

orientation, a goal in life. Reality is thoroughly fragmented. The cultural climate is becoming favourable again for so-called leader figures who seem to know where they are heading. So as to find a way to a common future, it seems to me that it is better and even more logical to go back to the biblical sources in a creative way, in order to meet the non-violent God that I have argued can be found there. This will entail a complete revision of creation theology, soteriology and ecclesiology, and, more than all this, a new way of living with creation, of making people free and of founding communities.

We cannot return to the repressive type of society of the past. Neither can we live forever in an empty space without boundaries. It seems to me that we can only hope in the revelation of the non-violent God who was in Jesus, and hope that there may happen to us that change of understanding which happened to St Paul in the no-man's land between Jerusalem and Damascus.

## Lefebvrism—Jansenism revisited?

Anthony Fisher OP

### I: Context and theory

#### *1. Similarities of background*

Jansenism and Lefebvrism arose in profoundly different worlds. Yet there are striking similarities between them in beliefs and practices—common tendencies, attitudes and assumptions.

Important similarities in the circumstances of their origins and development help to explain these. Not, of course, that the same weight can be given to all these similarities.

For example, both movements have been led by people with *charismatic personalities*. Central to the development of Jansenism was a series of individuals with powerful personalities such as Saint-Cyran, the Arnaulds, Nichole and Pascal. Their biographies are well recorded—all too well, for the Jansenists loved writing hagiographies of each other—and need not be retold here. Suffice it to say that 'the personal factor' was pre-eminent in the direction of the coterie<sup>1</sup>.

Though vacillating and, by his own admission, inclined toward

inordinate indignation<sup>2</sup>, the personality and strong personal authority of Marcel Lefebvre, leader of the so-called 'Tridentine movement', has been central throughout the events linked with his name: his leadership at the Second Vatican Council of the conservative faction known as the *Coetus Internationalis Patrum* and his attack there against collegiality, against the declarations on religious liberty and against relations with non-Christians<sup>3</sup>; his founding after the Council of the diocesan society 'The Priestly Fraternity of S. Pius X' in Fribourg; his setting-up of the seminary boasting preconciliar discipline, training and rites which was soon moved to Ecône; his illicit celebration of 'Tridentine' Masses and ordination of deacons, priests and finally bishops<sup>4</sup>.

Arguably any successful movements of the sort we are considering need charismatic leadership, but there are other similarities which cannot be explained away in that way. Both Jansenism and Lefebvristism appealed to and consciously recruited *young people*—perhaps seeking identity, certainty and strong authority-figures at a time of disorientation in, and alienation from, a rapidly-changing church and society—as well as a wider group of older people despairing about the state of the Church. Both Jansenism and Lefebvristism arose at (and responded to) times of *religious indifferentism, disillusionment and confusion*, manifesting themselves in, for example, declining vocations and religious practice. And while the members of these groups were far more diverse than appeared on the surface, what united them was *malcontent and pessimism* about church and society rather than positive doctrine or policy<sup>5</sup>.

The Lefebvrist group parallels many other indicators of a *conservative swing in the Catholic Church* (as in many other churches) today, such as: the proliferation of conservative popular movements and publications<sup>6</sup>; a more 'robust' Church discipline in such matters as doctrinal fidelity of theologians, censorship, appointments to sees, annulments of marriages and 'laicisations' of priests; the popularity of stricter religious orders; and the enormous personal popularity of Pope John Paul II. Likewise Jansenism arose in a period of magisterial suspicion of intellectual novelties<sup>7</sup> and of strong reaction to moral laxism, marked by renewal movements such as the Sacred Heart Devotion and Quietism, popular spiritual writers and new religious orders. In turn the two factions also reflected *conservative socio-economic milieux*.

Although both movements soon extended beyond the frontiers of France, they were both *French* not only in origin and spirit but in the sources of their greatest support<sup>8</sup>. What is most obviously shared in common by the Jansenist centre of Port-Royal de Paris and the Lefebvrist squatter-church of S. Nicholas du Chardonnet in Paris<sup>9</sup>. The Ecône seminary was established in Switzerland because of the opposition of the French bishops, but remains very much a French seminary in exile.

The two movements occurred after and essentially as reactions to

*ecumenical councils*. The Jansenists openly denied the Council of Trent's 'lax' doctrine of attrition (that a penitent might be absolved for sorrow for sins conceived even from such 'base' motives as fear of hell) and encouragement of communion. Influenced by them, the French Church resisted the registration and application of Trent's decrees until well into the 17th century, and the Jansenists continued to complain that the Council had been too 'humanistic' and scholastic, and not Augustinian enough.

