 'au regard de la France, et de tout le monde mesmes, sans parler seulement de la Chrestienté' (*La victoire de la verité contre l'hérésie*, p.2); and Adrian Daillé described the capital as 'ce fameux théâtre, où l'on est à la veuë de tout ce qu'il y a de plus poly, de plus sçavant, et de plus relevé dans le Monde' (*Abbrege de la vie de Monsieur Daillé* (1671), p.12).
24. 'Autobiographie', pp.334–35.
25. 'Autobiographie', p.336; H.-J. Martin, 2, 627–28.
26. Dibon, p.101 (see also, pp.53–54). Full reference for work by François Burgersdijk: *Institutionum Logicarum Libri Duo* (Leiden, 1626). In 1621 du Moulin published a French version of his logic textbook, *Elements de la logique françoise* (Sedan, 1621), REP 2735. In the dedicatory epistle he reasserted his belief in the value of the study of logic: 'Ce que la main est entre les outils, cela mesme est la Logique entre les arts et sciences. Car comme la main est un outil general qui manie tous autres outils, ainsi la Logique est un instrument general, dont la cognoissance sert à manier toute autre cognoissance, et à s'en servir avec dextérité. Et comme c'est le propre de l'art de polir et parfaire la nature, ainsi c'est le devoir de cest art de polir et reigler la raison naturelle. Car il y a une Logique naturelle, de laquelle l'homme se sert naturellement sans y

apporter aucun artifice. Mesme les paysans font des syllogismes sans y penser. Mais la philosophie ayant fouillé tous les ressorts de la raison naturelle, a remarqué les causes de la bonté d'un discours, et y a posé des reigles' (Geneva 1631 edition, p.3). The modest success of du Moulin's textbook continued throughout the first half of the century; the French and English translations as well as the original Latin work were regularly re-printed until the 1640s.

27. Brian G. Armstrong, *Calvinism and the Amyraut Heresy: Protestant Scholasticism and Humanism in Seventeenth Century France* (Madison, Milwaukee and London, 1969), p.83. Armstrong draws damning conclusions regarding du Moulin's scholasticism from the latter's emphasis on the importance of mastering logical procedures (pp.83, 135), but seems unaware that Aristotle's *Organon* remained the basis of courses in logic in France throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries (see L. W. B. Brockliss, *French Higher Education in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries* (Oxford, 1987), pp.194–205).
28. 'Autobiographie', pp.336–38.
29. 'Autobiographie', pp.338–39. During this first journey to Lorraine du Moulin met his future wife, Marie de Colignon. (Their four children — Pierre, Esther, Louis and Cyrus — are all mentioned in later pages of his autobiography.) Du Moulin was to continue to spend a portion of each year serving as chaplain to the duchess until her death in 1604.
30. See above, Chapter 1, p.15.
31. *Novelty of Popery*, pp.465–66. Peter du Moulin writes that 'Du Perron, then Bishop of Evreux, and Father Cotton ... had several bickerings with him, but yet had soon done; for being worsted, and not used to deal with such an Adversary, they did avoid to meet with him, leaving others of the Court Clergy to try their fortune with him' and then goes on to give a brief account of a dispute between the two men ('The Author's Life', f.***2 recto).
32. See Haag, 9, 383–87; Jacques Davy du Perron, *Articles des Ministres et autres*.
33. See above, Chapter 3, p.116.
34. 'The Author's Life', ff.***2 verso–3 recto.
35. For full title, see above, Chapter 2, n.14.

Jacques Suarez de Sainte-Marie, *Torrent de feu sortant de la face de Dieu pour desseicher les eaux de Mara encloses dans la chossée du Molin d'Ablon. Où est amplement prouvé le Purgatoire et suffrages pour les trespassez; et sont decouvertes les faussetez et calomnies du ministre Molin* (Paris, 1603), REP 543; Pierre-Victor Palma Cayet, *La Fournaise ardente* (for full title, see above, Chapter 2, n.14); André Duval, *Feux d'Hélie pour tarir les eaux de Siloé. Auquel est amplement prouvé le Purgatoire contre le ministre Du Moulin et respondu aux raisons et allegations contraires* (Paris, 1603), REP 503.

- André Duval (1564–1638), Sorbonne doctor appointed to the first chair of theology founded by Henri IV in 1596; opponent of Richer during the regency period. The fact that Duval contributed to this debate suggests that he may have been one of those involved in du Moulin's 1602 conference with members of the Faculty of Theology which was terminated by the king. (Sources: DTC, 4, 1967; Feret, *La faculté de théologie de Paris et ses docteurs les plus célèbres* ... *Époque moderne*, 5 vols (Paris, 1900–07), 4, 329–39.)
36. *Accroissement des Eaux de Siloé, pour esteindre le feu du Purgatoire et noyer les satisfactions humaines et les indulgences papales, contre les raisons et allegations d'un Cordelier portugais, defendues par trois escrits, dont l'un est du mesme Cordelier, intitulé Le Torrent du feu, etc ... , les autres de deux docteurs de la Sorbonne, l'un intitulé la Fournaise ardente, l'autre Le feu d'Helie* ... (La Rochelle, 1604), REP 577. Du Moulin mentions in this work that its appearance had been delayed by a journey of some seven months. Rimbault surmises that this may have included, in addition to his trip to the national synod, a visit to Lorraine where the king's sister died in February 1604 (p.32). According to Peter du Moulin, his father had resisted an attempt by du Perron to remove him from the duchess's sickroom: 'When she drew neer to her end, *Du Moulin* standing by her Bed-side, *Du Perron* came and said he was sent by the King, and would remove him by plain force. But *Du Moulin* held fast the Bed post' (f.***3 verso).
37. For full title, see above, Chapter 3, n.39; all quotations are from the Geneva 1631 edition, REP 3740.
38. For full title, see above, Chapter 3, n.101.
39. *Cayet, La Conference des ministres accordee, et puis refusee par eux*, p.17.
40. See above, Chapter 3, nn.26 and 52(d) for full titles of the three main accounts of this conference by Adair, Maucouvent and Cayet. All quotations from Adair's *Narré de la conférence* are from the Geneva 1625 edition (REP 3292).
41. See below, pp.180–83.
42. See above, Chapter 3, n.96.
43. *Cartel de deffy*, p.5. All quotations are from the Geneva 1625 edition, REP 3321.
44. *Destruction des faux arguments et sophismes du sieur de Montigny*: for full title, see above, Chapter 3, n.28.
45. Du Moulin, *Bouclier de la foy* [1618] (Geneva, 1635) REP 3981, p.304 (see above, Chapter 1, n.151, for full title of first edition).
46. According to Jacques Le Goff, 'le Purgatoire s'installe dans la croyance de la chrétienté occidentale entre 1150 et 1250 environ' (*La naissance du Purgatoire* (Paris, 1981), p.14). Le Goff, pp.121–31, analyses the contribution of Gregory the Great (c.540–604), chiefly through his *Dialogues*.

47. Many of the points made by Higman regarding Calvin's polemical style and method are equally applicable to du Moulin's writing. See Francis M. Higman, *The Style of John Calvin in his French Polemical Treatises* (Oxford, 1967).
48. See below, p.204 and n.111.
49. For full title, see above, Chapter 1, n.122. This quotation is from the Geneva 1631 edition REP 3738, p.22.
50. Full title: *Methode de convaincre par la sainte escriture, tous schismatiques et heretiques. Selon laquelle est demonstree la fausseté de la doctrine des pretenduz reformez Calvinistes, Zvingliens, et Lutheriens, contraire à celle des Catholiques: és points de l'Eglise, De la parole de Dieu, ou tradition Apostolique non escrite, De la presence réelle du corps et du sang de Jesus-Christ, au S. Sacrement de l'Eucharistie, De la Transsubstantiation, Du Sacrifice de la Messe, De la communion souz une espece, Du Purgatoire, Des Indulgences, De la veneration et invocation des saints, De la veneration de leurs reliques, et De la veneration des images. Contre le sieur du Moulin, ministre de la pretendue Eglise reformée, continuant à renier sa confession de Foy* (Paris, 1604), REP 561.
51. *See above, n. 37.*
52. See above, Chapter 3, p.98.
53. Full title: *Abbrege des controverses Ou Sommaire des erreurs de nostre temps, avec leur réfutation par textes exprès de la Bible de Louvain* ('Se vendent à Charenton', 1624), REP 3201.
54. 'The Author's Life', f.***2 recto: 'The Baron of Mountataire told me, that being at Cardinal Du Perron's table, and some discourse of Religion and Ministers being moved, one President Chevalier said that Du Moulin was an Ass; Upon which the Cardinal answered the President, You do him wrong Sir; He is such an Ass, that no man ever rubbed against him, but returned with a kick'.
55. 'J'insistay fort envers l'assemblée que la demande de l'approchement de l'Eglise de Paris ne fust point mise au cahier des demandes qu'on dressoit en l'assemblée pour les bailler aux deputés généraux: mais que M. le duc de Sully, qui alors estoit en grand credit, fust notre député pour cet article' ('Autobiographie', p.341).
56. See above, Chapter 1, pp.22-23.
57. *Trente-deux demandes proposées par le P. Coton*; for full title, see above, Chapter 1, n.77.
58. *Correction fraternelle faite à M. Du Moulin, ministre de Pontcharenton* (Paris, 1607), REP 785 (no surviving copy listed); Philothée, bachelier en théologie, *Suite de la Correction fraternelle. Ou continuation des reparties faictes contre les responses de M. Du Moulin Ministre de Charantonneau, sur les pretendues demandes du R. P. Cotton* (Paris, 1607), REP 808 (only one surviving copy

- listed). L'Estoile bought Gontéry's reply on 25 April (VIII, 291).
59. For full title, see above, Chapter 1, n.77. The 'narré' published anonymously by Gontéry which is referred to here does not appear to have survived. Although du Moulin makes no reference to this particular meeting with Gontéry in his autobiography there is evidence for at least two meetings between the two men. (Rimbault is mistaken in claiming that the *Apologie pour la sainte Cène* must have been published in 1609 because it followed the debate between du Moulin and Gontéry in that year (pp.43–44).)
 60. *La Defence de la Sainte Eucharistie et presence reelle du corps de Jesus-Christ. Contre la pretendue Apologie de la Cene, publiée par Pierre du Moulin, Ministre de Charenton ...* (Paris, 1607) REP 770; followed two years later by his *Refutation des faussetez contenues en la deuxiesme edition de l'Apologie de la Cene, du Ministre du Moulin ...* (Paris, 1609), REP 958.
 61. (1609), REP 970; (1610), REP 1112–14. This first series of exchanges between du Moulin and Coeffeteau ended in 1610 with the publication by du Moulin of an *Anatomie du livre du sieur Coeffeteau* (see above, Chapter 3, n.6); Coeffeteau refused to continue further with these exchanges.
 62. The main source of information on this conference is Dubé's thesis, 'Bérulle et les protestants, 1593–1610', which contains the following account of du Moulin's involvement: 'Entre temps, du Moulin était arrivé et c'est lui, si on en croit le procès-verbal de la dernière journée, qui sera l'occasion de la rupture. Le pasteur de Charenton dont plusieurs reconnaissent l'intelligence mais aussi l'emportement scandalisa tous les catholiques présents en les traictant de "prétendus catholiques" et en refusant de se rétracter tant qu'on emploierait l'expression "prétendue réformée" pour désigner son Eglise. ... Du Moulin refusa de continuer le débat et quitta les lieux disant à Séguiran "qu'ils se verroient à Paris" (1, 101).
 63. See above, Chapter 3, n.34.
 64. *Copie d'une lettre escrite au Roy*: for full title, see above, Chapter 3, n.24
 65. *Response ... aux lettres du sieur Gontier*: for full title, see above, Chapter 2, n.10. All quotations are taken from the Geneva 1625 edition, REP 3327.
 66. See above, Chapter 2, p.71.
 67. *Discours sur le sujet proposé en la rencontre du R. P. Gontier, et du Sieur du Moulin; où est traicté De la mission des pasteurs en l'Eglise, sur l'article 31. de la confession de foy imprimée à Genève. Du sacrifice de la Messe, célébré en l'Eglise chrestienne. De la presence reelle du corps de Jesus Christ en la sainte Eucharistie ...* (Paris, 1609), REP 951. Source for Coton's remark: Dubé, 1, 119. Du Perron's reaction to the new work may well have been one of surprise: Dubé shows that in this book Bérulle drew extensively on du Perron's

- own publications, often including entire paragraphs virtually unchanged (2, 72–95).
68. *Declaration de l'erreur de nostre temps, et du moyen qu'il a tenu pour s'insinuer. Avec la replique contre le Sieur du Moulin ministre, respondant à une lettre escrite au Roy ... le tout contenu en six discours* (Rouen, 1609), REP 997.
 69. See above, Chapter 2, pp.71–72.
 70. See below, Chapter 5, pp.285–86.
 71. Full titles: *Théophile ou de l'Amour divin. Traicté contenant cinq degrez, cinq marques, cinq aides. De l'Amour de Dieu* (La Rochelle, 1609), REP 977; *Heracrite ou de la Vanité et misere de la vie humaine ...* (La Rochelle, 1609), REP 972. DS, 2, 35.
 72. For full title, see above, Chapter 3, n.39. The 1609 edition was published anonymously; copies survive in the BN (not listed in the *Répertoire*) and in the Bibliothèque de la Mazarine. The earliest French edition bearing du Moulin's name was published at Sedan in 1624 (REP 3218) but the English translation of 1610 clearly identified him as the author.
 73. L'Estoile, X, 16–17 (September 1609).
 74. Nicolas Coeffeteau, *Responce à l'Advertissement, adressé par le ... Roy de la Grande Bretagne, Jacques I. à tous les princes et potentats de la chrestienté ...* (Paris, 1609), REP 959; Thomas Pelletier, *La Religion catholique soustenue en tous les poincts de sa doctrine. Contre le livre adressé aux rois, potentats et republiques de la chrestienté par ... Jacques I. roy d'Angleterre, d'Escosse et d'Irlande* (Paris, 1610), REP 1161–62. L'Estoile, X, 100 (December 1609). See above, Chapter 1, p.25.
 75. All quotations are from the Geneva 1625 edition, REP 3332.
 76. Letter from du Moulin to Madame Du Parc, dated 6 April 1607, reproduced in Gontéry's *Correction fraternelle* (text as cited by Prat, 2, 644).
 77. All quotations are from the Sedan 1624 edition, REP 3218.
 78. Title: *Oppositions of the Word of God together with the Doctrine of the Romane Church. Moreover, what points are held by the same Church, which she hideth from those whom she meaneth to draw to her faction* (London, 1610).
 79. All quotations are from the Geneva 1610 edition, REP 1112.
 80. 'Confession de foy faite d'un commun accord par les françois qui desirent vivre selon la pureté de l'Evangile de nostre Seigneur Jesus Christ', in *Les CL. Pseaumes de David mis en rime françoise, par Clement Marot, et Theodore de Besze. Avec la forme des prieres ecclesiastiques, et la maniere d'administrer*

les Sacremens, et celebrer le Mariage (Geneva, 1605).

Pp.8-9. Pp.12-15.	81.	All quotations are from the Geneva 1625 edition, REP 3333.
	84.	'Autobiographie', p.342.
	85.	For full titles of <i>Defense de la foy catholique</i> and part three (<i>De l'Accomplissement des prophéties</i>), see above, Chapter 1, nn.122-23. The Latin version was entitled <i>De monarchia temporalis pontificis romani liber, quo imperatoris, regum et principul jura adversus usurpationes papae defenduntur</i> (Geneva and London, 1614), REP 1619-20.
	86.	Letter from van der Mijle to du Moulin (21 April 1611). Cited by Cohen, p.293. The quotations which follow in the text are from the same source.
	87.	Rimbault gives a full account of this affair and the resulting publications (pp.57-59).
	88.	Letter to M. de Rouvray (4 October 1613), in <i>Mémoires et correspondance de Duplessis Mornay</i> , XII, 418-20 (p.420).
	89.	Letter to Thomas Edmondes (4 October 1613), in <i>Mémoires et correspondance de Duplessis-Mornay</i> , XII, 421-22 (p.421).
	90.	See Rimbault, pp.71-75 and 235-38.
	91.	See above, Chapter 1, p.36.
	92.	For full title, see above, Chapter 1, n.138.
	93.	See above, Chapter 1, p.27; also, Pannier (<i>L'Eglise ... sous Louis XIII (1610-1621)</i> , 1, 64, n.1), Bréchillet-Jourdain (p.59, where the author cites Richer's MS history of the university: 'Petrus Molineus minister auctor huius libelli credebatur'), and Prat (3, 286-87, citing a letter from P. Fronton du Duc which also identifies du Moulin as the author).
	94.	Pannier suggests as an alternative interpretation César de Plaix (using his initials reversed), an advocate in the Paris Parlement, already author of a <i>Passe-partout des Pères jésuites</i> (<i>L'Eglise ... sous Louis XIII (1610-21)</i> , pp.63-64).
	95.	Pannier, <i>L'Eglise ... sous Louis XIII (1610-21)</i> , p.61.
	96.	L'Estoile notes in his diary that the Protestant librarian and scholar Justel had lent him a copy of James I's new apology — <i>Apologia pro juramento fidelitatis</i> — in July 1609: 'Ladite Apologie est notée, à la main, du ministre Du Moulin, auquel le Roy d'Angleterre l'avoit envoiée; et l'avoit, ledit Du Moulin, prestée à M. Justel' (IX, 286).
	97.	(p.462). All quotations are from the revised edition published at Geneva in 1612, REP 1382.
	98.	See above, p.164 and Chapter 2, pp.70-71.

99. Urbain summarises a letter, dated 16 December 1611, in which the king, 'tout en remerciant du Moulin de son livre, se sentit obligé de lui faire des remontrances sur le sans façon avec lequel il traitait l'autorité des Pères' (p.176, cited from BN MS Dupuy, vol 571, folio 61).
100. Pannier, *L'Eglise . . . sous Louis XIII (1610-1)*, pp.81-82. In the same meeting Casaubon also agreed to give du Moulin a copy of the latter's *Défense de la foy catholique* in which the Genevan scholar had noted 'beaucoup d'endroits . . . très défectueux'. Pattison gives further details from contemporary sources of the contrasting theological standpoints of du Moulin and Casaubon, and quotes at length from a letter written by du Moulin to bishop Montagu in which he urged that Casaubon be kept in England and provided with the means of pursuing his work of refuting Baronius, claiming that, should Casaubon return to Paris, his defection to Catholicism was assured (pp.401-5).
101. *Le Mercure françois*, I (Paris, 1611), ff.377 verso-378 recto.
102. See above, Chapter 1, pp.39-40.
103. Full title: *De la toute puissance de Dieu et de sa volonté. Traitté auquel est exposé comment la toute puissance de Dieu et sa volonté doivent reigler nostre foy, au poinct du saint Sacrement* (La Rochelle, 1617), REP 2021.
104. Full title: *De la juste providence de Dieu, traicté auquel est examiné un escrit du sieur Arnoux, jésuite, par lequel il prétend prouver que Calvin fait Dieu auteur de peché* (La Rochelle, 1617), REP 2017-19; (Saumur, 1617), REP 2020. (This work is not mentioned by Rimbault and is missing from his bibliography.)
105. (Sedan, 1618), REP 2190-92.
106. For full title, see above, Chapter 1, n.151.
107. For full title, see above, Chapter 1, n.151. This work is often listed in bibliographies as a separate work although, in later editions, it does not have a proper title page of its own and is presented as an integral part of the *Bouclier*.
108. In 1617, 21 titles out of 44 refer to du Moulin or the Charenton pastors; in 1618, 25 titles out of 47 refer to du Moulin (and, to a lesser extent, to the pastors). (These figures do not include reprints, editions by different Parisian printers or additional works produced outside Paris.)
109. 'Autobiographie', p.344.
110. Full title: *Rencontre et conference verbale entre le sieur Bourguignon, cy-devant ministre des Eglises pretendües reformées, et le sieur Du Moulin ministre à Charenton . . .* (Paris, 1617), REP 1959. Bourguignon, like Pierre Cayet twenty years earlier, was to publish quite a number of pamphlets in the years 1617-20 publicising the reasons for his abjuration (see REP 1954-8, 1960, 2146, 2338, 2507).

111. Full title: *Le Rabelais reformé par les Ministres, et nommément par Pierre Du Moulin ministre de Charenton, pour response aux bouffonneries inserées en son livre de la vocation des pasteurs* (Brussels, 1619), REP 2393. This was to be one of the most notorious Catholic replies to du Moulin's *De la vocation des pasteurs* but consists chiefly of invective against du Moulin and his colleagues rather than a critique of the work in question (Rimbault, pp.169–73). Garasse introduced his book in the following terms:

 'Pierre du Moulin s'est eslevé de nostre temps, garny de l'esprit de ces trois bouffons, archibouffon, et maistre des moqueurs, ayant pour son partage l'impieté de Lucian, la rage de Calvin, et les sornettes de Rabelais; humeur qui predomine en luy, comme la bile noire commandoit en l'esprit de Calvin. ... J'appelle cet ouvrage LE RABELAIS REFORMÉ, pour ce que c'est sur les idees de Rabelais que du Moulin s'est tellement formé, qu'il en retient les inventions, les sornettes et locutions entieres, ainsi que vous verrez au progrez de ce livre' (pp.7–8).
112. 'Autobiographie', p.466. François Monginot, *Resolution des doutes, ou Sommaire decision des controverses entre l'Eglise reformée et l'Eglise romaine ... Traicté contenant les causes et raisons qui ont meu le dit F. Monginot à sortir de l'Eglise romaine, pour se ranger à l'Eglise reformée* (La Rochelle, 1617), REP 2069–70; (La Rochelle/Charenton, 1617), REP 2067, 2071; (Die, 1617), REP 2068. For Catholic replies, see REP 1998, 2101.
113. 'Autobiographie', pp.467–8.
114. 'Note écrite de la main de S. François de Sales au sujet de la dispute qu'il avoit eue avec le fameux ministre Dumoulin sur l'Eucharistie', in *Nouvelles lettres inédites de S. François de Sales*, 2 vols (Paris, 1835), II, 373 (cited by Pannier, *L'Eglise ... sous Louis XIII (1610–21)*, p.429).
115. See below, pp.215–16.
116. See above, Chapter 1, p.40, and below, Epilogue, pp.364–67.
117. See below, Epilogue, p.367; for evidence of Véron's efforts to draw du Moulin into a debate, see the titles of REP 2470, 2659, 2662, 2668–9, 2855, 2857–9.
118. For more details of later Charenton ministers' reactions to the method, see below, Epilogue, Section 2.
119. 'L'an 1617, Messeigneurs des Estats généraux, voulans pourvoir aux désordres de leur pais, causés par l'arminianisme, se résolurent de tenir un synode national à Dordrecht. Ils escrivirent aux Eglises de France, d'Angleterre, d'Allemagne, les prians de leur envoyer des pasteurs choisies, assavoir: Messieurs Chamier, Chauve, et Rivet et moy' ('Autobiographie', p.470).
120. Full title: *Anatome Arminianismi, seu enucleatio controversiarum quae in Belgio agitantur, super doctrina de providentia, de praedestinatione, de morte*

Christi, de natura et gratia (Leyden, 1619), REP 2370.

121. 2, 219.
122. 'Le P. Arnoux, jésuite, nous envoya un cartel de deffi, par lequel il nous provoquait à comparoistre devant la reyne, pour rendre raison de nostre religion. J'eus charge de mes collègues de faire une responce ...' ('Autobiographie', p.344). The quotation regarding Article 31 on pp.208–9 is from the Geneva 1635 edition (pp.17–8). All other quotations from this work are from the first edition, published at Charenton in 1617 by Nicolas Bourdin.
123. 'Autobiographie', pp.465–6.
124. See below, Appendix, pp.393–402.
125. See above, Chapter 3, pp.113–14, and below, Chapter 6, pp.345–47.
126. *Veritable narré de la Conference entre les Sieurs Du Moulin, et de Raconis* (Geneva 1631 edition), p.87.
127. See below, p.232 and n.141.
128. See below, Chapter 6, p.330.
129. 'L. M. N.', *La Réfutation de la nouvelle hérésie du ministre Du Moulin touchant la vocation des pasteurs et de l'article 31 de la confession de foi des prétendus réformés* (Paris, 1618), REP 2274, pp.23–4 (as cited by Rimbault, p.154).
130. Rimbault, p.153, cites a passage from a letter first published in *Reverendi in Christo Patris Lanceloti Episcopi Wintoniensis, Opuscula quaedam posthuma* (London, 1629).
131. The letters concerning this particular issue were later published separately, in *Of Episcopacy. Three Epistles of Peter du Moulin ... answered by ... L. Andrewes ...* (1647).
132. (p.281). All quotations and page numbers in this section are from the Charenton 1618 edition, REP 2182.
133. From the translator's foreword, 'To the Christian Reader', in *The Jesuites Shifts, and Evasions. Or, His deportment in Controversies of Religion. Or, A Treatise, wherein the causes are examined why Mr. Arnoux, the Jesuite, refuseth to answer to seventeene questions propounded by the Ministers of the Church of Paris. Wherein also the Treatise of five evasions which he hath added to the examination of our confession, is likewise examined and answered* (London, 1624).
134. See above, Chapter 1, p.43. Du Moulin was elected moderator and in this role is likely to have been a strong influence on the synod's decisions. In two important respects, certainly, the synod's position conformed to du Moulin's own firmly-held convictions: in the formulation of a 'serment' sworn by all those

present, endorsing the doctrine of the Synod of Dordrecht and condemning Arminianism; secondly, in the refusal to sanction any protest against the French king's action against Protestants in Béarn. (This latter view was soon to be overthrown by the assembly at La Rochelle.)

135. In the autumn of 1621, he provisionally accepted posts as a minister of the church at Sedan and a professor of theology at the academy 'in case that he could not obtain his restitution to the Church at Paris' ('The Author's Life', f.****4 recto).
136. *Lettre de Monsieur du Moulin Pasteur en l'Eglise de Paris, écrite à un de son troupeau* (Geneva, 1631), pp.45–6. (The letter is dated 2 November 1621.)
137. (Sedan, 1622), REP 2943–44.
138. This quotation and the following one are from the third edition (Geneva 1625), REP 3213, ff.A.ii.verso-recto.
139. (Paris, 1620), REP 2550.
140. Full title: *Nouveauté du Papisme, opposée à l'antiquité du vray christianisme. Contre le livre, de Monsieur le Cardinal du Perron, intitulé, Replique a la Response du serenissime Roy Jacques I. Roy de la Grand'Bretagne ...* (Sedan, 1627), REP 3494, (Geneva, 1627), REP 3493. An additional treatise to this work was published two years later: *L'Antibarbare, ou du Langage incogneu tant és prieres des particuliers qu'au service public. Où aussi sont representees les clauses principales de la Messe, qui scandaliseroient le peuple s'il les entendoit* (Sedan, 1629), REP 3609. (Apart from its title-page, the work entitled *Le Vray barbare en langage cogneu, tant é discours, conférences que libelles séditieux* and printed 'En Enfer, par J. Jannon, 1629' (REP 3612) is identical to *L'Antibarbare*.)
141. Full title: *Du Juge des controverses. Traitté auquel est defendue l'autorité et la perfection de la sainte Escriture, contre les usurpations et accusations de l'Eglise romaine* (Sedan, 1630), REP 3689, (Geneva, 1630), REP 3688; the final treatise of this work was published the following year: *Des traditions et de la perfection et suffisance de l'Escriture sainte ... avec un catalogue ou dénombrement des traditions romaines ...* (Sedan, 1631), REP 3742.
142. Full title: *Anatomie de la Messe. Où est monstre par l'Escriture sainte, et par le tesmoignages de l'ancienne Eglise, que la Mese est contraire à la parole de Dieu et esloignee du chemin de salut* (Geneva, 1636), REP 4047–48; second edition (Sedan, 1636), REP 4049; and, *Deuxieme partie de l'Anatomie de la Messe. Contenant la Messe en françois et en latin. Avec un commentaire où sont aussi descrites les diverses especes de Messes, avec les mysteres et ceremonies, et origine de chasque pièce de la Messe ...* (Sedan, 1639), REP 4188.

143. Three letters are reprinted in *Lettres des Sieurs du Moulin et de Balzac, Esquelles avec un concert d'eloquence, ilz donnent leur advis sur la Religion, et sur le devoir des subjects envers leurs princes* (The Hague, 1633) REP 3864. All quotations are from this edition. (For individual letters, see also REP 3836-40, 3862-3, 3867-68.)
144. Jean Jehasse, *Guez de Balzac et le Génie Romain* (Saint-Etienne, 1977), pp.235-36. The fact that the letters were widely copied and reprinted (without Guez de Balzac's permission) caused him some embarrassment since this correspondence was likely to compromise him in the eyes of the *dévots* (Jehasse, p.236). The archbishop of Rouen, François de Harlay, soon published an *Advis aux curieux sur les communications de Du Moulin et de Balzac* (Paris, 1633), REP 3881, in which he criticised both correspondents. The Jesuit Silvestro Pietrasanta attacked du Moulin in a work entitled *Notae in epistolam Petri Molinaei ad Balzacam, cum responsione ad haereses, errores et calumnias eius, ac vindicia urbis Romae et Pontificis Romani* (Antwerp, 1634), REP 3949; du Moulin responded two years later with *Hyperaspistes. Sive Defensor veritatis adversus calumnias et opprobria ingesta in veram religionem a Sylvestro Petrosancta Jesuita Romano* (Geneva, 1636), REP 4053.
145. 'Quelqu'un paraventure par un style elabouré se pourra faire admirer par quelques esprits malades, et desgoutez: mais il ne fera jamais par ce moyen un homme craignant Dieu: car on plante la pieté és cœurs, non point en chatoüillant, mais en piquant la conscience. Un pere qui tanse ses enfans, ne conte point ses paroles. Le zele ne se donne point le loisir de chercher des figures d'oraison. Vouloir par un style fleury consoler un affligé, c'est presenter un bouquet de violettes à un qui meurt de faim. Mille fleurs de Rhetorique ne resoudront jamais un homme au martyre, ny ne la prepareront à la mort' (*De la vocation des pasteurs*, f.a.iiii.recto). Cf: 'Je ne fay point consister le vray sçavoir à élaborer et embellir son langage, de beaucoup d'ornemens: la simplicité a plus d'efficace' ('Lettre à ses fils', *VIIIe Décade de Sermons*).
146. (Saumur, 1634), REP 3918.
147. See, for example, the work by B. G. Armstrong, cited in n.27 above; Leonard Proctor, 'The theology of Moïse Amyraut considered as a reaction against seventeenth-century Calvinism' (un-published Ph. D. thesis, University of Leeds, 1952); François Laplanche, *Orthodoxie et prédication: L'Œuvre d'Amyraut et la querelle de la grâce universelle* (Paris, 1965).
149. Armstrong, pp.86-87, 132-36. 148. [See below, p.250, following n.167.]
150. Armstrong, pp.273-75.
151. See François Laplanche, *L'Évidence du Dieu Chrétien: Religion, culture et société dans l'apologétique protestante de la France classique (1576-1670)* (Strasburg, 1983), pp.114-28; see also below, Epilogue, Section 2.

152. Congar, Lecaillon and Rousseau, pp.302–6. Du Moulin's letters to the duke at this period were never published in his lifetime but appeared some fifty years later in an English translation by his son: *A short view of the chief points in Controversy between the reformed Churches and the Church of Rome In Two Letters to the Duke of Bouillon, Upon his turning Papist* (London, 1686) has not previously featured in bibliographies of du Moulin's works.
153. Congar, Lecaillon and Rousseau, pp.306–7. From 1620 onwards both the Jesuit and Capuchin orders had been redoubling their missionary effort with the establishment of numerous similar 'maisons de missions': 'Ces petits établissements, auxquels n'étaient affectés que quelques Pères, étaient implantés dans des zones qui semblaient requérir des soins particuliers, souvent notamment en raison d'une forte présence protestante' (Dompmnier, p.201).
154. Du Moulin's publications against the Sedan Capuchins include: *Trois Sermons faits en présence des Pères Capucins qui les ont honorez de leur presence* (Sedan, 1630), REP 4237 (see also REP 4320–21); *Le Capucin. Traitté auquel est descrite et examinee l'origine des Capucins, leurs vœux, reigles et disciplines* (Sedan, 1641), REP 4317, (Geneva, 1641) REP 4314–16; *Examen du Livre du Père Joseph de Morlais Capucin, intitulé lettre du sieur Crescentian de Mont-Ouvert, et promettant la réfutation de trois sermons de Du Moulin* (Sedan, 1641), REP 4318.
155. Full title: *La Vie et religion de deux bons Papes, Léon premier et Grégoire premier, où est monsté que la doctrine et religion de ces pontifes tant célèbres est contraire à la religion romaine de ce temps* (Sedan, 1650), REP 4869.
156. All quotations are from the Geneva 1633 edition, REP 3865.
157. Du Moulin makes a similar point in his *Du Juge des controverses* in 1631: 'Quelques menus brouillans de Jesuites se sentans foibles à la rencontre, pressez de l'evidence de la verité, se sont avisez d'une chicanerie importune, qui tend à accrocher la dispute des l'entrée, et empescher que jamais on ne vienne à l'examen de la doctrine. Leur ruse est d'interroguer tousjours, au lieu d'argumenter ... Mais ceux de nos adversaires qui sont mieux pourvus de sçavoir comme Thomas, Bellarmin, Baronious, Du Perron, Salmeron, Vazquez rejettent ceste philosophie hargneuse, et ceste chicanerie, qui pointille sur les syllabes, qui n'est faite que pour ne rien faire, et pour braver en fuyant' (*Des traditions* [1631] (Geneva 1632 edition), REP 3803, pp.214–15).
158. *Correspondance du P. Marin Mersenne*, edited by Cornelis de Waard et al., 17 vols and index (Paris, 1945–88), 2, 13 and 111.
159. In 1640, one of du Moulin's former students, Limbourg, circulated rumours that at the 1637 synod (where the 'heresy trial' against Amyraut also took place) many pastors had expressed their dissatisfaction with the *Nouveauté du Papisme* and had formed a project to jointly prepare a more effective refutation

of du Perron. Jean Mestrezat denied that such discussions had taken place and also denied that he had ever spoken slightly of du Moulin's book, writing (in a letter dated August 1640) that 'je n'ay jamais parlé audit Limbourg touchant le livre de la Nouveauté du Papisme, en quelque façon que ce soit. Et si je luy en avois parlé je n'eusse peu luy dire que ce que ma conscience m'en tesmoigne, asçavoir que j'en ay esté edifié' (reproduced in *Justification de Monsieur du Moulin contre les impostures et calomnies de Léonard Le Maire, dit Limbourg* (Charenton, 1640), REP 4235, p.38). Despite Mestrezat's denial, his claim that he had been 'edified' by du Moulin's book suggests very strongly that he felt unable to praise the book on scholarly grounds.

160. *Du Juge des controverses* (Geneva 1631 edition), REP 3739, p.13.
 161. See, for example, *Des traditions* (Geneva 1632 edition), REP 3803, pp.213-30.
 162. *Des traditions*, p.296.
 163. *Anatomie de la messe*, p.107.
 164. See (1624), REP 3205-6, 3209, 3211-13, 3215-6, 3219-22; (1625), REP 3320-21, 3324-27, 3329, 3331-33; (1630) 3685-88; (1631) 3735-41, 3743-44; (1632) 3799, 3802-3; (1635) 3981-2, 3987, 3989-90; (1636) 4050-2, 4055.
 165. Cited by Cohen, p.176, from a University of Leiden MS.
 166. Desgraves's *Répertoire* lists surviving copies of editions of du Moulin's *Apologie pour la sainte Cène* [1607] produced in 1660 (REP 5442); of the *Défense de la foy catholique* [1610] in 1662 (and *De l'accomplissement des propheties* [1612] in 1660) (REP 5640, 5440); of the *Défense de la confession de foy* [1617] and the *Bouclier de la foy* [1618] in 1670 (REP 6061, 6059); and, finally, of *De la vocation des pasteurs* [1618] in 1672 (REP 6187).
 167. Solé, 1, 59, n.14: 'le ministre de Blain Philippe Le Noir remarque, en mars 1666, que les ouvrages de Du Moulin sont plus répandus parmi le "peuple" que ceux de Daillé' (cited from MS 388.1 held by the Bibliothèque de la Société de l'Histoire du Protestantisme Français).
-
148. Preface to *Examen de la Doctrine de Messieurs Amyrault et Testard, l'un Pasteur et Professeur en Theologie à Saumur, l'autre Pasteur à Blois. Touchant la Predestination, et les poincts qui en dependent ... Avec un advis d'un personnage desinteressé sur ledit Examen* (Amsterdam, 1638), pages un-numbered.

PART III

CHAPTER 5

Du Perron and associated controversialists

5.1 Jacques Davy du Perron (1556–1618)¹

Jacques Davy du Perron was, without doubt, the most influential French Catholic controversialist of the early seventeenth century.² L'Estoile, writing in August 1598, described the bishop as a man 'qui estoit estimé ici, comme l'Atlas de l'Eglise Catholique, Apostolique et Rommaine' (VII, 134). This reputation, built upon the conferences, sermons and pamphlets of the foregoing years, was to be further enhanced by du Perron's victory over du Plessis-Mornay in the conference at Fontainebleau in May 1600 and this in turn fuelled the ambitions of many other Catholic controversialists. Du Perron was active in promoting the interests of a number of these polemicists while pursuing his own campaign to persuade distinguished members of the Protestant church to embrace the Catholic faith.³ All du Moulin's non-Jesuit opponents in the early part of his time in Paris were friends or protégés of du Perron.

Despite the fact that du Perron belonged to a Protestant family and did not join the Catholic church until his early twenties, he made no attempt as a controversialist to capitalise on his Protestant background in his debates or publications but adhered strictly to the conventional Catholic approach exemplified by his contemporary, Robert Bellarmine. The focus of du Perron's arguments, in all his books and conferences, was the historical scholarship of his opponents, an approach founded on his uncompromising views on the limitations of scripture and the crucial importance of the writings of the church fathers. During du Perron's most active period of involvement in Parisian debate, spanning the years 1597–1602, the 'juge des controverses' issue was central to all the disputes in which he engaged. The earliest account of his views on this question survives in an exposition of 'l'autorité et nécessité des Traditions Apostoliques', made for the benefit of Harlay de Sancy and published initially by one of the bishop's Protestant opponents, Daniel Tilenus.⁴ Du Perron's defence of the Catholic position, contained in a refutation of Tilenus's edition, will be examined below.

Sermon series at S. Médéric (1597)

Du Perron's interest in religious controversy was not, however, merely academic; his over-riding purpose was to achieve conversions to Catholicism and to this end he decided (in 1597) to give a series of sermons in which he attempted to familiarise lay members of the church with the method and the arguments he himself employed. The first sermon was preached at the church of S. Médéric shortly after Easter 1597 and the series continued on a regular basis until Whit Sunday of the same year. Du Perron claimed, in these sermons, to have deliberately chosen to present his arguments 'plustost comme Lecteur que comme Orateur' avoiding any 'enrichissement de paroles' and proceeding 'par formes de leçons et de Catechisme' (pp.711-12). A pile of books was placed on a bench nearby and passages were read out or verified from these by du Perron's younger brother, Jean, or by other assistants. D'Aubigné suggested that their chief purpose was to combat the tedium induced by du Perron's slow and pedantic method.⁵ The sermons nevertheless drew large congregations and a number of visits by the king and by the papal legate gave the seal of official approval to du Perron's endeavours.⁶

Only the opening of the first sermon survives but in this du Perron described the reasons which had led him to undertake the project, the manner in which he would present his arguments and the structure of the series as a whole.⁷ It was, claimed du Perron, a necessary part of his duties as a bishop to teach lay members of the church 'comme par forme de Catechisme, à rendre raison de leur foy, et justifier la cause de la religion Catholique aux poincts où elle est injustement accusée et calomniée' (p.709). The scheme which he proposed to follow, beginning with the fundamental question of the 'juge des controverses', was similar to that later seen in other comprehensive treatments of the controversies between Catholics and Protestants such as Bouju's *Methode*, Coton's *Institution catholique* or *La vraye procedure* by Gontéry:

je commenceray par la question qui a esté entamée en nostre derniere conference [with Tilenus] ... qui est de sçavoir quels sont les principes de doctrine par lesquels on peut et doit decider toutes les controverses de la Religion Chrestienne: et puis ayant estably et borné l'estenduë des loix par lesquelles tous nos differents peuvent et doivent estre terminez, je passeray à la seconde question qui est de sçavoir à qui il appartient

seurement et infailliblement de les appliquer et interpreter. Et apres avoir verifié que c'est à l'Eglise seule; je viendray à la troisième question generale, qui comprendra tout le traicté de l'Eglise, laquelle je diviseray en sept parties: Asçavoir que c'est que l'Eglise, quelle est l'autorité de ceste Eglise, quelles sont ses marques, quel est son ministere, quelle est sa doctrine; quels sont ses Sacrements, et quelles ses ceremonies: et traiteray chacun de ces poincts en un ou plusieurs Sermons, selon que la fertilité de la matiere le pourra permettre. (p.712)

Summing-up the evidence to be presented in this first sermon, du Perron emphasised that scripture and tradition were to be regarded as sources of equal authority: 'nous sommes obligez de regler toutes nos contentions tant par la parole de Dieu, que les Apostres nous ont laissé dans leurs escrits, que nous appellons parole de Dieu escrite, que par celle qu'ils ont laissée de vive voix, et imprimée par leur tres-exprés commandement en la pratique actuelle du Culte, des formalitez et observations de l'Eglise naissante et primitive' (p.712).

The Fontainebleau conference (1600)

In July of the following year (1598) du Plessis-Mornay's book *De l'Institution, usage et doctrine du Sainct Sacrement de l'Eucharistie en l'Eglise Ancienne* was published.⁸ The author's intention was to demonstrate that the Catholic mass was based on neither scripture nor apostolic tradition but was an invention belonging to the sixth century. Du Plessis also challenged the historical basis of many other Catholic doctrines and practices while claiming to find numerous instances of conformity between the beliefs and practices of the early church fathers and present-day Protestants. This vast work was the product of considerable erudition; du Plessis had cited in the region of 5000 passages from scripture, the church fathers and Catholic theologians of more recent times, although he had not, as many Protestants regretted, provided references in every instance.⁹ The book caused a great stir, as de Thou recounts:

la beauté du stile le faisoit rechercher de tout le monde, et lire avec d'autant plus d'avidité, que l'Auteur appuyoit son sentiment de l'autorité des PP. Grecs et Latins, et même de quelques théologiens scholastiques. Pour arrêter les mauvais effects que ce Livre pouvoit produire, nos Docteurs ne manquèrent pas dans leurs sermons d'en décrire l'Auteur comme faussaire. Quelques-uns même dressèrent une liste de tous les passages falsifiés;

et plusieurs travaillèrent à le refuter par quelques ouvrages qui furent imprimés.¹⁰

In March 1599 du Plessis-Mornay learned that du Perron was among those who claimed to have discovered numerous errors in his use of historical evidence. Du Plessis wrote to the bishop, offering to refute any such allegations in a private debate. Du Perron promptly replied in print, challenging the Protestant author to a public conference and promising to prove that the book contained 'cinq cents énormes faussetez de conte faict et sans hyperbole'. Du Plessis accepted the challenge.¹¹

The Fontainebleau conference took place on 4 May 1600 in circumstances which were in almost every respect unfavourable to du Plessis-Mornay. Chief among his grievances was the fact that the list of five hundred errors of which he had requested a copy as early as 14 April was still not forthcoming even when he arrived at Fontainebleau on the 29th of the month. Faced with du Plessis's threatened withdrawal, the Catholics agreed to draw up a list of sixty passages for discussion but these only reached him at midnight on the eve of the conference. Du Plessis was obliged to stay up most of the night preparing his response. The following day, nine of the sixteen passages for which du Plessis had managed to prepare his case were examined by du Perron before an assembly of well over 200 people, including Henri IV himself and many leading ecclesiastics and nobles. The jury judged in favour of du Perron's arguments in every instance.¹² During the evening following this first session, du Plessis fell ill; the conference was postponed and, finally, abandoned.

Sully was among the Protestants present at the conference and was appalled by du Plessis's performance:

il se défendit si foiblement qu'il faisoit rire les uns, mettoit les autres en colere, et faisoit pitié aux autres; ... au fonds je ne vis jamais homme si estonné, ny qui se defendit si mal. Si nostre religion n'avoit un meilleur fondement que ses jambes et ses bras en croix (car il les tenoit ainsi), je la quitterois plutost aujourd'huy que demain.¹³

Casaubon, however, one of the Protestant members of the jury, placed more emphasis on the ability and character of du Plessis-Mornay's opponent:

Vous savez à quel adversaire il avait affaire, vous n'ignorez pas que cet adversaire est passé maître en fait de jongleries sophistiques et d'une redoutable habileté. Depuis plus de seize mois, et au delà, il n'a eu d'autre souci, d'autre labeur que d'éplucher le livre en question, afin d'y relever tout ce qui pouvait prêter le flanc à des critiques ou sérieuses ou spécieuses, et devenir pour lui un titre de gloire. J'en suis attristé jusqu'au larmes, chaque fois que me revient en pensée la déplorable journée ou fut ainsi remportée cette victoire de paradoxe sur le plus noble caractère, sur l'esprit le plus éminent, et, qui plus est, sur la vérité elle-même.¹⁴

The propaganda value of the Fontainebleau conference proved to be tremendous, as the king clearly anticipated in his widely-publicised letter to the duc d'Épernon.¹⁵ Although the conference fell far short of that comprehensive demonstration of du Plessis's lack of scholarly integrity which du Perron had originally promised, nevertheless the king, Parisian Catholics, and the Vatican were delighted with its outcome: 'un *Te Deum* fut célébré, le Roi prit part à une procession, tête-nue, le jour de la Fête-Dieu; le Pape adressa le 29 mai un bref de félicitations au défenseur de la foi catholique'.¹⁶

Negotiations for a conference at S. Germain (1600)

In the autumn of that same year, in an attempt to build on his Fontainebleau success and further advance the Catholic cause, du Perron tried to organise another conference at S. Germain for the benefit of Catherine, duchesse de Bar, the king's obstinately Protestant sister.¹⁷ The negotiations for the conference were conducted in writing between du Perron and a group of Protestant ministers which included Tilenus and Pierre du Moulin, with the duchess acting as intermediary. These letters were eventually published by du Perron with a substantial concluding response after his efforts to arrange a debate had proved fruitless.¹⁸ As described in Chapter 3, the ministers refused to be drawn into any debate except on their own terms. These conditions, in accordance with the new regulations added to the 'Discipline des Eglises Reformées', were calculated to minimise the element of public spectacle and to monitor the records of the proceedings at every stage.¹⁹ Du Perron objected that such conditions would make the debate extremely tedious for those present; the ministers maintained:

Que tout en sera plus authentiques, rien sujet à desaveu ny à deguisement, estant signé de part et d'autre. Que la longueur du temps se recompensera par la grandeur du fruit qui en reviendra, non seulement à son Altesse, ains à tous les absents desireux de sçavoir les raisons alleguées de part et d'autre. (pp.16–17)

Although these preliminaries did not result in the meeting du Perron hoped for, the published letters are in themselves interesting for the statements they contain of du Perron's views on the proper conduct and content of such debates and the respective roles of scripture, reason and the evidence of the theologians of the early church.

Du Perron's approach, as mentioned above, was pre-eminently a scholarly one; his presentation of the Catholic case was chiefly concerned with the interpretation of the writings of the early church as a means of resolving controversial issues. At an early stage in the exchanges with the ministers he made clear his opposition to dealing with controversial issues on a rational rather than a historical basis:

Car aux arguments de la Philosophie, où les preuves se font par les seuls principes de la lumiere naturelle, il ne faut que deux brieves propositions et une conclusion pour former un argument: Mais en la Theologie positive, et ès controverses de la Religion, où les preuves se doivent faire par autorité, et non par simple raison naturelle, il faut que les passages tous entiers des auteurs entrent dans les propositions de chaque argument: et bien souvent vingt, et trente passages de divers auteurs, en une seule proposition. Que le mesme se doit dire des responses et solutions: Car estant question en la pluspart des responses d'expliquer le style et l'intention des auteurs; il faut verifier l'explication de chasque passage par la Conference et conformité des autres lieux. (pp.31–32)

Du Perron's method, described here and put into practice in his conference with Tilenus and his sermon series at S. Méderic, is thus completely at odds with that envisaged by the Protestant ministers.

In earlier conferences du Perron had stressed that the venue should be a place well-supplied with the necessary books. Similarly, on this occasion du Perron objected to the ministers' suggestion that the conference need not take place at S. Germain on the grounds that 'faire porter à sa [Madame's] suite la quantité et qualité des livres requis ... seroit chose trop plus difficile, que de les recouvrer

en un lieu arrêté et proche de Paris' (p.38). When the ministers suggested that the debate be conducted on the basis of 'la seule Ecriture Sainte, l'interpretant par elle-mesme' and remarked that the Bible was very 'portatif' (p.51), du Perron firmly rejected such an approach: 'les moyens ... par lesquels chaque particulier extraict les conclusions de ces conferences de passages, ne sont que moyens humains, à scavoir l'operation de la raison et du discours' (p.69). He argued that, since there would always be disagreements over the precise meaning of particular words and phrases,

il ne reste plus autre remede, sinon de recourir au sens qui a eu cours en l'Eglise primitive, en laquelle la vraye intelligence des écrits des Apostres a esté baillée de vive voix par les Apostres mesmes à leurs disciples, et transmise de main en main par leurs disciples à leurs successeurs. (p.70)

Du Perron further justified this approach by claiming that 'les Ministres de France mesme font profession de dire qu'ils reçoivent le commun consentement des Peres des cinq premiers siecles, pour arbitre de l'interpretation de l'Escriture' (p.70). Du Perron therefore, unlike most other Catholic controversialists of the period, was not prepared to engage in a conference under the accepted conditions of syllogistic debate or to claim that his arguments were based solely on scripture. The breakdown in negotiations for this conference was due, therefore, not only to the ministers' insistence on a complete transcription of the discussion (as du Perron alleged) but also to his own intransigence on these important questions.

Réfutation de l'écrit de ... Tilenus (1601)

Another work published the following year contains further important statements by du Perron on the role of scripture in the solving of religious differences; this was his *Refutation de l'écrit de M. Daniel Tilenus*, the long-awaited response to a Protestant edition of the bishop's views on the importance and validity of apostolic traditions.²⁰ In 1597 Tilenus had contrived to obtain a copy of notes taken by Théophraste Bouju, sieur de Beaulieu during du Perron's meetings with the Protestant Harlay de Sancy and had published them under a title of his own devising, *De l'Insuffisance et Imperfection de l'Ecriture Sainte*. Du Perron did not respond to this pamphlet until 1601. In his reply, du Perron used the name of an English friend and Catholic convert, Henry Constable, (although he stated plainly in preface and dedication that he was in fact the author).²¹ Examining his opponent's book paragraph by paragraph, he set his original remarks alongside Tilenus's response and then gave further explanations under the name of Constable.

