

6

Manuals and hagiography: mirrors of French ideals?

Didactic literature for bishops was hardly a new phenomenon in the seventeenth century; indeed its pedigree extends all the way back to the early church. Nor was it an exclusively French tradition. During the late sixteenth century numerous efforts were made outside France to produce texts which would be sources of both spiritual nourishment and practical administrative guidance for prelates.¹ Within France itself, however, no work of this kind was produced during that period, probably because the civil wars discouraged it in favour of straightforwardly robust polemics. To compensate, Latin and vernacular editions of non-French episcopal literature were published to serve the needs of the French episcopate, a practice continued in the following century, with French editions of Possevin's discourse on Borromeo, Giussano's history of Borromeo and an abridged life of the archbishop of Milan based on existing literature.² Then, as the French church recovered in the first decades of the seventeenth century, French writers began to compose works of their own, specifically designed to serve their bishops. This was a feature of a wider development within the reform movement, whereby other clerical groups, like *curés*, were offered detailed written advice on the nature and functions of their office.³

The preceding chapters have used evidence from many of the treatises and other works, composed in France through the seventeenth century, which dealt with the duties and responsibilities incumbent upon bishops: works which were designed, therefore, and written by both prelates and non-episcopal clergy, to function as guidebooks for bishops. However, the abundance of texts means that they repay closer exploration on several fronts, for they teach much about the germination and dissemination of episcopal ideals. First, how did their detailed construction of episcopacy compare with those described in the previous chapters? The answer to this question is as relevant for the pastoral angle of episcopacy as it is for the jurisdictional and theological, and is directly related to the chapter's second major objective of tracking the emergence of the ideal episcopal pastorate. Here, the extensive evidence provided by published texts

is supplemented by the private writings and correspondence of bishops themselves and of those other individuals who played powerful roles in influencing the bishops' conception of their pastorate. These sources are necessarily somewhat selective but are sufficiently varied in both authorship and chronology to enable us to discern how far bishops and their advisors, in practice, could, and actually did, share the administrative, pastoral and spiritual ideals of prelacy presented within published works.

These publications on episcopacy can be crudely arranged under two headings: general guides that treated the character of episcopacy and the duties associated with it, and hagiographic works. Of course, hagiographic works always contained elements of the first literary category, in that the lives of particular bishops were presented as the models or examples for their ecclesiastical descendants. They were composed using a mixture of documentary and oral sources and were based on historical facts that were then given a distinctly hagiographic hue. Étienne Molinier, who published a biography of Barthélemy de Donadieu, bishop of Comminges, shortly after the prelate's death in 1637, observed that he did not intend his composition to be a panegyric or oratory: instead he wrote as a 'faithful historian' who was content to propose 'the fact in its truth, and purity'.⁴ His work, however, was not simply a factual account of the bishop's life, but rather used facts to exalt Donadieu's character and actions within an idealised framework.

With the return of stability to the French church, writers were free to produce theological works which ranged wider than defences against protestantism, a fact confirmed by the large numbers of publications that flooded the market from the 1620s onwards. Foreign works relating to episcopacy continued to be printed in France but were now progressively accompanied by native French productions. Some of these texts were composed by bishops themselves, though the majority were written by non-episcopal clergy: of the thirty-eight such works published between 1600 and 1670, eleven were written by French bishops while the remainder were by other members of the French clergy. It is significant that bishops themselves wrote both didactic and hagiographic texts: three manuals to guide bishops in their vocation and eight hagiographic treatises. Non-episcopal clergy, in contrast, tended to focus almost exclusively on hagiography: twenty-three of their works belonged to this category. The bishops' preference for instructional publications perhaps points to their conviction that this was a type of work immediately necessary to their own, and their confreres', vocational needs. That in turn perhaps explains why non-episcopal clergy may have felt less qualified to produce this type of very specialised text, and so concentrated on the generally more straightforward and traditional hagiography.

Manuals of instruction tended to follow a distinct structural pattern, although they varied in length from reasonably compact volumes to extended

treatises like those of Bishop Camus. After an introductory preface in which the author revealed his intention to provide a source of information and guidance for bishops, they first treated the origin and meaning of the episcopal office, particularly pointing to its august lineage and illustrious roots in the apostolic church. They usually attended to the formation of the bishop's vocation and to his consecration as well as to the dignity of his office and then progressed to examine his responsibilities under the broad headings of administration, teaching and episcopal perfection. This final category led to discussion of episcopal sanctity and the proper means by which to cultivate personal virtue. This type of text invariably cited ancient and contemporary bishops as examples for their readers to learn from and to imitate in their own lives.

Hagiographic compositions, on the other hand, chose one or several bishops as their principal subject and painted a picture of the ideal prelate from their biographies, elaborating on their saintly qualities and industrious lives. Most were, moreover, written with the aim of securing the beatification of their worthy subject, if this had not already taken place, and included direct pleas to the papacy to achieve this. Again, an introductory preface preceded the main body of text, frequently dedicated to a contemporary French bishop who was usually the author's patron. Often these volumes were produced by former servants or assistants of the bishop who was under their spotlight: one such was produced by Jean-Baptiste Noulleau on Étienne de Villazel.⁵ The format of the works was, without exception, conventional, beginning with a description of the life of the subject and proceeding from his birth, through his call to the episcopate, his consecration and work as bishop, to his death and the miracles associated with it. They usually concluded with a litany of prayers to the saintly bishop and recommendations that he be beatified. Included throughout were lengthy discussions of the bishop's virtues with numerous examples of how these had been put into practice. Each work was designed, therefore, to demonstrate that its candidate satisfied the requirements for official sanctification: doctrinal purity, heroic virtue and miraculous intercessions after death.⁶ Generally, however, the bishops were presented principally as virtuous models of episcopal excellence, rather than as workers of miraculous wonders, a balance that highlights the didactic character of these texts.

Finally, hagiography can be broadly subdivided into compositions which presented ancient bishops and those which concentrated on bishops of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Works, however, which had seventeenth-century French bishops as their subject were far fewer in number than those dealing with the ancient church fathers and recently deceased non-French bishops, like Charles Borromeo. In addition, we must take account of the growing vogue for diocesan histories, which generally contained succinct biographies of successive bishops, ancient and contemporary.⁷ These were not composed as

didactic works but principally as historical records. Yet their descriptions of particular bishops at times assumed a distinctly hagiographic tone and, if only for this reason, they will on occasion be cited in the course of this chapter.

One of the most noticeable features of seventeenth-century literature on the office of bishop is its marked tendency to reflect the dominant features of the episcopal ideology then emerging in the French church. From the early 1620s, when publications began to appear, they stressed the dignity, perfection and obligations of the episcopal state, in a manner closely resembling the ideas of Bérulle and his successors. Perhaps surprisingly for a Jesuit, though it may have been because he was a close associate of reform-minded prelates like Cardinal de La Rochefoucauld and Octave de Bellegarde of Sens,⁸ Étienne Binet declared grandly in 1633 that neither heavenly or earthly eloquence could ‘worthily represent the dignity of those who hold the first rank in the Hierarchy’. He proceeded then to describe the ecclesiastical hierarchy in straightforwardly Dionysian terms: bishops were ‘vicars of God . . . who burn with love of God, . . . the image of the living God, his lieutenant under heaven . . . Can one conceive anything more eminent?’⁹ Around the same date, Nicolas Lescapier, a royal *prédicateur*, also emphasised the perfection of the episcopal state and the function of bishops to draw others to perfection, through their governmental authority and powers of order: ‘What power has a father on his children, and what respect and obedience the children owe their father; whatever condition men might be, they are the children of bishops.’¹⁰ The writing of the Oratorian spiritualist and theologian Jean-Baptiste Noulleau on episcopacy was also filled with the ideas propagated by Bérulle, Eudes, Olier and other leading reformers. It is quite consistent, consequently, to find Noulleau presenting bishops as ‘surveyors’ or supervisors over all those below them in the church’s hierarchy.¹¹ Their office was one of perfection, requiring that they be irreproachable in their own lives so that they might draw others to perfection by acting as a light in darkness. Too many bishops of the present century, Noulleau confessed, palpably failed to live up this calling because they were infected with the ‘spirit of the world’.¹²