Similarly Lefebvrists have repudiated Vatican II as modernist, secular, humanist, Protestant, Masonic and corrupted by the 'Trojan horses' of collegiality, religious freedom and ecumenism<sup>10</sup>. The Brazilian bishop Antonio de Castro Mayer, who in 1988 co-consecrated with Lefebvre four bishops (the event leading to Lefebvre being declared a schismatic) and who is the spiritual father of the extreme right-wing 'Tradition, Family and Property' Movement, has branded as heretic the church that follows the Council<sup>11</sup>, while Lefebvre has professed:

We refuse and have always refused to follow the Rome of neo-modernist and neo-Protestant tendencies which clearly manifested themselves in the Second Vatican Council and after the Council in all the reforms which issued from it ... This reform, the fruit of liberalism and modernism, is completely and utterly poisoned; it starts from heresy and ends with heresy ... For our salvation, the sole attitude of fidelity to the Church and Catholic doctrine is the categorical refusal of acceptance of the reform ...<sup>12</sup>

The reaction of the Holy See to both the movements, Jansenism and Lefebvristism, was conciliatory in the extreme. Despite condemnations of some propositions 'from' the *Augustinus* in 1643, 1653, 1656 and 1664, Rome did little to suppress the group or remove its adherents from positions of importance, offering the *Pax Clementina* rather than allow the French episcopate to be split into warring factions. Rome's delays and relative tolerance were probably also due to the influence of the Roman Dominicans, still engaged in a 'cold war' with the Jesuits over *de Auxiliis* (their doctrines on grace and free will). It was not until the next century that strong action was taken by the popes against the movement.

Even greater efforts were made to ensure the continued communion of Lefebvre's fraternity with the Church, reflecting perhaps Roman sympathy for many of their positions but also the new ecumenical consciousness that schisms can be caused by harsh reactions. Paul VI, who described Lefebvre as 'for 13 years the greatest cross of my pontificate'<sup>13</sup>, none the less tried by apostolic visitors, letters and a personal meeting to reconcile the wayward bishop. Even after a decade of illicit ordinations and other Lefebvrist irregularities, Rome continued to negotiate (though some suggest only half-heartedly). Following another apostolic visitation of the Fraternity, by Cardinal Gagnon, John Paul II directed that 'everything possible should be done' to

accommodate Lefebvre's group, and, although Lefebvre repudiated on the very next day the Protocol which he and Cardinal Ratzinger signed and made new and even greater demands, the Holy See nevertheless continued to negotiate; even after the schism the Pope fulfilled many of his undertakings in the Protocol<sup>14</sup>.

## 2. *The rigorist mentality*

Jansenism is remembered most of all for its rigorist mentality. At the heart of the Jansenist position was a profound pessimism about the world and the power of the human will to resist evil, leading to propositions like 'L'impuissance d'accomplir les Commandements se trouve mesme aux Justes'<sup>15</sup>. Their 'bible', Cornelius Jansen's *Augustinus* (1640), held the neo-Calvinist position that, as a result of the fall, human beings are irremediably corrupt and only a few can be saved, and these only by irresistible grace. Thus they opposed the 'humanism' of the Council of Trent; the then-fashionable devotions to the Blessed Sacrament, Christ's humanity, and Mary; 'easy' absolution and frequent communion ('spiritual luxury, even blasphemy'); the 'laxist' moral theology of the Jesuits<sup>16</sup> and the confessional handbooks; and activities such as dancing and theatre. They prided themselves on course habits, all-night vigils, use of the discipline, abstinence from the sacraments, and other mortifications. They developed a 'gloomy and tragic outlook on Christian life', 'a deep sense of sin' and a 'fierce spirituality of atonement by suffering'<sup>17</sup>.

