## Montfort and Jansenism

In biographies of St. Louis Marie de Montfort published in the 19th and 20th centuries, much is made of the part played by Jansenists and their movement (Jansenism) in the difficulties experienced practically throughout his priestly life by the saint. Before examining the probability of that being the case, it will be helpful to give a brief resumé of what Jansenism was, and how it affected the French church.<sup>1</sup>

The movement known as Jansenism takes its name from Cornelius Jansen, commonly known as Jansenius, who was born in what is now the Southern Netherlands in 1585. A brilliant scholar, he was ordained to the priesthood in 1614 and named professor of exegesis at the University of Leuven (Louvain) around 1617. Under pressure from the reformation doctrine on grace, theologians of the time were caught up with the reconciliation of grace and free will. Jansen vigorously upheld what he called the Augustinian approach (closely aligned with that of St Thomas Aguinas), upholding the absolute primacy of God who, as he wills, moves his creatures freely although infallibly through an efficacious actual grace. This view underlined the depth of the permanent wounds inflicted on human nature by original sin, and to such a degree that the phrase "Augustinian pessimism" was coined. To this view was opposed the "optimism" of the humanist Jesuit school which put more responsibility in the hands of God's creatures by placing between God's sovereignty and efficacious grace, the theory that God first considers how an individual would respond in all possible circumstances when granted sufficient grace for salvation; the individual's response would render the sufficient grace efficacious. Only then would God's sovereignty decide which circumstances would qualify an individual's life. It is impossible for us today to imagine the intensity of the battle between these two theories. The Holy See had to step in to keep both sides at bay by establishing a commission to study the dispute: the famous Congregatio de auxiliis, which met at various intervals from 1598 to 1606. Although the majority on the commission voted to condemn Luis de Molina, the leading Jesuit proponent of "sufficient grace rendered efficacious by man's response," Pope Paul V never promulgated the censure, hoping to heal the divisions through continued discussions.

Jansenius was resolved to show that only the Augustinian view was the mind of the Church. After some years of study, he began, in 1627, his chef-d'oeuvre, "Augustinus", which was intended to explain the authentic thought of Augustine on the question of grace and free will. After having been named Bishop of Ypres in 1635, he put the finishing touches to the work and completed it only a few days before he died of the plague in 1638. The book, published in 1640 and praised by Jansenius' close friends, Saint-Cyran (Jean du Verger de Hauranne, Abbot of Saint-Cyran) and Antoine Arnauld (founder of the Jansenist community of Port Royal), was immediately accused of Calvinism by the Jesuits and others. Pope Urban VIII condemned Augustinus in 1643 but in such general terms that it had little effect.

In 1649 the directors of the Faculty of theology at the Sorbonne in Paris proposed that the faculty examine seven propositions - later reduced to five - without explicitly affirming

<sup>-</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> For this account of Jansenism, I am indebted to Fr. Pat Gaffney, S.M.M., who, on 5 March 1999, published what he called an "elective" note on Jansenism on the Internet, specifically on the Montfort Spirituality Forum of the Catholic Information Network: <a href="http://www.cin.org/archives/montfort/199903/0032.html">http://www.cin.org/archives/montfort/199903/0032.html</a>; and to John McManners, *Church and Society in Eighteenth-Century France Volume 2: The Religion of the People and the Politics of Religion.* Oxford University Press. Oxford Scholarship Online. Oxford University Press. 1999. <a href="http://www.oxfordscholarship.com/oso/public/content/religion/0198270046/toc.html">http://www.oxfordscholarship.com/oso/public/content/religion/0198270046/toc.html</a>, chapters 35 and 36 (as well as chapter 26 on *Religious Practice*).