The adoption of the reformers’ conception of episcopacy is even more marked in the compositions published by bishops themselves. Bishop Etampes’s *Advis* flamboyantly likened diocesan bishops to the moon, stars and sun, since it was their role to dissipate the shadows of ignorance from men’s minds. Bishops formed the most eminent rank within the church, were the mediators between God and man, and were the leaders and fathers of the faithful.¹³ That elevated rank meant that they must live lives of absolute sanctity and illuminate their flock by example and words.¹⁴ The writings of Jean-Pierre Camus echoed these views precisely. He published a detailed manual for bishops, designed to function as a

mirror in which his fellow 'vicars and ambassadors of God' could contemplate themselves and 'note what good you have so as to render thanks for it to the Father of lights, . . . and as to what you lack, that you will try to attain the pure gold that the Angel in the Apocalypse counsels a bishop to buy in order to render himself rich for eternity'.¹⁵ Camus's prelates were sentinels and superintendents who gave 'order to all' regarding 'God's service and the people's health'.¹⁶

In fact, Camus was among those who actually used Bérulle's striking title, *grand prêtre*, to describe the good bishop who possessed all the qualities of an ordinary parish priest, but in greater abundance and intensity.¹⁷ In part, the title referred to the jurisdiction that a bishop enjoyed over his priests and to his ability to celebrate the eucharist.¹⁸ Yet, beyond these, the bishop also held the greatest ability to reveal or mediate God's truths to his people through teaching and through the sacraments of confirmation and ordination: 'The divine man, filled with sacred knowledge' purged sins, enlightened souls and drew them to virtue and ultimately union with God.¹⁹ His pre-eminence bound him to fulfil his role of government and ambassadorship consistently and wholeheartedly, for if he did not he would be 'like the Sun which warms all things without having any degree of heat in itself'.²⁰ Bishops were leaders, Camus noted, whom those below them in ecclesiastical rank must obey, but this power brought obligations of personal sanctity, as befitted those closest to God.²¹

Etampes and Camus composed their writings during the decades when Bérulle's ideas on the priesthood and episcopacy were in the ascendant and when prominent figures like Condren, Saint-Cyran and de Paul were promoting them through their writings, correspondence and involvement in clerical reform. The opinions expressed by both bishops demonstrate yet again the penetration of the reform school's understanding of episcopacy into the episcopate itself. Indeed, Camus was certainly not the only bishop explicitly to adopt the crucial Bérullian title of *grand prêtre*. In 1649 and 1656, five south-western bishops met in Mercuès to discuss the character and purpose of their episcopal vocation and the ways in which these could inform their behaviour most beneficially. The conferences' participants were Caulet, Pavillon, Solminihac, Brandon of Périgueux and Sévin of Sarlat. All five were conscientious overseers of their dioceses. Their dedication to their responsibilities is perfectly clear from the records which they made of their meetings: as sources, these sessions demonstrate the breadth and depth of reflection in which it was possible for bishops to engage during a series of intensive meetings, and their attention to specific aspects of episcopal spirituality and pastoral care reveals their primary reform concerns and interests. Furthermore, the results of these discussions provide an illuminating case study of just what spiritual views prelates could, and were willing to, adopt as principles for their lives.²² Significantly, after promising to celebrate the eucharist frequently, the Mercuès

bishops used the embracing term *grand prêtre* to describe its centrality to the episcopal life. In the eucharistic celebration, the bishop honoured God, appeased his 'ire', and thanked him for the blessings he had granted his people. By bringing the sacrifice of Christ into relief, however, the mass also became an excellent preparation for death, and was more applicable to bishops than to any other members of the church, 'because of the particular alliance that we have contracted with our Lord'. Like Bérulle and Olier, the conferences encouraged bishops to identify with Christ, for 'we are like the victim that must be immolated for all the people of our dioceses, and we will approach with this spirit of victim.'²³ More broadly, their entire lives, every thought and action, should be informed by love of the cross, so that they would sacrifice their own lives to God; they would 'suffer all for God's glory and the health of others'.²⁴

The vision of episcopal sacrifice, imitation of Christ and union with the divine that these five bishops embraced under the banner of *grand prêtre* was a classic formulation of the Bérullian school's theology. The school's influence on bishops' understanding of their office obviously began quite early in the century and tended to progress in tandem with the reformers' refinement of their own views of episcopacy. Most apparently, the prolific work of Antoine Godeau tracks this process. He shared the opinion that bishops held first rank within the ecclesiastical hierarchy, with authority over those inferior in grade. He too conceived a direct connection between that sublime status and the lives of bishops: the episcopate was 'the most holy dignity on earth, . . . the participation in all the grandeur and all the power of the Son of God', and its incumbents must be 'more elevated above the people as much by their virtues as by their character'.²⁵ But Godeau belonged to a later generation of bishops than Camus and Etampes, born in 1584 and 1589 respectively. He was born in 1605 and was consecrated bishop in 1636, by which time both Camus and Etampes had been bishops for many years.²⁶ So he entered the episcopate at the point when the reformers' stress on the dignity and authority of bishops was being voiced by members of the episcopate itself as well as by apologists like Saint-Cyran, Hallier and Le Maistre. As a result, his writings on episcopacy, produced from the early 1650s endorsed these conceptions but were also profoundly shaped by the sophisticated exposition of episcopacy defined by Jean-Jacques Olier.²⁷

In 1642, Camus had argued that there appeared to be no reason to deny that episcopacy possessed a unique character of its own, on the basis of its powers of perfection and jurisdiction, even though the office was one element of the sacrament of order.²⁸ But, progressing further than Camus, Godeau followed Olier's conception of episcopacy openly and completely. In 1657, he published a life of Charles Borromeo for his own instruction and that of other prelates.²⁹ Although he used material from earlier histories, Godeau added his own opinions and emphases throughout. According to him, God had given Borromeo

to the church as an example to bishops at a time when the re-establishment of discipline was vital. To achieve this, Borromeo held a plenitude of episcopal spirit to diffuse throughout his province. Like Olier, Godeau therefore identified a specifically episcopal grace by which bishops drew their charges towards perfection. This vivifying grace animated the actions and words of bishops as they functioned as pastors and governors in their dioceses. It was spread through the zealous actions of purification, illumination and perfection, each evident in conscientious administration, a lack of selfishness, a 'pure and ardent love of the Church', 'love of their flock' and love of God.³⁰

Before Godeau's exposition, no other bishop had expressed the distinction of order between bishops and priests in a manner so close to that which Olier submitted to the Assembly and sent to all French bishops in 1651. Godeau reiterated this understanding of episcopal grace when he wrote eight years later in his eulogy of the late Jean-Baptiste Gault, bishop of Marseille: 'The highest degree of grace on earth is that of the episcopate; and Father Gault was entirely penetrated with it.' This grace was manifested and imparted through Gault's devotion to preaching, works of charity and poverty and, in general, the imitation of his master, Jesus Christ.³¹ Godeau's praise of Nicolas Pavillon also endorsed this view. He claimed that the bishop of Alet possessed a plenitude of episcopal spirit, granted by Jesus Christ, which enabled him to fulfil his functions as bishop with mildness, zeal, wisdom, prudence and evangelical simplicity.³² That notion of episcopal grace and character was contained too in the hagiographic writing of the Jansenist cleric Isaac Le Maistre de Sacy. Of the same generation as Olier and Godeau, Le Maistre's life of Barthélemy des Martyrs affirmed that only the bishop could spread 'the grace and benedictions of Heaven' through 'the grace of his character and his person'. This grace operated through correcting, fortifying, perfecting, appeasing and consoling or, in other words, through conscientious care of the diocesan flock.³³