The rhetoric and apparent orientation of the Lefebvrists is often very similar. They proclaim their rigorism, enforce strict pre-conciliar disciplines on their seminarians and priests, and bemoan the corrupt humanism and laxism of post-conciliar life. In a typical *fervorino* Lefebvre declared:

We should know how to do without television and break with the desires of the flesh, the lusts of the eyes, the pride of life and honours. We must know how to do penances, abstaining from all that is too much of this world, all that panders to the flesh and indecent dress. All such things should be wholly forbidden to true Christians or we shall be bereft of God's grace, the grace needful now to our salvation. We should go from one disaster to another.<sup>18</sup>

Celibacy, even virginity, is presented by Lefebvre as *essential* to priesthood, because of the exalted power of the priest ('he is able to make God obey his words!')<sup>19</sup>. One reporter found the Lefebvrist bishop, Richard Williamson,

scathing about the emphasis placed on God's compassion by those he calls modernist Catholics—or, in one of his more colourful excesses, 'Roman Protestants'. Such people, he says, have no recognition that His compassion must be earned, that it is not given unconditionally.<sup>20</sup>

Thus in continuity with several other strands in Christian history, these two groups responded to pessimism about human nature, the Church and the world by embracing a severe moral and disciplinary regime which (for all the Jansenists' talk about grace) was intended to mark out the true believers and help ensure their salvation. Further study of the psychology of repression and the sociology of cults of 'the persecuted elect' may yield a deeper understanding of both these movements.

### 3. *Tradition and traditionalism*

The authority of tradition (as drawn from and eventually equated with St Augustine) was a central doctrine of Jansenism. Essentially antiquarians, the Jansenists were opposed to philosophical reasoning ('the mother of all heresies') in theology, indeed to all methods of theology apart from the true one of 'memory' or study of tradition<sup>21</sup>. Arnauld insisted that one has to interpret even the definitions of the Council of Trent and the popes by Augustine<sup>22</sup>. St-Cyran campaigned for a return to the discipline of the primitive Church<sup>23</sup>. And soon enough their *ecclesiola* began to identify itself with the 'invisible Church', the 'true Church', the remnant after the Great Apostasy, martyrs for the traditional faith against a decadent church<sup>24</sup>. For all the talk about grace, the possibility of authentic development of doctrine and practice under the guidance of the Holy Spirit did not seem to enter the Jansenist equation.

Lefebvre's motto has been 'Nihil innovetur nisi quod traditum est' and his war-cry 'Fight for the *maintenance of Tradition*, and fight fearlessly'<sup>25</sup>. He insists that his break-away was necessary in order to 'remain in the Traditional doctrine and discipline of the Church' at a time when 'the Rome of today (is) infested by modernism'. In 1976 he declared in the Lille sports stadium: 'We are not in schism; we are the continuers of the Catholic Church; it is those who introduce innovations who have gone into schism; we are carrying on the Tradition.'<sup>26</sup>

Paul VI and John Paul II identified a selective and contradictory notion of tradition at the heart of the Lefebvrist ideology. Like Jansenism, it canonises a particular period of the Church's tradition—here the century preceding Vatican II—as the litmus test for the authenticity of later teaching. It fails to take into account the ability of tradition to accommodate authentic organic development. For Lefebvre, being true to the Tradition—always with a capital T—requires being ahistorical, being bound by a mummified magisterium, to be interpreted with the same fundamentalism with which some have used the Scriptures and the Jansenists used Augustine, and symbolised by a mummified liturgy and discipline.

Thus Lefebvre makes a host of historically and doctrinally untenable claims: the Mass of Pius V is the traditional Mass of the last twenty centuries and Pius V changed nothing but simply codified what was from the time of the apostles<sup>27</sup>; clerical celibacy, indeed virginity, has

been the practice of the Church since apostolic times, with married clergy barely tolerated even in the Eastern church<sup>28</sup>; concelebration goes counter to the very purpose of the Mass and communion in the hand 'constitutes contempt for the presence of Our Lord, which is sacrilege'<sup>29</sup>; the divine office should be priests-only prayer<sup>30</sup>; general absolutions are not sacramental<sup>31</sup>; anointing of the sick is properly only Extreme Unction for the dying<sup>32</sup>; charismatic revival is the work of the devil<sup>33</sup>; and so on.

Lefebvre also implies, but never states outright, that *Novus Ordo* Masses are invalid—he calls them 'Protestant' or 'Lutheran' Masses—and decries the ill-effects of the new rite on priests and seminarians: 'now that it has been profaned it no longer gives or channels grace' and 'until the true Sacrifice of the Mass is re-established in all its divine reality there will be no more seminaries and no more seminarians'<sup>34</sup>. Lefebvrist also criticise the view that 'the sacrifice on Calvary took place once and forever' and is unrepeatable—the clear teaching of the Letter to the Hebrews and the Council of Trent—asserting that it is repeated at each Mass<sup>35</sup>.

