

Jesuit Father
François Annat and his
Role as Minister for
Religious Affairs in
17th Century France

Jesuit Father François Annat and his Role as Minister for Religious Affairs in 17th Century France

By

Brian Van Hove

**Cambridge
Scholars
Publishing**



Jesuit Father François Annat and his Role as Minister for Religious
Affairs in 17th Century France

By Brian Van Hove

This book first published 2024 (draft 1999)

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2024 by Brian Van Hove

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-5275-6504-1

ISBN (13): 978-1-5275-6504-3

TABLE OF CONTENTS

François Annat in Context.....	1
Polemical Jansenism in France.....	69
Pascal Preserves the Name “Annat”	79
Who Really Was Annat?	107

FRANÇOIS ANNAT IN CONTEXT

Official Jesuit sources remembered François Annat (1590-1670) more as the mediator of the Affair of the Corsican Guard than for other activities, including his anti-Jansenism.¹ The ceremonial letters of Father General Giovanni Paolo Oliva (1600-1681), badly organized and edited without dates, focus on congratulating him for resolving this particular conflict to the exclusion of thanking him for anything else.² In this Annat

¹ Father General Franz Xaver Wernz (1842-1914), a renowned canonist, was concerned about the history of the Society and ordered each national group to produce its own history. The mandate came from General Congregation XXIV, Decree § 21, and the work of his predecessor, Father General Luis Martín. In France, there resulted the studies of Joseph Brucker, *La Compagnie de Jésus. Esquisse de son institut et de son histoire (1521-1773)* (Paris: Beauchesne, 1919); and appearing in five volumes in 1925, Henri Fougeray, *Histoire de la Compagnie de Jésus en France des Origines à la Suppression (1528-1762)*. One further effect was undoubtedly the revision of Wernz's own *Abriss der Geschichte der Gesellschaft Jesu* (Münster: Joseph Krick, 1876) which first appeared before he became Superior General, and afterward made more available by the edition of Ludwig Schmitt (1846-1917), *Synopsis historiae Societatis Jesu* (Ratisbonae: Typis Friderici Pustet, 1914). This volume was published to celebrate the first centenary of the restoration of the Society, 1814-1914, and bore the usual restriction "pro nostris tantum". It was reprinted in 1920 and revised by Joannes B. Goetstouwers (1879-1945) (Louvain: Typis ad S. Alphonsi, 1950) in 820 cols. Though it was ready for the fourth centenary of the confirmation of the Society in 1940, it could not be published until after World War II. See cols. 213, 221, 616. A more comprehensive replacement, the *Dictionary of the History of the Society of Jesus*, begun in 1979 by the Institutum Historicum S.I. in Rome and originally planned for Spanish and English versions, was published in Spain on December 3, 2001, as the *Diccionario de la Historia de la Compañía de Jesús*, co-published by the Pontifical University of Comillas (Madrid) and the Jesuit Historical Institute (Rome). The article on Annat was contributed by the late Paul Duclos (1917-1993), former archivist of the Province of France. His bibliography is inconclusive.

² See *Lettere di Giovanni Paolo Oliva Della Compagnia di Gesù* (Roma: presso il Varese, 1681) esp. Tomo primo, pp. 33, 107, 362, 405 (index p. 500, "Annati"). Only Tomo primo and Tomo secondo were published. Tomo tertio was printed but not published. Secondo and tertio contain some of the same material. The project may have been canceled. Father General Oliva is not to be confused with another

succeeded where others had failed. But since no one ever acclaimed Annat to be a saint, it is arguable that he has been all but forgotten. Were it not for at least one of his major adversaries (Blaise Pascal) having an illustrious place in French literature, this might be true.³

Oliva was the preacher to the papal court. Beginning in 1661 he served as Vicar-General for Goswin Nickel (1584-1664), then himself became Superior General of the Society of Jesus in 1664.⁴ But as Minister for Ecclesiastical Affairs, or Royal Confessor, Annat was doing no more than his duty in working toward a settlement between the pope, Alexander VII,⁵ and the French king. Negotiations were continually in motion with other countries relative to several diplomatic problems that intersected with the Gallican Church. The “Allianzteppich”⁶ celebrates the renewal of the treaty with the Swiss, November 18, 1663. The ceremony in the cathedral of Notre-Dame de Paris took place when the Corsican Guard question was in full heat. Another tapestry was later commissioned to commemorate the

Ioannes Paulus Oliva (1542-1593) who was provincial of the Milan Province, 1587-1592.

³ The official menology gives an account of his life which surrounds his name with sentimental words, but this type of ceremonial necrology from the nineteenth century is not known for its historical reliability. See Élesban Guilhermy and Jacques Terrien, *Ménologe de la Compagnie de Jésus. Assistance de France*, 14 vols. (Paris: M. Schneider, 1892) Tome I, pp. 737-739.

⁴ The transition was a smooth one. Annat wrote to Oliva to say there would be no changes required as far as the Court of France and the Jesuits were concerned. ARSI, Gal. 71, f. 164r. Letter, Annat to Oliva, sent from Paris to Rome, 29 August, 1664, transcript.

⁵ Fabio Chigi (1599-1667)

⁶ See the reproduction from the Swiss National Museum. It is the only known image of François Annat, done after a painting by Charles Le Brun (1619-1690). During research, the first reference to the Gobelins tapestry in the series “Histoire du Roy” came from Ernest Jovy in a letter to Léon Roques. See AER, ROQ. 7, “Documents divers, lettres, et notes sur Annat”. Letter, Ernest Jovy to Léon Roques, sent from Vitry-le-François to Rodez, 11 October, 1910, orig. Roques had planned to do a doctoral thesis on Annat. He was overwhelmed with the quantity of information he had collected, and the project was never finished. He died in 1946. See Alphonse Auguste, *Les Origines du Jansénisme dans le diocèse de Toulouse*, vol. III in the series *Études sur la Réforme Catholique dans l’ancien Diocèse de Toulouse* (Paris: Librairie A. Picard, 1922), p. 35, n. 1. The project of the thesis is discussed at length by Bernard Combes de Patris, “Notes sur les travaux et manuscrits de Monsieur le Chanoine Roques” in *Procès-verbaux des séances de la Société des Lettres, Sciences et Arts de l’Aveyron* 35 (1945-1948), pp. 156-166.

conclusion of that event, too, which had taken place on July 28, 1664.⁷ The following day François Annat wrote to Honoré Fabri to speak of it. That letter is available for study.⁸

⁷ See the reproduction from the Musée National du Louvre. This Gobelins tapestry is called “L’Audience du Légat” and may be found both in the Musée du Château de Versailles and in the Musée du Louvre (1^{er} étage, 4, Salle 62/ Salle Claude Ott, *Objets d’art de l’époque néo-classique*, GMIT 95-1, Dépôt du Mobilier national). It was executed between 1667-1672, and is the seventh in the series “Histoire du Roy”. The King is seated in his private chamber while the Legate Chigi, also seated, reads the “excuses” from the pope assuming a somewhat humiliated posture. Annat wrote to Fabri the day after Chigi met with Louis XIV, 29 July 1664. Philippe Diéudonné gives further references and reflections, “Aux Origines de la Paix de l’Église: de la crise de 1665 à l’intervention du Comte de Brienne”, in *RHE* LXXXIX, 2 (1994), p. 350, n. 11.

⁸ By way of introduction, this is how the *Mémoires* of René Rapin (1621-1687) identify Honoré Fabri (Fabry): “Le P. Annat avoit à Rome un homme de confiance, grand théologien, habile en tout, mais fort versé dans tout le manège de la cour de Rome, qu’il connoissoit très-bien; c’étoit un jésuite nommé Honoré Fabri, François de la province de Lyon, qui depuis plusieurs années s’occupoit des fonctions de la pénitencerie de Saint-Pierre. Ce jésuite s’étoit tellement remply l’esprit du détail de la nouvelle opinion qu’il n’y avoit presque personne alors à Rome qui en fût mieux instruit, et comme il étoit devenu, par la connoissance parfaite qu’il avoit de cette affaire, intime amy du cardinal Albissy, par la médiation duquel on faisoit savoir au pape ce qu’il falloit qu’il sût sur le jansénisme et qu’il en étoit toujours favorablement écouté..”. See René Rapin, *Mémoires*, III (Paris: Aubineau, 1865) p. 237. The other side is stated succinctly by the biographer of Henry Arnould, the Bishop of Angers: “On sait que le P. Fabri étoit l’agent des Jésuites français à Rome et jouissait de la plus grande autorité. Cf. Michaud, *Louis XIV et Innocent XI...*” See Claude Cochin, *Henry Arnould, évêque d’Angers (1597-1692)* (Paris: Auguste Picard, 1921) p. 201, n. 1. This book was posthumous and unfinished. Honoré Fabri was assigned as a penitentiary of St. Peter’s, a multi-lingual community in Rome capable of dispensing from censures and absolving from sins reserved to the Pope, and entrusted to the Society of Jesus in 1570 by Pius V. He served as its Vice-Rector after 1664, then as Rector between 1677 and 1680. See Josef Wicki, “Le ‘memorie’ dei Penitenzieri di S. Pietro”, in *AHSI* 57 (1988) pp. 263-314. Most of the scholarship on Fabri in this century has been on his notable contributions to science, not his religious activity. The ARSI has further listings for him. See Gal. 74, “De statu S.I. 1680-1681”; “cum epp. et censuris 1668-1691”; also Gal. 74a, “Nonnulla Societatem et Ecclesiam spectantia 1679-1685”; “—atque obiter de abdicatione G. Nickel et de electione in Vicarium Gen. I.P. Oliva 1682-1683”; “—de Generali C. de Noyelle et visitatione apud Oratorem Regis Galliae 1682-1687. [Elogium Ludovici XIV]”. On one pseudonym, see Lucien Ceyssens, “L’action antijanséniste du P. Brunon Neusser OFM”, in *Franziskanische Studien* 35, 4 (1953) pp. 401-411. [Unfortunately the 1953 study of Ceyssens was not yet able to benefit from the 1955 work of Walter Ong which