Etampes, Camus and Godeau were among the most outspoken of bishops in questions relating to the jurisdiction and status of bishops; their actions mirrored the teaching in their hagiographic and didactic treatises. Although most authors placed themselves firmly within the episcopate's camp on these questions, one interesting exception was the Jesuit Nicolas Talon, author of a treatise on the celebrated bishop of Geneva François de Sales, during the 1630s. Talon stressed the intimate relationship between the bishop of Geneva and the Jesuits, to whom he had initially entrusted his preparation for the episcopate. Before his consecration, according to Talon, de Sales made a general confession of his whole life to the Jesuits and a private confession to Jean Fourier, the rector of the Jesuit college at Chambéry. Thereafter, the Jesuits retained the bishop's confidence and he unerringly turned to them for spiritual direction.³⁴ De Sales's other biographers did not stress this point, clearly

suggesting that Talon's particular aim was to portray the Jesuits in as positive a light as possible to highlight de Sales's confidence in their advice and teachings. His preferred technique was to use a particular incident in de Sales's life to refute the criticisms of those who undermined the order's competence and claims in pastoral care. The message was clear: bishops should follow de Sales's example and entrust themselves to the advice of the Jesuits, rather than oppose them. It was a particularly timely but provocative observation given the growing ill will of many French prelates towards the order. To have earned the trust and co-operation of François de Sales was itself a major seal of approval, and thus a tremendous enhancement of the Jesuits' prestige and reputation.

On the other hand, most texts accentuated the jurisdictional authority of bishops over members of the regular orders. Etampes's *Advis* incorporated a number of the decrees contained in the *Déclaration sur les réguliers* that he had composed on behalf of the 1625 Assembly: it combined counsel on the characteristics of virtuous bishops with comprehensive specifications of their jurisdictional authority over the regular clergy.³⁵ That assumption resonated throughout episcopal literature, and notably within Godeau's publications during the 1650s. He strongly endorsed the principles of the 1625 *Déclaration* and incorporated this attitude into his hagiographic works, by adapting the examples of Charles Borromeo and Augustine of Hippo to contemporary France. In his *Vie de S. Augustin*, published in 1652, Godeau examined the life and vocation of this early church bishop. In seventeenth-century France, religious caused 'occasions of trouble and dispute' to a degree unknown in the primitive church: 'The auxiliaries do not wish to recognise the legitimate leaders . . . The submission is only in words and reverences . . . one changes the privilege of being able to serve into pretensions to command.' Augustine had held religious in high regard but this did not mean that he suffered their faults; on the contrary, he ensured that they lived properly and obediently. All bishops were the centre of diocesan unity, whose paternal instructions and 'orders for combat' should be obeyed by the regulars within their jurisdictional remit.³⁶

Godeau reiterated this argument five years later, in his account of Borromeo's episcopate, devoting a whole chapter to the archbishop's conduct towards the regulars. Like Augustine, Borromeo held the regulars in esteem and aided them whenever possible. At the same time, he did not abandon the 'strict rules' of episcopal jurisdiction and courageously regulated religious through disciplinary acts, ordinances and visits, permitting nothing to 'diminish the authority of his charge'.³⁷ This was the correct policy for prelates: like their illustrious forebears, they should respect the religious vocation and aid regulars whenever possible, but never allow the jurisdictional authority of their office to be jeopardised. Jean-Baptiste Noulleau echoed Godeau's sentiments in his counsels to bishops, drawing on the life of Étienne Villazel, a less celebrated bishop

of his own time. Noulleau explicitly condemned Rome's willingness to interfere in the government of dioceses and its blatant ignoring of the episcopal right to rule. Ecclesiastical discipline was put in grave danger, he warned, when the papacy upheld the regulars' supposed privileges, particularly in cases relating to the sacrament of confession. Villazel had opposed this undermining of episcopal authority, but it would be rectified only if the papacy left 'to all the holy bishops . . . the episcopal jurisdiction on all the consciences of their dioceses'.³⁸

Intrinsically related to the episcopal–regular issue was that of bishops' jurisdictional *droit divin*. As the episcopate moved towards its explicit endorsement of this theory of episcopal power, it was simultaneously incorporated into contemporary works on episcopacy. Camus's writings bear witness to the doctrine's unofficial acceptance during the 1640s. Citing François de Sales to support his argument, Camus could 'see none who contradicts this [doctrine], not only regarding order, but also regarding jurisdiction', a rather disingenuous comment given that he was well aware that both regulars and the papacy felt that they possessed watertight cases against the teaching. He then added that the distinction by theologians between 'immediate' and 'mediate' jurisdiction was a creation of the previous century and simply exacerbated debate.³⁹

Once again, Antoine Godeau's work also reflects the steady change in the episcopate's perspective. Just as his eulogy of Borromeo furnished an occasion to expound on episcopal grace, the bishop's eulogy of Barthélemy des Martyrs enabled him to express precisely his adherence to the *droit divin* concept of episcopal jurisdiction. When he attended the Council of Trent, the archbishop of Braga had been particularly vocal in the call for episcopal residence to be defined as arising from divine law.⁴⁰ In recounting Martyrs's convictions, Godeau described the bones of the actual debate in a deceptively neutral manner, but then lambasted the Cardinal de Lorraine for his failure to hold firm in his support for the definition of episcopal residence as a precept of *droit divin*; Godeau's personal conviction on the subject was therein frankly articulated. He acknowledged that the cardinal compromised in order to avert schism, but still insisted that if he had not done so, then the issue would have been resolved definitively and satisfactorily.⁴¹ The fact that Godeau condemned Lorraine so firmly is significant, especially when it is recalled that he generally valued unity within the church and abhorred schism. So, he worked diligently to bring about the 1669 *Paix de l'église* and expressed his 'heart's joy' when it was forged.⁴² But he did not admire Lorraine's position since it was detrimental to a fundamental characteristic of episcopacy. This particular eulogy was published in 1665 as part of an entire hagiographic volume of worthy bishops, just following the Assembly's endorsement of bishops' jurisdictional *droit divin* in 1657. Indeed, Godeau proved more definite, positive and open than Camus in his embracing of the theory, and undoubtedly benefited from the Assembly's action. His

eulogy testifies to the growing willingness of bishops to proclaim publicly and categorically the independence of their jurisdiction from papal interference on the basis of *droit divin*. It also reflects the bishop of Vence's willingness to adopt the example of a revered individual to further his own opinions.

In the same year, the Oratorian Noulleau used this strategy to defend precisely the same claim as Godeau. His account of Villazel's life confirmed that the bishop of Saint-Brieuc had permanently resided in his diocese, with 'never the least thought to leave it' following his consecration. Noulleau then observed that Villazel had believed episcopal residence 'to be of divine law' before slipping in the provocative allegation that the fathers of Trent and the ancient church had also considered this to be the case.⁴³ This was, of course, inaccurate since the Tridentine delegates had been badly split in opinion on the question, but Noulleau skated over this point in order to support his claim. Like Godeau, he resorted to hagiography to promote a particular view of episcopacy, one that endorsed extensive episcopal jurisdictional authority in dioceses. Villazel's reputation as a worthy bishop could be expected to bring added legitimacy to the theory of *droit divin*, just as those of Barthélemy des Martyrs and François de Sales would.

Two important points must be noted here in relation to the adoption of contemporary ideas on episcopal perfection, dignity and jurisdiction into French works on episcopacy. First, the ideas contained within them were neither unique nor original. Rather, the texts reflected and promoted ideas formulated by reformers and bishops as they struggled to deal with actual events and situations facing the contemporary episcopate. This does not imply that they played no role in the dissemination of ideas of episcopal prestige and jurisdiction, but their part was a secondary or supportive, rather than a seminal, one. Godeau and other authors used their sources and evidence in a manner which validated and reinforced particular ideas and viewpoints, with the aim of influencing their readership or confirming them in their views.