Thus the official Church is said to have abandoned 'Tradition', presumably for heresy: 'among the highest circles in Rome there are now people who have lost the faith'. The Lefebvrist are the remnant of the 'true Church', with a divine mission in the face of the unleashing of the devil against the Church, and they must guarantee their continuity by consecrating bishops<sup>36</sup>.

#### 4. Attitudes to Rome

The question of Roman authority—long disputed in France, especially in the Conciliarist and Gallican controversies—was also an issue for the Jansenists and their opponents. In general there was ambiguity and vacillation early on, with protestations of loyalty beside constant cavilling and revolt, but by the 18th century an unambiguous anti-Roman sentiment came in response to Roman opposition and in the hope of winning supporters.

Lefebvre has repeatedly promised fidelity to the pope and made almost ultramontane claims regarding papal authority, including the determining of liturgical rites<sup>38</sup>. But in the face of Roman opposition he started in 1972 to preach rebellion from papal directives. 'To the extent to which he does not cling to Tradition, we are not bound by the acts of the Holy Father'<sup>39</sup>. His position on papal power has varied, and he and his followers have often been ambiguous about whether they were pledging fidelity to a particular pontiff or only to the institution itself in the abstract<sup>40</sup>.

John Paul II has interpreted the Lefebvrist crisis as one of a group abandoning communion with the Successor of Peter and the unity of Christ's flock<sup>41</sup>. Certainly the unlawful episcopal ordinations represented a conscious and public schism from the Roman Church. At that Mass Lefebvre declared that John Paul II had 'adhered to errors, grave errors,

which have led to the ruin of the Church and the destruction of the Catholic priesthood'. And Lefebvre's newly ordained bishop, Richard Williamson, declared that 'the Vatican would be punished by God for what it is doing to the Roman Catholic Church'.

There are, then, significant affinities between Jansenism and Lefebvristism, both in context and doctrine, with similar attitudes to rigour, tradition and Roman authority. How far, though, are there similarities in practice?

## II: Practice

### 1. *The political agenda*

The controversies in which the Jansenist and Lefebvrist movements took part were not only doctrinal or ecclesial; they had important political elements, even if neither group was politically homogeneous. What, if anything, did these have in common?

St-Cyran was involved in political intrigues from very early<sup>42</sup>. At the time of the Fronde many Jansenists supported the king; many of their leaders and supporters were from the leading families<sup>43</sup>; and Arnauld and Pascal remained 'loyalist' throughout<sup>44</sup>. Pascal preached strict law and order and obedience to the state, consistent with the Jansenists' radical pessimism about human choice<sup>45</sup>. But the party had an ambivalent relationship with the French court, sometimes enjoying its protection and sometimes encountering persecution. Only after long suffering the latter did most of the remaining Jansenists come reluctantly to oppose absolute monarchy<sup>46</sup>. Both inside and outside France their doctrines were also a tool for nationalist-political assertions of independence vis-à-vis Rome<sup>47</sup>.

Support for absolute Catholic monarchy against socialism and democracy has been central to the Lefebvre ideology—however little the 'grassroots' membership understands this. Lefebvre believes in 'the providential part played by the authority of the State in helping and upholding citizens in obtaining their salvation' and the consequent need to re-establish 'Christendom' against those wicked French revolutionary (and freemasonic) ideals of *liberté*, *égalité* and *fraternité* which have penetrated Church and society to the ruination of both<sup>48</sup>. In his homily at the episcopal ordinations in 1988, Lefebvre claimed that Vatican II had adopted all the political ideologies condemned by previous popes. Co-consecrating with him was Bishop Meyer<sup>49</sup>. Both readily equate modernism, sillonism, socialism, freemasonry, heresy, and immorality, with 'the most monstrous error of Satan—Communism'<sup>50</sup>. Richard Williamson, who was consecrated by them, isolates as a principal area of division between the Lefebvrists and Rome 'the rights of man, which, while superficially attractive, represent a revolt against God'<sup>51</sup>. Prominent among those present at Williamson's ordination was the

Bourbon claimant to the French throne.

Lefebvristism's political stance must be seen in the context of the French right-wing tradition of *Intégrisme*. From before the turn of the century, this movement claimed to represent 'integral' Catholicism in opposition to minimalising tendencies of their liberal and 'modernist' enemies. Promoting a closed and certain tradition, they offered ardent but selective obedience to Rome when it suited them, were intensely opposed to Christian democracy and other 'modernism', and were notorious intriguers. Umberto Benigni's secret society, the 'Sodality of St Pius V', was small but it was influential: in 1914, for instance, it almost succeeded in having Christian trade unionism condemned<sup>52</sup>.

