

THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA

Gallican Vision, Anglican Perspectives:
The Reception of the Works of Louis Ellies Du Pin into England

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to the Faculty of the
School of Theology and Religious Studies
Of The Catholic University of America
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

©

Copyright

All Rights Reserved

By

Dennis R. Di Mauro

Washington, D.C.

2012

Gallican Vision, Anglican Perspectives:
The Reception of the Works of Louis Ellies Du Pin into England

Dennis R. Di Mauro, Ph.D.

Director: Jacques M. Grès-Gayer, D. Hist., D. Theo.
Acting Director: Nelson H. Minnich, Ph.D.

This dissertation examines the twenty-seven English editions of famed Gallican church historian Louis Ellies Du Pin. While Du Pin's life and works have been extensively researched by Grès-Gayer, his English translations, and reactions to them, have never been fully studied. The research takes an in-depth look at his Protestant editors' comments, as well as those of other prominent scholars who cite Du Pin's works in their own. Their varied depictions of Du Pin include: Protestant sympathizer, pre-enlightenment scholar, and a staunch Catholic. The dissertation includes English Catholic reactions to Du Pin as a traitor to the Catholic cause and a closet Jansenist. Was the "English Du Pin" the Real Du Pin? The conclusion explains how the English misunderstood him, and explores the many facets of the real scholar: a debunker of ancient forgeries, an agenda-driven Gallican, and a clumsy ecumenist.

This dissertation by Dennis R. Di Mauro fulfills the requirement for the doctoral degree in church history approved by Jacques M. Grès-Gayer, D. Hist., D. Theo., as Director, Nelson H. Minnich, Ph.D. as Acting Director, and Joseph M. White, Ph. D., and Michael Root, Ph. D., as Readers.

Fr. Jacques M. Grès-Gayer, D. Hist., D. Theo.,
Dissertation Director,
Rev. Mark Morozowich, Acting Dean,
on behalf of Fr. Grès-Gayer

Nelson H. Minnich, Ph. D., Acting Director

Joseph M. White, Ph. D., Reader

Michael Root, Ph. D., Reader

...as long as he never suffers the Sorbonist to break in upon the Historian, his Writings carry an Authority with them, greater than they could have done had they come from a Protestant. Truth, I confess, is the same whoever speaks it; yet all Men grant, that it carries a more Convictive Force along with it, when extorted from those whose Ingenuity over-bears their Interest, than when it freely comes from men that advance their Cause by telling it.

-William Wotton

Acknowledgements

Without the work of so many devoted scholars, this work would not have been possible.

First, I thank my advisor, Dr. Jacques Grès-Gayer, whose support and encouragement has been invaluable through my years at the Catholic University of America. To a large extent, this work is a continuation of his lifelong work on Du Pin and Gallicanism.

Together, we pondered the questions of Du Pin's life and work, some of which we were able to answer. I hope that this addition on Du Pin's English works helps fill a small gap in Dr. Grès-Gayer's scholarship. Second, I thank Dr. Nelson Minnich, who graciously stepped into the director's role during Dr. Grès-Gayer's illness. Dr. Minnich, whose classes are somewhat legendary at the university, stressed competence in languages and the importance of substantiating conclusions. I am confident that these basics will serve me well in future academic research. Third, a great deal of thanks goes to Dr. Joseph M. White who gave the dissertation a thoughtful reading and made useful suggestions in the areas of print culture and patristic scholarship. His assistance at the final phases of this dissertation was in a class by itself. Fourth, I also thank Dr. Michael Root for assisting as reader during Dr. Grès-Gayer's absence. His expertise in ecumenism and Anglican history helped avoid a number of errors.

I also thank those who made this research a pleasure: Lenore Rouse and the staff of Catholic University of America Rare Books and Special Collections; Karen O'Connell and the staff of the Rare Book Collection at Lauinger Library, Georgetown University;

and Anne Marie Menta, Graham Sheriff and the staff of the Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library at Yale University.

Finally, I thank my wife Coco, and my daughters, Zoey, Lucy, and Veronica. While I certainly sacrificed a great deal to complete this project, I realize that in many ways you sacrificed even more. Your love, encouragement, and support made all this possible. I promise that this is my first and last Ph.D. Remind me once in a while to make it up to you.

Table of Contents

Abbreviations	ix
Introduction.....	1
Gallicanism	3
History of Print Culture	6
Organizing the Reactions to Du Pin's English Editions	12
Chapter I: Du Pin Background.....	16
<i>A Vitae Brevis</i> of Louis Ellies Du Pin	16
France and the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes.....	21
The Times in England: James II	25
William and Mary	29
Anne.....	36
George I	38
Chapter 2: Du Pin in England	41
Du Pin's First English Edition: <i>De Antiqua Ecclesiae Disciplina Dissertationes Historicae</i>	41
<i>A New History of Ecclesiastical Writers</i>	46
<i>A Compleat History of the Canons and Writers, of the Books of the Old and New Testament</i>	63
<i>A New Ecclesiastical History of Sixteenth Century</i>	65
<i>A New Ecclesiastical History of Seventeenth Century</i>	74
1722 Dublin edition of the <i>New History</i>	78
Other Works Published in England.....	80
Chapter 3: Du Pin the Reformer	95
French Polemical Works.....	95
Catholic/Protestant Polemical Debates in England and Intra-Protestant Debates Over Polity	98
How History was used in Intra-Protestant Debates in England and the Failure in Recognizing Du Pin's Gallican Agenda	103
Prefaces of Du Pin's English Editions	105

Edward Stillingfleet	107
William Fleetwood.....	111
Edward Gee.....	117
Joseph Bingham	121
Thomas Brett.....	130
The Elder and Younger Edwards Synge.....	134
<i>Bibliothèque des auteurs separez de la communion de l'Église romaine</i>	140
Subscribers of the 1722 Dublin Edition of the <i>New History</i>	143
Polemical Uses of Du Pin's Scholarship	146
Chapter 4 – Du Pin the Heretic	149
The Gallican and Jansenist Causes	149
English Protestant and Catholic Views on Jansenism	155
A Protestant Defender?	160
Case of Conscience	161
<i>Two Letters with Some Remarks upon the Fourth Tome of the English Edition of</i> <i>Lewis Du Pin's Compendious History of the Church</i>	165
<i>Monsieur Du Pin's Motives and Reasons, In Defense of Cardinal de Noailles (The</i> <i>Archbishop of Paris) His Appeal to a General Council</i>	170
English Catholic Attitudes on Du Pin's Works	177
Chapter 5: Du Pin the Catholic	179
How Du Pin's Catholic Biases Were Nearly Uniformly Excused.....	179
<i>Jesus the Son of David</i>	182
Was Du Pin Viewed as an Orthodox Catholic?	196
Chapter 6: Du Pin the Gallican	198
How Du Pin Used his History to Sustain Gallican Ecclesiology and the <i>Condemnation of Monsieur Du Pin</i>	198
William Wotton	201
Digby Cotes	203
Stillingfleet, Fleetwood, Bingham, and Synge	204
Catholic Works	207
<i>The Genuine Epistles of St. Ignatius</i>	209
Were Du Pin's Gallican Views Used to Support English Agendas?	214

Chapter 7: Du Pin the Pre-Enlightenment Scholar	216
European Demand for Pre-Enlightenment Works	216
Ease of Use	217
Were Du Pin's Views on the Authority of Patristic Texts Consistent with Anglican Views?.....	218
Republic of Letters.....	220
Sources which Testify to Du Pin's Academic Esteem in England	222
Catholic Detractors	223
Editors' Esteem for Du Pin's Scholarship	230
Citations from Protestant Theologians and Historians	233
Works of Du Pin in British Libraries and Book Sales	243
Use of Du Pin's Work in British Biblical Studies (to include Studies of Josephus' History)	247
Protestant English Views on Du Pin's Academic Integrity	255
Did Du Pin's Irenic Reputation Enhance his Academic Credentials?	256
Ecumenical in his Own Mind	273
Conclusion	277
Reasons for Du Pin's Acceptance in England	277
Was the "English Du Pin" the Real Du Pin?	282
Bibliography	285
Original Sources.....	285
Secondary Works	295
Bibliographies, Catalogs, and Dictionaries.....	301

Abbreviations

AASA	Edmund Elys. “An Answer to Six Arguments” (1700)
ATD	Edward Synge. <i>The Archbishop of Tuam's Defence</i> (1729)
BAS	<i>Bibliothèque des auteurs separez</i> (1718)
BP	Thomas Bray. <i>Biblioteca Parochialis</i> (1707)
CC	<i>A Case of Conscience</i> (1703)
CHC13	<i>A Compendious History of the Church</i> (1713)
CH99	<i>A Compleat History of the Canons and Writers</i> (1699)
CMSD20	<i>A Compleat Method of Studying Divinity</i> (1720)
Commonitorium	“Commonitorium” (1718)
Condemnation	de Champvallon. <i>The Condemnation of Monsieur Du Pin</i> (1696)
CPL	Thomas Brett. <i>A Collection of the Principal Liturgies</i> (1720)
Disciplina	<i>De Antiqua Ecclesiae Disciplina Dissertationes Historicae</i> (London, 1691)
GESI	Ignatius of Antioch. <i>The Genuine Epistles of St. Ignatius</i> (1708)
HRS	Abbot of Vertot. <i>The History of the Revolutions in Spain</i> (1724)
Imitation	Thomas à Kempis. <i>The Christian Pattern: or, the Imitation of Jesus Christ</i> (1710)
JSD	<i>Jesus, the Son of David</i> (1730)
MDPMR	<i>Monsieur Du Pin's Motives and Reasons</i> (1718)
NH22	<i>A New History of Ecclesiastical Writers</i> (1722)
NH93	<i>A New History of Ecclesiastical Writers</i> (1693)
NH99	<i>A New History of Ecclesiastical Writers</i> (1699)
OE	Joseph Bingham. <i>Origines Ecclesiasticae</i> (1711)
Seventeenth C. 1725	<i>A New Ecclesiastical History of Seventeenth Century</i> (1725)
Sixteenth C. 1703	<i>A New Ecclesiastical History of Sixteenth Century</i> (1703)
Sixteenth C. 1706	<i>A New Ecclesiastical History of Sixteenth Century</i> (1706)
TL	<i>Two Letters</i> (1717)
ULH09	<i>Universal Library of Historians</i> (1709)

Introduction

Sébastien Le Nain Tillemont, the famous Jansenist author of *Memoires pour server a l'histoire ecclésiastique des six premiers siècles* (1693), wrote that, “All of my science, and maybe also all of my vocation, is merely for the clarification of the facts of the first centuries [of the Church].”¹ Indeed, Tillemont and a group of international contemporaries such as Louis Ellies Du Pin, Claude Fleury, William Cave, and James Ussher laid the groundwork for the widespread belief in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries that the writings of the fathers, and especially the canons of the first four ecumenical councils, were the bases of “true” Christian faith and practice. This new historical understanding led to creation of an academic and devotional movement which sought to recreate the primitive Church through strict adherence to Christian morality, the reintroduction of penitential practices, and an emphasis on religious experience.²

Jansenists and staunch Gallicans like Du Pin used this historical research to question the foundations of the papacy. It was hoped that an understanding of Christian life practiced in the first centuries might dispel the prejudices that Catholic and Protestant Christians had for each other and could thereby lead to new opportunities for Christian unity based on the practices of these “pure” centuries of the early Church.³

¹ “*Toute ma science, et peut être aussi toute ma vocation, se borne à l'éclaircissement des faits des premiers siècles,*” cited in Bruno Neveu, *Erudition et religion* (Paris:Albin Michel, 1994), 334; Sébastien Le Nain Tillemont, *Memoires pour server a l'histoire ecclésiastique des six premiers siècles* (Paris : Robustel, 1693).

² Neveu, 334, 339, 344, 347-348.

³ Ibid., 339, 341.

Following in the footsteps of the Bollandists and Maurists and other critical church historians of the early seventeenth century, Louis Ellies Du Pin amassed a huge body of work devoted to unlocking the Church's history, while at the same time furthering his own Gallican vision. These works were marketed in his native France and across Europe, and especially in the British Isles. In fact, probably no other French author of his time was translated into English in as many editions.

This dissertation examines the twenty-seven English editions of Louis Ellies Du Pin, the influential Gallican church historian. While Jacques Grès-Gayer has extensively researched his life and works, his English editions and reactions to them, have never been fully studied. These reactions reveal a great deal about the beliefs and prejudices of his English-language readers.

The writings of his works' editors and other contemporary Protestant commentators depict Du Pin as a Protestant sympathizer, a pre-enlightenment scholar, and a staunch Catholic. This dissertation includes English Catholic responses to Du Pin as a traitor to the Catholic cause and a closet Jansenist. It concludes with extensive discussions of the true Du Pin revealed in these editions: a diligent scholar who exposed ancient forgeries, an agenda-driven Gallican, and a clumsy ecumenist.

Most important, this dissertation will attempt to illuminate the English religious milieu in light of Du Pin's works. What were English divines attempting to accomplish by reading and citing Du Pin? Furthermore, did the English writers understand Du Pin's intentions and goals?

Gallicanism

By the late seventeenth century, the French had long held a privileged position *vis-à-vis* the pope over ecclesial matters within France. This status, based on the Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges (1438) and especially on the Concordat of Francis I (or Bologna) (1516), gave the king the right to nominate France's bishops. According to Mousnier, these Gallican liberties were based on two basic principles: episcopalism and regalism. Episcopalism was the view that Jesus had given the keys of the Church to all the bishops, not just the pope. As such, the pope's canons and decrees were only valid if the Church universal accepted them. Regalism viewed the secular arm as divinely ordained and equal to the spiritual. The king had the right to appoint bishops and abbots, and papal bulls could only enter France with his permission. Roman judicial decisions were not valid in France (unless accepted), and civil courts had jurisdiction in church matters which dealt with the civil law.⁴

By Du Pin's time, numerous works had been written on Gallican ecclesiology. The most famous is probably Jacques Leschassier's *De la Liberté Ancienne et Canonique l'Église Gallicane*, which posited an ancient canon law guaranteeing the liberties of all national churches. Leschassier believed that the relationship between the papacy and secular rulers was intact until the reign of Pope Gregory VII, when the allegedly aggrandizing papacy overstepped its local authority. Another more contemporary work in

⁴ David Ogg, *Europe in the Seventeenth Century* (New York: McMillan Co., 1946), 295; John O'Malley, *Catholicism in Early Modern History: A Guide to Research* (St. Louis, MO: Center for Reformation Research, 1988), 51; Roland Mousnier, *Les institutions de la France sous la monarchie absolue* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1974), 245, 248; Gerald R. Cragg, *The Church and the Age of Reason, 1648-1789* (Baltimore: Penguin Books, Ltd., 1960), 22.

this area was Louis Maimbourg's *Traité historique de l'établissement et des prerogatives de l'Église de Rome et de ses évêques* (1682).⁵

Despite the concordat and its strong literary support, Gallicanism proved to be a constant source of contention between the papacy and the French church in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. In 1662, the faculty of the Sorbonne, with the king's support, proposed six propositions, which supported the traditional Gallican Liberties. But in 1665, Pope Alexander VII issued *Cum ad Aures*, which condemned these six clauses.⁶

By the late 1670s, the issue of the Gallican liberties came to a head over a dispute regarding the king's right to the *régale*. The *régale* was the right to receive the revenues from a vacant see between the time of a bishop's death and the installation of his successor. Two bishops, whose dioceses had been created since the Concordat of Francis I, and whom the pope and not the king nominated, refused to grant the *régale* to Louis upon their deaths, citing the church's liberty from the king. These bishops appealed the king's decision to claim the *régale* in their dioceses to Pope Clement X. To complicate matters further, the appealing bishops were Jansenists, and the king linked their loyalty to the pope (also known as ultramontanism) to this heresy. After one of the bishops, François-Etienne Caulet of Parmier, died, a conflict ensued between the ultramontanist (and Jansenist) members of Parmier's cathedral chapter and its Gallican vicar general, an

⁵ W. J. Bousma, "Gallicanism and the Nature of Christendom," in *A Usable Past, Essays in European Cultural History* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1990), 316, 317; Elisabeth Israels Perry, *From Theology to History: French Religious Controversy and the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1973), 217.

⁶ H. G. Judge, "Louis XIV and the Church," in John C. Rule, *Louis XIV and the Craft of Kingship* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1970), 247.

appointee of the Archbishop of Toulouse. In order to support the papal loyalists in the conflict, the new pope, Innocent XI, excommunicated the vicar general in 1678.⁷

The Gallican controversy continued into the next decade, when in 1682, Louis XIV called an Assembly of the Clergy to ratify his right to the *régale* in the new dioceses, and to state formally the powers of the French church. Jacques-Benigne Bossuet, the famed Bishop of Meaux, served as the moderator of this historic assembly. It reaffirmed the six Sorbonne articles of 1663 and created a new set, which were eventually called the “Four Articles.” They asserted that: 1) a king could not be subject to the power of the pope in temporal matters, 2) a council is superior to the pope, according to the conclusions of the Council of Constance, 3) the French church held a right to its own rules, customs, and constitutions, and 4) the pope’s right to decide matters of theology was only valid if such conclusions were accepted by the entire Church.⁸

Innocent XI responded with a letter on 2 April of that year which nullified the assembly’s conclusions. He refused to accept any newly nominated bishop who was involved in the assembly. This act left thirty-five dioceses vacant in January of 1689.⁹

In 1687, the tension between the pope and France increased when Innocent XI attempted to end the *franchise des quartiers*, which was the ability of foreign embassies to grant asylum to criminal fugitives in their embassies in Rome. The pope saw the

⁷ Pierre Goubert, *The Ancien Régime: French Society 1600-1750*, tr. by Steve Cox (New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1973), 135; Cragg, 24; Ogg, 297; John B. Wolf, *Louis XIV* (New York: W.W. Norton and Co. 1968), 390.

⁸ Jacques M. Gres-Gayer, “The Magisterium of the Faculty of Theology of Paris in the Seventeenth Century,” *Theological Studies* 53 (1992): 440; Jean Delumeau, *Le Catholicisme entre Luther et Voltaire* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1971), 169; R. Po-Chia Hsia, *The World of Catholic Renewal 1540-1770* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 105; Judge, 250.

⁹ Judge, 251, 252; Delumeau, 170.

ending of the *franchise* as vital for maintaining order in the city, but Louis saw it as an attack on his prerogatives, and he blatantly ignored its retraction.¹⁰

In 1688, after the French defied the pope's *franchise* ban, Innocent XI retaliated by secretly excommunicating the king and his ministers. In response, he had Charles Colbert de Croissy, the secretary of state, launch a massive propaganda campaign, which, in various works, called the pope a Quietist, a Jansenist, and an ally of William of Orange.¹¹

After the success of the Glorious Revolution of 1688 in England, which signaled a heightening Protestant power in Europe, Louis sought improved relations with the Holy See. On August 12, 1689, Innocent XI died, and the following month his successor, Alexander VIII, sought *rapprochement*. Then in 1693, after years of only marginally successful negotiations, Louis XIV issued a letter ensuring Alexander VIII's successor, Innocent XII, that the *Four Articles* would not be enforced. The pope accepted this gesture and approved the remaining episcopal nominations.¹²

History of Print Culture

Shortly after the advent of printing, national governments sought ways to regulate the publishing industry. Both Catholic and Protestant countries censored books they believed were potentially dangerous to the faithful, or that threatened the legitimacy of their national churches. In 1485, the archbishop of Mainz required the licensing of all German vernacular translations. Bishops' officials often served as book censors, and an episcopal imprimatur was required before any work could be published. Two years later, Pope

¹⁰ Judge, 252; Wolf, 389.

¹¹ Wolf, 392; Judge, 253.

¹² Judge, 253; Joseph Bergin, *Crown, Church and Episcopate under Louis XIV* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2004), 255; Bergin, 259.

Innocent VIII issued the bull *Inter multiplices* which threatened excommunication for printing works that had not been previously approved by a local bishop. However, it is unclear whether it was widely implemented.¹³

Lateran Council V (1512-1517) reiterated the requirement that the local bishop or his censors examine books prior to publication. It did not specifically prohibit vernacular translations but included a prohibition on attacks against prominent persons.¹⁴ The council decreed, “We therefore establish and ordain that henceforth, for all future time, no one may dare to print or have printed any book or other writing of whatever kind in Rome or in any other cities and dioceses, without the book or writings having first been closely examined.”¹⁵ Violators were threatened with excommunication and a one-hundred ducat fine. Minnich believes this decree became the basis for the Church’s system of imprimaturs and indexes.¹⁶

At the fourth session of the Council of Trent, the Lateran decree was reiterated, and the Vulgate, the Latin Bible, was declared an authentic version of the Bible for the Catholic Church. The meaning of this pronouncement was unclear since, like Lateran V, the council did not specifically prohibit vernacular translations. Nevertheless, few

¹³ Elizabeth Eisenstein, *The Printing Revolution in Early Modern Europe* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 29, 178, 348. Nelson Minnich, “The Fifth Lateran Council and Preventive Censorship of Printed Books,” *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa* 5 (2010):75, 78

¹⁴ Norman P. Tanner, ed., *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils* (Washington, DC: Sheed and Ward and Georgetown University Press, 1990), 633; Minnich, “The Fifth Lateran Council and Preventive Censorship of Printed Books,” 93.

¹⁵ Tanner, 633.

¹⁶ Tanner, 633; Minnich, “The Fifth Lateran Council and Preventive Censorship of Printed Books,” 104.

Catholic rulers sponsored translations in the century following the council, and they were usually produced in Protestant countries.¹⁷

The *Index Librorum Prohibitorum*, or list of prohibited books, which Pope Paul IV first announced in 1559, also had a chilling effect on publishing in Catholic countries. The Index was published in 1564, and although it prohibited vernacular Bible reading in general, it did allow learned men who had their bishop's permission to read translations. Clement VIII revoked his exception in 1593.¹⁸

In Protestant nations, censorship was much less stringent than in Catholic ones, but existed nonetheless. For instance, Henry VIII banned the Tyndale Bible in 1543. The Archbishop of Canterbury Reginald Pole's 1556 *Decretum II*, which included the Lateran decree, was largely incorporated by Elizabeth I. Works written by "free thinkers," who held the anti-religious belief that logic and reason were the only bases for truth, were under constant scrutiny by English authorities.¹⁹

Governments commonly licensed printers to control their activities. In 1554, to stop the influx of Protestant works into Spain, the royal council mandated a special license for bookstores importing or printing foreign volumes. Licensing varied from country to

¹⁷ Minnich, "The Fifth Lateran Council and Preventive Censorship of Printed Books," 104; Eisenstein, *The Printing Press as an Agent of Change*, 348-349.

¹⁸ This index was by no means the first. For other sixteenth-century indexes from the Universities of Paris and Louvain and national indexes from Venice, Portugal, and Spain, see J. M. de Bujanda, Francis M. Higman, and James K. Farge, eds., *Index des livres interdits* 6 volumes (Sherbrooke, Quebec: Centre d'Études de la Renaissance, 1985); Eisenstein, *The Printing Revolution in Early Modern Europe*, 348; Julia, "Reading and the Counter-Reformation," 239, 243.

¹⁹ Eisenstein, *The Printing Revolution in Early Modern Europe*, 181; Minnich, "The Fifth Lateran Council and Preventive Censorship of Printed Books," 103; Eisenstein, *The Printing Press as an Agent of Change*, 142.

country, but it was common in Protestant countries. In England, John Milton even petitioned for liberty from licensed printing.²⁰

The banning of heretical books had a chilling effect on the printing industry in Catholic nations. The threat of censorship led printers to avoid new titles in favor of printing only “safe” literature such as previously approved devotional books.

Scientists such as Galileo Galilei, Johannes Kepler, and Tommaso Campanella often had to circumvent the local censors by illegally publishing their works in Protestant countries. It is, however, important to understand that the censors were concerned with these works’ religious conclusions and not their scientific content.²¹

In Paris, a few families of master printers dominated the print guild, *Communauté des libraires et imprimeurs de Paris*, and after 1618 every printer had to be a member. Ordinances were created to regulate printing, mandating a minimum of four presses, and specifying the type to be used.²²

Guild members maintained a tight monopoly, and non-guild members were not even allowed to sell old paper. This monopoly lasted until the revolution, and guild members actively policed the industry, reporting on the activities of non-guild printers to maintain their market share.²³

Becoming a guild member allowed a printer to purchase *privilèges*, which were the equivalents of copyrights today. Privileges were issued in Protestant countries as well,

²⁰ Minnich, “The Fifth Lateran Council and Preventive Censorship of Printed Books,” 103; Eisenstein, *The Printing Press as an Agent of Change*, 639, 682.

²¹ Eisenstein, *The Printing Revolution in Early Modern Europe*, 676; Eisenstein, *The Printing Press as an Agent of Change*, 19, 415, 647; Paul Grendler, “Church Censorship of Science in the Sixteenth Century,” *Catholic Historical Review* 97 (2001): 76-80.

²² Darnton, *The Literary Underground of the Old Regime*, 186-187.

²³ Ibid., 174, 186, 188-189.

and in England they provided the exclusive right to print Bibles, law books, almanacs, catechisms, and other publications.²⁴

In addition to *privilèges*, printers had to obtain permission from the government for each title printed. They could receive two types: *permissions publiques*, the explicit permissions granted for acceptable titles, and *permissions tacits*, the permissions for books not explicitly banned by the censors.²⁵

Unlike other countries where local bishops or inquisitors acted as censors, in France the secular Parlement and the king, in consultation with the Sorbonne doctors, approved books for publication. According to Eisenstein, the years 1678-1701 were the most stringently censored period during the *ancien régime*. Hence, many famous French writers were forced to publish outside of France. As a result, a cosmopolitan French-language press flourished in Holland. Cities bordering France became engaged in the clandestine book trade, publishing banned books and then smuggling them back across the border. The revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685 led to a mass exodus of Huguenots from France into other countries, especially England. This exodus resulted in Huguenots' publishing French translations of English works in Holland. Of course, other works banned in France were published as well. For instance, Erasmus's *Opera Omnia* was published in Holland by the Huguenot Jean Le Clerc.²⁶

The Reformation started an exodus of publishing from Catholic countries to the more tolerant Protestant ones. Great early centers of publishing such as Venice, Antwerp, and

²⁴ Darnton, 186; Eisenstein, *The Printing Press as an Agent of Change*, 120n.

²⁵ Darnton, *The Literary Underground of the Old Regime*, 174.

²⁶ Nelson Minnich, "The Fifth Lateran Council and Preventive Censorship of Printed Books," 84; Eisenstein, *The Printing Press as an Agent of Change*, 145, 646, 680n.

Lyons ceded influence to Wittenberg, Basel, and Geneva, making Protestant nations the preeminent printers between 1550 and 1800. The decline of Venetian leadership in publishing followed acceptance of Roman standards of censorship, including the *Index Librorum Prohibitorum*.²⁷

Many of Europe's largest printers resided in Swiss cities. The city of Basel benefitted greatly from the Sorbonne's condemnation of Luther's works in 1521, gaining a near monopoly in *Lutherania* marketed clandestinely in France. During the 1550s, the number of printers in Geneva grew from six to more than three hundred. By 1585, Lyon's industry had been reduced to simply adding title pages to Swiss-manufactured books to hide their Calvinist origins before their shipment to Italy and Spain.²⁸

The Dutch were by far the most prolific, printing the majority of Europe's books during the seventeenth century. Much of the printing business in Catholic Antwerp moved to the Northern provinces after the Dutch Reformation. Dutch printers allowed Catholic scientific and philosophical thought of such writers as Galileo and Descartes to circulate throughout Europe. The new print culture in Protestant countries such as Holland and Switzerland created an international intellectual exchange now known as the Republic of Letters, a topic discussed in more detail in Chapter 7.²⁹

Protestants believed that the printing press was a powerful weapon in the Reformed arsenal.³⁰ Elizabeth Eisenstein notes that "Tributes to the power of the press were more

²⁷ Eisenstein, *The Printing Revolution in Early Modern Europe*, 192-193; Eisenstein, *The Printing Press as an Agent of Change*, 407, 411.

²⁸ Eisenstein, *The Printing Revolution in Early Modern Europe*, 192, 193; Eisenstein, *The Printing Press as an Agent of Change*, 407, 411.

²⁹ Eisenstein, *The Printing Press as an Agent of Change*, 138, 408, 413, 645.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 19.

compatible with patriotic themes in Protestant realms; emphasis on the epoch-making functions performed by printing had anti-papist and anti-Roman overtones.”³¹ Protestants took advantage of the freedom they were allowed by printing works that the Index banned. This freedom gave entrepreneurs a means of breaking into the business.³²

Robert Darnton’s studies of the print culture during this period reveal a lucrative underground book trade. He researched the *Société typographique de Neuchâtel*, a printer on the border of France which marketed so-called *livres philosophiques*: obscene, irreligious or seditious works. The *Société typographique* illegally manufactured books copyrighted to other printers within France. *Assureurs* (smugglers) then transported the books back to France for sale. If caught, they were subject to sentences as harsh as a lifetime in the galleys. These risks raised the price of illegal books substantially.³³

Organizing the Reactions to Du Pin’s English Editions

Chapter 1- “Du Pin Background” will provide the essential historical context for understanding the life and times of Louis Ellies Du Pin. After an abbreviated biography of Du Pin, short synopses describe the reigns of French and English monarchs Louis XIV, James II, William and Mary, Anne, and George I for the political context of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries.

³¹ Eisenstein, *The Printing Press as an Agent of Change*, 19.

³² Ibid., 145, 416.

³³ Darnton, *The Literary Underground of the Old Regime*; Robert Darnton, *Poetry and the Police: Communication Networks in Eighteenth-Century Paris* (Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1982), 122, 123, 128, 131.

Through the era, the large number Du Pin's works translated into English attests to his widespread acceptance. Foremost the *New History* "was a staple work on the shelves of the English Clergy during the reign of Queen Anne."³⁴

Chapter 2 – "Du Pin in England," will review Du Pin's larger and most popular translations and examine reactions to his English editions of editors, translators, and commentators. A few other English Du Pin works, including various letters and excerpts added to other authors' works, will be discussed in later chapters.

Anglican divines used Du Pin's writings in their own polemical works on controversial topics dividing Catholics and Protestants, such as transubstantiation and the veneration of images. Chapter 3 – "Du Pin the Reformer" will take an in-depth look into how his books assisted Anglican authors in these efforts.

English Catholics' reaction to Du Pin's works was overwhelmingly negative, no doubt because of Anglican writers' use of Du Pin's books as sources for anti-Catholic works and the influence of the strongly ultramontane Jesuits ministering to Catholics in the English mission. In a country with a majority Catholic population, such as France, minority voices from Gallican and Jansenist circles found their audiences. In England, where the Catholic faith was persecuted, such critical opinions of the pope and ultramontane theology were viewed as counterproductive to the more basic goal of Catholic survival. Chapter 4 – "Du Pin the Heretic" discusses this Catholic reaction to Du Pin's English works and provides insight into those doctrines and disciplines English

³⁴ Thompson & Holm, 17.

Catholics believed were indispensable for preventing the extinction of British Catholicism.

While Anglican reactions to Du Pin's works were predominantly positive, a few English Protestant commentators from Presbyterian Scotland and the non-juror community took a more critical view of his works. Chapter 5 – "Du Pin the Catholic" will discuss these negative reactions, and how he was depicted as simply another "Papist" author defending Catholic doctrines.

Du Pin's Gallican agenda, as noted, was actively promoted throughout his works. While such an ecclesiology would seem to have been more useful for protecting the prerogatives of national churches still within the Catholic fold, a number of Du Pin's commentators have revealed that some in the Church of England viewed their national church in a very similar manner as France, Venice, or other Catholic nations seeking autonomy from the Holy See's authority. Some Protestant writers, such as William Wake, believed that the Holy See retained its status of holding a primacy among equals, even in regard to the reformed Church of England. Chapter 6 – "Du Pin the Gallican" will demonstrate how his extensive historical research on the early Church and his guiding vision of Gallicanism influenced Anglican divines in developing a rationale for the Church of England's separation from the Holy See. That rationale included maintaining an episcopal polity independent from but still relating to the See of Rome.

Du Pin was a master at exposing myths, legends, forgeries, and other dubious works from early Christianity. Since these works had previously been used as sources in polemics to support doctrines that he considered later innovations, Du Pin can be

accurately viewed as a pre-enlightenment scholar whose critical method sought to uncover past historical errors and forgeries. Chapter 7 – “Du Pin the Enlightenment Scholar” reviews the myriad ways he helped create a new tone of academic rigor in England. The results of this rigor, both in Du Pin’s works and those others, elicited a strong demand for books which could determine the true polity, doctrines, and liturgical practices used in the early Church. The practices could then be incorporated into the Church of England to create a truly apostolic communion. As will be discussed in Chapter 1, Du Pin engaged in ecumenical correspondence between himself and William Wake to fashion a union between the French and English churches. Chapter 7 revisits this dialog and explores other ways in which Du Pin, through his works and his actions, furthered efforts to unite the national churches of Europe in the early eighteenth century.

Finally, the conclusion will consolidate the different facets of who Du Pin was to the English nation. It will aim to determine if the English portrait of this historian was accurate. Did English scholars understand Du Pin’s motives and intentions? Furthermore, was their high regard for his academic integrity warranted?

Chapter I: Du Pin Background

A Vitae Brevis of Louis Ellies Du Pin

Louis Ellies Du Pin was born in Paris on June 17, 1657. Little is known about his early life, except that he was a relative of Jean Racine, the renowned playwright and devoted Jansenist.¹

After receiving his doctorate at the Sorbonne in 1684, he was appointed to the faculty of the University of Paris where he remained an outspoken figure for most of his life.² Soon after receiving his doctorate, he began work on the *Nouvelle Bibliothèque des Auteurs ecclésiastiques*, which sought to provide “a new library of all the ecclesiastical authors since Jesus Christ until our [time], containing the history of their life, the catalog, the critique and chronology of their works, the summary of those [things] which they contain, a judgement on their style and on their doctrine, and a count of the different editions of their works.”³ The completed work (up to the fourteenth century) was contained in an incredible thirteen volumes.

The *Nouvelle Bibliothèque* was unique in two respects: it 1) questioned the validity of some church doctrines because of their development after the apostolic age, and 2) it was

¹ Jacques Gres-Gayer, "Un théologien gallican, témoin de son temps: Louis Ellies Du Pin (1657–1719)," *Revue d'Histoire de l'Église de France* 72 (1986): 68, 76.

² *Ibid.*, 69.

³ “une nouvelle bibliothèque de tous le auteurs ecclésiastiques depuis Jésus-Christ jusqu’à nous, contenant l’histoire de leur vie, le catalogue, la critique et la chronologie de leurs ouvrages, le sommaire de ceux qu’ils contiennent, un jugement sur leur style et sur leur doctrine et le dénombrement des différentes éditions de leurs oeuvres,” in Louis Ellies Du Pin, *Nouvelle Bibliothèque des Auteurs Ecclésiastiques du Dix-Séptieme Siècle* (Paris, 1719), 2.

the first comprehensive work to attempt a critical review of the authenticity of all the writers of ecclesiastical history in the Church's first fifteen centuries.⁴

Bossuet, who served as the *ex officio* chancellor of the University of Paris, attacked the work. The King's Council later banned the *Nouvelle Bibliothèque* in 1696, and it could not be sold until Du Pin's retractions were incorporated into a new edition.⁵ All existent copies were to be turned into the council. It eventually "free[d him] ... from all suspicion of Error,"⁶ because of his willingness to retract and his insistence that his errors resulted from inadvertent mistakes that could take place in such a large work.

The unnamed translator's "Advertisement" found in the condemnation and retraction (1696 English edition) provides a window into Anglican opinions of late seventeenth-century French Catholicism. The translator opines that Louis XIV instigated Du Pin's condemnation to assuage the pope's anger over the Gallican Assembly of the Clergy (1682). As stated before, the French church had already retracted the "Four Articles" in 1693, but relations were still strained. The translator believed that Du Pin's retraction was similar to the French church's retraction of the Four Articles. He believed that Du Pin was forced to retract rather than convinced of his errors.⁷

In 1704, Louis XIV banished Du Pin to the small town of Châtellerault for his supposed Jansenist views related to his signing of the pro-Jansenist *Cas de conscience* at the Sorbonne on 20 July 1701 and subsequent refusal to remove his signature. This document held that a priest could grant absolution to a penitent unwilling to disavow

⁴ NH93, i-x.

⁵ Mousnier, 234; Condemnation, 30.

⁶ Condemnation, 31.

⁷ Condemnation B1, B2.

Jansenist doctrine but willing to maintain a respectful silence on the matter. The king correctly saw this approach as a means for Jansenists and Gallicans like Du Pin to avoid adhering to settled doctrine and papal authority.⁸

During his exile, Du Pin took on the strongly Gallican tasks of editing a collection of medieval conciliarists' writings, with special emphasis on Jean Gerson (1706), and writing a defense of the Four Gallican Articles (1707). In 1711, Du Pin updated the *Nouvelle Bibliothèque* through the end of the seventeenth century. Du Pin's fortunes improved following Louis XIV's death in 1715 and the accession of his great grandson, five-year old Louis XV, and the regent Philippe d'Orleans. Royal attitudes towards Gallicans and Jansenists were more favorable, and Du Pin was allowed to return from exile.⁹

In his final years, Du Pin actively opposed Clement XI's anti-Jansenist apostolic constitution *Unigenitus* (1713), which had denounced Pasquier Quesnel's *Réflexions morales*. Du Pin believed the pope's actions infringed upon the traditional Gallican liberties and his *Mémoires et Réflexions sur la Constitution Unigenitus* was published in Amsterdam in 1717. He believed *Unigenitus* failed to follow Gallican principles for church sanctions. In his mind, such sanctions should be initiated by the unanimous consent of a nation's bishops, and then receive the pope's approval. Since opinions in

⁸ Jacques Gres-Gayer, "Le gallicanisme de Louis Ellis Du Pin (1657-1719)," 65; Norman Sykes, *William Wake* 2 vols. (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 255; Judge, 257.

⁹ Gres-Gayer, "Un théologien gallican, témoin de son temps: Louis Ellies Du Pin (1657–1719)," 90-92.

France on Quesnel's *Réflexions morales* were not unanimous, the pope had usurped his position in its censure.¹⁰

Du Pin gained fame for his correspondence with William Wake, the archbishop of Canterbury, in the early eighteenth century. This dialogue, discussing a possible union of Anglican and Gallican churches, did not attract the support of the French bishops who were unwilling to break with the pope.¹¹

This ecumenical dialogue reveals English attitudes toward the faculty of the Sorbonne in general and about Du Pin specifically. After reviewing their correspondence, it is apparent that Wake and the English ambassador's chaplain, William Beauvoir, believed that the Gallicans of the Sorbonne were key players in a possible unification plan as well as kindred spirits in their anti-papal sentiments. Wake like Du Pin viewed the ideal polity of universal Christianity as one of quasi-independent national churches respecting each others' excommunications. Impressed with Du Pin's *De Antiqua Ecclesiae Disciplina Dissertationes Historicae*, Wake called it "not far from the kingdom of God,"¹² and he regarded the Sorbonne doctors as "the most celebrated persons of any in the Roman church."¹³ Furthermore, the dialogue demonstrates that the Anglican and French churches then had a strong dependence on the traditions of the church fathers in debating controversial doctrines. Beauvoir suspected that Du Pin had some doubts about a number

¹⁰ Louis Ellies Du Pin, *Mémoires et réflexions sur la Constitution Unigenitus* (Amsterdam. 1717); Jacques Gres-Gayer, "The Unigenitus of Clement XI: A Fresh Look at the Issues," *Theological Studies* 49 (1988): 272.

¹¹ Jacques Gres-Gayer, "Louis Ellies Du Pin," in *New Catholic Encyclopedia* vol. 4 (Washington DC: Gale, 2002), 944; Jacques Gres-Gayer, *Paris-Cantorbéry, 1717-1720: le dossier d'un premier oecuménisme*. (Paris: Beauchesne, 1989), 140.

¹² Jacques Gres-Gayer, *Paris-Cantorbéry, 1717-1720: le dossier d'un premier oecuménisme* (Paris: Beauchesne, 1989), 252.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 356.

of Catholic doctrines including transubstantiation. In the correspondence, Du Pin created a document called the “Commonitorium,” which he hoped would create a blueprint for mutual agreements on disputed doctrines. In this document, he makes numerous conciliatory overtures such as proposing the apocrypha may be viewed as deuterocanonical texts, the veneration of relics be considered adiaphora, and Anglicans be allowed to consider the Eucharist transmuted rather than transubstantiated, a term Bossuet had used. In keeping with his Gallican view, Du Pin believed that the hoped-for union of French and English churches would not require the pope’s consent.¹⁴

A point-by-point critique of the Thirty-Nine Articles, the Church of England’s doctrinal confession, was included in the “Commonitorium.” It included a request for theological concessions, including rewriting Anglican doctrine on the nature of the Eucharist, which the archbishop viewed as offensive. Wake had hoped the polemic over *Unigenitus* would trigger a French break with the Holy See, but the proposed union failed to gain the support of the archbishop of Paris, Cardinal Louis-Antoine de Noailles. The correspondence ended when Du Pin died on 7 June 1719.¹⁵

¹⁴ Jacques Gres-Gayer, *Paris-Cantorbéry, 1717-1720: le dossier d’un premier oecuménisme*, 258; Sykes, *William Wake* v. 2, 267, 282, 305, 307, 308, 310; Gres-Gayer, “Un théologien gallican, témoin de son temps: Louis Ellies Du Pin (1657–1719),” 113.

¹⁵ Gres-Gayer, “Un théologien gallican, témoin de son temps: Louis Ellies Du Pin (1657–1719),” 112; Gres-Gayer, *Paris-Cantorbéry, 1717-1720: le dossier d’un premier oecuménisme*, 125, 374.

France and the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes

As mentioned above, Louis XIV's revocation of the Edict of Nantes (1598) in 1685 resulted in the widespread persecution and mass exodus of Protestants from France, including a large emigration of Huguenots into Ireland.¹⁶

The kings of France had long seen the Edict of Nantes as a temporary solution created to avoid bloodshed, and they had slowly worked to reverse the Reformation's legacy in France. For example, Cardinal Armand de Richelieu, Louis XIII's chief minister, sought to thwart Protestant interests with a successful but cruel eleven-month siege in 1627-1628 of the Protestant city of La Rochelle. He sent Jesuit and Capuchin missions to Protestant cities in the 1630s in an attempt to convert the Huguenots. The *Compagnie du Saint-Sacrement*, a society with lay and clergy members, *Parlement*, and the Council of State, worked to convert Protestants and remove them from positions of influence. The *Compagnie* acted as a religious police, assuring that Protestants remove their hats and decorate their homes during Eucharistic processions. Restrictions on local Protestant churches' ability to communicate with one another eliminated their national synods, the last one held in 1659.¹⁷

While Cardinal Jules Mazarin, chief minister for Louis XIV from 1642-1661 had treated Protestants leniently, Louis XIV strongly believed the religious unity of France was a key element in its political unity, and he actively worked to convert Huguenots.

¹⁶ Hsia, 67; Jean Orcibal, "Louis XIV and the Edict of Nantes," in *Louis XIV and Absolutism*, pp. 154-176, ed. by Ragnhild Hatton (Columbus, OH: Ohio State University Press, 1976), 166; Stephen Conway, "Christians, Catholics, Protestants: The Religious Links of Britain and Ireland with Continental Europe." *The English Historical Review* 124, no. 509 (2009): 846.

¹⁷ Orcibal, 154; John McManners, *Church and Society in Eighteenth Century France* v. 2 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), 570; Mousnier, 308, 309, 312.

McManners believes that Louis feared the democracy of Huguenot church councils was a breeding ground for republicanism.¹⁸

In a declaration in 1669, the Huguenot faith could only be practiced in those towns where it had existed in 1598. In addition, government positions were closed to Huguenots, and their funerals were to be held at night.¹⁹ Jean Orcibal has made the convincing argument that the Gallican controversy with the pope over the “*régale* made the need even greater for Louis to convert Protestants to show himself a Catholic more orthodox than the pope himself.”²⁰ Late in his reign, the king’s morganatic but pious wife, Madame Françoise de Maintenon, strictly suppressed licentiousness at court. Because of his political views about religion and later Maintenon’s influence, efforts to convert the Reformed continued to increase as his reign progressed, as he used carrots and then sticks to sway the reluctant “heretics.”²¹

Among the carrots were cash gifts for conversions (called the *caisse des conversions*) with some miscreants converting several times to game the system. Other incentives included tax breaks and even in some cases royal pensions.²²

He used persuasion to elicit changes of heart. One of the most famous instances of this was Bossuet’s conversion of the famed General Henri de Turrene in 1668. Bossuet elicited further conversions through the use of his *Exposition de Doctrine de l’Église Catholique sur des Matières de Controverse* (1671), and he spent four years writing the

¹⁸ John O’Malley, *Catholicism in Early Modern History: A Guide to Research* (St. Louis, MO: Center for Reformation Research, 1988), 54; Orcibal, 157; McManners, 576.

¹⁹ Judge, 242; Ogg, 303.

²⁰ Orcibal, 158.

²¹ Cragg, 20; Judge, 242.

²² Judge, 242; McManners, 571; Wolf, 387.

Histoire des Variations de Églises Protestantes (1688), which decried the numerous factions resulting from the Protestant Reformation.²³

Louis XIV's main techniques especially in his later years were sticks. They included the strict regulation of Huguenots schools, resulting in numerous closings, and the use of old laws to close down Protestant chapels with over 150 closing between 1681-1684. The Huguenots were barred from certain professions such as midwives because of a fear of Protestant baptisms, and other government and learned professions, including medicine, printing, and bookselling. Protestant doctors were prohibited from treating Catholics.²⁴

After years of oppressions, Protestant delegates from around France assembled in Toulouse to discuss a response to the ever-growing measures. The result was Claude Brousson's book, *Apologie du projet des Réformés de France*, which held that the government had no right to prohibit Protestant worship since it was done in response to a divine command. However, this response had no influence on the ever-tightening measures.²⁵

The cruelest stick was the quartering of troops in Huguenot homes (the *dragonnades*), in which the techniques of intimidation included burning furniture for firewood and demanding food and drink until the host families were bankrupt. Other atrocities were committed such as robbings, beatings, and rape. Such a persecution was no doubt known

²³ Wolf, 387; Jacques-Benigne Bossuet, *Exposition de doctrine de l'Église Catholique sur des matières de controverse* (Paris: S. Mabre-Cramoisy, 1686); Elisabeth Israels Perry, *From Theology to History: French Religious Controversy and the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1973), 71; Jacques-Benigne Bossuet, *Histoire des variations de églises protestantes* (Paris: S. Mabre-Cramoisy, 1688).

²⁴ McManners, 571-573; Wolf, 387.

²⁵ McManners, 569.

to the king himself. This final barbarity resulted in many coerced conversions, for which such terror tactics in Bearn in the spring of 1685 elicited mass conversions in Montauban, Montpellier, Poitou, and other departments even before the troops arrived. Popular riots erupted in Vivarais and in Dauphiné in response to the *dragonnades*.²⁶

A number of theories posit why the king revoked the Edict of Nantes. Catholic clergy assemblies in the late 1600s lobbied to outlaw the Protestant faith. Orcibal notes that Louis falsely believed nearly all Huguenots had already been converted. McManners believes that the king may have been emboldened to take the final step since a Catholic king now reigned in England. Whatever the reason, Louis XIV implemented the final complete prohibition, the Edict of Fontainebleau, on 22 October 1685. At that time, between 1.5 to 2 million Huguenots lived in France, and Protestants were numerous in the provinces of Dauphiné, Cévennes, Saintonge, and Poitou. Louis had hoped that this action would ingratiate himself to the pope, but Innocent opposed the action due its use of violence to incite conversions, formally condemning the *dragonnades* three years later in 1688.²⁷

The edict exiled Huguenot ministers, closed all Protestant schools, and threatened the galleys for those Huguenot laypersons who attempted to emigrate. The new law threatened to take children from parents who refused to have them raised in the Catholic faith. Elector Frederick William I of Brandenburg-Prussia offered asylum in his Edict of Potsdam for those who could travel to Brandenburg. A costly twenty-year-long Huguenot uprising called the Camisard rebellion (centered in the Cévennes region of

²⁶ Mousnier, 311; Orcibal, 158, 160; Judge, 243; McManners, 571, 573.

²⁷ Judge, 241, 252; McManners, 569, 575, 577, 584; Mousnier, 313; Orcibal, 156.

southern France) ended Louis' hope for a peaceful conversion of the remaining Protestants. This uprising started on 24 July 1702 in Languedoc when police arrested a Huguenot family attempting to escape to Switzerland. Camisard rebels rescued the family and murdered the oppressive inspector of missions, Abbé du Chailu. McManners believes that the beginning of the war between France and the Protestant states of the United Provinces and England encouraged the rebels to take up arms.²⁸

Another difficulty of the policy was that it resulted in convictions for those who reverted back to Protestantism from their coerced conversions. McManners estimates that approximately 100,000 Protestants emigrated by 1689 and the same number again by 1720, destroying the woolen industry in Sedan and the paper making business in Normandy and Auvergne.²⁹

The Times in England: James II

Du Pin's *Nouvelle Bibliothèque* was first published in France in 1686 during the reign of England's King James II. The king grew up in France, and he therefore understood the advantages of an authoritarian system where the crown had few encumbrances to absolute rule. In addition, his grandfather, James I, articulated the divine right of kings to rule in his works *True Law of Free Monarchies* (1598) and *Basilikon Doron* (1599).³⁰

Such unlimited power was not attainable in late seventeenth-century England, where the Parliament had previously deposed James's father Charles I in 1648 and executed him

²⁸ Cragg, 21; McManners, 584, 591; Mousnier, 313-314; Ogg, 305; Wolf, 394.

²⁹ Wolf, 398; McManners, 587.

³⁰ John Miller, *James I: A Study in Kingship*. (Hove, East Sussex: Wayland Publishing Limited, 1977), 124.

the following year. James, a convert to Catholicism, sought to return the nation to the Catholic faith or at least grant Catholics religious toleration throughout his reign.

James was plagued with two Dutch and therefore Protestant-sponsored rebellions occurring in the first months of his reign. His nephew, the Duke of Monmouth, the illegitimate son of Charles II, led the first coup attempt, and the Earl of Argyl started the second. However, the king's armies quickly defeated both uprisings.³¹

James introduced toleration for Catholicism into England in 1685, when he urged Anglican ministers through the Archbishop of Canterbury William Sancroft to desist in preaching on controversial topics dividing Protestants and Catholics. However, when the London priest John Sharp, later Archbishop of York, preached on the threat of the nearby Irish Catholic population, Bishop Henry Compton of London refused to have him removed. The king thereupon had Compton tried before the Ecclesiastical Commission and relieved as dean of the Royal Chapel and member of the Privy Council. By then James had introduced Catholic masses at the chapels of St. James Palace and Whitehall and was absent at Anglican services traditionally held for the royal household.³²

The king's influence led to publishing books which aimed to convert Protestants to the Catholic faith. In fact, a Catholic convert, Henry Hills, was appointed the king's official printer. Catholic works were not assigned to this printer alone, since Richard Chiswell and others printed many titles. Popularizing Catholic doctrine through the press resulted in a pamphlet war between Catholic and Anglican theological positions.

³¹ Richard E. Boyer, *English Declarations of Indulgence 1687 and 1688* (Mouton: The Hague, 1968), 36.

³² Gordon Rupp, *Religion in England: 1688-1791* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986), 48; Boyer, 26-29, 43-44.

Prominent clerics were involved in these debates, such as the future archbishops of Canterbury, John Tillotson and Wake. Included in this ongoing debate were Bossuet; Bishop Edward Stillingfleet of Worcester; the Catholic John Gother; and George Villiers, Duke of Buckingham, who advocated religious toleration.³³

James initiated several reforms to legitimize the practice of Catholicism in England. Since Parliament refused to revoke the Test Act, he prorogued its enforcement on November 20, 1685. In the same year, he began appointing Catholics to command positions in his army in violation of the Test Act, and he set up a Catholic chapel tent for their use. He reinstated diplomatic relations with the Holy See, receiving the papal nuncio, Archbishop Ferdinando d'Adda. In addition, the king allowed his favorite chaplain, Jesuit Edward Petre, to be present at court. Petre's influence on the king caused concern because the priest's role usurped the position of the Anglican dean of the royal chapel. James allowed Catholic religious orders to establish houses in London. He attempted to secure high positions at Oxford University for Catholics previously prohibited, notably appointing Bonaventure Giffard as president in 1688.³⁴

Upon accession to the throne, James made efforts towards religious tolerance. One such action involved the resolution of the "Popish Plot," a fictitious Jesuit conspiracy to murder Charles II concocted by Titus Oates. This slander had resulted in the prosecution

³³ Boyer, 37, 38-39, 47.

³⁴ Will and Ariel Durant, *The Age of Louis XIV* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1963), 290; Boyer, 37, 40, 49; F. C Turner, *James II* (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1948), 326; Basil Hemphill, *The Early Vicars Apostolic of England 1685-1750* (London: Burns and Oates, 1954), 12.

of many Catholics. The king had Oates retried for perjury, and this new trial resulted in a conviction.³⁵

James issued his first Declaration of Indulgence on April 4, 1687 to end the enforcement of laws that aimed to persecute Catholics and Protestant non-conformists. It thereby allowed Catholics to enter public office. James reissued his Declaration of Indulgence on April 27, 1688, when it became apparent that Parliament would not repeal the Test Act and the penal laws.³⁶

John Miller has opined that James' reasoning behind the declaration may have been more political than spiritual, and he mentions the king's proclamation of March 18 explaining that the English Civil War resulted from forced religious uniformity imposed during his father Charles I's reign. If the king's stated opinions are taken at face value, one might make the case that he was simply advocating religious liberty for Catholics and dissenters as a means of maintaining domestic tranquility and his own rule, rather than attempting to return England to Catholicism.³⁷

Catholics were able to make some advances in Britain during James's reign. Already in 1572, a seminary was founded at Douai in the Spanish Netherlands. There priests were educated, often completing twelve to fourteen years of study before ordination, and then returning to Britain in secret since being a priest was considered high treason and a capital offense. Between the Reformation and the time of James' rule, England only had a short period of having a Catholic bishop, when William Bishop and then Richard Smith

³⁵ O'Malley, 75.

³⁶ Turner, 307, 395; Mark Goldie and Clare Jackson, "Williamite Tyranny and the Whig Jacobites," in *Redefining William III*, eds. Esther Mijers and David Onnekink (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2007), 189.

³⁷ Miller, 165.

held the office (1623-1631). After 1631, Smith's chapter members (canons) led the church in hiding.³⁸

However, under James, John Leyburn, the former president of Douai College, was appointed vicar apostolic over all of England and Wales (1685-1688), and in 1688 the nation was divided into four districts, London, Midlands, Western, and Northern. Each district was led by its own vicar apostolic, an ordained bishop but lacking the faculties of a diocesan bishop. Originally, James II and Smith's canons opposed the creation of vicariates, and instead advocated creating dioceses which they believed in a somewhat Gallican view would provide the English church some autonomy from the jurisdiction of the Congregation of the Propaganda Fide in Rome. Since vicars apostolic had to obtain permission from the Congregation for some aspects of governing their flock, their range of authority was limited.³⁹

William and Mary

The Dutch Calvinist minister Cornelius Trigland educated William III, and this strict upbringing influenced him to prohibit drinking and the performing arts from the court. His opponents often viewed the king as somewhat of a prude, in the same vein as Oliver Cromwell, since he emphasized the power of prayer during his military campaigns, attempted to set a moral tone at court, and emphasized religious faith. Mary sought to encourage popular piety, and she had court preachers' sermons published for the

³⁸ Hemphill, vii, 2-3, 10, 99.

³⁹ Ibid., x, 6-9.

edification of the populace. Parish renewal was a consistent church theme during their joint reign.⁴⁰

William's Calvinist background led him to view the Glorious Revolution and its success as preordained by God. The works of eminent clergymen, such as Tillotson, Wake, and John Tenison (who would follow Tillotson as Archbishop of Canterbury) portrayed William as a savior sent by God to rid Britain of James II and Catholicism. Gilbert Burnet, one-time holder of the chair of theology at Glasgow and bishop of Salisbury, delivered William's coronation sermon, describing the reign as a New Jerusalem descending upon England. This theme continued during the Nine Years' War, when William was characterized in sermons as the defender of the Reformation and the government and the church ordered public fasts in support of the war effort. Burnet's close relationship with the king elicited much of this adulation, as he had accompanied him from The Hague in the invasion of England during the revolution. In contrast, Louis XIV was often portrayed as the archenemy of the Reformation and even compared to the Turk.⁴¹

Tony Claydon, in his *William III and the Godly Revolution*, offered a new interpretation of the "courtly reformation" led by such divines as Burnet, Tillotson, Tenison, Wake, and Stillingfleet. William's court preachers had been previously

⁴⁰ Fritz Broeyer, "William II and the Reformed Church of the Netherlands," in *Redefining William III*, eds. Esther Mijers and David Onnekink (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2007), 110, 121; Tony Claydon, "Protestantism, Universal Monarchy and Christendom in William's War Propaganda, 1689-1697," in *Redefining William III*, eds. Esther Mijers and David Onnekink (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2007), 126, 130.

⁴¹ Perry, 211; Claydon, "Protestantism, Universal Monarchy and Christendom in William's War Propaganda, 1689-1697," 126-127, 131, 139; Broeyer, 122; Julie Conroy, "*A Preservative against Popery* (1738): The Use of Late Seventeenth Century Polemical Works to Discourage Conversions from the Church of England," (Ph.D. Dissertation, The Catholic University of America, 2008), 68.

described as Whig-leaning Latitudinarians devoted to reason and the comprehension of dissenters.⁴² But Claydon challenges this anti-Tory characterization. He notes that Gilbert and the others often sought to reach out to Tory clergymen to support the king's goals. He writes,

...the bishops used a rhetoric of reformation to pursue an ecclesiological compromise between whig and tory. This goes against the grain of much historiography, which has presented the movement for reformation in the 1690s as essentially hostile to tory ideals. Portraying moral reform as part of a 'whiggish' programme to conciliate dissent, many scholars have not recognized that the programme (at least as promoted by Burnet and his allies) could find a theological middle ground between the parties.⁴³

Claydon describes the divines' court preaching as a premeditated propaganda campaign. Moral instruction, traditionally the purview of the clergy, was used to advance political goals. Sermons were delivered and later published which condemned bickering between political parties. To appeal to the Tories, the preachers often portrayed William as a godly governor and defender of the Anglican faith. This depiction is apparent in Tenison's *Discourse of the Ecclesial Commission*. Burnet appealed to Tory churchmen by opening talks about comprehension at a church convocation rather than in Parliament. He avoided areas of Tory/Whig contention such as the king's right to succession, stressing his *de facto* authority rather than his *de jure* right to rule. Having the clergy champion his cause allowed the king to distance himself from the fray.⁴⁴

Despite his pious appearance, William often took a purely political stance in making religious decisions and did not limit his social circle to the pious. He had at least one

⁴² Tony Claydon, *William III and the Godly Revolution* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 155, 160.

⁴³ Ibid., 159-160.

⁴⁴ Ibid., 155, 158-159, 164, 166, 167, 169, 174.

affair, with the Countess of Orkney, Elizabeth Villiers. Although Burnet was a favorite of the king, he still maintained his independence and criticized William for his adultery.⁴⁵

The reign of William and Mary was a hotbed of intra-Protestant controversy. The king's Calvinist background led him to walk a thin line between Anglicans and non-conformists. The theological conflicts during the joint reign dealt mostly with the persecution of Calvinists and the government's occasional tolerance towards them. Few debated the treatment of Catholics, who were generally seen as a threat to the state. Military conflicts tied to the Catholic faith and specifically France, such as the aforementioned Nine Years' War, which was waged until 1697, only strengthened the anti-Catholic consensus.⁴⁶

Catholics were not an insignificant minority in the seventeenth century, growing from around 60,000 early in the century to around 80,000 before the its end with around 20,000 in London itself, centered in the largely Irish East End and St. Giles neighborhoods. Since Catholic mass was only legal in foreign embassies, the Catholic community often congregated in the chapels of foreign delegations, most notable the Sardinian chapel on Duke St., Lincoln's Inn. The four vicariates managed to survive underground, and their masses were usually held in the homes of upper-class aristocrats. The four vicars apostolic and all the other clergy were required to wear civilian clothes, and they were often relentlessly hunted down. Bishop Bonaventure Giffard of the Midlands was arrested numerous times, and Bishop Richard Challoner of London was

⁴⁵ Broeyer, 116; Claydon, "Protestantism, Universal Monarchy and Christendom in William's War Propaganda, 1689-1697," 127; Rupp, 86.

⁴⁶ Broeyer, 118; Cragg, 67; Derek Jarrett, *Britain: 1688-1815* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1965), 112; William A. Speck. "William II and the Three Kingdoms," in *Redefining William III*, eds. Esther Mijers and David Onnekink (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2007), 51.

known to have preached in an inn at Holburn. Bishop Thomas Williams, O.P., of the northern vicariate was even required to become a housekeeper to support himself.⁴⁷

Catholics were required to pay double taxes, and dealt with other restrictions such as prohibitions from government work, or from work as barristers, doctors, or schoolmasters. They were restricted from land purchases, bearing arms, and owning horses which cost over £5. An act in 1700 allowed Protestants to remove their Catholic relatives from inheriting familial lands. In addition, no Catholic could vote in parliamentary elections, or send their children overseas for education. In short, Catholics under William III were treated in a similar fashion to the way Protestants had been treated in France before the Edict of Fontainebleau.⁴⁸

Restrictions upon Catholics in Ireland were tightened under the reign of William and Mary. Early in their reign, the seats of Parliament, by and large, were held by what were known as “Old English Catholics,” or Catholics from originally English families who had been given their familial lands by the crown. After James II’s failed attempt to invade and capture the Emerald Isle, the Treaty of Limerick, negotiated with the remaining rebels in 1691, assured Catholics freedom of religion, a promise never fulfilled. In this environment, the established Anglican Church of Ireland became the official church body, though only 20% of all Irish were Protestant, and half of these were not Anglican but Presbyterian.⁴⁹

⁴⁷ Rupp, 190, 192; Hemphill, 2-3, 79-80, 129; O’Malley, 51.

⁴⁸ Hemphill, 85, 87, 88.

⁴⁹ Patrick J. Corish, *The Irish Catholic Experience* (Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, Inc., 1985), 122; Jarrett, 78.

Although Holy Roman Emperor Leopold I, through his influence with the king, was able to delay the persecution of Irish Catholic clergy for a time, by 1697, all Catholic bishops and regulars, that is, clergy of religious orders who were often viewed as French agents, were banished from Ireland in the so-called Banishment Act. At the end of William's reign on May 4, 1702, anti-Catholic sentiment increased when England declared war on Catholic France during the War of the Spanish Succession.⁵⁰

These persecutions had a dramatic effect on Catholic land ownership: in 1688, Catholics owned 20-25% of Irish land, but they only held title to 14% of the land by 1702. As in England, converts to Protestantism became the sole heirs of their familial estates. By 1700 because of Catholic flight approximately one third of the population of Ireland was Protestant.⁵¹

At the beginning of the reign of William and Mary, bishops were required to take loyalty oaths to the new monarchs. The archbishop of Canterbury under James II, William Sancroft, and several bishops refused to abandon their oaths to James and were deprived of their dioceses. These "non-juring" clerics included 300-400 Anglican priests. Many professors at Oxford refused to take oaths to the new king and queen.⁵²

Consistent with his agenda of religious toleration among Protestants, William advocated the reintegration of Protestant religious dissenters. The dissenting population, while a minority, was sizable. In 1676, they numbered 108,677 vs. 2,477,254 Anglicans,

⁵⁰ Wout Troost, "Ireland's Role in the Foreign Policy of William III" in *Redefining William III*, eds. Esther Mijers and David Onnekink (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2007), 61-64; Corish, 125; Jarrett, 114.

⁵¹ Speck, 48; Corish, 123; O'Malley, 78.

⁵² Rupp, 5.

although the number may have been higher since many hid their religion for fear of church persecution. By 1710, London alone had 101,500 dissenters.⁵³

The Tory Secretary of State, Daniel Finch, Earl of Nottingham, introduced the Bill for Comprehension in Parliament, which sought to entice dissenting ministers back into the established church. His sponsorship was positioned to sway the high church vote. It was the first unsuccessful bill designed to reunite the church. The bill would have removed the liturgical requirements for returning clergy to kneel at communion or wear vestments, but required them to take the oath against transubstantiation and for doctrines of the Anglican Church.⁵⁴

Undeterred by the failure of the comprehension bill, Lord Nottingham sponsored another one, resulting in the Toleration Act, which granted some leniency to dissenters. Like the comprehension bill, it required them to disavow transubstantiation but allowed them to maintain their own houses of worship, which were properly registered with the government.⁵⁵

Since the comprehension bill had failed, the new Archbishop of Canterbury, John Tillotson, attempted to introduce changes to the *Book of Common Prayer* (such as making vestments optional), to make the Anglican church more welcoming for dissenting clergy. However, these changes failed, since the high church party, led by its prolocutor Dr. William Jane, strongly opposed them at the convocation. Jane ended the convocation with the famous sentence, “*Nolumus lege Angliae mutari.*”⁵⁶ Tillotson, who lost the

⁵³ Jarrett, 68.

⁵⁴ Rupp, 54; Jarrett, 70.

⁵⁵ Jarrett, 70.

