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Introduction

Protestant thought in France, in the seventeenth century, has long been a neglected subject. In an article published in 1955 Walter Rex whose study on Pierre Bayle and religious controversy has been one of the primary inspirations of this dissertation, wrote: "Il n'y a pas de période, semble-t-il dans l'histoire de la théologie protestante aussi peu connue que celle qui va du synode de Dordrecht à la Révocation." This is not true simply for theology, but even more for other aspects of Protestant thought—philosophy, history, scholarship for instance—in France in the seventeenth century. The remarkable vitality of Protestant thought in these fields has been overlooked. To give an example, the work of Cappel in biblical criticism has hardly been studied at all. Yet he was a pioneer in the field, acknowledged as such by late seventeenth century and eighteenth century critics, such as Simon and Vogel.

A study of seventeenth century Protestant thought is important for another reason. Nowadays we tend to underestimate the impact that religion had on all aspects of seventeenth century life. Yet this was a period when the rhythm of everyday life was punctuated by the return of religious ceremonies, when a village or a town was first and foremost a parish or a consistoire, and when truly France lived 'à l'heure de son clocher'. Furthermore, religion was at the very foundation of thought. The terms in which problems were set and often
the solution reached were in essence religious.

To ignore the fundamental role of religion during the period, is bound to give rise to misinterpretations. In recent years, more attention has been given to this role. A number of studies have shown how fruitful can be the approach which takes into account the religious element when studying literary genres, groups of writers or even individual works. The seventeenth century in France is above all a great Catholic century. The creation of new religious orders, the development of the Jansenist movement, the works of Bossuet or Pascal, all exemplify the vitality of French Catholicism during that period. It is therefore understandable that these studies should have concentrated mostly on Catholic rather than Protestant thought. Nevertheless, in the seventeenth century, France was the only European country where, thanks to the Edict of Nantes, the two churches and the two communities actually co-existed. The Edict of Nantes of course only marks the beginning of an attempt at a peaceful co-existence which was never fully achieved. The fact remains that France, more than any other country, witnessed a confrontation between Catholicism and Protestantism. This confrontation varied from dialogue to persecution, but left a deep mark on French life and French thought of the period and must be taken into account when studying the century.

Before this can be done, however, the intellectual history of the French Protestants in the seventeenth century must be
known. This is a task of considerable magnitude. The aim of this dissertation is simply to provide material and suggest lines of approach for such a history. The Académie of Saumur, together with those of Nîmes, Montauban, Die and Sedan, was an institution of higher learning where the réformés went to be educated and where the pasteurs received their theological training. Our study of intellectual life in Saumur rests on the belief that it can help to bring about a better knowledge of the intellectual formation and pursuits of seventeenth century French protestants.

Walter Rex and Mme E. Labrousse, among others, have indicated the need for an adequate study of intellectual life in Saumur. There are several monographs which provide useful information on the Académie. Among these we must mention the works of P. Marchegay and J. L. Métayer. Interesting facts can also be found in D. Bourchenin's Etude sur les Académies protestantes. Yet in our view, these studies suffer from two major drawbacks. First they are, on the whole, anecdotal: they are rich in details but often not on what we consider the more essential aspect, the role played by Saumur as a theological and intellectual centre. It is this role that we have tried to describe and assess here. Secondly Métayer and his nineteenth century predecessors envisaged history mainly as political history. Their works are not in fact the only ones which suffer from an over-emphasis on the evolution of the political situation of the réformés. When one consults general bibliographies on the
history of the period one is struck by the abundance of publications dealing with this question and, particularly, with the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes. It is as if historians, and particularly nineteenth century Protestant historians had not yet recovered from the trauma of the Revocation. The Revocation was indeed an act of momentous consequences. Nevertheless it is surprising how little work has been done on the internal changes brought about by the repression. Yet the oppression of the réformés also affected their intellectual life and this is particularly true in the case of the Académie of Saumur, because of the pre-eminent position which it held. In brief this study is not concerned with social or political history but with intellectual history. The social and political backgrounds are taken into account and studied only when they are of direct relevance to this subject.

Our study is also limited to the period which starts in 1633 with the appointment of Amyraut, La Place and Cappel to the chairs of theology. The Académie opened in 1600. But until 1614, it remained a secondary college without the necessary chairs of theology. Furthermore Protestant universities did not receive their statutes until the synod of Alès in 1620. During the following decade, there was no continuity in the teaching of philosophy or theology at the Académie. The chairs were filled as circumstances allowed; for until the Peace of Alès in 1629, the major concern of the réformés was to fight for political privileges, even if this entailed open rebellion.
Duplessis-Mornay, founder of the Académie, often recruited professors abroad and was not interested in their doctrinal position: he called indifferently for Gomar or Cameron. In most cases these professors did not stay long enough to foster intellectual development in Saumur. 8

Cameron is the exception. Although his two stays in Saumur were brief, he had a great influence on Amyraut, La Place and Cappel who were his students. 9 We have carefully considered the question of including a separate treatment of his doctrine in this study and have decided against it. The problems analysed by Cameron and his solutions must be envisaged in a broader context — that of the challenge to dogma raised by Arminianism. This is what we shall do in our first chapter. Cameron played an important part: he made Amyraut aware of that challenge. He suggested a method for answering it, but it was Amyraut who elaborated solutions in a systematic fashion. Furthermore, it is Amyraut and La Place's doctrine which drew the attention of the French churches to Saumur. It is therefore with a study of these theologians that we shall start.

A study of the intellectual life of Saumur inevitably faces a certain number of problems. The first concerns method. In our view there is a continuity in the doctrine of the various professors who taught at Saumur. Amyraut, La Place and Cappel, all share the same rationalist approach. This rationalist spirit also inspired the work of their successors. Each of the individual authors which we shall study marks a stage in a progression. At the same time many of them are thinkers in
their own right. Some balance between these two aspects must therefore be achieved when dealing with their works. Furthermore the Académie was part of the autonomous system of ecclesiastical government granted to the French reformed churches by the Edict of Nantes. We believe therefore that the doctrine of each individual professor cannot be fully understood outside the context of these relations between the churches and the Académie.

The other sort of problems relate to documentation. Manuscript sources on the life of the réformés during the seventeenth century have so far been relatively neglected. As J. Delorme has pointed out, the formidable task of investigating the various sources for local history has yet to be undertaken. The tracing of manuscript sources is made more difficult in our case, by the fact that when they emigrated, the réformés often took important documents with them. This must explain the disappearance of the acts of provincial synods such as those of Anjou or Poitou, or that of the Registre of the Académie for the years 1673-1683, which we have not been able to trace. As for printed sources, the lack of specialised bibliography on the history of the protestants during the seventeenth century creates major difficulties. It is true that useful information can be found in biographical dictionaries such as Haag’s work, La France protestante. However, general bibliographies often neglect ‘minor’ theologians or controversialists. Cioranescu’s Bibliographie de la littérature française XVIIème siècle,
for instance relegates Cappel to the introductory chapter and does not mention his *Pivot de la foi* which is of fundamental importance for an understanding of Cappel's intellectual position.

We have been fortunate in being able to use a large collection of manuscripts and printed sources relating to Saumur which is now kept in Marsh's Library, Dublin. This collection was formed by Elie Bouhéreau, a former student of the Académie, who emigrated to Ireland after the Revocation. The manuscripts in the collection are more fully described in Appendix I. It is enough to say at this stage that they include lecture notes written while Bouhéreau was a student in Saumur and a number of letters by Bouhéreau's friends which throw an interesting light on intellectual life in the Académie. These manuscripts have hitherto remained unnoticed, but must, of course, be supplemented by other sources, particularly the *Registre* of the Académie (now in Saumur municipal library). The printed sources in the collection are varied and include a number of rare pamphlets, locally printed, and of great importance for a study of the relations of the Académie with the local churches, or the provincial and national synods. Indeed the collection fully justifies the high esteem in which Bouhéreau was held, for his knowledge, by his contemporaries. Bayle, for instance, had this to say on him when he met him in 1694: 'My Lord Galway', he wrote, 'amène avec lui pour secrétaire un fort honnête homme et savant, nommé Mr Bouhéreau, à qui
Lefèvre de Saumur a tant écrit de lettres.\textsuperscript{12}

Taking into account the problems just mentioned we have been led to adopt the following policy. First we aim at documenting the various aspects of intellectual life in Saumur. These are little known and our study is, we believe, the first attempt at such a systematic presentation. We have also chosen to emphasise an aspect which has so far overlooked, that of the relations between the Académie and the Protestant ecclesiastical authorities. The study is therefore divided into three parts. The first (1633-1660) covers a period during which the Académie and the synods gradually define their relations. The second part (1660-1670) concentrates on the period of intense intellectual activity made possible by the relatively stable position which the Académie succeeded in securing for itself within the edifice of the French reformed churches. The third part (1670-1685) describes the disruption of these relations and shows how this affected the intellectual life of the Académie. In each part, individual authors are treated both as representatives of the spirit of Saumur and for their own originality. If at the end we have succeeded in presenting original material and in suggesting interpretations for a further assessment of the importance and influence of Saumur, this dissertation will have fulfilled its purpose.

The spelling, punctuation and capitalisation of the sources have been modernised. In our quotations we have indicated doubtful readings or interpolations by the use of square brackets.
We have included at the end a bibliography and three appendices: the first one gives an account of Bouhéreau and his collection; the second clarifies a certain number of terms relating to the academic body, or to academic and religious life; the third briefly reviews the various financial means which the Académie had at its disposal.

We wish to thank Professor E. J. Arnould for his supervision, and Miss P. Pollard, from Trinity College Library and Marsh's Library, Dublin, for her kind assistance in helping to trace rare printed sources. We also thank for their help the librarians of La Rochelle and Saumur municipal libraries, the librarian in charge of Archives Tronchin in the Bibliothèque publique et universitaire, Geneva, and the librarian of the Bibliothèque de la Société de l'histoire du protestantisme français in Paris. Finally, we wish to dedicate this work to François, who was born four years ago when we first started our research and to Étienne, who was born in Dublin, when his father was reading Chouet’s Correspondence in Geneva.
Notes to the Introduction


2. Among those we may quote H. Busson, La Pensée religieuse française de Charron à Pascal (Paris 1933), L. Goldman, Le Dieu caché, Étude sur la vision tragique dans les pensées de Pascal et dans le théâtre de Racine (Paris, 1955). Walter Rex's study: Essays on Pierre Bayle and religious controversy (The Hague, 1965) remains the only study so far which treats a Protestant writer in the context of the religious thought of the period.


6. F. Laplanche in Orthodoxie et prédication, l'oeuvre de Moyse Amyraut et la querelle de la grâce universelle (Paris, 1965) follows Marchegay and Métayer and gives the date of the creation of the chair of theology as 1611. However, an entry in Registre (21 July 1614, f.8) shows that funds were made available for these chairs and professors appointed for the first time only in 1614. L. Cappel was appointed to teach Hebrew studies on 9 Dec. 1613. But this teaching did not include Biblical Studies. (Registre, f.1).

7. The Loix générale des Académies dressées pour les Eglises reformées de France, au synode d'Alès l'an 1620 are transcribed in Registre, 30 Dec. 1620, f.56-7.

8. In the Registre for 1 Sept. 1620, the Conseil académique elaborated a list of recommendations for its députés to the coming synod of Alès. Among other things the députés were told to ask the synod to ensure that the Académie would not be without a chair of theology. We also note an entry for 21 July, 1620 where Cameron complains of
the heavy duties imposed on him, "attendu qu'... il a fait à lui tout seul toutes les fonctions de deux professeurs" (f. 49)


11. Two Registres have survived and are kept in the library; the one for 1613-1673 (MS I A 1) and the one for 1683-4 (MS I A 4).

PART I

ÉGLISE AND ACADEMIE: THE DELICATE COMPROMISE

1633 - 1660
Chapter I

EGLISE AND ACADEMIE

The years 1633-1660 circumscribe a crucial period in the relations between the academy of Saumur and the ecclesiastical authorities. During that period, through a series of serious crises which resulted in a compromise, the Académie asserted its freedom to discuss doctrinal questions. It elaborated a new orthodoxy for the French reformed churches. It also defined the type of relations which could exist from the point of view of authority between professeurs and pasteurs. Finally, also during that period, the Académie succeeded in securing some measure of financial independence. On all these points a compromise was reached and endorsed by the last national synod held in Loudun in 1659. During that synod the doctrine of Saumur was finally accepted in the form given to it by its most outstanding champion Amyraut, and some balance of power was achieved between the churches and the academy. The synod had sent three deputies, Debordeu, Guitton and Homoís, to control the activities of the Académie in Saumur. In fact, they concluded their visit by expressing their satisfaction and their best wishes to the entire academic body: "grâces à Dieu,
nous n'avons pas trouvé le mal si grand qu'il avait été représenté, et avons reçu une joie singulière de voir un si beau et bon nombre de jeunes hommes voués au service de la maison de Dieu. Nous les avons exhortés de cheminer de plus en plus comme il est séant à une profession si sainte et avons reçu toute sorte de satisfaction de leur respectueuse modestie et déférence aux avertissements de leurs supérieurs, espérant, selon leurs promesses qu'ils nous ont faites, qu'à l'avenir encore plus que par le passé, ils s'étudieront d'ôter toute occasion de se plaindre de leur conduite. En suit de quoi nous leur avons souhaité de la part du Seigneur toute bénédiction sur leurs labours et augmentation de ses grâces.  

This was achieved thanks mostly to Josué de la Place, Louis Cappel and Moyse Amyraut, the three professors of theology who had been appointed by the provincial synod of Anjou, Touraine and Maine in June 1633. Throughout the period under study and until their deaths, all three assumed major responsibilities in the academy: together with their colleagues, the pasteurs Beaujardin and d'Huisseau, they ruled as Recteur or Principal over students and teachers; as deputies to the national or provincial synods they fought for the autonomy of their university; they also took care of financial and legal problems. In exercising their responsibilities they were faced with many issues of
a practical nature, relating to discipline or curriculum. They were often at loggerheads with the synods over these. However it is their teaching and their publications which more than anything else brought about a very serious confrontation between the Académie and the ecclesiastical bodies.

The various stages of this confrontation are as many moments of a crisis latent in the French reformed churches, which the publications of Amyraut, La Place and Cappel brought into the open; the problem that emerged was that of orthodoxy and authority: because the academy had received little autonomy in its statutes, any teaching which appeared to be at variance with the doctrine recognised as orthodox by the churches, any show of intellectual independence by the professors was seen by the synods as a threat to their authority. This was made abundantly clear by the recommendation of the national synod of Alençon in 1637, which concluded the first stage of the confrontation: "Pour maintenir en son entier la pureté de la doctrine et empêcher toute mésintelligence entre pasteurs professeurs et églises, prévenir les inconvénients qui s'en suivraient et serrer de près les liens spirituels de l'union et de la charité fraternelle qui doit être entre les fidèles, le Synode défend, à peine de déposition, aux pasteurs et professeurs, de traiter,
en leurs prédications, leçons et écrits, des questions curieuses, qui aient été ou soient encore en achoppement, étant nécessaire de se tenir à la simplicité de l'Eglise sainte et aux déclarations communes de la créance orthodoxe fondées sur icelle, et approuvées par les synodes nationaux, notamment celui de Charenton tenu en l'an 1623."5

What the three professors and with them the Académie tried to assertin, was their right to discuss these "questions en achoppement", to affirm that they were l'Eglise as much as any other individual consistoire or provincial synod: if there remained unsolved questions, then they had as much of a right to speak on orthodoxy as ecclesiastical bodies.

The Académie however never sought total independence from ecclesiastical discipline. It was Amyraut in fact who, as we shall later see, eventually gave the most articulate statement on the structure of power within the French reformed churches; and those in Saumur who disagreed were strongly condemned by him and the majority of the academic body. What the Académie achieved was the recognition that it had its place within the federal edifice of protestant churches in France: the three professors, and particularly Amyraut and La Place, fought to obtain for their university the same rights and duties as any other ecclesiastical body. The chapters which follow give an account of this struggle

4.
and analyse the compromise which was finally reached: a delicate balance was achieved and thanks to it, for a few years from 1660 to 1670 the académie of Saumur was the centre of a brilliant intellectual life. Later, after studying these golden years, we shall enquire into the reasons of Saumur's decadence and downfall. Bayle in his article on Amyraut in the Dictionnaire Historique et critique, recalls the difficulties which La Place, Amyraut and Cappel had to face, and writes: "Ces plaintes n'empêchaient pas qu'on y vît (i.e. in Saumur) un grand concours de proposants qui diminua à vue d'œil après la mort de ces trois illustres professeurs ...." The decadence of Saumur had many different causes. It is true that in Amyraut the academy lost an outstanding professor and her champion; nevertheless Bayle overlooks other important factors (and particularly the ever hardening policy of the king towards his protestant subjects). A discussion of the question would be premature, but we can already say at this stage that Bayle is right when he states that the delicate doctrinal balance achieved during the years 1633-1660 was never anything other than compromise, which could only work if the protestant churches remained in a relatively secure position; its inherent weakness could not stand up to the stress of later years: "N'est-il pas vrai", wrote Bayle, "que jamais remède ne fut aussi palliatif que celui-là?" The history
of Saumur's struggle for its autonomy and of its rise to fame is therefore all important, as it helps to understand the suddenness of its downfall.

"La pureté de la doctrine"

The impact of the theology of Amyraut and La Place on the orthodox and the opposition the academy encountered because of it cannot be understood without reference to the particular doctrinal situation of the French reformed churches at the time of their appointment. For Amyraut was the first French theologian to attempt elaborating a point of doctrine which arose from the orthodox definitions embodied in the canons of the Synod of Dort. The present chapter, therefore, shall analyse the decisions of the Synod of Dort and the consequences of their endorsement by the French reformed churches; we shall then endeavour to assess the amount of control to which the academies and particularly Saumur, were submitted on doctrinal matters, in order to put in proper perspective the crises which arose from Amyraut's and La Place's publications.

The Synod of Dort opened on 13 November 1618 and remained in session until 9 March 1619. No French delegate attended the Synod: by edict, the King had forbidden the churches of his kingdom to send delegations to any synod held outside the frontiers. As it was pointed out by David
Blondel, who wrote the earliest history of the controverses saumuriennes, this absence was fraught with dangerous consequences. For the Synod of Dort was not simply an ecclesiastical court convened to judge and sentence the Arminians, as it has often been suggested. As important perhaps as the condemnation of arminianism in which it resulted, is the fact that it openly discussed and tried to clarify the fundamental points of calvinist doctrine. And as Blondel shows in his Actes authentiques, the true purpose behind the convening of this general synod of all calvinist churches was to elaborate a concordat, a common confession of faith, which would accommodate different conceptions and allow for diverging interpretations, in order to achieve eventually a reunion with the Lutheran churches. As Bossuet informs us, it was envisaged as "something of an oecumenical council". The discussion on doctrine was to lead to a peaceful agreement which would be used as a basis for the reunion of all reformed churches. This spirit of compromise was in fact largely prevalent even before Dort, and was voiced by P. Du Moulin himself, the champion of the French churches, as early as 1615, in a letter to the provincial synod of Ile de France, where he outlined precisely such a council: "Là je ne voudrais point qu'on disputât de la religion, car depuis que les esprits sont échauffés, ils
ne se rendent jamais, et chacun s'en retournant dit qu'il a vaincu. Mais je voudrais que sur la table fût mise la Confession des églises de France, d'Angleterre, d'Ecosse, des Pays-Bas, du Paléstinat etc. [et] que de ces Confessions on tâchât d'en dresser une commune en laquelle on dissimulât plusieurs choses, sans la connaissance desquelles on peut être sauvé, comme est la question de Piscator sur le franc-arbitre, et plusieurs opinions subtiles proposées par Arminius sur le franc-arbitre, la prédestination et persévérance des saints etc."

The fact is that the Synod of Dort did condemn the doctrine of Arminius. But this is not to say that there was not a high degree of difference even between those opposed to him; admittedly all delegates (except of course the Remonstrants, i.e. those in his favour) endorsed the final canons, but during the debates many delegates took the opportunity to explain their conceptions in their own terms: the difference was considerable between the positions represented by the delegation from Geneva and, on the other extreme, the delegations from England or Bremen; and those who differed made it a point to have their judgments recorded and published as part of the official acts of the synod. In fact the synod was clearer on what it rejected than on what it affirmed: the canons themselves grouped in the original acts under the four headings of 'prédestination, élection et réprobation', 'étendue de la rédemption',.
'corruption de l'homme' and 'persevérence des saints' are worded in an ambiguous, often negative way. It is only much later that they became codified as the ‘five points of calvinist’ doctrine, and summarized as follows: 1) Fallen man in his natural state lacks all power to believe, despite all external inducements that may be extended to him (the doctrine of total depravity); 2) God’s election is a free and unconditional choice of sinners to be redeemed by Christ (the doctrine of unconditional election); 3) The end of the redeeming work of Christ is the salvation of the elect (the doctrine of limited atonement); 4) The Holy Spirit never fails to bring men to faith (the doctrine of irresistible grace); 5) Those who believe persevere in faith and are kept in grace (the doctrine of the preservation of the saints). But the four original canons were first and foremost counter-propositions, elaborated as compromise answers to the doctrine of the Remonstrants. In their interpretation of all the debated points, as the acts of the synod show, delegations were far from being unanimous.¹²

Nowhere are these differences in interpretation clearer, and the ambiguity of the canons more striking than in those texts concerned with the central problem of predestination, that is to say God’s decree and plan of salvation¹³ – and its corollary, the question of justification¹⁴. It was on
this problem that the Arminians and their Dutch adversaries, the Gomarists held totally different views. For Gomar, predestination to salvation was both absolute and particular; it was absolute in this sense that it did not depend on any condition, and particular as God, by His eternal decree, decided which man would be saved and which would be damned. For the Arminians, to say that God had decided en toute éternité who he would damn, whatever the merits of the individual sinner, was ultimately to make God responsible for sin; they argued along the following lines: "certes si jamais il a été bon, c'est maintenant qu'il est, pour la gloire de Dieu et le bien des églises réformées, qu'elles soient purgées et nettoyées de ces dogmes pour lesquelles elles ont été jusqu'à maintenant diffamées par toute la chrétienté, tels que sont les suivants, à savoir que Dieu a ordonné et destiné à la mort la plus grande partie des hommes sans considération du péché ... qu'il a prédestiné et créé le péché et même qu'il procure qu'il se fasse". When Bayle, much later, came back on this problem in his Réponses aux questions d'un provincial, he pointed out that if indeed one wanted to rationalize the strict doctrine of predestination, one was inevitably led to a manichean conception of the Deity and to stoicism as the only suitable ethical doctrine. However, the Remonstrants' challenge to the stricter doctrine of predestination was not purely of an intellectual nature,
as it later became with Bayle: In their case the desire to elucidate and rationalize dogma, was accompanied by strong ethical and pastoral considerations: they viewed the stricter interpretation of Gomar as leading to despair or immorality; it meant that man was deprived of all moral responsibility, and that teaching the Gospel was au fond useless and irrelevant: "quart à la réprobation", they wrote, "il faudra retrancher beaucoup de choses lesquelles comme une gangrène gâtent et corrompent la sainte doctrine et font que plusieurs pécheurs sont en crainte du désespoir".\(^{17}\) Against this they rebelled: God could only be conceived in terms of His infinite Goodness; to teach a doctrine that contradicted this was to offend reason and to destroy hope. The sum of the decree of predestination was therefore that God had willed to save those who have faith and preserve it. God’s election was general, but the responsibility for salvation ultimately rested on man.\(^{18}\) The consequences of this principle were as follows:\(^{19}\) Man after the fall has not lost his ability to be good. Such ability, or liberty as they called it, was essential to his nature; in itself however this ability was not sufficient, and man needed the assisting grace of God for his 'conversion': "gratiam Dei statuimus esse principium progressum et complementum omnis boni: adeo ut ne ipse quidem regenitus absque praecedente ista, sive praeveniente,
excitante, prosequente et cooperante gratia, bonum ullum salutare cogitare, velle, aut peragere possit". This divine grace was afforded to all men to enable them to repent: and those who cooperated on their own free will with divine grace, would be saved. In other words the decree of election was simply the purpose of God to save believers: "Decretum vocant Remonstrantes (decretum) praedestinationem ad salutem, quia eo decernitur, qua ratione et conditio Deus peccatores saluti destinet ... Etiamsi hujus modi praedestinationi non sit praedestinationi certarum personarum, est tamen omnium hominum praedestinationi, si modo credant, et in virtute praedestinationi certarum personarum, quae et quando credunt". 21

More than the outright rejection of arminianism by the stricter orthodox, the important fact is that some delegations understood the implications of the Remonstrants' challenge and were not content with its being condemned but left unanswered. This was the reaction of the delegation from Bremen, together with those from Hesse and from England. The delegates from Hesse for instance made the following statement: "Nous avons en horreur la nécessité fatale des Manichéens et des Stoïques, par laquelle ils ont fausement excogité et controuvé que la volonté même de l'homme était comme forcée et de nécessité contrainte de vouloir et de ne le pas faire; erreur dont nous sommes certains et assurés que
les Eglises réformées sont du tout éloignées, et estimons par conséquent que les frères Remonstrants leur font un très grand tort de les taxer d'être manichéennes ou de tremper en l'opinion des philosophes stoïques".22 The 'liberal' delegations therefore insisted for a specific answer to the accusations. A whole session, the 132nd on 19th April 1619 was spent discussing whether the synod should include among the errors rejected not simply those of the Remonstrants, but also phrases and locutions that implied the strictest interpretation of reprobation: "On examina le formulaire de la réjection des calomnies, lequel avait été fait et dressé, auquel quelques-uns estimaient qu'on devait aussi ajouter la réjection de certaines locutions et façons de parler dures et incommodes, lesquelles se rencontraient en certains écrits des docteurs de l'Eglise réformée".23 A vote was taken and the inclusion was rejected: the Synod took the view that it could be left to those concerned to explain the difficult points of doctrine in a way which would be both correct (doctrinally) and acceptable (pastorally), "vu qu'il était évident et clair que le Saint-Esprit lui-même s'était servi et avait usurpé quelques-unes de ces façons de parler; et pareillement il y en avait quelques-unes que les Remonstrants eux-mêmes admettaient et recevaient, étant sainement entendues, mais (qu') il y en avait plusieurs qui
pouvaient être droîtement et commodément expliquées, moyennant qu'on y apportât de la charité". The synod therefore acknowledged more or less explicitly, that there were various approaches to the dogma of predestination, provided that the transcendental nature of God and the supernatural character of grace were not questioned. As it was emphasised by the theologians from Hesse themselves, what mattered most was to avoid reducing the might of God by increasing the strength of man. But provided the danger was avoided, one could choose, to explain predestination, the method one considered the best.

In their 'judgments' the theologians from Bremen, Hesse or Great Britain, did precisely this: far from shying away from the Arminian challenge they took it up and suggested that the apparent contradictions that the Remonstrants saw in the orthodox doctrine, could be explained in a rational way. The fact that they did, and the way they did it are important. Rather than accept the Arminian conclusion that, when absolute and particular, predestination made non-sense of God as revealed in the Scripture or that if it made sense, it was offensive to man's conception of God, they tried to introduce various levels of significance: they contended that, if considered absolutely, God's decree remained beyond human comprehension, but that it could be explained in human terms;
and in this case, one could hypothetically distinguish between God's various motives, His different purposes, and tentatively establish a succession in His affections and His decrees. They applied this crucial methodological distinction to two points: on predestination, the 'liberal' theologians were thus able to use the notion of efficaciousness: as the theologians from Great Britain pointed out, election really signifies God's decree considered from the point of view of its fulfillment: "le décret de l'élection ou de la prédestination à salut est la volonté efficace de Dieu par laquelle ... il a proposé de sauver l'homme déchu et lui a préparé tels moyens par lesquels il a voulu efficacement et infailliblement amener les élus à cette fin ... Nous appelons ce décret une volonté efficace d'autant qu'elle regarde non pas un simple ordre à la vie ... ainsi qu'Adam a été ordonné à la béatitude ou félicité, mais elle regarde et décerne l'événement même de cet ordre".  

The method followed is even clearer in the passages where the Arminian doctrine of election is rejected: the distinction between definite and infinite or complete and incomplete election, which the Arminians which to introduce was a false one; what could be said however is that considered from the point of view of mankind, God's decree may appear to be enacted in different ways: "Encore qu'on puisse assigner diverses actions et opérations de Dieu pour le regard de la diversité des objets, comme sont la fin et les moyens, si est
cependant que jamais l'Ecriture ne fait mention de divers degrés ou espèces d'élection. Car l'élection est une certaine ordonnance infaillible à salut des personnes particulières, laquelle demeure en l'entendement et volonté de Dieu". The error therefore was to confuse the order of causality with that of temporality, or not to distinguish between God's decrees envisaged from the point of view of his essence, and on the other hand from that of their manifestation in a series of events. And this crucial distinction was further applied by them to the doctrine of grace: "à peine peut-on distinguer par ordre de temps l'oeuvre de Dieu convertissant l'homme et l'action de l'homme se convertissant à Dieu Il faut toutefois par ordre de causalité que l'oeuvre de Dieu précède et que l'action suive". The cautious wording of the statement ("À peine") does not detract from the clarity of the thought: Walter Rex has rightly observed that the method that the liberal theologians followed at Dort was "a breaking up of the doctrine into separate units which were only temporarily and theoretically conceived as distinct from one another". Yet by introducing such distinctions they were able to answer the objections of the Arminians on their own rational ground, without in their view, taking any mystery out of dogma itself. Furthermore, their method was definitely not ruled out by the synod: contrary to the received view, the canons of Dort did allow
for some measure of doctrinal autonomy.

"Le seul docteur, c'est Dieu"

It is precisely for such autonomy that Amyraut and with him the Academy of Saumur fought for: as he wrote in 1636, just before the convening of the national synod which was to examine his doctrine, "qui ne sait qu'encore qu'on soit pleinement d'accord ès points esquels consiste la religion, qu'on ait même Confession de foi, même Liturgie, même Discipline, mêmes déclarations publiques et mêmes règles de l'exercice de son ministère, il est impossible pourtant qu'on ait même traditive en tout, et que toutes les concep-
tions des théologiens soient conformes, comme si elles étai-
ent jetées en même moule ...."?28 Again and again in their writings, correspondence and prefaces the theologians of Saumur refer to the synod of Dort in support of their claim: its Actes, they say, specifically recognized the right of those who chose to interpret doctrine in their own terms: furthermore, a synod was never anything else than an assembly of pious and learned men; the authority of its decision was not sans appel; the only judge of truth was God. And Amyraut made use of this argument in his Lettre à Monsieur de La Milletiere: "c'est à ceux de l'Eglise romaine", he wrote, "à branler quand leurs docteurs branlent .... les peuples de la religion (i.e. the Protestants) sont instruits tout autre-
ment. Le seul docteur sur l'autorité duquel ils se reposent
c'est Dieu; le seul témoignage qui leur atteste la vérité de leur créance, c'est l'ionction de par le Saint [Esprit] qui leur enseigne toute chose". The synod of Dort in its wisdom had realised this, thus entitling theologians to follow their own method of discussion. Later a pastor from Paris, Mestrezat, who was in favour of Amyraut, wrote a letter to the pasteurs of Bas-Languedoc where he admirably summed up the attitude of the Saumur professor and his supporters on the significance of Dort: "vous y voyez", he wrote, 'les théologiens de la Grande-Bretagne et les théologiens de Breme et ceux de Wétéranie parlant comme a parlé Monsieur Cameron et comme parle Monsieur Amyraut. Vous y voyez les autres parler autrement et tous nonobstant cette diversité s'embrasser comme orthodoxes ...".

However the synod of Dort was not simply for Amyraut and Saumur an example which warranted their right to a share of authority on doctrinal matters; in the doctrine of the 'liberal' theologians as recorded its acts they also found their inspiration. The French churches, because they had not attended Dort, were not given the opportunity to participate in discussions of fundamental importance. The national synod of Alès which met a year after Dort (in 1620) simply endorsed the canons, and although the acts of this synod mention that the canons were 'pondered most attentively' they were not discussed at any length: "A motion was made in this
national synod that some course should be taken in time to prevent the spreading of the Arminian errors ... This assembly embraced the motion very readily, and approved of it as very laudable, just and needful for the peace of the church of God and for the conservation of the purity of doctrine... This assembly after invocation of the name of God, decreed that the Articles of the said national council held at Dort, should be read in full synod, while being read accordingly and every article pondered most attentively, they were all received by a common unanimous consent".  

The synod then elaborated an oath which was to be taken by all the delegates to future synods; it is clear from the wording that the synod intended all further discussion of the canons to be forbidden. The form of the oath was: "I do swear and protest before God and this holy assembly that I do receive, approve and embrace all the doctrines taught and decided by the Synod of Dort, and the Confession of our churches. I swear and promise to persevere in the profession of this doctrine during my whole life and to defend it with the utmost of my power, and that I will never, neither by preaching nor teaching in the schools, nor by writing, depart from it". And the next national synod, that of Charenton in 1623, published a translation of the canons of Dort, as part of its official acts. At no time was there any attempt by a theologian present at the 1620 and 1623 synods to discuss
the problems and to recognize that there was need for a further enquiry. Now in our view this is what Amyraut attempted to do. Both he and his colleagues considered themselves the doctrinal heirs of the theologians from England and Bremen. They had become acquainted with their method through the works of John Cameron, a Scotsman who had taught in Saumur for two years, between 1618 and 1620, at the height of the Arminian crisis. The greater part of his works were devoted to answering the Arminian objections, following the same method as the one adopted by the delegations from England and Bremen at Dort. Like them, he distinguished between the order of causality and that of temporality. He also developed a theory of the action of grace as envisaged from the human point of view. He saw it as an **illuminatio** of the will by the intellect, whereby the will was necessarily drawn to faith. And that **illuminatio** was properly speaking the work of supernatural grace which 'presented' to the intellect the reasons to believe, in such a way as it could not resist them. Through Cameron, Amyraut and Saumur learnt from the liberal theologians how the **intellectual** challenge of the Remonstrants could be answered. Unlike them they were not involved in a direct confrontation with Arminianism; but thanks to them they became aware of the problems Arminianism raised, and in the judgments of the liberals at Dort or in Cameron's works they found their inspiration.35
The theology of Saumur therefore is a protracted attempt by French theologians to answer the rationalist challenge of the Arminians. In a letter dated 20th March, 1641, Louis Cappel defending himself and his colleagues, wrote to Theodore Trouchin, and stated unequivocally that such was their inspiration, their method, their purpose: "J'apprends que pour condamner Cameron\textsuperscript{36}, on nous charge d'erreurs et d'hérésies, et on déclame contre la doctrine et la méthode de Saumur . . . . \[\text{cette méthode}\] est comme vous savez très bien, tout du long dans les Actes du Synode de Dordrecht, en l'explication des docteurs d'Angleterre et de Brême qui n'y ont pas été condamnés pour hérésie pour cela, ni rien de \[\text{fait}\] à l'encontre de leur méthode. Nous ne querellons personne pour l'autre, qu'on nous laisse la nôtre en paix, qu'ils défendent la leur, s'ils peuvent, contre les attaques des Arminiens, nous en seront très aises. Nous espérons bien de défendre la nôtre et les définitions de Dordrecht par icelle, contre tout ce que sauraient alléguer les Arminiens contre la vérité. Si leur \[i.e., the orthodox\] méthode ou la nôtre est plus sûre ou meilleure pour le maintien de la vérité orthodoxe nous espérons que Dieu . . . le fera connaître. Cependant laissons-en le jugement à ceux qui voudront enfoncer ces matières, aussi bien comme on fait de la solidité ou invalidité des raisons où on appuie une opinion. Si une raison n'est pas jugée forte on la laisse, si une autre
This remarkable letter shows what was the true spirit of the theologians of Saumur: what inspired them was the desire to reassess dogma in the light of the Arminian challenge: the Arminians had called the dogma of predestination to the tribunal of reason, the Saumur theologians came to its defense. They chose to do it precisely on the terms elected by their adversaries: "Si une raison n'est pas jugée forte, on la laisse, si une autre paraît meilleure on s'en sert". We are surprised at the hardiesse of such a position, and it was certainly this bold approach which aroused suspicion among the conservatives. Yet this hardiesse is more apparent than real. They were not true 'novateurs': the right of the individual to examine doctrine on his own had been one of the primary inspirations of the Reformation: Amyraut and his colleagues did not question the fundamental points of dogma, they simply exercised what they considered their legitimate responsibility and chose the method which best suited their purpose.

"Pasteurs, professeurs et Eglise"

The letter from Cappel quoted above is interesting from another point of view: it shows that Amyraut, La Place, and
Cappel himself were always united in defending one another's doctrine. Both the unity and the form which the reactions to their publications took indicate that the crisis which was brought out into the open by their works was not purely of a doctrinal nature, but also had ecclesiastical implications. For the three theologians were not simply speaking for themselves but also for the Académie and the future pasteurs it trained. And the opposition they met when they exerted their right to discuss questions with the young proposants in the way they, as theologians and professors, considered the best, would not have been as strong if from the date of their foundation, the academies had been given a well-defined place in the federal structure of the French reformed churches.  

Their statutes however put them in an ambiguous situation: first of all the 'laws' governing the academies were elaborated very late. Although the necessity for protestant institutions of higher learning had been made clear as early as 1596 by the national synod of Saumur, for many years the major effort was directed towards the development of the colleges (or secondary schools). To complete their studies the future pasteurs originally had to go abroad (to Geneva or the 'marginal' universities, like Sedan). Only a few important figures among the French Protestants of the older generation devoted their efforts to create proper universities.
Duplessis-Mornay who founded Saumur, was one of them. He foresaw the need to educate a body of intellectually trained men who would be able to hold their ground in the great intellectual debate which the Edict of Nantes made possible. When he heard of the death of De Bèze he wrote to one of his friends, Merlin: "Vous m'avez attristé de la mort de M. de Bèze; et trois ou quatre étoiles qui nous restent, couchées, je ne vois qu'épaisses ténèbres parmi nous.... Je voudrais bien vous voir plus soigneux de rechercher des jeunes gens pour allumer nos chandelles." However, the academies were really established in 1620 only, when the national synod of Alès gave them their 'general laws' or statutes.

Two facts emerge from a study of these statutes. First, from the point of view of structure, the universities were submitted to the control of the local church. They were given two governing bodies, the Conseil ordinaire, and the Conseil extraordinaire, both dominated by the consistoire: the Conseil ordinaire included the professeurs publics, the Principal and the pasteurs. The Conseil extraordinaire, which dealt with all fundamental questions, was composed of the conseil ordinaire plus some elders chosen by the guild-hall, or else members of the consistoire.

Secondly, as far as the appointment of staff and allocation of financial resources were concerned, the academics were totally dependant on the provincial synods: Professors
of divinity were chosen by the conseil extraordinaire, but the nominees were examined by the provincial synod and finally appointed by it. Although nothing is said in the statutes about publications, the synod provincial kept an eye on the theses submitted by divinity students whose studies were paid by the synod or a consistoire, thus having un droit de regard on students and staff alike. Finally, the universities derived the major part of their financial resources from contributions paid by the provinces (the rate of which was determined by the national synod). This also constituted an indirect but efficient means of pressure on the governing bodies. Furthermore the academies did not participate in any synod; if they sent députés, these went to submit a case, but not to take part in the voting. In these circumstances, Amyraut's and La Place's attempt to reassess dogma could only lead to a crisis.

In the next chapters, we shall follow the development of this crisis: its history is interesting not simply from the doctrinal point of view. Indeed, the 'new' Saumur theology laid the foundations for later rationalist developments. But when they defended their doctrine, the three professors were not simply maintaining that religious doctrine can be submitted to a rational examination; they were also fighting for their freedom to do so, in face of
repeated efforts from the synods to codify dogma. And yet they did not simply speak for themselves but also for their students, the future pasteurs, the other theologians. They understood that in a period where a remarkable aggiornamento of the Catholic church was taking place, particularly in France, the reformed churches could only survive if they kept alive the independance of judgment which had inspired the early reformers; and after all this was the role that Duplessis-Mornay had assigned to Saumur.
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Chapter II

THE NEW ORTHODOXY OF AMYRAUT AND LA PLACE

This chapter follows the elaboration of a new orthodoxy by Amyraut and La Place and its gradual acceptance by the synods. As we have shown in chapter I the doctrine of the two Saumur theologians must be understood as an answer to the Arminian challenge; however the controversies which surrounded the publication of their books were not simply inspired by doctrinal considerations. What was also at question was the right of the Académie and its teachers to speak on matters of doctrine. The controversies therefore also raised the question of ecclesiastical discipline; their outcome was the emergence of Saumur as a new Calvinist centre, equal to Geneva, Sedan or Leyden.

Three stages can be distinguished in the rise of Saumur. During the first one a direct confrontation occurred between Amyraut and the older theologians, after he published his Bref traité de la prédestination in 1634. The first stage ended on a note of appeasement with the national synod of Alençon in 1637. During the second stage between 1640 and 1649 the Académie's ecclesiastical position was threatened by the provincial synods of Poitou and Saintonge and the questions of doctrine were used as a pretext for a counter-attack of the older theologians. During the third stage,
the doctrine of Saumur underwent a new development thanks to La Place and his theses on original sin. La Place died in 1655\(^1\) without having won recognition for his doctrine; but by that date the opposition to Saumur had considerably lessened and the last national synod of the French churches, which ended in Loudun in January 1660, showed that the new doctrine was no longer a major issue. After 1655, Saumur remained in the limelight but for different reasons: the attention of the orthodox, particularly abroad, had turned to Cappel and his work in the field of biblical criticism. This subject deserves special consideration and we shall treat it in the next chapter.

The predestination controversy

The first stage in the controversy about the theology of Saumur centers around Amyraut's *Bref traité de la prédestination* which was published in 1634.\(^2\) We shall first examine the origins and doctrinal contents of Amyraut's work and then discuss the reactions to it and finally show how the synod of Alençon dealt with the controversy. We shall then be in a position to assess the repercussions of this first crisis on the Académie as a whole.

There are some doubts about the immediate reason for the publication of the *Bref traité de la prédestination*. In his discussion of this question, F. Laplanche infers, from a
passage in the preface of Amyraut's *Sermons*, published two years later\(^3\), that the *Bref traité de la prédestination* was written to confirm a huguenot nobleman in his faith, particularly on the difficult dogma of predestination. Indeed in the preface of his *Sermons* Amyraut writes: "Il y a environ dix-huit mois qu'un homme de qualité nouvellement venu dans notre profession et menaçant assez apparemment dès lors du changement arrivé depuis, avait coutume de dire entre ses familiers que la doctrine de la prédestination, telle qu'elle était enseignée dans nos églises, lui faisait horreur".\(^4\) However, in his narration of the controversy, found in his *Adversus Epistolae historicae criminationes defensio*, which appeared in 1649,\(^5\) Amyraut does not mention the incident. It is clear that, although the *Bref traité de la prédestination* had an immediate apologetical purpose, the topic itself had been of special importance to the Saumur theologian for some time.

Amyraut had already \(\text{broached the subject in his inaugural theses } \textit{De sacerdotio Christi}.\(^6\) He had of course steered clear of any difficulty regarding the orthodox doctrine: circumstances did not permit such an incursion. Yet the *Bref traité de la prédestination* was not simply a work for one particular occasion, as if Amyraut had never before considered the difficulties inherent in the doctrine of predestination. The book in fact does not really review the five points of doctrine as they had been endorsed by the synod of Alès, in such a way as to accommodate the scruples
of those who found it difficult to accept them. Rather it selects one of the five points (the fourth) and shows that the doctrine of predestination ultimately rests on the way it is interpreted. The treatise is an original work, which examines a specific problem, that of salvation, from a privileged point of view, that of the working of grace. As Amyraut wrote in his *Lettre à La Milletière*, a short pamphlet published a few years later, the central question for him was: "la manière et l'efficace de l'opération, qui est presque la seule importante en la matière de la prédestination, pour ce que les autres en dépendent".\(^7\)

Now it is clear that Amyraut had already approached the question and progressed towards his original solution, before the *Bref traité de la prédestination* was published. For the problem of grace is discussed in the theses *De tribus foederibus divinis* submitted by one of his students, J. Ruveus in December 1634.\(^8\) We learn from Amyraut's *Defensio ad Chabrolium* that he had finished the *Bref traité de la prédestination* less than three months before: "anno 1634", he writes, "tractaculum meum circum mensem Septembrem in lucem enitentem..."\(^9\) However, theology theses were by tradition a summary of the course dictated to the students during the year: the theses *De tribus foederibus divinis* thus constitute an invaluable evidence on Amyraut's teaching in 1633-4. They show that he had already elaborated his major point of doctrine when he published the *Bref traité de la prédestination*. For we find
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this point presented in the same form both in the Bref traité de la prédestination and in the Theses.