Du Perron objected strongly to the title which Tilenus had given to his edition — *De l'Insuffisance ... de la Sainte Ecriture* — describing it as 'de l'imposition ou plutôt de l'imposture de Tilenus, qui s'est forgé ce monstre, pour le combattre' and asserted that his understanding of the role of scripture — that 'L'Ecriture n'est pas suffisante immédiatement et par soi seule sans l'adresse qu'elle nous donne aux traditions apostoliques pour refuter toutes les hérésies' — was not tantamount to regarding scripture as 'insuffisante':

Car qui ne scait quelle difference il y a entre les propositions modifiees, et les propositions simples: et quelle fraude c'est d'argumenter des unes aux autres? Le Roi n'est pas suffisant immédiatement et par soy seul, c'est à dire sans l'ayde des ministres et officiers sur lesquels il dépose une partie de sa charge, pour gouverner son Royaume: Ergo le Roy est insuffisant? Qui endurera cette injure? Le Symbole des Apostres n'est pas suffisant immédiatement et par soy seul pour convaincre toutes les heresies: Ergo il est insuffisant? Qui supportera ce blaspheme? Il y a deux sortes de suffisance, l'une immediate, l'autre mediate: l'une que le sujet que nous appellons suffisant, exhibe immédiatement et par luy-mesme: l'autre qu'il exhibe mediatement et par les moyens qu'il se subordonne et substitué. ... La sainte Ecriture contient immédiatement tous les points principaux et fondamentaux de la Religion Chrestienne: et quant aux menues particularitez, les contient toutes ou immédiatement ou mediatement, c'est

à dire, ou nous les enseigne elle mesme, ou nous adresse aux moyens qui nous les doivent enseigner, ascavoir, aux institutions et coustumes que les Apostres ont consignées de vive voix à l'Eglise de leur siecle: Ergo elle est insuffisante? En quelle école? (*Diverses Œuvres*, pp.365–66)

Tavard, in *La Tradition au XVII^e siècle en France et en Angleterre*, describes the distinction which du Perron is drawing here as one which reveals 'une différence fondamentale de conception et de langage' between Catholics and Protestants:

il y a une suffisance catholique de l'Écriture, très différente de sa suffisance protestante. L'Écriture est suffisante, mais non toute seule. Elle-même exige la Tradition des apôtres, à laquelle elle renvoie. Les protestants entendent la suffisance de l'Écriture en proposition simple; partant ils accusent les catholiques d'enseigner son insuffisance également en proposition simple. En réalité, les catholiques ne peuvent comprendre l'une ou l'autre, la suffisance ou l'insuffisance de l'Écriture, qu'en proposition modifiée.²²

Du Perron firmly rejected the Protestant conception of scripture's 'suffisance à salut':

D'alleguer que l'Écriture est suffisante pour nous conduire à salut, si cela s'entend immédiatement, c'est à dire sans l'interposition des moyens ordonnés pour nous en extraire et proposer le sens tout formé et déterminé, ascavoir la vive voix de l'Eglise et le ministère des pasteurs et docteurs, ceste proposition est non seulement fausse, mais absurde et ridicule. ... Il y a bien difference entre ce que l'Ecriture comprend en soi, et ce que chacun de nous comprend de l'Ecriture, entre ce qui se peut recueillir de l'Ecriture absolument, et ce que chaque particulier peut recueillir de l'Ecriture, qui est la question dont il s'agit en ce fait. (*Diverses Oeuvres*, pp.843–44)

Scripture's role in bringing men to salvation, according to du Perron, was to 'servir de règle et de patron aux pasteurs et docteurs de l'Eglise pour nous y conduire'. It is simply a part of tradition which happens to be written down, as his comment on a passage from John's gospel shows: 'lesquelles paroles ont commencé d'être Ecriture depuis l'édition de l'Evangile de Saint Jean, mais auparavant étaient Tradition'. Furthermore, 'La parole de Dieu non écrite, que nous appelons Tradition apostolique, est de même force et autorité que l'écrite; et sans elle la seule Ecriture n'est pas suffisante pour réfuter toutes les hérésies'. The church, then, was to be the infallible 'juge des controverses' and du Perron offered the following explanation

of the statement, 'L'Eglise ne peut errer aux choses de salut':

Ils [Catholic theologians] ne pretendent pas par là, que l'Eglise ait autorité d'introduire aucune autre doctrine que celle qu'elle a receüe, soit par écrit, soit par Tradition verbale de la parole des Apostres: Mais qu'elle est tellement assistée de l'esprit de Dieu, suivant les promesses de son époux, que soit pour la garde, soit pour l'interpretation de cette parole, il ne la laisse jamais tomber en erreur: de sorte qu'encore qu'elle puisse bien rendre conte de toutes ses actions pour ce regard à ceux qui en sont capables; neantmoins aux simples fideles qui ne sont pas suffisants pour faire d'eux mesmes cest examen, reste cette assurance et ceste consolation, que s'en reposant sur le jugement de celle que Dieu leur a donnée pour colonne et firmament de verité, ils ne peuvent estre trompez en la foy ni hazarder leur salut. (*Diverses Œuvres*, p.400)

This desire to place scripture firmly in the context of the Catholic tradition as a whole and under the authority of the Catholic Church led du Perron both to exaggerate the difficulties of interpreting scripture (as seen above in his reason for refusing to argue on the basis of scripture with Madame's ministers), and also to disparage the hermeneutical principles which the Protestants attempted to apply. Conversely, he tended to present the procedures by which 'l'unanimité de la creance des Peres' might be discerned as far more straightforward and conclusive than his Protestant opponents would allow:

les anciens Peres et Docteurs Catholiques, non repris et notez par l'Eglise, ne discordent jamais aux choses qui sont de l'essence, soit de la Foy, soit des Sacrements, soit des ceremonies universelles de l'ancienne Eglise. Et d'ailleurs . . . il y a bien difference entre les passages où les Pères parlent de leurs sens particulier, et ceux où ils parlent comme témoins et rapporteurs de l'usage et de la profession de l'Eglise universelle de leurs siècles.²³

Du Perron's exposition of these questions deserves close attention as he is essentially expounding the view to which all fellow Catholic polemicists were bound to subscribe, implicitly or explicitly. Other controversialists might present the issues rather less starkly, placing more emphasis on the importance of scripture, even claiming to be prepared to argue solely on the basis of scripture and to conform to the rules of syllogistic debate in order to maintain the dialogue with their opponents; the bishop of Evreux chose to polarise the 'juge des controverses' question and would only engage in debate on his own terms. Du Perron stated

the Catholic view of the relationship between scripture and tradition in such a bold and unequivocal manner that it is scarcely surprising that Tilenus should accuse him of treating scripture as inadequate and imperfect. Similarly, Pierre du Moulin, analysing du Perron's presentation of the 'juge des controverses' question in his preface to *Nouveauté du Papisme*, was content to quote extensively from du Perron's remarks, feeling that such statements sufficiently demonstrated the way in which du Perron 'ravale l'autorité de l'Escriture Sainte'.²⁴ More recently, Tavard has noted that du Perron's formulations regarding scripture and tradition and the degree to which apostolic traditions should be regarded as part of God's 'Parole' are overstated (p.41). This determination to place scripture firmly within tradition and under the authority of the Catholic church was undoubtedly inspired by his involvement in anti-Protestant polemic.

Later involvement in religious debate (1607–1618)

These publications mark the end of du Perron's most active period of involvement in the polemic against Protestants at Paris, although throughout the remaining years of his life he had several substantial works refuting Protestant doctrine in hand. He had begun work, for instance, on a refutation of du Plessis-Mornay's *De l'Institution* soon after its publication in 1598, and eventually allowed Coeffeteau to edit and publish this preliminary work in 1617; the product of his continuing work on the eucharist, eventually entitled *Traitté du Saint Sacrement de l'Eucharistie*, was published posthumously (in 1622).²⁵

The pattern of his involvement in the controversies between Protestant and Catholics is similar to that of du Moulin and of other polemicists examined in these chapters. In the early years du Perron had actively sought out opportunities for discussion and debate — with Tilenus, with du Plessis-Mornay, and with the local Protestant ministers — and had devoted considerable time and energy to writing and publishing the pamphlets which fuelled these debates. But accumulating ecclesiastical responsibilities and his desire to write definitively on the major controversial issues meant that du Perron's involvement in this type of debate almost ceased in the years after 1601. The long-term projects which du Perron then undertook — two on aspects of the eucharistic debate and two in reply to James

I — were intended to be as well-researched and complete as he could make them. In the event, only one of these works was published in his lifetime.

In 1604 du Perron was made a cardinal and spent the next few years in Rome; during this time he was also made archbishop of Sens and *grand aumônier* (1606). Upon his return in 1607 he was mainly occupied with ecclesiastical affairs and with the administration of the Collège Royal (although, as described in Chapter 1, d'Aubigné reveals that du Perron was also involved in an apparently crucial exchange on the subject of church union).²⁶ Following the assassination of Henri IV in 1610 du Perron retained his influence at court and was made a member of the regency council. He became closely involved in the clergy's resistance to the Gallican backlash which the king's assassination had provoked.²⁷ He also became involved (in 1611) in a printed exchange of correspondence with James I (with Isaac Casaubon as intermediary).²⁸ Du Perron understood Casaubon's second letter to be from the English king himself and began work on a reply which remained unpublished at the time of his death.²⁹ In January 1615 he angered the English king once again with derogatory remarks made in his *Harangue sur l'article du serment* during the Estates General. As described in Chapter 4, James enlisted the help of du Moulin in composing a declaration in reply.³⁰ Du Perron began work on a response to this work, but once again, it remained incomplete at the time of his death in 1618 and was never in fact published.³¹

Du Perron was, as already stated, a tremendously influential figure in religious debate during the first half of the seventeenth century. It could be argued that his importance derived as much from his appreciation of the significance of religious debate in political terms as from his pretensions to scholarship for du Perron clearly understood the propaganda value of a successful conference or the timely publication of a pamphlet, letter or speech and many of the episodes in his involvement in religious controversy can be seen to have, alongside their avowed religious aim of converting or refuting Protestants, a political purpose in that they further undermined the Protestants' position and influence in French affairs. Du Perron was also concerned to popularise the arguments used by Catholic controversialists: this was evident in his sermon series at S. Méderic in 1597 and also in the fact

that all his works were written in French even when, as du Moulin noted on one occasion, a reply in Latin might have seemed more appropriate.³² The outcome of the conferences which he initiated at the turn of the century encouraged many other Catholic controversialists to seek out similar opportunities for debate and, on numerous occasions, du Perron used his influence to secure preferment or pensions for those active in the field of religious polemic.

Despite these important features of his role in religious debate, his contemporaries regarded him as, above all, a scholarly contributor to religious debate and du Perron, himself, clearly took his researches in early church history very seriously.³³ In a letter to Bellarmine — whom, with Baronius, he described as ‘les deux lumières de l’Eglise dans le siècle où nous sommes’ — he referred with pride to the new arguments which he had assembled regarding the authenticity of documents, the reliability of witnesses or translations and the misapplication of texts by the Protestants.³⁴ Some modern scholars, including Tavard and Snoeks, have objected that du Perron’s over-riding concern to refute the Protestants’ position often impaired the quality of his arguments. Snoeks, for example, remarks that ‘essentiellement polémiste, du Perron ne peut guère être comparé aux érudits désintéressés de son époque, . . . : il fait trop facilement fi des règles de la critique, lorsque le besoin s’en fait sentir; il recourt abusivement aux ressources de la dialectique ou de la scolastique . . .’. Nevertheless, Snoeks is forced to concede the importance of du Perron’s contribution to inter-confessional debate:

Quoiqu’il ne brille point par l’originalité, il fait un sérieux effort pour participer au courant humaniste de recherches positives au sujet de la doctrine des Pères de l’Eglise. A ce point de vue, son oeuvre manifeste des préoccupations de critique historique supérieures à celles dont Bellarmine fait preuve dans ses *Controverses*, de tendance plus dogmatique. . . c’est lui qui assura au polémistes catholiques français la maîtrise dans la controverse consacrée à l’argument de tradition, au cours du premier quart du XVII^e siècle, en attendant la brillante réplique du calviniste Edme Aubertin, dont ils mirent longtemps à relever le défi.³⁵

Du Perron’s publications — plagiarised by Bérulle as well as Bouju — continued to be highly-regarded long after his death. Bossuet described him as ‘ce rare et admirable génie dont les ouvrages, presque divins, sont les plus fermes remparts de l’Eglise contre les herétiques modernes’ while du Moulin, in his *Nouveauté du*

5.1 *Du Perron*

Papisme, wrote: 'il est certain que nul de ceux qui en France ont broüillé le papier en faveur du Pape ne lui peut estre comparé'.³⁶

5.2 Pierre-Victor Palma Cayet (1545–1610)³⁷

The first of du Moulin's opponents following his arrival in Paris was the former Protestant pastor and chaplain to Catherine de Bourbon, Pierre Cayet, in whose conversion to Catholicism du Perron had played a significant part. As a controversialist, however, Cayet seems to have been influenced far less by du Perron than were the other two writers examined in this chapter. His unorthodox and flamboyant approach to religious polemic accords well with other aspects of his colourful career both before and after his return to the Catholic fold in 1595.

A passage from one of Cayet's own works suggests that as early as 1587 he had been arguing in favour of union between the French Protestant and Catholic churches.³⁸ Thereafter, the king's abjuration in 1593 and Cayet's frequent contact with du Perron made his defection to Catholicism seem ever more likely. Cayet's activities brought complaints from the local consistory, particularly his authorship of a book on church union which, according to Pannier, had been produced in consultation with du Perron.³⁹ The provincial synod finally decided to expel Cayet from the Protestant ministry.

In the summer of 1595 Cayet returned as a student to the Sorbonne, formally abjured the Protestant faith on 9 November and was ordained priest only a few weeks later. After thirty years of an unremarkable existence as pastor, tutor and chaplain, Cayet now embarked on a new career, most notably as a religious polemicist but also as a historian and translator. In these first few years Cayet's defection was amply rewarded in terms of titles and positions: he gained a doctorate in theology, and the title *protonotaire du Saint-Siège*; was appointed by the king as lecturer in Hebrew and later *chronologue royal*; in 1598 he became rector of the university. The Sorbonne appears to have been eager to make use of the services of this new recruit and on 15 June 1594 — over a year before his formal abjuration — had given Cayet a comprehensive *privilege* allowing him to publish any books he might write.⁴⁰ A flurry of pamphlets issued from the pen of Cayet during the early years following his conversion. They included letters and replies to the published views of former Protestant colleagues in which he justified his decision to join the Catholic church; appeals to various sections of the Protestant

church; and arguments in favour of church union (for Cayet was writing in the period prior to the Edict of Nantes).⁴¹

Early polemical works (1596–1601)

‘L'appast avec lequel on attire le menu peuple, ce sont les petits livrets que l'on seme parmy eux, qui, selon que la nouveauté luy plaist, se la forme tellement en son esprit, qu'il est impossible de luy oster, et principalement où il y va de la religion’.⁴² Cayet made this observation with regard to the religious propaganda produced during the League years but it seems equally apt as a description of his own philosophy in contributing to religious debate from 1596 onwards. For rather less than ten years Cayet was to continue publishing pamphlets of religious polemic and throughout this period there seems to have been little development in the scope or method of his works. His three dozen or so pamphlets relating to controversial religious issues are all *libelles*, published in octavo format and only rarely exceeding one hundred pages. (Their average length was under seventy pages.) His choice of subjects and the presentation of his arguments seem also to have been guided by his desire to produce works for a popular readership. This is seen particularly clearly in his use of antitheses, presented in a strongly visual manner. Baroni cites the following example from a pamphlet published in 1597;⁴³ the first column was entitled ‘Les Pasteurs de l'Eglise’; the second, ‘Les Ministres pretendus’:

L'Eglise est unique,
1. fondée sur monsieur
saint Pierre, 2. dont le saint
Siège est à Rome,
3. et demeurera jusques
à la consommation
du siècle.

Preuves: Eph.4, Matth.17,
II Petr.3, Matth.28.

L'Eglise est en toutes nations,
1. fondée en la confession de
S. Pierre, 2. dont le siege est
partout, 3. et n'est en aucun
lieu prefix.

Preuves: Nulles que par
interprétation, opposée, et
toute contraire à
l'interpretation des Pères et
anciens Docteurs.

Pannier cites two other examples from pamphlets of this period.⁴⁴

A pamphlet of 1600 entitled *La Resolution des deux questions proposées à*

Fontaine-bleau seems to typify much of Cayet's writing.⁴⁵ The full title reveals that these two questions were 'Quelle est la vraye Eglise qu'il faut suivre', and 'Quelle est la Bible qu'il faut croire'. Cayet resolves these fundamental issues in a mere sixteen pages, disposing of the 'juge des controverses' issue in his opening paragraph:

pour sçavoir qui est cette vraye Eglise, il faut le resoudre par le Symbole des Apostres qui est la commune et generale Confession de tous les Chrestiens. ... Mais ledit Symbole ne se trouve point par escrit dans le corps de la Bible, en texte expres: ains est seulement par tradition de l'Eglise. Il appert donc que la tradition de l'Eglise est la regle de la parole mesme. (p.4)

Cayet then proceeds to examine the three marks of the Church as mentioned in the Apostles' creed, that it is 'holy', 'Catholic' and the 'communion of saints'. On the first point he makes the questionable assertion that 'le terme de Sainte est equipolent à perpetuité et permanence inviolable' and that therefore Calvin, by recognising the perpetuity of the church, stands condemned by his own words. He goes on to claim that the term 'catholique' means that 'elle est tousjours d'un mesme consentement' and then contrasts this with the disagreements within the Protestant churches:

Or toutes Sectes et heresies sont discordantes d'avec l'Eglise, et entre elles mesmes. Cela se void par les livres de Luther, Calvin, Zvingle, Beze et tous autres. Calvin appelle Luther fanatique, Luther appelle Calvin demoniacle, Zvingle les injurie tous ensemble, Beze en sa Creophagie appelle Luther et tous ceux de sa Secte des Asnes. ... Quelle apparence y a-il, que telles gens soient seulement de l'Eglise ...? (pp.6-7)

On the final point Cayet defines the 'Communion des Saints' as 'la correspondance et aide mutuel de l'Eglise militante, avec l'Eglise triomphante':

c'est la vraye Eglise, celle en laquelle les Saints sont priez et requis, recogneus, et invocques avec les Anges. Or toutes les sectes font au contraire. Car ils ostent aux Saints et aux Anges la vertu et la puissance de nous aider.

and thus he concludes: 'Voila en fin les marques de l'Eglise vraye, lesquelles se trouvent en l'Eglise Romaine' (p.8).

Cayet resolves the second question in favour of the Vulgate in an equally summary manner (and makes, in passing, some interesting observations on other versions):

il n'y a qu'une sainte Bible. Mais elle est en trois langues autentiques et sacrées, Hebraïque, Grecque et Latine, dont la diversité desdits langages n'estant point entendu de plusieurs, il est advenu que les sectaires, se meslans de tourner la sainte Bible en Latin à leur mode, et en leurs langues vulgaires: ils y ont apporté contant, autant de diversitez comme il y a de diverses Sectes et de diverses opinions.

Mais l'Eglise n'a qu'une Bible en tout, esgale par tout, de laquelle nul n'est autheur de sa traduction, que l'Eglise elle mesme, conduite par le saint Esprit: sans y apposer aucun nom particulier.

L'Eglise a sa Bible ... Mais Luther est contraire à Jean Hus, et Jean Hus à Wyclef, Zvingle en ces complanations s'est montré ridicule. Calvin s'est meslé à la traverse, et a corrompu les passages d'Olivetanus. Beze a corrigé Calvin, Castellio en a fait une traduction de mignardise Latine, Junius a barbouillé force additions contraires aux autres. Erasme a mis tout à sa fantasia, ne se souciant de l'Eglise: ni d'aucun autre antiquité. (pp.9-10)

As with his interpretation of the Apostles' Creed Cayet reaches the orthodox solution to the issue in question by a rather unorthodox route, claiming that the variety of other versions available of itself renders the Vulgate authoritative. He finally resolves the question by examining three scriptural texts in the Vulgate and the Genevan translation and concludes: 'La vraye Bible est celle de l'Eglise Romaine, toutes les autres sont fausses. Voila ce qui se peut dire sommairement sur les deux questions proposées' (p.14).

This sketchy and slightly unconventional treatment of two major issues is typical of much of Cayet's writing on controversial questions. Other longer works are notable for their lack of any sequence or structure in the presentation of the arguments and his writing style — characterised by short, unconnected sentences, a limited vocabulary and little skill in deploying those rhetorical effects familiar to other Catholic controversialists and to du Moulin — is undistinguished. All these features also suggest that his pamphlets were very hurriedly written.

Cayet's value as a polemicist, however, resided in the fact of his former af-

filiation to the Protestant church and his familiarity with the writings of Calvin (which is evident in all his pamphlets). As Adair was to note in his account of the conference between Cayet and du Moulin:

[Cayet] propose avec beaucoup d'apparence combien grand estoit le mespris de ce Sacrement [i.e. the Eucharist] en nos Eglises car pour avoir long temps enseigné entre nous il estoit croyable, qu'il en parloit avec verité'.⁴⁶

In addition, his claim to base his arguments solely on scripture and his confidence in his own wide linguistic knowledge added a note of authority to his arguments. In his *Remonstrance et supplication tres-humble à Madame* of 1601, for example, he offered to prove to his former Protestant colleagues

qu'ils sont en hérésie, et ce par la seule et simple parole de Dieu en latin, grec, hébreu, françois, aleman, italien, espagnol, anglois, escossois, *ad aper-turam librorum*: je dis par leurs livres mesmes, et s'ils veulent passer en Orient je leur monstrey leur condamnation en syriaque, chaldaïque, rabbinique, arabe, Turc, persique, armenien et aethiopique, en chacune langue par son propre dialecte et chacun dialecte par son propre caractere, je l'entreprends à la peine de ma vie.⁴⁷

The method referred to in this passage is seen in use in a short pamphlet published the previous year, *Le Purgatoire prouvé par la Parole de Dieu*.⁴⁸ In this Cayet promised 'la preuve du Purgatoire, par la parole de Dieu, conformément aux textes originaux des langues Hebraïque et Grecque, avec la collation des parafrases et translations autentiques' and he claimed to have extended his researches to the teachings of Ethiopian, Armenian, Maronite and Abyssinian Christians, all of whom believed in purgatory (f.2 verso). The pamphlet consisted of a survey of all Old and New Testament references regarded by Catholics as evidence of the existence of purgatory. The author examined each reference in turn and noted the way in which key words and phrases had been rendered in the Vulgate and in the Calvinists' Geneva version; he concluded that 'Calvin et ses semblables veulent perpetuellement regler l'Ecriture à leur sens propre, et non pas s'y soumettre eux-mesmes' (f.24 recto). Cayet had already promised that a comparison of the Vulgate with 'les versions en Alemand de Luther, en Anglois, en Flamant, Italien, Espagnol et autres langues vulgaires' would produce the same result (f.16 verso). This practice of comparing the Vulgate with Protestant translations was a key

feature of Cayet's method and was to reappear in his later encounters with du Moulin.

Exchanges with du Moulin (1601–1603)

The events of 1600–1 show that Cayet was eager to become involved in conferences. In his *Remonstrance et supplication tres-humble à Madame* Cayet offered to take part in a verbal debate for the benefit of Catherine de Bar but his offer, like that of du Perron, was not accepted.⁴⁹ In early 1602, however, a conference was arranged between Cayet and du Moulin.⁵⁰ The former chaplain of 'Madame' seems to have been anxious to ensure that his encounter with her new chaplain should go ahead unhindered:

A cette occasion le Docteur Cayet apres en avoir communiqué aux chefs de la faculté: Et encores aux Prelats plus superieurs, pour ne rien faire sans congé: Et d'abondant avoir adverty Monseigneur le Reverendissime Evesque d'Evreux, afin qu'advenant au point du besoin, il le representast à sa Majesté, pour obvier à tout inconvenient. A pres toutes ces diligences et precautions, le dit Cayer pria et obtint de deux bons Docteurs bien versez aux controverses, et deux Licentiez de la faculté, d'y vouloir assister.⁵¹

After several postponements, the conference finally took place in late May. Its outcome, as described in Chapter 4, fell far short of Cayet's hopes and ambitions.⁵²

In this conference, as in his earlier pamphlets, Cayet promised proof of Catholic doctrine 'par le texte de l'Escriture Sainte' in Hebrew, Greek and Latin. Du Moulin, however, denied that the Vulgate could be regarded as authoritative — 'la Bible Latine est une version, et ne peut estre appelee Original' — and produced several examples of the alleged corruption of the Hebrew text in the Vulgate from which he concluded: 'En somme la diversité est si grande que Bellarmin est contraint de condamner l'Hebreu et le Grec, et soustient qu'il faut plustost croire la version que l'Original, et que la fontaine estant troublé il faut venir aux ruisseaux' (Adair, pp.126–27).

Cayet attempted to impress the audience with his knowledge of Hebrew, pointing out

que Sa Majesté l'avait honoré de la charge de professeur en Hebreu: puis se mit à lire sept out huit versets en Hebreu, qui ne touchoyent en rien à ce dont il estoit question: du Moulin interrompit sa lecture, lui disant qu'il n'estoit point ici pour faire paroistre son sçavoir, ni pour parler de sa charge, mais pour chercher la verité. (Adair, pp.95-96)

Cayet's self-confidence seems to have been his undoing: as noted in Chapter 4, du Moulin prepared and dictated his arguments very carefully; Cayet 'proposoit et respondoit sur le champ de son chef'. He showed little skill in syllogistic debate and even sided with du Moulin against his own so-called 'assistants' in disagreements on this topic (Adair, p.141). His willingness to improvise also led him to venture ill-considered remarks on a wide variety of issues. Examples abound in the Protestant account of Cayet's faulty syllogisms and his willingness to embark on speculations which du Moulin regarded as typically 'sorboniques'. The following passage, however, is from the account given by Cayet's supporter, Maucouvent.

[Cayet] 'adjousta qu'on ne parle en Paradis que la langue des Anges, et que ledit Cayer pourroit debatre que c'est le latin plustost qu'autre langage, d'autant que suivant ce qu'il est dit en Daniel, chap. II. les Anges Princes des nations favorisent ceux, sur lesquels ils ont leur principautez. Or est il que la nation Romaine est demeurée la derniere en auctorité et y est encores au monde, il s'ensuivroit donc que c'estoit le langage imperial entre les Anges.' (pp.12-13)

The conference was broken up after eight sessions. The fact that Cayet's superiors forbade him to sign the written records seemed to confirm the impression that Cayet had failed badly. His efforts to dispel the unfavourable publicity resulting from this conference gave rise to a further series of pamphlets in which he and a supporter tried to defend Cayet's performance and attacked both du Moulin and Adair.⁵³

When du Moulin became involved in another debate the following year (April 1603) with Suarez de Sainte-Marie, Cayet availed himself of this fresh opportunity to attack his Protestant adversary. As noted above, Cayet had written a book on the scriptural basis of purgatory in 1600; when du Moulin's *Eaux de Siloé* appeared in 1603, Cayet's response followed within only a few weeks. *La Fournaise ardente* purported to refute du Moulin using scriptural and rational arguments: 'Voila par l'Ecriture la reverberation de la fantaisie Ministrale, et par

la raison humaine mesme, la conviction de leur erreur' (p.11). The most striking feature of this pamphlet however was the way in which Cayet used the language of alchemy, presenting his arguments as 'matieres alambiquees' under headings such as 'l'evaporation des devisions du Ministre pretendu' and 'la fixation du Purgatoire'. This novel approach quickly led to a decision by Cayet's superiors to censure the work, as described by L'Estoile.⁵⁴

Cayet's involvement in religious debate was seriously curtailed by this second humiliation and only a few more works of religious controversy from his pen were published in the remaining years of his life. He turned instead to the writing of contemporary history and published his *Chronologie septenaire* in 1605. This same work however was also to attract the disapproval of Cayet's Catholic superiors: it was condemned on 31 July 1605 by the Faculty of Theology and, on 18 November 1605, placed on the Index. As the *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique* records, 'l'auteur y soutenait, entre autre erreurs, que le pape, en matière de foi, n'avait pas une autorité supérieure à celle des évêques'.⁵⁵ Cayet continued his work, publishing a *Chronologie novenaire* in 1608 and a defence of his previous *Chronologie* in 1610.⁵⁶ His encounters with du Moulin, however, had effectively put an end to his career as a religious polemicist.

The *libelles* produced by Cayet from 1596 onwards are interesting as examples of the popular religious polemic which proceeded alongside the more scholarly exchanges of, for example, du Perron and du Plessis-Mornay. His method, unlike du Perron's, seems to have been based chiefly on the education he had received as a Protestant, to which he owed his knowledge of scripture, biblical languages and the writings of Calvin — even d'Aubigné was prepared to concede that Cayet was 'docte' (but 'fol')⁵⁷ — but the quirky and individualistic approach of this elderly convert eventually brought him into disrepute with the guardians of Catholic orthodoxy. Cayet died on 10 March 1610 at the age of 75. Recording his burial the following day, L'Estoile, who had noted various episodes in Cayet's career over the preceding fifteen years, offered the following epitaph: 'Ce jour, fust enterré, dans l'église S.-Victor-lès-Paris, nostre maistre Victor Cayet, bon docteur et docte, mais un peu douteux, confus et brouillé en sa théologie' (X, 164).

5.3 Théophraste Bouju (?–1622)⁵⁸

Théophraste Bouju, like Coeffeteau, belonged to du Perron's closest circle of friends. According to d'Aubigné's *La confession catholique du sieur de Sancy*, Bouju owed his conversion to Catholicism and his position at court as *conseiller* and *aumônier du roi* to du Perron.⁵⁹ But in addition to this, Bouju seems to have been uniquely placed to assimilate the arguments used by du Perron in religious debate. He himself wrote: 'j'ay eu l'honneur de faire une partie de mes estudes en philosophie et Theologie aupres de luy, et y apprendre une grande partie du peu que j'en sçay' ⁶⁰ and this remark is further explained by a letter written by du Perron to Bouju in February 1604:

vous scavez que toutes vos estudes, et de Philosophie, et de Theologie, vous les avez faittes, par l'espace de quatre ou cinq ans, en ma conversation domestique, *Una mecum dulces capiens cibos*, et estant admis à toutes mes plus intimes et secrettes meditations. Vous sçavez que durant tout ce temps-là, je ne vous ay rien celé; que vous avez eu la licence, de voir, de manier, et transcrire, tout ce que je composois, et à mesure que je le composois.⁶¹

Bouju's published works span the years 1603 to 1620 but belong to three brief periods within that time. His five anti-Protestant works belong to 1603–4 and 1619–20 while, in the intervening years, he published an attack on two writers expressing Gallican views (1613) and a textbook on Aristotelian philosophy (1614).⁶²

Destruction des faux arguments et sophismes ... de Montigny (1603)

Bouju's three early books, directed against Lobéran de Montigny and Pierre du Moulin, are of particular interest as they show their Catholic author attempting to emphasise the scriptural basis of his method of engaging in religious debate. The first of this early sequence of books was entitled *Destruction des faux arguments et sophismes du sieur de Montigny* and contained twelve letters exchanged between Bouju and the Parisian minister over a period of several months followed by four letters from an additional correspondence which Bouju had initiated with du Moulin.⁶³

The issue on which Bouju challenged Montigny was an aspect of eucharistic doctrine. In the opening to his book, he promised to demonstrate conclusively that

la doctrine de la pretendue Eglise reformée, pour le regard du Sacrement de l'Eucharistie, n'est point parole de Dieu, ny fondée sur *la Sainte Es-criture*, mais une invention fantastique de Calvin qui en est l'auteur. On y verra aussi comme elle enveloppe vraiment de la contradiction en soy, et est sujette aux mesmes difficultez et absurditez *selon la raison humaine* que les Calvinistes objectent contre la croyance de l'Eglise Catholique, Apostolique et Romaine ... (p.5)

By the same tests of scripture and reason, Bouju asserted that Catholic doctrine would prove to be soundly-based:

on jugera manifestement par les vains efforts du sieur du Montigny, voulant refuter ce point de la croyance des Catholiques *par l'Escriture*, et *par la raison humaine*, sans espargner les subtilitez ny les sophismes, comme elle est fondée sur la roche ... (p.6)

Bouju's deliberate emphasis on both scripture and reason in the presentation of his arguments is the most interesting aspect of this book. Like Cayet at this same period Bouju seems especially anxious to claim that scripture supports Catholic belief. He may well have been influenced in this by the controversy which had arisen following the publication of du Perron's apparently dismissive remarks on the value of scripture. (Bouju appears to have acted as scribe at the meetings between du Perron and Harlay de Sancy and eventually published an authorised account of du

Perron's views in response to Tilenus's version.⁶⁴ Allied to this appeal to scripture, however, Bouju also claimed to draw particularly on rational arguments which, as he correctly observed, were the main source of Calvinist objections to the Mass. The most striking aspect of Bouju's claim to refute his opponents by the use of rational argument was his insistence on presenting the arguments in syllogistic form. Asserting the value of this method of proceeding to Montigny, Bouju explained that 'on peut rapporter en trois lignes les nerfs et la force de toute une grande quantité de langage, qui cache ordinairement la verité, et l'obscurcit'(pp.31-4). Writing later to du Moulin, Bouju again insisted that 'il faudra deduire les raisons que vous penserez avoir par syllogismes en forme, attendu que vous n'ignorez pas que c'est le moyen qu'on doit tenir aux conferences et disputes qui ont la verité pour but' (*Cartel de deffy*, p.8).

Montigny, for his part, was extremely sceptical about religious debate using syllogistic logic. He claimed that Bouju was mis-using this approach (and that du Perron had also done so at the Mantes conference), that the use of syllogisms had no precedent in scripture or early church history and cited Tertullian's condemnation of logic as the weapon of heresy.⁶⁵ In reply Bouju cited Augustine:

[Augustine] scavoit bien qu'on en pouvoit abuser aussi bien de l'eloquence et des autres bonnes choses, mais pour cela il ne laissoit pas d'en bien user. La Dialectique (disait cette grande lumiere de l'Eglise, contre l'heretique Cresconius Donastiste) qu'est-ce que la science de disputer? ... Il en parloit en ces termes contre les heretiques, et il enseignoit en ses livres de la doctrine Chrestienne ce qui s'ensuit; La science de disputer (disoit-il) vaut beaucoup pour penetrer et dissoudre tous les genres de questions qui sont aux saintes Lettres. (pp.409-10)

Bouju went on to claim that Christ and St. Paul had both made use of this form of argument, and portrayed the role of dialectic in combating heresy with considerable force:

On sçait bien qu'il n'est pas necessaire d'instruire les simples ny les enfans de l'Eglise, qui ont des-ja la foy, par syllogismes ny arguments, ce n'est pas dequoy il est question, nous parlons de disputer contre ceux qui soustiennent des erreurs et impugnent la verité. Le devoir du peuple est de croire, se tenant dans le fort de l'Eglise, et celuy des Pasteurs et Docteurs, de combattre les ennemis avec leurs armes mesmes. Nous sommes aussi

d'accord que les Peres disent que les heretiques se servent de la Dialectique pour planter leurs erreurs mais ils ne cellent non plus, qu'ils en fait tout de mesme de la sainte Escriture, et de l'eloquence. Et qui doute que les innovateurs en la Religion, ne s'aident des plus subtiles forces pour parvenir à leurs desseins? N'a-ce pas esté par ces artifices que les pretendus reformez semerent il y a cinquante ou soixante ans leurs erreurs, lors qu'ils commencerent premierement à comparoistre au monde, et comme ils continuent encores tous les jours à decevoir les infirmes, leur monstrant des absurditez selon la raison humaine, en la croyance de l'Eglise? Qui ne sçait qu'on peut abuser de toutes choses, excepté des vertus Chrestiennes et Morales, et qu'il n'y a rien de si saint, que les meschans, n'employent pour parvenir à leur fin? La Dialectique, la Philosophie et l'Eloquence sont de fortes armes pour les revoltez de l'Eglise, qui est pourquoy les hérétiques s'en sont servis et pourquoy les Peres crioient contre le mal que la Dialectique faisoit en leurs disputes. Mais le remede à cela, c'est de la leur arracher des mains par elle-mesme car la Dialectique illuminée de la foy et qui sert à l'Eglise, convaincq la sophisterie, sans qu'elle luy puisse resister. (pp.407-9)

The exchanges between Montigny and Bouju on this question are particularly interesting as they show that at this time Bouju's opinion on the value of syllogistic debate was the reverse of that held by his mentor, du Perron. The respective positions of the Catholic and Protestant writers on this occasion are also striking in view of later developments in religious disputes: only a decade later du Moulin was to find himself defending the use of syllogisms in religious disputes while the Jesuit controversialists Gontéry and Véron condemned this method of proceeding.

Montigny eventually refused to continue the correspondence, alleging that Bouju had failed to conduct the debate properly and had continually refused to substantiate his objections with biblical evidence. By this stage Bouju had already written to Pierre du Moulin suggesting that the younger pastor might take over. The first four letters of the ensuing correspondence appear in both Bouju's *Destruction des faux arguments* and in du Moulin's response, entitled *Cartel de deffy du sieur de Bouju*.⁶⁶ Du Moulin was scathing in his response to Bouju's application of logic to obscure rather than illuminate the issues under debate but did not condemn the proper use of rational procedures. As described in Chapter 4, he dismissed Bouju's claim to argue solely on the basis of scripture as fraudulent and cited passages from major contemporary controversialists as evidence of the Catholic view of scripture's inadequacy.⁶⁷

Methode de convaincre par la sainte esriture (1604)

Bouju replied to du Moulin and elaborated his method in the major work of this period published in 1604: *Methode de convaincre par la sainte esriture tous schismatiques et heretiques*.⁶⁸ The book was dedicated to the new king of England, James I. In his dedicatory preface, Bouju wrote that his work possessed ‘les mesmes fondemens et principes, que vostre Majesté propose, pour décider nos differents : (à scavoir que ‘la doctrine de la foy, et la maniere dont Dieu veult estre servy, sont fondées sur la sainte esriture’) and he expressed the hope that his book might be instrumental in bringing about James’s entry into the Catholic church.

Although the book’s title boldly proclaims a ‘methode de convaincre par la sainte esriture’, Bouju had substantially modified his earlier commitment to scripturally-based argument alone. The full title summarises the sequence of arguments whereby Bouju used scripture to identify the true church and hence the judge of disputed religious issues. Scripture is thereafter referred to as ‘loy’ rather than ‘juge’ and the Catholic understanding of the ‘parole non-ecrite’ is explained. As the author goes on to discuss various aspects of eucharistic doctrine — which occupy almost two-thirds of the book — and then, in a series of short chapters, purgatory, indulgences, the veneration of saints, their relics and images, scriptural evidence is interpreted and supplemented by substantial evidence drawn from the writings of the early church. Similarly, Bouju’s conclusion does not describe a verification of Catholic doctrine based solely on scripture:

nous avons demonstré en ce livre que la doctrine des Catholiques est fondée sur la sainte escripture, autorisée par la vraye Eglise de Jesus Christ, par ses conciles, et par tous les saints Peres qui en ont esté les pasteurs et docteurs. (p.853)

So, although the title and the early part of Bouju’s book seem to announce a new approach to debate with the Protestants, the form which his arguments eventually assume and his conclusions appear to be entirely conventional, and more in accordance with those theologians earlier referred to by du Moulin, Bellarmine and du Perron.

The reason for the modifications in Bouju’s arguments soon became apparent when it was revealed that du Perron had written to Bouju accusing him of plagia-

rism. Du Perron had apparently allowed Bouju access to the first part of his reply to du Plessis-Mornay (which was already at the printers, but not yet published). When the appearance of Bouju's *Methode* pre-empted his own work, du Perron immediately wrote to its author alleging that Bouju had 'enlevé les traittez tous complets, transcrits mot à mot, et sans en obmettre une seule syllabe', that these borrowings made up 'la plus grande partie de vostre livre' and that the result of Bouju's actions was to 'ravoir à mes écrits, la fleur et la grace de la nouveauté'.⁶⁹ This revelation was exploited to the full by du Moulin in *Nouvelles briques pour le bastiment de Babel*, the small pamphlet which he published in reply to Bouju's *Methode*.⁷⁰ To this Bouju replied within the year with a pamphlet of his own, *La honteuse fuite du sieur du Moulin ministre, apres avoir renié sa confession de foy*.⁷¹ He defended himself against the charge of plagiarism and claimed success in the application of his *Methode* to du Moulin's arguments:

je luy ay faict nier les principes de sa religion pretendue, renonçant à sa confession de foy, . . . je l'ay chassé de la sainte Escriture, je luy ay faict habandonner les Peres, et quitter la raison humaine, montrant son ignorance en la philosophie par laquelle il attaquoit les mysteres de la religion. Et en tout cela j'ay procedé selon la Sainte Escriture, en expliquant le sens des passages qui est en dispute par la voix de la vraye Eglise et espouse de Jesus Christ, parlant par ses pasteurs et docteurs, par ses conciles, par sa pratique, et par son usage receu par tout le monde Chrestien. (p.5)

This passage makes clear once again that the earlier idea of scripture interpreted by reason as the sole source of arguments has given way to that of scripture interpreted by the church and its representatives. Bouju's apparently innovatory approach has thus become simply the conventional Catholic approach but with a slight change of emphasis in its presentation to the reader.

Later publications

Bouju's *Honteuse fuite* marks the end of his early period of involvement in debate with the Protestants. Two more published works followed in 1613 and 1614: an attack on Edmond Richer — which identifies Bouju as a supporter of the anti-Gallican standpoint adopted by most of the French clergy in these years (and, most notably, by du Perron) — and a philosophy textbook entitled *Corps de toute la philosophie, ... par démonstration et auctorité d'Aristote*.⁷² This work, dedicated to the queen regent and the young Louis XIII, is summed up by its author as 'Aristote fait François'. Bouju shows the same concern to make the procedures of logical argument accessible to the French nobility which had been evident in his early pamphlet against Montigny. It is interesting to note also his wholehearted endorsement of Aristotle as 'Prince des Philosophes' (which contrasts with the more cautious attitude adopted by Coeffeteau)⁷³ and the way in which he was prepared to assert the value of translating classical philosophy into French in specifically religious terms: 'Elle pourra servir à la Religion en faisant connoistre clairement que l'une et l'autre n'ont qu'un mesme but' (dedicatory preface).

The appearance of a new edition of Bouju's *Methode* in 1618 seems to mark a revival of his interest in religious debate.⁷⁴ The following year he published a volume containing two short treatises against works by du Moulin: *Destruction de la pretendue vocation des ministres à la charge de Pasteurs selon le livre mesme de Du Moulin leur confrere. Plus le Bouclier de leur foy faussé par la sainte Esriture*.⁷⁵ Neither of these works, however, provides a sustained examination of du Moulin's arguments; Bouju readily referred his readers to du Perron or Coeffeteau (or to his own *Methode*) and otherwise ventured arguments of a mainly practical or rational nature, making only sparing use of scriptural and historical evidence. Although du Moulin's *Bouclier de la foy* and *De la vocation des pasteurs* had both been written in response to the 'méthodiste' style of argument and Bouju makes reference to recent controversies involving P. Arnoux and the bishop of Luçon,⁷⁶ he himself continued to employ the approach established in his *Methode*. Thus, on the question of establishing the canon of scripture and the true meaning of scripture, Bouju concluded that

pour terminer les differends de la Religion par cette partie de l'Esriture

que nos adversaires reçoivent, tant parce qu'elle contient en termes exprez qu'en bonne consequence: Il faut que ce soit selon qu'elle est interpretee par la vraye Eglise de Jesus Christ qui est la Catholique, de laquelle nous oyons la voix par ses pasteurs et docteurs, par ses conciles, par sa pratique, et par son usage. Et cette escriture ainsi interpretee nous apprendra que c'est à l'Eglise à discerner ce qui est parole de Dieu: Que les livres que les ministres rejettent de la Bible n'en doivent point estre rejettez: Et qu'il y a une parolle de Dieu non escrite en la Bible. (p.136)

Although Théophraste Bouju's reputation as disciple and plagiarist of Davy du Perron has survived to the present day, his method does not appear to have been studied since du Moulin himself replied to his works in the early 1600s. Modern commentators have assumed that Bouju's method was merely an inferior version of du Perron's own.⁷⁷ His early books are however interesting in two respects. First of all, as an apology for the scholastic style of argumentation in religious debate (and for the detailed explanations which they contain concerning the proper use of logic). Whereas du Perron and Coeffeteau had moved away from this more scholastic approach in favour of historical argument at an early stage, Bouju's ingenuous enthusiasm for syllogistic argument seems to have persisted throughout his career as a polemicist. Secondly, Bouju's early works are interesting as an attempt to present religious debate in quite a striking way: his claim to combat the Protestants on the sole basis of scripture foreshadowed that of the 'méthodiste' controversialists even though his emphasis on logical deductions from scripture made his approach, in another sense, entirely the reverse of the Gontéry method. The modification in his method which took place, under the influence of his borrowings from du Perron, is in itself revealing for it confirms the view of other more established Catholic controversialists that scripture interpreted by reason was not an adequate basis for demonstrating the validity of Catholic doctrine.

5.4 Nicolas Coeffeteau (1574–1623)⁷⁸

Nicolas Coeffeteau is the last of this group of controversialists associated with du Perron. He joined the Dominican order in 1588, gained a doctorate at the Sorbonne, and was quickly promoted within his order, its teaching establishment and the capital's Faculty of Theology. At the turn of the century, he became a protégé of du Perron, with whom he shared interests in poetry, classical literature and philosophy as well as in religious debate.⁷⁹ It was through the good offices of du Perron that Coeffeteau was appointed *prédicateur ordinaire du roi* in 1608, and that he became a member of a circle of cultivated clergymen and laymen (which the young Guez de Balzac also frequented).⁸⁰ Similarly, it was du Perron who recommended Coeffeteau as a suitable author to reply to King James I following the latter's 'Advertissement' addressed to the sovereigns of Europe.

Coeffeteau's active involvement in Catholic/Protestant debates covered a period of fifteen years during which time he published only eight works.⁸¹ (There is no record of any involvement on his part in conferences.) Four of Coeffeteau's works were directed solely against du Moulin and most of his published output was devoted to the eucharist. His writing on this subject (which, as he himself admitted, was greatly influenced by du Perron's work) provides a good example of the standard scholarly method of defending Catholic doctrine.

Early publications (1607–1609)

Coeffeteau's first publication in his own right was *Les merveilles de la sainte Eucharistie discourues et défendus contre les infidelles, avec le sacrifice de l'Eglise catholique* which, as the title suggests, set out to emphasise the mystery of the eucharist.⁸² Arguments drawn from church history are used but, as Snoeks notes, the author 'y recourt assez volontiers aux légendes antiques et à la speculation philosophique'.⁸³ Overall there is a strongly scholastic flavour to Coeffeteau's method and the titles of the eleven 'discours' of which the book is composed indicate the emphasis which the author gave to the paradoxes implicit in Catholic doctrine:

III. Comment il se peut faire que le corps de Jesus-Christ, aussi grand qu'il est au Ciel, soit sous une si petite Hostie: et comme derechef il est possible que la quantité de l'Hostie, et le reste des autres accidens du pain et du vin demeurent au Sacrement, sans estre appuyez de leurs substances.

IIII. Comme nonobstant les esperances de la blancheur et de la rougeur à l'Hostie et au calice, l'on ne doit croire qu'il y ayt au Sacrement autre substance que celle du Corps et du Sang du Fils de Dieu, les accidens demeurans sans appuy. (...)

VIII. Comme encore que les loix communes des corps ne souffrent pas qu'un mesme corps se trouve en plusieurs lieux: que cela toutesfois ne peut empescher que le Corps de Jesus-Christ ne soit en plusieurs Autels: cela estant un effect de la Toute-puissance divine (...)

X. Que Dieu estant capable de suspendre les effects des causes secondes, il peut empescher qu'un corps ne s'estende dans le lieu par sa quantité et ses dimensions, le lieu n'estant nullement de l'essence du corps. (...)

Later that year, Coeffeteau finally entered the arena of Parisian religious polemic when he replied to Pierre du Moulin's *Apologie pour la sainte Cène*. As a result of his work on *Les merveilles de la sainte Eucharistie* Coeffeteau was in a position to respond rapidly; his 800-page reply was written and published within six weeks, appearing in early November under the title: *La défense de la sainte Eucharistie et présence réelle du corps de Jésus-Christ*.⁸⁴

Coeffeteau's work opens with a rhetorical condemnation of the malign influence of Protestant writers:

Il faut bien dire que les Ministres, organes de Sathan, ont usé d'enchantement pour tromper les François, et les debaucher de la foy qu'ils avoient tousjours constamment defendue. Leurs discours pleins d'artifices, et leurs ecris ornez de belles paroles, ont esté les instrumens de la ruine de ces Ames, qui se sont laissées malheureusement abuser par les prestiges de l'erreur... les peuples se devoient souvenir que les femmes prostituées sont plus curieuses du fard et des ornemens, que les sages et pudiques ...

and it is in this context that the Catholic author was prepared to concede his opponent's skill as a writer: 'ayant entrepris de renverser les fondemens de nostre croyance, il [du Moulin] a recherché les plus belles paroles qu'il a peu trouver' (f.5 verso).

Coeffeteau then turned immediately to the striking claim which du Moulin had made at the beginning of his *Apologie pour la sainte Cène*:

En ce point de l'Eucharistie nous avons de nostre costé non seulement la parole de Dieu, la raison, le sens, l'experience, la deposition des Anciens, mais mesmes le tesmoignage de nos adversaires. Ministre, Retournons au partage, le droit d'ainesse nous donne le chois devant vous! Laissés nous donq la parole de Dieu et la deposition des anciens, et vous accommodés du reste comme vous pourrés, car l'employant contre nous il nous sera fort aisé de montrer la foiblesse de vos armes, et de faire voir que vos raisons n'ont nulle force contre Dieu, ny l'experience de vos sens aucune solidité contre la verité. (pp.10-11)

Coeffeteau thus indicated the basis on which he would construct his defence of the Catholic eucharist — scripture and tradition — but, as in du Perron's works, the authoritative interpretation of these sources could only be made by the Catholic church. In essence Coeffeteau's arguments were to be founded on two appeals to authority: that of the Catholic church as 'juge des controverses' and more importantly that exercised by God over His creation — his 'toute-puissance' — through which the mystery of the eucharist, in defiance of natural laws and human reason, had been brought into being:

ceux qui quittant les choses naturelles et familiares à l'homme veuillent s'élever aux mysteres divins, se doivent servir d'une autre lumiere que la naturelle, il faut qu'ils implorent l'aide de la foy, sans laquelle ils ne peuvent que se perdre en ce grand abisme des merveilles de Dieu ... Combien donq honteusement et malheureusement tout ensemble le sieur du Moulin a il

peché contre les loix de la Religion, contre les regles de la foy, entreprenant en ce chapitre de renverser toute la doctrine de l'Eucharistie que nous professons en l'Eglise, par les raisons naturelles? Car c'est tout le sujet de son discours et de ses argumens. (pp.177-79)

Citing Chrysostom, Coeffeteau denied that the senses or human experience could act as 'juges souverains d'un article de foy, que toute l'antiquité s'efforce de confirmer par la seule puissance de Dieu, qui fait au Ciel et en la terre tout ce qu'il veut, sçachant bien que les regles des Philosophes luy sont contraires' and makes great play with du Moulin's references to classical philosophers:

apres avoir produit les inconveniens que la raison naturelle, et nos sens remarquent en la suite de nostre creance, qui tient que le Sauveur est vraiment present, selon sa parole au Sacrement de l'autel, il nous allegue Ciceron et Aven-Roes ... Quelle honte d'opposer Ciceron et Aven-Roes [*sic*] à Jesus-Christ, les Philosophes à l'Eglise. ... Ou sont donq ces belles protestations? *La parole de Dieu contenuë és saintes Escritures, est juge souveraine des differens en la Religion. C'est elle qui nous peut rendre sages à salut, ja n'avienne que les hommes soient juges en la cause de Dieu, ou que la Religion que Dieu requiert de l'homme soit mise en la discretion de l'homme.* Ne voyons nous pas maintenant que ce n'estoit qu'un peu de sucre, pour nous deguiser le poison! qu'une apparence de Brebis pour nous couvrir la rage du Loup? Car on nous fait icy arbitres de la Religion, non des Chrestiens, mais des Payens, non des Docteurs, mais des Philosophes, que Tertullian appelle les Patriarches des heretiques. (pp.179-81)

Coeffeteau returned to this question again in Chapter XVII when he replied to du Moulin's rational objections to the idea of 'accidens sans sujet':

[du Moulin] entreprend ... de prouver qu'il est impossible que les accidens subsistent sans sujet, parce que l'on ne voit point cela hors du Sacrement. Il commence mal, par Aristote, qui n'a peu voir plus loing que le commun cours des choses n'estant éclairé que de la seule lumiere naturelle: et icy il est question de la foy. Mais pour le faire paroistre avec de la vanité, il dit, que *les Catholiques en font leur Apostre*. Ce qui est une imposture si visible qu'elle ne demande point de responce, car l'on sçait qu'ou il s'agit de la foy, Aristote n'a nulle autorité parmi nous. Pour la Philosophie, nous suivons l'opinion de ceux qui l'ont nommé le Démon ou le Genie de la nature. Aux passages donq que le Ministre allegue de luy, nous ne repondons autre chose sinon que nous traitons une question de la foy non une dispute de la Philosophie. (pp.555-56)

Coeffeteau nevertheless allowed himself to be drawn into an explanation of the disputed concept using the terms of scholastic philosophy which, despite the care with which he proceeded, suggests how rebarbative ordinary readers would have found this approach. Beginning with a distinction between two types of definition — those in which ‘il n’entre rien qui ne soit de mesme genre’ and others due to ‘quelque chose d’adjoin et tiré d’un autre genre’ — he explained that ‘accidens’ belonged to this second category: ‘leur essence demeure entiere, encore qu’on arrache actuellement la chose definie de ce qu’on luy adjoint’.

Et de cette sorte disons nous que les accidens peuvent estre separez actuellement de la substance, leur demeurant seulement l’inclination à cette substance, qui est arrestée par la puissance de Dieu, capable de conserver aussi bien l’accident sans sujet, comme avec son sujet. (p.557)

The fact that du Moulin’s attack on the Catholic eucharist was largely based on rational objections of the kind being discussed in the above passage was to lead the Catholic writer to make extensive use of the arguments developed by scholastic theologians which he had already featured in *Les merveilles*. Historical examples nevertheless occupy a substantial part of Coeffeteau’s book, particularly with regard to the doctrine of the real presence.

Du Moulin’s reply to Coeffeteau did not appear until the summer of 1609 and then only in the form of a second revised edition of his original work. In this much expanded version, almost twice the length of the original, du Moulin responded to some of Coeffeteau’s arguments and explanations and provided additional historical evidence. He also commented on the style and tone of Coeffeteau’s work:

Quant à son stile on void clairement qu’il emprunte mes termes et se pare de mes plumes, puis me paye en injures m’appellant organe de Sathan, loup enragé, Hyaene, effronté, ame desesperée et furieuse, chien qui se prend à la pierre, imposteur, impudent, etc. Paroles qui seroyent trouvées estranges, si elles se disoyent en un autre habit. Mais c’est le privilege de la robe. (Geneva 1610 edition, REP 1112, p.72)

L’Estoile, however, judged later that there was little to choose between the two writers on this point: ‘[du Moulin] luy donne des pinssades assez aigres et plaisantes; reproche audit Coeffeteau ses calomnies et injures, encores que de ce

costé-là, ils n'ayent rien à se reprocher l'un à l'autre' (X, 148). Coeffeteau published his refutation of the new *Apologie* within three weeks.⁸⁵ He reaffirmed the appeals to authority on which he had based his original reply:

si j'ai employé les autoritez, comme il me reproche que j'ay fait, en cela j'ay suivy le stile des vrais Theologiens, qui sçavent n'y avoir argument plus fort ès matieres de la Religion, que celuy qui est pris de l'autorité, les autres qui sont empruntées de la raison, estant foibles, lasches et aisés à deffaire. (f.4.recto)

In this book and du Moulin's reply, published in early 1610, the original subject of the debate had virtually disappeared and the dispute had degenerated to the level of personal recriminations and allegations of 'fautes en grammaire', 'ignorances en l'histoire' and 'erreurs en philosophie'.⁸⁶ The final word on this occasion was to remain with du Moulin. Coeffeteau was already engaged in the delicate task of refuting the English king's 'Advertissement', an undertaking which would, in any case, soon bring him once more into conflict with the Charenton pastor. The character of the exchanges described above may well have been a matter of regret to Coeffeteau. He refused to continue debating in this acrimonious vein and these two polemical works against du Moulin's *Apologie* are notable by their absence from Coeffeteau's *Œuvres*, published in 1622.