This French theological movement had its counterparts outside France (such as the Italian *intransegni*) and outside theology, e.g. in the Action Française movement, founded by the atheist Charles Maurras (1868–1952), who saw the Catholic Church as the home of order, tradition and authority, and a necessary part of his programme for the restoration of the Catholic monarchy<sup>53</sup>. This self-appointed Inquisition for denouncing unsound Catholics (e.g. democrats) as Modernists was itself, rather belatedly, condemned by Pius XI, and finally discredited for its role in Vichy France during the Second World War.

Congar has shown Lefebvre's links with Action Française<sup>54</sup>. Prominent among his supporters and funders have been members of Europe's old families who feel betrayed by a democratising Church. Lefebvre has offered as models of the Catholic Church and state Franco's Spain, Salazar's Portugal, Galtieri's Argentina, and Pinochet's Chile<sup>55</sup>. The last hiding place of Paul Touvier, who was quite recently arrested and committed to trial for crimes against humanity, was a Lefebvrist monastery at Nice.

## 2. *Coping with non-Christians*

The Jansenists condemned as Semi-Pelagian the view that 'Christ died for all men.'<sup>56</sup> Convinced as they were that the greater part of even Christian humanity (especially Protestant) was damned, non-Christians were obviously without hope. Pagan belief in God was not even a remote preparation for the Gospel and the Chinese rites were yet another instance of Jesuit laxism. St-Cyran delighted in telling the school-boys of Port-Royal that even Virgil was damned for having written 'immoral verses' and Jansen exclaimed, in a sort of ecstasy, 'not one drop of grace for the pagans!'<sup>57</sup> The Jews, however, were the object of Jansen's particular scorn<sup>58</sup>.

A central objection of the Lefebvrists to Vatican II and the post-conciliar reforms has been in the area of ecumenism and religious liberty. For so long a missionary who worked hard to convert pagans to Christianity, at the Council Lefebvre insisted that 'the *raison d'être* of missions' is that 'the Catholic Church is the sole ark of salvation outside which no man can be saved', and he condemned the conciliar reforms for



discouraging missionaries<sup>59</sup>. Due to the 'grave spiritual condition' of the Africans and the 'train of festering sores in society' brought by 'all religions, save the true, the Catholic religion', there is the threat of eternal damnation overhanging those who refuse to believe<sup>60</sup>.

Thus the Lefebvrists complain that translations of the *Novus Ordo* words of institution smack of 'universal salvation'. When announcing his intended schism in his letter to the Pope of 2 June 1988, Lefebvre claimed it was his baptismal duty to oppose the reforms born of 'the spirit of Vatican II and the spirit of Assisi', because of 'the false ecumenism' which is 'leading the Church to ruin and Catholics to apostasy'<sup>61</sup>. 'The spirit of Assisi' referred to John Paul II's historic 1986 day of prayer for peace with leaders of the world's major religions. Lefebvrists complain that the Pope prayed with people who evoke multiple gods, and ancestral and demonic spirits.

There are also hints of an anti-semitic xenophobia reminiscent of Action Française in the Lefebvrists' rhetoric. Viewing the rapprochement with Judaism at Vatican II with alarm, Lefebvre was involved in various failed manoeuvres to reverse this at the Council<sup>62</sup>. One of the things his party objected to was the Council's repudiation of the notion of collective Jewish guilt for the execution of Jesus, its deprecation of anti-semitism and maltreatment of Jews, and its failure to call the Jews to conversion. Nor has Cardinal Lustiger's self-description as a Jew helped to endear him to the Lefebvrist demonstrators in Paris.

### 3. *Strategies*

The Jansenists were well-known for their use of rhetorical devices. Lefebvre too is skilled in rhetoric, especially in the use of the 'McCarthyist' technique of guilt by association and insinuation. Various thoughts and individuals are paired and thereby identified: moderns and modernists, communists and Protestants, Buddhists and Freemasons, heresy and immorality<sup>63</sup>. Another striking parallel between the Jansenists and Lefebvrists is the tactical use of equivocation, ambiguous formulae, hair-splitting and sophistries.