The second point to note is that there was one important exception to this alignment. Chapter 4 documented that the Jansenist bishops manifested a fuller sense of collegiality than most other bishops in the debates over episcopal jurisdiction, a more apostolic and pastoral viewpoint that underpinned their opposition to the Assembly and the papacy. In comparison, when it drew swords with the state, the episcopate as a whole succeeded in broadening its concern to encompass not just episcopal welfare but that of the universal church.⁴⁴ However, the protection of both was invariably presented as an episcopal task in hagiographic and didactic works. Borromeo, according to Camus, knew that, as a prelate, he had to defend ecclesiastical interests 'like a judicious bee' defending its honey 'with the point of its sting', just as Jesus Christ had defended his temple when necessary; this sentiment was reiterated by Claude de La

Chambre in his panegyric of the archbishop.⁴⁵ Bishops were encouraged to follow his illustrious example of episcopal leadership: Jean Lemarie praised the devotion of the bishop of Saint-Malo, Guillaume Le Gouverneur, to Borromeo and hailed his defence of ecclesiastical privileges in the hope of spurring him to still greater efforts.⁴⁶ So too had Ambrose and Thomas of Canterbury conserved the spiritual jurisdiction of the church with constant vigilance; like them, all bishops should know that, in fulfilling the demands of their vocation, they might face suffering, torture and, ultimately, a horrific death. Their office was 'a true apprenticeship of martyrdom', which might bring, at any moment, 'the knife on the throat' that would pour 'all [their] blood on the prepared altar'.⁴⁷

The lives of more recent bishops were also harnessed to promote this aspect of episcopal duty. Le Maistre's treatise on Martyrs described the archbishop's battle with the Portuguese secular authorities to prevent them encroaching on his jurisdiction. His actions were just because he was motivated purely by his desire to defend the church, just as Borromeo was.⁴⁸ Thomas de Villeneuve, the archbishop of Valencia, had also acted in this worthy manner to shield his church.⁴⁹ Likewise, François de Sales was occasionally presented as fulfilling perfectly his responsibility as defender of the church, though not nearly so often as Charles Borromeo; Antoine Godeau, in his eulogy of the bishop of Geneva, praised his courage and zeal in withstanding the efforts of temporal officials to intimidate and dominate him. According to Godeau, de Sales thought little of sacrificing his personal interests for the honour of his master and ministry.⁵⁰

While Camus acknowledged that a bishop's jurisdiction was limited to his own diocese he felt that this did not preclude him from keeping a close eye on affairs outside his immediate sphere of government: 'Although bishops might be bound to care within certain limits, that one calls the diocese . . . they do not however lose the care of the church in general, for the good of which they must work with all their strength.'⁵¹ Episcopal communion was vital, cautioned Camus, but so too was ecclesiastical unity, and bishops had a duty to foster both as far as possible.⁵² It was true, Noulleau declared, that a bishop could occasionally leave his diocese, but only for its spiritual benefit or for the needs of the universal church. Of course, it was his duty to care principally for those under his charge in his diocese. Yet he must always seek the good of all the faithful and be prepared to act to that end when necessary. Villazel, according to Noulleau, fulfilled this apostolic responsibility admirably, always actively seeking 'the exaltation of the mother church'.⁵³ Talon noted that, like de Sales, a bishop should be 'the pastor not only of a people and place, but the common father of all people, and all places . . . the head, the eye, the ear and the hand of the world and of the church'. This was to be a true fisher of souls, as Jesus and the first Apostles had been.⁵⁴ Antoine Godeau called on the lives of Augustine,

Borromeo, de Sales and Martyrs to make essentially the same point. In the fifth century Augustine had famously demonstrated his concern for the welfare of the entire church through his opposition to the terrible Donatist and Pelagian heresies that had threatened to tear the church asunder.⁵⁵ Generations later, Borromeo's zeal had surpassed the limits of his diocese when he actively advised and encouraged clergy who were not under his direct jurisdiction.⁵⁶ Likewise, François de Sales had reached beyond his diocese through personal contacts, publications and preaching, with the result that his charity knew 'no other limits than the entire church'.⁵⁷ Godeau's eulogy of Barthélemy des Martyrs also made reference to this ideal episcopal quality, possession of which had enabled Martyrs to love his own diocesan church and the universal church, and to serve them both at the Council of Trent.⁵⁸

For one so expansive on bishops' apostolic responsibility for universal spiritual welfare in his hagiography, it is a little curious to find no reference to this topic in Godeau's pronouncements on the Formulary debate and the judgement of bishops. Clearly, he regarded the actions of Borromeo, de Sales and Martyrs as worthy of emulation, and his own successive publications on the clerical and episcopal vocations were obvious attempts to follow in their steps. Most bishops tended to produce manuals for the clergy of their own dioceses; Godeau composed two treatises for the use of ordinands outside as well as within Vence.⁵⁹ So he was acutely sensitive to the need for bishops to cultivate apostolic responsibility for the whole church, and tried to live accordingly and to propagate this idea through his hagiographic works. However, like the majority of French bishops, when involved in actual contemporary papal–episcopal jurisdictional controversies, he tended to neglect their pastoral and apostolic aspects and to concentrate principally on their specific implications for the episcopate. The discrepancy between his hagiographic publications and his arguments when confronted with actual jurisdictional dilemmas provides further confirmation that episcopal works reflected and disseminated ideas emanating from particular topical events, rather than the reverse.

As brought to life in didactic manuals and hagiographic texts, the accomplished prelate governed his diocese according to his divinely given power of jurisdiction. He used his power of order to mediate between God and man and to draw the faithful towards perfection. The rank and perfection of his charge necessitated a personal style of life which corresponded to his hierarchical vocation. Finally, he displayed an active concern for the well-being of the entire ecclesiastical community. These were fundamental principles of government and authority, but were, equally, crucial elements of episcopal spirituality and pastoral work. Yet they were not simply abstract tenets; rather, their advocates intended that they be incorporated into the vocations of the bishops whom

they saw nominated to dioceses, administering dioceses and participating in Assemblies.

Both bishops and non-episcopal writers used the lives of ancient and contemporary bishops to portray the ideals to which seventeenth-century French bishops should aspire. Following the contemporary fascination with the fathers of the early church,⁶⁰ they particularly resorted to the Apostles, Timothy, Augustine, John Chrysostom, Gregory the Great and Ambrose, as well as to the ultimate pastor, Jesus Christ. Of medieval bishops, only Thomas of Canterbury rivalled them in prominence, and he was generally singled out for his defence of church rights against the English monarch, Henry II.⁶¹ Episodes from the lives of bishops and the advice that they had given on the episcopal vocation were recorded and discussed in detail for the benefit of the reader and, whenever possible, related to particular events currently affecting French bishops. Thus, Claude Morel portrayed the anti-Jansenist bishops of the Assembly as heroic descendants of Augustine, successful conqueror of the Pelagian heresy. They were, he claimed, filled with 'the dignity of their character', Augustinian zeal and 'God's knowledge'.⁶² In fact, authors regularly referred to current events in their texts, whether by composing an entire work in reference to a topical controversy concerning episcopacy, like Morel, or by making specific observations during the course of their treatise. The dissections of jurisdictional *droit divin* and of the regulars' rights were instances of this.