⁵⁶ Rupp, 56.

election as prolocutor to Jane, was consistently the target of high church divines' attacks for his non-conformist upbringing and was even accused of Socinianism.⁵⁷

Anne

Ascending the throne in 1702, Anne had a reputation for strong support of the Anglican faith. She, like her sister Mary, had been students of the aforementioned anti-Catholic bishop of London, Henry Compton. Her Anglican upbringing led to tension with her father, James II, who restricted visits to her sister Mary, for fear of her Protestant influence on the young Anne. The efforts of James II's son, James Francis Edward Stuart "The Old Pretender," threatened Anne's reign. He, with Louis XIV's support, made an unsuccessful attempt to invade Scotland in March of 1708.⁵⁸

Anne supported the Tory party, known for its strong support of the Church of England and its persecution of Presbyterians and non-conformists. During Anne's reign, the convocation of 1710-1711 authorized construction of fifty new churches from funds derived from a tax on coal.⁵⁹

In 1702, the Tories failed to enact the occasional conformity bill, which attempted to prevent religious non-conformists from evading the Test Act by receiving communion at an Anglican church before attending their dissenting church later in the day.⁶⁰

Anti-dissenter sentiment was strong during Anne's reign, and it was fueled through impassioned sermons of Anglican clergy. One such preacher, Dr. Henry Sacheverell, fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford gave a famous sermon at St. Paul's Cathedral,

⁵⁷ Claydon, *William III and the Godly Revolution*, 171; Rupp, 37.

⁵⁸ Rupp, 48; David Green, *Queen Anne* (New York: Scribner's, 1970), 39; Jarrett, 124.

⁵⁹ Green, 69; Rupp, 62.

⁶⁰ Green, 108.

London in 1709. The sermon, entitled *The Perils of False Brethren in Church and State*, accused the Whigs of nearly being non-conformists themselves. Therein, Sacheverell imprudently named names, attacking first minister Sidney Godolphin by using his nickname, Volpone. This sermon resulted in Sacheverell's impeachment trial before the House of Lords beginning in February of 1710, at which Burnet, Wake, and the royal chaplain Charles Trimmell testified against him, and Sharp, now Anne's personal confessor and spiritual advisor, came to his defense. By the first of March, the great drama of the proceedings had incited mobs, who attacked local dissenting chapels.⁶¹

Sacheverell was ultimately convicted by a 69-52 vote but was given only a slap on the wrist for a sentence: his sermon was burnt, and he was not allowed to advance in the ecclesial hierarchy for three years. In 1713, the queen showed support for him by giving him the benefice of St. Andrews, Holborn, a high church parish.⁶²

In November of 1710, the Tories won a decisive Parliamentary victory as a result of the Sacheverell trial. The newfound political strength allowed the Tories to enact the Occasional Conformity Act and the Schism Act (which required dissenting schools to be licensed by the church and use the Anglican liturgy) in the last months of Anne's reign. However, since they went into effect the day the queen died, they were never enforced.⁶³

Persecution of Catholics remained intense during Anne's reign especially in Ireland, where in 1704 all secular priests were required to register with the state under the Registration Act. The act required them to post a surety of £50 to guarantee their loyalty. Catholics were effectively excluded from the Irish Parliament. The wording of its

⁶¹ Rupp, 66-71.

⁶² Ibid., 69.

⁶³ Ibid., 64, 69; Green, 334.

membership oath was changed to require allegiance to the Anglican faith so that no observant Catholic would take the oath. The poor condition of Catholics became arguably worse after the aforementioned failed Jacobite invasion of Scotland in March of 1708. All Irish priests were required to renounce their oaths to the Stuarts, although only a few did so. In addition, unscrupulous laity called “priest catchers” took cash incentives to turn in priests who refused to give up their oaths. In the same year, Catholics were prohibited from purchasing land.⁶⁴

But despite the conditions of persecution in Ireland, the Catholic Church was never reduced to a mission church as in England and Wales, and the Irish church continued to survive under the existing diocesan system.⁶⁵

George I

George’s Lutheran upbringing on the continent led him in a manner similar to William III to have greater tolerance for non-conformists. Bishop Benjamin Hoadley of Bangor promoted a more lenient attitude toward dissenters in a sermon before the king in 1717, based upon his earlier work, *A Preservative Against the Principles and Practices of the Non-Jurors* (1716). The sermon attacked the Anglican Church’s right to doctrinal authority and advocated individual freedom in the areas of personal conscience and salvation. It called for the revocation of the Occasional Conformity Act and resulted in what was known as the “Bangorian Controversy” among Britain’s bishops. This controversy resulted in a pamphlet war on the place of church authority. One pamphlet

⁶⁴ Corish, 123, 124, 125.

⁶⁵ O’Malley, 79.

by William Law entitled *Three Letters to the Bishop of Bangor*, strongly advocated the necessity of apostolic succession. The tensions between high church advocates like Bishop Francis Atterbury of Rochester and low church advocates like Hoadley became so strained that the church convocation held that year had to be adjourned, since forceful protests were anticipated. The convocation had already condemned Hoadley because the bishops believed he had contradicted articles 19 and 20 of the Thirty-Nine Articles by denying the doctrine of the visibility of the Church.⁶⁶

George's sympathy for the rights of Protestant dissenters led to the revocation of both the Occasional Conformity and Schism Acts in December 1718 despite Archbishop Wake's strong opposition to their revocation. In the same year, Parliament passed the Act for Quieting and Establishing Corporations, which allowed persons who had not received the Anglican sacrament to remain officers in corporations. The law stated that if no one challenged a nonconformist officer's status within six months of his taking the position, he could retain his office within that corporation.⁶⁷

As to the treatment of Catholics, most restrictions from Anne's reign were retained. In the Jacobite uprising in 1715, the "Old Pretender" tried once again to invade Scotland, claim its throne, and then invade England, and it kept the populace on alert for any Catholic-inspired revolt. During all periods in this study, most Catholics held pro-Jacobite sympathies, making them suspect to most English men and women.⁶⁸

⁶⁶ Dorothy Marshall, *Eighteenth Century England* (New York: David McKay Co. Inc., 1962), 102; Rupp, 89, 90, 96, 99.

⁶⁷ Jarrett, 162; Rupp, 84; Marshall, 104.

⁶⁸ Green, 186; Jarrett, 154; Hemphill, 91, 105-6.

In the Catholic community, some clerics believed the answer for ending oppression was to remove any suspicion of disloyalty to the crown. One response to this dilemma by Bishop John Stonor, vicar apostolic of the Midlands, was to have all Catholics take an oath of allegiance to the crown and an abjuration of loyalty to the Jacobite heirs in order to remove this popular suspicion. Thomas Strickland, a priest and Stonor's ally, led an effort to persuade the pope to abandon his advocacy of the Stuarts in order that English Catholics might faithfully take the oath of allegiance to King George. Strickland even presented a plan to the English government, in which the state would end persecution in exchange for full oaths of allegiance and abjuration by all Catholics.⁶⁹

For the most part, Catholics were treated relatively well during King George's reign, probably because of efforts to demonstrate their loyalty to the British Crown. As a result of this "depoliticization," local magistrates were reluctant to press charges against Catholics within their jurisdictions.⁷⁰

⁶⁹ Stephen Conway. "Christians, Catholics, Protestants: The Religious Links of Britain and Ireland with Continental Europe." *The English Historical Review* 124, no. 509 (2009): 840; Hemphill, 108, 110-111.

⁷⁰ Conroy, 39.

Chapter 2: Du Pin in England

Du Pin's works were not the first such Gallican works translated from the French for an English language readership. For instance, Richer's *De Ecclesiastica et Politica Potestate* (1611) was translated as *A Treatise of Ecclesiasticall and Politike Power* (London, 1612). But the sheer volume of Du Pin's English editions attests to the considerable readership he attracted in Britain during this period.¹

Du Pin's First English Edition: *De Antiqua Ecclesiae Disciplina Dissertationes Historicae*

At least twenty-seven editions of Du Pin's works were published in the British Isles during the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. Fortunately for the historian, nearly all these works included dedications, advertisements, introductions, and prefaces written by the works' editors and translators.

These editorial contributions, appearing during and shortly after Du Pin's lifetime, give today's historian great insight into his works' valued attributes and "selling points," and they shed light on how Du Pin's works were used. They provide insight into how the typical reader: usually a clergyman, lawyer, or other educated person, viewed Du Pin.

One could make the case that many of the following preface and introduction quotes come from biased commentators who had a financial interest in the promotion and sale of the *New History* and later works. But other commentators arriving at the same conclusions as presented in later chapters can be cited. These opinions build upon those

¹ Edmond Richer, *De Ecclesiastica et Politica Potestate* (Parisii, 1611); W. J. Bousma, "Gallicanism and the Nature of Christendom," in *A Usable Past, Essays in European Cultural History* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1990), 319.

below and amply demonstrate that they were consistent with those of the learned British population in general.

Du Pin's first work published in England was *De Antiqua Ecclesiae Disciplina Dissertationes Historicae*, a work comparing the pope's contemporary prerogatives to those in early church history. It originally appeared in Paris in 1686 and was placed on the Index two years later. Abel Swall published it in London in 1691 in the original Latin. In this volume, Du Pin sought to discover an ideal structure of the Church supposedly based on the wishes of Jesus himself, rejecting the contemporary Tridentine model. The formidable Jacques-Benigne Bossuet later attacked its conclusions.²

De Antiqua Ecclesiae Disciplina, conferring on Du Pin an international stature, made the case for the ancient liberties of national churches and defended the authority of the ecumenical church councils over that of the pope. Using his substantial historical talents, Du Pin extracted evidence from the church fathers' writings, the excerpts of the *acta* and decrees of the ecumenical councils, and works of prominent theologians to make his case for the autonomy of national churches, especially the Gallican church. As such, it argues for numerous assertions consistent with the Gallican vision of the Church. For instance, Du Pin opined that the ancient model and division of the churches, shown in a review of the fourth century, demonstrated that it was the patriarchs and metropolitans and not solely the pope who decided church teaching.³

² Jacques Gres-Gayer, "Un théologien gallican, témoin de son temps: Louis Ellies Du Pin (1657–1719)," *Revue d'Histoire de l'Église de France* 72 (1986): 70-71; Jacques Gres-Gayer, "Louis Ellies Du Pin," *New Catholic Encyclopedia* 2 ed. (Washington, DC: Thomson Gale, 2002), 944; Gres-Gayer, "Le gallicanisme de Louis Ellis Du Pin (1657-1719)," 42; J.W. Thompson & B. J. Holm, 31.

³ *Disciplina*, 1.

Du Pin provides historical examples of the local bishop adjudicating heresy trials such as Marcion's case. He demonstrates that excommunications were not the sole prerogative of the pope but were shared by the entire Church. Furthermore, he asserts, they were not to be conducted for political purposes.⁴

In Du Pin's view, Peter's primacy and consequently the church of Rome's is simply one which can be best described as a first among equals. Peter should be correctly understood as representing the Church (not just Rome), and therefore Christ gave the keys to the entire Church not just the bishop of Rome. Du Pin asserts that the pope's decisions were not unalterable, nor were his decisions infallible as some Catholic theologians had claimed. Furthermore, the authority of councils was generally considered above that of the Roman Pontiff.⁵

The seventh dissertation of the work includes discussions on extending papal power into the temporal realm, an area of interest for Anglican divines. Examples include the third chapter entitled, "On that third rule explained, truly Christ and all the apostles banished temporal power and jurisdiction from the Church,"⁶ and the first chapter (section 5), entitled "In that fifth argument, which is bound up [by that fact that the] Church does not have authority in the temporal matters, therefore that by [using] material strength and the sword it is insufficiently able to compel men."⁷

⁴ *Disciplina*, 148, 250, 260.

⁵ *Disciplina*, 307-309, 339-342, 377.

⁶ "*In quo tertia ratio exponitur, Christum nempe & Apostolos omnem Potestatem & Jurisdictionem temporalem ab Ecclesia abandare,*" in *Disciplina*, 442.

⁷ "*In quo quinto argumento evincitur Ecclesiam in temporalia nullam habere auctoritatem, eo quod per vim gladiumque materiale homines cogere minime possit.*" in *Disciplina*, 448.

Both these sections asserted that Christ and the apostles did not intend for the Church to have the temporal power to rule over a kingdom, nor should it hold the authority to punish anyone physically for their crimes. The implication, of course, was that popes had overstepped the limits of apostolic authority.

In the same vein, Du Pin sought to verify historically his premise that the spiritual and temporal powers ought to remain separated. An example is the third chapter's section four entitled, "Or if the fourth argument, having been desired from the testimony of the Roman bishops and of the holy fathers by which it is brought about that the Church has so much power in spiritual matters, just so by kings in temporal matters, so therefore neither power by itself is dependent on the other."⁸

These sections were important to the Anglican divine who sought to demonstrate the papacy's illegitimacy, explaining that it has and currently is violating Jesus' and the apostles' prohibition of the Church's use of temporal power. Coming from a Catholic author, this work became a vital tool in anti-papal and anti-Catholic polemics.

Anglican divines used these and other sections in *De Antiqua Ecclesiae Disciplina* to advocate the separation of powers between church and state and to limit the papacy's ability to prosecute and punish its religious or political enemies. This work, probably more than the *Nouvelle Bibliothèque*, solidified Du Pin's reputation as a noted Gallican author and historian throughout Europe. Its principles colored his more historical future works.

⁸ "Seu quartum argumentum petatum ex testimoniis Romanorum Episcoporum, sanctorumque Patrum quibus efficitur Ecclesiam in spiritualia tantum habere potestatem, non secus ab Reges in sola temporalia, ita ut neutra potestas a se invicem dependeat," in *Disciplina*, 445.

Interestingly, the University of Paris doctors' comments regarding the work's historical and theological content (included in the 1686 Paris edition of the *De Antiqua Ecclesiae Disciplina*) are not found in the English edition. The work had received the approbation of the doctors of the University of Paris, to include Braier, De la Genest, Biord, Rouland, Du Bois, De Riviere, De Goué, along with an *Admonitio ad lectorem eaque pernecessaria*, which included a number of "elucidations, softenings, and even corrections" to Du Pin's work.⁹

One correction, concerning the See of Rome's primacy, cites page 16, line 8 (as well as three other places in the Paris edition). It states, "About Rome in the West: thereupon concerning how the patriarchy of the Roman See is treated, [but] not of its primacy, which it possesses from Christ [himself, and] not from the size of the regal power of the city."¹⁰ Here the doctors refute one of the Du Pin's main assertions against the primacy of the See of Rome.

While the 1691 London edition incorporated the *errata* or grammatical corrections which were included in a preface to the 1686 Paris edition, the editors omitted the doctors' admonitions of content. The editors no doubt believed these admonitions were "Papist" changes added to temper the author's Gallican message. Moreover they may have believed these *admonitiones* unneeded as not an original part of Du Pin's work.

⁹ "...cum hoc opus currentibus typis esset excusum, atque ut fieri solet in manus Doctorum Parisiensium, qui illud legere et approbare non dedignati sunt, pervenisset; visum est eis quaedam esse vel elucidanda, vel emollienda, vel etiam emendanda, ne cui operis nostri calumniandi et reprehendendi ansa praeberetur. Horum ergo, ut par erat, monitis atque consiliis, ne dicam praeceptis, obsequentes, sequentes circa singula observationes praemittimus, quas ut legas, Lector, te etiam atque etiam rogo," in *Disciplina*, [xxiii].

¹⁰ "Roma in Occidente: ibi de Romanae sedis Patriarchatu agitur, non autem de ejus Primatu quem habit a Christo, non ex solius urbis amplitudine. Idem observandum ad finem S. 7. ejusdem *Dissertationes*, p. 21 & 38 ad finem, ac 39 initio." in *Ibid.*, [xxiii].

Regardless of the reason, the omission shows the editors' adaptation to the tastes of English readers, unlikely to welcome any "softenings or corrections."¹¹ to Du Pin's anti-papal message.

A New History of Ecclesiastical Writers

Du Pin's signature work, the *Nouvelle Bibliothèque*, originally published in Paris in 1686, was translated into English as the *New History of Ecclesiastical Writers*. Abel Swall and Tim Child published it in London in three editions: 1692, 1693, and 1696.¹²

William Wotton (1666-1727) translated all three of these editions, presumably with a team of translators. Wotton, an English divine widely known as a child prodigy in classical languages, graduated with a Bachelor of Arts from Cambridge at the tender age of fourteen and became a fellow of the Royal Society at twenty-one. As a historian in his own right, he authored *Reflections upon Ancient and Modern Learning* (1694), a historical study of the growth of scientific concepts that Jonathan Swift later satirized. He also wrote a *History of Rome from the Death of Antonius* (1701) dedicated to his mentor, Gilbert Burnet.¹³

Unfortunately, Wotton's morals did not match his scholarship. While rector of Middleton Keynes, Buckinghamshire, he was disgraced for public drunkenness and soliciting prostitutes and exiled to Wales for eight years. More important for this study,

¹¹ *Disciplina*, [xiii-xxvi].

¹² Louis Ellies Du Pin, *Nouvelle bibliothèque des auteurs ecclésiastiques* (Paris: André Pralard, 1686), [i]; Louis Ellies Du Pin, *New History of Ecclesiastical Writers*, tr. by William Wotton (London: Abel Swall and Tim. Childe at the Unicorn in St. Paul's Church-yard, 1692); NH93; Louis Ellies Du Pin, *New History of Ecclesiastical Writers*, tr. by William Wotton (London: Abel Swall and Tim. Childe at the Unicorn in St. Paul's Church-yard, 1696).

¹³ David Stoker. "William Wotton." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, vol. 60, ed. by H.C.G. Matthew and Brian Harrison. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 386.

Wotton actively defended the Anglican faith against the views of deists and nonjurors in numerous works and published a defense of the church convocation of 1711. As such, he represents the typical commentator of Du Pin presented in this dissertation: an orthodox Anglican who sought to defend the established church from its domestic detractors.¹⁴

The 1692 edition of the *New History of Ecclesiastical Writers* could not be located for this study and likely consisted of only the first two volumes, but the 1693 and 1696 versions are essentially identical, and therefore the 1696 version was likely printed solely in response to continued demand.

An additional 1695 edition with the Wotton translation was originally published in London under the alternative title, *A New Ecclesiastical History*, by William Horton. In 1722, George Grierson printed a Dublin edition with the Wotton translation. The Dublin edition consists of three large volumes which includes the history of the sixteenth century. This edition includes a subscriber list composed of mostly Anglican divines and Protestant members of the Irish Parliament.¹⁵

The 1693 *New History* included the complete history of the Church between the first and fifteenth centuries in thirteen volumes. The set was an encyclopedia-sized work, organized chronologically. Only the six-volume original set appeared in that first extant edition. The first volume discussed the Church's first three centuries, and the second volume only the fourth century because of an in-depth discussion of that century's important councils. The third and fourth volumes reviewed the fifth century's first and

¹⁴ Stoker, 387.

¹⁵ Louis Ellies Du Pin, *A New Ecclesiastical History*, tr. By William Wotton (London: Abel Swall and Tim. Childe at the Unicorn in St. Paul's Church-yard, 1695); Louis Ellies Du Pin, *Histoire de l'Église et des auteurs ecclésiastiques du seizième siècle* (Paris: André Pralard, 1701); NH22, [vii-viii].

second halves, the fifth volume explored the sixth century, and the sixth volume treated the seventh and eighth centuries.

In 1695, the *New History*'s seventh volume (on the ninth century) was released. The eighth, ninth, and tenth volumes (narrating the tenth, eleventh, and twelfth centuries, respectively) followed in 1698. The thirteen-volume set was finally completed in 1699 with the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth tomes (that chronicled the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth centuries, respectively).

The work included indexes, tables, and timelines which made it an eminently useful desk reference for answering almost any theological question that might arise concerning the work's fifteen-century span. The translators remained true to the French originals, leaving in potentially offensive terms like "hereticks," when referring to the Protestants. The editor (most likely Wotton) included marginal notes providing useful clarifications for his English audience.

A short review of discoveries Du Pin proposed in *New History* is needed to understand the impact that this signature work had on theological debate in Britain. As demonstrated below, the first volume's importance dealt mostly with Du Pin's determination of the authenticity of works attributed to the church fathers. An excellent example is Du Pin's discussion of the Liturgy of St. Peter. Du Pin writes in the 1693 *New History*,

The *Liturgy*, or *Greek and Latin Mass*, attributed to *St. Peter*, and published by *Lindanus* in the year 1589. from a Manuscript of Cardinal *Sirlet*'s, that was not very ancient, and which was afterward Printed at *Paris* by *Morellus*, Anno 1595. cannot be *St. Peter*'s for the following Reasons, since mention is made therein of *St. Sixtus*, [Pope] *Cornelius* and *St. Cyprian* [second and third century figures, and therefore the references to them would have been anachronisms]: the Virgin *Mary* is called the *Mother of God*, a Term that was not generally in use, until after

the Condemnation of the *Nestorian* Heresie; The canon of the *Latin Mass*, which is reputed by St. *Gregory*, to have been composed by a *Scholastick*, that is to say, a Learned Man of the Fifth Century, is entirely inserted therein: Moreover it contains diverse Litanies taken from the *Sacramentarium* of St. *Gregory*, and the *Liturgies* of St. *Basil* and St. *Chrysostom*: There are also Prayers for the *Patriarch*, a term altogether unknown before the end of the Fourth Age of the Church, and for the *most religious Emperors*. In short, if St. *Peter* had been the Author of this Liturgy, it would have been used by the Church of *Rome*, neither would it have lain hid during so many Ages. These Reasons made the Learned Cardinal *Bona* [Giovanni Bona, author of *De Rebus Liturgicis* (Rome, 1671)] say, that this Liturgy was forged, and that it was in all probability compiled by a *Grecian* priest *Latinized*, because it is collected partly from the *Greek* Liturgy and partly from the *Latin*, and the name of St. *Peter* was prefixed to it, either that it might obtain more Authority, or because a great part of the Liturgy of the Church of *Rome* was comprehended therein.¹⁶

This key quote, explaining how an ancient liturgy was a forgery goes to the heart of Du Pin's aim for his *Nouvelle Bibliothèque*. Above, he sought to discredit the authenticity of the Liturgy of St. Peter, a Mass containing both Greek and Latin elements, which, he explains, St. Peter could not have written. He shows the mass contains liturgical and theological elements unknown during the first century: it includes wording from later Roman liturgies, describes Mary as the Mother of God, prays for patriarchs, addresses Roman emperors who were Christian, and so forth.

His reason for examining this liturgy and others dating from the apostolic age was to prevent French ultramontanes from propounding Roman doctrines based on these spurious works. In doing so, Du Pin freely promoted his Gallican vision of the Church, and sought to remove any contrary models that ultramontanes proposed on the basis of them.

¹⁶ NH93, vol. 1, 8.

In the *New History*, Du Pin refused to hide Catholic responsibility for the rise of various heresies over the history of the Church. For instance, in regard to the Albigensian heresy, Du Pin writes,

The Great Sect of the *Albigenses* was a Mixture and Composure of all those particular Sects [the Buncaires, Siscidois, Cathari, and others which had arisen in the south of France during this period]: It spread it self in *Languedoc*, *Provence*, *Dauphiné*, and *Arragon*: *Raymond* Count of *Toulouse* supported their Party which was become very Numerous and Powerful, especially in *Languedoc*, and grew every Day stronger and stronger **by the Remissness of the Prelates, and the Irregular Manners of the Ecclesiastics.**¹⁷ [bolding mine]

Especially noteworthy, in Du Pin's volume on the twelfth century, was chapter XX entitled, "Observations on the Ecclesiastical Affairs of the Twelfth Century."¹⁸ This chapter reviews the twelfth-century changes in ecclesiastic discipline. Foremost, he discusses the increase of papal power occurring during this era. He writes,

For it was in this Century, that they established their Sovereignty in *Rome*, and their Independency of the Emperor, and even assum'd to themselves a Right of conferring the Imperial Crown: they extended their Jurisdiction and Authority over the Churches farther than they had hitherto done, and met with much less Opposition in their Attempts than in former Times. The most part of the Councils were call'd either by them; or by their Legates, and they were the Authors of the Constitutions that were made therein, and to which the Bishops scarce did any Thing else but give their Consent. Appeals to the Pope in all sorts of Causes, and in favor of all sorts of Persons, were become so frequent, that no Affair was transacted, the Determination of which was not immediately referr'd to the Court of *Rome*; which oblig'd those Persons, who had any Zeal for the maintaining of Church Discipline, and among others, St. *Bernard*, publickly to complain of the Abuse.¹⁹

Du Pin believes the twelfth century introduced the novelty of Roman authority, including the right to decide appeals over the heads of local bishops. He discusses the

¹⁷ NH93, vol. 11, 150.

¹⁸ NH93, vol. 10, 216.

¹⁹ NH93, vol. 10, 217.

century's changes such as frequent use of dispensations, greater influence in the selection of bishops, and the cardinals' new role of electing the pope.²⁰

He notes that stricter prohibitions against priestly simony and concubinage appear in this century. Du Pin writes that marriages of priests were nullified at the first Lateran Council in 1123, which ended the inheritance of clergy assets by their illegitimate children. He explains that public penance was discouraged, and certain sins such as the abuse of priests were reserved for the absolution of the pope.²¹

The clergy's reservation of the cup became more widespread during this century, and some authors used the term "transubstantiation."²² In his section on Bishop Peter de Celles of Chartres, presented in the twelfth-century volume, Du Pin explains that the term "transubstantiation" first appeared at that time. He writes, "In his [de Celles'] Eighth Sermon on the Lord's Supper, we find the Term of *Transubstantiation*, which is also in *Stephen* Bishop of *Autun*, who liv'd in the same Century: And indeed those two Authors are the first that made use of it."²³

Du Pin considered the twelfth the most novelty-ridden century in church history. To him, the changes in papal power on appeals, temporal authority, reservation of absolution from certain sins, priestly marriage, and the Eucharist made it the most damaging to his vision of the early Church.

In addition to discussing twelfth-century Eucharistic changes, Du Pin devotes a long explanation to the ninth-century debate on Holy Communion between Radbertus and

²⁰ NH93, vol. 10, 217.

²¹ NH93, vol. 10, 217, 218.

²² NH93, vol. 10, 218.

²³ NH93, vol. 10, 156.

Ratramnus entitled, “*The History of the Controversie upon the Eucharist Debated in the Ninth Century*.”²⁴ He notes, “The Famous Controversie of the Church of *Rome* with the *Lutherans* and *Calvinists*, upon the *Eucharist*, has made men more attentive to all Controversies, formerly raised about that Mystery.”²⁵ Du Pin then explores in depth the ninth-century controversy in response to a contemporary seventeenth-century demand for the Church’s Eucharistic history.

In this section, Du Pin describes the more corporeal Eucharistic theology of Radbertus (a.k.a. Paschasius) but notes that several theologians, including Ratramnus (who held to a more spiritual presence) opposed his theology. He writes,

Amongst the authors of the same Century that have but cursorily treated of this Matter, *Amalatus*, *Florus*, and *Druthmarus* speak of it like *Ratramnus*. . . About the latter end of this Century, *Erigerus* Abbott of *Lobbes* Wrote against the same Proposition which *Ratramnus* had attempted to overthrow; but still maintaining the Real Presence in the Eucharist. *Sigebert* and the Author who continued the Chronicle of *Lobbes*, speaking of him, observe, That he had *Collected many Passages out of the Orthodox Fathers against Paschasius Radbertus, touching the Body and Blood of our Saviour*.²⁶

In this Eucharistic discussion, Du Pin notes that Ratramnus advocated a real presence more spiritual than that of Paschasius (and the Catholic Church of Du Pin’s day), and he quotes him in this section.

Lastly, He [Ratramnus] concludes this first Part in these Words; ‘By what hath been said hitherto it plainly appears, That the Body and Blood of our Saviour received in the Church by the Mouth of the Faithful, are Figures, if consider’d by the visible and outward Form of the Bread and Wine: But, if considered by their Substance, hidden to our Eyes, that is, by the Power of the Divine Word, they are indeed the Body and Blood of Christ. Therefore, according to the visible

²⁴ NH93, vol. 7, 69.

²⁵ NH93, vol. 7, 69.

²⁶ NH93, vol. 7, 77.

Creature, they are a Food for our Bodies, but, by the Power of a mightier Substance, they nourish and sanctifie the Souls of the Faithful.²⁷

It is noteworthy that Du Pin discussed at length the Eucharistic controversy that was such a bone of contention between Catholics and Protestants during the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. Indeed, Du Pin was not averse to giving a “losing” historical view such as that of Ratramnus’ presence of “the power of the Divine Word” equal time in the discussion of past theological ideas. This discussion reveals Du Pin’s own conciliatory views on the Eucharist already discussed in his ecumenical correspondence with William Wake. They testify to his willingness to be honest about a disputed issue’s history without taking a hard line position on one side. Yet despite keeping some academic distance from these controversies, his readers will actively defend their own doctrines on the Eucharist and other topics based on his history.

Du Pin did not avoid other topics that Catholics and Protestants disputed. For instance, on the veneration of images that was the main topic of the Second Council of Nicaea (787), Du Pin made the case that the council’s decision did not correspond to the Church’s universal opinion. Wotton took note of Du Pin’s view and in a footnote explained that Roman Emperor Leo II had previously prohibited veneration because it elicited idolatry among the faithful. Wotton specifically calls such veneration and the council’s approval of it an innovation. He writes,

Some indeed did zealously oppose themselves against this **Innovation** [devotion to images] (of whom, *Epipanius* was the Chief) not as a thing absolutely unlawful, but as fearing it might introduce Idolatry among the People, but because it was declared, that no Worship was intended or allowed them; they submitted,

²⁷ NH93, vol. 7, 76.

but not withstanding, what these men foresaw, did, in process of time, come to pass: For not only the people became downright Idolaters, but even the most Learned paid too great a Reverence to them, saying Prayers before them, and worshipping Christ by his Image. This grand Abuse of them, stirred up the Emperor *Leo* to remove Images out of the Churches, and to destroy and burn them, as the Cause of so great a Sin.²⁸ [bolding mine]

Again Du Pin gives equal treatment to a heretical theological position: in this case the prohibition of image veneration which the Second Council of Nicaea later rescinded.

John Spurr has noted that “the appeal to history was crucial to establishing the authority of the various churches, and the authority of the church was vital to the eternal fate of its members.”²⁹ He explores the low tolerance for perceived contemporary innovations during this period, a sentiment Du Pin shared. Du Pin suggests that image veneration was an innovation and consequently, he considers the determination of the Second Council of Nicaea to be one as well. In his dissertation, Peter Blewett discusses this aversion to innovations which Du Pin sees as causing nearly all the problems of his contemporary Church and especially the heightened authority of the See of Rome.³⁰

As is evident throughout this dissertation, it is unclear whether or not many of the users of Du Pin’s work had a fully formed idea about the nature of his Gallican vision, and, therefore, the motivations behind his history. Nevertheless, these same commentators would actively use his Gallican work in supporting their own agendas, whether they were in the area of Protestant apologetics, the defense of Anglicanism

²⁸ William Wotton, in NH93, vol. 6, 131.

²⁹ John Spurr. “ ‘A Special Kindness for Dead Bishops’: the Church, History, and Testimony in Seventeenth Century Protestantism.” *The Catholic Historical Review* 92.2 (2006): 310.

³⁰ Ibid., 311; Peter F. Blewett, “The Gallicanism of L.E. Du Pin,” (Ph.D. Dissertation, Boston College, 1969).

versus the rise of the nonconformists, or in the promotion of non-juror theology (discussed further in Chapter 5).

William Wotton did not share this apparent Protestant ignorance about Du Pin, and he relates his knowledge of Du Pin's motivations and trials in the 1693 *New History*'s third volume's preface. He writes,

Since the Publication of the former Volumes of this *Bibliotheca* in our Language, we have had an account, That the Author was censured for it at *Paris*: It was reasonable enough to expect, that some notice would be taken of that great freedom, with which he so industriously asserts the Privileges of National Churches; especially if ever the French King should command those of his Clergy, who assisted in the General Assembly in 1682. to make such Submissions as the Court of *Rome* would accept of.³¹

Wotton understands that the *Nouvelle Bibliothèque*'s avid Gallican promotion might lead to Du Pin's eventual persecution. This could happen, according to Wotton, when and if Louis XIV needed to make peace with Rome.

Wotton even dares to attribute Du Pin's censure by the archbishop of Paris, Cardinal François de Harlay de Champvallon, to a dispute over his edition of the Psalms which had overshadowed Bossuet's own edition published the previous year. According to Wotton, the catalyst had to be the publication of this Du Pin Psalm edition in 1691, which sparked Bossuet's ire and protest the following year, 1692. Wotton attributes the action to the pressure exerted by the pope's nuncio, rather than by the will of Parlement, which seems to have made conciliatory remarks towards Du Pin because of his willingness to

³¹ William Wotton. "Preface" in NH93, vol. 3, [iii].

retract.³² Wotton opined that the censure might limit the academic liberty and consequently the quality of his future work. He writes,

A Censure thus carried on, will be so little to our Author's Disadvantage that few Persons will think the worse of this Book upon that account; it is his misfortune that he lives in a Country where he had no other way to save his Liberty, and perhaps his Life, but by yielding to the Storm: And, according to the Principles of his Religion, he was bound to submit to his Diocesan. But this will lessen the Authority of any Books that M. *Du Pin* may hereafter print upon Ecclesiastical Matters, because Fear of giving Offense will make him extremely cautious, and he will dread a severe Inquisition that may set upon every thing which he shall write.³³

He alleged that Du Pin's edition of the Psalms corrected a number of translating errors in Bossuet's edition. According to Wotton, Bossuet's anger at the insolence of these corrections led him to attack Du Pin's major work, the *Nouvelle Bibliothèque*, in retaliation.³⁴ He writes,

If we may judge of all those things which M. Du Pin has retracted or mollified by that Specimen in the *Histoire des Ouvrages des Scavans* [a book which contained du Pin's condemnation and retraction], the Proceedings against him have been spiteful and malicious, rather to satisfie those particular Persons who are concerned to see his Credit lessened, than because he really deserv'd so rough a Treatment...It is evident enough, from this short Specimen, That his Accusers had no Inclination to spare him, but would make him smart for all that Liberty with which he made his Abridgements, and passed his Censures upon the Writings of the ancientest Fathers of the Church.³⁵

Wotton points out that in fairness all other doctors of the Sorbonne providing approbations should have been punished as well, since they would have been aware of

³² William Wotton. "Preface" in NH93, vol. 3, [iii]; Jacques-Benigne Bossuet, *Liber Psalmorum, cum Notis Jacobi Benigni Bossueti Episcopi Meldensis*. (Lyon: Anisson, Posuel, Claude Rigaud, 1690); Louis Ellies Du Pin. *Liber Psalmorum, cum Notis Quibus Eorum Sensus Litteralis Exponitur*. Parisiis: A. Prallard, 1691); Wotton, "Preface" in NH93, vol. 3, [iii, iv].

³³ Wotton, "Preface" in NH93, vol. 3, [v].

³⁴ Ibid., vol. 3, [iii].

³⁵ Ibid., vol. 3, [iv].

how Protestants might use this work to their advantage.³⁶ He further proposed that the same doctors must have believed the contents of the *Nouvelle Bibliothèque* to be true and asked why no one acted upon the *Nouvelle Bibliothèque* until six years after its publication. The publication of Du Pin's edition of the Psalms explained the timing. To Wotton, spite and jealousy were the motivations for Du Pin's unjust persecution and not academic questions regarding its merits.

Another excellent source that sheds light on how Du Pin's work was received in England is the publisher Timothy Child's advertisement for the 1692 edition of *A New History of Ecclesiastical Writers*. Child, a London bookseller and publisher, marketed many historical works, such as Thomas Hearne's *Ductor Historicus, a Short System of Universal History* (1714) and Gerard Brandt's *The History of the Reformation and Other Ecclesiastical Transactions In and About the Low-Countries* (1720).³⁷

Child's advertisement extols the usefulness of the *New History* which "has so freely laid open the Forgeries of their [Catholic] old *Liturgies, Decretals, Spurious Works*, ascribed to the Fathers, &c."³⁸ He explains that several foreign Protestant divines have favorably reviewed the book, and then specifically notes four English divines, Edward Stillingfleet, William Cave, William Fleetwood, and Edward Gee, who cited Du Pin's previous works in their books.³⁹

³⁶ Wotton, "Preface" in NH93, vol. 3, [iv].

³⁷ Timothy Child, *Proposals for Printing by Subscription, Bibliotheca Patrum: Or, A New Ecclesiastical History*. (London: Abel Swall and Tim. Childe at the Unicorn in St. Paul's Church-yard, 1692), [i-iv]; Daniel R. Woolf, *Reading History in Early Modern England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 251; Gerard Brandt, *The History of the Reformation and Other Ecclesiastical Transactions In and About the Low-Countries*. (London: Printed by T. Wood, for Timothy Childe, 1720).

³⁸ Child, [i].

³⁹ Ibid., [i].

Three authors, Edward Stillingfleet, William Fleetwood, and Edward Gee, used Du Pin for controversial purposes, while Cave cited the *New History* for its academic utility. The three controversial works of Stillingfleet, Fleetwood, and Gee were published during James II's reign, when as mentioned controversialist writings proliferated, and the Reformation in England seemed threatened. It is noteworthy that a number of late seventeenth-century controversial works were reprinted in a work called *A Preventative Against Popery* (1738), when concerns of rising conversions to Catholicism stimulated a demand for reprinting Protestant arguments against Catholic doctrine.⁴⁰

The advertisement published inside the 1693 edition of the *New History* itself yields valuable information. Unlike *Proposals for Printing by Subscription, Bibliotheca Patrum: Or, A New Ecclesiastical History*, as previously discussed an advertisement in itself, this advertisement is attached to the work's first volume, and in it Wotton explains the new English edition's value. He writes,

...as long as he never suffers the Sorbonist to break in upon the Historian, his Writings carry an Authority with them, greater than they could have done had they come from a Protestant. Truth, I confess, is the same whoever speaks it; yet all Men grant, that it carries a more Convictive Force along with it, when extorted from those whose Ingenuity over-bears their Interest, than when it freely comes from men that advance their Cause by telling it.⁴¹

⁴⁰ For more information on this topic see Julie Conroy. "A *Preservative against Popery* (1738): The Use of Late Seventeenth Century Polemical Works to Discourage Conversions from the Church of England," (Ph.D. Dissertation, The Catholic University of America, 2008); Edmund Gibson, ed. *A Preservative against Popery, in Several Select Discourses upon the Principal Heads of Controversy between Protestants and Papists: Written and Published by the Most Eminent Divines of the Church of England, Chiefly in the Reign of King James II*, 3 vols. (London: Printed for H. Knaplock, 1738).

⁴¹ Wotton. "Advertisement Concerning This Translation," in NH93, vol. 1, [iii].

This quote confirms the reason why so many English divines cited Du Pin's history. If one writes a history that refutes his own faith tradition, he is simply more convincing than an author whose history only serves to substantiate his own beliefs.

More high praise for Du Pin's scholarship can be found in the "To The Reader" section in volume eight of the 1693 *New History* (on the tenth century). Therein, an anonymous writer, possibly William Jones who dedicates the volume to Bishop Henry Compton of London, or perhaps Wotton, highly lauds Du Pin's work. He writes,

The most ingenious M. *Du Pin* follow'd these Luminaries [the great church writers of tenth century], and took them for his Guides, in writing the Ecclesiastical History of the Age in which they flourish'd, and in giving an Impartial Account of the Matters treated of by them; which he has done with that Clearness, Generosity and Integrity, which is so inseparable from the Character of this Great Man.⁴²

It is notable that the author indicates his "integrity" which is "so inseparable from Character of this Great Man." This quote highlights the differing national perceptions of Du Pin's character. In England, commentators lauded his integrity, but in France many questioned it.

More than other prefaces reviewed in this chapter, "The Translator to the Reader" section in the *New History*'s eleventh volume sheds specific light on its utility to the English divine regarding various theological topics. This usefulness is evident in the areas of transubstantiation, papal punishments, and scholasticism. This section demonstrates again the high regard English Anglican divines had for his academic discipline.

⁴² "To The Reader" NH93, vol. 8, [vi].

In this preface, preceding the 1699 volumes of the *New History* and addressing the thirteenth, fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, an anonymous translator (probably Wotton) shows how Du Pin's history was useful in contesting the Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation and the Albigensian crusade in the thirteenth century. He writes,

It has been observ'd by Monsieur *Du Pin* and others, That School-Divinity was corrupted in the 13th Century, by introducing into it the principles of *Aristotle's* Philosophy, whereby all Matters of Doctrin were resolved into a great many curious and useless Questions, and decided by the Maxims of that Philosophy (which yet was learned not from the *Greek* Originals, but the corrupt Versions of the *Arabians*) as if they were of equal Authority with the Scriptures: And as this mixture corrupted the Simplicity of the ancient Christian Faith, so it was the cause of many Mischiefs, among which I reckon this to be none of the least, that it furnish'd Men with such Principles as were subservient to maintain the Popish Doctrin of Transubstantiation.⁴³

Again Du Pin proved useful in polemical attacks on transubstantiation: this time through his discussion of how Aristotelian categories were introduced in the twelfth century to provide the basis for the doctrine's philosophy. Du Pin recognized a faith "innovation," which became a Protestant argument in the attack on Catholic doctrine.

The translator demonstrates how Du Pin's research on Lateran Council IV and the ninth-century debate between Radbertus and Ratramnus supported the Anglican view of the Eucharist. He writes,

The first pretended General Council in which Transubstantiation is said to be established, was the fourth *Lateran* Council under *Innocent* III. in the Year 1215. But *Du Pin* has plainly prov'd, that the canons which go under the Name of this Council were not made by the Council it self, but only by Pope *Innocent* III. who read some of them in the Council, and after its Dissolution added many more as he pleased, *Dissert. 7 de Antiq. Eccl. Discipl. Ch. 3 Sec. 4.* which is a Trick that the Popes had commonly used in the 12th Century, who published their own Constitutions as the Decrees of Councils, *Du Pin Hist. Eccl. 10th Cent.* [actually

⁴³ "The Translator to the Reader," in NH99, vol. 11, [iii].

the twelfth century] p. 217...As to the Term of Transubstantiation, *Du Pin* says it was first used by *Celles* Bishop of *Chartes*, and *Stephen* Bishop of *Autun*, in the 12th Century, p. 156. As to the Doctrin it self, it appears to have been first published by Paschasius in his Treatise of the Body and Blood of Our Saviour about the year, 832 ... He [Paschasius] might very well call it *wonderful* Doctrin, not only for its apparent Absurdity, but for its Novelty (since the like Expressions had never been used before) which is ingeniously confess'd by *Bellarm. de Scriptor. Eccl. ad annum* 850 and by Sirmondus in the Life of *Paschasius* prefix'd to his Works, *par. 1618.* and may be plainly proved from the Writings of most learned Men in this Century...In the same century, after this Doctrin was published, it met with great Opposition from many eminent Men, such as *Ratramnus, Joannes Scotus, Amalarius, Florus, Druthmarus*, and *Erigerus*, all of which are own'd by *Du Pin* to have oppos'd the Doctrin of *Paschasius*, *Cent. 9th p. 77.*⁴⁴

According to Wotton, Du Pin demonstrated that Lateran IV had not promulgated the doctrine of transubstantiation which the assertive Pope Innocent III allegedly inserted into its canons after the fact. Hence the term *transubstantiation* was first introduced in the twelfth century, and the doctrines Radbertus advanced, allegedly the equivalent of the contemporary view of transubstantiation, were vehemently opposed during his lifetime.

Du Pin provides numerous explanations of transubstantiation and the opposing views. The translator writes, "These things [citations which dispute transubstantiation] are so plainly and frequently asserted in this Book, that I must Transcribe the greatest part of it, if I would produce all the Passages which are to this Purpose."⁴⁵

As seen below, while the author questions Du Pin's approach in understanding the subject, he nevertheless is convinced that the Sorbonne doctor proves the falsity of the doctrine itself. In commenting on Du Pin's reference to a book of Ratramnus (also known as Bertram the Priest) on the Eucharist, the translator states,

⁴⁴ "The Translator to the Reader," in NH99, vol. 11, [iv].

⁴⁵ "The Translator to the Reader," in NH99, vol. 11, [v].

The main Question of *Bertram's* Book then is not, as *Du Pin* puts it, Whether the Body of Christ be in the Eucharist in as visible and palpable a manner as when he liv'd upon Earth...But, *Whether in the Sacrament we receive the same Body of Christ which was Born of the Virgin, Crucified, and Rose again ...*and this he flatly denies, and plainly disproves, in direct opposition to *Paschasius* [Radbertus], and the Doctrin of the present Roman Church. He says indeed, *the Elements are truly Christ's Body and Blood*; but then he explains himself, *they are not so as to their [vi]sible Nature, but by the Power of the Divine Word ...*it plainly appears that he did not believe the Sacrament to be a meer Sign and Figure of Christ's Body and Blood, but thought they were Really present, not in a Carnal but in a Spiritual Sense.⁴⁶

Here Wotton evidently believes that Ratramnus's book convincingly refutes

Radbertus's view on the Eucharist and consequently the contemporary official Catholic Eucharistic theology.

In "The Translator to the Reader" preface, Wotton discusses Du Pin's treatment of the Albigensians in the thirteenth century. He writes,

Mr. *Du Pin* in this History has given us some account of the barbarous Proceedings against the *Albigenses* by the Croisade and the Inquisition, without passing any Censure upon these Actions; but lest any should suspect by his Silence, that he approv'd them, I will now briefly shew you what Opinion he had of all Corporal Punishments, when they are us'd by Ecclesiasticks. And this will appear from his Book of Ecclesiastical Discipline [*De Antiqua Ecclesiae Disciplina Dissertationes Historicae* (Eng. ed. 1691)], *Dissert.* 7. where 1st in the Preface he tells us, *That the Civil Power respects Mens Bodies, which may be forc'd to a Compliance, and therefore the Civil Magistrate may Punish Men with Corporal Punishment and Death; but the Ecclesiastical Power respects Mens Minds which cannot be forc'd...they can inflict no other Punishment but that of Excommunication.* And then 2ndly, in *Ch. I. Section 5.* of the same *Dissertation* he ...says..., *'tis a thing unheard of among the Ancients that the Church should inflict any other Punishment than that of Excommunication, or Deposition... it was only in the latter Ages that the Church obtain'd of the Emperors a Power to inflict Corporal Punishment.*⁴⁷

⁴⁶ "The Translator to the Reader," in NH99, vol. 11, [v].

⁴⁷ "The Translator to the Reader," in NH99, vol. 11, [vi].

This second quote is noteworthy, showing how Du Pin worked to dispute Catholic discipline, which was a constant target of Protestant polemical attack especially concerning inquisitions and alleged Reformation-era atrocities.

In “The Translator to the Reader” section, Wotton showers high praise on Du Pin’s academic integrity and evenhandedness. He writes,

As Monsieur *Du Pin* has merited the Applause of the Learned World, for his former Volumes of Ecclesiastical History; so in these three which are now publish’d, he continues still to write like himself, and maintain the same Character which has been given of him; he is no less faithful in his Relations, judicial in his Reflections, exact in his Criticisms, and moderate in his Censures of those who differ from him; and even more impartial than would be expected from one of a contrary Party...the excellent Historian has enlightened these dark Ages, by giving a clearer account of them than any one Writer before him, for he has brought to light some notable Pieces of History which seem’d to be buried in Oblivion, and collected together the several Fragments which were scatter’d in many Volumes, and plac’d them in such a clear light, that the Darkness of the Times serves to set off and commend the Judgment of the Historian.”⁴⁸

A Compleat History of the Canons and Writers, of the Books of the Old and New Testament

In 1699 Du Pin published *Dissertation préliminaire ou prolégomènes sur la Bible*,⁴⁹ an addition to the *Nouvelle Bibliothèque* that presents the writers of Holy Scripture, and which received so much scorn from the father of historical biblical criticism, Richard Simon. It was later published in English as *A Compleat History of the Canons and Writers, of the Books of the Old and New Testament* by H. Rhodes, in 1699.

The latter title, published in a two-volume set, consists of one volume treating the Old Testament and a second on the New Testament. *A Compleat History of the Canons and*

⁴⁸ “The Translator to the Reader,” in NH99, vol. 11, [iii].

⁴⁹ Louis Ellies Du Pin, *Dissertation préliminaire ou prolégomènes sur la Bible*. (Paris: Chez Pralard, 1699).

Writers discusses numerous biblical topics, such as the deuterocanonical books, spurious texts linked to the Bible, the authority and inspiration of the Bible, its authorship, as well as a review of Bible translations and advice on hermeneutics.

One of Du Pin's noteworthy positions articulated in this book is his advocacy of translating the Bible into vernacular languages. He writes,

It is very hard to imagine, that so extravagant a Paradox as this could enter into the Thoughts of Men; that the Sacred Scripture of the Old and New Testament, was only intended to be read by the Priests, and other Persons enlightened in the Matters of Religion; and that, according to the true Intention of God and the Sacred Authors, the reading of the Bible was not permitted either to the *Jews* or *Christians* in general; but to be kept from them as a hidden Mystery; It is, I say, very hard to imagine that a Thought so little Consonant to right Reason as this, could enter into the Thoughts of any rational Man... But it is no difficult Task to evince the contrary from the Holy Scripture it self, and the constant Practice both of the *Jews* and *Christians*.⁵⁰

Here Du Pin used quite a derisive tone to dismiss the views of anyone who might hold that Holy Scripture should not be translated in the vernacular and should instead be reserved for the use and proclamation of the clergy alone.

Du Pin used his book to refute the theories of Richard Simon which put into doubt the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. He writes,

But 'tis not at all necessary to suppose what Mr. Simon advances, *viz.* that there were always among the *Hebrews*, Prophets or publick Scribes Divinely Inspir'd who kept publick Registers of the Histories and Affairs which concern'd the State, who are the Authors of all the Sacred Writings, and who had a Right of reducing them as they pleas'd; to add to them, or take out of them what they thought convenient. This new *Hypothesis* is not founded on any solid Principle. There is no mention made in any place of Scripture of those public Scribes Inspir'd by God; they are nowhere styl'd Prophets.⁵¹

⁵⁰ CH99, 222.

⁵¹ CH99, 43.

Here Du Pin refuted Simon's theory that the Bible's first five books were not authored by Moses himself, but in his stead public scribes gathered the community's historical information and wrote the Pentateuch. Grès-Gayer points out that Simon was responding to Baruch Spinoza's assertion that Moses could not have authored the Pentateuch. Obviously, Du Pin's more traditional position would have been attractive to an Anglican audience.⁵²

Anglican divines used Du Pin's work to defend the Bible's integrity and infallibility as demonstrated in the preface of *A Compleat History of the Canons and Writers of the Books of the Old and New Testaments*. It explains that Du Pin advocated the translation of the Bible into the vernacular. However, as one might expect from the Protestant editor, it attacks Du Pin's defense of the Apocrypha's reliability and his explanation of how these books came to be added to the Bible. But the preface praises Du Pin's defense of the Bible's reliability. It specifically notes the usefulness of Du Pin's works in refuting such biblical scholars as Richard Simon, Baruch Spinoza, Jean Le Clerc, and the political philosopher Thomas Hobbes.⁵³

A New Ecclesiastical History of Sixteenth Century

Four years later, André Pralard published another edition of Du Pin's *Nouvelle Bibliothèque* profiling the sixteenth-century Reformation era. This work, subsequently translated into English, was published in London by A&J Churchill and Timothy Child as

⁵² Jacques Gres-Gayer, "Un théologien gallican et l'Écriture Sainte. Le 'Projet biblique' de Louis Ellies Du Pin (1657-1719)," in *Le Grand Siècle et la Bible*, ed. J. R. Armogathe. (Paris, Beauchesne, 1989), 262.

⁵³ CH99, i-ii.

the two volume *A New Ecclesiastical History of Sixteenth Century*. The anonymous translator's identity has commonly been attributed to Wotton.⁵⁴

The first edition, presenting the Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges, Lateran Council V, the rise of the reformers, and the biographies of prominent early-sixteenth-century Catholic writers, was published in 1703. The second edition, a two-volume set, containing the volume above plus an additional one interpreting the Council of Trent, the ecclesiastical history of Europe from the council until the end of the century, and biographies of prominent Catholic authors of the second half of the sixteenth century was published in 1706. The publication of a second edition (of the 1703 edition) in 1710 by J. Wild attests to its successful reception.⁵⁵

The *New Ecclesiastical History of Sixteenth Century* with its extensive histories of the Protestant Reformation did not include any Protestant writers in its biographies of ecclesiastical writers (that was included in the latter portions of both volumes). The biographies of these non-Catholic writers were left to a later work, *Bibliothèque des auteurs separez de la communion de l'Église romaine* (1718), a work which remarkably was never translated into English. Abbreviated versions of these biographies were included in the *New Ecclesiastical History of the Seventeenth Century* (1725), which will be discussed later in the chapter.

⁵⁴ Louis Ellies Du Pin, *Nouvelle Bibliothèque des Auteurs Ecclésiastiques: Contenant l'Histoire de Leur Vie, le Catalogue, la Critique, et la Chronologie de Leurs Ouvrages 13, Des auteurs du XVI. Siècle de l'Église* (Paris: Andre Pralard, 1703); Sixteenth C. 1706; Stoker, 387.

⁵⁵ Sixteenth C. 1703, vol. 1.; Sixteenth C. 1706, vol. 2; Louis Ellies Du Pin, *New Ecclesiastical History of Sixteenth Century*, A. (London: J. Wild for T. Child at the White-Hart at the West End of St. Paul's Church-yard, 1710).

Interestingly, *A New Ecclesiastical History of Sixteenth Century* begins with about fifteen pages explaining the Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges (1438), even though it occurs in the fifteenth and not the sixteenth century. This addition, typical of Du Pin, lays the sixteenth-century groundwork with a historical basis for the prerogatives of the French church *vis-à-vis* the papacy. He gives special attention to the Concordat of Bologna, which secured the king's right to nominate clerics to major French benefices and became another key document supporting the French church's historical Gallican privileges.⁵⁶

In the second volume on the Council of Trent, Du Pin emphasizes that the council infringed upon the liberties of the Gallican church. He wrote,

One of the principle Articles of the Liberties of the *Gallican* Church is the Ancient Custom of judging of Bishops. This the Council of *Trent* has departed from, when it commanded, That Criminal and Important Causes against Bishops, even of Heresie, which deserves Deprivation of Dignity, should be heard and judged by the Pope alone, exclusively of all others... This Practice is absolutely contrary to the Disposition of the Ancient Canons, and the Usage authorized in this Kingdom. It is contrary likewise to the *Concordat*, and the Laws of the Kingdom, which do not allow that any of the King's Subjects should be compelled to go in Person to plead out of his Dominions... the Council gives the Pope a Power of deposing Non-resident Bishops, and of putting others in their Places. This is also an Encroachment upon the Episcopal Authority, and a Breach of the *Concordat*.⁵⁷

Du Pin, while showing that Luther and other reformers relied on the Bible as the basis of their theologies, maintained that the former's biblical interpretations were often incorrect. He attributed Luther's errors to a misinterpretation of scripture rather than nefarious purposes, as numerous Catholic authors alleged. For example, Du Pin's

⁵⁶ Sixteenth C. 1703, vol. 1, Book 1, 2-14, 26-31.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, vol. 2, Book 3, 356.

account of Luther's theological presentation at the Augustinian Colloquy at Heidelberg in 1518 states,

Lastly, The summ of all these propositions [on justification] is, that the Just Man lives not by the works of the Law but by Faith. It was upon this Sentence of the Apostle St. *Paul*, not rightly understood, that *Luther* built forty other Propositions, which he maintain'd *April* 26. of the same Year, in the Monastery of St. *Augustin* at *Heydelberg*...⁵⁸

Du Pin was willing to use works of Protestant historians in addition to Catholic sources in his work, which was an additional demonstration of evenhandedness. For instance, in discussing the last hours of Thomas Müntzer, the radical reformer and leader of the peasant's revolt, Du Pin includes a commentary of the famous Protestant historian, Johann Sleidan. Du Pin writes,

Some say, That *Muncer* shewed much sorrow, renounced his Errours, and returned again into the Communion of the [Catholic] Church; That he confessed his Sins to a Priest, and received the Sacrament under one Kind: Others say, That he recited the *Lutheran* Confession of Faith, which the Duke of *Brunswick* was pleased to dictate to him. ***Sleidan* adds, That Muncer was then under so great Trouble and Consternation of Mind, that he could not give any Account of his Faith.**⁵⁹ [bolding mine]

Du Pin uses Gilbert Burnet's *History of the Reformation of the Church of England* (1679) in discussing the great English Catholic reformer and papal legate to the Council of Trent, Cardinal Reginald Pole. Du Pin writes,

The Protestant Writers, even M. *Burnet* himself, cannot forbear applauding the Virtues of this great Cardinal. *He was*, says M. *Burnet*, *eminent for his Learning, his Modesty, the Excellency of his Temper, and his Humility*. He adds, *That he ought to be look'd upon as a Prelate who had as much Virtue as any Man of that Age*; and that if the rest of the Bishops had acted according to his Maxims, and

⁵⁸ Sixteenth C. 1703, vol. 1, Book 2, 37.

⁵⁹ Sixteenth C. 1703, vol. 1, Book 2, 99.

shew'd the same Moderation, he had perfectly reconciled the Kingdom of *England* to the Holy See.⁶⁰

Naturally, Du Pin used well known Catholic sources. In the work, he cites the controversial Paulo Sarpi, an outspoken anti-papal Venetian historian as well as the pro-papal Pietro Pallavicino, a Jesuit professor at the Collegium Romanum. These authors had previously written histories of the Council of Trent. Sarpi's *Historia del Concilio Tridentino*, a 1619 Italian work published in London, was translated into English the following year. Pallavicino's response, *Istoria del Concilio di Trento*, appeared in two volumes (Rome, 1656-1657).⁶¹

In discussing the opening of the Council of Trent, Du Pin cites both historians. He writes, "the *Bull for Opening the Council* being Read in the Congregation; a Bishop, *Fr. Paul* says of Astorga, and *Palavicini* of *Jaen*, proposed that it would be convenient to have the Bulls for Calling the Council, and the Powers of the Legates, read."⁶²

Du Pin did not avoid discussing the corruption within the Catholic Church during this century. About the writings of George Cassander, a Flemish theologian who attempted to reconcile Catholics and Protestants, Du Pin writes,

Lastly, If in these last corrupt Times, some opinions be crept in contrary to the Holy Scriptures, and to ancient Tradition, he [Cassander] owns that they ought to be avoided and shunned; But he does not think that private Men ought to oppose them before all Mankind indifferently, especially when it is certain that such Disputes will cause Scandal...⁶³

⁶⁰ Sixteenth C. 1706, vol. 2, Book 3, 24.

⁶¹ Paulo Sarpi, *Historia del concilio Tridentino*. (Londra: Appresso Giovan. Billio., 1619); Paulo Sarpi, *The Historie of the Councel of Trent*. (London: Printed by Robert Barker, and Iohn Bill, printers to the Kings most Excellent Maiestie, 1620); Pietro Pallavicino. *Istoria del Concilio di Trento*. (Roma: nella stamperia d'Angelo Bernabo: per Giovanni Casoni, 1656-1657).

⁶² Sixteenth C. 1706, vol. 2, Book 3, 2.

⁶³ Sixteenth C. 1706, vol. 2, Book 5, 48.

Therefore, in recounting the Reformation period, Du Pin does not shy away from the possibility that unscriptural novelties may have crept into the corrupted Church.

Concerning Anglican views on the *New Ecclesiastical History of Sixteenth Century*, the work's most revealing quote appears in the 1703 edition's (volume one) anonymous translator's advertisement.⁶⁴ Here the translator (called a "Learned Divine of the Church of England), probably Wotton, acknowledged that Du Pin believed Luther used the Bible as a guide in deciding controversial issues. As discussed above, the average Catholic controversialist usually ignored this interpretation. Wotton apologizes for Du Pin's use of "heretick" in describing Protestants. He writes, "*But though he calls Luther and Zuinglius Hereticks, yet he opens the Grounds upon which they went: He shews how Luther was used, and what his Concessions were at first, How he made the Scripture his Guide of Controversies, and labored to explain and translate it for the Use of the People...*"⁶⁵

The advertisement states that while other Catholic authors have slandered the reformers, Protestants have awaited one who would fairly represent the facts. Here Wotton explains how the Protestant faith has at last found its Catholic champion,

Such an [impartial] Account in the main our Author has here given: Such an Account from a Doctor of the Sorbonne, (in a Country where the Protestant Religion has been lately rooted out) as we ought to bles God for, and of which admirable Use may be made. For when he tells us what Luther's doctrine was, he fetches it out of his own Writings, and represents it nakedly as it is. The Abuses

⁶⁴ Learned Divine of the Church of England, "Advertisement Concerning This English Translation," in *Sixteenth C.* 1703, vol. 1, [i].

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, vol. 1, [vi-vii].

*and Corruptions of the Church of Rome he dissembles not: So that one may from him make a right Judgment of the State of the Church at that time.*⁶⁶

In the same volume, the “Learned Divine” (probably Wotton) boasts that Du Pin follows the Reformation histories of both Johannes Sleidan and Gilbert Burnet in his own history, which makes him unique as a Catholic in his willingness to utilize Protestant sources for his works. He writes,

*In his [Du Pin’s] History of the Reformation, Sleidan and Bishop Burnet are usually his Guides; and though he seldom names them, yet he very often follows them, where his own Party have often slandered the Persons whom he has occasion to write of; which will be visible to everyone that will compare Sander’s [sic] calumnies [the Catholic Nicolas Sanders’ accusations of atrocities under Elizabeth I] that are collected at the End of Bishop Burnet’s History of the Reformation of the Church of England, with Du Pin’s Relations of the same Things.*⁶⁷

Much can be learned from prefaces found in Volume Two (1706) of Du Pin’s *A New Ecclesiastical History of Sixteenth Century*, which examines the Council of Trent. This volume includes an “Advertisement Before the English Translation,” written by an anonymous author, most likely the publishers A. or J. Churchill or Timothy Child, but possibly Wotton. It holds in great esteem Du Pin’s impartiality, since *A New Ecclesiastical History of Sixteenth Century* relies heavily on Sarpi’s *Historia del Concilio Tridentino*. While Sarpi’s work is recognized today as deeply biased and imperfect, Du Pin’s use of a source unfavorable to the papacy was ample demonstration of his impartiality in the publisher’s mind.⁶⁸

⁶⁶ Learned Divine of the Church of England, “Advertisement Concerning This English Translation,” in *Sixteenth C.* 1703, vol. 1, [vi].

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, vol. 1, [vi].

⁶⁸ “Advertisement Before the English Translation” in *Sixteenth C.* 1706, vol. 2, [v-vi].

The anonymous author of an “Advertisement Before the English Translation” boasts that Du Pin utilized Pietro Pallavicino’s history as well as Gilbert Burnet’s *The History of the Reformation of the Church of England*, and that Du Pin quotes from the reformers’ own works.⁶⁹ The author believes that Du Pin as an unbiased observer utilized a wide range of sources to include orthodox Catholic and Protestant ones to arrive at the most evenhanded results. He notes Du Pin’s discoveries regarding the actual liturgical practices of the ancient Church and also that he challenged his Catholic readers to an honest consideration of current Catholic practice compared to that of ancient Christianity. He writes,

*The particular Usefulness therefore of this Volume to a Protestant is evident. The Church of Rome ... pretends to nothing less than Infallibility, and to an immediate Title granted by Jesus Christ, the True Head of his Church, to the Bishops of Rome as his Vicars to govern the Catholick Church. Nothing therefore could have been more Providential, than that the History of the Council of Trent, which brought Popery to the Form, in which we now see it, should first have been written by a Man [Paolo Sarpi] who lived and died in that communion, and that in such a manner as a Protestant would wish to have had it written; that afterwards this History should have faithfully turned into French by a Profess’d Roman Catholick [Abraham Nicolas Amelot de la Houssaye]; and last of all, that his Version should have been copied by a Doctor of the Sorbonne [Du Pin] and interwoven ... into his own History... They [Catholics] are desired therefore to compare its [Trent’s] Negotiations with the History of the first and purest Ages of Christianity... they must at least own, that contrary Courses were then followed from those which our Savior and his Apostles took when they preached up that Kingdom which Jesus Christ himself said was not of this World.*⁷⁰

Thus, the anonymous writer believed that *A New Ecclesiastical History of Sixteenth Century* was an ideal work for anti-Catholic polemics. Foremost, it is favorable to the Protestant cause, because of its role in highlighting the disparity between the canons of

⁶⁹ “Advertisement Before the English Translation” in *Sixteenth C.* 1706, vol. 2, [v-vi].

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, vol. 2, [v-vi].

Trent and the practices of the primitive Church. As a distinct bonus, Catholics provide all this evidence themselves. A Catholic (Sarpi) wrote the first history of the Council of Trent. Another Catholic, Abraham Nicholas Amelot de la Houssaye, a French historian and Gallican, translated it into French. Still another Catholic, Du Pin, incorporated it into a recent history. The anonymous author considers this edition a “considerable Step towards” the destruction of “Popery.”⁷¹

Another preface in *A New Ecclesiastical History of Sixteenth Century* that demonstrates the work’s usefulness in providing a historical basis for the Anglican church’s independence from the Holy See is William Wotton’s dedication letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury, Thomas Tenison. The letter is found in its second volume.

This dedicatory letter explains the work’s Gallican uses in regard to the Anglican church. It states that *A New Ecclesiastical History of Sixteenth Century* is “...a Book which gives a particular Account of the most Artificial, and, at the same time, most violent Attempts that were ever made to destroy the Privileges of the Episcopal Order, by endeavoring to subject the whole Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction, and that too, by a pretended Commission from Jesus Christ to the sole Power of the Bishops of *Rome*.”⁷² He adds, “Though its Author be of a different Communion, a Doctor of that Church which Esteems and Treats us as Hereticks; yet his great Candor and Impartiality may reasonably

⁷¹ “Advertisement Before the English Translation” in *Sixteenth C. 1706*, vol. 2, [v-vi].

⁷² William Wotton, “To the Most Reverent Father in God, Thomas, Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, Primate of All England, and Metropolitan,” in *Sixteenth C. 1706*, vol. 2, [iii-iv].