that they were from Jansen, although it was known by all that the first proposition was almost verbatim from Augustinus and the others were claimed to be resumés of Jansen's thought. A censure of sorts was imposed on these propositions by the Sorbonne. The entire situation was referred to Rome in 1650 by about 90 bishops, although a dozen others felt that the problem should be decided in France without the interference of the pope. From this time on, a decided Gallicanism<sup>2</sup> becomes essentially intertwined with Jansenism. In 1653 Pope Innocent X condemned the five propositions by the bull *Cum occasione*, but it seems that no person, book or school of opinion was censured by this bull. However, it has been alleged that a "group of anti-Jansenist, Jesuit-inspired theologians in Rome, led by Cardinal Albizzi, had done their best to push Cum occasione into a censure on Jansenius, adding an extra reference to the Augustinus at the end of the bull and attempting to insert phrases ensuring the whole pronouncement would be classed as infallible." In response, the French bishops explicitly attributed the five propositions to Jansen, and it seems that Pope Innocent was then pressured into agreeing with this statement. Prodded by writings which affirmed that Pope Innocent had thereby condemned Augustinus, Antoine Arnauld responded that he had not found the five propositions in Augustinus. In spite of Blaise Pascals's (one of the "gentlemen of Port Royal") brilliant and sarcastic Lettres à un Provincial, which upheld the Jansenist cause against the Jesuits and Dominicans (accusing them of a lax moral code), Innocent's successor, Pope Alexander VII affirmed that they were from Augustinus and were to be condemned precisely according to Jansen's meaning.

Arnauld's famous response distinguished between the dogmatic truth, to which Arnauld pledged complete adherence – namely, that the five propositions were heretical as understood by the Holy Father, – and the historical fact, which Arnauld categorically denied – that they were to be found in the *Augustinus*. From this point on, the discussion about grace practically disappears, and, especially after Alexander VII ordered the signing of a formulary drawn up by the Assembly of the Clergy, condemning the five propositions and at the same time recognizing that they stemmed from Jansen, the focus is on Rome's attempt to force assent to the "fact" that the propositions came from Jansen's thought as represented in *Augustinus*. The doctrinal controversies on grace, therefore, appear to be only the wallpaper in the salon of Gallicanism. Four Bishops rose up in defence of Arnauld's stance and were bitterly opposed by Louis XIV, who thought that Jansenists, particularly the Port Royal community, were a threat to his supreme sovereignty.

With the reign of Clement IX a striking compromise was reached. The four recalcitrant bishops were permitted to sign the formulary after the insertion of a paragraph distinguishing historical fact from dogmatic truth. This became known as the *Pax Clementina*, which was even officially promulgated in January 1669. What it meant in practice was that there could be a "respectful silence" concerning the fact of whether or not the five propositions were the thought of Jansen. During this lull in the controversy, Port Royal became alive, not with studies on the nature of grace and freedom, but with scholarly translations of the Bible into French and commentaries on it by Le Maistre de Sacy (Montfort was well acquainted with his work), polemical writings against Protestants, and the lugubrious moral theology of Pierre Nicole.

-

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> 'Gallicanism' refers to the claim, common in the French church of the time of Louis XIV and St. Louis Marie, that the Church in France, by time-honoured tradition, enjoyed a certain 'independence' from Rome in various matters, notably the appointment of bishops and the acceptance of Papal decisions given in Papal Bulls and other documents.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> McManners, op. cit., pgs 347-8, citing L. Ceyssens, 'Les Cinq Propositions de Jansénius à Rome', Rev. hist. ecclés. (1971), 449-501.

However, a new and complicated phase in Gallican Jansenism evolved with the appearance in 1692 (the year that St. Louis Marie went to Paris to study at Saint-Sulpice) of the Oratorian Pasquier Quesnel's "The New Testament with Moral Reflections," a highly Augustinian work, at least bordering on the extremes of Jansenism. It bore the prestigious imprimatur of Cardinal de Noailles, Archbishop of Paris. However, the same cardinal Noailles condemned the work of Martin de Barcos, another Jansenist, Exposition of the Faith of the Church touching on Grace and Predestination, as "false, temerarious, scandalous, impious, blasphemous, injurious to God, worthy of anathema and heretical," since he believed that it renewed the doctrine of the Five Propositions of Jansen. The Cardinal was publicly derided for having approved the work of Quesnel and condemned the work of Barcos, although both proposed the doctrine of Jansen.