As the title indicates the theme chosen for the thesis is the covenants. Without entering into a detailed study of the background to covenant theology, we must indicate that, to judge by the Theses, Amyraut differs from contemporary covenant theologians on one important point. Following Calvin, early XVIIth century theologians distinguished between the covenant of works and the covenant of grace, in other words, between the covenant of the Law and that of the Gospel. Calvin insisted that there was no break of continuity between the one and the other: the common purpose of both was to ensure man's salvation; both had been conceived by God as a means to repair the damage caused by original sin. For Calvin therefore the notion of covenant did not apply to God's original revelation to Adam before the Fall. After Calvin, theologians tried to clarify the status of this original revelation. One solution was to view the covenant of Sinai as expliciting and renewing it: the sum of the covenant of works therefore was both the unwritten and the written Law. On the other hand, if God's plan of salvation was unique, and if there was no interruption of His purpose from the Old to the New Testament, the various steps of the administration of the covenant of grace could be traced back from Jesus-Christ to Moses, from Moses to Abraham and from Abraham to Adam after the Fall. Other theologians therefore limited
the covenant of works to God's original revelation in the
Garden of Eden; in their conception, the covenant of grace
started with God's declaring to Adam, after the Fall, His
gracious purpose to save the elect through Christ. At
the time when Amyraut wrote, however, the concept of covenant
had not been thoroughly elucidated and theologians debated
whether the covenant of Sinai, for instance, was of work or
of grace.13

Amyraut's original contribution to the question is to
distinguish clearly between three covenants: the covenant of
grace ('foedus gratiae') the covenant of law ('foedus legale') -
with Moses - and what he calls 'the natural covenant' ('foedus
naturale') where the parties are God acting as creator and
Adam as His creature. Amyraut conceives this last covenant as
the natural union (or communion) between God and all men
in the person of Adam: "qua primus homo fuit, [Adamus] uni-
versum genus humanum, quod ex eo nasciturum erat, veluti
representavit. Itaque foedus naturale omnes homines nisi
peccatum intervenisset, ex aequo spectabat".14 Original sin
entails the destruction of this communion: "peccatum enim
abolevit naturalem illam communionem".15

What was this natural covenant and how was it affected
by man's Fall? It is the answer to these questions that
the foundation of Amyraut's doctrine of grace ultimately
rests. He describes Adam before the Fall as endowed with
the necessary faculties (the intellect and the will) which enabled him to comprehend and implement God's own Will: "Adamus praeditus fuit ipsis facultatibus intellectus ac voluntatis quae et leges illas a Summo Legislatore conditas comprehendere, et comprehensas observare potuerunt". The effect of original sin was to impair man's faculties. But to say that Adam was not originally endowed by God with the proper means (i.e. intellect and will) to carry out His purpose, would be offensive to our conception of His infinite Goodness.

Now this is exactly the starting point of the Bref traité de la prédestination: "Non seulement la sapience du Créateur, qui requiert que toutes choses soient convenablement disposées", writes Amyraut, "mais sa bonté encore et l'amour qu'il porte à tout ce qui en tient et qui lui ressemble, l'aura conduit à avoir l'œil ouvert d'une façon singulière sur la pièce la plus précieuse de l'univers, pour la destiner à une fin qui surmonte d'autant la fin à laquelle chacune des choses est ordonnée, comme l'entendement et la volonté de l'homme surmontent toutes autres facultés".

Predestination is this special bond between God and His creature, whereby God from His Goodness and Wisdom has destined man to accomplish His purpose and has endowed him, to that end, with right reason and a good will. And as in the Theses de tribus foederibus, in the Bref traité de la prédestination, the effect of original sin is described in...
as an impairment of man's faculties: "Le premier effet du péché est de laisser de si épisses ténèbres en l'entende-
ment que désormais il ne puisse être éclairci que par une
lumière surnaturelle". ¹⁹ Both the Theses and the treatise
ultimately rest on this conception of human nature which is
the foundation of Amyraut's doctrine, and on its corollary
a definition of grace as a supernatural illumination. In
the Bref traité de la prédestination this last point is
made more explicit: the perfect state of communion between
God and man is said to be man's natural state; nature is
constantly changing and original sin therefore was itself
part of a natural process: "Si donc Dieu eût créé l'homme
tel qu'il eût été impossible qu'il péchât, il ne l'eût pas
mis en l'état de la nature, mais en une condition surnatu-
relle". ¹⁹ By themselves then, man's impaired faculties would
not be capable of regeneration. Only through a supernatural
act can they be restored: or as the Theses de tribus foeder-
ibus put it: "Homo autem peccator, si quam partem obedi-
tiae mandatis divinis praebat, id tamen habet non a
facultatibus naturalibus, sed a Spiritu Dei facultates illas
regenerante". ²⁰

From this conception of man's nature there follow
two corollaries of special importance for the doctrine of
predestination. The first one concerns the action of grace.
Grace, says Amyraut, acts by suddenly illuminating the
intellect, and through this illumination the intellect can-
not fail to grasp the truth of the Gospel. The action of grace therefore is irresistible: "la chose nous étant proposée de cette façon, et nos facultés intérieures étant si bien disposées par la grâce de Dieu, il est impossible que nous ne croyions, c'est à dire que nous ne recevions la lumière de cette vérité et que nous ne désirions ardemment d'être jouissant tant de la sainteté qu'elle communique de la félicité qu'elle présente". 21 The conversion of the sinner by grace can thus be conceived in two ways: in the sinner, it can be described as an ordinary action of the illuminated intellect upon the will; though it is also the extraordinary work of God; and once it has occurred it cannot be cancelled. Once converted, the elect cannot but persevere in their faith.

The second consequence concerns God's plan of salvation, which for Amyraut, can also be envisaged in two ways. First Adam, before the Fall, exemplifies God's design for mankind. God, therefore, cannot but wish to restore in all men this natural communion which original sin destroyed; God's plan of salvation, says Amyraut, could only be universal; "La misère de l'homme étant égale et universelle, et le désir que Dieu a eu de les en délivrer par le moyen d'un si grand Rédempteur, procédant de la compassion qu'il a eue d'eux comme de ses créatures tombées en une si grande ruine, puisqu'ils sont ses créatures également, la grâce de la rédemption qu'il leur a offerte, a dû être égale et univer-
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selle". At the same time election is a special case of salvation: God is free to dispense the necessary grace the way he chooses: "la chose dépend de ce que Dieu use de sa merci avec une liberté toute entière, et dont nous ne pouvons fonder autre cause que sa volonté". On the one hand, therefore, salvation exemplifies God's perfect Goodness, on the other, His perfect Freedom.

To sum up; Amyraut's method, in our view, is strikingly "existential": in this lies his originality. He does not attempt to explain the mysteries of faith as such, but only the sense they have for man. His hypotheses on God's nature and on His purpose are not arbitrary, in as much as they rest on an analysis of the situation of man. What Amyraut undertakes to explore is the significance of the relations between Creator and creature. Secondly, this existential enquiry is based on a rationalist conception of man. For Amyraut the predominant faculty is the intellect, which, given the proper supernatural conditions, is capable of grasping truth. Faith therefore is the determination of the will by the intellect, once it has received an illumination. In the last resort, the mysteries of dogma are beyond the reach of reason; but if dogma is also man's truth, then an attempt can be made to explicate it, and some approximate formulation can be given that will satisfy man's rationality. Finally this method leads Amyraut to distinguish
between two kinds of predestination. As he writes in the treatise, "Ce n'est pas qu'ordinairement on ne prenne ce mot de prédé-destination simplement pour celle qu'on regarde le salut et qu'on ne la tienne communément entre ceux qui sont bien enseignés par la Parole de Dieu et ne veulent point trop déferer à la volonté de l'homme pour être d'un évènement indubitable de la même façon que si c'était un décret absolu et qui ne dépendit de condition quelconque ... Mais la raison de cela est que la prédé-destination au salut étant conditionné et regardant tout le genre humain également, et le genre humain étant universellement corrompu par le péché et incapable d'accomplir cette condition dont le salut dépend, il arrive nécessairement, non par aucun vice de la prédé-destination en elle-même, mais par la dureté de l'obstination de l'esprit humain, que cette première prédé-destination est frustratoire pour ceux qui n'ont point de part en la seconde .... Et ainsi l'Ecriture Sainte même, comme si ce n'était qu'un même conseil en égard aux prédé-destinés la prédé-destination conditionnelle au salut, avec l'élection absolue à la foi; pour ce qu'en ce qui les concerne, bien que l'une soit conditionnelle, elle est pourtant aussi certaine comme si elle était absolue, à cause de la certitude infaillible et absolue de l'évènement de l'autre dont elle dépend."

We now understand why Amyraut's opponents gave the name of 'hypothetical universalism' to his method.
Amyraut's conceptions, as explained in the Theses de tribus foederibus and the Bref traité de la prédestination, immediately gave rise to strong objections which led to a discussion of his doctrine in the national synod of Alençon in 1637. Amyraut's major critic was Pierre Du Moulin, the champion of the older generation of French protestants and a professor of Theology at Sedan. He wrote an Examen of the doctrine of Amyraut and that of Testard, a pasteur at Blois, who had published a treatise entitled Εὐρημία κόσμον seu synopsis doctrinae de natura et de gratia which contains a doctrine in some ways similar to that of the Bref traité de la prédestination. The Examen, first circulated in manuscript, was eventually published by Courcelle, a French Arminian who lived in the Low-Countries. Du Moulin's objections (or 'controverses') presented in the Examen under seven headings, can be reduced to three major points. They are important for, due to the author's prestige, the debates that followed were based on Du Moulin's presentation of his opponent's doctrine rather than on Amyraut's true conceptions. What Du Moulin attempted to show was that Amyraut's innovations contradicted the doctrine embodied in the canons of Dort, or at least were a bad compromise between these and Arminianism. In so doing Du Moulin purposely or not, missed
the original aspects of Amyraut's treatise, which we have just emphasized, and immediately raised the question of his opponent's orthodoxy.

The first criticism made by Du Moulin is that by emphasizing the universality of God's plan of salvation, Amyraut has altered the order of God's decrees as they have been codified by the synod of Dort. Du Moulin argues that the most important decree is God's election of the few, and His reprobation of the others: "nous posons en premier lieu le décret par lequel de la masse du genre humain ... Dieu de pure grâce a choisi quelques-uns pour les délivrer de perdition ... laissant les autres à la corruption naturelle et malédiction qu'ils ont méritée.27 According to Du Moulin, the doctrine of a general predestination to salvation, on the condition of faith, is Arminianism in disguise. Furthermore, Amyraut's view of God's decrees entails a dangerous conception of God. Du Moulin's second set of objections concern this point: according to his critic, Amyraut conceives God as if His decrees were not eternal but had changed in the course of time. However, the synod of Dort's classification of God's decrees was in no way temporal: "cet ordre ne pose dès décrets de Dieu aucune postérité de Dieu"28 Amyraut's 'conditional' predestination leads to attribute 'second thoughts' to God and thus gives Him an anthropomorphic nature: "sur quoi M. Amyraut a des termes exquis, par lesquels il attribue à Dieu des désirs,
des envies, des regrets, des contraintes, dit que Dieu
sent autant que sa nature le peut souffrir, les mêmes
émotions qui nous agitent". According to Du Moulin, this
contradicts the Scripture and also reason. What Amyraut's
critic misses of course is the important methodological
distinction, used by Amyraut, between God as He is in Himself
and as such he cannot be the object of knowledge — and the
significance of God for man, which can be subjected to a
rational analysis.

The last category of objections concern mainly Amyraut's
view of Christ the Redeemer. Here again Du Moulin accuses
Amyraut of contradicting the canons of Dort: "Le Synode
de Dordrecht ...... nie que le conseil et intention de Dieu
en livrant son fils à la mort, ont été de sauver tous les
hommes également ... Les mots du Synode au chapitre 2,
canon 8, sont: "Fuit hoc Dei Patris liberrimum concilium
et gratiosissima voluntas atque intentio, ut mortis ejus
filii et salvia efficacia se exerceret in omnibus electis
ad eos solos fide [sic] donandos et per eam ad salutem
efficaciter perducendos". Amyraut, says Du Moulin, would
extend God's wish to save mankind, to include even those
who do not know the Gospel. According to Du Moulin, this
entails a contradiction: "Si Dieu désire de sauver tous les
hommes, il faut nécessairement qu'il donne à tous assez de
lumière et de grâce pour parvenir au salut".

On the whole, the formal logic of Du Moulin's criti-
forced into submission.

In the quarrel that followed, the entire Académie of Saumur was involved. In our view this involvement of the Académie is perhaps the most important aspect of the crisis: and D. Blondel, the first to write on the subject in his Actes authentiques, laid great emphasis on this point. On the contrary F. Laplanche, in his recently published book, Orthodoxie et prédication, concentrates more on individual reactions than on the involvement of the Académie in the quarrel. But as we have shown, Du Moulin's attack raised the question of ecclesiastical discipline. The Conseil had given its verbal approbation to the Bref traité de la prédestination. In Du Moulin's attack and in other hostile reactions which followed, the Conseil saw a threat to the entire Academy. As they put it when they nominated La Place to deputize to the forthcoming national synod:

"La Compagnie a donné charge à son député de remontrer très humblement au synode national .... le tort qu'on a fait au dit Sieur Amyaut, et en sa personne, non seulement à cette Académie, dans laquelle jusques à présent il a servi avec beaucoup de louanges et approbation, mais aussi à l'Église de Dieu ...." During the crisis, the academy acted as a united body, determined to maintain the right of the Conseil to judge of the orthodoxy of its members,
and to protect that measure of authority which they had acquired. Also as Blondel points out, neither Testard nor Amyrault lacked support from their churches: "Testard et Amyrault ne se sont point présentés au synode national comme cités, constitués in reatu, mais comme complaignants, assistés de leurs frères approbateurs, et implorant la protection de l'assemblée contre ceux qui s'étaient déclarés leurs parties".37

The first ecclesiastical bodies to take steps against Amyrault were the provincial synods of Saintonge and Poitou held in 1635. According to Amyrault's Defensio ad Chabrolium, the synods, alarmed by rumours about the Bref traité which was just published, sent to Saumur two deputies, Du Soule, from Lusignan, and Vincent from La Rochelle: "anno 1635 una cum Rever[endo] viro D[omin]o Solano in hanc urbem [Vincenti]us venit, et uterque, ut ipsis a Synodis Santon-iensis ac Pictaniensii mandatum erat, mecum de libro meo communicavit".38 Again, according to Amyrault, whose statement is corroborated by a letter written by Daillé to Du Soule,39 the two deputies requested him not to publish anything until the next national synod. Amyrault, in response to their request, asked them to certify his orthodoxy, thereby stopping rumours that were spreading on the purpose of the visit: "Convenit
inter nos ut communis aedificationis procurandae, et rumorem quos in Ecclesia et in academia nostra eorum adventus excitaverat, sedandorum causa, primum in ecclesiastico senatu, cui interessent ex ecclesia fidelium primarii, ex academia professores quidam et theologiae candidati, luculentum mihi testimonium perluberten". 40 The request was accepted and Amyraut presented one of his sermons, upon which he was congratulated by the two deputies. 41 Perhaps encouraged by this, and determined to continue his exposition of doctrine, Amyraut set to work on preparing an edition of his Sermons, despite a letter he received signed by both deputies and asking him to refrain from publishing. 42 He clearly saw that the authoritarian attitude of the synod jeopardized the intellectual independence of the academy, 43 and refused their request.

In the clash that followed, the Académie took a unanimous stand in favour of Amyraut. Foreseeing the opposition, Amyraut had mustered the support of the pasteurs of Charenton who knew and appreciated him. 44 As soon as his Sermons were published, early in 1636, he sent them a copy: he received a letter in answer, signed by all the pasteurs, in which they expressed their approval: "Domine ac plurimum honorande frater", they wrote, "Accepius sex conciones quas nobiscum communicare dignatus es, et post quam eas legimus, nobis vehementer satisfactum est,
quod in eis reperimus cum res ipsas, tum etiam loquendi rationes quibus exprimuntur, tales ut nihil nobis desit ad spem concipiendam fore ut Ecclesiae Dei ex illis omne genus aedificationis percipiat ...".

In his Defensio ad Chabrolium Amyraut quotes from several individual letters which he also received from his friends in Paris. Daille intervened on his behalf, by writing to Du Soule and calling for appeasement. He also sent letters to De Langle, a pasteur from Rouen, and to Rivet where he argued in favour of Amyraut's orthodoxy. Le Faucheur wrote to the pasteurs of Geneva, and Mestrezat to Du Moulin. Despite all these attempts, the provincial synod of Saintonge, held in May 1636, condemned Amyraut's doctrine and threatened to call back all 'proposants' from Saintonge who studied in Saumur and to withdraw the contributions from the province. The letter sent by the synod is lost, but Amyraut in his Defensio ad Chabrolium leaves us in no doubt about its tone and content: "Habita est synodus fratrum Santonum mense maio ... Scriptum est ad Senatum academicum Salmuriensem, verbis atrocibus et plenis cum expostulationum adversus Amyraldus tum severarum obnuntiationum, ni de rebus illis aequus cum piscibus sileret, et studiosos santones ex Academica revocatum iri et pensionem, quam Santonum provincia Academiae contribuebat, iri retenendum". The Conseil decided to come to the defence of their professor of theology and to make representations to the pasteurs of Saintonge.
By that date however the opposition to Amyraut and Saumur had gathered strength. Du Moulin's Examen was already being circulated, and A. Rivet, a theologian of the older generation who had emigrated to Holland) joined in by writing a critical discussion of Amyraut's treatise. In this work he appealed to the coming national synod and asked for an examination of all Amyraut's writings. Finally in April 1637 the pasteurs of Geneva, unconvinced by Le Faucheur's defense of Amyraut, sent letters to his opponents and to the national synod which was about to convene. The pasteurs approached the controversy from the point of view of authority. Without actually condemning Amyraut's doctrine, they expressed concern at what they considered a challenge to the established order. As the Registre de la vénérable Compagnie puts it: "l'origine du mal est que les bonnes vieilles choses ennuient". For the pasteurs of Geneva the case was closed. The churches had defined orthodoxy and they had the proper means to enforce it. To discuss doctrinal matters was to challenge ecclesiastical power. Furthermore the Vénérable Compagnie probably feared that the prominent role assumed by the Swiss churches in that field might be threatened by the new developments in Saumur. This appears from the letter by the Geneva pasteurs received while the synod of Alençon was in session. "Nous sommes extrêmement surpris," wrote the pasteurs, "et nos frères de Suisse sont aussi fort offensés de ce qu'on se sert du nom
de ces illustres docteurs de nos églises, pour défendre ces nouveautés". And they asked the synod to enforce discipline as strictly as necessary and to appoint a commissaire who would supervise the activities of the academies.

The stand taken by Du Moulin, the reactions from the provincial synods and the word of warning from Geneva leave no doubt on the intentions of the opponents of Saumur. They envisaged the coming national synod as "un petit Dordrecht": both Du Moulin and the Geneva pasteurs in fact specifically cited it as an example. This new synod of Dort would re-issue the canons and embody in them a formal condemnation of Amyraut's doctrine. The aim would be to obtain total submission or to take disciplinary action. The Conseil of the Académie was aware of this, prepared for the confrontation. First they tried to bring the synod of their province (Anjou) to approve Amyraut's doctrine. Even there, they failed: the provincial Synod which met early in May 1637 refused to vouch for Amyraut's orthodoxy. On hearing the views the Conseil reacted unanimously: "La Compagnie a jugé qu'il n'y avait rien d'écrits du Sieur Amyraut .... qui choque en aucune façon les fondements de la foi contenus dans l'Ecriture Sainte et la Confession de foi des églises réformées du royaume, et les articles du dit Synode de Dordrecht reçus par lesdites églises".

Having thus formally endorsed Amyraut's doctrine, they elaborated a long memorandum with precise instructions for La Place
who was to represent them at the national synod. The Council expressed two major directives. First, La Place was to defend Amyraut's doctrine: "Quant à ce qui concerne l'affaire de la prédestination et ses suites, M. de La Place représentera premièrement comment le Conseil a examiné cette affaire ... n'a rien observé dans la doctrine du dit sieur qui choque en aucune façon les fondements de la foi, soit en choses, soit en termes, mais même a jugé que la méthode qu'il a suivie est la plus propre pour éclaircir les saintes matières ...". La Place was instructed to act in the following fashion: "Il soutiendra l'approbation qui a été donnée à l'ouvrage de M. Amyraut par Messieurs ses collègues ..." The Academy was also intent on protecting its rights. Foreseeing that the coming synod would be something of an ecclesiastical court, it requested La Place to do his utmost to prevent any encroachment: "Il fera tout son possible pour soutenir le droit accordé aux académies par le dernier synode national touchant telles approbations, en cas que quelques-uns essayent de le rogner ... Il fera valoir les inconvénients que cela apporterait à ceux qui servent dans l'Académie ... joignant à cela que les académies ayant ordinairement plusieurs gens doctes, il n'est pas à craindre qu'il arrive quelque inconvénient de telles approbations qu'elles pourront donner." Finally, La Place was to try and obtain the condemnation of
various pamphlets against Amyraut (particularly anonymous ones circulating in Poitou).

The Conseil's fears were not without foundations. A manuscript account of the proceedings of the national synod (which met in Alençon in June 1637) shows that it was indeed conducted on similar lines as the synod of Dort. First, Basnage and De Langle, both friends of Du Moulin, endeavoured to keep Amyraut out of the debates until 8 June. Furthermore the synod decided to appoint five Commissaires to examine all writings relating to the case and to present their judgement on them: the synod had thus become an ecclesiastical court of justice. Then the battle of procedure started. Amyraut wanted to refute Du Moulin's objections and present his own case. The Du Moulin faction on the contrary wanted the synod to be free to examine Amyraut and Testard on whatever points they wished. On this occasion the 'conservatives' won: "il fut dit qu'il était en la liberté et la puissance de la Compagnie de les interroger et de leur demander éclaircissement généralement sur tout ce qu'ils avaient écrit..." The following day however thanks to De Launay, another secretary, Amyraut won a major procedural victory. The delegations sent by the individual churches included both pastors and elders; while the first were trained theologians, who could follow Amyraut's reasoning, the second were more likely to be influenced by appeals to
discipline and the prestige of Du Moulin, Rivet and Basnage. De Launay raised the point of whether both categories would be entitled to vote on the judgments rendered by the commissaires on Amyraut's doctrine. The Journal is particularly interesting on the debate that took place on this question. It reveals the true intentions of Amyraut's adversaries: "M. De Launay ... dit que la discipline et ensuite l'arrêt du synode de Montpellier (en 1598) voulait que les points de doctrine fussent jugés et décidés par les seuls pasteurs ... que de plus il importait ... que les anciens n'opinions pas, pour ce que si les dits jugements étaient autres que les accusés ne désireraient, ils pourraient s'efforcer de les affaiblir et de les invalider, disant qu'ils avaient passé par les voix des anciens qui d'ordinaire ne sont pas versés en ces questions les plus hautes et les plus rudes de la théologie ...." Despite Basnage's opposition, the synod decided not to give the right of vote to the elders, "À quoi Monsieur Basnage eut de la peine à acquiescer, alléguant qu’an synode de Dordrecht, les anciens y avaient opiné." The examination of the two theologians started on 18 June. They were asked to clarify their doctrine of the universal offer of redemption and on conditional decrees. The debate on these two points lasted until 22 June. On that day Amyraut was interrogated on the fundamental question of
God's Goodness: "Il fut interrogé sur ce qu'il avait dit que ce qui a mû Dieu à créer le monde, c'était l'exercice de sa bonté et [en] lui objecta le 4è v. du XVIème ch. des Prov[erbes] ... il s'expliqua fort bien sur le champ." 65

Seven new commissaires were then appointed to sum up the debates. Testard and, in particular, Amyraut, must have convinced a good number of their colleagues of their orthodoxy, for the new commissaires' mandate was to elaborate conciliatory recommendations which could be accepted both by the 'accused' and their adversaries. These recommendations were submitted to the synod and Amyraut on 3 July. Amyraut raised one major objection which concerned the proposed interdiction of any further discussion of controversial questions. In his statement Amyraut spoke not only for himself but also for Saumur: "le synode", he said, [en] défendant sous peine de déposition de traiter de ces choses, déclarait tacitement qu'il méritait d'être déposé". 66 He added that this made the teaching of theology an unrewarding and futile task, and offered his resignation. Finally a compromise was reached: [M. Amyraut] dit qu'il ne pouvait pas se départir d'une opinion qu'il tenait très véritable et orthodoxe et laquelle il était prêt de prouver telle. La Compagnie lui ayant répliqué qu'on lui laissait la liberté de sa créance sur ces choses et qu'on requérait seulement qu'il se tût en silence sur icelles, il acquiesça et fit la promesse qu'on désirait, avec mécontentement toute fois de se voir si
fort pressé ..... et pour fin, requit qu'on fit que les étrangers n'écrivissent point sur ces matières, pour ce qu'en ce cas, il ne pourrait pas se taire.⁶⁷

The decisions of the synod had two major consequences: As far as the doctrine of Amyraut is concerned, there is, all considered, very little criticism of importance in the final recommendation as recorded in the acts. Some of the phrases Amyraut had used were condemned as ill-advised or ambiguous. On the other hand he had been forced to elucidate his conceptions and give them the rigorous formulation which they did not possess in the Bref traité de la prédestination. In fact, the acts of Alençon provide us with the only systematic and concise exposition of his major points of doctrine. On grace, Amyraut clarified his distinction between the sufficiency and the efficaciousness of the death of Christ: "Jésus-Christ est mort pour tous les hommes suffisamment et pour les seuls élus efficacement, et (que) par conséquent il a voulu mourir pour tous les hommes au regard de la suffisance de sa satisfaction, et pour les seuls élus au regard de l'efficace vivifiante et salutaire d'icelle". The synod rejected the phrase "mort également pour tous les hommes" which was in any case a less precise formulation.⁶⁹ On God's decrees, Amyraut and Testard concisely defined predestination as "la volonté de Dieu révélée en sa parole de donner sa grâce et vie aux croyants".⁷⁰ They also clarified their notion of the
conditionality of the decrees: "ils ne l'ont appelé décret conditionnel que par anthropopathie, à cause que Dieu en a promis les effets que sous la condition de la foi et de la repentance."71 They insisted that this method of explaining God's will did not assume any temporality in God's nature: "cela ne pose en Dieu ni ignorance de l'événement, ni corruption en sa volonté, laquelle est toujours ferme et immuable en elle-même, conformément à la nature de Dieu."72 And Amyraut made clear what his purpose had been: "Ledit Sieur Amyraut a particulièrement professé qu'il n'a donné le nom de prédestination universelle et conditionnelle à cette volonté de Dieu que par une forme de concession, en s'accommodant au langage de l'adversaire, et néanmoins d'autant que plusieurs en ont été offensés, il s'est offert de la rayer dans les lieux de son écrit ou elle se rencontre."73 Finally that part of the acts which immediately follows the one that we have just quoted, contains the clearest definition given of the method applied by Amyraut and his disciples. For this reason, we shall quote it in full: "Et quant à ce qu'ils ont distingué divers décrets dans le conseil de Dieu, le premier de sauver par Jésus-Christ tous les hommes s'ils croient en lui, le second de donner la foi à quelques-uns, ils ont déclaré ne l'avoir fait que pour s'accomoder à la manière et à l'ordre que tient l'esprit humain ... croyant au reste que les décrets qu'ils considèrent comme divers, ont été formés en Dieu en les mêmes moments, sans aucune
succession de pensée, en ordre de priorité ou postériorité, la volonté de ce souverain et incompréhensible dessein n'étant qu'un seul acte éternel en lui, de façon que si nous pouvions concevoir les choses comme elles sont en lui de toute éternité, nous comprendrions les décrets par un seul acte de l'entendement, car ils ne sont en effet qu'un seul acte de son éternelle et immuable volonté."

Here we find an admirably concise and clear formulation of the crucial methodological distinction between temporality and causality already used by the theologians of Bremen at Dort; and also a clear statement of Amyraut's purpose: a rational examination of dogma, legitimated by the nature of man's understanding, and whose end was incidentally to make hypotheses on God's nature, but essentially to account for man's experience of faith and religious situation. Because it was inserted in the acts and thus widely publicized, this admirable statement must have helped more than anything else, perhaps, to give a wide audience to the new Saumur theology.

We must now assess the effect of the decisions of the synod of Alençon on the position of the Académie: if on doctrine the compromise reached was, all told, not unfavourable to the theologian of Saumur, from the point of view of the Académie, the outcome of the synod was—superficially at least—the reinforcement of ecclesiastical control. In fact the synod's decisions on this question are the only
ones which the *Conseil* transcribed in the *Registre*. As we have already pointed out, in the *Discipline des églises réformées de France*, article 14, relating to publications, did not institute any specific procedure for the sanctioning of books on doctrinal matters.75 The 1636 provincial synods, had requested the strict application of article 14. The 1637 national synod went further: it elaborated a formal procedure which would apply to all publications by members of the academies: "Le synode interdit de violer directement ou indirectement les règlements tant de ce synode que des précédents, pour l'impression des livres, du contenu desquels les approbateurs seront responsables à leurs provinces, aussi que les auteurs; enjoint à celles dans le ressort desquelles sont les académies d'en prendre un soin particulier, en les faisant visiter de temps en temps par personnes choisies pour cet effet, et obliger les professeurs tant en théologie qu'en philosophie d'envoyer de six mois en six mois aux examinateurs des livres des provinces voisines, un ou deux extraits des thèses qui auront été soutenues en public ...." For the first time mention was made of special *examinateurs* whose task would be to control the orthodoxy of publications. A tighter control was also instituted on the students. They would have to obtain a certificate of conduct from the *pasteurs* and the *consistoire* as well as from their teachers. On the other hand, some decisions were to the advantage of the academies, and of
Saumur in particular: for the synod forbade anybody to assume on his own, the role of a critic, or to write for or against a particular doctrine. If someone thought there was ground for complaint, he would first have to bring the unorthodox passages to the notice of the examinateurs and the authors, or to that of the ecclesiastical body to which the examinateurs belonged. Judgment could only be given by the appropriate provincial synod, but no other: "Le synode interdit d'abondance tant à l'église qu'à la province d'où sortira la plainte d'en prendre connaissance pour en juger .... ains la renvoyer selon la Discipline aux assemblées à la juridiction desquelles seront soumis celui ou ceux contre lesquels elle sera formée ...."76

This last clause provided a safeguard and the Académie lost no time in testing it. In 1638, a year after the synod, the Conseil decided to send a député to the provincial synod of Poitou to complain about pamphlets attacking Amyraut's writings, which had been published by two pasteurs from Poitou, Dartois and Bouquet.77 The Conseil won its case, as is shown by the report given by Cappel, and transcribed in the Registre, "le sieur Dartois présent au synode y a été confirmé d'avoir écrit et publié son livre intitulé Clavis mysterii praedestinationis ..... [et enjoint] d'en retirer tous les exemplaires ...."78

Thus the Académie had survived the first confrontation; and Amyraut felt free to devote the following years to his
teaching and to writing new books. He wrote several pamphlets against La Milletière who under Richelieu’s patronage was trying to reconcile the Reformés with the Catholic church. And in 1641 he published his Doctrinae Calvini defensio in which he answered the objections of an anonymous Arminian pamphlet against Calvin. In all these books he followed the same method and used the same arguments, albeit in a simplified form, as in the treatise on predestination. Rivet approved of the Doctrinae Calvini defensio and sent a congratulatory letter to Amyraut:

"Calvinum solide defendidisti; doctrinam de gratia speciali, de ejus efficacia invicta et de finali perseverantia ita fundasti, ut omnes orthodoxi nunc debeant agnoscere te esse longe dissitum atque remotum ab illis rebus quibus novatores hasce regiones i.e. the Low-Countries turbarunt ...." La Milletière and the anonymous Arminian had offered Amyraut an excellent occasion to demonstrate again his doctrinal orthodoxy. Assured of Rivet’s approbation and safeguarded by the new procedure established by the synod of Alençon, Amyraut and his Académie appeared to have overcome all opposition.

The Académie and the provinces

The period of appeasement did not last long; because of the opposition of the pasteurs from the neighbouring provinces
of Poitou and Saintonge, a new and complex crisis developed in 1643 and lasted until the **Acte de Thouars** in 1649. Documents on this new confrontation are scarce: the acts of the provincial synods are seemingly lost, and if the correspondence of the **pasteurs** from La Rochelle\(^\text{82}\) throws some light on the attitude of some of those involved, the more important evidence comes from printed sources, usually pamphlets, written in a \(\text{p\breve{o}lemical}\) vein, and often difficult to trace. In this section we shall mainly rely for our information on two of these pamphlets: both are brief histories of the crisis, written by the two major protagonists, Amyraut and Philippe Vincent, the **pasteur** from La Rochelle; and both are dedicated to Jean Chabrol who was pasteur of Thouars. The first one, the **Epistola historica et apologetica** \(^\text{83}\)... was written by Vincent and published in 1648; the second is Amyraut's **Defensio ad Chabrolium** already quoted, which constitutes a reply to Vincent. Because he overlooked these pamphlets, F. Laplance in *Orthodoxie et Prédication*, has laid too much emphasis, in our view, on the role played by Spanheim's writings against hypothetical universalism. Yet Spanheim himself, in a letter to the **pasteur** Paul Berry, quoted by Laplance, admits that he had not sought to be involved in a new controversy: "J'avoue avoir été tiré en cette contention très innocemment et à regret", he wrote. "J'ai cette satisfaction que ma conscience ne me reproche pas d'avoir cherché querelle. J'espère que vous le reconnaîtrez
par l'Apologete que j'en ai dressée". There is no reason to doubt his word: His Theses, which appeared in 1644, were an academic discussion of the question of grace by his students at Leyden, did not specifically mention Amyraut. Blondel is quite clear on this point. If Amyraut decided to answer them, it is because he feared that works published abroad, and taking a different view from his, might be used as a pretext for further action against the Académie and himself: as we have seen, Amyraut's opponents had already adopted these tactics during the predestination controversy.

The second crisis therefore has different roots: its main cause in fact, is the opposition of the provincial synods to Saumur. We already know that the churches of Poitou and Saintonge had been the first to criticize Amyraut's work on predestination (see supra p.49). They were also responsible for the new quarrel. In 1643 the provincial synod of Poitou met at Saint-Maixent. Three young proposants who had studied in Saumur and had been offered ministries in the province, came to the synod to be examined. The Synod asked them to clarify their view on predestination, and rejected them as unorthodox. The incident is recorded in the Registre for 20 July, 1643:

"Le Sieur d'Huisseau représenté au long à la compagnie ce qui s'est passé au sujet de l'affaire des trois proposants de cette Académie ..... et le sujet pourquoi ils ont été refusé ... The Conseil realised the effect of the synod's decision: it
created a precedent which, if followed by other provinces, would lead to the closing of the Académie. The discussion of the incident which is recorded in the Registre shows how concerned the Conseil was: "l'a même ont été ouïs ... chacun des trois proposants sur ce qui regarde leur renvoi ... Sur quoi la compagnie considérant que cette affaire et procédure du synode de Poitou regarde non seulement le cas particulier de ces jeunes gens, mais aussi tout le corps des proposants qui sont en cette académie et particulièrement les personnes des professeurs en théologie qui y enseignent, comme s'ils mettaient en avant fausse et mauvaise doctrine ..... et généralement toute l'école, qui par cette procédure est taxée et décriée et qui serait peut-être désertée et abandonnée, s'il n'y était promptement remédié .... à cette cause il a été avisé et résolu 1) que ces jeunes gens en leur particulier et tous les proposants en général, à la fin de la prochaine proposition seront exhortés et encouragés pour ne/ se point rebouter de cet accident, ainsi continuer et poursuivre courageusement leurs études en cette académie, avec assurance et espérance que cet exemple de la province de Poitou n'est pas pour être suivi et que le prochain synode national donnera ordre que cette chose n'arrivera plus ci-après; 2) qu'il sera écrit aux professeurs en théologie de Genève et de Montauban pour avoir leur avis et leur sentiment de l'écrit ci-devant imprimé par M. Amyraut De absoluto reprobationis decreto ...."88 Surprisingly F. Laplanche in Orthodoxie et prédication (p.172) fails to see
La Rochelle, the town where he was pastor had long embodied the fighting spirit of the huguenots. The last political venture of the Réformés had taken place in that town in 1626; during the siege, its inhabitants had shown the remarkable endurance, mixed with religious fanaticism, thanks to which the Réformés had managed to obtain many political concessions, at the end of the previous century. Vincent had taken a very active part in the siege, and had negotiated an honorable capitulation. Amyrault on the contrary embodied new aims and a new spirit. Politically he advocated loyalty to the monarchy; as his Apologie pour ceux de la religion showed, he was critical of rebellion of La Rochelle and emphasized the necessity for co-operation. Vincent viewed the Apologie as offensive to the founders and older defenders of the reformed faith in France: "quod genus istud est Apologiae ....? Qua re fretus homo, si tot et tantis viris aequiparetur, inglorius, ausus est talium busta et ceneres movere, et insurgere in tot heroes et magnanimos principes...?" For Vincent, Amyrault's task was to instill into the youth the spirit of their fathers, not to criticize or launch into vain speculations: "Exhortus est tandem ex ipsorum cineribus, non ulterior, sed accusator qui, quasi anteeat ipsis sapientia, et melius norit quae congruent necne cum Evangelio Domini Jesu, contra ipsos pronunciat, quam prudentiore consilio regnasset in sua aula et continuisset se intra scholae pulpita ipse, inquam, prae eis homo parum aestimandus ........?" It is clear from the invectives
the connection between these two decisions. This passage from
the Registre however confirms our own interpretation of the
new crisis. There was considerable tension between Saumur and
the churches of the neighbouring provinces, and any publication
by professors of the Académie could be used as a pretext by the
provinces to deal a deadly blow to Saumur. Fortunately
Amyraut had already received Rivet's approbation for the
incriminated book. We learn from the Defensio ad Chabrolium
that he had also written a letter to several other theologians
and that being aware of where the conflict was likely to
start again, he had sent a copy to Vincent, the pasteur from
La Rochelle. In this letter he must have emphasized once more
the orthodoxy of his method. For Vincent in his reply, made
an allusion to the subject: "perspicio" he wrote, "... et
te et relinquos fratres, qui hanc viam sequimini, firmiter
fundamentum retinere et excellenter pugnare tam adversus
veteres quam novos inimicos gratiae quales sunt Arminius atque
alii, adeo ut si qui sint qui tibi contrarium imputent,
indignissime te calumniare videantur ...". Amyraut himself
in the passage of the Defensio ad Chabrolium, where he records
the event, informs us that the rising hostility in the provinces
was the true cause of his intervention: "quo factum Sammaxentiense,
turbas quae paulatim considebant, denuo concitaret Vincentius.7
Id factum, cum nobis occasionem praebuisset literas ad varios
missitandi, earum exemplar unum ad auctorem nostrum (i.e. Vincent)
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per ferendum cura vi . . ." 91 Throughout this second crisis the adversaries of Saumur from Poitou and Saintonge adopted the same tactics: they tried to obtain a condemnation of Amyraut's or La Place's new writings in order to bring to heel the Académie.

There are various reasons which explain this hostility of the provincial synods. First there was undoubtedly a personal animosity between Amyraut and his leading opponents, Champverson and Vincent, from La Rochelle. The Epistola historica and the Defensio ad Chabrolium contain a number of arguments ad hominem. Amyraut repeatedly accuses Vincent of a sinister double jeu. 92 The pasteurs from La Rochelle saw Amyraut as pursuing his own glory even at the cost of creating dissension among the French churches. The portrait given of Amyraut in the last pages of Epistola historica is anything but flattering: "Ipsum Deum obnixe rogo", he wrote "velit fratri in melius mutare et ipsi condonare quae peccavit contra ipsius ecclesiam pacem ejus turbando; contra puram nostram doctrinam, nova sua placita obtruingo; contra charitatem tot insignes Dei servos impetendo et prosidendo .. contra gravitatem et modestiam per tot scommata, dictoria, sarcasmos .... etc" 93

There was more to this confrontation than mere personal antagonism. The theologians of Saumur and the pasteurs from La Rochelle belonged to different generations. By his milieu and his background, if not by his age (for he was born in 1600) Vincent was steeped in an older more militant tradition.
of this passage, that the conflict between Saumur and the pasteurs from Poitou or Saintonge was also a clash of generations.

Finally we must not underestimate the part played by financial and economic considerations. As Vincent said in a letter to De Bouilly, a protestant nobleman from Saumur, which he wrote in 1647, at the height of the quarrel: "nous n'estimons pas justé de les [i.e. the students] confier à un professeur qui malgré nous, combien que stipendié de nous, leur donne une traditive de théologie que nous ne pouvons pas approuver. De plus nous en craignons encore plus la faction que le fond même des dogmes." 97

In fact it appears that both the provinces of Poitou and Saintonge owed money to Saumur: The funds used by the academies came from two sources: a small portion came from their share of the King's allocation to the Reformed churches; 98 but the greater part came from the contributions of the provinces who pledged to pay a certain sum of money to the academies they supported. At the time of the synod of Alençon, both provinces already owed large sums to Saumur. 99 In 1637, according to the accounts transcribed in the Papier de recette des deniers de l'Académie 100 the province of Poitou owed 1,624 livres and that of Saintonge 265 livres to Saumur. The situation did not improve in the following years. In the 1644 Synod of Charenton, 4,130 livres were
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allocated to Saumur per year; on this total, the province of Poitou was to pay 975 *livres*, and the province of Saintonge 575 *livres*.\(^1\) Constantly from that date Saumur deputized to the provincial synods of Poitou and Saintonge to obtain payment both of the yearly contribution and of the sums owed. Amyraut in his *Defensio ad Chabrolium* informs us that he went to the synod of Saintonge held in Archiac in June 1646 specially for that purpose. However he had no sooner raised the matter than Champvernon, another *pasteur* from La Rochelle, challenged him on his orthodoxy, using as a pretext theses which had been submitted recently in the *Académie*.\(^2\) When called to the Synod, Amyraut made it plain that he considered this treatment as a way to bring the downfall of his *Académie*: "Amyraldus / Oratione itineris sui rationes exposuit, ductas ex extrema necessitudine in quantum Academia versabatur ob vetera nomina non solutum a nonnullis provinciis pensionum. Concessum demississime rogavit ut rem illam pro virili parte curaret et Scholae ruinam impedere eniteretur ...."\(^3\) He had reason to be concerned. In 1644, already, as it appears from the *Papier de recette des deniers de l'Académie*, the province of Saintonge had not paid the sums owed since Alençon\(^4\) and in 1646 the total sum paid by the province amounted to 400 *livres*, less than half the yearly contribution.\(^5\) As for the contributions of the province of Poitou, Saumur was in an even less
favourable position, According to a report by d'Huisseau
transcribed in Papier de recette des deniers de l'Academie;
"Le 20 juillet 1643 M. d'Huisseau a rapporté du synode de
Saint-Maixent de la province ¼ la somme de douze cent sept livres
qui lui ont été baillées là, sur lesquelles il y a eu déchet
et taxe de trois livres quinze sols sur le change de l'argent
en or et quelque pièce d'argent qui s'est trouvée fausse.
Cy reste du: 1,203 livres, 5 sols." ¹⁰⁶ The contributions of
Poitou for the years 1645 and 1696 only reached 1,004 and
1,023 livres respectively,¹⁰⁷ barely above the regular level
and not enough to refund a substantial portion of the debt.
In this circumstances, as the incidents of Saint-Maixent and
Archiac show, it is difficult to decide whether the two pro-
vinces in this second crisis were genuinely concerned with
problems of doctrine.