The correspondence of Annat to Jean Ferrier and Honoré Fabri details the collaboration among the Jesuits who dealt with the unfolding Jansenist crisis. Their correspondence was sometimes filed in the Holy Office, and

interprets more satisfactorily the problem of pseudonyms in this period. See Walter J. Ong, "Père Cossart, Du Monstier, and Ramus's Protestantism in the Light of a New Manuscript" in *AHSI*, XXIV, fasc. 47, (Jan.-Jun.) 1955, esp. pp. 161-163.] Philippe Dieudonné calls Fabri "inlassable"—see his "Aux Origines de la Paix de l'Église: de la crise de 1665 à l'intervention du Comte de Brienne", p. 351, and p. 351, n. 15; and also, *La paix clémentine: défaite et victoire du premier jansénisme français sous le pontificat de Clément IX (1667-1669)* (Leuven: University Press, 2003) pp. 6; 6, n. 28; 41; 41, n. 151; 43; 68; 75; 133, n. 64; 137; 227; 253; 255; 255, n. 46; and 259. Much of Annat's correspondence in the Holy Office is to Fabri, who presumably served as secretary or even special delegate for the French Regional Assistant ["Assistentia Galliae", organized into an Assistancy in 1608] responsible for the matter of Jansenism. Annat at times will ask him to show information to the Assistant, who beginning in 1661 was Claude Boucher to whom Annat wrote either directly or through Fabri. At least juridically, it would have been Boucher, the Regional Assistant for France, who was really responsible. Boucher was ex-Provincial of Francia, but he was not a writer, and he does not figure into public controversy with the Jansenists. The Jesuit catalogues used the term "Scriptor" for those who were writers. No correspondence has yet been found between Annat and his immediate successor, Pierre Le Cazre, who was appointed after Annat left Rome. Le Cazre was French Regional Assistant, 1652-1661, when the Eleventh General Congregation, opening 9 May 1661, elected Boucher. After that Le Cazre returned to France and became Provincial of the Champagne Province, and died in that office on 17 April 1664. The Twelfth General Congregation elected Paul Fontaine (1617-1692) in 1682 to replace Boucher who only lived one more year, dying in Rome in 1683. Fontaine had served two triennials as Provincial of Aquitaine (1668-1671; 1677-1680). The General had four Assistants—one each for France, Germany, Spain, and Italy. The administrative boundaries then were different from today's. Nor was it required that the Assistant had to come from the given territory. This was the case with Florentin de Montmorency who was ex-Provincial of the Gallo-Belgian Province and elected by General Congregation VIII in 1646 to be the Regional Assistant for Germany. He served until 1649 when General Congregation IX elected Goswin Nickel, a "German", to replace him. The seventeenth century French Assistants are in order of their election or appointment: 1608: Louis Richeome; 1615: Étienne Charlet; 1646: Barthélémy Jacquinot; 1648: François Annat; 1652: Pierre Le Cazre; 1661: Claude Boucher; 1682: Paul Fontaine; 1692: Jean Bomier; 1696: Pierre Dozenne. See Pierre Delattre (1876-1961), ed., *Les Établissements des Jésuites en France depuis quatre siècles*, Tome II (Enghien-Wetteren: Institut supérieur de Théologie-Imprimerie De Meester Frères, 1955), col. 535. Delattre replaced and continued earlier work by E. Piaget, *Histoire de l'établissement des Jésuites en France (1540-1640)* (Leyde, 1893).

was known to the nuncio at the time.⁹ Even the conferences, “le projet d’accommodement”,¹⁰ that Jean Ferrier had with the Jansenist delegation early in 1663 in Toulouse were dutifully reported upon and sent to Rome,¹¹ notably to the French Assistancy by means of Honoré Fabri. In turn, he functioned as a coordinator for the Regional Assistant to the Superior General.¹²

⁹ See AJPF, C-Pa, 1/6 “F”. Henri Chérot (1856-1906) had copied ca. 1906 by an associate from the Vatican Archives, “Nunziatura di Francia”, parts relating to the Jesuits, Cardinal Albizzi, and the Jansenist question from the period 1640-1670. These copies still exist in the form of short references and extraits or quotations rather than integral documents, although the researcher who worked for Chérot explicitly said he was working with the originals. An example relates to the correspondence between Annat and Fabri: “On n’a pas encore reçu les censures de la Sorbonne, ceci peut expliquer le silence du Pape. ‘Soggiungo de piu a V.S. ché essendosi fatta diligenza in tutte le lettere e scritture inviate dal P. Annat al P. Fabri sopra queste materie, non si trova che gl’habbia scritto mai circa quelle prima Censura: onde ne meno il P. Fabri ne ha havuto notitia se non modernamente: et à N.S. sara facile di ricontrare questa verita con l’istesso P. Annat’.” Arch. Vat., Nunz. di Francia, 126, deciferati, fol. 29r-29v. Chigi a Roberti, Nunzio, 18 Maggio 1665.

¹⁰ The first tentatives made by Gilbert de Choiseul were during the summer of 1662, around the time of the Affair of the Corsican Guard. Ferrier was considered a suitable interlocutor because he was a friend of Annat. See Auguste, *Les Origines du Jansénisme dans le diocèse de Toulouse*, *ibid.*, pp. 138-140.

¹¹ They were a peace effort between the monarchy and the Jansenist party which failed. Ferrier was well-known for being a friend of Annat. See Étienne Dejean, *Un Prélat indépendant au XVII^e siècle, Nicolas Pavillon, évêque d’Alet (1637-1677)* (Paris: Librairie Plon, 1909), pp. 179-180. Each side blamed the other. The Clementine Peace, shortly thereafter, was negotiated without Annat’s advice and against it. This was partly due to his poor health and advanced age, and because the Jesuits were blamed for the failure of the “projet d’accommodement”. Annat’s longest letter to the General denounces the Peace. “Pax omni bello peior est.” See ARSI, Gal. 71, #193r&v-#194r&v. Also Philippe Dieudonné, *La paix clémentine: défaite et victoire du premier jansénisme français sous le pontificat de Clément IX (1667-1669)*, *passim*. Jacques M. Gres-Gayer, reviewing Dieudonné, says the historical reconstruction of the Clementine Peace remains unfinished. See *CHR*, XCI, n.3 (July 2005), pp. 539-541.

¹² Pierre Blet seems to be incorrect on the point of the role of Fabri. “L’archevêque de Toulouse en communiqua au duc de Chaulnes, qui interrogea à son tour le P. Fabri, assistant du général des jésuites.” See “Louis XIV et les Papes aux prises avec le Jansénisme (Suite; 1665-1669)”, in *Archivum Historiae Pontificiae* 32 (1994) Rome, Pontificia Universitatis Gregoriana, Facultas Historiae Ecclesiasticae, p. 81. Claude Boucher was the Assistant to the General (requiring he be elected by a General Congregation, or appointed by the General in case of a death, then

Annat's private letters, the few that have survived from surely thousands written over a long career,¹³ are in a simple, direct style. They are no-nonsense communications of fact and information, often composed in haste as the press of duty permitted so little time. Still, he did not rely on the services of a secretary. They are done by himself, particularly since they were destined for his Jesuit superiors or collaborators. Occasionally they contain anecdotes or afterthoughts. The reader begins to recognize the authentic hand of Annat, whether in his Latin, French, or Italian. The confidential nature of this writing was assured more completely when he wrote without help.

With that in mind, the Affair of the Corsican Guard may be perceived as a distraction for Annat. Despite the well-known dual system, with boundaries between the spiritual and temporal sovereignties attributed to

confirmed by a subsequent General Congregation, as in the case of Annat), though Fabri "assisted" perhaps in a broad sense. The letter of Annat to Boucher, sent from Paris to Rome, January 26, 1663, addresses him as "R. P. Assistant". He had become Assistant in 1661. See ACDF [l'Arcivio della Congregazione per la Dottrina della Fede], St. St. F-2-c, Acta in Galliis in Causa Jansenii et circa Formularium, Annis 1663-1664-1665, #4r&v, orig. Charles-Albert, le duc de Chaulnes, was "ambassadeur extraordinaire" in Rome, 1660-1668. Antoine Adam, in addition to discussing the "tentatives de paix" (pp. 249-254), also indicates that Fabri was a close friend of Cardinal Francesco Albizzi. See *Du Mysticisme à la Révolte* (Paris: Fayard, 1968), p. 250. Contemporary historian Lucien Ceyssens points to the influence of the Assessor of the Holy Office, Cardinal Albizzi, in the repression of the Jansenists.