Exempt him from the Croud of Writers of his own Church, and give him a Title to our Value and Regard...”⁷³

It is notable that Wotton mentions Du Pin’s impartiality despite his membership in the Catholic communion, again testifying to the widespread acceptance of this notion. In fact, in a manner similar to the “Learned Divine” in the “Advertisement Concerning This English Translation,” Wotton marvels at Du Pin’s evenhandedness in his margin notes in the second volume, when he notes that he follows Burnet’s history more closely than the work of the Catholic Nicolas Sanders. Wotton writes,

The *English Reader* need not be told, that Bishop *Burnet* has, at the end of each Volume of his *History of the Reformation*, given a distinct Answer to the most notorious Falsehoods in *Sanders*’s history. What is remarkable is, that *Du Pin*, in his Account of the Ecclesiastical History of *England* in this Century, generally follows Bishop *Burnet* where he contradicts *Sanders*.⁷⁴

To Wotton, Du Pin evidently has the integrity to follow a more reliable Protestant source, even when it contradicts an inferior Catholic one.

A New Ecclesiastical History of Sixteenth Century, in which Du Pin used both Protestants and Catholic sources to obtain an evenhanded assessment of this most controversial century, was an indispensable tool in providing the historical sources needed to defend the Anglican church against Catholics domestically and internationally.

A New Ecclesiastical History of Seventeenth Century

Du Pin then completed his famous work with an edition presenting the seventeenth century entitled *Histoire ecclésiastique du dix-septième siècle*, published by Pralard in

⁷³ William Wotton, “To the Most Reverent Father in God, Thomas, Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, Primate of All England, and Metropolitan,” in *Sixteenth C. 1706*, vol. 2, [iii-iv].

⁷⁴ William Wotton in *Sixteenth C. 1706*, vol. 2, book 5, 120.

Paris (1714). L. Lichfield published Digby Cotes' translation of the work in Oxford in 1725. Cotes served as principal of Magdalen Hall and public orator at Oxford University.⁷⁵

It is not known how many volumes were to be published, but only the first volume was printed. Separated into two parts, Books I-IV treated the century's ecclesial history, and Books V-VII reviewed the great church writers' lives and works. The first part gave special emphasis to the important Gallican advances in France. Gallican sections included the tracts of Messrs. Du Puy (Jacques and Pierre, two prominent Gallican brothers), fifteen pages on the Gallican writings of Edmund Richer (longer than any other section in the volume), the history of the Venetian interdict, the writings of Paulo Sarpi, and academic works at Clermont and Paris concerning the infallibility of the pope. This section included other topics as well, such as the Jansenist controversy and the revocation of the Edict of Nantes.⁷⁶

While the issue of papal infallibility was hotly debated during this period, Minnich explains that no decision was reached at the Council of Trent. He indicates that during the council's third period (1562-1563), a voting bloc led by Charles de Guise, cardinal of Lorraine, and aligned with the imperial delegation and episcopalists from the German states, Spain, and Italy, rejected the notion that bishops were vicars of the pope. Instead, they maintained that their authority came directly from God. They rejected the Council of Florence's affirmation of the pope's complete authority over the universal Church,

⁷⁵ Louis Ellies Du Pin, *Histoire Ecclésiastique du Dix-Septième Siècle*. (Paris: André Pralard, 1714); Seventeenth C. 1725, vol. 1.

⁷⁶ Seventeenth C. 1725, vol. 1. 15-22, 32-48, 58-71, 75-81, 101-102, 147-151, 167.

noting its inconsistency with the councils of Constance and Basel. A compromise, which held that the pope was the universal bishop of the Church, was also rejected.⁷⁷

At the council's conclusion, according to Minnich, the fathers gave the pope the responsibility to consult with local parties should difficulties arise in their acceptance of its canons. The pope could also convene another council to reconcile differences.

Minnich adds that the bishops, perhaps unwittingly, gave the pope the prerogative to suggest solutions to issues that might arise. This "blank check" allowed for the creation of the Congregation of the Council, which decided issues of doctrine and morals for the next three hundred years. Nevertheless, it was not until Vatican I (1869-1870) when an official, albeit limited, doctrine of papal infallibility was finally secured.⁷⁸

Typical of the *New History's* editions, it includes useful indexes and chronological tables. But unlike his sixteenth-century history, the seventeenth-century edition offers some examination of major non-Catholic authors of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries such as Melancthon, Calvin, Socinius, etc. Not part of Du Pin's original *Histoire Ecclésiastique du Dix-Septième Siècle*, they were translations of short biographies and histories extracted from his *Bibliothèque des auteurs separez de la communion de l'Église romaine*.⁷⁹

Digby Cotes' "A Translator's Preface" explains the episcopal polity as the biblical model for the Church. He notes that the Anglican church, based on the ancient Church,⁸⁰

⁷⁷ Nelson H. Minnich "Councils of the Catholic Reformation: A Historical Survey," in *The Church, the Councils, and Reform*, edited by Gerald Christianson, Thomas M. Izbicki, and Christopher M. Bellitto. Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 2008, 57.

⁷⁸ Minnich "Councils of the Catholic Reformation: A Historical Survey, 58.

⁷⁹ Seventeenth C. 1725, vol. 1, 217-220, 230-243, 254-273; BAS vol. 1, 76-351, 601-654.

⁸⁰ Digby Cotes, "A Translator's Preface" in Seventeenth C. 1725, vol. 1, [iii].

gains its legitimacy from the Church's earliest structures, rather than from the reformers.

He writes,

Our Religion was not founded by *Luther* or *Calvin*, but on the Prophets and Apostles, Jesus Christ himself being the chief Corner-Stone of this noble, and ever, we hope, lasting structure. Which was model'd with equal Piety and Wisdom, adorn'd with every Primitive and Apostolick Rite that could add either Beauty or Strength to the Building, and cemented with the Blood of the most pious and learned Men of the Kingdom.⁸¹

It is especially noteworthy that Du Pin's work may have been used to prove that the apostles themselves started the Church, and consequently the Anglican church. Neveu believes this claim was a fundamental premise of Anglican ecclesiology during this period.⁸²

Even more interesting is Cotes' Gallican view of national church sovereignty. Du Pin's Gallican vision supported his view of the Church of England's legitimate authority and its right to govern its own domestic ecclesial affairs. This vision served to prove the illegitimacy of certain non-national church groups, such as the dissenters in Britain, by demonstrating that they had illicitly separated themselves from the church.

Cotes reveals this attitude when discussing the Scottish Reformation. He again attacks the Calvinists' polity when he states that "Ecclesial power being rais'd too high in the Times of Popery, was depress'd as much too low in this kingdom [Scotland], and other Places, where the Reformation prevail'd, by the motley Institution of a Minister and Lay-Elders."⁸³ Du Pin's work provides the Gallican ideal as the perfect antidote for the perceived "extreme" polities of the Presbyterians. Cotes continued by using Du Pin's

⁸¹ Digby Cotes, "A Translator's Preface" in *Seventeenth C. 1725*, vol. 1, [iii].

⁸² Neveu, 349.

⁸³ Digby Cotes, "A Translator's Preface" in *Seventeenth C. 1725*, vol. 1, [iii].

“antidote” against the authority of the Holy See. In discussing the English church’s successful break from the papacy, he writes,

...we divided from her as one particular national church may do from another, neither of which has any Authority to prescribe to the other in Ecclesiastical Matters. But the Case of the Dissenters from the Church of *England* is far otherwise. For if the Imposition of indifferent Things be thought a sufficient Ground for Separation, as it is now generally urg’d, since the Plea of their Unlawfulness is given up, then we must have separated from the Apostilick Church, which had some Rites, whose Indifferency is acknowledg’d by their being totally difus’d, and from all the Reform’d Churches on Earth, which can never subsist without prescribing Rules in such Matters.⁸⁴

Indeed Cotes, in a Gallican fashion, saw the papacy as a national church like any other, except that it had risen in insolence to assume the mastery of all others. Moreover, Cotes slights dissenters, demonstrating their unwarranted separation from the Church of England over indifferent matters. To him, a separation of national churches was permitted since they had no authority over each other. However, the willful separation of Christians within one nation especially over theological *adiaphora* could never be condoned.⁸⁵

1722 Dublin edition of the *New History*

One cannot leave the subject of the *New History* and subsequent editions on the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries without reviewing the prefaces of the 1722 Dublin edition. Most are identical to the London editions, but the preface to the Dublin edition’s second volume gives added insight into contemporary perspectives. Its anonymous author lauds Du Pin’s discussion of the second Council of Nicaea at which the veneration

⁸⁴ Digby Cotes, “A Translator’s Preface” in *Seventeenth C. 1725*, vol. 1, [vii].

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, vol. 1, [vii].

of images was defended. In speaking of Du Pin's discussion of the eighth century, he writes,

In short, there was much Superstition, and little solid Piety in this Age; as witness the Adoration of Images, which was now first broached: And here we cannot enough admire, with what Justness and Fidelity our excellent Author relates the Disputes which were carried on in the second Council of *Nice*[a], on that Subject. And this Piece of History alone is sufficient to let any rational Man see, how late that idolatrous Innovation was introduced into the Church, and how little the primitive Christians even dreamt of it.⁸⁶

As shown in previous London prefaces, the anonymous author embraces Du Pin's view of the veneration of images as a novelty thereby using this historical discovery to substantiate contemporary Anglican liturgical practices and reject Romans ones. According to Conroy, Anglican controversialists often argued that the Second Council of Nicaea, with its decision to condone the veneration of images, was the first ecumenical council to turn its back on the universal consensus of the Church. Many Anglican commentators believed the Catholic Church's era of corruptions started after this council.⁸⁷

In discussing Du Pin's view of the ninth century, the author notes his academic integrity and includes a reference to the censures and punishments he received in France. The anonymous translator wrote,

The Ninth Century was perplexed with so many intricate *Controversies* quite through it, that scarce any Person, but one of Mr. *du Pin*'s great Abilities, and firm Judgment, would have dared to meddle with it; yet he hath done it with that Clearness, Integrity, and Faithfulness, that is render'd one of the most profitable parts of *Church-History*. Indeed, the Roughness of the Way [a reference to his censures and exile] hath forced him out of his former Method, and this Part of his

⁸⁶ NH22, vol. 2, [iii].

⁸⁷ Conroy, 249.

History appears in a different Dress from his former; yet the same Ingenuity, Learning, and Freedom, is so visible throughout, that no Man hath any thing of the *Critick*, can doubt it to be his... It may be justly suspected, that our *Author* should represent Things most fairly for the *Romish* Side, in which, by his Profession, he is engaged, few being impartial in such Cases; but, to the just commendation of Mr. *Du Pin*'s Integrity, it ought to be said, that he hath even in those Points, no farther inclined to his own Side, than the Zeal of the contending Parties hath justly oblig'd him... So that considering the Temptation our *Author* had to be partial in the *History* of this *Century* [referencing the controversial issues of that century such as grace and the real presence], more than in any of the former, he is more admired for his Impartiality and Integrity in this, than in the *Former Volumes*.⁸⁸

Other Works Published in England

Remarkably, nine different editions of the *New History* were published in English. Even more surprisingly, fourteen other editions of various Du Pin works appeared in the British Isles.

For instance, Pierre Giffart published Du Pin's *Bibliothèque universelle des historiens* in Paris in 1707. R. Bonwicke published its English translation as the *Universal Library of Historians* in 1709. This two-volume work holds the distinction as Du Pin's only secular history translated into English. His longer work on secular history, *l'Histoire profane depuis son commencement jusqu'a present*, published in Paris in 1714, surprisingly never appeared in English.⁸⁹

In *The Universal Library of Historians*, Du Pin uses the same critical method for ancient secular history as he used with ecclesial history in the *Nouvelle Bibliothèque*. Its

⁸⁸ NH22, vol. 2, [iii].

⁸⁹ Louis Ellies Du Pin, *Bibliothèque universelle des historiens* (Paris: Pierre Giffart, 1707); Louis Ellies Du Pin, *Universal Library of Historians* (London: R. Bonwicke, J. Tonson, W. Freeman, Tim. Goodwin, J. Walthoe, 1709); Louis Ellies Du Pin, *L' Histoire profane depuis son commencement jusqu'a present*. (Paris: Vincent, 1714).

first section discusses “the pretended Ante-diluvian Historians” and that “The Phoenicians have nothing [no history] older than the Deluge.”⁹⁰ In other words, Du Pin’s role as “debunker” of false history remains pronounced in this work, as it was in previous ones.

The first volume, in a similar technique used in the *Nouvelle Bibliothèque*, includes an author-by-author critical discussion of the ancient Jewish, Egyptian, Chaldean and Phoenician secular historians. This volume explores the Greek and Roman authors living until the Peloponnesian War as well as longer discussions on Thucydides and Herodotus.⁹¹ For theological purposes, Du Pin reiterates his belief in Moses’s authentic authorship of the Pentateuch, and supposed distinction as the first historian whose work is still extant. He writes,

Moses by Universal consent is allow’d to be the most Antient Historian which we have extant: for whether he was contemporary to *Inachus*, as St. *Justin Martyr*, *Athenagoras*, *Tatian*, *Clement of Alexandria*, *Tertullian*, *Julius Africanus*, and other Christian Authors, *Josephus* and *Justus* amongst the *Jews*, and the *Pagan Writers*, *Manethon* *Ptolemæus*, *Mendesius* or the *Mendesian*, *Apion* of *Alexandria*, and *Porphyrius* suppose; or whether he liv’d in the time of *Cecrops*, the first King of *Athens*, according to *Eusebius* [the famous fourth-century church historian], it is yet certain that he proceeded, not only all the Authors; but all the Histories, and even the Fables of the *Greeks*; since according to the Calculation of the first, he was 675, and pursuant to that of the last 275 Years before the *Trojan* War. All Authors both Sacred and Profane, or rather all Nations, with common consent make him the Author of the *Jewish* Laws and History. The one and the other are comprised in his Five Books now extant, and known to us by the Title of the *Pentateuch*. This is no place to shew that they are truly written by that Author; I have already in another Work [*Dissertation préliminaire ou prolégomènes sur la Bible* (1699)] prov’d it at large, and sufficiently answered the Conjectures, which some Criticks have alleg’d to prove that they did not come out of *Moses’s* Hand in the condition that they at present are.⁹²

⁹⁰ ULH09, vol. 1, 1, 5.

⁹¹ ULH09, vol. 1, 29, 30-48, 48-53, 64-69, 177-194, 227-243, 244-365, 366-427, 430-440.

⁹² ULH09, vol. 1, 29.

The second volume, focusing on Greek authors before Alexander the Great's reign, reviews the history of Xenophon, the fourth-century B.C. Greek historian and friend of Socrates, and includes chronological tables charting the lives of the historians reviewed.⁹³

Some of Du Pin's other works were translated abridgements of the *Nouvelle Bibliothèque* already published in Paris. One example, *Histoire de l'Église en abrégé*, published in Paris by Jacques Vincent (1712), is an abridged version of the *Nouvelle Bibliothèque* presented in a question-and-answer format. Perry believes the work is seriously flawed since she doubts he read a single Protestant author during its preparation. This claim is doubtful since Du Pin included a review of Protestant authors' works in his seventeenth-century edition of the *Nouvelle Bibliothèque*, which was abridged into this work.⁹⁴

The *Histoire de l'Église en abrégé* appeared in two separate English editions as *A Compendious History of the Church* in 1713 and 1716, with the second edition little changed from the first. Its German translation in question-and-answer format was published as *Des Herrn L. E. Du-Pin Kurtzer-Begriff der Gantzen Kirchen-Historie von Anfang der Welt biß auf unsere Zeit: aus Frag und Antwort Bestehend* in 1713. The third edition of *Histoire de l'Église en abrégé* replaced the original question-and-answer format with a more readable narrative. Thomas Fenton translated it into English as *The History of the Church* (1724).⁹⁵

⁹³ ULH09, vol. 2, 1-52, 53-68, 251-258, 261-263, 268-270, 308-309, 317-340, 345-359.

⁹⁴ Louis Ellies Du Pin, *Histoire de l'Église en abrégé* (Paris: Jacques Vincent, 1712); Perry, 223.

⁹⁵ CHC13; Louis Ellies Du Pin, *A Compendious History of the Church* (London: Bernard Lintott at the Cross-Keys between the Temple Gates, 1716); Louis Ellies Du Pin, *Des Herrn L. E. Du-Pin Kurtzer-*

A Compendious History of the Church, written in the most popular style of Du Pin's English editions, condenses the combined seventeen volumes of the *New History*, *A New Ecclesiastical History of Sixteenth Century*, and *A New Ecclesiastical History of Seventeenth Century* into four.

The *Compendious History*'s first volume includes an interpretation of the Old and New Testaments. Before the New Testament section, Du Pin included the preface, "The Usefulness of Church History; why that Study is so much neglected. The Plan of an Abridgement of Church History, by Way of Questions and Answers."⁹⁶ In this introduction, he gave his reasoning for writing *A Compendious History of the Church*. He writes, "as for a Abridgement of the whole Body of the Church History, I know not of any we have fit to be read and study'd by Children, Women, and the most simple Persons."⁹⁷ Du Pin intended this work as more approachable and readable history for non-academic use.

The second volume includes the first eight centuries of church history. Du Pin is uncharacteristically pastoral in this work, using history to enhance the faith of ordinary people. Nevertheless, he cannot resist propounding his Gallican views. In the section entitled "An Abridgement of the Doctrine, Discipline and Morals of the three first Centuries," he writes,

They granted to the Bishops civil Metropoles, Prerogatives and Rights over the Churches of the Province depending upon the Metropolis. The Churches of

Begriff Der gantzen Kirchen-Historie Von Anfang der Welt biß auf unsere Zeit : aus Frag und Antwort bestehend (Regensburg: Seidel, 1713); Louis Ellies Du Pin, *The History of the Church* (London: Bernard Lintott at the Cross-Keys between the Temple Gates, 1724).

⁹⁶ CHC13, vol. 1, 238.

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, vol. 1, 240.

Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch, were look'd upon as the First, and their Bishops enjoy'd great Prerogatives. The Church of *Rome* founded by *S. Peter* was look'd upon as the first of all, and its Bishop as the first Bishop in the World. He was consulted by the rest, and his Opinion was of great Weight altho' he was not believed to be Infallible. The Decisions of the Councils were much regarded, and the Opinion of the Universal Church, *i.e.* of all the churches, pass'd for an infallible Rule of Faith.⁹⁸

Du Pin asserts the following propositions in this passage: archbishops beside the pope had powerful prerogatives to rule their provinces, the councils are the final arbiters of the faith, and the pope is not infallible.

The third volume includes the history of the ninth through fifteenth centuries. The final volume addressed the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries with an emphasis on French controversies such as Gallicanism, Jansenism, and the academic works related to them. This included topics such as: “The History of the Pragmatic Sanction,” “*Of Jansenius’s Book, and the Disputes raised on the Occasion of it in the Low-Countries, and in France,*” and “*Disputes relating to the Edition of the Proofs of the Liberties of the Gallican Church, the book entitled Galus Optatus [Gallus Optatus de Cavendo Schismate – an anti-Gallican pamphlet written by Michael Rabardeus], [and] Peter Cellot’s Treatise concerning the Hierarchy.*” Notable in this last volume is how the translators (as in the *New History*) left in Du Pin’s text such words as “Heresie” and “pretended Reformed Church” to describe the various Protestant movements.⁹⁹

Esteem for Du Pin’s scholarship can be found in the introductory letter of the 1724 edition of the *History of the Church*, which, as mentioned before, was a translated version of the third French edition of the *Histoire de l’Église en abrégé* written in narrative form.

⁹⁸ CHC13, vol. 2. 73-74.

⁹⁹ CHC13, vol. 3; CHC13 vol.4, 1-4, 13, 47, 178.

As such, the *History of the Church* closely mirrors the content and structure of A *Compendious History of the Church*. The translator, Thomas Fenton, wrote this introductory letter to Anthony Henley, Esq. Gentleman Commoner Christ-Church Oxford, his student at Oxford, who conferred the former's benefice. Fenton explains that the work's first and second French editions, presented in question-and-answer format, were changed to a standard narrative in the third edition, and extended to 1718. Fenton states that *Histoire de l'Église en abrégé* was an abridgement of *Nouvelle Bibliothèque*, since several unidentified persons urged Du Pin to write an abridged version of that lengthy history.¹⁰⁰ The esteem for his scholarship is apparent in this comment from the letter,

It will need no further recommendation, as coming from an author so universally esteem'd by the learned world. He may indeed seem to have been too partial to the Roman Communion especially in his account of the Reformation: but 'tis may be ascribed to the exigency of publick affairs, rather than to any bigotry in himself; who was reputed to have a very great veneration for the Doctrine, Discipline, and worship of the Church of England...¹⁰¹

By this time his ecumenical work with Wake has become known to at least the *cognoscenti*. His partiality to the Catholic Church in his presentation of the Reformation is attributed to censorship, as Beauvoir had done regarding Du Pin's transubstantiation views during the Wake dialogue. It is apparent Fenton knows Du Pin recognized the validity of Anglican orders in that exchange.

Another work attributed to Du Pin, *The Evangelical History*, a two-volume set—one volume on the life of Jesus and another on the lives of the apostles, was published in

¹⁰⁰ Louis Ellies Du Pin, *History of the Church*, Third Edition. (London: Printed for Bernard Lintot at the Cross-keys between the Temple Gates, 1724); Thomas Fenton, "Preface," in *Ibid.*, [iii, vi].

¹⁰¹ Thomas Fenton, "Preface," in *Ibid.*, [vi].

various English editions (and titles) between 1694 and 1731. The first edition on Jesus was the unattributed *An Exact History of the Life, Death and Acts of our Blessed Saviour Jesus Christ* (London, 1694). The first edition with Du Pin named as author appeared the same year entitled *The Evangelical History, or the Life of Our Blessed Saviour Jesus Christ*. Another edition of the latter was published in 1696 with a second volume added entitled *The Evangelical History Part the Second: Being the Lives and Acts of the Holy Apostles*. The work's positive reception prompted two more editions published in 1703 and 1712 by Timothy Child, and a third in 1732 by R. Ware.¹⁰²

However, Du Pin, named as the author of all but the first edition, was not the likely primary author. The volumes' straightforward style, in contrast to Du Pin's detailed prose, and the existence of an identical French edition of the Jesus volume entitled *Histoire de la vie de Notre Seigneur Jésus-Christ* (1687) by Nicolas Le Tourneux, a famed preacher and Jansenist, makes Du Pin's authorship dubious.¹⁰³ Neveu has designated Le Tourneux the "best representative of the pastoral liturgy movement [during this] time."¹⁰⁴ His best known work, *l'Année chrétienne*, presents the lives of the saints in order of their saint's days¹⁰⁵ as was the normal practice. Like his *Histoire de la Vie de*

¹⁰² Louis Ellies Du Pin, *The Evangelical History* (London: Mary Smith at Bishop Beveridge's Head, 1720); *An Exact History of the Life, Death and Acts of our Blessed Saviour Jesus Christ* (London: Abel Swall and Tim. Childe at the Unicorn in St. Paul's Church-yard, 1694); Louis Ellies Du Pin, *The Evangelical History, or the Life of Our Blessed Saviour Jesus Christ* (London: Abel Swall and Tim. Childe at the Unicorn in St. Paul's Church-yard, 1694, 1696); Louis Ellies Du Pin, *The Evangelical History: Being the Lives and Acts of the Holy Apostles* (London: Abel Swall and Tim. Childe at the Unicorn in St. Paul's Church-yard, 1696); Louis Ellies Du Pin, *The Evangelical History* (London: T. Childe at the White-Hart at the West End of St. Paul's Church-yard, 1703, 1712); Louis Ellies Du Pin, *The Evangelical History* (London: R. Ware at the Bible and Sun in Amen-Corner near Pater-noster-Row, 1732).

¹⁰³ Nicolas Le Tourneux, *Histoire de la Vie de Notre Seigneur Jésus-Christ*. (Paris: Hélie Josset, 1687); Bruno Neveu, *Erudition et religion* (Paris: Albin Michel, 1994), 64.

¹⁰⁴ "le meilleur représentant du mouvement de pastorale liturgique du temps," in Neveu, 64.

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, 64.

Nostre Seigneur Jésus-Christ, it combines “serious criticism with the purposes of practical edification.”¹⁰⁶ It was a formidable vehicle for Le Tourneux’s Jansenist views. After his death in 1687, Antoine Arnauld and the Jansenist Ernest Ruth d’Ans assumed the work of *l’Année chrétienne*, which was only partially completed.¹⁰⁷

How Du Pin was attributed as author of the English edition of *Histoire de la vie de Nostre Seigneur Jésus-Christ* is unclear, but perhaps he undertook the editing of the French editions after Le Tourneux’s death in 1686 and completed another edition on the apostles. If this assumption is correct, the whereabouts of Du Pin’s French edition on the apostles remains a mystery. Affixing Du Pin’s name to these editions would have been a more lucrative marketing plan than simply placing the more obscure name (in England at least) of Le Tourneux on the cover.

Like the *Compendious History*, *The Evangelical History* aimed for a general readership. In the 1694 edition, Le Tourneux’s preface outlines its pastoral goals, and a life of Christ follows. The volume is organized into four books. The first treats the births of Jesus and John the Baptist, including such topics as the “The Conception of Jesus Christ” and “Jesus Teaches What We Must Do to Be Saved.” The second book examines the first two years of Jesus’s preaching ministry, and the third book addresses his final earthly year. The last book in the first volume addresses Jesus’s crucifixion, resurrection, and ascension.¹⁰⁸

¹⁰⁶ “le sérieux de la critique et les desseins d’édification pratique,” in Neveu, 64.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid., 64, 65.

¹⁰⁸ Louis Ellies Du Pin, *The Evangelical History, or the Life of Our Blessed Saviour Jesus Christ* (London: Abel Swall and Tim. Childe at the Unicorn in St. Paul’s Church-yard, 1694), vol. 1, 5, 35-79, 80-150, 151-223.

The second volume (1696) on the apostles provides biographies of Paul, Barnabas, Mark, and Luke in addition to the original twelve apostles. It includes a map of the apostolic travels and concludes with a useful chronology. Both volumes are illustrated with pictures of great biblical figures. Of all the works in English translation, this one is by far the most pastoral, undoubtedly reflecting Le Tourneux's style and influence.

A preface showing English divines' esteem for Du Pin's scholarship appears in the second volume. Its "To the Reader" section lays out its goals to,

...represent in Miniature the Actions and Doctrins of those excellent Men, who being the first Founders of the Christian Church in all Parts of the World, gave us an example not only how earnestly and courageously we should contend for the Faith once delivered to the Saints, but how Pure, Holy and Harmless Lives we should lead in the Profession of it.

The *smallness* of the Volume can be no just Objection against the *Compleatness* of the Work; for tho' indeed, others have put out more copious Treatises upon this Subject, yet it is evident, that for want of more pertinent Matter, they have been forced to swell out their Books with large Digressions about Jewish Customs, Topographical Descriptions, Traditional Stories out of Spurious Authors, and such like Things; which tho' in some Cases they are not unuseful, yet have no necessary Relation to the Subject in Hand. In this Volume you have every thing that is *certain*, and warranted by good Authors, concerning the Actions of the Apostles; and nothing of *dubious* Credit is mentioned; unless there be some particular Reason required to set its deserved Mark of Falsehood and Forgery upon it: So that this Treatise, as short as it seems, hath two of the best Properties of all Writings, *Brevity* and *Certainty*.¹⁰⁹

Again the reputation of Du Pin's work is revealed in *The Evangelical History*: its composition using the most reliable sources of the most credible authors ignored all dubious and spurious works.

¹⁰⁹ "To the Reader," in Louis Ellies Du Pin, *The Evangelical History: Containing the Lives and Acts of the Holy Apostles, Comprehensively and Plainly Related* 2 vols (London: Printed for T. Childe at the White Hart at the West-end of St. Paul's Church-yard, 1696).

Works not directly related to the *Nouvelle Bibliothèque* were translated and published, such as Du Pin's *Méthode pour étudier la Théologie* (1716) published in London as *A Compleat Method of Studying Divinity* (1720). It is remarkable that a French Catholic author's work on such a topic was published in England in an age of Protestant-Catholic hostility. Its publication in England despite these religious enmities further attests to Du Pin's acceptance there.¹¹⁰

A Compleat Method of Studying Divinity, a one volume work, discusses such topics as “*Of the Dispositions or Preparations Necessary for the Study of Divinity*” and “*Of the Treatises to be read upon the Truth of the Christian Religion against Heathens, Jews and Atheists.*”¹¹¹ In short, it provides a seminarian the background knowledge needed to complete a course of theological study.

This work, like the *Nouvelle Bibliothèque*, contains extensive lists of authors and titles Du Pin recommends for theological reference. These works include Du Pin's own books as well. For instance, on the subject, “*Of the Books to be read in the Study of Tradition,*” Du Pin writes, “...we ought, as has been observ'd, to have general Idea of *Ecclesiastical History*, and the *Fathers*, which may be got by reading some Abridgments thereof, and Critical Works, as the *Bibliothèque*, for instance, of *Ecclesiastical Authors*, the *Abridgement of Ecclesiastical History*, Mr. *Fleury's History*, the *Rationarum Temporum* of *Petavius*, and the *Historia Literaria* of Dr. *Cave.*”¹¹² Du Pin's noteworthy inclusion of

¹¹⁰ Louis Ellies Du Pin, *Méthode pour étudier la théologie* (Paris: Antoine-Urbain Coustelier, 1716); Louis Ellies Du Pin, *A Compleat Method of Studying Divinity* (London: Mary Smith at Bishop Beveridge's Head, 1720).

¹¹¹ CMSD20, 101, 174.

¹¹² CMSD20, 191.

Protestant writers such as William Cave as well as Catholic authors attests to his ecumenical spirit.

The book concludes with “the Most Material Questions to be Examined and Discussed in a Course of Theological Studies.” This section includes such questions as “*Of the Division of the Bible into Chapters and Verses*” and then presents useful titles for reference. Unlike the first half of the *Compleat Method of Studying Divinity*, no prose appears in this section simply the references themselves. Practically, it is an index of works by subject.¹¹³

As one might expect, Du Pin furthers his Gallicanism with these reading recommendations. For instance, in the section entitled “*Of the Study of Ecclesiastical Discipline*,” Du Pin recommends the following authors and works on the topic of authority of the pope and general councils: “the Treatises of *Dailée, Gerson, Clemangis, Almainus, Cardinal Cusa, Albert Pighius, Cardinal Pool, Belarmin, Simon Vigor, Richerius, Mr. de Launoi*.”¹¹⁴ The first five of these were fifteenth-century conciliarists, the second two, Pighius and Pole, were Catholic Reformation figures who took compromise positions towards the Protestants, often siding with the emperor rather than the pope. He ends the list with three famous Gallican authors, Simon Vigor, Richer, and de Launoy. In fact, of the eleven authors Du Pin mentions only one, Robert Bellarmine, espouses a pro-papal opinion.

¹¹³ CMSD20, 321, 332.

¹¹⁴ CMSD20, 223, 224.

The English perception of Du Pin for impeccable scholarship and impartiality can be found in the preface to this work. As stated before, one is struck that a book by a Catholic on such a topic was published in England. In proactively responding to the inevitable objection that since Du Pin was Catholic his work must be biased in that direction, the anonymous author of its preface writes,

...he is so far from being biassed by the Prejudices common amongst the Writers of that Church, that, it must be own'd, few Protestant Writers are found to be more Ingenious or Impartial; and, in Justice to him, I think my self obliged to say, that upon every Question, even in the Controversy between the Papists and Protestants, he always directs to the most judicious Writers (in my Opinion) on both Sides; which is surely a Demonstration of his Impartiality.¹¹⁵

The preface author demonstrates how this work is unique compared to anything currently on the market. According to him, only three domestic attempts had been made to write on the same subject. Bishop John Wilkins of Chester made the first attempt with his *Ecclesiastes or, a Discourse Concerning the Gift of Preaching* (1646), but this work was not equal to Du Pin's since it only addresses the limited subject of preaching. According to the author, Rev. Dr. Thomas Bennet's *Directions for Studying: I. A General System or Body of Divinity: II. The Thirty Nine Articles of Religion: To Which is Added St. Jerom's Epistle to Nepotianus* (1714) was unsatisfactory since it did not fully complete the task undertaken. Dr. Bray's *Bibliotheca Parochialis, or, A Scheme of such Theological Heads both General and Particular, as are More Peculiarly Requisite to be Well Studied by Every Pastor of a Parish* (1697) needed, according to the author, another volume to complete the study and was criticized as "immethodical." In short, Du Pin's work was preferable to anything then on the market. One can surmise that this book with

¹¹⁵ Anonymous in CMSD20, v-vi.

its expansive listing of authors and works would have been valuable as a bibliographical reference, organized by topic, if nothing else.¹¹⁶

Another work published in England which includes Du Pin's writings is the Archbishop François de Harlay de Champvallon's condemnation of the *Nouvelle Bibliothèque*, printed in Paris by François Muguet in 1693 and translated and published with Du Pin's retraction in London in 1696. This work will be extensively reviewed in Chapter Seven.¹¹⁷

Du Pin's last work is one attributed to him in Worldcat named *Histoires des Révolutions des Espagne* (1724) published in English as *The History of the Revolutions in Spain* in 1724. The "Abbot of Vertot," René-Aubert Vertot, a contemporary historian known for other similar French works translated into English, such as the *History of the Revolutions in Sweden* (1696) and the *History of the Revolution in Portugal* (1700), approved these editions published after Du Pin's death in 1719.¹¹⁸

Because Vertot approved the work, Du Pin was not mentioned as the author in the 1724 edition. Nevertheless, its Worldcat bibliographic record states that Jean de Vayrac, a Du Pin pseudonym, completed it since the original dedication to the regent of France, Philippe d'Orléans, was signed by "Vairac." Du Pin was likely a major contributor to the work, which was written in a format proven successful in Vertot's other works, and Vertot possibly edited the work himself. It is possible that some of Du Pin's research

¹¹⁶ Anonymous in CMSD20, viii-x.

¹¹⁷ François Harlay de Champvallon, *Ordonnance de Monseigneur l'Archevesque portant condamnation d'un livre intitulé Nouvelle bibliothèque des auteurs ecclésiastiques*. (Paris: François Muguet, 1693); Condemnation.

¹¹⁸ Abbé de Vertot, *Histoires des révolutions d'Espagne* (Paris: C.E. Hochereau, 1724); HRS; Abbot of Vertot, *The History of the Revolutions in Sweden* (London: A. Swall and T. Child, 1696); Abbot of Vertot, *The History of the Revolution in Portugal* (London: Matthew Gilliflower, 1700).

from his *L'Histoire profane: depuis son commencement jusqu'à présent* (1714) was incorporated into it.¹¹⁹

The History of the Revolutions in Spain is a five-volume work. In speaking of “revolutions,” Du Pin really refers to any military action. The first volume explores the the early barbarian invasions into Spain (409) until the invasion of the Moors (710), and the second volume explains the establishment of the Spanish kingdoms of Oviedo, Leon, and Castile (718-1230). Volume Three contains the Moorish revolutions from 716 until the defeat of Granada in 1492, as well as the revolutions in Navarre from 733 to 1521. Volume Four includes the Catalonian revolutions from 759 until Aragon annexed that kingdom in 1162, the revolutions on the islands of Majorca until 1376, and the revolutions in Aragon from 1034 until that kingdom was united with Castile under Ferdinand and Isabella, as well as the Portuguese revolutions from 1089 until the time of publication. The final volume includes the Castilian revolutions from 1230 until the unification with Aragon in 1453, the Castilian revolutions from 1454 to 1480, and revolutions under the Habsburgs and Bourbons. These volumes included tables of the kings of Spain and Portugal and useful indexes.¹²⁰

The translator of *The History of the Revolutions in Spain* was Joseph Morgan, a historian of some note himself. His birth and death dates are unknown, but his most productive years occurred in the first four decades of the eighteenth century. He is probably best known for his monthly pamphlet, *Phoenix Britannicus: a Miscellaneous*

¹¹⁹ “Dedication,” in HRS, viii; Louis Ellies Du Pin, *L'Histoire profane depuis son commencement jusqu'à present* (Paris: Vincent, 1714).

¹²⁰ HRS, vol. 1, 3; HRS, vol. 2, 281; HRS, vol. 3, 1; HRS, vol. 3, 201; HRS, vol. 4, 323; HRS, vol. 4, 407; HRS, vol. 4, 501; HRS, vol. 4, 559; HRS, vol. 5, 7; HRS, vol. 5, 105; HRS, vol. 5, 177; HRS, vol. 5, 247.

Collection of Scarce and Curious Tracts, which ran for six months in 1732, as well as the two-volume *History of Algiers* (1728-1729) and *Mahometism Fully Explained* (1725).¹²¹

As in other translators' descriptions of Du Pin's work, Morgan praises the author's use of the most reliable sources and his search for historical accuracy. He states that "*the Author, who professes to have struck out all that favor'd of Fable in the Spanish Chronicles, and to have been a most exact Observer of every Point of Chronology.*"¹²²

Morgan notices some bias in the fifth volume when discussing the War of Spanish Succession and William III's involvement in political actions starting the war. Morgan states in a footnote that, "*We cannot forbear observing in this Place, but that our French Historian appears a perfect Bigot to the enslaving Principles of Lewis the Fourteenth's Politicks.*"¹²³ Nevertheless, not much can be determined about English views on Du Pin from comments in the prefaces or body of this edition, since Morgan appears to give the credit or blame solely to Vertot himself.

¹²¹ Gordon Goodwin, "Joseph Morgan." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, vol. 39, ed. by H.C.G. Matthew and Brian Harrison (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 132-133.

¹²² "The Translator's Advertisement," in HRS, vol. 1, ii.

¹²³ HRS, vol. 5, 252.

Chapter 3: Du Pin the Reformer

Du Pin provided historical narratives which were useful for defending theological positions. While Protestant/Catholic tensions were heightened during the reign of James II, defending the Reformation remained a deep concern for English Protestants even after the Glorious Revolution, the fear of a Jacobite invasion and restoration heightened in the wake of invasion attempts from the “Old Pretender,” James Francis Edward Stuart in 1707 and 1715. The subsequent religious defense of the Protestant succession to the throne reinforced these sentiments.¹

French Polemical Works

Many polemical works produced for Catholic/Protestant controversial debate originated in France. Perry outlines the vast number of such writings whose publication coincides with the revocation of the Edict of Nantes and its aftermath. These include over 100 books or pamphlets on the Reformation’s history published in other European countries. In these writings, authors turned to church history to bolster their arguments. Examples of such works include the Gallican Louis Maimbourg’s *Histoire du Luthéranisme*, and his *Histoire du Calvinisme* (1682), a poorly written history to which several Protestants responded including Pierre Bayle, in his *Critique générale de l’histoire du Calvinisme de M. Maimbourg*. Another was the Jansenist Pierre Nicole’s

¹ Edward Gregg, “James Francis Edward,” *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* vol. 29 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 675.

Prejugez légitimes and its response, Jean Claude's *Défense de la Réformation* (1673), which held Catholics at fault in the schism.²

This French controversialist debate apparently influenced the English one. Perry reports that Maucroiz's French version of *De Origine et Progressu Schismatic Anglicani* of Jesuit Nicholas Sanders prompted Burnet to write his *History of the English Reformation*. Burnet wrote a short work on the St. Bartholomew's Day Massacre as the Huguenot persecutions in France grew exponentially. Perry explains that Burnet was a hostile critic of Antoine Varillas's book, *Histoire de l' Heresie de Viclef*.³

In England, as Conroy notes, the French Catholic works were translated and published to counteract the ultramontane influence of English Catholics. Letters of the Gallican Jean Launoy (1603-1678) published in Cambridge in 1689, show that Catholics differed in interpreting church history. The ultramontane version did not prevail. Launoy's views on Peter's primacy informed Thomas Tenison's *A Discourse Concerning a Guide in Matters of Faith* (1683). The latter translated and published *Of the Incurable Scepticism of the Church of Rome* (1688) of the French pastor Jean La Placette, who argued that the fathers' varied interpretations of scripture meant a standard Catholic belief was illusory. La Placette questioned the possibility of irreformable papal decrees, since it was impossible to determine if a pope's decision might conflict with his own conscience.⁴

Another French Protestant controversialist, Pierre Jurieu, had his *Abrégé de l'histoire de Concile de Trente* translated and published in 1684, and Louis du Four de Longuevue's *Traitté d'un auteur de la communion romaine touchant la*

² Perry, 6-7, 8-9, 12-14, 65, 94.

³ Ibid., 9, 10, 15.

⁴ Conroy, 19, 102, 181, 209.

transubstantiation was translated by William Wake and published in 1687. In his *Missionarie's Arts Discovered*, Wake cites Richer to buttress his view that church councils were superior in authority to the pope. In addition, the Venetian Paulo Sarpi's aforementioned anti-papal *Historia del Concilio tridentino*, while not French, was another example of a Gallican work published in London during this period (in 1620 and 1676).⁵

Conroy explains that the strong Gallican tone of the French works were especially useful in making arguments against Roman ecclesiology. English controversialists relied heavily on these Gallican works to demonstrate that some Catholics did not hold to the Roman authority's position on every theological subject.⁶

Anthony Milton notes a few French authors who denied the heretical nature of Protestant theology. For instance, Pierre De Belloy's *Apologie Catholique*, later translated and published as *A Catholic Apology against the Libels of the League* (1585), condemned the future Henry IV's excommunication and denied that Protestants were heretics. Likewise, Henry Constable's *Examen pacifique de la doctrine des Huguenots*, translated in 1623 as *The Catholike Moderator: or A Moderate Examination of the Doctrine of the Protestants*, asserted that the Huguenots were not heretics. It gained a wide readership in England.⁷

⁵ Conroy, 19, 97.

⁶ Ibid., 270.

⁷ Milton, 238.

Catholic/Protestant Polemical Debates in England and Intra-Protestant Debates Over Polity

Julie Conroy describes the dynamics of polemical debates, widely published and lasting for years. For instance, William Wake, an avid controversialist, wrote against Bossuet's *Exposition de la doctrine de l'Église catholique* (1671) in his *Exposition of the Doctrine of the Church of England*, published in four editions between 1686 and 1688. Bossuet did not respond directly to Wake's attack, but his translator, the Benedictine Joseph Johnston (1656-1723), took up his cause. Johnston, known as the "Vindicator," aimed to vindicate Bossuet's writings against Wake. The success of Bossuet's *Exposition* in convincing Protestants to embrace the Catholic faith cannot be overestimated. The conversion of thousands across Europe has been attributed to this singular work.⁸

This initial Wake-Johnston exchange resulted in several rounds of debate between Johnston and other Anglican divines. In the same vein, Conroy cites Catholic John Gother's *A Papist Misrepresented, and Represented* (1685), to which many Anglican divines responded.⁹

One goal of Protestant controversialists was to contest the views of Robert Bellarmine, Bossuet, and other prominent Catholic apologists. In due course, English Protestant divines made extensive use of Du Pin's works to buttress their own theological positions. One aspect of the debate is what Conroy calls "claim[ing] the support of the

⁸ Conroy, 11, 25, 77, 85, 231, 270.

⁹ Ibid., 11.

others' tools." For Protestants, referencing the early church fathers and Du Pin's related scholarship proved useful.¹⁰

Unlike the Catholic/Protestant debates dealing mostly with theological topics, the intra-Protestant ones raging in England often addressed disputes over polity. Dating from the sixteenth century when theologian Richard Hooker's *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity* (1594) championed the episcopalian position, Anglicans presented the apostolic origins of the trifold ministry of bishops, priests, and deacons. Hooker rejected a presbyter's ability to ordain but did not assert the episcopal polity's immutability. Other divines advanced more practical reasons. For instance, Bishop George Carlton embraced episcopalianism as useful for governing the clergy.¹¹

Sykes notes that even in the sixteenth century, Hooker and Archbishop John Whitgift of Canterbury recognized that the episcopal polity was not of biblical origin but evolved from the church organization the apostles created. Whitgift believed that in times of persecution, a structure of bishops might be temporarily abandoned and replaced with "seniors" (elders or presbyters).¹²

Whitgift's view became known as the "necessity argument." It asserts that a presbyter might ordain in tumultuous times such as the Reformation. In a similar way, Matthew Sutcliffe, an anti-Presbyterian pamphleteer, considered these ordinations "extraordinary vocations," in which God might utilize alternate means to fulfill his purposes.¹³

¹⁰ Conroy, 15, 17, 285.

¹¹ Norman Sykes, *Old Priest and New Presbyter* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1956), 11; Milton, *Catholic and Reformed* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 478, 484.

¹² Sykes, *Old Priest and New Presbyter*, 20, 23, 34.

¹³ Milton, 476, 477.

Another champion of the episcopalian cause, Richard Bancroft, appointed Archbishop of Canterbury in 1604, held to Jesus's institution of the episcopal polity. In a 1588 sermon, he asked why Christ would begin this type of church structure for 1500 years and then suddenly decide to change it. Thomas Bilson's *The Perpetual Government of Christ's Church* proposed four perpetual functions of the Church: dispensing the Word, administration of sacraments, imposition of hands in ordination, and turning of the keys of absolution. The latter two only a bishop could administer. Other pro-episcopal works include Dr. John Bridges' *Defence of the Government Established in the Church of England for Ecclesiastical Matters* (1587), and Sutcliffe's *A Treatise of Ecclesiastical Discipline* (1591), which, like Bancroft's sermon, held that the episcopal polity was devised by Christ himself.¹⁴

During this same period, Thomas Cartwright, professor of divinity at Cambridge University, believing the Church of England was insufficiently reformed, wrote *Admonitions to Parliament* (1572) to advocate abolishing the diocesan episcopacy and the *Book of Common Prayer*. These views gained influence in neighboring Scotland, where the presbyterian polity was introduced in 1585 despite James VI's opposition.¹⁵

By the seventeenth century, many Anglican works on church polity held that the episcopal polity was *divino jure*. Nevertheless, during the Synod of Dort (1618-1619), the English delegation toned down their pro-episcopal sentiments, which Archbishop

¹⁴ Sykes, *Old Priest and New Presbyterian*, 25, 61, 63.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 48, 56.

William Laud and his followers later criticized. During his tenure as archbishop of Canterbury, works supporting “necessity” arguments were actively censored.¹⁶

Other pro-episcopal works, including Richard Montagu’s *De Originibus Ecclesiasticus*, rejected the “necessity argument” and insisted that reformed ministers had to prove their ordinations through miracles. Bishop Joseph Hall of Exeter wrote *Episcopacy by Divine Right* (1637), a response to his removal from office under Laud for suspected Presbyterian sympathies. In a correspondence with Laud before its publication, the archbishop urged him to abandon his position accepting presbyteries when the episcopal polity was temporarily suspended. However, Hall maintained his position in order to preserve cordial relations with continental Protestant church bodies.¹⁷

Jeremy Taylor’s *Episcopacy Asserted* (1642) was a systematic critique of Presbyterian orders. It considered the episcopal polity one of the core beliefs of Christianity and apostolic succession the only means the church fathers used to determine orthodoxy. He believed continental Protestant churches could have found sympathetic bishops in England or the German states to confer ordination but purposely chose not to accept episcopal orders. To Taylor, this decision rendered their sacraments invalid. Charles I, a staunch episcopalian, supported many of these efforts, considering the Presbyterians “absolutely unlawful” and even “more erroneous than the church of Rome.”¹⁸

Supporters of the episcopal polity relied on patristic studies of Sts. Clement, Ignatius, and Cyprian used to promote their cause. Yet Bishop Lancelot Andrewes of Winchester, William Wake, and other seventeenth-century divines held to the possibility of non-

¹⁶ Sykes, *Old Priest and New Presbyter*, 67; Milton, 484, 488.

¹⁷ Sykes, *Old Priest and New Presbyter*, 67, 115; Milton, 489, 490, 491.

¹⁸ Milton, 492, 493.

episcopal ordinations in extenuating circumstances. Anglican Archbishop James Ussher of Armagh favored intercommunion with the Reformed but nevertheless rejected their polity. Sykes notes that overseas pastors with presbyterian ordinations were allowed to serve in England during the reigns of James I, Charles I, and indeed up until 1661 by simply subscribing to the Thirty-Nine Articles. After the Restoration an episcopal consecration became mandatory in all cases, thereby eliminating the possibility of renewing the pre-Civil War ecumenical exchange.¹⁹

By 1668, negotiations had begun in earnest to allow dissenters, such as Richard Baxter, William Bates, and Thomas Manton, to take up benefices again in the Church of England. On the episcopal side, John Tillotson, Edward Stillingfleet, Hezekiah Burton, John Wilkins, and Edward Reynolds led the discussions. Without success, Baxter and the dissenters sought changes in the *Book of Common Prayer*, and they also failed to obtain permission to omit certain church ceremonies. They hoped a “legal authority” from a king’s minister, in this case, a bishop, would simply agree to receive them as “comprehended.” By 1675, Baxter proposed that dissenters might be allowed to “take authority to exercise the office of presbyter,” but this proposal proved unacceptable. Later in 1689, royal commissioners considered a plan for dissenters’ ordination with the words “if they have not already been ordained” added to the ordination rite. Such wording would allow dissenters’ ordinations in the Church of England without

¹⁹ Milton, 479, 482; Sykes, *Old Priest and New Presbyterian*, 69, 71, 74, 82, 88, 99, 116.

disavowing their original non-episcopal ordinations. The plan leaked out before the annual convocation to the alarm of high church clerics. It was never debated.²⁰

By 1689, the Toleration Act granted some religious liberty to dissenters but did not remove the limits on holding public office or result in the comprehension of dissenting clergy into the Church of England as Latitudinarians had hoped. The passage of the Occasional Conformity Laws during Anne's reign further exacerbated tensions between dissenters and the Church of England. Those opposing the conformity laws noted that Baxter and Bates had long practiced occasional conformity and argued its prohibition would sever even this tenuous communion between the parties. Nevertheless, during these years and in the following reign of George I, high church leaders such as John Sharp, John Robinson, and George Smalridge thwarted low church divines with aspirations of comprehension such as Archbishop Thomas Tenison.²¹

How History was used in Intra-Protestant Debates in England and the Failure in Recognizing Du Pin's Gallican Agenda

Was Du Pin's historical work deemed useful in these intra-Protestant debates in England? Rupp claims the first four centuries of Christianity's history became the basis of contemporary ecclesiology for non-jurors and Latitudinarians such as Simon Patrick as expressed in his *Brief Account*.²²

As such, British scholars used history to buttress their claims during intra-Protestant debates. For instance, Peter Heylyn's *Ecclesia Restaurata* (1662) attempted to portray

²⁰ Sykes, *Old Priest and New Presbyter*, 130, 132.

²¹ Ibid., 138, 141, 148.

²² Rupp, 17, 31.

Puritans as reckless innovators. Another work early in this period, Anglican William Cave's *Primitive Christianity* (1673), reviews ancient rites and popular piety. In his history, Presbyterian Roger Morrice compared those whom he considered heroes of the faith to "hierarchists" such as Archbishop William Laud. In addition, Jeremy Collier's anti-erastian *Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain* (1708) showed history's usefulness in arguing issues of church polity.²³

Another history, Edward Stillingfleet's *Origines Britannicae; or The Antiquities of the British Churches* defended the Anglican church's legitimate autonomy and argues that St. Paul brought Christianity to Britain. He also wrote *Origines Sacrae*, in which like Du Pin, he investigated and discredited the authenticity of many early hermetic writings. His *History of My Own Time* demonstrates the value of contemporary history to defend theological positions of current interest.²⁴

It is noteworthy that most of the latter Protestant commentators deeply misunderstood Du Pin's motivations. While many believed he was a "kindred spirit" questioning the sources on which apologists for the papacy relied, they usually did not detect his Gallican slant. Seeing their world through the lens of Protestant/Catholic controversial debates and literature, they did not recognize his desire to defend the French church's prerogatives against the ultramontanists and Jesuits inside France. Instead, they tended to see Du Pin as a lone honest Catholic whose search for the truth led him invariably to defend some Protestant theological positions.

²³ Spurr, 313, 319, 320; Rupp, 17.

²⁴ Edward Stillingfleet, *Origines Britannicae; or The Antiquities of the British Churches* (London: Printed by M. Flesher for Henry Mortlock, 1685); Spurr, 318; Rupp, 34-35, 87.

Prefaces of Du Pin's English Editions

As previously discussed, prefaces to the English editions of Du Pin's books demonstrate their usefulness in defending Protestant positions. For instance, Wotton's preface to the eleventh volume of the *New History* indicates that Du Pin's work refutes the doctrine of transubstantiation, especially in discussing the ninth-century Eucharistic controversy dividing Radbertus and Ratramnus. Wotton notes that Du Pin attacks Catholic inquisitions, such as the thirteenth-century Albigensian Crusade and uses his *De Antiqua Disciplina* against the papal use of corporate punishments in general.

Du Pin's works buttressed another Protestant position, the value of translating the Bible into vernacular languages, as the editor of his *A Compleat History of the Canons and Writers of the Books of the Old and New Testaments* explains. The same editor lauds its value in defending the Bible's reliability against the views of critical scholars such as Simon, Spinoza, and others.

William Wotton, in an advertisement in the *New Ecclesiastical History of Sixteenth Century*, notes Du Pin's recognition that the reformers used the Bible to develop their doctrines. He also notes Du Pin's discussion of the corruptions in the sixteenth-century Church. Furthermore he explains that Du Pin's own history uses the works of Protestants Johann Sleidan and Gilbert Burnet. Wotton again cites Du Pin's use of Burnet in his dedicatory letter in the second volume of the *New Ecclesiastical History of Sixteenth Century*.

In the "Advertisement Before the English Translation" of the *New Ecclesiastical History of Sixteenth Century*'s second volume, Wotton explains how Du Pin's work

demonstrates the disparity between the canons of the Council of Trent and the liturgical practices of the ancient Church. He calls the work a “considerable Step towards” the destruction of “Popery.”²⁵

In the 1722 Dublin edition of the *New History*, the anonymous author of its preface notes its usefulness in addressing veneration of images and showing such devotion as a late introduction in church practices. Furthermore, the author notes such devotion might lead to idolatry.

Thus, the prefaces of Du Pin’s English works reveal that his books were useful to Protestant controversialists in the areas of transubstantiation, veneration of images, papal rights to temporal punishments, the reliability of scripture, translation of the Bible into vernacular languages, corruptions of the sixteenth-century Catholic Church, and alleged novelties in the Council of Trent’s canons and decrees.

Independent works of prominent English authors similarly laud Du Pin’s usefulness and will be discussed below. These works further substantiate the possibly biased opinions of his editors and translators.

Child’s advertisement for *A New History of Ecclesiastical Writers* (1692), though not attached to the 1692 edition itself, sheds light on the identity of some of its more prominent readers. It was likely distributed as a free broadsheet to elicit subscribers to this multi-volume work. Three authors cited in the advertisement, Edward Stillingfleet, William Fleetwood, and Edward Gee, used information from the *Nouvelle Bibliothèque* for Protestant/Catholic controversial purposes.

²⁵ “Advertisement Before the English Translation” in *Sixteenth C.* 1706, vol. 2, [vi].

Edward Stillingfleet

The first work Child cites is Edward Stillingfleet's *The Doctrine of the Trinity and Transubstantiation Compared as to Scripture, Reason, and Tradition* (1688), which is structured as a dialogue between a "Protestant and a Papist." Stillingfleet's accomplished career included dean of St. Paul's Cathedral, London, and chaplain to Charles II, in which he gained a reputation as a talented preacher. Appointed bishop of Worcester in 1689, he was undoubtedly the most famous cleric of his time, publishing works in theology and philosophy and most famously debating John Locke on the implications of his epistemology. This debate began with Stillingfleet's *A Discourse on the Vindication of the Trinity* (1696), which responded to freethinker John Toland's *Christianity Not Mystrious* (1697). In the work, Stillingfleet blamed Locke's philosophy for the skepticism displayed in Toland's book.²⁶

Stillingfleet, as an historian in his own right, had published *Origines Britannicae, or Antiquities of the British Churches* (1685) to establish the antiquity of the Christian Church before the Romans arrived in Britain and to refute accusations of "priest craft" in the practices of the Church of England. He is the author of other controversial works against Catholics during the 1660s and 1670s which he had written with the encouragement of Bishop Humphrey Henchman of London. This production continued in the 1680s in works such as *The Council of Trent Examin'd and Disprov'd by Catholick Tradition* (1688), which aims to prove that some of the Council of Trent's canons were

²⁶ Edward Stillingfleet, *The Doctrine of the Trinity and Transubstantiation Compared as to Scripture, Reason, and Tradition* (London: W. Rogers at the Sun over against St. Dunstan's Church in Fleet-street, 1688), 1; Conroy, 51; Sarah Hutton, "Science, Philosophy, and Atheism: Edward Stillingfleet's Defence of Religion," in *Scepticism and Irreligion in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries*, edited by Richard H. Popkin and Arjo Vanderjagt (New York: E.J. Brill, 1993), 102, 103, 104.

novelties. Stillingfleet was a frequent member of the court of delegates, the highest ecclesial court in England, and Queen Mary's candidate for the see of Canterbury. Nevertheless, he was ultimately passed over in favor of Thomas Tenison.²⁷

In *Transubstantiation Compared as to Scripture, Reason, and Tradition*, Stillingfleet cites the 1686 French edition of the *Nouvelle Bibliothèque* in the margins when a "Papist" attempts to prove the truth of transubstantiation through the use of ancient (and dubious) liturgies such as the Liturgies of St. Peter, St. Matthew, and St. James. He writes,

P. ["Papist"] I begin with the *Ancient Liturgies of St. Peter, St. James, and St. Matthew*.

Pr. [Protestant] Are you in earnest?

P. Why; what is the matter?

Pr. Do not you know that these are rejected as *Supposititious* by your own Writers? And a very late and learned Dr. of the *Sorbon* [Du Pin], hath given full and clear Evidences of it.

P. Suppose they are, *Yet they may be of Antiquity enough, to give some competent Testimony as to Tradition*.

Pr. No such matter, For he proves *St. Peter's Liturgy* to be later than the Sacramentary of *St. Gregory*; and so can prove nothing for the first 600 years, and the *Ætheopick Liturgy*, or *St. Matthew's*, he shews to be very late. That of *St. James*, he thinks to have been some time before the Five *General Councils*, but by no means to have been *St. James's*."²⁸

Du Pin's refutation of St. Peter's Liturgy was discussed in Chapter 2. The following is the section to which Stillingfleet refers concerning the Liturgy of St. Matthew,

The Mass of the *Ethiopians* that bears the name of *St. Matthew*, appears more evidently to be forged [than St. Peter's liturgy]. There are Collects for Popes, Kings, Patriarchs, and Arch-Bishops: The Twelve Apostles are therein invoked: The Four Evangelists are cited, as also the Synods of *Nice[a]*, *Constantinople*, and *Ephesus*: The *Nicene Creed* is inserted with the Particle *Filoque*: Moreover mention is likewise made of *St. Athanasius*, *St. Gregory*, and *St. Basil*, together

²⁷ Edward Stillingfleet, *Origines Britannicae, or Antiquities of the British Churches*. (London: Printed by M. Flesher for Henry Mortlock, 1685); Barry Till, "Edward Stillingfleet," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* vol. 52 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 791, 796; Conroy, 82.

²⁸ Edward Stillingfleet, *The Doctrine of the Trinity and Transubstantiation Compared as to Scripture, Reason, and Tradition*, 33.

with the *Epact*, the *Golden Number*, and the *Trisagion*; which plainly shews that this Liturgy is of a very late date.²⁹

Stillingfleet references this section of the *Nouvelle Bibliothèque* on the Liturgy of St. James,

There remains only the Liturgy attributed to St. *James*, which divers Learned Men have taken much pains to vindicate, but to no purpose; for although it is more ancient than those that we have already examined, since it is cited in the Synod that was holden in the Emperor's palace in *Trullo*, after the Fifth General Council [692], yet we ought not to say, that St. *James* was the Author thereof, or that it was composed in his time. For, 1. The Virgin *Mary* is call'd in this liturgy the *Mother of God*; and the Son and the Holy Ghost are said to be Consubstantial with the Father, terms that were altogether unknown in St. *James*' time: but supposing that they were not, is it credible, that this Authority should not be alledged in the Councils of *Nice*[a], *Ephesus* and *Constantinople*? 2. We find therein the *Trisagion* [a liturgical hymn] and the *Doxology*, that is to say, the *Sanctus* and the *Gloria Patri*, which were not generally recited by the Church until the Fifth Century; for though it might be proved that they were used before, yet it must be confessed, that it was not the general custom of the church. 3. There were Collects for those that were shut up in Monasteries: Can any man say, that there were monasteries in the time of St. *James*? 4. There is mention made of Confessors, a term that was not inserted in the Divine Offices, till a long time after St. *James*, even according to the Confession of *Bellarmin*. 5. In this Liturgy there is mention made of Churches, Incense, Altars, etc. can it be imagined that these things were used in St. *James*' time? 6. We find therein very many Citations of the Epistles of St. *Paul*, the greatest part wherof were written after St. *James*' death; neither ought we to object with Cardinals *Bona* and *Bellarmin*, that these things were afterward inserted, because it is not probable, that they should be added in so many places; besides, the Connexion and Ceremonies of this whole Liturgy do not agree with the time of the Apostles.³⁰

In these two citations from the *Nouvelle Bibliothèque* Du Pin disproves the apostolic provenance of various ancient liturgies. He has rendered the above liturgies useless for demonstrating the doctrine's existence in the primitive Church. Therefore, in *Transubstantiation Compared as to Scripture, Reason, and Tradition*, Stillingfleet uses

²⁹ Throughout this chapter we will be using the London 1693 translation in our citations since it faithfully renders the 1686 Paris edition; NH93, vol. 1, 8.

³⁰ NH93, vol. 1, 8-9.

Du Pin's research to refute outdated Catholic arguments for the antiquity of the transubstantiation doctrine.

Obviously, discrediting transubstantiation was not Du Pin's goal. In his "Commonitorium," written during the Wake correspondence, he attempted to conform the Thirty-Nine Articles to Catholic doctrine and practice thereby facilitating a possible Anglican/Gallican church union. In the latter work, Du Pin defends transubstantiation against article 28, which categorically contests this Catholic doctrine. He boldly suggests rewording the article to make it acceptable to both sides. He writes,

In the next article on the Lord's Supper they are in considerable disagreement with that ancient church tradition. For the gospel states concerning this, *this is my body, this is my blood*, all of the fathers declared that the bread and wine is changed into the body and blood of Christ; it [the article] does not in a serious manner assert a real presence of the body and blood of Jesus Christ in the Eucharist reducing it to only a figure or only a spiritual eating, in regard to the expression 'transubstantiation,' it will be nothing to hold at a distance if the fact[s] can be agreed upon. I wish therefore that this article be expressed: 'in the Eucharistic sacrament, the true bread and wine truly and really change into the body and blood of Christ, and is truly and really received by those who receive the consecrated bread and wine, although this oral reception will be useless unless it is approached and accepted in faith and holiness.' Thus, this article devised by our men will not be rejected and ought not to be disagreeable to you Anglicans.³¹

Thus, Du Pin's goal was not to refute transubstantiation but rather to prove that Roman liturgical practices in the early Church could no more be shown as apostolic in origin than could the liturgy of any national church. Again, Du Pin's research furthered

³¹ "In articulo sequenti [#28] de Coena Domini nonnulla sunt quae antiquae Ecclesiae traditioni non sunt consona. Nam juxta illud dictum evangelicum *hoc est corpus meum, hic est sanguis meus*, Patres omnes censuerunt panem et vinum transmutari in corpus et sanguinem Christi; modo id serio dicatur nec praesentia realis corporis et sanguinis J. C. in Eucharistia ad solam figuram aut spiritualem sumptionem unice redigatur, quoad transubstantiationis vocem, nihil necesse erit eam abhibere si de re conveniat. Vellem itaque hunc articulum sic exprimi: *in sacramento Eucharistiae, panis et vinum vere ac realiter transmutantur in corpus et sanguinem Christi, et vere ac realiter recipiuntur ab iis qui panem et vinum consecratum accipiunt, licet inutilis sit ista receptio oralis nisi accedat fides et sanctitas suscipientis*. Ita conceptus articulus a nostris rejici nequibit et vobis Anglicanis non debet esse odiosus." In *Commonitorium*, 198.

his Gallican mission. Nevertheless, by discrediting these ancient liturgies, he removed a number of key writings which Catholic controversialists previously used to defend Catholic doctrine. In other words, in employing historical scholarship to refute ultramontanism, Du Pin unwittingly destroyed the sometimes dubious historical foundations of numerous Catholic theological positions including transubstantiation.

William Fleetwood

William Fleetwood was well known as bishop of St. Asaph in Wales (1708-1714), bishop of Ely (1714-1723), famed preacher, and chaplain to William and Mary. As a Whig, Fleetwood voted in the House of Lords to convict Henry Sacheverell and to repeal the Occasional Conformity and Schism Acts in 1718.³²

Fleetwood's *An Account of the Life and Death of the Blessed Virgin According to Romish Writers with the Grounds of the Worship Paid to Her* (1687), mentioned in Child's 1692 advertisement, employs Du Pin's historical work for anti-Catholic polemics. Fleetwood calls the work a translation of *La Véritable dévotion envers la Sainte Vierge* (1679) by French Jesuit Jean-Baptiste Crasset with some alteration of style and additions, but it is in fact his own work in which he extensively cites the testimonies and miracle stories contained in Crasset's tract.³³

In *An Account of the Life and Death of the Blessed Virgin*, Fleetwood cites Du Pin in its preface entitled "A Preface in Answer to the Apology for the Contemplations, e&."

³² Stuart Handley, "William Fleetwood," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* vol. 20 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 30-31.

³³ Child, [i]; Conroy, 235.

The original *Apology for the Contemplations* having been previously written by “J.C.” (the Franciscan priest John Cross).³⁴

In this preface, Fleetwood attempts to refute the liturgical sources, such as the *Acts of the Passion of St. Andrew*, which Cross had cited in his book in defense of Marian devotion. Citing pp.47-48 of the 1686 Paris *Nouvelle Bibliothèque*, Fleetwood writes,

...we are more obliged to *Monsieur Du Pin*, a late [recent] *French Author*, both for his candor and good nature, whose words I will set down at full concerning this present Matter.