In a dispute raised by the Sorbonne concerning the *Pax Clementina*'s approval of "respectful silence", Quesnel was singled out, arrested, and his papers seized. Although Quesnel himself escaped to exile in Brussels, his documents revealed how widespread and well organized Jansenism was, which, for political reasons rather than matters of doctrine, disturbed Louis XIV. His appeal to Clement XI in 1705 (the year before Saint Louis Marie visited the Pope) gave rise to the bull *Vineam Domini* which shattered the *Pax Clementina* by condemning the "respectful silence" approved by his predecessor. The Bishops of Luçon and La Rochelle wrote a forceful condemnation of Quesnel's "*Moral Reflections*." Both signed a joint pastoral letter, issued in 1711 (the very year that Montfort began five years of ministry in the area), alerting their people to the errors of Quesnel, for which they were rewarded with a virulent attack by Cardinal de Noailles, who still continued to approve the work.

Pope Clement XI hesitated to intervene, but in September 1713, he issued the Bull *Unigenitus* which condemened 101 propositions taken from the *Moral Reflections*. Louis XIV wanted it implemented immediately; however nine bishops, including the Cardinal of Paris, would not accept the Bull, claiming that it condemned a number of propositions which – although clearly from Quesnel – were in perfect accord with Catholic faith. The problem was not as with *Augustinus* a disagreement about historical fact but the more serious one, disagreement about dogmatic truth. Since "Acceptants" among the clergy (that is, those who accepted the Bull) outnumbered the "Appellants" (those who, in line with Gallican principles, appealed to a future General Council against the Bull), in 1714 Louis XIV forcibly imposed the Bull on parliament and on the Sorbonne. The King's death the following year left the situation in turmoil. The new regent, Philip of Orléans, seemed favourable to the Jansenist party, causing many "Acceptants" to recant their support for *Unigenitus*.

In March 1717, four Bishops arrived at the Sorbonne to place on record a notarized act by which they appealed from the Bull to a General Council, thereby upholding a fundamental plank of the Gallicans, the superiority of a General Council over the Pope. Some appealed to "a Pope better informed," i.e., refusing allegiance to *Unigenitus* until a Pope more in accord with their theology would be elected (i.e., who would then condemn the Bull *Unigenitus*).

Jansenism itself seems to have been put aside: the issue now was nothing more than whether the Church in France would follow the example of England and tear itself away from Peter to become a national church. The four original Appellants were joined by other Bishops, bringing their number to almost twenty – among whom was Bishop Desmaretz of St Malo – and about three thousand priests out of the approximately 100,000 French clergy. Religious communities, like the Benedictines, Oratorians, Carmelites and Ursulines, were especially confused by the inroads that the arguments of the Appellants made within their religious orders. The excommunication of the Appellants by Clement XI had little effect and

the battle between them and the Acceptants engulfed the Church in France. The schismatic Jansenist Church of Utrecht in Holland came into existence through the controversy.

The successor of Cardinal de Noailles, an avowed Acceptant, obtained in 1730 a royal decree making *Unigenitus* the law of the land, depriving all who did not subscribe to it of pensions and benefices. Often through inquisitional tactics, all dioceses and religious orders accepted the Bull, and Jansenism as an active party slowly faded away.

From the above, it is clear that Jansenism began as a *dogmatic* stance – concerning the relationship of free will to the grace of God. However, it was not so much this dogmatic Jansenism which caused havoc in the French church, as a sort of moral Jansenism (which certainly flowed from the dogmatic stance of the Jansenists), which expressed itself in a rigorist interpretation of what was acceptable in the life of a Christian, and therefore in the pastoral practice of the Church. Its supporters claimed to be trying to go back to the practices of the primitive Christian church. In particular, this rigorist attitude was applied to the sacraments, especially of the Eucharist and of Penance. So, for example, it was held by those of Jansenist leanings that frequent Communion was to be permitted only to those whose spiritual lives were unimpeachable – which meant in practice to virtually no-one. Similarly, it was held that sacramental absolution could only be given to someone who had already proved by their actions that they were genuinely repentant and really converted to a new way of life. For those who held these views to an extreme degree, it was even conceivable that a person on his or her deathbed should be refused absolution. The justice of God was more emphasised than his mercy. Many of these pastoral approaches flowed from the community of Port Royal and its followers, many of whom were genuinely ardent souls, sometimes practising an extreme asceticism in their own lives.<sup>4</sup>