¹³ Thirty-eight were found in the Holy Office Archives (ACDF); ninety-five in the Roman Archives of the Society of Jesus (ARSI); two in the Bibliothèque Royal Albert I^{er} in Brussels (BRA). No autographs were found in the Archives jésuites de la Province de France. All these letters were dated between 1654 and 1669 when Annat was Royal Confessor. There was passive correspondence in the form of notes from the Jesuit Generals for part of the time between the years 1652-1654 (ARSI) when Annat was Provincial in Paris. With the exception of the letters in Brussels published by Lucien Ceyssens, none of this material has been edited or published. Annat's published writings, both the long and the short, are mostly identified, but perhaps not all. With the anonymous and pseudonymous writings of his day, some might have escaped the bibliographers altogether or might have been wrongly attributed. Ernest M. Rivière identified some of these works in his "Supplément" to Sommervogel, and Léopold Willaert continued after him. Annat's known works are relatively accessible in those libraries which specialize in rare books, but no single collection has assembled them all. There are two known lost works.

the Roman Pontiff,¹⁴ the human element could still come into play. Pride and injury in the Age of Glory were frequently factors in diplomatic life. Small events could become symbols of deeper passions, or excuses for settling old grudges. Real motivations were veiled while decoys functioned as explanations.

It had already been in evidence during the Fronde when the nuncio was recalled because of his alliance with the Frondeurs. And again, after that, when Alexander VII was elected Pope in 1655. The French Court nearly exercised its right of exclusion against him, and Alexander never forgot it. His pride was injured. He had a reputation for being pro-Spanish, which may have vexed the French.¹⁵ For six or seven years there had been bad relations between France and Rome over Alexander's refusal to accept

¹⁴ For a discussion of the boundaries of jurisdiction, and whether the Jesuits in France might have been Gallican in their outlook, see Pierre Blet, "Jésuites Gallicans au XVII^e siècle? À propos de l'ouvrage du P. Guittou sur le P. de La Chaize", in *AHSI* XXIX, fasc. 57 (1960), pp. 55-84. There is reason to believe that when it came to a conflict of interests, the Royal Confessor was loyal to the monarch first, and to the Jesuit General secondly. St. Ignatius had been concerned about the "spiritus nationalis", which only increased in the seventeenth century. But there is no necessary conflict between 'raison d'état' and the ultramontanism so typical of the classic Jesuit. Blet says of Annat: "Certes Annat distinguait en Alexandre VII le Souverain Pontife et le chef de l'État romain: nulle trace en cela de gallicanisme, ni épiscopal, ni parlementaire. N'empêche que si Charles Gérin avait eu connaissance de cette correspondance, il y a fort à penser qu'il eût dénoncé en lui un horrible 'gallican' et un précurseur de La Chaize." *Ibid.*, p. 73. The correspondence referred to, transcribed, is in ARSI, Gal. 71. Obviously Charles Gérin writing in 1894 would not have seen Gal. 71 at that time. See Charles Gérin, *Louis XIV et le Saint-Siège* (Paris, 1894). Blet also corrects Gérin's *Louis XIV et le Saint-Siège*, vol. I, p. 239, on two dubious letters of P. Duneau. See his *Le Clergé de France et la Monarchie, Étude sur les Assemblées Générales du Clergé de 1615 à 1666* (Rome: Librairie Éditrice de l'Université Grégorienne, 1959), Livre IV, p. 311, n. 115.

¹⁵ Alexander had a way of vexing everybody. As cardinal, he had written an approval of *De la Fréquente Communion* when he was nuncio in Münster. Charles de Montchal and a large number of bishops had also approved it. As pope in 1655 and 1656 he had condemned, in two series, 45 laxist and probabilist propositions. Another of his pro-Jansenist acts was "le bruit court qu'il a désapprouvé le clergé de Saint-Sulpice refusant au duc de Liancourt l'absolution." See André Dodin, "Monsieur Vincent et Jean Duvergier de Hauranne", in *Chroniques de Port-Royal* 26-27-28, (Paris: Bibliothèque Mazarine, 1977-1978-1979), p. 66.

French “commissaires” to prosecute the refugee Cardinal de Retz.¹⁶ As late as May 12, 1662, Annat wrote to Fabri:

Je suis informé de bone[sic] part que le Roy d'Angleterre est mecontent du pape et que ce mecontentement nuit aux Catholiques, le suiet est le refus que sur S.S. d'avoir esgard au desir de cette Maiesté qui lui est allez comme quoi qu'elle ne s'en soit pas expliquée directement, ne le pouvoir pas faire raison d'Estat, pour le Cardinalat de M. d'Aubigny,¹⁷ il est proche

¹⁶ Jean-François-Paul de Gondi (1614-1679). His predecessor was Jean-François de Gondi, the first archbishop of Paris, who died in March, 1654, during the Fronde. *Sede vacante*, dioceses were run by their cathedral chapters and a system of Grands Vicaires, which left room for intrigue. But when the cardinal de Retz was in Rome, *sede plena*, the situation was even more irregular.

¹⁷ Ludovic Stuart d'Aubigny was an Anglo-French distant relative of the royal Stuarts. He was a canon of Notre-Dame de Paris, Grand Almoner of France, and was about to be made cardinal by Alexander VII when he died in 1665. He had friends among the Jansenists, and so was “guilty by association”, but he was not a Jansenist, according to Annat. He performed diplomatic roles, notably serving as mediator with the court of Charles II for the possible establishment of a Catholic bishop in England. Most of his projects failed. Detailed information is available in Ruth Clark, *Strangers and Sojourners at Port Royal: Being an account of the connections between the British Isles and the jansenists of France and Holland* (Cambridge: The University Press, 1932). See esp. Chap. VI, “Ludovic Stuart d'Aubigny and his French Friends (pp. 75-88), and Chap. VII, “Aubigny and the Cardinalate” (pp. 89-100). The antecedent to the discussion is the clash between supporters of the titular bishop of Chalcedon, Richard Smith, and the Jesuits in 1631-1632. This exacerbated the division between the Regulars and the Seculars in England, and showed the two models of bishop as once again irreconcilable: one taught by the Jesuits, that the bishop is delegated by the Pope; and the other by the school which taught the bishop rules by divine right. Saint-Cyran's *Petrus Aurelius* was written against the Jesuit conception in 1632, and in support of Smith. Jacques Sirmond responded with his *Anaréticus*, and Charles Le Breton in 1646 published the *De Elogio Aureliano, Paulus Romanus, Candido Hesychio*. Somewhat later François Pinthereau published his *Anti-Aurelius Aureliani Theologi* (Lugduni, 1656) which opened with a testimony by the Bishop of Vabres, Isaac Habert. The Holy Office ruled on all this in 1633, which decree was published in Rome in 1642. For René Rapin's version of events, see his *Histoire du Janénisme depuis son origine jusqu'en 1644* (Paris: Gaume Frères et J. Duprey, Éditeurs, 1861), Livre VI, pp. 213-227, 258-310. For Saint-Amour's version, see *Journal de M^r de Saint-Amour, Docteur de Sorbonne, De ce qui s'est fait à Rome dans l'Affaire des Cinq Propositions* (Paris: 1662), Troisième Partie, Chapitre VI, pp. 110-114; and *ibid.*, Recueil des pièces que j'ay creu devoir mettre à la fin de ce Journal, “Decret de l'Inquisition sur les livres d'Angleterre”, pp. 27-32. A contemporary and more detailed account of the duel between Saint-Cyran (1581-1638) and Jacques Sirmond, centering on the aspect of the bishop and the sacrament of Confirmation,

parent du Roy d'Angleterre et par consequence de la premiere noblesse de ces isles le roy l'aime et l'escoute; et c'est lui qui soutient tout ce qu'il y a de fameut support pour les Catholiques, on a creu autrefois qu'il estoit de la cabale des Jansenistes quand il seroit a passif, pour ce qu'il seroit de celle du cardinal de Retz, mais il n'a aucune attache a tous cez sentimens et l'a tres grande a notre compagnie comme ie voi non seulement par les lettres qu'il m'a ecrites mais (#569v) encore par celles que m'escrivent nos P.P. Anglois et entrautres le provincial.¹⁸

The matter of the English king's relative is not the present concern, but the reference to de Retz is important. He was presumed to be a *frondeur* and of the Jansenists.¹⁹ This was at least the "amalgam" policy of Mazarin as suggested by Petitfils:

L'avènement d'Alexandre VII en janvier 1655 ne ralentit pas le zèle romain de Mazarin, qui s'efforçait pour l'heure de discréditer Retz, évadé et réfugié dans la Ville éternelle. Pratiquant l'amalgame, il clamait partout que le prétendu archevêque de Paris était un janséniste enragé, ce que le Souverain pontife contestait. En février, le marquis de Liancourt, ami de Port-Royal, se vit refuser l'absolution par un vicaire de Saint-Sulpice. Cela fit scandale. Le marquis protesta qu'il n'avait jamais lu une seule ligne de Jansénius. Antoine Arnauld prit alors feu et flamme pour lui et publia deux lettres polémiques. Quelques mois plus tard, en janvier 1656, la Sorbonne condamna à nouveau le bouillant docteur et le chassa de son sein, sans vouloir entendre ses justifications ni même ses regrets.

is found in Jean Orcibal, *Les Origines du Jansénisme: I, Correspondance de Jansénius* (Paris: Librairie philosophique J. Vrin, 1947), pp. 496-497, n. 7, and pp. 562-563, n. 1.