Opinions are divided about the Acts of Passion of St. Andrew written by the Presbyters of Achaia, which are in Surius's History of the Saints, Nov. 30. Baronius, Bellarmine, and some other Catholick criticks receive them, but a great many more reject them. The Ancients knew no other Acts of St. Andrew, than such as were corrupted by the Manichees of which St. Austin, Philastrius, and Pope Innocent the first make mention, and which Gelasius puts into the number of Apocryphal Books: But it is certain, that those were not the same with these we are now speaking of; and it is yet as certain that these latter Acts of the Passion of *St. Andrew*, were never cited by any that lived before the 7th or 8th Century. Such as *Remigius Autissiodorensis*, who died about 900. *Petrus Damiani*, 1072. *Lanfranc*, *St. Bernard* and *Ivo of Chartes*. By which we see we cannot be assured of the truth of it...And therefore this Passion ought at least to be looked upon as a doubtful thing, and such as *St. Jerome* says we not make any use of, to prove any matter of Faith. Thus far that learned person [Du Pin], and we thank him for his ingenuity.³⁵

Du Pin's own section on the *Acts of Passion of St. Andrew*, some of which is contained in the quote above, states,

Men are divided in their Censures upon the Acts of the Passion of *St. Andrew* written by the Priests of *Achaia*, which are inserted in the History of the Saints published by *Surius, Baronius, Bellarmine*, and some other Critics of the Church of *Rome* admit them as authentick, but they are rejected by many. The ancient Ecclesiastical Writers know no other Records of *St. Andrew* than those that were corrupted by the *Manichees*, mentioned by *St. Augustine, Philastrius*, and Pope

³⁴ Samuel Halkett and John Laing, *Dictionary of Anonymous and Pseudonymous Literature* vol. 1 (New York: Haskell House Publishers, LTD, 1971), 121.

³⁵ William Fleetwood, *An Account of the Life and Death of the Blessed Virgin According to Romish Writers with the Grounds of the Worship Paid to Her* (London: H. Clark for Thomas Newborough at the Star in St. Paul's Churchyard, 1687), xvi-xvii.

Innocent, and which are reckoned by *Gelasius* in the number of Apocryphal Books. But it is certain that those were different from these whereof we now discourse; It is also evident, that these last Acts of the Passion of *St. Andrew*, have been cited by none but Authors that lived since the Seventh or Eighth Century, as by *Remigius Altissiodorensis*, *Petrus Damianus*, *Lanfrank*, *St. Bernard*, and *Ivo Carnutensis*, which is the cause that we can have no assurance that they are very ancient. Thirdly, the Mystery of the Trinity is not only explained in these Acts after such a manner as gives us occasion to suspect, that he that wrote them lived after the Council of *Nice[a]*; but he likewise propagates the Error of the modern *Greeks*, in affirming, that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father, and remains in the Son. It is indeed objected, that there are Manuscripts wherein these words are not expressed, but who knows, whether they have not been omitted in some, rather than added in others. Therefore this history ought at least to be esteemed, as a dubious Writing, *that cannot be applied*, (as *St. Jerome* declares) *to prove any Doctrine of Faith*.³⁶

Having discredited the *Acts of Passion of St. Andrew* because it may date from the late seventh century, he has impaired Cross's effort to defend Marian devotional practices. He proceeds (as had Stillingfleet) to use the *Nouvelle Bibliothèque* to reject another ancient writing, the *Liturgy of St. Peter* (previously discussed in Chapter 2), on which Cross based his defense of the Catholic doctrine of Eucharistic sacrifice. He writes,

...the afore-mentioned *Ellies du Pin*, Doctor of the *Sorbon*, and at present in great repute with the Church of *France*, hath dispatch'd this business effectually, and made use of Card. *Bona's* [Giovanni Bona, Catholic Eucharistic scholar] Arguments, and because I find I grow tedious, I will take leave to translate a *short Chapter* of his, which will give you full satisfaction in the point of Liturgies, and will also be answer to your third Citation out of the Liturgy of *S. James Minor*.

Of the Liturgies falsely attributed to the Apostles, p. 21

We need only reflect a little on the celebration of the Eucharist in S. Paul's Epistle to the Corinthians, and on what Just. Martyr, and others of the first Ecclesiastick Writers have delivered down on that Subject, to be persuaded that the Apostles and their Successors celebrated the Sacrifice of the Mass, with great simplicity. This is what has been observed by all who have written on the Liturgies, who agree, that Mass was, in the first days, performed without much Ceremony, and a very few Prayers made use of; but that by little and little both

³⁶ NH93, vol. 1, 17.

Prayers and Ceremonies encreased, to conciliate the greater reverence to the Sacrifice. At last the Churches ordered and set down in Writing, the manner of Celebrating, which was called the Liturgy. And the reason of their differing, proceeded from their conforming to the several Usages and Customs of several places. And because men are naturally carried to change something in their exterior part of Worship, there have therefore many things been added from time to time in these Liturgies.’ This Remark alone may suffice to let you see, that the Liturgies which carry the Apostles names, and Evangelists, are truly none of theirs.”³⁷

Fleetwood could easily show that a Catholic doctor of the Sorbonne seriously doubted the authenticity of several ancient liturgies, on which an English Catholic such as Cross defended numerous doctrines, including Eucharistic sacrifice. This fact made the *Nouvelle Bibliothèque* a powerful weapon as the number of polemical publications escalated dramatically during James II’s reign.

Continuing to use Du Pin’s 1686 *Nouvelle Bibliothèque* to refute Cross’s dependence on ancient and (according to Du Pin) spurious liturgies, Fleetwood adds these final remarks from pages 90-92 of Du Pin’s work concerning the forged works of Pseudo-Dionysius, traditionally believed to have been written by the biblical figure Dionysius the Areopagite, and often used to support the hierarchical structure of the Catholic Church,

Du Pin has done the business effectually, and therefore I will not grudge the pains of making an abstract of his judgment from the Reasons following.

1. The manner of these Books [of Pseudo-Dionysius] first appearing looks suspicious; they were unknown to all antiquity, and at last produced by the *Severiani*, Hereticks in a Conference held with the *Catholick* Bishops at *Constantinople*, in the Emperor’s Palace, in Five hundred thirty two to support their Errors by. But what do the *Catholicks* say to this? How can you shew us, (say they to the Hereticks) that these Testimonies you say are *Dionysius* his, are so indeed? had they been so they could not have been unknown to blessed *Cyril*. But why do we mention St. *Cyril*, for if St. *Athanasius* had believed them to be St. *Denis* his, would he not have made use of that Authority, to prove the

³⁷ Fleetwood, xxii-xxiii.

Consubstantiality of the blessed Trinity, against the Blasphemies of *Arius*? but now since none of the Ancients has cited them, how can you prove them to belong to *Dionysius*? Thus that Council argued then; but afterwards, finding nothing in the Books repugnant to the Faith, they were admitted for genuine. But *Du Pin* could not find that the Council had taken care to answer their own Arguments and Objections. To this he adds, that they are wholly omitted by St. *Jerome* and St. *Austin* whose purposes they would have served very well, had they known them.

2. The Style and Method are very different from the way of Writing in the first and second Age of the Church. The style is puffed, affected, and unnatural; the meanest simplest things are magnified extravagantly; the Periods are artificial and his Reasons ranged in great order, which looks more like a Philosopher, writing at leisure, and with premeditation.

3. The Subject of these Books does not at all agree with the times of St. *Denis*. The *Christians* in the first ages were taken up in three sorts of Works, in making Apologies for their Religion, in Letters of Instruction to the Faithful, and exhorting them to Martyrdom; and lastly, in writing against Hereticks. . . . He who is not satisfied with what is already set down, must read *Du Pin* himself, who has treated this matter so fully, and yet in short, that he has left nothing to doubt of. And thus I have dispatched, I think, your honorable Testimonies of the First Age, by shewing, that there is not one of them genuine, and authentick, even in the judgment of Authors of your own Communion.”³⁸

Above, Fleetwood uses the portion of the *Nouvelle Bibliothèque* Du Pin devoted to refuting works falsely attributed to Dionysius the Aeropagite. In this section, Du Pin explains why these works simply cannot be attributed to that biblical figure,

I could also very willingly forbear to give any Account of the Books that were attributed to him [Dionysius the Aeropagite], or to shew how they have been forged, were it not the Design of my Work obligeth me to this undertaking; therefore I shall do it with as much Brevity and Moderation as possible. We must observe First, that the manner of the first appearing of those Books ought to be suspected; for it is certain, that being unknown to all Antiquity; they were first quoted by the *Severian* Hereticks, in a Conference holden between them, and the Orthodox Bishops at *Constantinople* in the Palace of the Emperor *Justinian* 532 Years after the Nativity of Jesus Christ. The silence of all the ancient Ecclesiastical Writers, is without doubt a very great prejudice to them; for who can imagine that so considerable an Author as St. *Denys* (if these Books had really been composed by him) should have been unknown to *Eusebius* and S. *Jerome*. . . . 2. The style and method of these Books, is very far from the manner of writing used in the First and Second Centuries, as being swelling and too much

³⁸ Fleetwood, xxix-xxxiii.

affected; the Author purposely leaves ordinary and natural Expressions, to make use of those that are lofty and Figurative, he Amplifies every thing, even that which ought to be recited after the most simple manner...

3. Neither are the Contents of these Books conformable to the *Genius* of the Age, wherein S. *Dionysius* the *Areopagite* lived. The Christians were employed in these primitive Times, in Composing Three sorts of Books, Apologies for their Religion, Epistles for the Instruction of the Faithful, and to exhort them to suffer Martyrdom; and Lastly, Treatises against the Hereticks....³⁹

Du Pin then presents specific reasons why the *Celestial Hierarchy* and other supposed works simply could not have been the work of the biblical figure Dionysius the Areopagite. He writes,

1. The Author of the Book [which had been attributed to Dionysius the Areopagite], *de Divinis Nominibus*, Dedicates it to *Timothy*, and then cites an Epistle of S. *Ignatius*. Now *Timothy* was dead when S. *Ignatius* wrote his Epistles, and *Onesimus* succeeded him; and besides, he calls *Timothy* his Son, and yet he must needs be older than S. *Denys*. 2. He cites and explains the Gospel according to S. *John*, and the Apocalypse, which were scarcely written when S. *Dionysius* the *Areopagite* was alive: And yet he declares in those Books, that he was but a young Man. He cites the Revelation, as undoubtedly included in the Canon of Holy Scripture, and yet it was very much questioned in the primitive Ages of the Church, whether it were Canonical or not. 4. He expressly produceth in *Lib. de Divinis Nomin. chap 4.* certain Passages out of the Epistle of S. *Ignatius* to the *Romans*, written by this Bishop a little before his Martyrdom; whereas S. *Ignatius* was put to Death under the Reign of the Emperor *Trajan*, and S. *Dionysius* the *Areopagite*, under that of *Domitian*, and consequently the latter was dead, when the former wrote this Epistle. *Maximus* replies that this Citation is added, but there are Three or four entire Lines that relate to this matter, which there is no reason to disallow. 5. This Author affirms that he was present at the Death of the Virgin *Mary*, but S. *Dionysius* the *Areopagite* was not Converted at that time; for it is generally believed, that she died Fifteen years after the Crucifixion of Jesus Christ, and S. *Paul* who Converted S. *Denys* came not to *Athens* till Seventeen years after our Saviour's Passion.⁴⁰

By various historical inductions, Du Pin offers proofs that these books are the work of a later writer. He opines that they were forged in either the fifth or sixth centuries.⁴¹

³⁹ NH93, vol. 1, 31-33.

⁴⁰ NH93, vol. 1, 33.

⁴¹ NH93, vol. 1, 34.

These two quotes show meticulous research in Du Pin's history and its undisputed value to Fleetwood and others in providing evidence to refute doubtful ancient works. Like Stillingfleet, Fleetwood relies on the *Nouvelle Bibliothèque* to reject Cross's sources. In this instance, Du Pin's scholarship is useful in showing that the Church's hierarchical structure, as Dionysius the Areopagite proposed in his work, does not date from the early Church, but rather is the work of a later writer now known as Pseudo-Dionysius. Hence, the contemporary structure of the Catholic Church according to the latter's *Celestial Hierarchy* could not be considered ancient church doctrine.

Again, Fleetwood cites Du Pin to cast doubt on ancient liturgies and writings his contemporaries invoked to defend Catholic doctrine. Fleetwood thereby portrays Catholic commentators such as Cross as behind the times in historical research. How does he prove their ignorance? He cites an ingenious member of their own tradition, a famous doctor of the Sorbonne.

Edward Gee

Another work cited in Child's advertisement and later used in Catholic-Protestant polemics during the reign of James II is Edward Gee's English work entitled, *Veteres Vindicati*, a response to Edward Sclater's *Consensus Veterum*.

Sclater, an Anglican priest who converted to Catholicism upon the accession of James II, explains that his belief in Christ's real presence in the Eucharist and dismay with the Church of England's separation from the universal Church, led to his conversion. Since he had been the curate of Putney, Sclater became known as "The Putney Convert."

Sclater appears to be an opportunist since he returned to the Anglican faith after the

Glorious Revolution in May of 1689 and was required to recite a public recantation that none other than Gee himself composed.⁴²

Edward Gee, dean of Lincoln cathedral, spent much of his professional life writing controversial literature, especially during James II's reign. Besides his debate with Sclater, Gee engaged in published debates with famed Catholic priest and writer John Gother (*An Answer to the Compiler of the Nubes Testium*, 1688) as well as James II's Jesuit chaplain Father Lewis Sabran (*A Letter to Father Lewis Sabran, Jesuite, in Answer to his Letter to a Peer of the Church of England*, 1688). In these works, Gee liberally cites the church fathers.⁴³

Like Stillingfleet, Gee uses the *Nouvelle Bibliothèque* in his *Veteres Vindicati* to disprove the authenticity of several ancient liturgies upon which Sclater bases a defense of an early belief in the doctrine of transubstantiation. With a biting tone he targets Sclater's claims,

...the present Learned and judicious Sorbonist Du Pin hath gathered enough against it [the Liturgy of St. Peter] and the rest to prove them all supposititious: if you have a mind to shew any parts, in this sort of Learning, I do not question, but the worthy Doctor, or some one here in England for him, will give all due satisfaction in the point, but alas, Sir, you seem to me; who judge of you by your Book, to be far from able to meddle in such matters. One Liturgy of yours he hath not encountered, that of Saint James the Elder, not because he had nothing to object against it, but because there was no such liturgy to be objected against ... Some Body wiser than some Body having I suppose put it in your head, that these same liturgies were not altogether unquestionable, you gravely tell us in your Preface that it was not your business to assert the author of them, e&. To which I answer that it is very well for you that it was not, since I am sure that you are a very unfit Man for any such thing... You say next, that it is enough for your purpose, if they be allowed of that Antiquity, that may give them some competent

⁴² Conroy, 78, Edward Vallance, "Edward Sclater," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* vol. 49 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 306-307.

⁴³ Warren Johnston, "Edward Gee," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* vol. 21 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 713.

interest in Tradition; to be short with you, *they* are not allowed any Authority, since not only *ours*, but your *own Authors*, *Du Pin* for example, have proved them *invinciblement*, (as *he* words it) *supposititious* and *Novel*... These things are sufficient to shew that I need not say *one word* to your *authorities* for *Transubstantiation* out of these forged Liturgies...⁴⁴

Like Stillingfleet and Fleetwood, Gee discredits the Liturgy of St. Peter (Du Pin's refutation is presented in Chapter 2), and the existence of the liturgy of St. James the Elder, which Sclater had used in his *Consensus Veterum*. Gee notes that Du Pin omits discussion of the latter liturgy, different from that of St. James cited above, and has done so because it had not existed.

Like the other controversialists, Gee used Du Pin's scholarship to discredit the sources of a Catholic controversialist, in this case Sclater who argues in favor of transubstantiation. Like Stillingfleet and Fleetwood, Gee cites a scholar (Du Pin) from Sclater's own communion as a way of showing that he is out of step with even those within the Catholic Church. Gee willfully portrays Sclater as an ignoramus foolishly utilizing discredited and dubious sources.

Gee (again like Fleetwood) relies on *Nouvelle Bibliothèque* a few pages later to refute Pseudo-Dionysius's works used to defend papal primacy, and to discredit dubious works of St. Martial.⁴⁵ He writes,

...if you desire to see these things proved and instanced *in*, do but look into *one* of *your own writers* the *Learned Sorbonist* I have mentioned above; and then tell me, how you could call *these* Arguments [Gee's previous objections to Sclater's sources] *pitiful Objections*, which are perfect *Demonstrations* of these Writings of

⁴⁴ Edward Gee, *Veteres Vindicati* (London: Printed for Henry Mortlock at the Phoenix in St. Paul's Church-yard and at the White Hart at Westminster Hall, 1687), 63-64.

⁴⁵ Sclater, *Consensus Veterum* (London: Printed by Henry Hills, Printer to the King's Most Excellent Majesty, For His Household and Chappel, and for him and Matt. Turner, at the Lamb in High Houlbourn, 1686), 11.

St. *Dionysius* their being forged, so that we must set St. *Denys* aside, and call in *his* Companion St. *Martial*.

But before we try *him*, I would fain know what *you* mentioned *him* for, you make *no use* of *him* or *his Epistles* in your *Book*: this is such a strange piece of hardness of you, that I cannot but wonder at *it*; Methinks *you* had business enough on your hands to prove the *Genuineness* of your *other Authors* and *Liturgies*, and needed not to have brought in *him* by head and shoulders hither, whom I will soon dispatch; now *he* is here and tell you that there was *no such Man* in *those Times*, and therefore *no Epistles* of *his*. *Du Pin* hath put the true *Martial* (if there *ever* were really such a Person) in the *third Century*.”⁴⁶

Gee attacks Sclater’s use of Pseudo-Dionysius’s *Celestial Hierarchy* to argue for transubstantiation as not the work of Dionysius the Areopagite, but a later forger as Fleetwood had previously done. He notes Sclater’s use of St. Martial, the third-century bishop of Limoges, in supporting the doctrine, although he explains that such an argument is not included in *Consensus Veterum*. It is unclear exactly where Sclater cites St. Martial to defend transubstantiation. Nevertheless, Gee uses Du Pin’s refutation of the supposed works of St. Martial from the *Nouvelle Bibliothèque* to exclude consideration of Martial’s views. He is undoubtedly citing the section on Martial from the first volume of the work. Du Pin writes,

St. *Martialis* came into *France* with St. *Dionysins* [sp.] [the St. Denis who was the first bishop of Paris, not St. Dionysius the Areopagite] under the Emperor Decius towards the year of our Lord 250. Two Letters attributed to him...have been since frequently Printed, and inserted into the last *Bibliotheca Patrum*, though no man questions that these Letters are Suppositious. For in the first place the Author tells us, that he lived with Jesus Christ, which can by no means agree with him who was Bishop of *Limoges* in 252. Secondly, in the Eighth Chapter of the Second Letter, he saith, that he Baptized King *Stephen* and another Tyrant with his Noblemen. Now in the time of *Martialis* there was neither King nor Tyrant in *France*. Thirdly, he tells us, that in his time the Temples of the Gods were demolished, and that Churches were built by the Kings Authority, which does not agree with the time of St. *Martialis*. Fourthly, the Texts of Scripture quoted in

⁴⁶ Gee, *Veteres Vindicati*, 65.

these Letters follow the vulgar Translation which was composed long after. Fifthly, the Author tells us, that he had eaten with Jesus Christ at the last Supper, though it is certain that none but the Apostles were there.⁴⁷

His historical analysis demonstrates that Martial's works could simply not be genuine.

Gee adopts the latter view to undercut Sclater's arguments in favor of transubstantiation.

Gee attacks Sclater's use of the *Passion of St. Andrew*, as Fleetwood had done, using the *Nouvelle Bibliothèque* to disprove its authenticity and thereby jettisoning the use of the ancient liturgy in supporting transubstantiation doctrine.

...that is a spurious book I need not urge our own Men. Dr. Cave [church historian William Cave], &c. onely, but *your own Du Pin* who (upon reasons able to destroy the credit of *it* wholly) says that *at least it ought to be considered as a doubtfull writing, which according to St. Hierom [Jerome], one cannot make use of to prove any Article of Faith*; as you have made *Transubstantiation* to be.⁴⁸

Joseph Bingham

Another Protestant apologist, Joseph Bingham, uses Du Pin's work in his *Origines Ecclesiasticæ: or, the Antiquities of the Christian Church* (1711). In this massive ten-volume work, Bingham, like Du Pin before him, aims to understand the practices and doctrine of the early Church.

An Anglican priest and fellow at Oxford, Bingham was removed from the university for espousing a questionable view of the Trinity. A sympathetic former student, Dr. John Radcliffe, arranged a benefice for him in Hampshire. Bingham wrote other historical works to determine true practices of the early Church such as *The French Church's Apology for the Church of England* (1706), in defense of the Church of England's

⁴⁷ NH93, vol. 1, 146.

⁴⁸ Gee, *Veteres Vindicati*, 67.

doctrine against attacks of dissenters, and *Scholastical History of Lay Baptism* (1712) to counter the view that only ordained ministers could validly baptize.⁴⁹

Bingham wrote *Origines Ecclesiasticæ: or, the Antiquities of the Christian Church* to redress the imbalance between adequate literature on ancient Greece or Rome and its lack for the Christian faith. Because a Catholic author would reveal biases in such work, he believed a Protestant should produce one. He writes,

*...these [Catholic] writers do by no means satisfy a Judicious and Inquisitive Reader, for several Reasons: I. Because their Accounts are very Imperfect, being confined chiefly to the Liturgical Part of Church-Antiquity, beside which there are a great many other things necessary to be explained, which they do not so much as touch upon, or once mention. 2. Because in treating of that Part they build much upon the Collections of Gratian, and such Modern Writers, and use the Authority of the spurious Epistles of the ancient Popes, which have been Exploded long ago, as having no Pretence to Antiquity in the Judgment of all Candid and Judicious Writers. But chiefly their Accounts are unsatisfactory, because, 3. "Their whole Design is to varnish over the Novel Practices of the Romish Church, and put a Face of Antiquity upon them: To which purpose they many times represent ancient Customs in Disguise, to make them look like the Practices of the present Age, and offer them to the Readers View not in their own Native Dress but in the Similitude and Resemblance of Modern Customs. . . . So that if we are to expect any exact Account of Church –Antiquities, it must be from some Protestant Authors, who can write with greater Freedom and less Prejudice concerning the Usages and Customs of the Primitive Church."*⁵⁰

Bingham presumes that Catholic church historians are simply apologists who misuse history to defend contemporary liturgical practices lacking accurate grounding in the ancient Church. As such, in Bingham's mind, they are uniformly suspect. Only a Protestant writer enjoyed the freedom to determine the truth about church history.

⁴⁹ OE, viii; Anthony Quinton, *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine* 79 (July 1986):384; Stuart Handley, "Joseph Bingham," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* vol. 5 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 759.

⁵⁰ OE, iii, iv.

Bingham in no way considers Du Pin an ordinary Catholic scholar. In fact, he recognizes just the opposite. In his work, Bingham cites two different views on the geographical extent of the pope's secular authority. The first view holds that the pope's jurisdiction includes seven provinces in Italy and the islands Sicily, Sardinia, and Corsica. Bingham cites other authors, like Du Pin, who believe the pope only has jurisdiction up to 100 miles outside the city of Rome. Both citations allegedly prove the Bishop of Rome has no jurisdiction outside the Papal States. Later, he cites Du Pin again to demonstrate that the papacy lacks secular jurisdiction in any European nation.⁵¹ In doing so, he explains how Du Pin differs from the typical Catholic church historian of his day and adds a slap at Bossuet. He writes,

And so *Du Pin* among the *Romanists* makes no scruple ingenuously to confess; exempting *Germany, Spain, France, Britain, Africa, Illyricum*, and Seven of the *Italic* Provinces from any subjection to the Jurisdiction of the *Roman* Patriarch in those first and primitive Ages. This is contrary to the general Stream and Current of the *Romish* Writers, one of which is so angry with *Du Pin* upon this Account that he treats him with all the Scorn and Bitterness imaginable for making such a bold Concession, and endeavors to answer both what he and Bishop Stillingfleet [presumably in *Origines Britannicae*] had advanc'd against the Patriarchal Power over the whole Western Empire.”⁵²

Du Pin is again seen as the “one honest man” inside the Catholic tradition rather than what he really was: a Gallican apologist aiming to prove the true limits of papal jurisdiction on historical grounds. But like other Protestant controversialists, Bingham overlooks Du Pin's Gallican context.

Having made a notable exception of Du Pin, Bingham cites him extensively throughout his work, using the *De Antiqua Ecclesiae Disciplina* (1686) and the *New*

⁵¹ OE v. 3, 329, 331.

⁵² OE v. 3, 331-332.

History (1692). As one might imagine, the majority of these citations deal with limiting the pope's authority. For instance, he uses Du Pin's works to emphasize the patriarchs' and not the pope's ancient authority. In his first volume, Bingham quotes Du Pin from the *De Antiqua Ecclesiae Disciplina* and the *New History* as stating that the office of patriarchs had developed before the Council of Nicaea.⁵³

Bingham is undoubtedly citing the *New History* below, in which Du Pin wrote about the power and privileges of patriarchal sees, beginning with the sixth canon of the Council of Nicaea:

'We Ordain, That the Ancient Custom shall be observ'd, which gives Power to the Bishop of *Alexandria*, over all the provinces of *Egypt*, *Libya* and *Pentapolis*, because the Bishop of *Rome* has the like Jurisdiction over all the Suburbicary Regions... We would likewise have the Rights and Privileges of the Church of *Antioch*, and the other Churches preserved; but these Rights ought not to prejudice those of the Metropolitans. If any one is Ordained without the consent of the Metropolitan, the Council declares, That he is no Bishop: But if any one is Canonically chosen by the Suffrage of almost all of the Bishops of the Province, and if there are but One or Two of a contrary Opinion, the Suffrages of the far greater number ought to carry it for the Ordination of those particular Persons.' This Canon being thus explain'd has no difficulty in it. *It does not oppose the Primacy of the Church of Rome, but neither does it establish it.* It preserves to Great Sees their ancient Privileges, that is, the Jurisdiction or Authority which they had over many Provinces, which was afterwards call'd the Jurisdiction of the Patriarch or Exarch. In this sense it is, That it compares the Church of *Rome* to the Church of *Alexandria*, by considering them all as Patriarchal Churches. It continues also to the Church of *Antioch*, and all the other Great Churches, whatsoever Rights they could have; but left their Authority should be prejudicial to the ordinary Metropolitans, who were subject to their Jurisdiction, the Council confirms what had been Ordain'd in the Fourth Canon concerning the Authority of the Metropolitans in the Ordination of Bishops. This Explication is easie and natural, and we have given many proofs of it in our Latin Dissertation concerning the ancient Discipline of the Church [*De Antiqua Disciplina*].⁵⁴

⁵³ OE v. 1, 211.

⁵⁴ NH93, vol. 2, 252.

This quote shows these offices' antiquity, how they predated any possible institution by the bishop of Rome, and how other patriarchs held powers in their jurisdictions similar to the pope's in his. Bingham intended to demonstrate the patriarchs' legitimate role in the early Church thereby showing the alleged primacy of one patriarch, the bishop of Rome, as a novelty. Later, he cites Du Pin as reporting the removal of six bishops for simony by John Chrysostom, the Patriarch of Constantinople, at a synod in Ephesus in 401, thereby again demonstrating the patriarchs' ancient power and the limitations of the pope's authority.⁵⁵ Bingham writes,

...the Patriarch had Power to take the Matter into his own Cognizance, and censure any Bishop within the limits of his Jurisdiction. Thus [fifth-century church historian Salminius Hermias] *Sozomen* observes of *Chrysostom*, that in one Visitation at *Ephesus* he deposed thirteen Bishops of *Asia*, *Lycia*, and *Phrygia* for Simony, and such other corrupt Practices. This was done in a Synod of 70 Bishops held at *Ephesus* An. 401 as *Valesius* [Henri Valois] and *Du Pin* observe out of [Galatian Bishop and Chrysostom biographer] *Palladius*, who mentions the same thing, though he speaks but of six Bishops then deposed.⁵⁶

Here Bingham cites the *New History* in which Du Pin writes,

...the Clergy of *Ephesus* and the Bishops of that Province made application to *S. Chrysostom* [patriarch of Constantinople], and prayed him to come into their Countrey, to establish some Order in the Church of *Ephesus*. He came thither in the end of Winter, of the Year 401, and assembled a Synod of Seventy Bishops, wherein Six Bishops were deposed, who were convicted of giving [the bishop] *Antoninus* Money for their Ordination.⁵⁷

In addition, Bingham cites Du Pin's work to provide support for Protestant theological positions on various contemporary controversial topics. Du Pin shows how Catholic apologists, Henri Valois and Robert Bellarmine, dissented from the accepted history of

⁵⁵ OE v. 1, 222.

⁵⁶ OE, v. 1, 222.

⁵⁷ NH93, vol. 3, 8.

the Council of Nicaea (AD 325), at which the council fathers decided that married priests need not leave their wives. Bingham states that they stubbornly held to a fallacious view of the council's actions, since acknowledging the correct history might prejudice the current discipline.⁵⁸ Bingham writes,

...the whole Council agreed to stifle the Motion that had been made, and left every Man to his Liberty [as to celibacy or the married state] as before. So *Socrates* and *Sozomen* tell the story. To which all that *Valesius* [Henri Valois] after *Bellarmin* has to say, is, That he suspects the Truth of the thing, and desires leave to dissent from his Historians. Which is but a poor Evasion, in the Judgment of *Du Pin* himself, who thus reflects upon them for it: Some question the Truth of this Story, says he; but I believe they do it for fear the Story might prejudice the present Discipline, rather than from any solid Proof they have for it. But they should consider, that this Canon is purely a Matter of Discipline, and that the Discipline of the Church may change according to the Times, and that 'tis not necessary for the Defence of it, to prove that it was always uniform in all Places. So that in the Judgment of the learned *Romanist* there is no Question to be made, but that the Council of *Nice*[a] decreed in Favour of the Married Clergy, as the Historians relate it did; and that then the Practice was different from that of the present Church of *Rome*, which others are so unwilling to have the World believe.⁵⁹

Bingham quotes here from the *New History's* third volume on the Council of Nicaea.

Du Pin relates the story of how the Egyptian Bishop Paphnutius spoke out against obligatory celibacy at the council,

The other Story [related by *Socrates* and *Sozomen*] concerns *Paphnutius* a Bishop in *Egypt*, who oppos'd the Canon, which was propos'd in the Council for obliging Bishops, Priests and Deacons to observe Celibacy. This good Man said, that tho' he liv'd all his Life-time in Celibacy, yet he did not think, that this Yoke ought to be impos'd upon the Clergy. Some question the truth of this Story; I believe they do it rather for fear least this Story might prejudice the present Discipline, than from any solid Proof they have for it. But these Persons should consider that this Canon is purely a matter of Discipline, and that the Discipline of the Church may

⁵⁸ OE, v. 2, 156.

⁵⁹ OE, v. 2, 156-157.

change according to the Times, and that 'tis not necessary for the Defence of it, to prove that it was always *Uniform in all Places*.⁶⁰

Bingham uses Du Pin to show how mandatory priestly celibacy was not an early church practice. Du Pin helps him substantiate his charge that Catholic authors will sometimes ignore evidence which might contradict their current practices.

Other Du Pin citations are used in *Origines Ecclesiasticæ* to attack contemporary Catholic liturgical practices. Du Pin rejects as spurious some of John Chrysostom's sermons which indicated a later form of liturgy that included the Lord's Prayer at the Eucharist, vesting of deacons, withdrawal of non-communicants, and practice of holding the book of gospels over a bishop's head at episcopal ordination.⁶¹ About one sermon entitled *De Uno Legislatore*, Du Pin doubts that it is truly John Chrysostom's. He writes,

The First Homily (the Author whereof shews, that there is the same Law-giver both of the Old and New Testament,) is not *Chrysostom's*, though *Photius* quotes it under his Name; for, 1. The Style is much different from *Chrysostom's*: 2. The order and disposition of this Homily differs much from those of S. *Chrysostom*. 3. It is full of Allegories, which are very rare in S. *Chrysostom*. 4. Most of the Thoughts are unworthy of him. 5. There is great Confusion. 6. It both begins and ends in a different manner than the Homilies of S. *Chrysostom*. 7. It is observable at the End of that Discourse, that it was written in a Time when the *Roman* Empire was under Oppression.⁶²

Bingham is able to use Du Pin's research to cast doubt on these older sermons of Chrysostom's and thereby question the antiquity of some contemporary Catholic liturgical practices.

Bingham attacked other Catholic practices by citing Du Pin. He noted Du Pin's views that Tertullian was too severe and acted alone in requiring a head covering for virgins.

⁶⁰ NH93, vol. 2, 253.

⁶¹ OE, vol. 5, 144, 216-217.

⁶² NH93, vol. 3, 22.

He also cited Du Pin's belief that Athanasius's sermon on the virgin Deipara and St. Gregory Thaumaturgus's sermon, both about the Feast of the Assumption, were composed at a later time hence spurious.⁶³

Du Pin's opinions informed Bingham's view of church discipline, such as the former's view that Chrysostom's homily 76, prohibiting a declaration of anathema, was genuine.⁶⁴ Bingham also used Du Pin's research to attack the distinction of mortal and venial sins. He writes,

And that this [the distinction of greater and lesser sins, rather than mortal or venial] was so from the Beginning, appears from what the learned *Du Pin* has discoursed upon this Matter against Mr. *Arnauld* and others of his own Communion. He observes that all the Ancients made this very Distinction between great and little Sins, and reckoned only very capital and mortal Crimes in the Number of such Sins as were to be punished with Excommunication.⁶⁵

Moreover, Bingham quotes Du Pin's discussion of the distinction between sins and the antiquity of mortal sin found in the *New History*. Du Pin writes,

... 'tis necessary to observe, How the Fathers understood this Distinction of great and little Sins. *Tertullian* who was the first who spoke directly of it in his Book of *Chastity*, places among the Number of little Sins, Anger, Evil-Speaking, a vain Oath, a Failure in our Promise, a Lye extorted by shame or necessity, etc. He calls these Capital or Mortal sins, Murder, Idolatry, Fraud, Apostacy, Blasphemy, Fornication and other Crimes of this Nature. These are also the Crimes which St. *Cyprian* calls great Sins in his Treatise of *Patience*. *Origin* in his Homily 15th upon *Leviticus*, says, That there are Mortal Sins which are not in the rank of great Sins. I know very well that Monsieur *Arnauld* has affirm'd, That in this place we must read, *culpa moralis*, for *culpa mortalis*, as it is to be found in one Edition. But ever since, the Master of the Sentences time who cites this place, it has been read *culpa mortalis*; and if one minds well the Sence, he will perceive that it is to be read so.⁶⁶

⁶³ OE, vol. 5, 268; OE, vol. 9, 183.

⁶⁴ OE, vol. 7, 144.

⁶⁵ OE, vol. 7, 209.

⁶⁶ NH93, vol. 2, 218.

In addition to the discussion of Tertullian's and Origen's views above, Bingham reports Du Pin's belief that Gregory of Nyssa listed all those sins requiring public penance or what Bingham would consider "great" sins, and all were severe – murder, adultery, theft, idolatry, etc. According to Du Pin, venial and some mortal sins were not subject to excommunication, nor did they require public penance. In other words, they are not what Bingham would consider "great" sins.⁶⁷

In the same section, Bingham refers to Du Pin's discussion of Ambrose's view on venial sins included in the *New History*. Writing like a moralistic Jansenist himself, but nevertheless refuting them, Du Pin states,

I would not have it thought that I make these Remarks to authorize Licentiousness, or to insinuate, That there are some Mortal Sins which may pass for Venial: God forbid that I should have such a detestable Design! On the contrary, my intention is to create a horror of all Sins; First of great Crimes. Secondly, of Sins which may be Mortal tho' they appear not so enormous. And Thirdly, even of slighter Sins also. But I thought myself oblig'd to observe here, for explaining the Passage of St. *Ambrose*, That none but the Sins of the first Class did subject Men to Publick Penance, and that 'tis of these only that the Fathers speak, and which they comprehend under the Name of Enormous Sins and Crimes; tho' there be others which may be also Mortal and which a Christian ought carefully to shun; but then they are such for which he was never subjected to the Humiliation of Publick Penance, but only to Corrections and Reprimands given in secret, as St. *Austin* [Augustine] informs us.⁶⁸

This discussion again demonstrates the difference between Du Pin's aims and those of the Protestant apologists who cite his work. He aimed to refute Antoine Arnauld, who had advocated public penances for mortal sins. As shown above, Du Pin attempts to demonstrate historically that most mortal sins never required public penance, but only those he calls "enormous" sins.

⁶⁷ OE, vol. 7, 213, 214.

⁶⁸ NH93, vol. 2, 219.

Bingham, on the other hand, reveals little interest in the previous century's French debates over mortal sin. Instead, he uses Du Pin's work to attack the distinction of mortal and venial sins themselves, and especially the Catholic practice of auricular confession. Bingham proposes three gradations of sins which he believes that St. Augustine held: 1) great sins, which deserve excommunication; 2) sins that are cured through penance, and 3) minor sins which can be forgiven through general confession and prayer. Du Pin's distinction between "enormous" and "slighter" sins assisted Bingham's efforts.⁶⁹

Thomas Brett

Yet Protestants' polemic discourse was not limited to undermining Catholic doctrine. In fact, their use of Du Pin's work in disproving the theological claims of ancient liturgies may be found in discussions among opposing groups of English Protestants.

Thomas Brett's *A Collection of the Principal Liturgies, Used by the Christian Church in the Celebration of the Holy Eucharist* (1720) reflects such an intra-Protestant use of Du Pin's histories. Thomas Brett, an avid liturgist and non-juror bishop famous for active involvement to unite non-jurors with the Greek Orthodox church in the late 1720s and early 1730s, proposed a primacy of the bishop of Jerusalem and parity for the sees of Rome and Constantinople.⁷⁰

⁶⁹ OE, vol. 7, 203.

⁷⁰ Robert Cornwall, "Thomas Brett," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* vol. 7 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 503; H.W. Langford, "The Non-Jurors and the Eastern Orthodox: A Paper Read to the Fellowship of St Alban and St Sergius Conference at Durham 26 June 1965," (Oxford: The Fellowship of St. Alban and St. Sergius, 2001), 1.

For the purposes of the present study, the focus is on Brett's search through the ancient traditions of the Church to provide evidence for the validity of non-juror liturgical practices. Converting to the non-juror position late in his career, Brett was accused of Catholic leanings and responded with *Dr. Brett's Vindication of Himself* (1715), in which he argues that he was only adhering to the early church practices. He continues in the same vein in his defense of Edward VI's liturgy in his *Tradition Necessary to Explain and Interpret the Holy Scriptures* (1718).⁷¹

Brett's reason for writing *A Collection of the Principal Liturgies* relates to the Usages Controversy, a dispute among non-jurors as to whether four practices were required in the consecration of the Eucharist: mixing the wine with water, the oblation, the invocation of the Holy Spirit, and a commemoration of Christians who have died. Brett hoped that a review of ancient liturgies would verify the first-century practice of including these Eucharistic elements. This study proved successful since in 1732 Brett fashioned a concordat which both sides of the non-juror controversy willingly signed.⁷²

In Brett's attempt to promote within the Eucharistic celebration a commemoration of deceased Christians, he touches upon his opposition to prayer for the dead in purgatory, as the Catholic Church teaches. He affirms that prayers for the dead in purgatory were not in the ancient liturgies. He asserts that these only included prayers for the dead at rest. As proof, he cites Du Pin's quotation from the Council of Florence (1439) on the same subject in which the Catholic Church attempted to impose the doctrine of purgatory

⁷¹ Cornwall, 504.

⁷² CPL, iii-iv; Cornwall, 504.

on the Orthodox churches.⁷³ Du Pin quotes from the council's canons, "the Souls of true Penitents, dying in the Love of God, before they have brought forth Fruits worthy of the Repentance of their Sins, are purified after their Death by the Pains of Purgatory, and that they are delivered from these Pains by the Suffrages of the Faithful that are Living, such as Holy Sacrifices, Prayers, Alms, and other Works of Piety, which the Faithful do for the other Faithful, according to the Orders of the Church."⁷⁴ In arguing for a commemoration of dead Christians, Brett asserts that purgatory "is a Doctrine utterly unknown to the Ancients, who never prayed for departed Souls as in a *State of Purgatory*, or of Temporal Punishment, but as in a State of Rest."⁷⁵

Brett's argument against prayer for souls in purgatory includes a refutation of the antiquity of the Roman liturgy, which many believed was derived from the *Sacramentarium of St. Gregory*. In doing so, he quotes Du Pin's *New History*. Relating Du Pin's opinions on the authenticity of the *Sacramentarium of S. Gregory*, Brett writes,

Du Pin, a learned *Romanist*, tells us, that it *cannot be affirmed that the Sacramentarium of S. Gregory is such now as it was in his Time. But on the contrary, it is certain that we have it not in its Purity, and that many things are added to it; for it is now a long time since three Authors were placed before it, to distinguish what was S. Gregory's, and what was added. The Abbot Grimbaldus, the Priest Rodradus, Monk of Tours who lived about the Year 849, and Albinus or Alcuinus, took this Care in the Editions which they made of the Sacramentary. But they do not agree among themselves about what is added to it, which shews that they have no certain Proof of it, but that they make this Distinction only by Conjecture.* Now if the Learned were convinced within 200 Years after the Death of *Gregory*, and about the Time the *Roman Missal* began to be used in *France* and other Countries, subject to the Empire of *Charles the Great*, that the Missal was even then altered from what it was in *Gregory's* days, and the most Learned of that Age, (for such were the three here mentioned), knew not how to correct it

⁷³ CPL, 194.

⁷⁴ NH93, vol. 13, 45.

⁷⁵ CPL, 195-196.

otherwise than by Conjecture, what Reason have we to believe the present Canon to be the same it was in *Gregory's* Time?⁷⁶

Brett cites the quote above from the volume on the sixth century of the *New History* where Du Pin writes,

The Sacramentary, in the Book of the Office of The Mass, would be more useful, if it were evident that we have it now the same which it was in the time of St. *Gregory*. But on the contrary, 'tis certain that we have it not in its purity; and that many things are added to it; for, it is now a long time since three Authors were pass'd before it, to distinguish what was St. *Gregory's* and what was added. The abbot *Grimboldus*, the priest *Rodradus*, Monk of *Tours*, who liv'd about the Year 849, and *Albinus* or *Alcuinus* took this care in the Editions which they made of the Sacramentary. But they do not agree among themselves about what is added to it, which shews that they have no certain proof of it, but that they make this distinction only by conjecture.⁷⁷

As in the Protestant/Catholic controversial literature presented previously in the chapter, Du Pin's scholarship is used to discredit, or at least place into doubt, the authenticity of certain church documents which the opposition has previously used to defend its theological doctrine. In this case, Brett uses Du Pin's *New History* to place into doubt whether the contemporary Sacramentary contained the actual words of the sixth-century Pope Gregory I, and therefore whether the idea of praying for the dead even existed in the sixth century. Again, Du Pin's effort to utilize history in furthering the Gallican cause (in this case by discrediting the Roman Missal) supplied English Protestants with sources to refute Catholic doctrine and adjudicate intra-Protestant disputes.

⁷⁶ CPL, 333.

⁷⁷ NH93, vol. 5, 102.

The Elder and Younger Edwards Synge

Another author extensively using Du Pin's research in his work was Edward Synge (1659-1741). Synge, an Irish Anglican priest, best known as bishop of Raphoe (1714-1716) and archbishop of Tuam (1716-1741), was a close friend and correspondent of Archbishop William Wake and vicar general to Archbishop William King, a subscriber to Du Pin's 1722 Dublin edition of the *New History*. Synge was a staunch defender of the Church of England and known for his opposition to the Toleration Bill of 1719. Like Wake, he corresponded with various Catholic theologians, such as Francois Martin of Louvain, on the topic of church unity.⁷⁸

In Synge's *A Sermon Against Persecution on Account of Religion* (1721), he, like Wotton before him, cites Du Pin in describing Catholic persecutions against the Albigenians and Waldensians.⁷⁹ In discussing the 1544 persecution of the Waldensians in the south of France, Synge writes that "an Army was sent against them, which joined with those of the Popes' Legate, and *caused them to be Massacred without distinction of Age or Sex*. As we are expressly told by a learned Popish Historian [Du Pin]."⁸⁰

One of Synge's sons, also named Edward and later bishop of Clonfert (1730-1731), Cloyne (1731-1733), Ferns and Leighlin (1733-1740), and Elfin (1740-1762), likewise cites Du Pin. This younger Synge gave a speech before the Irish Parliament on October 23, 1725 on the anniversary of the Irish Rebellion of 1641, when he advocated toleration

⁷⁸ Marie-Louise Legg, "Edward Synge," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* vol. 53 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 613-615.

⁷⁹ Edward Synge, *A Sermon Against Persecution on Account of Religion* (Dublin: Printed by J. Carson, for Jer. and Sil. Pepyat in Skinner Row, Booksellers, 1721), 23-24.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 24.

of Catholics and proposed an oath of allegiance with wording they might accept. Steven Radcliffe, the vicar of Naas, energetically opposed him in a letter, and a published debate ensued.⁸¹

One question addressed in the debate was what type of Catholic the state could tolerate. To Synge, a Catholic who did not “own and contend for the *pretended* Power of the Pope, in the utmost extent in which it was ever either Claim’d or Exercis’d,”⁸² could be considered a lawful subject of the crown. He lambasted Radcliffe for not making a distinction between this type of Catholic, essentially a Gallican or the British equivalent, and the more suspect ultramontane. In Synge’s published response to Radcliffe, he cites Du Pin and some other Catholic scholars, including Richer. These citations demonstrate a substantial minority of Catholics with Gallican opinions, and thus a convincing number of Catholics who denied extreme positions on papal power and infallibility.⁸³ Synge writes,

Have you never heard of the Writings of *William* or *John Barclays*, of *Edmundus Richerius*, *Johannes Launoius*, *Natalis Alexander*, the most learned *L. Ellies du pin*, or of *Peter Welsh* or *Redmund Caron(d)*? If you have not I would beg you would get Their Books and Read them, and then you will understand the state of this Question better than you now do. But till you do this, suffer me to tell you that every one of these Men liv’d and dy’d in the Communion of the Church of *Rome*, and yet they all denied and expressly writ against this Power, and some of them have Collected a vast Multitude of Authorities to prove that this never was the *Doctrine of the Church of Rome*, and have given *very plausible* answers to every thing that has been urg’d on the other Side.⁸⁴

⁸¹ Legg, “Edward Synge,” 615; Stephen Radcliffe, *A Letter to the Reverend Mr. Edward Synge, Prebendary of St. Patrick’s Occasioned by a Late Sermon Preached in St. Andrews, Dublin, Before the Honorable House of Commons, October 23rd, 1725* (Dublin: Printed by and For J. Hyde, Bookseller, in Dame Street, 1725).

⁸² Edward Synge, *A Vindication of a Sermon Preach’d Before the Honourable House of Commons of Ireland. On Saturday the 23rd of October, 1725* (Dublin: Printed by A. Rhames, for Robert Owen, Bookseller in Skinner-Row, 1726), 66.

⁸³ Ibid., 66-67.

⁸⁴ Ibid., 66-67.

Above, Synge cites a litany of authors with nationalist tendencies opposing papal power and/or infallibility to prove that Catholics could in fact be the English king's loyal subjects while remaining within the Catholic communion.

Four years later, the elder Synge published *The Archbishop of Tuam's Defence of his Charitable Address to All who are of the Communion of the Church of Rome: in Reply to Dr. Nary's Answer* (1729), in which he liberally cites Du Pin's 1722 Dublin edition of the *New History*. This work launched an ongoing debate with Cornelius Nary, a Catholic parish priest in Dublin.

Nary, after studies at the University of Paris in the 1680s and 1690s, returned to Ireland and began his controversial writings with *A Modest and True Account of the Chief Points in Controversy Between Roman Catholics and Protestants* (1696) in response to the views of Archbishop John Tillotson of Canterbury. But Nary was no ultramontanist. In 1722, the Holy See condemned his English translation of the New Testament for its Jansenist slant. An avid historian, Nary published *A New History of the World* in 1720. He participated in conversations concerning an acceptable loyalty oath for Catholics in Ireland, but Protestants opposed his wording for its lack of an abjuration of the Stuarts.⁸⁵

In *The Archbishop of Tuam's Defence*, the elder Synge makes a case that salvation only requires what the apostles taught and was not dependent upon any canons of the ecumenical councils. For support, he cites Gregory of Nazianzus' views on the Council of Constantinople in the *New History*. Synge writes,

⁸⁵ Patrick Fagan, "Cornelius Nary," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* vol. 40 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 210.

...the plain Reader (for whose sake I chiefly write) may find his [Gregory's] Words in the Ecclesiastical History of *Du Pin* Page 259. Edit. *Dub. I never saw*, says he, *the End of a Council which was happy, and pleasant, and which did not rather increase the Evil than diminish it.* p. 55. 'Tis true *Du Pin* ascribes these Words to his *Passion and Resentment* for the ill Usage he had met with from the *Council of Constantinople*: But who can imagine that a Person of such great Piety, as *Gregory* is known to have been, should pass such a General Censure upon *All Councils*, for no other Reason but because He had not been well used by *One*? Nor is it to be imagined that one of *his Character* could, upon any account, speak after this manner, if the current Doctrine of the Church, (whereof he was an Orthodox Member) had been the same *concerning Councils*, as you would now advance, and yet never be censured for it, but after his Death be lookt upon as a *Saint*, altho' he never retracted what he has here so plainly said."⁸⁶

As Synge notes, Du Pin attempted to dismiss Gregory's quote as merely the result of frustration when he wrote, "But this Censure which he [Gregory] wrote when he was vexed with the Council of *Constantinople*, which had not treated him very favourably, ought not to pass for a rule, but only for a Testimony of his resentment which came from St. *Gregory* in his *Passion*."⁸⁷ In this case, Synge spins a clever argument. First, he uses Gregory's quote from the 1722 Dublin edition of Du Pin's *New History*, and then argues against the latter's view that Gregory's statement was an emotional reaction to his poor treatment at the council. Instead, Synge makes the case that the quote accurately represents Gregory's view of all ecumenical councils. If so, and Gregory was canonized despite his statement, what is the meaning of sainthood in the Catholic Church if a saint made such negative statements against councils whose decisions are the basis of contemporary Catholic doctrine? To Synge, the answer is clear: the councils and their canons must be grossly corrupt. Again, Du Pin furnished strong arguments for polemical

⁸⁶ ATD, 29.

⁸⁷ NH22, vol. 1, 259.

battles, in this case attacking the councils' authority which English Protestants then energetically used.

The elder Synge cites Du Pin in *The Archbishop of Tuam's Defence* to defend his view that images of saints should not be displayed in a church. He writes,

If any of them [the readers of his book] will look into the *English Translation of Du Pin's Ecclesiastical History*, reprinted in *Dublin*, pag. 592. and 593. of the First Volume: There he will find that the very learned Man (who lived and died in the *Roman Communion*) giving an account of the *Council of Eliberius*, which was held about the year 30[5]., the *Canons wherof* (he says) *are very ancient and very authentick*; and when he comes to the 36th Canon, which expressly forbids *Pictures to be placed in Churches*; he says that *many Explications have been given of this Passage, but to him it seems better to understand it in the plainest Sense, and to confess that the Fathers of this Council did not approve the Use of Images.*"⁸⁸

Du Pin states the following about the thirty-sixth canon of the Council of Eliberius (or Elvira) (305), "The 36th has very much exercis'd Divines. Thus it is expressed, 'We would not have Pictures placed in Churches, lest the Object of our Worship and Adoration should be painted upon the Walls.' Many Explications have been given of this Passage, but to me it seems better to understand it in the plainest Sense, and to confess that the Fathers of this Council did not approve the Use of Images..."⁸⁹

Du Pin's historical honesty is again used to attack Catholic doctrines, in this case the veneration of images. In concluding, Synge challenges Nary to prove that the faithful must offer such devotion to the images of saints, despite the canon proclaimed at Elvira. In this case, a lifelong Catholic, Du Pin, is cited as proof that even Catholics may disagree with a Catholic apologist such as Cornelius Nary. Du Pin is shown here in the

⁸⁸ ATD, 93-94.

⁸⁹ NH22, vol. 1, 593.

role of discrediting various interpretations of the ancient councils previously serving to explain contemporary Catholic liturgical practices.⁹⁰

Synge cites Du Pin to discredit the Catholic practice of praying for the dead.

Dismissing Nary's understanding of ancient liturgies to demonstrate the practice of the early Church, Synge writes,

You also quote several *ancient Liturgies*. But you have already granted, (p. 59) *that neither the liturgies of St. James or St. Mark were reduced to Writing before the Beginning of the Fourth Century*; and you here tell us (pag. 175.) that the Liturgy that goes under the name of *St. Clement was compiled out of the Apostolic Constitutions*; which (the *English Reader* may find by *Du Pin*, pag. 51.) *belong to the Third, or rather the Fourth Century, and that they have been from time to time, corrected, altered, and augmented according to the various Customs of different Ages and Countries*: Nor will you venture to say that the Authority of these *Constitutions* is sufficient to establish an *Article of Faith*.⁹¹

Du Pin's substantive comments on the liturgies of St. James and St. Mark have been quoted earlier. In the quote above, Synge cites Du Pin's explanation of the actual date of the constitution's authorship from the 1722 Dublin edition of the *New History*. Du Pin writes, "It is therefore extremely difficult to determine when the Constitutions ascribed to the Apostles first appeared, since the Author of them is absolutely unknown, neither can it be proved whether they were at first the same as they are now. We can only conjecture, that it is most probable that the Constitutions ascribed to the Apostles or *St. Clement* belong to the third, or rather the fourth Century..."⁹²

As Stillingfleet had done over forty years before, Synge casts doubt on ancient liturgies to remove the historical foundations for a disputed Catholic doctrine.

⁹⁰ ATD, 94.

⁹¹ ATD, 310.

⁹² NH22, vol. 1, 51.

The elder Synge relies on Du Pin's history again to support the Protestant position against venerating images in a later work entitled, *The Archbishop of Tuam's*

Observations on Dr. Nary's Rejoinder (1731).⁹³ Synge writes,

...to satisfie the plain *English* Reader touching a Matter of *Fact*, viz. that *Images* were not *worshipped* in the Primitive Church, I referred him to *Du Pin's* Account of the 36th Canon of the *Council of Eliberis*, and the Sense of that learned *Romanist* upon it. But the Doctor (Pag. 74.) *makes no great account of what Du Pin* says, because he was *obliged to retract many Errors*. But if they who charged him (perhaps too partially) with *other Errors*, did not find Fault with what he *here says*, it is a sure Sign that they thought him therein to be in the Right.⁹⁴

In yet another of his works, the elder Synge uses Du Pin's discussion of the thirty-sixth canon of the Council of Elvira (previously quoted above) to provide conciliar evidence of the ancient prohibition of venerating images. Here Synge dismisses Nary's questioning of Du Pin's reliability by noting the alleged partiality of his critics.

Bibliothèque des auteurs separez de la communion de l'Église romaine

Another work, Du Pin's *Bibliothèque des auteurs separez de la communion de l'Église romaine*, never fully translated into English although some excerpts appear in the 1725 Oxford edition of *A New Ecclesiastical History of Seventeenth Century*, bears directly on Catholic/Protestant controversial theology. This work reviews writings of non-Catholic authors in a manner similar to those he reviewed from the Catholic communion in the *Nouvelle Bibliothèque*. The first volume addresses the work of Martin Luther and other Lutheran authors such as Phillip Melanchthon and Andreas Osiander.

⁹³ Edward Synge, *The Archbishop of Tuam's Observations on Dr. Nary's Rejoinder* (Dublin: Printed for R. Owen, Bookseller in Skinner-Row, 1731), 141.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, 141.

He continues with the works of the “sacramentarian” scholars in Switzerland, Ulrich Zwingli, Andreas Karlstadt and Johannes Oecolampadius. He discusses Calvinist leaders, John Calvin, Theodore Beza, Peter Martyr, Martin Bucer, and John Knox. This portion of the first volume also includes authors Du Pin considered the Socinian movement’s leaders, Laelius Socinus, Michael Servetus, and Bernardo Ochino.⁹⁵

The first volume’s second part discusses non-Catholic historians of the latter half of the sixteenth century, including the same non-Catholic movements as in the first section. Some notable authors in this section include Johann Sleidan and John Foxe.⁹⁶ About Sleidan Du Pin wrote,

He started writing in Latin the history of the Alleged Reformed under Charles V, and he did it with so much elegance & politeness, that it was in a short time circulated throughout the world, esteemed for the delicateness and the nobility of its style, and was translated into several languages. In effect, though in this history he may have taken sides with the Lutherans & for the Alleged Reformed, one cannot deny that it is perfectly well written. As for the truth of the facts it has been contested, and it has been written that Charles V has said that this historian has advanced several falsities on that which he has written about him; Nevertheless, he appears quite exact in his narrations. His history is most interesting, he reports the considerable events, the exploits of an illustrious emperor, the disputes, the differences, the wars that Religion gave rise to, the cruel battles that had destroyed Germany, the banishments and the proscriptions of the Princes, and a number of incredible adventures and of surprising trials and tribulations. His style is, as we have said, pure, polite, and Ciceronian. He has the know how to join the historian to that of the orator.⁹⁷

⁹⁵ This work was published in two volumes by Andre Pralard in 1718; BAS vol. 1, 5-76, 76-88, 88-91, 106-125, 126-189, 192-201, 202-268.

⁹⁶ BAS vol. 1, 434-436, 598.

⁹⁷ “Il entreprit d’écrire en Latin l’Histoire de la Prétenduë Réforme sous Charles-Quint, & il le fit avec tant d’élegance & de politesse, qu’elle fut en peu de tems répanduë dans le monde, estimée pour la délicatesse & la noblesse du style, & traduite en plusieurs langues. En effet, quoique dans cette Histoire il ait pris parti pour les Lutheriens & pour les Prétendus Réformez, on ne peut nier qu’elle ne soit parfaitement bien écrite. Quant à la verité des faits elle a été contestée, & l’on écrit que Charles-Quint avoit dit que cet Historien avoit avancé plusieurs faussetez dans ce qu’il avoit écrit de lui; neantmoins il paroît assez exact dans ses narrations. Son Histoire est des plus interessantes, il y rapport des événemens considerables, les exploits d’un illustre Empereur, les disputes, les differens, les guerres que la Religion a fait naître, les cruelles batailles qui ont défolé l’Allemagne, les bannissemens & les proscriptions des

He adds,

One can say that the concentration which Sleidan himself had given in order to render his history perfect, had strongly disabled his mind at the end of his life (although he was not quite fifty one years old when he died in 1556). He had forgotten the names of his three daughters. Furthermore, it is useless to speak more of this author; as one cannot create an excerpt of his works which are not historical or rhetorical, and we ourselves have said enough on this with regard to his style and his character.⁹⁸

Du Pin's respect for the work of Johannes Sleidan, one of the most prominent sixteenth-century Protestant historians is evident. Du Pin's willingness to value works on the basis of their historical merits, rather than holding any overt prejudices regarding the allegiances of the author, further heightened his reputation among his English readers.

The first volume's third and final portion provides a history of conflicts and negotiations among different Protestant groups during the sixteenth century especially over the theology of the Eucharist.⁹⁹

The second volume, released in 1619, treats the period 1600-1650 and follows the format of the first, discussing the various non-Catholic authors and movements and includes a history of intra-Protestant negotiations and controversies.¹⁰⁰

Perhaps the reason why Du Pin's work was not translated into English is his repeated use of the term "prétendue réforme" (pretended reform) to describe the Protestant

Princes, & un nombre incroyable d'avantures & de vicissitudes surprenantes. Son style est, comme nous avons dit, pur, poli & Ciceronien. Il a sçu joindre l'Historien à celui d'Orateur," in BAS, vol. 1, 435.

⁹⁸ "On dit que l'application que Sleidan s'étoit donnée pour rendre son Histoire parfaite, avoit si fort assoibli son esprit sur la fin de sa vie que (quoiqu'il ne fût âgé de cinquante un an quand il mourut en 1556.) il avoit oublié les noms de ses trois filles. Il est inutile de parler davantage de cet Auteur; car on ne peut pas faire en extrait de ses Ouvrages qui ne sont que d'Histoire ou de Rhetorique, & nous nous sommes assez déclarés sur ce qui regarde son style & son caractere," in BAS, vol.1, 436.

⁹⁹ BAS, vol. 1, 614-646, 649-650.

¹⁰⁰ BAS, vol. 2.

movement. While the term may have been standard usage in France to discuss Calvinist Protestants, its constant repetition may have rendered it objectionable for the overwhelmingly Protestant readership in England.¹⁰¹

Du Pin's critical history directed at Catholic authors may have been acceptable to English readers, but a pejorative term for Protestants leaders and writers was not. However, it is possible that similar bibliographies and histories were readily available from domestic Reformed historians, so that the *Bibliothèque des auteurs separez* provided little new information not already widely available.

Subscribers of the 1722 Dublin Edition of the *New History*

Another useful source for determining Du Pin's influence among Anglicans is the subscriber list affixed as a preface to the *New History*'s 1722 Dublin edition. As mentioned earlier, the subscriber list, composed mostly of Anglican divines and Protestant members of the Irish Parliament, comprises a virtual "Who's Who" of the most prominent Irish Protestants of that time. As such, a short discussion of several prominent subscribers provides some perspective on Du Pin's influence.¹⁰²

The notable Irish Protestant clerics listed there are: Archbishop William King of Dublin; Belfast Presbyterian minister James Kirkpatrick; Henry Maule, dean of Cloyne and later the bishop of Meath; Bishop Charles Cobbe of Killala and later archbishop of Dublin; Bishop James Stopford of Cloyne, a close friend of Jonathan Swift; Thomas Sheridan, priest, schoolmaster, playwright, and tutor to the Lord Lieutenant's son; Bishop

¹⁰¹ BAS, vol. 2, 435.

¹⁰² NH22, [vii-viii].

Timothy Godwin of Kilmore and later archbishop of Cashel; Bishop Francis Hutchinson of Down and Connor whose history of witchcraft took a critical view of witch trials; and Patrick Delaney, dean of Down.¹⁰³

The most notable subscriber, Archbishop William King, considered “the single most important Irish Protestant churchman of his era,” was active in church reform as well as Protestant/Catholic polemics. In 1697, he published *An Answer to the Considerations which Obliged Peter Manby...to Embrace, What He Calls the Catholick Religion*, in response to the views of Peter Manby, former dean of Derry, explaining his conversion to Catholicism. King’s efforts included debates with Irish Presbyterians. In 1694, he published *A Discourse Concerning the Inventions of Men in the Worship of God* to show that Anglican worship’s music, prayer, and Holy Communion had more biblical foundations than Presbyterian practices. King, known for efforts in evangelizing Irish Catholics, advocated teaching the Irish language at Trinity College as an evangelization tool.¹⁰⁴

¹⁰³ Thompson Cooper, rev. R.G. Ingram, “Charles Cobbe,” *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* vol. 12 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 270; E. I. Carlyle, rev. Philip Carter, “James Stopford,” *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* vol. 52 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 934; W. R. Meyer, “Thomas Sheridan,” *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* vol. 50 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 305-306; Alexander Gordon, rev. Patrick McNally, “Timothy Godwin,” *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* vol. 22 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 619; Toby Barnard, “Francis Hutchinson,” *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* vol. 29, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 10; Toby Barnard, “Patrick Delaney,” *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* vol. 15, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 713.

¹⁰⁴ S. J. Connolly, “William King,” *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* vol. 31 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 681, 682, 685; Patrick J. Corish, *The Irish Catholic Experience* (Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, Inc., 1985), 125.

Another notable subscriber, Bishop Henry Maule of Meath, advocated instituting new Protestant schools as a means of stamping out Catholicism in Ireland.¹⁰⁵

Other subscribers included military leaders such as army Major General Pierce Butler, the Jacobite earl of Newcastle, and Thomas Burgh, military engineer and architect of a number of Dublin public buildings such as the Custom House and Trinity College Library. Burgh served as Member of Parliament (MP) for Naas from 1713 to 1730.

Another military subscriber was Pierce Butler, a Jacobite military officer who served as privy counselor of Ireland under James II as well as Lord Lieutenant of Kilkenny. After his first wife died, he married the illegitimate daughter of James II, Henrietta Fitzjames.¹⁰⁶

Gustavus Hamilton, another military subscriber, attained the rank of major general and served in the war in Ireland against Jacobite forces 1690-1691. Hamilton served as MP for Donegal and Starbae, governor of Coleraine and later Athlone, and was a member of the Irish Privy council under William III, Anne, and George I.¹⁰⁷

Huguenot immigrants were listed among the subscribers, such as David Chaigneau, later pastor of a French congregation in Carlow, and William Binauld, a bookseller in Dublin and publisher of a book of Psalms, the Bible, and the *Book of Common Prayer*.

¹⁰⁵ Toby Barnard, "Henry Maule," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* vol. 37 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 430.

¹⁰⁶ Rolf Loeber, "Thomas Burgh," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* vol. 8 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 788-789; T.F. Henderson and rev. by P.J. C. Elliott-Wright, "Pierce Butler," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* vol. 9 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 191-192.

¹⁰⁷ T.F. Henderson and rev. by Harman Murtagh, "Gustavus Hamilton," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* vol. 24 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 810.

Both subscribers signal a possible French Protestant recognition of the usefulness of the *Nouvelle Bibliothèque* in countering Catholic doctrine.¹⁰⁸

Polemical Uses of Du Pin's Scholarship

Having reviewed all these works, what can be said about the use of Du Pin's scholarship in Catholic/Protestant polemics in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries?

1) Du Pin's work in determining the provenance of ancient Christian liturgies such as the Liturgy of St. Peter allowed Protestants to deny the ancient nature of several Catholic doctrines. Protestant apologists consistently used his history in coming to terms with such diverse persons and topics as Gregory of Nazianzus, Dionysius the Areopagite, the *Sacramentum* of St. Gregory, St. Ambrose, Tertullian, St. John Chrysostom, Sozomen, St. Augustine, as well as the canons of the Councils of Nicea, Florence, and Elvira.