Major publications (1609–1614)

Coeffeteau's *Response à l'advertissement*, a neat octavo volume of only 159 pages, was put on sale towards the end of December 1609 and, as described in Chapter 1, was widely praised.⁸⁷ His successful fulfilment of this royal commission marks a transition in Coeffeteau's perception of his own role in contemporary religious debate which is confirmed by the two works which followed, written against du Moulin and du Plessis-Mornay. Du Moulin's *Défense de la foy catholique* — his reply to Coeffeteau's *Response à l'advertissement* — did not appear until the autumn of 1610 and in the early months of the regency period, the authorities tried, unsuccessfully, to suppress both this book and du Plessis-Mornay's *Mystere d'iniquité*.⁸⁸ Coeffeteau eventually produced refutations of these two Protestant works: his *Response au livre intitulée le mystère d'iniquité du sieur Du Plessis* appeared in late 1613 and the long-awaited reply to du Moulin — *Apologie pour la Response à l'Advertissement* — in 1614.⁸⁹ Both of these works contain well over 1000 pages, the first in folio, the second in octavo format, and show a far more consistent reliance on historical argument and a much closer resemblance to the works of du Perron.

Coeffeteau's reply to du Plessis-Mornay's *Mystere d'iniquité* shows his continuing interest in this second main area of religious debate — the authority of the Catholic church and, more particularly, of the Pope — to which his reply to James I had first brought him. Coeffeteau spent two years on this new book, which was published in September 1613. The book was well-received by his Catholic colleagues and drew a lengthy reply from one of French Protestantism's most notable scholars, André Rivet.⁹¹ The *Response au livre ... du sieur Du Plessis* contains further evidence of Coeffeteau's 'gallicanisme mitigé' which had already been apparent in his reply to James I.⁹² According to Urbain,

Le nonce n'en voulut pas trop à Coeffeteau de ces opinions éparses dans la réfutation du *Mystere d'iniquité*. Il les excusa même, et en rejeta la faute sur le malheur des temps. Il constatait que l'ouvrage était universellement estimé et qu'on en espérait le plus grand bien.⁹³

In Coeffeteau's *Apologie pour la response* the author provides a clear statement of the Catholic view of scripture (and suggests, once again, how invaluable

Tilenus's edition of du Perron's exposition on this issue had proved for Protestant controversialists):

Vous-vous jettez maintenant sur l'Ecriture, et nous accusez de l'avoir blasmée en nos livres *d'insuffisance ou d'imperfection*, et peut-estre que vous entendez ce grand Cardinal, . . . qui a decouvert vostre foiblesse, et la mauvaise foy de vos allegations: mais j'ay faict voir en ma Response au Serenissime Roy de la grande Bretagne que le titre *de l'insuffisance de l'écriture* donné à un de ses livres, estoit de l'imposition ou plustost de l'imposture de Tilenus, et l'Auteur mesmes en a faict une assez suffisante declaration. . . .

Nous vous disons donc avec Tertullian, *que nous adorons la plenitude des Escritures*, parce que où elles parlent, on ne peut rien desirer, et faut que toute eloquence humaine soit muette. Nous vous disons qu'elle est suffisante pour nous instruire à salut, d'autant que si elle-mesme ne nous explique toutes les particularités que nous devons croire, elle nous enseigne, à qui nous devons avoir recours pour nous en instruire, et nous renvoye à l'Eglise, qu'elle nous declare estre la Colonne et le Firmament de verité. Alors dict saint Augustin contre Cresconius, *nous gardons la verité des Escritures quand nous suyvons ce qu'approuve l'Eglise universelle: que l'autorité des mesmes escritures nous recommande, afin que l'écriture ne pouvant tromper, celui qui a crainte de l'estre, aille consulter l'Eglise; que l'Ecriture Sainte monstre et faict voir sans aucune ambiguité.* (Paris 1614 edition, p.79)

It is also possible to see in this work how Coeffeteau's method of approaching the eucharistic controversy had developed. In the original *Response à l'advertissement*, Coeffeteau had dealt briefly with this issue in the following terms:

Nous voicy maintenant au point de la Transsubstantiation, que vous mettez au rang de ceux que vous croyez avoir esté forgez depuis les cinq premiers siecles en l'Eglise Romaine: et toutesfois, SIRE, c'estoit un Pere des quatre premiers siecles qui parlant du Sacrement disoit, *Puis donc que nostre Seigneur nous declare et nous dit du pain, Cecy est mon corps, qui est-ce qui osera plus en douter, et dire ce n'est pas son sang? Autrefois en Cana de Galilee il a changé l'eau qui a affinité avec le sang en vin, et ne ser-il point digne d'estre creu changeant le vin en sang?* Ceux qui rejettent les Catecheses de cet Autheur, n'ont ny front ny raison, puis qu'elles sont citées és premiers siecles par Theodoret, et és siecles suivans par saint Jean Damascene deux lumieres de l'Orient. (*Œuvres*, pp.341-42)

Coeffeteau's marginal references cited Cyril of Jerusalem, Gaudentius, Ambrose and Chrysostom in support of Catholic doctrine. Du Moulin had replied, in his *Defence de la foy catholique*, that the first two of these passages were false, the third 'tronqué' and the fourth 'pris à contre-sens', and had then ventured historical and scriptural evidence of his own in opposition to Catholic doctrine (pp.334-52). In his *Apologie pour la response*, therefore, Coeffeteau examined the texts put forward on both sides in an attempt to show that transsubstantiation had a sound basis in both scripture and early church history (*Œuvres*, pp.575-602).

Dealing with the first two passages originally cited, Coeffeteau merely reaffirmed the authenticity of the first and claimed that, however doubtful the attribution of the second passage to a particular author, it was nevertheless 'allegué à propos, estant au moins d'un auteur des cinq premiers siècles, qui au demeurant monstre une singuliere erudition jointe à une grande pieté en ses écrits, dignes pour ce sujet d'estre reverez de toute personne docte et Chrestienne' (p.577). With regard to the third passage, du Moulin had quite correctly noted that, by citing only the first of several examples listed by Ambrose, the sense of the text had been subtly altered in order to provide a far more specific confirmation of transsubstantiation. Coeffeteau was obliged to expand his argument and provide a rather less convincing commentary on the entire passage. On the fourth passage du Moulin 'suivant le stile du sieur du Plessis' had claimed that 'sainct Chrysostome enfle son discours, et que ce sont toutes paroles hyperboliques, et pleines d'excès' and had given several other examples from Chrysostom's sermons. Coeffeteau dismissed this argument as 'une pure charlaterie':

Car souz ombre que quelquefois les Peres usent d'ornemens, ce n'est pas à dire qu'ils soient toujours sur les figures, autrement nous n'aurions rien d'asseuré en leur foy, ny rien de solide en leurs escrits. (p.582)

Turning then to an examination of the texts cited by du Moulin from other early church fathers, Coeffeteau dismissed these too as 'impertinemment alleguez', 'misérablement depravé', deliberately misinterpreted or based on a wilful misunderstanding of Catholic doctrine (pp.583-99). In like fashion, Coeffeteau denied that the passages from scripture listed by du Moulin, and most notably 1 Corinthians 11 which refers to a 'commemoration', are incompatible with Catholic doctrine and

he concluded this section with a fine rhetorical passage affirming the scriptural basis of transsubstantiation and God's omnipotence (p.602).

The exchanges between du Moulin and Coeffeteau on this point illustrate the underlying pattern of virtually all such debates. Following their attempts to proceed on a basis which appears to be acceptable to both parties — in this case, scripture and the testimony of the church fathers of the first five hundred years — the two opponents quickly became entrenched in disputes over the authenticity of texts and of their interpretations, accompanied by mutual accusations of bad faith.

Later works (1617–1622)

Coeffeteau, like Bouju, returned to the fray once more in 1617 when he published a pamphlet attacking the four Charenton ministers and a reply to du Moulin's treatise 'de la toutepuissance de Dieu'.⁹⁴ The reply of the newly-appointed bishop of Metz,⁹⁵ reiterated the arguments that he had marshalled on several previous occasions in his polemical feud with du Moulin but in a noticeably more forceful manner. He referred to the Calvinists as 'ces Sacramentaires' who 'combatent ouvertement la Toute-puissance de Dieu' and 'par une execrable audance revoquent en doute les paroles de son Testament et de sa derniere volonté' and cited Luther's description of them as '*fanatiques, proditeurs, et parricides de Jesus-Christ, Blasphemateurs contre le saint Esprit, et seducteurs du monde*' (*Œuvres*, p.718). In a particularly striking and rhetorical passage, Coeffeteau visualised Christ's condemnation of the Protestants on the Day of Judgement:

Je vous avois protesté que je laissois mon corps au Sacrement, avec des paroles si claires que vous n'en sçauriez vous mesmes imaginer de plus expresses. ... Que m'eust-il cousté de dire; Tenez, Prenez, Ceci est le signe de mon corps? (Œuvres, p.727)

and the passage concludes with a remark concerning Protestant methods of interpreting that key phrase, 'Ceci est mon corps', which recalls earlier comments on this subject by Coeffeteau (see above) but which had also at this date become a characteristic feature of Gontéry's 'méthodiste' style of argument: 'Que pourront-

ils [the Protestants] donc opposer à ces foudres? A qui auront-ils recours? Aux Aristotes ou aux Averroës, qui gémiront sous la violence des supplices?’ (p.727).

In his treatise, du Moulin had criticised the Catholics for invariably appealing to the concept of divine omnipotence in support of the doctrine of the real presence, and had claimed that while God’s omnipotence might make all things possible, only scripture revealed God’s promises and intentions, and scripture contained no evidence of this doctrine. Coeffeteau’s reply reveals the unbridgeable gulf between opposing Catholic and Protestant views on this issue for, while presented as an emphatic denial of du Moulin’s interpretation, it nevertheless seems merely to restate the position which du Moulin had challenged:

L’Eglise Catholique n’a jamais mis en avant la Toute-puissance de Dieu pour obliger précisément les Calvinistes à croire la Transubstantiation du pain au corps de Jesus-Christ. Mais apres leur avoir solidement prouvé la verité de ce changement par les expresses paroles du Testament du Fils de Dieu, *Cecy est mon corps*, qui ne souffrent point qu’on reconnoisse au Sacrement d’autre substance que celle du corps de Jesus-Christ, s’il arrive comme c’est leur ordinaire, qu’ils fascent naistre là dessus des difficultez prises des sens, et du commun cours de la nature, alors pour combattre cette infidelité, et pour destruire toutes ces sortes d’argumens qu’ils produisent pour renverser la volonté de Dieu, elle a recours à sa Toute-puissance, et monstre qu’ayant fait au Ciel et en la terre de plus grandes merveilles que celle de la Transubstantiation il merite bien qu’on croye que cet œuvre ne surpasse pas sa puissance; (*Œuvres*, pp.719–20)

In this same year, 1617, Coeffeteau was connected with the publication of yet another Catholic work on the subject of the eucharist but this time in the capacity of editor rather than author. Throughout his career at Paris Coeffeteau had remained in close touch with du Perron, as a frequent visitor to the latter’s home and as a regular correspondent. (In his *Apologie pour la response* he had referred to du Perron as ‘ce grand Cardinal, la lumiere de son siecle, et l’appuy des lettres’ and as a scholar ‘duquel nous nous avoüons ingenüement les disciples’ (*Œuvres*, p.596).) In 1617 du Perron allowed Coeffeteau to prepare a preliminary version of his refutation of du Plessis-Mornay’s book on the eucharist for publication.⁹⁶

One further work of religious controversy by Coeffeteau was published in 1622, the year before his death, in an edition of his *Œuvres*.⁹⁷ The new book was, once

again, on the subject of the eucharist — *Traité des Noms de l'Eucharistie* — and du Moulin figures among those Protestant authors whose writings Coeffeteau claimed to refute. For this book Coeffeteau adopted a scheme of his own rather than following the sequence of arguments as assembled by his named opponents. The *Traité des Noms de l'Eucharistie* examines the two chief scriptural accounts of the institution of the eucharist, given by Matthew and Paul, and in twenty chapters deals in turn with the various names and descriptions of the eucharist as they emerge from or are linked with these two accounts. The work thus has a much stronger scriptural basis than most Catholic treatments of the eucharistic debate and, although Coeffeteau pays particular attention to those names which are the source of disagreement between Protestants and Catholics, the evidence is often presented more objectively than in his earlier works. The book is nevertheless a work of polemic and Snoeks notes that Coeffeteau's arguments regarding the symbolic expressions used by the church fathers in referring to the eucharist make this particularly clear. 'Il n'empêche cependant que l'usage ancien de certains autres termes tels que, par exemple, celui de "Cène du Seigneur", donne également lieu à des aperçus historiques intéressants. Ceux-ci sont empreints d'un réel souci d'impartialité, en particulier dans le jugement porté sur les thèses de certains théologiens catholiques' (p.71).

The exchanges between du Moulin and Coeffeteau were unusually sustained, continuing over a period of fifteen years, and reflect changes in the methods of the two controversialists concerned and also developments in religious debate on a wider front. Confronted by du Moulin with the standard rational objections to Catholic eucharistic doctrine, Coeffeteau quickly abandoned arguments based on reason in favour of those based on early church history; the contrast is very marked between his earliest works, in which he readily employed the language and precepts of scholastic philosophy, and those of 1613–22, which are clearly influenced by du Perron's works of the same period. Snoeks regrets that Coeffeteau 'entraîné peut-être par la tactique de son principal adversaire, n'ait pas orienté son attention d'une manière plus soutenue vers l'examen de l'ancienne tradition de l'Eglise' and concludes that, in comparison with du Perron, Coeffeteau 'n'a joué dans la controverse qu'un rôle secondaire' (p.72).⁹⁸ But, even allowing for the fact

5.4 Coeffeteau

that Coeffeteau showed less commitment than du Perron to extending the range of historical arguments available to Catholic controversialists, his contribution is nevertheless significant as one of a comparatively small number of French theologians dealing with controversial issues in a scholarly manner but in the vernacular rather than in Latin. Coeffeteau, in company with Davy du Perron, is notable for his virtually exclusive use of French for his works of religious controversy. Only one Latin work by Coeffeteau, published posthumously in 1623, is recorded; all his other contributions to religious debate were in French.⁹⁹ Many of the passages cited above reveal Coeffeteau's skilful use of rhetoric, which L'Estoile had also admired in his preaching.¹⁰⁰ Jean-Pierre Camus described du Perron, Coeffeteau and du Vair as 'les trois sources où désormais il faudra puiser l'Eloquence et l'Elégance Française ... les trois patrons de l'Eloquence de nostre langue'.¹⁰¹

* * *

The four controversialists featured in this chapter illustrate the range of religious debate taking place in Paris in the first decade following the Edict of Nantes. Du Perron, through his own publications and his active support for other Catholic polemicists, dominates this phase in the development of inter-confessional debate but the three other controversialists examined here all developed somewhat different methods of engaging in controversy based on their own expertise and in response to the method of their main Protestant opponent, Pierre du Moulin. A feature common to the writing of all four men was the desire to reclaim scripture from the Protestants and to defend the Catholic Church against the accusation that it regarded scripture as inadequate and imperfect. The polemicists examined in the following chapter were to provide new insights and ideas in pursuit of this aim which led to the development of a method whose keynote was attack rather than defence.

Notes to Chapter 5

1. Sources for biography: 'Discours sommaire de la vie et trespas de l'Illustrissime cardinal du Perron', in *Les Diverses Œuvres de l'illustrissime cardinal Du Perron*, ... contenant plusieurs livres ... non encore vus, ni publiés ... ensemble tous les écrits mis au jour de son vivant, et maintenant réimprimés sur ses exemplaires laissez, reveus, corrigez et augmentez de sa main (Paris, 1622), REP 2948, pp.1–36; P. Feret, *Le Cardinal du Perron, orateur, controversiste, écrivain: Etude historique et critique* (Paris, 1877); DTC, 4, 1953–60; DHGE, 14, 1130–36 (entry by R. Snoeks).
2. See above, Chapter 1, pp.12–13, 16–17.
3. See above, Chapter 3, p.98.
4. See above, Chapter 3, nn.5, 52 (a).
5. 'Monsieur le Convertisseur a pris la peine de venir prescher et pescher à St Merry, ... son frère et quelques autres de ses apostres ont une banque devant la chaire chargée de beaux livres. Ils les ouvrent à la citation des passages, ils les ferment le plus fort qu'ils peuvent, pour resveiller l'assistance: mais tant est douce la polologie de ce personnage, que la plus part y dorment trois heures, et comme à la pescherie, y gagnent force rheumes; en quoi la Faculté de Théologie apporte des commoditez nouvelles à la Faculté de Médecine' (*La confession catholique du sieur de Sancy*, in *Œuvres*, p.620).
6. 'Discours sommaire de la vie', p.17.
7. *Commencement du premier sermon faict à Saint-Mederic*, in *Diverses Œuvres* pp.709–13.
8. For full title, see Chapter 1, n.48.
9. After the Fontainebleau conference, du Plessis began work on a second edition of *De l'institution ... de l'Eucharistie*, published in 1604, for which every reference was checked and every passage quoted provided with a reference (REP 594).
10. Cited by Patry, p.385, n.35.
11. Accounts of this conference are given by Feret (*Le Cardinal du Perron*, pp.150–168) and Patry (pp.382–99).
12. Kappler (2, 34–36) summarises the findings of J. Lalot — published in his *Essai historique sur la conférence tenue à Fontainebleau entre Duplessis-Mornay et Du Perron le 4 mai 1600* (Paris, 1889) — which reveal that the jury's decisions on the majority of the nine texts examined were neither as objective nor as conclusive as was later claimed.
13. *Mémoires*, I, xcvi, p.330.

14. Letter to Scaliger, cited by Patry, p.391, n.56.
15. See above, Chapter 1, p.16.
16. Patry, p.393; du Perron, *Les Ambassades et Negotiations de l'Illustrissime et Reverendissime Cardinal du Perron, ... Avec les plus belles et eloquentes lettres, ... qu'il a écrites sur toutes sortes de sujets ...* (Paris, 1623), p.210.

 Agrippa d'Aubigné describes an encounter which he had with du Perron a fortnight after the conference of Fontainebleau in which, he alleges, he defeated du Perron in a discussion on the reliability of the church fathers. Kappler suggests that the official record of this meeting, which apparently took place in front of an assembly of 400 people, may have been deliberately suppressed by the king (2, 39–41). (See, *Sa Vie à ses enfants*, in *Œuvres*, p.434; also, *Histoire universelle*, in *Œuvres complètes*, 1, 373–82.)
17. See Chapter 1, pp.16–17.
18. See above, Chapter 3, n.60.
19. See Chapter 3, pp.105–06.
20. For full title, see above, Chapter 3, n.5.
21. See above, Chapter 4, n.10. Constable was the author of an interesting book, sometimes attributed to du Perron, entitled *Examen pacifique de la doctrine des Huguenots* (1589).
22. (Paris, 1969), p.34.
23. *Articles des ministres*, p.85.
24. *Nouveauté du Papisme*, third edition (1633), ff.b.iiii.verso–c.ii.verso.
25. *Examen du livre du sieur du Plessis contre la messe, composé il y a environ dis-huit ans par Messire Jacques Davy, ... maintenant cardinal du Perron ... et publié par ... Messire Nicolas Coeffeteau ...* (Evreux, 1617), REP 2025; *Traitté du Sainct Sacrement de l'Eucharistie, divisé en trois livres, contenant la réfutation du livre du sieur du Plessis Mornay contre la messe ...* (Paris, 1622), REP 2951.
26. See above, Chapter 1, pp.24–25.
27. See above, Chapter 1, p.36, and Chapter 2, p.74.
28. See above, Chapter 3, n.20.
29. It was eventually published in 1620 under the title, *Replique à la Response du serenissime Roy de la Grand Bretagne* (Paris, 1620), REP 2550.
30. See above, Chapter 4, pp.192–93.

31. Feret provides a detailed summary of its contents based on the MS held in the BN (*Le Cardinal du Perron*, pp.321–47).
32. Preface to *Nouveauté du Papisme*, f.b.ii.recto.
33. Feret describes du Perron's meticulous approach and his efforts to obtain new documents (*Le Cardinal du Perron*, p.240).
34. Cited by Couderc, 1, 120–21.
35. DHGE, 14, 1133.
36. *Panegyrique de S. Francois de Sales*, cited by Feret, *Le Cardinal du Perron*, p.243; *Nouveauté du Papisme* (1633), f.d.iv.recto.
37. Sources for biography: P. Feret, *La faculté de théologie de Paris*, 2, 153–82; Haag, 3, 293–99; Pannier, *L'Eglise ... sous Henri IV*, pp.52–66; DTC, 2, 2046–47. Pierre-Victor Palma Cayet (as he later came to be known) had first arrived in Paris in the late 1550s to study at the Sorbonne. In 1562, following the example of one of his teachers, the dialectician Pierre de la Ramée, he became a convert to the Protestant faith. Soon after, he went to Geneva to pursue his studies in theology and Hebrew. From Geneva, Cayet went on to spend some time studying in Germany before entering the ministry of the French Reformed Church. After only a short period as a full-time pastor Cayet became, in 1584, chaplain to Catherine de Bourbon, sister to the future king and returned to Paris in her entourage in 1594.
38. See Léonard, *Histoire générale du protestantisme*, 2, 141–43. Du Perron was also associated with a book by Constable on a similar theme (see above, n.21).
39. Title: *Consilium pium de componendo religionis dissidio*, later translated as *Advertissement sur les points de la religion pour en composer les différends* (Paris, 1596). Cayet was also accused of several other misdemeanours, including involvement in alchemy (Pannier, *L'Eglise ... sous Henri IV*, p.58).
40. See, for example, *La Discipline des Ministres de la religion pretendüe reformée* (Paris, 1600), REP 164.
41. CIOR 16 lists ten works belonging to these categories: 6018, 6019, 6022, 6026; 6020, 6025; 6021, 6029, 6030, 6031.
42. *Chronologie novenaire, contenant l'histoire de la guerre sous le regne du tres-chrestien roy Henri IIII. Et les choses plus memorables advenues par tout le monde, depuis l'an 1589 jusques à la paix faicte à Vervins en juin 1598.* (Paris, 1608); also in *Nouvelle collection des mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de France*, edited by Michaud and Poujoulat (Paris, 1838), p.22.
43. Victor Baroni, *La Contre-Réforme devant la Bible* (Lausanne, 1943), pp.372–73. Title of Cayet's pamphlet: *Discours de la vraye Eglise et de la droite succession des légitimes Pasteurs en icelle* (Paris, 1597).

44. Pannier, *L'Eglise ... sous Henri IV*, pp.62–63.
45. Title: *La Resolution des deux questions proposées à Fontaine-bleau, le jour de l'Ascension derniere, 1600. A sçavoir, Quelle est la vraye Eglise qu'il faut suivre, et quelle est la Bible qu'il faut croire* (Paris, 1600), REP 166.
46. *Le Narré de la Conference ... entre Monsieur du Moulin et Monsieur Cayet*, pp.88–89.
47. Title: *Remonstrance et supplication tres-humble à Madame ... pour vouloir recognoistre nostre mere Sainte Eglise Catholique Apostolique et Romaine ...* (Paris, 1601), REP 283.
48. (Paris, 1600), REP 165.
49. See above, Chapter 1, p.17.
50. For titles of publications, see above, Chapter 3, nn.26, 52 (d).
51. *La conference des ministres accordee, et puis refusee par eux*, pp.74–75.
52. See above, Chapter 4, p.153.
53. See above, Chapter 3, p.64 and n.96; also *Defense et arrest de la verité contre Archibald Adair, escossais ...* (Paris, 1603), REP 486.
54. See above, Chapter 2, p.64 and nn.14, 25.
55. 2, 2046–47.
56. *Défenses pour maistre Pierre-Victor Cayet contre la pretendue censure de la Chronologie septenaire* (Paris, 1610).
57. *Œuvres*, p.576.
58. Sources for biography: DTC, 2, 1092; DHGE, 10, 49–50; Haag, 2, 422–23.
59. *Œuvres*, p.628.
60. *La honteuse fuite du sieur du Moulin ministre, apres avoir renié sa confession de foy ...* (Paris, 1604), REP 560, p.12.
61. *Les Ambassades et Negotiations*, p.126.
62. Title: *Deux advis, l'un sur le livre de M. Edmond Richer intitulé 'De la puissance ecclésiastique et politique', l'autre sur un livre dont l'auteur ne se nomme point, qui est intitulé 'Commentaire sur l'auctorité de quelque concile que ce soit sur le pape'* (Paris, 1613) REP 1471; *Corps de toute la philosophie, divisé en deux parties par démonstration et auctorité d'Aristote* (Paris, 1614), REP 1590.
63. For full title, see above, Chapter 3, n.28.
64. See above, Chapter 3, n.52 (a).

65. See above, Chapter 3, p.122.
66. For full title, see above, Chapter 3, n.28. The letters appear to have been faithfully reproduced in both works apart from the fact that Bouju omits the lists of alleged Catholic errors which du Moulin challenges him to defend with scripture.
67. See above, Chapter 4, pp.153–58.
68. For full title, see above, Chapter 4, n.50.
69. *Les Ambassades et Negotiations*, pp.123, 125. Pages 121–33 of this work contain a series of letters written by du Perron in February 1604 on the subject of Bouju's plagiarism.
70. See the 'advertissement' of this work. At least one modern commentator has dismissed the affair as a fabrication on the part of Bouju's opponents but the published evidence of du Perron's letters and the explanations given by Bouju in his next work make it clear that he had indeed borrowed substantial sections from du Perron's works without acknowledgment (see J. Dédieu, DHGE, 10, 49–50).
71. See above, n.60, for full title.
72. See above, n.62, for full title.
73. See below, p.283.
74. REP 2144. Bouju's *La honteuse fuite du sieur du Moulin* also seems to have been republished in 1619 (see REP 2337).
75. (Paris, 1619), REP 2336. One further work followed in 1620, directed this time against the Genevan Protestant, Simon Vigor: *Deffence pour la hierarchie de l'Eglise et de nostre S. Père le Pape, contre les faussetez et calomnies de maistre Simon Vigor* (Paris), REP 2505. Bouju is thought to have died in 1622. The appearance of *Les Ambassades et Negotiations* of du Perron in 1623, making public the letters of 1604, would tend to confirm this.
76. See for example, pp.219–20.
77. Baroni, for example, in *La Contre-Réforme devant la Bible*, refers to Bouju's plagiarism, offers no analysis of his method but nevertheless concludes that 'Bouju passait pour un piètre théologien' (p.373). Coeffeteau, however, described Bouju as a 'personnage de singuliere erudition' (*Œuvres*, p.583).
78. Sources for biography: DTC, 3, 267–71; P. Feret, *La faculté de théologie de Paris*, 5, 207–25; Charles Urbain, *Nicolas Coeffeteau: Un des fondateurs de la prose française (1574–1623)*.
79. See CIOR 17 for bibliography of Coeffeteau's translations and publications on subjects other than theology.

80. J. Jehasse, *Guez de Balzac et le Génie Romain* (Paris, 1977), pp.33, 34, 69; Urbain, p.59.
81. His earliest contribution to religious debate was as the translator of a Latin work which, with the author's permission, he reworked and published under the title *Examen d'une confession de foy publiée n'aguères en France sous le nom du roy d'Angleterre. Fait premierement en latin par G. Cheisolme et puis en françois et plus au long par F. Nicolas Coeffeteau* (Paris, 1604) REP 569.
82. (Paris, 1607), REP 700.
83. Snoeks, *L'argument de tradition*, p.70. Coeffeteau's interest in scholastic writers also led him to begin work on a translation of the *Summa* (at the request of Queen Marguerite, Henri IV's former wife). The Sorbonne, hearing of Coeffeteau's project, asked him to abandon it immediately and to attempt to curb the queen's interest in such matters, fearing lest 'la doctrine de saint Thomas ne perdit son prix, si on la soumettait au jugement des femmes ou des gens mal disposés'. Coeffeteau contented himself with publishing a translation of a single treatise, *De Deo uno*, re-ordering the arguments to some extent and adding an introduction: *Premier essay des questions theologiques traitées en nostre langue selon le stile de S. Thomas et des autres scolastiques* (Paris, 1607), REP 771 (see Urbain, pp.148–50).
84. For full title, see above, Chapter 4, n.60.
85. Full title: *Refutation des faussetez contenues en la deuxiesme edition de l'Apologie de la Cene, du Ministre du Moulin* (Paris, 1609), REP 958.
86. See above, Chapter 3, p.90 and n.6, Chapter 4, p.173.
87. See above, Chapter 1, p.22.
88. See above, Chapter 2, pp.76–77.
89. Full title: *Apologie pour la Response à l'Advertissement du serenissime Roy de la Grande Bretagne, contre les accusations de Pierre du Moulin, Ministre de Charenton* (Paris, 1614), REP 1601.
90. Full title: *Response au livre intitulé le Mystere d'iniquité du Sieur Du Plessis. Où l'on voit fidellement deducte l'histoire des souverains pontifes, des empereurs, et des roys chrestiens, depuis S. Pierre jusques à nostre siècle*. (Paris, 1614), REP 1602.
91. A. Rivet, *Remarques et considerations sur la Réponse de F. Nicolas Coeffeteau Moine de la Secte de Dominique, au livre de Messire Philippe de Mornay Seigneur du Plessis-Marly, intitulé le Mystère d'iniquité, c'est à dire l'Histoire de la Papauté ...* (Saumur, 1617), REP 2105.
92. This expression, coined by Urbain, p.193, reappears in most of the dictionary entries and references to Coeffeteau.

93. Summarised from Ubaldini's dispatches, dated 26 September 1613 (Urbain, p.195, n.1).
94. Title: *Response au manifeste publié par les perturbateurs du repos de l'Estat* (Paris, 1617), REP 1980–95; *Examen ou réfutation d'un livre de la toute-puissance et de la volonté de Dieu, publié par Pierre du Moulin, ministre à Charonton*, (Paris, 1617), REP 1978.
95. Coeffeteau was appointed bishop of Dardania *in partibus* and co-adjutor bishop of Metz in June 1617, then bishop of Marseilles in August 1621 but he died in 1623 without having taken up his post there.
96. See above, n.25.
97. Full title: *Œuvres de R. P. en Dieu F. Nic. Coeffeteau ... Contenant un Nouveau Traicté des Noms de l'Eucharistie, auquel est refuté tout ce que les Srs. du Plessis, Casaubon, et M. Pierre du Moulin Ministre de Charenton ont escrit sur ce sujet contre la doctrine de l'Eglise: Avec divers autres Traictez cy devant publiez par le mesme Authheur* (Paris, 1622), REP 2906.
98. Rivet, in his *Remarques et considerations*, commented that little of Coeffeteau's material was new: 'si ce qu'il a de Baronius, Bellarmin et Gretserus (je laisse les autres aides) luy estoit osté, ce grand escrit se trouveroit réduit à peu de feuilles et ceste grosse masse de corps descharnée et enervée, ne pourroit composer un miserable Skelete... il n'a pas eu besoin de grande Bibliotheque, et ... le principal de sa peine a esté employé, plus à abbreger et traduire les conceptions d'autrui, qu'à concevoir et enfanter les siennes' (preface, f.A.2.verso).
99. Coeffeteau's only recorded Latin composition was published posthumously in 1623: *Pro sacra monarchia Ecclesiae catholicae et Romanae, adversus rempublicam Marci Antonii de Dominis, libri quatuor apologetici* (Paris, 1623), REP 3080. Composed at Rome's request against Marc-Antoine de Dominis, the latter had retracted his heretical opinions before Coeffeteau had completed his work against him.
100. See, for example, X, 294 (June 1610).
101. Cited by Jehasse, p.116.

CHAPTER 6

Jesuit and 'méthodiste' controversialists

6.1 Pierre Coton (1564–1626)¹

Just as the Edict of Nantes in 1598 had significantly altered the course of life in the capital by allowing Protestants there to exercise certain civil and religious freedoms, so the Edict of Rouen registered some five years later (30 September 1603) reintroduced another ingredient to the religious life of the city when it revoked the expulsion order made against the Jesuits by the Paris Parlement in 1594. The man who played an important part in negotiating the Jesuits' return was P. Pierre Coton, only four years older than Pierre du Moulin, and destined to remain a powerful influence on French affairs for the next thirteen years as well as an active participant in religious debate. In his role as confessor to both Henri IV (1608–10) and Louis XIII (1610–17) Coton was involved in several important developments in French foreign policy as well as defending the interests of the Society of Jesus during a critical period. He was also the author of a number of devotional works popular during the seventeenth century and a long-standing friend and supporter of Bérulle.

Pierre Coton entered the Society of Jesus at the age of nineteen and over the next ten years studied at Milan, at Rome (where his spiritual director was Robert Bellarmine) and finally at Lyon. From 1598 onwards, he was engaged in a preaching campaign against Protestantism in the provinces of Dauphiné, Provence and Languedoc. The two main areas of debate on which Coton was to concentrate — scripture and the eucharist — are both evident in his polemical exchanges during these early years. In 1599 Coton preached a series of sermons at Grenoble in which he attacked the work of the Genevan Bible translators. This sermon series provided Coton with the idea for a larger project — eventually entitled *Genève plagiaire* — which he completed some eighteen years later.² The eucharist was the subject of Coton's first major published work, *Du très-saint et très-auguste sacrement et sacrifice de la Messe*, which appeared in 1600.³ This book in turn gave rise to

the most notable polemical encounter of these early years: Coton's conference at Nîmes with Daniel Chamier.⁴

Conference with Chamier (1600)

When Coton discovered that the Protestant pastor at Nîmes, Moynier, was working with Chamier on compiling a list of passages allegedly misused in Coton's book, the Jesuit author decided to travel to Nîmes and defend his work in person. Coton began by organising a series of open meetings there in which, with two assistants and using editions borrowed from the town's Protestant consistory, he set out to verify his use of historical evidence. He then wrote to the Protestant elders, asking that a conference be arranged so that he and Chamier might 'conférer charitablement deux fois la semaine sur les points de nos controverses, et voir, ... quelle est, sur iceux, la volonté de Dieu, par les Saintes-Ecritures, et quelle la créance des Saints Pères, à l'ouverture des livres'.⁵ A conference was agreed; Chamier travelled to Nîmes and the first session opened on 26 September 1600. Coton emphasised that the object in view — as in the Fontainebleau conference five months earlier — was the testing of academic integrity rather than of doctrine:

il s'agissait uniquement de prouver soit la fidélité, soit la fausseté des citations de son *Traité sur le sacrifice de la messe*, et, pour cela, de confronter d'une part les passages critiqués avec les textes originaux, de l'autre ces mêmes passages avec la version de Chamier. Tout se réduisait donc, sauf quelques brèves explications nécessaires, à une vérification pure et simple; quiconque savait lire et comprendre, pourrait juger.⁶

According to the Catholic account, the conference proceeded in a proper manner for the first two sessions and the strength of Coton's case was beginning to emerge. From the third session onwards however Chamier began to employ a strategy which deprived Coton of a reasonable opportunity to respond fully to the Protestant's arguments. In session three, Chamier, having asked to be allowed to 'exposer en quelques mots son opinion sur l'Eucharistie', spoke for three hours. In the small amount of time remaining Coton nevertheless managed to defend the doctrine of transsubstantiation 'avec tant de grâce, éloquence, doctrine, modestie, affluence de raisons, termes exquis' that, according to one Catholic observer, many Protestants began to be won over; they dubbed Coton 'l'enchanteur'.⁷ Over the

following four sessions Chamier pursued the same strategy until, at the end of session seven on 3 October, Coton's reply was deferred until the following day. When Coton arrived next morning he found the conference moderators in a meeting with the newly-arrived president of the *chambre de l'Édit* at Castres who decided that the conference should be broken off immediately.⁸

Coton's conference at Nîmes demonstrates why the Jesuits were soon to make such an impact on the Parisian scene. Coton and his colleagues were to arrive in the capital as seasoned campaigners in religious debate, with a proven ability to preach and evangelise effectively and the determination to seek out opportunities for debate (as Coton did in going to Nîmes). The account also reveals something of Coton's own particular qualities — his unusually courteous manner and carefully reasoned arguments — which were to make him a force to be reckoned with in Parisian religious and political affairs.

Conference with Gigord (1608)

Coton's reputation as a preacher and controversialist had already reached the French king when in 1603 Henri IV decided to take up the question of the Jesuits' return. He requested Coton's participation in the negotiations leading up to the Edict of Rouen and, as described in Chapter 1, Coton then remained at the royal court, partly as a guarantor of his colleagues' good conduct.⁹ In early 1604, Coton and his companion (*socius*) were the only Jesuits in Paris but they were soon joined by a small group which included P. Jean Gontéry from Bordeaux.¹⁰ The Lenten sermon series preached in March 1604 by Coton, Gontéry and 'le Cordelier portugais' (Suarez de Sainte-Marie, another of du Moulin's opponents in debate) attracted tremendous public interest, as L'Estoile recounts:

Il y en avoit trois à Paris, en ce karesme, qui avoient toute la presse de la ville, qu'on désignoit par les trois noms suivans: *le Docteur, l'Orateur, le Prédicateur*. Le Docteur estoit le Cordelier portugais qui preschoit à S.-Paul (qu'on trouvoit toutesfois estre douteur en plusieurs points); l'Orateur, le Père Cotton, qui preschoit devant le Roy, fort propre pour une Cour, estant doué de toutes les parties requises en un bon courtizan; le Prédicateur, le Père Gontier, jésuite, qui preschoit à S.-Jean, fort propre pour un peuple qui se repaist plus de belles paroles que d'autre chose. (VIII, 124–25)

6.1 Coton

Once established at Paris Coton pursued his preaching and polemic against the Protestants of the capital as he had previously campaigned against them in the provinces. Peter du Moulin reveals that his father had some contact with the Jesuit, certainly prior to the death of Catherine de Bourbon.¹¹ Du Moulin's *Trente-deux demandes du P. Coton* was published in reply to one of the prepared lists of objections to Protestant doctrine which Coton had circulated at court. Coton eventually took up the challenge of du Moulin's pamphlet and replied to the latter's reciprocal questions in a section appended to his *Institution catholique*.

Coton's verbal exchanges with du Moulin are less well-documented than those with another Protestant minister, Jean Gigord of Montpellier. The record of the informal conference between these two men — also examined in Chapter 3 — provides valuable insights into Coton's method and his favoured area of debate.¹² The meeting took place in the first half of 1608, the same year in which Coton succeeded René Benoist as the king's confessor. Gigord was already known to the Parisian Jesuits as the author of a book on the eucharist and a participant in debate.¹³ During his visit to the royal court, Gigord, by his own account, was manoeuvred against his will into an informal conference with Coton.

The following extracts from the Catholic version of the encounter show Coton challenging Gigord to prove the scriptural basis of Protestant eucharistic doctrine. As in so many debates of this period the issue of transsubstantiation was chosen as a particularly favourable one in which to demonstrate that Catholic doctrine was based literally on the Bible and Protestant doctrine on a deliberate evasion of biblical statements.

Coton began by challenging Gigord to provide a text from scripture proving that in the Lord's Supper 'on ne recevoit le corps de Jesus-Christ que par la seule foi'. Gigord cited a passage from John 6, which he rendered as 'Qui croit en moi n'aura point de faim et n'aura point de soif', whereupon the Jesuit then used syllogistic argumentation to draw his opponent into making a plainly illogical statement:

le Père ... lui demanda seulement s'il estimoit que croire au Fils de Dieu et faire la cène fût une même chose. Le sieur Gigord fut une demi-heure

avant que vouloir répondre à cette demande, divaguant incessamment; mais enfin, pressé d'interrogations, il répondit qu'oui. Et à l'encontre de cet *oui*, le Père lui fit ce syllogisme:

Croire au Fils de Dieu, selon vous, c'est faire la cène:

Or, maintenant vous croyez au Fils de Dieu;

Maintenant donc vous faites la cène.

M. Gigord roula longtemps cet argument sans y répondre: se mit sur l'exposition de la foi; voulut déclarer les fruits de la communion. Mais il fut ramené par demandes succinctes et serrées à ce dont il étoit question (2, 604)¹⁴

Coton went on to outline Catholic eucharistic doctrine and its foundation in scripture:

voyons s'il est vrai qu'après la parole du Fils de Dieu il demeure encore pain, ou s'il change non-seulement d'usage, mais encore de nature.

Ici le P. Coton rapporte les passages de saint Matthieu, de saint Marc, de saint Luc, de la première Epître aux Corinthiens, où est racontée l'institution du Sacrement de l'Eucharistie; puis s'adressant à son adversaire:

A l'encontre de ces textes si exprès, lui dit-il, si vous en avez un seul où il soit écrit que le pain est la figure du corps (encore que la pluralité doive prévaloir sur le petit nombre), nous nous joindrons à vous. (2, 605-6)

Gigord attempted instead to draw analogies with other titles or descriptions of Christ: 'Le ministre n'en trouva point, mais il rappela que Jésus-Christ porte dans l'Ecriture les titres de Pierre angulaire, de Porte, de Vigne, de Lion, d'Agneau, et d'autres qui ne peuvent avoir qu'un sens figuratif' (2, 606). Coton's reply combined the demand for a totally literal confirmation of Protestant doctrine with objections on a grammatical basis:

Il est vrai, dit le Père; mais avez-vous aucun passage où il soit dit de Jésus-Christ: *Ceci est une pierre*. — Ceci est une vigne. — Ceci est un lion. — Ceci est un agneau? Ou que, de la pierre, de la porte, de la vigne, d'un lion, d'un agneau, il y est dit: *Ceci est mon corps*?

Le ministre avouant que non, le Père lui fit reconnoître la différence qu'il

y a entre le pronom surnommé démonstratif et les autres; parce que le démonstratif ne s'emploie jamais que pour démontrer et faire bien entendre la réalité et propriété d'une chose; comme l'on peut bien dire du Roi qu'il est le soleil de sa Cour; mais non pas: Cecy est un soleil, parce que l'oreille n'entend jamais le mot de *cecy*, que l'on n'attende la réalité et la substance de la chose unie à ce pronom par la copule verbale. (2, 606)

Coton's description of the special qualities of the demonstrative pronoun, confidently expounded, would no doubt have impressed his listeners. After some time Gigord ventured another scripture passage, from 1 Corinthians, 'Le pain, que nous rompons, n'est-ce pas la communion du corps de Christ?', but Coton denied that there was any mention here 'de figure ou de tropologie' (2, 606-7). Gigord then repeated an earlier argument, 'que *hoc* vouloit dire le pain, et conséquemment que c'étoit à dire *signifie*:

Sur quoi le Père répondit que s'il étoit loisible d'ainsi gloser les paroles de Dieu, et leur donner un contre-sens, il ne tenoit à rien que l'on ne tombât en l'erreur des Manichéens qui donnoient un corps imaginaire au Fils de Dieu, et que *Verbum caro factum est* ne se puisse expliquer: Le Verbe est signifié par la chair; et en saint Matthieu (3) *Hic est Filius meus*, ne se puisse traduire: Celui-ci signifie mon Fils, ou est la figure de mon Fils. Bref, s'il est permis de renverser, ajouter ou diminuer à la parole de Dieu, que désormais on n'aurait que la parole des hommes, et l'on n'orroit que blasphemes. (2, 607)

Gigord's remaining arguments are answered by Coton with expositions of the difference between human and divine utterances — 'les nôtres sont significatives seulement, et celles de Dieu sont effectives' — and of 'la double présence du Fils de Dieu: l'ordinaire et l'extraordinaire, la visible et l'invisible' (2, 608-9). The Catholic observer's description of Gigord as 'plutôt ébloui de la splendeur de telles raisons que persuadé' suggests the effect of Coton's well-prepared attack (2, 608); the extent to which the Protestant account underlined Gigord's lack of inclination or preparation for this encounter seems an acknowledgement of the fact that public opinion had accorded victory to Coton.

Coton's performance in this encounter reveals why he was ready to endorse the syllogistic method of debate so wholeheartedly.¹⁵ The method which he put into effect was very different to that favoured by du Perron. It was, above all, an attack

on Protestant doctrine rather than a defence of Catholic doctrine, the arguments were drawn from scripture rather than from the writings of the church fathers, and the discussion proceeded using the syllogistic method of framing arguments (which du Perron had refused to use in the proposed encounter with Tilenus, du Moulin and others in 1600).¹⁶ Coton's obvious skill in wielding logical argument also provides a contrast with his colleague Gontéry whose participation in conventional syllogistic debate did not meet with the same success. As will be shown below, Gontéry's new method seems to have been developed to obviate the difficulties which he experienced in such disputes.

Coton in defence of the Society of Jesus (1610)

The assassination of Henri IV led to attacks on the Jesuits from many sources. P. Coton was the target of much of this polemic, as the nuncio Ubaldini described in a letter to Rome, dated 29 September 1610:

Les huguenots et tous leurs adhérents, qui persécutent les Pères Jésuites, ont dirigé leurs batteries surtout contre le P. Coton: ils s'efforcent par toutes sortes d'artifices de le faire sortir du service de Sa Majesté et de la Cour, puisqu'il est, à leurs yeux, la principale cause du crédit dont la Compagnie continue à y jouir; car, par sa douceur, sa prudence, sa discretion, son affabilité, il se concilie, ainsi qu'aux autres Pères, quand il peut le faire sans préjudice de la conscience, la bienveillance des princes et des ministres.¹⁷

Ubaldini even envisaged the possibility that the Jesuits' opponents might suggest P. Gontéry as a replacement for P. Coton:

car ils savent que cette charge ne serait pas longtemps remplie par un religieux, qui, dans l'ardeur de son zèle, fait souvent contre les hérétiques, particulièrement contre les huguenots, des sorties qui le leur rendent odieux. En sorte que, sous prétexte de prévenir tout danger de sédition, il leur sera facile d'obtenir aussi son renvoi. (3, 295)

An episode described by L'Estoile in April 1611, in which Gontéry was reprimanded by the *premier président* for preaching sedition against the Protestants, confirms Ubaldini's description of the contrasting characters of these two men:

Le Père Coton, excusant son compagnon (faisant le doucet et le mitouard comme de coustume), dit qu'à la vérité le Père Gontier s'estoit oublié; mais que ceux qui connoissaient l'humeur du personnage, comme lui, l'imputeroit plustost à un zèle et promptitude qui l'emportoit souvent et lui faisoit faire de telles escapades, que non pas à quelque malice ou mauvais dessein. (XI, 105)

As described in Chapter 1, Coton was to retain his position as royal confessor and become a member of the regent's closest circle of advisers. He defended the Jesuits against the charge of advocating regicide in a pamphlet entitled *Lettre declaratoire de la doctrine des Pères Jésuites*, published in the summer of 1610. This was followed some months later by a *Response apologetique à l'Anticoton*.¹⁸ The most interesting publication of this period, however, was his *Institution catholique*, which had been commissioned by Henri IV several years earlier and completed in 1607.¹⁹

Coton's *Institution catholique* (1610)

The *Institution catholique*, like a number of other works of this period, attempted to deal with the full range of controversial issues between Catholics and Protestants. The most remarkable feature of this work, however, was the author's attempt, after an examination of the evidence on each question, to suggest a 'voie d'accord' between the two faiths:

Quant aux preuves, elles sont prises de l'Ecriture alléguée souvent selon la version de Geneve, pour avoir plus de force avec les desvoyez; des Peres tant Grecs que Latins citez separément et selon le temps auquel ils ont vescu; de nos propres adversaires, et finalement de la raison, apres lesquelles, je monstre en quoy et comment on se peut accorder; prenant ce que je leur relasche des saints Conciles, des Decrets et de la pratique de l'Eglise, et ce que j'attends d'eux le tirant de leurs propres Docteurs: le tout affin que chacun puisse veoir a l'œil et sans fard la naïfve et pure vérité de la foy catholique. (f.b.iii recto)

Coton's treatment of the issue of purgatory provides a good example of his method.²⁰ He opens with an acknowledgement of the Protestants' chief objection to the concept of purgatory:

Le Purgatoire fait peur à ceux qui cudent que ce mot repugne à l'expiation et purgation faicte par le sang tres-precieux de l'Agneau sans macule; ne

s'appercevans pas que si le purgatoire y repugne, aussi fait le Baptesme, puis que baptiser et purger signifient nettoyer, l'un par feu, l'autre par eau; elemens en cecy dissemblablement semblables. (2, 1362)

After examining the significance of purgatory in a more general and less contentious sense — 'tout ce qui sert de purification, et d'expiation à nos pechez' — Coton turns to purgatory as it was normally understood. His definition artfully incorporates the standard Catholic interpretation of Christ's words of warning (in Luke 12. 58–59), thus implying that Jesus had made an explicit reference to purgatory:

Icy par le mot de Purgatoire nous entendons un lieu sous-terrain par dessus l'Enfer des damnez, où les ames qui sont souillées de peché veniel, ou qui n'ont satisfait à la divine justice en ce monde, sont purgees par le feu temporel, *miris sed veris modis* comme dit S. Augustin. Nostre Sauveur l'appelle en saint Luc douziesme, prison ou conciergerie, quand il nous admoneste d'estre d'accord tandis que nous sommes au chemin de ceste vie, de peur d'estre citez en jugement, et condamnez de tenir prison jusques à la totale liquidation de nos debtes, voire jusques à la derniere pite. (2, 1363)

Coton then goes on to argue the necessity of the existence of purgatory from the belief, shared by Catholics and Protestants, that sin attracts God's judgement: 'Il n'y a Pasteur ny Ministre qui ne dye souvent au peuple qu'à cause des pechez qui regnent en Chrestienté, Dieu afflige son Eglise; ne s'appervant pas qu'ils recognoissent par là un Purgatoire sur terre et le mescognoissent souz terre' (2, 1365). He offers numerous examples from daily life of misfortunes occasioned by human sinfulness, supplements these with examples from the Old Testament and concludes:

Ce que presupposé, s'il arrive que l'homme receu en grace vienne à mourir devant que d'avoir satisfait à son Dieu, disons avec l'Ecriture, l'Eglise Catholique et les Peres, qu'il y a un endroict où les satisfactions de JESUS-CHRIST luy sont appliquees, d'autant qu'il est en grace ... il faut necessairement le rapporter au Purgatoire. (2, 1367)

Coton then examines three important passages of scripture frequently cited by the church fathers: 1 Corinthians 3.13 and 15.29, and 2 Maccabees 12.43. In the latter case he argues the canonicity of this text but is also prepared to assert its relevance simply as an authentic historical text which confirms the practice of

praying for the dead, 'du moins veritables à l'esgal d'Herodote, Plutarque et Tite Live' (2, 1370). He then turns to evidence from the writings of the Church Fathers, citing Theodoretus, John Damascene, Gregory of Nazianzus, Jerome, Tertullian, Cyprian, Ambrose and Augustine (2, 1371–73). His conclusion is presented in two parts: the first is based on Calvin's recognition of the evidence of prayer for the dead in the early church and of the authority of such evidence; the second on a logical deduction made from another statement by Calvin regarding the persistent effect of sin:

Qui dira desormais que nous soyons irreconciliables en ce point? Qui nyera la priere pour les morts? Qui osera dementir l'antiquité et toute l'estendue des siecles? Qui refusera une doctrine qui selon Calvin mesme a esté en usage en l'Eglise Chrestienne il y a plus de treize cens ans? Et si ce qu'il enseigne au livre quatriesme de ses Institutions, chapitre second paragraphe troisesme, est veritable, qu'aucun changement de doctrine ne s'estoit faict en l'Eglise depuis les Apostres jusques au temps de saint Augustin qui vivoit quatre cens ans apres nostre Seigneur ne s'ensuit il donc pas que la priere des morts est une partie de la doctrine des Apostres? doctrine que personne ne peut rejeter sans temerité, et sans tomber au crime d'heresie.

On le peut confirmer d'abondant par la doctrine du mesme; Car au quatriesme de son Institution, il escrit que la tache du peché demeure en l'homme tout le temps de sa vie; D'où l'on infere de cinq choses l'une, ou qu'il y a un lieu de Purgatoire apres ce mortel sejour, ou que tous les hommes se perdent, ou que la tache du peché les suit entrant en gloire; ou qu'elle est effacee par la mort de l'homme, comme par cause efficiente de remission; ou que le peché est remis à l'instant du decez par une extraordinaire application des merites du fils de Dieu. Cette derniere proposition n'a aucune preuve en l'Ecriture ny en la raison; ains si elle estoit veritable tous seroient sauvez, ce qui est diametralement contre l'Ecriture; la penultiesme est blasphematoire, à sçavoir que l'homme soit sauvé par sa propre mort: et si ainsi estoit, pas un ne se perdrait: la troisesme, que la tache du peché entre en gloire, est contre l'expresse parole de Dieu: la seconde pareillement à sçavoir que tous sont damnez: Reste donc la premiere. A laquelle chacun se rangera d'autant plus volontiers, si nous prenons garde que l'Eglise n'oblige personne et ne commande à personne de prier pour les morts, se contentant de nous inviter à ce faire, à tiltre de pieté et charité Chrestienne. (2, 1373–74)

Coton's approach to this issue is rather more sophisticated than that used by Cayet and Suarez. He makes no claim to base his arguments solely on scripture (as du

Moulin's two opponents had in 1603) and in fact he uses only a few major biblical passages in his argument. It is the apparent objectivity of his tone and method, as he draws inferences from Calvin's own writings or presents alternatives to the Catholic solution and then eliminates these by a process of logical deduction, which is so persuasive.