¹⁸ ACDF, St. St. F-2-b, Acta in Causa Jansenii in Galliis, et in Belgio, Annis 1661, 1662, #569r&v. Letter, Annat to Fabri, sent from Paris to Rome, 12 May 1662, orig. It is nearly certain the letters Annat refers to are lost. The fact that d'Aubigny would have so much friendly correspondance with the Jesuits almost automatically proves he was not a Jansenist-sympathizer. And as an English patriot, he would have been aware of the painful events with the titular bishop of Chalcedon that went before his effort to install a "bishop of Dunkerque". Later, James II wanted to reestablish the hierarchy *tout court*, but the Holy See wisely used the model of Holland and set up a system of 4 vicars apostolic which lasted until 1850.

¹⁹ Contemporary scholarship has tended to separate the Fronde from Jansenism. But older historians, and many people in general, held to an interpretation that there was some kind of link. It could not be a pure coincidence that some of the same people belonged to the Fronde when it was politically or militarily active, and to the Jansenist party as well.

En appuyant chaudement les molinistes Mazarin avait voulu contrebalancer à Rome l'effet désastreux produit par le traité signé avec Cromwell.²⁰

Perhaps even de Retz's later submission to the king was a model for Annat of a bishop who was refractory, in whatever manner, but subsequently rehabilitated. Even the members of the royal family who were *frondeurs* were finally reconciled, though they were initially commanded to live at a distance. Nevertheless de Retz was reconciled freely, after the death of Mazarin in 1661. Annat's thinking may have been that on the ecclesiastical plane, if de Retz did it, so could others, even though their situations were different. This was especially so if they were mere suffragans overshadowed by their metropolitan archbishops who disagreed with them. The majority of bishops in France, while they may not have been as explicitly anti-Jansenist as that Docteur of the Sorbonne, Isaac Habert, were docile to higher authority. Of course the threat of deprivation of income by the loss of their benefices might have aided any of their decisions. A potentially refractory bishop had positive and negative reasons for tendering his submission to the royal (and papal) authority.

The added problem that force would obtain an insincere signing of the formulary of submission was well known. The "Prédicateur de sa Maiesté pour les Controverses", l'Abbé Des-Isles, said so explicitly: ... "croyez assurément que leur conversion n'est qu'apparente; que leur demarche est hipocrite; que la crainte de la perte de biens temporels et de leurs dignitez a forcé les mouvements de leur inclination".²¹ Dissimulating Jansenists were hard to catch and detect.

But this is what made Jansenism so amazing—neither "the carrot nor the stick" seemed to work successfully against some of them in the time of Annat. This heroic recalcitrance, and the persecutions they suffereed, gave them a romantic appeal to later centuries.

But hardly had this question of de Retz been finally resolved, and it was indeed favorably resolved in 1662 by his voluntary resignation on June 5, than the duc de Créqui arrived in Rome.²² He was the ambassador

²⁰ See Jean-Christian Petitfils, *Louis XIV* (Préface de Pierre Goubert) (Paris: Librairie Perrin, 1995), pp. 160-161.

²¹ See his "Troisieme Lettre a une Personne de Merite, dans laquelle est montré que les cinq propositions de Jansenius sont condamnées dans le sens de ce Prelat, et que ses opinions ne sont point de saint Thomas" (Paris: Chés Florentin Lambert, 1668). Copy in ACDF, St. St. F-2-e, Acta in Galliis circa Formularium anno 1668, #543-#568, printed document, pp. 1-52.

²² To avoid confusion, the duc was Charles, the eldest. "La famille de Créquy était composée de trois frères: l'ainé, Charles III du nom, lieutenant général, ambassadeur, etc., avait été créé duc et pair en 1653; le second, Alphonse, comte de Canaples,

of France. No sooner his arrival, but a fresh crisis.²³ This one was completely unexpected. We have the text by Annat where he expresses the problem. Louis XIV wanted satisfaction for the insult to his ambassador and the injury to his entourage in Rome:

S.M. fara la guerra mal volontieri, perche desidera sommamente di vivere con unione e buona corrispondenza con S. Stà. La fara nondimeno perche è persuasa che gli interessi della sua Corona dimandano sodisfattione uguale a l'iniuria fatta di questo e quanto io ho potuto scuoprire in questa materia.²⁴

Annat's work at Court made him a type of minister or cabinet officer.²⁵ Among other confidential topics, Annat was "ex officio" privy to the Court's mind in matters of international conflict and in the writing of treaties, insofar as these may have had religious overtones. He was a go-

devint duc de Lesdiguières et pair de France, par l'extinction de la branche aînée de sa maison; enfin, le troisième était le célèbre maréchal François de Créquy. See *Mémoires du marquis de Pomponne: état de l'Europe (1671 à 1680)*, ed. J. Mavidal (Paris: Librairie de Huet, 1868), vol. 2, p. 515, n. 1. A convenient listing of the ambassador's predecessors and successors may be found in Maximilien Samson-Frédéric Schoell, *Cours d'Histoire des États Européens, depuis le bouleversement de l'empire romain d'occident jusqu'en 1789*, Tome trente-cinquième, "Histoire du XVII^e siècle (tome onzième) (Paris: A. Pihan Delaforest; Berlin: Duncker et Humblot, 1832), Liste des Ambassadeurs, pp. 330-331 (France to the Court of Rome), and pp. 334-335 (the Court of Rome to France).

²³ See Régis de Chantelauze, *Le Cardinal de Retz et ses missions diplomatiques à Rome* (Paris: Librairie académique Didier, 1879), pp. 77-78; 398.

²⁴ ARSI, Gal. 71, f. 152r, transcript. Also given in French by Blet, "Jésuites Gallicanes au XVII^e siècle?", *ibid.*, p. 72. His n. 59 incorrectly identifies the original to be in Latin. The transcription provided by the Archivum Romanum S.I. is in Italian. The archivist related that the transcriptions were done years ago by a secretary for Blet's use, which dates it no later than 1960, since the book review speaks of having access to it by then. The evidence for this is in Blet's criticism of Charles Gérin, *Louis XIV et le Saint-Siège*, vol. I (Paris, 1894) that the correspondence of the Royal Confessor to Oliva (ARSI, Gal. 71) is known and corrects Gérin. Certainly Blet may have consulted Gal. 71 before 1960; he was not able to consult the ACDF, however. See *ibid.*, p. 73.

²⁵ A general treatment of the role of the Royal Confessor in France down through time can be found in Georges Minois, *Le confesseur du roi. Les directeurs de conscience sous la monarchie française* (Paris: A. Fayard, 1988). A review of this book indicating its insufficiencies was written by Roger Aubert in *RHE* I (1991) pp. 244-246. Fayard often does not publish notes, which is a serious handicap for this book which, otherwise, is somewhat cursory and superficial. Still there exists no other contemporary study of the French Jesuit Confessors.

between for petitioners who had come to Court asking favors of the king. Annat's good offices, naturally, were filtered by means of his own judgment.²⁶ And that judgment is reflected in his writings which concentrate upon the theme of Jansenism. During his confessorate of sixteen years no other topic can be found so consistently in his writing, so dominating is the Jansenist question. But Jansenism was half-hidden, and related to every other issue. It was complex, and gave rise to suspicions.

Unlike other Jesuits of his era who sometimes engaged in anti-Jansenist polemics, François Annat did not leave a separate legacy of classical poems or spiritual books. He wrote no poetry, plays, or devotional works. His focus was narrow. All his writing before the *Scientia Media* was theological controversy, and all his writing after it (1645-1668) was anti-Jansenist theological polemics. At least we have no known exceptions. His writing career was concentrated on his polemical ability to respond to hostile adversaries in this single area. He wanted to undo the movement by whatever means were at his disposal, from personal influence to the application of legal penalties in a State bound to protect the Church.

Along with diplomacy and writing, however, the eleemosynary aspect of his role should not be underestimated. Time and again in the documents there are to be found expressions similar to this one: ...“through the intermediary of Père Annat, the king was asked if he might consider granting clemency...”²⁷ Annat's powers of discretion, in the practical order, were oriented toward his anti-Jansenism.

²⁶ The biographer of Nicolas Pavillon has this to say about the intermediary role of Annat: “Cependant le P. Annat ne devait pas décourager et jusqu'à la fin, profitant de ce que l'évêque d'Alet était en désaccord avec le roi à propos de la signature du formulaire, il n'allait cesser de se faire l'intermédiaire et le défenseur des prétendues victimes de la rigueur de N. Pavillon, accueillant et recueillant contre lui les témoignages les plus bas et les plus suspects. Il s'agissait en effet d'une lutte entre deux principes, ou plutôt, car les principes ne pouvaient pas être précisément le point fort du confesseur de Louis XIV, d'une lutte entre deux religions et deux morales; celles du bon père de Pascal, et celles de Dieu; il s'agissait aussi pour les jésuites d'une revanche à prendre en essayant de ridiculiser les rigueurs d'un évêque qu'ils n'étaient pas fâchés,—bien qu'assez fins pour lire au fond de son âme simple et droite,—de confondre avec les jansénistes, nous voulons dire en quatre mots: la revanche des *Provinciales*.” See *Un Prêlat indépendant au XVII^e siècle*, Nicolas Pavillon, évêque d'Alet (1637-1677), *ibid.*, pp. 89-93.