2) Du Pin's work evidently assisted Protestant controversialists in attacking Catholic practices and institutions, such as clerical celibacy, persecution of Protestants, liturgical practices, purgatory, transubstantiation, Catholic church discipline, the Latin Vulgate as the official text of the Bible, scholarly criticism of the Bible, the veneration of images, Marian doctrine, Eucharistic sacrifice, Catholic Church polity, papal primacy, and mortal sin.

3) Protestant apologists could cite a renowned Catholic scholar as an authority on the veracity of ancient church writings. Du Pin was not considered an ordinary Catholic

¹⁰⁸ Grace Lawless Lee, *The Huguenot Settlements in Ireland* (Westminster, MD: Heritage Books Inc, 2009), 130; John Fontaine, *The Journal of John Fontaine: An Irish Huguenot Son in Spain and Virginia, 1710-1719* (Williamsburg, VA: Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, 1972), 147.

scholar, but one willing to contest views within his own communion. His work, considered unbiased, placed him in the role of an erudite middleman in polemical debates.

4) The works of commentators, such as Stillingfleet, Fleetwood, Bingham, Brett, and the elder and younger Synge, serve to verify the consistent reaction stated in prefaces of nearly all Du Pin's works: that his research was invaluable in providing evidence useful to Protestant apologists engaged in the controversial debates of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries.

5) A review of Du Pin's *Bibliothèque des auteurs separez de la communion de l'Église romaine* demonstrates Du Pin's willingness to consider Protestants as an integral part of the Church universal and to recognize their contributions to Christian thought. His acceptance of the Protestant histories of Sleidan and Burnet and inclusion of these authors' research in his own works shows his evenhandedness in the Catholic/Protestant debates, and led to British Protestant authors' enthusiastic reception of his works.

6) A review of the subscribers to Du Pin's 1722 Dublin edition of the *New History* demonstrates his influence among the highest strata of Irish Protestant society.

7) Finally, citations from the prefaces, Protestant commentators, and Du Pin himself, demonstrate the great divergence between his motivations in writing his history, and those of his readers. He used research to champion the Gallican cause or to take up another question of import in the current domestic French debate, such as penance practices dividing the Jansenists and the Jesuits. His Anglican readers, on the other hand,

sought to plumb his research for discoveries useful in debates between Catholics and Protestants within the British Isles.

Chapter 4 – Du Pin the Heretic

While English and Irish Anglicans held Du Pin and his publications in high regard, Catholics in the British Isles had the opposite opinion. In fact, Catholics portrayed Du Pin as a secret Jansenist and a relapsed heretic, and his writings were generally viewed with suspicion in the Catholic community. Much suspicion may be attributed to awareness of official punishments imposed in France, such as his censure and subsequent retraction after publishing *Nouvelle Bibliothèque* as well as his signing of *Cas de Conscience* and resulting exile to Châtellerault.

The Gallican and Jansenist Causes

Throughout the period, staunch Gallicans such as Du Pin were often incorrectly identified with the Jansenist cause. As discussed in Chapter 2, seventeenth-century Gallicanism was epitomized in the writing of Edmond Richer, the syndic of the Sorbonne elected in 1608. His signature work, *De ecclesiastica et politica potestate* (1611), asserts that only a church council has infallible authority. Richer emphasizes the individual priest's authority as opposed to the bishop's traditional role of directing the clergy. As a result of the controversy his work stirred, the French government deposed him in 1612. Nevertheless, Richer's work was influential in French ecclesial circles during the 1650s.¹

While Gallicans were concerned with limiting the papacy's authority rather than promoting Cornelius Jansen's theology, their goals at times coincided with those of the Jansenists. For instance, the Jansenist cardinal of Retz, Jean François Paul de Gondi, a

¹ William Doyle, *Jansenism* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2000), 14, 81.

leader of the Fronde uprising (1649-1652), trumpeted the independent authority of the parish priest. In addition, the cardinal opposed the Jesuits' alleged lax moral theology in ministering the sacrament of penance, a complaint many Gallicans and Jansenists shared.²

Jansenists and Gallicans united in opposition to several papal bulls and apostolic constitutions designed to combat the Jansenist heresy. The formulary controversy of 1664 was one instance of such Jansenist/Gallican cooperation. The four ordinaries opposing the Formulary, the bishops of Angers, Alet, Beauvais, and Pamiers, refused to sign the anti-Jansenist document whose provisions, they believed, would infringe upon their episcopal rights. Moreover, even the nineteen bishops endorsing the Formulary expressed support for the episcopal rights of the four on the same grounds. In fact, this widespread Gallican view against disciplining the four led to the 1669 compromise, *Peace of the Church*.³

Another example of Jansenists and Gallicans sharing similar goals arose over the acceptance of *Ad Sacram* in 1665. In this case, the Parlement sought to prevent the acceptance of the papal bull because it might allow an inquisition to be instituted in France, thereby lessening its own authority over the French church. Antoine Le Maistre promoted this view in his *Lettre d'un avocat au Parlement à un de ses amis* (1657). In

² Doyle, 26.

³ Alexander Sedgwick, *Jansenism in Seventeenth-Century France* (Charlottesville, VA: University Press of Virginia, 1977), 136-137, 138.

this case, Parlement unwittingly defended the Jansenist cause to preserve its own traditional Gallican prerogatives.⁴

A number of famed Jansenists held to strongly Gallican worldviews. For instance, Pasquier Quesnel's edition of St. Leo's works, published in 1675, articulated such extreme Gallican views of the Church that the work was regarded as a premeditated slight to the pope's prerogatives. The famous Four Gallican Articles, the declaration of the assembly of the clergy of France in 1682 resulting from the *regale* controversy, elicited strong support of outspoken Jansenists including Antoine Arnauld. In the introduction to Arnauld's famous book, *De la fréquente communion*, which his nephew Martin de Barcos composed, Saints Peter and Paul are designated "two heads of the church that make but one" – an implied insult to Petrine and consequently papal authority.⁵

As noted above, Gallicans and Jansenists shared opposition to papal infallibility and supported a conciliarist view of church authority. For instance, Jansenists Jean du Vergier de Hauranne, the abbé of Saint-Cyran (a.k.a. Saint-Cyran), and Godefroi Hermant, professor at the University of Paris, defended episcopal prerogatives over those of the pope. Saint-Cyran, in his *La somme des fautes du père Garasse*, celebrated living in a nation enjoying ecclesiastical liberties unlike those of many other Catholic countries. The aforementioned Jansenists Hermant and Quesnel held that all papal bulls and decrees required episcopal approval before their promulgation in a French diocese.⁶

⁴ Doyle, 31; Sedgwick, 83.

⁵ Sedgwick, 55, 148, 176.

⁶ Ibid., 73, 156-158, 173.

One notable occasion for collaboration of Gallicans and Jansenists took place during the so-called “Case of Conscience” (1701), as discussed in the introduction. Gallicans, including Du Pin, avidly supported this penance case. The latter defended the case because it limited papal authority in favor of local control of the French church.

Parlement typically led the opposition to papal bulls, constitutions, and decrees issued in response to the Jansenist heresy. However, its invariable concern was how papal directives limited its own authority over the church. Thus, it is fair to conclude that Parlement often gave political but not theological support to Jansenist goals.⁷

The battle against the apostolic constitution *Unigenitus* provides another example of Gallicans and Jansenists on the same side of an argument. In this instance, Parlement became concerned that *Unigenitus* gave the papacy the right to decide what the French people could or could not read. In response, Parlement registered the bull with a disclaimer that protected the traditional Gallican Liberties.⁸

Doyle notes that the Gallican spirit of the French clergy, now largely seminary educated, prompted its support for such biblical works as *Moral Reflections* in opposition to *Unigenitus*. They did so not because they supported *Moral Reflections*’ alleged Jansenist undercurrents, but rather because they sought to use such works to develop their own conclusions. This theological liberty allowed the clergy to maintain independence from episcopal control and Roman authority. It is noteworthy that Quesnel’s *Moral Reflections* contained Richerist and other Gallican conciliar views.⁹

⁷ Doyle, 67, 82.

⁸ Ibid., 46.

⁹ Ibid., 48; Sedgwick, 190.

The French clergy were by and large concerned that *Unigenitus*'s propositions 72-78, and 90-91, attacked Richerist Gallicanism. Unlike other bulls and constitutions issued to combat the Jansenist heresy, *Unigenitus* proceeded to attack French Gallicans by condemning conciliarism, individual scripture interpretation, and vernacular Bible translations.¹⁰

Gallican opposition to *Unigenitus* was further strengthened through publication of such works as Nicolas Le Gros's *Du Renversement des libertés de l'Église gallicane dans l'affaire de la constitution "Unigenitus"* (1716). Doyle estimates that by 1718, three quarters of the clergy in the archdiocese of Paris opposed the papal anti-Jansenist encyclical *Pastoral Officii* for the same Gallican reasons shown above.¹¹

Interestingly, Sedgwick concludes that the apostolic constitution reinforced the Gallican alliance of the Archbishop of Paris, Cardinal Louis Antoine de Noailles, Parlement, and the Jansenists as *the* coalition allowing the Jansenist movement to survive into the eighteenth century.¹²

In a similar fashion, P. Lucien Ceyssens describes the Gallican and Jansenist causes as often unwittingly aligned in the aftermath of *Unigenitus*. Since Jesuit ultramontanes requested the constitution, it placed the Gallican forces of church and *Parlement* on the same side in the controversy, but of course for different reasons. Ceyssens makes the case that this unwitting alliance arose during the acceptance of the previous bull, *Vineam*

¹⁰ Doyle, 48; Sedgwick, 190.

¹¹ Doyle, 50, 51.

¹² Sedgwick, 207.

Domini (1705), which was strongly opposed on the basis of Gallican sensibilities.¹³

Furthermore, Ceyssens finds that by this time the popes regarded the fight against Jansenism as a fight against Gallicanism, while the king considered these efforts as a means of limiting the Jansenist bishops' power, in order to maximize his own influence over the church. Ceyssens concludes,

By fighting Jansenism, the pope, much like his predecessors, intended to destroy Gallicanism, to lead the French clergy to acknowledge his supreme authority and his personal infallibility; on the contrary, the king, wanted to reduce the influence of the Jansenists bishops, which so clearly manifested itself during the *régale* affair, to reinforce his hold on the Gallican clergy. Basically, by fighting Jansenism together, one intended to strengthen Gallicanism, the other to weaken it.¹⁴

While the king pushed for the constitution's acceptance, he never intended to surrender his Gallican prerogatives to the pope.¹⁵

Ceyssens points out that the Holy See's tendency to link Jansenism with Gallicanism led to extra caution in the constitution's acceptance, and it led French authorities to request advanced drafts to peruse.¹⁶ Parlement and the doctors of the Sorbonne, who believed "they were guardians of the storehouse of the faith and judges of the first order,"¹⁷ took up the Gallican defense. Ceyssens noted that this effort highlighted the battle between old (Gallican and Jansenist) and new (Molinist) ideas. He wrote, "One can see that the reception of the bull would be a clash between Gallicanism and

¹³ P. Lucien Ceyssens. *Le Sort de la Bulle Unigenitus* (Lueven: Leuven University Press, 1992), 43, 104.

¹⁴ "En combattant le jansénisme, le pape, tout comme ses prédécesseurs, entend détruire le gallicanisme, amener le Clergé de France à reconnaître son autorité suprême et même son infailibilité personnelle; le roi, au contraire, veut réduire l'influence des évêques jansénistes, qui s'était manifestée si clairement pendant l'affaire de la Régale, afin de renforcer son emprise sur le Clergé gallican. Au fond, en combattant ensemble le jansénisme, l'un entendait fortifier le gallicanisme, l'autre l'énervier," in *Ibid.*, 105.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 115.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 106.

¹⁷ "qui se croyaient gardiens du dépôt de la foi et juges en première instance," in *Ibid.*, 106.

ultramontanism, between old theology (Augustinianism and Thomism) and modern theology (Molinism).”¹⁸

Another important insight of Bruno Neveu is that the resurgence of patristic research, conducted to further Gallican principles in France during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, was a tool that the Jansenists later used to defend their doctrines against the Jesuits.¹⁹ In this way, both parties were plumbing the ancient texts in order to cite the practices of primitive Christians for their own contemporary purposes.

For all these reasons, many were confused about the relationship between Gallicanism and Jansenism, and the ever-present tendency to confuse one with the other. While Du Pin was not a Jansenist, one could see how over the course of the era, Gallicans, like Du Pin, were often regarded as allies of the Jansenist heretics. As shown above, this confusion became more pronounced after the promulgation of *Unigenitus*.

English Protestant and Catholic Views on Jansenism

Ruth Cark, in her work *Strangers and Sojourners at Port Royal*, cites forty-five works (between the years 1653-1718) either printed in English or published in England in other languages dealing specifically with Jansenism. These include translations of Pascal’s *Provincial Letters* (1657), Arnauld’s works on Jesuit casuistry (1662, 1664), Pierre Nicole’s *Moral Essays* (1677), Quesnel’s *Moral Reflections* (1709), and books

¹⁸ “On le voit, la réception de la bulle sera un affrontement entre le gallicanisme et l’ultramontisme, entre le théologique ancienne (augustinisme et thomisme) et la théologie moderne (molinisme),” in Ceyssens, 108.

¹⁹ Jean Louis Quantin, “Anglican Scholarship Gone Mad? Henry Dodwell (1641-1711) and Christian Antiquity,” *History of Scholarship: A Selection of Papers from the Seminar on the History of Scholarship Held Annually at the Warburg Institute*, eds. C.R. Lita and J.L. Quantin (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 354.

recounting the Jansenist movement's history such as Theophilus Gale's *The True Idea of Jansenisme, both Historick and Dogmatick* (1669). The constitution *Unigenitus* was translated and published in England in 1714, the year after its promulgation. In its preface Pasquier Quesnel is described as a "second Luther." Accordingly, ample works in English provided details of the Jansenist/Jesuit debates to the English public.²⁰

For the most part, the vast output of Jansenist translations reflected a uniform enmity toward the Jesuits, mostly from Anglicans, but even from some Catholics. Jansenists were the preferred, although in no way fully acceptable, type of Catholic for English Protestants, who admired their piety, their dependence on Holy Scripture, and their opposition to papal infallibility. For Calvinists, the anti-Molinist Jansenists seemed to be the most "reformed" Catholics. As such, they gained the sympathies of a segment of prominent English scholars, including mathematician Isaac Barrow, non-juror Bishop Thomas Ken, non-conformist Theophilus Gale, and Puritan John Owen. John Wesley even commented on *Unigenitus*, claiming it "destroys the very foundation of Christianity" and terminated efforts to reunite Catholics with Protestants. Evidently, the controversy attracted the interest of Anglicans because it demonstrated dissention among the Catholic faithful, an attribute which Catholics were so often accusing Protestants.²¹

The majority of these works were aimed at the Jesuits, and thus many French anti-Jesuit works were translated into English such as the *Additionalls to the mistery of Jesuitisme* (1657). Arnauld's *Nouvelle hérésie des Jesuites* (1662), translated and published the same year as *The new Heresie of the Jesuits Publickly maintain'd at Paris*

²⁰ Ruth Clark, *Strangers and Sojourners at Port Royal* (Cambridge: The University Press, 1932), 152, 260, 278-287.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 102, 134, 135, 138-139, 141, 142, 256, 257.

in the Colledge of Clermont, contested papal infallibility as promoted by the Jesuits. A similar work, the translation of Pierre Nicole's *Pernicieuses conséquences* (1662), which was entitled *Mysterie of Jesuitisme, and its pernicious consequences as it relates to Kings and States* (1666) attacked Jesuit influence.²²

The Popish Plot elicited the publication of several translated Jansenist works which were then used to attack the Jesuits. One such book, *La morale des Jésuites* (1667) by Nicholas Perrault was published under the English title, *The Jesuit Morals* (1670). The Popish Plot also brought forth a flurry of anti-Jesuit pamphlets and another English edition of the *Provincial Letters* in 1679.²³

However, during this period English Catholics maintained a general opposition to Jansenist views with several notable exceptions. The first worth discussing is the aforementioned Catholic priest Thomas White, also known as Blackloe. He wrote *Tabulae Suffragialis* (1657) which the Holy See banned for alleged Jansenist sympathies. During the interregnum, White proposed that Catholics reject papal supremacy in order to enhance the perception of their loyalty to the state. Several of his followers, including Henry Holden, later a doctor of the Sorbonne, and the secular priest and controversialist, John Sergeant (1623-1707), were believed to have held Jansenist sympathies.²⁴

The seminary at Douai was accused of harboring Jansenist teachings, beginning with Dr. Matthew Kellison, its president for twenty-seven years in the early 1600s. Many accusations were unfounded, but some had credence, especially among Blackloe's

²² Clark, 103, 106, 110.

²³ Ibid., 112, 113. *La morale des Jésuites* was translated by Israel Tonge, best known for his involvement in the Popish Plot.

²⁴ Clark, 152, 154-155, 162; Conroy, 77.

followers, such as Drs. Edward Daniel and Tomas Carr. John Leyburn, another president and later vicar apostolic of all England, was at the very least a friendly correspondent with Arnould and several other Jansenists. The papal internuncio in Cologne, Archbishop Giovanni Bussi, accused a professor there, Edward Hawarden, of Jansenism in 1707, an accusation resulting in the latter's resignation. Many accusations came as expected from Jesuits, whose concerted effort to take over the college in 1709 aimed to rid it of teachings they opposed. James III's court at Saint-Germain took up the Douai professors' cause and wrote letters of support to Cardinal Alessandro Caprara, the Cardinal Protector of England in the Roman curia. The latter suggested that the president of the college, Edward Paston, visit Rome to reassure the pope and his curia of the college's orthodoxy. Such a trip never took place, but in 1711 officials of the Holy See conducted a visitation of the college and reported it free of Jansenist teachings.²⁵

While full-fledged English Jansenists were rare, French Jansenists apparently influenced the views of English clergy on several issues. For instance, the aforementioned English Catholic controversialist John Gother, having adopted the views of prominent Jansenists, discouraged the veneration of images and relics, and following French Jansenist bishops' views, avoided making Mary seem "more compassionate than her Son."²⁶

The Jansenist nuns of Port Royal welcomed exiled Jacobites and made several converts among the Stuart court including Dr. John Betham, the teacher of the Old Pretender's son, Charles Edward. Other Jansenist converts at the court of Saint-Germain

²⁵ Clark, 181-186.

²⁶ Conroy, 232, 233.

included Francis Fitzjames, later bishop of Soissons, and the aforementioned Lord Edward Drummond of Cargill, who was imprisoned in the Bastille for a short time.²⁷

A few prominent Irish Catholics were drawn to Jansenism such as Cornelius Daly, a doctor of the University of Paris accused of Jansenist sympathies, Michael Moor, denied the position of provost at Trinity College, Dublin, because of his Jansenist leanings, and Bishop Luke Fagan of Meath, who ordained schismatic Jansenist priests from Utrecht in the 1710s.²⁸

Jansenism attracted some support in Scotland under the aegis of the Innes family (Thomas, Lewis, and George) who taught at the Collège des Écossais and whose graduates returned to Scotland as missionaries.²⁹

While Jansenism gained a few adherents in the British Isles and among the exiled court, for the most part English Catholics published works on Jansenism aimed to stop its spread. In 1694, Father William Darrell translated and published the Jesuit Gabriel Daniel's 1694 reply to the *Provincial Letters*. In this work, Darrell added his own comments, alleging Pascal fabricated many dialogues included in the *Provincial Letters*. In 1702, the aforementioned Jesuit priest Thomas Fairfax published the *Secret Policy of the Jansenists*, widely distributed throughout the order, as well as a *Short History of Jansenism in Holland* (1702) to discourage further the spread of Jansenist views among Catholics in England. The latter work and the translation of the *Cas de Conscience*, which he published in 1703, started a witch-hunt of sorts against those English Catholics suspected, usually falsely, of adhering to the heresy. Shortly after the English *Case of*

²⁷ Clark, 226, 233, 242-251, 254.

²⁸ Ibid., 210, 211-214.

²⁹ Ibid., 233.

Conscience's publication, accusations were made against the professors at Douai (as noted above), and a few years later against various secular priests in England, who allegedly corresponded with Jansenists in Holland. This heightened suspicion resulted in denying Father Gerald Saltmarsh's promotion to the episcopate owing to accusations of rigorism and Jansenism from the papal internuncio in Cologne, Bussi.³⁰

A Protestant Defender?

One possible reason for Du Pin's fame in England was the seemingly traitorous role he played in subverting the Catholic cause. This role begs the question: was Bossuet correct? Was the *Nouvelle Bibliothèque* just a polemical tool for Protestants intent upon disproving Catholic doctrine?

As shown in Chapter 3, Du Pin's work provided Anglican apologists a means of refuting outdated Catholic arguments and allowed them to state they were using the historical work of a prominent Catholic doctor within the Catholic communion to support their positions. But as already demonstrated, supporting Protestant doctrine or Jansenism was never Du Pin's goal. On the contrary, his works targeted theological topics under debate within France. Foremost, of course, was the defense of traditional Gallican liberties.

Moreover, it is significant that English Catholics cared little about Gallican/ultramontane debates so prominent on the other side of the English Channel. With the possible exception of a three-year window during James II's reign, English Catholics were more concerned with matters of day-to-day survival than the debates

³⁰ Clark, 161-163, 170.

between Louis XIV and the popes about ecclesiastical authority, or whether the Jesuits were too lenient in conferring absolution in confessions. This “survival agenda” generally led them toward an ultramontane position, which equated an attack on the pope with an attack on Catholicism. Apparently the Jesuits’ ministry in the Catholic mission areas of Britain stimulated the opposition to Gallicanism.

Case of Conscience

The first Catholic document shedding light on English Catholics’ attitudes toward Du Pin’s person and work is the *Case of Conscience*, which the aforementioned Father Fairfax translated into English (London, 1703). That the *Case* was printed for “A.B.,” and its preface labels the signers of the *Case of Conscience* a “Schismatical Party,” suggests that the publisher was a Catholic whose goal was to expose the *Case*’s unorthodox nature and the heretical status of Jansenism in general. Typical of an English Catholic discussion of Jansenism during these times, the work reveals no understanding that Du Pin as a staunch Gallican theologian might sign the case in order to defend the French church’s prerogatives. Indeed, any Gallican opinions that the publisher detected were considered dishonest means of defending the Jansenist “heresy.” As noted above, distinguishing between Gallicans and Jansenists becomes confusing since both took the same side during crucial debates especially in the early eighteenth century when the French nation became embroiled over the *Case of Conscience* and the apostolic constitution *Unigenitus*.³¹

³¹ Clark, 163.

Contrary to the accepted view, the *Case of Conscience* was not fictitious but an actual penance case. Grès-Gayer explains that the abbé Pascal Frehel, the curé of Notre-Dame-du-Port, regularly heard the confessions of a nephew of Pascal's named Louis Périer, a canon of Clairmont. Frehel, in turn, commonly confessed to a seminary superior named M. Gay, who later refused to grant him absolution because of his connection to the Jansenist Périer. In response, Frehel submitted the case of absolving a cleric who held several Jansenist views to some of his friends at the Sorbonne.³²

The case was submitted to the doctors for their approval in 1701; twenty-three doctors signed an original version. A second version, revised by Nicolas Petitpied, obtained forty doctors' signatures, although some later denied having signed the *Case*. Published in Paris in July of 1702, the *Case* soon provoked Bossuet's opposition. The latter proposed to Cardinal Noailles, Archbishop of Paris, that he seek retractions from the signers. A January 1703 letter addressed to Noailles, which Du Pin probably wrote himself, opined that condemning the forty signers called into question Clement XI's *Peace of the Church*, an earlier compromise which temporarily resolved the Jansenist question.³³

In early 1703, the Holy See condemned the *Case* in the papal bull *Cum Nuper*. In March, Noailles asked all the doctors to sign an Act of Submission. Five doctors, including Du Pin, refused to sign, resulting in his exile to Châtellerault and the loss of his royal professorship. Another doctor, whose pivotal role allowed for agreement on the second version of the *Case*, Nicolas Petitpied, refused to retract and was exiled to

³² *Cas de Conscience Proposeè par un Confesseur de Province...* (Paris: s.n., 1701); Jacques Grès-Gayer, *D'un jansenisme à l'autre: Chroniques de Sorbonne 1696-1713* (Paris: Nolin, 2007), 246.

³³ Grès-Gayer, "The Unigenitus of Clement XI :A Fresh Look at the Issues," 261; Grès-Gayer, *D'un jansenisme à l'autre: Chroniques de Sorbonne 1696-1714*, 255, 257, 259.

Beaune. Clement XI subsequently issued *Vineam Domini* (July 1705) condemning the respectful silence allowed in the *Case* but avoided trampling the king's prerogatives.³⁴

The *Case* actually resulted in the Holy See changing its response to the Jansenist movement. The curia began to see it as a vehicle for questioning the papacy's authority, and thus linked it to the Gallican movement. What really started during the *Case of Conscience* is what Grès-Gayer calls a "second Jansenism," when emphasis on Jansenist doctrine diminished as controversy over church authority increased. It had become a way for Gallican advocates in the Sorbonne, and in France generally, to advance their own anti-papal agendas.³⁵ Grès-Gayer aptly concludes that the faculty of the Sorbonne "[was] the most visible party of a project or a program conceived by reformist Gallicans who jumped at opportunities to promote it [Gallicanism]."³⁶

The 1703 English volume of the *Case* included letters and dialogues in addition to the case itself. They argued that allowing the Jansenist heresy to remain would encourage other heresies to persist such as Quietism and Calvinism. They also proposed that such tolerance would result in a Church with no means of adjudicating matters of faith. Furthermore, the *Case* was characterized as a repetition of the old *droit/fait* debate of the 1660's.³⁷ For instance, in "A Dialogue Between the Old and Young doctor of the Sorbonne," included in this volume, the fictitious old doctor, "O.D." writes,

³⁴ Grès-Gayer, *D'un jansenisme à l'autre: Chroniques de Sorbonne 1696-1713*, 262-263, 275; Grès-Gayer, "The Unigenitus of Clement XI :A Fresh Look at the Issues," 263.

³⁵ Grès-Gayer, "The Unigenitus of Clement XI :A Fresh Look at the Issues," 263; Grès-Gayer, *D'un jansenisme à l'autre: Chroniques de Sorbonne 1696-1713*, 280.

³⁶ "il est la partie la plus visible d'un projet ou d'un programme conçu par des gallicans réformistes qui saisissent les occasions pour le promouvoir," in *Ibid.*, 280.

³⁷ CC, 29, 31-32.

Why do you not make short on't, and say, that our Forty Doctors, by this their Decision, revive the famous disputes of *Right* and *Fact*, so bandied in the case of *Jansenius*, and decided by so many Briefs, so many Censures, so many Decrees of the Clergy, back'd by the Arrests of the King. For, should their Decision be allow'd of, what the Popes, King, and Bishops had hitherto done concerning *Jansenius* and his Abettors, signifies now even just nothing.³⁸

In “A Dialogue Between the Old and Young doctor of the Sorbonne,” the author also states “Monsieur *Dupin* [who] blasted at several Tribunals, shall be regarded and treated as a Relapse[d] [heretic].”³⁹ No words are minced in describing Du Pin himself. His signature on the *Case* labels him a relapsed heretic, plain and simple. His reputation as an historian and theologian of renown is of little consequence. But the volume is not completely one sided in the Jansenist/Jesuit debate, since it includes a letter against the Jesuits accusing them of attacking the signers of the *Case of Conscience*, and it specifically targets Jesuit casuistry and the Chinese Rites Controversy.⁴⁰

The volume includes Cardinal Noailles' condemnation of the *Case*, and the April 1, 1703 submission of the majority of signers, reversing their former positions. It concludes with the Holy See's letters and pronouncements on the Jansenist controversy, as well as French royal responses. It includes Clement XI's April 10, 1703 letter praising Louis XIV for his diligence in punishing the *Case of Conscience* signers and urging him to make more public pronouncements against future works defending Jansenism.⁴¹

In the same letter Pope Clement XI writes, “[Louis XIV] has begun to punish, according to their deserts, the chief approvers of that most *Wicked Libel, Ellie du Pin, a*

³⁸ CC, 29.

³⁹ CC, 33.

⁴⁰ CC, 53-59.

⁴¹ CC. 60-68, 69-70, 86-88.

man of Wicked Doctrine, and guilty of frequent attempts against the Dignity of the Sea Apostolick.”⁴² The work ends with “Remarks upon the Case of Conscience,” a point-by-point refutation of the cleric’s positions in the *Case*.⁴³

The *Case of Conscience*’s English translation gives us a glimpse of Catholic views on Du Pin during this period. The latter is portrayed as a relapsed heretic, an enemy of the pope, and a Jansenist sympathizer. The editors paint a dire picture: if Du Pin and his ilk are able to win this battle in the Church; chaos will likely be the result.

Two Letters with Some Remarks upon the Fourth Tome of the English Edition of Lewis Du Pin’s Compendious History of the Church

Another fascinating work offering a glimpse into English Catholic attitudes toward Du Pin is *Two Letters with Some Remarks upon the Fourth Tome of the English Edition of Lewis Du Pin’s Compendious History of the Church* (1713). Based on a cursory perusal of Du Pin’s fourth volume of *Compendious History of the Church*, published the same year, the anonymous reviewer predicts the success of his recent publication because he has allegedly distorted the facts. He believes that the average English (and Protestant) reader will embrace these distortions.⁴⁴

The author predicts that the fourth volume’s favorable reception will be based on the assumption that Du Pin is, according to the author, a Jansenist. Evidence for the latter is Du Pin’s April 27, 1689 letter to leading Jansenist Pasquier Quesnel, stating that Jansen’s views were consistent with the undoubtedly orthodox St. Augustine. The author cites Du

⁴² CC, 86.

⁴³ CC, 117-136.

⁴⁴ TL, 1-2.

Pin's signature on the *Cas de Conscience* as further proof of his Jansenist sympathies.⁴⁵

In addition, he asserts that Clement XI's accusation (in his 1703 letter to Louis XIV previously cited above) that Du Pin is "a Man of Wicked doctrine, and guilty of frequent Insolencies against the See Apostolick,"⁴⁶ should endear him to the English Protestant reader. He dismisses Du Pin's recantation of his alleged errors in the *Nouvelle Bibliothèque* as insincere.⁴⁷

The author explains Du Pin's use of omissions and mistranslations to further his defense of Jansenism. He cites a passage in the fourth tome that misquotes Pius V's bull against Baius to leave the impression the pope opposed only Baius's supporters' understanding of his works rather than the works themselves.⁴⁸ Du Pin writes,

They [his adversaries] address'd themselves to Pope *Pius V*, and demanded his Censure of seventy-six Propositions advanced by *Baius*. The *Cordeliers* of *Flanders* were the Delators [denouncers] of them, and obtain'd a Bull dated on the first of *October, 1567*, by which the Pope condemn'd those Propositions in general, and respectively, as heretical, erroneous, suspicious, rash, scandalous, and offensive to pious Ears, however with this Clause, *That some of them might be maintain'd in the Rigour in the proper Sense of the Words of the Authors*; or as others translate them, *That altho' there be some of them that may be absolutely maintain'd, yet the Pope condemns them in the rigorous and proper Sense which the Authors of them had*. Be that as it will, the name of *Baius* was spared in the bull.⁴⁹

The anonymous author responds,

Now observe: First, By the first Translation of that Clause, *Du Pin* renews that sorry Cavil about the *Comma*, in *Pius V*. 's Bull, long since hissed off[f] the Stage: The meaning of that Cavil was to represent that Pope condemning propositions *maintainable in themselves* and in the *Sense* of those, who abetted them. A Pope,

⁴⁵ TL, 2-3

⁴⁶ TL, 3.

⁴⁷ TL, 4.

⁴⁸ TL, 4.

⁴⁹ CHC13, v. 4, 158-159.

who does so, makes a pretty Figure in the Church. Secondly, By the second Translation of that Clause, *du Pin* makes the Pope say, That, tho' those Propositions may be *Absolutely* maintained, yet he condemns them in Rigour, and in the Sense, the Authors of them *had*. A pretty Idea of a Pope exerting the Rigour of his Authority against the Sense a Man has in *his Head*, and asserts in his Words nothing, but what may be *absolutely maintained*. And does the Pope speak *thus*? No. Judge of his, and *du Pin*'s Candour, by the very Words of the Bull. *Quas quidem Sententias, stricto coram Nobis, examine ponderatas, quanquam nonnulla aliquo pacto sustineri possint, in rigore et proprio verborum sensu ab assertoribus intento, damnamus, etc.* Which Propositions, considered in a diligent Discussion of them in our Pretence, tho' some of them may, in *some Manner* (aliquo pacto), be maintained, we Condemn in the absolute and proper Sense of the Words expressed by the Authors of them.⁵⁰

Thus the anonymous author decries the deconstruction Du Pin and others used to muddle Pius V's clear anti-Baius (and therefore anti-Jansenist) judgement. He discounts the idea of the pope only censuring the sense in which Baius' advocates understood his works rather than the works themselves. He maintains that Pius V made no such assertion. Du Pin is therefore portrayed as a sophist who twists facts to defend Jansenism.

On the issue of Pope Innocent X's landmark *Cum Occasione*, the author cites Du Pin's assertion that the bull against Jansenius was hastily written. The author believes Du Pin was parroting the common Jansenist accusation that the pope's bull was composed without allowing an adequate defense.⁵¹ In volume four of *A Compendious History of the Church*, Du Pin writes, "Immediately the Pope [Innocent X] caus'd the Bull [*Cum Occasione*] for the Condemnation of the five Propositions to be drawn up dated on the last Day of *May*, which was published and posted up at *Rome* on the 9th of June."⁵²

⁵⁰ TL, 4-5.

⁵¹ TL, 9.

⁵² CHC13, v. 4, 190.

That the word “immediately” described the pope’s action is irksome to the anonymous author. He writes,

For observe the whole Art of it lies in this Word (*Immediately*.) We all know, what Lamentations the [Jansenist] Party made against the Precipitancy of *Innocent X.* in that Affair, that he would not allow the Abettors of *Jansenius*, regular Conferences, nor Time enough to explain themselves, &c. And upon such Pretences, they have been ever since calling for a Revision of the Cause, and maintain the Doctrine of the five Propositions of *Jansenius*, is that of St. *Austin* [Augustine]. Now this same *immediately*, in this Church Historian [Du Pin], comes wonderfully well in, in this Place, and may do Service to the Cause.⁵³

In scrutinizing Du Pin’s work closely, the author focuses on any term or insinuation in support of the Jansenist movement.

Besides Du Pin’s twisted facts or wording to help the Jansenist cause, the author deals extensively with his perceived sins of omission, Bossuet’s complaint of thirty years before. For instance, in Du Pin’s writing about the Sorbonne’s censures of Jesuits authors Jacobus Vernant and Amadeus Guimenius, he finds a failure to mention Pope Alexander VII’s later condemnation of those same censures. He attacks Arnauld’s distinction between *droit* and *fait* as a premeditated distraction that Du Pin was aware of but chose to omit from his history.⁵⁴

In peppering the work with other complaints about Du Pin’s integrity and alleged Jansenist sympathies, he considers the latter’s arguments against Jesuit casuistry as merely distractions to deflect criticism from the Jansenists.⁵⁵ He states that the book is “Compendious only in this Sense, that it conceals what is most Disadvantageous to the

⁵³ TL, 9.

⁵⁴ TL, 12, 27.

⁵⁵ TL, 12-13.

good Old Cause [Jansenism], whilst it retails, what may recommend it to Advantage.”⁵⁶

As the author sarcastically writes, “Thus you have my Reason to except against the *Sincerity of this Sublime Genius and Writer of the first Rank...*,”⁵⁷ undoubtedly recognizing his perceived prominence among contemporary Anglican divines and parroting accolades that others used to praise him. The writer’s misguided opinion of Du Pin’s Jansenism raises the possibility that Jansenist views may have been quite attractive to the strongly Reformed (meaning advocating predestination, in this case) Anglican church of the day.

While the author could have made several strong criticisms, as Bossuet and Simon had before him, the two letters contained a great deal of quibbling over alleged omissions of sources which would have added little to the historical quality of Du Pin’s work.

Since a Catholic evidently wrote these two letters and expressed views on contemporary French penance debates as merely a distraction, it appears the author was a prominent Jesuit. The author’s loyalty to the Holy See and his anonymity suggests a possible illegal status in England. In addition, many of Du Pin’s alleged slights and omissions relate to purported injustices towards members of the Society of Jesus.

The comments included in *Two Letters* are consistent with Catholic reactions to Du Pin that French commentators noted: Du Pin is an agenda-driven Gallican (and possibly even a Jansenist) who either distorts history or omits key facts and passages which contradict his “Gallican Ideal” (as Grès-Gayer puts it). Many Catholic authors apparently viewed

⁵⁶ TL, 16.

⁵⁷ TL, 14.

any appeal to Gallican principles as a disingenuous attempt to defend Jansenism or to divert attention from the heresy.

Monsieur Du Pin's Motives and Reasons, In Defense of Cardinal de Noailles (The Archbishop of Paris) His Appeal to a General Council

The only remaining mystery concerning an English edition of Du Pin's work is the book, *Monsieur Du Pin's Motives and Reasons, In Defense of Cardinal de Noailles (The Archbishop of Paris) His Appeal to a General Council* (1718), which claims to have been translated from the Italian by an unidentified "Friend abroad."⁵⁸ This volume includes Du Pin's letter in defense of Archbishop Noailles's appeal to a general council regarding *Unigenitus*, and the response of Cardinal Filippo Antonio Gualterio. It concludes with a short history of the entire Jansenist movement culminating in *Unigenitus*. The Italian version of the work is unfortunately no longer extant.

Despite the mystery concerning the work's provenance, a Catholic edited the Italian edition, which was then translated into English. Unlike other works referenced in this dissertation, it is a translation and not an English writer's original work. Nevertheless, its translation and publication in England, as discussed below, indicates it was deemed useful to the English reader.

The work starts with Du Pin's letter to an unknown Italian recipient citing the reasons he and his colleagues were appealing to a general council to protest *Unigenitus*. The letter aims to provide the Italian friend some talking points for defending the Gallican position in Italy. He writes,

⁵⁸ MDPMR, [i].

Sir, That you may not be unprepared to give to the *Italians* Satisfaction upon the Subject of the Constitution [*Unigenitus*]; I have sent you a few Heads to enable you to reason the Point, with such as are willing to understand the Grounds we go upon, in appealing to a General Council. The business we are about is not a yesterday's Quarrel, nor a private Contest between the See of *Rome*, and Cardinal *Noailles*; our Ancestors have frequently been engaged in the same Controversy, and 'tis no less the Interest of Religion in general than the felicity of the *Gallican* Church, which gives us the present Alarm.⁵⁹

Later in this letter, Du Pin outlines the traditional Gallican privileges as the bases for opposing the constitution. As in *De Antiqua* and other works, he asserts that the pope's authority is inferior to that of a general council, and opines that he has no right to supersede the ancient Gallican privileges, etc.⁶⁰ Du Pin defends the prerogatives of national bishops and their divine right to rule over their own jurisdictions. In doing so, he points out the papal usurpation of episcopal rights and the popes' attempts to assert such authority for themselves. He writes, "The See of *Rome* allows Bishops no Jurisdiction, but what is derived from the Pope immediately, whereas they are prepared to make it out, that their Power is conferr'd upon 'em by God."⁶¹

The popes have typically had an aversion to general assemblies, since they could potentially limit papal power *vis-à-vis* the rights and privileges of national churches. To Du Pin, the popes play politics rather than resolve issues in the proper manner, stating, "of late Years, the Bishops of *Rome* have discover'd an Aversion to such kind of Assemblies, 'tis plain they had a *Politick* View in it, being afraid, lest the Bishops should

⁵⁹ MDPMR, 1-2.

⁶⁰ Ibid., 3.

⁶¹ Ibid., 5.

question them for the Incroachments they had made upon National Churches, and the Episcopal Order.”⁶²

As expected, this letter contains little in direct defense of Jansenism. In fact, Du Pin refers to the controversy of grace as a great “Evil,” which the popes have failed to resolve satisfactorily, thus making the prospect of a church council all the more needed.⁶³ In this way, he used Jansenism to promote Gallicanism – not by defending a doctrine which might be viewed as *adiaphora* against the threat of papal intervention, but rather by demonstrating that the papacy was completely inept in resolving this theological controversy. Since the papacy failed in its leadership role of maintaining peace in the Church, a council was needed to attain tranquility. Du Pin’s argument might explain why the papacy linked Jansenism so closely with Gallicanism, as Grès-Gayer concludes above.

The letter contains a good deal of papal bashing, no doubt horrifying its pro-papal Catholic audience. Therein, the pope is deemed an incompetent and the constitution itself regarded as the result of the Roman curia’s corruption. For instance, Du Pin writes, “No National Church is obliged to surrender up immemorial Privileges at the Request of an incompetent Authority.”⁶⁴ He adds, “The Persons commonly employed in procuring Decrees from *Rome* are justly suspected as Party-men, remarkable for their Ignorance, and in the late Constitution a large Bribe is said to have carried the Cause.”⁶⁵

⁶² MDPMR, 6.

⁶³ Ibid., 7.

⁶⁴ Ibid., 3.

⁶⁵ Ibid., 4-5.

Archbishop Filippo Antonio Gualterio, papal nuncio to France and personal friend and advisor to the “Old Pretender,” James Stuart, responded in a letter published in the same volume. Because of his esteem for Gualterio, James secured his appointment from the Holy See as Cardinal Protector of England. From this position he represented James before the pope and Roman curia. In his Roman palace, Gualterio accommodated James and his court during their 1717 visit to Rome. The cardinal took part in the effort to secure the release of Maria Clementina Sobieska, James’s fiancé, whom the Holy Roman Emperor Charles VI imprisoned in a failed attempt to prevent their marriage and the birth of a future Jacobite heir.⁶⁶

Gualterio offered a point-by-point refutation of Du Pin’s letter and included an attack on the impracticality of the papal appeal, believing fifty years could pass before a general council reached a conclusive decision. In the meantime, anarchy would prevail in the Church,⁶⁷ as he writes,

I own every Nation has a Custom to inspect, and approve of the Pope’s Decrees, for the Sake of Order and Decency; and that they may be made more acceptable to the People, by having the State concur with the Church; but ‘tis the very Embrio and next Preparative to Schism and Heresy, to assume a Power of rejecting them. Now to expect Relief from the tedious Expedient of a General Council upon every impertinent Ecclesiasticks Appeal, is to give Men a License to renounce the Head of the Church and Centre of Unity for half a Century, till all the Princes of *Europe* can agree upon such an Assembly. And during this fatal Interval, designing Men seize the Juncture, and upon the pretence that the Pope’s Decrees are not binding before they are receiv’d, Errors go uncorrected, and a General Council finds the World involved in inveterate Mistakes.⁶⁸

⁶⁶ Edward Corp, *A Court in Exile: The Stuarts in France, 1689-1718* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 23, 28, 60, 67, 127.

⁶⁷ Filippo Antonio Gualterio in MDPMR, 17.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 16-17.

Gualterio apparently considered Du Pin and other appellants true Jansenists, constituting an impertinent minority within the French church and promoting their cause by invoking a false interpretation of the Gallican liberties,⁶⁹ He writes,

...now and then a deluded Prelate was perswaded to act in their [the Jansenists'] favor, but the Church was never divided, the Bishops and all the Clergy of Distinction went all the Lengths of the See of *Rome*, received its Decrees, and constantly employed both the Pulpit and the Press, to reduce that Refractory Gang. Yet still they cry we are a Legion; we stand upon the footing of the *Gallican* Liberties; our Cause is National and cannot be decided but by a General Council. Vain and Impertinent Branch of human Race! They have often imposed upon particular Persons, and now they have the Assurance to make a General Assault by way of trick, whereas they ate contemptible for their Number. The *Gallican* Church rejects their Methods, and their Impertinence in appealing to a General Council, will very probably be corrected with a Parish-Prison.⁷⁰

Gualterio's choice wording belittles Du Pin's Gallican view of a French national church which the king protected from external influence and Parlement defended legally.⁷¹ Noting that "The Liberties of the *Gallican* Church are Fetters to the Universal Church,"⁷² he warns against invoking the Parlement to intervene in ecclesiastical affairs.⁷³

In France, a recent forced sale of church property, including plates and furniture sold at below market prices to the state, appeared to Gualterio as equivalent to the dissolution of the monasteries during the English Reformation. Accordingly, he feared the rise of a Henry VIII in France unless the Jansenist party could be contained.⁷⁴ He writes,

⁶⁹ Filippo Antonio Gualterio in MDPMR, 24-26, 29.

⁷⁰ Ibid., 24-25.

⁷¹ Conroy, 316.

⁷² Filippo Antonio Gualterio in MDPMR, 31.

⁷³ Ibid., 31.

⁷⁴ Ibid., 32.

Their [the churches'] Altars have been twice stripped in the late War [War of Spanish Succession], of their Plate and Furniture; and the Proprietors obliged to sell them at a Court Price. And thus as the Dissolution of the Monasteries in *England*, became a Free Deed by the Abbots and Priors subscribing a surrender, though all was trick and equivalent to Compulsion, so these Uncanonical Proceedings in *France*, seem to prognosticate *Henry VIII*. But Heaven, certainly has better Blessings in Store for that flourishing Nation, and these Symptoms of a Defection are not real, but only the Dreams of delirious *Jansenists*, who are so possess'd with the justness of their Cause, that they imagin all Mankind is coming over into their Measures.⁷⁵

As before, Gualterio links Jansenism to Gallicanism and the king's resultant challenge to the legitimate authority of the Church. Seen this way, Jansenism and consequently Gallicanism ultimately leads to church nationalization, as in England. Jansenism, no longer just a heresy, is now considered a threat to the Church's authority.

Gualterio's other responses demonstrate an unabashed arrogance within the papal party. For instance, when responding to the accusation that anti-Jansenists parties bribed the Holy See to issue *Unigenitus*, Gualterio does not dispute the accusation, but instead responds that the Jansenists should have simply outbid them. He writes, "As for bribing in order to procure the *Constitution*, why did not the *Jansenists* bid higher, and so redeem the Truth. To contribute towards propagating an Error, aggravates the Crime. But 'tis a glorious task to advance Truth; either therefore the Appellants must have been surprised in the Affair of the Constitution, or they valued their Money more than the Gospel."⁷⁶

The volume concludes with a short history of Jansenism, which explains that its theology is a false understanding of Augustine.⁷⁷ It states,

⁷⁵ Filippo Antonio Gualterio in MDPMR, 32.

⁷⁶ Ibid., 19.

⁷⁷ "A Key to the History of the Constitution, *Unigenitus*," in MDPMR, 35.

...those who pretended to be his [Augustine's] Disciples had not the same Fate, for having no Regard to the Nature of the Controversy, but only to the bare Words of their Master, they have constantly made use of his Name to propagate several Mistakes which, at first being only unguarded Assertions, were gradually improved, and are now upon the point of being settled in Obstinacy, and Heresy. So that in Effect, what we now call a *Jansenist* is one who mistakes the Sense, but boasts of adhering to the Letter of St. *Augustin's* Works.⁷⁸

After a short overview of the Jansenist movement with a decidedly negative slant, it ends with the 101 propositions of *Unigenitus*.⁷⁹

Since this entire work was originally in Italian, what can be learned from its translation into English in 1718? Admittedly, the work provides one example of an Italian view of Du Pin and the Jansenist movement. As for reasons why the work was translated and sold in England, it appears that English Catholics were the targeted market, since it was clearly anti-Jansenist. It includes Gualterio's letter, an important figure for English Catholics in their hopes for a Jacobite restoration. The Catholic reader would have welcomed his refutation of Jansenism and Gallicanism. The work stood up Du Pin's original letter like a straw man to be pummeled by the Catholic champion, Gualterio. A derisive history of the Jansenist movement then reinforced the message.

This work warns against the Gallicanism, which Du Pin espouses, and the orthodox Catholic must strenuously oppose. Du Pin is characteristically described as an enemy to the papacy and a heretic and charlatan. Indeed, Du Pin was regarded as a troublemaker who would twist the truth to promote his alleged Gallican/Jansenist ideal: a crusade ultimately leading to widespread anarchy within the Catholic Church. Furthermore, Gallicanism was not considered a time-honored tradition of the French church or even

⁷⁸ "A Key to the History of the Constitution, *Unigenitus*," in MDPMR, 35.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, 33-53, 53-60.

within Christianity, but a disingenuous means of protecting the heresy of Jansenism, which pontifical decrees and apostolic constitutions had formally condemned during the previous century.

English Catholic Attitudes on Du Pin's Works

In the aforementioned three works written for English Catholics, what can be learned about their attitudes towards Du Pin and his works?

Foremost, Catholic works portray Du Pin as a secret Jansenist or at least a sympathizer purposely twisting his history to defend the heresy. This skewed history revealed in omissions of contradictory facts, places the papacy's actions in doubt and those of Jansenists in a positive light. Catholic detractors accused him of using time-honored Jansenist deconstruction techniques to circumvent papal bulls and constitutions. Such accusations are reminiscent of Bossuet's and Simon's responses in the late seventeenth century, but while the latter were concerned with Du Pin's Gallican slant, these early eighteenth-century accusers attacked his alleged Jansenist sympathies.

Du Pin's esteem within the Anglican community made him a pariah among English Catholics. The author of *Two Letters* sarcastically refers to him as a "*Sublime Genius and Writer of the first Rank*" and doubts his sincerity. Italian and English Catholics recognized his high reputation among Protestants and their use of his works in presenting Reformed doctrines. As such, they presumably regarded his history with suspicion. His true agenda, the defense of Gallican prerogatives, was generally unrecognized in that community.

That English Catholic understandings of Du Pin's motivations differed from those of French Catholics reflects the environment of the typical English Catholic. Unlike French Catholics, those in the British Isles lived under penal laws that threatened persecution. As such, they had slight inclination to concern themselves with intra-Catholic theological debates raging in France. Furthermore, Jesuits comprised a majority of the English clergy, and they were unlikely to promote a favorable view of their Jansenist or Gallican adversaries. Catholics with these sympathies were few and far between in England, while perhaps somewhat more numerous in Ireland.

In such an environment, attacking papal rights was equivalent to attacking the Catholic Church. Du Pin's aim to limit the papacy's authority was regarded as a pseudo-Protestant position in England. His view of the papacy as corrupt, even willing to accept bribes for issuing *Unigenitus*, elicits Gualterio's tacit confirmation. Nevertheless, Du Pin's position is considered counterproductive to the English Catholic mission and its survival. English Catholics believed that Jansenism/Gallicanism was a movement invariably leading to Protestantism in France and the death of Catholicism in Great Britain.

Chapter 5: Du Pin the Catholic

Previous chapters cited Protestant commentators who recognized Du Pin as a kindred spirit to the Reformed cause, and Catholic critics who viewed Du Pin as an unrepentant heretic and threat to the Holy See. The question remains, then, whether any author on either side of the Protestant/Catholic divide viewed Du Pin as an orthodox French Catholic. That is, did any author in Britain believe that he sought to defend the traditional beliefs and doctrines of the Catholic Church?

This question is posed, since Du Pin truly believed he was defending the Catholic faith from all innovations and adulterations, whether from Protestants without, or ultramontanes within, the Catholic fold.

How Du Pin's Catholic Biases Were Nearly Uniformly Excused

In previous chapters the quotes of various Protestant commentators offer some indication of Du Pin's Catholic biases. However, in these cases a "but" is usually added to this recognition, and a further explanation of Du Pin's unbiased nature follows. For instance, William Wotton explained that while Du Pin held an academic chair as a doctor of the Sorbonne, he usually did not let his university position slant his history.¹

In Chapter Two, a "Learned Divine" (probably Wotton) writing in an advertisement attached to the *New Ecclesiastical History of Sixteenth Century* wrote that while Du Pin called Luther and Zwingli "hereticks," he still explained that they depended on scripture

¹ Full quote can found on p. 58 of this dissertation.

to develop their theologies.² Again Du Pin's tendency to label reformers "heretics" emerges, but often he recognizes their positive contributions.

In Chapter 3, Edward Synge notes that Gregory of Nazianzus once wrote that the ecumenical councils increased rather than diminished evil.³ Synge conveys Du Pin's belief that Gregory wrote in anger about the troubles he experienced at the Council of Constantinople. However, Synge questions how someone of Gregory's piety would over generalize that all councils were "evil" based on his personal difficulties. Synge apparently questioned Du Pin's view of Gregory's anger, because he believed Catholic scholars were not allowed to challenge the authority of ecumenical councils. He assumes Du Pin was responding to pressures within the French church.

In a book review of Du Pin's 1711 Amsterdam edition of the *Nouvelle Bibliothèque*, as discussed at greater length in Chapter Seven, the reviewer noted that the persecution Du Pin suffered prompted restraint. He wrote, "Had Dr. *du Pin* composed these Two Books without any Restraint upon him, 'tis highly probable his Extracts would have been more Curious and Instructive, and attended with several Reflections which he did not think fit to publish."⁴ In this case, the author recognizes the Catholic slant of Du Pin's history, attributed to the repressive environment of early eighteenth-century France.

² See quote on p. 70 of this dissertation.

³ See quote on p. 137 of this dissertation.

⁴ *Memoires of Literature* v. 1 (London: Printed by J. Roberts and Sold by A. Baldwin, near the Oxford-Arms in Warwick-lane, 1711), 233.

Contemporary English readers could not have missed that Du Pin was a devout Catholic. In Chapter Two, Du Pin notes that Luther's doctrine of justification represented, in his view, a misunderstanding of Paul's message.⁵

As noted before, Du Pin uses the term "Heretick" throughout his works in describing the reformers. In addition, English readers could not have missed his constant use of the term "pretendue réforme" to describe Calvinists.⁶ While editors clarified his biases for English readers in explanatory notes, more often than not offensive words and phrases were simply allowed to stand on the basis of Du Pin's reputation as an even-handed critic of dubious writings.

Du Pin's "Commonitorium" (as discussed in Chapter Seven) shows his willingness to defend disputed Catholic doctrines against Protestants, as in the case of the twenty-eighth article of the Church of England's Thirty-Nine Articles, in which Du Pin defended transubstantiation. But Anglicans doubted that he freely chose to argue against the article. Instead, they believed that domestic pressures compelled him to do so. As an example, William Beauvoir, chaplain to the British ambassador to France, in discussing Du Pin's defense of transubstantiation in the "Commonitorium" writes, "but what startles me most is their [Du Pin and Dr. Patrice Piers de Girardin, another French ecumenist] firm adherence to the doctrine of transubstantiation. Whatever they pretend I can hardly believe them in earnest about that point. One thing is observable, that both people and

⁵ See quote on p. 68 of this dissertation.

⁶ BAS, 435.

priests are less addicted than ever in idolatry and superstition, and the *religieux* in general are despised.”⁷

Du Pin had little hesitation in defending Catholic doctrine well grounded historically and alleging errors among the Protestant reformers. These views appeared in his translated works and usually without editorial comment. Yet as his reputation in England as a renowned scholar willing to question the authenticity of theological works grew, he was widely considered a Protestant sympathizer. On the Catholic side, a common opinion held that as a relapsed heretic he used the Gallican Liberties to defend Jansenism surreptitiously. In England, he was generally not considered a “True Catholic.”

Jesus the Son of David

Among the works reviewed in this dissertation for the period 1686-1730, one anonymous author formed the opinion that Du Pin was a Catholic controversialist in *Jesus the Son of David; or, a Full Sollution of all the Difficulties about His Genealogy in Matthew and Luke. Against Monsieur Du Pin and the Church of Rome*, published in Edinburgh in 1730. The author leaves the impression of eccentricity in aiming to discredit commonly accepted traditions. The book’s anti-Catholic tone and publication in Edinburgh suggest that the author was a strongly partisan Scottish Presbyterian.⁸

⁷ William Beauvoir, “Letter from William Beauvoir to William Wake, 14 May, 1718,” in Jacques Gres-Gayer, *Paris-Cantorbéry (1717-1720): le dossier d’un premier oecumenisme* (Paris; Beauchesne, 1981), 154-155.

⁸ JSD. The author appears to have published the title as the last of a three-volume set, which included the titles *Nero and Paul*, and *Palm-Sunday and Good Friday*. In *Nero and Paul*, the author alleged that Paul did not die in Rome but instead escaped from confinement there. In *Palm-Sunday and Good Friday*, the author attempted to prove that Jesus entered Jerusalem on Palm Saturday and died on Maundy Thursday. *Nero and Paul: or, a Clear Demonstration that the Apostle Outlived that Emperor* (Edinburgh: s.n., 1730). *Palm Sunday and Good Friday; or a Fatal Engagement, Wherein these Two Popish Chiefs, With Their Whole Clans, Are Cut Off upon the Spot, by Clear Demonstration* (Edinburgh: s.n., 1730).

In the introduction, he acknowledges that Catholics disagreed among themselves regarding biblical genealogies, noting, as others have in this study, that Du Pin was not considered a typical Catholic academic. Nevertheless, he notes that whatever position Catholic scholars took on the genealogies, all were mistaken concerning their correct elucidation.

The author's opinion of Du Pin appears somewhat divided. At times, he portrays the latter's history as accurately reflecting traditional beliefs regarding the Bible and early church history. At other times, he posits his history as being all wrong – a reflection of a corrupt Catholic Church falsifying church history solely for its political purposes.

The author excuses Du Pin for alleged errors, in the belief the church forced him to hold certain outrageous positions, lest he suffer exile or worse consequences. Ultimately, the author lumped all Catholics together as unreliable, though he considered Du Pin's research credible when it helped his arguments. Yet he harshly attacked his other conclusions as simply "Papist" when they contradicted his own views.

The author stated his goal: he sought to contest Du Pin's views on Matthew's and Luke's genealogies on the grounds that the Israelites kept reliable birth records, and that boys were added to these rolls after circumcision. He held that each Israelite man had in his possession a certificate of his own genealogy.⁹

Accordingly, Luke recorded the genealogy in his gospel from Jesus's own certificate. Any differences in genealogies were not errors in the originals; other factors intervened. For instance, the difference between "Cainan son of Arphaxad," in Luke 3:36, and

⁹ JSD, 4.

Genesis' "Caiman, son of Enos," was attributed to a transcriber's mistake. The author held that the original monograph as found in Genesis was correct.¹⁰

The author believed that Luke's genealogy showed Jesus' line descending through Heli, whom he believed was Mary's father rather than Joachim, as tradition has it. In doing so, Luke avoided any implication that Joseph was Jesus's real father. The author pointed out that this view made sense according to the genealogies of Jewish virgins during this time, since they included a virgin's father, and only included her husband once she married. Furthermore, the author held that adopted fathers were not included in Jewish lineages, and this belief dispensed with the idea that Heli might have been Joseph's adoptive father after his natural father died.¹¹

On the other hand, the author believed that Matthew's genealogy followed Joseph's ancestry. The author discussed how this genealogy did not match the one in Luke because Matthew expunged evil kings and replaced them with their brothers or other relatives. The author held that the genealogy in Matthew (unlike Luke's) was not an accurate listing of Jesus' forebears, but those of Joseph, who is linked to Jesus by only a non-genetic consanguinity. He added that Matthew's genealogy was not "the" genealogy of Christ but rather "a" genealogy based on this non-blood relationship.¹²

In the author's first direct mention of a Du Pin work, he quotes *A Compleat History of the Canons and Writers, of the Books of the Old and New Testament* (1699) which states "All the Ancients agree as we have already observed that the Gospel of St. *Matthew* is the

¹⁰ JSD, 5.

¹¹ JSD, 6, 25, 26.

¹² JSD, 7, 8.

first of the four in order of Time.”¹³ While the author agreed that the ancients held this, he believed that they were wrong, since an acceptance of Matthew’s primacy would have made his genealogy the first and best, which he believed impossible, since it descended through Jesus’s stepfather, Joseph. He attributed Du Pin’s (and the ancients’) error to the blindness of the Catholic Church over the ages.¹⁴

Du Pin is cited next in *A Compendious History of the Church* in a discussion of the third-century church historian, Sextus Julius Africanus, who addressed genealogies. The author, in discussing Du Pin’s retelling of Africanus’s reconciliation writes, “That *Africanus* about two hundred Years after the Death of our Saviour, writes [and now paraphrasing *A Compendious History of the Church*], ‘That *Matthew* followed the natural Descent, and *Luke* that which was according to the Law.’”¹⁵ Du Pin had written the explanation in the question and answer format of the *Compendious History*,

Q. How can that Difference [in the names of the two genealogies] be reconciled?
 A. Several Ways. The first, and the ancientest, is transmitted to us by *Africanus*, who having liv’d about 200 Years after the Death of JESUS CHRIST, might be well acquainted with that Affair, either by Memoirs or Tradition. That Author, to reconcile the said Difference, has Recourse to the Law that was in Force among the *Jews*, and oblig’d Brothers to marry the Wives of their Brothers who died without Issue. He says therefore, that *Mathan*, who was descended from *David* by *Solomon*, married a woman call’d *Estha*, by whom she had *Jacob* and that the same Woman married *Melchi*, or rather *Mahat*, who was descended from *David* by *Nathan*, by whom she had a Son call’d *Heli*, that so *Heli* and *Jacob* were Brothers by their Mother, and that *Heli* dying without Children, *Jacob* was oblig’d to marry the Widow, by whom he had *Joseph* the husband of *Mary*, who was consequently the true Son of *Jacob*, and Son to *Heli* according to the Law. He descended from *Solomon* by *Jacob*, and from *Nathan* by *Heli*.¹⁶

¹³ CH99, 36.

¹⁴ JSD, 8.

¹⁵ JSD, 9.

¹⁶ CHC13, 222.

By this somewhat convoluted explanation (graphically depicted on the following page of the *Compendious History*), Africanus believed that Matthew followed the actual bloodline down to Joseph, while Luke followed Joseph's legal parentage, including adoptive parents like Heli. In this way, Africanus explained the differences in the two genealogies. The author of *Jesus the Son of David* disagreed with Africanus, believing that while Matthew's genealogy included the bloodline of Joseph, Luke's followed the natural bloodline of Jesus, to include Mary.¹⁷

The author references Du Pin again in "*his compendious History of the Church*," noting that *Du Pin* was unclear as to whether Mary was of the house of David. The author cites him as writing that "it is certain that *Joseph* was of the House of *David*, and it is LIKELY Mary was so too."¹⁸ This wording, besides the capitalization of "likely," is identical to the original. This statement dismayed the author since it implied that the Catholic Church did not necessarily believe that Jesus was of the line of David. In the author's mind, Jesus must descend from the line of David (through Mary) in order to fulfill the Old Testament prophecies.¹⁹

The author cited Du Pin's assertion that Jews were required to marry in the same race and family. Du Pin had also addressed Mary's and Elizabeth's relationship in light of this requirement. He writes, "Q. How then was she [Mary] related to *Elizabeth*, who was of the Tribe of *Levi*? A. It is possible that some of her Ancestors had married a Daughter

¹⁷ JSD, 9.

¹⁸ JSD, 10.

¹⁹ CHC13, 221; JSD, 10, 23.

of the Tribe of *Levi*; for the Law, which forbid marrying into another Tribe, did not take Place as to the Tribe of *Levi*.”²⁰

Because of this section, the author inferred that Du Pin believed Mary and Joseph descended from the House of David, since by law they would have belonged to same family. In this case he doesn't seem to consider Mary's "likely" status in the House of David, as discussed by Du Pin above. The author then asks how Elizabeth could have been Mary's cousin, that is, a family member, since they lived far apart. By Du Pin's reasoning, the author proposed, Mary and Elizabeth would not have been relatives at all.²¹ But from the quote above, Du Pin had already addressed this question demonstrating that the prohibition of intermarriage between tribes did not include the priestly tribe of Levites to which Elizabeth belonged. The author appears to have ignored this explanation in his effort to dissect Du Pin's scholarship.

The author discusses at length how Heli, listed in Luke's genealogy, was Mary's father, an idea crucial to his belief that she and Jesus belonged to the House of David, thereby fulfilling the Old Testament prophecies and Paul's words in Romans 1:3.²²

His assertion that Heli and his wife, and not Joachim and Anne, were Mary's parents, contests the Catholic traditions about Mary's parentage and introduces several alternative hypotheses. One posits the feast of St. Anne as an intentional "Papist" fiction. The

²⁰ CHC13, vol. 1, 224.

²¹ JSD, 21.

²² Ibid., 21.

author opined that the papacy had chosen not to reveal the true father of Mary, Heli, since Pope Gregory XIII had established feast days for Anne and Joachim.²³

Surprisingly, the author then used Du Pin's history to prove his point about the identity of Mary's true father. He noted that in *A Compendious History of the Church* Du Pin finds that no liturgical feasts were celebrated for the virgin's parents until the twelfth century, insinuating that the names Joachim and Anne were medieval fabrications.²⁴ Du Pin actually writes, "The *Greek Church* honour'd S. Anne ever since the sixth Century, but the *Latin Church* has not instituted the Feast of S. *Joachim* and S. *Anne* but since the twelfth Century."²⁵ The anonymous author thereby has omitted the more convincing Greek tradition to make his point.

He believed that Joachim and Anna were not the traditional names of Mary's parents, but were instead extracted from a Catholic fable written earlier to deceive the faithful. Du Pin had defended the Church's tradition about the names of Mary's parents in *A Compendious History of the Church*. While the earliest works identifying their names may have been of dubious authorship, Du Pin believed that whoever initially recorded them would have had no reason to simply invent them.²⁶ He writes,

The Fathers have said of *Joachim* and *Anna*, Father and Mother to the Virgin, is only founded on the *Book of the Birth of the Virgin*, falsely ascrib'd to S. *James of Jerusalem*. However it is possible, that the Names of *Joachim* and *Anna* might be known by Tradition; at least it may be said, that it is likely those who contriv'd those false Histories, being ancient, might know the true Names of the Father and Mother of the Virgin; and that it is not credible that they should have invented false ones.²⁷

²³ JSD, 14, 23.

²⁴ Ibid., 15.

²⁵ CHC13, vol. 1, 337.

²⁶ JSD, 15, 16; CHC13, vol. 1, 337.