The first hostilities began in December 1644 during
the national synod of Charenton. Amyraut had read Spanheim's
theses which had been brought to his notice by Saumaise.¹⁰⁸
Although Spanheim's criticisms were directed against the
theologians from Bremen, Amyraut also saw in them a question-
ing of his doctrine. He wrote a refutation of Spanheim
entitled Doctrina de gratia universali ut ab orthodoxis
explicatur defensio. Spanheim's objections in the theses,
were put in syllogistic form, each proposition being
demonstrated logically and with the help of quotations
from the Scripture.¹⁰⁹ In his answer Amyraut refuted each
of Spanheim's points both by rational and scriptural arguments. His dissertation is clear and concise but does not put forward any point which had not already been discussed in the Theses de tribus foederibus or in the Bref traité. By publishing his answer, however, Amyraut would have created the pretext that the provinces were looking for, and laid himself open to the accusation of infringing the ban on publications dealing with delicate doctrinal topics.

Printing of the dissertation had already started. Amyraut acted cautiously: he brought a few advanced copies of the book which contained it, to the national synod of Charenton which met in December 1644. There Amyraut submitted these copies to Rivet and a few friends on the understanding they would not communicate the book to others. He then asked the synod to be allowed to publish his answer. This was granted to him on condition that he would first ask permission from his own provincial synod (that of Anjou, Touraine and Le Maine). There is evidence that some copies fell into the hands of Amyraut's opponents: Rivet mentions the fact in a letter to the theologian of Saumur. In the Defensio ad Chabrolium Amyraut claims these copies were even put up for sale in order to substantiate the accusation of a breach of discipline. There is no doubt that the pasteurs of Poitou were the culprits for they were the ones to make that accusation during the synod. Furthermore they reiterated the charge during their provincial synod which was convened a few months after in
June 1645, and elected a député who was to appear before the next synod of Anjou, Amyraut's province, and to make representations on this point. 115 Despite these attempts, the synod of Anjou supported Amyraut and gave him the required authorization: "Le Sieur Amyraut .... a remontré que par le synode national de Charenton dernier il avait été arrêté que si quelques écrits publics venaient de dehors le royaume par lesquels sa doctrine fût rendue suspecte ou sa réputation flétrie, il demanderait permission au synode d'y faire réponse et défendre sa doctrine et réputation, et étant notoire que le Sieur Spanheim a composé de gros livres impugnant sa doctrine, demande qu'il lui soit donc permis de se défendre .... 1a Compagnie, vu l'arrêté du dit synode national, et que les livres du dit Sieur Spanheim se voient dans les boutiques des libraires, a permis au Sieur Amyraut de se défendre ...." 116 Amyraut thus encouraged, allowed the sale of his Dissertationes quatuor. Then on receiving the new and lengthy volume where Spanheim reprinted his own theses, together with a long word-for-word refutation of Amyraut's dissertation, 117 he wrote two new defenses - his Fidei Mosis Amyraldi and the Specimen animadversionum. 118 The content of these two books is of little interest: in fact they show that by that date Amyraut had nothing new to say on the question. However, they mark a turning point in the confrontation between the Académie and its neighbouring provinces: Amyraut and the Conseil now knew how to protect themselves against
their accusators: the procedure for the approbation of books had turned to the disadvantage of the pasteurs of Poitou who remained helpless. In fact in 1647 the Conseil felt strong enough to send them a warning through the synod of Anjou: "Sont priés les dits députés [de l'Académie] de requérir le synode [d'Anjou] de la part de cette compagnie de vouloir charger bien expressément son député au prochain synode du Poitou, d'y solliciter avec toute affection ... le paiement des grands arrérages que la dite province de Poitou doit à cette Académie, et d'y faire plainte de ce [que] ... ceux qui y enseignent sont, par gens mal appris, chargés et taxés d'hérésie et hétérodoxie ... [et] d'y témoigner avec vigueur, qu'elle se sent obligée de se défendre et protéger contre tels faux et calomnies, n'ayant rien reconnu en elle à raison de quoi elle doive être ainsi diffamée ... "

The difficulties with the pasteurs of Saintonge lasted longer: As we have seen, Amyraut had gone to the provincial synod of Archiac in 1646 to ask for payment of the sum owed by Saintonge to Saumur. When the synod met on the 6th July with Vincent as Moderator and Champvernon as his assessor, Amyraut formally presented his request. The answer of the Moderator, according to Amyraut was quite abrupt: The synod was not satisfied with the doctrine taught at Saumur: "Moderator ei dixit, sibi datum esse negotium a concessu ut propensam ipsius in bonum Academiae voluntatem declararet ..."
at non posse se dissimulare quin praecipua causa retardatae
solutionis residuarum pensionum in eo consisteret quod
affectus ecclesiariarum refrixerat, ideo quia cum superioribus
temporibus nonnullae contentiones exortae essent, super
rebus quibusdam quas professores theologiae salmurienses
docebant," and Vincent added: "Neminem esse e studiosis
theologiae qui non esset ejusmodi dogmatibus imbutus
eamque ordinariam esse materiam tum publicarum actionum, tum
privatorum colloquiorum ...."120

The synod then turned its attention to the theses De
Spiritu Servitutis 121 which had been read publicly in Saumur
a few months before, by one of Amyraut's students Jacob
Papin. Papin's father, a pasteur, had asked Champvernnon for
his judgment of them. In his reply Champvernnon accused
Amyraut of a breach of discipline, and of heterodoxy.122
Amyraut complained of these accusations to the synod and
offered to answer them. The synod refused and asked
Amyraut to promise not to publish anything more, as he
had been requested during the synod of Alençon. As the
Defensio ad Chabrolium clearly showed, the province of Saintonge
was looking for a pretext to antagonize Amyraut.123 The outcome
of the synod in fact was that the province decided it would
refer the case of the theses to the next national synod.124

There is no doubt that a storm was brewing: The Apologie
pour ceux de la religion125 which appeared in 1647, made matters
worse. It contained some criticisms of La Rochelle, which the
province of Saintonge could not accept. The pasteurs prepared
a new provincial synod to be held in Thouars
with a view of sanctioning Amyraut severely. The intervention of Henri Charles de la Tremouille, Duke of Thouars and Prince of Tarente, restored peace. He offered his mediation and brought peace between Amyraut, Vincent and Champverson. As Blondel informs us, La Tremouille elaborated an act of reconciliation, in which the pasteurs of Saintonge promised not to question again Saumur's orthodoxy and discipline. Thus the intervention of a secular authority sealed the compromise elaborated 12 years before at Alençon: "Le dit Sieur Amyraut a promis de se tenir toujours aux arrêts et déclarations des synodes nationaux ponctuellement et de disputer, de vive voix, ou par écrit, des matières contestées entre eux [i.e. Amyraut and Vincent]; et de moyennier en tant qu'en lui sera, envers ses collèges qu'ils garderont le même ordre. Pareillement les dits sieurs de Champverson et Vincent ont promis de ne point envier ni disputer de ces matières et même de s'employer dans la province de Saintonge à procurer la paix et à ce qu'elle ne porte aucune plainte au synode national contre le dit sieur Amyraut ...."¹²⁷

It would be wrong to view the Acte de Thouars as putting an end to the doctrinal controversy. As we have shown this second crisis out of which the Academy emerged on a much more secure position, had not raised any new doctrinal question: what the provinces of Poitou and Saintonge had tried was to assume control over Saumur and its teachers: what the Académie achieved was the practical enforcement of the compromise.
which had been spelt out at Alençon. Because he failed to see the period in this light F. Laplanche wrongly attributes Amyraut's apparent lack of interest in his subject after Thouars, to his failing health and the desire to avoid a new confrontation with the synods. The real explanation in our view lies elsewhere: Amyraut had no more to say on doctrine. As we have seen, by the year 1640, he had stated his views, discussed them and successfully defended them. His Académie had survived two crises, and was in a much stronger position locally and nationally. During the period just studied, one of Amyraut's major preoccupations had been to defend his right to teach what he considered the true doctrine. Having succeeded, he turned his attention to his teaching and to his other academic duties. It was La Place in fact, and not Amyraut, who gave to the doctrine of Saumur its last original development.

La Place's doctrine on original sin.

The first mention made of La Place's doctrine of original sin is found in the acts of the 1644 national synod of Charenton: "Rapport ayant été fait au synode de certains écrits imprimés et manuscrits par lesquels toute la nature du péché originel est constituée en la seule résidant ordinairement en tous les hommes l'imputation du premier péché d'Adam est niée, La Compagnie condamne la dite doctrine en tant
qu'elle restreint la nature du péché en la seule corruption heréditaire de la postérité d'Adam, à l'exclusion de l'imputation du premier péché par lequel il est tombé." 129 The synod also decided that all future pasteurs would be required to sign a form condemning this doctrine. Amyraut in the Defensio ad Chabrolium, says that it was Vincent who brought the doctrine to the attention of the synod; according to Amyraut, Vincent was already trying to stir up trouble against the Académie: "meditabatur (tamen) eodem illo temporis articulo ingens vulnus quod ejus cum aliis opera huic Academiae in negotio de imputatione peccati Adae impositum esse putatur, nec in eo inferendo quisquam fuit eo acrior, aut magis obstinatus." 130

In its decision, the synod did not name the 'writings' which were so condemned. However, there exists an anonymous account of the doctrinal controversy which followed Charenton. This Disputatio, as we shall call it, gives us the following information: "de primi peccati, quo lapsus est, imputatione, nullum ante synodum illam nationalem scriptum a Placeo prodierat, praeter Theses de statu hominis lapsi ante gratiam, disputatas publice mense febr. an. 1640." 131 It was therefore on these published five years before Charenton, that La Place was condemned. 132

The Disputatio also provides us with valuable information on the development of the controversy after Charenton: we learn that Garissolle, a professor of theology at Montauban wrote a refutation of La Place's theses in two parts. The
first one written before Charenton was answered not by La Place but by a friend of his. According to the Disputatio, this first answer or 'manuscriptum prius' was lost. After the synod of Charenton, La Place received the second part of Garissolle's objections, which he sent back with his comments. This constitutes what the Disputatio calls 'manuscriptum posteriorius'. Garissolle sent the 'manuscriptum posteriorius' back to La Place with marginal comments. La Place wrote a new answer. The 1655 Disputatio therefore consists both of an account of the controversy (the 'disputatio' proper, written by someone else than La Place) and La Place's Examen, which contains La Place's 'manuscriptum posteriorius' together with Garissolle's objections and La Place's new answers. For our account of the last controversy around the theology of Saumur we shall rely on this only source which has hitherto been unnoticed.

The doctrine of the imputation of original sin to Adam's posterity is fundamental to the Christian faith. The points of diversity between various theologians during the Middle Ages and between the Catholic church and the reformers did not relate to the fact of imputation: all theologians accepted the doctrine that mankind suffers penal evils on account of Adam's sin. Where they disagreed was either on the grounds of this imputation or on its consequences. The doctrine generally adopted by the Protestant churches was the following one: by virtue of the union (natural and federal, to use Amyraut's own distinction)
between Adam and his posterity, sin is the ground on which the penalty threatened against mankind also directly concerns all his descendants; and his guilt is their guilt. The early reformers although they emphasized the pollution of human nature that resulted from this imputation, insisted that all men directly participate in Adam's guilt. Without entering into a detailed discussion of the differences of interpretation both in the Catholic church and among the early reformers, we can say that, at the time when La Place published his theses, all reformed theologians adhered to the doctrine of a direct or immediate imputation of original sin. 

In the Theses de statu hominis lapsi, the doctrine of immediate imputation is never discussed as such. What La Place is analysing is the state of man before grace regenerates him: Elaborating on Amyraut's doctrine as presented in the Theses de tribus foederibus divinis and in the Bref traité de la prédestination he states that the effects of original sin in all men are a mutation and depravation of man's moral faculties: "Sequuta est igitur lapsum universalis omnium facultatum moralium mutatio et depravatio, mentis practicae ignorantìa pravae dispositionis circa summum bonum; voluntatis aversio a vero fine seu summo bono, tanquam sibi malo, et conversio ad creaturas sensibiles tanquam ad summum suum bonum; appetitus extra limites a natura positos evagatio infinita". According to La Place, these however are the consequences of
original sin, and therefore man's natural condition; but Adam before the Fall was endowed with all the right faculties; the true punishment that God inflicted on Adam and therefore on mankind, was death: "Hujus peccati te λος esse mortem, quae peccati stipendium dicitur et vitae aeternae opponitur."\textsuperscript{138} The corruption of man's faculty is only the effect\textsuperscript{139} of original sin, and we are only mediate involved in Adam’s guilt, through our sharing his moral make-up after the Fall. Men sin but when sinning, they do not directly re-enact Adam's original infringement of God’s orders. To say otherwise would be contrary to Scripture, right reason and our notion of God’s Justice: "Si igitur malum illud necesse est, aut ipsa actualis inobedentia Adami, quae nobis imputetur, aut vitium ex illa natum. Prius (nisi hoc sensu, quod ob peccatum, nobis ab origine inhaerens digni sumus, qui eodem loco habeamus ac si inobedentiam illam admissemus,) non potest colligi ex Sacris Litteris ... nec etiam congruit cum recta ratione ... si Adami inobedientiae nobis imputatur, debuisset etiam imputari ejus obedientia, si perstississet in integritate ... si peccavit (Adamus) ut caput generis humani, cur non etiam puniri eodem nom?\textsuperscript{140}

Thus La Place can describe the mediate imputation of Adam's original sin as only a peccati contagio.\textsuperscript{141} And the theologian of Saumur draws the analogy between the way this 'contagion' affects all of man's faculties, and the way a disease spreads through the human body.\textsuperscript{142}

La Place’s main concern in the Theses was to continue the rational examination of dogma.
where Amyraut had left it; Amyraut as we have shown had been concerned with the regenerating effects of grace on Man's faculties. La Place in his *Theses* is more interested in discussing the meaning of sin in psychological and moral terms. His theory of human nature is more developed than that of Amyraut, and his analysis of man's depravity is an important addition to the doctrine of his colleague. He reveals more clearly the *moralistic* approach which is common to both.

Finally, he shares the conviction with Amyraut that the mysteries of faith, as revealed in the Scripture cannot but conform with the conception of God which man can form through the right exercise of reason. In La Place however, the appeal to the 'reasonableness' of dogma is more explicit. In his answer to Garissolle's objections in the *Examen*, the use he makes of rational criteria is expressed in a remarkably cogent form: "Denique cum Deus nihil faciat nisi sapientissime et justissime et optime, si ejus modi imputati aut justitiae, aut sapientae, aut bonitati repugnare videatur, quominus tribuatur Deo, pia refugit conscientia, nec potest id a se impetrare, nisi, vel toMatur illa repugnantia, vel disertis Scripturae testimoniiis, quae profecto nulla sunt, ad eam credendam aliquo modo cogatur. Quaecumque enim docentur in sacrís litteris, ea mihi egregie concordare cum recta ratione videntur, ubique divinae virtutes conspicuæ sunt. Quis ergo credat in actione divina tanti momenti, unde omnium hominum pendet condemnatio, et mortis Christi necessitas, ..."
La Place's reactions to the condemnation of the doctrine of non-imputation by the national synod were mixed. He understood that the decision of the synod could bring new difficulties to the Académie: His Theses, as his anonymous supporter remarks in the Disputatio, had been submitted five years before the synod, and at the time had not raised any comment. The motives of those who had inspired the decision of the national synod were not purely doctrinal. As the Conseil put it: "La compagnie considérant combien la condamnation de la doctrine qui nie l'imputation du péché d'Adam peut apporter de préjudice non seulement à l'édification publique, mais aussi à la réputation de cette académie, et décourager ceux qui étudient en théologie a unanimement été d'avis de n'abandonner pas cette affaire." It was however more prudent not to involve the Académie in a new quarrel: "néanmoins pour de bonnes raisons [la Compagnie] n'a pas estimé expédient de l'entreprendre en son nom, mais a jugé qu'il était du devoir du Sieur de La Place de se transporter à Thouars dans le synode du Poitou ... [pour] y faire les remonstrances convenables ... Encore que la compagnie remette à un autre temps à se déclarer pour l'affaire de la non-imputation du péché d'Adam, néanmoins elle remet à la prudence des dits sieurs Cappel et Amyrault, si le cas le
requiert, de parler en faveur du dit de La Place et de la non-imputation, comme de la part et au nom de cette compagnie." 146

La Place therefore decided not to answer his critics publicly. In the years that followed, three books were written against (directly or indirectly) the doctrine of non-imputation: in 1646 A. Rivet published his Decretae synodi nationalis Carentone habita anno 1644, which is merely a collection of extracts from various docteurs réformés who had written on the subject. La Place saw no point in answering it. 147 The same year Samuel Des Marets devoted a few pages of his Theologiae elenchticae nova synopsis to La Place's theses. 148 But the major attack came from Garissolle in two separate refutations. As we have seen, La Place received a manuscript copy of these and sent a manuscript answer to the author, but this piece and the subsequent remarks he added to Garissolle's objections, were not printed until 1655. His purpose in remaining silent was not simply to protect Saumur. Quite rightly he felt that his doctrine had been misunderstood, and that by clarifying it privately to his major and most influential critic, he would be able to obtain a reversal of the Charenton decision. But first, in 1646, he took his case to the provincial synod of Anjou, and obtained the support of the pasteurs of Saumur's province: "la compagnie [i.e. the synod] considérant l'importance de la matière et la condition de la personne du dit Sieur de
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La Place, arrête que les députés de cette province au dit synode national [prochain] assisteront le sieur de La Place et avec lui demanderont que la matière contenue au dit article soit revue et repassée.

La Place then set out to answer Garissolle's objections. The sum of the dispute, says La Place in his *Examen*, is whether Adam's actual act of disobedience and not simply the corruption of human nature that followed it, is imputed to mankind: "Est igitur quaestio inter nos instituta duntaxat de primo peccato Adami sumpto primo modo, hoc est, de actuali ejus inobedentia, de actione illa interna et externa qua Dei hægem transgressus est actu, præcisa ab habituali corruptione quae actionem illam sequuta est: num ea nobis nascentibus imputetur?" La Place's central argument is that we can only understand this problem, and therefore answer it, by distinguishing between Adam's actual act, and the universal situation of man: Adam and only Adam disobeyed God's commandment; his Fall however is our fall. One could therefore distinguish two kinds of imputation, one antecedent (or immediate), the other consequent (or mediate). The first one according to which mankind shares in Adam's actual act, is the one which La Place dismisses: "Immediatam voco eam quam solam thesibus quas tuas refutandas tibi sumpsisti negare volui, qua putatur actio illa Adami, hoc est vetiti fructus manducatio ejus posteris omnibus (Christo excepto), proxime, immediate, hoc ipso quod filii
sunt Adami, imputari .... Hanc solam imputationem actionis illius ego negavi, quia non decetur in sacris literis aequa fidei nostrae norma, quia pugnat cum sacris literis, quia Deum facit authorem peccati, quia Dei justitiam dehonestat .... quia nonnulla trahit secum absurda."151 And later in the Examen La Place elucidates his view on mediate imputation. He says that we are only involved in Adam's sin in as much as our nature is inherently depraved: "Hujus enim corruptionis propagationem in omnes posteros soli naturae vitiosae ascribo ex qua nihil protest gigni nisi vitiosum."152 Original sin therefore does not affect us as an historical event but ontologically, as the sign of man's transition from his perfect essence to his corrupt nature.

Our analysis must inevitably leave aside the numerous and varied arguments which La Place uses to substantiate his interpretation. Nevertheless one point must be made clear: La Place was not defending his orthodoxy, tailoring, so to speak, his doctrine to accommodate his opponent. He was elucidating, in his own terms, one aspect of dogma which he thought had been misinterpreted. By the time the Disputatio was published, his manuscript had been circulated to the leaders of the French churches. His interpretation must have convinced many. The Disputatio quotes a letter which La Place received in 1653 from Drelincourt, who as commissaire in the synod of Charenton had elaborated the incriminating article: "Monsieur et tres honore frere", he wrote, "j'ai lu avec une satisfac-
tion très particulière l'écrit qu'il vous a plu me communiquer et je loue Dieu de tout mon coeur de voir par là heureusement terminé ce dont j'appréhendais du trouble et de la division dans nos églises. Car Monsieur, je vous puis bien assurer et tous ceux qui en peuvent douter, que l'intention du dernier synode de Charenton n'a nullement été de condamner ni votre personne, ni la doctrine que vous proposez .... Nous n'avons jamais pensé à poser cette imputation du péché d'Adam que vous appelez antécédente et immédiate, mais seulement celle que vous nommez conséquente et médiate ...." And Drelincourt added "Si l'occasion se présente de vous justifier envers ceux qui ne sont point informés de ces choses ou qui ont des préjugés à l'encontre, je vous assure, Monsieur, que je ne m'y oubliai pas. Il y a de la gloire de Dieu et de l'édition publique, que cette vérité soit connue, afin qu'il n'ait rien qui empêche que les grâces éminentes dont Dieu vous a enrichi ne produisent leur fruit partout." 154

Drelincourt's letter is a fitting conclusion to our study of the struggle of Saumur and the two professors to win recognition from the churches. When La Place died in 1655, the Académie had survived three crises; its doctrine had been accepted, and its intellectual independence protected. In 1660, the last national synod, held in Loudun, sealed the compromise, which had been hammered out through a debate that had lasted 27 years. A few churches still voiced their
discontent. Amyraut and his friend Daillé were again accused of not having complied with the regulations concerning publications. But the synod rejected these accusations. It exhorted Amyraut to continue to devote "les beaux talents que Dieu a impartis" to the edification of the French church. Furthermore the procedure elaborated at Alençon was confirmed. Publications had to be submitted to special examinateurs, but any complaints would only be made to them. Finally the synod decided that students would not be requested to sign a form condemning La Place's doctrine. The words of Mestrezat written in 1653 had finally been heard: "Cependant quel danger...y aura-t-il de dire que Dieu a agréable la conversion de tout pécheur, moyennant que Dieu veuille de telle sorte la conversion de ses élus, qu'aussi il la produise par l'efficace de sa grâce ....... Et quel grand différent, et capable de diviser, peut-il y avoir vu que tous conviennent en ces points?"

The compromise thus reached and the spirit of tolerance voiced by Mestrezat made a new development of rationalism possible. This occurred during the period which opens in 1660 and constitutes Saumur's golden age. Before we come to study its three major representatives we must devote our attention to the special contribution of Cappel to this rational spirit.
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141. Ibidem, sect. XXXIII, p.211.
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Disputatio, p. 7 "cur igitur tamdui dilata est Thesium illarum accusatio, siqueidem sunt accusatae?"

Registre, 8 June 1645, f. 139

Idem, loc. cit.

Disputatio, p. 33

S. Des Maretz, Theologiae elenchticae nova synopsis, sive index controversarum fidei ex Sacris Scripturis a Jacobo Tirimo Jesuite concinnatus et censura perpetua auctum, emendatus, refutatus vol. I (Groningen, 1640), controversia XI (De statu primorum parentum et de peccato originali). p. 482-490.

Registre, 4 September 1647, f. 144

La Place, Examen, in Disputatio, p. 170 (Italics in text).
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Ibidem, p. 453.

Drélincourt to La Place, 10 December 1653 in Disputatio, p. 29-30.

Complaints were against the publication of two books. One by Daillé was a defense of Saumur, entitled Joannis Dallaei apologia pro duabris in Gallia protestantium synodis nationalibus, printed without his consent in Amsterdam in 1655. The other was the reprint of Amyraut's Dissertationes; Amyraut had added two new dissertations, one of which De peccato originis, reiterated La Place's doctrine of mediate imputation. A minister from Saintonge having got wind of this had, attacked Amyraut just before the synod in 1655. The minister's name was Gautier.

Actes du synode national de Loudun (1660), Marsh's Library, MS 2.3.3.3 & f. 92.

Idem, f. 91

Ibidem, loc. cit.

We have already quoted another passage from this letter. See supra ch. I, p. 18, and note 31.
Chapter III

LOUIS CAPPÉL AND BIBLICAL CRITICISM

Louis Cappel stands apart from La Place and Amyraut, superficially at least. Unlike his two colleagues, Cappel, for one, did not attend any of the synods where a debate on the theology of Saumur took place. None of the books he published were discussed during his lifetime by ecclesiastical bodies. When he did enter into discussions it was reluctantly and with scholars rather than theologians. His works belatedly aroused a great interest but abroad rather than in his country; in France it was a Catholic scholar, Fr. J. Morin, an oratorian who edited his Critica Sacra; it was also another oratorian, Richard Simon, who paid tribute to his discoveries, and praised him as one of the founders of textual criticism. Simon devoted an entire chapter of his Histoire critique du Vieux Testament to an assessment of Cappel's contribution in that field;¹ he saw Cappel as one who had laid down rules for a new discipline: "chaque art", he wrote in the preface, "a des termes particuliers et qui lui sont en quelque manière consacrés. C'est en ce sens qu'on trouvera souvent dans cet ouvrage le mot de critique .... les personnes savantes sont déjà accoutumées à l'usage de ces termes dans notre langue. Quand on parle par exemple du livre

¹
que Cappel a fait imprimer sous le titre de *Critica sacra*, et
des commentaires sur l'Ecriture imprimés en Angleterre, on
dit en français *La Critique de Cappel, les Critiques d'Angle-
terre ....*² Cappel truly belongs to that great family of
XVIIth century scholars whose bonds extended beyond national
frontiers and across religious barriers.³ Yet Cappel is also
part of Saumur. His work is inspired by the same considera-
tions, and founded on the same principles as that of his two
colleagues. In fact he displays even more of a rational
enthusiasm than La Place and Amyraut. Ch. IV of his *Pivot
de la foi*⁴ (the only book he wrote in French), for instance,
contains this striking hymn to reason reminiscent of neopla-
tonism: "comme ës choses physiques et oeuvres de la nature,
il y a cet ordre et agencement si beau et admirable, si réglé,
certain et constant .... qui témoigne une industriouse sagesse
qui en est l'auteur, ainsi ës choses humaines, ës action, dis-je
des hommes et production de son esprit et volonté on peut
reconnaître un ordre admirable et une beauté émerveillable ...
cet ordre et beauté paraît ou en l'adresse, industrie, sagesse
et subtilité de l'esprit humain, ou en la droiture de ses
actions et effets de sa volonté, que l'on appelle vertu
morale, dont l'une et l'autre marque quelque chose de divin
dans l'homme ...."⁵ For Cappel all the foundations of man's
morality are to be found in his rationality: "cette vertu
a sa racine et son fondement en la nature de l'homme, en tant

104.
qu'il est raisonnable et doué de volonté et d'intelligence ..."^6  
Man's duty is to exercise his reason properly. When he does, that man cannot comprehend both the physical and the spiritual world: "c'est par icelle \[\text{sic}\] qu'il connaît non seule-
ment les choses singulières, individuelles et matérielles, mais aussi les universelles. Et par elle il discourt, raisonne, argumante, tire et déduit une chose de l'autre, pénètre dans la nature des choses, et recherche les causes d'icelle, d'où naissent la science et la connaissance de la philosophie ..."^7  
For Cappel, therefore, Reason is the key to knowledge and virtue, provided it is rightly used. In Le Pivot de la foi, Cappel does not enlarge on this last point. His book, as he says, is not devised to refute the wrong arguments of the atheists but to prove positively that there is a God and a Providence: "Il y a deux façons de traiter une chose, l'une est de prouver positivement qu'elle est et quelle elle est, l'autre de répondre et réfuter ce qui se peut apporter à l'encontre. Nous nous proposons ici seulement de prouver contre les athées qu'il y a un Dieu, et non de répondre à tout ce qu'la perversité et la subtilité de l'esprit humain ingénieux à son propre mal peut apporter pour se persuader du contraire ..."^8  
It is however interesting to note that for Cappel there is an 'economy' of reason. The proper use of reason is what he calls 'la droite raison'.^9  Although he does not develop this conception, we can infer it from this
description he gives of error, which comes, he says, from three sources: "1, par affection et désir que nous portons à la chose; 2, par autorité; 3, par raisons colorées et trompeuses". But the root of error is to be found in man's natural corruption, the weakness of his will which inclines him to follow his passions and the perversion of his mind that will invent false justifications: "nous croyons volontiers et nous persuadons aisément ce que nous désirons". Right reason, to avoid these dangers, must be in fact guided by the Holy Spirit. Like his colleagues therefore, Cappel when exalting the power of reason does not lose sight of the inherent weakness of man's intellect. Nor does he claim that our reasoning can ever give us direct knowledge of God's true essence. But he affirms even more positively than Amyraut or La Place, that we can reach true conceptions of God's nature provided we do not reify them: Human knowledge is not divine knowledge; God always transcends our conceptions. Their validity however is guaranteed by God Himself, who gave us reason: "Aussi ne raisonne et ne discourt-il pas à la façon des hommes, tirant l'un de l'autre par conséquence, ni pensant une chose après l'autre... Il n'y a en lui (je veux dire en sa sagesse et intelligence), non plus qu'en l'éternité de sa durée, ni premier ni second, ni devant ni après ni derrière, ains toutes ses pensées, desseins, conseils et volontés ne sont en lui qu'un seul même et pur acte .... [au contraire] nous concevons..."
said to manifest itself through His Creation but more clearly through His Word. And he clearly diverges from Calvin's doctrine according to which the Scripture is the only source of knowledge of God. In fact in 1559, when the French churches elaborated their Confession, Calvin wrote a preamble for it, which provides a useful contrast with Cappel's doctrine:

"Nous tenons", writes Calvin in the Preamble, "les livres de la Sainte-Ecriture comme la somme de la seule vérité infaillible de Dieu, à laquelle il n'est permis de contredire. Même parce que là est contenue la règle parfaite de toute sagesse, nous croyons qu'il n'est licite d'y rien ajouter et diminuer mais qu'il y faut acquériser en tout et partout". The opposition however is more apparent than real. For Cappel carefully distinguishes between those truths that can be comprehended by reason, and the mysteries revealed in the Scripture which remain beyond the reach of human understanding. The Trinity is such a mystery. In his Theses de Deo uno et trino, he firmly establishes this distinction in the opening section:

"Deum ..... infinitum esse omni modo ipsa recta ratio dictat ..... unum et simplicissimum esse indidem confirmatur, et sapien-
tissimi quique inter nos ipsos ethnicos agoverunt, licet pro-
miscuum vulgus, superstitione varia dementatum ... immanem deorum coluerit. Trinum esse, non triplicem humana ratio
divitare, aut assequi, non potuit; sola divina in sacris
litteris revelatio nobis patefecit. Et tanti quidem mysterii
l'essence de Dieu, ses vertus et propriétés ... comme sous autant d'images, formes et conceptions diverses et distinctes, pour ce qu'étant corporels et finis et lui esprit et infini en toutes façons, nous ne pouvons voir ni comprendre Dieu, tel qu'il est en soi ..."\textsuperscript{13}

Reason, Revelation and the Scripture

These qualifications as we have seen do not detract from the value of reason. For Cappel reason remains a valid instrument for the knowledge of God. In fact the natural light of reason, like the supernatural light of revelation constitute for him the only two ways that are open to man in his search for this knowledge. The originality of Cappel is to emphasize the first. The Theses de origine et necessitate Scripturae\textsuperscript{14} for instance, start unexpectedly not by an affirmation of the divine character of the Scripture, but by a reference to the teaching of reason: "Ipsa rationis naturalis lux docet ens et bonum reciprocari, bonumque adeo sui esse communicativum."\textsuperscript{15} And in section V of the same he puts reason on a par with revelation: "\textsuperscript{Est} duplex in homine Dei cognitio, altera naturalis quō ex creaturis, quis, qualis et quantus sit Deus, earum author et causa, \textit{ratiocinando assequi potuit}, altera supernaturalia quō Deus in Verbo se illi revelavit."\textsuperscript{16}

On this point, Cappel goes much further than the doctrine of the Confession de foi of the French churches where God is
Sacra Scriptura nobis aperit ... modum et rationem
qua id tieri possit neque explicat, neque si explicaret, capere in hoc mortali statu valeremus, nec humana verba ad rem tantam explicandum sufficere possent". 20 And in the next sections of the Theses, the argumentation against Arianism is based solely on scriptural arguments. For instance section XVI reads "Demonstrandum itaque est adversus eos /I.e. Arianos/ ex Scriptura Christum ab aeterno reapse exsitisse, item esse Patri equalem et ejusdem plane cum eo essentiae ...". 21

This is not to say that Cappel opposes Reason to Revelation. Although the word of God as revealed in the Scripture ultimately takes precedence over reason, there is in Cappel a deep conviction that there can be no disagreement with the authority of Revelation and the authority of reason. After all, God is the source for both. As Cappel states in the Theses de Deo uno et trino, the sense of a mystery cannot be contrary to right reason: "non est expectandum ut rem ipsam, qualis in se reapse est explicemus, aut eam perversae laevitivitis ingenii humani subjiciamus atque approbemus; satis fuerit si modo in eo mysterio nihil statuatur, quod recte rationi (quam longe etiam superat) vere repugnet et adversetur, eamque evertat". 22

Reason provides negative criteria, confirming a contrario the truth of Revelation. But the relationship between reason and revelation extends further for Cappel. Reason, guided by the Holy Spirit has a positive use: it establishes the fact of
Revelation, and also the nature of that Revelation.

First reason can demonstrate the divine origin of the Scripture, thus establishing they truly reveal God's Word to us. In Le Pivot de la foi, the main proofs of the divine characters of Scripture are said to be "1, la qualité et condition; 2, le nombre et la diversité; 3, le but et la fin des écrivains sacrés et finalement la nature et qualité des choses qu'ils écrivent". More than the proofs themselves, it is the method followed by Cappel which is interesting: Cappel argues as a historian taking the Bible as a document. If it can be shown to be valid, then what it tells must be true. He argues against a fraud, on logical ground, on internal evidence and on external evidence both literary and non-literary: "Dira-t-on que quelqu'un longtemps depuis Moïse ait forgé et publié ces livres sous son nom? 1, cela se dit gratis, sans couleur ni apparence ni fondement de raison; 2, cela est contre le témoignage des plus anciens monuments de l'histoire, qui n'attribuent point ces livres à d'autres qu'à Moïse et n'accusent personne de les lui avoir supposés. Diodore de Sicile écrit que Moyse a donné aux Juifs leurs lois les ayant reçues du Dieu nommé 7777 qui est le propre nom de Dieu "Taoh" 5, une bonne partie de leurs loix [i.e. des Juifs] et constitutions politiques et ecclésiastiques ont pour fondement ces narrations ...." Once demonstrated, the divine origin of the Scripture, several consequences follow as to
their nature. These divine characteristics of the Scripture are of great importance as they determine the principles on which Biblical interpretation is based, and also the measure of textual criticism considered permissible.

Cappel's views on the divine characters of scripture and his rules of interpretation are found in his Theses de summo controversiarum judice,25 where they are presented in a remarkably systematic form. If the Scripture are the Word of God, says Cappel, then they are fundamentally clear and understandable. Cappel's purpose in the Theses de summo controversiarum judice is to refute the position of Catholic controversialists and his arguments are therefore presented in a negative way. If the Scripture are not clear, he writes, all interpretations are possible and nobody (and not even the church) can be sure to have found the truth: total pyrrhonism will inevitably follow: "Certe vel nihil omnino sciri atque cognosci potest, nobisque in veterum Pyrrhonorum castra, pridemque explosam sententiam, inigrandum est, qui omnem rerum omnium certitudinem una cum ipsa ratione evertebant - vel cum verum vero semper consonet, falsumque illi adventur et repugnet, demonstrari poterit de quacumque falsa sententia eam veritatis regulae adversari, omnisque proinde haeresis atque error in fide momentosus, revincetur ex Scriptura, illaque convictio a quolibet veri studioso (si non sit plane hebes et stupidus) agnoscit esse vera."26 Furthermore to deny the
understandibility of the Scripture is to render them useless and 
to make a mockery of God. If the Scriptures are the word 
of God, this word must be clear: "Id vero Dei sapientiae et 
bonitati prorsus repugnat (quasi vel potuerit, vel moluerit 
ita loqui ut ab omnibus veri studiosis facile intelligeretur) 
hocque pacto, tota Scriptura redditur inutilis prorsus atque 
supervacanea." 27

Following Calvin and indeed all the other Reformers 
Cappel therefore asserts the principle of the self-interpreting 
Scripture. 28 However he gives an original development to the 
rule "scriptura sacra sui ipsius interpres". First by 
emphasizing the clarity of the Scripture; On points of 
fundamental importance, he writes, the true sense of the 
Scripture is evident: "Potest ergo legitimus Scripturae sensus, 
in rebus momentosis et ad salutem necessariis certo deprehendi, 
si non in omnibus omnino, at saltem in multis qui clarissimi 
sunt locis." 29 Secondly, the principles of interpretation for 
less clear passages are embodied in the Canon. And to establish 
this point, Cappel draws an analogy between the principles of 
human knowledge and those of divine knowledge, which more than 
anything else perhaps in his writings reveals his deep rationalist 
commitment. The sense of more difficult passages, he writes, can 
be logically deduced (as theorems) from the propositions of 
the Canon: "Quemadmodum ergo in omnibus humanis disciplinis 
sunt quaedam unicaeque arti et disciplinae propria principia,
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ex quibus deducuntur et probantur omnia theorematum, propositiones et conclusiones, quae ad disciplinam illam cujus sunt principia pertinent ... sic sane Christiana religio sua habet certa et indubitata apud omnes Christianos principia, Scripturam nempe certo librorum numero constantem, tanquam normam fidei christianae indubitatissimam."\(^3^0\)

Thus for Cappel the Scripture are a self-correcting, integrated system of clear knowledge. This clarity and unity of sense which they possess, has of course its source in the unity of divine authorship. Following Calvin, Cappel views the various writers of the Old and the New Testament as *instruments* of God: "Certe quos Deus olim voluit esse Ecclesiae suae doctores ... quibusque simpliciter et absolute credi voluit tamquam singularibus suis legatis, quales fuerunt Moses, Prophetae et Apostoli, eos iis veluti circumscrip sit et ab aliis omnibus hominibus distinxit, signis, notis et characteribus divinis ...ut nemo, nisi ultero ac sponte caecus, non puterit videre homines illos esse plane divinos, eosque non proprio instinctu sed Spiritus Dei impulso, ea dicere quae loquebantur ..."\(^3^1\)

It is this conception of the Scripture which constitutes for Cappel the foundation and therefore determines the method of biblical criticism. For what Cappel establishes \(\text{is that it is truly the word of God which is written down in the Scripture.}\)

Cappel admits that in the course of history God used as instruments men who spoke different languages. The reason for this, writes Cappel, is that God was concerned with
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being immediately understood: He spoke in Hebrew to the Jews
and in Greek to the Gentiles. As for the various translations
of the Old Testament, they were made for the convenience of the
people, and those who made them were faithful to God's original
design to speak in the vernacular.

Thus Cappel reaches the notion of source: whatever their
defects, the various texts all refer back to a source, the
very Word of God with its characteristics of purity, clarity
and veracity. The purpose of biblical criticism is to find
this source: *Semper purius ex ipso fonte bibuntur aquae.*

And from the notion of source Cappel's fundamental methodological
principle is derived: the variations, the obvious errors in the
different versions of the Old Testament can only be attributed to
human failure. There has been no wilful alteration of the
entire source itself. Variation does not mean corruption;
or as Cappel later put it, in the introduction to his Critica
sacra: "Aliud autem est varia lectio, aliud vero depravatio et
corruptio. Varia enim lectio oritur a scribarum incuria, incog-
mitantia, ignorantia; aliquando ab eorumdem temeritate et audacia;
denique et plurimum, ac fere sempe, ab humana infirmitate ... at
depravatio est a certo consilio, a frauda et malitia, ut sensus,
introductur falsus, impius, hereticus .."36

In the Theses, this notion of a source remains ambiguous.
It could be understood as purely historical, the relative
antiquity of different versions thus deciding their authenticity.
On the other hand if the Scriptures are self-
explanatory is it not the sense which is really the criterion? The two approaches do not coincide. Let us see how Cappel's conception of a source evolved when he applied it to concrete problems of textual criticism.

From the Arcanum punctationis to the Critica sacra

Before we attempt to follow the evolution of Cappel's method, and given an analysis of his two major works, it is necessary to outline the state of textual research on the Old Testament, at the time when Cappel published his Arcanum punctationis. As Archbishop Marsh has pointed out, at the time Cappel published this first work, the leading Hebrew scholar, John Buxtorf (the elder) based his research on the conviction that all the copies of the Hebrew Bible, as well as the manuscripts, contained the same text. It is not surprising that Buxtorf should affirm the literal integrity of the Scripture. There was indeed a great amount of conformity amongst the various texts. For all the editions of the Hebrew text Buxtorf knew, were based on the Masoretic text, that is to say on a text handed down through centuries by the rabbis. This uniform text contained marginal notes, called the "Mesorah" (i.e. "tradition"). The Masorah was in fact a collection of textual readings, but had through the centuries acquired a mystical character. Following the Jewish conceptions of his day, therefore, Buxtorf (the elder) regarded
the 'Masorah' not as material of textual criticism, but of interpretation. His Tiberias which he published in 1620 contains first a history of the 'Masorah', and then an elucidation of its meaning. Both the character of the Masoretes' work, and its history, as he understood them, were for Buxtorf a proof of the integrity of the Hebrew text: As he wrote in Tiberias: "In hoc studio admirabilis priscorum Hebraeorum diligentia, ardentissimus circa conservationem textus Verbi Dei zelus ... emicat. Hic enim latissime patent Oriens et Occidens, uno ore, uno modo verbum Dei legitur, hic omnium librorum qui vel in Asia, vel in Africa, vel in Europa sunt, sine ulla discrepantia, consonans harmonia cernitur ..."  

However in 1620, new manuscript evidence came to light - a copy of the Pentateuch, written in the Samaritan script. It had been known that such a Samaritan Pentateuch existed, but no copy had been obtained until Pietro à Valle brought one back from the Middle East. He also asked for a translation of this Pentateuch into the Samaritan language and presented it to the library of the Oratorians in Paris. It is there that an Oratorian, Jean Morin, consulted it and set to work on it. This first discovery was followed by that of other Samaritan copies and the excitement this caused was considerable. Cappel knew Morin, who taught at a College that the Oratorians had founded in Saumur. Simon's Antiquitates Ecclesiae
orientalis contains a letter by Morin to him which shows that
the two scholars co-operated by investigating this new piece of
evidence. 45 The lessons that Morin and Cappel drew from a
study of the Samaritan Pentateuch were the following: both
the Hebrew and the Samaritan Pentateuch manifestly contained
the same work, although at times the text was different.
Both also contained the same words although the letters them-
selves were very different.

