

This is an Open Access document downloaded from ORCA, Cardiff University's institutional repository: <https://orca.cardiff.ac.uk/id/eprint/118156/>

This is the author's version of a work that was submitted to / accepted for publication.

Citation for final published version:

Williams, Mark R. F. 2019. Translating the Jansenist controversy in Britain and Ireland. *English Historical Review* 134 (566) , pp. 59-91. 10.1093/ehr/cey397

Publishers page: <https://doi.org/10.1093/ehr/cey397>

Please note:

Changes made as a result of publishing processes such as copy-editing, formatting and page numbers may not be reflected in this version. For the definitive version of this publication, please refer to the published source. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite this paper.

This version is being made available in accordance with publisher policies. See <http://orca.cf.ac.uk/policies.html> for usage policies. Copyright and moral rights for publications made available in ORCA are retained by the copyright holders.



**Translating the Jansenist Controversy in Britain and Ireland**

Few things lay beyond the improving gaze of Robert Boyle. A founding member of the Royal Society and an exemplary ‘man of letters’, Boyle was at the centre of a web of ideas with truly global resonances. Drawing upon correspondents in Europe, the Americas, and South Asia, this network (comprised variously of merchants, natural philosophers, ambassadors, missionaries, and combinations thereof) fed voraciously upon rumour and novelties from even further afield, extending Boyle’s geographical line of sight as far as China and Spanish America through ‘trustworthy’ intermediaries.<sup>1</sup> Indeed, the perceived universality of these interactions, it was thought, would aid in stripping away the distortions of politics and confessional division to ensure the free flow of scientific knowledge and ‘true religion’.<sup>2</sup> Here, in the letters which surrounded Boyle, were the lenses through which the world could be seen and observed, governed by understood codes of practice and authentication towards a common, universal end.

However, serving the cause of ‘true religion’ through gathering such knowledge proved easier than applying it. This was made apparent to Boyle in the summer of 1681 when he set out to evangelise the Catholics of his native Ireland through the printing of a complete Bible in Irish. In many respects this was just the latest in a long line of attempts to resolve what Protestants in both Ireland and Britain saw as Ireland’s ‘Catholic problem’: an effort to put old sacramental wine into new bottles.<sup>3</sup> Sputtering attempts since the sixteenth century to employ the Irish language to evangelising ends had most recently culminated in a manuscript translation by William Bedell, Church of Ireland bishop of Kilmore, of the Old Testament into

<sup>1</sup> S. Shapin, *A Social History of Truth: Civility and Science in Seventeenth-century England* (Chicago, 1994), pp. 129-30; 291-302.

<sup>2</sup> See, for instance, A. M. Blair, *Too Much to Know: Managing Scholarly Information Before the Modern Age* (New Haven, 2010); R. Mayhew, ‘British Geography’s Republic of Letters: Mapping an Imagined Community, 1600-1800’, *Journal of the History of Ideas*, lxxv (2004), pp. 251-276. Also see M. Ogborn, *Indian Ink: Script and Print in the Making of the East India Company* (Chicago, 2007) for discussion of Boyle’s East India Company networks.

<sup>3</sup> T. Barnard, ‘Protestants and the Irish Language, c. 1675-1725’, *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, xlv (1993), esp. pp. 247-8; M. Hunter, *Boyle: Between God and Science* (New Haven, 2009), pp. 196-7.

Irish during the 1630s.<sup>4</sup> Now revisited against the tensions of the Popish Plot and Exclusion Crisis (1678-81), this renewed act of translation was meant to ease persistent anxieties regarding the political loyalties of Irish Catholics, offering up an encounter with written, revealed ‘truth’ where force appeared to have failed.

Boyle possessed not only the resources but also the pious incentive to bring about this translation. A fervent Protestant, he could also deploy his immense wealth from familial landholdings in the (predominantly Catholic) Irish province of Munster towards ‘improving’ ends. As governor of the Company for the Propagation of the Gospel in New England, Boyle was already a leading proponent of gospel translation for English colonists like the ‘Apostle to the Indians’, John Eliot.<sup>5</sup> Indeed, other members of the Royal Society – who, as will be shown, were to prompt this translation venture – had already turned their minds towards resolving the ‘Irish problem’. Such bright minds as fellow polymath William Petty had written as recently as 1679 of the need to disarm Irish Catholics, demolish their homes, and force the migration of Catholic clergy in order to reduce them to ‘a serviceable temper’. This sort of devastation would prepare Ireland for the sowing of Protestant ‘prosperity’.<sup>6</sup> Drawing upon collaborators in Dublin – including Henry Jones, Church of Ireland bishop of Meath, Narcissus Marsh, Trinity College Provost, and Andrew Sall, a former Jesuit turned Anglican apologist – Boyle’s Irish Bible was ostensibly a more graceful answer to a commonly-perceived problem.

This bible, however, also had origins well beyond the familiar shores of Britain and Ireland. Through the cosmopolitan lenses at Boyle’s disposal, plans developed to affix to this

<sup>4</sup> T. O’Connor, ‘Religious Change, 1550-1800’ in R. Gillespie and A. Hadfield, eds., *The Irish Book in English, 1550-1800* (Oxford, 2005), pp. 173-6.

<sup>5</sup> Eliot’s correspondence with Boyle is contained throughout *The Correspondence of Robert Boyle (Electronic Edn.)* [hereafter *Boyle Correspondence*] <http://pm.nlx.com>; see, in particular, Eliot’s ‘The present state of the Indians in the Massachusetts[sic] government, in the matter of Religion this present yeare 1669’, written to Boyle 6 July 1669, pp. 138-40.

<sup>6</sup> B[ritish] L[ibrary] [hereafter BL] Add[itional] MSS 27852 [Petty Papers], fos. 170-1, ‘Consideracions how the protestants (or non-papists) of Ireland may disable the Papists there’; Toby Barnard, *Improving Ireland? Projectors, prophets and profiteers, 1641-1786* (Dublin, 2008); T. McCormick, *William Petty and the Ambitions of Political Arithmetic* (Oxford, 2010).

bible the preface to the 1667 Bible de Port Royal (or ‘Mons’ Bible), translating first from French to English and then into Irish. Published between 1665 and 1693 by the Amsterdam printer Daniel Elzevier, this iteration of the Bible was the collaborative effort of the so-called Jansenists of Port-Royal-des-Champs – a highly controversial, ambiguous, and deeply divisive ‘reform’ movement within European Catholicism.<sup>7</sup> The original French version, prepared by Louis-Isaac Lemaistre de Sacy, blended patristics and homiletic traditions with a purist view of the composite texts. This was to be wielded in the cause of reforming the Catholic Church *from within* through vernacular engagement with Scripture and personal knowledge of the ‘logic’ of historical faith.<sup>8</sup> Scholarly translation into the vernacular gave a lustre of ‘rationality’ to the Jansenist understanding of Catholicism, not only among reform-minded Catholics but also, crucially, to curious Protestant onlookers. To Boyle and his collaborators the Mons Bible represented first and foremost ‘a peice [sic] of great Learning & Piety ... much esteemed by the better sort of the Romanists’. Such ‘learning and piety’, Boyle believed, would help to ‘recommend the Introduction of the Irish Testament to the better sort of Papists’.<sup>9</sup> In this way, the group had made what they felt to be an informed distinction between the Catholics of Europe and sought, through the appropriation, translation, and subsequent circulation of this Jansenist text, to bridge the gap between Protestant and Catholic.<sup>10</sup> Borrowing this text from the Jansenists would further the cause of ‘true religion’ and unity across Christendom by showing Irish Catholics the apparent reforming tendencies of the ‘better sort’ among their

<sup>7</sup> F. Korsten, ‘The Elzeviers and England’, in L. Hellinga, A. Duke, J. Harskamp and T. Hermans, eds., *The Bookshop of the World: The Role of the Low Countries in the Book-Trade 1473-1941* (Goy-Houten, 2001), pp. 131-44.

<sup>8</sup> B. E. Schwarzbach, ‘Reason and the Bible in the So-Called Age of Reason’, *Huntington Library Quarterly*, lxxiv (2011), p. 438.

<sup>9</sup> [Boyle] to [Jones], [8 or 9 April 1681], *Boyle Correspondence*, v, pp. 250-51. D. Kostroun, *Feminism, Absolutism, and Jansenism: Louis XIV and the Port-Royal Nuns* (Cambridge 2011); P. Dieudonné, *La Paix Clémentine: Défaite et Victoire du Premier Jansénisme Français sous le Pontificat de Clément IX (1667-1669)* (Leuven, 2003); D. K. Van Kley, *The Religious Origins of the French Revolution* (New Haven, 1999); A. Sedgwick, *Jansenism in Seventeenth Century France: Voices from the Wilderness* (Charlottesville, 1977).

<sup>10</sup> Michael Hunter notes that this falls typically within Boyle’s ‘irenic stance’ on such theological matters: Hunter, *Boyle*, p. 197.

Continental coreligionists. It was a way of putting to use the broadening horizons facilitated by the seemingly uncomplicated cosmopolitanism of people like Boyle.

Boyle's project already reveals an often-ignored undercurrent of interest among British and Irish Protestants in the controversies and implications of Europe broadly, and France especially. That this interest was piqued, and action undertaken, at the height of anti-Catholic anxieties across the Three Kingdoms suggests in the first instance that cross-confessional dialogue endured (or was even prompted by) such heated circumstances. However, the Irish Bible's fate should also serve as a historiographical warning. For all this apparent optimism, the project failed, and the 'Jansenist Preface' never graced the final, published versions of the Irish Bible. The act of translation, as it proceeded, threw up unexpected complexities for Boyle and his collaborators: namely, that the Jansenists were, in fact, deeply devout Catholics. Even worse for the startled scholars, these Jansenists whom they were now encountering were fervently anti-Protestant, writing as much in opposition to the voices of Protestant Europe as their co-confessionalists. It was a moment of profound misunderstanding and disorientation which deeply frustrated Boyle and his collaborators, forcing recognition that their would-be allies whose ideas had so preoccupied them were, in fact, opponents. Completed copies of the Bible, stripped of all but the most benign mention of the newly-encountered Jansenist controversy, were unceremoniously foisted upon the Gaelic-speaking Scots in hopes of cutting losses and evangelising yet another Celtic threat to English, Protestant hegemony in the Three Kingdoms.<sup>11</sup>

In short, the story of the Preface is one of connections only partially realised, and 'truths' stumbled into rather than revealed through unfettered curiosity or cosmopolitan idealism. It prompts a straightforward question: what went wrong? What had precipitated such intense interest in the Jansenist controversy among Boyle and his collaborators at a time of

---

<sup>11</sup> Barnard, 'Protestants and the Irish Language, c. 1675-1725', p. 250.

such deep inter-confessional anxiety, and what had driven them to act upon it with so little apparent understanding of its complexities? What, in effect, had produced this translation of Jansenism? The first aim of this article, then, will be to chart the wider circulation of information regarding the Jansenist controversy (and, with it, the French and European scene against which it unfolded) in order to explain the dissonances which appeared most acutely in Boyle's project. Casting of the Jansenist 'movement', such as it was, as a sort of proto-Protestant, 'rational' intervention within Catholic Europe was far from unique: indeed, many Protestants in Britain and Ireland eagerly watched, supported, and translated the controversy, lending consensus to the interpretation upon which Boyle and his collaborators built their efforts. Tracing this interest and the subsequent refractions it created will therefore, in the first instance, lend essential context to this moment of encounter.

A final twist further complicates these threads: namely, that the Catholics of Ireland had already had their 'Jansenist moment' decades before this project began. As Thomas O'Connor has shown, Irish Catholics had already been deeply engaged with, and been a major influence upon, the Jansenist controversy from its inception.<sup>12</sup> Indeed, to many of those Irish Catholics, these reformulations had provided just the sort of revitalisation and reframing of Catholicism needed to ease many of those political and confessional tensions that concerned Boyle. Yet, neither Boyle nor his collaborators – despite extensive links to Ireland, clear investment in the 'reform' of its Catholic population, and an apparent interest with the wider Jansenist controversy – were aware of this engagement. Instead, all of them saw the representation of Jansenism to Irish Catholics through the translated preface as a recent, useful novelty easily transferred across confessional soils, evidently ignorant of the existing roots which preceded their efforts. Explaining this blind-spot will, therefore, pose another aim for

---

<sup>12</sup> O'Connor, *Irish Jansenists, 1600-1670*; I. Campbell, 'Power after Machiavelli: Richard Bellings, Reason of State and Jansenism in Seventeenth-Century Ireland', in A. McElligott, L. Chambers, C. Breathnach and C. Lawless, eds., *Power in History: From Medieval Ireland to the Post-Modern World* (Dublin, 2011), pp. 45-62.

this article. It requires looking not only to the media through which these ideas were transmitted, but also to the spaces and structures of power which determined their flow (or stoppage) within and across these regions.<sup>13</sup> Contextualising the Jansenist Preface will mean explaining not only why ideas about Jansenists and Jansenism at large had moved, but how and through whom. These maps of connection and exchange were created not only by scholars like Boyle, but by highly-mobile exiles, itinerant clergy, foreign emissaries, and displaced peoples whose relationships with European confessional cultures shaped subsequent renditions of Jansenism and the purposes which it (or they) served.