²⁷ CHC13, vol. 1, 337.

The author dismisses this reasoning as that of a willing accomplice in propagating the Catholic Church's fictions.²⁸ He writes,

He [Du Pin] would seek no more but to have that granted, that these [Joachim and Anne] were the Names of the Parents of *Mary*, because the Church of *Rome* has decided that, and the *Roman* and *Parisian* Missals have the Feast of *Joachim*, the Father of the Virgin, on *March* 20. Her Husband Joseph dies the day before that *Anna* her Mother dies, and is invoked (as the rest are in their Turns) on *July* 26... This presents you a small Sample of that vast Ocean of Fables that is maintained in the Church of *Rome*.²⁹

Du Pin defended his position by citing the sixth-century church historian, St. Epiphanius Scholasticus, who recorded the virgin's father as Joachim. He even attempted to harmonize the Church's tradition with the biblical text by stating that the name Joachim was simply a derivation of the name Heli. But the author of *Jesus the Son of David* strenuously dismissed this possibility, arguing that no etymological evidence exists to support this assertion despite the two names' apparent similarity.³⁰ The author writes, "He [Du Pin] says, That St. *Epiphanius* says, the Virgin's Father was *Joachim*... How will *Du Pin* make the same with *Heli*? Why, here it is: *Heli* is the same with *Eliacim*, whence may be made *Joachim*, the name St. *Epiphanius* gives the Virgin's Father."³¹ The author adds, "*Eliacim* is not the same Name as *Joachim*, tho' by going to the Etymologies out of two Words of the same Signification, you may bring them to bear the same Sense in Part, but not fully, as is evident to any that know *Hebrew*."³²

Furthermore, the gospel reading for the Mass on Joachim's feast day in the Roman

²⁸ JSD, 16.

²⁹ JSD, 15.

³⁰ JSD, 17.

³¹ JSD, 17.

³² JSD, 17.

Missal did not include the genealogy reading on Heli in Luke 3 but instead the nativity text from Matthew 1. Hence, the author made the case that Catholic theologians did not agree with Du Pin's reconciliation of the names, Heli and Joachim.³³

Believing Du Pin took his position on Mary's parents based on fear of church authority, the author considered his history unreliable on controversial subjects. On the other hand, fear of punishment was not the case for non-controversial doctrines, in which he thought the Sorbonne doctor highly credible. He writes,

Any that will read *Du Pin's Ecclesiastical History* will see he is not a credulous Author, except *per Force*. The Case stood thus with him, He had no Mind to quit his honourable and lucrative Post, and turn Refugee, and be in Danger of being caught and burnt alive. These Inconveniences he could not shun, unless he kept the great Feast of the Virgin's Conception, and also officiate as Priest then, when called, or when it was his Turn. He must do the same with *Anna's* and *Joachim's* (tho' I do find this last in the Missal of *Sarum* [an eleventh-century mass used widely in England before the Reformation]) or have *Rome, France, Paris* against him. He must therefore endeavor to perswade his conscience of the veriest Nonsense in the World, except it will allow him to speak and act known Lies, and offer them up as a Sacrifice to almighty God."³⁴

The above quote demonstrates the author's awareness of Du Pin's past exile, and the pressures against his controversial scholarship.

The author concludes the book with a tirade against the Catholic doctrines he opposed. First he attacks devotion to the Virgin Mary, including a sequence (hymn) in the Sarum Missal, a pre-Reformation book of Mass texts used in England for the feast of Mary's Nativity, in which he demonstrates its excessive Mariology.³⁵ Alleging the phrase *gratia*

³³ JSD, 34.

³⁴ JSD, 31.

³⁵ JSD, 37-39.

plena was a false translation of Luke designed to elevate Mary, he states it should be translated “*that has Favour graciously bestowed on thee.*”³⁶

Alleging an egregious example of excessive Marian devotion in the Roman Missal, he notes that Mary had, according to an unnamed pope, inherited all the good that God gave to man. He points out that even many French regarded the Roman Missal as far too Marian, but they avoided confronting the Holy See about its content.³⁷ He writes, “The *French* sure think the *Romish* Missal horribly idolatrous, but they call it only indiscreet Devotion; They dare neither do nor say all they would.”³⁸

In due course, the author attacked the doctrine that Jesus descended into hell before his resurrection. To him, Christ’s body did not physically descend there to preach to souls. In interpreting 1 Peter 3:12, he explains that Jesus’s spirit did indeed preach to the souls in hell but his body did not actually descend to hell when he preached there.³⁹

To prove his point, he indicated that the old man in Luke 16 did not possess his physical body in hell. To do so, he cited Du Pin from *A Compleat History of the Canons and Writers, of the Books of the Old and New Testament* as stating that the Greek version of Luke 16:23, that is — Erasmus’s version, as Pope Leo X approved, rendered the passage as, “*But the Rich man died, and was buried; and in Hell he lift up his Eyes, being in Torment.*”⁴⁰ He concluded that the rich man’s body never went to hell only his soul which called up to Lazarus from hell. Rather than being in hell, his body resided where it had been buried. In a similar way to the old man’s, Jesus’s body never traveled to hell,

³⁶ JSD, 40.

³⁷ JSD, 71.

³⁸ JSD, 71.

³⁹ JSD, 43, 49-50.

⁴⁰ JSD, 56.

only his spirit which then preached to those suffering there. But despite their knowledge of the true message of the verse, the author believed Catholics had put a mystical twist on its exegesis, saying the rich man's body was buried in hell thereby proving Christ's body could have descended into hell.⁴¹

The author returns to the ancient versions of the Apostle's Creed to demonstrate that the doctrine of Jesus's physical descent into hell was not unanimously held in the ancient Church. He cites *A Compleat History of the Canons and Writers, of the Books of the Old and New Testament*, which sets in opposite columns the Vulgar, Roman, Aquilian, and Oriental versions of the creed and notes that the Oriental and Roman versions did not mention Jesus' descent into hell.⁴² Both state that Jesus "*Was crucified under Pontius Pilate and was Buried,*" but they leave out "*he descended into Hell,*"⁴³ found in the Vulgar and Aquilian versions.

The author's obsession about whether Jesus's body descended to hell is demonstrated by his willingness to use poetry as evidence against the doctrine. For instance, he examined the poetry of the sixth-century subdeacon Arator, who arrived at the same conclusion. He even used the poetry of the sixteenth-century humanist George Buchanan to prove that Jesus' body was in the grave rather than in hell.⁴⁴

The next target in the author's scope was the doctrine of purgatory, which is initially addressed as lacking biblical evidence. He uses Du Pin's history as usual when it suited him, such as the latter's belief that the story of Pope Gregory I's praying the Emperor

⁴¹ JSD, 56.

⁴² CH99, vol. 2, 143; JSD, 66.

⁴³ CH99, vol. 2, 143.

⁴⁴ JSD, 61, 62.

Trajan out of hell was a fable. The author used this doubt to substantiate his attack on purgatory. While the author gives no citation, and Du Pin's refutation cannot be found in *A Compendious History of the Church*, it does appear in the *New History*.⁴⁵ Du Pin writes,

I shall not stay to refute a fabulous Story related by St. *John Damascene*, which is famous among the *Greeks*; that St. *Gregory* going into a publick place, and seeing a statue of *Trajan* who was leaping off his Horse to hearken to a Widow, was so mov'd with the goodness of this Action that he pray'd to God for the repose of his Soul; and obtain'd his Salvation. This Fable, which had deceived the People and the Devoto's for a time, is now become the Object of Laughter and Contempt to all those who have the least discretion. The Fact of *Trajan*, upon which it is founded; is not related by any of those who wrote the *Roman History*. In the time of St. *Gregory*, the ancient Statues were not erected in the public places of *Rome*, as formerly, and St. *Gregory* was too much perswaded that damned Infidels had no hopes of Salvation; to be so daring as to ask of God a thing so contrary to his unalterable laws; And therefore which way soever this Invention of the Modern *Greeks* be consider'd, 'tis equally indefensible.⁴⁶

While the anonymous author has found a suitable quote from Du Pin, one wonders how discrediting the Trajan fable furthers his argument against purgatory. Possibly, the author's understanding of purgatory was confused with hell. Given his limited grasp of Catholic teaching on purgatory, this story may have been included as another example of "Papist" prevarications.

In attacking the veneration of images, the author alleged that Catholics made the first two commandments into one by burying the "you shall not make unto you any graven images" into the commandment of "having no other gods before Him." According to the author, the revision allowed for the worship of images.⁴⁷ The Catholic Church then

⁴⁵ JSD, 51, 54; NH93, vol. 5, 102.

⁴⁶ NH93, vol. 5, 102.

⁴⁷ JSD, 69.

allegedly created two commandments (their ninth and tenth) to keep the commandment count at ten. To the author, Catholics “...have wedged in two in the Room of one. They have, to recompense this (if it may be called Compensation) divided the tenth Command, as it is in our Catechism, in two, tho’ all the World may see they are but one. Why have they done this?...They will have it believed that Images of God may be made, and worshipped too, but only not called the true God, nor worshipped with equal honor to him.”⁴⁸ Again the author suspects Catholic chicanery — this time changing the Ten Commandments to allow for the veneration of images.

On priestly celibacy, he alleged that the fourth-century Pope Siricius lied when stating Jewish priests were continent “during their course,” i.e. their period of service in the temple. Siricius thought “their course” lasted an entire year and established a precedent for priestly celibacy based on the ancient Jewish tradition. But citing 1 Chronicles 24:18, the author found twenty-four “courses” during a year so that each family of priests was responsible for one twenty-fourth of the year. As such, he concluded that the Bible showed a course lasted only about two weeks.⁴⁹

The author assailed the seventeenth-century Jesuit theologian Martin Becan, who held that the apostles maintained perpetual continence.⁵⁰ He responded that Matthew 19:10 (really 19:11) contradicts the idea of requiring celibacy and writes, “Christ’s Counsel Matth. 19:10, &c. *He that can receive it, let him receive it*; that is, not to marry. I ask, Is not the Pope *Antichrist*, that commands what Christ did not, that these that cannot receive

⁴⁸ JSD, 70.

⁴⁹ JSD, 72.

⁵⁰ JSD, 75.

it shall receive it?”⁵¹ The author refutes Becan’s assertion that Peter’s wife died during the early years of the Church thereby showing that Peter, although previously married, maintained celibacy during his ministry. As the author points out, no scriptural reason existed for holding a belief in Peter’s celibacy, and he questioned how Becan could claim the latter as true.⁵²

Finally, the author alleges that the Catholic Church purposefully mistranslated the original Greek in the Latin Vulgate in order to promote transubstantiation. To protect the doctrine, he believed that the Catholic Church would always retain the Vulgate.⁵³

In evaluating the author’s use of Du Pin and his works in *Jesus the Son of David*, a few conclusions can be made. The author believed that although individual Catholics may differ on interpretations of history and theology, they were all in error. The author considered Du Pin as complicit in perpetuating the “myth” that Joachim and Anne were the names of Mary’s parents. He was also accused of covering up for the “lies” of the Catholic Church. Du Pin was inexorably linked to this false tradition, but his research could at times be used to verify views expressed in *Jesus the Son of God*.

Since only the anonymous author among those examined here regarded Du Pin as a “true Catholic” willing to defend Catholic doctrine, one might speculate why. One reason might have been that while Anglican authors had some positive views about conciliatory Catholics, the more “reformed” Presbyterians were generally hostile. Some

⁵¹ JSD, 75.

⁵² JSD, 75.

⁵³ JSD, 78, 79.

Scottish Presbyterians saw Anglicans themselves as “Papists.” They regarded Catholics’ theological views as simply wrong and dismissed them.

That this work was published in 1730 may account for the author’s unexpected opinions. By then, eleven years after Du Pin’s death, his reputation as a rogue Catholic and accused heretic in France as well as an historian of interest and an ecumenical figure may have diminished in public recognition. As such, Du Pin may have been linked to other Catholic commentators of recent interest.

Furthermore, the author explained that Du Pin could not write freely in his *A Compendious History of the Church* because of church pressures. While the author regarded Du Pin as an influential scholar whom he could cite to substantiate his assertions, he treated him with skepticism, since he believed all his writings were produced in the context of an oppressive church. In conclusion, unlike authors in previous chapters who thought Du Pin’s “papism” never got in the way of his scholarship, at least one author believed otherwise.

Was Du Pin Viewed as an Orthodox Catholic?

Besides the anonymous author, is there another who considered Du Pin a “true” or “orthodox” Catholic? Not likely. Wotton’s comments reveal an understanding that academic neutrality motivated Du Pin, who sought to avoid having Catholic doctrine prejudice his work. While Du Pin did not hide his Catholic views, i.e., pointing out the errors of the reformers, these views did not deter him from presenting an accurate portrayal of their lives, ministries, and unique motivations. Anglican divines attributed many of Du Pin’s more doctrinal positions to pressures from ecclesial authorities and

secular authorities in France, a view parroted in *Jesus the Son of David*. Letters from the Du Pin/Wake correspondence reveal that the censors may have indeed been a factor.

The only exception was, as stated above, *Jesus the Son of David*, in which Du Pin is considered simply another disingenuous “papist” defender of Catholic dogma. Yet even this author attributes many of Du Pin’s views to these same domestic pressures. The latter work’s Scottish Presbyterian origin explains its less conciliatory approach to Catholics in general. The late date of its publication (1730), when the renegade mystique of Du Pin was beginning to be forgotten, may also have been a factor in its conclusions.

Chapter 6: Du Pin the Gallican

In previous chapters, a number of English divines, such as William Wotton and Digby Cotes, recognize Du Pin as a devoted Gallican scholar. Nevertheless, Du Pin's Gallican ideas were usually not incorporated into Anglican divines' works. Instead, these clerics used Du Pin's scholarship for their own purposes: anti-Catholic polemics, intra-Protestant debate, and, as discussed in Chapter Seven, pre-enlightenment scholarship. An exception is *The Genuine Epistles of St. Ignatius*, Robert Calder's 1708 edition of William Wake's earlier translation. This work includes an examination of Du Pin's Gallicanism and provides ample historical data to support the structures and doctrines of the Church of England.

How Du Pin Used his History to Sustain Gallican Ecclesiology and the *Condemnation of Monsieur Du Pin*

As discussed before, Du Pin's histories were formidable vehicles for furthering his own aims. Two examples can be found in the history of the Venetian Interdict found in his *A New Ecclesiastical History of Seventeenth Century*, and in the history of the conciliar movement in *New History's* thirteenth volume, which examines the fifteenth century. At times, this Gallican propaganda was barely noticeable, while at other times it was obvious to the reader.

For instance, in his section on the Venetian interdict in *A New Ecclesiastical History of Seventeenth Century* in which he profiles the Doge's response to the pope's threat of interdict, Du Pin writes,

...he thought himself oblig'd to employ his Cares, in maintaining the publick Tranquility and supporting the Authority of the Prince. That he protested before God, he had not omitted any means of informing, and laying before the Pope, the strong and convincing Reasons of the Republick. But that having found his Ears clos'd, and seen the Brief he had publish'd against all kind of Reason and Justice, in Opposition to the Doctrine of the Holy Scripture, the Fathers and Canons, and to the Prejudice of the Secular Authority which God has bestow'd upon Sovereign Princes, the Liberty of the State and the Publick Repose, and to the great Scandal and Offense of the whole Christian world, he held that Brief to be not only Unjust but also Null, unlawfully fulminated in Fact and contrary to the Rules of Law, and that he would use the same Remedies which his Predecessors and other Princes have used against the Popes, who abused the Authority which God had given them to Edification, and pass'd the Bounds of their Power.¹

Du Pin reveals a strong Gallican tone to portray the pope as impervious to reason, overstepping his authority, and bringing “great Scandal and Offense [on] the whole Christian world.”

In his account of the Council of Constance appearing in the thirteenth volume of the *New History*, he explains in Gallican fashion how the decree *Haec Sancta* placed the pope under the authority of a council. Du Pin writes,

The Decree made in these two Sessions concerning the Authority of the Council above the Pope, did plainly decide the Question, and subjected the Pope, as well as to Faith as Manners, to the Judgment of a General Council. And this ought not to be understood only of a time of Schism, or in case the Pope were doubtful, but generally in all other Cases; 1. Because the Words of the Council are general; 2. They import that all the World, even the Pope himself, is oblig'd to obey the Council, not only as to what concerns the extirpation of Schism, but also as to the Reformation of the Church in its Head and Members, as well as in Doctrin as Manners; 3. Because they speak not only of this particular Council, but of any other Council lawfully assembled; 4. Because they contain general Penalties against all that should not obey the Council, of whatsoever Dignity they were; Because they deduce the Authority of the Council above the Pope from its representation of the Church, and from its Infallibility, and this agrees to all general Councils at what time soever they were celebrated; 6 Because the Council acknowledges *John XXIII.* for lawful and undoubted Pope. From all which it appears, That there can be no place to doubt but this Decree was General.

¹ Seventeenth C. 1725, vol. 1, Book II, 18.

The Authority of this Decree cannot any longer be disputed, since it was made in full Council, after the Matter was resolv'd upon by the Nations, and with the unanimous consent of all the Fathers...²

Du Pin cavalierly dismissed the unique circumstances of the Council of Constance and its effort to alleviate the leadership crisis of three disputants claiming the papal throne. He refused to take seriously the papalist argument that the fifteenth-century councils may have been historical anomalies. He avoids discussing the ultramontane view that papal authority over the Church was again restored after the problem of the contested papacy was resolved. Moreover, while not as blatant as the quotation above, Du Pin continued this Gallican tone throughout the English editions of his histories.

As mentioned, Du Pin's Gallican thought is revealed in the English translation of *The Genuine Epistles of St. Ignatius*. Before discussing this work, other authors who recognized Du Pin's Gallican views will be reviewed.

In Chapter One as noted, Paris's archbishop, Cardinal François de Harlay de Champvallon's *The Condemnation of Monsieur Du Pin* had been published in London in 1696. The introduction or "Advertisement" of its English translation states that Louis XIV's condemnation of Du Pin aimed to improve relations with the pope damaged since the Assembly of the Clergy approved the Four Gallican Articles (1682). While the "Four Articles" had been retracted in 1683, tensions still strained relations between Louis and the Holy See. The king needed improved relations with the pope to secure papal support away from the Grand Alliance and towards the French in the Nine Year's War.³

² NH93, vol. 13, 15.

³ "Advertisement" in *Condemnation*, B1.

While the author of the “Advertisement” recognized Du Pin’s supporting role in the French church’s struggles over authority issues, the importance of his works to the English reader lay in the area of Catholic/Protestant polemics, not Gallicanism. Besides the political motivations, the author of the “Advertisement” noted that French Catholics,

*...charged him with Imprudence in delivering Truths very unseasonably: for while they were extirpating the Opinions of Protestants as damnable Heresie, it was no ways proper to Publish a Book which yields great advantage to Protestants, and which shews that their Sentiments are more agreeable to what the Primitive Church and Fathers held, than the present Tenets and Practices of the Church of Rome.*⁴

Du Pin’s *New History* aimed to forward the Gallican cause. To Anglicans it was more important as a tool whereby they could convincingly defend Protestant doctrines by using his history of the “Primitive Church.”

William Wotton

A keen observer of Du Pin’s thought, William Wotton recognized the pains he bore for the Gallican cause. As cited in Chapter Two from the preface of the 1693 *New History*’s third volume, Wotton attributes his censure to the outspoken Gallicanism of his French works and because Louis XIV needed to make peace with the pope after the 1682 Assembly of the Clergy.⁵

Wotton and the translator of the 1696 edition of Du Pin’s condemnation and retraction also recognize him as a dedicated Gallican advocate caught up in a political reversal at the French court. This reversal required Du Pin’s and others’ censure to demonstrate orthodoxy to the Holy See and gain its support in the Nine Year’s War.

⁴ “Advertisement” in Condemnation, B1.

⁵ See full quote on p. 55 of this dissertation.

In Chapter Two, Wotton's dedication letter to Archbishop Thomas Tenison in *A New Ecclesiastical History of Sixteenth Century's* second volume (1706) explains the papacy's alleged attempts to usurp the power of local bishops through a fictitious commission from Jesus Christ. Though not directly related to Gallican thought, Wotton notes that the book aims to substantiate the Roman See's allegedly unjustified extension of its authority over local sees.⁶

In Chapter 2, Wotton's "Advertisement Before the English Translation," in Volume Two of *A New Ecclesiastical History of Sixteenth Century* notes that Du Pin's discoveries indicate a dramatic difference between the Tridentine Catholic Church and the apostolic Church. Wotton believed this volume useful in helping Protestants counter the alleged claims of the Catholic Church, to include infallibility and Jesus's institution of the bishop of Rome's authority. Wotton hoped by studying early church history as Du Pin laid out, Catholics would come to understand that their church's contemporary doctrine differed from its early practices.⁷

From the foregoing examples, William Wotton was aware of the Gallican content in the *New History* and *A New Ecclesiastical History of Sixteenth Century*. He recognized that Du Pin's agenda prompted his persecution in France, as he became a political figure during the Nine Year's War negotiations with the Holy See. He noted that Du Pin's Gallicanism revealed the disparity between the polity of the primitive Church and the contemporary Tridentine Catholic Church, which favored the authority of the papacy over the local episcopates' prerogatives.

⁶ See full quote on p. 73 of this dissertation.

⁷ See full quote on p. 72 of this dissertation.

Unlike many commentators in this study Wotton had no illusions about Du Pin's real agenda. Nevertheless, the former's recognition of the latter's aims did not make Wotton a Gallican himself. That is – Wotton's perspective was similar to other divines citing his work: he referenced those chapters of Du Pin's works deemed effective in contesting controversial Catholic doctrines. Generally, Wotton did not adopt a Gallican worldview to argue for the Church of England's legitimacy as separate from the Catholic Church.

Digby Cotes

In Chapter Two, another translator of Du Pin's, Digby Cotes, began the first volume of *A New Ecclesiastical History of Seventeenth Century* with "A Translator's Preface" to explain that the episcopal polity fulfilled the biblical model and maintained the rites of the ancient Church.⁸ Thus Cotes, in his introduction, based the Church of England's legitimacy on primitive practices rather than the Reformation leaders' teachings. According to Cotes, Luther and Calvin were not the founders of the Anglican faith. Instead, its true founders were the prophets, apostles, and Jesus Christ himself.⁹ While he did not cite Du Pin directly in this introduction, his history helped Cotes accomplish his goal of defending the primitive bases of the Church of England's practices and structure.

As noted in Chapter Two, Cotes recognized that Du Pin's Gallican vision could be useful in proving the heterodoxy of non-national church bodies, such as the nonconformists in Britain. In this effort, Cotes focuses on the Scottish Reformation and

⁸ Digby Cotes, "A Translator's Preface" in Louis Ellies Du Pin. *New Ecclesiastical History of Seventeenth Century*, A. (Oxford: L. Lichfield for T. Combes at the Bible and Dove in Pater-noster-Row, 1725), [ii-viii].

⁹ See full quote on p. 77 of this dissertation.

especially the Calvinist polity. He wrote that while the bishop's role was overemphasized before the Reformation, it was now underemphasized in Scotland and other Protestant nations where ministers and lay elders presided over worship.¹⁰

While Presbyterians were portrayed as extremists who invited chaos, Du Pin's work also provided a source of ecclesiological ideas to discredit the Catholic Church. Cotes explained in the "Translator's Preface" how the Church of England legitimately separated from the Holy See, as any national church had a right to do. That right included prescribing its own liturgical practices and enforcing those practices within its borders. The dissenters in England, accordingly, were nothing more than outlaws unwilling to conform to the state church and making indifferent matters the cause for separation.¹¹

Indeed, Cotes believed that Gallicanism supported the ideal compromise: the *via media* that is the Church of England. Such a church does not assert its ecclesial prerogatives over the rest of the world, but it professes to follow a biblically-based structure providing peace, harmony, and theological uniformity within its native land. While Cotes' preface recognized the Gallican model's usefulness for defending the Church of England; his short treatise did not specifically cite and incorporate Du Pin's work for this purpose.

Stillingfleet, Fleetwood, Bingham, and Synge

In Chapter Three, four English authors found the Gallican model useful in defending the Church of England. For instance, Edward Stillingfleet's *Origines Britannicae, or*

¹⁰ See full quote on p. 77 of this dissertation.

¹¹ See full quote on p. 78 of this dissertation.

Antiquities of the British Churches (1685) proposed that the Christian Church existed in Britain long before the Romans landed there.¹² Like Stillingfleet, William Fleetwood revealed his use of the *Nouvelle Bibliothèque* to reject the authenticity of Pseudo-Dionysius's *Celestial Hierarchy* in his debate with John Cross. As explained, Du Pin's research helped Fleetwood demonstrate that the work was not that of the biblical figure Dionysius the Areopagite, and was therefore not a useful resource for determining the correct biblical structure of the Church.

In Chapter Three, Joseph Bingham, in his *Origines Ecclesiasticæ*, adopted several of Du Pin's Gallican facts, explaining that many believed the Bishop of Rome's jurisdiction extended only to seven provinces in Italy and Sicily, Sardinia, and Corsica, thereby limiting the pope's reach. Later in the work, Bingham cites Du Pin's own view of the Holy See's jurisdiction, restricting the pope's control to a 100-mile radius around Rome.¹³ Bingham writes, "*Du Pin...exempt[s] Germany, Spain, France, Britain, Africa, Illyricum, and Seven of the Italick Provinces from any subjection to the Jurisdiction of the Roman Patriarch in those first and primitive Ages.*"¹⁴

In his work's first volume, Bingham cited Du Pin from *De Antiqua Ecclesiae Disciplina* and the *New History* as stating that the office of patriarchs originated before the Council of Nicaea.¹⁵ Bingham cites *New History*'s section on the Council of Nicaea's sixth canon to support the antiquity of patriarchal authority. In noting that Nicaea preserved the patriarchs' authority *vis-à-vis* the pope, Du Pin writes that the council "*does*

¹² Edward Stillingfleet, *Origines Britannicae, or Antiquities of the British Churches* (London: Printed by M. Flesher for Henry Mortlock, 1685).

¹³ OE v. 3, 329, 331.

¹⁴ OE, v. 3, 331-332; See full quote on p. 123 of this dissertation.

¹⁵ OE, v. 1, 211.

not oppose the Primacy of the Church of Rome, but neither does it establish it. It preserves to Great Sees their ancient Privileges, that is, the Jurisdiction or Authority which they had over many Provinces, which was afterwards call'd the Jurisdiction of the Patriarch or Exarch. In this sense it is, That it compares the Church of *Rome* to the Church of *Alexandria*, by considering them all as Patriarchal Churches.”¹⁶ Bingham draws further from the *New History* to defend patriarchs’ authority to excommunicate heretical bishops, citing in volume three the role of St. John Chrysostom, the patriarch of Constantinople, in excommunicating six bishops for simony at Ephesus in 401. Du Pin thereby demonstrated the lack of historical backing for the view that only the pope had such authority.¹⁷

In Chapter Three, the younger Edward Synge cited Du Pin and other Gallican scholars when responding to Steven Radcliffe’s attack on his sermon advocating greater tolerance toward Catholics. He explained that many Catholics did not hold ultramontane views, and therefore they could be trusted as loyal subjects of the king.¹⁸ Synge writes, “Have you never heard of the Writings of *William* or *John Barclays*, of *Edmundus Richerius*, *Johannes Launoius*, *Natalis Alexander*, the most learned *L. Ellies du pin*...every one of these Men liv’d and dy’d in the Communion of the Church of *Rome*, and yet they all denied and expressly writ against this [papal] Power.”¹⁹

¹⁶ NH93, vol. 2, 252; See full quote on p. 124 of this dissertation.

¹⁷ OE, v. 1, 222.

¹⁸ Edward Synge, *A Vindication of a Sermon Preach'd Before the Honourable House of Commons of Ireland. On Saturday the 23rd of October, 1725* (Dublin: Printed by A. Rhames, for Robert Owen, Bookseller in Skinner-Row, 1726), 66-67.

¹⁹ Ibid., 66-67; See full quote on p. 135 of this dissertation.

Du Pin is recognized as a different kind of Catholic, a Gallican, who while remaining loyal to the Catholic communion, did not regularly support papal views.

Catholic Works

In Chapter Four, several Catholic works were discussed which recognize Du Pin as a Gallican. Their authors simply viewed Gallicanism as either an underhanded tool for defending Jansenism or a dangerous movement aiming to instigate a break from Rome.

The preface of the English edition of *Case of Conscience* called its signers a “Schismatical Party,” and its “A Dialogue Between the Old and Young doctor of the Sorbonne” stated that “Monsieur *Dupin* [who] blasted at several Tribunals, shall be regarded and treated as a Relapse[d] [heretic].”²⁰ In Pope Clement XI’s April 10 letter, included in this volume, he writes, “[Louis XIV] has begun to punish, according to their deserts, the chief approvers of that most *Wicked Libel, Ellie du Pin, a man of Wicked Doctrine, and guilty of frequent attempts against the Dignity of the Sea Apostolick.*”²¹ Thus, while Du Pin’s Gallicanism was recognized, it was considered a pretext to promote heresy and division within the Church. Grès-Gayer properly concludes that by the early eighteenth century, Jansenism was viewed as closely allied to Gallicanism in a combined effort to limit the authority of the Holy See over local churches. Parlement’s role in rebuffing papal attacks on Jansenism created the perception of a Gallican-Jansenist alliance. Naturally, Parlement only took this action to defend its own Gallican

²⁰ CC, 33.

²¹ CC, 86.

prerogatives, but regardless the Jansenist heresy was perceived as aligned with the Gallican agenda and as more politically motivated.²²

In a similar way in *Two Letters with Some Remarks upon the Fourth Tome of the English Edition of Lewis Du Pin's Compendious History of the Church* (1713), the author explains Du Pin's signature on the *Case of Conscience* as proof of his Jansenist sympathies. The author was simply unwilling to believe that Gallican principles might convince a doctor of the Sorbonne to sign a Jansenist document.

In Chapter Four, the recognition of Du Pin's Gallican views in *Monsieur Du Pin's Motives and Reasons* is confirmed in a letter from Du Pin to an Italian friend with Gallican talking points on the apostolic constitution *Unigenitus*. Du Pin writes, "Sir, That you may not be unprepared to give to the *Italians* Satisfaction upon the Subject of the Constitution [*Unigenitus*]; I have sent you a few Heads to enable you to reason the Point, with such as are willing to understand the Grounds we go upon, in appealing to a General Council."²³

Monsieur Du Pin's Motives and Reasons included a treatise by Filippo Antonio Gualterio alleging that Du Pin and his allies were simply Jansenists disingenuously invoking the Gallican Liberties in order to defend the heresy.²⁴

Previous chapters discuss a widespread recognition of Du Pin as an international authority on Gallican principles. Du Pin's two translators, Digby Cotes and especially William Wotton, recognized his Gallican reputation. A number of other distinguished

²² Jacques Gres-Gayer, "The Unigenitus of Clement XI: A Fresh Look at the Issues, 263; Clark, 216.

²³ MDPMR, 1-2; See full quote on p. 171 of this dissertation.

²⁴ Filippo Antonio Gualterio in MDPMR, 24-26, 29.

commentators such as Edward Stillingfleet, William Fleetwood, Joseph Bingham, and the younger Edward Synge noted his extensive research supporting the prerogatives of national churches. In addition, all the Catholic works presented in this edition recognized Du Pin's Gallican views.

Moreover, these recognitions fit primarily into two categories: 1) Anglican divines drawing on Du Pin's Gallican research to question Catholic doctrines, and 2) Catholics seeking to demonstrate that Du Pin was either a secret Jansenist using the Gallican Liberties to defend the heresy or a schismatic bent on inciting division within the Church.

Nevertheless, none of the authors cited above wrote an entire work, which effectively incorporated Du Pin's Gallican principles as a means of defending the rights of national churches against Catholic incursions. That is – none of these authors used Du Pin's research for the true purpose in which it was written in the first place: to demonstrate historically the right of a local or national church to manage its own affairs and maintain ecclesial discipline within its own boundaries.

The Genuine Epistles of St. Ignatius

The exception to this pattern is Robert Calder's edition of William Wake's translation of *The Genuine Epistles of St. Ignatius* (1708). This translation Wake completed in 1693²⁵ was augmented with Du Pin's treatise supporting the authenticity of the Ignatian letters and a similar treatise by Calder.

²⁵ *The Genuine Epistles of the Apostolical Fathers S. Barnabas, S. Ignatius, S. Clement, S. Polycarp, the Shepherd of Hermas, and the Martyrdoms of St. Ignatius and St. Polycarp*, tr. by William Wake (London : Printed for Ric. Sare at Grays-Inn Gate next Holborn, 1693).

Calder, a Scottish episcopal divine and avid defender of the *Book of Common Prayer*, was imprisoned in Edinburgh for ten months in 1693 for illegally holding services, having been deprived of his benefice in 1688 for refusing to pray for the new monarchs, William and Mary. The following year he opened his own house church in Aberdeen, which flourished until it was closed under pressure in 1706. Calder then moved to Elgin, where he was again ejected in 1707, and later moved back to Edinburgh, where he served a congregation in Toddrick's Wynd. There, he was convicted and fined for not praying for King George in 1716. Calder was an avid writer in defense of the episcopal polity in Scotland, having written *Reasons for a Toleration of the Episcopal Clergy of Scotland* (1703), and *The Divine Right of Episcopacy* (1705).²⁶

From information provided in the untitled preface, undoubtedly written by Calder, this work was intended to provide historical support for the offices of bishop, priest, and deacon against the protestation of dissenters, a constant threat to the Church of England during Queen Anne's reign. The preface provides a short biography of Ignatius, in which Calder writes that he "*wrote thence four Epistles, to four several Churches, to establish them in the Profession, and Practice of Faith, Charity, Unity and Uniformity, and particularly in Obedience to their lawful Governours; to wit, the Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons, three Orders, which, no doubt, he knew, to be of divine Institution, and of Apostolic practice.*"²⁷

Throughout the volume, Ignatius urges the laity to be faithful to their bishops and priests. The authority of bishops and their role in preventing heresy are evident

²⁶ David M. Bertie, "Robert Calder." in *Scottish Episcopal Clergy 1689-2000* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, LTD, 2000), 19.

²⁷ "A Short Account of the Life and Martyrdom, of St. Ignatius," in GESI, [xvi].

throughout the epistles.²⁸ For instance, in the Epistle to the Ephesians he writes, “that by uniform Obedience, *ye may be perfectly joyned together in the same Mind; and in the same Judgment*; and may all speak the same things. And that being subject to your Bishop, and his Presbytery, ye may be wholly and thoroughly Sanctified.”²⁹ Other examples include, “For Jesus Christ, our Inseparable Life, is the Mind of the Father, as the Bishops appointed even unto the utmost Bounds of the Earth, are the Mind of Jesus Christ,” and “it is therefore evident, that we ought to look upon the Bishop, even as we would do upon the Lord Jesus.”³⁰

In the letter to the Smyrnians, Ignatius writes,

Let no Man do anything of what belongs to the Church without the Bishop. Let that *Eucharist* be look'd upon as Firm and Just, which is either *offer'd* by the Bishop, or by Him to whom the Bishop has given his Consent. Wheresoever the Bishop shall appear, there let the People also be: As where Jesus Christ is, there is the Catholick Church. It is not lawful without the Bishop, neither to Baptize, nor to celebrate the Holy Communion: But whatsoever he shall approve of, that is also pleasing unto God; that so whatever is done, may be secure and well done.

FOR what remains, it is very reasonable that we should repent, whilst there is yet time to return unto God. It is a good thing to have a due regard both to God and to the Bishop. He that Honours the Bishop, shall be Honoured of God. But he that does anything without his knowledge, Ministers unto the Devil.”³¹

This same exhortation of devotion to the bishop's office appears in Ignatius's Epistle to the Magnesians.³² In this letter, Ignatius urged the faithful not to take advantage of the young bishop installed there, and that “it will therefore behove you, with all Sincerity to obey your Bishop, in Honour of Him, whose pleasure it is *that ye should do so*. Because he that *does not so*, deceives not the Bishop whom he sees, but affronts him that is

²⁸ GESI, 68.

²⁹ Ibid., 10.

³⁰ Ibid., 10-11, 12-13.

³¹ Ibid., 81-82.

³² Ibid., 24-36.

Invisible. For whatsoever of this kind *is done*, it reflects not upon Man, but upon God who knows the secrets of our hearts.”³³ He further explains that “Your Bishop presiding in the place of God; Your Presbyters in the place of the Council of the Apostles, and your Deacons most Dear to me, being entrusted with the Ministry of Jesus Christ.”³⁴

Calder added Du Pin’s section from the *New History* addressing St. Ignatius, entitled “A Vindication of the Epistles of St. Ignatius.” As the title suggests, Du Pin’s work is a vital addition to prove the legitimacy of these letters, and consequently the early Church’s emphasis on the episcopate’s authority. In speaking of the letters included in this edition, some doubt existed as to Ignatius’s authorship of several, but Du Pin deemed as bonafide those published by Dutch Theologian Isaac Vossius in 1646.³⁵ He writes, “I have now only to enquire whether the seven Epistles, according to the Edition of *Vossius* were written by St. *Ignatius* and the first Question that offers it self to our Examination, is whether this Father wrote any Epistles at all? To which I reply, that it cannot be reasonably doubted.”³⁶

After Du Pin’s history, Calder’s appendix entitled, “An Appendix, *Shewing that tho’ Ignatius’s Epistles were lost; yet there are Testimonies from undoubted Writers, in the first three Centuries, shewing what Church Government was in Europe, Asia, and Africa*”³⁷ reviews the works of other early church writers such as Hermas, St. Clement of

³³ GESI, 29.

³⁴ GESI, 30-31.

³⁵ NH93, vol. 1, 35-44; Louis Ellies Du Pin, “A Vindication of the Epistles of St. Ignatius,” in GESI, 2-45; Isaac Vossius, *Epistolae Genuinae S. Ignatii Martyris* (Apud Ioannem Blaeu: Amstelodami, 1646).

³⁶ Louis Ellies Du Pin, “A Vindication of the Epistles of St. Ignatius,” in GESI, 21-22.

³⁷ “An Appendix, *Shewing that tho’ Ignatius’s Epistles were lost; yet there are Testimonies from undoubted Writers, in the first three Centuries, shewing what Church Government was in Europe, Asia, and Africa*,” in GESI, [46].

Rome, Polycarp, Tertullian, and Irenaeus emphasizing the threefold orders of bishop, presbyter, and deacon, and the validity of those orders through apostolic succession.³⁸ In one example of Calder's many citations in support for the triple office, he writes, "I hold my self with *Tertullian a Presbyter of the Church of Carthage*, who flourished in the Year 194 till 216. I cite him for two reasons. First, for the clear Distinction he makes betwixt *Bishops, Presbyters*, and *Deacons*. Secondly, For holding by the rule of Apostolical Succession, as the surest way to distinguish a true *Minister* from a *Pretender*; or one that runs unsent."³⁹ This appendix offers a glimpse why Wake's and Du Pin's works were republished at this time: because of their usefulness in proving the first-century practice of an episcopal church polity.

The volume concludes with "A Short Answer to Mr. William Jameson, His Impugning the Authority of St. Ignatius's Epistles, In the Second Part of His *Nazianzeni Querela*." In this work, Calder refutes Jameson's *Nazianzeni Querela*, a work which proposed that Ignatius' use of the word 'bishop' had been a name of labor rather than of dignity. Jameson, a staunch Presbyterian controversialist, was appointed in 1690 as a paid lecturer at the University of Glasgow after the purge of its episcopalian divines. He held this position for over thirty years. Jameson's works, including the above mentioned *Nazianzeni Querela et Votum Justum: the Fundamentals of the Hierarchy Examined and Disproved* (1697) and *Roma Racoviana et Racovia Romana* (1702), defended the Presbyterian church polity in Scotland.⁴⁰

³⁸ GESI, [46-50]

³⁹ Ibid., [3].

⁴⁰ Colin Kidd, *Subverting Scotland's Past: Scottish Whig Historians and the Creation of an Anglo-British Identity 1689-1830* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 66; James Tait, rev. Campbell

In his refutation Calder writes, “These Epistles, I say (as to their authority) are vehemently oppos’d, because they clash with the model of Presbyterie, the beginning whereof, is not older than the *Geneva Platform*: and because, in every Epistle, the Government by *Bishop, Presbyters* and *Deacons*, is plainly asserted, and so *Episcopacy* maintained to be of Divine, Apostolical, and Primitive Right.”⁴¹ Calder cited Du Pin’s short history of St. Ignatius, with its promotion of the Gallican ideal, to verify the authenticity of the Ignatian epistles. He then used the epistles to attack the Presbyterian church polity, confirmed as Scotland’s state church the previous year in the Act of Union (1707).⁴²

Were Du Pin’s Gallican Views Used to Support English Agendas?

Did English writers use Du Pin’s Gallican theory in support of their own works? With the exception of *The Genuine Epistles of St. Ignatius* they did not. While many English writers cited Du Pin in their works, and a few made some cursory references to some of his Gallican arguments, they were not using Du Pin’s research to advocate a Gallican view of the Church. For the most part, Protestants during this period were using Du Pin’s history to find academic substantiation for the doctrines of the Church of England. Catholics, on the other hand, cited Du Pin’s work to warn the faithful of the combined Gallican/Jansenist threat. Indeed, it is fair to conclude that nearly every commentator in

F. Lloyd, “William Jameson,” *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* vol. 29 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 765.

⁴¹ Robert Calder, “A Short Answer to Mr. William Jameson, His Impugning the Authority of St. Ignatius’s Epistles, In the Second Part of His *Nazianzeni Querela*,” in GESI, 4.

⁴² Jeffrey Stephen, *Scottish Presbyterians and the Act of Union 1707* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2007), 66.

England misunderstood Du Pin's purpose, with Protestants considering him a crypto-reformer and Catholics suspecting him a surreptitious Jansenist.

Robert Calder and probably William Wake were two notable exceptions to this conclusion, considering the Anglican and Gallican Churches as engaged in a common struggle against Rome. Du Pin helped these writers to promote the legitimacy and authority of the bishops in Britain and gave them the historical evidence needed to argue for the independence of the English church from the Holy See.

In addition, these English divines believed the Gallican emphasis on the local bishop's authority could be used to argue against nonconformists in Britain, who favored Presbyterian or congregational polities. The tri-fold ministry of bishop, presbyter (priest), and deacon, gave full authority to the bishop over his own diocese, and to the priests and deacons over their own parishes. As such, they argued, any other form of church polity, such as presbyteries or autonomous congregations, were unbiblical and inconsistent with early Church practices. Such a truly Gallican argument was missing from all other Du Pin commentators.

Chapter 7: Du Pin the Pre-Enlightenment Scholar

In addition to their anti-Catholic polemical uses, English divines valued Du Pin's works as useful for personal study. Thompson and Holm claimed the *New History* "was a staple work on the shelves of the English Clergy during the reign of Queen Anne."¹ In other words, the recognition of Du Pin's eminent scholarship made his works trusted references for historical and theological research.

European Demand for Pre-Enlightenment Works

The growing interest in "pre-enlightenment" scholarship, with its more critical view of ancient theological works and their provenance, stimulated demand for Du Pin's work. Works such as *Acta Sanctorum* (1658) by the Jesuit Bollandists unmasked many ancient works as forgeries. These works reflected the strictest historical integrity, and they incorporated modern historical techniques for assuring the authenticity of primitive texts.²

Later, Mabillon and the Maurists set a new standard in accuracy, unraveling myths such as that of Pope Joan, insisting on historical verification, and following rules for determining the authenticity of sources. Mabillon contested the historicity of some of the saints and stirred a strong reaction. He also presented a new method for authenticating

¹ J.W. Thompson & B. J. Holm, *A History of Critical Writing* (New York: Macmillan and Co., 1942), 17.

² Perry, 50; Thompson & Holm, 18, 19.

relics. Like Du Pin's work, Mabillon's *De Re Diplomatica* (1680) determined the authenticity of various primitive texts and stressed a strong commitment to the truth.³

Another contemporary author with similar techniques was Louis-Sébastien Le Nain de Tillemont whose *Histoire des empereurs et des autres princes qui ont régné durant les six premiers siècles de l'Église* (1690) Edward Gibbon admired for "erudition, diligence, veracity and scrupulous minuteness."⁴

In short, such works included Du Pin's *Nouvelle Bibliothèque* and his other works, which were well received in England in this "pre-enlightenment" esteem for historical veracity.

Part of Du Pin's aim in pursuing historical research was defending the Bible's inerrancy. Therefore, this chapter will include English reactions to Du Pin's efforts to defend traditional views concerning the authorship and reliability of the sacred texts.

Ease of Use

Justin Champion's article examining Du Pin's English editions proposes that their enthusiastic reception was a result of their ease of use. Champion notes that his work assisted seventeenth-century readers to 'know... the edition,' that is, to discern between spurious and genuine titles.⁵ He shows Du Pin's success in condensing a huge amount of literature into an encyclopedia-sized work, explaining that "although very little in these volumes was 'original' erudition, [they] did synthesize and digest vast quantities of

³ Thompson & Holm, 17-21; Perry, 50.

⁴ Perry, 28.

⁵ Justin Champion, "'To know the edition': Erudition and Polemic in Eighteenth-Century Clerical Culture," in *The Making of Marsh's Library: Learning, Politics and Religion in Ireland, 1650-1750*, ed. Muriel McCarthy and Ann Simmons (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2004), 130.

learning into easily accessible material.”⁶ Champion recognized that Du Pin’s footnotes, which used letters that were then annotated after each section (rather than at the end of the volume) provided a system of reference that offered additional information but did not detain the reader from the body of the work. Moreover, Du Pin’s works provided numerous tables and charts which were eminently useful to the reader.⁷ To Champion, such “citation and annotation made authority: it ‘justified and proved’ assertions.”⁸ According to him, the superior design of Du Pin’s works led to their success in England.

Were Du Pin’s Views on the Authority of Patristic Texts Consistent with Anglican Views?

Did Anglican scholars depend on patristic texts to determine the authenticity of contemporary church practices?

Quantin notes that in high church circles, Anglican scholars relied heavily on patristic texts in arguing their theological positions. While Catholics and Protestants had consulted patristic texts widely since the Reformation, the use of ancient works became more pronounced in England starting in the early seventeenth century. Quantin gives the example of Marco Antonio De Dominis, the Catholic bishop of Spalato, who fled to England after being threatened by the inquisition for his anti-papal views. There under James I’s patronage, he published *De Republica ecclesiastica*, which justified England’s

⁶ Champion, 131.

⁷ Ibid., 131.

⁸ Ibid., 132.

separation from the Holy See on the basis of patristic writings. He held that apostolic practice could be proven by the fathers' unanimity on fundamental doctrine.⁹

Archbishop Laud, as well as high church leaders after the Restoration promoted study of the earliest texts, especially at Oxford University. Much of this study countered the Calvinist scripture interpretations championed by the Puritans. It concentrated on the works of ante-Nicene fathers such as Clement and Irenaeus.¹⁰

Quantin noted a shift in seventeenth-century patristic scholarship from a post-Reformation anti-papal emphasis on *sola scriptura*, to one in the seventeenth century targeting dissenters and using arguments based on tradition. For instance, Bishop John Fell of Oxford translated Cyprian's writings and targeted the polities of Catholics and Presbyterians as innovations adulterating the allegedly true view of the episcopacy. Another scholar, Henry Dodwell, a non-juror and Oxford University lecturer, used patristics to defend non-juror theology. He drew from early writings to defend the antiquity of the diocesan episcopacy. He also used them to prove the soul was not immortal by nature.¹¹

Du Pin's works flourished in this fertile environment of English patristic scholarship. Quantin further indicates that this heavy dependence of high church divines on ancient Christian writings lasted well into the eighteenth century. Some high church scholars

⁹ Jean Louis Quantin, "Anglican Scholarship Gone Mad? Henry Dodwell (1641-1711) and Christian Antiquity," *History of Scholarship: A Selection of Papers from the Seminar on the History of Scholarship Held Annually at the Warburg Institute*, eds. C.R. Lita and J.L. Quantin (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 331, 354; Jean-Louis Quantin, *The Church of England and Christian Antiquity* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009), 148-149.

¹⁰ Quantin, "Anglican Scholarship Gone Mad? Henry Dodwell (1641-1711) and Christian Antiquity," 311; Quantin, *The Church of England and Christian Antiquity*, 9, 160.

¹¹ Quantin, *The Church of England and Christian Antiquity*, 397-399; Quantin, "Anglican Scholarship Gone Mad? Henry Dodwell (1641-1711) and Christian Antiquity," 308, 313, 328, 332, 346.

even abandoned the authority of scripture in favor of these early texts to prove their points.¹²

Republic of Letters

As discussed in the introduction, a “Republic of Letters” existed among the cognoscenti of Europe which transcended national borders. Learned men, often clergy, engaged in avid correspondence with other scholars across Europe, exchanging the latest ideas and discoveries and reading the newest books.

William Wake’s correspondence reveals his search for French books in his exchanges with William Beauvoir, chaplain to the ambassador to France. Grès-Gayer catalogs these books in his comprehensive dissertation on the Wake-Du Pin correspondence. The list of thirty-seven works includes such famous titles as Fleury’s *Histoire ecclésiastique*, Moreri’s *Le Grande Dictionnaire*, Tillemont’s *Mémoires pour servir à l’histoire ecclésiastique des six premiers siècles*, and Quesnel’s *La discipline de l’Église*. While some works were requested or referenced for the project of union in which Wake was engaged, most were recent books which he wanted to acquire.¹³

Quantin acknowledges the existence of this “Republic of Letters” and gives the example of the Irish controversialist Henry Dodwell, who had corresponded with humanist scholars across Europe such as Charles Du Lange in France as well as the Bollandist Daniel Papebroch. Foreign scholars engaged to teach at Oxford University,

¹² Quantin, “Anglican Scholarship Gone Mad? Henry Dodwell (1641-1711) and Christian Antiquity,” 331, 347.

¹³ Jacques Gres-Gayer. “*Le Projet pour Unir le Parti des Jansenistes Opposants as l’Église Anglicane*,” vol. 3 (PhD dissertation, *Université de Paris*, 1981), 1132-1134.

such as the Dutch scholar Isaac Vossius and the German Gottlieb Schelwig further augmented the republic.¹⁴

Probably the most influential scholar to document this “Republic of Letters” is Bruno Neveu. In his work *Erudition et religion*, Neveu describes the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries as a time of open dialogue and intellectual exchange among scholars of different nationalities and religions. He writes,

This was then, it is true, the occasion or always some attempt at that time [at] a collective work or a succession of monographs - by subject, by epoch, by country, [or] by historical figure would succeed one other - and at the same time [there was] a revival of this Republic of the Letters in which learned French, British scholars, and the Roman or Florentine *litterati* had a sense of being part. Their facility to live in an empire without borders other than those of science, high above the differences of nationality and even religion, where bibliographic information was held in the place of a common language, cannot fail to encourage our contemporaries.¹⁵

Neveu notes that several periodicals stimulated this academic dialogue, of which the most prominent, *Journal des sçavans*, reviewed new publications from across Europe. Similar journals were published in other European cities such as Leipzig’s *Acta eruditorum*. Some figures with an avid taste for international academic exchange included Léonard de Sainte-Catherine, who published *Recueils de quelques nouvelles journalières de la République des Lettres*, which chronicled European scholars’ activities between 1691 and 1706, and Nicolas Thoynard, who corresponded with Wilhelm

¹⁴ Quantin, 314, 317-318, 330, 334.

¹⁵ “Ce serait, il est vrai, l’occasion ou jamais d’entreprendre alors une œuvre collective, où se succéderaient les monographies - par sujet, par époque, par pays, par personnage - et de ressusciter du même coup cette République des Lettres dont les doctes français, les scholars britanniques, les litterati romains ou florentins avaient le sentiment d’être les sujets. Leur aisance à vivre dans un empire sans autres frontières que celles de la science, supérieur aux distinctions de nationalité et même de religion, où l’information bibliographique tient lieu de langage commun, ne saurait manquer d’encourager nos contemporains,” in Neveu, 25.

Gottfried Leibniz in Germany, Jean-Georges Graevius in Holland, and Cardinal Enrico Noris in Italy. Another famous French scholar in the republic was Emery Bigot, who at his death possessed 250 and 500 letters respectively from Dutch scholars Isaac Vossius and Nicholas Heinsius, and others from Italian librarians Francisco Bernardino Ferrari and Antonio Magliabechi. Bigot's collection was so impressive that Du Pin attempted to obtain permission to publish these letters in 1700.¹⁶

Yet some exchanges were less than cordial as theological arguments crossed borders, such as the debate between Gilbert Burnet and Melchisedech Thévenot over the correct history of Henry VIII's divorce. As mentioned in the introduction, to elude censorship French authors published their works in Holland, which furthered this Republic of Letters, and soon made Dutch publishing houses more prominent than those of Paris or Lyon. After the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, letters from Protestant exiles in England to their correspondents in France increased the international exchange of information. Many works were cited across borders with Gibbon's use of Mabillon's works in his *History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* as just one example.¹⁷

Sources which Testify to Du Pin's Academic Esteem in England

Sources revealing Protestant views on Du Pin's academic integrity fall into three areas. The first includes advertisements, letters, and forewords from the works of Du Pin translated into English. While these sources should be treated with caution, since the authors had a financial interest in the success of Du Pin's English translations, they are

¹⁶ Neveu, 27, 33, 48, 54, 75.

¹⁷ Ibid., 42-44, 49, 57, 79.

still useful in showing what these translators, editors, and publishers believed were the strong points of Du Pin's scholarship. The second set of sources consists of independent works of Protestant theologians and historians (which are not attached to Du Pin's own works) that demonstrate the high regard for Du Pin's history. These works verify the views of the aforementioned translators, editors, and publishers of Du Pin's English editions. The final group of sources consists of eighteenth-century catalogs of libraries and booksellers. Both types of sources demonstrate how commonly Du Pin's histories could be found in private and university libraries during this period.

Catholic Detractors

The English divines' high regard for Du Pin's work contrasts sharply with the negative reactions of prominent French clerics of his day. To many French commentators, Du Pin was more than willing to sacrifice his academic integrity in order to promote Gallicanism.

As Chapter One describes, one of Du Pin's most formidable detractors, Jacques-Bénigne Bossuet, attacked his perceived errors in *Remarques sur l'Histoire des Conciles d'Ephèse et de Calcédoine de M. Dupin*. In this work, Bossuet, a committed Gallican himself, accused Du Pin of critical omissions in the history of the councils to "prove" the pope exercised no primacy in their proceedings.¹⁸

Jacques Grès-Gayer has explained the differences between Du Pin's and Bossuet's types of Gallicanism. Unlike Bossuet, Du Pin and his colleagues at the Sorbonne sought to use history as a means of uncovering the alleged falsehoods of the papacy. Du Pin

¹⁸ Jacques-Bénigne Bossuet, *Oeuvres Posthumes de Messire Jacques-Bénigne Bossuet*. Tome second (Amsterdam: Compagnie des Libraires, 1753), 549-620; Hsia, 73.

believed in a collegiality of bishops, which made a local bishop nearly autonomous in his own diocese. The pope held a primacy of honor, but his role ended there.¹⁹

Bossuet's reaction to this transparent reduction of the papacy is shown in his critique of Du Pin's history of the Council of Ephesus,

After all, it is very easy to understand that it is a result of Mr. Du Pin's error that we have seen here. He in no way wanted to account for these words in the pronouncement of the council: "We, compelled by the holy canons, and by the letter of our Holy Father Celestine;" he deleted them and did not want to remember that the council acted in execution and in confirmation of the pronouncement of the Pope. How wonderful that holy Cyril, who was committed to its execution, had continued until the end to act by virtue of his commission? Without it, the council would have lacked an absolutely necessary thing, which was the authority of the Holy See, and would not have had the Pope included in its unity; this point which one cannot deny has always been the rule, and also fundamentally known [to be the case] in these occasions.²⁰

Du Pin omitted pronouncements verifying the papalists' claims, and he limited the pope's jurisdiction by portraying him as solely a legal church authority who lacked the capacity to understand theological concepts. He wrote, "Judgments by the Pope and by the [university] Faculty are of different genres. The Faculty is only a doctrinal judgment [*avis doctrinal*], the one by the pope and the bishops is a juridical decision. The first

¹⁹ Gres-Gayer. "Le Gallicanism de Louis Ellis Du Pin (1657-1719)," 39-41, 48, 50.

²⁰ "Après tout, il est bien aisé de comprendre que c'est ici une suite de l'erreur de M. Dupin que nous avons vue. Il a voulu compter pour rien ces paroles de la Sentence du Concile : Nous, contraints par les saints Canons, & par la Lettre de notre Saint-Père Célestin; » il les a supprimées et n'a pas voulu se souvenir que le Concile procédoit en exécution & en confirmation de la Sentence du Pape. Quelle merveille que Saint Cyrille, qui étoit commis pour l'exécuter, ait continué jusqu'à la fin d'agir en vertu de sa commission? Sans cela le concile aurait manqué d'une chose absolument nécessaire, qui étoit l'autorité du Saint-Siège, et n'aurait pas eu le Pape dans son unité ; ce qu'on ne niera point qui n'ait toujours été de la règle, et réputé fondamental en ces occasions." Bossuet, *Oeuvres Posthumes de Messire Jacques-Benigne Bossuet*, 559.

establishes Truth by way of counsel and instruction, the other by authority and jurisdiction.”²¹

Believing that the *Nouvelle Bibliothèque* introduced historical novelties, Bossuet thought it Du Pin’s bid for fame. Such a history undermined papal and ecclesial authority in general.²² He wrote (again regarding Du Pin’s chapter on the Council of Ephesus):

One can now see what particular features he ended up with, or rather the historical omissions of our author. One sees that they weakened the primacy of the Holy See, the respectability of councils, the authority of the Fathers, and the majesty of the religion. They excuse the heretics; they obscure the faith. It is here that one finally arrives, in desiring to give an air of distinguished capacity. One perhaps does not at first fall to the bottom of the abyss; but evil grows with the use of such license. One ought to be quite afraid for those who desire to appear learned through uniqueness. It is what lost Nestorius in the end, about whom we have spoken so much.²³

Despite Wotton’s accusation (see Chapter Two) that Du Pin’s publication of his own edition of the Psalms stirred Bossuet’s criticism of the *Nouvelle Bibliothèque*, the latter’s accusations had merit. Du Pin typically discounted papalists’ arguments in his works as his history of the Council of Constance and *Haec Sancta* show. Furthermore, he often omitted key portions of the *acta* and decrees of the councils supporting the papalist position.

As his retraction below reveals, Du Pin responded to his critics by openly admitting to some omissions as well as other anti-papal conclusions. It cannot be denied that Du Pin

²¹ Cited in Jacques M. Gres-Gayer, “The Magisterium of the Faculty of Theology of Paris in the Seventeenth Century,” *Theological Studies* 53 (1992): 448-9.

²² Bossuet, *Oeuvres Posthumes de Messire Jacques-Benigne Bossuet*. Tome second, 549.

²³ “On voit maintenant à quoi aboutissent les particularités, ou plutôt les omissions de l’Histoire de notre Auteur. On voit qu’elles affoiblissent la primauté du Saint-Siège, la dignité des Conciles, l’autorité des Pères, la majesté de la Religion. Elles excusent les Hérétiques ; elles obscurcissent la Foi. C’est là enfin qu’on en vient, en se voulant donner un air de capacité distingué. On ne tombe peut-être pas d’abord au fond de l’abîme; mais le mal croît avec la licence. On doit tout craindre pour ceux qui veulent paroître scavans par des singularités. C’est ce qui perdit à la fin Nestorius, dont nous avons tant parlé,” Bossuet, *Oeuvres Posthumes de Messire Jacques-Benigne Bossuet*. Tome second, 620.

was more than willing to hide facts and ignore opposing views in treating church history, and especially in his histories of the ecumenical councils which shed light on the Gallican-ultramontane controversy.

Grès-Gayer notes that moderate Gallicans like Bossuet believed Du Pin was providing Protestants with sources useful for attacking the Catholic faith. The *Nouvelle Bibliothèque* and an addition, *Dissertation préliminaire ou Prolégomènes sur la Bible* (1699), provoked biblical scholar Richard Simon's criticism in several contemporary letters and in his *Critique de la bibliothèque des auteurs ecclésiastiques et des prolégomènes de la Bible*, ultimately published in 1730.²⁴ Simon's scathing criticism centered on Du Pin's alleged errors, mainly attributed to his lack of language skills,

MR. DU-PIN has undertaken a work which is beyond his abilities. It is a great boldness for an author to write about matters which he acknowledges to be greatly obscure themselves, without having all of the qualities necessary for the plan that he has undertaken. I dare to say that Mr. Du-Pin, famed doctor of the Sorbonne, has manifestly fallen into this error, when without having any knowledge of the oriental languages or the critique of holy [writ] he has once again published in three tomes his *dissertation préliminaire*, where he speaks of Hebrew, of Syriac, of Samaritan, of Arabic, and many other languages of which he doesn't even know the characters. There he cites each page of the books of the Rabbis which he hasn't ever read, whom he has not even been able to read, because he does not understand the languages in which these books have been written.²⁵

²⁴ Jacques Gres-Gayer, "Le Gallicanism de Louis Ellis Du Pin (1657-1719)," 44; Louis Ellies Du Pin, *Dissertation préliminaire ou prolégomènes sur la Bible* (Paris: Chez Pralard, 1699); Jacques Gres-Gayer, "Un Théologien Gallican et l'Écriture Sainte. Le 'Projet biblique' de Louis Ellies Du Pin (1657-1719)," in *Le Grand Siècle et la Bible*, ed. J. R. Armogathe (Paris: Beauchesne, 1989), 256.

²⁵ "Mr. Dupin a entrepris un ouvrage qui est au dessus de ses forces. C'est une grande hardiesse à un Auteur d'écrire sur des matieres qu'il reconnoît être fort obscures et embarrassées d'elles mêmes sans avoir toute les qualitez nécessaires pour le dessein qu'il entreprend. J'ose assurer que Mr. Dupin fameux Docteur de Sorbonne est tombé manifestement dans cette faute, lorsque sans avoir aucune connoissance des langues Orientales et de la Critique sacrée, il a publié de nouveau en trois Tomes sa dissertation préliminaire, où il parle d'hébreu, de syriaque, de samaritain, d'arabe, et de plusieurs autres langues dont il ne connoît pas même les caracteres. Il y cite à chaque page les livres des Rabbins qu'il n'a jamais lûs, et qu'il n'a même pû lire, parce qu'il n'entendpoint la langue dans laquelle ces livres ont été écrits." in Richard Simon, *Critique De La Bibliothèque Des Auteurs Ecclésiastiques Et Des Prolégomènes De La Bible, Publiez (sic) par M. Elies Du-Pin, avec des Eclaircissemens & des Suppléments aux Endroits où l'on*

In 1691, Matthieu Petit-Didier wrote a critique of the *Nouvelle Bibliothèque*, attacking Du Pin's historical conclusions on original sin, the biblical canon, grace, and clerical celibacy. Du Pin dismissively responded to Petit-Didier in the sixth volume of his work. Bossuet believed that Du Pin's arrogant response showed that he was undermining accepted views of church history, and he urged the chancellor, Louis Boucherat, and the Archbishop of Paris, Cardinal François Harlay de Champvallon, to condemn the *Nouvelle Bibliothèque*. When the latter condemned the work in 1696, Du Pin chose to retract some of his own conclusions which Simon, Petit-Didier, and especially Bossuet had questioned.²⁶

Much can be learned about Du Pin's Gallicanism and the resulting scandal in the condemnation and retraction itself. The condemnation explains that four divines of the University of Paris had examined the book and found error in many sections. Du Pin chose to retract several historical conclusions that dealt with the first centuries of the early Church, and he was under the impression that they would not be published.²⁷

Some retractions dealt with disputed Catholic doctrines, especially Du Pin's accounts of early church practices which differed from contemporary ones. These historical "discoveries," aimed at the papacy, attempted to undermine papal authority, or even alleged that the Holy See had created historic novelties to increase its prestige and power.

les a Jugei Neïcessaires, par feu M. Richard Simon, avec des Remarques (Paris: Etienne Ganeau, 1730), 1-2.

²⁶ Gres-Gayer, "Un théologien gallican, témoin de son temps: Louis Ellies Du Pin (1657–1719)," 73; Condemnation, 9-30.

²⁷ Condemnation, 6-10; Gres-Gayer "Un théologien gallican, témoin de son temps: Louis Ellies Du Pin (1657–1719)," 79.

For instance, in his retraction, he reversed his assertions that some fathers doubted the eternal punishment of the damned, and that the doctrine of original sin was not universally held in the early Church. He denied having an aversion to using the term “Mother of God,” which was Bossuet’s accusation. He denied his assertion that purgatory was unknown in the first three centuries, that Augustine had invented a new theory of grace and predestination, and that the word “altar” was not used to describe the table upon which the Eucharist was celebrated.²⁸

He retracted his view that venial sins were publically confessed in the sixth century, and that historical evidence existed which showed that marriage was not always indissoluble. Du Pin reversed himself on the institution of Lent, stating that the apostles did in fact institute this church season.²⁹

Other retractions dealt with his history of the early ecumenical councils. Du Pin denied that heretics were Church members. He also retracted his sympathy for Nestorius and his view that the emperor was a major influence in the deliberations at the Council of Ephesus (a major Gallican historical conclusion which he had used to elevate the king’s prerogatives as opposed to the pope). In his chapter on the council, Du Pin had elaborately described the efforts of the emperor’s representative, Candidian, to assure that John of Antioch and the eastern bishops could participate in the council. Similarly, he had described Emperor Theodorus’s nullification of the council Cyril led. Both

²⁸ Condemnation, 11, 12, 13, 14; Bossuet, *Oeuvres Posthumes de Messire Jacques-Benigne Bossuet*. Tome second, 587.