Jansenism was famed for its convenient distinctions<sup>64</sup> and (rather loud and flexible) 'reverential silence' which so exasperated church and state authorities. De Lubac notes Jansen's tendency to hyperbole, paradox, self-contradiction and skilful corruption of the text of Augustine. Less well known were the secret plans and boyish pass-words, the whispering and vows of secrecy, the intrigues and evasions, which pervaded the party's whole life.<sup>65</sup>

Commentators on Lefebvristism have also noted equivocation, vacillation, marked differences between public and private statements, and a tendency to use various careful 'forms of words which to an extent have obscured the reality' of the movement's repudiation of the Council.<sup>66</sup> Paul VI expressed frustration about the failure of Lefebvre to declare himself clearly.<sup>67</sup> But the most remarkable incident was, of

course, Lefebvre's withdrawal from the Protocol which he signed on 5 May 1988 twenty-four hours after signing it. The justifications for this extraordinary about-face, in so far as any were offered at all, were the notions of 'emergency' and *sede vacante*.

In 1987 Cardinal Lustiger of Paris had pointed out that lack of faculties invalidated the marriages performed and absolutions granted by the renegade priests illegally operating at S. Nicholas du Chardonney. The response of the Lefebvrists was that the Church was in a 'state of emergency' and that faculties were thus automatic. The 'lunatic fringe' of the movement claims that Paul VI was assassinated and replaced by a Marxist look-alike, and that ever since then anti-popes have sat on the Chair of Peter. More 'reasonably', some have argued that the present pope, like Paul VI before him, is in heresy; if in heresy, he automatically ceases to be pope and the See of Rome becomes vacant, *sede apostolica vacante*—a phrase some Lefebvrist priests insert in the canon of the Mass in place of the name of the pope.

While Lefebvre himself has not so far stated the *sede vacantist* position publicly, he is said to have claimed that 'the chair of Peter and the posts of authority in Rome are occupied by antichrists'<sup>68</sup>, and the *sede vacantist* line is apparently taught in the Lefebvrist seminaries. By this convenient argument the Fraternity can claim complete allegiance to the Roman Pontiff and the Magisterium, while refusing obedience to a 'pretend pope' such as John Paul II. Likewise a papal mandate for the episcopal ordinations was not necessary, both because of the state of emergency and because the Roman see is vacant!

### III: Differences and continuity

In addition to the fact that the groups arose in profoundly different worlds, there are, of course, other important differences between them. The Jansenists, for instance, engaged in much more public and academic controversy. Their writings were works of impressive scholarship and have exercised an important influence on Catholic spirituality ever since. They were on the whole more 'enlightened' (for instance, they supported the availability of bibles in the vernacular and their ecclesiology was 'modern'). Also, although a smaller group than the Lefebvrists, they had much more support among the French hierarchy. Furthermore, their banner was doctrinal (the *Augustinus*) rather than liturgical, and their public talk was of grace rather than of corruption of the Tradition. Only after a century did they dwindle to become a more eccentric, marginal and sectarian group.

None the less, the similarities are more striking, and arguably the making of a historical comparison like this should help us to understand Lefebvristism and put it into perspective.

Can we, though, go any further than this? Here no attempt has been

made to establish a genealogical relationship between the two movements. All the same, two intermediary relatives or ‘missing links’ might be noted. The first, already considered, is the *intégriste* movement, especially Action Française. A second link, from the other end, is the surviving Jansenists. While there are informal Jansenist tendencies in many places and individuals in the Church even today, the official remnant is the ‘Schism of Utrecht’<sup>69</sup>. The small sect still survives, especially in Holland, as a result of union with the Old Catholics, and the trespasser curé of the Lefebvrist’s Paris church has suggested that these two groups—the remnant of the Jansenists and the more recently invented Lefebvrist—might join up.

Whether or not these birds of a feather ever flock together, the likeness of their plumage is surely well established?

*I am grateful to the Revd. S. Boland CSSR, who first suggested that I explore this comparison, and to the Revd. P. Stenhouse MSC, whose writing on the political side of Lefebvristism I have found helpful.*