Tracing the wider geography of the Jansenist Preface both deepens and broadens historiographical debates increasingly concerned with the interstices of mobility, religious culture, and encounter. Already evident is the relevance of these efforts to a rapidly-expanding historiography on the broader 'European' dimensions of Britain and Ireland's experience of reformation. The apparent interest in Jansenism among Boyle and his collaborators not only calls into question the insularity of religious cultures within the Three Kingdoms, but also the cross-fertilisations made possible across confessional boundaries (however permeable, permanent, or transparent they proved to be).<sup>14</sup> Closer attention to the nascent interests in Jansenism from the 1650s onwards and the forms of French Catholicism in which it took root help to complicate superficial confessional divisions often imposed on this period. It suggests, for instance, that such shifts as Steve Pincus's 'Gallican moment' of the 1680s have an older and more complex pedigree. Far from a moment of Catholic 'modernity' born only in the turmoil of the late-Restoration crises, interest in the 'grey areas' of European confessional

<sup>13</sup> T. Cresswell, *On the Move: Mobility in the Modern Western World* (London, 2006), p. 4.

<sup>14</sup> G. Glickman, 'Christian Reunion, the Anglo-French Alliance and the English Catholic Imagination, 1660–72', *ante*, cxxviii (2013), pp. 263–91; Claydon, *Europe and the Making of England, 1660–1760*; M. Questier, *Catholicism and Community in Early Modern England: Politics, Aristocratic Patronage and Religion, c.1550–1640* (Cambridge, 2006); T. Ó hAnnracháin, *Catholic Europe, 1592–1648: Centre and Peripheries* (Oxford, 2015).

divisions had a deep, well-established hinterland.<sup>15</sup> This was born not only of moments of cultural encounter, but by the subsequent relating and recreation of what was seen, heard, and deemed worthy of translating at home.

The transmission and subsequent translations of Jansenism also foreground the questionable status of the ‘British Isles’ as a coherent unit of religious discourse. The assumption that the Irish Sea somehow provided a ‘natural’, unimpeded space for Ireland and Britain in both religious matters and cultural connection than the ‘English’ Channel which separated them from (or provided a bridge to) Continental Europe is complicated by the noticeable silences and blind-spots between these regions and cultures which this article will reveal.<sup>16</sup> I suggest that these interstices of power and mobility had as much to do with the shaping of these religious discourses as the supposedly ‘natural’ geographies of political unity or nationhood; that the confessional gaze of many parties in both Ireland and Britain did not prefigure the simplistic east-west axis or binaries of ‘otherness’ which much historical analysis still projects backwards from the eighteenth century. Such historiographical compartmentalisation has not only left historical understanding of Jansenism incomplete, but the wider confessional and cultural terrain across which it spread only partially mapped. Its relative absence from Anglophone historiography beyond theological interest contrasts sharply, for instance, with its long-standing, privileged position in studies of the *ancien régime* in France as part of the revolutionary prelude.<sup>17</sup> Clearly, interest in the Jansenist endeavour spanned confessional and geographical divides; but what onlookers and participants saw, how they saw it, and where they wanted it to go tells us not only about the connections which defined

<sup>15</sup> Pincus, *1688: The First Modern Revolution* (New Haven, 2009), pp. 122-142; L. Colley, *Britons: Forging the Nation 1707-1837* (Yale, 1992); cf. Glickman, *The English Catholic Community, 1688-1745: Politics, Culture and Ideology* (Woodbridge, 2009).

<sup>16</sup> R. Morieux, *Une mer pour deux royaumes: La Manche, frontière franco-anglaise* (Rennes, 2008), ch. 1.

<sup>17</sup> O. Andurand, *La grande affaire: les évêques de France face à l'Unigenitus* (Rennes, 2017); A. Richardt, *Le jansénisme: de Jansénius à la mort de Louis XIV* (Paris, 2011); C. Maire, *De la cause de Dieu à la cause de la nation. Le jansénisme aux XVIIIe siècle* (Paris, 1998).

Formatted: French (France)

Formatted: French (France)



religious culture and (with it) politics in these regions, but also the sorts of ‘connectedness’ – partial, tentative, and awkward as they often proved to be – which both bound and divided the early modern world.<sup>18</sup>

Essential to successive understandings of the Jansenist controversy were the ambiguities of the movement itself. Like ‘Puritanism’ in Britain and Ireland, ‘Jansenism’ was a pejorative term first assigned to those who defended the works of the Dutch theologian and bishop of Ypres, Cornelius Jansen.<sup>19</sup> Jansen’s most influential work, the posthumously-published *Augustinus* (1640), sought above all else to return the Catholic Church to its moral roots in Augustinian conceptions of salvation. God’s grace alone, argued Jansen, was capable of guiding humanity towards salvation; any other apparatus which claimed powers of intercession beyond the grace of God was, in effect, not only dishonest and misguided, but ultimately in denial about humanity’s fundamental corruption. A return to this Augustinian emphasis on divine grace would, according to Jansen, aid in purging the Catholic Church of his day of increasingly bad doctrine and its worldly repercussions. Of particular concern to Jansen was what he perceived to have been the misapplication of physical force and meddling in temporal affairs which, at the time of Jansen’s writing, had perpetuated the sort of confessional conflict which had deeply divided his homeland.<sup>20</sup> The Society of Jesus was found to be particularly guilty of these excesses for what Jansen perceived as deviance verging on heresy: their apparent resuscitation of fifth-century Pelagianism (denying original sin and

<sup>18</sup> S. Subrahmanyam, ‘Connected Histories: Notes towards a Reconfiguration of Early Modern Eurasia’, *Modern Asian Studies*, xxxi (1997), pp. 735–62; M. Werner and B. Zimmermann, ‘Beyond Comparison: Histoire Croisée and the Challenge of Reflexivity’, *History and Theory*, xlv (2006), pp. 30–50.

<sup>19</sup> R. Briggs, *Communities of Belief: Cultural and Social Tension in Early Modern France* (Oxford, 1989), pp. 339–363.

I use ‘Jansenism’ and ‘Jansenist’ here with the understanding that it is not, in itself, a term positively adopted by any of Jansen’s followers. See L. Ceyssens, ‘Que Penser Finalement de l’histoire du Jansénisme et de l’Antijansénisme?’ *Revue d’histoire ecclésiastique*, lxxxviii (1993), pp. 108–30.

<sup>20</sup> G. H. Janssen, *The Dutch Revolt and Catholic Exile in Reformation Europe* (Cambridge, 2014).

upholding salvation through personal – even non-Christian - virtue) and the practise of casuistry (in essence the consideration of moral cases through confessional principle, but tied in anti-Jesuit critiques to allegations of laxity and equivocation) were among Jansen’s chief grievances.<sup>21</sup> In such supposed misinterpretations and applications of doctrine – warped, as Jansen perceived them to have been, around the form of Augustine’s theology – Jansen found a growing portion of the Church which was so malleable on key tenets of faith that it could justify anything: even regicide.<sup>22</sup> Adherents of the Spanish Jesuit Luis de Molina (1535-1600) – referred to as ‘Molinists’ in polemics – would figure prominently in the debates to come, over-emphasising (in the eyes of Jansen and his proponents) free will in the achievement of salvation and, alluringly for interested Protestant parties, the *potestas indirecta* (that is, the capacity to intervene in temporal matters on grounds such as heresy or tyranny) of the papacy.<sup>23</sup> This juxtaposition of reformer-against-Jesuit would loom large in subsequent appropriations and re-appropriations of Jansen’s theology by the onlookers mentioned above.

These concerns for spiritual purity and piety, especially the sinful nature of humanity, subsequently fused with a widespread print debate. This added political heat to the controversy. The pastoral implications of Jansen’s theology were most eloquently articulated by the French theologian and Sorbonne faculty member Antoine Arnauld in his 1643 *De la fréquente communion*.<sup>24</sup> Here, Arnauld provided what Thomas O’Connor has dubbed ‘the first manifesto of French Jansenism’, lending to the theology of Jansen a deep sense of interiority which upheld the corruption of the individual and the need for grace, through contrition, penance and Holy Communion to attain a deeper piety.<sup>25</sup> Arnauld expounded upon the question of popular

<sup>21</sup> Harro Höpfl, *Jesuit Political Thought: The Society of Jesus and the State, c. 1540-1630* (Cambridge, 2004).

<sup>22</sup> Sedgwick, *Jansenism in Seventeenth-Century France*, pp. 48-50..

<sup>23</sup> Höpfl, *Jesuit Political Thought*, chs. 10; 14. Thomas Hobbes, among others, wrote to condemn *potestas indirecta* in this spirit: see M. Terpstra, ‘The Political Theology of Potestas Indirecta’, *Religion, State, and Society*, 41.2 (2013), pp. 133-51.

<sup>24</sup> Arnauld, *De la Fréquente Communion où les Sentimens des Pères* (Paris, 1643).

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid*, pp. 352-3; O’Connor, *Irish Jansenists*, pp. 208-9.

religious practice through a sharp critique of empty acts of devotion posing as contrition and penitence: God alone opened the doors to penitence, and only to those who had thought seriously on their salvation.<sup>26</sup> Concerned with protecting the sanctity of the Eucharist against empty gesture, such assertions again lent themselves, as the *Augustinus* had done, to allegations of disingenuousness against the Church and the Jesuits. By 1643, Arnauld, in collaboration with sympathetic Sorbonne theologians, was writing open attacks on the alleged confessional laxity of the Society of Jesus, most notably his *Théologie Morale des Jésuites* (1643). While these works deepened theological cracks in the façade of the Church, they also, once combined with intensifying political turbulence in France, became socially disruptive. As the Fronde unfolded in the streets of Paris, stories circulated of ejected *curés*, strict penance enforced on parishioners, and scathing critiques of perceived papal and ecclesiastical excess emanating from pulpits across France.<sup>27</sup> Print itself was driven increasingly underground as battles ensued between the state and printers over the control of controversial literature, with Jansenist tracts at the forefront of both sides' concerns.<sup>28</sup> Through these incidents, internecine debate was turned outwards to incorporate popular questions of piety and devotion; moreover, as would become crucial in later appropriations of the controversy, it became all the more political.

That Jansenism ultimately found its firmest roots in France arose from a particular configuration of secular and ecclesiastical power known as Gallicanism, grounded on what were often termed the 'Gallican Liberties'. These were a loosely-defined assortment of rights and privileges largely understood through negotiated ideas of papal autonomy and the relation of the church to the French monarchy.<sup>29</sup> Frequently open to debate on historical, theological,

<sup>26</sup> Arnauld, *De la Fréquente Communion*, p. 87.

<sup>27</sup> Accounts of these sorts of incidents intertwine with much of the literature on the Fronde. Useful examples can be found in O'Connor, *Irish Jansenists*, pp. 207-17; Sedgwick, *Jansenism*, pp. 55-74; R.J. Bonney, 'Cardinal Mazarin and the Great Nobility during the Fronde', *ante*, xcvi (October 1981), pp. 818-33; J. Bergin, *Crown, Church and Episcopate under Louis XIV* (London, 2004), *passim*.

<sup>28</sup> Henri Jean-Martin, *Print, Power, and People in Seventeenth-Century France*, trans. David Gerrard (London, 1993), pp. 389-415.

<sup>29</sup> Bergin, *The Making of the French Episcopate, 1589-1661* (New Haven, 1996), ch. 1, esp. pp. 28-9.

and political grounds, these ancient rights of the French Church – ‘so easy to invoke and so impossible to define’, according to Robin Briggs – hedged papal authority in France through assertions of royal supremacy, conciliarism (that is, the principle of an ecumenical council outweighing the supremacy of the pope), and the ancient jurisdiction of the Church in France.<sup>30</sup> Many of these ‘Gallican Liberties’ had originated in the conciliarist and state-forming traditions of the fifteenth century which, in a connection which did not escape later commentators in Britain and Ireland, had ultimately given weight to the arguments of English reformers in the sixteenth century.<sup>31</sup> That the Liberties found resonance in the course of the French Wars of Religion – particularly as a shield for bishops at odds with the papacy, secular definition of heresy trials, and the lessons of Henri IV’s assassination – also aided immensely in framing them positively for Protestant onlookers.<sup>32</sup>

While the Jansenists of Port Royal were by no means wholly accepted by the Gallican Church, the Gallican clergy resented the impositions of the papacy far more and, in particular, the Jesuits in seeking to root out these heterodoxies. As the temporal and spiritual implications of Jansenist views drew the attention of the papacy and the Society of Jesus, the French Church divided on the matter, with many bristling at the perceived violation of French ecclesiastical autonomy. As Daniella Kostroun has recently shown, the possibility of using Jansenist emphasis on divine grace to divorce Catholics from temporal authority could easily be construed as incitement to rebellion, providing a language with which to oppose the state as effectively as the church.<sup>33</sup> Thus, in 1653, at the prompting of Cardinal Mazarin, the papacy condemned five of the propositions supposed to have been drawn from the *Augustinus* in the

<sup>30</sup> Briggs, *Communities of Belief*, ch. 5.