Among bishops of the contemporary era, it was Charles Borromeo and François de Sales who were by far the most influential and who received most attention from bishops and authors. Apart from editions of their own works, the prelates were each the subject of many French texts relating to the episcopal vocation. After his death in 1622, de Sales proved just as favoured a subject as the late archbishop of Milan, with at least eight treatises on his life by French authors. Borromeo, the foremost episcopal model of the late sixteenth century, merited six treatises, plus translations into French of several hagiographic biographies by non-French authors. Both bishops were far more popular as principal subjects for treatises than any ancient bishop or French prelate: excluding Godeau's *Éloge des évêques*, just four works on ancient prelates and ten on contemporary French bishops were published between 1600 and 1670.⁶³

Regardless of their biographical preferences, all publications stressed that even the exemplary administration of a diocese was not sufficient to discharge the episcopal burden. Episcopal and other authors often used the customary Pauline observation that although the office was a good work, it was a heavy burden, in terms both of responsibility for souls and of a bishop's ultimate accountability to God.⁶⁴ For that reason, it was essential that one possessed a true vocation. Reluctance to accept a nomination, because of a feeling of personal unworthiness, was the surest indication that one had a legitimate calling

to the episcopate. Camus, quoting de Sales's advice to him, advised that a potential prelate should assess his capacity for the office and seek the advice of wise counsellors while praying to God for guidance.⁶⁵ When contemporaries emphasised the profound soul-searching that a potential bishop had to undergo before accepting the care of a diocese, they were logically led towards discussion of the core episcopal virtues. These basically amounted to the Christian virtues, which every Christian ought to possess in some degree. The difference between the virtues of a bishop and all others, however, was that the prelate should possess these in eminence, to a far greater extent than any other member of Christ's faithful. As Bérulle and his disciples observed, there must be a correlation between the wondrous perfection of the episcopal office and the personal perfection of its incumbents.

In 1625, shortly after the death of de Sales, the Assembly of Clergy petitioned the papacy for his beatification. This call was repeated in 1635 and again in 1645, 1650 and 1655. In the letter of petition that the deputies sent to Urban VIII in 1625, they noted the exemplary life of the late bishop of Geneva and his piety, humility and moderation.⁶⁶ These, agreed authors of hagiographic works on de Sales, were qualities which he had possessed in abundance.⁶⁷ They were also attributed to other illustrious bishops and deemed essential to a good bishop.⁶⁸ But what exactly did contemporaries mean when they used these words to describe a worthy prelate, the type of paragon that they wished all French bishops to emulate?

Piety embraced all other episcopal qualities, wrote Camus, since 'if all Christians are called a holy nation, how much more holy must be those who govern them spiritually'.⁶⁹ If a prelate managed to achieve this virtue, then he would be 'the copy of his prototype . . . Jesus Christ, as much as it is possible for human fragility'.⁷⁰ Essential to episcopal piety were constant trust in God and an entire willingness to follow his wishes. A bishop knew what these were by frequent prayer, reading of Scripture and celebration of the mass, through which God revealed his will to his servant and granted him the strength to implement it. Piety, then, sanctified all external acts and seasoned them 'with the salt of prayer'. It was intricately related to wisdom, and could not be achieved without it. A bishop should be capable of guiding others, mediating the truth of revelation to them and interceding on their behalf; it was essential that he himself was particularly close to God and that he was capable of interpreting the divine mysteries: 'He should be so devoted to prayer, that he knows already by experience that he will be able to obtain from God what he asks of him'.⁷¹

Humility was one of the most prominent virtues within works on episcopacy, highlighted in the hope of counterbalancing the accent placed on the great dignity of bishops and on the powers which the office granted its incumbents. Even if a bishop was pious, moderate and wise, he should always remind

himself of his unworthiness before God and strive to eradicate his shortcomings, preserving 'a spirit of low esteem', which always 'holds them to be vile and abject to their own eyes'.⁷² It was not enough for a bishop to possess the same degree of humility as an ordinary Christian, Maubourg stressed; he must, like Thomas of Villeneuve, be far more humble and self-effacing than others.⁷³ On Borromeo, Camus wrote approvingly that, despite his noble birth and titles, the archbishop never allowed any 'tumour in his truly humble heart'. Instead, he lived a simple and penitent life of constant labour.⁷⁴ In fact, their acute feelings of unworthiness had traditionally distressed saintly bishops, and it was only their trust in God and complete submission to his will that had allowed them to continue in their vocation.⁷⁵

The Mercuès conferences demonstrate the fact that at least some French bishops were consciously striving toward this ideal: both stressed the fact that prelates must be as humble as Jesus, their model, had been.⁷⁶ Their instigator, Alain de Solminihac, reminded himself to be 'strongly reserved in talking about myself . . . I will abstain from all discourse which will be able to turn to my praise . . . I will not talk of the faults of others, if I am not obliged . . . Humility and mildness will be my two dearest virtues.'⁷⁷ Indeed, like Godeau, Solminihac displayed a marked reluctance even to accept his nomination to Cahors in 1636, telling those who tried to encourage him to change his mind not only that was he unworthy of the honour, but that he feared that the episcopate would expose him to the temptations of the world.⁷⁸ Only after much prayer and spiritual advice did Solminihac finally assume his position as bishop. He was anxious, however, to ensure that he would never give in to the temptations of pride or self-indulgence, and his rule of life expressly recommended that he remain 'always in the presence of God' through concentrating on the type of spiritual matters that would 'inflamm[e] [him] with love of God'. He vowed that, as Christ's 'living copy', he would not have any will but that 'of my God' and that he would not perform any action that was not inspired by God. In this absolute self-abnegation, he would be joined with Christ himself, for Christ would give the strength and virtue to animate the bishop's imitation of his wholehearted service of God.⁷⁹ These ideas had surely been fostered by a long friendship with Jean Barrault, bishop of Bazas and Arles, a *dévot* mentor with ties to the Bérullian circle and to François de Sales. In letters to Solminihac, Barrault did not hesitate to advise his younger friend on the necessity of following God's will without regard for oneself. He asked Solminihac to understand that self-abnegation would enable one to ignore the world's temptations, and that the suffering of episcopal life would ultimately bring one to Heaven.⁸⁰

However important these accomplishments were, authors and bishops agreed that it was impossible for a prelate to live up to the dignity and perfection of his charge without charity and zeal, possessed, like the other virtues, in

eminence. Charity was the ‘proper virtue’ of bishops,⁸¹ understood both in the manner of compassionate love for God and neighbour and in the sense of a bishop’s organised aid to the needy. In both conceptions, the bishop’s compassion, patience and clemency in dealing with the faithful were to act as an example to them, so that they too would act charitably towards their fellow men. When judging sins, bishops should use prudent charity, showing mercy when necessary and applying rigour only when useful.⁸² They were also obliged to undertake extensive works of charity, through care of the poor and sick. Once again, the examples of Borromeo, de Sales and Martyrs proved especially powerful,⁸³ and prelates were reminded that they were not ‘highwaymen’ who held their dioceses to ransom. In fact, they were not even the ‘true masters’, but ‘simple managers’ of their revenues.⁸⁴ Although they were permitted to administer their familial inheritance if necessary, bishops were never to waste ecclesiastical goods or favour their relatives with grants from the church’s patrimony, for their first loyalty lay with the diocese whose spouse they were.⁸⁵

There are abundant examples of bishops who regarded themselves as the temporary guardians of the church’s goods, and, in particular, who spent most of their revenue, and even any familial wealth, on caring for the needy: Cospeau, Solminihac, Pavillon, Choart de Buzenval, Caulet, Fouquet de la Varenne and Le Camus.⁸⁶ Indeed, alms-giving was one subject of the letters exchanged between Caulet and Le Camus: the inexperienced Le Camus requested Caulet’s advice on the most efficacious means of administering alms and was rewarded with a short memoir outlining his obligation to distribute frequently and to the deserving. These were the rules that guided Caulet’s celebrated generosity; he sold his own valuables to feed the needy of Pamiers.⁸⁷ Some bishops, like René Le Sauvage, left all their worldly goods to the poor when they died, though the wills in which they made their bequests are not necessarily a reliable indication of their attitudes towards episcopal luxury or the poor over the course of their episcopal careers.⁸⁸ Indeed, even the conscientious Henri de Sponde and Fénelon were amongst the many bishops who left their possessions to their relatives rather than to the poor, an indulgence that would have been heavily frowned upon by Solminihac and Camus.⁸⁹ Because of the long years that they spent in charitable work, both men died with practically no belongings or savings and could not have benefited their families even if they had wished to do so.⁹⁰