²⁹ Condemnation, 15, 28.

retractions were crucial, since they dealt directly with the secular arm's authority in influencing church doctrine.³⁰

Du Pin apologized for his tone in discussing this council when he stated, "these words not appearing respectful enough to the Council which I honor, I wish I had not used them, tho' I did it innocently and without any bad intention."³¹ Concerning Nicaea II, he explained that he was not attempting to oppose the council and its support for the veneration of images, nor in any way defend iconoclasts. Du Pin's impious attitude towards the proceedings of some councils had been of great concern to Bossuet.³²

Du Pin stated that he had not attempted to question the reasoning for the celibacy of priests nor the primacy of the pope. He acknowledged omitting some passages of the church fathers such as Cyprian and Augustine supporting papal primacy. This admission verified his evident Gallican agenda.³³

His detractors' greatest concern was the effect his writings would have in providing Protestants with sources and arguments favoring their doctrines. Specifically, he did not want Protestants to find in his work any opposition to celebrating daily Mass or the confession of venial sins. Du Pin used his retraction to deny any slander against the church fathers including Gregory of Nazianzus, Pope Cornelius, Jerome, Augustine, Cyril, St. Leo, Eusebius, Gennadius, and others. He retracted slanders against the

³⁰ Condemnation, 16, 17, 19; NH93, 198.

³¹ Condemnation, 21.

³² Condemnation, 22-23; Bossuet, *Oeuvres Posthumes de Messire Jacques-Benigne Bossuet*. Tome second, 581-2.

³³ Condemnation, 23-24.

scholastic divines, including St. Thomas, whom he admits he did not quote with exactness.³⁴

While Du Pin may have retracted these alleged errors out of fear of further penalties, and did not believe himself truly in error, it appears that many Catholic clerics honestly questioned his conclusions.

The low regard for Du Pin's scholarship among English Catholics is shown in *Two Letters with Some Remarks upon the Fourth Tome of the English Edition of Lewis Du Pin's Compendious History of the Church* (1713), as previously discussed. Its anonymous author explained how Du Pin was allegedly nefarious with his omissions and mistranslations. These French criticisms (and the one English criticism cited above) of Du Pin's scholarship were ignored among Protestants on the other side of the English Channel. If anything, such attacks only increased Du Pin's favorable reputation among English readers who believed that he was falsely persecuted for his Protestant sympathies, his Gallican principles, and for offending the often jealous and tyrannical Bossuet.

Editors' Esteem for Du Pin's Scholarship

As previously noted, British translators and editors admired Du Pin's purportedly impeccable scholarship. In the "To The Reader" section of the 1693 *New History's* volume eight on the tenth century, William Jones wrote that Du Pin impartially treated its great writers with clearness, generosity, and integrity. He even considered Du Pin a

³⁴ Condemnation, 25-28.

“Great Man.”³⁵ Likewise in “The Translator to the Reader” introduction of volume eight, Wotton lauded Du Pin’s academic integrity, stating that he deserved the applause of the learned world for past volumes, and the three volumes then released reflected the expected outstanding scholarship. Wotton noted that Du Pin maintained an impartiality rare among Catholics as he brought to light sections of history formerly buried in scattered sources.³⁶

As discussed previously, Du Pin defended the authority of sacred scripture. The preface of *A Compleat History of the Canons and Writers of the Books of the Old and New Testaments* explained that Du Pin encouraged the translation of scripture into the vernacular. The preface noted Du Pin’s defense of the Bible’s reliability and the work’s usefulness in refuting modern biblical scholars such as Simon. Nevertheless, its Protestant editor attacked Du Pin’s defense of the inspired nature of the Apocrypha.³⁷

William Wotton, in the “Advertisement Concerning This English Translation” in volume one of *A New Ecclesiastical History of the Sixteenth Century*, lauded Du Pin’s evenhandedness. He wrote that this work, from a doctor of the Sorbonne in a nation hostile to the Protestant faith, was indeed a gift from God. He marveled at Du Pin’s willingness to understand Luther from his own writings. Lastly, he noted how Du Pin was willing to lay bare the corruptions of the Church’s past.

In his dedicatory letter to Archbishop Thomas Tenison in the second volume of the *New Ecclesiastical History of Sixteenth Century*, Wotton again noted Du Pin’s

³⁵ Full quote can be found on p. 59 of this dissertation.

³⁶ Full quote can be found on p. 63 of this dissertation.

³⁷ CH99, i, ii.

impartiality by stating that although he used the term “hereticks” to describe Protestants, his impartiality separated him from other Catholic scholars and made his work valuable for Protestant readers.³⁸

In that same volume, Wotton notes Du Pin’s occasional willingness to favor Protestant sources over Catholic ones in his writings. While one would have expected Du Pin as a Catholic to follow the narrative of Catholic Nicholas Sanders’ history of the Reformation, he actually relies on the history written by Anglican Bishop Gilbert Burnet.³⁹

In discussing Du Pin’s view of the ninth century, the anonymous editor of the 1722 Dublin edition of the *New History* noted that despite the persecution Du Pin suffered in France, his history remained amazingly reliable. The editor explained that while Du Pin’s censures and exile had taken a toll on some of the previous openness of his method, he was still remarkably unbiased, even in still controverted areas of ninth-century history, such as grace and the real presence. In fact, he believed that on these issues he was even more impartial than he had been in previous volumes.⁴⁰

The anonymous translator of the second volume of the *Evangelical History* noted Du Pin’s completeness and use of the most credible sources in this abbreviated work. The translator believed that similar works available contained long and useless digressions, while Du Pin included only pertinent subject matter. Furthermore, Du Pin had removed all dubious sources, resulting in a concise and reliable history of the apostles.⁴¹

³⁸ Full quote can be found on p. 70 of this dissertation.

³⁹ Full quote can be found on p. 74 of this dissertation.

⁴⁰ Full quote can be found on pp. 79-80 of this dissertation.

⁴¹ Full quote can be found on p. 88 of this dissertation.

Finally, like Wotton above, the anonymous translator of his *Compleat Method of Studying Divinity* noted Du Pin's willingness to use the best sources available with little regard to whether the author was Catholic or Protestant. He remarked that Du Pin held none of the typical Catholic author's alleged prejudices. Few Protestant writers were more brilliant or impartial. When dealing with a controversial subject, the translator believed that Du Pin always quoted the most insightful writers regardless of their faith tradition.

The foregoing views of Du Pin's high reputation for historical excellence, while biased since they are related to marketing his works in Britain and Ireland, are overwhelming and similar to views of other authors.

Citations from Protestant Theologians and Historians

Works of British Protestant authors that were not appended to his translations suggest that Du Pin was considered a trusted "pre-enlightenment" critical scholar. One such author, William Cave, cited the 1686 edition of the *Nouvelle Bibliothèque* in the *Prolegomena* of his *Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Historia Literaria* (London, 1688). The *Historia Literaria* was Cave's most famous work, and it was also published in Geneva and Italy.⁴² Like Du Pin and most of his contemporaries, Cave understood the early Church as the best example of pure unadulterated Christian faith and practice. He wrote, "I find no better way than to retire in those primitive and better times, those first pure

⁴² Gretchen E. Minton, "William Cave," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* vol. 10 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 605; Quantin, 316.

Ages of the Gospel.”⁴³ Indeed, he believed that era enjoyed the “most admirable examples of a divine and religious Life, of a real and unfeigned Piety, a sincere and universal Charity, a strict Temperance and Sobriety,”⁴⁴ and often contrasted it with the alleged later corruptions of Rome. Furthermore, he used his work in an attempt to demonstrate the continuity between the apostolic and Anglican churches, including the primitive origins of its contemporary sacramental and liturgical practices.⁴⁵ His regard for Du Pin is noted in Child’s advertisement for the 1692 edition of the *New History*.

As an Anglican divine Cave is well known as chaplain to Charles II, and later as a canon at Windsor. He served as the vicar of Islington in Middlesex (1622-1691), the rector of All Hallows-the-Great parish in London (1679-1689), and the vicar of Isleworth (1690-1713).⁴⁶ Cave’s interests and publications were similar to Du Pin’s.

In his first work, *Primitive Christianity* (1673), Cave promoted early Christianity as a model for the contemporary Church. His works *Ecclesiastici* (1683) and *Apostolici* (1677) provided a history of its first four centuries and recorded the biographies of the great church fathers. In a quasi-Gallican fashion, Cave attempted to validate the Church of England’s seventeenth-century institution and structure in *A Dissertation Concerning the Government of the Ancient Church* (1683), *A Serious Exhortation* (1683), and *A Discourse Concerning the Unity of the Catholick Church* (1684).⁴⁷

⁴³ Cited in Neveu, 350.

⁴⁴ Cited in Ibid., 350.

⁴⁵ Ibid., 351, 352.

⁴⁶ Minton, 604-605.

⁴⁷ Minton, 604, 605.

The *Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Historia Literaria* explored much the same ground as Du Pin's *New History*, reviewing all the writers of church history to 1517. Henry Wharton assisted in this massive endeavor, for which he believed he had not received a deserved recognition, although he later received credit for writing the work's final three centuries. The *Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Historia Literaria* contributed to the ongoing debate between Cave and Swiss Protestant biblical scholar Jean LeClerc (author of *Bibliothèque universelle et historique*, 1686) concerning the alleged Arian views of Eusebius.⁴⁸

In *Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Historia Literaria* Cave writes,

From our time, two French writers drew from part of the same argument; namely Louis Ellies Du Pin, a theologian on the faculty of the Sorbonne, whose French edition of the *Nouvelle Bibliothèque des Auteurs ecclésiastiques* was published in octavo format in Paris in 1686. A man (how great is he who publishes things in Latin, one may observe, indeed not at all a captive of his native French) who is a wise, unclouded, and a most diligent cultivator of ecclesial antiquity. The other, Casimir Oudin, a Norbertine priest, who at the same place and time, published a supplement to Bellarmine's *De Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis*. Where, in a work of the same unity with the diligence of Du Pin, had summoned the same kind of judgment: neither had so many disgraceful errors been interwoven nor even to such a degree as existed in parts of the great works from [church historians] Mirao [Aubert Mireus], Labbao [the Jesuit Phillipe Labbe], Vosseo [Gerardus Vossius], etc.⁴⁹

Cave had a high regard for Du Pin's scholarship, command of Latin, and diligence in avoiding the errors of earlier historians. It is noteworthy that Cave, a trusted Protestant

⁴⁸ Conroy, 64; Minton, 605.

⁴⁹ *Ex eo tempore duo Scriptores Galli idem argumentum ex parte tractarunt; viz. Lud. Ellies Du Pin, facultatis Sorbonicæ Theologus qui Auctorum Ecclesiasticorum novam bibliothecam Gallico sermone edidit Paris. 1686. 8^o. Vir (quantum ex iis quæ latinè edidit, perspicere licet, Gallica enim haud satis capio) doctus and candidus, & antiquitatis ecclesiasticæ cultor diligentissimus. Alter, Casimirus Oudin, Presbyter Præmonstratensis, qui eodem loco & tempore Supplementum ad Bellarminum de scriptoribus ecclesiasticis evulgavit. Quo in opera utinam eundem cum Du- Pin diligentiam, par judicium adhibuisset non tot foedis erroribus se implicuisset nec adèò magnam operis sui partem ex Mirao, Labbao, Vosseo, aliisq.," in William Cave, *Historia Literaria* (London: Richard Chiswell, 1688), i-ii.*

historian cited in numerous works, quoted Du Pin. As mentioned in Chapter 2, Du Pin recommended Cave's *Historia Literaria* as a trusted source as well in his *Compleat Method of Studying Divinity*.

Another work amply displaying Du Pin's historiography is Thomas Bray's *Biblioteca Parochialis, &c. or a Scheme of Such Theological and other Heads, as Seem Requisite to be Perus'd or Occasionally Consulted by the Reverend Clergy* (1707). Bray was educated at Oxford from B.A. to doctor of divinity. Ordained in 1682, Bray served in a number of posts, notably as the rector of Sheldon, Warwickshire beginning in 1690, and St. Botolph, Aldgate from 1708 until the end of his life.⁵⁰

Bray gained influence with the publication of *Catechetical Lectures* (1696), including his method of youth catechesis. He was devoted to promoting the establishment of clerical libraries to help clergy address the arguments of dissenters, atheists, deists, and Socinians. During his lifetime, Bray founded over eighty such libraries in Britain, as well as thirty-nine in the colonies. In 1699, Bray founded the *Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge* (SPCK), which was devoted to creating libraries and schools for the poor, distributing Christian books and tracts, and funding overseas missions.⁵¹

As the title of the aforementioned *Biblioteca Parochialis* attests, Bray provides a useful guide to books a clergyman might consult. Therein, Bray recommends the *New History* for understanding the church fathers, philosophers, and the provenance of the

⁵⁰ Leonard W. Cowie. "Thomas Bray," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* vol. 7 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 408, 409, 410. Bray was a 1678 graduate of All Souls College, Oxford, and he received his MA from Hart Hall, Oxford in 1693, and later his BD and DD from Magdalen College, Oxford in 1696.

⁵¹ Cowie, 408-410. In 1701, The SPCK's foreign missions section became the *Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts* (SPG). Bray spent two months in 1700 in Maryland as the Bishop of London's commissary, overseeing the work of the parishes there.

Celestial Hierarchy of Dionysius the Areopagite. For the books of the Bible, Bray recommended Du Pin's *A Compleat History of the Canons and Writers, of the Books of the Old and New Testament* (1699), and on "Liturgical Government and Discipline of the Church," his *De Antiqua Ecclesiae Disciplina Dissertationes Historicae* (1686).⁵²

Bray's recommendations reinforce Thompson and Holm's claim (in Chapter One) that Du Pin's books were trusted shelf references for English divines. In addition, it is remarkable an English cleric who devoted his life's work to educating clergy (in order to defend them against dissenters) recommended the works of the Catholic Du Pin. One can only conclude that Du Pin's academic reputation was impeccable at least to Bray if not to others. He recognized the Catholic author as an impartial and trusted colleague.

George Hickes' translation of Thomas à Kempis' *Imitation of Christ* provides yet another example of the esteem that English authors had for Du Pin's historical accuracy. Published in London in 1710, Hickes, in his dedication, portrays à Kempis as a Protestant before his time and makes the case that he opposed various Catholic doctrines, such as papal infallibility and pilgrimages, and was vocal in decrying the church corruptions of his day. Hickes liberally cites Du Pin in discussing the authenticity of à Kempis' authorship of the *Imitation of Christ*. As to whether Jean Gerson really authored the *Imitation*, Hickes uses Du Pin's two editions of Gerson's works as well as the *Nouvelle Bibliothèque* to bolster his assertion that the *Imitation* was in fact a bona fide work of

⁵² BP, 31, 37, 84-85, 150, 411.

Thomas à Kempis. The latter's authorship had been disputed in the past since either Gerson or an abbot named Gersen were purported to have written the famous work.⁵³

On the controversy over à Kempis' authorship Hickes writes, "The curious Reader may here consult, if he please, the Elaborate Dissertation on this Controversy, which is prefix before the last Edition of his [Gerson's] Works at *Paris*, by the indefatigable and candid *Du Pin*, and his Life in his Ecclesiastical History."⁵⁴

Joseph Bingham, as noted in Chapter Three, advanced Du Pin's reputation for excellent scholarship by citing him as a source for polemical attacks on the Catholic Church. In Bingham's second volume of *Origines Ecclesiasticæ: or, the Antiquities of the Christian Church* (1711), he relies on Du Pin to vindicate Origen against accusations of lapsing during the persecutions, to show that Theodore, Bishop of Oxyrinchus, reordained schismatic presbyters when they returned to the church after leaving the communion of Meletius, and to prove that Athanasius did not write the Athanasian Creed, but another writer did so at a later date. This dual use of Du Pin's work is typical in this study, since authors used his scholarship for polemical and academic purposes.⁵⁵

Bingham also references Du Pin in *A Scholastical History of Lay-Baptism* (1713). As in the *Origines Ecclesiasticæ*, Bingham cites his discussion of the reordination of the heretical followers of Meletius at the Council of Nicaea (325). Later in this same work, he cites Du Pin's view that the Gnostic heretic Novatian was not a true bishop before his

⁵³ Jean Gerson. *Opera Omnia* (Antwerp: s.n., 1706), cited in *Imitation*, xlvii; *Imitation*, [iv], 1-1iii.

⁵⁴ *Imitation*, liii.

⁵⁵ OE, 119-120, 127, 186.

schism but only a priest. Bingham's citations above demonstrate the common use of Du Pin's works as trusted historical references.⁵⁶

Another work demonstrating Du Pin's academic reputation is *Memoires of Literature* v. 1, a publication reviewing new books printed during the years 1710-1711. In it, an anonymous author reviewed the 1711 Amsterdam edition of the *Nouvelle Bibliothèque*, which included two new volumes that interpreted seventeenth-century authors.⁵⁷ The unnamed reviewer writes,

The last Century has produced such a vast Number of Ecclesiastical Writers, that Dr. *du Pin* found it necessary to mention only the most Considerable. He takes no Notice of the Protestant Authors in these Two Volumes; which I can hardly ascribe to any Partiality. I rather believe that he durst not give an Account of their Works, or that he designs to do it upon another Occasion. The author has publish'd Two other Volumes for the XVIIth Century, which are actually in the Press at *Amsterdam*. He appears very cautious in this Part of the *Bibliothèque*; and I cannot forbear saying that it does not fully answer my Expectation. Had Dr. *du Pin* composed these Two Books without any Restraint upon him, 'tis highly probable his Extracts would have been more Curious and Instructive, and attended with several Reflections which he did not think fit to publish."⁵⁸

The writer then shares excerpts from Du Pin's histories of the French Jesuit author Theophilus Raynaud and the French author and curate of Vibrai, Jean Baptiste Thiers, which the author believed were especially entertaining. With a high opinion of Du Pin's scholarship and impartiality, he willingly excused Du Pin's exclusion of Protestant writers of church history, based on his previous knowledge of him. He believes Du Pin

⁵⁶ Joseph Bingham, *The Works of the Learned Joseph Bingham, M. A. Late Rector of Havant, and Sometime Fellow of University-College in Oxford* (London: Printed for Robert Knaplock at the Bishop's-Head in St. Paul's Church-Yard, 1726), 610, 691.

⁵⁷ Louis Ellies Du Pin, *Nouvelle Bibliothèque des auteurs ecclésiastiques* Tomes XVII-XVIII (Amsterdam: Chez Pierre Humbert, 1711).

⁵⁸ *Memoires of Literature* vol. 1 (London: Printed by J. Roberts and Sold by A. Baldwin, near the Oxford-Arms in Warwick-lane, 1711), 233.

intends to review Protestant writers on another occasion, which in due course he does in *Bibliothèque des auteurs separez de la communion de l'Église Romaine* (1718).⁵⁹

The anonymous author recognizes that Du Pin writes under restraints, thereby resulting in a less satisfying product. The author is aware of his recent return from exile, and he attributes this less-than-perfect work to a reticence in making more creative assertions that could restrict him again to Châtellerault. By 1711, Du Pin's reputation for impartiality became so widespread in England that commentators looked for excuses to explain works that might elicit an opinion to the contrary.

Another demonstration of Du Pin's reputation as an admired historian in England can be found in Nicolaus Trivet's *Annales Sex Regum* (1719), a history of the twelfth-through fourteenth-century kings of England, originally written in the fourteenth century. In its section "Testimonia," the editor, Antony Hall, provides an excerpt from the fourteenth-century section of the *Nouvelle Bibliothèque* in which Du Pin discusses Trivet, a famed church historian of that century. Du Pin's inclusion of Trivet in the *Nouvelle Bibliothèque* attests to the latter's historical importance and as convincing evidence this new edition of his history of English kings might be worth buying.⁶⁰

The reliance of English scholars on Du Pin's authority can be seen in a 1720 Cambridge translation of Eusebius's *Historia Ecclesiae*, published in Latin and Greek, with annotations by the London librarian, William Reading. In citing Du Pin twenty-nine times in the three-volume work, Reading obviously regarded him as a reliable source. For instance, he cited Du Pin to prove that several Catholic scholars such as Erasmus,

⁵⁹*Memoires of Literature* vol. 1, 233-235.

⁶⁰Nicolai Triveti, *Annales Sex Regum* (Oxonii: E Theatro Sheldoniano, 1719), [xxvi].

Bellarmino, and others, believed a letter mentioned in the history (allegedly between Jesus and King Agbar of Edessa) was a forgery.⁶¹

Another contemporary writer who cites Du Pin is Robert Millar in *The History of the Propagation of Christianity, and Overthrow of Paganism* (1723). This Scottish author's history of the Church aims to vindicate the Christian faith against the growing tide of deism that Millar saw in contemporary society. It was later published in London in 1726. Millar, minister at Paisley Abbey in Scotland, was devoted to combating the growth of deism in Britain and encouraging evangelistic efforts. This work greatly influenced contemporary missionary efforts, and Millar was heavily dependent on Cotton Mather's history of the American missions in his work.⁶²

Throughout the book, Millar considers Du Pin a trusted historian, and he liberally uses his works to determine the veracity of ancient texts. For instance, Millar cites Du Pin's *A Compendious History of the Church* to substantiate his contention that some ancient martyrologies were dubious.⁶³ He writes,

The learned *M. Du Pin* remarks, "That the picture which *Eusebius* draws of the State of the Church, (*viz.* that just now narrated) during the first Eighteen Years of the Reign of *Diocletian*, 'tis thought, rather represents the East than the West, because the Martyrologies make Mention of many Martyrs in *Gaul*, who could

⁶¹ Eusebius, *Eusebii Pamphili, Socratis Scholastici, Hermiae Sozomeni, Theodoriti et Evagrii, item Philostorgii et Theodori Lectoris quæ Extant Historiæ Ecclesiasticæ*. 3 vols. (Cantabrigiæ: Typis Academicis. Curâ Cornelii Crownfield. Impensis Executorum Joannis Nicholson Nuperi Bibliopolæ: & Prostant Venales apud Robertum Knaplock & Danielem Midwinter Bibliopolas Londinenses, 1720), vol. 1, 37.

⁶² Robert Millar, *The History of the Propagation of Christianity, and Overthrow of Paganism*, vol. 1 (Edinburgh : Printed by J. Mosman, 1723); Robert Millar, *The History of the Propagation of Christianity, and Overthrow of Paganism* vol. 1 (London : printed and sold by G. Strahan in Cornhill; S. Chandler, J. Clark, and R. Hett in the Poultry; T. Sanders in Little-Britain; J. Mac-Euen in the Strand; L. Stokie and T. Green at Charing-Cross; and J. Stag in West-Minster-Hall, 1726), x-xi; Richard B. Sher. "Robert Millar," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* vol. 38 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 192.

⁶³ Louis Ellies Du Pin, *A Compendious History of the Church*. vol. 2 (London: Bernard Lintott at the Cross-Keys between the Temple Gates, 1716), 78.

not have suffered after the Persecution was declared, since *Gaul* being under the Dominion of *Constantius Chlorus*, was free from Persecution. 'Tis said, that *Maximianus* coming to *Gaul*, in the Year 286, put to Death a whole Legion, that was wholly made up of Christians. 'Tis said, that he immediately sent *Rictius Varus*, famous in the Martyrologies under the Name of *Rictiovarus*, who condemned to Death an incredible Number of Christians in *Gaul*. We likewise find, that the famous St. *Sebastian* suffered Martyrdom at *Rome* in 285 or 286 and some other Martyrs were put to Death in that City before the 'Persecution was declared.'” These things are looked upon as uncertain or fabulous even by M. *Du Pin*; and I may add, that the *Roman* Martyrologies are no sufficient Vouchers, since they advance many legendary Stories concerning the Martyrs, without sufficient Foundation in Antiquity, and which therefore deserve no Credit, as we have formerly observed, when speaking of the *First Persecution by Nero*.⁶⁴

Later, Millar again cites *A Compendious History of the Church* as well as the *Histoire de l'Église et des auteurs ecclésiastiques du seizième siècle* on the question of the martyrologies.⁶⁵ He writes,

But even the Matter of Fact itself [concerning alleged martyrdom in Gaul] is questioned by very learned Criticks and Historians, Popish and Protestant, and particularly by *Du Pin* and *Spanhemius*, not to insist upon others. The former says “*But it is surprising that neither Eusebius, nor the Author of the Book concerning the Death of the Persecutors, thought to be Lactantius, Contemporaries had no Knowledge of so remarkable Facts, or that having Knowledge of them, they should speak, as they did, of the Church then enjoying a profound Peace, and an entire Liberty. How can we reconcile that Good-will which they say the Emperors had for the Christians, with the unheard of Cruelties executed in Gaul by the Order of Maximinus and at Rome by Command of Diocletian?*”⁶⁶

Millar argues that the Christian faith was active in fourth-century Persia by referencing *Du Pin*'s *A Compendious History of the Church*.⁶⁷ He writes, “Before I conclude this Chapter, I shall observe, that the Christian Religion was propagated in

⁶⁴ Millar, 554-555.

⁶⁵ *Du Pin*, *A Compendious History of the Church* vol. 2, 78; Louis Ellies *Du Pin*, *Histoire de l'Église et des auteurs ecclésiastiques du seizième siècle*, vol. 2 (Paris: Chez Andre Pralard, 1703), 175.

⁶⁶ Millar, vol. 1, 557-58.

⁶⁷ *Du Pin*, *A Compendious History of the Church*, vol. 2, 86.

Persia in the Fourth Century. Some authors [citing Du Pin] are of Opinion that there were Christians in that Kingdom in the Days of *John* the Apostle, since his first Epistle is in some Copies directed to the *Parthians*.”⁶⁸ He also cited Du Pin’s history of the sixteenth century. In the 1731 edition of the same work, Millar, referencing Du Pin’s 1710 Amsterdam edition of the *Nouvelle Bibliothèque* in his examination of the dispute over the treatment of Native Americans in Latin America, writes, “The learned and laborious Mons. *du Pin* has given us an abstract of the life of the Bishop of *Chiapa* [Bartholomew de las Casas] and of this whole dispute.”⁶⁹

In conclusion, Protestant authors citing Du Pin’s scholarship, such as Cave, Bray, Hickes, Bingham, Millar, and others, portray him as a trusted source on historical and theological topics.

Works of Du Pin in British Libraries and Book Sales

Library catalogs reveal British divines’ regard for Du Pin’s works. Although the records are undoubtedly incomplete, Thompson and Holm’s claim that the *Nouvelle Bibliothèque* was a staple on the shelves of English divines during the reign of Queen Anne gains some verification in library catalogs listing Du Pin’s works.

The first example of an eighteenth-century library catalog holding his works is the 1715 catalog from Trinity College in Dublin. It contains two of his works, the 1693 edition of the *New History* and the 1708 Amsterdam edition of *Bibliothèque universelle des historiens*. A 1733 catalog of the library of Charles Bruce, 3rd Earl of Ailesbury

⁶⁸ Millar, vol. 1, 669-670.

⁶⁹ Millar, vol. 2, 361; Sixteenth C. 1706, vol. 2, Book 2, 62-71.

(printed in Oxford) includes the 1730 Paris edition of Simon's critique of the *Nouvelle Bibliothèque*, Du Pin's 1707 *Traité de la puissance ecclésiastique et temporelle*, a 1721 Brussels edition of Du Pin's *Histoire du Concile de Trente*, a 1716 edition of his *Histoire du regne Louis XIII, Roy de France*, a 1715 Amsterdam edition of *Nouvelle Bibliothèque*, a 1718 Paris edition of the *Bibliothèque des auteurs separez de la communion de l'Église romaine*, and the 1701 Paris edition of the *Dissertation préliminaire*. A 1742 catalog of the University of Edinburgh's law faculty held Du Pin's editions of Gerson and Optatus as well as a 1715 Paris edition of the *Nouvelle Bibliothèque*, a 1701 *Dissertation préliminaire*, and the 1691 *De Antiqua Ecclesiae Disciplina*.⁷⁰

Along the same lines, a 1758 library catalog of Archibald Campbell, Duke of Argyll in Glasgow reveals the possession of a Paris edition of the *Bibliothèque universelle des historiens* (1707). A prominent figure in Scottish politics for over five decades, the duke served as lord high treasurer of Scotland, a Scottish peer in the House of Lords, and Secretary of State for Scotland. He was wounded defending his ancestral lands during the Jacobite uprising of 1715. Recognized as a father of the Scottish enlightenment, Campbell owned one of the largest private libraries at that time.⁷¹

⁷⁰ Trinity College (Dublin, Ireland) Library, *Catalogus Librorum in Bibliotheca Collegii Sanctae et Individuae Trinitatis Reginae Elizabethae juxta Dublin* (Dublinii: Typis et Impensis Johannis Hyde, 1715), 130; Charles Bruce, Earl of Ailesbury, *A Catalogue of the Books of the Right Honourable Charles Viscount Bruce of Amptill (Son and Heir Apparent of Thomas Earl of Ailesbury) and Baron Bruce of Whorleton, in his Library at Totenham In the County of Wiltes* (Oxford: Printed at the Theater, 1733), 12, 14, 53, 95, 96, 283; Faculty of Advocates, *A Catalogue of the Library of the Faculty of Advocates, Edinburgh*, vol. 1 (Edinburgh: Printed by Thomas, Walter, and Thomas Ruddiman, 1742), 236, 419, 455; vol. 2, 416.

⁷¹ *Catalogus Librorum Archibald Campbell, Duke of Argyll* vol. 1 (Glasgae: In Aedibus Academicis Excudebat Andreas Foulis, Academiae Typographus, 1758), 27; Alexander Murdoch, "Archibald Campbell," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* vol. 9 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 726-728, 730, 733.

In addition, the 1791 catalog of the University of Glasgow included a 1717 Antwerp edition of the *l'Histoire profane*, a 1711 Paris edition of the *Nouvelle Bibliothèque*, a 1709 London edition of the *Universal Library of Historians*, a 1700 London edition of *The Compleat History of the Canons and Writers of the New and Old Testaments*, a 1725 Oxford edition of the *New History*, and the vindication of the letters of Ignatius, which is included in Wake's 1709 London edition of his letters. Just these examples demonstrate the ubiquity of Du Pin's works in British libraries during the eighteenth century.⁷²

Catalogs for book sales provide another means of determining the acceptance of Du Pin's works. For instance, a 1713 London book sale catalog of a Dr. Salmon (recently deceased) included a 1700 Paris edition of St. Optatus's works, and a 1691 *De Antiqua Ecclesiae Disciplina*. The 1717 catalog for the sale of William Innys' library includes the 1708 Amsterdam edition of *Bibliothèque universelle des historiens*, and Du Pin's 1706 Antwerp edition of Gerson's works. A 1724 catalog of J. Groenewegen and A. vander Hoeck included Du Pin's 1700 Paris edition of St. Optatus' works, the 1708 Amsterdam edition of *Bibliothèque universelle des historiens*, and a 1706 Cologne edition of a work called *Notes sur le Concile de Trente*, a likely abridgement of the second volume of *Histoire de l'Église et des auteurs ecclésiastiques du seizième siècle*, which profiled the council. A 1727 book catalog of Rev. Daniel Williams included a

⁷² University of Glasgow, *Library Catalogus Impressorum Librorum in Bibliotheca Universitatis Glasguensis* (Glasgae: In Aedibus Academicis Excudebat Andreas Foulis, Academiae Typographus, 1791), 142.

1696 London edition of the *New History*, a 1686 Paris edition of *De Antiqua Ecclesiae Disciplina*, and 1686 and 1691 editions of the *Nouvelle Bibliothèque*.⁷³

Yet another example of a book catalog listing Du Pin's works is the 1730 London catalog of a "Mr. J. Woodman, *Deceas'd*; and a D. Lyon, who leaves off *Business*," which included the 1701 Amsterdam edition of the *Dissertation préliminaire*. Another catalog of vander Hoeck's (1730) lists the 1693 Paris edition of the *Nouvelle Bibliothèque*, and a 1692 Latin version of the same work.⁷⁴

In addition, a 1732 London catalog for a book sale of Nicolas Prevost and Company, included Du Pin's 1701 edition of St. Optatus's works, a 1706 Antwerp edition of Gerson's works, a 1691 Paris edition of *De Antiqua Ecclesiae Disciplina*, the 1690 and 1701 Paris editions of the *Nouvelle Bibliothèque*, a 1708 Amsterdam edition of the *Bibliothèque universelle des historiens*, a 1730 Paris edition of Simon's critique of the *Nouvelle Bibliothèque*, and a 1714 Paris edition of the *Histoire de l'Église en abrégé*.⁷⁵

It is fair to conclude that the catalogs of book sales during this century adequately attest to the widespread acceptance of Du Pin's works and verify the findings of the library catalogs shown above.

⁷³ Thomas Ballard, *Bibliotheca Salmoneana, Pars Prima. Or, a Catalogue of Part of the Library of the Learned William Salmon, M.D. Deceas'd* (London: s.n., 1713), 2, 7; William Innys, *Catalogus Librorum Domi forisque Impressorum: Quibus Bibliopolium Suum Nuperrime Adauxit Gulielmus Innys* (Londini: 1717), 4, 7; J. Groenewegen and A. vander Hoeck, *Catalogus Insignium & Omnis Generis Studii Librorum. Being a Catalogue of Choice, Valuable, and Very Scarce Books: Folio* (London, 1724), 2, 4, 44; Dr. Williams's Library, *Bibliothecae Quam Vir Doctus, & Admodum Reverendus, Daniel Williams, S.T.P. Bono Publico Legavit, Catalogus* (Londini: Typis Jacobi Bettenham, 1727), 25, 101, 103, 354.

⁷⁴ Christopher Bateman, *A Catalogue of Scarce and Valuable books, Being the Entire Stock of Mr. J. Woodman, Deceas'd; and D. Lyon, Who Leaves off Business* (London: 1730), 75; Abraham Vandenhoeck, *Bibliopolium Vandenhoeckianum: or, a Catalogue of Books in most Faculties and Languages: Quarto* (London: 1730), 42, 44.

⁷⁵ *Catalogus Librorum in Omnibus Facultatibus & Linguis Praestantissimorum: Historia* (London: Nicolas Prevost and Company, 1732), 4, 10, 22, 37, 44, 53.

Use of Du Pin's Work in British Biblical Studies (to include Studies of Josephus' History)

Du Pin published a sizable number of works on the Bible. These included his *Dissertation préliminaire ou prolégomènes sur la Bible* (1699), a commentary and Latin edition of the first five books of the Bible (the Pentateuch), a commentary on the Book of Revelation, as well as Latin and French editions of the Psalms.⁷⁶

Du Pin became a trusted biblical expert in Britain after the publication of a translation of his *Dissertation préliminaire*, entitled *A Compleat History of the Canons and Writers, of the Books of the Old and New Testament* (1699), discussed in Chapter Two. A shortened version of the *Dissertation préliminaire*, perhaps an abbreviated preliminary copy, had been attached to the beginning of the *Nouvelle Bibliothèque* and its subsequent English translations.

In Chapter One, the scathing reactions of French biblical scholars such as Richard Simon to the *Dissertation préliminaire* were based on Du Pin's limited language skills, and because it defended the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch against the views of modern critics. Du Pin later reversed his assertion that those Old Testament books omitted from the Jewish canon might be considered deuterocanonical, a view he nevertheless asserted again in a later edition of the *Dissertation préliminaire* (1701) and in *Traité de la doctrine* (1703).⁷⁷

⁷⁶ Gres-Gayer, "Un théologien gallican et l'Écriture Sainte. Le 'Projet biblique' de Louis Ellies Du Pin (1657-1719)," 256.

⁷⁷ Ibid., 258.

Interestingly, Grès-Gayer notes that Du Pin's views on the Bible were, for the most part, quite similar to Simon's: both believed Holy Scripture was inerrant, and both held that it had little value for providing information in the fields of philosophy or science.⁷⁸

Du Pin agreed with Jansenists such as Antoine Arnauld that the Bible should be translated into the vernacular to reach even the simplest persons, although he recognized that the restriction on Bible reading resulted from its misuse. But unlike the Jansenists, he held to the possibility of scientific errors in the text: a view that Grès-Gayer considers to be more 'Molinist' than one might expect from Du Pin.⁷⁹

Despite the opinions of Du Pin's French detractors, British Protestant readers considered his works trustworthy and reliable. The one exception is Edmund Elys' *Observations on Several Books* (London, 1700) treating the related topic of Josephus' writings. Its preface states that the primary reason for its publication is to determine whether the idea of God is implanted into each human being at birth (i.e. whether it is innate), or whether it arises later upon rational reflection.

The latter work includes four letters. The first three letters deal with the question of innate ideas. The first one is from Elys to John Locke on the subject, and the second is a refutation some of Locke's essays on the same topic. The third letter refutes Gerhardus de Uries' writings, which argue for the impossibility of innate ideas. The fourth letter, the one addressed in this study, seems out of place, as it deals with the narrative about Jesus in Josephus' *Jewish Antiquities*.

⁷⁸ Grès-Gayer, "Un théologien gallican et l'Écriture Sainte. Le 'Projet biblique' de Louis Ellies Du Pin (1657-1719)," 261.

⁷⁹ Ibid., 257-258, 271, 273.

This letter is entitled, “An Answer to Six Arguments Produced by *Du-Pin*, to prove that Passage in *Josephus*’s to be spurious; together with some Reflections on a Passage in *Cornelius Tacitus*; and another in one of *Pliny*’s Epistles concerning the Christian Religion.”⁸⁰ The volume ends with a short work not listed in the table of contents, in which Elys responds to Pierre Daniel Huet’s work against Cartesian views on the existence of God.⁸¹

Elys, a nonjuror and rector of a parish in East Allington, Devon, graduated from Balliol College, Oxford with a Bachelor of Arts degree in 1655, and a Master of Arts in 1658. His tenure at East Allington was plagued with various difficulties because of his loyalty to Laudian groups within the church. He was imprisoned for a short time as an “enemy to the Common Wealth,” and then temporarily deprived of his living in 1677, ending up in debtor’s prison in London. Allowed to return to his parish, he again stirred controversy when he read James II’s Declaration of Indulgence from the pulpit in 1688, and then published a letter defending the reading. After the Glorious Revolution, he refused to renounce his oath to James and was permanently deprived of his benefice, living out the rest of his life as a nonjurist.⁸²

While known primarily for his poetry, Elys was a prolific writer on controversial theological subjects. He was an avid defender of the Quakers, a vocal opponent of

⁸⁰ Edmund Elys, “An Answer to Six Arguments Produced by *Du-Pin*, to prove that Passage in *Josephus*’s (in which there is such honorable mention of Jesus Christ) to be spurious; together with some Reflections on a Passage in *Cornelius Tacitus*; and another in one of *Pliny*’s Epistles concerning the Christian Religion,” in *Observations on Several Books* (London: Printed for W. Marshal, 1700), 3-14.

⁸¹ Pierre Daniel Huet, *Censura Philosophae Cartesiana* (Parisiis : Apud Danielelem Horthemels, 1689).

⁸² Stanford Lehmberg, “Edmund Elys,” *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* vol. 18 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 384-385.

Socianian theology and Cartesian philosophy, and a foe of Calvinist and Jansenist views on grace. He even wrote a book in opposition to cock-fighting.⁸³

In the fourth letter of *Observations on Several Books*, Elys addresses the section of Du Pin's *New History* which interprets Josephus' short chapter on the life of Jesus. He explains that he received Du Pin's arguments from an unnamed individual to whom he is now responding. These arguments can be found on pp. 25-26 of the first-century chapter of *New History's* first volume, in which Du Pin comments on Book 18, chapter 4 of Josephus's *Jewish Antiquities*. Since Chapter 4 is a short passage, Du Pin's translation follows in its entirety below to facilitate the arguments of Du Pin and Elys. It states,

...at that time there was a wise Man named JESUS, (if we may only call him a Man; for he wrought many Miracles, and taught the truth to those that received it with joy,) who had a great number of Disciples, as well among the Jews as the Gentiles; that he was the CHRIST, and that being accused by the chief of his Nation, he was crucified by Pilat's Order: That nevertheless, he was not abandoned by those [that loved him, because he had appeared unto them alive on the Third day, as was foretold by the Prophets, and that he was Author of the Sect of the Christians, which remains at this day.⁸⁴

As its title suggests, Elys addresses Du Pin's six arguments against the authenticity of Josephus's chapter on Jesus. His goal is to demonstrate that Josephus himself wrote the chapter without the editing or elaboration of later redactors.

The first argument discusses the author's style, which Du Pin finds "Intricate, and not very fluent; and different from that of *Josephus*."⁸⁵ Elys dismisses this criticism, stating that Du Pin does not have "the least Ground for such a Saying."⁸⁶ In the second

⁸³ Lehmberg, 385.

⁸⁴ NH93, vol. 1, 25.

⁸⁵ AASA, 3.

⁸⁶ AASA, 3.

argument, Du Pin insists that Josephus' chapter on Jesus must have been added after the fact, since the following section starts by discussing Pilate's massacre of the Jews and has no connection with the previous section on Jesus. To this, Elys responds that these two sections are in fact connected, since Pilate was responsible for the crucifixion of Jesus as well as the massacre of the Jews.⁸⁷

In the third argument, Du Pin claims the quotation "*Jesus Christ is therein called God, his Miracles and Resurrection is acknowledged, and it is declared, that these things were foretold by the Prophets,*"⁸⁸ did not reflect the views of a faithful first-century Jew. Elys counters that Josephus did not refer to Jesus as God but rather as a "wise man," and Du Pin's translation is therefore faulty. In addition, Elys notes, Josephus' allusions to Jesus' divinity could have been based on his great admiration for the well-known signs and wonders Jesus had performed.⁸⁹

Elys cites another work by Josephus, *Contra Apionem*, in which he asserts that God does not require acts of religion such as those of the Pharisees, but rather that "all Actions, and Studies, and Discourses have Reference to the Service of GOD."⁹⁰ Elys then argues that this statement verifies Josephus' high regard for Jesus's antinomianism in the *Jewish Antiquities* and adds, "How perfectly agreeable [are Josephus's sentiments] to the *Preaching of CHRIST and his Apostles?*"⁹¹ He then cites gospel verses in which Jesus exhorts his disciples to serve God. To Elys, these verses demonstrate the similar

⁸⁷ AASA, 4.

⁸⁸ NH93, vol. 1, 25.

⁸⁹ AASA, 4-5.

⁹⁰ AASA, 6.

⁹¹ AASA, 6.

religious views of Jesus and Josephus, and they explain how Josephus could have believed that Jesus was a wise man about whom the prophets had spoken.

In the fourth argument, Du Pin questions why Josephus, as a zealous Jew, would have spoken so highly of Jesus, since he did not believe that he was the Messiah (as Origen attests in his *Contra Celsius*). Du Pin also questions why Josephus as a devout Jew would have accused his countrymen of unjustly condemning Jesus to death. First, Elys answers that he has already discussed why Josephus had such a high esteem for Jesus in responding to Du Pin's third argument. Second, he explains that Josephus did not expressly say that the Jews in Jerusalem were unjust in crucifying Jesus. Third, he notes that Josephus did not confess that Jesus was the Christ but only reported that others considered him to be the Messiah.⁹²

In the fifth question, Du Pin notes that Josephus describes St. James as "the Brother of Jesus Christ." But he then questions why Josephus had not elaborated on who Christ was in his discussion of James. He accounts for this omission by opining that the quote was a later editor's insertion. Elys responds that if Josephus had commended Jesus again in this section as he had in the previous reference to him, he would have appeared too pro-Christian for his Jewish readers. Therefore, it made sense to Elys that Josephus avoided adding too many complimentary passages. He adds that Josephus's passage on St. James, narrating the popular outrage following the latter's murder, was a testament to his high esteem for Jesus and his followers.⁹³

⁹² AASA, 7.

⁹³ NH93, vol. 1, 25; AASA, 8.

In the last of the six arguments, Du Pin alleges that Origen never mentioned Josephus' reference to Jesus. He concludes that *Jewish Antiquities* must have been redacted after Origen's time. Nor had Photius, the ninth-century patriarch of Constantinople, whose edition of Josephus's work left out the paragraph about Jesus. Du Pin believes that Origen and Photius, in commenting on *Jewish Antiquities*, used the original monograph or a reliable copy thereof subsequently redacted by a later Christian scribe.⁹⁴

Elys noted Origen's observation that Josephus, a non-Christian, nevertheless believed that James was "a Just and Upright Man."⁹⁵ He explains that Photius in his copy of Josephus wrote the words "About that Time was the PASSION which bringeth Salvation"⁹⁶ and concludes "By which words it is manifest that *Photius* did take notice that *Josephus* made mention of our *Saviour*."⁹⁷ Elys adds that Photius would have reflected longer on this passage "if he could have imagin'd that there ever have been in after Ages such a sort of *Hypercritical* Gentlemen, professing themselves to be *Christians*; who pretend to see farther into the Defects of the Antient Champions of the *Christian Religion* than any of their acutest *Heathen* Adversaries could ever do."⁹⁸ Thus, Elys linked Du Pin to a demonized contemporary group of unchristian and hypercritical scholars.

Elys gathered the comments of other ancient scholars to support his claims. For instance, he points to Eusebius' reference of Josephus' praise for John the Baptist to argue that Josephus could have admired Jesus and his followers. In addition, Elys cites

⁹⁴ AASA, 9.

⁹⁵ AASA, 9.

⁹⁶ AASA, 9.

⁹⁷ AASA, 9.

⁹⁸ AASA, 10.

the works of Theodoret, Pliny, and Tacitus which testify to Pontius Pilate's persecution of Christ. To Elys, these citations served as proofs of Jesus' resurrection.⁹⁹

One might ask why this letter on Josephus was included in a predominantly philosophical volume. Elys may have believed the abandonment of innate ideas and the discrediting of Josephus's works had similar destructive effects. He believes that "*Hypercritical* Gentlemen," such as Du Pin and his ilk, severely threatened the salvation of the faithful. He concludes by adding that, "I shall not make any Apology for the length of this Letter, since the Design of it is no less than this, to Excite in my own Heart, and in yours, and in the Hearts of all the Readers (if it shall be made public) the most Earnest and Effectual Desires of that Joy and Satisfaction, which shall never end, but continually encrease, till it be Consummated in the Full, Perfect, and Eternal Enjoyment of the *LORD OUR GOD*."¹⁰⁰

Observations on Several Books has the unique distinction of being one of the few Protestant books studied which takes a consistently negative view Du Pin's work. To Elys, an insinuation that Josephus' works were spurious equated to an attack on the Christian faith itself. Throughout this work, he attempted to verify the validity of *Jewish Antiquities* by referencing other chapters of Josephus or even other ancient works. While Elys was somewhat successful in defending Josephus through a circular argument, he nevertheless dodged Du Pin's main assertions.

Perhaps Elys's reaction was a conservative response to the popular acceptance of Du Pin's critical method. It may be that Elys, as a nonjuror, was out of step with the period's

⁹⁹ AASA, 10.

¹⁰⁰ AASA, 14.

more liberal divines in the Church of England. He therefore avoided the influence of his Anglican counterparts, who generally considered Du Pin a trusted academic.

Protestant English Views on Du Pin's Academic Integrity

Given all these examples, what can be said about Protestant views of Du Pin's academic integrity? Beginning with advertisements and letters related to Du Pin's English editions, he was lauded as a renowned author whose unbiased research and meticulous scholarship made his work a "must read" for determining the veracity of any church document. Indeed, he "merited the Applause of the Learned World," as one who, though a Catholic, retained the highest integrity and impartiality. Du Pin supposedly used the widest range of sources - from Sarpi to Burnet to Pallavicino. His advertisements touted his work as the best available: reliable, concise, and accurate.

While one might dismiss these advertisements as mere sale pitches to promote his new editions, the testimony of other authors and commentators confirms his sparkling reputation. Du Pin's works were commonly used as reference books for British divines, and many authors (Cave, Bray, Bingham, Millar, etc.) cited his opinions. In fact, Du Pin's simple act of including a historian in the *New History* seems to have substantiated that writer's historical importance.

The possibility that Du Pin might have been prejudiced was almost universally dismissed. As shown above, the author of *Memoires of Literature* refuted any accusation of bias by stating that Du Pin's fear of returning to exile likely motivated an avoidance of Protestant topics rather than any innate prejudice of the doctor himself.

Finally, prestigious libraries at Edinburgh, Glasgow, and Trinity College as well as numerous book sales attest to the widespread acceptance of Du Pin's scholarship, and further verify Thompson and Holm's claims that Du Pin's works were esteemed desk references for the Anglican clergy.

With the lone exception of the nonjuror Edmund Elys, those using Du Pin's work for academic purposes rather than polemical ones, regarded him as a true "pre-enlightenment" scholar with the highest integrity and academic credentials: one who could be trusted to guide the reader in identifying the forged works of the Church's past.

Did Du Pin's Irenic Reputation Enhance his Academic Credentials?

Du Pin presented himself as ecumenical in two ways. First, he appeared irenic in his writings, and in many works English Protestant commentators positively responded to these overtures. Secondly, Du Pin was ecumenical (or at least tried to be) during his correspondence with William Wake from 1717 until his death the following year. In this second area of Du Pin's ecumenism, the reactions of Wake and Beauvoir to the dialogue are especially informative. A reference to these dialogues that was found in a preface of a later Du Pin translation will also be discussed below.

Du Pin often maintained an ecumenical tone in his works. For instance, Du Pin sought to understand Reformation figures such as Calvin and Luther on the basis of their professed intentions rather than on some Catholic authors' unfounded aspersions. Typical Catholic accusations projected nefarious motivations such as the desire to renounce celibacy or to acquire fame. Du Pin avoided such stereotypes and was willing to quote the reformers' own works. He also used the works of Protestant historians, such

as Sleidan, Cave, and Burnet, if they proved more reliable than Catholic sources. Such willingness to include Protestant works showed his evenhandedness in the contemporary atmosphere of nearly constant Catholic/Protestant controversial debates, and this tendency led to British Protestant readers' enthusiastic reception.

In addition, that Du Pin wrote a history of Protestant authors (i.e. *Bibliothèque des auteurs separez de la communion de l'Église romaine*) demonstrates that he considered them fellow Christians who had contributed to theological scholarship. In the first half of that work's first volume, Du Pin discussed the histories of Protestant movements, and in the second half he reviewed the non-Catholic historians from the latter half of the sixteenth century including some notable authors, i.e. Johann Sleidan, and even John

Fox.¹⁰¹ Concerning Joseph Sleidan, as mentioned in Chapter Three, Du Pin wrote,

Esteemed for the delicateness and the nobility of its style, [*De Statu Religionis et Reipublicae, Carolo Qvinto, Caesare, Commentarii*] was translated into several languages... though in this history he may have taken sides with the Lutherans & for the Alleged Reformed, one cannot deny that it is perfectly well written... he appears quite exact in his narrations... He has the know how to join the historian to that of the orator.¹⁰²

He adds, "It is useless to speak more of this author; as one cannot create an excerpt of his works which are not historical or rhetorical, and we ourselves have said enough on

¹⁰¹ BAS, 434-436, 598.

¹⁰² "Estimée pour la délicatesse & la noblesse du style, & traduite en plusieurs langues. En effet, quoique dans cette Histoire il ait pris parti pour les Lutheriens & pour les Prétendus Réformez, on ne peut nier qu'elle ne soit parfaitement bien écrite. Quant à la verité des faits elle a été contestée, & l'on écrit que Charles-Quint avoit dit que cet Historien avoit avancé plusieurs faussetez dans ce qu'il avoit écrit de lui; neantmoins il paroît assez exact dans ses narrations... Il a sçû joindre l'Historien à celui d'Orateur," in BAS, vol.1, 435. See full quote on p. 141 of this dissertation.

this with regard to his style and his character.”¹⁰³ Du Pin’s outspoken admiration for a controversial Reformation historian showed his willingness to assess works according to their historical merits, regardless of the source. Such an attitude undoubtedly increased his readership in England and his ecumenical reputation there.

As mentioned previously in Chapter Two, Du Pin recommended the work of Protestant historian William Cave in his book, the *Compleat Method of Studying Divinity*.¹⁰⁴ On the subject, “*Of the Books to be read in the Study of Tradition*,” Du Pin’s recommendation of contemporary Protestant writers such as William Cave sent a clear signal of ecumenical inclusion to Protestant readers.¹⁰⁵

In Chapter Seven, William Wotton, in the “Advertisement Concerning This English Translation” in volume one of the *New History*, expounded on Du Pin’s willingness to understand and respect the reformers’ motivations. In the second volume of *A New Ecclesiastical History of Sixteenth Century*, Wotton lauded Du Pin’s willingness to include the Protestant cause and noted that his candor and impartiality set him apart from the allegedly biased commentators in the Catholic communion. In that same volume, Wotton explains that Du Pin had no hesitance in favoring the histories of Protestant writers over Catholic ones. While one would have expected Du Pin to follow the Catholic Nicolas Sanders’ history of the Reformation, he actually relies on Anglican

¹⁰³ “Il est inutile de parler davantage de cet Auteur; car on ne peut pas faire en extrait de ses Ouvrages qui ne sont que d’Histoire ou de Rhetorique, & nous nous sommes assez déclarés sur ce qui regarde son style & son caractère,” in BAS, vol. 1, 436.

¹⁰⁴ See full quote on p. 89 of this dissertation.

¹⁰⁵ CMSD, 191.

Bishop Gilbert Burnet's work.¹⁰⁶ From the evidence in Wotton's prefaces, Du Pin's work amply demonstrated his ecumenical tendencies to his English readers.

Du Pin's ecumenism often lacked tact, which may reflect his never having stepped upon British soil to meet the Protestants. For instance, his aforementioned use of "heretick" and "Prétendue Réformée" and his willingness to dismiss Protestant doctrine showed a lack of diplomatic skill. Ultimately, this shortcoming would be a stumbling block in his later ecumenical dialogue with William Wake.

However much the ecumenical spirit of his writings impressed English Protestant readers, Du Pin's true ecumenism was revealed only after his irenic awareness moved from the theoretical to the concrete (1717). The letters exchanged among Du Pin, Archbishop William Wake, and the chaplain to the English Ambassador to France, William Beauvoir, demonstrate that Du Pin avidly worked to find common theological positions acceptable to both French Catholics and English Protestants.

Previous scholars had recognized France as a model for England's reunification with the Catholic Church. For instance, the Anglican Richard Montagu believed that the Gallican Church might offer a guide for an Anglican church reunited with, yet still essentially independent from, the papacy. He viewed the English church's break as a separation from the secular authority of the pope only, and he saw similarities between England's and France's relationships with the Holy See. Montagu advocated a meeting with the French clergy to discuss a possible reunion.¹⁰⁷

¹⁰⁶ See full quote on p. 71 of this dissertation.

¹⁰⁷ Milton, 266, 344.

Other English theologians admired French ecclesiology. Bishop Richard Corbet of Norwich had favored a patriarchal structure in the church, as many Gallicans had advocated. The theologian Robert Butterfield considered the Gallicans set apart from the rest of the “papists,” since the French crown had not yet promulgated the canons and decrees of the Council of Trent.¹⁰⁸ Anglican clergyman Ephraim Pagit called the French church, “the best Priviledged of the Churches in Christendome under the pope.”¹⁰⁹ He believed that an English church union with France was much more likely than a similar union with the Reformed churches. Hope for an English/French church union was especially active in the 1620s and 1630s, when, according to Milton, the French church tenaciously defended its Gallican liberties. In fact, by 1638 rumors reached England that the French were considering their own patriarchate in Paris.¹¹⁰

The Wake/Du Pin correspondence in the early eighteenth century continued these church unity efforts. In a 1717 letter Wake writes to Beauvoir, “I am much obliged to you for making my name known to Dr. Du Pin. He is a gent[leman] by whose labours I have profited these many years, and I do really admire how it has been possible for one man to publish so much, and yet so comely, as he has generally done. I desire my respects to him, and if there is anything here whereby I may be serviceable to Him, he will freely command me...”¹¹¹ Du Pin’s ecumenical reputation resulting from the irenic

¹⁰⁸ Milton, 227, 241,

¹⁰⁹ Ibid., 268.

¹¹⁰ Ibid., 267, 344.

¹¹¹ William Wake, “A January 2nd 1717 Letter from William Wake to William Beauvoir” in Jacques Gres-Gayer, *Paris – Cantorbéry (1717-1720): le dossier un premier oecumenisme* (Paris: Beauchesne, 1989), 107.

style of his English works is amply demonstrated in this appreciative letter of the Archbishop of Canterbury.

This reputation was further reinforced after Wake read a copy of Du Pin's *Bibliothèque des auteurs separez de la communion de l'Église romaine*. In a 1718 letter from Wake to Du Pin, the archbishop writes, "Your new *Bibliothèque* has been delivered to me by the care of Mr. Beauvoir. I am perfectly astonished to think how it is possible for one man to read, and write so many volumes and all so correctly, as you have done, and even in your now advanced age will continue to do."¹¹² In another letter from the archbishop to William Beauvoir, Wake lauded Du Pin's *De Antiqua Ecclesiae Disciplina Dissertationes Historicae* as a work that is "I think not far from the kingdom of God."¹¹³

Another letter from Beauvoir to the archbishop is revealing as Beauvoir writes, "Dr. Du Pin with whom I dined last Monday and with the Syndic of the Sorbonne and two other doctors...talked as if the whole kingdom was to appeal to a future General Council. They wished for a union with the Church of England as the most effectual means to unite all the Western Churches."¹¹⁴ Du Pin and others in Paris advocated a union of the Anglican and Gallican churches during these years when the apostolic constitution *Unigenitus* stirred strong reactions against the Holy See.

Despite Du Pin's stellar reputation as an ecumenist among the English (including Wake and Beauvoir) and the heady times in Paris which heightened hopes for the possibility of a union, the dialogue began to stall shortly after discussions started.

¹¹² William Beauvoir, "Letter from William Beauvoir to William Wake, 14 May, 1718," in *Ibid.*, 148.

¹¹³ William Wake, "Letter from William Wake to William Beauvoir, 6 November, 1718," in *Ibid.*, 252.

¹¹⁴ William Beauvoir, "Letter from William Beauvoir to William Wake, 11 December, 1718," in *Ibid.*, 102.

Du Pin took it upon himself to write the “Commonitorium,” a proposal for theological unity based on a new interpretation of the Anglican Thirty-Nine Articles. He hoped that this new understanding of the Anglican tenets of faith might allow for a unification of the French and English churches at this pivotal time in history when tension over the apostolic constitution *Unigenitus* favored a break between the French church and the Holy See. Beauvoir received the “Commonitorium” from Du Pin and forwarded it to Wake.¹¹⁵

In the work, Du Pin invokes a few examples from the Church’s record of making concessions to reconcile itself with heresies, especially those of Meletius and the Donatists. While Du Pin appeared to set the stage for the Church’s ecumenical efforts, he unwittingly insulted Anglicans by implying they were heretics. Wake’s biographer, Norman Sykes, confirms that the archbishop did in fact believe that Du Pin had insulted the Church of England.¹¹⁶

Du Pin gave an extended overview of English church history since the Reformation as a prelude to addressing how each of the Anglican Thirty-Nine Articles could be reconciled with contemporary Catholic theology. He indicates that these articles resulted from compromises with Presbyterians, perhaps implying that they might be amended further to reconcile Anglicans with the Catholic Church.¹¹⁷

¹¹⁵ William Beauvoir, “Letter from William Beauvoir to William Wake, 18 August, 1718,” in *Ibid.*, 185.

¹¹⁶ Commonitorium, 189-190; Sykes, *William Wake, Archbishop of Canterbury: 1657-1737* 2 vols., 311.

¹¹⁷ Du Pin’s history of the heretics and the English Reformation appear to be taken from the *Nouvelle Bibliothèque*, see notes 2, 3, 8, 13 in Gres-Gayer, *Paris-Cantorbéry (1717-1720): le dossier d’un premier oecumenisme*, 202; Commonitorium, 188-203; Sykes, *William Wake, Archbishop of Canterbury: 1657-1737* 2 vols, 304.

A detailed review of the “Commonitorium,” as Sykes has done in his biography of Wake and Grès-Gayer accomplished more recently, is unnecessary here. However, a few examples are offered to demonstrate Du Pin’s academic integrity and his willingness to occasionally counter prevailing Catholic doctrine.¹¹⁸

For instance, in his statement on the sixth article (*Of the Sufficiency of Scripture*), he conceded that the Apocrypha might be viewed as deuterocanonical. On the fourteenth (*Of Works of Supererogation*) he conceded that the use of the word “supererogation” might be avoided if it offended Anglican sensibilities. In addressing article twenty-two (*Of Purgatory*), Du Pin included a strong statement on the veneration of images considering it to be adiaphora. Concerning article twenty-four, *Of speaking in the Congregation in such a tongue as the people understandeth*, Du Pin expressed his approval of Mass in the vernacular where the practice is accepted.¹¹⁹

In article thirty (*Of Both Kinds*), Du Pin allowed for the possibility of Utraquism, although he did not believe it should be recognized as divine law. On article thirty-two (*Of the Marriage of Priests*), Du Pin noted that celibacy was merely a church discipline and therefore clerical marriage could be allowed. He gave the example of the Greeks in support of married clergy and noted that such a practice was not an obstacle to union with the Church of England.¹²⁰

¹¹⁸ Sykes, *William Wake, Archbishop of Canterbury: 1657-1737* 2 vols.; Grès-Gayer, “*Le projet pour unir le parti des Jansenistes opposants as l’Église anglicane*” vol. 3 (PhD dissertation, Université de Paris, 1981).

¹¹⁹ Sykes, *William Wake, Archbishop of Canterbury: 1657-1737* 2 vols., 305, 307; Grès-Gayer, “*Le projet pour unir le parti des Jansenistes opposants as l’Église anglicane*,” vol. 3, 1025.

¹²⁰ Sykes, *William Wake, Archbishop of Canterbury: 1657-1737* 2 vols, 307-308; *Commonitorium*, 199.

In a very Gallican fashion, Du Pin concurred with article thirty-three (*Of Excommunicated Persons, how they are to be avoided*), and article thirty-four (*Of the Traditions of the Church*), which dealt with national churches' right to institute rites and discipline those who disrupted them. Du Pin approved of article thirty-five (*Of Homilies*), which had recommended that certain homilies, written during Edward VI's reign, be read by the laity.¹²¹ Du Pin concurred with disseminating homilies for such a purpose, but he qualified approval by adding "but on the contents of any of them we are not able to offer judgment because we have not read them."¹²²

On article thirty-six, he approved acceptance of Anglican orders. He writes,

I do not want the ordinations of bishops, or priests, or deacons pronounced null. Certain ones may be, perhaps, dubious, but nothing forbids these [ordinations] from being accepted by the Gallican Church, just as the Council of Nicaea holds certain (God forbid an injury to the word) the ordinations of the Meletians and Novatians. And therefore if a union takes place, all the bishops, priests, deacons, ministers, and holders of benefices in the Anglican Church will be preserved in their ministerial orders, functions, and benefits by right or by the indulgence of the Church.¹²³

The discussion over whether the Catholic Church in France could accept the ordinations of the Church of England was a topic of great importance during the entire ecumenical correspondence, as amply demonstrated during the dialogue when Wake asked Beauvoir if Du Pin had a copy of Francis Mason's *Vindiciae Ecclesiae Anglicanae*;

¹²¹ Sykes, *William Wake, Archbishop of Canterbury: 1657-1737* 2 vols, 199, 308.

¹²² "sed de iis quae continentur quoniam non legimus, iudicium ferre non possumus," in *Commonitorium*, 199-200.

¹²³ "Nollem ordinationes sive Episcoporum, sive Presbyterorum, sive Diaconorum Anglicanorum nullas pronuntiari, possunt esse quaedam fortasse dubia, sed nihil vetat quominus haec probet Ecclesia Gallicana, sicut Concilium Nicaenum Meletianorum et Novatianorum (absit verbo injuria) ordinationes rata habuit. Ideoque si fiat unio, omnes Episcopi, Presbyteri, Diaconi, Ministri, Beneficiati Communionis Anglicanae in suis ordinibus, functionibus, ministeriis et beneficiis conservabuntur sive ex jure, sive ex indulgentia Ecclesiae," in *Commonitorium*, 199-200.

sive de Legitimo eiusdem Ministerio (1625), which detailed how and who consecrated the first bishops in the Church of England after the Reformation. Assuring the French of the apostolic succession of English ordinations was a key element in negotiating a possible union. Wake urged Beauvoir to stay well informed on the subject since it was often of interest to French divines.¹²⁴

On article thirty-seven (*Of the Civil Magistrates*), which asserts the monarch's right to rule over the Church of England, Du Pin asserted the pope's primacy to assure orthodoxy and to uphold canon law. Nevertheless, he held to his usual Gallican position that such primacy could not interfere with the local bishops' prerogatives.¹²⁵

However, in the "Commonitorium" Du Pin demonstrates a lack of ecumenical grace by offering compromises directly contradicting the central tenets of the Protestant Reformation. On the eleventh article, *Of the Justification of Man, which asserts that man is justified through faith alone*, Du Pin writes, "We are justified by faith alone in Christ, which is explained in article 11, we do not refuse to acknowledge as true. But also along with faith is charity, which works by means of faith, and is combined with good works which are altogether necessary for salvation, as is recognized by the following article [which discusses good works]."¹²⁶ Such a statement opposing the central tenet of the Protestant faith was not helpful in an ecumenical dialog. Did Du Pin really expect the

¹²⁴ William Wake, "Letter from William Wake to William Beauvoir, 6 November, 1718," in Jacques Gres-Gayer, *Paris – Cantorbéry (1717-1720): Le Dossier un Premier Œcumenisme* (Paris: Beauchesne, 1989), 252.

¹²⁵ Sykes, *William Wake, Archbishop of Canterbury: 1657-1737* 2 vols., 309; Gres-Gayer, "*Le projet pour unir le parti des Jansenistes opposants as l'Église anglicane*" vol. 3, 1040.

¹²⁶ "Fide sola in Christum nos justificari, quod articulo 11 exponitur, non inficiamur. Sed fide, charitate per fidem operante, necnon et adjunctis boni operibus quae omnino necessaria sunt ad Salutem, ut articulo sequenti agnoscitur," in *Commonitorium*, 194.