<sup>31</sup> J.H.M. Salmon, ‘Clovis and Constantine: the uses of history in 16th century Gallicanism’, *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, xli (1990), pp. 584-605; L. Racaut, ‘Anglicanism and Gallicanism: between Rome and Geneva?’, *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte*, xcvi (2005), pp. 198-220.

<sup>32</sup> Bergin, *Making of the French Episcopate*, ch. 9, esp. pp. 338-9; J.H.M. Salmon, *The French Religious Wars in English Political Thought* (London, 1959).

<sup>33</sup> D. Kostroun, *Feminism, Absolutism, and Jansenism* (Cambridge, 2011).

bull *Cum occasione*, declaring four heretical and the fifth false. These condemnations – distilled as they were from a perverse interpretation of the *Augustinus* – reasserted Christian liberty and, in particular, the importance of human action in cooperation with God’s grace. Dense theology aside, this further deepened rifts between Jansen’s supporters, the Church, and the French state. Mazarin himself circulated the encyclical to reluctant French bishops with the hope that they would authenticate the papacy’s reading of *Augustinus*.<sup>34</sup> The French Church divided in its allegiances as Jansenism became associated with subversion: important *frondeurs* opposed to Mazarin were also linked to the emergent Jansenist ‘movement’, with pamphlets circulating through Paris condemning the ‘cabals and intrigues’ of prominent Jansenist sympathisers like Jean-François Paul de Gondi, cardinal de Retz.<sup>35</sup> Moreover, the extension of these debates into print made them more readily available for a wider, interested European audience: both Arnauld’s more fervent anti-Jesuit tracts and Blaise Pascal’s brilliant *Lettres Provinciales* (1656) lent an air of celebrity to Jansenist publications.<sup>36</sup> The sceptical country bumpkin featured in Pascal’s earliest *Lettres* provided the reasoned voice of the ordinary person struggling to comprehend the attacks (and deviance) of the Jesuits. It also proved an immensely popular satire on the perceived excesses of the papacy from an author already renowned for ‘rational’ scientific enquiry.<sup>37</sup> In this Pascal joined Arnauld among Jansenists whose commitment to ‘reason’ through natural philosophy, mathematics, and religious polemic lent an increasingly pan-European air of celebrity with significant allure.<sup>38</sup>

There is a vast literature on these divisions within the Gallican church and, more particularly, the Jansenist debate in France; for the purposes of this article, however, the

<sup>34</sup> Sedgwick, *Jansenism*, pp. 68-71.

<sup>35</sup> Archivio Segreto Vaticano [ASV], Rome, Segretario di Francia, Vol. 108, fos. 118; 272; 279 [Royal Pamphlets against de Retz].

<sup>36</sup> Arnauld, *L’innocence et la vérité défendues contre les calomnies et les faussetez que les Jésuites ont employées en divers libelles* (Paris, 1652).

<sup>37</sup> B. Pascal, *The Provincial Letters* [*Les Lettres Provinciales*] (London, 1967).

<sup>38</sup> F. Delforge, *Les Petites Ecoles de Port Royal, 1637-1660* (Paris, 1685).

essential point remains that these controversies were ambiguous and amorphous. Jansenist writings provided both the scriptural authority and the polemical vigour to ignite reforming sympathies across Europe. The dissemination of the debates in print, as well as the writers' common concern for the daily practices of devotion, made Jansenism an eminently readable and accessible controversy beyond clerical, religious, and learned networks. The decades of tension which ensued provided ample evidence of Jansenism's capacity to subvert, reform, or replenish, depending on how it was read and who was reading it. For contemporaries, this ambiguity made 'Jansenism', in effect, open to a vast array of interpretations: a mirror in which almost any image, however refracted or skewed it may have been, could be found. Especially in the eyes of curious Protestants like Robert Boyle and his colleagues, these were struggles easily populated with a familiar cast of characters: a reforming minority eager to employ vernacular print to spread a godly and more 'rational' message, an overbearing papacy, and the shady manipulations of the old foe, the Jesuits. It became a tale worth telling.

The appearance of the Jansenist controversy within Anglophone discourse was the product of three particular trends of the mid-seventeenth century. First among these was the efflorescence of print following the Civil Wars of the 1640s. It would be reductive to suggest that the 'print revolution' of the 1640s which has so often been cited as a catalyst for rising political awareness drove a similar rise in interest in the 'wider world' as a whole; nevertheless, it provided an ever-broadening space in which essential translations, reportage, and rumour could circulate about foreign controversies as part of a wider 'culture of communication'.<sup>39</sup> Historians seeking to chart the ebb and flow of Francophobia and 'public opinion(s)' in the

---

<sup>39</sup> A. Fox, *Oral and Literate Culture in England, 1500-1700* (Oxford, 2000), p. 336.

Restoration period have pointed to the centrality of print in both informing its readership and hardening prejudices.<sup>40</sup> Narrating and shaping the struggles of the Jansenists grafted easily onto this emergent printed discourse.

Second, as Tony Claydon has emphasised, the mid-seventeenth century witnessed not only a marked increase in British travel through Continental Europe, but also a proliferation of written works and reportage about precisely what there was to see and how it should be read against a broader confessional and cultural geography.<sup>41</sup> This trend is most often observed in relation to ‘tourists’ through Europe, but to this must be added those who, during the experiments of the 1650s and the Restoration backlashes, took refuge on the Continent as exiles. A growing literature has shown that the dislocating practicalities of surviving exile, in particular, could challenge confessional and cultural boundaries in ways that the more culturally-quarantined act of guided travel was not meant to facilitate or encourage.<sup>42</sup> While there had always been a deep-seated connection between the religious cultures of the Three Kingdoms and wider European contexts, the scale and diversity of these movements ensured different returns than before. Interest in, and subsequent manipulations of Jansenism fit neatly, as such, into questions of what such travel ‘brought back’.<sup>43</sup>

Finally, interest in the Jansenist controversy must be seen as a product of a general coalescence in the post-Restoration period around the problem of attaining a meaningful

<sup>40</sup> M. Knights, *Politics and Opinion in Crisis, 1678-81* (Cambridge, 1994); Pincus, 1688; Tony Claydon, *Europe and the Making of England, 1660-1760* (Cambridge, 2007), ch. 1; G. Stedman, *Cultural Exchange in Seventeenth-Century France and England* (Farnham, 2013).

<sup>41</sup> Claydon, *Europe and the Making of England*, ch. 1.

<sup>42</sup> For examples of the extensive literature on ‘tourists’ during this period see, for instance, J. Stoye, *English Travellers Abroad, 1604-1667: Their Influence in English Society and Politics* (New Haven, 1989); A. Games, *The Web of Empire: English Cosmopolitans in an Age of Expansion, 1560-1660* (Oxford, 2008); R. Sweet, *Cities and the Grand Tour: The British in Italy, c.1690-1820* (Cambridge, 2012); R. Ansell, ‘Educational Travel in Protestant Families From Post-Restoration Ireland’, *Historical Journal*, lviii (December 2015), pp. 931-58. On exile see T. Raylor, ‘Exiles, expatriates, and travellers: towards a cultural and intellectual history of the English abroad, 1640-1660’ in P. Major, ed., *Literatures of Exile in the English Revolution and its Aftermath 1640-1690* (Farnham, 2010), pp. 15-43; J. Spohnholz and G. K. Waite, eds., *Exile and Religious Identity, 1500-1800* (London, 2014); M. Williams, *The King’s Irishmen: The Irish in the Exiled Court of Charles II, 1649-1660* (Woodbridge, 2014).

<sup>43</sup> J. Gallagher, ‘The Italian London of John North: Cultural Contact and Linguistic Encounter in Early Modern England’, *Renaissance Quarterly*, lxx (2017), p. 89.

religious settlement in the aftermath of the sectarian divisions of the 1640s and 1650s. This sort of balancing of church and state was by no means a problem unique to the Three Kingdoms: the Westphalia negotiations which closed the Thirty Years War (at least, its major theatre) had brought tensions between doctrinal authority and state power to the forefront of wider political and cultural strife.<sup>44</sup> In Ireland this was most clearly manifested in the mission of Gianbattista Rinuccini, archbishop of Fermo and papal nuncio, whose political and doctrinal interventions as part of these wider European dimensions strained confederate and royalist cooperation during and after the civil wars of the 1640s.<sup>45</sup> In England, these tensions showed as a general state of confessional anxiety blended with an (over)optimistic belief in the capacity of the restored Charles II to make good on his pacifying overtures. While the Established Church sought to clearly demarcate its supremacy over England (less successfully in the rest of the Stuart kingdoms), memories of past loyalties shown by English Catholics in the Civil Wars and a (temporarily) deeper distrust of Protestant dissenters calmed some of these confessional waters. This made unusual crossings between Catholic Europe and the Three Kingdoms plausible, but always subject to suspicion.<sup>46</sup>

Out of this churn arose a strikingly ambivalent reading of both France and French Catholicism well-removed from the more virulent mix of anti-Catholicism and Francophobia which characterised later periods. Protestants travelling in France during the course of the 1640s and 1650s both witnessed first-hand and subsequently recorded their thoughts on fractures between the French Church and the papacy. For instance, the Church of England clergyman John Bargrave, nephew of the Dean of Canterbury, travelled extensively among the convents and churches of France during the 1640s, communicating with Catholics in Latin where, he confessed, his French failed him. His diary notes heated debates with and between

<sup>44</sup> P. Wilson, *Europe's Tragedy: A New History of the Thirty Years War* (London, 2009).

<sup>45</sup> T. Ó hAnnracháin, *Catholic Reformation in Ireland: The Mission of Rinuccini 1645-1649*, (Oxford, 2002).

<sup>46</sup> G. Glickman, 'Christian Reunion', 263-91; Tim Harris, *Restoration: Charles II and His Kingdoms, 1660-1685* (London, 2005).



Parisian Jesuits (among them Scots and Englishmen) regarding vernacular Scripture and the fallibility of the papacy, and attending a Master's disputation at the Jesuit College (though with too many 'interpositions of the French tongue' for his liking).<sup>47</sup> Similarly, in 1659 the Irish Protestant and future diplomat Robert Southwell noted, after extensive travels, the absence of the Inquisition in France through 'the King allowing of noe more of the Ordinances which come from the Pope then [sic] what are compatible with his owne Interest'.<sup>48</sup> In later years Southwell would speak of Antoine Arnauld's 'celebrated' works, despite being embroiled in controversy with the latter's son.<sup>49</sup> Others clearly seized upon the opportunities which exile provided to acquire copies of books by Jansenists, their opponents, and supporters: libraries of exiles from this period later abounded with such works.<sup>50</sup> Reports of the Fronde, often written between exiles and their correspondents at home, were frequently coupled with observations about the autonomy of the French clergy and the condition of the Jansenists.<sup>51</sup> As Cardinal Mazarin allied himself with Cromwell's Protectorate, royalist exiles eagerly tracked the movements of the aforementioned Jansenist sympathiser and *frondeur*, Cardinal de Retz, partly in expectation that he might serve as a powerful Catholic ally for the Stuart cause.<sup>52</sup> These direct encounters with French Catholicism and Catholics produced more concerted efforts to translate what was seen and read for a wider audience; more immediately, they piqued curiosity

<sup>47</sup> Canterbury Cathedral Archives U11/8 John Bargrave Diary, *passim*.

<sup>48</sup> BL Add MSS 58219, 'Diary and commonplace book of travels in France, 1659', fo. 25.

<sup>49</sup> BL Add MSS 38015, fo. 280.

<sup>50</sup> Library acquisitions have been addressed in T. J. Palmer, 'Jansenism, Holy Living and the Church of England: Historical and Comparative Perspectives, c. 1640-1700' (Univ. of Oxford DPhil Thesis, 2015), pp. 68-82.

<sup>51</sup> For instance, Carte Manuscripts, Bodleian Library [hereafter 'Carte MSS'], Vol. 131, fo. 208, Thomas Talbot to the King, 14 April 1656, Paris; Carte MSS.29.312, 'Extract of a Lettre from Paris of ye 10<sup>th</sup> of March 1651 st. no'; Clarendon State Papers [hereafter CISP], Bodleian Library, Oxford, Volume 93, fo. 120, *Memoranda* by Hyde of the addresses to Rome prepared for C.D.R., i.e. de Retz', June [?] 1656; National Library of Ireland, Ormonde Papers MS2324, Volume 24, fos. 27-32, Thomas Talbot to James Butler, marquis of Ormond, 6/16 May 1659, Paris.