Because charity sprang from love of God and love of one’s flock, it was vital that a bishop learn to endure personal trials and sacrifices if he were to serve both adequately.⁹¹ For the Jansenist bishops, their apostolic crusade on behalf of the entire church fulfilled that criterion. Yet even though other seventeenth-century bishops did not share the quartet’s crushing pressures they could also adopt the language of charity and martyrdom to understand the

purpose of episcopal suffering. Positively, injuries to his person, traps and persecution enabled a bishop to follow in the footsteps of Christ; as Antoine Godeau commented, bishops were more like Jesus than any other member of the church, and their trials offered them the opportunity to imitate his earthly torments. Each should expect that 'one charges them of injuries, that one gives a bad sense to their most innocent actions, that one erects traps for them, that one mocks their remonstrances, and that one persecutes them'. Godeau explicitly called this testing life a martyrdom, a martyrdom of the spirit that must be endured for the greater good of his soul and the church of Christ.⁹² Like the beleaguered bishop, Christ had entered into 'sufferings, labours and ignominies; and finally he offered himself in sacrifice to the Cross'. Godeau was keen to apply this principle to his own life to give purpose to the difficulties that he encountered in his diocese.⁹³ He welcomed unavoidable opposition as a means of cultivating the Christ-like virtues of holiness and zeal: 'I must render them benedictions for their injuries, and service for their persecutions.' In spotting 'roses among the thorns', Godeau knew that 'the bishop the most removed from his patria, the most destitute of all human help, and of all consolation, the most mistrusted, the most persecuted' could thank God for the opportunity to become 'more similar to him than others'.⁹⁴

Every day of his episcopal life, the bishop was presented with challenges and temptations which could be transformed into propitiatory offerings to God for his own sins and the sins of the faithful.⁹⁵ Godeau suffered desperately from loneliness in remote Vence. As a native of Paris, a member of the Académie Française, and a natural extrovert, he found his isolation from news and society very trying. Reflecting on his sacrifice in leaving Paris, he consoled himself with the knowledge that he could turn his trials into positive lessons: the good bishop should gaze on God and not on the world, or as Gregory the Great had termed it, be in the world, but not of it. Naturally, he would encounter despair, but, even in those dark times, he had to soldier onwards, like Paul and the Apostles.⁹⁶ Bishops could only do so if they were 'dead to themselves', an essential quality that the humble Godeau was sure that he lacked.⁹⁷ Adopting a classic doctrine of Bérulle *et al.*, Godeau argued that if the bishop endured his scourges through steadfastly gazing on God alone, then he simultaneously sacrificed Christ and himself to God. In suffering like Christ, the bishop was united with him.⁹⁸ A recent example was Alain de Solminihac, one of the few French bishops included in Godeau's *Éloge des évêques*. In that work, Solminihac was presented as a bishop who had completely abandoned himself to God, so that he became like a 'Christian infant'. That had produced two marvellous results: the bishop's detachment from the world meant that his actions had been informed solely by his charitable love for God; equally, he had been capable of immense sacrifices for divine glory.⁹⁹

Solminihac's life displayed the zeal so beloved by French authors: zeal for his own moral and spiritual welfare and zeal in ensuring that his charges attained their heavenly reward also. A favoured epithet of French authors to define the ideal bishop was 'irreproachable', used interchangeably to describe responsible administration and virtue: it was essential that a bishop be truly spiritual and holy as well as an efficient and responsible supervisor of his diocese. This was why Solminihac chose Nicolas Sévin as his successor for Cahors: Sévin was what Solminihac considered to be an 'apostolic man' and, therefore, well equipped to be a diocesan bishop. Solminihac made sustained efforts to ensure that his wish would be granted, by repeated reminders, through Vincent de Paul, to the queen regent of her promise to allow him to choose just such 'an apostolic man' as his successor. In due course, Sévin was installed as coadjutor and then bishop of Cahors, fulfilling Solminihac's hope that his episcopal style would be continued following his death.¹⁰⁰

For Solminihac, episcopal activity was closely connected to personal virtue, since responsible administration was assumed to supplement virtue and to bring bishops closer to perfection and, therefore, nearer to God. This widely held understanding of administration was framed by the decrees of the Council of Trent, but was underpinned by a particularly spiritual point of view. Of course, the preliminary requirement for successful administration was residence. As the hinges on which religious life turned, bishops ought to be at 'the centre of their diocese', and therefore able to care for it personally and effectively.¹⁰¹ It was for this reason that Solminihac so strongly urged Bishops Jean de Lingendes of Sarlat and Jean d'Estrades of Périgueux to reside in their dioceses. He failed ultimately in both cases: Lingendes left his diocese after a short sojourn there and Estrades never even set foot in Périgueux.¹⁰² Undeterred, in 1654 Solminihac advised the newly appointed bishop of Périgueux, Cyrus Villers la Faye, with whom he was closely associated, that residence, accompanied by visitations, was absolutely vital to successful administration.¹⁰³

Residence, declared Camus with his usual candour, was better than nothing at all, but it must be accompanied by the fulfilment of other duties: visitations, synods and preaching.¹⁰⁴ In fact, a bishop's entire life should be a perpetual visitation, a constant round of teaching, supervision and administration.¹⁰⁵ 'Communicating his presence and his charity to the whole body of his diocese, [the bishop] spreads the graces and the blessings of Heaven on all those who are its members.'¹⁰⁶ Borromeo was by far the most popular example here, recognised as one whose administration had most effectively put Trent's directives into action. Ancient bishops like Augustine or Ambrose did not figure in this context. Nor, interestingly, was it generally a prominent subject in works on de Sales, except when he was presented as the imitator of Borromeo. The visitations of Barthélemy des Martyrs and Thomas de Villeneuve

were also lauded,¹⁰⁷ but since far more treatises related to Borromeo than to either of these it was the administrative practice of the archbishop of Milan that was presented as the model for French bishops.

Many bishops took Camus's connection between preaching and residency to heart: in his sermons to his frequent diocesan synods, Henri Arnauld spoke passionately about the apostolic duty of preaching passed to him from the New Testament: 'I know that according to the Gospel, the bishop is the light which must illuminate the whole church; according to Saint Paul he is the father who must instruct his children.'¹⁰⁸ The new emphasis on preaching owed much to the Renaissance revival of classical studies, but was more directly indebted to the Council of Trent and to the legacy of leading bishops like Borromeo, Martyrs and de Sales.¹⁰⁹ Preaching had become an essential accomplishment for any bishop, with orators celebrated for their mastery of it.¹¹⁰ Publications usually offered detailed guidance on the manner in which bishops ought to preach: their sermons should be simple, clear and to the point. Since the goal was to illuminate and perfect listeners, content should be suited to their ability to understand and contain nothing that could confuse them.¹¹¹ Flattering plaudits could be earned by rhetorical flourishes, but it was more important to move people to faith than to win compliments and material rewards. Like Augustine, Godeau advised, bishops should preach humbly, with zeal and sincerity and with a pure and knowledgeable doctrine.¹¹² The style of de Sales was also recommended to prelates; his chief aim and advice had been to persuade people towards faith, rather than to please them by elegant words.¹¹³

Bishops were 'the salt of the earth and the light of the world', whose preaching seasoned and purified the souls of the faithful.¹¹⁴ Pavillon's rule of life obliged him to preach on feast days and the first day of each month,¹¹⁵ and other evidence suggests that many French bishops also preached regularly.¹¹⁶ To encourage the timid, authors assured them that the spirit of God would animate their words so that they would have great force despite their simplicity. Jesus himself, noted Camus, had used simple but effective words and images. If a bishop was personally pious, his faith would shine through his words and excite his listeners to conversion and belief.¹¹⁷ Here, authors scored a deep link between the personal episcopal virtues of piety and wisdom and responsible administration. The bishop's example, the act of fulfilling his duty in obedience to God, was as important as the content of his teaching. Of course, it was naturally also desirable that bishops be knowledgeable in doctrine. Study, prayer and spiritual reading were the only means by which this could be cultivated; the fruits would guide the bishop's own life and thoughts and enable him to enlighten others. Bishops were doctors, but their knowledge could not be likened to that of those who acted as secular leaders, for it was 'the knowledge of God', the 'celestial bread of the evangelical word'.¹¹⁸