As with any deeply divisive controversy, there is a temptation to caricature one's opponents in a way which is not entirely truthful. So, Jansenists have been almost lampooned, for example, in biographies of Montfort stemming from the past two centuries, as being totally against the idea of frequent Communion. Yet, it would seem that, on the contrary, their *ideal* was indeed one of frequent communion, though "their rigorism tended to keep the average worshipper from the altar... For those who strove for perfection, Arnauld, Nicole, and Quesnel regarded daily reception as the rule: just as the body must be nourished by food daily, said Quesnel, so must the soul. This meant strict daily preparation, though Nicole ruled that a new confession was not needed for each approach to the Sacrament – it was sufficient to have a conscience clear from all but venial sins. The nuns of Port-Royal communicated on Sundays, saints' days, and Thursdays, a pattern not confined to the Jansenists, for the Visitandines did the same..." But of course "a lay person out and about in the world could hardly have maintained the dispositions required by Port-Royal" – this "strict daily preparation" requiring an almost heroic virtue. This does, however, serve as a warning to us not to accept as strict fact what may partake of the nature of caricature.

From this summary of the Jansenist controversy in France, it can be seen that much of the dispute was taking place during Montfort's lifetime, and in particular during the years of his studies in Paris and his subsequent priestly ministry. It might therefore be taken for granted that traces of it would be found in the facts of his life, and also in his writings. Yet it is a curious anomaly that two of Montfort's first three biographers (Joseph Grandet, writing

\_

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Henri Daniel, Saint Louis-Marie Grignion de Montfort. Ce qu'il fut. Ce qu'il fit, Téqui, Toulouse, 1967, pgs. 218-219.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> McManners, *op. cit.*, pgs 101-102.

within eight years of his death; <sup>6</sup> and Charles Besnard, who was Superior General of the Company of Mary from 1756 to 1788<sup>7</sup>) make no mention whatsoever, in their accounts, of Jansenism or the Jansenists.

The third (Jean-Baptiste Blain, who knew the saint personally<sup>8</sup>), although he claims that Pope Clement XI sent St. Louis Marie back to France after his pilgrimage to Rome, to "continue exercising his zeal to check the progress of the new doctrine," (which he equates with the "errors of Fr. Quesnel", one of the leading exponents of Jansenist piety, as we have seen), and goes on to ascribe "the opposition he met and ... the interdictions he had to bear in some dioceses" to the supporters of Fr. Quesnel, may well have been projecting his own anti-Jansenist stance on Montfort. Grandet, who is more specific both about the date of St. Louis Marie's visit to Rome, and the circumstances of what happened at his audience with the Holy Father, gives no hint of this interpretation.

Blain also hints (without clearly stating the case) that St. Louis Marie finally left the community of Saint-Clément in Nantes in 1701 because of Jansenist tendencies and principles which he found there. Later biographers, while not necessarily concurring with this as the reason for Montfort's leaving, also suggest that Jansenism was rife in Saint-Clément. However, Fr. Henri Daniel, S.M.M., in his book *Saint Louis-Marie Grignion de Montfort. Ce qu'il fut. Ce qu'il fit* (Téqui, 1967), makes a very persuasive case for the view that Saint-Clément was infected with Jansenist leanings only much later, perhaps as late as 1711, long after St. Louis Marie's stay there. Again, it could be that Blain, who is often confused concerning dates, is projecting his own anti-Jansenist stance onto a period in St. Louis Marie's life which is not justified by the facts. Certainly, the long letter written by Montfort to Father Leschassier in December 1700, about three months after his arrival in Saint-Clément, gives no hint of his finding Jansenist teachings or principles predominating there. On the contrary, his dissatisfaction is with other matters entirely, which he found to be breaches of good discipline and obstacles to his leading a missionary life. And again, Grandet makes no mention of the presence of Jansenists at Saint-Clément.

Blain has a comment to make also concerning the difficulties experienced by St. Louis Marie on passing through Montfort-la-Cane, though Blain is evidently not sure of when

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> Joseph Grandet, La Vie de Messire Louis-Marie Grignion de Montfort, Prêtre Missionnaire Apostolique, Nantes, 1724