The 'advertissement aux catholiques' reveals that Coton was anxious to reassure fellow Catholics of the soundness of his method: 'si je parle d'accord, n'estimez pourtant que je veuille mettre en compromis la foy de l'Eglise, ou que je relasche en rien de sa pure doctrine, qui est, a esté, et sera tousjours la mesme' (f.b.ii verso). To forestall any objections from the Faculty of Theology concerning the unusually conciliatory approach adopted in this book, Coton decided to seek Rome's approval; this, however, led to a two-year delay in the book's publication. Prat's summary of the correspondence between Paris and Rome concerning Coton's book reveals the king's eagerness to see the book published, the hostility of the Faculty of Theology's representatives on the examining panel in Rome, and the enthusiasm of Robert Bellarmine for Coton's work.²¹ By the time the *Institution catholique* received its *approbation* on 19 June 1610, the moment for conciliation seemed to have passed. The dedicatory prefaces to Henri IV and the regent and those addressed to Catholic and Protestant readers all contain explicit or veiled references to the necessity of restoring religious unity by the elimination of the French Reformed Church.

Genève plagiaire (1618)

These three works published in 1610 were Coton's only works of religious controversy until the end of the regency period. Once again the career of a major Parisian controversialist reflects the general trend towards a reduction in religious polemic during these years. He was, as noted in Chapter 1, closely involved in France's political affairs during this time; he continued to be active in advancing the interests of the Society of Jesus (most notably with regard to their collège de Clermont); and he also published several devotional works.²² In 1617, following the teenage king's *coup d'état*, Coton was replaced by Arnoux as royal confessor.²³ His next important contribution to religious debate was published the following year: *Genève plagiaire, ou vérification des dépravations de la parole de Dieu qui se trouvent es Bibles de Genève*. This was the work for which his sermons at Grenoble in 1599 had provided the original idea. In his dedicatory epistle to Louis XIII, dated 'A Paris, sur mon départ, le 18 juillet 1617', Coton outlined his method and traced the development of his project in parallel with that of the young king to whom he had been spiritual director and then confessor for over a decade:

L'Hérésie, poison des âmes et, gangrène des Etats, ne s'est glissée parmi vos peuples, Sire, et n'y a causé le mal intestin que la France ressent dans ses entrailles, que sous apparence de la parole de Dieu. Avec ce prétexte, elle rejette impunément les Conciles, ne tient compte des Saints-Pères, mesprise les Traditions, et fait une telle illusion, qu'elle ose se vanter de posséder l'empire de vérité. Insolence que l'on ne peut mieux réprimer, mal que l'on ne sçaurait ny plus promptement ny plus efficacement desraciner, qu'en faisant voir au monde, qu'au lieu de la parole de Dieu, dont elle fait parade, elle nous substitue celle des hommes, et celle mesme de l'ennemy des hommes.

Cette méthode, Sire, donne droit au cœur de l'hérésie, la bat en ruyne, et la sape en ses propres fondemens. Je me la suis proposée, il y a dix-huit ans, et m'y suis employé avec la diligence et fidélité qu'un chacun pourra reconnoistre par la lecture de ce livre. Il estoit en sa naissance quand il pleut à la Divine Bonté de vous donner à la France, depuis, il a pris son accroissement auprès de vostre sacrée et très-auguste personne, et maintenant, qui est la seizième de vostre âge, il est en quelque maturité. ('Au Roy')

The book itself was a folio volume of well over a thousand pages. It was

divided into ten parts covering 'tous les sujets controversés entre catholiques et protestants'; one hundred and eighty biblical passages were examined. In each case, Coton dealt with the text under five headings: section one contained the passage as rendered in the Vulgate and the versions of Louvain and Geneva; section two identified the 'dépravation' perpetrated by the Genevan translators; sections three and four examined the evidence to support the Catholic interpretation and the motive behind the Protestants' 'dépravation'; finally, section five, drew together testimonies drawn from scripture, from the church fathers (cited in their original languages and in translation), and from reason in favour of Catholic doctrine.

The Protestant theologian, V. Baroni, includes a detailed analysis of Coton's method and of his objections to the Genevan translation in his article on Catholic controversialists of the seventeenth century.²⁴ He concludes that in the majority of cases Coton's criticisms were ill-founded, superficial or doctrinally-motivated but he does concede that in 'une dizaine de passages' the translators themselves appear to have been influenced by 'préoccupations confessionnelles'. Coton's *Genève plagiaire* provoked a number of Protestant replies.²⁵ The most important challenge to Coton's book was mounted by Benedict Turretin in a work entitled: *Défense de la fidélité des traductions*.²⁶ To this Coton replied in 1619 with a further huge volume of 900 pages: *Recheute de Genève plagiaire*.²⁷ This work, as the full title reveals, was presented in the form of a dialogue — between d'Eraniste (a Genevan Protestant) and d'Ortodoxe (a French Catholic). Turretin responded once more with a *Recheute du jésuite plagiaire* which appeared the following year. Finally, in 1626, Coton's opponent completed his earlier partial refutation of *Genève plagiaire* with the publication of a quarto volume of almost one thousand pages: *Suite de la fidélité des traductions*.²⁸

It seems clear that the polemical impact of Coton's *Genève plagiaire* derived in large part from its sheer size and forbidding appearance, with eleven hundred closely-printed folio pages, citing texts in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin. The Parisian controversialist, Halier, made precisely this point in a pamphlet of 1619 when he described the 'Geneve Plagiaire du R. Pere Coton, grande lumiere de nostre siecle', as 'monstrant tant de passages corrompus dedans leurs [the Protestants'] Bibles et principaux poincts de la Foy, que pour les recueillir et mettre en évidence il en a fallu en gros volume'.²⁹ Coton himself ingenuously made a similar point when

he made the Catholic speaker in his *Recheute de Genève plagiaire* comment of Turretin's book that 'ce qui m'a déplu d'abord est que cette réponse apologétique est un assez petit *in quarto*; là où Genève plagiaire est un gros volume *in folio*'.³⁰

This tendency towards longer and more heavily-documented works in the latter part of Coton's career provides one of several points of similarity with his long-standing adversary, du Moulin. During their respective careers at Paris, the two men had also shown the same commitment to the syllogistic method in conferences and to adapting scholarly arguments to the demands of a popular readership and in response to a volatile political situation. In the case of Coton's *Genève plagiaire*, however, the book's size and consequent high cost may well have proved counter-productive; very few copies of this colossal work (or of the subsequent volumes in the exchange) survive in French libraries.³¹

P. Coton occupies an important place in Parisian religious polemic in the early seventeenth century. His two major works, the *Institution catholique* and *Genève plagiaire*, are both notable departures from the accepted methods and arguments of religious debate. In both works he employed the standard scholarly method, combining biblical, historical and rational arguments, but in his *Institution catholique* this was directed towards an unconventional purpose, that of conciliating rather than merely refuting Protestant opponents. This work continued to be regarded as a model of the conciliatory approach until Jean-Pierre Le Camus published *L'Avoisinement des Protestans vers l'Eglise Romaine* in 1640, with the intention of providing a more compact and readable work conceived in the same spirit as the *Institution catholique*.³² Coton's *Genève plagiaire* recalls Cayet's earlier attempts to capitalise on his knowledge of biblical languages in order to discredit the Protestants' translation but it is far more comprehensive. Finally, Coton's dispute with Gigord reveals his ability as a conference participant, particularly his skilful use of syllogistic logic. His method in this encounter was, as noted above, in marked contrast to that of du Perron; it was, on the other hand, very similar to that which his colleague Gontéry attempted to enforce in his early encounters with provincial Protestants and with du Moulin. While Coton was to transfer his attention to debate on a more scholarly level, Gontéry concentrated on perfecting his conference

method as an approach capable of being used even by lay members of the Catholic church to silence Protestant opponents.

6.2 Jean Gontéry (1562–1617)³³

Born at Turin, Gontéry came to Paris to study at the Jesuits' collège de Clermont; he eventually gained a doctorate in theology and joined the Society of Jesus in 1584. During the 1590s Gontéry was mainly concerned with the Jesuits' educational work: he was the first rector of their college at Agen from 1591, established a new college at Béziers in 1595 and then transferred to Bordeaux. It was from this city that he came to Paris in 1604 following the registration of the Edict of Rouen.

With his first Lenten sermon series at the church of S. Jean in March of that year Gontéry immediately established his reputation as a preacher. Preaching against heresy seems always to have been his main concern. In Paris, Gontéry's sermons on this subject frequently led to complaints that he was inciting Catholic citizens to acts of sedition against local Protestants.³⁴ His activities as a preacher and controversialist were not, however, confined to Paris. During the years 1606–16, he travelled to many parts of France, preaching in cathedrals and city churches, meeting with Protestants wavering in their commitment to the French Reformed Church and challenging local ministers to conferences on their behalf. It was in the course of these endeavours that he gradually evolved a new approach to verbal disputes which was then taken up and promoted (from 1615 onwards) by the younger Jesuit, François Véron. Gontéry's role as the inventor of the method used by Véron is generally recognised in accounts of the development of religious debate in the early seventeenth century — Véron himself always took care to acknowledge his debt to Gontéry — but the development of this method as it emerges from Gontéry's own publications has not been the subject of any previous detailed study.³⁵

La vraye procedure pour terminer le different en matiere de Religion (1606)

The earliest work describing a conference in which Gontéry had taken part belongs to 1599 and is in fact a Protestant account of a debate between Gontéry and Jean Gigord.³⁶ It was not until 1606 that a Catholic account of his arguments was published. *La vraye procedure pour terminer le different en matiere de Religion* was supposedly edited by a certain Saint-Julian but it seems far more likely that the work is in fact by Gontéry.³⁷

In his 'Advis pour Messieurs les Religionnaires' Gontéry addressed the Protestants directly; many of his favourite arguments are featured here in much the same form in which they appeared seven years later in his most important work, *La pierre de touche*:

Il n'y qu'un mot. Ou vostre religion est toute fondee sur la Sainte Escriture, ou sur quelque autre chose. On vous abbreuve avec le laict de cette opinion, qu'elle estoit toute bastie sur l'expresse parole de Dieu escrite, que c'est la pierre de touche, qu'il ne faut rien recevoir qui ne soit là. Vuidez nettement ce point icy, car s'il est bien vuide, vous serez comme des rochers en vostre creance. Il n'y a rien si commun chez vous que le mot de sacrement, de cene, de trinité, rien de tout cela en la signification que vous le prenez n'est en la Sainte Escriture. On vous dira que par consequences necessaires on tire ces mots là de la creance qui y est. Vous n'estes donc plus sur ceste simplicité et pureté de parole de Dieu. Car puis qu'il faut un grandissime art à tirer des consequences necessaires et pour les reconnoistre, vous voyla hors de l'Escriture. Dailleurs voicy des mots Expres, *Cecy est mon corps. Et je vous donneray ma chair à manger.* Ce sont paroles expresses de l'Escriture. On vous presche qu'il ne les faut prendre comme elles sont, et comme elles sonnent, par ce que la lettre tue, mais l'Esprit vivifie, dit S. Paul, il faut doncques vous mettre en queste de cet esprit vivifiant et fuir à toute bride cette lettre meurtrière. On vous met en avant Christ est la Pierre, la vigne, par lesquels textes vous estes forcez d'abandonner l'Escriture, et de chercher quelque'un qui la vous interprete, qui est un homme fautif: ou en estes vous doncques?

Through a brisk series of arguments and counter-arguments, Gontéry thus opens with four main points against the Protestant claim to be based solely on 'l'expresse parole de Dieu escrite': (i) that the very vocabulary of the Protestants' confession of faith includes words that do not appear in scripture; (ii) that 'conséquences nécessaires' are not admissible because they interpret, and therefore add to, scripture

and are subject to human error; (iii) that, in the crucial matter of the eucharist, the Protestants exploit the distinction between the spirit and the letter of the law to justify their denial of a clear scriptural statement; (iv) that the obscurity of scripture again demands interpretation and thus the intervention of 'un homme fautif'. Gontéry pursues the idea of the obscurity of scripture through an examination of a passage from Luke 24 as interpreted by Augustine. The passage describes how the apostles, confronted by the risen Christ, 'ne vouloyent point croire qu'il fust resuscité'. From this, Gontéry concludes that

on ne puisse debatre des mysteres cachez de la Religion, qui sont si esloignez du sens et du jugement, non seulement des hommes brutaux mais mesme des plus desliez. Sçachez Messieurs, que la creance est une pure force que l'homme fait à son propre jugement, le forçant de prester consentement à choses qui surpassent toute nostre capacité: et ce pour le respect et la reverence que nous portons à ceux que Dieu nous a envoyez de sa part pour nous declarer ses volonte.

Thus Gontéry, like Coeffeteau, emphasises that in religious matters reason must be subordinate to the testimonies of authority. The idea that man is not capable of forming careful and objective judgements because his choice is always influenced by 'volonté' or 'nos apetits et nos gousts' appears again in the first chapter of *La vraye procedure* and in the 'Advis au Lecteur' of *La pierre de touche* in terms strongly reminiscent of Montaigne. It is by means of this idea that Gontéry introduces the notion of the need for some judge who can pronounce a definitive judgement, and this in turn leads to a consideration of possible alternatives. In *La vraye procedure* Gontéry presents his exposition as an objective quest for the arbitrator of all controversial religious questions: 'la vraye procedure pour terminer ce different [between Protestants and Catholics] est de recourir à quelque juge qui prononçant selon les loix divines, nous mette hors de cour, et de contestation par un arrest definitif'. The Protestants regard scripture itself as the 'juge des controverses'; Gontéry attempts to prove that the Bible, by its very nature, is not suitable for such a role, and also that the way the Protestants interpret the Bible shows that they do not and cannot adhere to their belief that the Bible is the 'reigle de toute verité'. In opposition to the Protestants' view of scripture as the judge of religious truth, Gontéry sets out to establish the Catholic Church as the only possible judge.

Towards the end of his book, the four stages of his argument are summarised by Gontéry as follows:

L'une que l'Ecriture Sainte nous a bien esté laissé pour loy, et pour le registre des ordonnances de nostre Dieu, mais non pour juge, puis qu'elle a esté écrite par les enfans de l'Eglise, est interpretée par ses Docteurs, est approuvée par ses legitimes pasteurs et publiée par l'auctorité de la mesme Eglise. Secondement, que Jesus Christ nous a donné l'Eglise, son Espouse pour juge, voulant que ses pasteurs legitimentement assemblez par l'auctorité souveraine decident les doutes et les controverses en matiere de la foy, ayant pouvoir de ruiner ou bienheurer ceux qui seront obeissants à Dieu. Voulant le mesme Dieu que les refractaires et desobeissants de ceste mesme Eglise ne soyent tenus en autre reputation que de payens et publicains; Et partant forclos du Royaume du Ciel.

Troisiesmement, nous avons monstéré que cette Eglise est la Thresoriere de verité et la colonne et vray appuy. Qu'elle n'est qu'une, qu'elle persistera tousjours visible et triomphante contre les efforts de Sathan jusques à la fin du monde. Finalement, que ceste Eglise est la Romaine fondée sur S. Pierre prince des Apostres, qui a reçu de Dieu en vicariat perpetuel pour soy et ses legitimes successeurs, l'ample pouvoir et le libre usage des clefs du Royaume du Ciel, comme vray pasteur de nos ames, et administrateur de la maison de Jesus Christ. D'ou il s'ensuit, que les Arrests des Conciles generaux qui ont esté tenu sont les prejuges, les Saints Peres sont les Tabellions et les tesmoins de la fidelité et creance de leur siecle, les Saintes Lettres sont les tables de la loy sacrée et les registres des ordonnances du Ciel. La seule Eglise Catholique, Apostolique et Romaine deüement assemblee par son chef qui est le legitime successeur de S. Pierre, en un Concile general est le vray Juge de toutes les controverses, qui peut tout declarer et expliquer en choses essentielles, laissant les menues decisions, aux Conciles provinciaux et aux Evesques et autres Prelats des lieux pour administrer la doctrine et la police. (pp.319–20)

The result of Gontéry's quest is thus a complete vindication of the Catholic Church's role as 'juge des controverses'.

La vraye procedure provides an exposition of the 'juge des controverses' question in Gontéry's own terms and thus the basis on which his new method was constructed. Many individual arguments used here reappear in his later works but the most important feature of all, seen particularly in Part 1, is the frequent demand for biblical statements which match Protestant doctrinal formulations word for word. This was to be the most distinctive feature of the new method.

Gontéry asserted that the Protestants, in making scripture their touchstone, were obliged to produce quotations from scripture corresponding in every detail to doctrinal statements. Failure to comply with this interpretation of their claim to be scripturally-based was proof, according to Gontéry, that the Protestants 'ne veulent aucun juge que leur bon plaisir' (p.12). As a corollary of this demand, Gontéry refused to allow the Protestants to make use of 'conséquences' — that is, to interpret the words of scripture in any way, whether to clarify obscure passages or to apply general statements to particular situations — arguing that because the Protestants denied the authority of the Catholic Church, any interpretation they might make was a purely individual one, without the authority of tradition which endorsed the interpretations of scripture accepted by the Catholic Church. (For it is important to note that Gontéry did not hesitate to make use of 'conséquences' in the second and third parts of his book when establishing the claims of the pope and of the Catholic Church.) In *La vraie procedure*, however, Gontéry was not proposing a method of engaging in debate to his readers. The arguments relevant to his conference method form only a small part of the 'vraye procedure' employed in this work, which is as much concerned with establishing the conformity between Catholic doctrine and scripture as with demonstrating the lack of consistency between the Protestants' theology and their touchstone. It is also interesting to note that at this point Gontéry had not fixed upon the forty articles of the French Reformed Churches' confession of faith as the target for his method. The interest of *La vraie procedure* lies in the fact that it demonstrates the origins of Gontéry's method by setting these arguments in the context of a conventional account of Catholic doctrine concerning scripture and the Church.

Conference with Basnage (1606)

Towards the end of his year-long stay at Caen, however, Gontéry initiated a conference which, as he later claimed, was the first occasion on which he had employed his method.³⁸ In the first informal discussion (into which his opponent, Benjamin Basnage, was unwittingly drawn) Gontéry demanded 'à sa façon accoustumée'

qu'il eust à luy monstrier par l'écriture, que l'écriture doive juger des differens qui se meuvent au fait de la Religion; ... qu'il monstrast en l'Escripture ces mots de *Consequence, de Moyen, de Reigle, d'Analogie de la Foy*, qu'il luy prouvast que *Basnage [ainsi] que la Fresnée, ont vocation légitime* (*Simple et veritable discours*, p.8)

Virtually the same issues were chosen by Gontéry, on behalf of his potential convert, for the formal conference which followed shortly afterwards:

1. *Si le texte de l'écriture sainte est le juge des controverses en matiere de Religion.*
2. *Si les ministres ont vocation legitime.*
3. *Si l'Eglise Catholique Romaine est le vray juge en matiere de Religion.*
(p.12)

Despite the fact that the use of 'conséquences' had been agreed in the conditions governing the dispute, once the debate was under way, Gontéry refused to co-operate with accepted conference procedure. The conventional method of proceeding required Gontéry to offer an objection or distinction in reply to the ministers' first syllogism regarding scripture's authority in controversial matters; instead,

Le Jesuite ... au lieu de respondre à la matiere de cet argument, duquel il ne pouvoit plus contester la forme, soit en niant, soit en distinguant l'une des propositions; se fait apporter un nouveau Testament, Grec et Siriaque, l'ayant ouvert, le presenta aux Ministres avec ceste demande: Qu'ils eussent à luy produire un texte formel, qui dist que l'Ecriture sainte doive estre le Juge des controverses: C'est a dire, qui contint en autant de mots leur assertion. (p.16)

The two ministers protested that Gontéry's demand was 'contre les regles de la

vraye dispute' but their opponent refused to continue the discussion until they had conceded that their proposition was not to be found 'en termes expres en l'écriture sainte' (p.19). The ministers eventually dictated the following statement:

(L'Escriture sainte est le Juge souverain des controverses, en matiere de Religion) ne se trouve point en autant de mots, ni autant de sillabes en l'écriture, mais que quant à la substance, elle y est en tesmoignages si manifestes, en textes si formels et en consequences si necessaires, qu'il sera contraint lui mesme de le recognoistre, quand on luy aura mis le doigt sur la lettre. (p.20)

But Gontéry still refused to accept this statement, demanding that the ministers, before being allowed to produce their 'conséquences', should state that they had no express biblical evidence to support their statement regarding the sovereignty of scripture. The Protestants refused to concede this point and Gontéry effectively took no further part in the debate. The ministers went on to provide the lady for whom the conference had been organised with a long exposition of Protestant doctrine regarding the testimonies of scripture and tradition; Gontéry relapsed into silence. According to the author of the Protestant account,

on s'estonna fort de ce profond silence, dans lequel il s'estoit retenu tout le temps qu'on avait parlé à sa proselite: ceux-là nottamment en furent extremement esbahis, qui se ressouvenoient d'avoir eu autresfois les oreilles tant battues de son verbiage, que ils ne pensoient point qu'il fut possible d'arrester ce flux de langue, de l'espuiser de paroles ... (p.26)

This conference provides the earliest evidence of Gontéry attempting to enforce the key feature of his new method, the demand that his Protestant opponents produce scriptural texts explicitly confirming their statements of belief. In the pamphlet relating the outcome of this conference which Gontéry published shortly afterwards the author confined his account to his success in extracting an admission from his opponents that they could not corroborate their statement with the strictly literal evidence which he had demanded. In reply however, the Protestant version emphasised the way in which Gontéry had thwarted their efforts to engage in intelligent debate and had finally made an undignified withdrawal from the discussions. (Du Moulin's description of his encounter with Gontéry in 1609 highlights this difficulty once again.)

Gontéry in Paris and Dieppe (1608–9)

The pattern of Gontéry's activity throughout the years 1606–14 was to remain virtually unchanged and consisted of prolonged preaching campaigns in major towns accompanied by attempts to engage local Protestant clergy in verbal disputes. In the spring of 1607 Gontéry was to be found at Paris and involved in skirmishes with Pierre du Moulin. As noted in Chapter 4, he seems to have taken part in a debate with the Charenton pastor which provided the inspiration for the latter's *Apologie pour la sainte Cène* and later addressed two 'corrections fraternelles' to du Moulin in reply to his *Trente-deux demandes*.³⁹ In 1608 Gontéry visited Dieppe. According to Fouqueray, his presence there provoked fierce opposition from the Protestants: services were disrupted and there was civil unrest in the streets.⁴⁰ A rumour even reached Paris that the Protestants had attempted to poison the Jesuit preacher.⁴¹ It may well have been in response to these rumours that Henri IV decided to write to Gontéry, expressing support for his endeavours and authorising him to remain there.⁴²

In the spring of 1609 Gontéry was once more in Paris, allegedly preaching sedition in his Lenten sermon series and, once again, engaging in a verbal dispute with du Moulin.⁴³ The outcome of this informal conference has been described in Chapter 4. In many respects, this encounter resembled that with Basnage at Caen in 1606. In both cases the Protestant version of events describes how the minister concerned had been brought to the conference location by a process of entrapment, with Gontéry arriving shortly afterwards, laden with books. In both cases the Protestants claimed that the supposed beneficiary of the conference had already been won over to the Catholic church in informal discussions with Gontéry. The two accounts also observe the same features of Gontéry's method in the ensuing discussion: his attempt to enforce the demand that his Protestant opponents produce explicit texts from scripture in support of their contentions, followed by a virtual withdrawal from the debate. Gontéry, in a letter to Henri IV which was published soon after du Moulin's version of events, restricted his comments to a single episode in his debate with the minister, claiming that he had forced du Moulin to renounce scripture when the latter suggested that the Vulgate's rendition of Matthew 26.28 conveyed the sense of the original more successfully than that of the Genevan translation.⁴⁴

A few months later Gontéry had returned to Dieppe and Henri IV wrote once again in support of his activities. His letter, addressed to the town's governor, gave permission for a projected conference to take place: 'je trouve bon que vous faciez faire en vostre presence une conference à Dieppe entre le Pere Gontier et les Ministres dudit lieu, où il y ait jusques à vingt ou trente personnes, mais que ce soit sans esmotion d'une part ou d'autre'. This letter, dated 18 August 1609, is reproduced in Gontéry's account of his unsuccessful negotiations for a conference with the ministers of Dieppe. *Les Consequences ausquelles a esté reduite la religion pretendue Reformée*, published in the autumn of 1609, was a dossier-style pamphlet, presenting the documents relative to the discussions which took place.⁴⁵ Gontéry and his opponents reached a deadlock when the ministers insisted that 'Dieu parlant aux Escritures, ou en termes expres, ou par consequences necessaires, sera le souverain juge des debats de la foy', a condition which, according to Gontéry, 'equivalloit un refus'. Disagreement centred on the crucial phrase 'par consequences necessaires', hence the title of Gontéry's book. The Catholic polemicist denounced the Protestants' insistence on the inclusion of this phrase as an abnegation of their claim to base their doctrine on scripture while the ministers themselves maintained that 'conséquences' were a legitimate means of drawing out the meaning of scripture. Their determination to secure this point suggests that the ministers were aware of Gontéry's method and knew how he would proceed once the conference had begun.

Gontéry himself seems to have regarded his debate at Dieppe as a good example of the effectiveness of his chosen line of argument and often referred back to it in later works when explaining his method and its applications. The 'advertisement' to Catholic readers also provides an interesting account of his search for an effective method of engaging in religious debate. He describes his researches into the methods of the church fathers and refers in passing to works by Theodoretus and Vincent de Lérins, to the 'traditive' method — that is, based on 'l'argument de tradition' or historical argument — used by, among others, Irenaeus and Basil the Great, and to those relying on 'la seule Sainte Escriture, comme souvent S. Augustin, disputant contre les Donatistes'. He concludes with those who had employed the prescriptive argument: 'Plusieurs et les mieux advisez se sont servis du droit des prescriptions, combatant l'Ennemy à la frontiere, comme fait Tertulien en ce beau livre des prescriptions' (f.e.i recto).⁴⁶ Later users of Gontéry's method

were to employ the prescriptive argument as a justification for refusing to engage in any discussion of Catholic doctrine and its basis in scripture. Gontéry, however, does not comment further on Tertullian's approach but instead describes how he discovered 'à force de prieres, d'estude, et de consultations de plus sçavans que moy' the fundamental deception upon which the Reformers had based their attack on the church of Rome:

l'admirable et dommageable imposture de Sathan, qui a persuadé un million d'ames, que la sainte Bible favorisait nos prétendus Reformateurs, qui l'ont mutilée et traduite à leur poste, l'ont glosée à leur mode, l'ont frangée de citations, lesquelles sous couleur d'adresse donne le change au Lecteur. Et ayant mis l'Ecriture és mains des artisans et des filandieres, leur ont fait croire, que la seule ouverture de ces livres sacrez declaroit les abus de l'Eglise Romaine, qui n'estoit remparée que d'inventions et traditions humaines à leur dire. (f.e.ii.recto-verso)

Gontéry then recounts how he put his discovery to the test:

j'ay veu les Ministres de plusieurs provinces de ce Royaume, je suis entré en conference privée avec eux, sous le compromis de ne prendre pour arbitre que la seule Bible, suivant l'article 5. de leur confession de foy. En toutes ces rencontres, je leur ay fait renoncer l'Ecriture, mesme de leur propre version, et les ay forcez d'en appeller aux interpretations de leur teste, et aux 'conséquences' tirées à leur façon, ce qui fust clairement reconnu en la basse Normandie, il y a trois ans, mais il s'est maintenant rendu notoire à Dieppe, en ceste conference que sa Majesté avoit permis en faveur de Monsieur de S. Cere; en laquelle les Ministres ont reduit en effet toutes leurs deffenses aux seules 'Consequences'. (f.e.ii.verso-e.iii.recto)

This passage shows that Gontéry was beginning to present his method as a new approach to religious debate and that he regarded the outcome of the negotiations at Dieppe as a fine example of its effectiveness, despite the fact that no conference had resulted from the discussions. Gontéry's alleged success in this encounter had depended entirely on the fact that M. de Saint Cere had accepted his contention that 'conséquences' — logical deductions from scripture — were inadmissible. If this type of argument *had* been accepted, as at Caen, then Gontéry would presumably have been obliged to take up this issue in the conference itself and disrupt established procedures as he had done in 1606.

A few months after this episode at Dieppe, Gontéry completed a work dealing with the issues raised in his conference with du Moulin and entitled *Declaration de l'erreur de nostre temps, et du moyen qu'il a tenu pour s'insinuer*.⁴⁷ The book is divided into six 'discours': in the first of these Gontéry dealt with the 'juge des controverses' question (as in *La vraye procedure*); in the remaining five he discussed aspects of the controversies surrounding the eucharist, referring particularly to arguments used by du Moulin in their 1609 conference and also in his *Apologie pour la sainte Cène*. The preface deserves quotation at length because it takes further the remarks made in Gontéry's previous book. Here he explains the relationship between his method and those of other Catholic theologians and controversialists and identifies the specific purpose for which his approach had been devised:

Ce peu de discours ne vise qu'à ce point, de faire cognoistre à la France la ruse des premiers Reformateurs, lesquels ont bien reconeu comme l'Eglise de Dieu s'estoit tousjours defendue contre la nouveauté des erreurs par l'auctorité des Conciles, et par l'antiquité des SS. Peres, qui ont tous esté de bon accord en ce qui est du fonds de la creance; la diversité des lieux, des aages, et des langues, n'ayant en rien intéressé leur concert; non plus que la varieté des tons ne rabat rien de l'harmonie (comme dit Theodoret) ains c'est de là qu'elle resulte. Par ainsi nos parties adverses se sont remparees contre ces puissantes armes, non de quelque force, mais d'une admirable finesse, faisant croire aux simples que les catholiques ne se reservoient que de vaines traditions, abolissant la sainte Bible pour la recognoistre contraire à leurs abus, comme ils parlent. Cela n'a pas empesché que nos Docteurs modernes n'ayant retenu la forme ancienne et legitime employant le temoignage de nos devanciers contre les profanes nouveautez, recherchant ès exemples des choses jugées en cas semblable, la decision des controverses de ce temps. L'ennemy a toutesfois gagné quelque avantage sur les esprit legers à la faveur de ceste procedure... l'adversaire a cest avantage, que ses oppositions sont populaires, tirées du sens et de la raison commune, tant esloignée des mysteres de la foy. Là où nos deffenses sont prises de la grandeur des choses sacrées, et de la profondeur des saintes lettres: lesquelles ne nous defavorisent en aucun article, pour petit qu'il soit, et ne contiennent aucunes des pretentions reformées en termes expres, ny par raison tirée de là: et neantmoins nos Reformateurs se vantent de les avoir toutes formelles.

La verité est que plusieurs anciens Heretiques, comme les Arrians, les Origenistes, et mesme les Anabaptistes de nostre temps ont en l'Ecriture quelques clauses qui semblent d'abord flater leur revolte. Ce qui a peu occasionner le Docteur Catholique d'appeller ses parties au seul Tribunal

des Pères et de l'antiquité, attendu que jamais loy ne fut si claire qu'elle ne peust souffrir une grande variété d'interpretations: ... Si bien que jusques icy il se trouve peu de personnes qui ayent voulu combattre l'erreur par la seule Escriture: ... Tant y a qu'à force de voir et de conferer de vive voix et par escrit contre nos adversaires, j'ay pris garde que de tant de poincts qu'ils ont mis en controverse, ils n'en ont aucun qui se trouve en l'Escriture de la façon qu'ils le preschent et pretendent; Si qu'ils se trouvent surpris d'avoir cassé et aboli l'Eglise, et les SS. Peres, sous couleur de suyvre la sainte Escriture, et en effect ils nous veulent regler sur le seul modele de leurs opinions; tellement que si on les poursuit vivement ils sont contraints de renoncer à leur Bible. Dequoy j'ay fait souvent l'essay avec plusieurs Ministres en divers lieux, et deux fois avec le Sieur du Moulin, luy faisant voir à l'œil que ses pretentions sont fondées en l'air, non en l'Escriture sainte. L'affaire est allé si avant qu'il n'y a plus aucun Ministre qui se hazarde de comparoistre en presence de personnes d'honneur, pour vuider aucun point de sa reformation, à la charge de se tenir aux termes de l'Evangile. D'autant qu'on peut occulairement resoudre le plus grand doute en demie heure, avec une manifeste demonstration de l'erreur auquel ils ont induit les pauvres ignorans. Ils ne demandent que des consequences, comme il s'est veu ès conferences qui se sont presentées à Caen, et à Dieppe. Ils ne veult plus qu'escire, et avec cela font semblant parfois d'appeller leurs causes devant les Peres; mais ce ne sont que fuites pour immortaliser leur procès, fuyant la parole escrite qu'ils avoient tant vantée, et qu'ils avoient prise pour leur juge unique.

This passage underlines the fact that Gontéry's perception of the issues fundamental to the conduct of religious controversy was in accord with that of contemporary authors who favoured the established historical approach: like du Perron he affirms the conformity of doctrine expressed in the varied contributions of the church fathers; he notes the same contrast between the mysteries of the faith, inaccessible to human reason, and the strongly rational approach of Protestant controversialists which Coeffeteau had also emphasised; and, like both these writers, he affirms the scriptural basis of Catholic doctrine. Gontéry even justifies the continuing reliance on the historical approach to religious debate of most Catholic controversialists. His own method, however, is presented here as a deliberate challenge to the popular appeal of Protestantism. The victims of the Protestants' stratagems are, according to Gontéry, 'les pauvres ignorans' (or 'les simples') who have been won over by arguments which are 'populaires, tirés du sens et de la raison commune'. On their behalf Gontéry has devised a method based on scripture which, he claims, can 'resoudre le plus grand doute en demie heure'. In the publications which followed

a few years later he was finally to present his method as one which might be used with equal success by others, and not only by the Catholic clergy but by the laity as well.

Gontéry in Germany, Sedan and at Bordeaux (1613)

During the troubled years 1609–11 Gontéry seems to have been present at Paris during every Lent and Advent preaching season. His reputation as a fiery preacher against heresy was well-established and references to his allegedly seditious preaching abound in the diaries of L'Estoile and Casaubon during this period.⁴⁸ Remarks made during his Advent sermon series in 1611 finally led the Paris Parlement to decree that he should be exiled for at least two years but the regent intervened, placed Gontéry under her personal protection and ensured that he was in Paris to preach during Lent 1612.⁴⁹ In 1613 Gontéry travelled to Germany to put his method to the test against Lutheran ministers. The marquis de Baden ('ou de Turlac') had promised the Catholic Sieur de Vaudemont, ('frere de son Altesse de Lorraine') 'de luy faire voir dans la Bible traduite à la Lutherienne, tous les poincts de la Confession d'Ausbourg'. Gontéry challenged six Lutheran ministers at Turlac to a conference which took place on 11 July 1613 before 'plusieurs Gentilshommes, Contes et Barons d'Allemagne':

le resultat de toute la Conference fut, que les Ministres ne sçauroient mon-
strer un seul passage dans l'Ecriture, formel et expres, portant un seul de
leurs articles de foy; si ce n'est qu'on y adjoustast ou changeast quelque
chose.⁵⁰

Two months later, on his way back to France, Gontéry stayed briefly at Charleville, in the Protestant principality of Sedan. He presented the governor of Sedan, Le Conte, with a copy of his latest pamphlet, relating his exploits in Germany, and invited the ministers of Sedan to respond to a similar challenge. In the ensuing correspondence, Le Conte, writing on behalf of Daniel Tilenus, Jacques Cappel and other local ministers, relayed to Gontéry their offer of a conference on the following terms:

ils vous envoient autres huict propositions, pour accompagner les vostres,
sans en requérir la preuve par aucune Bible, de quelque version ou im-

pression que ce soit: mais par les actes des Conciles, escrits des Peres, ou Histoires Ecclesiastiques, qui se trouvent dans les premiers cinq cens ans apres la naissance de nostre Seigneur: s'offrans de monstrez les vostres aussi clairement dans la Bible, que vous monstrez les leurs en la maniere susdicte. (*Lettres du Pere Gontery*, pp.4-5)

Gontéry refused to relinquish his own challenge or to be drawn into any defence of Catholic doctrine:

Je me suis ... offert d'aller dans Sedan, si vos Ministres vouloient entreprendre de me monstrez un seul passage expres et formel dans la Bible, contenant un seul article de vostre foy reformee: Sur quoy, ... vous nous rapportez que les Ministres ne scauroient le faire, bien desireroient-ils ... qu'on leur fist voir dans les Histoires des questions frivoles. (p.19)

Le Conte's fourth letter bluntly summed up the Protestant ministers' view of Gontéry's method:

trouver dans la Bible toutes les propositions escrites en mesmes mots, syllabes, lettres, pointcs, qu'un Jesuite les voudra arrenger, ou composer, les Theologiens de Tournal, ou autres, n'auroient non plus de raison, ny de sens, à le promettre, qu'un Moyne a de front à le stipuler: ceste maniere de conter ainsi les syllabes, et les lettres, sans se soucier du sens, ne convenant que aux sorciers, ou magiciens, non aux Theologiens et Chrestiens. (p.55)

Since Gontéry would only agree to a conference on his own terms, the correspondence up to this point was accordingly published by the Protestants at Sedan.⁵¹

Soon afterwards Gontéry's version of events appeared under the title *L'entiere desconfiture des erreurs de ce temps*.⁵² In the dedicatory epistle of M. Pelot (the supposed compiler of this work),⁵³ Gontéry's method is presented for the first time as an approach which may be employed with ease by any reasonably intelligent Catholic:

Voicy ... un expedient court, aisé et fort asseuré, par lequel tout Catholique de bon sens, pour peu qu'il sache ratiociner, pourra de mesme main deffaire nos adversaires par leurs propres armes; et restablir en son entier l'ancienne fermeté de nostre foy. (p.4)

L'entiere desconfiture des erreurs is a re-working of material which had first appeared in Gontéry's letters to le Conte and consists of an examination, almost clause-by-clause, of four articles from the French Reformed Church's confession of faith. The four articles chosen — 4, 5, 28 and 31 — contain statements on the canon of scripture as agreed by the Protestants (4), the role of scripture (5), the condemnation of the Roman Catholic Church (28) and finally, the exceptional circumstances which gave rise to the Reformation and justify the vocation of Protestant pastors (31). (The book also contains some guidelines on entering into debate with Protestants and discussion of specific points arising from the correspondence with Le Conte.) Gontéry compares the four articles with the texts of the relevant Bible references cited alongside each of them in the Protestants' confession of faith. His conclusion is an unqualified condemnation of these key statements of the Protestants' doctrinal standpoint:

La conclusion finale de tout ce que dessus, Messieurs les Religionnaires est que toute l'accusation dressée contre nous en l'article 28. de vostre Confession de foy, n'est qu'une pure Calomnie. Le 31, n'est qu'une pure Usurpation d'auctorité, que vous vous arroyez. Le 5. auquel vous entreprenez reformer tout le monde par la seule escriture, n'est qu'un Mensonge. De maniere que tout vostre Religion, n'est qu'un simple desaveu, ou contradiction de l'Ecriture sainte, et une invention toute humaine fantastique et erronée. Dieu par sa grace vous dessille les yeux, pour voir ceste verité. (p.196)

Jacques Cappel, a leading teacher and minister at Sedan, attacked Gontéry's new method in a pamphlet published the same year and entitled *Les Trophees de P. Gonteri Jesuite*.⁵⁴ Gontéry, however, had by this time moved on to Bordeaux where he preached in the cathedral during Advent and, in accordance with his normal practice, challenged local Protestants to a conference.⁵⁵ From this visit to Bordeaux emerged Gontéry's major work, *La pierre de touche, ou la vraye methode pour désabuser les esprits trompez soubz couleur de réformation*.⁵⁶

***La pierre de touche* (1614)**

La pierre de touche appeared in two parts, in April and June 1614. Its contents draw heavily on earlier works and on Gontéry's experiences as a participant in conferences. Broadly speaking, Part 1 contains the theoretical and Part 2 the practical aspects of his method. The first part is simply a slightly amplified version of *L'entiere desconfiture des erreurs*, published the previous year. Part 2 is based on Gontéry's experiences as a polemicist and by far the largest portion of the book is given over to his attempt to engage in debate with the Protestant ministers at Dieppe in 1608 and therefore draws extensively on his earlier book *Les consequences ausquelles a esté réduite la religion prétendue réformée* (1609). Gontéry justifies this by stating that the refusal of the Dieppe ministers to engage in debate on the terms he suggested had since been repeated by 'les Allemants, les Sedanois, et les Beuglois Ministres du Bourdelois' (2, 90); he then summarises his exchanges with the German ministers, those of Sedan and of Bordeaux. (It is interesting to note that he does not draw attention to his encounters with du Moulin.)

In his 'avis au lecteur' Gontéry emphasised, even more strongly than in his previous book, that his treatise was outlining 'un art, par lequel toute sorte de personnes, pour peu d'entendement qu'elles ayent, pourront ruiner sans peine, toute ceste prétenduë Religion, soy disant Reformée' (1, 12):

Mais d'autant que ce n'est pas icy seulement une demonstration certaine: mais que c'est un art contenant quelque industrieuse procedure, il sera necessaire pour le commencement, de bien lire ce petit traicté avec l'esprit present, et attentif, pour en bien posseder les principes, et les preceptes: et puis il les faudra practiquer. Ce qui ne se pourra pas faire en une sepmaine, ou deux, mais au long-aller on se trouvera instruit, et saisy (comme dict est) d'un arme de combat, et d'un moyen court, certain et tres facile, pour convaincre d'erreur les plus beaux esprits, et les plus rusés de ce party reformé, et pour renverser tous leurs fondements, rompre leurs artifices, et empescher leurs fuites, et stratagemes. De maniere que non seulement les Docteurs (qui n'ont besoin d'instruction) mais les escholiers de Theologie, de Philosophie, de Rhétorique; voire mesme la noblesse, le gen-d'arme, le praticien du palais, le plus simple bourgeois, et l'artisan pourra facilement, et entierement desfaire, ce qu'on pourroit penser estre si puissant, et que nos parties crient estre invincible (1, 14-15)

This can be seen as the third important stage in the development of Gontéry's

method. The first had been his decision to disrupt standard conference procedure by refusing to accept the use of 'conséquences'; the second came with the concentration of his attack on a few crucial articles from his opponents' confession of faith. These two measures resulted in an approach which set aside the usual paraphernalia of religious argument: as Gontéry himself explained in his dedicatory epistle, 'Je n'employeray . . . ny citations des Peres, ny allegations de raisons prises de la Theologie, ny autres moyens qu'on a accoustumé a mettre en avant, pour establir la verité Chrestienne, ou pour dissiper l'erreur . . . Nous nous contenterons d'employer leur seule confession de foy, qu'ils ont présentée au Roy, et qu'ils appellent le cry de tout leur party'. Thus Gontéry's method consisted simply of the confrontation of two texts: the Protestants' confession of faith and the Bible as cited in the margins of that confession. Finally, he recognised the potential of this approach in the hands of ordinary Catholics.

* * *

Gontéry's method attracted little attention until the year of his death, 1617, when the controversy provoked by Arnoux's sermon publicised the 'méthodiste' arguments which the preacher had employed.⁵⁷ This, combined with Véron's ardent espousal of Gontéry's method, eventually brought official and popular recognition and unleashed hordes of 'missionnaires' against the Protestants of France in the 1620s (and again in the 1650s).⁵⁸ Protestant controversialists naturally condemned the new style of argument: du Moulin's reaction was described in Chapter 4; that of later Parisian pastors will be examined in the epilogue which follows Chapter 6. The historians of Protestantism, too, have been scathing in their criticism of the method: 'Ce n'est qu'une pure chicane ou logomachie, à la portée de tous les disputeurs, et destinée à ameuter contre l'Eglise réformée une multitude d'illettrés, doués seulement de la bonne foi jésuitique et de poumons infatigables'.⁵⁹ More recently, however, Richard Popkin, in his *History of scepticism* has pointed out that the method was not merely a piece of sophistry but a product of scepticism's influence from the mid-sixteenth century onwards.⁶⁰

Gontéry's tendency to downgrade rational procedures and to emphasise the fallibility of human reason was noted in his earliest work, *La vraye procedure* and

this attitude still prevails in his *Pierre de touche*. Page one begins with a reflection on the fickleness of human nature:

la volonté ... ayant nostre entendement en sa main comme un flambeau, elle le porte où bon luy semble: l'obligeant de considerer, et de conclurre ce qui luy vient à gré: ou de passer par dessus, et de refuter ce, qui luy est à contrecœur, quelque vray ou bon qu'il soit ...

and in another important passage, cited in Chapter 3, Gontéry emphasised the difficulty of drawing sound conclusions on the basis of rational procedures.⁶¹ The careful placing of these passages containing sceptical objections to the reliability of human reason tends to confirm Popkin's contention that the new method was the result of 'the alliance of Pyrrhonists and Catholics in the advocacy of fideistic Christianity' (which he traces back to Montaigne and Charron and also to Maldonatus, a Jesuit teacher at Paris in the 1560s).⁶² However, the opposition which Popkin creates between regarding the method as *either* a mere stratagem *or* the product of a considered philosophical standpoint is, in fact, a false one. The influence of Montaigne and Charron on French theologians and controversialists of the early seventeenth century seems undeniable and, as has already been noted above, the combination of a fideistic attitude towards the authority of the Catholic Church and its doctrinal formulations and of a sceptical standpoint with regard to scripture is equally evident in the writings of du Perron and Coeffeteau on the one hand and of Gontéry and Véron on the other. The outcome of this semi-sceptical stance was, however, entirely different as regards the respective contributions made by these controversialists to religious polemic, leading in the first two cases to scholarly explorations of the historical arguments in favour of Catholicism and against Protestantism and, in the latter two, to a form of popular polemic which bypassed all the conventions of intelligent debate and frequently featured as part of missionary campaigns which were also characterised by inflammatory preaching and civil unrest. Popkin's emphasis on the philosophical principles underlying the method as exemplified by Véron tends, unfortunately, to minimise the context and the provocative manner in which it was applied. There is, however, no doubt that, whatever its source or motivation, Gontéry's discovery of a new method of engaging Protestants in debate was to have a profound effect upon religious controversy in the decade following his death.

6.3 Jean Arnoux (1576–1636)⁶⁴

In June 1617 a sermon preached in the presence of the French court at Fontainebleau by P. Jean Arnoux, recently appointed royal confessor in place of P. Coton, drew a much-publicised reply from the Protestant ministers of Paris (led by du Moulin). As a result of the controversy generated by the ministers' pamphlet and Arnoux's response, Gontéry's method was brought to the attention of a far wider audience.

At the age of 41, Arnoux was ten years younger than his predecessor. He had entered the Society of Jesus in 1594 and, following his training, had spent some years teaching philosophy and theology. Prior to his new appointment, however, he had been engaged in missionary activity, preaching against the Protestants of the Midi and so, like Coton and Gontéry, Arnoux arrived in Paris as an experienced campaigner against heresy. The earliest evidence of Arnoux's involvement in polemic with the Parisian Protestants belongs to the same year as his sermon at Fontainebleau — 1617 — and almost certainly took place in the earlier part of the year. Du Moulin had published a treatise entitled *De la juste providence de Dieu* in which he claimed to reply to a short work by Arnoux.⁶⁵ Arnoux replied with a book refuting du Moulin's pamphlet (but also denying the attribution of the original pamphlet to himself).⁶⁶

In his sermon preached at Fontainebleau on 25 June, Arnoux set out to demonstrate, using the Protestants' own version of the Bible, that 'les textes cotez à la marge de leur confession de foy, en preuve des poincts que nous disputons aujourd'huy, n'estoient ny exprés, ny formels, pour appuyer le contenu des articles d'erreur'.⁶⁷ At the end of the sermon a Protestant listener apparently persuaded Arnoux to give him his sermon notes; these were then passed on to the Charenton pastors and provided the basis for their reply, the *Defense de la confession de foy*, written by du Moulin but signed by all four ministers. The contents of this pamphlet and the controversy which it provoked have been described in earlier chapters.⁶⁸

A month later, on 14 July, the Parisian printers Joseph Cottureau and Sebastien Chappelet were given a ten-year *privilege* to print and sell Arnoux's written account of his arguments, entitled *La confession de foy de messieurs les ministres convaincue de nullité par leurs propres Bibles*. According to Arnoux, this pamphlet was published at the king's express wish: 'Le Roy ... apres m'avoir ouy favorablement ces jours passez à Fontainebleau ... me commanda de donner au jour le discours d'une petite demie heure' (p.25).⁶⁹ It went through at least five editions in the remaining months of the year.

La confession de foy ... convaincue de nullité (1617)

The book was divided into two parts of similar length. In Part 1 Arnoux elaborated the arguments first used in his sermon and in Part 2 he responded to the Charenton pastors' *Defense de la confession de foy*. The keynote of his dedicatory epistle to Louis XIII, although expressed in moderate terms, was the desirability of eliminating Protestantism: Arnoux suggested that France's tolerance towards its Protestants and 'le diffame du meslange en matiere de Foy' had resulted in a loss of prestige and influence on the European scene (pp.6-7).

In the main section of Part 1, Arnoux developed the material used in his sermon at greater length. It is possible that du Moulin's refusal in his treatise published earlier in the year to be bound by Calvin's statements regarding Protestant doctrine had led Arnoux to recognise the virtues of Gontéry's method, based solely on the Protestants' confession of faith. Arnoux was certainly determined not to allow the precise formulations of these statements to be disclaimed by Protestants: he emphasised the importance both of the confession itself — 'qui chez eux tient quelque lieu de Symbole' — and, more specifically, of the wording of its articles and the choice of Bible references placed alongside most of them. According to Arnoux, every decision regarding the articles of this confession of faith had been made 'par le rapport, et concert des plus sçavans Ministres qui les ont bastis' (p.26).

Having grouped the forty articles of the confession under three headings according to whether he judged them to be in conformity with Catholic doctrine, somewhat suspect or plainly contrary to Catholic belief, Arnoux then chose to deal only with those seventeen belonging to the latter group (pp.29-30). By the

close examination of these articles and their accompanying Bible references Arnoux intended to demonstrate two points: firstly, that 'les articles contraires à l'Eglise Romaine n'ont aucun fondement, en la parole de Dieu, qu'ils alleguent en leur marge' and, secondly, that 'par leurs propres Bibles, il nous appert qu'apres tous les tronçonnemens, et depravations qu'ils y ont faictes de leurs mains, encores y avons nous une grande quantité de textes formellement contraires aux articles dressez contre nostre creance' (p.32). For each of these seventeen articles Arnoux provided: (i) in the lefthand column, the text of the relevant article with his own explanation of its significance; (ii) in the righthand column, the Bible references quoted in full, followed by his comments on the relevance (or irrelevance) of these passages and their true meaning; (iii) beneath these two columns, and extending across the full width of the page, a scripture text which allegedly contradicted the article of Reformed faith under consideration, once again accompanied by his own interpretation of the text. (See example cited in full below.)

The method of presentation has every appearance of being comprehensive and objective. On closer study, however, it is evident that the success of Arnoux's arguments depended to a large extent on the interpretations which he himself made of each article, its Bible reference and the scripture passage placed in opposition. In many instances Arnoux re-interpreted Protestant doctrine in the most unfavourable manner possible and then confronted this interpretation (rather than the original article) with the texts cited from scripture. He claimed, for example, that the doctrine of justification by faith had been devised to '[combattre] la charité et l'exercice des vertus' (p.53); then, when a later article stated that good works were an inevitable consequence of faith, Arnoux asserted that this was merely evidence of the Protestants' pride and deceit (p.59). In reply to Article 24, which stated that Jesus Christ was the sole advocate between God and Man (and which was supported by Paul's statement to this effect in 1 Timothy 2.5) Arnoux offered arguments and biblical evidence which were less than conclusive. He cited a text from James 5.14 (in which elders of the church are summoned to pray for a sick man) as evidence of Jesus Christ and Christians interceding together as 'plusieurs Advocats', then asked whether 'les Saints dans le Ciel' were to be considered 'moins cognoissans de nos necessitez, ou moins charitables?' (pp.63-65). The example cited in full overleaf, which concerns the last of the seventeen articles featured in Arnoux's pamphlet — Article 38, on the eucharist — provides a good

Extract from *La Confession de foy des ministres convaincu de nullité par leurs propres Bibles* (Paris, 1617) REP 1931, pp.82-85.

ARTICLE XXXVIII

Ainsi nous tenons que le pain et la coupe nous estans donnez en la Cene, nous servent vrayement de nourriture spirituelle, d'autant qu'il nous monstrent comme à l'œil la chair de Jesus Christ estre nostre viande, et son sang nostre breuvage, et rejettons les fantastiques, et sacramentai/p.83/res qui ne veulent recevoir tels signes et marques, veu que nostre seigneur JESUS-CHRIST prononce, Cecy est mon corps, et ceste coupe est mon sang.