<sup>52</sup> Carte.29.312., 'Extract of a Lettre from Paris of ye 10<sup>th</sup> of March 1651 st. no'; HMC *Ormonde NS*, I.302., Bennet to Ormond, 11/21 August 1654, Paris; CISP.57.371., Kingston to 'Mr Lawrence' [Hyde], 7/17 April 1658, Paris.

and, through subsequent circulation, drove further debate about these changes in France and Christendom generally.

Print in England echoed these sentiments beyond the Restoration, praising the apparent ascendancy of a more flexible French Catholicism and (perhaps more important) the perceived weakening of the papacy. An anonymous translation of an (allegedly) French report on the visit of Pope Alexander VII to Paris in 1665 noted that only the laws of France, the principles of the Sorbonne, and the 'low esteem' which the French people for the Pope now kept this 'Spiritual Empire' at bay.<sup>53</sup> Even as the Popish Plot and Exclusion Crisis unfolded, the London press relayed reports of Louis XIV and the French episcopate's joint assertions of the Gallican Liberties. Printers not only passed on translations of the bulls, edicts, and letters which passed between the concerned parties, but narrated with enthusiasm the longer-term struggles of the Bourbons and the French clergy to hold at bay the papacy's apparent attempts at usurpation.<sup>54</sup> Evidently undeterred – or perhaps prompted by – contemporary anti-Catholic sentiments and fears of Jesuit plotting, commentators emphasised the relative moderateness of the Gallican Church. The lay gentleman Stephen Amy, in a 1681 pamphlet defending a recent anti-Catholic treatise by Thomas Barlow, bishop of Lincoln, understood such views on the Gallican Church to be universal, commenting that 'Every Body knows the French Popery is much gentler and more converseable sort of thing than the Spanish, or Italian'. For Amy, such differences helped to explain France's prosperity.<sup>55</sup> But Amy was no sympathiser with Catholicism: recent 'massacres in *Piedmont, France, and Ireland*' were clearly on his mind and should, he noted,

<sup>53</sup> Anon., *A Discourse of a Citizen of Paris* (London, 1665), 'f2-f3'.

<sup>54</sup> Examples include *A Letter Written to the French King* (London, 1680); *The decrees of the Parlement of Paris upon a copy of the Pope's brief of the first of January, 1681* (London, 1681); *The Pope's third breve threatening to excommunicate the most Christian king together with the French clergies reply upon the subject of that breve* (London, 1681); *A Brief Account of the Proceedings of the French Clergy* (London, 1682); Gilbert Burnet, *News from France in a leatter giving a relation of the present state of the difference between the French king and the court of Rome* (London, 1682); Idem, *The letter writ by the last Assembly General of the Clergy of France to the Protestants* (London, 1683).

<sup>55</sup> Amy, *A praefatory discourse to a late pamphlet intituled, A memento for English Protestants* (London, 1681), pp. 14-15.

have prompted any ‘good Protestant’ to condemn them. Nevertheless, he could not deny that French Catholicism was ‘more plyant, and submissive to the Civil Magistrate, and more hospitable to Strangers and Dissenters’.<sup>56</sup> None of these authors failed to grasp the historical value of these debates and summarise them for their Protestant audience: assertions of papal fallibility, even in the cause of upholding a Catholic Bourbon monarch and underpinned by the authority of a Catholic university such as the Sorbonne, could represent a decisive blow against the papacy and Jesuits.

Fascination with Jansenism within England grafted easily onto these rising perceptions of French Catholicism as an increasingly different ‘sort’ than its ‘Romish’ or Spanish counterpart. Again, translations of French controversial publications laid important foundations. Amid the wider turbulence of the 1650s, anonymous translations of Pascal’s *Lettres* managed to find the English press almost instantly, appearing in 1656-7 as *Les Provinciales: or, The Mystery of Jesuitism*, with further additions grafted on in both English and French editions as Pascal’s work trickled across the Channel.<sup>57</sup> Other anonymous translators – including a professed ‘well-wisher to the distressed Church of England’ – provided accounts of Jansenist tensions with the Jesuits and early translations of Arnauld into English.<sup>58</sup> These translations prompted early uses of the Jansenists as exposers of Jesuit hypocrisy: Richard Baxter, for instance, clearly read and deployed the *Provinciales* against ‘Jesuitry’.<sup>59</sup> The French Capuchin Zacharie de Lisieux’s 1660 fusion of theology, history, and geography entitled *Relation du pays de Jansénie* was translated into English in 1668. Lisieux

<sup>56</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 1; 15. Italics original. Amy is here referring to the 1655 Waldensian Massacre and 1641 Irish Rebellion; ‘France’ most likely refers to the St Bartholomew’s Day Massacre of 1572 given later [p. 5] references to Paris.

<sup>57</sup> For instance, in *Additional to the Mystery of Jesuitism* (London, 1658), and *La Théologie des Jésuites et Nouveaux Casuistes* (Cologne, 1667)

<sup>58</sup> [Anon.], *A Journall of Proceedings between the Jansenists and the Jesuits* ([London], 1659); Anon., *The New Heresie of the Jesuits* (London, 1662); [Etienne Agard de Champs], *The secret policy of the Iansenists, and the present state of the Sorbon* (‘Troyes’[?], 1667).

<sup>59</sup> Palmer, ‘Jansenism’, pp. 144-5.

cast the Jansenists as the over-confident and dour occupants of an otherwise lush land located between the neighbouring regions of Libertinia, Desesperia, Calvinia, and a ‘tempestuous sea’ to the south.<sup>60</sup> Most of all, the inhabitants of ‘Jansenia’ were no devotees of the pope, believing that all those who abided by the pope’s declarations were ‘meer simpletons, brainless and heartless People’.<sup>61</sup>

Such ready juxtapositions of ‘rational’ Jansenism against the familiar, ‘irrational’ brand of Catholicism – especially another weapon against Jesuitism and the papacy – prompted the earliest English writings on Jansenism. Only a year after Lisieux’s work, the Congregationalist John Owen wrote in his Preface to Theophilus Gale’s *The True Idea of Jansenisme* that ‘there are very few, amongst us ... who have not taken notice of the discourses and reports concerning Jansenisme’.<sup>62</sup> Noting that this was not merely a religious, but also a civil controversy with real implications for ‘the whole Papal World’, Owen nevertheless lamented that the debate had thus far only been disseminated in theological works ‘in the French tongue ... whereunto the generality of scholars amongst us are strangers’, and in the spheres of the political elite. Taking it upon himself to fill this void, Gale, then resident in the Huguenot stronghold of Caen, assembled one of the first histories of Jansenism in English. Gale recounted the theological foundations in the *Augustinus*, the Jansenists’ ‘moderate and favorable [sic] persuasions about *Church Discipline*’, and their advocacy – crucially, though falsely – of ‘libertie of conscience [sic]’.<sup>63</sup> In the meantime Owen praised Gale’s effort to further disseminate and raise awareness of this Jansenist ‘inroad ... which might open a way to further light and knowledge among the Papists themselves.’<sup>64</sup> In effect, both men saw themselves engaged not only in a translation of

<sup>60</sup> Lisieux, *A Relation of the Country of Jansenia*, pp. 2-3.

<sup>61</sup> *Ibid*, p. 41.

<sup>62</sup> *The True Idea of Jansenisme, both Historick and Dogmatick* (London, 1669), a2r; S.J. Pigney ‘Theophilus Gale (1628-79), Nonconformist Scholar and Intellectual: An Introduction to his Life and Writings’, *The Journal of the United Reformed Church History Society*, vii (October 2005), pp. 407-20

<sup>63</sup> *True Idea*, p. 61; 164.

<sup>64</sup> *Ibid*, a6r.

these controversies for a Protestant audience but, like Boyle and his later collaborators, as conduits for the ‘improvement’ of their own Catholic neighbours through the example of their French counterparts.

Beneath this growing trade in printed translations and exposure of the ‘progress’ of Jansenism against papal power, a broader network of correspondence helped to authenticate these accounts and spur further engagement. Crucially for Boyle’s endeavour, many of the most active participants in these translations and transmissions were seminal figures in the early Royal Society. Their trustworthiness made the Jansenist cause – such as it was represented – all the more appealing. The two figures of particular importance on this front were the Society’s industrious secretary, Henry Oldenburg, and the polymath diarist, John Evelyn.

John Evelyn’s translations of the Jansenist controversy were born of a combination of travel, curiosity, and a sense of religious duty. Evelyn had travelled extensively in France during the 1640s effectively in a state of voluntary exile and was closely affiliated with the exiled royalists in Paris during the Interregnum. His time in Paris, in particular, was one of constant intellectual activity, with numerous book acquisitions, scientific enquiry, and even clandestine religious debates with Catholics like the recent convert Thomas Keightley.<sup>65</sup> As Gillian Darley has shown, Evelyn’s ensuing Francophilia brought about a flurry of works devoted to describing the country, its people, politics, and (crucially) religion.<sup>66</sup> A ‘loose trilogy’ of printed works devoted to these descriptions was intended to counteract what Evelyn perceived to have been an expanding world of ‘charlatan teachers and poor translations’

<sup>65</sup> BL Add MSS.78928.46., Evelyn to John Cosin, 28 July 1651, Paris; Evelyn to Keightley, 25 March 1651, in D. Chambers and D. Galbraith, eds., *The Letterbooks of John Evelyn* [hereafter *Letterbooks*], 2 vols (London, 2014), i, pp. 86-91.

<sup>66</sup> G. Darley, *John Evelyn: Living for Ingenuity* (New Haven, 2006), 115-17; J. Spurr, “‘A Sublime and Noble Service’: John Evelyn and the Church of England” in F. Harris and M. Hunter, eds., *John Evelyn and his Milieu* (London, 2003), pp. 145-63.

muddying these waters and obscuring the apparent truths gleaned from his own observations.<sup>67</sup> His 1652 work *The State of France* was intended as a travel guide for a ‘young gentleman’.<sup>68</sup> It was also an anatomisation of the French body politic in order to establish, with some measure of empirical authority, how it was that France had ‘emerged ... the sole victorious and Flourishing Nation of *Europe*’.<sup>69</sup> Among the most admirable of these qualities were, Evelyn professed, both the relative absence within the French polity of ‘those frequent *Schismatiques* and broachers of ridiculous *Enthusiasms*, as abound amongst us’ and their theological unity with their pastors. Indeed, Evelyn projected that, if not for the secular implications of doing so, many within the French Catholic hierarchy would ‘openly *profess* themselves *Jansenianists* ... so do they come on a great way towards a *Reformation*.’<sup>70</sup> The character of the Catholics of France, Evelyn related, was such that these inclinations toward reformation appeared almost inevitable, they being ‘nothing so precise, secret, and *bigotish* as are either the *Recusants* of *England, Spain, or Italy*.’<sup>71</sup> As previously shown, others echoed this sentiment, pointing to French Catholicism – and, crucially, the Jansenist controversy which had now taken root within it – as a sign of the impending ‘improvement’ of Catholicism among the ‘better papists’ of France.

It was this apparent desire to improve upon these ‘charlatans and poor translations’ that compelled Evelyn to translate and present the writings of the Jansenists to a wider Anglophone audience. To this end, on 2 January 1665 Evelyn noted in his diary ‘This day was publishd by me that part of the *Mystery of Jesuitisme* translat[e]d & collected by me, though without name, containing the *Imaginarie Heresy* with 4 letters & other Pieces.’<sup>72</sup> This combined a number of

<sup>67</sup> Darley, *Evelyn*, p. 116, referring to *The State of France* (London, 1652), *The Character of England* (London, 1659), and *Fumifugium* (1661).

<sup>68</sup> Evelyn, *State of France*, ‘Prefatory Letter’. Italics original.

<sup>69</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 2.

<sup>70</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 82-3. Italics original.

<sup>71</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 80.

<sup>72</sup> Guy de la Bédoyère, ed., *The Diary of John Evelyn* [hereafter *Evelyn Diary*] (Bangor, 1995), p. 141.

works by Antoine Arnauld and Pierre Nicole (a collaborator of Arnauld's) with letters and other commentary intended to frame not only Jansenism, but also the wider divisions of Catholicism in France for an English reading audience.<sup>73</sup> Evelyn, like Oldenburg, positioned these efforts at translation in opposition to expanding papal power in France and Europe generally, writing in his dedicatory epistle of the abuses of the Jesuits and papacy in responding to the reforming tendencies of the Jansenists: a 'hindrance of that glorious Unity' to which Christendom aspired.<sup>74</sup> Lending cultural weight and theological authority to these glosses, Evelyn appended correspondence and translations which he claimed to have collected in his French travels. A 1651 letter, drawn from a French pamphlet, was affixed in which Mademoiselle de Bourbon's own confessor noted the hypocrisy of Rome's stance towards the Jansenists and Gallican Church.<sup>75</sup> Another letter, which Evelyn 'translated out of the French copy', originally condemning a Sorbonne thesis, spoke of the 'pernicious doctrine' of papal infallibility as emanating, yet again, from a Jesuit conspiracy which would undermine the traditional autonomy of the Gallican Church.<sup>76</sup> Evelyn also cited a letter to Rome by the well-known English Catholic controversialist and familiar of the Parisian circle of Marin Mersenne, Thomas White (alias Blacklo), whom Evelyn had likely met in Paris. This excoriated the papacy for allowing the Jesuits to infringe upon the ancient liberties of the French church.<sup>77</sup> Drawing upon these authorities, Evelyn subsequently praised the Sorbonne as 'the greatest Catholic university in our parts of the world', unsurpassed in learning and doctrine, while condemning Rome for innovations which clearly ran 'against the Maximes of the French

<sup>73</sup> Arnauld's *La nouvelle hérésie des Jésuites* (Paris, 1662) and Pierre Nicole, *Lettres de l'hérésie imaginaire* (Paris, 1664).