In the Arcanum punctuationis Cappel argued against Buxtorf
Tiberias that the vowel-points of the Hebrew text were of a
much more recent invention than Buxtorf thought. 46 His reasoning
was that the Samaritan Pentateuch was not a version of the Hebrew
Pentateuch, but rather that both were versions of an earlier
source, antecedent to the captivity in Babylon. For the Pentateuch
is the only part of the Bible which is recognised sacred by the
Samaritans; if they had received their sacred books from the
Jews after the captivity in Babylon, these books would not have
been confined to the five books of Moses. And Cappel concluded
that of the two scripts, the older is the Samaritan script. The
Jews adopted the Chaldean script on their return from their
captivity: "Judaeos autem qui ad captivitatem usque Babylonicam,
iisdem usi fuerant literis, in captivitate ut propriae linguae
pauletim ita cepit oFlivio, ut saltem minus familiaris inter eos
(in vulgo maxime) ea esse iepetit, contraque Chaldaica evaserit
illis quasi vernacula ... sic etiam propriorum
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characterum veluti obliti, chaldaiciis assuefacti sunt. Unde factum ut soluta captivitate, Esdias Legem et integra sacra Bibli, illis characteribus (Chaldaicis nimium) qui in captivitate Judaeis evaserant una cum lingua ipsa familiares. 47 Cappel could conclude that as the Samaritan script did not use vowel-punctuation, this feature of the Hebrew was of recent acquisition. 48

What is interesting in the Arcanum punctationis is Cappel's method and the conclusions he draws. First he treats the Samaritan Pentateuch as a piece of historical evidence whose validity has to be established. He does this by confronting various Samaritan documents where no trace of vowel-punctuation can be found. 49 He further confirms his conclusion by showing that the marginal notes ("keri" and "cetib") of Hebrew bibles relate to alternative readings of the consonants alone. 50 Finally Cappel shows that some variations between the older translations of the Old Testament (The Septuagint, various paraphrases, Jerome's Vulgate) spring from the lack of punctuation of the manuscript sources. 51 This last point is of particular interest for it shows that Cappel's textual criticism is not directed against the fundamental authenticity of the Scripture. His entire effort in fact is devoted to assign a precise historical cause to textual errors in order to preserve the essential integrity of the text. At the time he published his Arcanum punctationis we could say that he envisaged his notion of source purely in historical terms. There were
obvious faults in the texts of the Scripture, but if they could be attributed to vowel-punctuation, and if furthermore vowel-punctuation was shown to be of recent acquisition, then the Scripture was exonerated from charges of confusion or contradiction. In the *arcanum punctationis antiquitas* is the criterion of authenticity.52

Cappel's *Arcanum punctationis* gave rise to objections not from J. Buxtorf himself but from his son, J. Buxtorf (the younger). These were published in 1648 with the title *Tractatus de punctorum vocalium et accentuum in libris Veteris Testamenti Hebraïcis origine*. Cappel refuted these objections in his *Vindiciae Arcanum punctationis* which was later published by his son, J. Cappel, as an addition to his reprint of *Arcanum punctationis*.53 We shall not follow the grammatical and historical arguments presented by J. Buxtorf for the antiquity of vowel-points, an arduous task which we leave to scholars well-versed in the Hebrew language. We only wish to summarize those arguments which Cappel himself calls in his 'theological' arguments and see how he answered them in the *Vindiciae*. The core of Buxtorf's theological objections was that the Scripture is the word of God, not simply as far as the sense is concerned but also in the very words used. If vowel points are not authentic, various meanings can be given to the words. In this case the interpretation of the Scripture is
purely human, and total scepticism follows. Unless one has recourse for interpretation to the guidance of the Church, as the Catholics do. To answer these objections Cappel in the *Arcani punctationis vindiciae* has recourse to a variety of arguments, some of them grammatical. His major point however is that spoken words as well as written ones can be ambiguous. If the case arises however, we must use our own judgment, but to guide it we have those rules of interpretation embodied in the Canon which has been given to us by the Holy Spirit, to help us to reach the true sense: "Unde ergo certo Spiritus Sancti mens deprehendi potest, in locis ejusmodi ambiguuis, nisi ex illo Canone, quemcum sequimur, non est tum quilibet prohibitus et arbitri verborum Spiritus Sancti interpres, sed ipse Spiritus Sanctus, qui ita voces in serie orationis collocavit ut ex antecedentum consequentium et ex attenta consideratione deprehendi possit quis sensus, quae lectio sit convenientior, ac proinde verior." In most cases however, the Scripture is perfectly clear, says Cappel, and no diversity of interpretation should occur. Furthermore from the point of view of *fides*, ambiguous passages cannot give rise to an infinite number of interpretations: "nemo negat textum non punctatum posse diverse legi, accipi et reddi etiam varie, sed quaeritur: primo, an ubique et perpetuo sit talis; secundo, ubi est talis sensus qui ex varia punctatione oritur, vel est aperte falsus, absurdus, unsulsus, ridiculus, atque tum sua ipsius
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absurdidate et falsitate prodit repiciendum ..." 57 Finally if an ambiguity cannot be solved it cannot be of extreme importance (for God does not wish to confuse men on fundamental matters of faith). In such a case however, no one is entitled to speak from a position of authority and diverging opinions must be tolerated: "Nemo ... alterius ex autoritate cedet, sed si sanus et aequus est, rationi et veritati cedet quae ex illo Canone demonstrari potest. Quae si non potest in quibusdam minime momentosis demonstrari ... hic mansuetudo et caritas locum habere debet, ut nemo alterum temere et sive causa imperose damnet ..." 58 "Ratio et veritas quae ex Canone demonstrari potest": This notion that this true sense must be sought, and that it can be reached (and in fact demonstrated) is central to Cappel's last work, the Critica sacra. 59 We shall first briefly outline its contents, then analyse Cappel's method and finally describe the reactions to which it gave rise.

The Critica sacra constitutes the sum of Cappel's twenty-six years of teaching in Saumur. By the wealth of its material and the richness of the argumentation it deserves to be placed among the monuments of 17th century scholarship. Our discussion must necessarily be limited to its major points, and particularly to its method. The work is divided into six books: Its purpose is to show how the Hebrew text of the Scripture
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can be rid of textual mistakes it contains. The first book of the Crítica sacra therefore is devoted to a study of the causes for error. As we have seen, by attempting to explain the historical reasons why such errors have crept into the Hebrew text, Cappel performs the task, essential in his eyes, of clearing the Scripture of the charge of textual corruption. In fact, the Crítica sacra is a demonstration that textual mistakes fall into various recognisable categories, which can all be attributed to human causes. As he writes in Book I, chapter I: "Fatemur quidem multiplicem codicum hebæos Veteris Testamenti irrepsisse, ex humana inter describendum infirmitate, scribarum indigentia, somnolentia aut ignorantia, verò lectionem: idque manifestum est in nostra Critica ... at negamus textum ipsum fuisse a Judæis data opera, certo consilio et fraude, ex odio christianam religionem, sive ante, sive post SS Augustini et Hieronymi tempora, corruptum, depravatam atque contaminatum." 60 Some of the textual errors in the Hebrew text, writes Cappel, have the same causes as errors in any other text (for instance, the New Testament). Among these are mistakes affecting letters, words, and the division of the text in sentences. 61 Those that are a special feature of the Hebrew text are those affecting vowel-punctuation. 62 Of this last category Cappel had already treated in Arcanum punctationis. All of them, writes Cappel, can be attributed to human failure: failure of the copyist for the
first category, or failure of the Masoretes to grasp the proper meaning for the second.

The Critica sacra therefore establishes the existence of these various readings. Cappel does this in several ways: 1, by collating the different parts of the Old Testament (Bk I); 2, by collating parallel passages in the Old and the New Testament (Bk II); 3, by discussing the various readings given by the marginal notes of the Hebrew text (Bk III); 4, by comparing the Septuagint with the Hebrew text (Bk IV); 5, finally by comparing also the various interpretations in several paraphrases and in Jerome's Vulgate.

To give an example, in Book III Cappel analyses the variations of the Keri and Cetib, the marginal readings of the Hebrew text. When dealing with those which refer to the omission of words (ch. 2), Cappel shows that those omissions are not all recorded by the various Bibles he has consulted. For instance, among the thirteen readings of that category he has counted, the addition of the word מַעַר to Esa, 55.9, is mentioned by the Keri and Cetib in Plantin's and Robert Estienne's Bibles, but not in Bomberg's.⁶³

If the Masorah itself offers various readings, if it does not always coincide with the other versions, what method is the critic to follow to find the true text? This is where Cappel takes a bold step forward. In the concluding part of Book III, having given the reasons which qualify the authority of the
Masorah, as indeed of all other texts or traditioves, he is left with one last criterion, that of sense: *Verum si res momentosa sit, absit ut auctoritate tantum nitamur. In codicem ergo dissenssione et pugna, si qua est alicui momenti, ratione agendum est, non auctoritate simpliciter, videndum (uti dixi) utralectio sensum fundat veriorem et commodiorem, quod eadem sit via et ratione, quomodumcumque occurit vox aliqua vel phrasis ambigua, disceptaturque de ejus sensu atque significatione, videndum nempe utra magis rei de qua agitur, antecedentibus, consequentibus, scopo scriptoris, et cum aliis scriptoris locis, totique ejus doctrinae conveniat atque congruat.*

Sense therefore is grammatical sense. In Cappel there is the deep-seated conviction that correct grammar equals true inspired sense. But ultimately, if the case arises where grammar itself is not helpful, then reason will decide on its own, with the guidance of those rules of interpretation established in the Scripture themselves: "verum vero semper consonat". From the fundamental principles of faith the true sense can always be demonstrated, in the same way as error can be demonstrated from the comparison of various versions, or from grammatical analysis: "si reapse erratum est, demonstrari poterit error, si erratum non esse, non poterit demonstrari. Imo contra poterit demonstrari erratum non esse, quia verum vero semper consonat, numquam adversatur." The source for the Scripture is not given once and for all in one *privileged* text; nor is it
necessarily found in the older versions. Man's task is to discover it through his knowledge of history or grammar, by applying this knowledge to the texts and by exercising his reason with the guidance of his faith. When he does this however, he can be sure that God never intended to confuse him. Truth will always be reached. As Cappel puts it in his introduction: "Paucae vel nullae invenientur [sententiae] quae (si aequa lance omnia perpendantur) sensum pariant falsum, impium, heterodoxum, analogiae fidei manifesto repugnantem ... quod si quae ejusmodi sint, relinquenda est lectio quae ejusmodi sensum depravatum et corruptum gignit, atque alia ampltetenda est quae sensum fundit veriorem, aptiorem et commodiorem." 67

Assessment of Cappel's work

Although Cappel at the beginning of the Critica sacra claims that the early reformers supported the same view, 68 he must have been aware that to replace the literal veracity by grammatical veracity and to assert that the sense of the Scripture can be rationally demonstrated, was to challenge the views of the majority of protestant theologians. The difficulties he encountered because of this are narrated in a letter sent in 1653 by J. Morin to Cardinal Barberini in Rome. 69 According to Morin, Cappel submitted the manuscript of his Critica sacra to theologians in Geneva,
Sedan and Leyden.⁷⁰ All rejected it, for they saw it as under-
mining their conviction that the Hebrew text as it stood, was
the authentic Word of God: "nihil plane certum esse posse eum
Ecclesiae authoritati nihil prorsus deferunt. Nam si tam multis
scatet mendis id quod est solum eorum fidei columnen, fidem
eorum necesse est esse caducam admodum et prorsus filcuneam;
hoc consequens, opposuerunt Cappello."⁷¹ In fact Morin
informed Barberini that one of Cappel's sons, a convert, sent
the manuscript to him, and Mersenne and Petau (two other
Catholic scholars), together with Morin, had the book printed
in 1650.⁷² Later in the pamphlet he wrote to defend himself
against the accusations of impiety levelled at him by Arnold
Bootius,⁷³ Cappel claimed that the publication had been done
without his consent. Yet he admitted that his book had been
approved by various friends, including Samuel Bochart.⁷⁴
There is no doubt therefore that he intended to publish it
himself, perhaps with minor alterations. Furthermore he
reiterated his major point in another defense he wrote this
time against John Buxtorf, the younger, who had already attacked
his Arcanum punctationis.⁷⁵ In this reply, the Criticae adversus
injutum censorem justa defenso, Cappel strongly affirmed
as he had done in the Theses and in Le Pivot de la foi, that
reason enables man to distinguish the truth, that is to say
in the case of the Scripture to grasp the true sense of the
text: "Certe, si reapse una est incommoda aut falsa, aut
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inconcina, illa sua falsitate, incommoditate et inconcinnitate
se prodit, et a peritis talis esse demonstrari potuerit.
Alioqui dicendum est, verum a falso, rectum a pravo et dis-
torto, falsum ab insulso, nulla ratione discerni posse, et
in antiquorum Pyrrhonium et Epechicorum partes nobis est
concedendum, quod nullus sanus admiserit."^76

Thus Cappel, like Amyraut and La Place, exemplifies the
rationalist spirit of Saumur. Like theirs his doctrine was
censored in the 1675 Formula consensus of the Swiss churches.77
But perhaps what the Swiss churches condemned was not so much
his work nor his conviction that Scripture, like dogma, are
clear and understandable. Rather they saw that Cappel’s
method remained safe as long as the fundamental sacredness
of the Scripture was not itself questioned. As Lefèvre
later showed, if one approached the Scripture in a profane
spirit, Cappel’s method could in fact be turned against
Revelation. It is more likely however, that the Swiss theolo-
gians were afraid of another conclusion to be drawn from Cappel’s
work. If in fact the Scripture was not as clear as Cappel was
convinced it was, then it would be necessary to have recourse
to a tradition of interpretation. Cappel had shown that the
Jewish tradition was not infallible. Only one tradition
remained which could claim antiquity, that of the Catholic
church. Morin had already reached this conclusion in his
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letter to Cardinal Barberini. But it was R. Simon who most forcefully expressed it later in his Histoire critique du Vieux Testament: "Il y a sans doute bien de l'ignorance ou de la présomption dans l'esprit des protestants qui prétendent que l'écriture est claire d'elle-même ... Bien loin donc qu'on doive croire avec [eux] que la voie la plus courte, la plus naturelle et la plus certaine pour décider les questions de la foi est de consulter l'Ecriture Sainte, on trouvera au contraire ... que si on sépare la règle de droit de celle de fait, c'est-à-dire, si on ne joint la Tradition avec l'Ecriture, on ne peut presque rien assurer de certain dans la religion."78
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PART II

THE GOLDEN AGE OF SAUMUR

1660 - 1670
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Chapter IV

A DECADE OF SUCCESS AND RELATIVE STABILITY

The last national synod of Loudun marks the beginning of a decade during which the intellectual life of the Académie reached its peak.

In a report he sent to his brother in 1664, Colbert de Croissy could write that the Académie of Saumur brought together "tout ce qu'il y a de gens d'esprit dans leur (i.e. the Protestants) parti pour la rendre célèbre et florissante." (1) But perhaps the best evidence of the success of the Académie is to be found in the decision of the Conseil, which concerns the registration and the accommodation of students. Various provinces had complained on the difficulty to find lodgings for students who were sent to Saumur. The Conseil and the Consistoire had to draw up a list of people who would be prepared to take boarders. The fact that they did and the terms used in the rules they also issued are a clear indication that they foresaw the increased number of students who were attracted to Saumur by its reputation. "Les pères et mères et autres parents qui enverront de la jeunesse pour étudier à Saumur
s'adresseront aux pasteurs et professeurs de l'Église et de l'Académie de ce lieu pour être informés des maisons où ils pourront placer ces jeunes gens aux trois prix de pensions, savoir 200 liras, 250 liras et 300 liras. It is not possible to know exactly how many students frequented Saumur during that period. According to some estimates, based on the number of seats reserved to students in the temple, around 1664, there were 400 students in Saumur—quite a considerable number for the period. There is evidence that the Conseil was thinking of extending the buildings of the Académie, for in February 1664, they considered the possibility of transferring the library to rooms belonging to the Principal in order to find room for an "auditoire de physique". More significant indication of the success of the Académie is found in the presence of foreign students in Saumur. Colbert de Croissy, in the report already quoted, states that the Académie was "une des plus connues des étrangers, qu'y viennent du côté de l'Allemagne et des pays septentrionaux pour apprendre la langue française et pour s'instruire". Some foreign proposants even came to study theology in Saumur: among those who submitted theological theses, we note the names of John Durrell, and Gabriel Ferguson from England, Daniel Dutens from Basle, Petrus Sylvius from Amsterdam. Undoubtedly Saumur's reputation sprang from the
achievements of Amyraut, La Place and Cappel. But their reputation would have been fruitless for the Académie, if it had not won recognition by the ecclesiastical authorities. This was made possible by Amyraut who a few years before Loudun produced the most elaborate statement ever written by a French theologian on the question of church government and defined the place of universities in the federal edifice of the French churches. In his treatise Du gouvernement de l'Eglise Amyraut argued for a federal structure of the French reformed churches, by showing that church government was neither purely democratic, nor aristocratic, nor monarchical. Church government cannot be purely democratic, he stated, because the people are not able to judge the special talents required to become a minister of the Word of God. Nor can it take the form of an aristocratic government: for in such a case the churches are in danger to lose the measure of freedom they have been given by God. Finally he argued that church government cannot take the form of a monarchy, because the authority of pasteurs is a gift of God. Pasteurs cannot be compared to civil magistrates who only have powers delegated to them by their sovereign: "c'est au nom de Dieu que nous assurons les hommes de leur salut...au lieu que les commandements que nous recevons des magistrats subalternes n'ont de poids ni d'autorité envers nous, sinon parce qu'ils sont envoyés du souverain". Amyraut thus showed that federal structure
of consistoires, colloques and synods (both provincial and national) was the only one which combined the advantages of the three forms without the dangers of any; it was the only one which separated the responsibilities of the teaching of the Gospel and the administration of the community. The first properly belonged to the pastors the second to the ecclesiastical bodies. When the case arose when a pastor or an assembly did not perform its duties, the decision was to be left to a national ecclesiastical body. In the Gouvernement d'Eglise, Amyraut to illustrate this point chose a very significant example: "Si dans une école publique où on enseigne la théologie, l'erreur vient à se glisser...qui remédiera à ce désordre? Qui jugera si ce qu'on enseigne est erreur on si ce ne l'est pas, si l'on ne fait des assemblées ecclésiastiques pour en prendre connaissance? Et qu'on ne dise point que les formules des confessions de foi et les liturgies en peuvent décider... dans les disputes de cette nature, chacun des partis tire ses formules de son côté.... sans l'autorité des synodes provinciaux et nationaux, il n'y a état, quelque magistrat qu'il ait, où les églises particulières ne soient dans un inévitable danger de tomber en peu de temps, en raison des dissentiments des docteurs et des pasteurs, dans une étrange difformité". The interesting point in the
passage is that implicitly dodeurs are assimilated to pasteurs and Académies to consistoires. In its decisions the synod of Loudun, undoubtedly adopted Amyraut's theory. For, as we have seen, the synod reaffirmed that the professors were responsible to their local synod, or in the last resort, to the national synod whose decision was final. The success of the Académie would not have been possible without the relatively stable position it thus gained at the national level.

The place of the Académie in Saumur

During the 1660-1670 decade the Académie also enjoyed a certain measure of stability at the local level. This stability however was also the result of a compromise: The church of Saumur during the years 1655-1660 was torn between two factions, a situation which could have threatened the success of the Académie. Amyraut himself insisted on the danger of the situation, during a meeting of the consistoire in 1655: "Quant à ce qui regardait le général de nos églises (M. Amyraut) représenta .... que l'édification de l'Eglise de Saumur était l'édification de toutes les églises de France, parce qu'on avait ici la crème de la jeunesse de toutes les provinces, de l'instruction desquelles on devait avoir un soin particulier". Our discussion of the background to the 1660-1670 decade must include a brief account of this local strife. Although Le gouvernement de l'Eglise a book which was born out of this confrontation,
It is mainly concerned, as we have seen, with the problem of the national structure of the churches. It is in fact in a short pamphlet entitled Appendice au livre du gouvernement de l'église, published in 1656, that Amyraut deals with the question of the role of individual churches. As for details of the quarrel itself, they are found in a book edited by the consistoire of Saumur, which contains a number of Pièces authentiques, together with a chronology of the events that led to the split of the protestant community of Saumur into two rival factions.

According to the narrative given in Pièces authentiques the responsibility for the dispute is to be attributed to Amyraut's colleague d'Huisseau. Both were pasteurs, and both as such had a seat in the Conseil. But d'Huisseau never held academic responsibilities. Amyraut on the contrary found that his teaching duties, together with his involvement in the various controversies we have previously analysed, left him very little time to take care of his pastoral duties. In 1655 therefore he asked to be relieved of some of these, and suggested that a theology student named De Beaujardin should perform them in his place. The intention was obviously to strengthen the links between the Académie and the consistoire. On January 14, 1555, during a long meeting of the protestant chefs de famille of Saumur which marked the beginning of the disturbance, Amyraut made the point that it was the best practical arrangement "si l'on établissait un
pasteur qui pût servir à l'école, il pourrait partager le ministère avec lui, quand l'occasion de servir en l'école se présenterait.\textsuperscript{14} Apart from the obvious convenience of the system, however, it is clear that Amyraut was thinking of the necessity of assuring some continuity in the teaching of the Académie. For the report quoted in Pièces authentiques shows that the true objective was to make sure that Saumur would never be left with a vacant chair of theology: "... il fallait mettre en considération que les trois professeurs en théologie qui sont maintenant ici sont désormais vieux et infirmes et qu'il y a de la prudence à ce qu'il y ait quelqu'un de prêt que serve à cette profession, à la première occasion qui s'en présentera .."\textsuperscript{15}

D'Huisseau's opposition was inspired by many considerations: the main one seems to have been personal animosity against Amyraut. As early as 1652 d'Huisseau had asked to be relieved of some of the heavy pastoral duties that he had to bear, because his three colleagues devoted most of their time to academic work.\textsuperscript{16} He therefore opposed the provisional nomination of De Beaupré, as perpetuating a system which he considered unfair to him, and put forward another candidate, Villemandi, who would be prepared to act for him. Perhaps he also aimed at obtaining a post of professor of theology. The Pièces authentiques, the only account of the disturbances, being written against d'Huisseau, is not altogether reliable.\textsuperscript{17}
It is interesting to note however that Amyraut rejected Villemandi, more for academic than truly pastoral reasons: "Pour le dit Sieur ... il [Amyraut] dit qu'il avait de beaux dons naturels, de belles connaissance acquises et du génie à l'éloquence. Mais que ses défauts étaient qu'il avait l'accent normand, la prononciation langlissante et un peu endormante, et le style à son jugement, plus approchant des anciens sophistes que des grands orateurs. Quant à la proposition qu'il avait faite on [l'] avait trouvée mauvaise ..."\(^{18}\)

A detailed account of the quarrel that evolved would be out of place. Two main facts emerge from the numerous consistorial documents or the petitions reprinted in Pièces authentiques.\(^ {19}\) The first is that d'Huissseau enjoyed some support in Saumur but that his faction, 'les opposants' as they are called in Pièces authentiques, never enjoyed a substantial majority in the Consistoire. Their moves to reject the nomination of Beaujardin, of Desloges who was also nominated by the Conseil in 1655, as a second possible candidate to another chair of theology, were always defeated. When they took their case to the provincial synods held in 1656, in Saumur in 1657, in Preuilly in 1658, in Baye in 1659, their propositions were also rejected. We are told in Pièces authentiques that they wrote a series of pamphlets challenging the validity of this rejection and questioning the right of the consistoire to decide for the entire community.
of Saumur. In other words they adopted positions very close to those known in England as congregationalism (or in France "les indépendants"). That d'Huisseau inclined towards congregationalism is certain. For in Pièces authentiques give an account of an incident where Amyraut and himself had an altercation on the subject of given: "comme l'on discourait auprès du feu, on tomba sur le propos des affaires d'Angleterre et de l'opinion des indépendants. Sur quoi le dit Sieur Amyraut les ayant par quelque ironie appelés les peuple des Saints du Souverain ... le dit sieur d'Huisseau releva ces paroles avec témoignage de ressentiment et dit que les indépendants étaient aussi bien le peuple des Saints du Souverain qu'aucunes églises ou aucunes personnes qui fussent au monde ... puis ... le dit sieur Amyraut ayant allégué les paroles de Milton au commencement de livre intitulé Défense pour le peuple d'Angleterre ... le dit sieur d'Huisseau ... soutint en termes formels que les synodes n'étaient point nécessaires pour le gouvernement de l'Eglise ..."20 Another document in Pièces authentiques quotes a passage from a pamphlet by a supporter of d'Huisseau, which gives a different version of the incident.21 "Il (d'Huisseau) se souvenait de ces choses: c'est qu'après le souper, étant entrés en conférence de diverses choses, Monsieur Amyraut se raillant du titre qu'on donnait à l'armée anglaise qui se qualifiait de l'Armée des saints, il lui dit que s'il y avait aujourd'hui quelque armée sur terre qui put porter le titre là, c'était
l'armée d'Angleterre... et sur ce que Monsieur Amyraut prit de là occasion de les accuser d'indépendance, le dit Sieur d'Huisseau dit qu'ils ne l'étaient pas tous et qu'au reste il y avait certains indépendants qui n'avaient autre erreur que quelque dissentiment avec nous en la forme du gouvernement de l'Eglise..."22 In both versions there is not enough to warrant our attributing d'Huisseau definite congregationalist views. At any rate, if the quarrel between the two factions did take some ideological form, it happened late and the commitment of d'Huisseau's followers to congregationalism remained superficial.

The second important aspect of the quarrel is that it could have had serious consequences for the Académie: by challenging the right of the Académie to choose in advance its candidates to the chair of theology,23 to prevent a sudden vacancy, d'Huisseau and his followers took an attitude which created two main dangers. First by arguing that pastoral problems should be given priority, d'Huisseau introduced a distinction which had never arisen before: "lorsque M. le Recteur proposa au Consistoire la résolution de l'Académie, touchant la vocation de ces deux messieurs qui pourraient servir non seulement dans l'école, mais aussi dans l'Eglise et eut requis que les trois cents livres du revenu que l'Eglise a en réserve, fussent employés à leur entretienement, moyennant quelque nombre de prédications dont le Consistoire conviendrait, le dit ... Sieur d'Huisseau n'y
voulut jamais consentir, disant que c'était une chose de
dangereuse conséquence ... quoiqu'il sût fort bien que ces
deniers ne leur devaient pas être donnés en qualité de
professeurs mais en qualité de pasteurs ...". 24 Secondly
d'Huisseau challenged the right of the Conseil académique
to nominate in advance successors to the chair of theology -
although the procedure had in fact been recommended by
various national synods from Alès to Charenton. By 1659 there-
fore the quarrel had reached dangerous proportions. Spirits were
high. D'Huisseau had ceased to attend the meetings of the
Conseil and the protestant community of Saumur was divided into
camps, and even the proposants took sides. 25 A local rivalry
thus threatened to jeopardize the future of the Académie.

Fortunately in 1659 both sides requested the national
synod of Loudun to put an end to the disturbance. The
national synod firmly admonished d'Huisseau on his conduct,
but blamed the consistoire for having published Pièces
authentiques. It also reaffirmed the right of the Conseil to
nominate candidates to the professorship of theology. On the
other hand, d'Huisseau was reinstated on the Conseil. 26 The
crisis which had shaken the Saumur community thus subsided.
Although in the decade 1660-1670, local rivalries still occasion-
ally played a part in the decisions of the Conseil, no major
incident capable of disrupting the links of the Académie to
Saumur community ever occurred. Locally as well as nationally
Saumur was at peace.
Amyraut died in 1665. With him the last representatives of the first generation of Saumur professors disappeared. By that date the number of pasteurs in Anjou and in all the provinces who had been trained under him, must have reached significant proportions. What had once been considered a controversial doctrine, constituted, for the younger generation, the very way they had been trained to think, their mental make-up, so to speak. The presence of these former students of Saumur among the pasteurs who attended Loudun, must undoubtedly account for the recognition that Amyraut won there. But their ever increasing number also explains the confidence with which the second generation of Saumur professors implicitly accepted intellectual positions for which Amyraut, La Place and Cappel had to fight. The three professors whose work we shall study in the next chapters are all representative of the rationalist spirit which had inspired their elders. On the other hand Gaussen, Chouet or Lefèvre, however, each brought a new, and broader approach to their own field of theology, philosophy or classical studies. These original developments would not have occurred, nor would not have been tolerated if La Place, Amyraut and Cappel had not paved the way for them, and had not secured for the Académie the necessary measure of intellectual independence, and a well defined place among the French churches.
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Chapter V

THE NEW SPIRIT OF SAUMUR: GAUSSEN

Our study of Saumur's golden years must begin with Gauscen. The reason is not that Gauscen as a professor of theology was of the calibre of his predecessor, Amyraut. Furthermore, unlike his colleagues Chouet or Lefèvre, he did not give a new impetus to intellectual life in Saumur. He wrote little, and his merit does not really lie in the originality of what he wrote. For instance, Bayle, always a good judge, refers to Gauscen's *Dissertationes theologicae* in one of his letters to his cousin Bayze: "M. Doull et moi, parlames hui d'une méthode d'étudier la théologie et nous convins qu'y ayant divers traités imprimés sur ce sujet, comme aussi sur la maniere de précher, il n'y avait qu'à choisir. Mr Doull ajouta, qu'il ne voyait point de meilleur guide dans la méthode des études de théologie que l'ouvrage que Mr Gauscen, professeur à Saumur a publié..." But Bayle adds "Jamais homme n'a été moins propre que moi à dresser une méthode d'études, car je n'ai suivi que ce qui était de mon goût ..."1 - remark which is not simply very characteristic of Bayle's approach, but also helps to put Gauscen's work into proper perspective. In fact the interest of Gauscen is that he is truly a product of Saumur, and
personifies the t\_astes of the Académie during the decade.

Gaussen's career was entirely devoted to Saumur. When he was first called to the chair of philosophy in 1661, to replace L. Hugues, he had just been asked, as a young proposant, to become pasteur of Poitiers. Obviously, Gaussen was not very happy about this last prospect and refused the offer. The church of Poitiers deputized to the Conseil Académique. The tracts that followed are recorded in the Registre for 26 July 1661. The Conseil left it to Gaussen to decide whether or not he would go to Poitiers: "La chose ayant été examinée ... tout ce Conseil a été unanimement d'avis que ... bien qu'il soit certain qu'à parler absolument l'exercice du ministère regarde plus directement et plus immédiatement la gloire de Dieu que la profession en philosophie, néanmoins, cette question si le dit Sieur Gaussen peut davantage servir à la gloire de Dieu en l'un qu'en l'autre, dépend de tant de considérations et de circonstances particulières ... et même en grande partie de la connaissance que le Sieur Gaussen a seul de soi-même et de la disposition de sa conscience, qu'elle ne veut et ne peut s'engager à la déterminer ..."² Gaussen's choice was to stay. His tastes and his way of life, as we shall see, did not really incline him towards pastoral duties. He belonged to that second generation of pasteurs formed at Saumur whom we described earlier, who by their formation were more inclined towards
intellec
tual pursuits. Saumur provided the proper milieu and
it is in Saumur that he made his career.

In fact there is something of the careerist in Gausse
His correspondence with Bouhéreau during the year 1664-5
shows that he had set his aim to succeed to Amyraut's chair.
On 19 January 1664, he informed Bouhéreau that Amyraut had died,
and added: "La semaine prochaine l'on délibérera sur qui on
doit jeter les yeux. Pour moi, je sais déjà assurément où la
plupart des voix iront, et je vous le dirai à l'oreille, à
condition que vous me gardiez le secret: ce sera Monsieur
Gousset, car il est aimé et estimé en cette ville. L'événement
vous apprendra que ma conjecture est bonne. Si mon maître
[i.e. Amyraut] ne m'eût pas manqué si tôt etc., vous savez bien
ce que je veux dire ..." 3 And in another letter, he unwittingly
reveals that he did his utmost to obtain the position, and
that he did not think very highly of his competitors: "J'ai
quelques affaires particulières qui me font un peu de peine.
Il me faut écrire je ne sais combien de lettres, faire et
recevoir des visites ... c'est une pitié cher Monsieur d'être
obligé de se déterminer à des gens dont vous ne connaissez ni
le savoir, ni le génie ni l'humeur ..." 4 Finally there is a
note of triumph in the hastily written billet on which he
announced that he had been appointed. 5

Both Gausse's dedication to a career and the fact that
he belonged to the Amyraut faction, made him a number of
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enemies in Saumur. When he mentions "des affaires particulières" in the letter already quoted, he refers in fact to a campaign against him. For we learn from Turon de Beyrie that a satire was circulated where Gausson was "cruellement déchiré". And Turon de Beyrie throws some light on the quarrel when he writes: "je ne m'étonne pas que M. Gausson ait eu des opposants à sa réception" and adds "voilà l'Académie terriblement déchirée et ce partage des proposants qui se divisent sous divers maîtres ne peut que lui être désavantageux. Le procédé de Monsieur d'Huisseau est d'un esprit bouillon et ennemi de l'ordre". The satire is lost, but in one of his letters to Bouhéreau, Tanneguy-Lefèvre gives an idea of the tone of the campaign: "quare non possum non vehementer dolere cum doctissimum, laboriosissimum, ingeniosissimumque juvenum, ab his, ab illis tam maligne, tamque inhumane lacerari video. Vin tu scire quae causa habet turbas faciat? Haec nempe; nimis praeclare de illius indole judicavit preceptor; familia et cognatos in hoc oppido non habet; vetulorum et otiosorum hominum tribus non ambit et quod omnia gravissimum est et indignissimum, juvenis est, mi Boherelle, non decrepitus senecio ..." In other words the arguments of the satire were of a personal nature. Although Gausson’s links with Amyraut were its true cause, the campaign must not be interpreted as being in any way directed against Gausson’s theological position. As we shall later see, Gausson in fact was not entirely devoted to the criticism of his illustrious predecessor. For his opponents, Gausson’s selection represented
the success or someone whose career rested on the personal
support he had given to Amyraut against d'Huisseau. And if
the satire is lost, there is in the Bouhéreau collection,
a shorter piece which confirms our interpretation. Furthermore,
it provides us with a not altogether unkind portrait of
Gaussen, and for this reason we shall quote it in full:

"Quitte ces lieux, éloigne-t-en
Lâche et pernicieux Zoïle;
Tu n'y trouveras point d'asile;
On n'y va plus parler que du docte Gaussen.
Mais demeure plutôt, car malgré l'imposture,
Il faut qu'un jour toi-même, après nos Sénateurs
Tu confirmes de lui tout ce que j'en augure.
Il faut que contre ta nature,
Gaussen te compte au rang de ses admirateurs.
Tu verras dans son air, dans son port, dans sa taille,
La justesse, la grâce avec la majesté;
Et j'ose t'assurer que quelque part qu'on aille,
On ne peut sans difficulté trouver une âme plus sincère
Plus grande, plus belle et moins fière.
D'ailleurs sa courtoisie et sa rare douceur,
Son entretien commode et rempli d'innocence,
En un mot sa charmante humeur,
Bannira bientôt de ton coeur,
La malice et la médiscance.
Mais si devant tes yeux il étale jamais
De son divin esprit les beautés sans pareilles,
O Zofile, je te promets
Que tu verras bien des merveilles.
La profonde science et la solidité,
L'éloquence, l'éclat, l'extrême politesse,
La présence et la netteté,
La pointe et la délicatesse
Empêcheront ton choix par la diversité.
Quoi donc, ce fameux personnage,
Sur les autres mortels a-t-il tant d'avantages,
Qu'ayant tous des défauts, il soit seul accompli?
Ah, j'ai tort, il est vrai, je mettais en oubli
Que pour tant de mérite il n'a pas assez d'âge.\(^8\)

L'éloquence, l'éclat, l'extrême politesse

---

**Politesse** is indeed a key word for an understanding of Gaussen's approach to study. On this the madrigal is undoubtedly fair. For politesse is the very ideal that Gaussen offered to his students in one of his addresses to them, *De studii theologici ratione*, printed in his *Quatuor dissertationes theologicae*.\(^9\) This piece is primarily intended to guide students in their studies. It enumerates various books which they should read, selecting the more useful. Gaussen distinguishes between classes of knowledge; in each the best books are always for him those that summarize and systematize.
On sacred history for instance the reason he gives for recommending Cappel is the concision of his *Chronologia sacra*: "Ludovico Cappellum qui Chronologiam sacram brevi libro complexus est". The foundations of learning for Gaussen are encyclopedic, that is to say both wide ranging and systematically arranged. The usefulness of commentaries or books of controversies, for instance, is that they provide a system of information: "Libri enim polemici et commentariorum non alio fere apud nos habentur loco, quam glossaria et dictionaria, quae quamquam studiosis omnino necessaria sint, nemo tamen, uno tenore umquam legerit". For Gaussen therefore a common-place book is the necessary instrument of the cultivated man: "De collectaneis disponendis ita judicamus, nullam posse studiosis qui multum, non multa legere debent, commodiorem methodum proponi, quam si notabiliora quaeque, prout illa sese objiciunt in unum librum, quasi per saturam conficiant, adscriptis ad marginem libri, quam ideo paulo oportet esse ampliorum, rerum singularum titulis quidem ad indicem alphabeticum relati, quid cuique paginae inscriptum fuerit, in tempore commodofaciant". Gaussen therefore considers learning as necessary, but also insists that it must be measured and discriminative. Knowledge must not be sought for knowledge's sake. The aim of study is not to be erudite, but to think clearly. This is why Gaussen emphasizes the necessity to go to the original or the essential text.
Gaussen is very critical of the wrong use of learning in disputations. Thinking is not an accumulation of pedantic quotations with their confusing jargon. The best ideas are formed in an unpedantic, polite, even familiar, discussion: "nam qui per longas syllogismos eo tandem cadit quo invadere statim initio oportebat, magno conatu nihil agit et auditoribus maximam, inani loquacitate, bene agendi occasionem precidit. Quippe Theologia et omnes in universum disciplinae, nulla ratione melius, quam familiari colloquio traduntur". Lefèvre in his letter to Bouhéréau already quoted shows that Gaussen had truly mastered the art of polished discussion, even on difficult subjects: "Inibi eram, mea suavitas", writes Lefèvre, "... cum forte in hortulum Gaussenus. Postquam de te, de me, de illo, de illis, sermones varii habiti fuerunt, iique non sine risu, nugis et jocis successerunt seria. Dein hominem rogare coepi, de illo D. Paulo loco quid censeret. Ibi vero ex eo didici quod iis omnibus dignum est, qui bonam mentem et acrem attentamque lectionem amant, quae duo in plerisque theologis hodie desiderantur. Primum gaudere se dixit quod locus ille D. Pauli mihi quoque difficilis visus esset, nam et tamen sibi visum fuisse ... Dein tribus verbis rem ita deter sit, ita elucidavit, ut me mei, ut me interpretem puduerit .." 14 Finally, Gaussen's ideal of style is also one of brevity and clarity as well as accuracy. The model he suggests is the
familiar letter: "eam autem styli aequabilitatem simul et claritatem facile acquirat ... qui nullum umquam scriptum, nec epistolium quidem ad familiares, sibi e manibus excidere patiatur, in quo accurata aliqua et rei quae scribitur apta diligentia non servetur ..."15 Gaussen's letters to Bouhéreau reveal a keen awareness of his own shortcomings. In fact, in one letter he mentions that he sent Bouhéreau the proofs of his dissertations, asking him to correct them: "Si vous avez fait quelques remarques dont vous jugez qu'il soit bon d'avertir le lecteur dans la préface vous me ferez plaisir de m'en avertir ... l'on est après d'imprimer cinq ou six leçons que j'ai faites "de ratione concionandi", où il y a un peu plus d'exactitude que dans le premier traité que vous avez vu. Mais ce sont toujours des leçons qui se sentent de notre métier et qui ne sont pas digne d'être présentées à des yeux aussi fins que les vôtres ..."16 Gaussen was from Gascogne, and, particularly when he wrote in French must have been sadly aware of the inadequacies of his native style, which must have suffered from the "péché originel des provinciaux", as another "provincial", Pierre Bayle, called it.17 For him therefore good style was a happy medium between ordinary language and flourished rhetoric. Gaussen particularly emphasizes this point in the dissertation "de ratione concionandi", where he discusses sermon writing: "dico amplexis figuram ... quae in usu communi aliquando, sed raro toleratur, in publicis allocationibus
item aliquando sed raro tolerari". He enumerates types of figures which the good sermon writer must avoid: stock-epithets, conceits and paraphrases. In other words, as in the case of learning or argumentation, Gaussen advocates "le naturel": "quominus illae \(\sqrt{\text{voces}}\) naturales erunt, eominus erunt in dicendo efficaces". His is truly a classical ideal.

The uses of reason

Moderation and simplification also characterize Gaussen's doctrinal position, both in theology and in ethics. To consider theology first, Gaussen defines it as a practical discipline whose foundations rest on divine authority, as jurisprudence does on human authority: "Theologia itaque nostra et practica est et ita dici debet, cum enim illa, ut et jurisprudentia non rationis discursu, sed testimonio et authoritate fulciatur". Theology is practical because its object is our salvation and the means thereof. God, says Gaussen, has given us the rules to follow to reach that end and they are embodied in the Scripture. The purpose of theology is to formulate these rules into dogma: "Theologia est doctrina quae homines docet quibus mediis Deus genus humanum ad salutem adducat." Theology therefore must concentrate on a study of the Scripture in which God has spelt out these rules: "theologiae quae eam salutem habet pro fine, totale et adaequatum objectum nullum aliud esse potest quam Verbum Dei."
This echoes another statement in the first dissertation that "nos enim optimus theologus dicitur qui librum Scriptuarum intelligit".22 There is strong dislike in Gaussen for what he calls "la métaphysique" or "les vaines spéculations des théologiens". In a letter to Bouhéreau he expresses this distrust very openly, a propos a book by Morus on the New Testament: "Je ne sais si vous avez vu les notes de M. Morus sur le Nouveau Testament. L'on les voit ici depuis quatre ou cinq jours en petit volume .. L'ouvrage est très digne de la réputation de son auteur à quelques subtilités près que je suis bien assuré que vous ne goûterez pas. Je crois que d'orénavant l'on va prendre cet air d'étudier en théologie, car pour nos lieux communs, après tant et de si épais volumes, il n'y a rien plus à faire. Et puis voulez vous que je vous dise franchement, à moins qu'ils ne soient traités par un excellent ouvrier, ils donnent dans la métaphysique ..."23

In the first dissertation Gaussen makes it clear that by 'métaphysique', he means the distortion of the message of the Scripture, which occurs when it is given an extraneous formulation. There Gaussen gives a brief review of various distortions which have been imposed on the christian message through the ages. The first culprits were the scholastics, who posed as followers of Aristotle: "Theologia captiva verius quam transfuga, in victoris castra transiit; et ut solent captivi, eorum qui vicerunt, vestes et linguam imitari, ita illa sibi Aristotelis - quid Aristotelis dico? -
interpretum Aristotelis debui dicere, linguam et habitum aptavit. Ea res in theologiam λογομαχίας inventum et insanabile disputandi cacoethes. According to Gaussen another example of logomachia is found in the doctrine Ramus: "et ecce tibi, praesertim in Germania, theologos Ramistas, qui quia magister Ramus Λογομαχίας amabat, nihil actum putent, nisi omnia minima maxima in duas partes secent."

But the major culprit for Gaussen is Descartes: "audaci facinore novam et ipse rationem invent, quam certissimum veri canonem putant .." We strike here at the root of Gaussen's criticism of "la métaphysique". What he refuses to accept is that only through philosophical reasoning can truth be reached in theology. He makes this very clear in his fourth dissertation "De utilitate philosophiae ad theologiam": "quam vero logicam, quamne metaphysicam hic a me commendari existimatis? Cartesiamne quam Renati Cartesii tanto pere celebrant? aut Cannonicam illum potius, quam ex Senis Gargetii hortus collectam Petrus Gassendus, nostro aevo, tanta diligentia excoluit? Sane utramque, si quidem utramque sua Theologici theorematum accommodassent." Philosophical methods are valid as long as they accept the propositions of theology. But if they set out to prove them they are bound to lead to heretical interpretations. Gaussen sees Socin as an extreme example, of the wrong use of reasoning. In Socin he denounces what constitutes for him the major crime, the rationalist prejudice: "Nos profecto cum Fausti Socini libros legimus, hoc nobis videmur
videre [sic] in id laborasse hominem, ut sibi theologiam pararet quae humanae ratione maxime probaretur, ad quam postea, ut ingenio suo [mirum in modum confidebat, Verbum Dei ... otiose detorqueret].