Tout cet article exclut la verité et realité du corps et sang (pour nous servir de la seule figure, par laquelle nous sommes retenus dans les elemens des Juifs) et des ombres vuides de corps et encor' que les Ministres de la dernière saison disciples de Calvin, ont introduit à son exemple, par une subtile methode, l'invention de parler comme nous, disans, que le corps de Christ en substance, et non seulement par effect, est donné et uny aux fideles en la Cene, toutesfois quand on les presse de respondre si ce corps est present /p.84/ localement aux signes, ils respondent que non, et qu'il en est distant comme le Ciel de la terre: d'où suit la contradiction manifeste, et est decouvert l'abus par ce Syllogisme. Il est impossible que deux substances esloignées l'une de l'autre comme le Ciel de la terre soient intimement et substantiellement conjointes l'une à l'autre: Or le corps du fils de Dieu est distant des signes ou especes du pain et du vin comme le ciel de la terre: Il ne peut donc par elles estre conjoint intimement et substantiellement au corps de ceux qui reçoivent les signes. En vain donc, disent-ils pour abuser le monde, que le corps est donné en substance, puis que par leur article, il est porté que le pain et la coupe sont donnez, pour monstrier à l'œil que le corps et le sang sont nostre nourriture.

TEXTE COTTÉ

Joan. 6 v.31. Nos peres ont mangé la manne au desert ainsi qu'il est escrit, il leur a donné à manger le pain du Ciel. 1. aux Cor. vers. 24. Et ayant rendu graces le rompit, et dit, Prenez et mangez, cecy est mon corps qui est rompu pour vous, faictes Cecy en commemoration de moy. Matt. 26. vers. 26. Et comme ils mangeoient, Jesus print le pain, et apres qu'il eut rendu grace, le rompit, et le bailla à ses disciples, et dit, Prenez, mangez, Cecy est mon corps.

Y a il en tous ces textes aucun texte formel, par lequel il soit dit, que la figure seule nous est donnée, que le pain et le vin nous monstrent à l'œil la chair et le sang? Je presse encore un coup, où sont les mots formels en chose de si grande consequence? et de quel courage pourront tous les Ministres du monde souffrir le reproche du Fils de Dieu, quand au jour du jugement universel il leur dira: J'ay enseigné par quatre miens escrivains irreprochables, et desquels vous avez fait estat, /p.84/ que j'avois dit de ma propre bouche en l'institution du Sacrement d'amour, et d'union: *Cecy est mon Corps, Cecy est mon Sang*, et mon Eglise l'a creu, par tant et tant de siecles, et vous estes venus sur vostre propre credit, querelans mon Eglise, et disans que j'avois voulu dire, *Cecy est du pain, Cecy est du vin, ce pain monstre ma chair, ce vin monstre mon Sang*, et de quoy vous a servy de faire passer en figure ce que j'avois donné en verité, et quel mal vous fust advenu de laisser croire au monde à ma parole nuëment et simplement entenduë, en matiere ou je ne pouvois l'employer avec equivoque, et a double sens, sans acquerir le blasme d'imposteur.

TEXTE CONTRAIRE

Jean 6. verset 56. *Ma chair est vrayement viande, et mon sang vrayement breuvage; Qui mange ma chair, et boit mon sang, il demeure en moy, et moy en luy.* Il ne se peut rien dire de plus expres, et je ne sçauois concevoir une glose plus formelle que ce texte, l'est tout seul sans aucun, *C'est à dire, ny consequence ny figure.*

illustration of his method. Once again, Arnoux re-interprets the article in order to challenge it more forcefully, claiming that its real purpose is to exclude 'la verité et realité du corps et sang'. He introduces the key word, 'figure', which then becomes the focus of his exposition in the second column; suggests that the Protestants' figurative understanding of the communion elements allies their eucharist more closely with the Jewish Passover; and then charges modern Protestant theologians with deliberately obscuring the disparity of doctrine between themselves and the Catholic church. In the central passage of column one, he then uses syllogistic reasoning to demonstrate that in the Protestant eucharist the body of Christ cannot be said to be present 'en substance' as some Protestant theologians might claim. He passes over the use of key biblical phrases at the end of the article without comment. In the righthand column Arnoux demands that the biblical texts disprove Catholic doctrine and support his re-interpretation of Article 38 rather than the actual statements used in the article: 'y a il en tous ces textes aucun texte formel, par lequel il soit dit, que la figure seule nous est donnée?' Then, in a passage which bears no relation to the texts under consideration, he reinforces his main argument by envisaging a hypothetical scene (also used by Coeffeteau) in which Christ sits in judgment over Protestant theologians, demanding to know 'quel mal vous fust advenu de laisser croire au monde à ma parole nuëment et simplement entendüe?'⁷⁰ Arnoux closes the section with an allegedly contradictory text which is, in his view, absolutely explicit and requires no further explanation.

In deciding to deal with seventeen articles from the forty rather than those three or four key articles around which Gontéry had constructed his attack, Arnoux had altered the nature of the argument slightly, replacing Gontéry's emphasis on the unsound basis of Protestant doctrine with a more comprehensive attack on a variety of aspects of Protestant belief. Arnoux does not, however, lose sight of Gontéry's chief aim of demonstrating that — in the strictest and most absolutely literal sense — Protestant doctrine was not based on 'la pure parole de Dieu'. He does seem, however, to devote more time than Gontéry had done to pointing out that Catholic believers could not be subjected to similar objections regarding the scriptural basis of their doctrine. He affirms the value of scripture and asserts that Catholic doctrine is invariably scriptural — 'Je suis avec vos maistres en ce point, que qui ne marche fermement, sur et dedans les termes de l'Ecriture sainte, plus il va s'avançant, plus il se recule en son voyage, plus il se perd, et plus il s'abandonne'

(p.11) — but, in his explanation regarding his use of ‘textes contraires’ below each article, he states clearly that the Catholic church did not sanction the use of literal biblical statements in a manner comparable to that which he had attributed to the Protestants:

je prie tous ceux qui liront cet escrit de faire consideration, que les textes que j’allegue contraires à l’erreur par lesquels il semble que je me rende aggresseur, ne sont pas cotez pour les maintenir tous formels en la lettre, sans l’interpretation de l’Eglise, car ce seroit me départir des fondemens de nostre creance qui ne se tient nullement à l’escorce de l’écriture, sinon en tant qu’elle est vivifiée de l’esprit, et du sens que nous en donne la tradition de l’Eglise: (pp.35–36)

(This contrast between Catholic and Protestant views of scripture was to be further explained in the second part of the book.)

The final section of Part 1 describes the various ‘voies d’évasion’ which, according to Arnoux, the Protestants used to evade his arguments. This list appears to have been developed by Arnoux himself; Gontéry often referred to some of these common Protestant objections but did not present such an analysis of the range of Protestant responses. Arnoux claimed that there were five main types of subterfuge employed by Protestant opponents:

Le premier est des gloses et interpretations: Le second des consequences: Le troisième des cercles: Le quatrième de la conformité ou rapport d’un texte à l’autre: Et le cinquième des inventions sophistiques. (pp.86–87)

Under the first two headings Arnoux examined (i) expositions of Bible passages preceded by a straightforward ‘c’est-à-dire’ and (ii) deductions made using standard logical procedures from scriptural statements, which Arnoux described as ‘le rempart des conséquences’ whereby ‘ils [Protestant theologians] dressent une ratiocination toute entiere’ on a single scriptural text (p.89). He explained his third category (‘le cercle’) as ‘une vice combattu par Aristote en ses Analytiques’ in which ‘celuy qui est pressé de respondre, preuve sa conclusion par une autre conclusion’ (p.91):

Par exemple, si sur leur article troisieme, par lequel ils renoncent aux Machabées, je les presse en ces termes: comment sçavez-vous que telle ou

telle Escriture est Canonique: ils respondent, parce que *l'esprit particulier nous le dit ainsi*, et si faisant instance je dis; d'où est-ce qu'il vous apert, que cest esprit particulier est infaillible: ils respondent, parce que l'Escriture le dit. Voyla le cercle tout entier. Ils prouvent l'Escriture par l'esprit particulier, et l'esprit particulier par l'Escriture. (pp.94-95)

The fourth type of argument, 'la conformité ou rapport d'un texte à l'autre', referred to the use of biblical texts to interpret one another and was, in Arnoux's opinion, 'la plus subtile de toutes'. The example which he cites was one frequently raised in discussions on transsubstantiation when Protestants would attempt to challenge the Catholic interpretation of Christ's words, 'Ceci est mon corps', by drawing analogies with other claims he made such as 'Je suis la vigne'. (Gigord, in his discussion with Coton, had used precisely this argument.)⁷¹ Under his fifth and final heading of 'inventions and subtilitez sophistiques' Arnoux grouped together a wide range of objections and counter-accusations regularly used by Protestant opponents. He listed beliefs which Protestants falsely attributed to Catholics ('toutes les vieilles calomnies des Payens contre les Chrestiens') and personal attacks made against Catholic opponents and particularly the Jesuits ('par eux eschaffaudez comme meurtriers, seditieux, rebelles et infames'). With regard to scripture he stated that the Protestants falsely claimed 'qu'ils [the Catholics] mesprisent l'Escriture sainte, qu'ils en cachent et dissimulent l'intelligence' and that, on the other hand, the Protestants were themselves guilty of these offences, not least in their Genevan translation of the Bible in which 'le texte original est corrompu' (pp.107-9).

Of these five categories of subterfuge, it should be noted, three would be regarded as legitimate techniques for drawing out the significance of scripture when applied by Catholic theologians and with the purpose of demonstrating the biblical basis of Catholic doctrine. The interpretations of scripture described in categories one, two and four were all to be seen in Arnoux's own remarks or in those of other Catholic theologians but he invariably forestalled any discussion of Catholic methods of exegesis. This section concluded the first and major part of Arnoux's pamphlet, to which du Moulin replied the following year (1618) with his *Bouclier de la foy* (in which the arguments were structured following Arnoux's original scheme).

In Part 2 of *La Confession de foy ... convaincue de nullité*, Arnoux responded to each section of the four pastors' *Defense de la confession de foy*.⁷² The arguments contained in these pages provide the counterpart to the first half of the book. In Part 1 Arnoux had described his method of attack, brought it to bear on the Protestants' doctrinal statements and analysed the various stratagems used by his opponents in response. In this second part Arnoux replied to the pastors' demand that he defend Catholic doctrine in a comparable manner. Arnoux refused to accept this challenge in terms which are clearly based on Tertullian:

Toutes ces demandes sont à mon advis impertinentes et desja responduës: je n'ay donc qu'à leur faire sçavoir: Premièrement que ce n'est pas à eux de m'enquerir de ma creance, parce que je suis en possession, et personne ne les a pouveus de commission pour arracher de mes mains les tiltres de l'heritage que je tiens; ains il ne sçauroient attenter sur le bien que je possède, et dont j'ay la prescription par tant et tant de siecles sans se mettre en danger d'estre tenus pour aggresseurs violens, et injustes petiteurs de ce qui n'est pas à eux.⁷³

This refusal to permit any reciprocal discussion of Catholic beliefs was a very important feature of the new method. Later in this second part Arnoux provided further important statements regarding the Catholic understanding of scripture and of the relationship between scripture and tradition which served to justify this refusal. According to Arnoux, Catholics had never claimed that their faith was based on scripture in terms similar to those used in Article 5 of the Protestants' confession:

nous n'avons jamais ... protesté ... que nous ne devions rien croire que ce qui est formel dedans l'Ecriture sainte et en termes expres: au contraire nous tenons la tradition qu'ils reprouvent, et recevons comme article de foy tous les decrets des conciles generaux, et ce qui est tenu par le commun consentement de l'Eglise (2, 91)

Arnoux presented Catholic belief as coherent and established 'par le commun consentement de l'Eglise'. Just as Gontéry had adopted the musical metaphor of harmony to describe the overall effect produced by the corpus of Catholic tradition, Arnoux used the image of precious metal and stones to explain the way in which Catholic belief had been developed and expounded:

ils font assez paroistre qu'ils veulent ignorer la distinction commune que nous mettons trestous, et de laquelle ils s'accordent, sçavoir est, Qu'il y a une difference notable entre le sens litteral du texte de l'Ecriture, et celui qu'on appelle un sens approprié *accommodatitius*, qui n'estant nullement contraire au sens litteral, et n'estant pas aussi formel pour convaincre un heretique; il ne laisse pas d'avoir une fort bonne grace aux aureilles Catholiques, dans les decrets des Papes, les discours des Peres, les explications des Conciles, les notes des Docteurs, les epistres des Saints, les livres des Catholiques, et principalement quand ils sont employez . . . pour esclaircir les matieres et les rendre plus illustres par le meslange de tels textes, qui sont perles dedans l'or appliquees a cet usage par les Peres Grecs et Latins, grands artisans de telles pieces (p.91)

Thus Arnoux argued, in accordance with the accepted Catholic view, that, for the Catholic Church, the Bible and tradition were inseparable, forming a continuum. His method, which combined a very positive view of scripture (and of tradition as a divinely-inspired commentary on scripture) with the Gontéry style of attack on Protestant doctrine, effectively turned the tables on his opponents. The Protestants had been accustomed to assert that only they held to 'la pure parole de Dieu' and to make a clear distinction between scripture and tradition as two entirely separate sources of Catholic doctrine. Arnoux responded with the claim that Catholicism *was* based on 'la pure parole de Dieu' (albeit defined in a different sense) whereas Protestant doctrine had been based on two separate sources: the literal statements contained in scripture and the interpretations given to those statements by various Reformed theologians, without authority or consistency. The contrast is drawn between scripture as interpreted over the centuries and assisted by divine inspiration and scripture distorted and manipulated by unauthorised innovators. From this standpoint of a scripturally-based Catholicism, and using Tertullian's prescriptive argument, Arnoux asserted his right to apply the Gontéry method rigorously against his Protestant opponents.

The pamphlets published in 1617 were to be Arnoux's only contributions to French religious polemic in print.⁷⁴ But another Catholic controversialist, Honorat de Mesnier, writing in 1619, described *La Confession de foy . . . convaincue de nullité* as one of the most influential books of the period.⁷⁵ His explanation of its significance provides an interesting reflection on the relative importance of the

major works of polemic — he cites Coton's *Institution catholique* and *Genève plagiaire* as examples — and pamphlets such as Arnoux's:

ce petit livre estant à bon marché, comme il est, et partant d'un si religieux et si Docte personnage est recherché et achepté de tout le monde, et monstre en peu de mots et si clairement la fausseté de la doctrine des Ministres que tous ceux qui le voyent et le lisent attentivement la recognoissent et detestent. (p.9)

Referring to Coton's massive works, de Mesnier remarked that

jamais du Moulin ny ses fauteurs Ministres ne se sont employez à respondre principalement aux grands volumes des Docteurs Catholiques, et quand on leur demande; pourquoy cela, ils disent que ces livres là ne peuvent estre veus que par fort peu de personnes, et partant qu'ils ne leur peuvent faire que fort peu de dommage. Mais si les Docteurs Catholiques composent bien quelque petit livre propre à refuter l'heresie des Ministres, tel qu'est celui du Pere Arnoux à l'heure du Moulin et tous ces freres, produisent tous leurs artifices pour arrester son cours, ou du moins pour le barbouiller luy et la renommee de son autheur, par leurs calomnies et mesdisances, afin qu'on ne le voye pas si volontiers. (pp.10–11)

De Mesnier may not have been entirely accurate in his analysis of the sequence of events in 1617 — it could be more justly argued that the ministers' pamphlet in reply to Arnoux had provoked a large number of Catholic *libelles* than the reverse (as de Mesnier claimed) — but his comments on the importance of pamphlets, as minor works of controversy playing a major role in forming public opinion, still hold good. The popularisation of the new method from this date onwards resulted in a proliferation of religious polemic in pamphlet form which was, in turn, part of a very marked expansion in pamphleteering of all kinds, generated chiefly by the political upheavals of the period.⁷⁶ Arnoux's comparatively brief involvement in Parisian religious debate seems to have provided the key event — his sermon at Fontainebleau — which finally increased public awareness of the method which Gontéry had been publicising in numerous sermons and publications for well over a decade.

6.4 Charles-François d'Abra de Raconis (1580?–1646)⁷⁷

Among the dozen or so replies to the Charenton pastors' *Defense de la confession de foy* in 1617 was a large volume — 'un livre de quatre doigts' as its author proudly described it — entitled *Responce à l'epistre des quatre ministres de Charenton*.⁷⁸ Its author was Charles-François d'Abra de Raconis, a former Protestant and, since the previous year, a teacher at the Collège de Navarre.⁷⁹ His book was based on a sermon series preached over the weeks following the appearance of the ministers' controversial pamphlet and was to be the first of a series of anti-Protestant works (directed chiefly against du Moulin) which Abra de Raconis produced over the next few years. The author identified himself on the title page as having been 'autrefois nourry parmy eux', a fact to which he was to refer frequently in his writing and preaching.⁸⁰ Abra de Raconis's initial attack on du Moulin and the Charenton ministers was soon followed by an attempt to engage du Moulin in a conference for the benefit of a Protestant lady on the point of abjuring her faith. The account of du Moulin's refusal to enter into a debate and the subsequent exchanges between Abra de Raconis and Brachet de la Milletière is contained in a letter published by the lady in question: *Lettre de Madame la baronne de Courville ... sur le sujet de sa conversion*.⁸¹ (The baronne abjured Protestantism shortly afterwards.)

Conference with du Moulin (1618)

In January 1618, as noted in Chapter 4, Abra de Raconis finally succeeded in obtaining a conference with du Moulin.⁸² The *cartel* presented to du Moulin by his opponent prior to the first meeting contained the following propositions:

- I Que la Religion Pretenduë n'a point de reigle asseurée.
- II Que la Cene des Pretendus Reformez ne se peut monstrier en l'Ecriture.
- III Que le Dieu de Calvin est le Diable.
- IV Que la Religion de Calvin qui se dit Reformée, n'est point Religion, mais Atheisme.⁸³

In the event, only the first of these statements was dealt with during the two sessions which took place. The scribes' records of the dictated arguments on this issue provide a good illustration of established conference procedure in general but, in addition, Abra de Raconis's statements show the key arguments of the Gontéry method being applied within this conventional format (whereas Gontéry and Véron themselves, as shown in other sections, preferred to disrupt standard procedures).⁸⁴ Raconis's approach thus brings out some of the implications of the sceptical view of scripture and human reason on which the method was based.

The transcription of the conference proceedings also reveals the combative stance adopted by both participants. In the negotiations over the rules for proceeding Raconis resisted all du Moulin's proposals, refusing to limit the discussion to areas of disagreement between the two confessions or to the use of authoritative statements of doctrine, and reacting vigorously against du Moulin's claims regarding the authority of scripture (ll.6–23). The same vigour is evident in the Catholic challenger's replies to du Moulin's objections to the syllogisms which follow (ll.165–203, 259–68) and in his marginal comments (ll.78, 121–2).

The syllogism stating that the Protestants had no reliable rule of faith with which Raconis opened the debate contains the essential argument on which the Gontéry method was based (ll.33–8). Du Moulin's objections to this first syllogism and the amended version which followed (ll.72–6) show that he recognised the

direction the debate was likely to take (ll.9–47, 53–9, 79–91). Raconis affected to treat du Moulin's point regarding 'les principes naturels de la raison' as an irrelevance which he was nevertheless prepared to concede. At this point Gontéry would have cited Article 5 of the Protestants' confession of faith (regarding 'la pure parole de Dieu') and would then have refused to allow the use of 'conséquences'. Raconis, however, chose to make a strategic concession in order to allow the debate to continue while still maintaining, like Gontéry, that faith and philosophy do not observe the same rules and that neither natural principles nor logical deductions are actually permissible (ll.93–9). His third syllogism incorporated du Moulin's objections on this matter in a pointedly unwieldy form (ll.109–18) but, in the final statement of this first session, du Moulin refused to allow the question of the role of reason in religious matters to be set aside (ll.125–36, 143–8).

Raconis's opening reply at the second session dealt, point by point, with the various issues raised by du Moulin. He dismissed the charge of inconsistency in his attitude to human reason, stating that reasoned debate and authoritative formulations of doctrine were quite distinct (ll.172–85). He argued against du Moulin's use of a quotation from Bellarmine, on the basis of the context in which the statement had occurred and of a distinction between negative and affirmative propositions (ll.186–96). He then returned once more to the characteristic contrast frequently drawn by Gontéry between human reason and religious faith, implying that Christian doctrine was under no obligation to conform to the dictates of human reason (ll.197–203). Finally, Raconis refused to respond to du Moulin's attempt to draw him into a defensive position (ll.204–5), and then went on to present his argument in support of the contested minor statement of his third syllogism (ll.210–27).

The major premiss of Raconis's fourth syllogism refers to three articles of belief which, he claimed, du Moulin would not be able to prove solely from scripture, even with the additional means which his opponent had secured in the preceding discussions. Once again, these three doctrines are all ones normally selected by Gontéry, Véron and others with which to challenge the Protestants' claim to be scripturally-based. (It seems likely that Raconis did not at this stage choose the most favoured area of debate — the eucharist — because this was intended to be the second of his four proposed subjects for debate.)

Only the arguments relating to the third issue, the nature of the Trinity, are reproduced in the appendix, but these reveal the skill and determination of the two opponents. Du Moulin refused to relinquish his claim that Bellarmine's statement favoured his own contention that logic had a legitimate role 'en matiere de la Foy' (ll.230-7), then went on to present a concise account of the Trinity as revealed in scripture (based, it should be noted, on an explicit biblical statement but also on those logical deductions which Raconis had conceded but which would not have been allowed by Gontéry) (ll.242-51). Once again, despite his defensive role, he challenged Raconis to acknowledge that Catholic doctrine had been formulated using the same texts and the same method (ll.252-57).

Raconis's reply on this occasion appears rather less cogent than his opening response. With regard to the text from Bellarmine, his taunt that du Moulin 'a moins receu dudit Bellarmin, que ledit de Raconis ne luy avoit accordé' ignored the fact that, despite his concession regarding the use of 'conséquences', he had originally claimed that such logical deductions were not acceptable (ll.259-68). In reply to du Moulin's biblical evidence regarding the nature of the Trinity, Raconis accepted his opponent's evidence regarding 'la Trinité des personnes' but claimed that 'l'unité de l'essence' remained unproven. His introduction of an additional biblical text and a passage from Calvin, as also the lavish use of learned distinctions regarding the concept of unity seem intended to obscure the issues while also impressing his listeners (ll.269-89). With his final reply, Raconis yielded to du Moulin's repeated attempts to force his opponent to defend the Catholic position (ll.295-300). His statement regarding the authority of the ecumenical councils reveals the other side of the 'méthodiste' coin: the sceptical stance of its practitioners with regard to the testimonies of scripture and human reason was combined with a completely unsceptical acceptance of the authoritative nature of the doctrine and institutions of the Catholic church. Part of the intention of Gontéry and Véron, in their inevitable attempts to disrupt conventional conference procedure and also in their repeated advice to those using the method *not* to allow any discussion of Catholic doctrine, seems to have been to avoid highlighting this dichotomy. (Thus it was that Tertullian's prescriptive argument came to hold a particular relevance for the 'méthodistes'.) Raconis's statement seems to offer du Moulin an open invitation to challenge his opponent on the infallibility of the councils and it is difficult

to see how Raconis could have avoided an embarrassing defeat when his turn came to take up the defensive position.

Raconis was clearly influenced by the arguments of the 'méthodistes' which had been so recently publicised by Arnoux: his choice of propositions for debate, as also many of his key arguments all bear the stamp of the new Jesuit approach. But in this encounter with du Moulin, the method is not applied in the rigorous manner prescribed by its chief exponents, whether in the matter of insisting on purely literal proofs from scripture or in refusing to countenance any discussion of Catholic doctrine. Raconis's next pamphlet suggests that he regretted his decision to allow du Moulin to make use of 'conséquences'. It also seems very likely that he was glad to seize the pretext offered by a change of venue to deprive du Moulin of the opportunity to assume the attacking role, as originally agreed. These were important points of divergence from the Gontéry method, which was intended to be entirely one of attack and whose object was to reduce the Protestant opponent to silence in a highly public and humiliating manner. The interest of this conference lies in the fact that it shows many of the fundamental arguments of the 'méthodistes' being applied by a non-Jesuit and within the conventional conference format. The exchanges between du Moulin and Abra de Raconis uncover the assumptions regarding the authority and reliability of scripture, reason and the institutions of the Catholic church on which the new strategy was based and against which du Moulin and later Protestant polemicists were to concentrate their attack.

Raconis appeared initially to have been well-satisfied with his performance and published his account of the proceedings only a fortnight after the breaking-off of the conference. The appearance of du Moulin's *Véritable narré* only a week later, however, in which his opponent also reproduced the full text dictated to the two scribes (with only one or two slight differences) seems to have caused Raconis to harbour doubts over the way these proceedings would be interpreted by Catholic and Protestant readers. Accordingly, he published a further pamphlet in mid-February, commenting on du Moulin's account and entitled *Le triomphe de la vérité*.⁸⁵ In this book Raconis responded to the final reply included by du Moulin in his version and also challenged many of the details in his opponent's

description of events before and after the conference, but its principal purpose was to provide a commentary on the conference proceedings:

L'interest de gaingner temps et d'avancer chemin en une Conference ... nous obligeoit à un discours, un peu serré, et comprenant en peu de mots beaucoup de choses ...

en ce discours serré tout le monde n'est pas capable d'en recognoistre la force, et de remarquer les manquements. J'ay creu pour le contentement de plusieurs devoir prendre de point en point tous les articles de ceste conference, pour faire voir la force de mes raisons et la foiblesse des responces de du Moulin. (pp.19–20)

The major portion of *Le Triomphe de la verité* was therefore a commentary on du Moulin's conference strategy, with the purpose of demonstrating that his opponent had been undermined by Raconis's arguments and obliged to employ various time-wasting 'digressions extravagantes'. In particular, Raconis emphasised his generosity in allowing du Moulin to make use of 'conséquences' — 'quoy que j'eusse bien la pouvoir de le faire vuider de ce fort' (p.31).

No reply from du Moulin appeared to *Le Triomphe de la verité*. A month later Raconis published a *Lettre amiable envoyee par le sieur de Raconis, au sieur du Moulin*.⁸⁶ (Du Moulin's reply to this friendly missive, included in his opponent's pamphlet, stated that he was prepared to take up the previous conference at the point at which it had been interrupted 'suivant les mesmes loix, et au mesme lieu' but would not accept a new challenge (p.7).) A pamphlet by one of Raconis's supporters, Halier, reveals that, a year later, Raconis was still dispatching occasional 'deffis' to the minister.⁸⁷ In a wry comment at the end of his *Veritable narré* of January 1618 du Moulin had attributed Raconis's dogged determination to engage him in debate to ambition: 'Je le voudrois servir, et ne suis pas marri qu'en son jeune aage il tasche d'acquérir de la reputation' wrote du Moulin (p.88). If this was indeed the case, Raconis appears to have achieved his aim: in July of the same year he was granted a *privilège général* for his writings and the following year was appointed *prédicateur du roi*.

Traitté pour conférer avec les hérétiques (1618)

The first of these two signs of official recognition was marked by the publication of a two-part work entitled *Traitté pour conférer avec les hérétiques*.⁸⁸ Part 1, which was apparently published in the form of a letter (Abra de Raconis refers to it as 'la lettre du sieur de Colincourt'), does not seem to have survived but, according to its author, contained an outline of the scriptural evidence which supported Catholic doctrine on disputed issues. Part 2 consisted chiefly of a refutation of those passages alleged by Protestant opponents against Catholicism, but the most interesting aspect of this book is the 'briefve et facile methode' it contains, which was intended to aid readers in any chance encounters with members of the Protestant church (pp.291–321). This thirty-page summary was plainly based on the method expounded by Gontéry and Véron and consists of fourteen 'observations' showing how the Catholic reader might proceed through a discussion of the propositions contained in Articles 31, 28 and 5 of the Protestants' confession of faith (and using, as an example, the question of the interpretation of the phrase 'Ceci est mon corps') to the point where 'un Ministre, ou autre pretendu reformé' would be compelled to 'reconoistre qu'il ne peut faire condamner nostre creance par l'Ecriture' (p.311). The choice of articles for debate is the same as that recommended by Gontéry, as also the use of the prescriptive argument as a convenient escape route if the Catholic encounters a difficult challenge regarding the doctrine of his own church (p.312) but, most important of all, Raconis is insistent on the need to deny the use of 'conséquences' in applying scriptural statements (pp.298, 300, 310, 316). In reply to the question, 'quel Juge?', Raconis states that, in accordance with Article 5, it is to be 'la pure et simple parole de Dieu contenue és saintes Escritures, sans adjouster, diminuer ou changer' (p.296). This treatise, published about six months after his encounter with du Moulin, suggests that Raconis had come to adhere far more strictly to the method as set out by Gontéry.

One further point of interest in this rare work is the dedicatory epistle addressed to the king in which Raconis suggested that His Majesty might himself master the new method: a single 'heure de loisir', claimed the author, would be sufficient 'pour concevoir la methode succincte que j'ay couchee sur la fin de ce traitté':

avec la pointe non-pareille de son esprit, que tout le monde admire, elle seule, sans autre estude de la Philosophie, et Theologie, que les occupations serieuses de son estat ne lui peuvent permettre, pourroit fermer la bouche à quelque Ministre que ce peut estre, ou autre de la religion pretendue; et le contraindre de recognoistre son erreur. (f.a.viii verso)

L'aveuglement des quatre ministres (1619)

A similar ambition seems to have inspired a fascinating little pamphlet which Raconis published a year later to mark his appointment as one of the king's preachers. Entitled, in its first edition, *L'aveuglement des quatre ministres sur la pretendue clarté de l'Ecriture*, Raconis's work consisted of the following sonnet accompanied by a two-part exposition of its significance.⁸⁹

Deux PIERRES, deux DRAGONS, avec deux d'ANGES,
 Deux CHESNES, deux HABITS, double ENDORMISSEMENT,
 Se trouve es Saints Cayers, pour estre un monument,
 Des vices ou vertus, par un contraire eschange.
 Celuy qui du costé des Ministres se range,
 Par l'ANGE de Sathan ENCHESNE doublement,
 Sous le DRAGON d'Enfer, a pour son [VESTEMENT]⁹⁰
 Le mensonge, et DORMANT en un ROCHER se change.
 Le juste est libre es FERS: un ANGE en pureté,
 REVESTU de son Dieu: ROCHER en fermeté,
 Et DRAGON CLAIR-VOYANT qui devore le vice.
 Huguenot si tu veux mettre en repos ton cœur,
 Fuy l'ANGE de Sathan, suy l'autre ANGE vainqueur,
 Qui confond les errans, decouvrant leur malice. (pp.8-9)

The sonnet, as Raconis explained in his dedicatory epistle, was intended to demonstrate that 'l'Ecriture n'est pas un livre si facile, que tout le monde, jusques aux femmes et artisans s'en doivent attribuer l'intelligence' and was based on six words from scripture which, according to the author, were capable of being interpreted in two completely opposite senses ('qui n'est pas chose qu'un chacun soit capable de decouvrir') (pp.5-6).

In the first part of his exposition, Abra de Raconis explained the meaning of the sonnet in general terms, drawing frequently on works by du Moulin to support

his claims regarding the Protestant view of scripture (pp.10–19). He challenged du Moulin once again to disprove the essential argument of the Gontéry method that 'Ils [the Protestants] n'ont aucun passage de l'Ecriture, pour l'establissement d'aucun article de leur creance contraire à celle de l'Eglise Romaine' (p.14). The chief purpose of this 'exposition du sonnet en general' is, however, to expand the point made in the dedicatory epistle, that the ambiguities and apparent contradictions present in scripture can only be undertood 'avec difficulté et par personnes de grand esprit, et non pas par des femmes et savetiers' (p.19).

In the second part of his exposition, Raconis dealt in turn with each of the six words used in the sonnet and gave biblical references, showing each word being used in two opposing senses (pp.20–3). Thus, for example, 'Le premier terme du sonnet c'est celuy de *'Pierre'* lequel se prend en bonne et en mauvaise part':

Il est pris en bonne part au 2. des Roys 22 vers. 2. qui est le Psal. 11 '*le Seigneur est ma pierre ou rocher c'est ma forteresse. et mon libérateur*'. Item en la 1. aux Corinth. 10 quand JESUS CHRIST est comparé à la pierre '*or la pierre estoit Christ*'.

En Ezech. 11. vers. 10 il se prend en mauvaise part. '*J'osteray le cœur de pierre hors de leur chair*': Ce que le mesme Prophete repete au ch. 36. verset 39. (p.20)

The epistle 'Au Roy' reveals that Raconis did not intend this short work to be simply a courtly curiosity. As with his 'briefve et facile methode', produced the previous year, the author ventured to hope that the king himself might use this publication to good effect:

Si la Matiere de ce Sonnet est pressante pour convaincre l'erreur, l'artifice en rendra, comme j'espere, la lecture agreable, et sera V. M. bien ayse d'avoir en peu de vers, faciles à retenir un argument qui porte le poignart sur la gorge de l'Heresie. (p.6)

Raconis went on to publish one further work against du Moulin soon afterwards — *La confession de foy des ministres percée à jour* — which forms part of the controversy first provoked by the Charenton ministers' declaration of 1617.⁹² The full title reveals that it was a reply to du Moulin's *Bouclier de la foy* and that

the author's contention was precisely that of Arnoux and the 'méthodistes': that the Protestants' confession of faith 'n'est appuyée sur aucun texte de l'Escriture'. Only one more work of anti-Protestant polemic was to appear from Raconis's pen, in 1624.⁹³ His account of a 'conférence par écrit' which took place in August/September 1623 reveals, incidentally, his endorsement of the activities of the chief exponent of the new method, François Véron, since he recommended that the latter should be invited to take up a verbal dispute which he himself was unable to continue.⁹⁴

Virtually all Raconis's anti-Protestant publications belong therefore to the period immediately following Arnoux's sermon and the controversy provoked by the local ministers' response. His works, albeit a minor contribution to the development of religious debate, are interesting from several points of view. They provide a representative sample of the pamphlets produced by many lesser-known controversialists inspired, in 1617, to join in attacking du Moulin. They are of interest also as evidence of the way in which the Jesuits' new method had begun to influence non-Jesuit controversialists. His conference with du Moulin provides the best evidence of the minister's response in the context of a verbal dispute to 'méthodiste' arguments in their more developed form, and thus complements his *Bouclier de la foy*. Abra de Raconis's career also indicates how energetic involvement in Parisian debate could act as an aid to advancement. Finally, his confidence in commending active participation in religious debate to Louis XIII, even to the extent of providing the teenage king with a useful mnemonic in the form of a sonnet, provides an early indication of how closely the promotion of Véron and the new method was to be bound up with the king's political action against French Protestants in the decade to follow.

Notes to Chapter 6

1. Sources for biography: DTC, 3, 1926–29; J.-M. Prat, *passim*; *Dictionnaire de spiritualité*, 2, 2, 2422–32.
2. Full title: *Genève plagiaire, ou Vérification des dépravations de la parole de Dieu qui se trouvent ès Bibles de Genève* (Paris, 1618), REP 2167.
3. Full title: *Du très-saint et très-auguste sacrement et sacrifice de la Messe, des merveilles, figures, vérité, antiquité et parties d'icelle. Discours contre les erreurs de nostre siècle et les cahiers d'un prédicant à Grenoble* (Avignon, 1600), REP 191.
4. Chamier had already engaged in a brief correspondence with Coton in July 1598 which is reproduced in his *Epistolae jesuiticae* (Geneva, 1599), REP 77, pp.18–27, 96–148.
5. Prat, 1, 536. For titles of two main accounts, see above, Chapter 3, nn.22, 52 (c).
6. Fouqueray, 2, 580.
7. Coton, however, like du Moulin, was not averse to writing in a rather coarser vein; Bremond comments on the Rabelaisian flavour of Coton's grotesque portrayal of Chamier in the Catholic account of their conference, as cited by Prat: see Henri Bremond, *Histoire littéraire du sentiment religieux en France depuis la fin des guerres de religion jusqu'à nos jours* 11 vols and index (Paris, 1929–36) 2, 79–81. Similarly, the *Dictionnaire de spiritualité* notes that 'Coton fut un controversiste affable, quoique, quelquefois, il "forçat, dit-il, son naturel" ('Epistre à Messieurs de Genève, *Recheute de Genève plagiaire*, p.32, cited in DS, 2.2, 2422).
8. See above, Chapter 3, pp.117–18.
9. See above, Chapter 1, p.18.
10. Gontéry wrote in 1614, 'le R. P. Coton fut appelé, pour estre prez de sa Majesté; et peu apres le Roy daigna de m'escire, que je le vinsse trouver' (dedicatory epistle of the *Second partie de la Pierre de Touche* (see below, n.56)).
11. The encounters of du Perron and Coton with du Moulin arose from the king's efforts to secure the conversion of Catherine de Bourbon: 'the Pope prest the King to make his Sister turn Catholick; and the King to please the Pope, did what he could for it, employing the most learned and subtil of his Clergy to seduce her, especially *Du Perron*, then Bishop of *Evreux*, and Father *Cotton*. These two had several bickerings with him [du Moulin], but yet had soon done; for being worsted, and not used to deal with such an Adversary, they did avoid

to meet with him, leaving others of the Court Clergy to try their fortune with him' (f.***2 recto).

12. For full titles of two main accounts, see above, Chapter 3, nn.22, 52 (f).
13. Gigord took part in a conference at Castres with P. Gontéry and was also present at that between Chamier and Coton.
14. All references in the text are to the account reproduced by Prat (2, 602–27).
15. See above, Chapter 3, p.122.
16. See above, Chapter 5, pp.256–57.
17. As translated by Prat, 3, 292–95 from MS in BN.
18. See above, Chapter 1, n.104, Chapter 2, n.56.
19. See above, Chapter 1, p.24 and n.79.
20. 2, 1362–75.
21. Prat, 2, 664–70.
22. The record of the existence of a book apparently entitled *Abrégé des Controverses* and probably published towards the end of the regency period survives only in the title of a Protestant response: N. Vignier's *Apologie catholique de la doctrine des églises réformées, contre un escrit du P. Coton imprimé à Blois, sous le titre d' 'Abrégé des Controverses' (Saumur, 1617), REP 2113.*
23. Following his departure from Paris, Coton resumed his itinerant preaching activity. In 1622 he became provincial of Aquitaine and, two years later, he was appointed provincial of Paris. He spent the last two years of his life in the capital, preoccupied once again with conciliating public opinion towards the Society of Jesus in the face of the controversy provoked by another book by an Italian Jesuit. The *Tractatus de haeresi, schismate, apostasia, sollicitatione in sacramento poenitentiae, et de potestate romani pontificis in his delictis puniendis* by Santarelli (published in Rome in 1624) incensed Gallican opinion in Paris because of the views expressed by its author on papal authority over secular sovereigns (DTC, 14, 1102–3).
24. V. Baroni, 'La Bible chez les controversistes catholiques du XVII^e siècle en France' in *Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuse*, XIX (1939), pp.97–129 (pp.106–13).
25. Jacques Cappel, *Plagiarius vapulans, seu Genevae bona fides translatione Bibliorum, contra P. Cottonum* (Geneva, 1620), REP 2513; Matthieu Cottière, *Traicté des originaux et versions, utile à tous fidelles et servant de response au general de la Geneve plagiaire de Pierre Coton Jesuite, et de defense aux versions de l'Ecriture receues es Eglises reformees* (Saumur, 1619), REP 2361; Théodore Tronchin, *Coton plagiaire ou la Verité de Dieu et la fidelité de Gen-*

eve, maintenue contre les depravations et accusations de P. Coton Jesuite contre la traduction de la S. Bible faicte à Geneve, contenus en un livre intitulé Geneve plagiaire (Geneva, 1620), REP 2652.

26. Full title: *Défense de la fidelité des traductions de la sainte Bible faites à Genève, opposée au livre du P. Coton intitulée 'Genève plagiaire'* (Geneva, 1619), REP 2458.
27. Full title: *Recheute de Genève plagiaire, ou réplique par voye de dialogue aux prétendues défenses de B. Turretin, ministre et professeur en l'eschole de Genève* (Lyon, 1619) REP 2360.
28. Full titles: *Recheute du jésuite plagiaire, ou examen des dialogues du P. Coton* (Geneva, 1620), REP 2654; *Suite de la fidélité des traductions de la S. Bible faites à Genève: contre le Plagiaire du P. Coton et autres écrits opposés aux versions de l'Escriture Sainte* (Geneva, 1626), REP 3456.
29. Halier, *Le Relais donné au sieur du Moulin ... Touchant le Libelle Anonyme dudit Sieur du Moulin, intitulé la Chasse de Raconis* (Paris, 1619), REP 2398, p.17.
30. Cited by Baroni, p.111. Turretin, in his *Recheute du Jésuite plagiaire*, retorted that 'La plainte de la petitesse du livre en comparaison du sien sera de saison quand les livres se vendront à la livre, (où une livre de Coton tiendra plus de voume que deux de choses solides)'.
31. Desgraves's bibliography (based chiefly on present-day library holdings) suggests that the exchanges provoked by Coton's book attracted little interest in Paris. Of the eight titles listed in notes 2 and 25–28 above, only two are available in Paris (in the BN and nowhere else) while, on average, only two other copies survive in provincial libraries. REP 2458 and 3456 (by Turretin) are not available in any French libraries.
32. (Paris, 1640), REP 4222. In his 'avant-propos' Camus explained how he had commended Coton's work to a Protestant friend: 'Je luy conseillai de lire l'Institution Catholique du P. Coton fameux Predicateur du Roy de la Compagnie des Jesuites, luy disant qu'il avoit fait ce livre là par le commandement du grand Henry, à dessein de monstrier aux Protestans que leur des-union d'avec les Romains n'estoit pas irreconciliable, et qu'il y avoit de la ressource et des moyens de reunion ... Il me crut, mais il se lassa bien tost de cette lecture, me disant qu'il s'estouffoit d'allegations et d'autoritez, et qu'il aimoit mieux des raisons courtes et pressantes' (ff.a.v.verso–a.vi.recto).
33. Sources for biography: Sommervogel, *Bibliothèque de la Compagnie de Jésus*, 3, 1567–74; DTC, 6, 1491–92; *Dictionnaire de spiritualité*, 6, 585–86.
34. See above, Chapter 1, p.25, Chapter 3, p.93.
35. Kappler's thesis contains the first moderately detailed outline of Gontéry's

method, but he does not comment on the evolution of this method and does not extend his analysis to those works not directly related to specific conferences (1, 199–204).

36. *Actes de la dispute et conférence tenue en la ville de Castres, au mois de septembre 1599, entre M. Jean Gontery, jésuite, et M. Jean Gigord, l'un des pasteurs de l'Eglise réformée de Montpellier* (Montpellier, 1599), REP 102.
37. For full title, see above, Chapter 3, n.16. J.-M. Quérard suggests that the name of Saint-Julian was 'un masque pris par le P. Gontéry pour pouvoir se louer lui-même, ainsi que la Société dont il était membre' (*Les Supercheries littéraires dévoilées* 3 vols (Paris, 1869–70) 3, 536). Even if this work was actually compiled under the editorship of Saint-Julian, Gontéry was clearly satisfied with the way his views were presented; he refers the readers of a later work, *Déclaration de l'erreur de nostre temps to La vraye procedure* for a fuller exposition of one of the points of his argument.
38. See above, Chapter 3, nn.52 (e), 97.
39. See above, Chapter 1, p.23, Chapter 4, pp.170–71.
40. Fouqueray, 3, 156–57.
41. L'Estoile wrote, on 29 March 1608: 'La nouvelle de la mort du père Gontier, Jésuite, à Dieppe, où il preschoit le Karesme, et qu'on disoit avoir esté empoisonné par les Huguenos, fut verifiée fausse par des lettres mesmes qu'on receust de lui à Paris, où ceste fausse nouvelle estoit tenue pour veritable' (IX, 62).
42. The king, in his letter dated 10 April, wrote: 'ayant sceu le grand fruit que vous avés faict dans ma ville de Dieppe en si peu de temps et reconnaissant qu'il est bien à propos que vous y demeuriez encore, je désire que vous y séjourniez jusqu'à ce que je vous donne advis de ma volonté sur vostre retour'. Gontéry publicised the king's letter in a short pamphlet published little more than a fortnight later: *La Response du P. J. Gontery, de la Compagnie de Jésus. A la demande d'un Gentil-homme, de la religion pretenduë reformée, touchant l'usage des Images. Avec une coppie de la lettre que le Roy a envoyé audit P. Gontery* (Paris, Rouen, Bordeaux, 1608), REP 885–87.
43. L'Estoile wrote in March 1609: 'Des prédications de Paris, pendant ce Quaresme: beaucoup de bruit et peu de fruit. Les Jésuites y tiennent les premières chaises; font la guerre aux Hérésies, . . . Entre tous les autres, Père Gontier s'en fait oïr et croire, et, par ses séditieuses prédications, s'efforçant de combattre l'Hérésie, l'establit plus (dit-on) qu'il ne la ruine' (IX, 242). See above, Chapter 4, pp.171–73, 185–89.
44. *Copie d'une lettre escrite au Roy*, p.6.
45. For full title, see above, Chapter 3, n.106.

46. The prescriptive argument of Tertullian (c. 160–c. 225) is set out in a treatise entitled ‘De praescriptione haereticorum’. In this work, intended for lay Christians, he argued against allowing heretics to challenge their beliefs on the basis of scripture: ‘[our opponents] mettent en avant les Écritures et par leur audace ils font tout de suite impression sur quelques-uns . . . C’est donc ici surtout que nous leur barrons la route en déclarant ‘qu’ils ne doivent pas être admis à disputer sur les Écritures . . .’ (chap. XV). As the one true Church ‘la vérité doit nous être adjugée en partage, à nous qui marchons dans cette règle que les Églises nous transmettent après l’avoir reçue des apôtres, les apôtres du Christ, le Christ de Dieu . . . nous étions donc bien fondé à soutenir que les hérétiques ne doivent pas être admis à nous provoquer sur les Écritures’ (chap. XXXVII) (quotations from the French parallel edition, *Traité de la prescription contre les hérétiques*, Sources chrétiennes, 46 (Paris, 1957), pp.109, 139).
47. For full title, see above, Chapter 4, n.68.
48. See above, Chapter 1, pp.25, 29; and Pannier, *L’Église . . . sous Louis XIII (1610–21)*, p.75.
49. Fouquieray, 3, 390–91. His account is based on a letter from the nuncio Ubaldini to cardinal Borghese, dated 19 January 1612.
50. *Lettres du Pere Gontery*, p.8. The full account of Gontéry’s conference with the Lutheran ministers is to be found in *Fuite honteuse des ministres luthériens d’Allemagne refusants d’entrer en conférence avec un père jésuite qui leur présentait pour toute règle et juge la seule Écriture traduite par eux memes* (attributed to P. Léonard Périn) (Pont-à-Mousson, Reims, Rouen, 1613), REP 1556. (Desgraves’s bibliography provides, for the first time, the location of a surviving copy of this work.)
51. *Lettres du Pere Gontery* . . . For full title, see above, Chapter 3, n.29.
52. Full title: *L’entiere desconfiture des erreurs de ce temps. Par laquelle est déclaré, que la Religion prétenduë Reformée n’a aucun fondement en l’Écriture Sainte, et qu’elle ne contient que des inventions purement humaines. Le tout extraict de quelques lettres du P. Gontery, écrites à M. le Conte gouverneur de Sedan, par la diligence de M. Pelot* (Charleville, Paris, Reims, 1613), REP 1515–17. No 1613 copies appear to have survived. All quotations are from the Reims edition of 1617 (REP 2040).
53. It seems likely that, as with *La vraie procédure* of 1606, Gontéry was in actual fact the author, especially as *L’entiere desconfiture* was to provide a major part of the material for *La Pierre de touche*, the most important exposition of his method.
54. Full title: *Les Trophees de P. Gonteri Jesuite, avec un Catechisme pour son instruction* (Sedan, 1613), REP 1475.
55. Among the Protestant ministers at Bordeaux was the Scotsman, Gilbert Primrose (Primerose, in French) who, between 1609 and 1611, published four vol-

umes of a work entitled *Le Voeu de Jacob opposé aux vœux des moines* (Bergerac, 1609–11), REP 1028, 1310–12. (Hence the title of the second part of Gontéry's book, see following note.)

56. Full title: *La Pierre de touche, ou la vraye methode pour desabuser les esprits trompez soubz couleur de reformation. D'icy on descouvrira l'incroyable ruse des Ministres faisans à croire aux simples, que les articles de leur confession de foy Reformée sont exprez dans la parole de Dieu escrite, sans qu'on y en puisse trouver une seule clause. D'où il apperra aussi que toute la Reformation pretenduë n'est qu'une invention purement humaine, et diabolique* (Bordeaux, 1614) REP 1640; *Seconde partie de la Pierre de Touche ou la vraye methode pour desabuser les esprits trompez soubz couleur de Reformation. Avec une correction fraternele, pour la refutation d'un libelle diffamatoire intitulé Le Voeu de jacob, escrit par un Escossois, nommé Gilbert, ministre de Begle* (Bordeaux, 1614), REP 1641.
57. Gontéry died on 11 November 1617. A short pamphlet entitled *Instruction du procez de la Religion pretenduë Reformée* and based on his *Pierre de touche* was published posthumously at Paris that year (REP 2041).

Desgraves's bibliography finally provides locations (in French provincial libraries) for two works belonging to 1616: *Du Juge des controverses en général du juge à la controverse des vœux de la sainte religion, sçavoir est de la pauvreté, chasteté et obeysance. Seconde partie.* (Paris), REP 1877 (this work may well have been intended as a refutation of the work by Primerose listed in n.55); *La Ruine totale de la confession de foy pretendue reformee. Contenant une verification precise de la divination, sur le manifeste intitulé, Response d'un advocat au sieur Gonteri Jesuite* (Caen), REP 1879. It has not been possible to consult either of these works.

58. See below, Epilogue, n.36.
59. O. Douen, *La Révocation de l'édit de Nantes à Paris d'après des documents inédits*, 3 vols (Paris, 1894), 1, 248.
60. *The History of Scepticism from Erasmus to Descartes*, revised edition (New York, 1968), Chapter 4.
61. See above, Chapter 3, p.122.
62. Popkin, pp.80–83.
63. This was the view of contemporary Protestants and their historians; see also, Louis I. Bredvold, *The Intellectual Milieu of John Dryden: Studies in some aspects of seventeenth-century thought* (Michigan, 1956), p.76.
64. Sources for biography: DTC, 1, 1990; Fouqueray, 3, 435–54; 4, 57–61.
65. See above, Chapter 4, n.104.

66. *Refutation du Traicté de la juste Providence de Dieu, ... Contre un escrit par luy faussement attribué au R. P. Arnoux* (Paris, 1618), REP 1939. It has not been possible to consult this work of which only one surviving copy is listed by Desgraves (located in Troyes).
67. *La Confession de foy ... convaincue de nullité*, pp.25–26.
68. See above, Chapter 1, p.39, Chapter 4, pp.207–11.
69. (p.25) All quotations in the text are from Chappelet's 1617 edition, REP 1931.
70. See above, Chapter 5, p.290.
71. See above, pp.305–06.
72. Part 2 is sometimes listed separately in bibliographies but, despite the fact that the two parts have separate paginations, Arnoux makes it clear that they form a single work.
73. Part 2, pp.89–90.
74. He was however active in securing conversions to Catholicism which were publicised in print (Fouquieray, 3, 440): *Ample et fidelle narré de l'heureuse conversion de Pierre Marcha, sieur de Pras, ministre de la Religion pretendüe reformée ...* (Paris, 1617), REP 1927, (Rouen, 1617), REP 2060, (Paris, 1618) REP 2126–27; *L'Heureuse conversion de Mme de Frontenac à la religion catholique apostolique et romaine, sur l'instruction du révérend Père Arnoux* (Paris, 1618), REP 2218–19.

 Arnoux was replaced by P. Séguiran in November 1621 and went immediately to Toulouse. According to E. Griselle, he was allowed to return to Paris for a preaching series in 1624 but Richelieu dissuaded the king from attending any of his sermons (*Louis XIII et Richelieu: Lettres et pièces diplomatiques* (Paris, 1911), pp.23–29).
75. Honorat de Mesnier, *Les Reproches du sieur du Moulin, Ministre de Charenton. Contre le Pere Arnoux* (Paris, 1619), REP 2428.
76. See above, Chapter 2, pp.62, 80.
77. Sources for biography: DTC, 1, 93–94; Feret, *La faculté de théologie de Paris*, 5, 121–31.
78. Feret summarises its contents (5, 123).
79. Bérulle was apparently involved in the discussions which led to the conversion of several members of the Abra de Raconis family (Dubé, 1, 39–45).
80. Pannier cites an extract from the *Mémoires du chanoine Hermant* (Paris, 1905, 1, 86) who recorded cardinal du Perron's opinion of the young preacher's zeal: 'Né huguenot, il voulait se signaler par son zèle. On rapporta un jour au

cardinal Du Perron que M. de Raconis, prêchant dans l'église Saint-Jacques, avait dit qu'il bénissait Dieu de ce qu'il espérait être sauvé, quoique son père et son grand-père fussent damnés. Le cardinal dit: "c'est un jeune homme qui a mangé de la ciguë, la tête lui tourne" ' (*L'Eglise ... sous Louis XIII (1610-21)*, p.409).