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> Charles Besnard, *Vie de M. Louis-Marie Grignion de Montfort*, Rome 1981, 2 Volumes. This biography was never published in the author's lifetime, having to wait until 1981 for its first edition; it was, however, the basis (almost word for word) of the biography published in 1785, of J. Picot de Clorivière, *La Vie de M. Louis-Marie Grignion de Montfort, missionnaire apostolique, instituteur des missionnaires du Saint-Esprit et des Filles de la Sagesse*, Paris, 1785.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> Jean-Baptiste Blain, *Abrégé de la Vie de Louis-Marie Grignion de Montfort*, Rome, 1973; though it appears to have been written before 1724 as a testimony to be used by Grandet for his biography, it received its first complete publication only in 1973. An English translation was published in 1977: Jean-Baptiste Blain, *Summary of the Life of L-M Grignion de Montfort*, Rome 1977.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> See Blain, chapter LXXVIII, pages 327-329 in the original ms. (pgs. 182-3 in the French edition of 1973; pgs. 174-6 in the English edition of 1977); and in particular footnote 176 in the French edition of 1973; footnote 103 in the English edition of 1977.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup> See, for example, E.C. Bolger, *The Man Called Montfort*, Liverpool, 1966, pg. 44.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>11</sup> Henri Daniel, Saint Louis-Marie Grignion de Montfort. Ce qu'il fut. Ce qu'il fit, Téqui, Toulouse, 1967, pgs. 202-7

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>12</sup> Letter 5, 6 December 1700, in *God Alone. The Collected Writings of St. Louis Marie de Montfort*, Bay Shore, 1987, pgs. 5-7.

this was. We know from Besnard that towards the end of the few months that Montfort stayed at Saint-Lazare with the two Brothers, Mathurin and John, "some rectors from the town" made a complaint against him to the Bishop of Saint-Malo, Mgr. Desmaretz, to the effect that, although he had no official position among the clergy of the town, he was attracting large crowds of people, including vagabonds and "layabout paupers", and seeking to make a name for himself among them. 13 However, as Fr. Daniel shows, there was no hint in their complaints of their emanating from a Jansenist milieu. 14 Blain, however, although he evidently does not know of this particular incident, may well have heard some rumours of the difficulties experienced, and ascribes them to the fact that "the zeal which he showed to spread devotion to the Blessed Virgin, to encourage people to say the Rosary and to visit the chapels dedicated to the Mother of God, did not please those who thought that it was in their interest to turn them away from these practices, especially from the last one." <sup>15</sup> Although he does not say so clearly, this is at least a hint that those who objected were Jansenists, and this was certainly the interpretation taken up by later biographers (notably Fr. Dalin<sup>16</sup>, and Mgr. Laveille<sup>17</sup>). The argument gained some strength from the fact that Mgr. Demaretz was certainly (at least later) favourable to the Jansenist cause, being one of those "Appellant" bishops who appealed to a later General Council from the Bull *Unigenitus*. But, as we have seen, there is no concrete evidence to suggest that Jansenism played a part in this episode in Montfort. In the light of Blain's notorious lack of precision concerning dates and particular circumstances, it would be rash to accept his interpretation too easily.

Montfort himself, in his writings, makes only one explicit mention of Jansenism, in Hymn 139, verse 55:

Loin de moi le jansénisme,

which is translated in *Jesus Living in Mary*, *Handbook of the Spirituality of St. Louis Marie de Montfort* as "Jansenism, away with you!" It is clear from the rest of the same verse that St. Louis Marie classed this Jansenism as a heresy, and therefore to be abhorred by all genuine Christians:

Loin de moi les hérétiques Que l'Église a condamnés, Avec leurs belles pratiques Et leurs livres raffinés. Loin de moi le calvinisme, Loin de moi le jansénisme. Je sers Dieu de tout mon cœur, C'est ma gloire et mon bonheur. 18

Daniel, *op. cit.*, pgs. 207-21

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>13</sup> Besnard, *op. cit.*, pgs. 148-150.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>14</sup> Daniel, *op. cit.*, pgs. 207-213.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>15</sup> Blain, *op. cit.*, pg. 140 (English edition of 1977).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>16</sup> Louis-Joseph Dalin, Vie du Vénérable Serviteur de Dieu, Louis-Marie Grignion de Montfort missionnaire apostolique, Leclerc, Paris, 1839.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>17</sup> A. Laveille, Le Bienheureux L.-M. Grignion de Montfort (1673-1716), d'après des documents inédits, Poussielgue, Paris, 1907.