²⁷ A good illustration is Annat's failure to change the king's mind in the case of Messire Roger de Rabutin, le Comte de Bussy, who was cast into the Bastille for writing the *Histoire amoureuse des Gaules* (1665). Père Jacques Nouet interceded with Père Annat, but the King would not listen, and Bussy languished in prison, gravely ill, for another six months before being exiled to Bourgogne. See Georges

The problem for the historian is that, along with the understandable loss of original documents, confidentiality prevented many interesting exchanges from ever being repeated, much less recorded. The nature of the work of the Royal Confessor shapes the search, and at least for certain precise questions, there will never be definite answers, only educated conjectures. We sometimes know Annat by his omissions, as well as by what he did.

Not that Annat was directly involved in explicitly political negotiations. That was forbidden.²⁸ But as a keeper of the king's conscience, he had replaced Vincent de Paul as a member of the "conseil de conscience" in 1654, just after his confessorial appointment that April.²⁹ Ambassadors carried out the wishes of the king, but Annat and others of the committee advised him in private council beforehand, especially in matters relating to religion. This included both French³⁰ and foreign ecclesiastical issues for which they were responsible. Annat's role was delicate. Father General

Bottereau, "Jacques Nouet, S.I. (1605-1688)" in *AHSI* XLVI, fasc. 91 (1977) pp. 338-339. Bussy was a friend of René Rapin, and their correspondence has recently been edited. See the *Correspondance avec le Père René Rapin*, ed. C. Rouben, (Paris: Librairie A.-G. Nizet, 1983). Annat guided the career of the young Anthymé Denis Cohon (1636-1703), nephew of the Bishop of Nîmes and Dol, son of Jean Cohon, Maître d'Hotel du Roi. See Prosper Falgairolle, *Lettres intimes de Mgr Cohon, Évêque de Nîmes* (Nîmes: Gervais Bedot et André Catelan, 1891). This is the passive correspondence between the bishop and his nephew, though Annat is mentioned often.

²⁸ General Congregation V in 1593 had stated in Decree § 47, "Engaging in affairs of state and in politics is strongly and severely prohibited to Ours." It added, "The benevolence and love of princes should be preserved in order to foster the divine service." See *For Matters of Greater Moment, The first Thirty Jesuit General Congregations: A brief history and a translation of the decrees* (St. Louis: The Institute of Jesuit Sources, 1994), p. 200.

²⁹ See Georges Minois, *Le confesseur du roi*, *ibid.*, p. 396. An intriguing understanding of Annat's appointment is in Adam, *ibid.*, pp. 205-206, n. 1. The interpretation is that Mazarin deliberately wanted a strong anti-Jansenist, and that an agent in Rome had sent "coded" information to this effect when Annat was sent to Paris to become Provincial. In other words, "in-house" Jesuit information was made available to the government, possibly with the knowledge or permission of the General. The world of the Courts was a world of intrigue. Perhaps this is what Annat meant by the "bagatelles" circulating about him at the time of his appointment. Mazarin's agent was François Duneau (1599-1684). See ARSI, Gal. 71, f. 112r. Letter, Annat to Nickel, sent from Paris to Rome, 17 April, 1654, transcript.

³⁰ Classic examples of thorny "internal" problems were the reduction of the number of liturgical feast days and the many ramifications of the conflict between the secular and the religious clergy.

Claudio Aquaviva (1542-1615) had issued an *Instruction for Royal Confessors* in 1602, and it was confirmed in 1608 by General Congregation VI,³¹ Decree § 21. The formal legislation was in effect, and it delimited Annat's activities.³²

The diplomatic crisis of the Corsican Guard erupted suddenly the year after Louis XIV began his personal reign (March-April 1661) following the death of Cardinal Mazarin on March 9. It was not the first clash between the French monarchy and the papacy, and it certainly was not going to be the last. Much more serious would be the rift with Pope Clement XI during the confessorate of François de La Chaize (1624-1709).³³ And there were other secondary skirmishes, in fact too numerous to cite. Two of them were after 1665, in the declining years of Annat—the incident surrounding the infallibilist and probabilist theories of Amadeus Guimenius and Jacques de Vernant, and the *Affaire des Quatre Évêques*.³⁴ Unlike the Affair of the Corsican Guard, they were doctrinal in nature. And doctrine was Annat's specialty.

³¹ The supreme legislative body of the Society of Jesus normally met in Rome, and was called upon the death of a General or more extraordinarily for solving crises. At times the seventeenth century popes demanded the Congregations meet every 9 years as a fixed interval, and not for the purposes set out in the Constitutions. The Jesuits often tried to be free of this encumbrance.

³² See *Ordinationes Praepositorum Generalium, et Instructiones ad Provinciales et Superioribus Societatis* (Avignon: François Seguin, 1838), Caput XI, “De Confessariis Principum”, (pp. 78-86). Also *For Matters of Greater Moment*, *ibid.*, p. 226. Annat had to request from the General the permissions needed to function, such as the permission for the “clavis” and the “sigilli”. He also asks for the privilege of sending and receiving letters, and of having on hand a small amount of money for eleemosynary or charitable purposes. Interestingly, he also asks Father General to be able to use funds that come to him through his “honorarium” for the editing, writing, and purchase of books. As we know, his *Scientia Media* finally appeared as a reprint in 1662, and the three-volume collection on grace, the *Opuscula*, in 1666. This may have been how they were financed. The *Ordinance* of Aquaviva is recalled by name as well, though the General seemed free to dispense from it in specific cases. See ARSI, Gal. 71, f. 115r&v. Letter, Annat to Nickel, 26 November, 1655, transcript. When the court traveled, Annat was expected to live in a nearby religious house known for its piety and uprightness, but there is some reason to conjecture that he may have petitioned the General for an exemption so he could take a room offered by the court, provided it was befitting a Religious.

³³ We possess a useful biography in Georges Guitton (1877-1962), *Le Père de La Chaize, confesseur de Louis XIV* (Paris: Beauchesne, 1959) 2 vols. Guitton relied upon the letters in the ARSI, “Letters to the Generals”. When Guitton's book was new, Pierre Blet and Lucien Ceysens reviewed it.

³⁴ Dieudonné, “Aux Origines de la Paix de l'Église”, 347-348.

Still, the event under consideration in 1662 has received a good deal of attention. A recent succinct description is by Jean-Christian Petitfils in his biography of Louis XIV. Petitfils has the advantage of nearly the last word after all the other biographers have had their say. The biographies of this king fill many shelves, perhaps since he was the longest-reigning monarch Europe ever had. But the incident is a useful one to dwell upon for an understanding of Annat, not only because later Jesuit historians thought much of it, but because it held together so many currents of that day.³⁵

The pontifical troops were undisciplined, to be sure, but there was never any suggestion of ill-intent on the part of the pope. Besides, it was August in Rome, a time when the climate would have rendered simple gendarmes or “sbires” from Corsica uncomfortable in their barracks. They drank too much and were bored. When one of their comrades got into a brawl with a Frenchman, the others rushed to his aid. There was no way to communicate—the rude fellows probably did not know cultivated Roman Italian, much less French. The fact that they were the “Corsican Guard” was in itself a kind of insult to the young king—that His Majesty’s ambassador should be fired upon by such uncouth ruffians in the hire of the very pope whom the French Government considered excluding from the papacy! The embassy was an extra-territorial property, and this meant in effect that France herself had been attacked!

Rather, it was how the pope handled the affront that provoked a reaction in the wake of these events. Papal insouciance irritated the twenty-five year-old Louis XIV. He wanted more, and got less, by way of abject apology from Alexander VII:

Créqui³⁶ arriva à Rome le 11 juin 1662, entouré d’une fastueuse escorte, affichant une morgue de commande, qui choqua plus qu’elle n’impressionna le petit monde feutré de la diplomatie pontificale. C’est alors qu’éclata le fameux incident de la garde corse. Dans la soirée du 20 août une bagarre d’après boire entre un domestique français et un soldat du

³⁵ Dieudonné shows concerning “les craintes” of Louis XIV that it was as early as 28 February 1662 that Annat had been told by the king about his opposition to papal infallibility: “Respondit rex: si enim in facto papa est infallibilis, fides illi erit habenda ubi me de throno deposuerit.” See Dieudonné, “Aux Origines de la Paix de l’Église”, pp. 348-349.

³⁶ The exhaustive study of Créqui’s mission is found in Charles De Moüy, *L’Ambassade du duc de Créqui. 1662-1665*. (Paris: Librairie Hachette, 1893), 2 vols. Annat is not mentioned by Count De Moüy, who was the successor of the Duc de Créqui in the Palazzo Farnese for at least two years in the 1880s. Before De Moüy, the most reliable account was Régis de Chantelauze, *ibid.*, esp. Chaps. II-III (suite), “Affaire de la Garde corse et du duc de Créqui”, pp. 71-173.

pape fait réagir toute la compagnie des gardes corses, qui vint battre les murs du palais Farnèse en vociférant contre leurs occupants. On tira. Il y eut des blessés et un mort: un des pages de l'ambassadrice qui rentrait chez elle en carrosse. Le duc de Créquy essuya sur le balcon une décharge de mousqueterie, qui heureusement ne l'atteignit pas.