81. For full title, see above, Chapter 3, n.23.
82. See above, Chapter 4, pp.212-15.
83. Du Moulin, *Veritable narré de la Conference entre les Sieurs Du Moulin, et de Raconis* (1631 edition), p.53.
84. See above, pp.321-22, and below, Epilogue, pp.365-66.
85. See above, Chapter 2, n.87, Chapter 3, p.105.
86. For full title, see above, Chapter 3, n.57.
87. Title: *Le Relais donné au sieur du Moulin, ministre de Charenton. ... Touchant le libelle anonyme du Sieur du Moulin, intitulé la Chasse de Raconis* (Paris, 1619), REP 2398.
88. Full title: *Seconde partie du Traitté pour conférer avec les Heretiques. Contenant l'explication des passages de l'Ecriture, qu'employent les Heretiques, contre les principaux articles de nostre Religion. Ensemble une briefve et facile Methode de traiter avec eux, et leur faire cognoistre l'erreur de leur creance* (Paris, 1618), REP 2120. (The other titles listed, REP 2118-9 and 2121, appear to refer also to this second part.)
89. Full title: *L'aveuglement des quatre ministres de Charenton. Sur la pretendue clarté de l'écriture* (Paris, 1619), REP 2310. This sonnet was reprinted the following year with a rather more striking title: *Le Bandeau des Ministres présenté au Roy* (Paris, 1620) REP 2479.
90. 'Vestement' is mistakenly set in lower rather than upper case letters in the original text.
91. Full title: *La confession de foy des ministres percée à jour, et son Bouclier mis en pièces. Traicté auquel la Confession de foy des ministres est examinée d'un bout à l'autre, et est monstre qu'elle n'est appuyée sur aucun texte de l'Ecriture: et les defences de du Moulin en son Bouclier renversées* (Paris, 1619), REP 2132. Feret summarises its contents (5, 124).
92. Title: *Conférence tenue entre le sieur de Raconis et les Ministres de Chillebeuf, du Verzin et de Paris, touchant le mystère de la sainte Eucharistie* (Paris, 1624), REP 3169.
93. The conference is summarised by Kappler (2, 221-3). It gave rise to a work by the Protestant minister involved, Isaac Chorin, entitled *Réfutation de la*

nouvelle méthode ou art qu'enseignent et professent les Jésuites de Cour et quelques modernes de la Religion romaine pour disputer contre ceux de la Religion réformée (Sedan, 1623), REP 3079.

Appointed bishop of Lavaur in 1637, Abra de Raconis (like Véron) wrote several works against the Jansenists in 1644 and 1645. He died on 16 July 1647.

EPILOGUE

EPILOGUE

Parisian religious debate (1621–1629)

As noted in Chapter 1, the events of the years 1621–29, from the point of view of religious polemic in the capital, act as a kind of coda to the foregoing period. As the king's military campaigns against the Protestants of southern France, suspended in 1622 then resumed in 1627, came to an end in 1629, the Parisian Protestants witnessed the reconstruction of their devastated church building, the resumption of worship and the establishment of a formidable ministerial team: Mestrezat, Drelin-court and Daillé (to be joined a few years later by Aubertin and Le Faucheur). The unifying theme in the development of Parisian religious controversy during this period is provided by François Véron and his 'méthode véronique' and the various responses elicited from the Charenton ministers.

1. François Véron (1575–1649)¹

François Véron was to be the major influence on Catholic participation in inter-confessional debate during the reign of Louis XIII just as du Perron had dominated the previous two decades. The change of emphasis which this entailed is aptly conveyed by the following judgement, passed by Véron on the works of his distinguished predecessor:

Je loue les hauts discours de nostre grand Cardinal [du Perron], et la solidité d'iceux, et me serait bien aisé de "dupliquer" pour lui. Mais quelles longueurs et subtilités de là? et quel nuage conséquemment au regard de la vue du peuple errant peu acérée, que nous voulons convaincre par ce témoignage?²

As this quotation suggests, Véron's polemic was deliberately orientated towards ordinary members of the Protestant community and away from the educated or courtly élite for whom du Perron's books and debates had been chiefly intended.

In addition to this emphasis on simplicity and popular appeal however, the other important feature of the method was its calculated denial of reciprocity: the Protestant opponent was not under any circumstances to be allowed to challenge

the Catholic questioner in return. The aggressive stance to be adopted within the debate was reinforced by the military and hunting metaphors frequently employed by Véron when expounding his method, and in a still more dramatic way by the propaganda campaigns, involving open-air sermons and large-scale leafleting, which usually accompanied his own conference challenges. Most strikingly of all, in 1621–22 and 1625–26, Véron's missions were actually conducted alongside the military campaigns undertaken against the Protestants by the French king.

Véron's *Bref et facile moyen* (1617)

Born in 1575, Véron joined the Society of Jesus in 1595 and spent the first part of his career teaching philosophy and theology in one of the Jesuit colleges. In 1615 he published his first work of religious controversy: an account of a conference between himself and a Protestant minister at Amiens which also included a summary of the method which he had used.³ Over the next few years, the pamphlet was reprinted several times, a Latin translation was prepared and, according to Véron, his book also 'apprit à parler anglois, hollandais, et allemand'.⁴

Véron's best-known account of his method appeared in 1617 and was entitled *Bref et facile moyen par lequel toute personne bien qu'elle ne soit versée en Théologie, peut par la seule Bible, soit de Genève, soit autre, et par la Confession de foy de la Religion pretenduë, faire paroistre evidemment à tout Ministre qu'il abuse, et à tout Religioneire qu'il est abusé en tous et en chacun des poincts de sa pretenduë reformation*.⁵ In the course of preparing this definitive version of his method, it appears that Véron had also introduced fellow Jesuits to this new approach: 'j'ay faict plusieurs Academies sur ce subject, en deux des plus fameux Colleges qu'ayons en France, ... partie pour aguerrir plusieurs en ce combat mystique; partie pour par les disputes, le rendre plus exact' (p.211).

This tiny duodecimo volume of two hundred pages contains a manual, divided into seven chapters in which Véron outlines his method, provides documentary evidence on specific controversial issues, and advice on conducting debates with ministers or lay Protestants. It thus represents a logical development of Gontéry's *Pierre de Touche* and Véron readily acknowledged his debt to his deceased colleague:

J'ay appris la substance de ce qui est contenu au premier chapitre de ce livret, du feu R. P. Gontery. Ce grand Veneur est auteur et inventeur de ceste façon si efficace et si facile de vener, par la pure parole escrite; mesmes de la version de Geneve. (pp.208-9)

He claimed, however, to have further refined the method in order to make it totally effective:

Nos Adversaires se voyants forcez par ce grand Guerrier de quitter leur fort de la pure parole escrite, se sont retirez en Renards dans des tannieres de quelques consequences, qu'ils promettent de deduire de la pure parole ecrite; et se servant de finesse de Renard, veulent faire couler leur dictes consequences pour paroles de la sainte escritture; au moins leur veulent donner esgale force qu'a icelle. Mon dessein principal en ce livret, est, de les chasser de ceste retraitte derniere; et tracer un moyen par lequel chacun le peut faire. Je le trace au chap. 2. et 3. (pp.209-10)

The first three chapters contain Véron's step-by-step introduction to the two main stages of his method. The arguments are presented in the form of hypothetical conversations between the Catholic reader and a Protestant minister or, alternatively, an uneducated member of the Protestant laity. In Chapter 1, Véron shows how to convince the Protestant opponent that 'il n'a aucune pure parole de l'Ecriture sainte, pour justifier aucun article de sa pretenduë Reformation' and recommends the 'confrontation des textes' to reinforce this point: 'Il le faut faire lire et relire au Religioneire, et le faire Juge luy mesme, si ceste pure parolle escripte cottée dict ce qu'enseigne l'article' (p.16). In Chapters 2 and 3, Véron demonstrates, using the same step-by-step approach, how to invalidate (1) Protestant interpretations of scripture — his chosen example is the phrase 'Ceci est mon corps' — and (2), their use of 'conséquences', logical deductions made from biblical texts. Chapter 4 supplements the opening chapter, dealing with other principal articles from the confession of faith in a similar way.

In Chapter 5 Véron issues an instruction of crucial importance to all readers intending to make use of the 'bref et facile moyen'. Throughout the foregoing pages Véron has stressed the need to prevent any Protestant opponent from embarking on 'détours'; in this brief chapter he warns the Catholic questioner against allowing himself to be cast in the defensive role:

C'est leur ordinaire de nous questionner ... et par ce moyen ... ils nous engagent à la preuve de nostre foy. Ruse grande! Catholiques prenés y garde: quand ils vous font telles questions, ne prenez pas la qualité de l'Acteur, n'apportez les textes de l'escriture en justification de vostre cause; bien qu'en ayes plusieurs: Non: Si pour respondre à leurs questions, vous apportez voz textes exprés, voyla le Ministre desengagé, et luy qui a renoncé à l'antiquité, aux Peres, aux Miracles, destournera l'escriture come il luy plaira, se mocquera de vous encor qu'eussiez plus de dix textes exprez; l'experience l'avere. Faictes autrement: ne vous laissez jamais donner le change. (pp.131–33)

Véron thus clearly states the way in which the new method denied the conventions of the traditional conference.

His remaining two chapters provide further documentation in the form of extracts from the Protestants' Genevan translation. Chapter 6 cites passages which, according to Véron, contradict specific formulations in the Protestants' confession of faith while the final chapter provides another thirty pages of quotations from the same version in which, according to Véron, the translators have deliberately distorted the sense of scriptural texts relating to all the main controversial issues. The point made by Véron with this last group of texts is in a sense quite separate from the method itself and was to feature in a number of his later pamphlets.⁶ 'Je n'ay veu aucun livre, qui monstrast les falsifications de la Bible de Geneve, par un moyen qui peut estre recogneu, de ceux mesmes qui n'entendent autre langue que la Françoisie', claimed the author (p.214), and it is interesting to note that Véron's popular presentation of this argument also pre-dates P. Coton's huge scholarly volume on the same subject by a year.⁷

This brief analysis of the structure of Véron's *Bref et facile moyen* reveals that it is, as its author admitted, a refinement of the approach employed by P. Gontéry in the previous decade. Véron, however, had not only extended the argument beyond the initial confrontation of Bible and confession of faith to include interpretations and logical deductions, but all the stages of the arguments have been presented in a clearer manual-form, making it more likely that Gontéry's ambitions for the widespread popular use of the method would be realised. In his concluding pages, Véron echoed his predecessor's hopes for the new approach:

J'ay voulu rendre ce moyen esgalement facile et solide; facile, pour pouvoir

estre practiqué mesmes par ceux qui n'ont estudié en Theologie; solide afin qu'il fut bien receu par les plus doctes, qui le recognoistront exactement aligné à la plus subtile Theologie, qu'on nomme Scholastique; et examiné selon les plus severes loix d'icelle; et partant le jugeront du tout imployable (pp.210–11)

The populist thrust of Véron's involvement in religious polemic was to be evident in all his activities over the years which followed, but it is also interesting to note at this point his emphasis on the sound theological and philosophical basis of the new approach.

Véron's missionary activities (1617–1629)

Over the next few years Véron attempted to apply his 'baillon' to Protestant ministers in several parts of northern France.⁸ All were unanimous in condemning the method itself and the provocative strategies employed by Véron in order to secure debates and to publicise them. J.-M. de L'Angle, a Protestant minister at Rouen, wrote at some length, in his reply to Véron's account of their 1618 conference, on the seditious nature of the activities of Véron and other Jesuits and suggested that, having discredited themselves in the eyes of educated Catholics, 'ils taschent à maintenir [leur credit] parmy la populace, et à l'animer à l'encontre de nous'.⁹ In the same year, Paul Ferry, pastor at Metz, published a substantial refutation of Véron's *Bref et facile moyen*.¹⁰ Du Moulin, a close friend of Ferry, wrote from Paris expressing the view that

Votre antagoniste n'était pas digne de votre labeur. Car ici il est tenu pour un étourdi et pour ignorant. Il était avec le P. Arnoux quand il me vint attaquer en ma chambre et voulut se mêler de discourir. Mais Arnoux le tança de ce qu'il le troublait, disant qu'il ne comprenait pas l'affaire.¹¹

In one of many challenges addressed to du Moulin — entitled, on this occasion, *Briefve responce des saints peres ... Au Bouclier de la Foy du Sieur du Moulin* — Véron made clear his strategy.¹² As he explained in his introduction, this initial pamphlet was intentionally brief so that

venant entre les mains d'un chacun, le simple peuple, si vous n'y respondrez, recognoistra ... que vostre Confession de Foy, estre vraiment convaincüe

de nullité, et le Bouclier qu'avez opposé pour sa defence, faucé et percé, par les traicts aigus de la seule sainte Escriture, en la bouche des Peres des quatre premiers siecles, . . . Je représenteray dans peu de jours en un autre petit cayer, les doctes responces des susdits Docteurs, pour faire voir à l'œil d'un chacun, que n'y avez reparty un seul mot; et partant qu'ils vous ont rendu muet; et finalement je casseray en plus de pieces ce dit Bouclier, en une plus longue responce, que j'y fais de vive voix, tous les Dimanches en mes Predications à S. Sulpice, et donne par cayers imprimez au public à proportion de mes Sermons. (pp.5-6)

This passage clearly shows that ordinary Parisians (of whom comparatively few belonged to the minority religion) were the target audience for the promised array of printed and verbal assaults on du Moulin's book and suggests the reasons why Véron's activities should so often have been blamed for encouraging sectarian hatred in the areas which he visited.

The year in which this pamphlet was published, 1620, witnessed a new stage in Véron's career when, with the permission of his superiors, he left the Society of Jesus in order to concentrate on his missionary activities. Over the next few years he conducted campaigns in the towns of Saintonge and Rouen (1620), Sainte-Foy and Bergerac (1621), in the Champagne and Brie regions (1622), at Paris (1624) and in Languedoc (1625). Almost invariably his challenges were refused by local Protestant ministers, already familiar with his method. In the face of such refusals which were often accompanied by claims that his conferences and open-air sermons violated the terms of the Edict of Nantes, Véron obtained letters patent from the king (dated 19 March 1622) which stated that

étant bien et dûment informé du zèle, doctrine et prudence dudit suppliant, nous lui avons permis et permettons de faire ses prédications ès places publiques, quand il le jugera à propos, et avoir conférences tant avec les ministres qu'avec autres de la religion réformée, en présence de quelque nombre médiocre de personnes, et ce en tel lieu et endroit de cestui nostre royaume que bon lui semblera, et sans que, pour quelque cause et prétexte que ce soit, il y puisse être empêché; entendant le tout, pourvu que ledit Véron ait la mission ordinaire des prélats des lieux où il se trouvera.¹³

During the early 1620s Véron had also been seeking support from the king, the

clergy assembly and from Rome for the formation of a 'congrégation de la Propagation de la Foy et des Missionnaires généraux des prélats de France'. He appears to have envisaged an organisation which would co-ordinate and expand the Catholic church's missionary effort along the lines established in his own campaigns. In 1624 Véron published a pamphlet addressed to the king and outlining his project: 'J'expose et deduis à Vostre Majesté un moyen facile et asseuré pour extirper dans 4. ou 5. ans de tout vostre Royaume, l'hérésie, cause de tous les troubles d'iceluy, et semence de perpetuelles rebellions'.¹⁴ The root of the problem, according to Véron, lay in the inferior quality of many Catholic curés in rural areas:

tous les ministres par toutes les campagnes, sont communement plus doctes et capables que les Curez des mesmes lieux, et souvent encore plus reglez en leurs deportemens extérieurs. ... Qui s'estonnera, Sire, si ceux qui sont nez dans l'heresie, y demeurent, n'entendans parler de la Religion Catholique que par la bouche de leurs Ministres, avantegez en ces qualitez par dessus les Curez? j'estimerai plustost que ce seroit un miracle s'ils se convertissoient.¹⁵

Véron suggested therefore that missionary support should be provided: 'gens doctes, Missionnaires qui combattent les Ministres, desabusent le peuple Errant et suppleent aux deffauts susmentionnez'. It is not clear to what extent Véron's endeavours in this direction were ever realised. Capuchin and Jesuit missionaries were, in any case, developing their evangelistic work in the provinces more energetically in the 1630s but this does not appear to have taken place under the auspices of a French 'congrégation de la Propagation de la Foy'. There is, on the other hand, evidence — in the 1620s and again around 1650 — of many un-educated lay missionaries, active in Paris and the provinces, using the 'méthode Véronique'.

By the end of the 1620s, however, Véron's activities were becoming a cause for concern to some Catholic clerics and to civil authorities. His conference at Caen with Samuel Bochart in 1628 and the consequent unrest provides the strongest evidence of the difficulties encountered by secular authorities as a result of Véron's method of large-scale evangelism. In response to complaints from the Protestants of Caen, the king ordered the Rouen *parlement* to intervene. Its members accordingly issued an *arrêt* prohibiting Véron and Bochart 'd'écrire l'un contre l'autre, ni de

prêcher aucunes paroles injurieuses, ni faire aucune conférence et assemblées sans notre expresse et particuliere permission' and also forbidding the 'bourgeois et habitants de Caen, de quelque qualité et condition qu'ils soient',

de s'assembler, quereller ni provoquer l'un l'autre de fait ou paroles offensives, sous prétexte de religion ou autrement, à peine d'être contre eux procédé comme perturbateurs du repos et tranquillité publiques.¹⁶

From this point onwards the tide of opinion seems to have turned against organised disputes as a method of evangelism. As noted above in Chapter 3, Rome's Congregation *de Propaganda Fide* had already prohibited conferences with heretics in 1625 and, in 1629, the Jesuit's General wrote, emphasising this point:

Ces conférences, le plus souvent inutiles, sont parfois dangereuses pour le bien de la Religion; aussi sont-elles condamnés par le Souverain Pontife.¹⁷

Some of the most distinguished figures of the French Counter-Reformation — including Jean Eudes and Vincent de Paul — expressed their disapproval of conferences in general and of the tactics employed by Véron in particular.¹⁸ Protestant ministers throughout France seem to have concluded at an early stage that debate with the exponents of the 'méthode véronique' was fruitless. The publications of the three young ministers at Charenton illustrate various aspects of the Protestant reaction to Véron's method — at a personal, popular or more philosophical level — and played a major part in formulating the response of the Protestant community as a whole.

2. Later Charenton ministers v. the 'méthodistes'

Conference between Véron and Mestrezat (1624)

After the departure of du Moulin in December 1620, only one senior member of the pastoral team, Samuel Durant, had remained at Paris (although he too found a refuge at Sedan for a time). The two other ministers, Jean Mestrezat and Charles Drelincourt (who had replaced Antoine de la Faye and Lobéran de Montigny in 1614 and 1620 respectively) were both in their late twenties. In 1626, following the death of Durant, they were joined by Jean Daillé, then thirty years old. Together these men shared the ministry of the Charenton church and the task of responding to the challenges of local Catholic controversialists throughout the 1620s.¹⁹ Exchanges between Véron and the Parisian pastors date chiefly from 1624, the period between the former Jesuit's two series of missionary campaigns in the provinces. In this year Véron attacked a new work on the eucharist by Jean Mestrezat in a pamphlet entitled *La Corneille de Charenton* and, soon afterwards, challenged the Protestant minister in his own home to a conference on behalf of the *maréchale* de Thémynes.²⁰ During the single meeting which took place, Véron, as ever, demanded that his opponent disprove his contention that no article of Protestant belief could be demonstrated satisfactorily in the Bible, even that of Geneva,

ny un mot à mot et sans aucune glose, equivalence, et consequence des sieurs Ministres, ny ... par gloses ou consequences qui ayent ceste condition, qu'on puisse monstrier d'icelles qu'elles soient suffisantes pour fonder et asseurer un article de foy et croyance divine.²¹

Mestrezat took up the challenge —

[je] veux monstrier la decision des principaux differents qui sont entre nous et l'Eglise Romaine par l'Ecriture sainte, tant en textes formels, que par des consequences si claires qu'un homme raisonnable ne les puisse nier.
(p.6)

— and went on to provide biblical texts which, he claimed, supported Protestant eucharistic doctrine. In addition, he attempted to explain how, in view of the in-

tended purpose of a confession of faith, its formulations could properly be described as scripturally-based and yet use terms other than those present in scripture:

il n'y a qu'à considerer quel est le but des confessions de foy, qui est de discerner diverses sectes les unes d'avec les autres; d'où s'ensuit qu'elles doivent estre conceuës en d'autres termes qu'en ceux qui sont communs à toutes les sectes: [Il] faut donques rechercher, pour la valeur d'une confession de foy, la substance d'icelle en l'Ecriture Sainte: laquelle Ecriture donne par les passages, que j'ay alleguez la substance de nostre confession de foy. (pp.12–13)

Véron, at several points in the proceedings, expressed his satisfaction with Mestrezat's frankness in effectively conceding his main point but was careful not to take up the challenges issued by Mestrezat regarding the scriptural and historical foundations of certain Catholic beliefs. He published his version of events the same year under the title, *La sainte Bible abandonnee par les Ministres de Charenton*.²² Mestrezat's account (which appears to be a faithful reproduction of the text of the conference proceedings) was not to be published until 1655. At this date the 'méthodiste' style of argument was enjoying a revival and, as the sub-title of the pamphlet claimed, Mestrezat presented these thirty-year-old exchanges as an illustration of 'combien est esloignée de raison la manière de disputer des disciples et successeurs de Véron'.²³

In 1624, as the same anonymous Protestant author recounts, Véron also visited both Durant and Drelincourt in their homes in order to issue his customary challenges. In reply to Véron's claim that the Genevan translation was 'corrompue', Durant refuted the example cited by the Catholic polemicist, showing the same disputed rendition in Morel's dictionary, with which 'on enseigne le grec tous les jours ès escholes de l'Eglise romaine'.²⁴ Drelincourt, in an exchange which echoed that between du Moulin and Gontéry in 1609, asked Véron to

donner un seul passage de l'Ecriture, par lequel Jesus-Christ ait ordonné des sacrificateurs pour l'offrir tous les jours en sacrifice propitiatoire pour la rémission des pechez des vivans et les morts, promettant de traiter le sieur Veron plus équitablement qu'il ne nous traite, et de ne point arrester aux mots, pourvu qu'il monstrast la chose. Mais Véron ne peut jamais alleguer aucun passage. Aussi estoit-ce chose du tout impossible. Et en

cest endroit, la conference ayant esté rompue, Veron contre son ordinaire, en a eu honte et n'en a jamais parlé.²⁵

Thereafter Véron secured no further debates with the Parisian pastors during this period and makes only a brief reappearance (in 1629) at the head of a disruptive element present at a conference between Mestrezat and P. Regourd in that year.²⁶

Conference between Regourd and Mestrezat (1629)

The debate in question, organised at the behest of the queen mother (in the absence of both the king and cardinal Richelieu) offers a striking conclusion to the series of debates which had taken place in Paris over the three decades since Henri IV authorised the Fontainebleau conference in 1600.

Mestrezat agreed to participate in the debate at very short notice but managed to secure the agreement of both the queen mother and P. Regourd to a list of conditions which included the publication of an official record of the proceedings. Quite exceptionally, it had been agreed that the subjects for debate would be drawn from Catholic doctrine — on the subjects of the eucharist (particularly transsubstantiation), purgatory and the use of images — all of which Mestrezat undertook to refute 'par la seule parole de Dieu'. Over the course of the first few sessions the audience grew progressively until, according to one estimate, there were three thousand present at the fourth session on Friday 13 July. By this stage, both the government and the archbishop were becoming extremely anxious to terminate the debate and the conference was eventually broken off two sessions later on Tuesday 17 July. (The appearance of P. Véron 'suivy d'une troupe mutine de gens de néant manifestant contre la poursuite de la conference' played a part in the participants' decision to end the debate.) The 'actes' of the conference were suppressed by royal command, but a detailed record of events has been preserved in a journal by the Protestant Isaac d'Huisseau.²⁷ Many years later, in a book attacking the 'méthodistes', Drelincourt was to refer to this conference as an example of the type of fruitful exchange Protestants were prepared to take part in, and wrote of 'le glorieux avantage que nostre Religion remporta de cette conference'.²⁸ From the point of view of the Catholic church and the French government, however, as Richelieu's correspondence reveals, the conference had been very unwelcome.

Writing from Languedoc — where the Grace of Alès was awaiting registration by the *parlement* of Toulouse and acceptance by the rebellious towns of Nîmes and Montauban — the cardinal expressed his amazement at the fact that the queen mother had,

par brevet, permis une conference entre un jesuite et un Ministre et qu'en suite ceste action a fait un tel esclat dans Paris que toute la ville en a esté scandalisée,

and also that the conference had proceeded without the intervention of cardinal Bérulle, leader of the queen's council, 'qui sçait combien de telles conferences attirent de périlleuses consequences'. He concluded however that the episode had at least demonstrated the desirability of forestalling any similar ventures in the future.²⁹ Bérulle, writing to Richelieu on the previous day, admitted that the conference had provided the Protestant church with a platform at a particularly inopportune time —

Je ne sçay pas à quoy on a pensé lorsque l'hœrésie est aux abois à vos pieds, de lui rendre la voix et la parolle, de la mettre en un throsne dans un Paris et luy faire faire, à la presence de prélats et religieux qui y ont esté, les prières publiques et le presche (ce qui jamais n'a esté fait) et ce par l'autorité de la royne,

— but explained that it had been decided that any forceful intervention by the government, Parlement or archbishop would have been likely to inflame the situation further.³⁰

It is not surprising, therefore, to find that Véron's plea, made to Louis XIII in 1633, that the king should command another Fontainebleau conference and compel the Protestant ministers to debate with him did not receive a favourable reply:

Qu'il plaise à Votre Majesté ... qu'elle commande, s'il lui plaît, cette entrevue; car les ministres fuyards, desesperés de pouvoir résiste à la force d'une certaine méthode par laquelle je les poursuis par l'Ecriture Sainte et les Saints Pères, ont arrêté, même par actes publics, à ce que j'entends, tant en leurs consistoires qu'en leur synode provincial et national, de demeurer muets toute leur vie ou la mienne sur toutes mes attaques, et de ne répondre jamais à mes cartels, prédications ou livres.³¹

Despite the fact that the ministers would no longer respond directly to Véron's challenges, they nevertheless produced a number of works refuting the method in a more general way or equipping lay members of the church to deal with its arguments. The most important of these were Drelincourt's *Abbrege des controverses* and two books by Jean Daillé, *Traicté de l'Employ des Saints Peres* and *La foy fondee sur les saintes escritures*.

Drelincourt's *Abbrege des controverses* (1624)

The first edition of Drelincourt's work was published in 1624 as an *Abbrege des controverses Ou Sommaire des erreurs de nostre temps avec leur refutation par textes expres de la Bible de Louvain*.³² It consisted of seventy articles of Catholic belief, covering the range of issues commonly raised in inter-confessional debate. In each case the Catholic statement was simply followed by several short quotations from scripture which, according to Drelincourt, contradicted the Catholic standpoint. These extracts, as the pamphlet's sub-title makes clear, were deliberately drawn from the authorised Catholic version of the Bible in French:

Car encores qu'ils [Catholic theologians] ayent emoussé la pointe de ce glaive de l'Esprit, si est-ce qu'il a assez d'efficace pour presser le mensonge jusques dans ses cachetes, et luy percer le cœur (f.a.ii.verso)

The work itself was addressed to ordinary Catholics and, although Drelincourt did not mention Véron by name, his comments seem to refer to his method:

On vous persuade que nous avons corrompu le texte de l'Ecriture, que nous l'alleguons à faux, et que nous en tirons de mauvaises consequences. En fin la calomnie qui n'a point de borne, a osé publier que nous avons abandonné la sainte Bible. (f.a.ii.recto)

In the second edition, published the following year, the contents had been improved or altered in several respects. The number of articles dealt with had been increased to eighty and, whereas the first edition had provided corroborative references in only a handful of cases, the new version cited almost one hundred marginal references to authoritative sources in support of the disputed Catholic statements of belief. (The vast majority of these were drawn from Bellarmine

(60) and the Council of Trent (26); only a very small number were taken from the writings of French theologians such as du Perron and Coton.)³³ The most important change in the editions of 1625 and 1626 was the use of the Genevan version for the scripture texts in preference to that of Louvain. Drelincourt explained that this substitution had been made in order to make the work better adapted for use by fellow Protestants:

Ce n'est pas que l'auteur ait changé son dessein de confondre l'Eglise romaine par leur propre Bible. Mais quelques Eglises l'ont prié de mettre au jour cette édition en faveur de notre jeunesse qui doit estre plus exercée en cette version.³⁴

The decision to add brief commentaries to quite a number of the Bible extracts also seems to have been made in order to help Protestant users in disputes with Catholics.

In this revised form the *Abbrégé des controverses* was to establish itself as a standard work and go through at least twenty editions. E. Benoist, writing in the 1690s, described the book's appeal in the following terms:

livre facile, populaire, qu'on pouvoit ^{toijours} avoir dans la poche à cause de sa petitesse, sans en être incommodé, et que les artisans, les servantes, les enfants même savoient par cœur. Les plus simples y trouvaient des armes proportionnés à leur portée, pour se défendre contre les Missionnaires.³⁵

Drelincourt was to write a number of other works over the years designed to help the Protestant laity in their encounters with Catholic missionaries. In 1629, for example, he published the first two of a projected series of eleven treatises under the title *Le combat romain*. These had also been written 'en faveur des moins instruits qui sont tous les jours harcelés de disputes' (p.3) but, perhaps as a consequence of the decline in the use of the method at about this date, Drelincourt did not go on to publish the remainder of the series.³⁶

The orientation of Drelincourt's contribution to religious controversy was clearly a popular rather than a scholarly one and in this respect shows strong similarities with much of du Moulin's output during his Parisian career. As mentioned in earlier chapters, the *Abbrégé des controverses* resembles several of du

Moulin's early pamphlets — his *Oppositions de la parole de Dieu, Nouvelles briques* or *Trente-deux demandes*. (There are parallels, too, between Drelincourt's later and longer works and the older pastor's *Bouclier de la foy*.) At least one modern commentator has dismissed Drelincourt as 'tiresomely unoriginal' and claimed that 'Du Moulin and Drelincourt in the main merely repeat one another'.³⁷ Such statements, however, ignore the fact that popular works of religious polemic were as necessary and desirable to meet the demands of the contemporary situation as the more scholarly contributions of Daillé and others. The large number of surviving editions of the works of du Moulin and Drelincourt tends to confirm this fact and Pierre Bayle was to describe the latter's contribution to religious debate in terms of unqualified approval:

Ce qu'il a écrit contre l'Eglise romaine a fortifié les protestants plus que l'on ne sauroit dire; car avec les armes qu'il leur a fournies, ceux mêmes qui n'avoient aucune étude, tenoient tête aux moines et aux curés, et prêtoient hardiment le collet aux missionnaires.³⁸

Daillé's *Traicté de l'Employ des Saints Peres* (1631)

Whereas the details of Mestrezat's 1624 encounter with Véron and of Drelincourt's *Abbrégé des controverses* show how the Parisian pastors responded on a practical front to the verbal challenges continually presented by the chief exponents of the 'méthodiste' approach, Jean Daillé's two major works provide supreme examples of the Protestant reaction to the philosophical standpoint implicit in the method. His *Traicté de l'Employ des Saints Peres* was, according to his son, written in 1628 but not published until 1631.³⁹ The author's main contention was that

Les Peres ne peuvent estre juges des controverses aujourd'hui agitees entre ceux de l'Eglise Romaine et les Protestans: I. parce qu'il [est], si non impossible, du moins tres-difficile de sçavoir nettement et precisément quel a esté leur sentiment sur icelles. II. parce que leur sentiment (posé qu'il fust certainement et clairement entendu) n'estant pas infaillible, ni hors de danger d'erreur, il ne peut avoir une autorité capable de satisfaire l'entendement, qui ne peut, ni ne doit croire, en matiere de Religion, que ce qu'il sçait estre assurément veritable.

Daillé was thus turning the sceptical objections made against scripture by the

'méthodistes' (and other Catholic theologians) — regarding the authenticity of texts, translations and interpretations — against the writings of the church fathers. His method and conclusions were, however, in a very different vein to those of Véron and in the course of his exceptionally succinct and orderly examination of this question Daillé declared his opposition to a certain style of making sceptical objections which he characterised as 'menües puntilles' —

plus seantes à des Pyrrhoniens et Academiques, qui veulent tout tirer en doute, qu'à des Chrestiens qui cherchent en la simplicité et sincerité de leur cœur de quoi appuyer leur foy.

The precise and objective terms in which he summed up his arguments typify his approach to the various issues raised throughout the entire work and his conclusions are, at this date, very striking from several points of view:

[il] s'ensuit, qu'il faut debatre nos differents par autre moyens que par leurs [the church fathers'] escrits; et suivre en la Religion la methode que l'on tient en toutes autres disciplines, nous servant des choses dont nous sommes d'accord, pour esclaircir celles dont nous sommes en contestation; comparant exactement les conclusions de l'une et de l'autre partie avec ses principes, recognus et confessez par toutes les deux, soit en la raison, soit en la revelation divine. Et quant aux Peres, les lire soigneusement, et sur tout sans préjugé de part ni d'autre, cerchans en leurs escrits leurs opinions et non les nostres; argumentant, de ce que nous y trouverons, negativement plustost qu'affirmativement, c'est à dire que nous tenions pour suspects les articles qui ne paroissent point chez eux, n'estant pas croyable que de si excellens hommes ayent ignorés les necessaires et principaux poincts de la foy: mais ne recevans pas incontinent pour infailliblement veritable tout ce qui se rencontrent chez eux, par ce qu'estans hommes, quoi que Saints, ils peuvent s'estre quelquefois mespris, soit par une simple ignorance, soit mesmes par quelque passion, n'en ayans pas esté entierement exempts, comme il paroist clairement par ce qui nous reste de leurs livres.

Daillé was thus arguing in favour of an objective and systematic analysis of the rational, biblical and historical evidence in every disputed area of Christian doctrine. His description of the proper procedure for resolving religious differences is remarkable for its unequivocal assertion that the method appropriate to this sphere is the same as 'en toutes autres disciplines' and for the emphasis he places on a rigorous but respectful approach to the testimonies of the Church Fathers.

Some of the essential points of Daillé's case, such as his cautious scepticism with regard to historical evidence or his endorsement of the role of human reason in formulating doctrine, are, not surprisingly, to be found in the works of du Moulin and other contemporary Protestant controversialists. Here, however, these views are not submerged in the ramifications of specific polemical exchanges and thus are stated more clearly and powerfully. Daillé's presentation of the issues is also far more irenic than du Moulin's, with the younger author displaying none of the verbal aggression which features so strongly in du Moulin's writing, and placing great emphasis instead on building on areas of agreement between the two confessions and on the assertion that both sides of every question should be examined with the same rigour and objectivity.

La foy fondee sur les saintes escritures (1634)

Daillé's other important work, dealing more directly with the implications of Véron's method was published a few years later but is, nevertheless, like his *Traicté de l'employ des saints peres*, a product of the debates which had taken place during the 1620s. *La foy fondee sur les saintes escritures. Contre les nouveaux Methodistes* appeared in early 1634.⁴⁰ Its contents complement those of the earlier work, arguing in favour of a faith based on the Bible interpreted by reason where the previous book had argued against the evidence of the church fathers as an irrefutable authority. Daillé's new work is, in fact, a three-part defence of the Protestants' confession of faith. The author explains at the outset that the confession's forty articles need to be divided into two categories — those which affirm Protestant beliefs and those which reject Catholic teachings — and that the Protestants can only be challenged to provide explicit scriptural texts for the former; the remaining articles can also be supported by biblical evidence but in a far less specific manner. Parts 2 and 3 deal accordingly with these two groups of articles (pp.71–127, 128–210).

The most interesting section of the book, however, from the point of view of the development of religious debate, is Part 1, in which Daillé examines the implications of the approach used by the 'nouveaux Methodistes'. The book opens with a description of the widespread use of Véron's method:

Il s'est élevé depuis quelques années certains Docteurs, qui pour rendre nostre religion odieuse, publient qu'elle ne se peut prouver par les Escritures, seules neantmoins selon nous capables de fonder la Foi. Leur invention a esté trouvée si plausible, que plusieurs de nos Adversaires y ont réduit toute leur Dialectique, estimans que pour nous desfaire il ne faut que nous demander un passage expres et formel sur chaque article de nostre Confession de Foi, et que quiconque est capable de presser ceste demande l'est aussi de nous veindre. Ceste facilité a multiplié les disputeurs parmi eux: et au lieu qu'au commencement ils suivoient les conferences sur la religion, et ne permettoient qu'aux Clercs d'en parler, maintenant toute sorte de gens les recherchent, jusques aux lingers, et aux garçons des patisseries, devenus Docteurs en un instant par ceste belle methode. Pour donc leur fermer la bouche, et armer les nostres contre leurs puntilles, j'ai entrepris de prouver brievement nostre Foi par les Escritures. (pp.1-2)

In one of his earliest chapters, Daillé dismisses the prescriptive argument with which 'méthodistes' invariably countered any challenge to Catholicism, claiming that it was both 'vain et impertinent' to assert that the Catholics are 'en possession':

Car si ceste possession qu'ils appellent, peut estre alleguée en ceste cause, les Apostres du Seigneur auroient eu tort de quereller le Payen sur sa religion, puisqu'il en estoit en possession depuis si longtemps; les Jesuites auroient tort aujourd'huy de vouloir chasser l'idolatrie des cœurs et des pagodes des Chinois, qu'elle possède de temps immemorial: (pp.12-3)⁴¹

In the chapters which follow, Daillé sets out to show that the method has no precedent either in the ministries of Christ and his apostles:

Quand le Tentateur alleguoit à nostre Seigneur le verset de Pseaume, '*Il donnera charge de toi à ses Anges*' pour lui persuader qu'il se jettast du haut du pinacle en bas, comment ne lui respondoit-il point selon ceste abregée Methode, *Que le passage n'estoit pas formel*? (p.17)

or in the writings of the church fathers and asks:

Qui croira que l'Eglise ait ignoré par l'espace de tant de siecles un si excellent moien de *baillonner ses ennemis*, et que ces honnestes gens (que l'on peut dire sans les offenser n'estre pas les plus habiles hommes de nostre aage) se soient en fin seuls avisés en nos jours de ce que les lumieres du monde n'avoient encore peu decouvrir, et que la povre Verité ait souspiré

si long temps dans les liens des *consequences* attendant sa liberté de la seule espée de ces nouveaux Alexandres? (p.18)

In the final group of chapters in Part 1, Daillé turns to the most crucial question raised by the method, the role of reason in determining religious truth (Chapters 9–13). In the first of these chapters, he begins by asserting, like du Moulin, that ‘ce qui se conclud evidemment et necessairement de l’Ecriture est veritable, et divin, et fait partie de l’Ecriture’ and supports this with evidence from two sources, scripture itself and contemporary Catholic theologians. Again like du Moulin some years earlier, Daillé gives pride of place to Bellarmine’s observations on this subject:

Le Cardinal Bellarmin, qui seul a plus de merite et de reputation dans le parti de Rome, que les auteurs et defenseurs de ceste nouvelle methode n’en ont tous ensemble, reconnoist la mesme verité: *Ce que l’on deduit evidemment de l’Ecriture* (dit-il) *est evidemment veritable, les Escritures presupposés.* (p.48)

In Chapter 10, he presents the most striking part of his argument when he claims that ‘la pretendue methode oste la certitude de toutes les connoissances humaines, et plonge la religion, les sciences, et toute la vie des hommes dans une horrible confusion’. Daillé claims that the ‘méthodistes’ are resorting to arguments more appropriate to sceptics and atheists and that it is not possible to undermine Protestant doctrine by sceptical objections whilst still retaining an unquestioning faith in Catholic doctrine:

La raison estant donc fautive, comment pourrons-nous estre asseurés de la verité des choses que nous avons par son moyen découvertes en l’Ecriture? ... Je ne trouverais pas estrange qu’un Athée nous fist ceste objection, puis que son impieté l’oblige à confondre toutes les connoissances de l’esprit humain dans une infinie et irremediable incertitude. Mais que des gens, qui font profession de la Religion Chrestienne, et qui d’ailleurs ont tant d’interest à conserver la foi, l’assurance, et mesmes la credulité dans le monde, nous proposent un discours qui ruine toutes ces choses de fond en comble, c’est à mon advis ou une imprudence, ou une passion extreme. Car considerés je vous prie où va ce beau discours; La raison (disent-ils) est fautive. Partant nous ne pouvons estre asseurés des conclusions qu’elle tire de l’Ecriture. Mais si ceste consequence est bonne, de quoi donc serons nous plus asseurés? Que deviendra premierement ceste tant vantée certitude de la foi Catholique qu’ils ont tousjours en la bouche? ... Car

qu'ils le vueillent ou non, c'est notre entendement qui reçoit les choses de la foi, qui les considere et est amené à les croire par les raisons de verité, qu'il voit en elles. (pp.49-50)

Even the Catholic church's use of the *notæ*, the marks of the Church, to prove that it is the true Church represents an appeal to reason:

comment en pouvez-vous estre asseuré, puis que ceste raison, au raport de laquelle vous le croyez est fautive? ... d'où dépend toute la foi Romaine, qu'une opinion douteuse et flottante ... ? (p.50)

Daillé extends his argument still further to suggest that the 'méthodiste' view of reason holds serious implications for every other field of human enquiry, entailing doubt with regard to

toutes les choses ... qui se demonstrent en la Mathematique, en la Physique, en la medecine et dans les autres sciences, puis que c'est la raison, ceste trompeuse maistresse, qui les nous enseigne (p.51)

Furthermore, suggests Daillé, 'outre les connoissances de l'entendement, ce discours nous oste d'abondant toutes les apprehensions de nos sens' so that the 'Methodistes' will ultimately be reduced to a position of total scepticism.

In the chapter which follows Daillé pursues the question of the fallibility of human reason and argues, with supporting quotations from Augustine, that the fact that knowledge and understanding or, more particularly, arguments based on scripture, are not always employed carefully and logically does not provide sufficient justification for the rejection of reason. In contrast to the 'méthodiste' claim that logic was merely an invention of pagan philosophers, Daillé (like du Moulin) portrays it as divinely-created:

ceste necessaire liaison des propositions avec leurs conclusions est un ouvrage, non de l'esprit ou du raisonnement de l'homme, mais de la volonté de Dieu, comme l'a expressément remarqué saint Augustin. *La verité des suites* (dit-il) *et des liaisons, qu'ont les propositions les unes avec les autres n'a pas esté instituée, mais considerée et remarquée par les hommes pour la pouvoir ou apprendre ou enseigner. Car elle est perpetuelle et divinement établie dans la raison des choses mesmes.* (p.58)

Thus Daillé presents the following conclusion regarding the 'méthodiste' standpoint with regard to reason:

toute ceste apprehension qu'ils nous donnent, de l'incertitude des conclusions tirées de l'Ecriture par le raisonnement n'est qu'une vaine chimere, que la seule passion leur a fait mettre en avant pour autoriser ceste ridicule methode à laquelle ils pretendent reduire les hommes de ne plus discourir; et sans laquelle ils voient bien qu'il ne leur est pas possible de defendre leur creance. (p.59)

Having re-established the validity of the role of human reasoning and perception in religious matters, Daillé then goes on, in Parts 2 and 3, to give a brief account of the Protestant faith and 'de prouver en suite chacun des articles dont elle consiste par la Sainte Escriture, ou en les y lisant, ou en les en deduisant evidemment' (p.71).

In comparison with du Moulin's *Bouclier de la foy* of 1618, Daillé's response to the attack mounted by the 'méthodistes' on the basis of Protestant belief as expressed in their confession of faith reveals a far more effective and clearly-argued approach. There is no doubt that, in the course of over a decade and a half, a wider range of arguments from scripture, church history and contemporary Catholic theologians had been assembled — although many points made by du Moulin reappear in Daillé book — but the younger minister also endorses the role of human reason and pursues the consequences of scepticism far more forcefully than du Moulin had done earlier. Daillé sets out to prove that the 'méthodiste' position of simultaneous scepticism with regard to the basis of Protestant doctrine and unquestioning belief in that of Catholicism is untenable. He does this by binding together the fate of both branches of the Christian Church (and also other fields of intellectual enquiry) to that of reason. The trustworthiness of rational procedures must be accepted in the face of the alternative of total scepticism.⁴²

Two decades later, when Mestrezat published his account of his 1624 conference with Véron, he still regarded this work by Daillé, together with Drelincourt's *Abbrégé*, as the best response to the method:

si quelqu'un veut voir une ample et forte refutation de la chicane de ces Disputeurs, qu'il lise le Traitté de Monsieur Daillé intitulé, La foy fondee

sur les Escritures. Et si quelqu'un veut voir nos controverses décidées par passages expres de l'Escriture sainte, qu'il lise l'Abbrégé des Controverses de Monsieur Drelincourt.⁴³

By the end of 1629, therefore, the popularity of Véron's method was waning. It is interesting to note that the period during which the method had gained currency and been practised most energetically — the years 1617–29 — corresponds very closely to that of the king's religious wars against the country's Protestants. Both the philosophy and practice of the method seem to accord particularly well with the Catholic mentality of this period and it may well be that Véron's missionary activities — whose main effect seems to have been to harass the Protestant minority and inflame Catholic opinion against them — played a small but significant part in securing a successful outcome to the king's crusades. However, by the time the elimination of Protestantism as a political and military force had been achieved with the Grace of Alès, grave doubts were already being expressed on the Catholic side regarding the consequences of Véron's activitiesⁱ from both a pastoral point of view and from that of preserving public order. Rome's strictures against verbal disputes finally began to be noted within France. Over the next decade the Catholic stance with regard to the country's Protestants was to become progressively more irenic. Richelieu took the initial steps towards his 'projet de réunion' in the early 1630s and the new spirit was perhaps most aptly summed-up in a book by Jean-Pierre Camus, published in 1640 and entitled *L'Avoisinement des Protestants vers l'Eglise Romaine*.⁴⁴ According to Jacques Solé, the method had also been a factor in creating a certain 'lassitude idéologique' in Catholic religious controversy which contrasted strongly with the vitality of the years 1598–1620. Both the number and quality of Catholic controversialists engaged in inter-confessional debate were, in his view and that of other commentators, much reduced.⁴⁵

On the Protestant side Véron's method also had a significant effect, leading to a decision on the part of most ministers to withdraw from verbal disputes. This in turn seems to have had an invigorating effect upon the church's controversialists. Liberated from the demands of debate at a local and popular level, members of the second generation of Parisian pastors were able to devote more of their time to

study, preaching and to the composition of major works of religious controversy. While the need for a popular presentation of controversial issues still remained — and was met chiefly by the publications of Charles Drelincourt — it was markedly less acute than in du Moulin's time. Daillé's response to the 'méthodistes' in his two works of 1631 and 1634 foreshadows the new developments in the Protestant approach to inter-confessional debate over the coming decades. His books, with those of Aubertin and Le Faucheur, present a strong contrast to du Moulin's publications. More moderate and dispassionate in tone, more scholarly and systematic in their choice and presentation of arguments, and also more adventurous in theological and philosophical terms, it is not surprising that modern scholars should identify so strongly with the younger generation of Charenton ministers and accordingly dismiss du Moulin's contribution. But, while there is no doubt that du Moulin's later publications appear outmoded in comparison with those of Daillé and his contemporaries, it is nonetheless true that his earlier sequence of works had played a vital part in meeting the need for a vigorous and effective response to the pressures upon the Parisian Protestant community in the years 1598-1621.

Notes to Epilogue

1. Sources for biography: 'Notice sur la vie de Fr. Véron et sur ses ouvrages' in *Règle de la foi catholique séparée de toutes les opinions de la théologie scolastique et de tous autres sentimens particuliers ou abus* [1645] (Paris-Besançon, 1825) edited by Labouderie, pp.iii-lxxvii; P. Feret, *Un curé de Charenton au XVII^e siècle* (Paris, 1881); DTC, 15, 2699-700. (The BN catalogue contains a fully-indexed entry for Véron listing over 200 items.)
2. *Méthode de traiter des controverses de religion, par la seule Escriture sainte* ... (Paris, 1638), REP 4161-64, p.392 (cited by Solé, 1, 10, n.8.).
3. *Le Ministre d'Amyens contraint de renoncer à la seule parole de l'Escriture sainte, rendu muet et mis en fuite sur le sujet du Saint Sacrement de l'autel* ... (Rouen, 1615), REP 1814 (also 1810-13).
4. *Abrégé de l'art et méthode nouvelle de baillonner les ministres de France et réduire les dévoyez à la religion catholique, ou Bref et facile moyen par lequel tout catholique peut faire paroist[r]e évidemment que tous les ministres sont des trompeurs en l'exercice de leurs charges et tous les religionnaires sont abusez en tous et un chacun des poincts de leur prétendue réformation, presché et enseigné en l'église de Rouen, en présence de neuf à dix mille personnes, par le P. François Véron, ... avec la pratique d'iceluy en une conférence entre ledit Père, et un des principaux ministres de la religion prétendue ... Édition douziesme* ... (Rouen, 1618), REP 2291.
5. (Pont-à-Mousson, 1617), REP 2112. This work was to be regularly re-issued in various guises throughout the next decade: see, for example, REP 2291 (1618), 2460 (1619), 2858 (1621), 3159 (1623), 3524 (1627).
6. See, for example, REP 2297 (1618), 3162 (1623), 3594 (n.d.).
7. See above, Chapter 6, pp.312-14.
8. See REP 2292, 2296, 2299 (1618); 2461-62, 2465-66, 2467, 2471-72 (1619).
9. *Recit de la Conference tenue entre Jean Maximilien de l'Angle Ministre de la parole de Dieu en l'Eglise Reformee de Rouen, et Francois Veron Jesuite* (Quevilly, [1618]), REP 2230, pp.6-7. (The sole copy located by Desgraves is ^{be}found in the Cosin collection.)
10. *Le Dernier Désespoir de la tradition contre l'Escriture, où est amplement réfuté le livre du P. François Véron, Jésuite, par lequel il prétend enseigner à toute personne, quoy que non versée en théologie, un bref et facile moyen de rejeter la Parole de Dieu, et convaincre les Eglises reformées d'erreur et d'abus en tous et un chacun point de leur doctrine, ...* (Sedan, 1618), REP 2200.
11. Letter dated 12 June 1618, in Bibliothèque de la Société de l'Histoire du Protestantisme Français, MS 760.5 (cited by Solé, 1, 66).

12. *Briefue responce des saints Peres des quatre premiers siècles par la seule Bible au "Bouclier de la foy" du sieur Du Moulin, ministre de Charenton, qui démontre la nullité de la confession de foy de la religion prétendue réformée, ...* (Paris, 1620), REP 2659.
13. These letters are reproduced in many of Véron's pamphlets including *La Corneille de Charenton* (see below, n.20). In the same year Véron was gratified to receive a letter from Rome indicating the approval of both the Pope and the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith which is reprinted in a number of his works (see, for example, *Regle generale de la foy catholique* (Paris, 1645), REP 4614, f.A.ii^v). His activities were endorsed by successive clergy assemblies from 1621 onwards and funds were made available to support his work ('Notice sur la vie de Fr. Véron', pp.viii-x). Feret cites a *mémoire* produced by the 1682 clergy assembly which still lists Véron's method as the last of four suggested approaches to converting Protestants (*Un curé de Charenton*, pp.27-28).
14. *L'Establissement de la Congrégation de la Propagation de la Foy et des Missionnaires Generaux des Prelats de France, Pour conferer avec les Ministres et prescher aux portes de leurs Temples et és places publiques, par toutes les Provinces de ceste Monarchie, au salut des devoyez, et pour le repos de l'Estat, ...* (Paris, 1624) REP 3280-81, p.3.
15. *L'Establissement*, pp.6-9.
16. Dated 18 January 1631 (cited by Feret, *Un curé de Charenton*, pp.57-8).
17. See above, Chapter 3, n.104. Letter cited by Fouqueray, 4, 264.
18. Dompnier, pp.186-89; Baroni, p.382.
19. These three men were joined in 1631 by Aubertin and Le Faucheur. The two decades which followed were described by Daillé's son as 'le bons tems de nôtre Eglise, sa belle saison, ses années de benediction et de prosperité' (*Abbrege de la vie de Monsieur Daillé*, p.35). See Solé, for an assessment of the contribution to religious debate of the five Charenton ministers who, at this period, 'règnent, sur le plan intellectuel, en compagnie de leurs collègues de Saumur, sur l'ensemble des Calvinistes français' (1, 74, 78-82).
20. Mestrezat's book: *De la communion a Jesus Christ, au sacrement de l'Eucharistie. Contre les cardinaux Bellarmin et du Perron ...* (Sedan, 1624), REP 3246; Véron's: *La Corneille de Charenton despoillée des plumes des oyseaux de Geneve et Sedan; et deffuy au Sr Mestrezat et à ses collegues ministres sur son livre intitulé, De la communion à Jesus Christ au sacrement de l'Eucharistie ...* (Paris, 1624), REP 3278-79. A pamphlet entitled *Le Hibou des Jesuites, opposé à la Corneille de Charenton* was then published against Véron (n.p., 1624), REP 3247. Most scholars have followed Haag in assigning this work to Mestrezat himself but the text of the pamphlet clearly shows that it was written by a supporter of Mestrezat and Bayle may well have been cor-

rect in claiming that Drelincourt was the author. The anonymous author of *Le Hibou des Jesuites* gives a very characteristic description of the method used by Gontéry and Véron when he refers to it as a 'Methode tellement ridicule, qu'il n'y a crocheteur, ny chambriere qui dedans un quart d'heure ne la puisse sçavoir aussi bien que Veron' (p.22).