<sup>74</sup> A. Arnauld [John Evelyn], *Mysteriou tes ayomias, that is, Another Part of the Mystery of Jesuitism or, The New Heresie of the Jesuites* (London, 1664), Epistle Dedicatory, iv.

<sup>75</sup> [Anon.], *La Chaîne du Hercule Gaulois ou les essais continus chrétiens, généalogiques, historiques, politiques et moraux* (Paris, 1651).

<sup>76</sup> *The Substance of the Advocate General's Plea*, in *Another Part of the Mystery*, pp. 242-4.

<sup>77</sup> *Another Part of the Mystery*, p. 231. S. Tutino, *Thomas White and the Blackloists: Between Politics and Theology during the English Civil War* (Aldershot, 2008); B.C. Southgate, 'Covetous of truth': the life and work of Thomas White, 1593-1676 (Dordrecht, 1993), p. 7.

government'.<sup>78</sup> Further translations followed: in 1666, Evelyn published a translation of Pierre Nicole's alluringly-titled *Pernicieuses conséquences de la nouvelle hérésie des Jesuites contre le roy et contre l'estat*. A literal rendering of the title would again have piqued Protestant interest through a familiar cast of villains.<sup>79</sup> In their totality, Evelyn's translations and appendices assembled a wide range of French source material with the explicit aim of not only making the original texts available to readers, but also to provide empirical evidence from 'reasonable' Catholics that the argument of the Jansenists was the legitimate and authoritative one, now justly arrayed against the papacy and – perhaps – heralding reformation.

Evelyn's efforts were met with enthusiasm by friends and commentators eager to see the 'advance' of Jansenism against the impositions of the papacy and the Jesuits. The aforementioned Thomas Barlow, bishop of Lincoln, wrote to Evelyn directly in order to praise 'the pious pains of the Jansenists and yourself'.<sup>80</sup> Barlow added that he, too, had 'perceive[d] by many letters from Paris and other parts of France that the sober French Catholics are strangely alarmed by the extravagant principles and practices of the Jesuits', finding this evidence authenticated by Evelyn's translations.<sup>81</sup> Evelyn himself promoted his publications among a group of friends in a way which left his motives clear. On a visit to Whitehall, Charles II informed Evelyn that he had kept the *Mystery* 'two days in his pocket, read it and encouraged [Evelyn]'.<sup>82</sup> (Though, as I will later show, this was certainly not the King's first encounter with Jansenist literature). Evelyn suspected that Sir Robert Moray – yet another Royal Society polymath and exile during the 1650s – had recommended it to the King.<sup>83</sup> Writing in March

<sup>78</sup> *Another Part of the Mystery*, pp. 244-5.

<sup>79</sup> [Evelyn] *The Pernicious Consequences of the New Heresies of the Jesuites against the King and the State* (London, 1666).

<sup>80</sup> Barlow to Evelyn, 'Queen's College', 21 June 1664, in W. Bray, ed., *Correspondence of John Evelyn F.R.S.* [hereafter *Evelyn Correspondence*], 4 vols. (London 1850-52), iii, p. 143.

<sup>81</sup> Barlow's own connections within scientific circles is worth noting. See Noel Malcolm and Mikko Tolonen, 'The Correspondence of Thomas Hobbes: Some New Items', *The Historical Journal*, li (June 2008), pp. 481-95.

<sup>82</sup> Bray, ed., *Evelyn Correspondence*, i, pp. 411-12.

<sup>83</sup> 26 January 1664/5 in de la Bédoyère, ed., *Evelyn Diary*, p. 142. On Moray, see D. Stevenson, ed., *Letters of Sir Robert Moray to the earl of Kincardine, 1657-73* (Aldershot, 2007).



1666 to John Wilkins, then dean of Ripon and secretary of the Royal Society, Evelyn noted of the *Pernicious Consequences* that ‘I annex an Epistolary Preface ... for their sakes, who, reading the Booke, might possibly conceive the French kings to have ben [sic] the onely persons in danger [from the papacy]’.<sup>84</sup>

Robert Boyle was notified personally by Evelyn of the printing of the *Mystery of Jesuitism* shortly before its publication. This evidently arose out of a sense of common cause in the furthering of ‘religion’: Boyle had also recommended to Evelyn a recently-printed Lithuanian bible out of common interest in universal religion.<sup>85</sup> Evelyn wrote to Boyle with clear intentions, saying:

If my book of architecture do not fall into your hands at Oxford, it will come with my apologie when I have the honour to kisse your hands at London as well as another Part of the *Mysterie of Jesuitisme* which (with some other papers relating to that horrible Iniquity) I have translated, and am now printing at Roystons; but without my name – so little ccredit [sic] there is in these dayes, in doing anything for the interest of Religion.<sup>86</sup>

Professions of frustration on Evelyn’s part over the credit to be gained for acting in the interest of religion belied the fact that he had apparently been asked to produce these translations at the command of Henry Hyde, Lord Cornbury (Catherine of Braganza’s private secretary, later her Lord Chamberlain) and his father, Edward Hyde (earl of Clarendon, Lord Chancellor and, like Evelyn, a former royalist exile). Evelyn had written with a tone of obedience to Cornbury in February 1665 that he was ‘perfectly disposed to serve, even in the greatest of drudgeries, the translation of books’ if for the benefit of the Church.<sup>87</sup> Again, Evelyn presented a copy of the book personally, giving one to Clarendon believing that the latter should see it before it was

<sup>84</sup> Evelyn to ‘the Deane of Ripon’, 12 March 1666, in *Letterbooks*, i, pp. 411-12.

<sup>85</sup> Likely *Pirma kniga Mayžėszaus wadynama Genesis* ([London?], [1660?]), noted in *Letterbooks*, i, p. 349 n. 6.

<sup>86</sup> Evelyn to Boyle, 23 November 1664, in *Letterbooks*, i, pp. 348-9. Richard Royston’s press was Evelyn’s venue of choice for these works and, intriguingly, the press where the anonymous English translations of the *Lettres Provinciales* had been printed. Evelyn later despaired when Royston fled London during the Plague that it would delay the printing of further controversial works. See Evelyn to Cornbury, 9 September 1665, in *Letterbooks*, p. 384.

<sup>87</sup> Evelyn to ‘my Lord Vi[s]count Cornbery’, 9 February 1664/5, in *Letterbooks*, i, pp. 358-60.

made ‘publique’.<sup>88</sup> In this sense, Evelyn’s efforts at translation served multiple purposes, employing them not only to help facilitate the success of Jansenists in their apparent ‘reformation’, but also to enrich the church to which he and his correspondents adhered within a universal conception of Christendom. The Jansenists were, in the view of both Evelyn and his correspondents, to be a central part of this universalising process. Howsoever Evelyn translated this controversy – in conversation, in his correspondence, or in print – he had become essential in the circulation of it.

Oldenburg’s relation of the Jansenist controversy ran largely in parallel to Evelyn’s efforts; his ‘translation’ of them, however, was undertaken through word of mouth and trusted informational networks.<sup>89</sup> Born in Bremen but embedded in British and Irish correspondence networks by virtue of his travels and work as tutor to such prominent nobility as Richard Jones, son of Viscount and Lady Ranelagh, he operated as a source of information on Parisian intellectual developments and the state of Christendom in general. He also functioned as an intermediary for the acquisition of French books and papers.<sup>90</sup> Combined with his unwavering Protestantism, this made Oldenburg’s subsequent fascination with and recounting of the Jansenist controversies authoritative in the view of his correspondents. In June 1660, Oldenburg was informed by an anonymous French Protestant close to the court of Louis XIV – likely a contact from time Oldenburg had spent in the Protestant stronghold of Saumur – of the imminent printing of the Bible into French by the Jansenists (alongside notice of a

<sup>88</sup> Evelyn to ‘Cornbery’, 2 January 1665, in *Letterbooks*, i, pp. 354-5.

<sup>89</sup> On wider cultures of translation, see Peter Burke, ‘The Renaissance Translator as Go-Between’, in Andreas Höfele and Werner von Koppenfels (eds.), *Renaissance Go-Betweens: Cultural Exchange in Early Modern Europe* (Berlin, 2005), pp. 17-31; Peter Burke, *Cultural Hybridity* (London, 2009), pp. 58-9.

<sup>90</sup> Oldenburg kept Robert Boyle abreast of Pascal’s scientific works as well as controversial writings by Antoine Arnauld and anti-Jesuit works: Oldenburg to Boyle, 17 November 1663, London, in A. R. Hall and M. B. Hall, eds., *The Correspondence of Henry Oldenburg* [hereafter *Oldenburg Correspondence*], 13 vols. (Madison, 1965-861), ii, pp. 309-11. Oldenburg himself benefitted from connections to Henri Justel in acquiring the controversial works of Arnauld. See ‘Justel to Oldenburg’, 25 July 1668, *Oldenburg Correspondence*, iv, pp. 567-8.

forthcoming translation of Rabelais).<sup>91</sup> Interest piqued, Oldenburg wrote to Boyle in November 1663 praising the progress of the Jansenists against the Jesuits within a wider reformation context, saying that ‘ye former fall upon ye latter without [sic] mercy, and seem to me to doe ym more mischief yn ever was done to ym by ye whole Body of Protestants since ye reformation’. He afterwards recommended to Boyle works by Antoine Arnauld which, Oldenburg contended, ‘layeth the Popes infallibility ... as flatt, as Protestants could doe’.<sup>92</sup> When the Mons Bible started to appear in 1667 (beginning with the New Testament) and was immediately censured, Oldenburg’s epistolary networks in London and Paris – among them the Huguenot and (by 1681) Royal Society member Henri Justel – suggested that the Sorbonne would be pressed to stifle the Jansenist effort.<sup>93</sup> Nor was Boyle the sole recipient of Oldenburg’s reports on the progress of the Jansenists against the papacy: Sir Joseph Williamson, later the second president of the Royal Society, was told of the scandals in Paris by Oldenburg in December 1667, when the latter remarked with annoyance that ‘The Assembly composed of men learned in the Oriental tongues which was to work on the liberties of the Gallican Church was dismissed yesterday in deference to Rome’, leaving the Jansenists alone to defend their vernacular Bible.<sup>94</sup> Their Bible had, in effect, become a symbol of their efforts to oppose papal intrusion while upholding godly reform; moreover, it was part of a cause which Oldenburg, like Evelyn, felt compelled to share with his correspondents in the cause of universal reformation.

By the latter half of the 1660s, Jansenism was a source of fascination among a growing group of Protestants in Britain. Where initial interest in the Gallican Church and its status within Christendom had fostered a sense of nascent reforming potential among Protestant

<sup>91</sup> ‘---’ to Oldenburg, 22 June 1660, Paris, *Oldenburg Correspondence*, i, 375; *ODNB*, ‘Oldenburg, Henry [Heinrich]’.

<sup>92</sup> Oldenburg to Boyle, 17 November 1663, London, *Oldenburg Correspondence*, ii, pp. 309-11.

<sup>93</sup> Henri Justel to Oldenburg, 25 September 1667, Paris, *Oldenburg Correspondence*, iii, p. 487; For Justel’s connections to the Royal Society, see BL Royal MSS Vol. 7 A.XII.

<sup>94</sup> Oldenburg to Williamson, 7 December 1667, *Oldenburg Correspondence*, iv, pp. 19-20.

onlookers, Jansenism appeared a realisation of it. Acts of translation for the sake of ‘universal religion’ made texts available to the curious (though not necessarily read), and word of mouth consistently placed the Jansenists at the barricades against papal imposition. The controversy represented a seam of curiosity which could be mined by the adventurous and the manipulative alike, implanted and enriched by an expansive network of interested parties whose information (and misinformation) would determine its value in these shifting confessional landscapes.