Louis XIV fut outré de ces événements et de la timidité des regrets de Sa Sainteté. Il fit mine de croire qu'il s'agissait d'un attentat³⁷ prémédité, 'dont jusqu'ici il n'y avait pas d'exemple chez les barbares mêmes'. Il exigea des réparations exemplaires: des excuses solennelles, le châtiment des coupables, la cassation de la garde corse, la destitution du gouverneur de Rome, le cardinal Imperiali, et du barigel responsable de la police pontificale. Alexandre VII négligeant de répondre, le duc de Créquy quitta la ville. Ni l'intimidation ni la négociation ne firent céder le pontife. Ce fut alors l'escalade. En juillet 1663 le parlement³⁸ de Provence prononça la réunion d'Avignon et du Comtat à la couronne. A la fin de l'année, 16 000 hommes de troupe furent envoyés à Parme et Modène pour soutenir ces duchés qui avaient des différends territoriaux avec l'administration pontificale.

En réponse, Alexandre tenta de susciter une sainte ligue. Finalement il dut s'incliner devant la menace de nouveaux renforts. Au traité de Pise, le 12 février 1664, il céda sur tout: il déclara la garde corse 'incapable de servir' et la 'nation corse' exclue à jamais du service pontifical, donna satisfaction aux clients de la France, les ducs de Parme et de Modène, et prit l'engagement d'élever à Rome une pyramide expiatoire rappelant l'attentat et les réparations accordées.³⁹ En contrepartie, le roi restitua

³⁷ The word "attentat" is very common in older and modern French, but there seems to be no exact English equivalent. "Attack, assault, crime, conspiracy, plot, outrage, violation, raid" plus an adjective such as "terrorist attack" come close.

³⁸ The French "parlement" system should not be confused with the Anglo-Saxon parliamentary tradition. An available reference is Marcel Marion, *Dictionnaire des Institutions de la France aux XVII et XVIII siècles* (Paris: Auguste Picard, 1923) "Parlements", pp. 422-433. A more recent one is François Bluche, ed., *Dictionnaire du Grand Siècle* (Paris: Fayard, 1990) esp. for the entries "Parlement de Paris" (pp. 1151-1153) and "Parlements" (p. 1153).

³⁹ Annat tried and failed to have the war reparations reduced. "Inclusa hoc fasciculo Epistola Domini de Lyonnet. Inscripta R.P. Generali ad V.P. mittitur non ad P.V. Eminentissimus Cardinalis Antonius tentavit se qua ratione posset obtineri ut conditiones aliquae pacis mitigarentur. Ego etiam super eadem re motus animorum exploravi sed hactenus sine fructu ac sine probabilis spei significatione, hic est fructus tam diu dilatae et tam aegre impetratae quae debebatur Pacis fact....Expectandum et dum occurrat Legatus, fieri potest ut tam gratus sit vicissini ille congressus et tam ingenua et benevola ex utrumque parte negotiatio ut aliquid remittatur tantae severitatis, qua in re si ego aliquid potero non patiat meum officum desiderari." ARSI, Gal. 71, f. 162r. Letter, Annat to Oliva, sent from Paris to Rome, 28 March 1664, copy.

Avignon et le Comtat, malgré la volonté de leurs habitants. Le 29 juillet 1664, à Fontainebleau, dans la chambre du roi, on vit pour la première fois dans l'histoire de France, comme le souligne Voltaire, un légat du pape, le neveu d'Alexandre VII en personne, le cardinal Flavio Chigi, présenter les excuses officielles de Rome. Audience humiliante pour le vaincu,⁴⁰ radieuse pour le vainqueur.

Cette politique de fermeté avait été inspirée par Hugues de Lionne, ennemie des 'bigots', qui considéra les succès remportés comme une victoire personnelle: 'On ne s'avisera pas de long temps à Rome, écrivait-il, de considérer un roi de France comme un roi du Japon!' Les relations avec la papauté s'améliorèrent sous le bref pontificat de Clément IX (1667-1669), au cours duquel le roi consentit à la démolition de l'humiliante pyramide.⁴¹

It took two years to straighten this out, 1662-1664. The papal counter-offensive of raising up a "Sainte Ligue" was a disaster. Papal properties in France had been confiscated before the settlement, and some pontifical enemies in Italy had been strengthened.⁴²

⁴⁰ The word "audience" is the one used for the title of the tapestry where the scene is depicted. Annat does not emphasize the humiliating aspect of this meeting in his letter to Fabri, perhaps because he was grateful any settlement at all had been reached.

⁴¹ See Jean-Christian Petitfils, *ibid.*, pp. 349-350. Another concise account is in Blet (who mentions Annat, whereas Petitfils does not), "Jésuites Gallicanes au XVII^e siècle?", *ibid.*, p. 72. For an older one, see Hyacinthe Robillard d'Avrigny, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire universelle de l'Europe, depuis 1600 jusqu'en 1716*, Tome III, (Paris: H.L. Guérin & L.F. Delatour, 1757; 5 vols.), pp. 267-269. They all agree with each other on the basic story. Even if the pyramid came down, the tapestry remained. It is another by the Gobelins manufacture done by Charles Le Brun in the series "Histoire du Roy". See Bernard Teyssèdre, *L'art au siècle de Louis XIV* (Paris: Livre de Poche, 1967), p. 80.

⁴² Nearly all Annat's correspondence to the Superior General in Rome for 1663, of what has survived, is concerned with this problem, whereas the letters from the same period to Fabri or Boucher deal with Jansenism. Unfortunately it is passive, and we do not know what the General wrote. Oliva seems to have served as a go-between with Alexander VII, and then was able to report back to Annat. At one point there was a real threat of a hot war between Louis XIV and the civil government of Alexander VII. Annat seems to implore the General in this passage: "...Padre mio carissimo et honoratissimo io buttarei non che dell'acqua ma del sangue in questo fuoco, ma se non piove dal cielo Romano tutta l'acqua dei nostri fiumi non basteranno per spegnere sì grande incendio." See ARSI, Gal. 71, f. 153r&v. Letter, Annat to Oliva, sent from Paris to Rome, 2 October 1663, transcript. Also see *ibid.*, f. 140r&v-141r&v; f. 142r&v; f. 151r&v; f. 152r&v; f. 156r&v; f. 160r&v; f. 161r&v; 162r&v; f. 163r&v.

Annat's health was failing and he complains of being immobilized by the gout.⁴³ At this point he had six more years to live.⁴⁴ He personally recounted to Fabri, as will be seen, the state visit of the papal legate, Cardinal Flavio Chigi, to see the king for the purpose of reading the apologies. It was immediately followed, in the same letter, by his anxiety over the progress of the anti-Jansenist Formulary.⁴⁵

The question of the Formulary in itself had already been a long battle ever since "Ad sacram" in 1656 and "Regiminis apostolici divina" the same year.⁴⁶ Before "Ad sacram", Annat and Archbishop Pierre de Marca of Toulouse (1594-1662),⁴⁷ behind the scenes, had been the authors of the

⁴³ The reference is to "le podagre" or "la goutte". Later references to his health are not as specific.

⁴⁴ Annat mentions resigning as early as 1663. "Io per ragione dell'età mia e per la necessità di prepar' mi alla morte ho desiderato un pezzo fa di ritirarmi d'ella corte, ma adesso sento obbligo di cercare qualche uscita." ARSI, Gal. 71, f. 156r. Letter, Annat to Oliva, sent from Paris to Rome, 23 November 1663, transcript. This was written exactly a week after the Alliance with the Swiss was renewed, 18 November 1663. The Nuncio refers to Annat's health in 1666, and says it prevented him from doing his work: "Parigi 8 Giugno 1666. Il Padre Annat è migliorato, e siamo rimasti d'esser domani assieme per discorrere copra l'affare de mandamenti de quatro Vescovi dovendo (crossed out: poi) egli poi giovedì passarsene a Fontanabló." See ACDF, St. St. F-2-d, Acta in Galliis in Causa Jansenii, et Circa Formularium, Ab anno 1666 ad Medietate anni 1668, #41r. Letter, Roberti to Barberini (presumably), sent from Paris to Rome, 8 June 1666, orig. (excerpt).

Pierre Bayle and others refer to the satires where Annat resigns because of the king's impenitence in regard to his mistresses, but there is no evidence for this.

⁴⁵ The text of the Formulary is available in Blet, *Le Clergé de France et la Monarchie*, Livre III, p. 215.

⁴⁶ For the printed and therefore "authentic" copies of these documents, see ACDF, St. St. F-2-b, *ibid.*, #249 (Ad Sacram) and St. St. F-2-c, *ibid.*, #650r—#651r (Regiminis Apostolici divina). In (It.) #483r-#487r is found the document stating that the Formulary of 17 March 1657, must be signed by all. It came from the Assemblée générale du Clergé and was approved by the appropriate royal lettres patentes. See #474r-#482r (Lettres Patentes du Roy en forme d'Edict, à Paris, 1664, pp. 1-18.) Copies of the same documents would also be placed in other collections related to the topic.