Are we to say then that Gaussen breaks away from the rationalism of his famous predecessors? In our view, this would be the wrong interpretation. First of all because Gaussen in the Quatuor dissertationes pays tribute to the work of his predecessors: "neque eo dicimus, quod virorum praestantissimorum opera aspernemur, quorum in hacse palaestra sese exerant industria." Secondly, Gaussen is not criticizing the rational approach to religious matters, but defining the proper uses of reason. Man must reject preconceived notions to approach the Word of God. If he does, he will reach truth: "eo enim fiet, ut praecognitas opiniones ad Scripturam, non contra, quam plurimi faciunt, Scripturas ad praecognitas opiniones examinet, et ita sit, non amplius felicitate tantum nascendi, sed scientia et fide christianus." And Gaussen is affirmative that some measure of truth can be reached. First human reason is capable of distinguishing the true from the false: "Si non invenendas veritatis quod nos, ut sunt res humanae, difficilium arbitramur, at certe, quod proximum est, evitandi erroris haec est norma, ut nihil unquam affirmes aut neges, nisi quod affirmandum et negandum distincte et clare intellexeris." Finally the truth
is embodied in the Scripture, and therefore this is where it can be found: "ita in theologia omnium tutissimus hic est Canon, ut nihil assensu comprobes, nisi quod in Scriptura dici, clare et distincte intellexeris." Clarity and distinctiveness, here, are of course the two cartesian criteria of evidence. Nothing is true which is not evident.

But how are we to find the truth? In a letter to Bouhéreau, Gaussen elaborates on this last point. Commenting again on Morus' book he writes: "l'auteur ... a fait ce que beaucoup de nos gens devraient faire tout de bon, je veux dire un peu mieux étudier les langues pour entendre l'Ecriture. Car il est constant que Dieu a parlé à nous, la question est d'entendre ce qu'il a dit. Pour cela il faut me servir de la grammaire et faire taire ma raison, si ce n'est en tant qu'elle m'est nécessaire à me servir de ma grammaire. Car si je lis la Bible simplement en théologien, je la lirai dans le dessein d'y trouver ce que j'ai lu dans mes thèses et quelque chose que je fasse je ne me guérirai jamais de ce préjugé." The letter helps us to understand Gaussen's conceptions: Gaussen in the Quatuor dissertationes attempts to put across, albeit confusedly, a conception of truth as immanent in the language of the Scripture. The divine language of the Scripture is like a cipher which is to be decoded; the key to that code is grammar. The only valid method is "tout examiner aux règles de ma grammaire", ... ce n'est pas qu'il ne faille étudier les lieux communs, mais c'est pour les réduire à l'Ecriture qui est la règle souveraine." Reason therefore does play an essential part first in learning the rules of the language of Scripture, secondly in applying
the evidence obtained from Scripture to the formulating of propositions.

In other words, while the first generation of Saumur theologians was concerned with investigating the possibilities of right reason, Gaussen defines the rules for right thinking. There is an ascēse of reason: it must get rid of prejudices, reject confused language and go straight to Scripture. Furthermore the language of reason is simple and clear: "me quinque ab hinc annis ... nihil usque adeo, obscurum et perplexum audivisse, quod ego et mecum alius quilibet ... non possit sermone vulgari et quodidiano declarare."35 Human words can only give inadequate approximation of the divine word, for the language of Scripture is a privileged language. Nevertheless reason can learn to speak it and translate it into clear propositions. In theology therefore, right thinking begins with philology: "Philologos huc intelligo qui, quia sunt quarum scientia exulti, nec aures disputationibus nostris tinitas habent, saepe de faecatiorem et a prejudiciis libriorem animum ad Scripturae interpretationem afferunt."36
The wise man is a happy man

Gausssen's views on ethics are found in the Theses philosophicae en Aristotele transcriptae which were submitted by six of his students in 1663. As the title itself indicates, his main inspiration is Aristotle, more precisely the Nicomachean ethics. Marginal annotation in the Theses refer to precise passages from Aristotle's work, and the end of the theses Gausszen gives the edition which he used. The Theses are short and concentrate on two main points: first he defines what constitutes the supreme good and secondly he examines the question of whether it is in our power to practise virtue.

Gausszen starts his discussion by pointing out the importance of having a clear conception of what the supreme good is in order that we may regulate our lives accordingly: "Summi boni cognito magnum ad vitam degendam habet momentum, ut signo aliquo nobis, tanquam sagittarius proposito, id quod expectere nos opportet facilius consequamur". Moral activity therefore is defined as knowing what good is and acting accordingly. Formally, virtue rests on judgement: "opus hominis et summi illius boni erit actio animae rationalis, secundum virtutem optimam et perfectissimam in vita perfecta"... an Aristotelian principle which, thus broadly defined, is common to many XVIIth century moralists from Du Vair to Descartes. Good is first defined by Gausszen
in terms of doing what is right, useful and pleasurable:
"cum autem tria sint quae sequi et expectare solemus,
honestum, utile et jucundum, tria contraria quae fugimus
et aversamur, turpe inutile et molestem, circa haec quidem
omniavir bonus recte agit et maxime quippe circa voluptatem."\textsuperscript{42}

Happiness therefore is in stoic fashion defined as ataraxia
"eam autem \sqrt{voluptatem}\ in primis intellegimus quae in quiete
magis quam in motu consistat".\textsuperscript{43} But happiness springs also
from acting \textit{rightly}. What is right is pleasurable: "nam
cum jucundum cuique illud sit cujus amans dicitur sic sane
amanti justitiam, ea quae sunt justa, jucunda sunt." Finally,
the highest happiness and the highest virtue come from the
exercise of reason in contemplation; for the wise man is
necessarily a happy man. The distinction here comes from
Aristotle: "jam nunc virtus alia in actione, alia in contem-
platione consistat, istam priori illi anteferendam putamus.
Nam et praestantissimae omnium facultatis est operatio et num
virtute admistam et implicatam voluptatem arbitremur, quae ex
sapientia oritur operatio, ea omnium hominum consensu,
jucundissimam habetur".\textsuperscript{44} For Gaus sen there is a gradation
in \textit{voluptas} which consists first in tranquillity of mind,
secondly, in the pleasure that comes from acting rightly and
finally, in the \textit{voluptas} which accompanies the exercise of
reason in contemplation.\textsuperscript{45} By assimulating \textit{voluptas} with
virtue, and by defining the most virtuous action (and the most
satisfying) as that which springs from \textit{sapientia}, Gaus sen, we
think, interprets Aristotle through the neo-stoic tradition. He also interprets it within the christian tradition: the more virtuous we are the more we accomplish what is truly divine in us. We share the first type of voluptas with brutes: "quippe [εα] voluptas res est communis omnibus animantibus". But only man is endowed with reason; and the godly gift of reason is what enables him to aim at perfection. His goal truly is: "virtutem optimam et perfectissimam, in vita perfecta". To reach it, however, man must make a proper use of his anima rationis.

But is it really in the power of man to act virtuously; is not our nature too corrupt and too weak? Gaussen does not enlarge on the problem and his answer is affirmative but tautological: "quod si honesta et turpia agere nostri est arbitrarii et pariter non agere, virtus et vitium sunt in nostra potestate". And he simply concludes by stating that those who say otherwise do not understand Aristotle or themselves: "qui hunc Aristotelis locum putant cum illa quam fides nos docuit, invita et inolita corruptione, pugnare, magistrum nostrum non intelligunt et seipos ignorant".

The recurrent reference to Aristotle in Gaussen situates him within the main stream of protestant rationalism (see next chapter). On this point however, he differed from his predecessors in this respect that he attempted a simplification of the doctrine of his maître à penser. As in learning and in style, his ideal thought was characterised by simplicity and clarity. And for Gaussen, Aristotle exemplified these very
qualities: "accuratam illa loquendi diligentiam, verborum castitatem et constructam in sensibus brevitatem ... quae sunt Aristotelis virtutes" he wrote in the Theses philosophicae. Without this simplification Chouet's reassessment of Aristotelian doctrine would not have been possible. Also, by insisting on a grammatical approach to Scripture Gaussen both continued the work of Cappel and rendered acceptable a bolder approach. In short, Gaussen embodies the ideal of the new generation of Saumur, and also heralds the original developments of Chouet and of Lefèvre.
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Chapter VI

CHOUET AND THE INTRODUCTION OF CARTESIANISM IN SAUMUR

With the appointment of Jean Robert Chouet to the chair of philosophy in 1664 a short but brilliant period of philosophical activity begins in the Académie. During the four years he spent there, Chouet transformed the teaching of philosophy, opened up new avenues in metaphysics and brought to Saumur the 'virtuoso' spirit of the new experimental physicists. Chouet stayed less than five years in Saumur, and left for Geneva in July 1669. The Conseil Académique realizing the prestige he had brought to Saumur expressed great concern at his leaving. Indeed, young men from the neighbouring provinces who would otherwise have gone to Saumur followed him to Geneva to study philosophy under him. Chouet's teaching however had left its mark on Saumur. It is this influence that we shall assess in this chapter.

The chair of philosophy became vacant in July 1664, when Gasssen who held it, was appointed to the chair of theology, in replacement of Amyraut who had died. His appointment is recorded by the Registre of 11 July 1664: "Monsieur Gasssen en conséquence de l'approbation qu'a fait le Synode de
sa nomination pour la profession de théologie en cette Académie, a déclaré aujourd'hui qu'il se décharge dès à présent de la profession pour l'année prochaine, n'ayant dessein de conduire les écoliers qu'il a sous lui que jusques à ce qu'il les ait fait passer bacheliers et qu'il laisse à la Compagnie la liberté de pourvoir à sa place..."
The chair of philosophy was then advertised by circular letter to the major churches in the kingdom. The pasteur from Saintonge, Villemandi, presented himself to the Conseil on October 22nd. It was decided that he would be examined on October 25th. Curiously enough, on the very day of Villemandi's arrival, the Conseil received a private letter - "une lettre particulière" - informing them that "un nommé Monsieur Chouet" had decided to apply. The letter came from Gaussen himself, or was sent from Geneva and forwarded by him to the Conseil; this Chouet knew (as his letters to Louis Tronchin clearly show). But at the time of his application however, Chouet was not aware of the complex quarrel in which he was being unwittingly used.

Gaussen's motives are clear. Villemandi had long been associated with d'Huisseau and, as such, he had become involved in the local strife between d'Huisseau and Amyrault; furthermore, Villemandi's province, Saintonge, had never been favourable to the theology of Amyrault. In the Conseil, where he was in a minority, d'Huisseau's efforts to find a
position for his protégé had failed. However, Amyraut's death provided the long awaited opportunity. D'Huisseau could now hope that someone favourable to him would obtain a chair at long last.

Gaussen, on the contrary, was a known supporter of Amyraut: his appointment to the chair of theology met with opposition from the d'Huisseau faction, whose hostility was not easily overcome. He made sure therefore to find a competitor for d'Huisseau's protégé: once he had informed those former students from Saumur (Villemandi included) who were likely candidates, as it was his duty to do, he himself wrote to Chouet suggesting that he should apply. Chouet later became aware of the personal quarrels which his election brought into the open. In a letter to Louis Tronchin of 3 July 1665, he refers to a 'cabale' against Gaussen that followed: "On peut assurément dire que mon élection en est la cause, quoique ce soit par accident, pour parler en philosophe. Car vous saurez que Mr Gaussen, ayant écrit à Mr Villemandi pour l'inviter à venir disputer la chaire ... et ayant invité M. Fornerot à y penser aussi, ces deux Messieurs s'imagine qu'en quoi qu'il arrêt, Mr Gaussen s'était obligé par cette invitation à porter leur intérêt. De sorte que Mr Fornerot ayant appris que Mr Gaussen avait écrit à Genève pour me faire venir, et Mr Villemandi sachant qu'il m'avait donné sa voix, tournèrent toute leur colère".
Unwittingly Chouet had become involved in the power struggle that raged in the Conseil. It is important to situate Chouet's election in its proper background in order not to interpret the reactions to it, as directed primarily at his theological views or his philosophical positions. It is only to outsiders, that his election must have appeared the victory of a follower of Amyraut's doctrine. Jacob Bayle for instance, in a letter to his father of April 7th 1665 wrote: "un jeune professeur en philosophie, partisan de M. Amyraut, a été mis en Saumur, à l'exclusion d'un ministre qui en était cru au plus digne." Clearly this cannot be a reference to Chouet's theological leanings. Chouet had studied with David Derodon in Nimes (where he studied philosophy only), then in Geneva with Gaspard de Wyss (for philosophy) and Louis Tronchin, his uncle (for theology). Among these, only Tronchin could be said to have been a follower of Amyraut's 'hypothetical universalism'. It is true that Amyraut had been Tronchin's teacher in Saumur, and that later in 1669 Tronchin supported the French proposant Charles Maurice, who refused to sign the formulaire, which condemned hypothetical universalism and was originally issued by the Vénérable Compagnie in 1647. But the episode occurred four years after Chouet's appointment to Saumur. Furthermore Tronchin was a theologian of independent judgment,
submitting arguments to critical evaluation, whatever the
system from which they came. As for Chouet himself, there
is no evidence that he was interested in a controversy already
a decade old. It is in fact during his stay in Saumur that
he became acquainted not strictly speaking with Amyraut's
doctrine but with Pajon's developments on it. Jacob Bayle's
statement therefore must be an allusion to the local strife
which had divided the Protestant community in Saumur between
two 'partis' and had degenerated in the Conseil Académique
into a personal quarrel, with d'Huisseau intent on settling
old accounts. It is only after a few months in Saumur, that
Chouet became fully aware of the quarrel. On 12 Mai 1665,
he sent the satire against Gaussen we already mentioned to
Tronchin and wrote: "le livre que je vous envoie est une satire contre
le Sénat Académique, particulièrement contre Mr Amyraut,
Mess. Beaujardin, Gaussen etc. ... on n'en sait pas bien
l'auteur, mais il est constant que c'est un homme qui a été
engagé dans les intérêts de Monsieur d'Huisseau contre
Monsieur Amyraut, dans les grandes querelles qu'ils ont
euas ensemble autrefois ..." We must point out however
that he clearly saw that it was a personal feud, and stated
that he did not want to be involved: "encore que Messieurs
de Beaujardin et Gaussen d'un côté, et lui d'Huisseau de
l'autre ne soient pas fort bons amis, je tâche pourtant de
m'entretenir avec les uns et les autres ..." From the start
therefore, Chouet's 'neutrality', the fact that he was a
foreigner who could in no way be linked with one of the two factions, certainly gave him an advantage. To be sure, his talent, and the attraction that cartesianism already had for some members of the Conseil, were the major reasons for his success: D'Huisseau himself (if we are to believe Chouet's own account) was forced to admit it: "j'ajouterais encore [le témoignage] de Mr d'Huisseau, qui ne doit pas être suspect à la Saintonge (car s'il y a eu quelque démêlé entre Saumur et cette province là, cela a été à cause de Monsieur Amyraut, de qui Monsieur d'Huisseau a toujours été ennemi), qui dit à Monsieur Villemandi en lui disant adieu, ces mêmes paroles: "Monsieur quand vous auriez été mon frère, je ne vous aurais pas pu donner ma voix etc."21. For the majority of the Conseil Chouet must have appeared as the ideally neutral candidate, and this was the all important factor in their minds. So, when they received the letter bringing news of Chouet's application and decided to postpone the examination until his arrival, they took great pains to emphasize their desire to reach a perfectly fair decision. They actually included a statement to that effect in the Registre: ... "pour montrer que nous ne voulons nous précipiter, et nous mettre à couvert de tout soupçon, a été résolu qu'on différa de commencer le dit examen jusques au 30ème de ce mois .."22 Such declaration is revealing of the amount of pressure which they were submitted, and of the strife amongst them. The
relief that most members of the Conseil must have felt when they found that this 'neutral' candidate was also a brilliant speaker and a good philosopher cannot be underestimated. It probably accounts for some of the demonstrations of enthusiasm which met some of Chouet's performances. The Conseil realised that Chouet's application and subsequent appointment was in more ways than one a happy turn. This was the general feeling that prevailed and it was voiced by Turon de Beyrie, Bouhéreau's cousin in one of his letters to him: "en vérité j'apprends avec beaucoup de joie la rencontre heureuse que l'on a faite de ce nouveau professeur en philosophie, outre l'intérêt public que j'y regarde, j'en prends un tout particulier pour un frère que j'ai ... qui doit aller étudier dans cette Académie." 23 ... 

'Veni, vidi, vici' can be used quite adequately to sum up Chouet's own account of the examination; he wrote to Louis Tronchin: "je vous dirai seulement qu'après avoir subi le plus rude examen dont jamais j'ai ouï parlé ... j'ai été fait professeur avec l'approbation de toute la ville et de toute l'Académie ... nous avons fait deux leçons devant le Sénat Académique, deux autres en public; une autre n'ayant que deux heures de préparation sans autre livre qu'Aristote, où était notre texte. Nous avons fait une dispute dont vous avez pu voir les thèses que j'envoyai la semaine passée à
mon père; enfin on nous donna deux heures devant le sénat académique pour nous faire des questions l'un à l'autre sur le champ, de toutes sortes de matières philosophiques ..".  

The *Registre de l'Académie* records the precise subjects of the dispute and the texts chosen for commentary. All texts were taken from Aristotle: one was ch. I, Bk III of his *Physics* (better known as *De Motu*); the others were ch. I Bk III of *Nichomachean Ethics*, ch. IV Bk I of *Posterior Analytics*, and finally ("parce que la Compagnie veut encore être plus particulièrement informée de leur suffisance"), ch. IV, Bk II of *Ethics*. The theme of the dispute was immaterial substances ("an dentur substantiae immateriales")

The reasons for this choice are clear. Aristotelianism — or rather a formalised version of Aristotle's philosophy derived mostly from XVIth century editors and commentators, such as Julius Caesar, Scaliger and Philip Melanchton — was the only philosophy taught in Saumur since its foundation. Later Bayle expressed surprise at the supremacy gained by Aristotelian philosophy over any other doctrine in the universities. "Ce qui doit donc étonner le plus les hommes les plus sages", he wrote in his *Dictionnaire*, "c'est que les professeurs se soient si furieusement entêtés des hypothèses philosophes d'Aristote." Without entering into a detailed analysis of the reasons, it is enough to state here that the XVIth century had witnessed a rediscovery of Aristotle, with the publication of his major works, with a text edited more accurately than ever before, and a new type of commentary.
As Bayle points out in the same article of his *Dictionnaire*, when discussing Rapin's assertion that Melanchton had rejected Aristotle's philosophy, what the early reformers (Luther excepted perhaps) strongly criticized was the logic and metaphysics of the School; what they denounced therefore was a corrupted version of Aristotelianism which had in their view been developed by the Scholastics.\(^{30}\) But Aristotle's pre-eminence far from being questioned was in fact enhanced. Bayle gives concluding examples to support his contentions. In this case as in many others, there was the wish to return to the authentic source from what was considered a deliberate fraud by the Catholic church. A century later, the same spirit of the early reformers is echoed by Gaussen in a letter to Bouhéreau, which also pinpoints the special role assigned to Aristotelianism in Saumur: "La bonne philosophie est une chose rare dans le monde, mais le bon est que l'on commence à se déniaiser partout et qu'on ne se fie plus que de la bonne sorte à ces vieux commentateurs dont nos pères étaient coiffés, car pour Aristote il sera toujours notre maître et le cher ami du coeur ..."\(^{31}\)

For Saumur, therefore, Aristotle was a *maître à penser*. With the majority of Protestant theologians and philosophers, those of Saumur found in his system, or more specifically in the *Organon*, the principle that there is a rational order immanent in reality. The existence of this order made poss-
ible an enquiry into reality. Furthermore the conception of an ordered universe arranged by degree of perfection, guaranteed the reality of intellectual and moral absolutes. Finally, this conception when applied to human nature provided a method of reaching the truth, which was ultimately guaranteed by the Creator. As Cappel wrote in _Le pivot de la foi_: "comme ës choses physiques et œuvres de la nature, il y a cet ordre et agencement si beau et admirable, si réglé, certain et constant ... qui témoigne une industrieuse sagesse qui en est l'auteur aussi, ës choses humaines, ës actions dis-je des hommes et production de son esprit et volonté on peut reconnaître un ordre admirable et une beauté émerveillable .."\(^{32}\)

It is pointless to ask if for the theologians of Saumur the rationalist conviction pre-existed or not its Aristotelian formulation. What is certain is that for Saumur Aristotle had showed that truth can be obtained and how to obtain it. In Aristotle's logic therefore they saw, not simply a set of practical rules for reasoning, but the very grammar of reason: logic was the art of exercising that fundamental rationality which was natural in us.\(^{33}\) As Cappel put it in the same chapter of _Le pivot de la foi_: "Aristote n'a pas forgé et inventé comme il lui a plu les règles et préceptes de bien argumenter ... mais seulement les a remarqués ës discours que tous hommes font naturellement,
et sur ces remarques en a dressés des règles et préceptes que nous avons eu son Organe et Logique, mais fixes certaines et immuables, fondées sur le droit et naturel raisonnement commun à tous les hommes."  

This explains the prominent place given to Aristotelian logic in philosophy courses, as they were taught in Saumur, when Chouet took the chair. Two of these courses have survived, carefully taken under dictation by eager students: The first one, by Druet, the longest standing professor in Saumur, who held the chair from 1628-1683 is nearly entirely devoted to logic; the sections on ethics and metaphysics, are just a summary of the relevant works by Aristotle. The second was taken by Bouhéreau himself while he was studying his philosophy under Isaac Hugues, Gaussen's immediate predecessor. It is contained in six volumes, under the general title of Cursus philosophiae manuscriptus ex ore Isaaci Hugonis exceptus ab Eliae Boherelli Rupellei, Eliae filio, Eliae Nepote, Petri pronepote, Salmurii 1658-9. In the course, the method of presentation never varies. First comes a summary of the doctrine ("ennaratio") then a discussion of traditional objections, in form of questions ("quaestiones"). Significantly the first part of Hugues' course is devoted to a discussion of the nature and rôle of logic. There Hugues gives a brief history of logic, then defines its uses. Finally he studies the divisions of logic. On the uses of
logic in theology, Hugues makes the point that without logic theologians cannot answer the objections raised by their Catholic adversaries. But logic for Hugues and Cappel was more than a technique. For all the professors of Saumur Aristotelianism was an instrument of enquiry and communication as well as of argumentation. Even more than a method however, it constituted their conceptual framework. For them Aristotle spoke the very language of rationality.

Chouet was put to the test: Did he know and could he interpret Aristotle? A personal enemy of his in Geneva had been coaxed into writing a letter to the Conseil in which Chouet was accused of being ignorant of Aristotle and scholastic philosophy. As he told his Uncle, Tronchin: "[Roussier] écrivit une lettre à Mons[Teur] Villemandi qui était toute contre moi: il y avait quelque apparence que M[Consieur] Villemandi l'avait mandiée, mais je ne l'ai pas pu bien découvrir... Roussier m'accusait d'un grand orgueil, d'avoir causé de grands désordres dans Genève... de ne savoir rien en théologie, d'entendre véritablement un peu la philosophie de Mr Gassendi, Descartes et Derodon, mais de n'avoir jamais lu ni Aristote, ni les Scholastiques..." Unfortunately the summary of his answers in the examination which Chouet had sent to Louis Tronchin, has been lost. Nevertheless it is possible to see what problems the texts he commented raised and in what spirit he had to tackle them.
The second day of examination for instance, was devoted to a commentary on Bk III ch. I of the *Nicomachean Ethics*. This book examines the problem of whether he who commits an evil action, does so knowingly. The Socratic doctrine of evil through ignorance is challenged by Aristotle in what constitutes in fact the embryo of a theory of human responsibility. It is a difficult passage, and modern commentators have shown that it must be interpreted as giving both a psychological and moral - even legal - definition of responsibility. Nevertheless, he can see why this particular text had been chosen. For in medieval times, the chapter was traditionally understood simply in terms of the doctrine of free-will. And a controversy had developed, particularly on the question of whether Aristotle's doctrine coincided with the teaching of the church. It is therefore on this problem that Chouet and his competitor were expected to argue. The passage assumed special importance in Saumur, as we have seen that Gaussen had already broached the question in his *Theses philosophicae*. It is unfortunate that Chouet's summary of what he said is lost, for his statements on the question, as found in the 1667 *Theses* are ambiguous. All the same, there is no doubt that the purpose of the examination was to sound both Chouet's theological views and his knowledge of Aristotle, and we can safely assume that Gaussen himself had inspired the choice.
Chouet's criticism of Aristotelianism

Chouet's examination set the tone for his stay in Saumur: His philosophy can be summed up as a reassessment of Aristotelianism in the light of cartesianism. The 1667 Theses reveal him as a philosopher in his own right, a clear and concise thinker, and an acute critic. Under his sharp examination, the rhetorics of the traditive disintegrate, and only the major concepts remain, and acquire the distinctiveness and the clarity which for Descartes constitute the criteria of right conception. The 1667 Theses are according to tradition divided into four parts which correspond to the four branches of philosophy, logics, metaphysics, physics and ethics. Among these only the first three are fully treated. Of the 28 pages numbered (title page and dedication excluded) which make up the pamphlet, less than two are devoted to ethics. Obviously Chouet intended his students to treat this subject separately, for the relevant section (Ex Ethics), is only two paragraphs long and ends abruptly with the phrase "sed plura, de iis, alias". We cannot say whether Chouet actually wrote more on ethics. No other theses by Chouet's students can be traced and there is no other allusion to the matter in his correspondence. Perhaps Chouet's examination had taught him the snares of too deep an enquiry into ethical questions; we are inclined to
think that Chouet voluntarily abstained from publishing anything on the subject, leav- ing untreated the difficult question of free-will which he had already encountered in his examination. Part II of the Theses ethicae simply states that if physical determination makes nonsense of the freedom of the will, a "certain moral necessity" can be reconciled within it. He thus seems to make his the theory that the intellect grasps the good and determines the will, which Amyraut, after Cameron, had elaborated: "vera libertas necessitatem et determinationem physicam quidem respuit: sed tamen eam posse cum aliqua morali necessitate stare, certissimum est". Chouet however does not give any analysis to support the contention, and equivocates: "Deus enim seipsum, Deum beati, et beatitudinem omnes homines, liberrime, licet necessario, amplectuntur". Yet the section ends with a rejection of the concept of the will as endowed only with the freedom to judge whether action is possible or not, and to incline accordingly. And in the next and last definition, Chouet again evades the issue and states, boldly yet bluntly, that a free act is that which is spontaneous and yet springs from previous cognition: "Libertatem nihil aliud esse quam facultatem illam qua sponte et ex praevia cognitione agimus". Although the section is too brief to support any interpretation, we must note that here Chouet appears to reject the restrictive definition of the freedom of the will as indifference given by
Descartes in Part I section 41 of *Principles*

In the *Theses logicae* and *Theses metaphysicae* however Descartes is Chouet's main inspiration. First the influence is particularly obvious in the passages where Chouet discusses method. In section XVI of the *Theses logicae* he defines method as "nihil aliud quam ordinata rerum cognoscendarum dispositio," a definition modelled on Descartes' "longues chaînes de raisons" in Pt II of *Discours de la méthode*.

Chouet discusses the traditional Aristotelian division of method as 'resolutive' (i.e. analysis) and 'compositive' (i.e. synthesis), and states that they are two aspects of the same progression of the mind along these chains of reason to the truth. In the concluding lines of this section Chouet enumerates the four cartesian rules, in the reverse order in which they are given by Descartes, and ends by paying tribute to the *Discourse on Method* and its author: "quarta [Regula] denique, sed quam, ob necessitatem et utilitatem, omnium primam recte dixeris: Nihil unquam veluti verum admittatur, nisi quod certo et evidenter verum esse cognoscatur. Quam regulam susiuscle explicat Renatus Descartes in Dissertatone sua de Methodo."52 Convinced of the infallibility of the method, therefore, Chouet can thus establish the proper status of logic: Logic is not simply an art, as rhetoricians would have it,53 it is not either a mental habit, but a science: "Logicam Scientiam potius quam Artem, vel Habûm
organicum dicendam esse existimamus". Its object is neither words nor ideas nor the "threefold act of understanding", but truth which can be reached if we conduct our minds the proper way. Logic gives us the instrument of knowledge.

It would be wrong however to view Chouet's 1667 Theses as a simple exposition of Descartes' doctrine, or a mere summary of cartesian philosophy, "selon l'ordre des raisons". Chouet's starting point is always Aristotle's definition, but his theses show an effort to reassess Aristotelian doctrine in the light of modern philosophy, by submitting the scholastic interpretation to a systematic critique following the rule "to reject as absolutely false anything which gave rise ... to the slightest doubt". The sections on universals in Theses logicae and that on substance in Theses metaphysicae provide good illustrations of the procedure.

In section II of Theses logicae Chouet begins by a concise statement of the problems raised by the notion of 'universals'. If universals can be defined, following Aristotle, as unity in multiplicity, the fundamental question is to know what constitutes this unity: "cum universale, ex Aristotele, unum sit in multis, disputant inter se illius interpretes quae in eo requiratur unitas." Chouet then gives a sharp and concise definition of the two extreme positions. First, realism (for Chouet, the doctrine of the Scotists):
"Quippe alii censent naturam universalem, unam esse et eamdem vera ac proprie sic dicta unitate, in omnibus singularibus." They teach that there is a universal nature which is properly and actually one and the same in all individual things. The opposite doctrine which Chouet also criticizes is that of a multiplicity of universals ("tot enim sunt naturae humanae, quot sunt homines"), and that the higher universal is an abstraction by the mind: "mens nostra naturam aliquam ab inferioribus conceptu quodam confuso, abstraheens et veluti secernens, eam universalitatem reddat."57 In other words there are as many individual essences as there are individual things. Unity comes from the mind, although based on some confused perceptions of a certain common essence. (Chouet might be thinking here of Ockham's doctrine). Then comes a discussion of these positions which is by no means easy to follow. If by natura ('naturam universalem'), ('naturae humanae') Chouet means essence as we think he does,58 then Chouet's criticism is directed at the reification of a logical category, by both doctrines: Chouet abruptly rejects the first doctrine by saying a doctrine lacks all probability ('omni probabilitate caret'). His discussion of the second, and his objection is longer and more interesting. For it seems that Chouet understands the second doctrine as not simply stating that the universal is in the mind, but rather that the mind finds the common essence in the individual
objects, and simply abstracts it: "naturam aliquam ab inferioribus conceptu quodam confuso abstrahens et veluti secernens". In this Chouet sees a contradiction. How could the mind infuse its unity to the individual object: ("conceptus sive idea illa, qua mens naturam ipsam concepit, una quidem est; at certe nulla inde rei sive naturae advenire potest unitas, nec profinde universalitas").

In the following section Chouet gives his own theory of universals. He distinguishes between the various uses of the term, and in each case Chouet shows that the contradictions or the improbability of the theories he has just rejected, spring from assuming from the use of the word, the existence of the object (i.e. a concept objectualized). Scholastic and post-Scholastic philosophy distinguished between 'universale in essendo', 'universae in significando', 'universale in praedicando'. The first ('universale in essendo') is properly the metaphysical universal, i.e. the platonic 'idea'; the second in praedicando, is the logical universal, about which the great debate between realists and nominalists took place; lastly, the Scholastics used the phrase universale in significando to designate the sign which stands for a logical universal (i.e. general words). Chouet's critique starts with the metaphysical universal; there are as many essences as there are particular objects "universale quod in essendo vocant, a singularibus realiter
non differe; cum quaecumque in rerum natura existunt ea sint singularia." A universal essence, therefore can only be these singular essences, apprehended together in their similarity: "naturam universalem nihil aliud esse praeter naturas ipsas singulares - collective sumptas sed quatenus inter se similes sunt". This does not mean however that singular objects partake of a certain universal nature. Chouet makes this point more explicit when he comes to defining the 'logical universal'. The universal in repraesentando as Chouet calls it, is the concept whereby the mind apprehends several singular objects, in as much as they have a certain relation of similarity between themselves: "Ex ea unitate sive similitudine fieri postea, ut naturae ipsae singulares unico concepto, id est, una et eadem idea repraesententem..." The reason why Chouet avoids using the Scholastic term "in praedicando", becomes clear. For Chouet, when we use universals, we use ideas that represent the objects, and therefore the name we use for that idea is itself universal: "immo et nomen ipsum universale in significando dicatur". The two sections on universals are characteristic of Chouet's procedure: starting from a critique of the traditional scholastic notions, and confronting the contradictory interpretations to which they have given rise, Chouet reaches a cartesian position: The universal (in essendo or in repraesantando) is a mode of thinking, or a general idea (with a general
word attached to it). In fact, Chouet's definition comes very close to that given by Descartes in *Principia* part I, 59: "Fiunt haec universalia ex eo tantum, quod una et eadem idea utamur ad omnia individua, quae inter se similia sunt, cogitanda". 66

Chouet's procedure can also be illustrated by his discussion of substance in *Thesee metaphysicae* sections V and VI. 67 Again he starts with the traditional Scholastic conception of *being* (*ens*): *ens* either belongs to external objects and is external to the mind that knows it (*ens reale*) or else *ens* is that which is conceived by the intellect as being, although it has no entity in itself (*ens rationis*). 68 Chouet states that it is not possible to conceive an object without conceiving it as being outside the mind: "primo eam divisionem non admittemus, quae eus distributo in Ens reale et Ens rationis: cum absolute nullum detur Ens rationis, quod simul Ens reale non sit. Illud enim quod objective tantum in intellectu esse dicunt, hactenus a nobis intelligi non potuit." 69

The Scholastic classification of *ens* according to the ten categories is then shown by Chouet to be artificial; his reasons are that there is no clear distinction or opposition between the various categories, nor are they immediately apprehended in the objects: "vitiosa quoque videtur vulgate illa division, qua Ens dividunt in decem illa genera, Substanciam; quantitatem, qualitatem etc. ... quoniam ejus membra opposita non sunt ... nam quantitas et quam plurimume
qualitates, puta potentiae naturales, a substantia sive a
subjecto cui insunt, realiter non differunt. Therefore
being is more properly divided between substance and
accident, and both are defined by Chouet in cartesian terms:
"Substantia, etiam si ita dicta fuerit, quod variis attribu-
tis quasi substet, male tamen definitur, "id quod accidentibus
substrat", ista quippe definitio Deo, qui tamen vera est sub-
stantia, competere nequit: melius igitur definitur substantia,
Eus per se subsistens, id est ab omni subjecto independens."71
The argumentation sums up Principia I sect. 51: there indeed,
substance is defined as 

In section 51 and the following ones however, Descartes
is at pains to distinguish between uncreated substance (God)
and created substance (both material and spiritual). Chouet
does not make the distinction and simply goes on to define
accidents as modes of substance: "Accidentia nihil aliud
esse praeter varios ipsius substantiae modos."72 Now in
section 56 of the Principles, Descartes distinguishes, albeit
obscurely, between attributes and modes, and in his answer
to Arnaud's objections to Meditations, he also defends himself,
albeit equivocally, against the criticisms of Arnaud for that
for him, attributes have no real existence outside their
subject: "Putat autem Arnaud me nulla accidentia realia
admittere, sed tantum modos, qui absque aliqua substantia,
cum insunt, non possunt intelligi, nec proinde etiam absque
illa existere. Quam objectionem perfacile possem eludere,
dicendo me nuncquam hactenus accidentia realia negasse .."73

Whether Descartes successfully answers Arnaud's objections is debatable. However, what is important is that Chouet clearly states that attributes have no existence outside their subject: "nulla omminovirtute fieri posse, ut accidens sine subjecto existat."74 The point of Arnaud's objection was that if one denies any reality to attributes, then the dogma of transubstantiation does not stand: for in the Eucharist, there is a change of substance, and if attributes do not really exist outside substance, then how can the attributes of bread and wine 'remain' 'attached' to what is not bread and wine any more, but the Body of Christ? Chouet obviously has grasped the importance of the objection, and the apparent contradiction between the cartesian view and Catholic doctrine; and he takes great care to add: "nulla omminovirtute fidei posse ut accidens \[ ... ab uno subjecto in aliud transeat\]."75

This is an important point in Chouet's interpretation of cartesianism, for he came back upon it some years later and laid great emphasis on it. In 1680 a proposant from Saumur, Sarrazin, had written to him and asked him to throw some light on the question of bodies and spirits. Chouet answered in two letters,76 which help us to put the 1667 Theses in their proper perspective. In the Theses Chouet had not specifically treated the problem of the relation between material and spiritual substances. Sarrazin in his letters
raised the question of the 'operation' of spirits: if only bodies can be said to be in loco, how can action of spirits on bodies be explained. Sarrazin was no doubt thinking of section VII of the 1667 Theses physicae which states: "sola corpora vere ac propie esse in loco: quippe, Spiritus, qui omnibus carent partibus, neque possunt esse in loco interno, siquidem quod nullam habet extensionem, nullam potest replere spatium; neque in loco externo, eternim quod nullum replet spatium, nullum quoque inter corpora obtinere potest situm". 77

In his answer to Sarrazin, dated 1 Sept. 1680, Chouet bases his argumentation precisely on the doctrine that attributes cannot be separated from substance: "les attributs d'une chose ne peuvent jamais être séparés de la chose même." 78 Extension being only an attribute of matter, the action of spirits cannot be local. But if in 1667 Chouet just accepted strict cartesian dualism, by 1680 he had developed his theory. For in the same letter to Sarrazin he adds "si nous concevons les esprits par rapport à leurs pensées ou à leurs opérations extérieures, nous pouvons accorder qu'ils sont dans le lieu non par une présence locale ... puisqu'ils n'ont aucune étendue, mais parce qu'ils y opèrent en excitant par leur pensée du mouvement dans tel ou tel corps." 79

In other words the 1667 Theses must not be taken as purely a formalised version of cartesianism. Chouet must
have already been aware of the problem central to the dualistic doctrine of Descartes. For the 1680 letters show that he had considered it, and reached a solution: "il est vrai qu'un esprit ne pouvant agir que par la pensée puisque nous ne connaissons en lui aucun autre attribut, et le corps n'agissant que par son mouvement, nous ne saurions concevoir que la pensée de celui-là naturellement et par elle-même puisse agir sur celui-ci ou que le mouvement d'un corps naturellement et par lui-même puisse opérer sur un esprit."80 Chouet's solution is that spirits are only the apparent causes of the motion of bodies. The real cause is God, through the general law he has established: "Dieu ... a fait cette loi que toutes les fois que l'âme aurait certaines pensées il en naîtrait tels ou tels mouvements dans le corps, et que toutes les fois que le corps aurait certains mouvements, l'âme en recevrait dans le même moment certaines pensées. Et ce n'est qu'en cette liaison du corps et des pensées de l'âme que consiste l'union admirable de ces deux parties."81 In other words, in 1680 Chouet had reached an occasionalist solution.

From this study of the 1667 Theses and of Chouet's letter to Sarrazin two important conclusions can be drawn: first, Chouet reached cartesian positions through a critique of Aristotelianism. For him, Cartesianism is first and foremost a reassessment of Aristotle. What it renders obsolete is the scholastic problematic and scholastic jargon. But it would
not be true to say that for him, Descartes stands as the victor and Aristotle the vanquished. Rather cartesianism is conceived by Chouet as a new development, with Aristotle as a starting point, a development which is in fact much truer to the original Aristotle than Scholastic philosophy ever was. He shared this view with some of the foremost contemporary exponents of cartesianism. Rohault, for instance wrote in his *Entretiens sur la Philosophie* published in Paris in 1671: "Si l'on examine la philosophie d'Aristote et qu'on veuille s'en rapporter au texte plutôt qu'aux commentaires, l'on verra qu'il n'y a point de doctrine qui s'accorde mieux avec celle de ce philosophe, que celle de Descartes."82 And Chouet could have written as Rohault did: "Ce grand homme ni ses disciples, ne viennent point avec fierté accuser partout Aristote d'erreurs ... les cartésiens demeurent d'accord de tout ce qu'Aristote a écrit, et ne différent des Aristoteliciens qu'en ce qu'ils passent de la manière métaphysique de traiter les choses ... à une manière plus physique et plus particulière ... par là on en montre le véritable usage, en faisant voir qu'elle est comme le premier degré pour monter aux connaissances les plus particulières et les plus élevées."83 For Chouet as for Rohault, Aristotle is the stepping-stone for a cartesian enquiry leading to particular knowledge, i.e. knowledge of the objects of the physical world. The second important point is that Chouet's acceptance of the
major tenets of cartesian doctrine is by no means servile. On the contrary, the letters written to Sarrazin in 1680 show an awareness of the problems of cartesianism. Chouet did not adhere once and for all to immutable tenets. His thoughts progressed over the years. If in 1667 Chouet was already aware of the central problem of dualism, his version of occasionalism was rather rudimentary: in section XV of Theses physicae, which as well as section VII, could have prompted Sarrazin's queries, he simply states that there is an agreement between mind and body: "is consensus, ut ad certas animae cogitationes, certi orientur in corpora motus, et vice versa .."84 In his 1680 letter it is God through his general laws who is the cause of this union.

Chouet and natural philosophy

Chouet's cartesianism broke away with the traditional approach to logic and metaphysics which had prevailed in Saumur until his arrival. It is in the field of Physics however that he really innovated. For his conceptions were radically different from those of his predecessors. Furthermore, he was not simply a theoretician but also an experimentalist. In the 1667 Theses the part devoted to Physics contains a number of references to experiments he performed, in a variety of fields. To judge by these theses, Chouet
acquainted his students with the major discoveries of the century. More important still, he brought to Saumur the new scientific spirit.

There is unfortunately no first hand report of his lectures in Saumur. When Chouet came to Saumur, Bouhéreau had just qualified, and his correspondents all belong to the earlier generation. Yet there is evidence in the Registre du Conseil to suggest that Chouet's teaching in the field of Physics made a tremendous impression on his colleagues and indeed attracted many students to the University: for when it was learnt, in 1669, that Geneva had offered Chouet a chair, the Conseil extraordinaire put it on record that Chouet's departure would constitute an irreparable loss to the Académie. And we find among the reasons given, that Chouet was in their eyes "un personnage qui nous a tous extrêmement édifiés par sa piété et par sa conduite et dont la grande capacité jointe à une merveilleuse dextérité qu'il a à bien enseigner a fait fleurir extraordinairement notre Académie". 85 Furthermore there is a direct account of Chouet's brilliant performance as a lecturer, just after he had left Saumur: It is found in a letter by P. Bayle to his father, dated 21 Sept. 1671 (less than two years after Chouet had left Saumur), Bayle talking of his various teachers in Geneva had this to say about Chouet's ability: "Pour la philosophie, elle fleurit ici extrêmement. M. Chouet, fils
du libraire, et neveu de M. Tronchin, enseigne celle de M. Descartes, avec grande réputation et un grand concours d'étrangers; aussi faut-il avouer que c'est un esprit extrême-ment délicat et également poli et solide. Il a enseigné la philosophie à Saumur pendant quelques années ... il fait tous les mercredis des expériences fort curieuses où il va beaucoup de monde. C'est le génie du siécle et la méthode des philosophes modernes ..."86 It is worth pointing out that Bayle emphasizes both Chouet's cartesianism and his virtuosity at performing experiments. In fact Chouet considered Physics, and particularly experimental physics, as the principal branch of philosophy, and he viewed the other branches as a preparation for it. When in 1685 Bouhéreau informed him that he wanted his eldest son to go and study in Geneva, Chouet in his reply emphasized this point: "Vous pourriez l'envoyer dès le mois d'Avril prochain, et lui faire voir dès à présent un compend de Logique, afin qu'il fût en état de faire sa physique ..."87 His correspondence with Bouhéreau reveals an insatiable curiosity in this field. He never missed the opportunity to meet other experimentalists. In 1670, for instance, he visited Lyon and sent this report to Bouhéreau: "vous ne sauriez vous imaginer combien il y a peu d'habiles gens et qui aiment les sciences dans cette ville, je veux dire, dans ses couvents, quoiqu'il y en ait une infinité: tout ce que j'ai vu de plus curieux, c'est le cabinet
d'un Monsieur de Servières, dont il est fort parlé dans les Voyages de Monconys: car assurément vous y voyez ce que les mathématiques peuvent produire de plus beau et de plus surprenant ..."\textsuperscript{88}

A comparison between Hugues' Cursus, already mentioned, and the 1667 Theses will show how radical a departure Chouet's teaching constituted from what was previously taught in Saumur in the field of physics. To consider theoretical physics first: Hugues adheres to a broadly Aristotelian theory of matter and form, seen as constituents of natural objects: Chouet on the contrary is looking for \underline{intelligible principles}: "Principia, ex quibus omnia oriuntur corpora, duplícis sunt generis, alia videlicet externa ... causa efficiens et causa finalis, alia interna ... Materia sempére et forma ..."\textsuperscript{89}

For Aristotelians, form was conceived as an agent acting upon its own matter as patient.\textsuperscript{90} Chouet in section V of the Theses physicae specifically refers to this conception, and his two fundamental criticisms \textit{are}: first the conception is self-contradictory; how can forms that cannot exist outside and independently from matter, act upon matter to constitute bodies? Secondly, and more important, the conception is useless and does not help in any way to understand natural phenomena. The passage is worth quoting in full as it exemplifies Chouet's approach: "quidne de substantialibus formis materiam illam informantibus, quas recentiores Aristotelis interpretes
follows Descartes by rejecting the idea that bodies are moved by force (virtus) distinguishable from motion. The cause of the motion of projectiles (the only one with which Chouet is concerned) is the impact of one body on another. Chouet however gives his own interpretation of this conception: "corpora projecta, ubi causa proficien te sejuncta sunt, aliquamdiu in motu perseverant, non quod ab aeris impulsa, vel virtute quadam impressa, quae a motus diversa sit, impelluntur, sed quod motum semel acceptum tamdiu tueri debeant quamdiu motus ille a corporibus sive causis extei rus non minuitur vel deletur ...". In other words, motion is understood by Chouet as a certain quantity of energy, which the body in motion uses up until it has exhausted it. Some of the energy is diverted by bodies which the projectile meets on its way, but projectiles once in motion would continue in a straight line until they came to rest ('in mid-air' so to speak), if it were not for gravity that pulls them down, "nisi a gravitate deorsum pellerentur".