- 1 cf. F.E. Weaver, *The Evolution of the Reform of Port-Royal* (Paris, 1978).
- 2 M. Lefebvre, *A Bishop Speaks*, Edinburgh, n.d. (1976?), p. 205.
- 3 Interventions on 11.10.63, 8.11.63, 24.9.64, 17—19.11.64, 20.9.65, 14.10.65.
- 4 The Congregation of Bishops suspended him *a divinis* on 24.7.76, and excommunicated him on 1.7.88.
- 5 cf. J. Delumeau, *Le catholicisme entre Luther et Voltaire* (Paris, 1971; ET London, 1977), p. 124; G. Namer, *L’abbé Leroy et ses amis: Essai sur le Jansénisme extrémiste intramondain* (Paris, 1964).
- 6 See D. Menozzi, ‘Rejections of the Council 1966—84’, in G. Alberigo et al. (eds.), *The Reception of Vatican II* (Catholic University of America, 1987), pp. 325—348.
- 7 cf. Delumeau, pp. 126—8.
- 8 cf. O. Chadwick, *The Popes and European Revolution* (Oxford, 1981), p. 392; J.O. Mills OP, ‘Quelle tradition?’ (editorial), *New Blackfriars*, July–August 1988, p. 306; P. Nichols, *The Pope’s Divisions: The Roman Catholic Church Today* (London, 1981), pp. 26—28.
- 9 Delumeau, p. 124, calls Paris Jansenism’s ‘influxive centre’.
- 10 Corresponding to the French Revolution’s ‘Satanic’ ideas of *liberté, égalité* and *fraternité*; cf. Lefebvre, pp. 16, 31—2, 45, 48, 54, 82, 135—6, 182, 202.
- 11 *Si si no no*, 10.12.84.
- 12 Lefebvre, pp. 189—90.
- 13 To Jean Guittou 8.9.76, quoted in P. Hebblethwaite, ‘Road to Schism’, *The Tablet*, 3.9.88, p. 1008.
- 14 Establishing a Commission to seek reconciliation with followers of Lefebvre, allowing a wider use of the ‘Tridentine rite’, and allowing for a society of priests and religious following the old discipline: *L’Osservatore Romano* (Eng. ed.), 27.6.88.
- 15 *Augustinus*, vol. III, 3, ch. 13 (condemned in *Cum occasione*, 1653).
- 16 Especially of Luis de Molina.
- 17 Chadwick, pp. 23, 47; H. Daniel-Rops, *L’Eglise des Temps Classiques: Le Grand Siècle des Ames* (Paris, 1963; ET London, 1963), p. 342. Also see R.A. Knox, in his polemical but often quite insightful *Enthusiasm* (Oxford, 1950), pp. 212—3, also pp. 202; 215—7.
- 18 Lefebvre, p. 139.
- 19 *ibid.* pp. 90—1, 112—3, 126—7, 156, 216.
- 20 N. Brown, ‘Ruled by a hard God’, *The Bulletin* (Sydney), 21.2.89, 108—9.
- 21 e.g. Jansen, *Augustinus*, vol. II, Proemium; Jansen to St-Cyran 5.3.1621 (de Lubac, p. 68); Arnauld, *Frequente Communion*.