For all this buzzing of translations and transmissions relating to Jansenism and French Catholicism, however, British Protestants remained strikingly deaf to the longstanding immersion of their Irish Catholic neighbours in those very same controversies. As Thomas O’Connor has shown, Irish Catholics had been intimately engaged with the ‘Jansenist controversy’ from its outset; indeed, they had played important roles within Louvain and the Sorbonne as the controversy was articulated, and as conduits for the transfer of its ideas across Europe (including Ireland itself). In this sense, as O’Connor states, ‘Jansenism’ was not an ‘import’ into Ireland ‘but part of a native response to particular exigencies of public life and church’.<sup>95</sup> However, the perennial Protestant ‘problem’ of Irish Catholic perseverance in the face of persecution and internecine division did not, it seem, extend to an awareness of these involvements with the wider Jansenist controversies. Whatever distorted versions of Jansenism and alternate models of Catholicism may have been moving between Britain and France, the connections between Ireland and Britain were, it seems, insufficient to warrant the attention of such finely-tuned listeners as Boyle, his collaborators, and the like-minded translators and observers already mentioned. Why?

---

<sup>95</sup> O’Connor, *Irish Jansenists*, p. 21.

The answer lies in the particular ways in which Irish Catholics (indeed, Irish Protestants as well) *moved* during the course of these controversies, and the different forms of connection which linked them to Continental Europe at large. Building on and complicating older nationalist narratives, the historiography of early modern Ireland has blossomed in the past decade through the tracing of clergy, scholars, soldiers, merchants, servants, labourers, exiles, and itinerant poor who moved across not only the vast territories of Catholic Europe but on a much broader global plane.<sup>96</sup> An expanding network of colleges devoted to sustaining Catholicism in Ireland, combined with a continuous state of European conflict and the forced dislocation of Irish Catholics in the Civil War and Interregnum periods, provided at once an inducement and a pressure to look outwards.<sup>97</sup> This created what Sean Connolly has described as ‘a mixture of involuntary and often traumatic displacement and the active seizure of new opportunities’ which would see some 350,000 emigrants between 1600 and 1800 drawn from a notably small population, many of whom never returned.<sup>98</sup> This had a profound effect on the ways in which confessional controversies such as Jansenism and ‘reformation’ as a whole circulated into, out of, and across Ireland.

By the late seventeenth century, it was largely incontrovertible – and, in the view of some onlookers, frustratingly unavoidable – that the Catholics of Ireland were highly mobile. From the perspective of suspicious Protestants on both sides of the Irish Sea, Ireland was beset throughout the Restoration period by a constant flux of incoming and outgoing malcontents, fomenting rebellion while sustaining Catholicism there. Thus, the Lord Lieutenant and Protestant magnate James Butler, duke of Ormond, could hear from sympathetic Catholic

<sup>96</sup> For instance, É. Ó Ciosáin, ‘Regrouping in Exile: British Communities in Western France in the Seventeenth Century’ in R. Armstrong and T. Ó hAnnracháin, eds., *Community in Early Modern Ireland* (Dublin, 2006), pp. 133-53; T. O’Connor, *The Irish in Europe, 1580-1815* (Dublin, 2001); Ó. R. Morales, *Ireland and the Spanish Empire, 1600-1825* (Dublin, 2010); I. P. Tostado, *Irish Influence at the Court of Spain in the Seventeenth Century* (Dublin, 2008).

<sup>97</sup> P. O’Connell, ‘The Early-Modern Irish College Network in Iberia, 1590-1800’ in T. O’Connor, ed., *The Irish in Europe: 1580-1815* (Dublin, 2001), pp. 49-64. For displacement during the Civil Wars and Interregnum, see Williams, *The King’s Irishmen* (Woodbridge, 2014).

<sup>98</sup> S. Connolly, *Divided Kingdom: Ireland 1630-1800* (Oxford, 2008), p. 375.

informants in the 1660s that goods were being searched by Lords Justices out of fear for Catholic insurrection: one source noted the sense of paranoia with which ‘horses and arms are sought for in trunks and cabinets, and silver cups are defin[e]d to be chalices’.<sup>99</sup> Fears of French invasion – eagerly stoked by Protestants across the Three Kingdoms as a political device – hinged upon the commonplace understanding that the Catholic clergy of Ireland were both mobile and untrustworthy, eager to bring about a French overthrow of Protestant rule. Informants tracked the movements of suspect Irish clergymen, while politicians on both sides of the Irish Sea noted with exasperation the continuance of foreign ‘seminaries and schools’ which made Catholicism within the Stuart kingdoms ‘impossible totally to extirpate’.<sup>100</sup> Seditious activity in both urban and rural areas of Ireland was traced to ‘forreigne authorities’ and their enduring links within ‘this kingdom’ while merchants passing between the Irish coast and the Bay of Biscay were called upon to detail French troop movements and Irish Catholic activity there.<sup>101</sup> Dublin’s coffee houses were given further sparks for this confessional kindling through inflammatory pamphlets linking Irish Catholics with subversive foreign elements. One such pamphlet pointed, first, to Catholic involvement in the Great Fire of London and, second, anticipated French invasion with ‘express command from Rome’.<sup>102</sup> Elsewhere, letters supposedly written by Catholic clergy – genuine or not – were ‘dropped in the streets’ to foment fears of an impending rebellion.<sup>103</sup>

<sup>99</sup> Carte MSS.214.315, Bellings to Ormond, 21 December 1661.

<sup>100</sup> Carte MSS.51.252., Ormond to Arlington, 26 November 1666, Kilkenny; Carte MSS.51.258., ‘A letter of intelligence in Irish’, 27 October 1666; Carte MSS.35.11., Archer to Ormond, 7 July 1666, London; Carte MSS.118.182-3, Orrery to Archbishop Boyle, 28 February 1679, Castle Martyr; BL Add MSS 29092.47-48., ‘The signall Case & Courage of ye Parliament in its last session, for ye preservation of our Religion against its enemies of ye Church of Rome’ [c. 1680].

<sup>101</sup> Carte MSS.214.261., ‘Observations of ye late deportment of the Irish giving suspition of their intentions to a new rebellion’; Carte MSS.34.269, ‘The Examination of Richard Clarke, Merchant, 19 January 1666/7’; Carte MSS.35.279., ‘The Examination of Patrick Mahon’ [17 Jan 1666/7]. Also see J. Kelly, ‘Disappointing the boundless ambitions of France’: Irish Protestants and the fear of invasion, 1661-1815’, *Studia Hibernica*, xxxvii (2011), pp. 27-105.

<sup>102</sup> Carte MSS.35.386., ‘A Warning to Protestants’ [‘Rec’d 21 April 67’].

<sup>103</sup> A. Creighton, ‘The Remonstrance of December 1661 and Catholic Politics in Restoration Ireland’, *Irish Historical Studies*, xxxiv (May 2004), p. 24.

At once, then, the highly-mobile status of Irish Catholics across Europe both ensured survival and fomented further anxieties among Protestants about their place within this expansive confessional geography. When, for instance, the exigencies of Stuart survival during the royalist exile temporarily lowered confessional barriers, unusual alliances helped to facilitate dialogue. Irish Catholic immersion in the Jansenist controversies was made evident to Charles II from the outset of the exile period. The prolific Parisian print trade facilitated the circulation of tracts documenting the connection of prominent Irish Catholics – including Donough MacCarthy, Lord Muskerry (Ormond's brother-in-law), Richard Bellings (lawyer and former secretary of the Catholic Confederates in the 1640s), and John Callaghan (a Sorbonne theologian) – to the heated debates within the University of Paris.<sup>104</sup> Prominent Irish Catholics with connections to the royalist court undertook – and were condemned by the papacy for – translations of the works of Antoine Arnauld. Richard Bellings is widely believed to have translated Arnauld's *De la fréquente communion* into English. Another translation of the same work by the Dominican Father John Nolan, along with Arnauld's 1645 work *Tradition de l'église sur le sujet de la pénitence et de la communion*, may well have led to the translator being imprisoned in Rome in 1653 for his Jansenist sympathies.<sup>105</sup> Certainly, a sufficient number of these translations were produced that Jansenist writings 'circulate[d] among the expatriate Irish community in Paris'.<sup>106</sup>

<sup>104</sup> Dublin City Library, Gilbert Manuscripts Vol. 260, J.C. O'Callaghan's *Jansenistes Hibernois*. This includes *Lettre de Monsieur Callaghan Docteur en Theologie de la Faculté de Paris & Curé-Prieur de Cour-Cheverny* (Paris, 1652); *Lettre de Monsieur Bellings gendre du Mylord de Mongaret, & Secrétaire d'Estate du Conseil Souverain des Catholiques d'Irlande* (Paris ; January, 1652); *Defense Des Hibernois Disciples de S Augustin O V* (Paris, 1651).

<sup>105</sup> The fate of Nolan's manuscript translations are obscure: H.F. Stewart noted having come across it in Cambridge, but it has since evaded discovery. See H.F. Stewart, 'Notice sur une traduction anglaise inédite de La Fréquente Communion' in *Mélanges de Philologie offerts à Jean-Jacques Salverda de Grave à L'occasion de sa soixante-dixième année par ses amis et ses élèves* (Paris, 1933) pp. 318-23. For Bellings's translation, see O'Connor, *Irish Jansenists*, p. 318.

<sup>106</sup> O'Connor, *Irish Jansenists*, p. 318.

Irish Catholics also proved the primary conduit through which many Protestant royalists subsequently encountered and comprehended those controversies. It seems likely, for instance, that Charles II was introduced to (though may not have read) both Jansenist and anti-Jansenist literature by Irish Catholic connections in Paris and the Low Countries during the 1650s, long before Evelyn's aforementioned efforts.<sup>107</sup> Moreover, as Charles II and the royalist exiles reached out to the clergy and courts of Catholic Europe for aid, positioning over papal supremacy afforded something of a litmus test for hesitant Protestants whose pragmatic need to speak through Catholic intermediaries was tempered by a distrust of overtly 'papist' allegiances.<sup>108</sup> Consequently, those with Jansenist inclinations and connections became central to the royalist diplomatic effort. The aforementioned Father Callaghan, then thoroughly embroiled in the Jansenist debates in Paris, was approached to serve as a royal envoy to Rome alongside fellow Irish Catholic Theobald, Lord Taaffe, to convince the Pope to invite all Catholics to 'lay aside all factions and animosities, [and] joyne together in there [sic] ... Majesties authority'.<sup>109</sup> Bellings, despite having translated these Jansenist materials during his years in Paris, was employed as an envoy to the imperial diet at Ratisbon in February 1655 and later corresponded with papal internuncios in the Low Countries.<sup>110</sup> Lord Muskerry and Sir George Hamilton – both of whom had been explicitly mentioned in Jansenist discourse within Parisian print and whose families resided for a time amongst the Jansenists in Port Royal during the exile – became intermediaries with the Catholic Court in Madrid.<sup>111</sup> Here, the Jansenist networks to which these Irish Catholics were connected ensured their usefulness to the royalist

<sup>107</sup> See, for instance, CISP.52.164, Father Peter Talbot to Ormond, 12 August 1656, Brussels.

<sup>108</sup> See Williams, *The King's Irishmen*, ch. 4.

<sup>109</sup> CISP.93.107-110., 'Draft by Hyde of Instructions by Charles II', April 1653.

<sup>110</sup> BL Add MSS 15856, fo. 49b, 'Procuracion for Richard Belinge', 23 February 1655, Cologne; 'De Vecchi à Rospigliosi, Br[ussels], 7 Oct 1656', in V. Busin, ed., *La Correspondance de Girolamo di Vecchi Internonce aux Pays-Bas (1656-1665)* (Brussels, 1999), p. 60.

<sup>111</sup> Hamilton had married Ormond's sister, Mary, in 1629. CISP.54.177., Copy of a commission from the King to Muskerry and Sir G[eorge] H[amilton], 'April 1657'; CISP.56.174., Muskerry and Hamilton to Ormond, 31 October 1657, Madrid; Clark, *Strangers and Sojourners*, pp. 41-2.



cause, seemingly bridging utility with a sense of Catholicism made congenial to Protestant anxieties through these ongoing disputes with the papacy.

The Restoration afforded a fleeting prospect for Irish Catholics and suspicious Protestant onlookers alike to employ these glimpses of alternate ‘Catholicisms’ to constructive ends. The apparent loyalty of many Irish Catholics to the Stuart crown in the course of the previous decades (increasingly countered by Protestant remembrances of the 1641 Rising) offered an opportunity to redefine the place of Catholicism within the Three Kingdoms; in many respects, the models which the Jansenist controversy and Gallican Church in which so much of it had been set lent theological and – crucially – profitable weight which could bend Protestant ears by providing exemplars of ‘moderate’ Catholicism.<sup>112</sup> What became known as the Irish Remonstrance took form through the efforts of the now-familiar Richard Bellings and Father Peter Walsh, a Franciscan who (again) had been deeply embedded in the politics of the Sorbonne and had remained close to Ormond and the royalist exiles throughout the 1650s. Where Bellings’ Jansenist inclinations appear relatively transparent, Walsh’s position reflected the ambiguity of the age: he had dedicated his theses at Louvain to Cornelius Jansen decades earlier amid a wider Irish Catholic engagement with the latter’s followers at the university, and readily acknowledged having read works like the *Augustinus*. He fell short of open affiliation.<sup>113</sup> What he shared with Bellings and others, however, was a desire to resolve questions of spiritual and temporal authority. With Ormond appointed as Lord Lieutenant of Ireland from 1661 and sympathy seemingly on the horizon, Bellings drafted an oath which set out a formula of temporal obedience to a Protestant monarch, aiming at the resolution of the question of spiritual and temporal supremacy. The arguments which followed were, as Anne Creighton has shown, ‘essentially Gallican’, drawing from Walsh and Bellings’s own

<sup>112</sup> For 1641, see T. Barnard, ‘The uses of 23 October 1641 and Irish Protestant celebration’, *ante*, cvi (1991), pp. 889-920.