21. *Actes d'une Conference tenue au sujet d'une dame, en l'année 1624. entre Monsieur Mestrezat, et le P. Véron. Où se voit combien est esloignée de raison la maniere de disputer des Disciples et Successeurs de Veron: et que la bouche leur a esté assez fermée des lors pour l'advenir* ('Se vendent à Charenton', 1655), REP 5121, pp.3-4.
22. *La Sainte Bible abandonnée par les ministres de Charenton, ou Actes de la conférence entre M. F. Véron, ... et le Sr Mestrezat, ministre de Charenton, sur l'Eucharistie, tenue au sujet de Madame la Mareschalle de Thémynes, en la maison dudit ministre, en la présence de plusieurs de l'une et de l'autre religion, en laquelle le ministre, le premier de tous, a confessé de ne pouvoir faire lire ny mesme un seul article controversé de toute la Confession de foy, ny de son catéchisme dans la Sainte Bible, sans y adjouster aucune sienne glose ou conséquence. Appel à continuer la conférence. Recheute de la corneille.* (Paris, n.d.), REP 7153.
23. *Recit veritable des conferences que les Pasteurs de l'Eglise de Paris ont eu avec le sieur Veron. Et particulièrement celle qui a esté tenuë au sujet de madame la mareschalle de Themines* (n.p., 1624), REP 3265. Tallemant des Réaux gives the following account of the *maréchale's* abjuration and reconversion: 'le pere Veron ... violent et farouche, luy alla dire que son pere et son grand-pere estoient damnez. ... Enfin, elle se fit catholique, plustost par condescendance qu'autrement. Elle fut choisie pour aller avec Mme de Chevreuse mener la reyne d'Angleterre en Angleterre. Là, elle vit du Moulin, qui, trouvant beaucoup de disposition en elle à resipiscence, la remit tout à fait dans le bon chemin, et, au bout de trois mois qu'elle eut changé de religion, elle en fit reconnoissance à Charenton' (*Les historiettes*, edited by Antoine Adam and G. Delassault, 2 vols (Paris, 1960-61), 2, 94). Mestrezat's decision not to publish his account soon after the conference was no doubt made chiefly out of deference to the *maréchale* but the author of the *Recit veritable* offers a further consideration: 'encore qu'en ceste conference le sieur Mestrezat ait eu toutes sortes d'avantages, si est-ce qu'il n'a point voulu la mettre au jour, pour ce qu'il reputoit deshonneur d'avoir conféré avec Véron, lequel parmi les siens propres est réputé avoir le cerveau mal timbré' (cited by Kappler, 2, 249-50).
24. Text as cited by Kappler (2, 251).
25. Text as cited by Kappler (2, 252).
26. In 1638 Véron became curé of Charenton and continued his campaign against Protestantism (later extending his attacks to include the Jansenists). P. Blet

describes how Véron was utilised by Richelieu against the Protestants and fell foul of successive papal nuncios and the Sorbonne in the years 1639–41 for publications containing certain 'écarts doctrinaux' which resulted from his desire to win over still more Protestants ('Le plan de Richelieu pour la réunion des protestants', *Gregorianum*, XLVII (1967), pp.100–29 (pp.108–10)). His reputation was regained to some extent by his *Règle générale de la foy catholique* of 1645; he died in 1649.

27. D'Huisseau's account (Leiden MS 301, pp.77–86) is reproduced by Pannier among his 'pièces justificatives' (*L'Eglise ... sous Louis XIII (1621–29)*, 2, 134–43); Alexandre Regourd, *Démonstrations catholiques, ou l'Art de reunir les pretendus reformez, et toute sorte de sectes, à la créance et communion de l'Eglise romaine. Avec les impostures des Ministres, singulièrement de Pierre Dumoulin et Jean Mestrezat*. (Paris, 1630), REP 3702; Mestrezat, *Traicté de l'Escripture Sainte Où est monstrée la certitude et plenitude de la Foy et son independance de l'autorité de l'Eglise. Contre les pretendue Demonstrations Catholiques du Jesuite REGOURD. En quoy est comprise la refutation du troisieme livre de la Replique du Cardinal DU PERRON touchant les traditions*. (Geneva, 1633), REP 3888–91.
28. *Avertissement sur les disputes et le procedé des Missionnaires* ('Se vend à Charonton', 1654), REP 5056, p.18.
29. Text as cited by Kappler (2, 294).
30. Text as cited by Kappler (2, 294).
31. *Cartels de deffy adressez au ministre Aubertin sur son dernier volume contre le S. Sacrement et conjointement au sieur Mestrezat, son collègue, sur son livre du mesme sujet, avec une briefve response ausdits ministres ...* (Paris, n.d.), REP 7098 (text as cited by Feret, *Un curé de Charenton*, pp.76–77).
32. See above, Chapter 4, n.53. Desgraves lists only one surviving copy of this first edition (in the BN) but another is to be found in the Cosin collection.
33. P. Bourguet, 'La Méthode de Charles Drelincourt pour son 'Abrégé des controverses'', in *La Controverse Religieuse (XVI^e–XIX^e siècles)*, 2 vols (Montpellier, 1980), 1, 151–55. (Bourguet is under the impression that the 1625 edition was the first edition.)
34. Cited by Pannier, *L'Eglise ... sous Louis XIII (1621–29)*, 1, 545.
35. *Histoire de l'Edit de Nantes*, 5 vols (Delft, 1693–95) IV, 30–31.
36. Full title: *Le Combat Romain: ou Examen des disputes de ce temps* (Geneva, 1629), REP 3607. When there was a resurgence in the use of the 'méthodiste' approach some years later, however, Drelincourt published two further works: *Dialogues familiers sur les principales objections des missionnaires de ce temps* (1648), REP 4726, and *Avertissement sur les disputes et le procedé des Mis-*

sionnaires (see above, n.28).

37. Walter E. Rex, *Essays on Pierre Bayle and religious controversy* (The Hague, 1965), pp.23, 28.
38. *Dictionnaire historique et critique*, third edition, 4 vols (Rotterdam, 1720).
39. Full title: *Traicté de l'Employ des saincts peres, Pour le jugement des differends qui sont aujourd'hui en la Religion* (Geneva, 1632) REP 3793-95; *Abbrege de la vie de Monsieur Daillé*, p.14. The quotations which follow in the text are all from the opening section of the work, entitled 'Dessein de tout l'ouvrage', of which the pages are un-numbered.
40. ('se vendent à Charenton', 1634), REP 3925-27. Adrian Daillé gives a similar assessment to that made in *Le Hibou des Jesuites* of 'le P. Veron, et les modernes Disputeurs du siècle': 'qui se sont rendus fameux par cette grossiere chicane avec laquelle ils vont traiter la controverse de maison en maison, d'une maniere à la verité fort digne de gens de Boutique comme ils sont la plupart, couteliers, faiseurs de lancettes, et autres Artisans sans lettre et sans étude' (pp.20-21).
41. Adrian Daillé notes that this was a new argument and a product of his father's voracious reading (*Abbrege de la vie de Monsieur Daillé*, pp.81-83).
42. For further discussions on the contribution of Protestant apologies for the role of reason in religious controversy to the wider philosophical debate concerning scepticism, see works referred to above by Popkin and Solé, also, *L'Évidence du Dieu Chrétien* by Laplanche.
43. *Actes d'une Conference tenue ... en l'année 1624*, p.27.
44. See, P. Blet, 'Le plan de Richelieu pour la réunion des protestants'.
45. 1, 4-5.

CONCLUSION

This study of the exchanges between du Moulin and his opponents in early-seventeenth-century Paris yields a number of important conclusions concerning religious polemic during the period.

In the most general terms, it clearly demonstrates that inter-confessional debate at a local level was a significant feature of Parisian life. It is interesting to note also that, in terms of influencing public opinion or the course of events, it was frequently the most ephemeral forms of religious debate — sermons and conferences, letters and pamphlets — which provoked the liveliest response. Again with regard to the forms of religious debate, this thesis has established the importance of conferences and the procedures employed in them. The description of these verbal disputes in Chapter 3 and the analysis (in Chapters 3, 4, and 6) of the conference record presented in the appendix provide the most detailed picture of this type of formal dispute so far attempted.

The requirements of this form of religious debate also played an important part in shaping the methods employed by controversialists. This is one of several general conclusions to emerge from the detailed study, in Parts II and III, of the careers and publications of du Moulin and eight of his Catholic opponents. The majority of the works featured, including many by the better-known polemicists, have been examined in more detail here than at any time since they were first subjected to the scrutiny of polemicists of the opposing view in the early 1600s. By studying both sides of the exchanges which took place and by observing a carefully chronological approach to the publications of individual authors, many important points have emerged regarding the evolution of the methods and arguments used. The experiences of a number of lesser-known controversialists, such as Cayet, Bouju, Arnoux and Abra de Raconis, as they attempted to adapt and popularise aspects of the methods and arguments employed by their better-known colleagues, have also been revealing.

All conclusions regarding individual authors have been presented in the relevant chapters but two further general conclusions arise from this study. First of all, the evidence of the publications of du Moulin and his opponents reveals the powerful popular appeal of the Protestants' commitment to *scriptura sola*. The chief

Conclusion

aim of du Moulin's polemic against the Catholic church was to capitalise on this advantage by continually contrasting 'la brieveté et clarté de nostre doctrine' with 'l'embarassement et perplexité de celle de nos adversaires'. Conversely, virtually all the Catholic controversialists studied above strove to dislodge their Protestant opponents from this favourable position by one means or another: by making competing claims to be scripturally-based, by attacking the Genevan translation or challenging the methods whereby the Protestants had formulated their doctrine on a scriptural basis.

Finally, the evidence of du Moulin's encounters with his Catholic opponents demonstrates the effect on the development of religious debate of the tension between the demands of popular polemic and religious controversy at a more scholarly level. For a number of the controversialists concerned, most notably du Perron, Coeffeteau and Coton, there was a gradual move away from debate at a popular level in order to concentrate on reviewing the historical and biblical evidence more thoroughly (although still, it should be stressed, with a polemical end in view). For others, the pressure in popular debate to achieve an immediate and unequivocal result played a large part in determining the arguments and strategies they employed. The 'méthode' developed by Gontéry and Véron was the most extreme example of a process whereby the over-riding aim of triumphing over one's opponent led to a refusal to engage in any genuine dialogue or to examine the evidence and the issues at stake. This thesis thus provides independent confirmation of the contrasts observed elsewhere between Catholic polemic in the two periods dominated by du Perron and Véron respectively, and between Protestant theology as exemplified by du Moulin and by the second generation of Charenton ministers. On both sides of the confessional divide the crucial factor leading to these developments in religious controversy seems to have been the degree to which the demands of popular polemic pre-empted a more searching and, sometimes, more objective examination of the evidence.

APPENDIX

Extract from *Les Actes de la Conference du sieur de Raconis professeur en theologie. Et du sieur du Moulin ministre de Charenton, en la maison dudit sieur du Moulin. Signez de part et d'autre* (Paris, 1618) REP 2114, pp.14-35.

A detailed comparison of this account with that of du Moulin (as re-printed in the 1631 edition of his works, REP 3743 and indicated by 'M' in the foot-notes) reveals a striking degree of conformity between the two texts. The three marginal comments — two by Raconis (ll.78, 121-2) and one by du Moulin (l.164, note) — are the only obvious, deliberate additions made by the participants themselves. Most other variations which occur are attributable either to the fact that each of the versions was based on only one of the two transcriptions made by the scribes or to errors introduced at the typesetting stage. (As with most publications of this type, the printers were, in addition, almost certainly to blame for the extremely poor punctuation in both versions.) In reproducing Raconis's text a few obvious errors which obscure the text's meaning, such as the use of 'n'y' instead of 'ny' or 'a' in place of 'à', have been corrected but other errors or inconsistencies in the spelling or accenting of words have been left un-altered. No attempt has been made to rationalise the generally poor punctuation of Raconis's text and no variations between the two texts with regard to punctuation or spelling have been noted. Similarly, the frequent variations between the two accounts in the way participants are referred to — 'le sieur de Raconis', 'monsieur de Raconis', 'ledit Raconis' — are not noted. All other variants are included in the footnotes.

**Actes de ce qui s'est passé en la conference
entre monsieur du Moulin, et monsieur de Raconis**

Du cinquiesme Janvier 1618

Regles convenues entre les parties.

- 1 Ne sera disputé que des points de la Religion.
- 2 Le sieur du Moulin ayant proposé qu'il ne seroit disputé des choses dont les parties sont d'accord. Le sieur de Raconis a reservé, sinon que de là se tire quelque chose combatant un article controversé.

Qu'ils disputeront en forme par arguments.

1-2 *Actes ... 1618*] M: absent.

4 *Regles ... parties.*] M: Fondemens et reigles proposees pour en convenir.

5 *Ne sera disputé*] M: A esté convenu qu'il ne sera disputé

6 *ayant proposé*] M: a proposé

7 *Le sieur de Raconis*] M: Mais le sieur de Raconis

8 *controversé*] M: contesté

9 *Qu'ils disputeront ... par arguments.*] M: 3. A esté convenu qu'on disputeroit par arguments en forme.

3 Le sieur du Moulin a proposé qu'il seroit loisible de se servir de la confession des adversaires. Monsieur de Raconis a répondu, que c'est un point controversé, s'il a droict de l'amener, et se presente pour le vuidier apres la decision des poincts qu'il a proposé en controverse./p.15/ 10

4 Proposé par le sieur du Moulin ce principe pour estre receu: que la vraye religion est fondée sur la parole de Dieu. A quoy a répondu le sieur de Raconis, si par la parole de Dieu s'entend tant l'escrite, que non escrite, qu'il la reçoit pour regle et non pour juge, si la seule escrite il la reçoit pour reigle partiale et que c'est un des articles qui doit estre agité. 15

5 Adjousté par monsieur du Moulin, que l'Eglise est sujete à la parole de Dieu. 20

Respondu par le sieur de Raconis qu'elle est sujette à la parole escrite pour ne luy contredire, mais non pas pour regler tous les articles de sa creance par icelle.

Monsieur du Moulin a dit que tout vray Chrestien est obligé de cognoistre que la doctrine tenuë universellement en son Eglise est veritable. 25

Monsieur de Raconis a adjousté ceste modification, si elle est tenuë comme de foy.

Premiere proposition faicte par Monsieur de Raconis.

Que la religion pretenduë reformée n'a point de regle asseurée.

Monsieur de Raconis ayant proposé ceste question la commence en ceste sorte. 30

Nulle Religion recevant la seule parole de Dieu contenue és saintes escritures en termes clairs, et qui n'a besoin d'interpretation a une regle asseurée.

Or la religion pretenduë reformée reçoit la /p.16/ seule parole de Dieu contenuë en la sainte Escriture en termes clairs, et qui n'ont besoin d'interpretation. 35

Donc elle n'a point de regle asseurée.

Le sieur du Moulin a répondu à la mineure, qu'elle n'est pas simplement, ny universellement veritable. Car nostre Eglise ne rejette point les interpretations 40

10 3] M: 4.

12 s'il a droict de l'amener et se presente] M: absent.

14 4. Proposé par le sieur du Moulin] M: 5. Le sieur du Moulin a proposé

19 5. Adjousté par monsieur du Moulin] M: 6. A esté adjousté par le sieur du Moulin

24 Monsieur du Moulin a dit] M: 7. Le sieur du Moulin a proposé

26-7 Monsieur de Raconis ... de foy] M: absent.

38+ R: heading absent] M: Du Moulin.

39 Le sieur ... mineure, qu'elle] M: Du Moulin a ainsi répondu: que la deuxiesme proposition de cet argument

prises de l'écriture mesme, en conferant un passage avec l'autre. Seulement elle rejette les interpretations que l'on faict estre d'égale autorité à l'écriture, n'y ayant que l'auteur de la loy, qui puisse donner des interpretations à la loy, qui soient d'égale autorité à la loy.

Secondement ceste proposition n'est universellement vraye, en ce qu'es choses non necessaires à salut, nous n'estimons pas qu'il soit necessaire d'estre reglé par l'écriture sainte. 45

Monsieur de Raconis poursuivant demande donc qu'il soit arresté qu'aux choses necessaires à salut, la seule parole de Dieu, contenue es saintes Escritures en lieux clairs, et n'ayans besoin d'interpretation, soit regle suffisante. Cela estant les termes du sieur du Moulin au traité de la juste providence de Dieu, page 4. 50

Le sieur du Moulin respond qu'il reçoit ceste maxime, que l'écriture sainte, claire, et n'ayant besoin d'interpretation es choses necessaires à salut, est regle suffisante de nostre foy, pourveu que par ce mot d'interpretation on entende, comme il a desja déclaré, une interpretation hors l'écriture d'égale autorité à l'écriture, laquelle interpretation il rejette totalement, estant certain que les /p.17/ criminels ne peuvent estre juges infallibles du sens de la Loy, ny les serviteurs interpretes infallibles de la volonté de leur maistre. 55 60

[de Raconis]

Monsieur de Raconis recueille de la responce de monsieur du Moulin que l'écriture, sans les interpretations prises hors l'écriture, est regle suffisante es points necessaires à salut, et demande s'il n'en est point d'accord.

[du Moulin]

Le sieur du Moulin prie le sieur de Raconis de reduire cela en argument, selon qu'il a esté convenu. 65

[de Raconis]

Monsieur de Raconis a dit, qu'il ne reduit point en argument, ce qui n'est qu'une proposition de son argument, et que d'elle et des autres qu'il adjousterà, il le forme en ceste sorte pour retomber à son but. 70

[Argument]

Nulle religion recevant (es articles et poincts necessaires à salut) la seule parole de Dieu en termes clairs, qui n'ont besoin d'interpretation prise hors l'écriture, a une reigle asseuree.

47+ R: heading absent] M: De Raconis.

52+ R: heading absent] M: Du Moulin.

56 *desja déclaré*] M: esté déclaré

56 *d'égale autorité à l'écriture*] M: absent.

60 In Raconis's account the speakers and syllogisms are sometimes indicated in the text but on other occasions in the margins. In order to simplify presentation all marginal notes have been moved into the text (as in du Moulin's version) but are enclosed in square brackets.

La religion pretendue reformée est telle.

75

Donc elle n'a point de reigle asseuree.

[du Moulin]

[Digression du sieur du Moulin pour sortir du sujet.]

Monsieur du Moulin demande esclarcissement de la 2. proposition, par laquelle il dit, que nostre Eglise en choses necessaires à salut, a pour regle la seule parole de Dieu claire, et n'ayant besoin d'interpretation prise hors l'escriture, si par là il entend nous obliger de n'employer point les principes naturels de la raison; comme, que /p.18/ *le tout est plus grand que sa partie; Que le bien vaut mieux que le mal*. Item plusieurs propositions qui ne se trouvent point en l'escriture sainte en termes exprés: comme, *que Dieu gouverne tout par sa providence, que Dieu est plus fort que le diable*, et plusieurs telles propositions qu'on deduit par consequence necessaire de la parole de Dieu.

80

85

Monsieur du Moulin demande donc, si pour esclarcissement d'un different il peut employer ces regles, Item, si comme le sieur de Raconis employe les paroles qu'il dit estre de du Moulin, pour s'en servir, il ne pourra pas aussi employer le texte de la Messe, les Conciles de l'Eglise Romaine, et choses semblables.

90

[de Raconis]

Monsieur de Raconis dit que les principes purement naturels, hors l'escriture, pour clairs qu'ils puissent estre, ne sont recevables pour la foy qui est obscure. Quant aux consequences tirées de l'escriture, elles ne sont non plus recevables, pour quelque couleur de necessité qu'on leur donne, dependant de la forme des argumens, desquels elles sont deduites; formes qui ne sont point de la Foy, et ne dependent que de l'autorité des Philosophes, qu'on peut nier sans errer en la foy.

95

Pour la derniere demande, si comme il employe les escrits de monsieur du Moulin; aussi le sieur du Moulin peut employer la Messe et les Conciles, il dit que pour aller à l'égal, il ne /p.19/ peut demander que le pouvoir d'employer ses escrits: Pour le reste, c'est un des poincts qui a esté reservé à vuidier par apres, neantmoins qu'il le reçoit aux consequences necessaires, sans obligation, n'exclud point la lumiere de nature: et que tout cela mis ensemble avec la seule parole de Dieu, ne peut donner à sa religion une regle asseuree: Ce qu'il prouve par ce troisieme argument.

100

105

[Argument]

Si par la seule parole de Dieu, soit en termes clairs, soit par consequences necessaires tirées d'icelle avec la lumiere naturelle, les principaux articles de ceste religion, et plus necessaires à salut, ne se peuvent asseurer et establir avec tout cela, la Religion pretendue reformée n'a point de reigle asseuree.

110

78 Digression ... du sujet] M: absent.

82 si par là il] M: Il demande donc si par là le Sieur Raconis

83 que sa partie] M: qu'une partie

91 et choses semblables] M: absent.

97 formes qui ne sont] M: formes ne sont

Or est-il que par la seule parole de Dieu soit en termes clairs, soit par
consequences necessaires tirées d'icelle, avec la lumiere naturelle, les 115
principaux articles, et plus necessaires à salut de la Religion pretendue
reformee ne se peuvent assurer et establir.

Donc avec tout cela la Religion pretendue reformee n'a point de reigle
assurée.

[du Moulin] 120

[Notez l'inique reproche veu ce que de Raconis n'a parlé que pour satisfaire à sa
demande.]

Du Moulin respond que le sieur de Raconis viole les loix de la dispute:
car estant obligé d'argumenter comme luy mesme a posé la loy, il s'espand en 125
longs discours. Dit en second lieu, qu'il ne met point les principes de la lumiere
/p.20/ naturelle pour regle de foy, mais comme outil necessaire pour manier
toute sorte de cognoissance: Que mesme ledit sieur se contredit, car ayant
voulu que nous argumentassions par syllogismes, il nous oblige necessairement
à user de quelques façons de parler qui ne sont en l'escriture, laquelle n'a point
de syllogisme formé et quant à ce que ledit sieur dit, qu'il peut rejeter les 130
consequences, parce qu'en les deduisant on use de quelque syllogisme duquel on
peut nier la forme, du Moulin respond, que celui qui nieroit un syllogisme bien
formé, où la suite est necessaire, et naturelle, pourroit voirement accrocher la
dispute: Mais estant homme sçavant il parleroit contre son sentiment, et contre
la verité de la chose, et contre les regles posées par luy mesme, par lesquelles 135
il nous oblige à argumenter. Que le sieur de Raconis n'a pas mesme droit
d'alleguer les paroles qu'il dit estre de du Moulin, comme du Moulin a droit
d'alleguer la Messe et les Conciles, pource que du Moulin n'a jamais donné
ses paroles pour regle infaillible, ny aucun particulier parmi nous, qui sommes
sujets à faillir, et prêts de recevoir instruction par la parole de Dieu, mais que 140
la Messe et les Conciles de l'Eglise Romaine sont tenus pour regle infaillible, et
à tout homme est denoncé anatheme qui en revoque rien en doute.

Là dessus du Moulin a raporté les paroles du /p.21/ Cardinal Bellarmin au
3. liv. de la Justif, chap. 3. Rien ne peut estre certain de certitude de foy, s'il 145
n'est contenu immediatement en la parole de Dieu ou ne se deduict par conse-
quence evidente de la parole de Dieu. Car la foy n'est point, si elle n'est appuyée
sur l'autorité de la parole de Dieu, et ny les heretiques, ny les Catholiques ne
doubtent point de ceste reigle.

Quant à l'argument, du M. nie simplement la 2. proposition, laquelle neant-
moins il dict estre mal convenable en la bouche de l'Eglise Rom. En laquelle 150
le peuple ne peut estre assuré que la Religion soit vraie, ne voyant point

121-2 Notez ... demande] M: absent.

126 comme outil necessaire] M: pour outils necessaires

130 et quant] M: Quant

144 chap. 3] M: chap. 8

146 n'est appuyée] M: n'est point appuyée

149 neantmoins] M: absent.

151 la Religion] M: sa Religion

l'Escripture ny l'antiquité, l'une luy estant defenduë, l'autre impossible.

[*de Raconis*]

Monsieur de Raconis au premier point nie qu'il viole la dispute, qu'il a promis de faire des arguments, quand il entrera en preuve, et non quand on luy 155 demandera l'explication de ses propositions.

Et comme ledict sieur de Raconis commençoit ceste responce, l'heure de midy estant passée la compagnie d'un commun consentement s'est separée, et a remis la conference à lundy matin, huict heures: à condition que ceste proposition vidée ou non, le sieur du Moulin pourra au reciproque le lendemain 160 objecter sur tel article de l'Eglise Romaine, qu'il luy plaira, et monsieur de Raconis se deffendre.

[signed] C.F.D'ABRA DE RACONIS. DU MOULIN.

/p.22/

Du Lundy unziesme Janvier 1618.

Le Sieur de Raconis a repris le discours par luy commencé. A dict en 165 premier lieu, qu'il ne viole point les loix de la dispute: Qu'il ne demandoit autre chose qu'à suivre et serrer son argument; Que ç'a esté le sieur du Moulin, lequel sous pretexte de demander l'explication d'une proposition, s'est espandu en des demandes hors du subject, ausquelles ledit de Raconis a voulu satisfaire pour son consentement, et ainsi que s'il y a de la faute, elle est de sa part, et 170 non du sieur de Raconis.

Au 2. point où du M. dit qu'il ne met pas les principes de la lumiere naturelle pour reigle de foy, mais pour outil necessaire à manier toute sorte de cognoissance, respond de Raconis que la question est de la regle de la foy, et que c'est dequoy parle sa proposition ... Le debat n'est pas si la lumiere naturelle, 175 est un outil pour agir; Que la conference estant d'homme raisonnable, à homme raisonnable, et non de cheval à cheval, non plus qu'on n'oste pas l'humanité de ceux qui con/p.23/ferent, aussi ne veut on pas esteindre leur lumiere naturelle, et que ceste demande est tout à fait hors de propos.

Adjouste en troisieme lieu, qu'il n'y a pas seulement ombre de contradiction en toute sa procedure; Qu'ils sont convenus d'agir par arguments, comme 180 estant l'argument le moyen le plus propre pour esclaircir la verité, et non comme portant autorité ou regle de foy, dont il s'agit icy, et qu'en ce sens il ne reçoit

152 *l'autre impossible.*] M: l'autre luy estant impossible de voir.

155 *et non ... propositions.*] M: absent.

163 M: signatures in reverse order.

164 *unziesme Janvier*] M: huictiesme Janvier. R dates second meeting incorrectly. M adds marginal note at this point: 'Le lecteur remarquera, Que le Sieur de Raconis eut trois jours à se preparer sur ceste response' (p.63).

172 *outil necessaire*] M: outils necessaires

les consequences, pour leur donner autorité de foy ainsi que toutes choses s'accordent bien.

185

Et parce que contre cecy le Sieur du M. produit l'autorité du Cardinal Bellarmin ... de R. respond qu'elle est inutilement employee, que c'est une proposition negative, qui assure ce qui est hors de debat entre les uns et les autres Catholiques et pretendus reformees, sçavoir que rien n'est de la foy, s'il n'est ou immediatement dans l'Escripture, ou s'il ne s'en deduict par une consequence evidente, pour de là prendre un argument, *ad hominem* contre la certitude pretendue de foy des pretendus reformes touchant leur justification particuliere mais qu'elle ne pose pas avec mesme assurance l'affirmative, que tout ce qui estoit immediatement en l'Escripture ou se deduict d'icelle par consequence evidente, soit de la foy: le premier est assuré, le second /p.24/ controversé.

190

195

Quant à ce qu'adjoute le Sieur du M. que celuy qui nieroit un syllogisme bien formé, et dont la suite est necessaire et naturelle, parleroit contre son sentiment; S. R. respond qu'il parleroit contre le sentiment d'un philosophe, mais non contre la foy d'un Chrestien. qu'il pecheroit contre la logicque, mais non pas contre la religion qui se sert d'arguments selon la convention pour moyen de conferer ensemble mais non pour establir autorité de foy en la forme d'un argument.

200

...

Quant aux Conciles et Canons de la Messe, il n'est question de peser le poids de leur autorité, que c'est un poinct reservé à debatre.

205

Finallement pour venir au poinct principal, /p.25/ avec protestation qu'il ne s'est arrêté au reste que par contrainte, pour suivre les digressions volontaires du sieur du Moulin, il met en teste la proposition mineure de son dernier argument, qui luy a esté nyée absolument, pour en donner la preuve.

210

Mineure nyée.

Or est-il que par la seule parolle de Dieu soit en termes clairs, ou par consequences necessaires tirées d'icelle, avec la lumiere naturelle les principaux articles, et plus necessaires à salut de la Religion pretendue reformee ne se peuvent assurer, ni establir.

Preuve de cette Proposition.

215

Les principaux articles, et plus necessaires à salut de la Religion pretendue reformée, sont que le nouveau Testament est Canonique, qu'en Jesus-Christ sont deux natures en une mesme personne, en la Trinité trois personnes en une mesme nature individue et plusieurs autres, qu'il est prest de produire apres la decision de ceux-cy./p.26/

220

Or est-il que tels articles ne se peuvent establir et assurer par la seule parolle de Dieu, soit en termes clairs, soit par consequences necessaires tirées d'icelle avec la lumiere naturelle.

184 *consequences, pour*] M: consequences, c'est à dire

204 *peser*] M: regarder

Donc par la seule parolle de Dieu, soit en termes clairs, soit par consequences necessaires tirées d'icelle, avec la lumiere naturelle, les principaux articles, et plus necessaires à salut de la Religion pretendue reformée, ne se peuvent asseurer et establir. 225

[du Moulin]

Du Moulin respond que le Sieur de Raconis feignant de combattre ce que du Moulin a dit, luy accorde ce qu'il demande: c'est à sçavoir que nous employons les principes de la lumiere naturelle, et les consequences necessaires, non pour estre articles de Foy; mais outil necessaire pour manier toute sorte de cognoissance; dit que la proposition de Bellarmin qui est negative, emporte l'affirmation que du Moulin pose: Car Bellarmin disant que rien n'est receu pour doctrine de Foy, s'il n'est immediatement en la parolle de Dieu, ou tiré par consequences necessaires, presuppose qu'on peut tirer des consequences necessaires en matiere de la Foy. ... 230 235

/p.27/

Response à l'argument.

Du Moulin respond que le sieur de Raconis, eust fort obligé la compagnie de choisir des poincts qui sont controversés entre nous: neantmoins il respond à la premiere proposition. 240

...

/p.29/

Quant à ce qu'on demande la preuve par l'escriture, qu'en la Trinité il y a trois personnes en unité d'essence, s'il s'agist du mot Trinité, je dis que le mot n'est pas une doctrine. Or icy nous disputons de doctrine: et neantmoins se trouve un mot equivalent: Car comme quatre et quaternité sont une mesme chose, aussi trois et Trinité sont mesme chose. Or S. Jean au chap. dernier de sa premiere epistre, dit qu'il y en a trois au Ciel, le pere, la parolle et le saint Esprit, et ces trois sont un. Et l'escriture sainte au lieu sus-allegé, dit qu'il n'y a qu'un Dieu, dont s'ensuit necessairement que le pere estant Dieu, le fils estant Dieu, et le S. Esprit estant Dieu, ils sont un mesme Dieu. Or estre un mesme Dieu, c'est estre une mesme essence. 245 250

...

/p.30/

Au reste monsieur du Moulin prie monsieur de Raconis de declarer s'il estime les preuves tirees de l'escriture par le premier Concile d'Ephese contre Nestorius faisant deux personnes en Jesus-Christ, ou les preuves tirees par le Concile de Calcedoine contre Eutichius confondant les natures: Item celles que les Docteurs de l'Eglise Romaine produisent en mesme façon que nous sur ce subject sont claires et tirees par consequence necessaire. 255

Responce de Monsieur de Raconis

232 outil necessaire] M: outils necessaires

236-7 en matiere de la Foy] M: és matieres de Foy

244 de doctrine] M: des doctrines

245 se trouve] M: il se trouve

258 Responce ... Raconis] M: de Raconis.

De Raconis respond que le sieur du Moulin se contentant de ce qu'il met en son escript, sçavoir que les principes de la lumiere naturelle, et les consequences 260
 necessaires sont outils pour manier toute sorte de cognoissance, rend ses precedentes responses inutiles: veu qu'à la premiere de/p.31/mande d'explication il luy avoit accordé tout cela, voire plus, l'avoit receu aux consequences necessaires: Et qu'il est bien aisé, qu'il tire moins du Cardinal Bellarmin qu'il ne luy avoit accordé. Car le Cardinal Bellarmin, ne luy donnant le pouvoir que de 265
 tirer des consequences necessaires, sans qu'il les peust employer pour establir chose de foy, il a moins receu dudit Bellarmin, que ledit de Raconis ne luy avoit accordé, le recevant aux consequences necessaires.

/p.34/

Quant est aussi des premisses du dernier chef il reçoit sans debat pour suffisantes celles qui prouvent la Trinité des personnes: mais dict que celles qui 270
 sont apportées pour l'unité de l'essence ne la peuvent establir ny en termes clairs, ny par consequence necessaire: que le tesmoignage de saint Jean allegué ne le prouve pas, qu'il est question de l'unité d'une nature individuë: cela n'est point porté. Plustost qu'à la lettre le contraire pourroit sembler se colliger des parolles suyvantes: parce que saint Jean en la mesme façon dit que les trois qui 275
 donnent tesmoignage en la terre, l'esprit, l'eau, et le sang sont un, qu'auparavant il a dict que les trois qui rendent tesmoignage dans le Ciel, le Pere, le Verbe, et le S. Esprit sont un. On ne sçauroit pas dire que l'esprit, l'eau et le sang sont un en unité de nature individuë: Calvin mesme sur ce lieu explicque l'unité de consentement et condamne ceux qui entendent l'unité de nature: comme 280
 les conseillers d'un mesme advis sont un, sçavoir en leur advis, voyla les mots de Calvin. Or quand il dit que ces trois sont un, cela ne se rapporte point à l'essence, mais plustost au consentement, comme s'il disoit que le Pere, et sa parolle eternelle, et l'esprit comme par une harmonie accordante approuvent, et 285
 donnent tesmoignage de Christ.

Dict d'avantage que quand il y auroit unité de nature la preuve ne seroit pas suffisante, /p.35/ parce que l'unité peut estre generique, specifique, et numerique; generique, comme tous les animaux sont un; specifique, comme tous les hommes sont un: numerique, comme tout homme particulier est un.

Partant (comme dessus) somme ledit sieur D.M. de produire un texte de 290
 l'escriture, ou donner une consequence necessaire tirée d'icelle qui dize l'unité numerique de la divinité: ou bien de consentir que ce poinct le plus asseuré, et plus necessaire à salut, ne se peut establir par la seule parolle de Dieu, soit en termes clairs, soit par consequences necessaire tirées d'icelle.

Quant à ce que D. M. demande, si Monsieur de R. estime les preuves 295
 des Conciles alleguées et doctrine de l'Eglise Romaine tirée de l'escriture bonnes, respond qu'il les estime tres asseurées, joignant l'autorité des con-

269 *premisses*] M: preuves

270 *prouvent* as in M] R: peuvent

285 *l'esprit comme* as in M] R: l'esprit sans comme

296-7 *Conciles alleguées et doctrine de l'Eglise Romaine tirée de l'escriture bonnes*] M: Conciles tirees de l'Escriture sur ce sujet bonnes

ciles, qu'il sçait ne point faillir, et avoir l'assistance du saint Esprit pour voir dans l'escriture, mais que de là aussi il collige que la seule parolle de Dieu n'est pas la regle de la foy.

300

Et comme le Sieur D. M. vouloit respondre, la compagnie s'estant levée à cause de l'heure de midy passée, la conference a esté remise à demain matin, auquel jour ledit sieur du Moulin opposera sur telle question qu'il luy plaira.

[signed] DE RACONIS. DU MOULIN.

303 *sur telle question qu'il luy plaira.*] M: sur telle question qu'il luy plaira: toutesfois luy [du Moulin] fut permis de respondre sur le champ de bouche, à condition de remettre à dicter à un autre jour. (M then continues with an account of his reply. Raconis, in his *Triomphe de la verité* (REP 2122), claimed that this printed version bore little resemblance to du Moulin's actual statement at the end of the conference session (p.77).)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The following bibliography lists all works referred to in the text and notes of the foregoing thesis. (A small number of additional secondary sources relevant to its subject have also been included). Wherever possible, entries for primary source works include the reference number for the listing of the relevant edition in Desgraves's *Répertoire* which in turn indicates the location of copies held by the major French libraries and by the British Library. Some items from the Cosin Collection in Durham are also listed by Desgraves (following the selection given in the article by E. Dubois listed below); a draft version of a detailed modern catalogue of the Cosin Library is now available in Durham University Library and editing of a final version of this catalogue is nearing completion.

Primary Sources

Abra de Raconis, Charles-François d', *Les actes de la conference du sieur de Raconis professeur en Theologie. Et du sieur du Moulin Ministre de Charenton, en la maison dudit Sieur du Moulin. Signez de part et d'autre* (Paris, 1618), REP 2114.

— *L'aveuglement des quatre ministres de Charenton. Sur la pretendue clarté de l'écriture* (Paris, 1619) REP 2310.

— *Le Bandeau des Ministres présenté au Roy* (Paris, 1620), REP 2479.

— *Conférence tenue entre le sieur de Raconis et les Ministres de Chillebeuf, du Vexin et de Paris, touchant le mystère de la sainte Eucharistie* (Paris, 1624), REP 3169.

— *La confession de foy des ministres percée à jour, et son Bouclier mis en pièces. Traicté auquel la Confession de foy des ministres est examinée d'un bout à l'autre, et est monsté qu'elle n'est appuyée sur aucun texte de l'Ecriture: et les defences de du Moulin en son Boucier renversées* (Paris, 1619), REP 2132.

— *Lettre amiable envoyée par le sieur de Raconis, au sieur du Moulin, sur le refus par escrit qu'il a fait des justes et honnestes offres à luy proposées par ledict sieur de Raconis, afin d'entrer en une nouvelle Conference particuliere* (Paris, n.d.), REP 2117.

— *Response à l'epistre des quatre ministres de Charenton, ensemble à deux autres escrites de Pierre Du Moulin. L'une de la puissance de Dieu et de sa volonté. L'autre, de sa juste providence* (Paris, 1617), REP 1926.

— *Seconde partie du Traitté pour conférer avec les Heretiques. Contenant l'explication des passages de l'Ecriture, qu'employent les Heretiques, contre les principaux articles de nostre Religion. Ensemble une briefue et facile*

Methode de traiter avec eux, et leur faire cognoistre l'erreur de leur creance (Paris, 1618), REP 2120.

- *Le Triomphe de la verité forçant le sieur du Moulin de confesser sa fuite en la conférence qu'il a eu avec le Sieur de Raconis, Licencie et Professeur en Theologie* (Paris, 1618), REP 2122.

Actes de la dispute et conférence tenue en la ville de Castres, au mois de septembre 1599, entre M. Jean Gontery, jésuite, et M. Jean Gigord, l'un des pasteurs de l'Eglise réformée de Montpelier (Montpelier, 1599), REP 102.

Adair, Archibald, *Le Narre de la Conference verbale et par escrit, tenue entre Monsieur du Moulin et Monsieur Cayet* (n.p., 1602) REP 371.

- *Narré de la conference verbale et par escrit, tenue entre M. Pierre du Moulin et M. Cayer ...* [1602] (Geneva, 1625), REP 3292.

Ample et fidelle narré de l'heureuse conversion de Pierre Marcha, sieur de Pras, ministre de la Religion pretenduë reformée ... (Paris, 1617), REP 1927; also (Rouen, 1617), REP 2060, (Paris, 1618), REP 2126-27.

Andrewes, Lancelot, *Of Episcopacy. Three Epistles of Peter du Moulin ... answered by ... L. Andrewes ...* (1647).

- *Reverendi in Christo Patris Lanceloti Episcopi Wintoniensis, Opuscula quaedam posthuma* (London, 1629).

Arnoux, Jean, *La Confession de foy des ministres convaincue de nullité par leurs propres Bibles: avec la replique à l'escrit concerté, signé et publié par les quatre Ministres de Charenton. Le tout en suite du discours fait à Fontainebleau le 25. de juin, en la presence de Sa Majesté* (Paris, 1617), REP 1931-34.

- *Refutation du Traicté de la juste Providence de Dieu, ... Contre en escrit par luy faussement attribué au R. P. Arnoux* (Paris, 1618), REP 1939.

Aubigné, Théodore-Agrippa d', *Œuvres*, edited by H. Weber (Paris, 1969).

- *Œuvres complètes*, edited by E. Réaume and F. de Caussade, 6 vols (1873-92).

Balzac, Jean-Louis Guez de, *Lettre de M. de Balzac à M. Du Moulin* (n.p., 1633).

- *Lettres des Sieurs du Moulin et de Balzac, Esquelles avec un concert d'eloquence, ilz donnent leur advis sur la Religion, et sur le devoir des subjects envers leurs princes* (The Hague, 1633) REP 3864.

- *Réplique à la satyre du ministre Du Moulin contre l'Eglise catholique et la lettre escrite par le Sr. de Balzac* (Paris, 1633).

Bayle, Pierre, *Dictionnaire historique et critique*, third edition, 4 vols (Rotterdam,

1720).

Bellarmino, Robert, *Disputationes de controversiis christianae fidei adversus huius temporis haereticos*, 3 vols (Ingolstadt, 1586).

— *Tractatus de Potestate Summi Pontificis in rebus temporalibus adversus Gulielmum Barclaium* ... (Rome, 1610), REP 1075.

Bérulle, Pierre de, *Discours sur le sujet proposé en la rencontre du R. P. Gontier, et du Sieur du Moulin; où est traité De la mission des pasteurs en l'Eglise, sur l'article 31. de la confession de foy imprimée à Genève. Du sacrifice de la Messe, célébré en l'Eglise chrestienne. De la presence réelle du corps de Jesus Christ en la sainte Eucharistie* ... (Paris, 1609), REP 951.

Bouju, Théophraste, sieur de Beaulieu, *Corps de toute la philosophie, divisé en deux parties par démonstration et auctorité d'Aristote* (Paris, 1614), REP 1590.

— *Deffence pour la hierarchie de l'Eglise et de nostre S. Père le Pape, contre les faussetez et calomnies de maistre Simon Vigor* (Paris), REP 2505.

— *Destruction des faux arguments et sophismes du sieur du Montigny, premier ministre de la prétendue Eglise reformée de Paris. Par lesquelles il veut prouver sa confession de foy du sacrement de l'Eucharistie, defendre les contradictions, dont elle se destruit elle-mesme, et reprouver la croyance des Catholiques. Plus, les lettres de refus du sieur du Moulin, second ministre, n'osant venir à la conférence, selon lesquelles, ou il est convaincu en sa confession de foy, ou il la renonce* (Paris, 1603), REP 476.

— *Destruction de la pretendue vocation des ministres à la charge de Pasteurs selon le livre mesme de Du Moulin leur confrere. Plus le Bouclier de leur foy faussé par la sainte Escriture* (Paris, 1619), REP 2336.

— *Deux advis, l'un sur le livre de M. Edmond Richer intitulé 'De la puissance ecclésiastique et politique', l'autre sur un livre dont l'auteur ne se nomme point, qui est intitulé 'Commentaire sur l'auctorité de quelque concile que ce soit sur le pape'* (Paris, 1613) REP 1471.

— *La honteuse fuite du sieur du Moulin ministre, apres avoir renié sa confession de foy* ... (Paris, 1604), REP 560.

— *Methode de convaincre par la sainte escriture, tous schismatiques et here-tiques. Selon laquelle est demonstree la fausseté de la doctrine des pretenduz reformez Calvinistes, Zvingliens, et Lutheriens, contraire à celle des Catholiques: és points de l'Eglise, De la parole de Dieu, ou tradition Apostolique non écrite, De la presence réelle du corps et du sang de Jesus-Christ, au S. Sacrement de l'Eucharistie, De la Transsubstantiation, Du Sacrifice de la Messe, De la communion souz une espece, Du Purgatoire, Des Indulgences, De la veneration et invocation des saints, De la venera-*

- tion de leurs reliques, et De la veneration des images. Contre le sieur du Moulin, ministre de la pretendue Eglise reformée, continuant à renier sa confession de Foy* (Paris, 1604), REP 561.
- Bourguignon, Daniel, *Rencontre et conference verbale entre le sieur Bourguignon, cy-devant ministre des Eglises pretendües reformées, et le sieur Du Moulin ministre à Charenton . . .* (Paris, 1617), REP 1959.
- Burgersdijk, François, *Institutionum Logicarum Libri Duo* (Leiden, 1626).
- Camus, Jean-Pierre, *L'Avoisinement des Protestants vers l'Eglise Romaine* (Paris, 1640), REP 4222.
- Cappel, Jacques, *Plagiarius vapulans, seu Genevae bona fides translatione Bibliorum, contra P. Cottonum* (Geneva, 1620), REP 2513.
- *Les Trophees de P. Gonteri Jesuite, avec un Catechisme pour son instruction* (Sedan, 1613), REP 1475.
- Carew, George, 'A relation of the State of France, with the Characters of Henry IV. and the principal Persons of that Court, drawn up by Sir George Carew, upon his Return from his Embassy there in 1609, and addressed to King James I.' in *An Historical View of the Negotiations between the Courts of England, France and Brussels, From the Year 1592 to 1617*, edited by T. Birch (London, 1749), pp.413–528.
- Casaubon, Isaac, *Responce du Sieur Casaubon à la Lettre de l'Illustrissime Cardinal Du Perron* (n.p., 1612), REP 1363.
- Cayet, Pierre-Victor Palma, *Advertissement sur les points de la religion pour en composer les différends* (Paris, 1596).
- *Chronologie septenaire, contenant l'histoire de la paix entre les roys de France et d'Espagne, et les choses les plus memorables advenues depuis la paix faicte à Vervins, le 2 de mai 1598, jusques à la fin de l'an 1604 [1605]*, in *Nouvelle collection des mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de France*, edited by Michaud and Poujoulat (Paris, 1838).
- *Chronologie novenaire, contenant l'histoire de la guerre sous le regne du tres-chrestien roy Henri IIII. Et les choses plus memorables advenues par tout le monde, depuis l'an 1589 jusques à la paix faicte à Vervins en juin 1598 [1608]*, in *Nouvelle collection des mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de France*, edited by Michaud and Poujoulat (Paris, 1838).
- *La Conference des ministres accordée, et puis refusée par eux, avec les Docteurs de la Sainte Eglise Catholique, Apostolique et Romaine* (Paris, 1602), REP 382.
- *Copie d'une lettre de maistre Victor-Palma Cayet, contenant les causes et les raisons de sa conversion a l'eglise catholique* (Paris, 1595).

- *Defense et arrest de la verité contre Archibald Adair, escossois* (Saint Germain, 1603), REP 486.
- *Défenses pour maistre Pierre-Victor Cayet contre la pretendue censure de la Chronologie septenaire* (Paris, 1610).
- *La Discipline des Ministres de la religion pretendüe reformée* (Paris, 1600), REP 164.
- *Discours de la vraye Eglise et de la droite succession des légitimes Pasteurs en icelle* (Paris, 1597).
- *La fournaise ardente et le four de reverbere, pour évaporer les prétendues eaux de Siloé et pour corroborer le Purgatoire, contre les hérésies, erreurs, calomnies, faussetez et cavillations ineptes du prétendu ministre Du Moulin* (Paris, 1603) REP 487.
- *Le Purgatoire prouvé par la Parole de Dieu* (Paris, 1600), REP 165.
- *Remonstrance et supplication tres-humble à Madame ... pour vouloir recognoistre nostre mere Sainte Eglise Catholique Apostolique et Romaine ...* (Paris, 1601), REP 283.
- *La Resolution des deux questions proposées à Fontaine-bleau, le jour de l'Ascension derniere, 1600. A sçavoir, Quelle est la vraye Eglise qu'il faut suivre, et quelle est la Bible qu'il faut croire* (Paris, 1600), REP 166.
- *La Victoire de la Verité, contre l'heresie par la refutation de toutes ses erreurs* (Paris, 1603), REP 489.

Chamier, Daniel, *Les Actes de la conference tenue a Nismes, entre Daniel Chamier, Ministre du Saint Evangile, Pasteur de l'Eglise du Montelimar et Pierre Coton Jesuite, predicateur audit Nismes. Publiez maintenant par ledit Chamier, pour faire voir les faussetez de ceux que Coton a fait imprimer a Lyon par Estienne Tantillon, sous le nom de P. Demezat* (Geneva, 1601), REP 268.

- *Epistolae jesuiticae* (Geneva, 1599), REP 77.
- *Panstratiae catholicae sive controversiarum de religione adversus pontificios corpus* (Geneva, 1626), REP 3416.

Chorin, Isaac, *Réfutation de la nouvelle méthode ou art qu'enseignent et professent les Jésuites de Cour et quelques modernes de la Religion romaine pour disputer contre ceux de la Religion reformée* (Sedan, 1623), REP 3079.

Coeffeteau, Nicolas, *Apologie pour la Response à l'Advertissement du serenissime Roy de la Grande Bretagne, contre les accusations de Pierre du Moulin, Ministre de Charenton* (Paris, 1614), REP 1601.

- *La Defence de la Sainte Eucharistie et presence reelle du corps de Jesus-*

- Christ. Contre la pretendue Apologie de la Cene, publiée par Pierre du Moulin, Ministre de Charenton ...* (Paris, 1607) REP 770.
- *Examen d'une confession de foy publiée n'aguères en France sous le nom du roy d'Angleterre. Fait premierement en latin par G. Cheisolme et puis en françois et plus au long par F. Nicolas Coeffeteau* (Paris, 1604) REP 569.
 - *Examen ou réfutation d'un livre de la toutepuissance et de la volonté de Dieu, publié par Pierre du Moulin, ministre à Charenton,* (Paris, 1617), REP 1978.
 - *Les merveilles de la sainte Eucharistie discourues et défendus contre les infidelles, avec le sacrifice de l'Eglise catholique* (Paris, 1607), REP 700.
 - *Œuvres de R. P. en Dieu F. Nic. Coeffeteau ... Contenant un Nouveau Traicté des Noms de l'Eucharistie, auquel est refuté tout ce que les Srs. du Plessis, Casaubon, et M. Pierre du Moulin Ministre de Charenton ont escrit sur ce sujet contre la doctrine de l'Eglise: Avec divers autres Traictez cy devant publiez par le mesme Autheur* (Paris, 1622), REP 2906.
 - *Premier essay des questions theologiques traitées en nostre langue selon le stile de S. Thomas et des autres scolastiques* (Paris, 1607), REP 771.
 - *Pro sacra monarchia Ecclesiae catholicae et Romanae, adversus rempublicam Marci Antonii de Dominis, libri quatuor apologetici* (Paris, 1623), REP 3080.
 - *Refutation des faussetez contenues en la deuxiesme edition de l'Apologie de la Cene, du Ministre du Moulin ...* (Paris, 1609), REP 958.
 - *Responce à l'Advertissement, adressé par le ... Roy de la Grande Bretagne, Jacques I. à tous les princes et potentats de la chrestienté ...* (Paris, 1609), REP 959.
 - *Response au livre intitulé le Mystere d'iniquité du Sieur Du Plessis. Où l'on voit fidellement deduicte l'histoire des souverains pontifes, des empereurs, et des roys chrestiens, depuis S. Pierre jusques à nostre siècle.* (Paris, 1614), REP 1602.
 - *Response au manifeste publié par les perturbateurs du repos de l'Estat* (Paris, 1617), REP 1980–95.
- Constable, Henry, *Examen pacifique de la doctrine des Huguenots* (1589).
- *The catholike moderator: or a moderate examination of the doctrine of the Protestants. Proving against the too rigid catholikes ... and against the arguments ... of ... the answer to the Catholike apologie ...* [1589] (London, 1624).
- Coryate, Thomas, *Crudities Hastily gobbled up in five Moneths travells in France,*

Savoy, Italy, Rhetia ... , Helvetia ... , some parts of high Germany, and the Netherlands (London, 1611).

Coton, Pierre, *Apologétique quatriesme* (Avignon, 1600), REP 188.

- *Genève plagiaire, ou Vérification des dépravations de la parole de Dieu qui se trouvent es Bibles de Genève* (Paris, 1618), REP 2167.
- *Institution catholique, où est déclarée et confirmée la Verité de la foy. Contre les heresies et superstitions de tout ce temps. Divisée en quatre livres, qui servent d'antidote aux quatre de l'Institution de Jean Calvin* (Paris, 1610), REP 1091.
- *Lettre déclaratoire de la doctrine des Pères Jésuites, conforme aux décrets du Concile de Constance, adressée à la Royne mere du Roy, Regente en France* (Paris, 1610) REP 1092–93.
- *Recheute de Genève plagiaire, ou réplique par voye de dialogue aux prétendues défenses de B. Turretin, ministre et professeur en l'eschole de Genève* (Lyon, 1619) REP 2360.
- *Sermons sur les principales matieres de la foy faicts par le R. P. Pierre Coton ... reduicts par luy mesme en forme de meditations* (Paris, 1617), REP 1993.
- *Du très-saint et très-auguste sacrement et sacrifice de la Messe, des merveilles, figures, vérité, antiquité et parties d'icelle. Discours contre les erreurs de nostre siècle et les cahiers d'un prédicant à Grenoble* (Avignon, 1600), REP 191.

Cottière, Matthieu, *Traicté des originaux et versions, utile à tous fides et servant de response au general de la Geneve plagiaire de Pierre Coton Jesuite, et de defense aux versions de l'Ecriture receues es Eglises reformees* (Saumur, 1619), REP 2361.

Lettre de Madame la Baronne de Courville, escrite a Madame de Montigny sa mere, sur le sujet de sa conversion. Où est fidelement rapporté ce qui se passa, tant au logis de Monsieur du Moulin, qu'en sa maison, entre Monsieur de Raconis bachelier et professeur en theologie, et Monsieur de la Miltière advocat en Parlement, au refus, et sur la fuite du Sieur du Moulin (Paris, 1617) REP 1994.