- 22 Arnauld, *Apologie pour M. Jansenius*.
- 23 According to the *Memoire* of Sébastien Zamet, Bishop of Langres, Mère Angélique 'spoke of nothing but the primitive church'.
- 24 cf. Weaver, chs VI & VII, and sources therein.
- 25 Lefebvre, pp. 203, 230.
- 26 Cited in Yves Congar OP, *Challenge to the Church, the Case of Archbishop Lefebvre* (London, 1977), and his similar 1978 article, 'Archbishop Lefebvre, Champion of "Tradition"? Some necessary clarifications'; likewise at *Ecône* 30.6.88.
- 27 Lefebvre, p. 139.
- 28 *ibid.* pp. 90—91, 112—3, 126—7.
- 29 *ibid.* pp. 111, 114.
- 30 *ibid.* p. 115.
- 31 *ibid.* p. 103.
- 32 *ibid.* p. 109.
- 33 *ibid.* p. 184.
- 34 *ibid.* pp. 96, 108—11, 114, 137, 192—204.
- 35 *ibid.* pp. 176, 215; cf. Congar; Williamson in the *Melbourne Age* 4.7.88.
- 36 *ibid.* pp. 136, 138, 143, 203.
- 37 cf. David Hudson, 'The nouvelles ecclésiastiques, Jansenism and conciliarism, 1717—1735', *Catholic Historical Review*, 70 (1984), 389—406.
- 38 Lefebvre, pp. 21—27, 37, 39, 46, 53, 69—70, 207. He also declared that 'where there is any contradiction between the faith of our bishop and that of Peter, there can be no hesitation, we must keep that of Peter, (p. 83) and told the Abbé de Nantes (another ultraconservative and a *sede vacantis*): 'Be assured that if any bishop breaks with Rome, it will not be I' (pp. 191, 208).
- 39 *ibid.* p. 116; cf. pp. 225, 229.
- 40 Congar; *L'Osservatore Romano* (Eng. ed.), 27.6.88.
- 41 *L'Osservatore Romano* (Eng. ed.), 27.6.88.
- 42 Delumeau, p. 116.
- 43 The Arnaulds were a very 'well-connected' dynasty. The Jansenists sought 'influence'. They drew their membership from well-respected upper middle-class or aristocratic families, and in their schools they only educated the same. Their wide penumbra of semi-adherents included 'fashionable ladies', parliamentarians, writers and clerics.
- 44 cf. C. Gazier, *Histoire du Monastère de Port-Royal* (Paris, 1929).
- 45 e.g. 'not being able to fortify justice, force has been justified' and 'force is queen of the world', *Pensées*, 299 and 303.
- 46 cf. R. Taveneaux, *Le Jansénisme et politique* (Paris, 1965).
- 47 One way of reading the Jansenist crisis is as a 'Gallican drama': cf. Chadwick, pp. 279—84; Daniel-Rops, pp. 406—25; J.M. Gres-Gayer, 'The Unigenitus of Clement XI: a fresh look at the issues', *Theological Studies* 49 (1988), p. 259—82, esp. pp. 278—9.
- 48 e.g. Lefebvre, pp. 54, 63, 70, 77, 181, 202.
- 49 The movement 'Tradition, Family and Property', of which he is ecclesial patron, is an extreme anti-socialist organisation which also deplores the concepts of *liberté, égalité, fraternité*, and Christian participation in left-wing politics. Founded in Brazil, it now has cells and has advertised its views widely elsewhere.
- 50 Lefebvre, pp. 4, 44, 48, 66, 228.
- 51 *Melbourne Age* 4.7.88.
- 52 Roger Aubert (ed.), *The Church in a Secularised Society* (London, 1978), pp. 200—3; E. Poulat, 'Intégrisme et national-catholicisme', *Esprit*, November 1959; F.J. van Beeck SJ, 'Integralism', *God Encountered: A Contemporary Catholic Systematic Theology* (London, 1989), pp. 57—62.
- 53 cf. L. Ward, *The Condemnation of the 'Action Française'* (London 1928).
- 54 *op. cit.*
- 55 Lefebvre, p. 101. J. Chalet, *Monseigneur Lefebvre* (Paris, 1976), pp. 205—6; Congar, *Challenge*, pp. 46—7; 'Lefebvre', p. 99.
- 56 Delumeau, pp. 104—5.
- 57 Henri de Lubac SJ, *Augustinianism and Modern Theology* (London, 1969), p. 37.
- 58 cf. *Augustinus*, vol. III, chs. 5—8; de Lubac, p. 92.

- 59 Lefebvre, pp. 100, 106—7, 152—3, 166.  
 60 *ibid.* pp. 33, 62, 78, 129.  
 61 *L'Osservatore Romano* (Eng. ed.), 27.6.88.  
 62 Felici's attempt to have liberal sections of *Nostra aetate* on the Jews redrafted by a commission including Lefebvre was overruled by Paul VI; later Lefebvre broke Council rules by circulating a letter calling on the Fathers to reject the declaration.  
 63 Lefebvre, pp. 4, 36, 44, 66, 71, 82, 95, 181, 203.  
 64 For example, that between *fait* and *droit* proposed by Arnauld in *Lettres à un Duc et Pair*.  
 65 de Lubac, pp. 37, 44; H. Daniel-Rops, pp. 343—4, 423.  
 66 e.g. Menozzi, *The Tablet* 25.6.88, p. 715.  
 67 cf. Congar, *Challenge*, 79—80; Hebblethwaite, p. 1009.  
 68 In a letter of 20.8.87 attributed to him.  
 69 *The Chapter of Utrecht completed the schism by electing as the new Archbishop the Jansenist Cornelius Steenoven without mandate from Rome.*

## The Word

James McGonigal

In a valley stumbled on  
 between fells, hayfields  
 groomed for autumn turning  
 lay flat out in the sun.

We stopped by the wall of a kirk  
 like a barn. Raspberry shoots  
 swung bright wild beads  
 at purse-lipped gravestones set to mark

the single word that passers-by  
 carry away: Edmond, or Dobbie,  
 Ashiestiel Farm or 1891,  
 one word we recognise

of all the pain and sorrow penned  
 to overwinter in this place, or joy  
 here stabled year by year.  
 Now in this valley's shimmering fen

it seems a steadfast island—holy once—  
 where travellers came to rest,  
 their shallow draughted vessels  
 at long last scraping stones.