<sup>113</sup> Though, as Ruth Clark has noted, this has not prevented Catholic historians from ‘tarring’ Walsh with the Jansenist brush. See Clark, *Strangers and Sojourners*, p. 207.

experiences with the French Church and Jansenist theology and directly applauding Sorbonne defences of Louis XIV's supremacy.<sup>114</sup> In effect another act of translation, this was an attempt to use a vocabulary which had seemingly appealed to those who, like Ormond and Charles II, had witnessed a different Catholicism in the 1650s, at a time when it might best be heard.

To this end, proponents of the Remonstrance, having been told by Ormond that the draft required some indication of consensus to gain political traction, began a concerted campaign to acquire signatories among the Catholic clergy and laity. For Ormond, the Remonstrance was likely little more than a cynical political ploy to divide the Catholic clergy and enlist the 'loyal'. Attempts to rally prominent Catholics to the cause extended not only to personal lobbying, but also printed appeals and defences of the Remonstrants' case. Here, again, Remonstrants looked to French Catholicism to provide useful parallels for their audience. For instance, in his 1662 *Loyalty Asserted*, the Franciscan and fellow framer of the Remonstrance, Redmond Caron, lamented

Must we never reflect upon our miseries at home or abroad; or scruple at what our neighbouring friends of the *Gallican* Church do teach and maintain? Or must any subject for private self-interest, discontent, fancy, or pretension, forgo his loyalty to *Caesar* ...?<sup>115</sup>

Caron likewise maintained that Walsh had condemned papal infallibility on grounds 'conformable to the censures of France', and 'for the publick good of an oppressed Religion'.<sup>116</sup> Walsh reminded the more influential Irish Protestants of the wider divisions within Catholic Europe, calling to mind the Gallican examples at hand. In 1662, Walsh wrote to Ormond warning of Irish Catholic opposition to the 'protestation' abroad, but noted that 'in France they can have the least colour', and that the French ambassador in Rome had voiced the Gallican

<sup>114</sup> Creighton, 'Remonstrance', pp. 29-31.

<sup>115</sup> Caron, *Loyalty Asserted, And the late Remonstrance of the Irish Clergy and Layty* [sic] (London, 1662), 61. Caron, too, had been close to the royalists during the exile period. See, for instance, Cambridge University Library Add MSS 533, Henrietta Maria to Monsieur l'Archevêque d'Athènes Nonce de sa Santeté', 23 October 1649, Paris.

<sup>116</sup> *Loyalty Asserted*, pp. 61-2.

Church's interest in supporting the Remonstrance.<sup>117</sup> Adding such international weight to these efforts was clearly seen by the Remonstrants as a means to align their cause with this 'better sort' of Catholic.

While entanglement with these broader confessional debates appeared to provide a possible solution to longstanding issues in Ireland, they also helped to ensure the failure of the Remonstrance. Ambiguities were quickly dissected and polarised. While the Remonstrance ultimately attracted dozens of signatories – both from the 'Gallican and Jansenist Irish faithful' of the previous decades – the apparent proximity of these ideas to the nearly-rebellious French Catholics, combined with deep suspicion of Ormond's motives, galled others.<sup>118</sup> Here, the unorthodoxy and (for some) heresy of Jansenism became a threatening intrusion on the Irish Church, to be named and purged rather than adopted for the sake of facilitating Protestant rule. A meeting of more than one-hundred Catholic clergy in Dublin in 1666 considered the proposals not only in their Gallican terms, but also their heretical Jansenist implications.<sup>119</sup> Papal representatives abroad, attuned to these shifts in Ireland, took care to remind Irish Catholics of their responsibilities. Just as Evelyn was eagerly announcing his Jansenist translations in London, a copy of Pope Alexander VII's 1665 anti-Jansenist formulary was circulated to Catholic clergy in Ireland, helping to remind them of the consequences of drifting too close to such deviance.<sup>120</sup>

The laity was likewise engaged to ensure that they remained unmoved by these overtures. Within a year of the Remonstrance first taking form, rumours reached Walsh that the papal nuncio at Brussels, Girolamo de Vechii (ironically, a key figure in helping the exiles in the 1650s), had personally facilitated the distribution of thousands of letters, 'dispersed throughout all Ireland immediat[e]ly', which informed the laity of the Pope's 'grievous

<sup>117</sup> Carte 222.241-2, Walsh to Ormond, 20 May 1662 [no location given].

<sup>118</sup> O'Connor, *Irish Jansenists*, pp. 338-9.

<sup>119</sup> Clark, *Strangers and Sojourners*, 206-7; O'Connor, *Irish Jansenists*, pp. 342-3.

<sup>120</sup> O'Connor, *Irish Jansenists*, p. 343.

resentment' of the Remonstrance. These encouraged readers (and presumably their listeners) to observe their fidelity to their king but not to be 'drawn into the same error' as some of their clergy. These letters, Walsh noted, 'wrought ... great opposition suddenly'.<sup>121</sup> Walsh also noted with resentment the public disavowal of the Remonstrance in the streets of Ireland: for instance, writing to Ormond in 1666, Walsh despaired of one Father Cian O'Carroll, a Dominican, who preached 'publicly against ye Remonstrance, calling those sign[e]d it heretick & exhorting the people publickly att the altars and in his sermons, rather to dye then [sic] consent to such doctrine'. A whirlwind of rumour enveloped Walsh and the wider Remonstrance cause: for instance, it was suggested that Redmond Moore, prior of Athy, who had recanted his signing of the Remonstrance in exchange for the office.<sup>122</sup> Walsh's *confreres* at Kilkenny had supposedly been kept from supporting the Remonstrance through rumours that their leadership had preached against the Blessed Virgin and that the King was supreme head of the Church. Indeed, some were said to have 'turn[e]d Protestant Minister'.<sup>123</sup> This again smacked of the allegations levelled against the Jansenists, with rumours of conversion and alleged connections to radicals and subversives doing as much to form a coherent opposition as any set text. In effect, many Irish Catholics had, like their Protestant contemporaries, concluded that Jansenists were Protestants in all but name; they had simply arrived at that conclusion by different routes.

For all of this turbulence, however, the Remonstrance and the Jansenist 'moment' in Ireland made little more than a ripple in the consciousness of even the most attentive of English Protestants. The various aforementioned publications intended to vindicate Irish loyalty fell from the London press to an uninterested audience, unable to gain a wider or sympathetic readership. English travellers in Dublin had to approach Walsh directly for a copy of the Remonstrance, unable to find one elsewhere; by 1670, Walsh was sending his only copy to

<sup>121</sup> Carte 221.247., 'Jerome de Vecchiis to the Roman Catholic Clergy of Ireland', 21 July 1662; Carte 221.249, 'Cardinal Francesco Barberini to the Roman Catholics of Ireland', 8 July 1662.

<sup>122</sup> Carte 221.228-9, Walsh to Ormond, 24 November 1666, Dublin.

<sup>123</sup> Carte 221.290., Walsh to Ormond, 24 November 1666, Dublin.

Ormond in London to ensure that a transcript could be made for further circulation.<sup>124</sup> Proponents of the Remonstrance found themselves increasingly on the margins in London. Ormond temporarily fell from grace in the late 1660s as the 1670 Secret Treaty of Dover, which offered Charles II's conversion to Catholicism in exchange for French funds, loomed on the political horizon. Richard Bellings, former translator of Jansenist works and co-author of the Remonstrance, became Master of Requests for Catherine of Braganza: curiously, Evelyn, amid his flurry of translations, would comment to Henry Hyde in 1665 that he longed to see Bellings and Hyde together 'at our poore Villa', but there is little to suggest further collaboration.<sup>125</sup> Bellings would be among the key negotiators in the aforementioned Secret Treaty, but then largely retired from public life, writing a history of the 1640s in his waning years.<sup>126</sup> Amid these shifts, Walsh feebly attempted to convince later Lords Lieutenant of the enduring possibility of melding duty to king and church; his continuing failure to do so, however, left him unable 'to confine the anguish of my soule within my breast'.<sup>127</sup> The influence of Jansenism remained among a small set of Irish Catholic elites for whom alignment with London remained a practical priority. For those who aligned against Walsh and his collaborators, the need to connect across the Irish Sea to sympathetic Protestants was less and less immediate. In Walsh's defeated words, not only the 'discontented Roman Catholic' clergy, but also the 'rude ignorant Rabble' who followed them, were looking to 'the maine authority of the great Pontiff of old Rome'.<sup>128</sup>

In short, the connective tissues which might have facilitated mutual awareness of Jansenism at a time of near concurrent interest across Britain and Ireland either failed to

<sup>124</sup> Carte 221.294, Walsh to Ormond, 30 November 1666, Dublin; Carte 45.391., Walsh to Ormond, [6 August?], 1670.

<sup>125</sup> Evelyn to 'Cornbery', 2 January 1665, in *Letterbooks*, i, pp. 354-5.

<sup>126</sup> Glickman, 'Christian Reunion', *passim*.

<sup>127</sup> BL Lansdowne MSS 242 Collections Relating to Ireland, 'P.W. to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland [the Earl of Essex]', 4 August 1674, London.

<sup>128</sup> *Ibid*.

strengthen or dissolved as movement between them – of print, people, or even rumour – fell short of the mark. Those who looked to exploit it in London fell from grace – effectively ending their role as intermediaries – while perceptions of Irish Catholics as unreformed and rebellious remained the dominant narrative of the London press. Irish Jansenism’s loudest strains through the 1660s did not register in the contemporary translations of Evelyn or the works of Theophilus Gale; nor did it resonate in the ear of the perceptive Oldenburg, proximate though he was to the colleges and theologians who had lent voice to Irish Catholicism years earlier. It remained almost wholly untranslated across these distances. Instead, while the ‘problem’ of Catholicism in Ireland remained in the minds of Protestants on either side of the Irish Sea, eyes remained firmly fixed on France for any prospective solution.

By tracing these threads across decades of engagement with and translation of Jansenism we arrive, finally, at a clear sense of what was to unravel at the moment when the Irish Bible collaborators encountered the ‘real’ Jansenists. Oblivious to these rises and falls in Ireland and convinced of the role now to be played by the Jansenists abroad, Boyle and his team carried on with the process of bringing Jansenist-infused ‘truths’ to Ireland’s Catholics. Through the autumn of 1680, all remained convinced that the Jansenists represented a force for progress in the undermining of papal supremacy in Europe. The Irish Jesuit-turned-Anglican Andrew Sall, whose conversion in the early 1670s had been aggressively condemned by Irish Catholic clergy and driven him to Oxford (where he met Boyle), declared he was ‘not a little joyed to hear so great an advance to right made in the Romish church as to suffer the word of God to come into vulgar tongues’, approving of the Preface idea in the process.<sup>129</sup> Henry Jones,

---

<sup>129</sup> A. Sall, *True Catholic and Apostolic Faith Maintain'd in the Church of England* (Oxford, 1676); Sall to Boyle, 26 October 1680, *Boyle Correspondence*, v, p. 220.

bishop of Meath, who only months earlier had spurred the trial of Oliver Plunkett within the wider ‘Popish Plot’ in Ireland, wrote approvingly of Boyle’s ‘zeal’ for the project, having previously advocated the resurrection of William Bedell’s translation project and published a fiery sermon advocating Irish knowledge of Scripture.<sup>130</sup> Jones encouraged Boyle’s intent ‘in joyning so farre with those of that Perswasion; they drawing toward us, although not closeing with us.’<sup>131</sup> Appropriately, it was an Irish acquaintance of Boyle’s – one Hugh Reilly, who had been born in France – who helped to facilitate the translation by checking the Irish transcription and correcting the press for the printing process.<sup>132</sup>

Further translations, however, produced harsh revelations. In September 1681, Jones began expressing reservations as to the actual views espoused in the Jansenist preface. An immediate source of the problem was that none of the major contributors had actually read the work, instead relying on trusted advice and word of mouth – of the kind provided by Oldenburg, Evelyn, and their contacts – to determine its potential value. Evidently Jones had taken both Boyle and his other collaborators at their word regarding the content of the preface, being ‘a stranger to the French’. Scepticism from the multilingual Sall, however, had given Jones cause to have the work translated and brought to him in English. What followed was, clearly, a shock to Jones. In a letter to his collaborator, Narcissus Marsh, which was then passed on to Boyle, Jones remarked on the ‘harsh reflections’ made in the text upon eminent Protestant reformers esteemed in the Established Church. In another letter to Boyle, Jones fretted that many of these reflections by the Jansenists were ‘a little too severe on protestant Translators [sic], which cannot well be coutenanc’d by us’. ‘A sentence or two’, Jones observed, if translated literally, might ‘savour too much of popery, to pass a protestant press’.<sup>133</sup> Given that the professed aim

<sup>130</sup> Jones, *A Sermon of Antichrist* (Dublin, 1676); J. Gibney, *Ireland and the Popish Plot* (London, 2009).