To the Mercuès participants, prayer was such a fundamental episcopal activity that their final recommendations included entire sections on this most necessary of tasks. Habitually undertaken, prayer would foster 'great detachment from all things, a destruction of ourselves, profound humility, great patience'. It functioned as a supportive foundation for the episcopal vocation because it was the primary defence against egoism, complacency and cowardice. Prayer simultaneously offered a path to God, for through it the bishop could intercede with God on behalf of the faithful while abandoning '[himself] to the movements that it will please God to give us, and to all that he will wish to do with us'.¹¹⁹ Several kinds of prayer were possible: eucharistic celebration, meditation on the Scriptures and contemplative reflection.¹²⁰ Through each, the bishop could gain the personal enlightenment so essential to effective teaching and so necessary if he was to escape from the 'obscurity and darkness' wrought by sin.¹²¹ In developing the intimate relationship with God that prayer offered, therefore, bishops would learn God's will and would be given the grace to fulfil it.¹²² All these assumptions lay at the root of Condren's advice to Zamet, and inspired Solminihac's and Pavillon's promises to pray daily and intensely for at least two hours.¹²³

In the late sixteenth century, Charles Borromeo had been the dominant model for French bishops, with his administrative policies adopted wholesale by reforming prelates in the absence of suitable contemporary French models. He had to share the limelight, however, with François de Sales, the late bishop of Geneva, in seventeenth-century French episcopal texts. Between them they received far more attention than any other bishops, ancient or recent. Saint Martin referred indirectly to this when he published his treatise on Thomas de Villeneuve in 1659. Admitting that Villeneuve had not been particularly popular in France up to this point, Saint Martin feared that his Spanish background would discourage wider readership in the future.¹²⁴

Borromeo and de Sales provided bridges between the bishops of the ancient church and those of the present, in that they were held to possess the superb qualities of Augustine, Ambrose and others. Yet their importance lay equally in the facts that they offered original contributions to conceptions of the episcopal vocation. Like Borromeo, de Sales was famous in France; in addition to his contact with French bishops like Camus, he was also the author of two works of devotion which became exceptionally well known in seventeenth-century France.¹²⁵ The bishop's impact upon episcopal pastoral ideals is complicated by the fact that, to some extent, he was understood in seventeenth-century France as an accomplished imitator of Borromeo, a prelate who mirrored the actions of the archbishop of Milan in the administration of his own diocese. He, too, had visited his diocese frequently, introduced clerical reforms

and instructed his clergy and laity by preaching and example. He was, according to Olier's *Discours sur François de Sales*, the 'imitator and perfect copy of Borromeo' in his diocesan government.¹²⁶ It was not only the clerical reform school which held this line of thought; others echoed it. In 1632, Cavet heralded de Sales's imitation of Borromeo in his zeal for an exact liturgy, preaching, sacrament administration, alms-giving and clerical discipline.¹²⁷ Bishop Maupas Du Tour made the same observation when praising the reforming administrations of both bishops.¹²⁸ In his administrative practices, therefore, de Sales was considered to be 'another Saint Charles',¹²⁹ and acted as a straightforward link between Borromeo and contemporary French prelates; they were to introduce Borromeoan practices just as de Sales had done. Still, he was not simply seen as an imitator of the late archbishop, that is, as a 'Borromeoan disciple', even though historiography has often portrayed him exclusively in this way;¹³⁰ he emerged as a model in his own right, separately from his emulation of Borromeoan administrative patterns. For whereas authors concentrated mainly on Borromeo's governing practices, they chose to spotlight de Sales's personal episcopal virtues. When Jean Lemarie compared Bishop Le Gouverneur of Saint-Malo to Borromeo, for example, it was entirely on the basis of both bishops' administrations: Le Gouverneur's residence, visits, synods, provision of good clergy and defence of church rights made him worthy of a Borromeoan tribute.¹³¹

Like a minority of prelates before 1600, many seventeenth-century French bishops did use the Borromeoan framework as the basis for their administrations. This model manifested itself, as Marc Venard and numerous diocesan and biographical studies have shown, in congregations, conferences and confessional practices. The availability of the *Acta ecclesiae Mediolanensis*, even before its publication in France in 1643, meant that many bishops used it as a basis from which to implement Trent's demands for diocesan reform.¹³² Unsurprisingly, La Rochefoucauld owned a copy (as well as two copies of the many *vitae* of the saint), but Solminihac possessed no fewer than three copies and Godeau also had a copy for use in his small diocese. The bishop of Vence particularly treasured his *Acta* because it was one that Borromeo had given to one of his Milanese *curés*.¹³³ Diocesan synods and visitations were fundamental features of the episcopates of all reform-minded French prelates,¹³⁴ and bishops who were themselves influenced by Borromeoan ideas encouraged others to implement them in their dioceses. Nicolas Sévin, bishop of Sarlat, asked Solminihac to lend him a copy of his *Acta* for an extended period.¹³⁵ The bishops of the 1649 Mercuès conference pledged to carry out regular visitations, hold diocesan synods and ensure the ordination of good clergy by the establishment of seminaries, policies which they were already engaged upon.¹³⁶ These promises fulfilled Trent's directives, but both Pavillon and Solminihac declared themselves

influenced by the example of Borromeo's government; Pavillon for the archbishop's untiring administration and Solminihac for his institutional policies. Solminihac wrote to Choart that he had established congregations forane 'following the example of those that Saint Charles Borromeo established'.¹³⁷

A considerable number of other bishops consciously modelled their administrations on Milan; François de Sourdis of Bordeaux is a classic example. While in Rome shortly after his appointment to the episcopate, he resolved to organise his diocese according to Borromeo's model. Thereafter, he maintained a regular correspondence with Federico Borromeo, discussing diocesan matters with him and seeking guidance for his episcopal activities.¹³⁸ Sourdis very much favoured Charles Borromeo's systematised approach to reform, so much so that he held twenty-one diocesan synods during his episcopal tenure, one almost every year, and established congregations forane to educate and discipline the parish clergy.¹³⁹ When he held his provincial council in 1624, it was in explicit imitation of Borromeo, 'the ornament of the Milanese church', while his visitations were carried out with the regularity and attention to detail of those of the Milanese archbishop.¹⁴⁰ Sourdis's sustained devotion to Borromeo's example led him to organise solemn processions, exposition of the Holy Sacrament, a pontifical mass and indulgences on the occasion of the late archbishop's canonisation in 1610. A panegyric of Charles Borromeo was also preached and a surplice presented to the *parlement* as a relic.¹⁴¹

Borromeo's impact on the French church was potent right through the seventeenth century. He was a freshly canonised saint, familiar to clergy and devout laity. His *Instructions aux confesseurs* proved hugely influential upon penitential practices down to the modern era, and contributed to a rigorous vein of penitential catholicism among the parish priests of France.¹⁴² Yet the legitimate claim that he bestrode the century 'like a colossus' can be a rather blunt instrument, obscuring the nuances of the archbishop's impact. One of the major dangers that invariably accompanies any blueprint, of course, is that it will lose its stimulus for progression, so that its 'ways' become definitions, set in stone, admired and copied, but not further elaborated. This is nowhere more evident than in the question of Borromeo's force as an episcopal ideal: it was starkly apparent in late sixteenth-century France, when bishops made no adaptations to the Borromeo model, but simply followed it closely. The seventeenth century, however, reacted rather differently. Here, the archbishop's specific importance lay in the fact that he was first and foremost an administrative model. This should not suggest that his personal virtue was not admired or that bishops were not recommended to imitate his humility, his prayer, prudence and wisdom. But it was chiefly his coherent, organised and easily accessible system of visits, synods and congregations which were proposed as the elements of a workable diocesan pastorate and which proved most influential

among French bishops. In this respect, conscientious bishops of the seventeenth century did not differ from their predecessors of the late sixteenth. Yet while Borromeo's personal stringency was admired, it was not necessarily presented as the ideal to be copied. He was considered too austere in his personal life and too strict for most French bishops to adopt his mortified manner of life.