Chouet does not specify what he understands by 'gravity'. His section on motion, because of its brevity, is indeed difficult to interpret. One thing however is certain, Chouet limits his examples to absolutely rigid bodies, and appears unaware of the complexities of the problem of motion which other experimentalists (particularly in England) had begun to investigate. The notion of elasticity is strikingly missing from his discussion of reflected motion:
"Motus reflexus, quo pila e.g. a pariete repellitur, diversus non est a moto directo ... paries enim nec motum directum delere, nec novum imprimere, sed illius determinationem solum immutare potest ..." In short, Chouet's interpretation constitutes a great step forward, when compared to Hugues' teaching, but is nevertheless limited by his unquestioning acceptance of cartesian mechanics.

In other fields Chouet's knowledge is more advanced: His section on the universe takes into account the recent astronomical discoveries, for instance the spots on the sun. He argues that these spots are the proof that the universe is corruptum: "si Coeli, eam quam contendunt, haberent duritiem, qui, quaeque, fieri posset ut maculae illae, non modo orirentur et interirent, sed circa solem, nunc in hanc, nunc illam partem moverentur?" Chouet decidedly supports the copernican view of the universe, for he continues: "adde quod ea, ante unum saeculum telescopiorum ope ab astronomis observata fuerint quae ejusmodi soliditatem prorsus destitut, puta quod Venus et Mercurius Soli ita circumducantur, ut nunc infra, nunc supra, nunc ad ejus latera, conspiciantur ..." On the contrary, Hugues in his Cursus adheres to the Ptolemaic conception of a universe made up of concentric spheres revolving around the earth. Book II, chapter III of his Summa Physica defines the motion of the heavens as circular, simple and perfect: "caelum movetur motu circulari", a cursory statement which reveals his unaware-
ness of Kepler's discovery of the elliptical orbits of planets, yet already well known. Indeed when in the following chapter Hugues mentions more "recent" astronomers, it is to point out that their work corrects some assumptions of the ancients concerning the relative position of the Sun, Venus and Mercury, and the number of spheres: "veteres astrologi quos Aristoteles secutus est, existimarunt orbi lunae proximum esse orbem solis, sed recentiores certis argumentis deprehenderunt solem situm esse in medio planetarum, et inter solem et lunam, terris proximam intercedere sphaeras Veneris et Mercurii; in hoc etiam recentiores deserverunt sententiam Aristoteles qui tantum octo caelos agnoverit ..." The notion of heavenly spheres and that of Venus and Mercury as placed between the sun and the moon ("the closest" to the earth) make it obvious that Hugues' conception of the heavens is broadly Ptolemaic.

To conclude: This comparison of the doctrines of Chouet and Hugues on the motion of projectiles and the movement of the heavens clearly shows the radical change that Chouet introduced in the teaching of physics at Saumur. At the same time we must not overestimate his contribution: by 1667 Copernicus heliocentrism and Kepler's laws were common knowledge. Secondly, Chouet does not seem aware of the recent attempts to take into account the question of elasticity and force for a satisfactory theory of motion. His conception of energy is over-simplified: he does not appear
to be aware of the two types of energy (kinetic and potential)
on which some scientist was already working at the time. However, it is when compared with Hugues' teaching and the predominant Aristotelianism of Saumur, that Chouet's Theses assume proper perspective. The examples given amply prove that, before him, in the field of physics, the teaching at Saumur lagged behind the major discoveries of the century. Chouet's major contribution is to have in no small way contributed to reduce that cultural gap.

Chouet as a 'virtuoso'

Both the originality and the limitations of Chouet's teaching are exemplified by section VII of the Theses physicae where he discussed the question of the existence of a vacuum. He describes his version of the Torricelli experiment where tubes are filled with mercury and then inverted into a vase (itself filled with mercury). Only the upper part of the tube empties itself, due to atmospheric pressure on the mercury in the vase (or the weight of the air', to put it into 17th century language): "celebre illud experimentum, quo constat hydrargyrum contentum intra vitreum tubum curjus altitudo 27. digitos excedat, in vas subjectum, non quidem totum, sed ex parte, defluere ..." It is clear that he had performed the experiment. Certainly, he had become quite familiar with it by 1670, as Bayle in the letter already quoted reported:
"Il [Chouet] a fait aussi les expériences de l'argent vif, du syphon, du thermomètre, de l'éolypile, des larmes de Hollande et plusieurs autres ... il est allé même sur des montagnes qui sont à 4 ou 5 lieues de Genève, pour y faire l'expérience de l'argent vif, car comme il l'explique par la pesanteur de l'air, son opinion est bien confirmée s'il arrive que plus le lieu où on fait l'expérience est haut, plus aussi l'argent vif descend dans un tuyau qu'on tient renversé; et il a trouvé la chose comme il la voulait, car au lieu que l'argent vif demeure suspendu à la hauteur de 26 pouces à Genève, il descendait jusqu'à 22 pouces sur la montagne ..."106

Chouet could then perform the experiment, and understood its significance. In the 1667 Theses however, he does not cite it as a proof of the weight of the air. The lesson he draws is that the Torricelli tubes disprove the existence of a thing such as a vacuum. This was one of the central problems of natural philosophy. Hugues in his Cursus devotes a whole chapter to it. His own rejection of the existence of a vacuum is based on the following arguments: Aristotle has defined the universe as a unity, and a plenum: "ex ea unitate sequitur omnia corpora ex quibus coagmentatur mundus, continue sibi cohaere, sequentur tangere ..."107 Also the universe is perfect, and a vacuum would be an imperfection; nature therefore abhors a vacuum; "plenitudo est habitus
et perfectio, sic vacuitas est privatio et non ens . . . .

melius enim est esse quam non esse, adeoque corpus melius

est privatione corporis. Denique docet experientia naturam . . .

abhorre a vacuo . . ."  

"Docet experientia" . . . Having given the a priori

reasons why a vacuum cannot exist, Hugues does refer to

experimentation to confirm his postulate: "si sit tribulās

fistula cujus extremitas una sit in aqua, altera in ore

guientis, tum attracto aere fistula inclusō, aqua sursum

fertur ad os guientis, ne vacuum admittatur in fistula."  

Now Chouet follows exactly the same procedure in section VII

of his Theses physicae: starting from his definition of

matter as extension, he is led to affirm that vacuum does not

exist: . . . "nullum esse spatium corpore vacuum: nam spatium

omne est extensum; at ubi est extensio, ibi rem materialem

esse oportet, cum extensio sit ipsa materiae essentia . . ."  

And as he is also an experimentalist, he proceeds to give an

account of the Torricelli experiment as supporting his view.

However, he was aware (as Bayle's letter amply shows) that

the point of his experiment is not that it disproves the exist-

tence of a vacuum but that it proves the weight of air.

Furthermore, in the 1667 Theses, he realizes that the experi-

ment he has just described is in contradiction with what he

tries to establish: "hydrāgyrum . . . non quidem totum, sed ex

parte defluere; quasi pars superior tubi pars ab hydrargyro

derelicta, omni corpore vacua remaneat."  

To explain the
phenomenon, therefore Chouet has to have recourse to the notion of a body subtler than air, i.e. ether: "verum tamen tua reponimus; primum, superiorem illum tubi partem non esse aere plenam: siquidem, ut caeteras mittamus rationes, pleraque fere omnia animalia quae eo immittuntur, illico enecantur; .... debere igitur spatium illum materia, quae ipso aere subtilior sit, quaeque vitri poros pervadere queat, esse repletum."112

Chouet's main concern in the Theses is clear. What he really wants to establish is the cartesian conception of matter against the Aristotelian theory, and to lay down what he considers the proper foundation of a scientific approach, even if this leads him to emphasize the negative, (and correct) rather than the correct lesson of the experiment.

There is no doubt on the other hand that he understood the notion of the weight of the air. For, quite apart from the description given by Bayle in 1671, there is evidence of this among the Bouhereau collection. This is a list in Bouhéreau's hand, of "quelques expériences qui dépendent de l'air."113 Among the 25 experiments listed some deal with the physical properties of the air. Experiment No. 5 for instance deals with the resistance of air: "faire que des fleurs dans une vaisseau vidé de l'air tombent comme du plomb"; experiments No. 2 and 7 deal with the spring of air: "2 faire qu'une vessie toute flasquée s'enfile d'elle même quand on ôte l'air du verre où elle est enfermée"; "7, faire soulever de grand poids par le ressort de l'air ...";
Another experiment, No. 15, deals with the transmission of sound in the air: "15, faire qu'une clochette dans le vide ne faîsse point de bruit, quoiqu'elle soit frappée de son marteau." Another category concerns the chemical properties of the air. A pistol does not fire in a vacuum: "16, faire qu'un bon pistolet ne fait point de feu quand on le lâche dans le vide". In a vacuum, fruit will remain preserved for a long time: "25, conserver des fruits longtemps dans le vide sans qu'ils se pourissent". Finally, some deal more specifically with the biological effects of the air: "18, faire voir que les animaux meurent presque tous quand on ôte l'air qui les environne".

Now, experiment 18 in Bouhereau's list is the one mentioned in the 1667 Theses ("omnia animalia quae eo immittuntur, ëllëo enecantur"). All the others are highly sophisticated experiments. The list and the 1667 Theses show that in Saumur already, Chouet kept up to date with new scientific discoveries. Bouhéreau's list in fact is taken from two treatises by Robert Boyle. The first, New Experiments physico-mechanical touching the spring of air, was published in England in 1660. The Latin translation, issued a year later, certainly found its way to the continent as Pascal appended an extract translated into French from the Latin, to his Traité de l'équilibre des liqueurs (Paris, 1663). The second of Boyle's books, his First Continuation, contains the experiments on the
chemical properties of the air but appeared only in 1669. Even if in Saumur Chouet did not perform all those experiments he left in the year Boyle’s First Continuation was published, in all probability he performed those concerning the physical properties of the air. For in Bouhéreau’s list, entry No. 21 shows precisely the same concern to refute Aristotelianism as the 1667 Theses. Entry 21 reads: "prouver que les effets surprenants qui arrivent ... ne sont pas causés par l’horreur du vide". Bouhéreau’s list of experiments and the 1667 Theses sum up Chouet’s contribution to Saumur. During the five years of his stay he introduced the Académie to the new scientific discoveries of which they had remained ignorant. It is however more as a philosopher than as experimentalist that Chouet left his mark on Saumur: he replaced outmoded aristotelianism by his own version of cartesian rationalism.
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Chapter VII

TANNEGUY-LEFEVRE AND CLASSICAL STUDIES

Tanneguy-Lefèvre is a curious figure; no other professor aroused as much enthusiasm or hostility in Saumur, and indeed among learned circles in France or abroad; his reputation as a scholar was high: the *Journal des savants*, not a very prolix magazine by any means, devoted a fairly long article (by the *Journal*s standards) to the second volume of Lefèvre's critical letters, which appeared in 1665.1 His way of life and his religious views, on the other hand, aroused suspicion. Indeed Bayle very abruptly mentioned him in one of his letters as "Mr Lefèvre qui, comme vous savez, est un homme sans religion ..."2 We shall later enquire whether or not he deserved this reputation. It is however certain that as a teacher he was outstanding: as professor of Greek in Saumur, he brought a considerable amount of fame to the Academy: like Gaussen and Chouet, he was one of the figures that contributed to make the period under study Saumur's golden age.

We learn from a letter written by Chouet to L. Tronchin that Lefèvre was elected to the Professorship of Greek in May 1665.3 Tronchin had studied in Saumur and had
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remained in contact with Lefèvre, and it can be gathered from Chouet's letter, that Tronchin was in fact thinking of bringing Lefèvre to Geneva. The threat of losing Lefèvre might have prompted the Academic authorities to offer him this appointment; certainly on several occasions, Lefèvre, aware of his own reputation, had recourse to the threat of leaving Saumur in order to try and obtain a better position from the Académie. Chouet still mentions the possibility of Lefèvre going to Geneva in a letter of 4th November 1665: "Je vous assure ... que je crois que ce serait un des plus grands biens qui pût arriver à notre Académie de Genève d'avoir cet homme là; car il rendrait tous les écoliers bons grecs et bons humanistes ..." Yet Lefèvre's nomination for the professorship had already been approved by the provincial synod that met in Saumur during the month of May. The acts of the synod, as transcribed in the Registre, provide a clue to Lefèvre's attitude: the position he was given was purely honorary - the new professor would not receive any salary: "La Compagnie considérant qu'il serait nécessaire pour la gloire et le bien de cette Académie de rétablir la profession en grec, et ayant appris que M. Lefèvre qui en est très capable, ne la refuserait pas si elle lui était adressée et que même il ne demanderait point des gages pour l'exercer, a résolu de la lui présenter, et l'ayant fait appeler, si tôt que la proposition lui en a été faite, il a déclaré qu'il l'accepterait très volontiers.
et qu'il était prêt de servir le public en cette charge, sans en demander aucune récompense ..."\(^5\) Chouet's letter however seems to indicate that Lefèvre was not really happy about the arrangement. And there is abundant evidence that in fact he was very interested in obtaining a better paid position. For we learn from Ménage, who knew him well, that "M. Lefèvre n'était pas content de l'Académie de Saumur où il était professeur. Il m'écrivit une fois pour me faire lui avoir le contrôle aux Traitées de Gabelle de Saumur."\(^6\) And, in the same passage, Ménage also mentions that Lefèvre had negotiated with a nobleman and courtier, De Vardes, to obtain a post of secretary to him.\(^7\) It is doubtful therefore whether Lefèvre was really satisfied with this unpaid position; and whether "servir le public" was his real concern. But he had made a point of not disclosing his real sentiments to the members of the Académie: As he wrote to Ménage, in a letter quoted in the same passage of Menagiana: "ils ne savent rien de ce qui se passe dans mon coeur, car je ne parle à personne ..."\(^8\)

Why this secrecy then and what were Lefèvre's real reasons for accepting the offer: the fact is that Lefèvre had been teaching in the Academy in a menial capacity for a long time. As a private tutor, approved by the University he was considered 'Regent honoraire'; and in April 1651 he was appointed 'Regent de troisième classe'.\(^9\) For fourteen
years therefore Lefèvre taught at a level far below his real capacities. The three years devoted to classical studies were in fact pre-university years. The modern equivalent of the "troisième classe" (in which Greek was taught) would be the upper form in a secondary school, or at most the pre-university year. And yet during that period Lefèvre was already renowned as a scholar. The reasons for this situation had nothing to do with Lefèvre's personality. Greek studies were considered as an ancillary discipline in the academies, and pre-eminence was given to Hebrew, the language of the Old Testament. Also Hellenists might well have been held slightly under suspicion: in the previous century, the great Greek scholars, the Estienne, for instance, had always been men of independant judgment and mild scepticism. So that when universities, for financial reasons, had to reduce the number of academic staff they employed, it was often the chair of Greek that suffered. And until Lefèvre's appointment, classical studies (which included the study of rhetoric and of Latin as well as Greek) were the responsibility of the professor of eloquence, assisted by various regents in charge of individual classes. Lefèvre therefore must have viewed his honorary appointment as a recognition both of his own merit and of the importance of hellenic studies. The Conseil saw it as enhancing the prestige, or in their own words "la gloire et le bien", of the Académie; and their
opinion was shared by others. The reaction of one of Bouhereau's correspondents, Turon de Beyrie, when hearing the news, can be taken as representative of that of many others who had met Lefèvre when studying at Saumur: "je suis bien aise de voir ... qu'il [Lefèvre] est aussi bien dans le Conseil Académique que je l'ai vu mal et je souhaiterais que les Eglises de France qui fournissent à l'entretien de cette Académie et qui prennent beaucoup de part à son avancement, formassent un nouveau fond pour ce nouvel emploi et qu'ils tâchassent à payer la gloire dont cette Académie lui sera redevable dans cette nouvelle profession ...."\(^\text{12}\) What Turon de Beyrie meant by his remark on Lefèvre's past difficulties with the Conseil will become apparent later; first we must assess Lefèvre's achievements and his contribution to the renown of Saumur.

Lefèvre's fame as a teacher

Lefèvre was first and foremost an outstanding teacher. After returning to Rouen, his native town, Bauldry, who had studied under Lefèvre and who, as we shall see later, became a scholar of some repute, sent a letter to Lefèvre which is an example of the affection and respectful feelings of a disciple for his master: "sans vous que ferais-je dans cette ville où les savants ne sont proprement que verba et voces, At vir doctus, qui sit idem Vōs, ubi ubi est? Salmurii tantum. C'est là que je le veux chercher toute ma vie et..."
que j'irai consulter désormais tous les oracles du monde ..."1

Chouet in the letter to Tronchin quoted above, mentioned that his cousin Croppet was coming to Saumur. One of the reasons given is that Croppet wished to attend Lefèvre's classes, and Chouet adds: "il ne saurait être auprès d'un plus grand homme que M. Lefèvre pour la langue grecque et les humanités."14 Lefèvre's talent as a teacher must have attracted a great number of students. As was the custom, some of them boarded with him, and Chouet reported that his cousin would unfortunately not be able to do so, "à cause du grand nombre d'écoliers qu'il y a". Lefèvre's popularity was such, and his lectures so well attended, that he was compelled to give private seminars. Even senior students and proposants found his courses useful. In the same letter Chouet suggested that Tronchin should do his utmost to bring Lefèvre to Geneva: "il ferait outre ses leçons publiques, des collèges particuliers, où il recevrait autant les proposants que les philosophes, et généralement tous ceux qui y voudraient aller, comme il fait ici..."

Lefèvre's success as a teacher sprung from his thorough mastery of the classics, and particularly of Greek. He owned a collection of the major editions of Greek and Latin writers, published in the previous century; some of them are found in Marsh's Library in Bouhereau's library. They contain extensive notes in the margins, for future reference.
For Lefèvre indeed, textual research and teaching went hand in hand: in a letter to Bouhéreau appended to his Méthode pour commencer les humanités grecques et latines, Lefèvre enumerates the classics he used in his classes; he states that they are not simply textbooks but also objects of further study: "Après quoi on a lu Hérodien, et quand il y aura ici des caractères grecs, je le ferai imprimer avec les corrections que j'ai faites, .... (et aussi) Quinte Curce, sur lequel j'ai fait des remarques, dont on pourra quelque jour régaler les savants ...." 15 Lefèvre's teaching therefore is grounded in his thorough knowledge of the texts. The list of classics edited by him is indeed impressive: his first two ventures were an edition of Lucian's De morte peregrini which was published in Paris by Croisy in 1653, followed by one of Timon by the same author, also printed by Cramoisy in 1655. 16 Most of the others however were printed in Saumur. In 1658 Lefèvre published an edition of Phaedra's Fables, to which he added the Selectae sententiae of Publius Syrus, with a short life of the author. 17 For the second edition of this work published in 1664, this time with translation, Lefèvre had recourse to Jean Lesnier, one of the official printers of the Académie. 18 Lesnier undoubtedly was his favourite printer: Lefèvre paid homage to Lesnier's work in the preface to his Lucretius, which appeared in 1662: "Typographus cujus opera usus sum, non sine magna sua molestia
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expertus est." \(^{19}\) The same printer issued a Longinus in 1663, \(^{20}\) Apollodoros's **Bibliotheca** in 1661, \(^{21}\) and in 1667 Aelianus' **Varia Historia**, the first separate edition of this work. \(^{22}\) After his voluntary retirement from the professorship, \(^{23}\) Lefèvre could no more use Lesnier, and the other works he edited were published by Rean. They include an edition of Justinus, \(^{24}\) one of Terence's comedies \(^{25}\) and finally one of Florus' **Epitome of Roman history**. \(^{26}\)

It is clear from this list that Lefèvre was guided in his choice not simply by scholarly interests but also by pedagogic considerations. In his **Méthode** he lays great emphasis on the interest which the teacher must arouse in his pupil. Languages, particularly classical languages, cannot be taught in a vacuum. The pupil must learn Latin or Greek as a key to reading pleasure. Phaedra's **Fables**, Florus' **Epitome** or even Aelianus' **Varia Historia** with its numerous anecdotes on animals, are simple enough and attractive to the young pupil: "il faut ... que la matière de ce petit auteur [qu'on donnera à l'enfant] soit ou fable ou histoire; car les pensées morales fatiguent les enfants: ils n'y trouvent aucun plaisir et cependant il faut toujours songer à leur rendre les choses agréables." \(^{27}\)

Easy scholarship in the teacher makes learning attractive to the pupil: this is Lefèvre's fundamental principle. Languages must not be taught mechanically. Their acquisition must be part of the broader study of an entire culture.
This notion is central to the Méthode. In this last book, his spiritual testament in a way, Lefèvre shows a remarkable awareness of the inadequacies of a purely grammatical approach to ancient languages. Lefèvre does not go as far as dispensing altogether with grammar, but he considers that those in his days are too complex. A good grammar should present cases and conjugations in a simple and clear way: "je tiens que toutes les grammaires qu'on met entre les mains des enfants, doivent être ainsi: il faut qu'elles soient simples, nettes, bien distinctes ..." 28

His concern extends to the actual physical appearance of the book (a strikingly modern view for the times): "s'il est possible, dans les paradigmes qu'on y met [Il faut qu'] il n'y ait jamais de ligne qui redouble." 29 A well printed textbook is of considerable help to the pupil: "La raison de cela est que l'imagination est beaucoup aidée, parce qu'elle prend plaisir à un arrangement juste et que par conséquent la mémoire en est excitée aussi." 30 And Lefèvre adds: "ce que je vous dis là c'est une chose que j'éprouve tous les jours."

The study of ancient languages then starts with grammar. But Lefèvre's disappointment with contemporary grammar books, their approach and their presentation, leads him to envisage the possibility that the good teacher may compose one himself. This is what he did, when he taught his son: "Je lui
écrivis donc une grammaire grecque de la même manière dont
avait été faite la latine. Il n'y avait que les paradigmes
tout simples et tout du long, soit pour les noms soit pour les
verbes; j'y mis même une très grande quantité d'adverbes les
plus usités, avec les nombres; et c'est une des premières
choses que doit apprendre un enfant en toute langue ...."31
The reason for this last inclusion is clear: learning grammar
is not an end in itself; it is the key to reading the texts.
Ignorance of this category of words creates obstacles when
it comes to translating from the original text: "quand on
en viendra à traduire .... il faudra toujours avoir le
dictionnaire à la main, et par conséquent prendre beaucoup
de temps," he observes in the same passage.

Another important aspect of the acquisition of grammar,
according to Lefèvre, is its logical progression. Rather than
learning paradigmes in succession and by heart, the pupil
should be able to use the fundamental ones to discover
the more complex. This is particularly true for verbs, which should
be studied once nouns and pronouns are fully mastered (and
only then): "je lui appris d'abord ses noms, ses pronoms,
et le premier verbe, de vive voix, et les lui fis lire, en
rêpétant, jusqu'à ce qu'il les sut parfaitement. Je lui fis
connaître ensuite, que quiconque sait bien un verbe de la
première conjugaison, sait aussi les verbes de la con-
jugaison suivante..."32 Here Lefèvre insists on the
active participation of the pupil: "je prenais chaque jour
un verbe d'une conjugaison différente, et le lui faisait appliquer sur celui qu'il avait appris d'abord."

Finally Lefèvre insists on the necessity to acquaint the pupil with the history, the mythology and even the geography of the country studied. This is where the lighter works of minor historians edited by Lefèvre find their use. The purpose of studying them is not erudition but primarily to arouse the interest of the pupil in the subject he is learning. The results, according to him are striking: "l'enfant s'imaginait être tout autre qu'il n'était auparavant, et les lectures qu'il fit depuis lui paraissait bien plus belles que celles qu'il avait faites avant d'en venir là".

To sum up: Lefèvre differs from the majority of his contemporaries not simply by his techniques of teaching. His goals also are totally different. Even in the Jesuits 'ratio studiorum', the study of Latin was ultimately intended to provide a model for writing in the vernacular. The purpose of Latin texts was to provide the student with a stock of phrases and images, and mythological and historical references, that were considered essential to beautiful style. Latin eloquence was the ideal, which pupils had to learn to imitate when writing, not only Latin but French as well. For Lefèvre on the contrary, Latin composition plays a very small part: "pour moi je me gardais bien de
suivre la manière que l'on suit ordinairement, qui est de commencer par la composition. Il n'y a rien selon mon sens, qui nui si fort à un enfant ...."36 His reasons for this tell much about his conception of the ancient languages as living languages: "cette langue [le latin] après tout, est comme les autres langues: cependant qui a jamais oui dire qu'on commence l'Hebreu, l'Arabe, l'Espagnol etc. par la composition?" Nor should translation be a French imitation of Latin, as in Lefèvre's view, most contemporary translations were: "vous ferez vous-même la version française, nette et simple, et sans aucune circonlocution ....."37 Indeed Lefèvre's own translation of Latin or Greek writers are good examples of this: his Festin de Xenophon for instance, or his Premier Alicibiade de Platon, both published in 1666 are written in an easy flowing style.38 And when he issued his own version of Plutarch's treatise on superstition, his criticisms of his famous predecessor Amyot were not only that Amyot had overlooked certain textual corruptions, but also that at times he had missed the 'genius' specific to each language.39

In short, while in the XVIIth century the study of ancient languages was intended to form good rhetoricians, Lefèvre's aim was to make good humanists. His educational ideal therefore is not the Roman schola nor the medieval university or monastery, but the Greek academy. Had this ideal been adopted, says Lefèvre, private tutors would
not be necessary, and there would be no educational distinction between the rich and the poor: "En Grèce, il y avait des écoles de musique où tous les enfants apprenaient ensemble, et les maîtres particuliers n'étaient que pour les personnes de haute qualité qui pourtant ne s'en servaient que fort rarement. Car les enfants deviennent plus aisés à mener et plus capables de l'égalité civile, quand ils font leurs petits exercices en commun. D'ailleurs comme ces écoles étaient d'ordinaire au coin des rues, les parents s'y arrêtaient fort souvent pour voir de quelle façon tout s'y passait ...."40 Lefèvre's disappointment with the teaching of the Academy, as compared to that ideal, later forced him to admit that his method could only be applied in his days by private tutors, and that poor children would not be able to benefit from it. Yet he expressed the hope that some improvement would be made in colleges along the lines he suggested: "on dira sans doute que ce que j'ai fait ne s'accommode nullement avec la pratique des collèges ...... on ajoutera à cela que cette manière d'enseigner n'est pas ce qu'il faut pour des personnes qui ont peu de bien ...... Si pourtant on obligeait les Régents à [Ia] pratiquer ... Je crois que les collèges seraient bien meilleurs qu'ils ne sont aujourd'hui et que les personnes du commun y trouveraient leur compte ...."41

When he published his Méthode Lefèvre was no longer Professor
of Greek. He had resigned from his position after having been censored by the provincial synod for his involvement in the publication of *La Réunion du Christianisme* [see next chap IX]. The *Registre* for Oct. 16th 1670, which records his declaration to the *Conseil* on the subject, makes it clear that Lefèvre's real complaint was the hostility which surrounded him in Saumur: "puisque on lui [Lefèvre] donnait des observateurs pour le temps à venir, il voyait bien qu'on voulait lui faire des affaires: qu'au reste il était capable de se conduire lui-même, sans avoir besoin d'inspecteurs de la part du Consistoire, ou de la part du Synode." This hostility, as we shall see, was mostly caused by his religious attitude. But there is no doubt that his approach to teaching also played a part in it. For *La Méthode* was written as a defense against those who threatened to forbid him to teach altogether. A cabale attempted in Saumur, to discredit him with those who still sent their children to him. Letters were sent to parents as far as Brittany and Languedoc (a measure of Lefèvre's popularity and efficiency). In the *Epître au lecteur*, printed at the beginning of *La Méthode* and in the letter to Bouhéreau, appended at the end, Lefèvre claims that he was the victim of jealousy and ignorance. His son, a living example of the success of his teaching and only fourteen years old, had already mastered Latin and Greek. J. Cappel, the son of Louis Cappel, who had succeeded his father to the chair of Hebrew, had allowed young Lefèvre to
attend his lectures. The presence of Lefèvre's son among much older students, was an unhappy reminder of the father's abilities. The Conseil, we learn from the letter to Bouhereau, deliberated about the case. Some argued that Hebrew could not be studied independently from theology; others that a student must be prepared for it, by having first mastered philosophy. As Lefèvre sarcastically writes: "c'était une chose scandaleuse à Messieurs les étudiants en théologie, de voir parmi eux un enfant de 1/4 ans qui a commencé sa grammaire hébraïque depuis huit mois, et qui cependant explique aussi bien que les plus forts de la troupe (quoique quelques-un d'eux aient commencé à hébraïser il y a plus de deux ans et demi) ........."\(^{43}\)

The true reason however, was that although he had resigned, Lefèvre had kept quite a number of pupils, whom he now taught privately. This must have appeared as a gesture of defiance to the Conseil, particularly as some of the younger members, friends of Lefèvre, continued to participate regularly in his classes. Gaussen, we learn, had remained friendly with him; as for Jacques Cappel, "quoiqu'il sache plus de grec que tous les sénateurs académiques ensemble, cependant, scandale horrible, il vient écouter tous les jours la lecture d'Homère qui se fait chez moi à dix heures du matin. Cela le perdra. Je / lui ai dit souvent........."\(^{44}\)

Under the sarcasm,
one senses Lefèvre's concern for his work. His ideal of a university was a challenge to the Conseil's conceptions. The word Académie had a different sense for him and for them. Now that students absented themselves from the other Regents' classes to follow his, he appeared to the Conseil a serious threat: "on a écrit jusques aux extrémités de la France, comme vous diriez Bretagne et Bas-Languedoc; et on a mandé que si on ne pouvait pas se résoudre à remettre au collège les personnes qui m'avaient été commises, on les retirât au moins de cette ville ...."45 Lefèvre's teaching which had brought fame to the Academy, had become a source of concern or as Lefèvre ironically put it: "il se trouvera que pour vivre sans scandale, on n'a qu'à faire perdre à la jeunesse plus de la moitié de l'année comme on fait ici ...."46

Such was Lefèvre's role as a teacher: his vision did not correspond to the reality of Saumur, yet he set standards which the Academy could not ignore. He attracted numerous pupils. If all did not attend the Academy, their presence was in itself beneficial. For this reason alone Lefèvre was tolerated. But it is as a scholar even more than as a teacher that he left his mark on those who knew him at Saumur.

The spirit of scholarship

Bouhéreau and Bauldry are good examples of the influence of Lefèvre as a scholar. Indeed more than his students they were in fact his disciples. Once they left Saumur they spent
the greater part of their lives studying the classics: "Je fais toujours quelque dissertation de critique," wrote Bauldry, "et la semaine passée, j'en achêvais une fort longue sur Michlée 5.2 vous la pourrez voir bientôt, car on me conseille de la faire imprimer: elle est soutenue d'une infinité de choses que je ne vous saurais marquer à cette heure pour lever les difficultés qui se présenteront d'abord à votre esprit ...."47

Tirelessly, they engaged in an everlasting search for the authentic text, the true sense, the correct reading. In their correspondence and the few works they published, is embodied this 'scholarly spirit' which they had acquired in Saumur, and for which Lefèvre was largely responsible.

Both of them shared the conceptions, instilled into them by Lefèvre, that the most worthwhile activity is "la critique", the critical examination of Latin and Greek texts. The importance it assumed in their eyes cannot be underestimated. When, for instance, Bouhéreau announced to Bauldry that he was engaged, his friend expressed a certain surprise, and a concern that this might detract him from his intellectual pursuits. It is quite clear from the actual wording of Bauldry's letter that he was not simply facetious: "Je pensais que vous aviez promis foi et loyauté aux Muses. Et s'il vous souvenait du temps passé, comme il m'en souvient, peut-être que vous ne le nieriez pas et trouveriez que j'avais grand raison ...."48 And indeed Bouhéreau and Bauldry's lives
were truly dedicated to a cult of the Muses. They were not poets or dramatists. They considered themselves as servants of ancient literature, protectors and preservers of the past, and restorers of its former glory. Lefèvre showed them the way: their total dedication to scholarship was his. He trained them in the methods; but he also gave them the taste. His attitude, which they copied, is summed up in a letter he wrote to Bouhéreau asking his former student, recently returned from a journey to Italy, to come and see him. In this letter the priorities are clear, the excitement, genuine: "j'ai à vous dire que nous ne commencerons point par la relation de votre voyage, nous ne parlerons pas même de Rome ni de sa grandeur, qui n'est plus que dans nos livres ... Il sera plus à propos, il me semble, de s'entretenir d'Euripide et de Sophocle, de voir un peu si Aristophane était aussi habile homme que notre M. de Molière ... Après que nous aurons vidé cette importante question, vous me parlerez s'il vous plaît de vos études, et moi je vous parlerai des miennes. Vous savez exactement tout ce que j'ai pensé depuis seize mois, tout ce que j'ai dit; tout ce que j'ai composé, soit en grec, en latin ou en français." 49

What was "La critique" for Lefèvre and his disciples? There is something in it of the collector's mania. It is a desire to record ideas, suggestions, conjectures that come to the scholar when he reads his favourite classics; Bauldry's
letters are full of these. Very often in fact, it would seem that the purpose of reading, is to create the occasion for them. One example taken among many in Bauldry's letters will suffice. It is all the more striking as in this case, the New Testament is the text which provides the occasion: "Je m'exerce assez sur le nouveau Testament où je trouve qu'il y a bien des choses à quoi l'on ne prend pas garde. D'où vient par exemple qu'au premier chapitre de la première épître à Timothée, on ne veut pas songer que "αξόγεω" qui se trouve au troisième verset à son rapport à "ταυτην ζην παρανελικτε" du dix-huitième. Je sais bien que l'hyperbole est furieux mais enfin il est ridicule de suppléer comme on fait "je t'avertis" ... Exercez-vous un peu sur ce verset là, je vous prie...⁵⁰ This desire to record the passing thoughts of the scholar takes an extreme form, in the miscellanies known as "ana". In fact Lefèvre's edition of the Scaligerana, if not the first by date, was used as a model for all subsequent collections of this type.⁵¹ It is worth noting that the book was reprinted, with additions, by Bauldry himself in 1695.⁵²

"La critique", as Bauldry and Bouhéreau understood it, was therefore both erudite and eclectic. In their view, these were the necessary qualities of the true scholar. But erudition and eclecticism were not an end in themselves. They were tools which had to be properly used. Bauldry's judgment on Le Moyne, an older scholar he had met in Rouen, is very significant in
this respect: "c'est un homme qui a furieusement lu, mais qui ne se sert pas avec beaucoup de jugement de sa lecture, et qui prend d'ordinaire pour son explication des passages difficiles, celle qui est la moins vraisemblable ..". 53

An example from Bauldry's correspondence will help to clarify what the true spirit and the proper method of scholarship was for him. In a letter written on 3 Dec. 1662, 54 Bauldry discusses a passage from Catullus, about which Bouhéreau and himself had made different conjectures: "vous ne sauriez croire la peine que m'ont donnée les deux vers de l'élegie "ad Manlium"... car je les ai examinés comme ils sont dans nos exemplaires, c'est-à-dire, sans les corriger et tantôt j'ai trouvé un peu de sens, tantôt moins de raison qu'en quoi que ce soit." Bauldry's method when confronted with the difficulty is the following: the conjecture he makes is not based on an historical evaluation of various readings found in the sources at his disposal... He simply chooses the one which gives the clearest and therefore, in his view, the most legitimate meaning. His assumption is that Catullus (and indeed all the other Latin and Greek writers that he studied) could only write clearly, naturally and without wasting words or using awkward phrases: "Je vous dirai familièrement que ma pensée me semble très raisonnable et que je ne désespère pas de vous la voir approuver... parce que vous avez encore remarqué avec moi que de la façon que vous expliquez "non est dea nescia nostrī", cet hémistiche
est inutile et hors de propos. En bonne conscience que sert à Catulle de dire "et demandez à Venus si elle ne me connaît pas bien?" And further down in the letter, commenting upon another conjecture of his, which he sent to Bouhéreau in a previous letter, Bauldry writes: "Je n'ai pas changé de sentiment depuis et je n'en changerai jamais selon l'apparence. En vérité vous auriez tort d'être d'un autre avis que moi en cette occasion, car je ne pense pas qu'il se puisse voir quoique ce soit de plus naturel que le sens que je donne à notre passage."

"Le sens naturel", this is the purpose of textual research as Bauldry, Bouhéreau and Lefèvre understand it; the method is not historical, nor even philological, but logical: Bauldry's edition of De Mortibus Persecutorum, or Bouhéreau's notes to his translation of Origines, all apply it. Their references and sources are not manuscripts, or the older editions, but the contemporary commentators. They assess the various conjectures, purely from the point of view of clarity of sense. They proceed as if the meaning of text pre-existed the words used. They believe implicitly that a difficult text is necessarily a corrupt text. The scholar's aim must be to restore it to its original purity of thought and clarity of expression.

The extreme consequences of this approach are clear: when no commentator is helpful, and when the 'corrupt text' resists all attempts to give up its secret, or its truth,
the scholar will assume the role of the writer. There are numerous passages in Lefèvre's *Epistolae*\(^{57}\) where he actually takes over from the author. He explains this procedure very strikingly in a letter to Sarrau where he deals with a difficult passage from Plautus: "ubi nihil video mihi apud interpretes subsidi quidquam esse (ita perspicaces, ita lyncei sunt) nil ego melius fore opportuniusve judicavi quam si versum illum Graecum olim (comoedia enim haec, ut ceterae Plautinae Graeca est) sua lingua denuo cuderem ...."\(^{58}\) In short Lefèvre saw the task of the scholar as not just restoring but also when necessary rewriting the text. As we shall see, when applied to the *New Testament*, this method raised objections, not simply about its validity but also about its true *purpose*. As Abbé Le Gallois wrote in his review in the *Journal des savants*, s'il était permis à tout le monde d'y changer ce qui ne lui plait pas, chacun se ferait une Écriture à sa fantaisie."\(^{59}\) Lefèvre, in other words, approached the Scripture from a different angle than Cappel: he did not draw the critical distinction between authentic sense and textual corruption. While the latter emended the *text*, Lefèvre corrected the *thought*. As we shall see his scholarship could be turned into a *machine de guerre* against religious belief.
Lefèvre, libertin or deist?

The comments of the *Journal des savants* raise the problem of Lefèvre's religious views. We should be wary not to follow some of the earlier controversialists, like Garasse, who saw atheism and libertinage in almost any position other than their own. It has also been pointed out by A. Adam that the term *libertin* applies to many different attitudes. And R. H. Popkin in chapter V of his *History of Scepticism*, has shown the difficulties of determining standards by which one can assess the religious position of even such a key figure of libertinage as La Mothe le Vayer. On the other hand we have Bayle's judgment on Lefèvre as "un homme sans religion", and also the criticism of *Le Journal des savants*. Without trying to apply a convenient label to Lefèvre, therefore, let us try and find what evidence there is to support this last judgment.

One aspect of Lefèvre's personality which for some of his contemporaries at Saumur constituted a source of scandal was his way of life. Students were often admonished on their unsanctified behaviour. The acts of the provincial synod which record Lefèvre's appointment, also contain a warning to the proposants on their conduct: "sur ce qu'il a été rapporté qu'ils sont trop superbement vêtus, qu'ils s'abandonnent à plusieurs débauches, qu'ils négligent leurs études pour fréquenter les filles .... [La Compagnie] leur a fait sur tous ces articles de grandes et sérieuses remonstrances."
Lefèvre's way of life did not fit into this context: he was an epicure. Chevreau, in a letter to Fr. Fronteau certainly gives this impression, when he narrates a dinner at Lefèvre's: "Ne pensez pas qu'il eut seulement dessein de vous traiter en grammarien et en philosophe, de critique, de syllogismes, de passages et d'autorités. Vous eussiez été régalé de ce que la province a de plus exquis; et quand il n'y eut eu dans le repas qu'il vous destinait que du vin de St. Laurens et de Bourgogne, que les perdreaux et les faisans qu'on lui avait envoyés de ces quartiers, il y eût eu assurément ce qui manquait dans le célèbre festin de Platon, et dans le banquet des sept sages de Plutarque..." Furthermore in the letter to Ménage, Lefèvre does not denounce as hypocrisy the puritanical style of life in Saumur, and sets himself as an example of honnête living: 'Moi, dis-je, qui vis plus honnêtement que ces marchands de choses saintes, moi qui ai l'approbation de tout ce qu'il y a d'honnêtes gens dans cette ville, soit de votre religion, soit de celle que ces cafards prêchent.'