⁴⁷ De Marca was Archbishop of Toulouse for ten years, 1652-1662, though he did not actually enter the see city until 1655. A summary of his anti-Jansenism for those years is in Auguste, *Les Origines du Jansénisme*, *ibid.*, Chapter III: "L'Épiscopat de P. de Marca (1652-1662)", pp. 62-151. The Holy Office followed his case due to an unfortunate early writing against the Holy See. He wrote a letter apologizing, and he was absolved. See ACDF, St. St. F-1-d, II: Acta in Galliis circa Constitutionem prefatam 1653-1654-1655-1656, #829. Letter, de Marca to

very first Formulary as early as 2 June 1655, attributing the Five Propositions to Jansenius.⁴⁸ That version, too, was approved by the Assemblée du Clergé which met at the Louvre.⁴⁹ Though the 1657 version⁵⁰ of the text of the Formulary⁵¹ was again duly approved, and it was destined to become the classic model, still in 1660 the debate went on:

Lorsque le Clergé se réunit en 1660, malgré le formulaire de 1657 et l'enregistrement en lit de justice de la bulle d'Alexandre VII, la question des cinq propositions de Jansénius n'était pas terminée. Mazarin, absorbé par l'achèvement de la guerre, ne semblait pas avoir beaucoup songé à Port-Royal et aux discussions sur la grâce. La paix enfin conclue, la Cour de Rome estima le moment venu de rappeler au gouvernement ses promesses pour l'extirpation du jansénisme; mais elle hésitait sur les moyens à prendre. De France, certains, comme le P. Annat, conseillaient un nouveau bref, voir un formulaire du Saint-Siège, au moins sous la forme d'une addition à la profession de foi des évêques. Mais à Rome on craignait la résistance de plusieurs évêques, et la perspective d'une Assemblée du Clergé rendait particulièrement circonspect. Le nonce

Innocent X, sent from Paris to Rome, 29 July 1653, Latin/orig. A certain cleric (Jansenist?) ten years later (Jean Vignaux?) tried to embarrass de Marca after his death. A curialist conflated letters of Annat and Ferrier to speak of it: "Un certo Giovane Ecclesiastico a fatto stampare certi manuscritti, composti da Mons.re di Marca mentre era laico, li quali contengono una dottrina molto contraria a quella, che hà professata (verso) doppo ché stato fatto vescovo, e molto disavvantaggiosa all'autorità della S.ta Sede. Questo è in tomo infolio; procuriamo con ogni diligenza di sopprimerlo." See ACDF, St. St. F-2-c, *ibid.*, #77r. Conflated summary, Annat and Ferrier to Fabri, sent from Paris to Rome, 15 June 1663, It. copy. Leading Jansenists, such as Jean Racine, had always maintained de Marca was an opportunist. De Marca would have replaced de Retz as Archbishop of Paris. Annat had worked with him in the "conseil de conscience"—can there be any doubt he was Annat's candidate to succeed de Retz?

⁴⁸ Louis Lafuma, *Pascal, Oeuvres complètes* (Paris: Seuil, 1963), I: "Les Provinciales", Chronologie, p. 12. Lafuma, who died in 1964, was Jean Mesnard's immediate predecessor in the task of editing a critical edition of Pascal's works.

⁴⁹ See Blet, *Le Clergé de France et la Monarchie*, Livre III, p. 214.

⁵⁰ On April 22, 1657, Nicolas Pavillon communicated to Gabriel de Ciron (1620-1675) a document which was his response to Antoine Arnauld's "cas de conscience" where, for him, it would be a sin to sign such a formulary. De Ciron, who was a canonist, advised the emissaries in favor of signing, saying one should submit to the judgment of the pope and the Assemblée du Clergé. See Auguste, *Les Origines du Jansénisme*, *ibid.*, p. 72.

⁵¹ It is found in Blet, *Le Clergé de France et la Monarchie*, Livre III, p. 215.

n'avait-il pas averti que certains prélats, *inclinati a novità*, songeaient à profiter de l'Assemblée pour faire réformer le formulaire de 1657?⁵²

The concept of a Formulary seemed to be the mechanism by which to win the war against these heretics. Annat was single-minded when it came to the bitter problem of the Jansenists. An enormous amount of effort was spent on various versions of a Formulary, all in vain. The discussions of the wording of those potential formularies of submission assumed, in his mind, that the Jansenist movement would be extinct if the proper Formulary were found and signed by all. Of course, it had to be signed in “good faith”, and that was still harder to procure. The goal was 100% uniformity in the kingdom. Thus, in his way of thinking, there would be no dissenting bishops, no dissenting Religious, no dissenting pastors, and no Jansenism. For Annat, the Formulary was a noose.

The sentence of Pierre Blet quoted above, which must be noted again with exceptional attention, is this one: “De France, certains, comme le P. Annat, conseillaient un nouveau bref, voir un formulaire du Saint-Siège, au moins sous la forme d’une addition à la profession de foi des évêques”. The logic was evident for the Royal Confessor who was looking ahead. He was responsible for the “feuille des bénéfices”, for the nomination and appointment of bishops.⁵³ Their oath upon taking office should have the

⁵² Blet, *ibid.*, Livre IV, pp. 292-293.

⁵³ The “conseil de conscience” existed between 1643 and 1686 before being suppressed. The nunciature in Paris was always informed of the decisions or recommendations reached during its “réunions”. Anne d’Autriche had established it in 1643 when her son was only five. “In more serious matters, Anne stood out against Father Vincent also. When she had taken him as her spiritual director after she became regent, she had also named him to the council of conscience: a group of eminent clergy who met weekly or biweekly to advise the crown on the fitness of candidates for ecclesiastical posts that were subject to royal nomination. These benefices included the bishoprics and many of the abbeys in the kingdom, as well as numerous lesser dignities. The man immediately in charge of their distribution was Mazarin, whom Louis XIII had designated before his death as most suitable for the work. Mazarin kept that responsibility even though many of Louis’s other arrangements were altered. He used his powers of patronage to consolidate his position, rewarding friends and keeping opponents hungry. He did not necessarily do this in every case, but sufficiently often to distress the devout, who held that religious considerations should be his paramount guide. For Catholic reformers, of course, the nomination of spiritually committed candidates was a major goal, since on it depended the inner renewal of the church. Judging by the surviving minutes, the council of conscience was not much of an obstacle to Mazarin since it ratified every nomination before it. Appearances are misleading, however, for the minutes did not record preceding arguments. Vincent de Paul for his part refused to

effect the Formulary was intended to have—a veritable abjuration of Jansenism as Jansenism had come to be understood by Annat. And it was best understood concretely in the persons of his adversaries who had already spent years denouncing him by the written word.

According to Annat's thinking, certainly an anti-Jansenist codicil in the episcopal oath would guarantee no future return of Jansenism. Annat's strategy was plain to see. His candidates were all to be carefully selected to be able, in good conscience, to accept and live out such an oath.⁵⁴ By

accommodate himself to political calculations. Time and again he protested one or another of Mazarin's nominations. On these occasions the queen backed Mazarin. At least once Father Vincent barely skirted disgrace when the queen heard that Mazarin was in very bad temper because Father Vincent's conscience did not agree with his own. Anne took ecclesiastical patronage very seriously and made her own inquiries about candidates, notably candidates for a bishopric, whom Mazarin presented, but she upheld Mazarin's authority against all challengers. His authority was, after all, the authority of the crown, her son's crown; and there is no question that in her heart, her son's interests came first." See Ruth Kleinman, *Anne of Austria, Queen of France* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1985), pp. 188-189. The Royal Confessor was only one member of the committee which, among other things, made nominations for the episcopacy. The "conseil" was disrupted by the Fronde, and then resumed. As soon as the King came into his majority in 1661 the "conseil de conscience" was summoned (Péréfixe, de Marca, Annat) for the purpose of repressing Port-Royal. During the confessorate of François de la Chaize, "The Great Confessor", he became the sole master of the "feuille des bénéfices" or the responsibility to make nominations for episcopal sees and other benefices in France. All episcopal nominations had to be finally ratified by Rome. The biographer of la Chaize adds, "Comme les P. Annat et Ferrier, ses prédécesseurs, la Chaize fit partie, des son entrée en charge, du "conseil de conscience", aux cotés de l'archevêque François de Harlay. Mais, vers 1686, Louis XIV, pour n'avoir plus à recouvrir aux avis de ce prélat, dont la conduite morale le choquait, supprima l'institution du 'Conseil'. Et, pendant les neuf ans que Harlay vécut encore, le confesseur fut pratiquement seul à proposer les candidats aux prélatures et bénéfices." See Guittou, *ibid.*, p. 149. Under Louis XV the "feuille des bénéfices" continued as a part of the government's responsibility. See Pierre Chevallier, "Une promotion épiscopale sous Louis XV", in *Revue d'histoire moderne et contemporaine* VI (1959), pp. 211-225.

⁵⁴ This was easier said than done because some dioceses had quasi-hereditary bishops since the line passed from uncle to nephew. For example, the family of M. de Buzenval in Beauvais held the diocese between 1596-1679. He entered the clerical state in order to prevent the diocese from falling outside family control. A dying bishop could name his successor due to privileges "immemorial", or the chapter could be "stacked" beforehand. See Jean Lesaulnier, "Nicolas Choart de Buzenval, Évêque de Beauvais (1611-1679)", in *Chroniques de Port-Royal* 32, *ibid.* (1983), p. 106.

controlling the “feuille des bénéfices”, and by controlling the Formulary, Annat could engineer the destruction of the Jansenists,⁵⁵ even before the police action of physically dispersing Port-Royal was expressed.