Daillé, Adrian, *Abregé de la vie de Monsieur Daillé* (1671).

Daillé, Jean, *Les deux derniers sermons de Mr Daillé prononcez à Charenton le jour de Pasques ... 1670. et le jeudy suivant. Avec un abregé de sa vie, et le catalogue de ses œuvres* ('Se vendent à Charenton', 1670).

- *La foy fondee sur les saintes scritures. Contre les nouveaux Methodistes* ('se vendent à Charenton', 1634) REP 3925–27.

- *Traicté de l'Employ des saints peres, Pour le jugement des differends qui sont aujourd'hui en la Religion* (Geneva, 1632) REP 3793–95.

Correspondance du nonce en France Innocenzo del Bufalo (1601–1604), edited by Bernard Barbiche (Rome and Paris, 1964).

Demezat, *Discours envoyé à Monseigneur l'Illustriss. Cardinal de Sourdis, archevesque de Bourdeaux et primat d'Aquitaine, contenant succinctement et au vray le narré de la conférence commencée à Nîmes, dans la maison du Roy le 26. septembre, et finie par ordonnance de la Cour le 3. d'octobre, mil six cens, entre le R. Pere Coton de la Compagnie de Jésus et M. Chamier Ministre* (Avignon, 1600), REP 190.

D'Huisseau, Isaac, *La Discipline des Eglise Reformées* (Geneva, 1666).

Dialogue de quelques ministres de Normandie, ou le Pronostic (compose par le Sieur Almanach dit de Billy (n.p., 1606), REP 687.

Drelincourt, Charles, *Abregé des controverses Ou Sommaire des erreurs de nostre temps, avec leur réfutation par textes exprès de la Bible de Louvain* ('Se vendent à Charenton', 1624), REP 3201.

- *Abregé des controverses, ou Sommaire des erreurs de l'Eglise romaine, avec leur refutation par textes exprès de l'Ecriture sainte* [1624] (Sedan, 1626) REP 3423.

- *Avertissement sur les disputes et le procedé des Missionnaires* ('Se vend à Charenton', 1654), REP 5056.

- *Le Combat Romain: ou Examen des disputes de ce temps* (Geneva, 1629), REP 3607.

- *Dialogues familiers sur les principales objections des missionnaires de ce temps* (1648), REP 4726.

Duchât, Timothée, *Recit veritable de la conference entre les sieurs Duchât Ministre de la Parole de Dieu, et Veron Jesuite. Contre les faussetez de la Conference pretendue entre les susdits, que ledit Veron a nouvellement mis au jour à son advantage* (Charenton, 1619) REP 2368.

Du Moulin, Peter, 'The Author's Life', in the prefatory material of his translation of his father's *Nouveauté du Papisme, The Novelty of popery, opposed to the antiquity of true Christianity. Against the book of Cardinal du Perron, entitled, A reply to the answer of . . . James King of Great Britain* (London, 1664).

Du Moulin, Pierre, *De l'Accomplissement des prophéties, où est monsté que les prophéties de saint Paul, de l'Apocalypse et de Daniel touchant les combats de l'Eglise sont accomplies* (La Rochelle, 1612), REP 1383.

- *Accroissement des Eaux de Siloé, pour esteindre le feu du Purgatoire et noyer les satisfactions humaines et les indulgences papales, contre les raisons et allegations d'un Cordelier portugais, defendues par trois escrits, dont l'un est du mesme Cordelier, intitulé Le Torrent du feu, etc ... , les autres de deux docteurs de la Sorbonne, l'un intitulé la Fournaise ardente, l'autre Le feu d'Helie ...* (La Rochelle, 1604), REP 577.
- *Accroissement des eaux de Siloé ...* [1604] (Geneva, 1624), REP 3209.
- *Anatome Arminianismi, seu enucleatio controversiarum quae in Belgio agitantur, super doctrina de providentia, de praedestinatione, de morte Christi, de natura et gratia* (Leyden, 1619), REP 2370.
- *Anatomie de la Messe. Où est monsté par l'Ecriture sainte, et par les tesmoignages de l'ancienne Eglise, que la Messe est contraire à la parole de Dieu et esloignée du chemin de salut* (Geneva, 1636), REP 4047-48; also, (Sedan, 1636), REP 4049.
- *Deuxieme partie de l'Anatomie de la Messe. Contenant la Messe en françois et en latin. Avec un commentaire où sont aussi descrites les diverses especes de Messes, avec les mysteres et ceremonies, et origine de chasque pièce de la Messe ...* (Sedan, 1639), REP 4188.
- *Anatomie du livre du sieur Coeffeteau intitulé Réfutation des faussetés contenues en la deuxième édition de l'Apologie de la Cène du Ministre du Moulin* (Sedan and Geneva, 1610), REP 1108-09.
- *L'Antibarbare, ou du Langage incogneu tant és prieres des particuliers qu'au service public. Où aussi sont representees les clauses principales de la Messe, qui scandaliseroient le peuple s'il les entendoit* (Sedan, 1629), REP 3609.
- *Apologie pour la sainte Cène du Seigneur, contre la presence corporelle et transsubstantiation* (La Rochelle, 1607), REP 775.
- *Apologie pour la Sainte Cene du Seigneur ... Dernière edition, en laquelle est satisfait à toutes les accusations des adversaires* [1607] (Geneva, 1610), REP 1112.
- 'Autobiographie de Pierre du Moulin', *Bulletin de l'histoire du protestantisme français* (1858), pp.170-182, 333-344, 465-477.
- *Bouclier de la foy, ou Defense de la Confession de foy des Eglises reformees du royaume de France. Contre les objections du Sr. Jehan Arnoux Rionnois Jesuite. Livre auquel sont decidees toutes les principales controverses entre les Eglises reformees, et l'Eglise romaine* (Charenton, 1618), REP 2182.
- *Bouclier de la foy, ou defense de la confession de foy des eglises réformées ... Dernière edition, reveuë et ... augmentee par l'auteur* [1618] (Geneva,

1635) REP 3981.

- *Le Capucin. Traitté auquel est descrite et examinée l'origine des Capucins, leurs vœux, reigles et disciplines* (Sedan, 1641), REP 4317; also (Geneva, 1641), REP 4314–16.
- *Cartel de deffy du sieur de Bouju surnommé de Beaulieu, envoyé au sieur du Moulin. Avec les responses et repliques de part et d'autre. Sur le point de la Cene, et des Marques de la vraye Eglise* (Paris, 1603), REP 475.
- *Cartel de deffy du sieur de Bouju ...* [1603] (Geneva, 1625), REP 3301.
- *Du combat chrestien: ou des afflictions* (Sedan, 1622), REP 2943–44.
- *Du combat chrestien: ou des afflictions ... Troisieme edition, reveuë et augmentee* [1622] (Geneva, 1624), REP 3213.
- *Copie d'une lettre de monsieur du Moulin ... escripte à un sien ami en Hollande* (Geneva, 1624), REP 3211. Letter dated 5 December 1616.
- *Les décades de sermons*, I–V (Geneva, 1643–45; VI–VIII (Sedan, 1647–49); IX (Sedan, 1652); X (Sedan, 1653).
- *Defense de la foy catholique, contenue au livre de ... Jacques I. Roy de la Grand'Bretagne et d'Irlande. Contre la Response de F.N. Coeffeteau ...* (Geneva, 1610), REP 1116–17.
- *Defense de la foy catholique ...* [1610] (Geneva, 1612), REP 1382.
- *Defense de la foy catholique ... Edition derniere reveuë et augmentée par l'auteur* [1610] (Geneva, 1631), REP 3738.
- *Eaux de Siloé. Pour esteindre le feu du Purgatoire. Contre les raisons et allégations d'un Cordelier portugays qui a presché le Purgatoire ce Caresme dernier à S. Jacques de la Boucherie* (La Rochelle, 1603), REP 499.
- *Elements de la logique françoise* (Sedan, 1621), REP 2735.
- *Examen de la Doctrine de Messieurs Amyrault et Testard, l'un Pasteur et Professeur en Theologie à Saumur, l'autre Pasteur à Blois. Touchant la Predestination, et les poincts qui en dependent ... Avec un advis d'un personnage desinteressé sur ledit Examen* (Amsterdam, 1638).
- *Examen du Livre du Père Joseph de Morlais Capucin, intitulé lettre du sieur Crescentian de Mont-Ouvert, et promettant la réfutation de trois sermons de Du Moulin* (Sedan, 1641) REP 4318.
- *Fuites et evasions du sieur Arnoux Jesuite. Traicté auquel sont examinées les causes pour lesquelles il refuse de respondre aux dix sept demandes des Pasteurs de l'Eglise de Paris. Où aussi est examiné le traicté des cinq evasions, qu'il a adjousté à l'examen de nostre Confession* (Charenton, 1618),

REP 2184–85.

- *The Jesuites Shifts, and Evasions. Or, His deportment in Controversies of Religion. Or. A Treatise, wherein the causes are examined why Mr. Arnoux, the Jesuite, refuseth to answer to seventeene questions propounded by the Ministers of the Church of Paris. Wherein also the Treatise of five evasions which he hath added to the examination of our confession, is likewise examined and answered* (London, 1624).
- *Heraclite ou de la Vanité et misere de la vie humaine ...* (La Rochelle, 1609), REP 972.
- *Hyperaspistes. Sive Defensor veritatis adversus calumnias et opprobria ingesta in veram religionem a Sylvestro Petrosancta Jesuita Romano* (Geneva, 1636), REP 4053.
- *De la juste providence de Dieu, traicté auquel est examiné un escrit du sieur Arnoux, jésuite, par lequel il prétend prouver que Calvin fait Dieu auteur de peché* (La Rochelle, 1617), REP 2017–19; (Saumur, 1617), REP 2020.
- *Du Juge des controverses. Traitté auquel est defendue l'autorité et la perfection de la sainte Escriture, contre les usurpations et accusations de l'Eglise romaine* (Sedan, 1630), REP 3689; also, (Geneva, 1630), REP 3688.
- *Lettre a Messieurs de l'Eglise romaine...* (Saumur, 1618), REP 2186.
- *Lettre de Monsieur du Moulin Pasteur en l'Eglise de Paris, écrite à un de son troupeau* (Geneva, 1631).
- *Lettre de M. du Moulin à M. de Balzac* (n.p., 1633).
- *Lettres des Sieurs du Moulin et de Balzac, Esquelles avec un concert d'eloquence, ilz donnent leur advis sur la Religion, et sur le devoir des subjects envers leurs princes* (The Hague, 1633) REP 3864.
- *De monarchia temporali pontificis romani liber, quo imperatoris, regum et principul jura adversus usurpationes papae defenduntur* (Geneva and London, 1614), REP 1619–20.
- *Nouveauté du Papisme, opposée à l'antiquité du vray christianisme. Contre le livre, de Monsieur le Cardinal du Perron, intitulé, Replique a la Response du serenissime Roy Jacques I. Roy de la Grand'Bretagne ...* (Sedan, 1627), REP 3494; also, (Geneva, 1627), REP 3493.
- *Nouveauté du Papisme ...* [1627] (Geneva, 1633), REP 3865.
- *Nouvelles Briques pour le Bastiment de Babel, c'est-a-dire erreurs de l'Eglise romaine, nouvellement forgez pour establir la grandeur de l'Eglise de Rome. Dediez a M. Bouju, sieur de Beaulieu, se vantant d'avoir pour soi*

- le consentement universel de l'antiquité... (La Rochelle, 1604) REP 579.*
- *Nouvelles briques pour le bastiment de Babel ... [1604] (Geneva, 1631), REP 3740.*
- *Oppositions de la parole de Dieu avec la doctrine de l'Eglise Romaine. Plus les matieres tenues en icelle Eglise Romaine qu'on cache à ceux qu'on y veut attirer (n.p., 1609), REP 1024.*
- *Oppositions de la parole de Dieu avec la doctrine de l'Eglise romaine ... [1609] (Sedan, 1624), REP 3218.*
- *Oppositions of the Word of God together with the Doctrine of the Romane Church. Moreover, what points are held by the same Church, which she hideth from those whom she meaneth to draw to her faction (London, 1610).*
- *Response du sieur du Moulin aux lettres du sieur Gontier, escrites au Roy sur le sujet de la conference tenue le 18. d'avril 1609 (n.p., 1609), REP 973-76, 982.*
- *Response du Sieur Du Moulin, aux lettres du sieur Gontier ... [1609] (Geneva, 1625), REP 3327.*
- *Response à quatre demandes, faites par un gentilhomme de Poictou (Geneva, 1624), REP 3219.*
- *A short view of the chief points in Controversy between the reformed Churches and the Church of Rome In Two Letters to the Duke of Bouillon, Upon his turning Papist (London, 1686).*
- *Théophile ou de l'Amour divin. Traicté contenant cinq degrez, cinq marques, cinq aides. De l'Amour de Dieu (La Rochelle, 1609), REP 977.*
- *De la toute puissance de Dieu et de sa volonté. Traitté auquel est exposé comment la toute puissance de Dieu et sa volonté doivent reigler nostre foy, au poinct du saint Sacrement (La Rochelle, 1617), REP 2021.*
- *Des traditions et de la perfection et suffisance de l'Ecriture sainte ... avec un catalogue ou dénombrement des traditions romaines ... (Sedan, 1631), REP 3742.*
- *Trente-deux demandes proposées par le P. Cotton, avec les solutions adjoustées au bout de chaque demande. Item soixante-quatre demandes proposées en contre-eschange. (La Rochelle, 1607), REP 777.*
- *Trente-deux demandes proposees par le pere Cotton ... [1607] (Geneva, 1625), REP 3332.*
- *Trois Sermons faits en présence des Pères Capucins qui les ont honorez de leur presence (Sedan, 1630), REP 4237.*

- *Veritable narré de la conference entre les sieurs du Moulin et de Raconis professeur en Theologie. Et de la forme de la rupture* (La Rochelle, 1618), REP 2188–89.
- *Veritable narré de la conference tenue entre les sieurs du Moulin et de Raconis ...* [1618] (Geneva, 1631), REP 3743.
- *Veritable narré de la conference entre les Sieurs Du Moulin et Gontier, seconde par Madame la Baronne de Salignac. Le samedi onziesme d'avril 1609.* (n.p., 1609), REP 978.
- *Veritable narré de la conference entre les sieurs du Moulin et Gontier ...* [1609] (Geneva, 1625), REP 3333.
- *La vie et religion de deux bons Papes, Léon premier et Grégoire premier, où est monsté que la doctrine et religion de ces pontifes tant célèbres est contraire à la religion romaine de ce temps* (Sedan, 1650), REP 4869.
- *De la vocation des pasteurs* (Sedan, 1618), REP 2190–92.
- *Le Vray barbare en langage cogneu, tant é discours, conférences que libelles séditieux* ('En Enfer, par J. Jannon, 1629'), REP 3612.

Du Perron, Jacques Davy, *Actes de la conference tenue entre le Sieur Evesque d'Evreux et le Sieur du Plessis, en presence du roy a Fontaine-Bleau le 4. de May 1600... Avec La Refutation du faux discours de la mesme Conference* (Evreux, 1601) REP 304.

- *Les Ambassades et Negotiations de l'Illustrissime et Reverendissime Cardinal du Perron, ... Avec les plus belles et eloquentes lettres, ... qu'il a écrites sur toutes sortes de sujets ...* (Paris, 1623).
- *Articles des ministres et autres appelez par madame pour la Conference, proposee entre eux et Monsieur l'Evesque d'Evreux. Avec les reponses et repliques des uns et des autres* (?Paris, 1601) REP 305.
- *Les Diverses Œuvres de l'illustrissime cardinal Du Perron, ... contenant plusieurs livres ... non encore vus, ni publiés ... ensemble tous les écrits mis au jour de son vivant, et maintenant réimprimés sur ses exemplaires laissez, reveus, corrigez et augmentez de sa main* (Paris, 1622), REP 2948.
- *Examen du livre du sieur du Plessis contre la messe, composé il y a environ dis-huit ans par Messire Jacques Davy, ... maintenant cardinal du Perron ... et publié par ... Messire Nicolas Coefffeteau ...* (Evreux, 1617), REP 2025.
- *Harangue faicte de la part de la chambre ecclésiastique, en celle du tiers Estat, sur l'Article du Serment* (Paris, 1615).
- *Lettre ... envoyée au sieur Casaubon en Angleterre* (Paris, 1611), REP

1256.

- *Réfutation de l'écrit de Maistre Daniel Tilenus contre le Discours de Monsieur l'Evesque d'Evreux, touchant les Traditions Apostoliques* (Evreux, 1601), REP 307.
- *Réplique à la Response du serenissime Roy de la Grand Bretagne* (Paris, 1620), REP 2550.
- *Response de Monsieur L'Evesque d'Evreux a la sommation du Sieur du Plessis. Avec une lettre écrite au roy par ledict Sieur Evesque* (Evreux, 1600) REP 206.
- *Traitté du Saint Sacrement de l'Eucharistie, divisé en trois livres, contenant la réfutation du livre du sieur du Plessis Mornay contre la messe . . .* (Paris, 1622), REP 2951.
- Du Plessis-Mornay, Philippe, *Discours veritable de la Conference tenue a Fontainebleau, le quatrieme May 1600. Entre le sieur du Plessis et l'Evesque d'Evreux* (Montpellier, 1600), REP 233.
- *De l'Institution, usage et doctrine du Saint Sacrement de l'Eucharistie, en l'Eglise ancienne. Ensemble, comment, quand et par quels degrez la Messe s'est introduite en sa place*, 4 books (La Rochelle, 1598), REP 38.
- *Mémoires et correspondance de Duplessis Mornay pour servir à l'histoire de la Réformation et des guerres civiles et religieuses en France sous les règnes de Charles IX, de Henri III, de Henri IV et de Louis XIII, depuis l'an 1571 jusqu'en 1623*, 12 vols (Paris, 1824-25).
- *Le Mystère d'Iniquité c'est à dire l'Histoire de la Papauté, par quels progrez elle est montée à ce comble, et quelles oppositions les gens de bien lui ont fait de temps en temps. Où sont aussi défendus les droicts des Empereurs, Rois et Princes Chrestiens contre les Assertions des Cardinaux Bellarmin et Baronius* (Saumur, 1611), REP 1290.
- *Response au livre publié par le Sieur Evesque d'Evreux sur la conference tenue a Fontaine-Bleau le quatreisme de May, 1600 . . . En laquelle sont incidemment traictees les principales matieres controverses en ce temps* (Saumur, 1602), REP 333.
- Duval, André, *Feux d'Hélie pour tarir les eaux de Siloé. Auquel est amplement prouvé le Purgatoire contre le ministre Du Moulin et respondu aux raisons et allegations contraires* (Paris, 1603), REP 503.
- Ferry, Paul, *Le Dernier Désespoir de la tradition contre l'Escriture, où est amplement réfuté le livre du P. François Véron, Jésuite, par lequel il prétend enseigner à toute personne, quoy que non versée en théologie, un bref et facile moyen de rejeter la Parole de Dieu, et convaincre les Eglises re-*

formées d'erreur et d'abus en tous et un chacun point de leur doctrine, ...
(Sedan, 1618), REP 2200.

Nouvelles lettres inédites de saint François de Sales, 2 vols (Paris, 1835).

— *Œuvres complètes*, 9 vols (Paris, 1861–64).

Garasse, François, *Le Rabelais reformé par les Ministres, et nommément par Pierre Du Moulin ministre de Charenton, pour response aux bouffonneries inserées en son livre de la vocation des pasteurs* (Brussels, 1619), REP 2393.

Gigord, Jean, *Pourparle entre Jean Gigord, Ministre de la Parole de Dieu en l'Eglise reformee de Montpellier et Pierre Coton, de la compagnie de ceux qui se disent Jesuites* (Montpellier, 1608), REP 882.

Gontéry, Jean, *Les Consequences auxquelles a esté reduite la religion pretendue Reformée après avoir recogneu qu'elle n'avoit aucun fondement en la sainte Escriture, voire apres y avoir renoncé. Deduictes par le Reverend Pere Gonteri, de la Compagnie de Jesus. Sur la Conference permise par le Roy, entre ledit Pere et les Ministres de Dieppe, en faveur de Monsieur de Saint Cere* (Rouen, 1609), REP 992.

— *Copie d'une lettre escrite au Roy, par le R. P. Gonthery de la Compagnie de Jésus, sur la conversion d'une dame de la religion pretendue reformee a la foy catholique. En ceste lettre se voit la veritable relation d'une conference, qu'a eu le dict R. P. avec le Sieur du Moulin ministre, auquel on a faict quitter la Sainte Escriture de la traduction mesme de Geneve. De ce mesme escrit on peut descouvrir l'imposture et la calomnie d'un libelle diffamatoire sans auther, sous le titre pretendu d'un veritable narre ldots* (Paris, 1609), REP 994.

— *Correction fraternelle faite à M. Du Moulin, ministre de Pontcharenton* (Paris, 1607), REP 785.

— *Declaration de l'erreur de nostre temps, et du moyen qu'il a tenu pour s'insinuer. Avec la replique contre le Sieur du Moulin ministre, respondant à une lettre escrite au Roy ... le tout contenu en six discours* (Rouen, 1609), REP 997.

— *L'entiere desconfiture des erreurs de ce temps. Par laquelle est déclaré, que la Religion pretenduë Reformée n'a aucun fondement en l'Escriture Sainte, et qu'elle ne contient que des inventions purement humaines. Le tout extraict de quelques lettres du P. Gontery, écrites à M. le Conte gouverneur de Sedan, par la diligence de M. Pelot* (Charleville, Paris, Reims, 1613), REP 1515–17.

— *Fuite honteuse des ministres luthériens d'Allemagne refusants d'entrer en conférence avec un père jésuite qui leur présentoit pour toute reigle et juge la seule Escriture traduite par eux mesmes* (sometimes attributed to

- P. Léonard Périn) (Pont-à-Mousson, Reims, Rouen, 1613), REP 1556.
- *Instruction du procez de la Religion pretenduë Reformée* (Paris, 1617) (REP 2041).
- *Du Juge des controverses en général. Première partie. – Application du traicté général du juge à la controverse des voeux de la sainte religion, sçavoir est de la pauvreté, chasteté et obeysance. Seconde partie* (Paris, 1616), REP 1877.
- *La Pierre de touche, ou la vraye methode pour desabuser les esprits trompez soubz couleur de reformation. D'icy on descouvrira l'incroyable ruse des ministres faisans croire aux simples que les articles de leur confession de foy reformée sont expres dans la parole de Dieu escrite, sans qu'on y en puisse trouver une seule clause. D'où il apperera aussi que toute la Reformation pretendue n'est qu'une invention purment humaine et diabolique* (Bordeaux, 1614) REP 1640.
- *Seconde partie de la Pierre de Touche ou la vraye methode pour desabuser les esprits trompez soubz couleur de Reformation. Avec une correction fraternele, pour la refutation d'un libelle diffamatoire intitulé Le Voeu de jacob, escrit par un Escossois, nommé Gilbert, ministre de Begle* (Bordeaux, 1614), REP 1641.
- *La Response du P. J. Gontery ... a la demande d'un gentilhomme de la religion pretendue reformee, touchant l'usage des images, avec une coppie de la lettre que le roy a envoyee au dit P. Gontery, afin de continuer ses predications en sa ville de Dieppe* (Lyon, 1608), REP 884; also, (Paris, Rouen, Bordeaux, 1608), REP 885–87.
- *La Ruine totale de la confession de foy pretendue reformee. Contenant une verification precise de la divination, sur le manifeste intitulé, Response d'un advocat au sieur Gonteri Jesuite* (Caen), REP 1879.
- *La vraye procedure pour terminer le différent en matiere de religion, extraict des sermons faits à Caen par le R. P. Gontery, de la Compagnie de Jesus* (Caen, 1606), REP 709.
- Halier, Pierre, *Le Relais donné au sieur du Moulin, ministre de Charenton. ... Touchant le libelle anonyme du Sieur du Moulin, intitulé la Chasse de Raconis* (Paris, 1619), REP 2398.
- Harlay, François de, *Advis aux curieux sur les communications de Du Moulin et de Balzac* (Paris, 1633), REP 3881.
- Lettres de Henri IV concernant les relations du Saint Siège et de la France (1595–1609)*, edited by Bernard Barbiche (Vatican City, 1968).
- The Life of Edward, First Lord Herbert of Cherbury*, edited by J. M. Shuttleworth

- (London, 1976).
- Mémoires de Godefroi Hermant, ... sur l'histoire ecclésiastique du XVII^e siècle (1630–1663)*, edited by A. Gazie, 6 vols (Paris, 1905).
- L'Heureuse conversion de Mme de Frontenac à la religion catholique apostolique et romaine, sur l'instruction du révérend Père Arnoux* (Paris, 1618), REP 2218–19.
- Le Hibou des Jesuites, opposé à la Corneille de Charenton* (n.p., 1624), REP 3247.
- James I, *An Apologie for the Oath of Allegiance. First set foorth without a name; and now acknowledged by the Authour, the Right High, and Mightie Prince, James, by the grace of God, King of Great Britaine, France and Ireland; Defender of the Faith, &c. Together with a Premonition of his Majesties, to all most Mightie Monarches, Kings, free Princes and States of Christendome.* (London, 1609).
- *Déclaration du Sérénissime Roy Jacques I. Roy de la Grand' Bretagne France et Irlande, Défenseur de la Foy. Pour le Droit des Rois et Indépendance de leurs Couronnes, Contre la Harangue de l'Illustrissime Cardinal du Perron prononcée en la chambre du Tiers Estat le XV de Janvier 1615.* (London, 1615), REP 1758.
- *Triplici nodo, triplex cuneus or An Apologie for the Oath of Allegiance, Against the two Breves of Pope Paulus Quintus, and the late Letter of Cardinal Bellarmine to G. Blackwel the Arch-Priest.* (London, 1607).
- L'Angle, Jean-Maximilien de, *Recit de la Conference tenue entre Jean Maximilien de l'Angle Ministre de la parole de Dieu en l'Eglise Reformee de Rouen, et Francois Veron Jesuite* (Quevilly, [1618]), REP 2230.
- L'Estoile, Pierre de, *Mémoires-Journaux*, edited by G. Brunet and others, 12 vols (Paris, 1875–96).
- Lettres du Pere Gontery Jesuite a Monsieur le Conte gouverneur de Sedan. Avec les responses* (Sedan, 1613), REP 1520.
- 'L. M. N.', *La Réfutation de la nouvelle hérésie du ministre Du Moulin touchant la vocation des pasteurs et de l'article 31 de la confession de foi des prétendus réformés* (Paris, 1618), REP 2274.
- Mariana, Juan, *De rege et regis institutione* (Mayence, 1605).
- Matthieu, Pierre, *Histoire de France et des choses mémorables advenues aux provinces estrangères durant sept années de paix du règne de Henri III* (Paris, 1605).
- Maucouvent, Antoine de, *Le Sommaire veritable des questions proposees en la conference advenue entre le Dr Cayet et un Ministre dit Du Moulin, avec*

- la Responce dudit Dr Cayer a l'escrit plein de calomnie que ledit pretendu ministre dit Du Moulin a fait publier* (Paris, 1602), REP 384, 429.
- 'Memnon, la statue de,' *Le Tocsin. Au Roy, à la Reyne Regente ... Contre le livre de la Puissance temporelle du Pape, mis n'agueres en lumière par le Cardinal Bellarmin Jesuite* (Leiden, 1611 'jouxte la copie imprimée à Paris') REP 1332.
- Le Mercure françois, ou la suite de l'histoire de la paix. Commençant l'an M. DC. V. pour suite du Septenaire du D. Cayer, et finissant au Sacre du Tres-Chrestien Roy de France et de Navarre Louys XIII., 25 vols* (Paris, 1611-48).
- Mesnier, Honorat de, *Les Reproches du sieur du Moulin, Ministre de Charenton. Contre le Pere Arnoux* (Paris, 1619) REP 2428.
- Mestrezat, Jean, *Actes d'une Conference tenue au sujet d'une dame, en l'année 1624. entre Monsieur Mestrezat, et le P. Véron. Où se voit combien est esloignée de raison la maniere de disputer des Disciples et Successeurs de Veron: et que la bouche leur a esté assez fermée des lors pour l'advenir* ('Se vendent à Charenton', 1655), REP 5121.
- *De la communion a Jesus Christ, au sacrement de l'Eucharistie. Contre les cardinaux Bellarmin et du Perron ...* (Sedan, 1624), REP 3246.
- *Traicté de l'Escripture Sainte Où est monstrée la certitude et plenitude de la Foy et son independance de l'autorité de l'Eglise. Contre les pretendue Demonstrations Catholiques du Jesuite REGOURD. En quoy est comprise la refutation du troisieme livre de la Replique du Cardinal DU PERRON touchant les traditions.* (Geneva, 1633), REP 3888-91.
- Monginot, François, *Resolution des doutes, ou Sommaire decision des controverses entre l'Eglise reformée et l'Eglise romaine ... Traicté contenant les causes et raisons qui ont meu le dit F. Monginot à sortir de l'Eglise romaine, pour se ranger à l'Eglise reformée* (La Rochelle, 1617), REP 2069-70; also, (La Rochelle/Charenton, 1617), REP 2067, 2071; (Die, 1617), REP 2068.
- Montigny, Lobéran de, Pierre du Moulin, Samuel Durant, Jean Mestrezat, *Défense de la confession de foy des Eglises Réformées de France, contre les accusations du sieur Arnould Jesuite, deduites en son Sermon fait en la présence du roy à Fontaine-Bleau, par lesquelles il soustient que les passages cottez en marge de nostre confession sont faux et inutiles* (Charenton, 1617), REP 2010-13.
- 'P.D.C.', *Anticoton, ou Refutation de la lettre déclaratoire du P. Coton, livre où est prouvé que les jésuites sont coupables et autheurs du parricide exécrable commis en la personne du roy tres-chrestien d'heureuse mémoire* (n.p., n.d.), REP 1110-11.

- Pelletier, Thomas, *La Religion catholique soustenue en tous les poincts de sa doctrine. Contre le livre adressé aux rois, potentats et republiques de la chrestienté par . . . Jacques I. roy d'Angleterre, d'Escosse et d'Irlande* (Paris, 1610), REP 1161–62.
- Philothée, [Gontéry?], *Suite de la Correction fraternele. Ou continuation des reparties faictes contre les responses de M. Du Moulin Ministre de Charantonneau, sur les pretendues demandes du R. P. Cotton* (Paris, 1607), REP 808.
- Pietrasanta, Silvestro, *Notae in epistolam Petri Molinaei ad Balzacum, cum responsione ad haereses, errores et calumnias eius, ac vindicia urbis Romae et Pontificis Romani* (Antwerp, 1634), REP 3949.
- 'P.M.D.D.M.S.E.', *Justification de Monsieur du Moulin contre les impostures et calomnies de Léonard Le Maire, dit Limbourg* (Charenton, 1640) REP 4235.
- Pourparlé entre le R. P. Coton, predicateur du Roy, de la Compagnie de Jésus, et le Sieur Gigord, ministre de la religion pretendue reformée à Montpellier. Declaré par une lettre missive du sieur d'Angenoud, seigneur d'Araans* (Lyon, 1608), REP 863.
- Primerose, Gilbert, *Le Voeu de Jacob opposé aux voeux des moines* (Bergerac, 1609–11), REP 1028, 1310–12.
- Les CL. Pseaumes de David mis en rime françoise, par Clement Marot, et Theodore de Besze. Avec la forme des prieres ecclesiastiques, et la maniere d'administrer les Sacremens, et celebrer le Mariage* (Geneva, 1605).
- Recit veritable des conferences que les Pasteurs de l'Eglise de Paris ont eu avec le sieur Veron. Et particulierement celle qui a esté tenuë au sujet de madame la mareschalle de Themines* (n.p., 1624) REP 3265.
- Regourd, Alexandre, *Demonstrations catholiques, ou l'Art de reunir les pretendus reformez, et toute sorte de sectes, à la créance et communion de l'Eglise romaine. Avec les impostures des Ministres, singulièrement de Pierre Dumoulin et Jean Mestrezat*. (Paris, 1630), REP 3702.
- Response apologetique a l'Anticoton et a ceux de sa suite. Presentee a la royne mere du roy, regente de France. Ou il est monstre, que les auteurs anonymes de ces libelles diffamatoires sont attaints des crimes d'herezie, leze majeste, perfidie, sacrilege, et tres-enorme imposture*. (Paris, 1610), REP 1094–94.
- Retz, Paul de Gondi, cardinal de, *Mémoires*, in *Œuvres*, edited by Marie-Thérèse Hipp and Michel Pernot, (Paris, 1984).
- Mémoires du cardinal de Richelieu*, 10 vols (Paris, 1907–31).
- *Les principaux poincts de la foi de l'Eglise catholique defendus contre l'escrit adressé au Roy par les quatre ministres de Charenton* (Poitiers, 1617), REP

2102-3.

— *Traité qui contient la methode la plus facile et la plus asseurée pour convertir ceux qui se sont separez de l'Eglise* (Paris, 1651).

Richer, Edmond, *Libellus de ecclesiastica et politica potestate* (Paris, 1611).

Rivet, André, *Remarques et considerations sur la Réponse de F. Nicolas Coeffeteau Moine de la Secte de Dominique, au livre de Messire Philippe de Mornay Seigneur du Plessis-Marly, intitulé le Mystère d'iniquité, c'est à dire l'Histoire de la Papauté ...* (Saumur, 1617), REP 2105.

Santarelli, Antonio, *Tractatus de haeresi, schismate, apostasia, sollicitatione in sacramento Poenitentiae, et de potestate Romani Pontificis in his delictis puniendis* (Rome, 1625).

Simple et Veritable Discours de ce qui s'est passe en la Conference commencee a Caen, entre le Jesuite Gonteri, accompagne d'un Docteur jacobin, et les Ministres de Caen et de Sainte-Mere Eglise (n.p., 1606), REP 690.

Suarez, Francisco, *Defensio fidei catholicae et apostolicae adversus anglicanae sectae errores, cum responsio ad apologiam pro juramento fidelitatis et praefationem monitoriam ... Jacobi magnae Britanniae regis* (Cologne, 1614).

Suarez de Sainte-Marie, Jacques, *Torrent de feu sortant de la face de Dieu pour desseicher les eaux de Mara encloses dans la chossée du Molin d'Ablon. Où est amplement prouvé le Purgatoire et suffrages pour les trespassez; et sont decouvertes les faussetez et calomnies du ministre Molin* (Paris, 1603), REP 543.

Sully, *Mémoires in Nouvelle collection des mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de France*, edited by Michaud and Poujoulat, 2 vols (Paris, 1837).

Tallemant des Réaux, Gédéon, *Les historiettes*, edited by Antoine Adam and G. Delassault, 2 vols (Paris, 1960-61).

Tilenus, Daniel, *Defense de la suffisance et perfection de l'escriture sainte, contre les cavillations du Sr. du Perron Evesque d'Evreux. Par lesquelles il s'efforce de maintenir son Traitté de l'Insuffisance et Imperfection de l'Ecriture Sainte* (Sedan, 1602) REP 465.

— *Traicte du Sieur du Perron, Evesque d'Evreux, De l'Insuffisance de l'Ecriture Sainte et de la Necessite et Authorite des Traditions non ecrites* (La Rochelle, 1598), REP 25.

Tronchin, Théodore, *Coton plagiaire ou la Verité de Dieu et la fidelité de Geneve, maintenue contre les depravations et accusations de P. Coton Jesuite contre la traduction de la S. Bible faicte à Geneve, contenus en un livre intitulé Geneve plagiaire* (Geneva, 1620), REP 2652.

Turretin, Benedict, *Défense de la fidelité des traductions de la sainte Bible faites à Genève, opposée au livre du P. Coton intitulée 'Genève plagiaire'* (Geneva, 1619), REP 2458.

— *Recheute du jésuite plagiaire, ou examen des dialogues du P. Coton* (Geneva, 1620), REP 2654.

— *Suite de la fidélité des traductions de la S. Bible faites à Genève: contre le Plagiaire du P. Coton et autres écrits opposés aux versions de l'Escriture Sainte* (Geneva, 1626), REP 3456.

Véron, François, *Abrégé de l'art et méthode nouvelle de baillonner les ministres de France et réduire les dévoyez à la religion catholique, ou Bref et facile moyen par lequel tout catholique peut faire paroist[r]e évidemment que tous les ministres sont des trompeurs en l'exercice de leurs charges et tous les religionnaires sont abusez en tous et un chacun des poincts de leur prétendue réformation, presché et enseigné en l'église de Rouen, en présence de neuf à dix mille personnes, par le P. François Véron, ... avec la pratique d'iceluy en une conférence entre ledit Père, et un des principaux ministres de la religion prétendue ... Édition douziesme ...* (Rouen, 1618), REP 2291.

— *Bref et facile moyen par lequel toute personne, bien qu'elle ne soit versée en Théologie, peut par la seule Bible, soit de Genève, soit autre, et par la Confession de foy de la Religion pretendüe, faire paroistre evidemment à tout Ministre qu'il abuse, et à tout Religioneire qu'il est abusé en tous et en chacun des poincts de sa pretendüe reformation* (Pont-à-Mousson, 1617), REP 2112.

— *Briefue responce des saints Peres des quatre premiers siècles par la seule Bible au "Bouclier de la foy" du sieur Du Moulin, ministre de Charenton, qui démontre la nullité de la confession de foy de la religion prétendue réformée, ...* (Paris, 1620) REP 2659.

— *Cartels de deffy adressez au ministre Aubertin sur son dernier volume contre le S. Sacrement et conjointement au sieur Mestrezat, son collègue, sur son livre du mesme sujet, avec une briefue response ausdits ministres ...* (Paris, n.d.), REP 7098.

— *La Corneille de Charenton despoillée des plumes des oyseaux de Geneve et Sedan; et deffy au Sr Mestrezat et à ses collegues ministres sur son livre intitulé, De la communion à Jesus Christ au sacrement de l'Eucharistie ...* (Paris, 1624), REP 3278-79.

— *L'Establissement de la Congrégation de la Propagation de la Foy et des Missionnaires Generaux des Prelats de France, Pour conferer avec les Ministres et prescher aux portes de leurs Temples et és places publiques, par toutes les Provinces de ceste Monarchie, au salut des devoyez, et pour le repos de l'Estat, ...* (Paris, 1624) REP 3280-81.

Bibliography

- *Le Ministre d'Amyens contraint de renoncer à la seule parole de l'Escriture sainte, rendu muet et mis en fuite sur le sujet du Saint Sacrement de l'autel* ... (Rouen, 1615), REP 1814; also 1810–13.
- *Règle de la foi catholique séparée de toutes les opinions de la théologie scolastique et de tous autres sentimens particuliers ou abus* [1645], edited by Labouderie (Paris–Besançon, 1825).
- *La Sainte Bible abandonnée par les ministres de Charenton, ou Actes de la conférence entre M. F. Véron, ... et le Sr Mestrezat, ministre de Charenton, sur l'Eucharistie, tenue au sujet de Madame la Mareschalle de Thémynes, en la maison dudit ministre, en la présence de plusieurs de l'une et de l'autre religion, en laquelle le ministre, le premier de tous, a confessé de ne pouvoir faire lire ny mesme un seul article controversé de toute la Confession de foy, ny de son catéchisme dans la Sainte Bible, sans y adjouster aucune sienne glose ou conséquence. Appel à continuer la conférence. Recherche de la corneille.* (Paris, n.d.) REP 7153.
- Vignier, N., *Apologie catholique de la doctrine des églises réformées, contre un esscrit du P. Coton imprimé à Blois, sous le titre d' 'Abrégé des Controverses'* (Saumur, 1617), REP 2113.
- Whitaker, William, *Disputatio de Sacra Scriptura, contra huius temporis Papistas, in primis Robertum Bellarminum ... et Thomam Stapletonum* ... (Cambridge, 1588).
- *A Disputation on Holy Scripture, against the Papists, especially Bellarmine and Stapleton*, translated and edited by William Fitzgerald (Cambridge, 1849).
- *Praelectiones ... in quibus tractatur controversia de Conciliis contra Pontificios, in primis R. Bellarminum Jesuitam* ... (Cambridge, 1600).
- *Praelectiones ... in quibus tractatur controversia de Ecclesia, contra Pontificios, in primis R. Bellarminum* ... (Cambridge, 1599).

Secondary Sources

- Armstrong, Brian G., *Calvinism and the Amyraut Heresy: Protestant Scholasticism and Humanism in Seventeenth Century France* (Madison, Milwaukee and London, 1969).
- Baroni, Victor, 'La Bible chez les controversistes catholiques du XVII^e siècle en France', *Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuse*, XIX (1939), pp.97–129.
- *La Contre-Réforme devant la Bible* (Lausanne, 1943).
- Bayley, Peter, *French Pulpit Oratory, 1598–1650: a study in themes and styles, with a descriptive catalogue of printed texts* (Cambridge, 1980).
- Benoist, Élie, *Histoire de l'Edit de Nantes*, 5 vols (Delft, 1693–95).
- Blet, Pierre, 'L'article du Tiers aux Etats généraux de 1614', *Revue d'Histoire moderne et contemporaine*, II (April–June 1985), pp.81–106.
- 'Le plan de Richelieu pour la réunion des protestants', *Gregorianum*, XLVII (1967), pp.100–29.
- Bourguet, P., 'La Méthode de Charles Drelincourt pour son 'Abrégé des controverses' ', in *La Controverse Religieuse (XVI^e–XIX^e siècles)*, 2 vols (Montpellier, 1980), 1, 151–55.
- Bréchillet-Jourdain, Charles M.-G., *Histoire de l'Université de Paris au XVII^e et au XVIII^e siècle*, 2 parts (Paris, 1862–66).
- Bredvold, Louis I., *The Intellectual Milieu of John Dryden: Studies in some aspects of seventeenth-century thought* (Michigan, 1956).
- Bremond, Henri, *Histoire littéraire du sentiment religieux en France depuis la fin des guerres de religion jusqu'à nos jours*, 11 vols and index (Paris, 1929–36).
- Briggs, Robin, *Early Modern France (1560–1715)* (Oxford, 1977).
- Brockliss, L. W. B., *French Higher Education in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries* (Oxford, 1987).
- Cohen, Gustave, *Écrivains français en Hollande dans la première moitié du XVII^e siècle* (Paris, 1920).
- Congar, Pierre, 'Les caractères propres de l'Académie protestante de Sedan (1602–1681)', *Histoire de l'enseignement de 1610 à nos jours. Actes du 95^e Congrès des sociétés savantes* (Reims, 1970), 1, 537–49.
- Congar, Pierre, Jean Lecaillon, Jacques Rousseau, *Sedan et le pays sedanais — vingt siècles d'histoire* (Paris, 1969).

- Couderc, J.-B., *Le vénérable Cardinal Bellarmin*, 2 vols (Paris, 1893).
- De Grève, Marcel, 'Rabelais, arme du R. P. Garasse', in *Les Jésuites parmi les hommes. Actes du Colloque de Clermont-Ferrand (avril 1985)*, edited by G. and G. Demerson, B. Dompnier and A. Regond (Clermont-Ferrand, 1987), pp.185-95.
- De Sceaux, Raoul, *Histoire des Frères Mineurs Capucins de la Province de Paris (1601-1660)*, vol 1 (Blois, 1965).
- Desgraves, Louis, 'Un aspect des controverses entre Catholiques et Protestants, les Récits de conversion (1598-1628)', in *La Conversion au XVII^e siècle. Actes du XII^e Colloque de Marseille (Janvier 1982)* (Marseille, 1983), pp.89-110.
- 'Les controverses sur la Messe à la fin du XVI^e siècle et au début du XVII^e siècle', in *Histoire de la Messe XVII-XIX^e siècles. Actes de la troisième rencontre d'histoire religieuse organisée à Fontevraud le 6 octobre 1979* (Angers, 1980), pp.37-50.
- *Les Haultin (1571-1623)* (Geneva, 1960).
- *Répertoire des ouvrages de controverse entre Catholiques et Protestants en France (1598-1685)*, 2 vols (1984-85).
- Dibon, Paul, *La philosophie néerlandaise au siècle d'or*, vol 1: *L'enseignement philosophique dans les universités à l'époque précartésienne (1575-1650)* (Amsterdam, 1954).
- Dompnier, Bernard, *Le venin de l'hérésie. Image du protestantisme et combat catholique au XVII^e siècle* (Paris, 1985).
- Douen, O., *La Révocation de l'édit de Nantes à Paris d'après des documents inédits*, 3 vols (Paris, 1894).
- Dubé, Wilfrid, 'Bérulle et les protestants (1593-1610)', 2 vols (un-published doctoral thesis, Paris, 1986).
- Dubois, Elfrieda, 'La Bibliothèque de l'évêque Cosin à Durham et sa collection de livres français de théologie et de spiritualité protestantes des XVI^e et XVII^e siècles', *Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire du Protestantisme Français* (1982), pp.173-88.
- Feret, P., *Le Cardinal du Perron, orateur, controversiste, écrivain: Etude historique et critique* (Paris, 1877).
- *Un curé de Charenton au XVII^e siècle* (Paris, 1881).
- *La Faculté de théologie de Paris et ses docteurs les plus célèbres ... Époque moderne*, 5 vols (Paris, 1900-07).
- Fouqueray, Henri, *Histoire de la Compagnie de Jésus en France des origines à la*

- suppression (1528–1762)* 5 vols (Paris, 1910–25).
- Fumaroli, Marc, *L'âge de l'éloquence: Rhétorique et res literaria de la Renaissance au seuil de l'époque classique* (Geneva, 1980).
- Gory, Gédéon, *Pierre du Moulin: Essai sur sa vie, sa controverse et sa polémique* (Paris, 1888).
- Greengrass, Mark, *France in the Age of Henri IV: the Struggle for Stability* (London, 1984).
- Griselle, Eugène, *Louis XIII et Richelieu: Lettres et pièces diplomatiques* (Paris, 1911).
- Hayden, J. Michael, 'Continuity in the France of Henri IV and Louis XIII: French foreign policy, 1598–1615', *Journal of Modern History*, XLV (1973), pp.1–23.
- *France and the Estates General of 1614* (London, 1974).
- Higman, Francis M., *The Style of John Calvin in his French Polemical Treatises* (Oxford, 1967).
- Histoire de l'édition française*, edited by H. J. Martin, Roger Chartier, Jean-Pierre Viret, 4 vols (Paris, 1982–86).
- Jehasse, Jean, *Guez de Balzac et le Génie Romain* (Saint-Etienne, 1977).
- Kappler, Emile, 'Conférences théologiques entre Catholiques et Protestants en France au XVII^e siècle', 2 vols (un-published doctoral thesis, University of Clermont, 1980).
- Lalot, J., *Essai historique sur la conférence tenue à Fontainebleau entre Duplessis-Mornay et Du Perron le 4 mai 1600* (Paris, 1889).
- Laplanche, François, *L'Évidence du Dieu Chrétien: Religion, culture et société dans l'apologétique protestante de la France classique (1576–1670)* (Strasbourg, 1983).
- *Orthodoxie et prédication: L'Œuvre d'Amyraut et la querelle de la grâce universelle* (Paris, 1965).
- Le Goff, Jacques, *La naissance du Purgatoire* (Paris, 1981).
- Léonard, Émile G., *Histoire générale du protestantisme*, 3 vols (Paris, 1961–64).
- Levi, Anthony, *French moralists: the theory of the passions (1585 to 1649)* (Oxford, 1964).
- Ligou, D., *Protestantisme en France de 1598 à 1715* (Paris, 1968).
- Mariéjol, H.-J., *Henri IV et Louis XIII*, vol 6, part 2 of the *Histoire de la France*

- illustrée*, edited by E. Lavissee, 9 vols (Paris, 1911).
- Martin, H.-J., *Le livre, pouvoirs et société à Paris au XVII^e siècle*, 2 vols (Geneva, 1969).
- Martin, Victor, *Le Gallicanisme et la réforme catholique* (Paris, 1919).
- Milward, Peter, *Religious Controversies of the Elizabethan Age: A Survey of Printed Sources* (London, 1977).
- *Religious Controversies of the Jacobean Age: A Survey of Printed Sources* (London, 1978).
- Mours, Samuel, *Le Protestantisme en France au dix-septième siècle* (Paris, 1967).
- Mousnier, Roland, *L'Assassinat d'Henri IV* (Paris, 1964).
- *Paris au XVII^e siècle, Les cours de Sorbonne* (Paris, 1961).
- Mousseaux, Maurice, 'Pierre du Moulin', *Bulletin de la Société de l'histoire du protestantisme français*, 114 (1968), pp.160–79.
- The New Cambridge Modern History*, vol IV, edited by J. P. Cooper (Cambridge, 1970).
- Pallier, Denis, *Recherches sur l'imprimerie à Paris pendant la Ligue* (Geneva, 1975).
- Pannier, Jacques, *L'Eglise Réformée de Paris sous Henri IV* (Paris, 1911).
- *L'Eglise Réformée de Paris sous Louis XIII (1610–1621)* (Paris, 1922).
- *L'Eglise Réformée de Paris sous Louis XIII de 1621 à 1629 environ*, 2 vols (Paris, 1931–32).
- 'Un pasteur de Paris, chanoine à Canterbury et recteur dans le Pays de Galles. P. Du Moulin (1615–1625)', *Proceedings of the Huguenot Society*, XIII (1925), pp.173–81.
- Patry, Raoul, *Philippe du Plessis-Mornay, un huguenot homme d'Etat (1549–1623)* (Paris, 1933).
- Pattison, Mark, *Isaac Casaubon*, second edition, edited by H. Nettlehip (Oxford, 1892).
- Pintard, René, *Le Libertinage érudit dans la première moitié du XVII^e siècle* (Paris, 1943).
- Popkin, Richard H., *The History of Scepticism from Erasmus to Descartes*, revised edition (New York, 1968).
- Pottinger, David Thomas, *The French Book Trade in the Ancien Regime (1500–1791)* (Cambridge, Mass., 1958).

Bibliography

- Prat, J.-M., *Recherches historiques et critiques sur la Compagnie de Jésus en France du temps du Père Coton*, 5 vols (Lyon, 1876–78).
- Préclin, S., 'Edmond Richer', *Revue d'Histoire moderne et contemporaine* (1930), pp.329–31.
- Proctor, Leonard, 'The theology of Moïse Amyraut considered as a reaction against seventeenth-century Calvinism' (un-published Ph. D. thesis, University of Leeds, 1952).
- Proctor, S.R.A., 'A study of the printed books in French in Bishop Cosin's Library, Durham' (un-published M.A. thesis, University of Durham, 1974).
- Quérard, Joseph Marie, *Les Supercheries littéraires dévoilées*, 3 vols (Paris, 1869–70).
- Ranum, Orest, *Paris in the Age of Absolutism* (New York, 1968).
- Rébelliau, Alfred, *Bossuet, historien du protestantisme. Etude sur l' "Histoire des Variations" et sur la controverse au dix-septième siècle*, third edition (Paris, 1909).
- Renouard, Philippe, *Répertoire des imprimeurs parisiens, libraires, fondateurs de caractères et correcteurs d'imprimerie depuis l'introduction de l'Imprimerie à Paris (1470) jusqu'à la fin du seizième siècle* (Paris, 1965).
- Rex, Walter E., *Essays on Pierre Bayle and religious controversy* (The Hague, 1965).
- Rimbault, Lucien, *Pierre du Moulin, 1568–1658, un pasteur classique à l'âge classique: Étude de théologie pastorale, sur des documents inédits* (Paris, 1966).
- Rossi, Mario M., *La Vita, le Opere, i Tempi di Edoardo Herbert di Chirbury*, 3 vols (Florence, 1947).
- Rothrock, George A., 'Some aspects of early Bourbon policy towards the Huguenots', *Church History* (1960), XXIX, 17–24.
- Snoeks, Rémi, *L'argument de tradition dans la controverse eucharistique entre catholiques et réformés français au XVII^e siècle* (Louvain–Gembloux, 1951).
- Solé, Jacques, *Le débat entre protestants et catholiques français de 1598 à 1685*, 4 vols (Paris, 1985).
- Soman, Alfred, 'Press, pulpit, and censorship in France before Richelieu', *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, CXX (1976) pp.439–463.
- Tapié, Victor L., *La France de Louis XIII et de Richelieu* (Paris, 1967).
- Tavard, Georges, *Holy Writ or Holy Church: The Crisis of the Protestant Reformation* (London, 1959).

Bibliography

- *La Tradition au XVII^e siècle en France et en Angleterre* (Paris, 1969).
- Taveneaux, R., *Le Catholicisme dans la France classique (1610–1715)*, 2 vols (Paris, 1980).
- Tertullian, 'De praescriptione haereticorum': *Traité de la prescription contre les hérétiques* [French parallel edition], Sources chrétiennes, 46 (Paris, 1957).
- Thils, Gustave, *Les notes de l'Eglise dans l'apologétique Catholique depuis la Réforme* (Gembloux, 1937).
- Urbain, Charles, *Nicolas Coeffeteau, dominicain, évêque de Marseille, un des fondateurs de la prose française (1574–1623)* (Pari, 1893).
- Viénot, Jean, *Histoire de la Réforme Française*, 2 vols (Paris, 1926–34).
- Vinet, Alexandre, *Histoire de la prédication parmi les réformés de France au dix-septième siècle* (Paris, 1860).
- Voeltzel, René, *Vraie et fausse Eglise selon les théologiens protestants du XVII^e siècle* (Paris, 1955).
- Wickes, G. A., *Henry Constable, Poet and Courtier, 1562–1613*, in *Biographical Studies, 1534–1820*, vol 2, no 4 (1954), pp.272–300.