However, the fact that for the more puritan in Saumur, Lefèvre's easy living was scandalous, does not help us to decide on Lefèvre's religious views. The hostility he aroused had deeper causes. We learn from a letter to Ménage quoted in the Menagiana that a campaign was started against him, both in the Consistoire and in the Conseil: "Je sais", he
wrote: "que l'on veut me jouer un mauvais tour, et devinez pourquoi. C'est que j'ai écrit en quelque endroit que les Anciens aimaient les yeux noirs, et que j'ai pardonné à Sappho si elle a aimé les femmes, puisque cette fureur lui a inspiré la belle ode que vous savez." The book which caused the furore was his *Vies des Poètes grecs*, a series of short essays in the form of letters where Lefèvre reveals a deep understanding of the Greek lyrical poets. Lefèvre found in the Greek example as he understood it, a certain ideal on which he tried to model his behaviour. "Les Grecs", he writes in the essay on Sappho, "avaient sans doute bien de l'esprit." What this *esprit* meant for him shows clearly in an ode to Anacreon, included in his *Lettre à Conrart* which serves as a preface to *Vies des Poètes grecs*. Anacreon was Lefèvre's favourite. And it is worth noting that he defended him against the current accusation of immorality. In the ode, the subject, the light yet scholarly treatment and the joyful and carefree sentiments are reminiscent of those of the "odelettes" of La Pléiade. Indeed Lefèvre in this self-portrait in disguise, seems to belong more to the sixteenth, than to the seventeenth century. There is something of the light-hearted spirit of the Renaissance in the concluding lines:

Ainsi c'est pour cela que la postérité
L'a toujours justement d'âge en âge chanté
Comme un franc goguenard, ami de goinfrerie
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Ami de billets doux et de badinerie.
Si donc ce qu'il faisait je le fais aujourd'hui
Je serais je me semble, aussi sage que lui
Et peut-être encore davantage.
Faisons en pourtant moins, car on peut être sage
Sans dire tout ce qu'il disait,
Sans faire tout ce qu'il faisait.70

The evocation of this ideal is accompanied by a
sentiment of mild nostalgia. Clearly, for Lefèvre, the
lives of his contemporaries did not display the same wisdom.
A year after the publication of his Vies des Poètes grecs
he expressed this view in the preface to his translation of
Plato's first Alcibiades: "Le livre que je publie aujourd'hui" he wrote, "n'est pas un livre du commun; il est rempli
de l'idée d'un meilleur temps que le nôtre ..."71 It must
have been this extolling of a sagesse foreign to the
christian ideal that Lefèvre's enemies found objectionable.
It would be wrong however to assume that sagesse was a convenient word for self-indulgence. For in the preface to his
translation of Plutarch's Traité de la superstition which
contains, as we shall see, a discussion of atheism, Lefèvre
strongly condemns as 'aveuglement' the type of atheism
which springs from being a slave of one's passions.72 But he
does not give his reasons for this condemnation, nor does he
define his own conception of happiness or of virtue. It is difficult
to decide
what was Lefèvre's true ethical position, for except in the brief passage mentioned, Lefèvre never really elaborated on the question. Nowhere in his letters or his other writings, do we find any attempt at formulating a moral theory. All we can say at this stage is that if Lefèvre was a libertin, it was by an attitude which was not positively christian. We should however note that his ideal was not inspired by any of the contemporary versions of Greek ethics. It was the Greek lyrical poets whom he considered an example. What is certain however is that he used that example to criticize moral conformity around him.

In the preface to Traité de la Superstition, already quoted, Lefèvre defines another type of atheism: "on appelle d'ordinaire athées, certains esprits qui se moquent de la religion (car le peuple parle ainsi) et je vois qu'on pouvait [sic] les appeler plus proprement irreligieux qu'athées." It is indeed in his own treatment of religious matters, more than in his ideal, that we can find evidence of Lefèvre's irreligion.

For Lefèvre never misses an opportunity to 'make fun' of dogma. He is not blatantly blasphemous, an attitude which could have very serious consequences in his days. Very cleverly Lefèvre manages to be just slightly sacrilegeous. His method is to allude to dogma, in a totally irreligious context. A good example of this is found in the Lettre à
Conrart, printed as a preface to *Vies des poètes grecs*. Lefèvre used the pretext of making half serious apologies for his poor grasp of the French language: had he not spent so much time studying Latin and Greek, his translations would probably be better. In a witty understatement, he sarcastically alludes to the Pentecost: "Il faudrait que je susse parler français. Cependant ce n'est plus la coutume d'apprendre les langues par révélation: et je n'ai jamais eu de maître en la nôtre .."75 The sarcasm is there, but is vague enough not to leave Lefèvre open to any serious charge. Another device used by Lefèvre is to give the same treatment to profane and religious matters. He is particularly good at this in some of the letters printed in *Epistolae*. In casual style and with an affected naïveté, at times even in slight jest, Lefèvre disserts on Greek or Latin passages chosen indifferently in Aristophanes or the Gospels. As the *Journal des savants* reviewer put it: "Au moins trouvera-t-on étrange de voir dans un même volume l'explication de plusieurs passages de l'Ecriture Sainte sales avec celle des plus endroits d'Aristophane, c'est-à-dire, ce qu'il y a de plus impur dans les livres des payens, avec ce qu'il y a de plus saint dans le Christianisme."76 But it is not simply his mockery which shows disbelief in Lefèvre. More important perhaps is his critical approach to the Scripture: "il ne s'est pas contenté de corriger les historiens
et les poètes," said Le Journal des savants; "il porte sa critique jusques sur l'Écriture Sainte .... il a changé des mots transportés des périodes, et quelquefois ôte des lignes toute entières, et cela sans apporter aucune/de ce qu'il avance, si ce n'est qu'il lui semble que le sens en serait meilleur et plus intelligible ..." We strike here at the root of Lefèvre's irreligion, his refusal to treat the Scripture as sacred. The method he applies to texts, whether sacred or profane, never varies. He is concerned as we have seen with the natural sense of a text: if a passage is obscure, the critic conjectures what its meaning should be: the right word (to Lefèvre's own understanding) must be the original one. The consequences of this method, when applied to passages of the New Testament, are far-reaching. Whilst most of his contemporaries would consider the more obscure passages (particularly parables) as figurative, and try to understand them as such, Lefèvre boldly rectifies them. For him the question is not to decide what the text actually means, but what it should mean.

A good example of his approach is found in one of his letters to Bouhèreau, where he discusses a passage of the Gospel according to St. John: "He said therefore again unto them... wither I go ye cannot come. The Jews therefore said, Will he kill himself, that he saith, Wither I go, ye cannot come?" Lefèvre contends that the phrase "Will he kill
himself" makes little sense. His reasons are as follows: If this is really what the Jews had understood they could have had no reason to express surprise at the rest of the words spoken by Jesus Christ that day, "ὅπου ἦ γὰρ ὁ θάνατος οὐκ ἔχεις ὑμῖν μὴ ἔχεις ὅπου ὁ θεὸς ἐστι ὁ λόγος." ("Wither I go you cannot come"): In Lefèvre's own words: "si dixissent Judaei ut hodie legitur; "μήτε ἀποκτενεῖ ἐαυτὸν "numquid si occident", non sub-junxiscent; "ότε λέγειν, ὅπου ἦ γὰρ ὁ θάνατος, ὑμεῖς ἐπὶ ὁ πατήρ ἔσται." After all, says Lefèvre, the Jews knew very well that they themselves would leave this earth one day: "Judaei enim, quin aliquando moritur, essent haud, ut opinor, dubitabant." Here Lefèvre is taking the opportunity of making fun of the passage, by treating it absurdly: the irony serves the purpose of showing that the text of the Gospel is like any text, a story similar to any story. The sanctity of the New Testament has evaporated, so to speak, in a smile.

This is not to say however, that Lefèvre is not earnestly concerned about the textual problems. For in the letter before this final quib, he earnestly endeavours to offer a satisfactory reading. He informs Bouhèreau that a solution to the difficulty has been suggested to him by Bauldry: instead of "κητα ἀποκτενεῖ ἐαυτὸν"("Will he kill himself?") one should read "αὐτοῦ ἐξεται ἐσονυλήτω"("Will he go in exile?"). His reasons for adopting this reading are the following: the
text with this correction, is more in conformity with a passage from the preceding chapter: In this last passage the comments of the Jews, on another statement by Jesus is: "wither will this man go that we shall not find him? will he go into the Dispersion among the Greeks?" For Lefèvre the comparison is correct. By changing "ἀνοκτένεν" into "ἀπὸ ἕξοποι" Bauldry restores unity and clarity to the text. Or in Lefèvre's own words: "Scis quid in illa epistola viderim? legi oportere non "ἀνοκτένεν" "occidet" sed "ἀπὸ ἕξοποι" hac sententia "numquid ipse in externas terras, relictā Judea, proficisci parat", quod, ex cap. 7 v 35 probatur: "εἰπεν οὖν οἱ ἱδρακίων πρὸς ἐκεῖνους", "dixerunt igitur Judaei apud se". Quid tandem? an "ipse occidet sese"? Nil minus sed "πῶς ἐν ὑπὸ κέλλειν πορεύεσθαι", "quo nem proficisci parat". Unde necessaria est emendatio ...."80

More than the solution itself, the reason given for it characterises Lefèvre's approach. His concern is to find, through comparison and conjecture, the clearest, the most logical meaning. In fact some of his reasoning is valid and superficially very modern. 20th century commentators have indeed pointed out that both passages must have at one stage belonged to the same chapter.81 Contrary to modern scholars however, Lefèvre does not simply propose a conjecture, as suggested to him in internal evidence. For him the new reading is the only one that fits, the only
solution to what he views as a logical problem: this is why he does not examine as Cappel would have done, whether graphically "εὐθανάσεως" could have been corrupted into "εὐθανάσεως". Furthermore once the solution proves to be logically satisfactory, he adopts it without questioning its historical validity. The verb is not in fact found in the Greek of the New Testament. It is only found with this meaning in Plato, Aristotle or Plutarch. When confronted with difficult obscure passages in the Scripture, therefore, Lefèvre boldly clarifies, emendates, improves. In so doing, he leaves his readers in doubt about his acceptance of the sacredness of the Scripture. Furthermore, his purpose in the letter to Bouhéreau, just quoted, cannot be simply textual criticism, yet it is not openly sacrilegious. Lefèvre cultivates understatement, and ambiguity. One thing however is clear, if Lefèvre criticizes the Scripture, it is not as a sceptic, but as a rationalist. His method rests on the conviction that there is no mystery in the Scripture, but only muddled thinking, and that truth can be reached purely by rational analysis. Finally there are the passages where Lefèvre reveals his views on religion more openly. The first is found in a piece entitled Tan.fabri in libris III praefatio ad lectorem inserted in his edition of Lucretius' De rerum natura. This piece is not to be confused with the general preface from which we have quoted above. It is in fact
concealed in the middle of the book and purports to be a commentary on the first three books of Lucretius' poem. Lefèvre's avowed aim in our piece is to clarify some aspects of Lucretius' doctrine, and show that they do not contradict the Christian view. This in itself is not very daring: adoption of Epicurean materialism did not necessarily entail that of Epicurean theism. What is interesting however, in Lefèvre, is his demonstration. The point he selects is Lucretius' doctrine of material souls. Lefèvre states A) that a Christian should not have any difficulty in accepting it. Bodies are material but a Christian believes in their resurrection; souls also could be material and be resurrected. The Christian dogma and Lucretius' doctrine can be reconciled. Then Lefèvre abruptly introduces another argument B) "Probet igitur Lucretius quam [rubebit], corpoream esse animorum naturam ... nil ille profecto dixerit quod hominem vere Christianum possit percellere, cum corporis nostri resurrectionem et immortalem, praeter universa physiologae vulgaris ac chymiae ipsius rationes ... futuram credamus, quae res si non majorem (quamquam majorem) parem certe in sese difficultatem habet ..." The double equivocation (si non majorem (quamquam majorem) parem certe difficultatem) emphasizes the point, rather than attenuates it: it is difficult, says Lefèvre, to reconcile the dogma of the resurrection of bodies with common physiological evidence and with the reasoning of chemistry. Lefèvre.
does not pursue the argument, leaving it to the reader to draw the conclusions that follow from A and B. What he is suggesting in fact is that Christian dogma is doubly inconsistent; first it makes an assumption contrary to what is commonly known (B); and secondly it is not even consistent with itself; once the resurrection of bodies has been assumed, there is no logical necessity to assume also that souls are immaterial (A).

It must be made clear that Lefèvre only suggests this reasoning. He is content with stating that the real difficulty is. As he says just before argument (B), it does not really matter whether souls are material or immaterial: "Animi nostri vel spirituales habeantur, vel corporei, si velis." What is difficult to understand is how bodies can be resurrected.

In this passage Lefèvre challenges one particular dogma from the point of view of its inconsistencies. There is however another text where he writes as a critic of all religious belief. This is the Preface to his translation of Plutarch’s Traité de la superstition. As we have seen the preface gives a definition of various types of atheism as a) mere aveuglement and b) as irreligion. To these Lefèvre adds a third: "outre ces deux espèces d'athéisme, j'estime qu'il y en a encore une autre. et c'est celle là qu'on
dit être inconcevable, et je m'en étonne: car il me semble qu'il peut y avoir des athées qui n'ont jamais eu de sentiment de Dieu."88 It is to this category of atheism that he devotes the major part of his Preface. First Lefèvre argues that such position is perfectly tenable: if men had an idea of God, they would not disagree about what God really is: "si ces notions ... étaient naturellement imprimées en nos coeurs d'où viendraient ces étranges, ces monstrueuses et ridicules dissentiments?"89 Furthermore, Lefèvre dismisses the objection ("la grande, la solennelle objection") that God could not allow such atheism to exist. This argument he says presupposes a Revelation: If examined without prejudice creation is nothing but an arbitrary action which does not in any way entail an obligation of the Creator as regards the creature: "il est extrêmement ridicule et téméraire de croire qu'une créature tirée du néant, d'où elle ne fut jamais sortie, car elle n'était pas, ait aucun droit de se plaindre, puisqu'entre ce qui est et ce qui n'est point, il n'y put y avoir de condition, point de traité, point d'obligation ...."90

Lefèvre then turns to an attack on superstition. Following Plutarch he argues that superstition has far worse consequences than atheism. The superstitious are blinded by custom, ignorance or fear. "L'ignorance de ces misérables est si grossière et si brutale qu'elle fait horreur à tout
homme qui a quelque sentiment de vertu." 91 All told, true atheism is a more honest position. What is important is that it constitutes a challenge that the superstitious, in their ignorance, cannot answer: "on peut voir tous les jours une infinité de personnes à qui ce nom de Dieu n'est pas inconnu. Mais pour la chose ne leur en parlez point, ils ne la connurent jamais ..." 92 The atheists need to be convinced, and it is not superstition that can achieve this aim. There is only one radical way, suggests Lefèvre. One must start afresh. Religion as we see it to-day, says Lefèvre, is like a long-built building where what is sound cannot be separated from what is not. It would be impossible to separate what is in fact superstition from what is not. And Lefèvre ends the Preface by a suggestion, which remains in the interrogative: "Si l'on a dessein de bâtir, n'est-il pas vrai qu'il faudrait mieux choisir une place toute pure et toute nette dont le fond fût bon et l'exposition avantageuse?" 93

On the whole Lefèvre's position is difficult to evaluate: He appears to have learnt from his Greek readings the art of aporia. However, his critical method, his attack on Revelation, his criticism of the inconsistencies of dogma, are all argued from the point of view of the rationalist. Without reading too much into the suggestion he makes in Traité de la superstition it seems possible therefore that he was inclined towards Deism. Also, we could interpret as
evidence of this, the approval he voiced for _La Réunion du christianisme_ (see chapter IX). It is not really surprising that Saumur tolerated his views; for he seemed to argue from accepted premises, and he refrained from clearly stating his conclusions. He died on 12 Sept. 1672. On hearing the news, Bauldry wrote to Bouhéreau: "La mort de M. Lefèvre m'a troublé, surtout parce qu'on m'a dit qu'elle n'a pas été bien chrétienne."94 Lefèvre had thus concealed his true feelings even to his friends. And yet both Bouhéreau and Bauldry should not have been surprised. They must have been aware that Lefèvre's ideal was not that of the Académie. He despised what he called in his Preface to _La Vie d'Aristippe_, "les petits adoucissements des régénérés". Despite his close links with Saumur he never totally belonged to it. In a deeply christian milieu he introduced and kept alive a profane, even a pagan spirit. For this reason Lefèvre became one of the first victims of the enforcement of orthodoxy which marks the beginning of Saumur's downfall.
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PART III

THE DOWNFALL OF SAUMUR 1670-1685
Chapter VIII

1670-1685, THE END OF SAUMUR

For the Académie the years 1670-1685 were a period of increasing hardship, which culminated in the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685. As an institution the Académie of Saumur was only slowly brought to a halt, but intellectually its downfall was very sudden. The fact is that Saumur had ceased to be a centre of intellectual life long before it was closed by the edict of the King. Historians who have written on the protestant academies during the XVIIIth century have perhaps over-emphasized the importance of the change in the King's policy, as a factor of this downfall.\(^1\) Saumur did suffer from the persecution to which the réformés were submitted after 1670. But the historians of the XIXth century by devoting the major part of their research to the way the policy of oppression was enacted, or those of the XXth century by concentrating on the causes of the King's policy,\(^2\) have perhaps underestimated the internal changes of the protestant communities, during the period. This is particularly true for Saumur. The downfall of Saumur was undoubtedly brought about by political and religious oppression. What is interesting however is the reactions of the Académie to the first measures of persecution. In our view, both the controversies against d'Huisseau and against Pajonism, which we shall study in the last two chapters,
can only be understood in this perspective. Submitted to external pressures, isolated from the churches whose edifice was progressively dismantled, the Conseil académique reluctantly assumed the responsibility for maintaining "la pureté de la doctrine". The concern of the Conseil was to obliterate any view which might have been used to support the current accusations of disloyalty and irreligion made against the protestants. Like the majority of the réformés, its members were concerned with demonstrating their political obedience and also their christian spirit. As the cases of d'Huisseau and Pajon show, the way the Conseil did this was by eliminating any trace of what might have appeared as heterodoxy.

The purpose of this brief introduction is to show the reasons for this attitude, by following the impact of repressive measures on the Académie. Historians have distinguished two phases in the series of measures that led to the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685. During the first, the oppression of the réformés took the form of the strict application and the restrictive interpretation of the clauses of the Edict. During the second, from 1682 to 1685, direct violence was used to bring about the greatest possible number of conversions. We shall only be concerned here with the first phase and the gradual effects of the ever-hardening policy of the King. Of the second, there is little to say: On 8 February 1685, the Académie was closed, and its members went into exile.

At first, while the neighbouring provinces, and
particularly Poitou, under the notorious intendant Marillac, already suffered from persecution, Saumur was not affected. In many other places in France, the Commissaires royaux who represented the King in the provincial synods asked local churches to prove that they were in existence before the promulgation of the Edict of Nantes. To those founded after, the Edict did not apply, and their destruction was therefore ordered. In Poitou for instance, as early as 1665 an Arrêt du Conseil d'Etat ordered the closing of temples and forbade the réformés to practise in 34 villages.5

By contrast Saumur and the Académie remained relatively secure. In 1670, the Commissaires of Anjou requested the Académie to show proof of its legitimate foundation. In a letter which we quote in the next chapter, Gaussen expresses a concern which might have been prompted by this request.6 Unfortunately the acts of the synod are lost, and significantly the Registre only records the part of the act which concerns its internal affairs (i.e. the d'Huisseau case). But E. Benoît in his Histoire de l'Edit de Nantes states that the first attempt to unsettle the Académie did not succeed, perhaps because in a Requête to the King, the protestant churches came to its support and argued that its existence was guaranteed by the Edict of Nantes: "Il y avait eu partage entre [les Commissaires] du Haut-Languedoc sur le droit de l'Académie de Montauban, qu'on avait transferée à Puylaurens, et comme on avait porté la cause de celle de Saumur devant les Commissaires d'Anjou, on s'attendait bien qu'ils suivraient l'exemple des autres. La Requête
exposait en fort peu de mots, mais nettement et solidement, les raisons qui servaient de fondement à leur subsistance ..."7

A few years after however a measure was taken which had serious consequences for Saumur. On February 1674 an Arrêt du Conseil d'État forbade the academies to send députés to provincial synods any more. The aim of the Arrêt was to sever many vital links between the academies and the local churches. As Benoît states, "on était par là aux Académies un des moyens les plus nécessaires à leur subsistance, savoir la communication avec les provinces voisines, où ils avaient assez souvent des remonstrances à faire au sujet de leur entretien".8 In the long run the decision to deprive the Académie of its financial support proved very damaging. On 15 July 1672 already the Conseil had taken a significant decision: it decided to stop giving prix de piété to the more successful students, "sur ce qu'il a été représenté de la pauvreté de l'Académie".9 From 1674, as the Papier de recette shows, the contributions received from the provinces became less and less regular. Indeed, even if the 1674 Arrêt had not been implemented, the reformed churches, hit by the repressive measures, could not muster the same financial resources any more. In 1674 the only contribution from Poitou came from one church, that of Fontenay and amounted to 53 livres only.10 Even Saumur's own province, Anjou, could only contribute 1110 livres for the two years 1674-5 - and this "sans préjudices des arrérages".11 By 1680 the situation had become critical. The account for that year states that "pour ce qui est des billets
des églises, de huit qui furent transmis ... il n'a été payé que deux seulement". Finally, the last account for the year 1674, show that by that time the Académie survived thanks mostly to private donations, and a generous contribution of the consistoire of Paris.13

Another effect of the 1674 Arrêt was that it became very difficult for Saumur to appoint permanent staff. In 1671 the Académie already had lost two prominent members of the staff who were not subjects of the King. If Chouet actually left on his own accord, Doull and Crespin, Régents de première classe, were forced to resign. As the Registre states: "M. Doull a représenté à la Compagnie une ordonnance donnée et signée par M. l'Intendant de cette province portant que Mess. Chouet, Crespin, Doull et tous autres étrangers aient à n'enseigner aucunement dans cette Académie ... et le dit Sieur Doull a déclaré qu'il est résolu d'obéir ..."14 After 1674 only one professor was given a regular appointment. This was Villemandi who in 1670 succeeded to Chouet, after the latter had returned to Geneva. But even Villemandi's appointment in 1670 broke away with the regular procedure. For he was nominated by the gouverneur of Saumur (a protestant) and given the chair without an examination. Gaussen opposed the procedure and we learn from the Registre that he was supported by some of the students.15 This incident is in itself significant of the incapacity of many in the Académie to adapt to new circumstances, and of their wish to adhere to rules and ideas that were no longer tenable. Eventually the
impossibility to hold proper examinations, the end of synodal authority on the matter, the dwindling number of candidates forced the Conseil to have recourse to the system of temporary appointments. Finally in 1683, after Villesandi's resignation, the Conseil had to divide the teaching of philosophy between seven proposants: "La Compagnie ... a jeté les yeux sur Monsieur de la Treille, proposant pour faire leçon aux physiciens par interim jusqu'au mois d'Avril prochain que l'on tâchera de remplir cette place; et au sujet de l'auditoire de logique qui reste à pourvoir ... il a été résolu qu'on proposerait à quatre [proposants] qui ont été nommés, de subir quelque espèce d'examen ... sur les matières de logique ... et que celui d'entre eux que la Compagnie jugerait le plus capable, serait prié de faire des leçons aux logiciens par interim". The incapacity of the Conseil to cope with all these difficulties is understandable: like the great majority of the réformés they were convinced to the end that these difficulties were only temporary. Early in 1685, a few days perhaps before the closing of the Académie, the Conseil was still planning to elect a new Principal, for there is a letter by Th. Barin, who held the office to Bouhéreau, where he offers him the position. Nevertheless, their attentisme had in fact brought intellectual life to an end, before the Académie itself closed down.

But the most important factor in the decay of intellectual life in the Académie is undoubtedly the disruption of the power
structure of the reformed churches. In 1670 the Conseil d'État had actually suggested that the réformés should hold a new national synod. According to Benoît the churches suspected that this would be used to bring pressure to bear on them and therefore declined the offer: "Cela ne tendait peut-être au fond qu'à inspirer aux réformés de la défiance les uns pour les autres, en leur persuadant qu'il y avait assez de ministres gagnés pour donner au Conseil un beau prétexte de dire que l'accomodement était fait". After 1670 however the King refused all requests to allow the convening of a new national synod. What is more, in 1679 a new edict forbade the convening of provincial synods or colloques without the King's consent, and imposed catholic Commissaires on those that would be allowed. The consequences of the measure were far reaching; the individual churches and the academies were left on their own and deprived of any means of consultation. Had the academy enjoyed in the past a greater measure of independence, within the ecclesiastical structure of the French churches, it would have been better equipped to face the storm. In Saumur however, as our study of La Réunion du christianisme will show, the Conseil clung to the compromise elaborated at Loudun, of which the national and provincial synods were an essential part. When the recourse to these became no longer possible, the Conseil remained helpless. As we shall see when we come to study the consequences of the 'affaire Pajon', the only reaction was to
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reject as heterodox the last sign of intellectual vitality.

In these last fifteen years therefore the Académie failed to recognize in time the need for change. The Conseil did eventually assume fuller responsibilities, but misused them. Under ever-increasing pressures, the delicate balance achieved in the year 1660 could not be maintained. In fact the performance of the Conseil during this last period shows that the relative stability of the previous decade, only rested, as Bayle suggested, on a bad compromise.
Notes to chapter VIII

1. This is very clear in the work of 19th century historians such as Bourchenin. Even Métayer's anecdotal history L'académie protestante de Saumur (Paris, 1933) suffers from the same over-emphasis.

2. A recent assessment of the causes of the persecution is found in J. Orcibal, Louis XIV et les protestants (Paris, 1951). Orcibal shows the important part played by Louis XIV's foreign policy in his decision to stamp out the reformed churches in France.
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16. Decision dated 11 Nov. 1683 in *Registre du Conseil académique de ceux de la R.P.R. de Saumur* (1683-4), Saumur, Bibliothèque municipale, MS I a4, f.9. A letter from Th. Barin, the Principal to Bouhéreau, dated 16 May 1684 indicates that the Conseil offered the position to Bouhéreau (Marsh's Library, MS Z.2.12.1). There are two letters from Th. Barin to Bouhéreau, wrongly included among those of an homonym E. Bärin (who was pasteur in Saintonge).
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Chapter IX

THE CONTROVERSY AROUND LA REUNION DU CHRISTIANISME

The publication in 1670 of d’Huisseau’s book La Réunion du christianisme marks the beginning of the fight of the Conseil against heterodoxy. The reactions to its publication were swift and violent. However, the Conseil académique and the churches did not simply condemn in the book an attempt to find common ground between the Catholic and the reformed churches. The reunion of the churches was indeed a well debated question at the time, and œcumenical projects were not new. If La Réunion du christianisme aroused much controversy, it must be because for the orthodox, it presented another danger. But this could not have been the fear that d’Huisseau was open to the seductions of Catholic doctrine. Indeed other writers on the question had in the past finally been ‘converted’ back to catholicism. But the case of d’Huisseau was different. He never waivered in his protestant principles. Undoubtedly he inclined towards congregationalism. But to his last day, he reaffirmed his fidelity to the spirit of the reformers. Confirmation of this is found in a letter by Villemandi who knew d’Huisseau in Saumur. In 1695 Villemandi wrote to Elie Benoît who was at the time working on a new edition of his Histoire de l’Edit de Nantes, and who, in the first edition, had passed a very
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severe judgment on d'Huissseau's publication. Villemandi had been asked by d'Huisseau's son who had been offended by Benoit's remarks, to set the record straight. In a long covering letter to the son's plea, he leaves no doubt about d'Huisseau's dedication to the protestant faith: "Ce n'est pas que je souhaite que s'il y a lieu de rétablir le mémoire de défunt M. d'Huisseau, vous ne le fassiez .... et même si j'osais, je vous en prierai. Car ayant été témoin de sa vie sur ses derniers jours, et surtout de la manière dont il est mort, j'en ai été singulièrement édifié; et il m'a paru toujours très éloigné de toutes les erreurs, superstitions et idolatries de la religion Romaine". There is no evidence whatever, to disprove the claim: D'Huisseau, as soon as he saw the hostility that his book aroused, withdrew from the controversy and did not himself publish any defense of it; nor was the publication of his book followed by his 'conversion', which for many others would have been the inevitable consequence of being considered as outcasts by their own church. It is in the approach chosen by d'Huisseau and even more in the challenge to the Conseil's authority that the true reasons of the condemnation of the book must be found.

D'Huisseau and the traditional approach to church reunion

All through the century, there had appeared a great number of Projets de Réunion: by writing a new book on this crucial question, d'Huisseau was not in any way innovating. In
Saumur itself, La Milletière had established the pattern for many others. A friend of Cameron he was deeply interested in the fundamental points of protestant doctrine and in 1637 published his *Moyens de la paix chrétienne* where he tried to narrow the gap between the Catholic and the reformed churches on these issues. The national synod of Alençon (1637) condemned the book "attendu que ledit Sr de la Milletière tâchait de renverser dans son troisième livre la doctrine de la justification par la foi ..." After his conversion, La Milletière, inspired by Richelieu, published a series of pamphlets, dealing systematically with the fundamental differences between Catholic and Protestant doctrine. He thus set a pattern for discussions of the question; and all attempts to deal with it until 1670, both on the Catholic and the Protestant side, concentrated on bridging the gap between the opposite doctrines, on grace, justification and good works.

The field of controversy had thus been narrowed since the time when Du Plessis-Mornay and Cardinal Du Perron had confronted themselves in the Conference de Fontainebleau in 1601. Their approach was simply to accumulate historical and theological arguments, endlessly borrowed from the church Fathers or the decisions of the early councils, or to discuss the *notae ecclesiae*, the 'marks' of the true church. After La Milletière on the contrary, the starting point for all those who wrote on the question was always doctrine. The more liberal protestants would try to show that the doctrine of justification by the direct
intervention of grace did not necessarily preclude the redemption of all men by Christ's death. But even attempts at explaining calvinist dogma in terms that could be accepted by the Catholic church were viewed with suspicion. Codurg in fact was condemned for his attempt at the Synod of Charenton in 1645 for having confused "les plus grandes grâces de Dieu, qui ne peuvent être séparées l'une de l'autre, quoiqu'elles soient toujours distinctes en elles-mêmes, à savoir l'absolution du pécheur ... par les mérite de Jesus-Christ ... et le Saint Esprit opérant la régénération dans leur coeur ..".  

D'Huisseau's book constituted a radical departure from the tradition of controversy and the accepted positions from which any discussion of the question of reunion had to be conducted. Of this d'Huisseau was conscious, for, in the Preface, he criticizes the previous attempts made at a reconciliation, for having remained at the surface of the matter: "on s'est ordinairement arrêté à remédier à quelques effets, sans remonter à la cause principale." The third part of the book contains in fact a highly critical review of the various methods previously followed. All have failed, states d'Huisseau, because they have taken for granted points of dogma, without enquiring into their validity; both sides have viewed the reunion of the churches as the adoption of the other church by their own, with a few minor modifications of doctrine and a few concessions on ritual. The original contribution of d'Huisseau to the question is to say that if both
churches earnestly considered what really constitutes the foundation of their respective faiths, they would find that it is the same in both: "il me semble que, pour travailler avec succès à une bonne réunion, il faut remonter à un principe duquel nous convenons tous ...."11 The implication is clear (even if d'Huisseau cautiously avoids saying it in so many words): a true reunion must bring about a new church, founded on a principle that all Christians can accept. The great advantage of this new church is that it will also be acceptable to all the peoples of the world, and particularly the pagans: "mon but," says d'Huisseau, "est de faire voir à tous les peuples du monde les avantages de la religion chrétienne .."12 More than reuniting the Protestant and Catholic churches, d'Huisseau is in fact concerned with laying the foundations for a universal church.

By what method could this be achieved? According to d'Huisseau, first it is necessary to revoke all common prejudices, in order to apprehend the fundamental conceptions common to both fields. And without mentioning Descartes by name, d'Huisseau daringly suggests that his method is only one that achieves this aim: "on a proposé depuis quelque temps dans la philosophie un moyen de bien raisonner et de faire de sûres démarches vers la vérité. On tient que pour cela il se faut absolument détacher de toutes opinions préconçues .. ne pouvons nous pas imiter ce procédé dans la religion?"13 Once rid of prejudices, fundamental dogmas must be submitted to the tribunal of reason.
It is reason that can without partiality tell us where the truth lies in the field of dogma: "Ne saurions nous envisager le fondement de la religion sans aucun engagement, le fondement de la religion que reconnaissent généralement tous ceux qui se disent chrétiens ... ne serait-ce pas un moyen infaillible pour reconnaître avec un esprit désintéressé, comment on doit s'avancer dans un chemin commun et ce qu'on peut édifier sur un fondement solide ....?"\textsuperscript{14}

In the Preface, d'Huisseau informs his readers that it was indeed a cartesian illumination that inspired him to write the book: "Je me suis d'abord défait de tous les préjugés qui me pouvaient être en obstacle, dans un si louable dessein. Je me suis dégagé pour un temps de tout ce que chaque communion de chrétiens pouvait avoir de singulier et qui la séparait des autres."\textsuperscript{15} But only the first stage of the cartesian method is represented in the book. Descartes' systematic questioning of all received opinions leads him to the 'cogito'; and from that moment, once assured of one unchallengeable and evident truth, Descartes starts to rebuild, progressing from one truth to the next until he reaches a comprehensive system.

D'Huisseau's call for a cartesian examination of various dogmas remains superficial: his main concern is to denounce as mere opinions or prejudices both Catholic and Protestant dogmas. \textit{La Réunion} is in fact a polemical book, devoted for the major part to a denunciation of the false rationalisations
given by both sides to try and justify their beliefs: "Je
désire donc que l'on quitte tous ces préjugés qui nous retien-
nent dans une religion, plutôt par de fausses apparences que
par jugement et par raison. C'est ainsi que les uns se
varent de leur antiquité, de la succession de leurs conduc-
teurs, de l'étendue de leur communion, de ses avantages
temporels ... c'est ainsi que les autres se prévalent de leur
simplicité, de leur petit nombre, du mépris que l'on fait
d'eux dans la société." In this long enumeration, it is easy
to recognise the 'reasons' traditionally put forward by the
controversialists to support their respective claims.

The polemical aspect of the book becomes evident in the
last pages of the book where d'Huissseau, by way of a parable,
tells the story of the Christian shipwrecked among pagans in
the Magellan Straights: "Je suppose qu'il soit arrivé inopiné-
ment que quelque chrétien ait été porté par la tempête dans la
Magellaine, ou dans quelque autre pays dont les habitants n'
aient jamais ouï parler de nos mystères." What would such
a man be able to tell 'les sauvages' about his religion? He
could turn them into good Christians, simply by showing them that there
is a God, that His Son died for our justification and that
"pourvu que nous nous étudions soigneusement à la piété et à
la charité envers nos prochains," we shall be given
everlasting happiness. Indeed, says d'Huissseau, they would be
happier than - if they became involved in all these theological
controversies which are of no help for salvation: "Je dirai que je les tiendrais plus heureux ... que si on venait à les surcharger de toutes ces questions curieuses dont on nous entretient ordinairement." \(^19\) Later in the book d'Huisseau comes back on this point and this time with more specific charges: "les sujets que l'on met d'ordinaire sur le tapis ès compagnies qu'on estime les plus réglées du monde sont pleins de vanité ... les nouvelles de ce qui se passe dans le monde, les affaires d'état, l'explication de quelques passages difficiles des anciens auteurs, quelques questions de mathématiques ou de physique ... sont l'occupation ordinaire de ces célèbres compagnies, à qui on rend tant de déférence". \(^20\) And d'Huisseau continues "Si on y propose un sujet tel que celui que je traite, on le reçoit froidement...." \(^21\) It seems clear that d'Huisseau had in mind the 'intellectual' or academic circles of Saumur and accused them of not being concerned with fundamental issues. D'Huisseau's book is partly a denunciation of the intellectual dishonesty and casuistry prevalent on both sides: "comment voulez-vous qu'un homme qui a l'esprit rempli d'une infinité d'idées, sur lesquelles il s'est déjà déterminé, puisse faire place à celles qui leur sont opposées, bien qu'effectivement elles lui soient plus salutaires?" \(^22\)

In the Preface d'Huisseau indicates that the purpose of the book is to suggest the method necessary in order to reach the true principles common to all religion, rather than
To analyse of these premises and of the dogmas that can be derived from them, once they are accepted. Furthermore, in the book, he alludes to the divine character of the Scripture, and states that in a further treatise he shall attempt to demonstrate it.²³ Pending this demonstration, d'Huisseau suggests that the only statements that can be accepted as true, by all Christians, as principles from which a true religion can be developed, are those contained in the Creed. But this is only a temporary solution: "Pour le présent, il me semble que pour travailler avec succès à une bonne réunion, il faut remonter à un principe duquel nous convenions tous ...."²⁴ This is certainly the most daring aspect of the book: what d'Huisseau suggests in this passage in fact, is that Descartes's position in part III of the Discourse on Methode, regarding the necessity of a provisional ethic, can be applied to matters of faith. The notion of a "provisional creed", that all churches could share until a rational assessment of dogma has been made, is perhaps the most radical of the book. The entire book rests in fact on this one idea; in itself it was for the orthodox scandalous enough. But the book also contained harsh criticism of not only the Catholic but also the Protestant churches; some passages could be interpreted as implying rejection of fundamental dogmas as mere 'opinions'. As soon as it appeared, there was an immediate outcry.
The number of pamphlets that were published for or against the is a measure of violent reactions it created: they were all published within a few months or even a few weeks of each other, and in a short space of time d'Huisseau's fate had been sealed. Evidence of this is given by Jurieu, who came back on the question in 1671 with his Examen du livre de la Réunion du christianisme. He was aware that the case against d'Huisseau was already closed: his book he said in the Preface, came six months too late, and Jurieu's real concern was to examine La Réunion for its broader implications, particularly the question of tolerance, his major preoccupation at the time. In fact the battle around La Réunion was fought mostly in Saumur and the neighbouring provinces. La Bastide immediately issued a confutation of d'Huisseau, which was published by Péan, the same printer who had been responsible for the publication of La Réunion itself. But it is in the pamphlets written in defense of La Réunion that one finds abundant evidence of the hostility which d'Huisseau had to face. There are three of these, all anonymous, and without imprint. One is a very small but virulent pamphlet against La Bastide, entitled Remarques sur les Remarques faites depuis peu sur le livre intitulé La Réunion du christianisme ... 1670 (no place): the type in which it is set and the ornament of the title page are the same as in La Réunion, and there is very little doubt that it was again published by Péan. This is also true of another pamphlet
defending d'Huisseau's character and entitled Apologie pour le livre intitulé La Réunion du christianisme et pour celui qui en a été soupçonné l'auteur à Saumur. Finally a more elaborate defense of the doctrine of La Réunion is to be found in the Traduction du Traité de Samuel Petit, professeur en théologie à Nîmes, touchant la réunion des chrétiens, avec quelques observations qui ont été faites sur un livre latin du Sieur Gaussen: A Lettre à Monsieur d'Huisseau serves as a preface to the book, which was probably to judge by the type used printed abroad (in Holland) and smuggled into France. The number of these publications, the haste and secrecy with which they were issued, the violence of their tone, are in themselves an indication of the crisis which shook Saumur in 1670. They are however useful in another respect: they provide a good source of information on what went on 'behind the scene'. In the Registre of the Académie, there is no direct evidence of the measures that were taken; yet d'Huisseau was as pasteur, a member of the Conseil. It is as if the Conseil had deliberately tried to conceal their embarrassment and perhaps, their shame. In fact the only mention of La Réunion in the Registre is found in the entry for 29 October 1670 where it is said that 'Mr de Haumont, avocat du Roi, ayant signé dimanche dernier l'Acte de condamnation au lieu de la Réunion en qualité de membre du Conseil Académique, la Compagnie a député vers lui Messieurs de Beaujardin et Daillé pour le prier de reprendre dans notre susdit
Conseil Académique, la place qu'il y occupait autrefois. 29
At that date already, the case, it seems, was nearly closed,
and the witch-hunt had been successful.

To call the campaign against La Réunion a witch-hunt
is in no way an exaggeration. Everyone in Saumur was involved.
The anonymous author of the pamphlet Remarques sur les
Remarques speaks of rumours purposely spread among the
ordinary people to discredit d'Huisseau in the eyes of his
flock: "témoin celle qui dans Saumur ne voulut jamais qu'on
portât chez elle le livre de la Réunion, disant qu'elle savait
de bonne part, et par des gens du métier, que l'on ne
pouvait lire douze lignes dans ce livre diabolique, que maître
Robert ne s'apparût en forme de bouc à ces lecteurs ..." 30
A brief account of this campaign and its outcome is therefore
in order, if we wish to put in proper perspective the accusations
levied against the Book. It must be pointed out first
that La Réunion is an anonymous book and that d'Huisseau's
condemnation by the Provincial Synod, which was convened in October
1670 rested on his constant refusal to sign the act condemning
the book. Indeed there is no doubt that others collaborated
to the book. The short Latin poem on peace and concord appended
to it was written by Lefèvre. Bouhéreau, his friend, knew about
this and informed Chouet of the fact, as it is apparent from
from Chouet's letter of Oct. 4 1670 where Lefèvre's author-
ship is taken for granted: "une des choses qui m'a en plus sur-
pris, dans toute cette affaire, c'est que Monsieur Lefe-
vre s'en soit mêlé et qu'il n'ait pas fait de difficulté à
mettre de si beaux vers (car j'avoue qu'il me semble que
Monsieur Lefèvre n'a jamais mieux réussi), à la tête d'une
si méchante pièce". In the letter to Benoît already quoted,
Villemandi states very clearly that Lefèvre in fact corrected
the proofs of the book, although he is adamant in his denial
that the publication of La Réunion was a concerted effort
... "je ne sais qui vous a parlé de cabale pour l'appuyer. Si
Messieurs Lefèvre et Crespin, qui ont été presque les
seuls dans Saumur, qui en ont su certainement l'édition, l'ont
apprové, l'un en le louant, l'autre lorsqu'il en a corrigé
les épreuves, et puis encore l'a défendu, toute autre raison
[ric] les a poussés à cela, qu'un dessein de réunion, j'en
suis fort assuré ..." The motives in both cases were
undoubtedly personal animosity. Crespin had long been a
personal enemy of some prominent members of the Conseil (and
particularly of Gaussen), and Lefèvre as we know despised
his academic colleagues and could not miss the opportunity of
helping in an enterprise which he knew would embarrass them.
Both indeed were censored by the Synod and both resigned,
Crespin on 29 September 1670 and Lefèvre on 6 October. It is
clear from the wording of the entry for that last date, that
for Lefèvre at least, the real reason (as Villemaini implies) was purely the desire to defy the ecclesiastical and academic authorities. The major responsibility fell on d'Huisseau, and he never denied it. The book however was published anonymously, and without the necessary attestation from the Academy. It therefore contravened the Discipline of the reformed churches which stated that books on religious matters had to be submitted to the relevant ecclesiastical or academic authorities. As a pasteur d'Huisseau was aware of the regulation; besides he had himself published an edition of the Discipline. In this case it was the duty of the prochain pasteur, or the professor of theology, to investigate the book and if necessary censor the author. Gaussen was both pasteur and professor, he therefore convened both the Consistoire and the Conseil: they censured the book during an extraordinary meeting where, as we learn from Villemaini, both bodies sat together.

The fact that d'Huisseau did not try to obtain an attestation indicates that d'Huisseau knew that the ideas he expressed in the book would not be acceptable to the Conseil. However, it must not be taken as signifying that d'Huisseau was so dedicated to his views, that he was prepared to incur the censorship of the orthodox, and become a martyr to his own cause. It must be remembered that d'Huisseau, as a congregationalist had challenged on several occasions the structure of power in the reformed churches; and after his confrontation with Amyraut he had managed to remain a pasteur, while
successfully challenging the authority of the consistoire or provincial synod. It is therefore quite possible that his decision to ignore the need for an attestation from an académie or ecclesiastical authority did not simply spring from the fear to be considered unorthodox, and the wish to publish what he considered the truth, whatever the consequences may be. He might well have tried to kill two birds with the same stone, by making a mockery of the Conseil's power. At any rate this is the danger Gaussen immediately foresaw when he wrote to Bouhéreau in May, obviously very soon after the publication of the book: "à propos de livres, avez vous vu celui de la Réunion? Que cette affaire nous fera de peine! Je ne sais si ce n'est point le dernier coup que D. [Sic] veut frapper pour nous perdre. Ce n'est point que j'aie dessein d'accuser personne et d'entrer dans le secret des coeurs où il n'y a que D. qui puisse entrer; mais enfin il est certain que toutes les circonstances qui pourraient rendre une entreprise de cette nature là mauvaise, ce sont rencontrées ici. Priez Dieu pour notre pauvre Académie, mon cher Monsieur, car en vérité nous n'eummes jamais tant de besoin des prières des honnêtes gens .."37 That d'Huisseau really tried to undermine the authority of the Academy seems certain. The fact is that a new decree was issued by the King's Conseil in 1670 which required printers to submit their books for approbation to the local magistrate. Now such a measure had been under dis- cussion since 1666, and everyone knew that it was coming. Further
royal decree was already issued when d'Huisseau's book appeared in 1665.
when the judges summoned Péan the printer, to appear before them. This we learn from the anonymous author of the Apologie. What Pean said for his defense, as narrated in the pamphlet, throws some light on the whole affair. For Péan claimed that the book had been given to him for printing by "une personne fort considérée par les gens de lettres" who had assured him that the book was perfectly acceptable. Although the name is not given it seems clear from what has been said above, and from the description given, that the person thus mentioned is Lefèvre. The judges summoned Lefèvre, who refused to disclose the name of the author, but offered to submit copies of the book to the judges for consideration and approbation. Furthermore, it is clear from the concluding remarks in our passage that when the Apologie was published, the magistrates had not yet reached a decision, and that the writers had good hopes that they would not condemn the printer and the author.