The policy of Annat is clear. But he met opposition all the way until his resignation early in the new year, 1670. The Jansenists were angry about his stranglehold over episcopal nominations. All the refractories, “li refrattarij” as the Holy Office called them, had been appointed before Annat became Confessor. In the time of Annat, certain curés had the hope of promotion on the basis of their anti-Jansenism, possibly despite their other deficiencies.

One traditional suggestion was that the arrow of political dissent, out of a kind of piety, was directed at the king’s minister rather than at the king’s person. But sometimes it was directed at both in an explicit way. Royal power was opposed. There were pamphlets circulating against even the

⁵⁵ The Formulary and benefices were formally linked together in 1664: “Le 19 avril 1664 parut la fameuse déclaration royale, par laquelle Sa Majesté ordonnait ‘que les bulles des papes Innocent X et Alexandre VII au sujet des cinq propositions seraient publiées dans tout le royaume, et que, pour faire cesser toutes les divisions qui partageaient ses sujets sur ces matières, tous les ecclésiastiques, séculiers et réguliers, signeraient le formulaire qui leur serait présenté par les archevêques et évêques.’ Et la déclaration ajoutait: ‘Sa Majesté veut en outre qu’à faute d’avoir par lesdits ecclésiastiques, pourvus de bénéfices, souscrit ledit formulaire, les bénéfices dont ils seront pourvus demeureront vacants et impétrables de plein droit, sans qu’il soit besoin d’aucune sentence ni déclaration judiciaire, et sans qu’ils puissent être rétablis dans leurs dits offices et bénéfices, encore qu’ils voulussent postérieurement signer ledit formulaire.’ Cette fois l’ordre était formel et la cour de Rome pouvait être satisfaite. Les jésuites et les quinze évêques courtisans qui, sous leur direction, avaient rédigé le nouveau formulaire après la rupture de la conférence d’accommodement, avaient encore mieux mérité d’elle que de la royauté.” Dejean, *ibid.*, pp. 183-184. Writing eight days earlier, Annat says clearly to Fabri what is to be expected in the April 19 declaration: “A faute de cela la declaration ne portera qu’une intrabilité a recevoir aucun benefice pour le regard de ceux qui n’en ont pas sils (sic) ne souscrivent dans deux mois ou devant leur Evesque ou dans le Greffe de la Cour Royale dans le reslat de laquelle ils se trouvent. Et po.ur le regard de ceux qui sont desia pourvus de benefice ou ils seroient declarez impetrables faute de souscrire, ou pour le mois priver du temporel iusqu’a ce qu’ils ayant souscrit.

Si nous avions un bref qui prescrire la maniere de professer sa souscrisstion aux Constitutions Apostoliques en abiurant la doctrine de Jansenius, tous les pretextes des Jansenistes cesseront. Et il n’y aura plus d’Evesques qui puisse resister. J’espere que la declaration sera verifiee avant l’arrivee du Legat. A Ses SS SS et oo. de Paris ce 11 Avril 1664. See ACDF, St. St. F-2-c, *ibid.*, #463r. Letter, Annat to Fabri, sent from Paris to Rome, 11 April 1664, orig.

king himself, and in the minds of some, he and Annat were inextricably linked. When Louis XIV died, he gave his heart to the Jesuits. It was placed in a reliquary in their church in Paris.

It is easy to understand that the Jansenists did not want to sign any Formulary which might compromise them. We know that in the “cas de conscience”, Antoine Arnauld considered it a sin to sign something that was false. Some could sign a Formulary with mental reservations, of which ploy they were accused, or they could sign one that was watered-down. The fainthearted would sign anything. There were ex-Jansenists everywhere.

If war with Spain or the “affaire de Retz” distracted Mazarin until 1660, then a breach in relations with the papacy distracted Louis XIV in 1662. These were felt as reprieves⁵⁶ by the Jansenists, and as Annat mentions, by the Calvinists, too. The energy of the Court was deflected away from them and, quite happily for their causes, toward these other matters more urgent.

For Annat, one of the unfortunate aspects of the rupture with Rome was that a number of ecclesiastical sees were left vacant due to the lack of papal confirmation. The nominees were waiting for their bulls before they could proceed to episcopal ordination and the management of their dioceses. Annat was not able to place “his men” in time,⁵⁷ and there were

⁵⁶ We might say the two “great” reprieves were the Affair of the Corsican Guard and the Clementine Peace of the Church. Each lasted about two years.

⁵⁷ Paris itself was vacant because Annat had nominated Hardouin de Péréfixe on 30 July 1662, just a month after the resignation of de Retz and just before the Affair of the Corsican Guard. “Le second est la curieuse nomination de L. Abelly au siège épiscopal de Rodez... à l’instigation du père Annat, jésuite. Curieuse, car le nouvel évêque est âgé de soixante ans et, au XVII^e siècle, les sexagénaires n’étaient guère épiscopables. Richelieu fut nommé à vingt-deux ans, J.-P. Camus à vingt-cinq ans, François de Sales et Caulet à trente-cinq ans, Doni d’Attichy à trente-trois ans. Mais le père Annat, qui voulait Mgr Hardouin de Péréfixe sur le siège de Paris, l’avait fait démissionner du siège de Rodez et l’avait fait nommer à Paris, le 30 juillet 1662. Le siège de Rodez étant vacant, le père Annat n’était pas mécontent de l’offrir à quelqu’un qui passait déjà pour un ami de la Compagnie de Jésus. Louis Abelly fut donc préconisé au siège de Rodez le 9 juin 1664 et sacré dans l’église des Jésuites le 24 août 1664. Deux semaines plus tard, la *Vie de Messire Vincent de Paul* signée Louis Abelly était mise en vente par Florentin Lambert (10 septembre 1664) et le nouvel évêque pouvait prendre la route de Rodez, où il fut intronisé le 29 octobre.” See André Dodin, “Martin de Barcos, Défenseur de Monsieur Vincent”, in *Chroniques de Port-Royal* 26-27-28, *ibid.* (1977-1978-1979), p. 116. The bulls came quickly for Abelly, since the “excuses” of the Nuncio were only read 29 July 1664, and he was consecrated bishop one month later in Rodez.

cases when the local chapter or others influenced by Jansenist sympathies steered things in their own direction.

For one instance, that is how things got so bad in Toulouse. *Sede vacante*, the Prince de Conti used his leverage against the cathedral chapter. Both Madame de Mondonville and the abbé Gabriel de Ciron⁵⁸ got the briefs they needed to found their communities and register their constitutions. It was all legal, and it was all Jansenist, as far as Annat was concerned. And it was unfortunate that Pierre de Marca had died and a successor could not be placed swiftly enough in the see of Toulouse.

He complained of the situation in a letter to Fabri:

V.R. me parle de quelques congregations de filles et de prestres dans Tholose dont le P. Ferrier lui a escrit. [Crossed out: L'establissement s'en fait a Tho.] Il est certains que c'est une affaire de consequence non seulement dans la ville de Tho.lose mais encore ailleurs. J'envoye a V.R. l'extrait de la fondation de celles des filles, ou elle pourra remarquer que le dessein de cette Dame fondatrice⁵⁹ semble estre bien esloigné de l'esprit des Saints fondateurs, ne respirant autre chose que ce que l'ambition peut suggerer, affestant une certain superiorité de Generale d'ordre et mettant cela pour condition de quelque peu de bien temporel qu'elle donne. Sur quoi c'est une chose a disputer pour scavoir si ce n'est pas simonie. Elle y remarquera en outre la defense de faire voeu solennel, de sobliger a Closture, de porter aucun habit particulier, qu'on interprete ici proceder de l'aversion que cette sorte de gens ont de lestat religieux, et de la persuasion que c'est un moindre bien d'estre religieux que d'estre seculier.⁶⁰ Le mal est que le pape qui n'est pas informé de ces choses, a l'instruire comme on croit de M.^r le Prince de Conty a donné un bref qui approuve cette institution. Ce bref fut présenté dernièrement au parlem.ent de Tho.lose avec certaines Constitutions que cette Dame a dressees. Et parce qu'elle est veuve et fille de Conseiller en ce parlem.ent, Et que son Directeur⁶¹ est fils et fr.re d'un president au Mortier, Et qu'elle s'est servit de l'occasion de la chambre des vacations l'enregistrement du bref a bien esté différé mais les constitutions ont esté enregistrees; nous n'avons pas pu pour encore les voir. Mas si elles sont conformes a la fond.ati.on tout cela donne du soupçon. Et ce qu'on peut dire en general, c'est qu'on reconnoit dans toutes ces devotions une grande aversion des Religieux en general et en particulier de la Comp^{ie}.⁶²

⁵⁸ Nephew of Innocent de Ciron, Chancelier de l'Université de Toulouse until 1648, and Chancelier when Annat was censured for the *Scientia Media* in 1645.

⁵⁹ Madame de Mondonville

⁶⁰ These accusations seem far-fetched.

⁶¹ Gabriel de Ciron

⁶² The Society of Jesus