Anglicans simply to add charity and good works to their formula of justification? Grès-Gayer believes that in this case Du Pin was using an understanding of justification which some moderate Protestants had adopted, such as Bishop William Forbes of Edinburgh and Flemish theologian George Cassander. In the same vein, on the twelfth article (*Of Good Works*), Du Pin holds that works were indeed involved in one's justification.¹²⁷

Concerning the nineteenth article (*Of the Church*), which holds that the Church exists wherever word and sacrament are faithfully ministered, Du Pin proposed to add the phrase "under legitimate pastors." Grès-Gayer notes that Cardinal Jacques Davy du Perron (d. 1618) had made the same assertion in his posthumous *Replique a la response du serenissime roy de la Grand Bretagne* (1620). In Gallican fashion, Du Pin believed the article's mention of local church errors should be removed from its second paragraph.¹²⁸

In the twentieth article *Of the Authority of the Church*, he agreed that it was not lawful for the Church to promulgate doctrines contrary to scripture, but he noted that such an act was in fact impossible, since Christ would not let the Church fall into this error. In article twenty-one, *Of the authority of General Councils*, which states that princes must convoke councils, and that this human element has caused some councils to err, Du Pin strongly disagreed. First, he noted that an ecumenical council could convene without the approval

¹²⁷ Grès-Gayer, "Le projet pour unir le parti des Jansenistes opposants as l'Église anglicane vol. 3, 1026, 1027.

¹²⁸ Sykes, *William Wake, Archbishop of Canterbury: 1657-1737*. 2 vols., 306.

of princes as happened in the early Church, and, second, local councils' errors, attributed to the influence of princes, were never recognized by the universal Church.¹²⁹

Article twenty-two, *Of Purgatory*, posited purgatory, veneration of images and relics, and the invocation of saints, as inventions contrary to scripture. Du Pin explained that the Anglican view of purgatory resulted from a poor Catholic exposition of this doctrine, and Grès-Gayer holds that Du Pin believed the doctrine was a poor theological interpretation.¹³⁰ Interestingly, Du Pin offered an argument repeated later when discussing the Eucharist: he opined that if Anglicans would simply view the subject another way, they would have no reason to object to the Catholic doctrine. He writes, "For if it is observed with the mind and usage that Catholics have accepted [on purgatory], there is nothing that the Anglicans would not be able to grasp or not be able to approve of themselves."¹³¹ As for indulgences, Du Pin noted that they are simply substitutions of penances in this life: pointing out that some Catholic theologians still opposed the idea that they dispensed with penances one might need to complete in the afterlife. His previous historical research on purgatory undoubtedly informed his position (as explained in Chapter Three).¹³²

On article twenty five, *Of the Sacraments*, he strongly defended the seven sacraments. Du Pin writes,

¹²⁹ Sykes, *William Wake, Archbishop of Canterbury: 1657-1737*. 2 vols., 306; Grès-Gayer, "Le projet pour unir le parti des Jansenistes opposants as l'Église anglicane" vol. 3, 1029.

¹³⁰ Commonitorium, 196; Grès-Gayer, "Le projet pour unir le parti des Jansenistes opposants as l'Église anglicane" vol. 3, 1029.

¹³¹ "Nam si secundum mentem et usum catholicorum accipiatur nihil habet quod in ea reprehendere possint Anglicani, et quod ipsi non approbent," in Commonitorium, 196.

¹³² Sykes, *William Wake, Archbishop of Canterbury: 1657-1737* 2 vols., 306.

Concerning the sacraments which are the subject of Article 25 [the five other than baptism and the Eucharist], it is not necessary that we take up the question of whether the[se] five sacraments which the Roman Church recognizes are immediately instituted by Christ. It suffices that the recognition of the sacraments cannot be denied when these signs of invisible grace are his way of working, and have already for some time have been adorned with the familiar name of sacraments in the usage of the Church.¹³³

Again Du Pin offered no common ground but simply dismissed this article which denied the sacramental nature of all Catholic sacraments except Baptism and Holy Communion.

Du Pin encountered difficulties addressing article twenty-eight (*Of the Lord's Supper*). As previously discussed in Chapter Three, he attempted to reword this article on the Eucharist. He writes,

In regard to the expression 'transubstantiation,' it will be nothing to hold at a distance if the fact[s] can be agreed upon. I wish therefore that this article be expressed: 'in the Eucharistic sacrament, the bread and wine truly and really changed [*transmutari*] into the body and blood of Christ, and are truly and really received by those who receive the consecrated bread and wine, although this oral reception will be useless unless the faith and holiness of the recipient is also present.' Thus, this article devised by our men will not be rejected and ought not to be disagreeable to you Anglicans.¹³⁴

Sykes notes that Du Pin uses the verb "transmutari" (translated here as "changed") as a possible ecumenical gesture, and Grès-Gayer concurs with this interpretation. Du Pin

¹³³ "De sacramentis circa quae versatur articulus 25, nihil necesse est ut quaestionem istam ingrediamur an quinque sacramenta quae Romana agnoscit Ecclesia a Christo immediate instituta sint, sufficit ut pro sacramentis agnoscantur, quod negari non potest, cum signa sint gratiae invisibilis quam suo modo operantur, et jam pridem in Ecclesia usitata sint a sacramentorum nomine decorate," in *Commonitorium*, 194.

¹³⁴ "...quoad transubstantiationis vocem, nihil necesse erit eam abhibere si de re conveniat. Vellem itaque hunc articulum sic exprimi: in sacramento Eucharistiae, panis et vinum vere ac realiter transmutantur in corpus et sanguinem Christi, et vere ac realiter recipiuntur ab iis qui panem et vinum consecratum accipiunt, licet inutilis sit ista receptio oralis nisi accedat fides et sanctitas suscipientis. Ita conceptus articulus a nostris rejici nequibit et vobis Anglicanis non debet esse odiosus," in *Commonitorium*, 198; see full quote on p. 122.

believed the verb might have been considered acceptable to Anglicans because of St. Cyril of Jerusalem's previous usage.¹³⁵

Despite this possibility, the overture only appears to have insulted Wake whose ire Du Pin stirred by suggesting that Anglicans should rewrite the article. He believed Du Pin's proposal insulted the dignity of the Archbishop of Canterbury's position. Wake writes to Beauvoir,

I cannot tell what to say to Dr. Du Pin. If he thinks we are to take their direction what to retain and what to give up, he is utterly mistaken. I am a friend to peace, but more to truth, and they may depend upon it. I shall always account our Church to stand upon an equal foot with theirs, and that we are no more to receive laws from them than we desire to impose any upon them. In short, the Church of England is free, is orthodox, she has plenary authority within herself, and has no need to recur to any other Church to direct her what to believe, or what to do. Nor will we otherwise than in a brotherly way and full equality of right and power, ever consent to have any treaty with that of France. And therefore, if they mean to deal with us, they must lay down this for the foundation, that we are to deal with one another upon *equal* terms. If consistently with our own establishment, we can agree upon a closer union with one another, well; if not, we are as much, and upon as good grounds, a free independent Church as they are. And for myself, as Archbishop of Canterbury, I have more power, larger privileges and greater authority than any of their Archbishops, from which, by the grace of God, I will not depart, no, not for the sake of a union with them.

You see, Sir, what my sense of this matter is, and may perhaps think that I have a little altered my mind since that affair was first set on foot. As to my desire of peace and union with all other Christian Churches, I am still the same. But with the Doctor's *Commonitorium*, I shall never comply. The matter must be put upon to another method, and whatever they think, they must alter some of their doctrines, and practices too, or a union with them can never be effected.¹³⁶

As previously mentioned in Chapter Five, William Beauvoir had doubted Du Pin's earnestness in defending transubstantiation in the "Commonitorium." He writes, "but

¹³⁵ Sykes, *William Wake, Archbishop of Canterbury: 1657-1737*. 2 vols., 308; Gres-Gayer, "*Le projet pour unir le parti des Jansenistes opposants as l'Église anglicane*" vol. 3, 1034.

¹³⁶ William Wake, "Letter from William Wake to William Beauvoir, 13 August, 1718," in Jacques Gres-Gayer, *Paris-Cantorbéry (1717-1720): Le dossier d'un premier oecumenisme*, 208-209.

what startles me most is their [Du Pin and Piers de Girardin, another French doctor of the Sorbonne] firm adherence to the doctrine of transubstantiation. Whatever they pretend I can hardly believe them in earnest about that point.”¹³⁷

The anger revealed in Wake’s letter and Beauvoir’s shock at Du Pin’s hard line on this doctrine shows how counterproductive his response to article twenty-eight had been. Wake doubted that Du Pin could carry on discussions with a sense of mutual honor and respect, and Beauvoir apparently suspected that political pressures intervened with Du Pin taking his position to placate those on the Catholic side, including a dishonest expression of his own views on transubstantiation.

Du Pin refuted article twenty-nine (*Of the wicked which do not eat the body of Christ, in the use of the Lord's Supper*) which states that the wicked who partook of the sacrament unworthily did not receive the body and blood of Christ. He corrected the article by noting that they did indeed receive the body and blood of Christ but not its benefits.¹³⁸

As for article thirty-one (*Of the one oblation of Christ finished upon the Cross*), Du Pin strongly defended the sacrifice of the Mass, which the article contests.¹³⁹ He writes,

Nor is it blasphemous, nor insane concerning the Church’s doctrine on the sacrifice of the mass, and we [do] consent that there is one completely perfect sacrifice of the cross that Christ has completely fulfilled [thereby] putting an end to the sacrificial. But in another way, we call upon the offering of the bloodless sacrifice of the host, because in the same memory his oblation continues through

¹³⁷ William Beauvoir, “Letter from William Beauvoir to William Wake, 14 May, 1718,” in *Ibid.*, 154-155; see full quote on p. 199.

¹³⁸ Gres-Gayer, “*Le projet pour unir le parti des Jansenistes opposants as l’Église anglicane*” vol. 3, 1036.

¹³⁹ Sykes, *William Wake, Archbishop of Canterbury: 1657-1737* 2 vols., 308.

the singular member of the church who simultaneously makes an offering with the priest.¹⁴⁰

Again, Du Pin offers a thorough critique of Anglican doctrine with no room for compromise.

In summation, Du Pin notes that if doctrine could be unified in the way he had proposed, including acceptance of Anglican orders, a union could be reached between the French and English bishops. This union could be completed without requiring the pope's approval. If the pope disapproved, Du Pin believed it could be appealed to the next church council. In such an eventuality, the active support and participation of both countries' monarchs would be required.¹⁴¹

To Du Pin's credit, he ignored several Tridentine positions in his responses, which were reduced to a matter of semantics, i.e., transmuted vs. transubstantiated. Nevertheless, Du Pin's ill-advised attempt at a point-by-point reconciliation of the Thirty-Nine Articles with Catholic doctrine insulted Wake, and unwittingly diminished Anglican doctrine and the dignity of the Archbishop of Canterbury. Sharing in the insult, Beauvoir decried Du Pin's lack of amendments to his first draft which he left essentially unchanged.¹⁴²

By November of 1718, rumors circulated in Paris about the Wake-Du Pin dialogue and negotiations for a possible union of the English and French churches. These rumors reached Rome the following month. In early 1719, Cardinals Armand Gaston de Rohan

¹⁴⁰ "*Nec blasphema est, nec insane circa sacrificium missae Ecclesiae doctrina, consentimus unum esse ac perfectissimum crucis sacrificium quo Christus omnia sacrificia abolendo implevit, nec aliter oblationem hostiae incruentum sacrificium appellamus nisi quia illius, sacrificii in eo memoria sit et ejus continuator oblation, per singular Ecclesiae membra qui simul cum sacerdote offerunt,*" in *Commonitorium*, 199.

¹⁴¹ Sykes. *William Wake, Archbishop of Canterbury: 1657-1737* 2 vols., 310.

¹⁴² *Ibid.*, 309; William Beauvoir, "Letter from William Beauvoir to William Wake, 18 August, 1718," in Jacques Gres-Gayer, *Paris-Cantorbéry (1717-1720): Le dossier d'un premier oecumenisme*, 185.

and Henri-Pons de Thiard de Bissy complained to the regent that the Archbishop of Paris, Cardinal Louis Antoine de Noailles, had instructed Du Pin to undertake a correspondence with Wake. As a result, the regent sent an abbé du Bois to examine and confiscate copies of the letters. This pressure suspended the correspondence, which ended permanently upon Du Pin's death on June 7, 1719.¹⁴³

News of Du Pin's correspondence with Wake became common knowledge in England. Thomas Fenton substantiated this public knowledge in the preface to Du Pin's *History of the Church*, in which he discusses the ecumenical dialogue and especially Du Pin's recognition of the Church of England's ordinations. Esteem for his scholarship is described in the preface, "It will need no further recommendation, as coming from an author so universally esteem'd by the learned world..who was reputed to have a very great veneration for the Doctrine, Discipline, and worship of the Church of England..."¹⁴⁴

By this time (1724), Du Pin's ecumenical work with Wake and perhaps even his recognition of Anglican orders had become known to the *cognoscenti*. His partiality to the Catholic Church in the *History of the Church's* Reformation section is attributed to politics in much the same way that Beauvoir had done regarding Du Pin's views on transubstantiation during the ecumenical dialogue.

¹⁴³ Louis XIV died in 1715 and his grandson Louis XV, aged five, acceded to the throne. Philippe, duke of Orleans, served as the young king's regent; William Beauvoir, "Letter from William Beauvoir to William Wake, 14 May, 1718," in Gres-Gayer, *Paris-Cantorbéry (1717-1720): Le dossier d'un premier oecumenisme*, 247; William Beauvoir, "Letter from William Beauvoir to William Wake, 31 December, 1718," in Ibid., 291; William Beauvoir, "Letter from William Beauvoir to William Wake, 11 February, 1719," in Ibid., 323; William Beauvoir, "Letter from William Beauvoir to William Wake, 13 April, 1719," in Ibid., 354; "Mort de Louis Ellies Du Pin Réactions du temps," in Ibid., 374.

¹⁴⁴ Thomas Fenton. "Preface," in Louis Ellies Du Pin, *History of the Church*, Third Edition (London: Printed for Bernard Lintot at the *Cross-keys* between the *Temple Gates*, 1724), [vi-vii]; see full quote on p. 86 of this dissertation.

Ecumenical in his Own Mind

Grès-Gayer captures Du Pin's ecumenical attitude expressed in the "Commonitorium" when he writes, "Du Pin...did not hesitate to propose the corrections which to him appeared necessary and which he believed to be acceptable on the part of his correspondent."¹⁴⁵

Often using the work of Bishop Forbes as his model of what the Anglican church *might* accept as orthodox theology and dismissing what the Anglican articles of faith actually stated, Du Pin often proposed changes which could be taken as a direct affront to the Church of England. As previously reviewed, the most egregious of these are head-on criticisms and proposed redactions of the articles dealing with *sola scriptura*, justification, the authority of the church councils, and the Eucharist.¹⁴⁶

While Du Pin appeared to believe that he was finding common ground on some disputed articles, his intransigence on key doctrines made his initiatives appear impertinent to his Anglican correspondents. In addition, his willingness to compare Anglicans to the heretics of old only served to provide insult to injury.

Du Pin apparently believed that if Anglicans would only look at some disputed doctrines in a different light they might accept Catholic positions which needed to be explained in a slightly different way. But he failed to realize how insulting such overtures may have been to English minds, since this strategy insinuated that Anglicans

¹⁴⁵ "Du Pin ...n'hésitant pas à proposer les corrections qui lui paraissant nécessaires et qu'il croit acceptables de le part de son corespondant" in Gres-Gayer, "Un théologien gallican, témoin de son temps: Louis Ellies Du Pin (1657–1719)," 111.

¹⁴⁶ Ibid., 111.

had not thought through these issues, or that they did not fully understand the Catholic position on these doctrines. Either implication proved fatal to the dialogue.

The original question then remains: Did the English view Du Pin as irenic? The answer to this question is that they did believe that he was an ecumenist, but especially in the case of Wake and Beauvoir, they did not think of him as a good ecumenist.

Before the dialogue, his ecumenical views received nearly unanimous approval from English Protestants whose views are recorded. He attempted to understand the reformers on their own terms, and he did not hesitate to cite the works of Protestant historians such as Gilbert Burnet if he believed they were superior to works available from his Catholic counterparts. He wrote an entire work, *Bibliothèque des auteurs separez de la communion de l'Église romaine*, devoted to the history and works of Protestants. He recommended the works of Protestant authors Johann Sleidan and William Cave in his own works.

In his writings, mostly published in English, Du Pin made a point of reaching out to Protestants and taking their views seriously. In addition, the Gallican anti-papalism pervading his works and informing his vision made him appear more ecumenical to the English reader. As such, Protestants were willing to overlook his defenses of traditional Catholic positions and his use of anti-Protestant terms such as “heretic.”

In 1717, Du Pin saw his big chance to put these ecumenical intentions into action for the sake of church unity. It was then that Du Pin’s ecumenism came into full relief: an ecumenism on his own terms permitting Anglicans to see the Church in light of the Gallican ideal.

In the *Weltanschauung* of his type of ecumenism, the Anglicans could ignore papal positions on issues of church structure, discipline, or liturgy, if they conformed to Du Pin's Gallican view. Thus it was acceptable to maintain that the papacy had erred but not that the Church catholic or the ecumenical councils had erred. The Anglicans were correct when they defended the prerogatives of local churches, such as their liberty to preach in the vernacular, offer Holy Communion to the laity in both kinds, develop their own rites, or allow priests to marry.

Unfortunately, Du Pin contested other Anglican doctrines that did not fit into his vision of the Church. His beliefs concerning Anglican doctrines fell into two categories: those in which the disagreements with Catholic doctrines were simply semantic, and those in which Anglicans were simply wrong.

In this first group were doctrines such as transubstantiation and supererogation. Since the differences on these topics were simply semantic, one could replace the term "transubstantiation" with "transmutari," or remove the term "supererogation" if it offended. One could always get around these or other terms, if they proved to be objectionable to Anglicans. But the content of the doctrines need not be altered.

The second group included doctrines such as the sacrifice of the mass and justification. On these doctrines, Anglicans simply needed to come to their senses for the sake of church unity. In Du Pin's mind, patristic writings substantiated these doctrines. As such, their legitimacy was simply not subject to debate.

To Wake and Beauvoir, the impertinence of Du Pin's response was a shock. They simply did not expect such a hard line reaction on disputed doctrines from an author with

such a stellar reputation as an ecumenist. Catholic positions previously spelled out in his writings, which his Anglican readers had been more than willing to ignore, came under a direct spotlight during the ecumenical dialogue.

Besides the obvious problem of offering such unequivocal positions, what proved even more counterproductive was the method he undertook to fashion a theological *détente*. One would think after addressing each of the Thirty-Nine Articles and then directly refuting one or two Anglican theological positions, Du Pin would have realized this technique would never prove successful in attaining doctrinal consensus. As Wake so astutely noted, “The matter must be put upon to another method.”¹⁴⁷

To conclude, though Du Pin truly was seen as ecumenical among his English readers, their perception undoubtedly resulted from a shared appreciation of his outspoken anti-papalism and his willingness to utilize, cite, and recommend works of Protestant theologians and historians. Protestants seemed willing to look the other way when he called Protestants “heretics,” or when he defended accepted Catholic doctrines that had nothing to do with his Gallicanism.

It was not until 1717 and the ecumenical dialogue that this willingness to defend disputed Catholic doctrines came into full view. While the “Commonitorium” may not have destroyed Du Pin’s reputation as an ecumenist in the minds of Wake and Beauvoir, it made them realize that he, while possibly devoted to ecumenical principles, was simply not very good at offering a constructive means of arriving at an irenic consensus.

¹⁴⁷ William Wake. “Letter from William Wake to William Beauvoir, 13 August, 1718,” in Jacques Gres-Gayer. *Paris-Cantorbéry (1717-1720): Le Dossier d’un Premier Oecumenisme*, 208-209.

Conclusion

The large number of English translations of Du Pin's works attests to his wide acceptance in England. Independent works of Stillingfleet, Fleetwood, and others, substantiating the positive opinions printed in the advertisements, prefaces, and dedications of his works, have also been cited.

After having completed this review, one might ask what conclusions can be drawn as to why Du Pin enjoyed such admiration in England during a time of heightened Catholic/Protestant polemics. In short, eight reasons can be given for Du Pin's acceptance in England: 1) his reputation as a foe of myths, 2) his willingness to air the papacy's corruption, 3) his tendency to portray accurately the lives and ministries of prominent Protestant leaders and cite their works, 4) his work's usefulness in polemical writings, 5) his Gallican research and its use in supporting the episcopal polity in England, 6) his Catholic identity, 7) his "renegade" reputation, and 8) his willingness to reach out to Protestants during his ecumenical correspondence with William Wake.

Reasons for Du Pin's Acceptance in England

Du Pin, following new historical methods the Bollandists and Maurists pioneered in the early seventeenth century, pursued the new trend of academic rigor which was then embraced in England. One element of this method was the search for the most reliable sources. English readers valued Du Pin's detections of falsehood in myths, legends, forgeries, and other dubious and spurious works.

This esteem is amply demonstrated in the positive reactions of his editors and translators to his exposure of the fraudulent *Liturgy of St. Peter*, the *Celestial Hierarchy* of Pseudo-Dionysius, and other reputedly ancient works used by Catholic controversialists. His works were valued as reliable guides which could protect English readers from the historical errors that would invariably lead to faulty theological conclusions.

Du Pin's dedication to intellectual honesty led him to admit the Church's mistakes. As shown above, he openly admitted the Church's corruptions before the Reformation, and he refused to hide the excesses of the twelfth-century crusade to convert the Albigensians. He had less reason to hide those sins which dealt with the unwarranted exercise of papal authority, as shown in his criticism of papal overreach in the twelfth century. For the English reader, such admissions helped to portray a corrupt See of Rome, which without justification and by force attempted to stamp out heresy in general and the Protestant Reformation specifically.

Nearly all the prefaces, introductions, and commentaries on Du Pin's work praised his evenhandedness towards Protestants. Unlike many Catholic historians, he considered Protestant historians worthy of consideration and cited them in his works. Wotton noted that he often chose to follow the histories of Protestant scholars rather than the available Catholic ones such as Sanders'. As stated above, he recommended the works of Protestants such as Gilbert Burnet and William Cave. This evenhandedness earned him widespread acceptance in England.

Du Pin respected the motivations of the sixteenth-century reformers and did not resort to accusations of nefarious purposes for formulating their doctrines or pursuing their ministries. He admitted that the reformers based their doctrines on Holy Scripture and he quoted from their works.

In addition, though it strains credibility, that the Catholic Du Pin could have his *A Compleat Method of Studying Divinity* (1720) translated in English and successfully sold in Protestant Britain attests to the trust the English had for his evenhanded scholarship.

Anglican divines often drew from Du Pin's research and interpretations in their own polemical works. He was more than willing to delve into the historical bases of theologically disputed doctrines. For instance, he explored the controversies surrounding the veneration of images at the Second Council of Nicaea, the ninth-century Eucharistic debates between Radburtus and Ratramnus, and the introduction of the term *transubstantiation* in the twelfth century. Du Pin's biblical works allowed Protestant writers to advocate vernacular translations of Holy Scripture, to argue for the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, and to articulate the infallibility of the Bible.

A strong demand arose in seventeenth-century England for patristic scholarship which then nourished theological discourse in the Church of England. Determining the true polity, doctrines, and liturgies of the early Church shaped practices in the Church of England and fashioned its self identity as a truly apostolic Church.

As mentioned before, Du Pin's Gallican ecclesiology was actively promoted throughout his works. While such an ideology would have been more useful for protecting the prerogatives of national churches still within the Catholic fold, some of Du

Pin's commentators, such as Wotton and Cotes, revealed that the Church of England understood itself as having the same goals as that of France and Venice: that is, wholly Catholic, yet free from the authority of the Holy See. Anglican divines used, often unwittingly, Du Pin's Gallican principles to justify the propriety of the Church of England's break with Rome and its maintenance of an Anglican polity independent from, but still theoretically in relation with, the Roman see.

As seen above, Digby Cotes utilized Du Pin's work to demonstrate that the primitive Church usually adopted the episcopal polity, against the claims of the non-conformists. This Gallican evidence attacked the perceived liturgical innovations of the non-conformists and Presbyterians and supported the right of a national church, such as the Church of England, to prescribe rites within its own jurisdiction and mandate their practice.

That Du Pin was a Catholic made his works especially convincing in controversial debates. Accordingly, when a famous Catholic scholar questioned the historicity of certain Catholic doctrines, it was more compelling than if a Protestant historian had done the same. Thus, being able to state, "even the famous Doctor of the Sorbonne questions such and such a doctrine," gave an argument an entirely greater weight than if a Protestant had been cited instead. This sentiment was revealed in Chapter 2, in which William Wotton was cited in the "Advertisement Concerning This Translation," a preface to the 1693 *New History*. Wotton noted that a work "*carries a more Convictive Force*

along with it”¹ when the author’s historical conclusions contradict the beliefs of his own faith tradition.

The persecution that Du Pin endured for his conclusions in the *Nouvelle Bibliothèque* as well as his temporary exile for signing the *Cas de Conscience*, resulted in his heightened reputation among Protestant readers in Britain. Both works and his official condemnation and retraction over the *Nouvelle Bibliothèque*, which were later translated and published in England, conferred on him recognition as a crypto-Protestant, or at least an outspoken renegade within the Catholic fold. As shown above, this awareness of Du Pin’s persecutions is revealed in the *Memoires in Literature* review of the *Nouvelle Bibliothèque* (Amsterdam, 1711). In that review, the anonymous author attributed its content to the pressure of French government censorship when he wrote, “Had Dr. *du Pin* composed these Two Books without any Restraint upon him, ‘tis highly probable his Extracts would have been more Curious and Instructive, and attended with several Reflections which he did not think fit to publish.”²

By the 1720s, English readers were well aware of the ecumenical dialogue which had taken place between Du Pin and Archbishop William Wake. The former’s respect for the English church and his recognition of the validity of its ordinations, undoubtedly contributed to the reputation he enjoyed among his English readers. This recognition was noted above in Fenton’s introduction to *History of the Church* (1724), which lauded Du

¹ Wotton, “Advertisment Concerning This Translation,” in NH93, vol. 1, [iii].

² *Memoires of Literature* vol. 1, 233.

Pin's "very great veneration for the Doctrine, Discipline, and worship of the Church of England."³

Was the "English Du Pin" the Real Du Pin?

The question then remains as to whether the English "got it right." Was Du Pin who they thought he was?

The answer to that question is both yes *and* no. The English had some understanding of the "academic" Du Pin, who attempted to learn the truth about the early centuries of the Church and to expose the forgeries and myths of the past. As an academic, he may have been *the* towering pre-enlightenment historian of his day, and English readers valued his contributions toward a modern and scientific understanding of the Church's history.

His British readers appreciated his willingness to attack dubious Catholic history and the resulting theological conclusions. Nevertheless, it is apparent that this perceived willingness to criticize long-held Catholic teachings was not an attempt to promote Reformation doctrine, but rather part a single-minded agenda to embarrass the Holy See at every turn. This Gallican anti-papal bias has been well demonstrated above with little evidence of Du Pin's outright promotion of Protestantism.

The English falsely interpreted Du Pin's Gallican attacks for Protestant sympathies. The common English perception that he may have harbored some affinity for Protestant theological doctrines can be easily dismissed by a cursory perusal of his "Commonitorium." The latter tactlessly and unsuccessfully attempted to reconcile the differences between the Thirty-Nine Articles and contemporary Catholic doctrine.

³ Fenton, "Preface," in Du Pin, *History of the Church*, Third Edition, [vii].

Historically, the “Commonitorium” is a valued source demonstrating how orthodox Du Pin was. One would have to believe that Du Pin completely falsified his beliefs in that document to conclude that he was a “crypto-Protestant.”

The ecumenical dialogue shows that Du Pin had empathy for the Church of England, especially in his acceptance of Anglican orders. However, Du Pin’s English readers only partially understood his ecumenical initiatives. While Protestants believed such overtures proved that he desired reconciliation with the Church of England because of his sympathies for Protestant doctrine and polity, Du Pin’s ecumenical outreach once again coincided with the consistent goal of his lifetime, the promotion of independent national churches – this time in cooperation with the Church of England. While his efforts were simply an extension of his Gallican agenda, his work in this area made a lasting difference for Anglican/Catholic understanding, at least for a time, as shown in the continued correspondence of Wake with Piers de Girardin, and later with Pierre François Le Courayer on the subject of Anglican orders. However, such ecumenical dialogue was short-lived, since the English soon turned to resolving intra-Protestant disputes in the mid-eighteenth century, when Catholics were excluded from any meaningful place in the arena of English academic or religious discourse.⁴

The English correctly recognized that Du Pin generally held the reformers in high regard. It is worth noting that Du Pin used the title *Bibliothèque des auteurs separez de la communion de L’Église romaine* for his history of Protestant writers, obviously

⁴ P. Piers de Girardin. “Letter from P.Piers de Girardin á William Wake,” August 2, 1719,” Gres-Gayer. *Paris-Cantorbéry, 1717-1720: Le Dossier d’un Premier Oecuménisme*, 393-394; Clark, 259.

avoiding “*hérétiques*” in its title. Perhaps Du Pin maintained this tone since he regarded Protestants and especially their historic leaders as allies in the struggle against Rome.

While English readers considered Du Pin a renegade, no evidence leads to the conclusion that he reveled in his persecution or sought accolades from English readers. If anything, Du Pin was glad to return to Paris after his exile in 1710, when he once again took up the cause of Gallicanism academically and ecumenically.

Bibliography

Original Sources

Beauvoir, William. "Letter from William Beauvoir to William Wake, 11 February, 1719," in *Paris-Cantorbéry (1717-1720): le dossier d'un premier oecumenisme*, edited by Jacques Grès-Gayer, 322-324. Paris: Beauchesne, 1981.

_____. "Letter from William Beauvoir to William Wake, 13 April, 1719," in *Paris-Cantorbéry (1717-1720): le dossier d'un premier oecumenisme* edited by Jacques Grès-Gayer, 353-355. Paris: Beauchesne, 1981.

_____. "Letter from William Beauvoir to William Wake, 14 May, 1718," in *Paris-Cantorbéry (1717-1720): le dossier d'un premier oecumenisme*, edited by Jacques Grès-Gayer, 154-155. Paris: Beauchesne, 1981.

_____. "Letter from William Beauvoir to William Wake, 18 August, 1718," in *Paris-Cantorbéry (1717-1720): le dossier d'un premier oecumenisme*, edited by Jacques Grès-Gayer, 247-249. Paris: Beauchesne, 1981.

_____. "Letter from William Beauvoir to William Wake, 31 December, 1718," in *Paris-Cantorbéry (1717-1720): le dossier d'un premier oecumenisme*, edited by Jacques Grès-Gayer, 290-292. Paris: Beauchesne, 1981.

Bingham, Joseph. *Origines Ecclesiasticæ: or, the Antiquities of the Christian Church* 4 vols. London: Printed for Robert Knaplock at the Bishop's Head at St. Paul's Church-yard, 1711.

_____. *The Works of the Learned Joseph Bingham, M. A. Late Rector of Havant, and Sometime Fellow of University-College in Oxford*. London: Printed for Robert Knaplock at the Bishop's-Head in St. Paul's Church-Yard, 1726.

Bossuet, Jacques-Benigne. *Exposition de doctrine de l'Église catholique sur des matières de controverse*. Paris: S. Mabre-Cramoisy, 1686.

_____. *Histoire des variations de églises protestantes*. Paris: S. Mabre-Cramoisy, 1688.

_____. *Liber Psalmorum, cum Notis Jacobi Benigni Bossueti Episcopi Meldensis*. Lyon: Anisson, Posuel, Claude Rigaud, 1690.

-
- . "Remarques sur l'Histoire des conciles d'Ephèse et de Chalcedoine de M. Dupin," in *Oeuvres posthumes de messire Jacques-Benigne Bossuet* Tome second, 549-620. Amsterdam: Compagnie des Libraries, 1753.
- Bray, Thomas. *Bibliotheca Parochialis, &c. or a Scheme of Such Theological and other Heads, as Seem Requisite to be Perus'd or Ocassionally Consulted by the Reverend Clergy*. London: Printed for S.H. by R. Wilkin at the King's Head in St. Paul's Church-yard; and W. Hawes at the Bible in Ludgate-street, 1707.
- Beauvoir, William. "Letter from William Beauvoir to William Wake, 14 May, 1718," in *Paris – Cantorbéry (1717-1720): le dossier un premier oecumenisme*, edited by Jacques Grès-Gayer, 148. Paris: Beauchesne, 1989.
-
- . "Letter from William Beauvoir to William Wake, 18 August, 1718," in *Paris – Cantorbéry (1717-1720): le dossier un premier oecumenisme*, edited by Jacques Grès-Gayer, 185. Paris: Beauchesne, 1989.
- Brett, Thomas. *A Collection of the Principal Liturgies, Used by the Christian Church in the Celebration of the Holy Eucharist*. London: printed for Richard King, at the Prince's Arms in S. Paul's Church-Yard, 1720.
- Cas de conscience proposei par un confesseur de province... s.n.*, 1701.
- A Case of Conscience: Propos'd to, and Decided by Forty Doctors of the Faculty at Paris, in Favour of Jansenism*. London: Printed for A. B., 1703.
- Cave, William. *Historia Literaria*. London: Richard Chiswell, 1688.
- Champvallon, Harlay de. *The Condemnation of Monsieur Du Pin, His History of Ecclesiastical Authors, by Archbishop of Paris; as also his own Retraction. Tr. out of French. Together with a Copy of the Submission of the French clergy to the Pope, in Reference to the Propositions of the Assembly, 1682*. London: Printed for Charles Brome and William Keblewhite, 1696.
-
- . *The Decree, or Ordonnance of the Arch-bishop of Paris: Wherein he Condemns Mons. Du Pin's Bibliotheca of Ecclesiastical Authors*. London: J. Nutt near Stationer's Hall, 1703.
-
- . *Ordonnance de Monseigneur l'Archevesque portant condamnation d'un livre intitulé Nouvelle bibliothèque des auteurs ecclésiastiques*. Paris: François Muguet, 1693.

Calder, Robert. "A Short Answer to Mr. William Jameson, His Impugning the Authority of St. Ignatius's Epistles, In the Second Part of His *Nazianzeni Querela*." in Ignatius of Antioch. *The Genuine Epistles of St. Ignatius*. Edinburgh: s.n., 1708.

Childe, Timothy. *Proposals for Printing by Subscription, Bibliotheca Patrum: Or, A New Ecclesiastical History*. London: Abel Swall and Tim. Childe at the Unicorn in St. Paul's Church-yard, 1692.

Cotes, Digby. "A Translator's Preface" in Louis Ellies Du Pin. *New Ecclesiastical History of Seventeenth Century*, A. Oxford: L. Lichfield for T. Combes at the Bible and Dove in Pater-noster-Row, 1725.

Du Pin, Louis Ellies. *Bibliothèque des auteurs separez de la communion de L'Église Romaine*. Paris: Andre Pralard, 1718.

_____. *Bibliothèque universelle des historiens*. Paris: Pierre Giffart, 1707.

_____. "Commonitorium de Modis Ineundae Pacis Inter Ecclesias Anglicanam et Gallicanum (1718)," in Jacques Grès-Gayer. *Paris-Cantobéry (1717-1720)*, 188-203. Paris: Beauchesne, 1989.

_____. *A Compendious History of the Church*. London: Bernard Lintott at the Cross-Keys between the Temple Gates, 1713.

_____. *A Compleat History of the Canons and Writers, of the Books of the Old and New Testament*, 2 vols. London: H. Rhodes at the Star, 1699.

_____. *A Compendious History of the Church*. London: Bernard Lintott at the Cross-Keys between the Temple Gates, 1715.

_____. *A Compleat Method of Studying Divinity*. London: Mary Smith at Bishop Beveridge's Head, 1720.

_____. *De Antiqua Ecclesiae Disciplina Dissertationes Historicae*. Parisiis: Arnoldum Seneuse, 1686.

_____. *De Antiqua Ecclesiae Disciplina Dissertationes Historicae*. London: Abel Swalle, 1691.

_____. *Des Herrn L. E. Du-Pin Kurtzer-Begriff Der gantzen Kirchen-Historie Von Anfang der Welt biß auf unsere Zeit: aus Frag und Antwort bestehend*. Regensburg: Seidel, 1713.

- _____. *Dissertation préliminaire ou prolégomènes sur la Bible*. Paris: Chez Pralard, 1699.
- _____. *The Evangelical History*. London: Mary Smith at Bishop Beveridge's Head, 1720.
- _____. *The Evangelical History, or the Life of Our Blessed Saviour Jesus Christ*. London: Abel Swall and Tim. Childe at the Unicorn in St. Paul's Church-yard, 1694.
- _____. *The Evangelical History, or the Life of Our Blessed Saviour Jesus Christ*. London: Abel Swall and Tim. Childe at the Unicorn in St. Paul's Church-yard, 1696.
- _____. *The Evangelical History: Being the Lives and Acts of the Holy Apostles*. London: Abel Swall and Tim. Childe at the Unicorn in St. Paul's Church-yard, 1696.
- _____. *The Evangelical History*. London: T. Childe at the White-Hart at the West End of St. Paul's Church-yard, 1703.
- _____. *The Evangelical History*. London: T. Childe at the White-Hart in St. Paul's Church-yard, 1712.
- _____. *The Evangelical History*. London: R. Ware at the Bible and Sun in Amen-Corner near Pater-noster-Row, 1732.
- _____. *Histoire de l'Église en abrégé*. Paris: Jacques Vincent, 1712.
- _____. *Histoire de l'Église et des auteurs ecclésiastiques du seizième siècle*. Paris: André Pralard, 1701.
- _____. *Histoire de l'Église et des auteurs ecclésiastiques du seizième siècle*. Paris: Chez Andre Pralard, 1703.
- _____. *Histoire ecclésiastique du dix-septième siècle*. Paris: André Pralard, 1714.
- _____. *Histoires des revolutions des Espagne*. Paris: C.E. Hochereau, 1724.
- _____. *The History of the Revolutions in Spain*. London: W. Mears at the Lamb without Temple-Bar; and T. Eblin, at the Prince's Arms over-against Exeter-Exchange in the Strand, 1724.

- _____. *L' Histoire profane depuis son commencement jusqu'a present.* Paris: Vincent, 1714.
- _____. *Liber Psalmorum, cum Notis Quibus Eorum Sensus Litteralis Exponitur.* Parisiis: A. Prallard, 1691.
- _____. *Mémoires et réflexions sur la Constitution Unigenitus.* Amsterdam, 1717.
- _____. *Methode pour etudier la theologie.* Paris: Antoine-Urbain Coustelier, 1716.
- _____. *Monsieur Du Pin's Motives and Reasons.* London: Printed by S. Redmayne, for R. King at the Queen's Head in Pater-noster-Row and Sold by W. Borcham, 1718.
- _____. *New Ecclesiastical History*, A. tr. by William Wotton. London: Abel Swall and Tim. Childe at the Unicorn in St. Paul's Church-yard, 1695.
- _____. *New Ecclesiastical History of Seventeenth Century*, A. Oxford: L. Lichfield for T. Combes at the Bible and Dove in Pater-noster-Row, 1725.
- _____. *New Ecclesiastical History of Sixteenth Century*, A. vol. 1. London: A&J Churchill at the Black Swan in Pater-noster-Row and Tim Child, at the White hart at the West End of St. Paul's Churchyard, 1703.
- _____. *New Ecclesiastical History of Sixteenth Century*, A. vol. 2. London: A&J Churchill at the Black Swan in Pater-noster-Row and Tim Child, at the White hart at the West End of St. Paul's Churchyard, 1706.
- _____. *New Ecclesiastical History of Sixteenth Century*, A. London: J. Wild for T. Child at the White-Hart at the West End of St. Paul's Church-yard, 1710.
- _____. *New History of Ecclesiastical Writers*, tr. by William Wotton. London: Abel Swall and Tim. Childe at the Unicorn in St. Paul's Church-yard, 1692.
- _____. *New History of Ecclesiastical Writers: Containing an Account of the Authors of the Several Books of the Old and New Testament, of the Lives and Writings of the Primitive Fathers, an Abridgement and Catalogue of their Works ... also a Compendious History of the Councils, with Chronological Tables of the Whole*, A. London: Printed for Abel Swalle and Tim. Thilbe, 1693.
- _____. *New History of Ecclesiastical Writers*, A. tr. by William Wotton. London: Abel Swall and Tim. Childe at the Unicorn in St. Paul's Church-yard, 1696.

- _____. *New History of Ecclesiastical Writers*, A. tr. by William Wotton. Dublin: George Grierson at the Two Bibles in Essex St., 1722.
- _____. *Nouvelle Bibliothèque des auteurs ecclésiastiques*. Paris: André Pralard, 1686.
- _____. *Nouvelle Bibliothèque des auteurs ecclésiastiques: contenant l'histoire de leur vie, le catalogue, la critique, et la chronologie de leurs ouvrages 13, des auteurs du XVI. Siècle de l'Église*. Paris: André Pralard, 1703.
- _____. *Nouvelle Bibliothèque des auteurs ecclésiastiques*, Tomes XVII-XVIII. Amsterdam: Chez Pierre Humbert, 1711.
- _____. *Nouvelle Bibliothèque des auteurs ecclésiastiques du Dix-Séptieme Siècle*. Paris: André Pralard, 1708.
- _____. *Universal Library of Historians*. London: R. Bonwicke, J. Tonson, W. Freeman, Tim. Goodwin, J. Walthoe, 1709.
- _____. "A Vindication of the Epistles of St. Ignatius." in Ignatius of Antioch. *The Genuine Epistles of St. Ignatius* Edinburgh: s.n, 1708.
- Elys, Edmund. "An Answer to Six Arguments Produced by *Du-Pin*, to prove that Passage in *Josephus*'s (in which there is such honorable mention of Jesus Christ) to be spurious; together with some Reflections on a Passage in *Cornelius Tacitus*; and another in one of *Pliny*'s Epistles concerning the Christian Religion." in *Observations on Several Books*. London: Printed for W. Marshal, 1700.
- Eusebius. *Eusebii Pamphili, Socratis Scholastici, Hermiae Sozomeni, Theodoriti et Evagrii, item Philostorgii et Theodori Lectoris quæ Extant Historiæ Ecclesiasticæ*. Cantabrigiæ: Typis Academicis. Curâ Cornelii Crownfield. Impensis Executorum Joannis Nicholson Nuperi Bibliopolæ: & Prostant Venales apud Robertum Knaplock & Danielelem Midwinter Bibliopolas Londinenses, 1720.
- Exact History of the Life, Death and Acts of our Blessed Saviour Jesus Christ*, An. London: Abel Swall and Tim. Childe at the Unicorn in St. Paul's Church-yard, 1694.
- Fenton, Thomas. "Preface," in Louis Ellies Du Pin. *History of the Church*, Third Edition. [v-viii]. London: Printed for Bernard Lintot at the *Cross-keys* between the *Temple Gates*, 1724.
- Fleetwood, William. *An Account of the Life and Death of the Blessed Virgin According to Romish Writers with the Grounds of the Worship Paid to Her*. London: H. Clark for Thomas Newborough at the Star in St. Paul's Churchyard, 1687.

Fontaine, John. *The Journal of John Fontaine: An Irish Huguenot Son in Spain and Virginia, 1710-1719*. Williamsburg, VA: Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, 1972.

Gee, Edward. *Veteres Vindicati*. London: Printed for Henry Mortlock at the Phoenix in St. Paul's Church-yard and at the White Hart at Westminster Hall, 1687.

The Genuine Epistles of the Apostolical Fathers S. Barnabas, S. Ignatius, S. Clement, S. Polycarp, the Shepherd of Hermas, and the Martyrdoms of St. Ignatius and St. Polycarp, tr. by William Wake. London: Printed for Ric. Sare at Grays-Inn Gate next Holborn, 1693.

Gerson, Jean. *Opera Omnia* (Antwerp, 1706), cited in Thomas à Kempis. *The Christian Pattern: or, the Imitation of Jesus Christ*, translated by George Hickes. London: Printed for John Nicholson at the King's Arms in Little Britain, Robert Knaplock at the Angel and Crown in St. Paul's Church-Yard, and Jonah Bowyer at the Rose in Ludgate-Street, Near the West End of St. Paul's Church, 1710.

Gibson, Edmund, ed. *A Preservative against Popery, in Several Select Discourses upon the Principal Heads of Controversy between Protestants and Papists: Written and Published by the Most Eminent Divines of the Church of England, Chiefly in the Reign of King James II* 3 vols. London: Printed for H. Knaplock, 1738.

Gualterio, Filippo Antonio in Louis Ellies Du Pin. *Monsieur Du Pin's Motives and Reasons*. London: Printed by S. Redmayne, for R. King at the Queen's Head in Pater-noster-Row and Sold by W. Borcham, 1718.

Huet, Pierre Daniel. *Censura Philosophae Cartesiana*. Parisiis: Apud Danielelem Horthemels, 1689.

Ignatius of Antioch. *The Genuine Epistles of St. Ignatius*. Edinburgh: s.n., 1708.

Jesus the Son of David; or, a Full Sollution of all the Difficulties about His Genealogy in Matthew and Luke. Against Monsieur Du Pin and the Church of Rome. Edinburgh: s.n., 1730.

à Kempis, Thomas. *The Christian Pattern: or, the Imitation of Jesus Christ*, translated by George Hickes. London: Printed for John Nicholson at the King's Arms in Little Britain, Robert Knaplock at the Angel and Crown in St. Paul's Church-Yard, and Jonah Bowyer at the Rose in Ludgate-Street, Near the West End of St. Paul's Church, 1710.

“A Key to the History of the Constitution, Unigenitus,” in Louis Ellies Du Pin. *Monsieur Du Pin's Motives and Reasons*, 33-53. London: Printed by S. Redmayne, for R. King at the Queen's Head in Pater-noster-Row and Sold by W. Borcham, 1718.

Le Tourneux, Nicolas. *Histoire de la vie de Nostre Seigneur Jésus-Christ*. Paris: Hélie Josset, 1687.

Memoires of Literature v. 1. London: Printed by J. Roberts and Sold by A. Baldwin, near the Oxford-Arms in Warwick-lane, 1711.

Millar, Robert. *The History of the Propagation of Christianity, and Overthrow of Paganism*. Edinburgh: Printed by J. Mosman, 1723.

_____. *The History of the Propagation of Christianity, and Overthrow of Paganism*. London : printed and sold by G. Strahan in Cornhill; S. Chandler, J. Clark, and R. Hett in the Poultry; T. Sanders in Little-Britain; J. Mac-Euen in the Strand; L. Stokie and T. Green at Charing-Cross; and J. Stag in West-Minster-Hall, 1726.

“*Mort de Louis Ellies Du Pin réactions du temps*,” in Jacques Grès-Gayer. *Paris-Cantorbéry (1717-1720): le dossier d'un premier oecumenisme*, 374-376. Paris: Beauchesne, 1981.

Nero and Paul: or, a Clear Demonstration that the Apostle Outlived that Emperor. Edinburgh: s.n., 1730.

Pallavicino, Pietro. *Istoria del Concilio di Trento*. Roma: nella stamperia d'Angelo Bernabo: per Giovanni Casoni, 1656-1657.

Palm Sunday and Good Friday; or a Fatal Engagement, Wherein these Two Popish Chiefs, With Their Whole Clans, Are Cut Off upon the Spot, by Clear Demonstration. Edinburgh: s.n., 1730.

Radcliffe, Stephen. *A Letter to the Reverend Mr. Edward Synge, Prebendary of St. Patrick's Occasioned by a Late Sermon Preached in St. Andrews, Dublin, Before the Honorable House of Commons, October 23rd, 1725*. Dublin: Printed by and For J. Hyde, Bookseller, in Dame Street, 1725.

Sarpi, Paulo. *Historia del Concilio Tridentino*. Londra: Appresso Giovan. Billio., 1619.

_____. *The Historie of the Councel of Trent*. London: Printed by Robert Barker, and Iohn Bill, printers to the Kings most Excellent Maiestie, 1620.

Sclater, Edward. *Consensus Veterum*. London: Printed by Henry Hills, Printer to the King's Most Excellent Majesty, For His Household and Chappel, and for him and Matt. Turner, at the Lamb in High Houlbourn, 1686.

Simon, Richard. *Critique de la bibliothèque des auteurs ecclésiastiques et des prolégomènes de la Bible, publiez [sic] par M. Elies Du-Pin, avec des*

éclaircissemens & des supplémens aux endroits où on les a jugé nécessaires. Paris: Etienne Ganeau, 1730.

Stillingfleet, Edward. *The Doctrine of the Trinity and Transubstantiation Compared as to Scripture, Reason, and Tradition.* London: W. Rogers at the Sun over against St. Dunstan's Church in Fleet-street, 1688.

Stillingfleet, Edward. *Origines Britannicae; or The Antiquities of the British Churches.* London: Printed by M. Flesher for Henry Mortlock, 1685.

Synge, Edward. *The Archbishop of Tuam's Defence of his Charitable Address to All who are of the Communion of the Church of Rome: in Reply to Dr. Nary's Answer.* Dublin: Printed for R. Owen, Bookseller in Skinner-Row, 1729.

_____. *The Archbishop of Tuam's Observations on Dr. Nary's Rejoinder.* Dublin: Printed for R. Owen, Bookseller in Skinner-Row, 1731.

_____. *A Sermon Against Persecution on Account of Religion.* Dublin: Printed by J. Carson, for Jer. and Sil. Pepyat in Skinner Row, Booksellers, 1721.

_____. *A Vindication of a Sermon Preach'd Before the Honourable House of Commons of Ireland. On Saturday the 23rd of October, 1725.* Dublin: Printed by A. Rhames, for Robert Owen, Bookseller in Skinner-Row, 1726.

Triveti, Nicolai. *Annales Sex Regum.* Oxonium: Theatrum Sheldonianum, 1719.

Two Letters with Some Remarks upon the Fourth Tome of the English Edition of Lewis Du Pin's Compendious History of the Church. London: Printed for John Morphew near Stationers-Hall, 1717.

Vertot, Abbé de. *Histoires des revolutions des Espagne.* Paris: C.E. Hochereau, 1724.

_____. *The History of the Revolution in Portugal.* London: Matthew Gilliflower, 1700.

_____. *The History of the Revolutions in Spain.* London: W. Mears at the Lamb without Temple-Bar; and T. Edlin, at the Prince's Arms over-against Exeter-Exchange in the Strand, 1724.

_____. *The History of the Revolutions in Sweden.* London: Printed for A. Swall and T. Child, 1696.

Vossius, Isaac. *Epistolæ Genuinæ S. Ignatii Martyris.* Amstelodami: Apud Ioannem Blaeu, 1646.

Wake, William. "A January 2nd 1717 Letter from William Wake to William Beauvoir" in *Paris – Cantorbéry (1717-1720): le dossier un premier oecumenisme*, edited by Jacques Grès-Gayer, 107. Paris: Beauchesne, 1989.

_____. "Letter from William Wake to William Beauvoir, 6 November, 1718," in *Paris – Cantorbéry (1717-1720): le dossier un premier oecumenisme*, edited by Jacques Grès-Gayer, 250-253. Paris: Beauchesne, 1989.

_____. "Letter from William Wake to William Beauvoir, 13 August, 1718," in *Paris – Cantorbéry (1717-1720): le dossier un premier oecumenisme*, edited by Jacques Grès-Gayer, 208-209. Paris: Beauchesne, 1989.

Wotton, William. "Advertisment Concerning This Translation," in *A New History of Ecclesiastical Writers: Containing an Account of the Authors of the Several Books of the Old and New Testament, of the Lives and Writings of the Primitive Fathers, an Abridgement and Catalogue of their Works ... also a Compendious History of the Councils, with Chronological Tables of the Whole*, vol. 1, [ii-iii]. London: Printed for Abel Swalle and Tim. Thilbe, 1693.

Secondary Works

Bergin, Joseph. *Crown, Church and Episcopate under Louis XIV*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2004.

Bertie, David. M. "Robert Calder." in *Scottish Episcopal Clergy 1689-2000*, 19. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, LTD, 2000.

Blewett, Peter F. "The Gallicanism of L.E. Du Pin," Ph.D. Dissertation, Boston College, 1969.

Bousma, W. J. "Gallicanism and the Nature of Christendom," in *A Usable Past, Essays in European Cultural History*, 308-320. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1990.

Boyer, Richard E. *English Declarations of Indulgence 1687 and 1688*. Mouton: The Hague, 1968.

Brandt, Gerard. *The History of the Reformation and Other Ecclesiastical Transactions In and About the Low-Countries*. London: Printed by T. Wood, for Timothy Childe, 1720.

Broeyer, Fritz. "William II and the Reformed Church of the Netherlands," in *Redefining William III*, eds. Esther Mijers and David Onnekink, 109-124. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2007.

Champion, Justin "'To know the edition': Erudition and Polemic in Eighteenth-Century Clerical Culture." In *The Making of Marsh's Library: Learning, Politics and Religion in Ireland, 1650-1750*, edited by Muriel McCarthy and Ann Simmons, 117-145. Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2004.

Ceyssens, P. Lucien. *Le sort de la bulle Unigenitus*. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992.

Clark, Ruth. *Strangers and Sojourners at Port Royal*. Cambridge: The University Press, 1932.

Claydon, Tony. "Protestantism, Universal Monarchy and Christendom in William's War Propaganda, 1689-1697," in *Redefining William III*, eds. Esther Mijers and David Onnekink, 125-142. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2007.

_____. *William III and the Godly Revolution*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

- Conroy, Julie. "A *Preservative against Popery* (1738): The Use of Late Seventeenth Century Polemical Works to Discourage Conversions from the Church of England," Ph.D. Dissertation, The Catholic University of America, 2008.
- Conway, Steven. "Christians, Catholics, Protestants: The Religious Links of Britain and Ireland with Continental Europe." *The English Historical Review* 124, no. 509 (2009): 833-862.
- Corish, Patrick J. *The Irish Catholic Experience*. Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, Inc., 1985.
- Corp, Edward. *A Court in Exile: The Stuarts in France, 1689-1718*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- _____. *The Jacobites at Urbino: An Exile Court in Transition*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2009.
- Cragg, Gerald R. *The Church and the Age of Reason 1648-1789*. Baltimore: Penguin Books, Ltd., 1960.
- Darnton, Robert. *The Literary Underground of the Old Regime*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1982.
- _____. *Poetry and the Police: Communication Networks in Eighteenth-Century Paris*. Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1982.
- Delumeau, Jean. *Le Catholicisme entre Luther et Voltaire*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1971.
- Doyle, William. *Jansenism*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 2000.
- Eisenstein, Elizabeth. *The Printing Press as an Agent of Change*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1979.
- _____. *The Printing Revolution in Early Modern Europe*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Goldie, Mark and Clare Jackson. "Williamite Tyranny and the Whig Jacobites," in *Redefining William III*, eds. Esther Mijers and David Onnekink, 177-200. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2007.
- Goubert, Pierre. *The Ancien Régime: French Society 1600-1750* tr. by Steve Cox. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1973.

- Green, David. *Queen Anne*. New York: Scribner Publishing, 1970.
- Grendler, Paul. "Church Censorship of Science in the Sixteenth Century," *Catholic Historical Review* 97 (2001): 76-80.
- Grès-Gayer, Jacques M. *D'un jansenisme à l'autre: Chroniques de Sorbonne 1696-1713*. Paris: Nolin, 2007.
- _____. "Le Gallicanism de Louis Ellis Du Pin (1657-1719)," *LIAS* 18 (1991): 37-82.
- _____. "Louis Ellis Du Pin," *New Catholic Encyclopedia* vol. 4, 944. Washington, DC: Gale, 2002.
- _____. "The Magisterium of the Faculty of Theology of Paris in the Seventeenth Century," *Theological Studies* 53 (1992): 424-450.
- _____. *Paris-Cantorbéry, 1717-1720: Le dossier d'un premier oecuménisme*. Paris: Beauchesne, 1989.
- _____. "Le projet pour unir le parti des Jansenistes opposants as l'Église anglicane," vol. 3. PhD dissertation, Université de Paris, 1981.
- _____. "Un théologien gallican et l'Écriture Sainte. Le 'Projet biblique' de Louis Ellies Du Pin (1657-1719)," in *Le Grand Siècle et la Bible*, edited by J. R. Armogathe, 255-275. Paris: Beauchesne, 1989.
- _____. "Un théologien gallican, témoin de son temps: Louis Ellies Du Pin (1657-1719)," *Revue d'Histoire de l'Église de France* 72 (1986): 67-121.
- _____. "The Unigenitus of Clement XI: A Fresh Look at the Issues," *Theological Studies* 49 (1988): 259-282.
- Hemphill, Basil. *The Early Vicars Apostolic of England 1685-1750*. London: Burns and Oates, 1954.
- Hsia, R. Po-Chia. *The World of Catholic Renewal 1540-1770*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Hutton, Sarah. "Science, Philosophy, and Atheism: Edward Stillingfleet's Defence of Religion," in *Scepticism and Irreligion in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries*, edited by Richard H. Popkin and Arjo Vanderjagt, 102-120. New York: E.J. Brill, 1993.

- Jarrett, Derek. *Britain: 1688-1815*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1965.
- Judge, H. G. "Louis XIV and the Church," in *Louis XIV and the Craft of Kingship*, edited by John C. Rule, 240-264. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1970.
- Julia, Dominique. "Reading and the Counter-Reformation," in *A History of Reading and the West*, ed. by Giglielmo Cavallo and Roger Chartier, 238-268. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press, 1999.
- Kidd, Colin. *Subverting Scotland's Past: Scottish Whig Historians and the Creation of an Anglo-British Identity 1689-1830*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Langford, H. W. "The Non-Jurors and the Eastern Orthodox: A Paper Read to the Fellowship of St Alban and St Sergius Conference at Durham 26 June 1965," *The Fellowship of St. Alban and St. Sergius*, 2001.
- Lee, Grace Lawless. *The Huguenot Settlements in Ireland*. Westminster, MD: Heritage Books Inc, 2009.
- Marshall, Dorothy. *Eighteenth Century England*. New York: David McKay Co. Inc., 1962.
- McManners, John. *Church and Society in Eighteenth Century France* 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998.
- Miller, James. *James II: A Study in Kingship*. Hove, East Sussex: Wayland Publishing Limited, 1977.
- Milton, Anthony. *Catholic and Reformed*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Minnich, Nelson H. "Councils of the Catholic Reformation: A Historical Survey," in *The Church, the Councils, and Reform*, edited by Gerald Christianson, Thomas M. Izbicki, and Christopher M. Bellitto, 27-59. Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 2008.
- _____. "The Fifth Lateran Council and Preventive Censorship of Printed Books," *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa* 5 (2010): 67-104.
- Mousnier, Roland. *Les institutions de la France sous la monarchie absolue*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1974.
- Neveu, Bruno. *Erudition et religion*. Paris: Albin Michel, 1994.

- Ogg, David. *Europe in the Seventeenth Century*. New York: McMillan Co., 1946.
- O'Malley, John, ed. *Catholicism in Early Modern History: A Guide to Research*. St. Louis, MO: Center for Reformation Research, 1988.
- Orcibal, J. "Louis XIV and the Edict of Nantes," in *Louis XIV and Absolutism*, edited by Ragnhild Hatton, 154-176. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University Press, 1976.
- Perry, Elisabeth Israels. *From Theology to History: French Religious Controversy and the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1973.
- Quantin, Jean Louis. "Anglican Scholarship Gone Mad? Henry Dodwell (1641-1711) and Christian Antiquity," in *History of Scholarship: A Selection of Papers from the Seminar on the History of Scholarship Held Annually at the Warburg Institute*, edited by C.R. Lita and J.L. Quantin, 305-356. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- _____. *The Church of England and Christian Antiquity*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Quinton, Anthony. *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine*. 79 (July 1986): 384.
- Rupp, Gordon. *Religion in England: 1688-1791*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986.
- Sedgwick, Alexander. *Jansenism in Seventeenth-Century France*. Charlottesville, VA: University Press of Virginia, 1977.
- Speck, William A. "William II and the Three Kingdoms," in *Redefining William III*, edited by Esther Mijers and David Onnekink, 39-52. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2007.
- Spurr, John. "'A Special Kindness for Dead Bishops': the Church, History, and Testimony in Seventeenth Century Protestantism." *The Catholic Historical Review* 92.2 (2006): 313-334.
- Stephen, Jeffrey. *Scottish Presbyterians and the Act of Union 1707*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2007.
- Sykes, Norman. *Old Priest and New Presbyterian*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1956.
- _____. *William Wake* 2 vols. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Tanner, Norman P. ed. *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*. Washington DC: Sheed and Ward and Georgetown University Press, 1990.

Thompson, J.W. & B. J. Holm. *A History of Critical Writing*. New York: Macmillan and Co., 1942.

Troost, Wout. "Ireland's Role in the Foreign Policy of William III," in *Redefining William III*, edited by Esther Mijers and David Onnekink, 53-68. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2007.

Turner, F. C. *James II*. London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1948.

Wolf, John B. *Louis XIV*. New York: W.W. Norton and Co., 1968.

Woolf, Daniel R. *Reading History in Early Modern England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Bibliographies, Catalogs, and Dictionaries

Ballard, Thomas. *Bibliotheca Salmoneana, Pars Prima. Or, a Catalogue of Part of the Library of the Learned William Salmon, M.D. Deceas'd.* London: T. Ballard, 1713.

Barnard, Toby. "Francis Hutchinson," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* vol. 29, 10. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

_____. "Patrick Delaney," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* vol. 15, pp. 713-714. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

_____. "Henry Maule," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* vol. 37, pp. 430. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Bateman, Christopher. *A Catalogue of Scarce and Valuable books, Being the Entire Stock of Mr. J. Woodman, Deceas'd; and D. Lyon, Who Leaves off Business.* London: C. Bateman, 1730.

Bruce, Charles, Earl of Ailesbury. *A Catalogue of the Books of the Right Honourable Charles Viscount Bruce of Ampthill (Son and Heir Apparent of Thomas Earl of Ailesbury) and Baron Bruce of Whorleton, in his Library at Totenham In the County of Wiltes.* Oxford: Printed at the Theater, 1733.

Carlyle, E. I. rev. Philip Carter. "James Stopford," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* vol. 52, 934. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Catalogus Librorum Archibald Campbell, Duke of Argyll. Glasgae: In Aedibus Academicis Excudebat Andreas Foulis, Academiae Typographus, 1758.

Catalogus Librorum in Omnibus Facultatibus & Linguis Præstantissimorum: Historia London: Nicolas Prevost and Company, 1732.

Connolly, S. J.. "William King," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* vol. 31, 681-686. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Cooper, Thompson, rev. R.G. Ingram. "Charles Cobbe," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* vol. 12, 270. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Cornwall, Robert. "Thomas Brett," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* vol. 7, 503-504. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Cowie, Leonard W. "Thomas Bray," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* vol. 7, 408-412. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

- Dr. Williams's Library. *Bibliothecae Quam Vir Doctus, & Admodum Reverendus, Daniel Williams, S.T.P. Bono Publico Legavit, Catalogus*. Londini: Typis Jacobi Bettenham, 1727.
- Fagan, Patrick. "Cornelius Nary," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* vol. 40, 210-211. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Faculty of Advocates. *A Catalogue of the Library of the Faculty of Advocates, Edinburgh*. Edinburgh: Printed by Thomas, Walter, and Thomas Ruddiman, 1742.
- Goodwin, Gordon. "Joseph Morgan." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, vol. 39, 132-133. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Gordon, Alexander. rev. Patrick McNally. "Timothy Godwin." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* vol. 22, 619. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Gregg, Edward. "James Francis Edward," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* vol. 29, 673-678. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Groenewegen, J. and A. vander Hoeck. *Catalogus Insignium & Omnis Generis Studii Librorum. Being a Catalogue of Choice, Valuable, and Very Scarce Books: Folio*. London, 1724.
- Halkett, Samuel and John Laing, *Dictionary of Anonymous and Pseudonymous Literature* vol. 1. New York: Haskell House Publishers, Ltd., 1971.
- Handley, Stuart. "Joseph Bingham," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* vol. 5, 759-760. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- _____. "William Fleetwood," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* vol. 20, 30-31. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Henderson, T.F and rev. by Harman Murtagh. "Gustavus Hamilton," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* vol. 24, 809-810. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- _____. and rev. by P.J. C. Elliott-Wright. "Pierce Butler," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* vol. 9, 191-192. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Innys, William. *Catalogus Librorum Domi forisque Impressorum: Quibus Bibliopolium Suum Nuperrime Adauxit Gulielmus Innys*. Londini: Veneunt apud dictum Guil. Innys ad Insignia Principis in Coemeterio D. Pauli, 1717.
- Johnston, Warren. "Edward Gee," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* vol. 21, 713-714. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

- Legg, Marie-Louise. "Edward Synge," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* vol. 53, 613-615. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Lehmberg, Stanford. "Edmund Elys," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* vol. 18, 384-385. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Loeber, Rolf. "Thomas Burgh," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* vol. 8, 788-789. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Meyer, W. R. "Thomas Sheridan," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* vol. 50, 305-306. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Minton, Gretchen E. "William Cave," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* vol. 10, 604-605. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Murdoch, Alexander. "Archibald Campbell," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* vol. 9, 726-733. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Sher, Richard B. "Robert Millar," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* vol. 38, 192-193. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Stoker, David. "William Wotton," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* vol. 60, 386-387. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Tait, James, rev. Campbell F. Lloyd. "William Jameson," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* vol. 29, 765-766. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Till, Barry. "Edward Stillingfleet," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* vol. 52, 789-798. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Trinity College (Dublin, Ireland) Library. *Catalogus Librorum in Bibliotheca Collegii Sanctæ et Individuæ Trinitatis Reginae Elizabethæ juxta Dublin*. Dublinii: Typis et Impensis Johannis Hyde, 1715.
- Vallance, Edward. "Edward Sclater," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* vol. 49, 306-307. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Vandenhoeck, Abraham. *Bibliopolium Vandenhoeckianum: or, a Catalogue of Books in most Faculties and Languages: Quarto*. London: s.n., 1730.
- University of Glasgow. *Library Catalogus Impressorum Librorum in Bibliotheca Universitatis Glasguensis*. Glasguæ: In Aedibus Academicis Excudebat Andreas Foulis, Academiae Typographus, 1791.