D'Huisseau's intentions and those of his supporters now become clear: by obtaining an 'unofficial' approbation from an eminent figure, he hoped to bypass the Conseil Académique. Furthermore, he knew the Conseil would censor his book, but hoped that the judges (all of them Catholic by that time), attracted by the subject matter of the book, would not refuse the approbation. The Conseil would have remained helpless, and
their authority would have suffered a serious setback. It seems that Gaussen had foreseen this and he tried his utmost to bring about a condemnation.

We learn from La Bastide’s pamphlet (p.61) that La Réunion was censured not simply by the Consistoire and Conseil in Saumur but also by the magistrates. On the 26 October de Haumont, who as barrister probably awaited this final decision before committing himself, also signed a written condemnation of the book. The Conseil had won; perhaps the Catholic magistrates had been deterred by the radical views expressed in the book. As Turon de Beyrie wrote to Bouhéreau: “je ne puis croire ce que tu me dis qu’il y ait de bonnes récompenses pour les auteurs et approbateurs. Car cet ouvrage est contraire à toutes les religions du monde et je ne doute pas que s’il avait été fait par un catholique, il ne fût tout aussitôt condamné par l’Inquisition et par la Sorbonne.”41

The motives of the Conseil

If our interpretation is correct, then the reactions against La Réunion du christianisme were primarily inspired by the wish to protect the Academy. In times when the king’s policy became more and more aggressive towards the reformed churches and their members, it was necessary to defend all the rights that they had acquired. Furthermore the last national synod had been held in Loudun ten years before. The hidden warning of the
commissaire royal to the assembly had become true. The King had finally decided not to allow a national synod any more. In these circumstances there were no higher instances to which controversial cases could be referred. If the authority of the provincial synods, and in the particular case of the Academies, that of Conseil and of the professors, was shaken, no way was left to protect the purity of the doctrine from unorthodox interpretations. At a time when the efforts of various "convertisseurs" were increasingly efficient, any appearance of clemency towards unorthodoxy, was bound to shake the convictions of those who hesitated. Indeed Jurieu with his sharp understanding of the situation, drew this very lesson from the case in his Examen du livre de la Réunion, his first book which sets the theme for many of his subsequent works. Heresies, he wrote, particularly in difficult times, were the greatest danger to which the churches could succumb. To tolerate them, was to deprive the faithful of the spirit of dedication which had been that of their fathers, and to undermine their conviction that they must fight for their faith. Later from his exile, Jurieu, analysing the reasons for the conversions that had followed the Revocation, reiterated the point. Toleration had undermined the determination of many, and the lack of moral fibre in some had to be attributed to the poor example set by their pasteurs who disagreed on
fundamental issues, or allowed the public discussion of such issues: "ce malheureux esprit," he wrote "nous était inconnu avant l'an 1669. Mais il y environ vingt ans qu'un pasteur demeurant à Saumur, homme d'ailleurs grave et sage, se laissa séduire par la lecture d'Episcopius, et s'oublia jusqu'à publier un livre sous le titre de La Réunion du christianisme." 44 It is tragically ironical that Gaussen, who, as we have seen, 45 had embodied the spirit of Saumur, was, because of the circumstances, forced to play the part of a persecutor.

D'Huissseau's true challenge

In this context, the accusations brought against the book assume proper perspective: La Bastide in the conclusion of his Remarques summarizes them in six points, which can be reduced to three categories. The main one concerns the breach of ecclesiastical discipline: La Bastide entirely approves of the proceedings against the book, and considers that its condemnation by the Synod was proper and exemplary. He does not go as far as Jurieu in calling for an immediate rejection of all unorthodox doctrines, but calls for the suspense of any publication that has not been properly approved: "il serait bon de \( \text{Tes} \) supprimer comme la Discipline et les Synodes l'ordonnent et comme j'apprends que le Consistoire et les Magistrats de Saumur l'ont ordonné.
Car qui a jamais ouï dire qu'on doive faire courir des imprimés en cachette, sans permission et sans communication sur des matières aussi délicates ...". Here lies the major objection to the book. The insistence of the critic on this point, the history of the case and the arguments put in favour of d'Huysseau, all indicate that our interpretation is correct. But if this is the case, the unorthodoxy of the book must be seen in a different light. In fact La Bastide never specifically accuses La Réunion du christianism of a breach of orthodoxy. His remarks as to its content are much more cautious than his denunciation of the breach of discipline.

La Bastide's first objection as to the substance of the book concerns its cartesianism. Quoting from La Réunion he writes: "Il faut se dépouiller de tous préjugés etc. comme on a proposé depuis quelque temps dans la philosophie etc." Il veut dire comme a fait Monsieur Descartes ... Ce sentiment est un peu hardi ... j'ai déjà touché qu'il n'en est pas de choses de la religion comme de celles de la nature. Dans la religion on ne doit pas être un moment sans croire, il n'est pas même possible de quitter un sentiment sans en prendre aussitôt un autre, ou différent ou opposé ...". The rational approach however is not in itself rejected by La Bastide. Indeed on this point La Bastide is rather embarrassed, for he continues:
"il faut croire ce que l'on croit, s'y affermir autant qu'on le peut par la raison, sans pourtant fermer les yeux à de nouvelles lumières ..."

The proper use of reason in matters of faith, and the denunciation of the 'irrationalities' or 'absurdities' of Catholic dogmas had been one of the lines of attack of Protestant polemists. Furthermore, as we have seen the works of Amyraut, La Place and Cappel were based on the role that reason can play in the interpretation of the Scripture or of dogma. Chouet in his Theses has pointed out that the new philosophy helped to challenge one of the fundamental dogmas of the Catholic church - transubstantiation. In fact, in 1675, five years after La Réunion du christianisme Elie Richard, a cousin of Bouhéreau, made use of this point in his pamphlet, Réflexions physiques sur la transubstantiation et sur ce que Mr Robault en a écrit dans ses entretiens. The book when published in La Rochelle carried the approbation of two pasteurs from the Consistoire. Yet Richard in this early attempt at a systematic discussion of transubstantiation in cartesian terms, made it clear that a rational examination was a method as valid as the traditional recourse to the Scripture. In fact Richard pointed out that he was continuing the work of his predecessors, in the true spirit of the Reformation. We thus understand La Bastide's equivocation and we can doubt whether on this particular point d'Huisseau would have qualified as unorthodox.
La Bastide's other objection to the content of the book is more explicit: "à la faveur de la Magellane il réduit nettement toute la religion à croire [sic] un Dieu créateur du ciel et de la terre et l'envoi de celui qu'il appelle son fils, sans parler ni de la divinité de ce fils, ni de ces deux natures unies ni un seul mot du Saint-Esprit...." 50 La Bastide's criticism of d'Huissesseau's approach to fundamental dogma is that it rests on "des sentiments qui tombent dans les maximes du socinianisme, en ce qu'il veut réduire l'essence de la religion aux seuls points reçus de l'aveu général de tous ceux qui se disent chrétiens sans exception". 51 Taken outside its context, d'Huissesseau's version of a Creed common to all christians, does sound like socinianism, particularly in view of the absence of any mention of the Trinity. However, d'Huissesseau was not presenting a definite dogma, but a provisional doctrine. And as the anonymous author of the Traduction du Traité de Samuel Petit did not fail to point out, it has long been agreed that any attempt at a reconciliation of the churches should start with a definition of the fundamental points of faith. Furthermore Gaussens himself had argued in favour of these fundamental points. Yet he was "le seul ministre qui conclut à l'interdiction de son collègue pour avoir simplement approuvé ledit livre". 52 The motive of jealousy which the anonymous pamphleteer attributes to Gaussens, seems
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unfair. Besides Gauussen was perfectly clear on the subject of the Trinity. Nevertheless the fact remains that d'Huisseau was not committing himself to a specific doctrine; he only stated what he considered a provisional, but sufficient basis for discussion. Everything considered, La Réunion du christianisme, although dealing with "des matières délicates", to use La Bastide's phrase, was not, blatantly at least, a very unorthodox book.

To sum up, the adversaries of d'Huisseau were mostly afraid of the possible consequences of the book. In the situation which confronted them and their churches, disregard for what was left of the authority of the synods and the Conseil Académique must have appeared a pure folly to them. Furthermore, d'Huisseau's approach was altogether too negative. There was in La Réunion du christianisme as La Bastide said: "un esprit de doute, s'il faut ainsi dire, répandu partout, et contraire aux principes de foi de l'une et l'autre communion." The Catholics would have seen this as proof that the Protestant faith was, in fact, deism in disguise. Some in fact did. When for instance the oratorian, Richard Simon in his "Letter to a huguenot gentleman", made this charge against the Protestants, he specifically mentioned La Réunion du christianisme as supporting his contention: "Ce sont ces gens là qui méritent, il me semble, le nom de Déistes et qui regardent la religion comme une invention de l'esprit humain ... L'affaire de
Mr d'Huisseau ... a fait un si grand bruit parmi vous que vous ne pouvez pas l'ignorer ... [dans son livre] il veut qu'on fasse abstraction de toutes les religions, parce que selon lui, elles ont toutes quelque défaut et que c'est le seul moyen d'en établir une exempte d'erreur ..."55 We have already pointed out that in the face of coming persecution, most Protestants tried to demonstrate their unfailing loyalty to established powers.56 They were also desperate in their concern for proving that they were true christians. The Conseil of the Académie and Gassen when they dealt with d'Huisseau's case must have been afraid that La Réunion du christianisme be considered by Catholics as proof to the contrary.

The tragic irony of the case is that La Réunion du christianisme was also born out of the circumstances of the time. D'Huisseau's reaction to the possibility of a reunion by force was quite opposed to that of the majority of his colleagues. They clung to their established rights and dogmas; he called for a new and radical approach. For him, while theologians continued their intricate, and to his eyes, not very honest controversies, they lost sight of the fundamental tenets of the faith. It is debatable whether d'Huisseau's approach would have inspired a better spirit of resistance, once the persecution started. The consequences of the affaire were not in any case favourable to either side; for after 1670,
any theological debate became immediately suspect to the Conseil. During its last years the history of the Académie is that of the elimination of all traces of original thinking. By condemning d'Huissseau, the Conseil had signed the death warrant for the freedom of thought of the Académie.
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Chapter X

THE REJECTION OF HETERODOXY: PAJON AND VILLEMANDI (1677-1683)

In this chapter we shall give an account of the last two crises which the Conseil faced before the closing of the Académie. These crises did not threaten the position of the Conseil as the publication of La Réunion du christianisme had done. They are however interesting for another reason. They show that the Conseil had drawn the lessons from the case against d'Huisseau: when they dealt with Pajonism or with Villemandi's publication, they actually took preventative measures. Thus they fully assumed, albeit belatedly, the responsibility for orthodoxy which befell them with the disappearance of the higher instances to which these cases were referred in normal times. But in so doing they condemned doctrines which sprang from positions elaborated in Saumur itself. By 1680 therefore there had occurred a reversal of roles. The Conseil, in the times of Amyraut, had defended the right to speak freely on religious matters; the effect of the ever-hardening of the King's policy towards the réformés was in fact to turn the Académie into a guardian of orthodoxy. We shall study this attitude of the Académie in two instances.
first in their condemnation of Pajonism, and secondly in their banishment of Villemandi.

The condemnation of Pajonism

Claude Pajon is a remarkable figure. The last representative of the new protestant theology in France before the Revocation, he published little. Two of the three books he did publish are straightforward spirited defenses of the protestants against catholic polemicists. The other one, which contains the text of a sermon he preached to the synod of Anjou in 1666, is an early work and does not present a full statement of his doctrine. Much of what he wrote has remained in manuscript and is difficult to trace. However, there is no doubt that he aroused a great interest. Several theologians in the last decade of the century published works inspired by his doctrine. He was discussed by no less a critic than Jurieu. Furthermore, his case, and that of his disciples (particularly Papin, to whom we shall later refer) became, so to speak, exemplary and gave rise to much discussion on the issue of toleration, at the end of the century. Finally, his first biographer, Chaufepié, on whom we shall rely for our information, has pointed out the similarities between some aspects of Pajon's doctrine and that of Leibniz. There seems to be little doubt that the influence of Pajon has so far been underestimated. He deserves a fuller treatment
than he has hitherto received. But this is a task of considerable magnitude, well outside the scope of the dissertation. In this chapter we shall limit ourselves to a study of Pajon's early links with Saumur, and after a brief summary of his doctrine, show how the Académie implemented its condemnation.

Pajon's association with Saumur dates from his youth: as a proposant he came to Saumur and studied under Amyraut. His qualifying theses are printed in vol. III of Syntagmata thesium. For a few years Pajon was a pasteur in a neighbouring province. On 3 May 1665 he was asked to preach a sermon to the provincial synod which had met to appoint Gaussen. He chose a theme from Corinthians II: "Or le Seigneur est cet Esprit là, et là où est l'Esprit du Seigneur, là est sa liberté". De Beaujardin and Du Soul were impressed by Pajon's performance and reported his "grande capacité" to the Conseil. The Conseil offered him the third chair of theology: "La Compagnie avec tous ceux qui composent le Conseil académique voyant la nécessité de l'Académie et jugeant que dans l'état où elle se trouve présentement elle a besoin d'un troisième professeur en théologie, et ayant ouï les témoignages avantageux qui ont été rendus à Maître Claude Pajon, pasteur de l'église de Marchenoir, ayant aussi vu des preuves de sa grande capacité, a jeté les yeux sur lui, afin de l'exercer conjointement avec Messieurs du Soul et Gaussen ...". Thus Pajon returned to Saumur as a professor, at the Conseil's request.
His stay in Saumur however did not last long. First of all, Pajon could not be formally appointed, before he had been allowed to take the position by his own provincial synod of Berry. The authorization only came in 1666. Already however Pajon’s views, in the Sermon, had aroused suspicion in other provinces. The Registre records that letters were received on the subject from the provincial synod of Bretagne. The Registre is more precise on the subject of a deputation from the church of Loudun: “Messieurs Du Gray et Montaux, anciens de l’église réformée de Loudun, se sont présentés ... et ont présenté une lettre ... par laquelle ils nous ont demandé de prendre connaissance de quelques écrits de Monsieur Pajon .... qui ont été vus de diverses personnes .... la Compagnie a entendu M. Pajon dans ses réponses et défenses ... et a jugé [à propos] d’attendre .... pour travailler pieusement et avec grande circonspection à une affaire de telle importance.” Eventually the decision was to keep Pajon on a temporary basis. Thus in the early years of the controversy, the Académie acted as it had always acted since Amyraut, by coming to the defence of the professor they had chosen. There is unfortunately little mention of Pajon’s stay in Bouhéreau’s correspondence. Nevertheless his talents were undoubtedly welcome in Saumur. Chouet, as we have seen, refers to him in one of his letters. As for Gaussen he called him “un collègue selon mon coeur”. Thus in 1667
Pajon clearly enjoyed a large measure of support: In one of its last shows of intellectual independence, the Conseil elaborated a substantial answer to the various letters received. It argued that Pajon's appointment had been confirmed, albeit temporarily, by the previous synod of Anjou held at St. Aignan in 1666. The Conseil also stated that it was satisfied as to Pajon's orthodoxy, and that in any case he could not be held responsible for some pieces he had written in his youth. There was however no fighting spirit in Pajon. Less than a year after, in August 1667, he accepted an offer of the church of Orléans, and returned to pastoral duties. The Conseil expressed its regret: "là témoignant premièremment l'extrême douleur qu'elle se voit à consentir la séparation d'un tel personnage ... les grands talents que Dieu lui a déparis le grand fruit que cette Ecole en retire ... et de plus s'est reservé ladite Compagnie le droit de redemander le Sieur Pajon ... lorsque la Providence de Dieu lui fera naître l'occasion."

A brief analysis of Pajon's doctrine will show why in these early years the Conseil had been so eager to keep him as a professor. For Pajon's conceptions were a development of Amyraut's doctrine. Like Amyraut, he was interested in the question of grace operates in the conversion of the sinner. Like him he saw conversion as a natural process in man. But he went further: for God cannot intervene directly in the ordinary
course of nature: there is in other words no particular Providence: "Dans sa création", he wrote, "Dieu a donné de certaines impressions et de certains mouvements dans les parties du monde, en sorte qu'il faut nécessairement que tels et tels effets s'ensuivent et que les effets soient ensuite cause d'autres effets ...".\textsuperscript{17}

Conversion is also a natural process: it is understood by the intellect of the message of the Scriptures and grace is this message, as it affects our intellect: "disons donc que le Seigneur formé dans nos âmes, par la prédication de l'évangile, cet esprit qui nous est communiqué", he wrote in his 1666 Sermon.\textsuperscript{18} Faith therefore is nothing other than knowledge of Jesus Christ, through the predication of the Gospel; and sin is ignorance. Pajon's opponents claimed that he thus denied that it is the Holy Spirit that generates our conversion. But Pajon rejected the accusation. There was no doubt, he said, that if one could artificially separate the Holy Spirit from God's message, the Scriptures would be useless. But this is not the case: "Il ne s'agit point" he wrote, "de savoir, comme la plupart du monde se l'imagine, si le Saint Esprit est l'auteur de notre conversion ... on est d'accord de tout cela .... Mais la question est de savoir si l'action du Saint Esprit qui nous convertit est distincte de celle de la Parole, et de tous les autres moyens dont il se sert pour nous convertir, ou si ce n'est qu'une seule et même action qui doit être rapportée au Saint Esprit, comme à
sa cause principale, et à la Parole et aux autres moyens comme aux organes dont le Saint Esprit se sert pour agir en nous." Pajon's doctrine therefore could be called an occasionalist theology. God is the final cause of our conversion but He uses the Scriptures and predications as instruments and achieves it through natural means. By introducing this distinction between the aim of God and his means, Pajon enlarged on the methodological distinction between the order of causality and that of temporality first applied by the theologians of Bremen and Amyraut.

We shall not study in detail the reasons which led to the rejection of Pajon's doctrine. As our quotation indicates, theologians, who had finally come to terms with Amyraut's views, saw in Pajon's new development an attempt at dispensing altogether with election. Pajon therefore was summoned to various ecclesiastical conferences but did not succeed in clearing the doubts. In 1676, those theologians, notably Claude and Jurieu, who because of their prestige had become in the eyes of the réformés the spiritual leaders of their churches, and in the absence of a national synod, the guardians of orthodoxy, met at Charenton and condemned Pajon's doctrine. The provincial synods of Ile de France held on 27 August 1677, and of Anjou, Touraine et Maine (Saumur's own province) held on 28 Oct. in the same year, followed suit. But while formally endorsing the condemnation
the synod of Anjou also asked the Académie to enforce it: "La Compagnie ayant dessein de conserver autant qu'il lui est possible la pureté de la doctrine de nos églises ... a déclaré conformément à la Parole de Dieu et à la confession de foi de nos églises que Dieu n'agit pas seulement par la prédiction extérieure de l'Evangile mais déploie encore une efficace particulière ... et à condamné ceux qui la nie ... Elle enjoint ... en particulier aux Ministres et aux professeurs de théologie de l'Académie de Saumur, d'avoir l’œil sur les étudiants en théologie pour ne pas permettre que ceux qui y sont ou qui y viendront nourissent ce sentiment ...".22

This is precisely what the members of the Conseil did: the contrast between their attitude after 1677 and their former support of Pajon is striking. The decisions of the Conseil after that date are not simply a direct denial of its attitude ten years before but also of the intellectual independence that had been the very spirit of Saumur. And yet the composition of the Conseil had not been radically altered: Gauzen, De Beaujardin and Druet were already on the Conseil in 1667. In fact their authority could only have been enhanced, since the other academic members all held, as we have seen, temporary appointments. Their attitude after 1677 can only be understood as an effect of the disruption of the regular channels for discussion and the dismantlement
of the machinery of ecclesiastical power, which was brought about by the repression. In the case of d'Huisseau, the Conseil had tried to protect its authority. Now that by necessity it had to be exercised in full, the Conseil misused it. For the first time the Académie became authoritarian.

The Registre for the years 1673-1683 is unfortunately lost. Only the one covering the years 1683-1684 has survived. The 1683 decisions of the Conseil however all refer to the condemnation of pajonism by the 1677 synods of Ile de France and of Anjou. Furthermore, the Conseil did not simply endorse the condemnation, it actually went further. First on 23 June 1683 it set up a procedure devised to control the orthodoxy of students: "La Compagnie désirant joindre ses soins dans une affaire de cette importance et seconder les bonnes intentions des compagnies supérieures, en faisant exécuter à l'avenir avec toute l'exactitude possible les dits règlements, a arrêté, suivant ce qui a déjà été déclaré aux dits étudiants en théologie, qu'on ferait à l'avenir une enquête fort exacte pour savoir si, entre les dits étudiants, il s'en rencontrerait quelqu'un dont les sentiments ne fussent pas purs, ou qui eût besoin de quelque instruction et que l'on exigerait de tous ceux qui sont envoyés pour étudier dans notre Académie de souscrire à la condamnation des doctrines qui se trouvent contraires à la Parole de Dieu .... et à l'acte du synode de Saumur ci-dessus mentionné touchant la grâce immédiate ...."
The Conseil further decided that theology students would be allowed to deliver propositions, only if they submitted to a special examination intended to assess their orthodoxy on these matters. The decision was challenged by a proposant, I. Papin, on 10 Sept. of the same year. He refused to sign the acts of the synod, and reminded the Conseil of their change of attitude: "I declared two things to them. The first, that I was surprised to see on the one hand an assembly of ministers, who after hearing Monsieur Pajon, would not condemn his doctrine, and on the other hand, other assemblies of ministers who would force me to sign his condemnation. The second that, after having examined myself to the bottom of the question, by the word of God alone, it did not appear to me, that it was there decided in an incontestable manner, and that therefore my conscience did not permit me to subscribe to the condemnation of either two parties". Papin, when he spoke of the freedom of the individual to understand dogma with the help of Scripture, was true to the very spirit of Saumur. The Conseil however refused to grant him the required attestation. The reasons they gave are striking: [on s'informa] de lui s'il voulait souscrire purement et simplement au dit acte qui déclare que Dieu dans la conversion de l'homme n'agit pas seulement par la prédication extérieure de l'Evangile et les autres circonstances qui l'accompagne, mais déploie encore en dedans de nous une efficace particulière et immédiate de son Esprit .... pour illuminer l'entendement et fléchir la volonté
à l'obéissance de Dieu ... Ce que le dit Papin ayant refusé de faire .... il a été résolu de ne lui point donner de témoignage.

It is easy to recognize in the phrases used by the Conseil to define the orthodox doctrine, terms used long before by Amyraut. But for Amyraut these terms stood for answers to long meditated problems. In 1683 on the contrary, Saumur had accepted to impose the codification of its own version of dogma. 27

The case of Villemandi

The decisions of the Conseil regarding the publication of Villemandi are the last and the extreme example of the Conseil's determination to enforce rigorously orthodoxy in Saumur. Villemandi's publications are in themselves of little interest. Villemandi's views are eclectic. Philosophy theses which he published in 1673 and 1674 are distinguished only by their curious mixture of aristotelian, epicurean and cartesian philosophy. 28 Furthermore, once in exile, he published a Traité de l'efficace des causes secondes contre quelques philosophes modernes and his Sceptismus debellatus where he argued from aristotelian positions. 29

Objections were raised against his doctrine. Yet the 1673 and 1674 Theses did not contain much that was original or unorthodox. His definition of the understanding (intellectus) is characteristic of his rather muddled attempt at synthesizing
diverging positions, without clearly committing himself to any: "Intellectus", he writes, "est mens spectata prout veritatem rerum percipit ac dijudicat. Non est facultas pure passiva ut sentiunt Epicurei, ac Cartesiani, non etiam pure activa, ut alii arbitrantur, sed passivo - activa". 30 If Villemandi refers to the action of divine truth on the intellect it is, so to speak, en passant and the wording of the passage is careful enough not to be blatantly Pajonist: "Quemadmodum intellectus idea summi veri, hoc est Dei, est naturaliter impressus, sic et voluntas summi boni, hoc est Dei, amore naturaliter est affecta". 31 It is thus difficult to see what the Conseil considered objectionable in Villemandi's views.

Furthermore, the lack of documents or the provincial synods before 1683, and the loss of the Registre for the period 1674-1683 make it difficult to judge what were the exact passages in the Theses which gave rise to the complaints. Nevertheless, that some objections were raised is clear from the entry in the Registre for 10 July 1683: "Les députés de Loudun en exécution de l'arrêté du dernier synode tenu à Belleme, ont rapporté les remarques faites par M. Desloges sur quelques traités de philosophie de M. de Villemandi ..." 32 If Desloges was the same person as the proposant who had been nominated to a chair of theology by the Conseil in 1655, then the objections might have been prompted by personal antagonism.
More probably the synod objected to what they considered as implicit Pajonism in the book.

What is interesting however in the case is that Villemandi, although a long-standing professor, was submitted by the Conseil to an examination on his orthodoxy: "La Compagnie ... a mandé [Te Sienr Villemandi] pour l'ouïr sur les dites remarques et répondre précisement par oui ou par non sur chacun des articles, ce qu'il a fait, assurant la Compagnie ... qu'il n'avait point de sentiment contraire à notre Confession de foi, à notre liturgie, à notre discipline ecclesiastique".33 This last mention of the decision of the Conseil provides a clue to their true intentions. What disturbed them most was that Villemandi's book had been published without the required approbation. For his defense he claimed that the publication of the first two had been made by Desbordes without his consent, an excuse which we find hard to believe, particularly as the 1675 reprint, also published without approbation, was not issued by Desbordes, but by another printer, Péan. The Conseil however strongly censured Villemandi, but ironically the Commissaire catholique used the opportunity to bring Villemandi's case to the attention of the civil authorities. On 10 and 25 Aug. 1683, a month after the meeting of the Conseil, two arrêts du Conseil d'Etat condemned the printers and sentenced Villemandi to banishment.

320.
The Conseil's attitude and the outcome of the case exemplify the contradictions experienced by all the réformés in France during that period. "Ceux de la religion Prétendue Réformée" as they were known, by faithfully abiding the edict and by enforcing among themselves regulations of other times, did not succeed in preventing oppression. In the Académie of Saumur, perhaps more than anywhere else, the only result they achieved was the disappearance of any trace of intellectual independence. As the cases of Pajon, Papin and, to a lesser degree, Villemandi, show already before the Revocation the Refuge had become the place where problems and ideas first elaborated in Saumur found a new development.
Notes to chapter X

1. One of the books is an answer to Nicole entitled Examen du livre qui a pour titre Préjugés legitimes contre les Calvinistes 2 vol. (Paris and Orléans, 1673). The other is a reprint of his reply to the Avertissement pastoral issued in 1682 by the catholic clergy. It is entitled Remarques sur l’avertissement pastoral avec une relation de ce qui se passa au Consistoire d’Orléans (Amsterdam, 1805).

2. We have not been able to trace a copy of this Sermon; according to Chaufepié it was printed in Saumur in 1666.

3. Several manuscript pieces by Pajon, including letters of Pajon to Chouet are in Archives Tronchin, vol. 53 and 120.

4. The most prominent among Pajon’s disciples was C. Le Cène. Among his published works we can quote his Entretien sur diverses matières de théologie (Amsterdam, 1685).

5. Traité de la nature et de la grâce (Rotterdam, 1688). Jurieu’s book was answered by another disciple of Pajon, Arbussi, in La juste idée de la grâce immédiate (The Hague, 1689).

6. By toleration is to be understood as toleration among the protestants: The only published study on this question is F. Puaux’s thesis, Les précurseurs français de la tolérance, already mentioned in the previous chapter.

7. J. G. de Chaufepié, Nouveau dictionnaire historique et critique, 4 vol. (Amsterdam, The Hague, 1750-1756), vol. III (1753), "art. Pajon", "letter P", p.5-16. In his extensive remarks, added as footnotes to the article, Chaufepié quotes from several manuscript sources by or on Pajon. As pointed out by Puaux (op. cit. p. ), Chaufepié had been gathering material for a history of French protestant doctrine in the 17th century, a project which unfortunately never came to light. Chaufepié’s information is remarkably detailed and accurate and we shall mostly rely on it for this chapter.

9. Chaufepié, op. cit., vol. 4 "article Pajon", p.6

10. *Registre*, ? May 1665, f.102. We may note here that of the two candidates whose nomination had caused the disturbances described in ch. IV, only one had a seat on the Conseil. He was not however professor of theology any more and must have owed his membership to the fact that he was pasteur. Although no further evidence can be found on the matter, it is clear that the reconciliation which followed Loudun, must have finally entailed the rejection of De Beaujardin and Desbordes as likely candidates to the chair.

11. It is recorded in an entry of the *Registre* for 30 May 1666 f.206


13. Idem, 30 Oct. 1666, f.208 - We may also note that a third deputation, from the church of Preuilly, was received on 1 Nov. 1666 (see Registre, f.209).

14. See ch. VI, p.217. Also this chapter, note 3.

15. *Registre*, 8 Nov. 1666, f.218


17. Quoted by Chaufepié, op. cit., *article Pajon*, p.6 'Remarque B'

18. Quoted in Chaufepié, op. cit., p.6 ("Remarque B")

19. Quoted in Chaufepié, op. cit., p.9

20. Chouet's 1680 version of occasionalism (see ch. VI, p. ) could have been partly inspired by Pajon.

21. On this meeting, see Chaufepié, op. cit., p.7

22. *Actes du synode d'Anjou, Touraine et Le Maine* (1677) in Chaufepié, op. cit., "Remarques D", p.8
23. Registre du Conseil académique de ceux de la R.P.R. de Saumur, in Saumur, Bibliothèque municipale, MS T A 4 hereafter abbreviated as Registre 1683-4

24. Registre 1683-4, 29 June, 1683, f.1


26. Registre 1683-4, 10 Sept. 1683, f.2 (emphasis ours)

27. The incident was repeated on 25 Oct. 1683. The wording of the Registre for that date is further confirmation of our interpretation: "Le Sieur Haller de Berne s'est présenté pour avoir ses témoignages ... il a été arrêté ... qu'on s'informerait de lui s'il voulait souscrire purement et simplement à l'acte du synode de notre province tenu en 1677 qui déclare que Dieu dans la conversion de l'homme n'agit pas seulement par la prédication extérieure de l'Evangile etc. vide supra, initio paginae [sic]. Ce que le dit Sieur ayant refusé de faire purement et simplement, La Compagnie ... ne lui a pu donner de témoignage." 

28. The titles of the two theses are: Dissertatio metaphysica de libertate homini (Saumur, Desbordes, 1673) and Manductio ad philosophiam vetero novam, in qua triplicis philosophiae ... Aristotelae nemp, Epicureae et Cartesiane placita ... adducuntur et conferuntur (Saumur, Desbordes, 1674). Both books were reprinted in one volume entitled Philosophiae Aristotelae, Epicureae et Cartesiane ... adumbratio ac parallelismus (Saumur, Pean, 1675). This reprint is dedicated to Bouhéreau. Our quotations are from the complete edition.

29. Traité de l'efficacité des causes secondes contre quelques philosophes modernes (Leyden, 1680). Scepticus debellatus seu humanae coquisitionis ratio ab his radicibus explicata, ejusdem certitudo adversus scepticos quosque veteres et novos (Leyden, 1697).

30. Philosophiae adumbratio, p.13

31. Idem, p.14

32. Registre, 1683-4, 10 July 1683, f.1

33. Idem, loc. cit.

34. The two Arrêts du Conseil d'État are transcribed in Registre 1683-4, f.2
Conclusion

To conclude, the Académie of Saumur occupies an eminent position in the history of French thought in the seventeenth century. We hope to have shown that Amyraut, La Place and Cappel by taking up the challenge of Arminianism greatly contributed to the elaboration of a French version of Calvinism which gave a prominent role to the criterion of reason. Their successors, Gaussen, Chouet and Lefèvre played a significant part in fostering new developments of this rationalism. Gaussen by his simplification of Aristotelianism helped to establish links between the doctrine of Saumur and that of Descartes. Chouet could then bring about an assimilation of the two. Lefèvre also is important in this respect for the use he made of rational criteria in textual criticism.

In these aspects of the doctrine of Saumur and more generally, in the spirit of the Académie, we can recognise the first foundations of eighteenth century thought. Indeed a claim can be made that from this point of view, Saumur represents a first version of the enlightenment which, if less studied, is nevertheless very real.

We have also emphasised the important role played by the relations between Church and Académie in the doctrinal development of Saumur. Until the compromise which the Académie achieved was disrupted by measures of oppression Saumur embodied
a spirit of intellectual independence and of freedom of judgment accepted as such by the churches. In this respect also we can truly speak of the enlightenment of Saumur.

Finally we venture to suggest that the development of the intellectual life of the Académie can help to understand better the thought of late seventeenth century writers in the Refuge, such as Bayle and Jurieu. The questions which pre-occupied them and some of the solutions which they put forward were, in our view, first elaborated in Saumur. We hope that this study provides documents and suggests interpretations which will make it possible to evaluate the influence of Saumur after the Revocation.
A brief account of Bouhéréau’s career

Elie Bouhéréau was born in 1643 at La Rochelle. The Bouhéréaus were a prominent family among the réformés of the town, where the father was an elder of the church. Bouhéréau was sent to study in Saumur in 1656 and remained there for four years during which he completed the normal courses of philosophy and theology. It is during these years that he made friends with P. Bauldry and Lefèvre. In 1660 he returned to La Rochelle where he remained until 1663. In December 1663 he went to Paris and returned in 1664 via Saumur. There he renewed his acquaintance with Gaussen and struck up a new friendship with Chouet. No documents can be traced for the years 1665-1667; according to Newport White these were the years when Bouhéréau went to study medicine in Holland, where his cousin, Elie Richard, had preceded him. Bouhéréau returned to France in 1667 and settled down to practise medicine in La Rochelle. In 1683 the oppression of the réformés became harder, and Bouhéréau was forbidden to practise. Bouhéréau escaped with his family late in 1685 and emigrated to England. On the accession of William III, he
became secretary to William Cox, envoy to the Swiss cantons and subsequently to H. De Ruvigny. When Ruvigny, by then Lord Galway, went to Ireland as Lord Justice in 1697, Bouhéreau accompanied him. This is when N. Marsh, the Archbishop of Dublin, noticed him and appointed him as his first librarian in 1701. He remained in that position until his death which occurred in 1719.

Sources for a biography of Bouhéreau, besides his correspondence, include: The Ellis papers for the years 1699–1701 (in the British Museum Library), and his diary, which he began in 1689 and kept until his death in 1719 (Marsh's Library, MS Z.2.2.2). A brief study of Bouhéreau's career is included in Newport J. D. White's Four good men (Dublin, 1927).

The Bouhéreau collection

It is not known how Bouhéreau succeeded in bringing his library with him when he fled from France. It is possible that he negotiated a fictitious sale with one of the English envoys in Paris in 1685. When he was given the position of librarian to Archbishop Marsh, the collection was incorporated in the Archbishop's own library, but kept separate: it is known in the reading room of the library. The original classification (by subject matters and sizes), established some time before Bouhéreau left France, is preserved. All
books which originally belonged to Bouhéreau's collection, are indicated by the letter R.

A detailed calendar of Bouhéreau's manuscript's has not yet been drawn up. The manuscripts fall into three categories: 1) Documents relating to the Reformed Church of La Rochelle (some of which were restored to the Consistoire of that town in 1862); 2) Documents relating to Bouhéreau's studies in Saumur. The most interesting of these is Hugues's Cursus philosophiae (MS 129); 3) Bouhéreau's correspondence, which can be classified as follows a) letters to and from relatives b) letters from pasteurs of Anjou or Poitou (mostly concerning the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes) c) letters from college friends or acquaintances.

Our study makes use of material mostly belonging to the last categorie: MS Z.2.2.13: P. Baudry's letters (1662-1683) MS Z. 2.2.14(17): J. R. Chouet's letters (1669-1685); MS Z.3.3.6: E. Gauisens's letters (1663-1673). Some useful information is also found in the letters from Turon de Beyrie, a cousin of Bouhéreau who also studied at Saumur (MS Z.2.2.(16)).
Appendix II

A list of terms relating to academic life and to academic or ecclesiastical bodies

Anciens: the elders of the church, sitting on the consistoire and chosen by co-optation. In some churches they were life members, in others they were renewed every few years.

Assemblée des chefs de famille: a meeting of all heads of families in the community, convened only to deal with extraordinary cases. The day-to-day running of the church was left to the consistoire.

Colloque: a regional grouping of several individual churches; also the ecclesiastical body convened by these churches (including usually 12 pasteurs and 12 elders, acting as delegates of their own churches).

Consistoire: or presbytère, the governing body of a local church composed of the pasteurs and elders.

Conseil académique: the governing body of the academies. The Conseil ordinaire took care of the daily administration of the college. It was composed of the professeurs publics, the recteur, the principal and the pasteurs. For important decisions the conseil
ordinaire was joined by some elders of the consistoire, together with the officials of the guild-hall, in cases where the town was in majority protestant, and with prominent members of the community (in Saumur for instance, d'Haumonty, avocat du roi). It thus became the conseil extraordinaire.

Curriculum: in Saumur, as in other academies, studies were divided between humanities (with three classes), philosophy studies (two years) and theology studies (two years). The three years of humanities were a preparatory course, which could be done in other secondary colleges.

Pasteurs: the pasteurs were recruited ("demandés") by the churches, among last year theology students. Their nomination was approved by the provincial synod to which the church belonged. They were submitted to an examination by the synod.

Principal: the provost of the academies, selected among the professeurs publics.

Professeurs publics: those in charge of theology and philosophy studies. All had to be pasteurs as well. The Loix générales des Académies specified that there should be at least two theology professors, with one in charge of Hebrew and Old Testament studies. The
Professeurs publics were nominated by the Académie, after an examination. The nomination was approved by the provincial synods, often after another public examination. Students of theology in their last year (studies took two years). They were thus called because of the propositions they delivered to the academic body.

Proposition: an exercise in form of sermon, in Latin or French delivered by theology students in front of the academic body.

Recteur: a member of the conseil académique in charge of studies and discipline.

Régents: the Régents taught humanities to the lower forms. In Saumur the Régents de première classe and Régents honoraires had the rank of professor. They had therefore precedence over the proposants in academic functions.

Theses: the qualifying examination of philosophy and theology students. Theses submitted by one or several students contained a summary of the courses they had received during their two years of studies.
Appendix III

THE FINANCIAL RESOURCES OF THE ACADEMIE

The academies needed money to pay for the maintenance of their buildings and for the salaries and wages. It may be noted however that the salaries of the professeurs publics were paid directly to them by the synod of their own or the neighbouring provinces. When, therefore, Amyraut was Principal his salary of Principal was paid by the Académie, but his salary of professor of theology by the province of Anjou.

The funds which the Académie had at its disposal came from various sources. The first was the minerval, i.e. the fees paid by students. In the case of theology students these fees were paid by their own provinces.

The major part of the financial resources of the Academies came from sums allocated to them by the national synods. Some of these were paid directly by the national synod, on the allocation given by the King to the Protestant churches. After 1630, this allocation became less and less regular and the national synod of Charenton (1631) elaborated a procedure, devised originally to supplement this contribution, but which became by necessity the only one on which the Academies could rely for regular funds.
The provinces were asked to earmark a certain sum per year, to be taken from the fifth of the total church collection (or denier des pauvres) in their provinces. They thus pledged to pay this sum regularly to the Academies and to make sure that individual churches would contribute their share (or cotisations).

All the sums received by the Académie of Saumur from 1631 to 1683 were entered into a Papier de recette and the accounts were audited every year. Each year a different professor took care of these accounts.
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Bossuet


- New ed. by Lequeux and Leroy, 5 vol., Paris, 17
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  studiosi philosophiae ..., Saumur, Desbordes,
  1663.

Gautier, (P.)
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  Mr Blondel ... Groningen, 1658.

Good, (T.)
- Brief English tract of logic, London,
  1677.
Jurieu, (P.)

- Examen du livre de la Réunion du christianisme ou traité de la tolérance en matière de religion, no place, 1671


- Traité de la nature et de la grâce, Amsterdam, 1685.

La Bastide

- Remarques sur le livre intitulé La réunion du christianisme ..., Saumur, Péan, 1670.

La Milletière (T. Brachet de)

- Les moyens de la paix chrétienne, pour la réunion des catholiques et des évangéliques ..., Saumur, Desbordes, 1637.

La Place, (J.de)

- Opera omnia, in unum corpus nunc primum collecta ..., 2 vol., Franeker, 1699-1703.

- Opuscula nonnulla, magna ex parte postuma ..., Saumur, Lesnier, 1656.

Le Cène, (C.)

- Entretiens sur diverses matières de théologie..., Amsterdam, 1685.
Leferre, (Anne) Mme Dacier

- Les poésies d'Anacréon et de Sappho, traduit en français, avec des remarques par Mme Dacier, Paris, 1681.
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Lefèvre, (Tanne-guy)
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- Id, pars altera; additae sunt Aristophanis Ecclésiaseusae cum interpretatione nova, notis et emendationibus, Saumur, Lerpinière, and Lesnier, 1665.
- La vie d'Aristippe écrite en grec par Diogène et mise en français par Mr Lefèvre, Paris, 1668.
- Le festin de Xenophon, de la version de Mr Lefèvre, Saumur, Lesnier, 1666.
- Le premier Alcibiade de Platon mis en français par Mr Lefèvre, Saumur, Lesnier, 1666.
- Les vies des poètes grecs en abrégé, Saumur, Lesnier, 1664.
- Méthode pour commencer les humanités grecques et latines, Saumur, René Péan, 1672.
- Traité de la superstition composé par Plutarque et traduit par Mr Lefèvre, avec entretien sur la vie de Romulus, Saumur, Lesnier, 1666.
- Apollodori Atheniensis Bibliotheces, sive de diis libri tres; Tanaquillus Faber recensuit et notulas addidit, Saumur, Lesnier, 1667.

- Claudii Aeliani varia historia; Tanaquillus Faber emendavit ... Saumur, Lesnier, 1667.

- Dionysii Longini, philosophi et rhetoris libellus ... Salmuri, Lesnier ... 1667.

- M. Juniani Justini historia ex trogo Pompeio; diligentissime recensuit et emendationes addidit Tanaquillus Faber, Saumur, Péan, 1671.

- Phaedri qui sub Augusto et Tibero vixit, fabulae, additae sunt notae et animadversiones Tan. Fabri ... Saumur, Lerpiniête, 1658.

- Prima Scaligerana, musquam ante hae edita, cum praefatione T. Fabri, Groningen, 1669.

- Terentii Casmodiae, Saumur, Péan, 1671.
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Baldwin, (J. M.) - Dictionary of philosophy and psychology, 3 T. in 4 vol., New York and London, 1901-1
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Ong, (W. J.) S.J. - Ramus, method and the decay of dialogue; from the art of discourse to the art of reason, Cambridge (Mass), 1958.

Orcibal, (J.) - Louis XIV et les protestants, Paris, 1951

Orme, (W.) - Bibliotheca biblica: a select list of books on sacred literature, Edinburgh, 1825.
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- Four good men, Dublin, 1927