 $<sup>^{18}</sup>$  Far from me be those heretics / the Church has condemned, / with their beautiful practices / and their refined books. / Far from me be Calvinism, / far from me be Jansenism. / I serve God with all my heart; / there lies my glory and my happiness.

In Hymn 22, verse 30, there is what is perhaps a veiled reference to Jansenism, which was commonly known in certain circles in his day as "the novelty" (*la nouveauté*):

Gardez-moi d'un grand précipice:
Du scrupule dans la justice,
De l'esprit de la nouveauté,
Soit dans ma foi, mon zèle ou ma conduite;
Gardez-moi de l'illusion,
De la fausse dévotion,
pour ne marcher qu'à votre suite. 19

In a number of other places in his writings we might find similar mistrustfulness of "novelty" <sup>20</sup>, but we certainly cannot be sure that he is referring specifically to Jansenism in these cases, nor indeed in this Hymn verse. It is therefore quite striking that in the writings of a man who, according to some of his biographers, was an implacable enemy of Jansenism and the Jansenists, so little reference to it or to them is to be found. The conclusion of the editors of Blain's account of Montfort's life, is that Montfort himself "was not deadly opposed to the trend which, after 1714, was for rejecting the Constitution *Unigenitus*." That is not to say that he himself had Jansenist leanings, but rather that, at that particular period of his life, it did not seem to him to be necessary to speak out strongly against what in effect was less of a serious problem in the Church of the West of France than perhaps in other parts of the kingdom, at least on the level of dogma. From the point of view of pastoral practice, Grandet assures us that "he always avoided those two fatal excesses which gave rise in former times, and which still today give rise to such great evils in the Church, namely, too great a rigour and too great a laxity in moral matters. He thundered in the pulpit against all vices, but he was both gentle and firm at the same time in the confessional. He had a particular gift for touching hearts, both in the confessional and in the pulpit. But he had such a horror of too severe moral teaching that he believed that rigorist confessors did a hundred times more harm in the Church than those who were lax, even though these also did much harm. 'I would much rather,' he used to say, 'suffer in Purgatory for showing too much gentleness towards my penitents than for having treated them with a severity which would bring them to despair." In this he is clearly aligning himself with those who opposed what was seen as Jansenist rigorism.

It would seem therefore that to take the view, as some of his biographers have done, that all Montfort's difficulties can be laid at the door of the Jansenists is a wild exaggeration. It is much more probable that many of his problems arose from his own idiosyncrasies and the suspicion that they aroused in the minds of those who were more conformable to accepted practice. And, although he was certainly opposed to a "Jansenistic" rigorism in pastoral practice, there is very little evidence in his writings that he was prepared to enter into

\_

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>19</sup> Preserve me from a great precipice: / scrupulosity in justice, / the spirit of novelty, / whether in my faith, my zeal or my conduct; / preserve me from illusion, / from false devotion, / that I may only walk in your footsteps.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>20</sup> E.g. Hymn 23:34

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>21</sup> Blain, footnote 176 in the French edition, footnote 103 in the English edition.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>22</sup> Grandet, *op. cit.*, pgs. 376-377 in the original (pgs. 205-6 in the edition of 1994).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>23</sup> This would seem to be the conclusion of Daniel, *op. cit.*, chapter XI. See also Louis Pérouas, *Grignion de Montfort, Les Pauvres et les Missions*, Cerf, Paris, 1966, pg.63. There is a very complete examination of the question in an article in two parts by A. Bachelier entitled *Le Père de Montfort et le Jansénisme* in *Recherches et Travaux*, Angers, Universitè Catholique de l'Ouest, Vol II (1947) pgs. 95 ff; Vol III (1948) pgs. 90 ff. This article comes to the same conclusion.

theological debate on this point, which might have been expected to give rise to intrigues against him on the part of those who favoured their views. On the other hand, it would be strange if he were not aware of the disputes taking place in the French church of his day, and we should "not fall into the opposite error of overlooking completely the repercussions of Jansenism on Louis's career, for he has been sent by Clement XI into the heart of a church very much influenced by Gallicanism and consequently rife with rebellious tendencies."<sup>24</sup>

Paul R. Allerton, smm August 2004

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>24</sup> Benedetta Papàsogli, *Montfort, A Prophet for Our Times*, Edizioni Monfortane, Rome, 1991, pg. 289.