<sup>131</sup> Jones to Marsh, 1 August 1681, *Boyle Correspondence*, v, pp. 265-6.

<sup>132</sup> For Reilly’s struggles with the translation, see Hugh Reilly to Boyle, 18 September 1682, *Boyle Correspondence*, v, pp. 338-9; Clark, *Strangers and Sojourners*, pp. 146-7.

<sup>133</sup> Jones to [Boyle], 27 August 1681, *Boyle Correspondence*, v, pp. 266-7.

of the translation was to ‘give the world a true Transcript of those the Jansenist prefaces’, this truth seemed wholly inconvenient.<sup>134</sup> Boyle was himself embarrassed in having to admit that he, too, had only read part of the Preface – only ‘here and there’ – before it was borrowed by an acquaintance.<sup>135</sup> This news ran wholly contrary to the reports – spun by the translations, correspondence, and word-of-mouth of previous decades and aided by friends such as Oldenburg and Evelyn – of the Jansenist promise.

Beyond this crisis of translation and the revelation of ‘true’ Jansenism, these surprises also precipitated an immediate repositioning of this effort within the wider confessional geographies of Christendom. Jones expressed sincere concern over both the accuracy of the translation and its potential repercussions if done insensitively: by ‘picking & choosing’ from the Jansenist work, Jones supposed, would they ‘disgust the Jansenists themselves, whom we would indulge’, and in doing so ‘gratify the common adversary’?<sup>136</sup> Boyle himself acknowledged that he, too, had not completely read the preface either; rather, it had been ‘got from me by a person of Quality before I had read more’. Indeed, Boyle acknowledged that he had not recommended it ‘upon [his] owne Judgment’, but rather ‘that of a very Learned & famous Divine & some other persons of eminent parts’.<sup>137</sup> Some of these ‘objections’ were, Boyle claimed, familiar to him beforehand, and he had instructed Reilly to ‘have them obviated in his translation into Irish’; others, however, had only just been brought to his attention.<sup>138</sup> This ground the process of translation – whatever it now was – to an abrupt halt.

With this brought to light, Boyle suggested that the Preface then be used, not in literal translation, but rather impressionistically as the ‘avowed sense’ of various divines of the

<sup>134</sup> Jones to Marsh, 1 August 1681, *Boyle Correspondence*, v, pp. 265-6. Jones to [Boyle], 27 August 1681, *Boyle Correspondence*, v, pp. 266-7.

<sup>135</sup> [Boyle] to [Jones], [27 September 1681] *Boyle Correspondence*, v, pp. 268-70.

<sup>136</sup> Jones to Marsh, 1 August 1681, *Boyle Correspondence*, v, pp. 265-6.

<sup>137</sup> [Boyle] to [Jones], [27 September 1681], *Boyle Correspondence*, v, pp. 268-70.

<sup>138</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 269.



Catholic Church praising the translation of Scripture into vulgar tongues.<sup>139</sup> This would, as such, accomplish the task of both providing models of ‘better papists’ for their Irish readership to follow while also, once again, manipulating these connections to suit immediate needs and avoid inconveniences. When the New Testament finally appeared in Irish in late 1681, it was this impression which was given to the supposed Irish readership, rather than the literal words of the Jansenists: namely, that ‘the Learned Doctors of Divinity of the University of Paris’ – not the Jansenists, by name – had printed the Bible in French in order to ensure that all, whether literate or not, might learn Scripture.<sup>140</sup> This final Preface, penned by Sall in English, was a clear attempt to ease Protestant anxieties while still translating a more ‘rational’ Catholicism, as it neither misrepresented their would-be Jansenist allies nor negated the possibility of representing to the Catholics of Ireland an authoritative shift towards ‘rationalism’ among their Continental brethren. This, it was hoped, the Catholics of Ireland would naturally be inclined to follow.

Though stripped of clear reference to the Jansenist controversy, the final Preface retained elements of the broader cultural and confessional interests which had driven the enterprise, offering yet another translation of Jansenism in the process. For instance, the University of Paris was cited as a means of lending scholarly credentials to the enterprise, as Evelyn and Oldenburg had both done in the course of their endeavours in the early 1660s. Nevertheless, it remained clear to those engaged in the project that this longer-term interest in and support of Jansenist efforts had relied upon a system of knowledge and information transfer which was far from perfect. Rather, when Boyle finally lent time to engaging with the actual substance of Jansenist polemic and its place within wider French religious and political culture, he had been suddenly and rudely made aware of the refractions and translations which had

---

<sup>139</sup> Ibid, pp. 268-70.

<sup>140</sup> ‘To the Christian People of Ireland, The Preface’ (London, 1681).

given rise to his own knowledge of the subject. In the process, both he and his collaborators were made to question and reconstruct not only the connections and disconnects which had made this possible, but also re-assess those which they wished to create.

Fascination with the Jansenist controversy within the Three Kingdoms lasted well beyond the scope of this singular moment of translation and the particularities of the post-Restoration political and cultural scene.<sup>141</sup> Amid the apparent ‘settlement’ of the Williamite regime and the further marginalising of Catholic public life, many Catholics remained key participants in debates over the Jansenist example.<sup>142</sup> In 1702, the printing of the *Cas de conscience* in France reinvigorated debates about papal infallibility and absolution, drawing the attention of the Sorbonne. The pamphlet itself would, like its many predecessors in the controversy, be translated into English in 1703.<sup>143</sup> The 1713 papal bull *Unigenitus* once again condemned key propositions of a resurgent Jansenism now embodied in the writings of the theologian Pasquier Quesnel. Three editions of the bull were published in English within the following year.<sup>144</sup> Spurred by such shifts, English and Irish Catholics remained entrenched participants in these debates across confessional spaces. Irish Catholics like Matthew Barnewall were imprisoned in the Bastille for reputedly circulating Jansenist literature, including vernacular copies of the New Testament to the diocese of Senlis in Northern France.<sup>145</sup> The English Catholic Sylvester Jenks, elevated in 1711 to the bishopric of the Northern District, published in 1710 his *Short Review of the Book of Jansenius*. Oddly, this

<sup>141</sup> Pincus, *1688*, pp. 122–42.

<sup>142</sup> Glickman, *English Catholic Community*, esp. ch. 5.

<sup>143</sup> Anon., *A case of conscience, propos'd to, and decided by forty doctors of the faculty at Paris, in favour of Jansenism* (London, 1703).

<sup>144</sup> Clark, *Strangers and Sojourners*, p. 260.

<sup>145</sup> M. Lyons, ‘The Interrogation of Matthew Barnewall, an Irish Jansenist Imprisoned in the Bastille, 1712–13’, *Archivium Hibernicum*, lix (2005), 79–89, esp. p. 88.

was apparently born of fears for an imminent ‘Jansenian invasion from Holland’. While condemnatory towards Jansenism, Jenks nevertheless lamented, as many before him now appear to have done, that Jansenism remained ‘so universally talk’d of, and so little understood’.<sup>146</sup> Writing to the Jesuit (and again, translator of anti-Jansenist literature into English) Thomas Fairfax, Jenks remarked that he had written as an ‘antidote’ to the recent flood of imported books from Holland defending the ‘heresy’. While rumours of all English Catholic clergy turning Jansenist were unwarranted, fears persisted that the Jansenists abroad would ‘heartily laugh at us’ if they tripped over questions of heresy and orthodoxy.<sup>147</sup> Like Boyle and his collaborators, there remained concern not only for looking beyond, but also for being watched from abroad.

A persistent fog remained to distort and direct these translations across confessional geographies. Protestant onlookers continued to marvel at the progress of Jansenism against both the strictures of the papacy and the oppressions of Louis XIV (who now saw the controversy as a conspiracy to topple his monarchy).<sup>148</sup> Updates to English readers kept them abreast of the controversies, but continued to cast Jansenists as proto-reformers and anti-papists.<sup>149</sup> Further translations of Pascal and Quesnel followed. The latter was now elevated by his English translator, like his Jansenist forebears decades earlier, as the ‘Present Luther of France’.<sup>150</sup> The ‘Gallican’ correspondence of the Archbishop of Canterbury, William Wake, was in no small part driven by an ongoing interest in the Jansenist controversy. The death of Louis XIV in 1715 and the onset of the regency of the Duke of Orléans once again brought

<sup>146</sup> Jenks, *Short Review* (London [?], 1710). Preface.

<sup>147</sup> Ushaw College Library, Durham, UC/M1/84, Letters by Sylvester Jenks to Thomas Fairfax (SJ), 1711, *passim*. Fairfax was the likely translator of *A Case of Conscience*.

<sup>148</sup> W. Doyle, *Jansenism: Catholic resistance to authority from the Reformation to the French Revolution* (Basingstoke, 2000), p. 43.

<sup>149</sup> Anon., *A Brief Abstract of the Memorial Concerning The State and Progress of Jansenism in Holland* (London, 1703).

<sup>150</sup> Anon., *The Pope’s Bull, condemning the New Testament, with Moral Reflections, done by Father Quesnel, the Present Luther of France* (London, 1714); B.M., *Thoughts on Religion and other Subjects by Monsieur Pascal* (London, 1704).

about a shift towards the reassertion of Gallican liberties, led by the Sorbonne, which captured Wake's interest. Appropriately for this discussion, one of the *appellants* who led this charge was the Irish Dr Patrick Piers de Girardin, who subsequently employed connections with the British envoy in France to open channels of negotiation for an Anglo-French ecclesiastical union.<sup>151</sup> Here, again, Irish Catholic connections in France intertwined with English Protestant curiosity: encouraged by favourable correspondence with Wake, Girardin travelled to England in the 1720s, advocating the regent's support for the Jansenists and spinning a wider 'anti-Roman' vision. This ultimately earned Girardin a reputation not only for being a spy, but also a Jansenist or – notably again – a Protestant.<sup>152</sup> These overtures collapsed alongside Girardin's estrangement from the French ecclesiastical establishment; however, Wake's interest in the Gallican example remained in place throughout the 1720s, again (or still) spurred on by the possibility of narrowing gaps which had been noticed, lamented, and yet persisted for more than seventy years.<sup>153</sup>

'Gaps' such as these, the opportunities taken to bridge them, and the topographies of culture, language, and information which determined their place in the imagination of those involved, ultimately speak to the unbalanced and unstable connections which defined this period. Looking at the many manifestations of Jansenism across these regions not only charts the multiple meanings ascribed to what was, from the outset, an ambiguous assemblage of ideas, but poses important questions about how these connections operated. In these examples, Jansenism functioned as a means to 'remedy' religious division; as a borrowed, then translated language through which to exert power and encourage the 'improvement' of those perceived to be insufficiently 'reformed'; and as a nearby reference point from which to orient and re-

<sup>151</sup> J. M. Gres-Gayer, 'An Irish Opportunist in Paris: Dr Piers de Girardin', in N. Aston, ed., *Religious change in Europe, 1650-1914* (Oxford, 1997), p. 61.

<sup>152</sup> Ibid, pp. 65-9.

<sup>153</sup> L. Adams, ed., *William Wake's Gallican Correspondence and Related Documents 1716-1731*, 7 vols. (New York, 1988-1993).

orient Europe and Christendom as a whole. All of these representations were reliant upon the sort of cosmopolitan connections which now comprise so much of early modern historiography: not only the translations and correspondences of élites, but the movement of texts, migrants, merchants, and exiles whose positions across a range of social and cultural backgrounds shifted the mirrors through which Jansenism was viewed. As this article has revealed, however, these various cosmopolitan encounters also produced what Sanjay Subrahmanyam has termed ‘friction and discomfort’ in the process as individuals and communities confronted the realities of their position: misunderstandings, diverse translations, and the creative reappraisals they engendered.<sup>154</sup> As Boyle’s efforts suggest, neither the act of looking outwards nor its products were neutral stances, often giving rise to new expressions of power rather than cosmopolitan consensus. Indeed, these engagements could clearly undercut or constrain one another. However, that interest in Jansenism persisted in Britain and Ireland during a period traditionally associated with hardening prejudices and deepening, irrevocable confessional divides suggests a constant state of reorientation, made uneasy by changing boundaries and constantly challenged by the realities of a mobile world. The place of Jansenism in these wider debates suggests that, well into the eighteenth century, there remained many different, ongoing translations of reformation.

---

<sup>154</sup> S. Subrahmanyam, *Three Ways to be Alien: Travels and Encounters in the Early Modern World* (London, 2011), p. 173.