French bishops and authors were not the first to reject aspects of the Borromeoan episcopate, though it had not previously been done publicly. The bishop of Bologna, Paleotti, had criticised what he considered to be Borromeo's excessively centralised control of his clergy, his extreme austerity and his inability to compromise with those less rigorous than himself.¹⁴³ Agostino Valier, another prominent post-Trent bishop, privately reproved Borromeo's rigid defence of ecclesiastical jurisdiction in his correspondence with Federico Borromeo, and counselled Federico not to attempt to imitate his uncle in all aspects of his episcopate.¹⁴⁴ Yet these opinions were only expressed privately and these men were certainly not willing to publish their views or to challenge the rapidly developing image of Borromeo as the ultimate model for all prelates. In the seventeenth-century French church, however, as bishops and reformers attempted to develop an ideal of episcopacy based on older traditions but responsive to immediate needs, they were unwilling simply to accept *en bloc* all aspects of the Borromeoan ideal. Rather, they developed a combination of the most relevant elements of Borromeo's and de Sales's episcopates and proposed this as the blueprint for contemporary French bishops.

Every French treatise on Charles Borromeo referred to his magnificent austerities and his life of physical penance.¹⁴⁵ Camus lauded the 'strange and extraordinary mortifications' by which Borromeo had reduced his body to servitude. In particular, Camus commented, Borromeo had wished to cultivate a spirit of chastity and humility through the subjection of his body to the divine will. His disciplines included a very frugal diet of bread and water, restricted sleep and extremely grim living conditions. That simplicity was all the more impressive to Camus because it was cultivated amid the material splendour of the Milanese archbishopric and by a man who had been born into a powerful noble family.¹⁴⁶ This observation had particular application to many bishops in seventeenth-century France. Étienne Cavet adopted it enthusiastically when he described Borromeo's 'one thousand inconveniences', his nocturnal vigils, abstinence, prayers and bodily mortifications.¹⁴⁷

However, although Camus displayed the greatest respect for Borromeo's feats in his homilies, he made it perfectly clear that he did not want his brethren to imitate them. 'We are no more than the cold ashes of which our predecessors were the blazing coals.'¹⁴⁸ Others were less scathing in their language, but they acquiesced with Camus's basic position. Olier agreed that Borromeo was a bishop possessed of 'miraculous and divine virtue', but did not shy from arguing

that the austerity and rigour of his life were simply too much for most bishops.¹⁴⁹ Godeau made precisely the same point in his eulogy of the late archbishop, recounting how Borromeo had undertaken tremendous penance throughout his career by offering his body for the sins of men. In sanctifying his own body through disciplines, therefore, he had sanctified others. But, wrote Godeau, 'The life of Saint Charles is not a regular example that all bishops have to follow.'¹⁵⁰ He pertinently observed that Christ had not lived an acutely austere life while on earth. Rather, he had lived as a man in the world, eating and drinking just as men did. Though his Apostles had practised their own austerities, as had other early bishops like Ambrose and Martin of Tours, Christ was obviously the principal model for bishops, and if he had avoided corporal mortification then so should they.¹⁵¹ Godeau had offered the same ideal in his eulogy of Augustine just five years before. Although he had to admit that the saintly Augustine had practised corporal penance, Godeau was at pains to stress that he had only done so only with the utmost circumspection and prudence.¹⁵² Obviously, Godeau was extremely anxious to discourage, or at the very least to restrict, physical mortification by bishops. To do so, he, like Camus, was not above implicitly criticising the practices of revered members of the Catholic episcopate, even when he did not have the confidence to condemn them outright.

Even a cursory examination of the published reflections, on the other hand, reveals an authorship that saw in de Sales a bishop who had neither approved of nor indulged in constant and radical corporal austerities, but who had, nonetheless, managed to live a life of supreme sanctity. Although Godeau agreed that de Sales did not overly indulge in the material offerings of life, his image was far from that of a bishop occupied with extreme bodily penance.¹⁵³ Olier's panegyric of the late bishop observed that the only external mortifications undertaken by de Sales had been the mockeries and contradiction inflicted by others,¹⁵⁴ and Caussin highlighted de Sales's moderate approach to fasting, vigils and possessions.¹⁵⁵ Both commentators then proceeded to paint the bishop not as a figure who purposely inflicted tremendous physical suffering on his body, but as a man who had followed 'the cross of God' through mortification of the heart and spirit. He was to be imitated because of 'the grandeur, ease, and the mildness of all his actions'.¹⁵⁶

Again and again, de Sales was presented as a bishop who had perfectly abandoned himself to God's will, an abnegation most famously apparent in his charity towards all. De Sales's episcopate was considered to have been very special indeed. His will had constantly been turned towards the good, even in the face of temptations and pressures from secular society. His charity had propelled the crucifying sacrifices and suffering of his episcopal life, for it was the supreme manifestation of love of God and mankind.¹⁵⁷ Bishops were constantly encouraged to adopt Salesian charity, on the basis that if anything could

overcome the human frailties of ambition and selfishness, it was this kind of compassionate love. Naturally, de Sales's life had required discipline, for it had often been difficult for him to resist sin, but this was a discipline willingly undertaken in charity. It was also an interior discipline of the will, rather than of the body, a 'poverty of the spirit' whose principles fitted comfortably with the doctrines of Bérulle, Olier and their disciples: their contemporary stress on the notions of suffering sacrifice, self-abnegation and the death of the self tipped the balance towards mental rather than corporal discipline.

Vincent de Paul offered a perfect example of this alignment when he advised Louis Abelly on the worries that bishops were forced to endure when they clashed with regular clergy in their dioceses. He told Abelly that the late bishop of Comminges, Donadieu de Griet, and Bishop de Sales had here offered perfect examples of conduct. Both had rejected regulars' resistance to their authority with a combination of firmness and charity, but had been sanctified through the suffering that they endured to defend proper ecclesiastical discipline.¹⁵⁸ When Étienne Caulet was plagued by rebellious priests in 1648, Jean-Jacques Olier was able to advise him that if his heart would only remain faithful to Christ, 'the rest is nothing'. His endurance of trials and devotion to God's wishes would bring its heavenly reward.¹⁵⁹ Olier even composed a little prayer of supplication to God, which asked him to produce bishops with 'a spirit of sanctity and separation' from the world.¹⁶⁰

Olier characterised the Salesian episcopate as 'mortification of the spirit, founded on the spirit, and operated by it, dividing the flesh from the spirit'. Linking de Sales's thought with his own theology, he declared that this type of penitence and suffering was sure to destroy human vices.¹⁶¹ Other authors often used the language of the French school's reformers to illustrate the bishop's particular virtue. Nicolas Caussin's treatise on de Sales admitted that physical mortification held some value but claimed that interior mortification, the 'cross of God', was the most admirable virtue of all. The whole of François de Sales's life was marked, he concluded, by this.¹⁶² Even Godeau, himself a bishop, acknowledged that bishops need only live reasonably simply and penitently, using prudence to mark the limits of their austerity. Charity, he said, the touchstone of de Sales's episcopal life, was the most important feature of episcopal actions, rather than extreme mortification.¹⁶³

At the same time, however, seventeenth-century bishops and reformers did not denigrate the memory of the red (or physical) martyrs. When describing actual martyrdom, they stuck firmly to traditional language and principles. As it had been for the early church, martyrdom was a wondrous vocation involving patient suffering, endurance of insult and injury and, ultimately, the shedding of blood, in order that one could witness to Jesus Christ. One example was Saint Savinian, archbishop of Sens, who was thought to have been

one of the original seventy-two disciples sent forth by Peter 'to plant this vine and to cultivate it well'.¹⁶⁵ He was a perfect example of apostolic mission for his descendants to follow, remarked his biographer, Étienne Binet, and a bishop who 'carried a heart of gold' and 'a soul of diamond'.¹⁶⁵ Savinian had not only worked energetically to convert and care for his people, he had also been a martyr for God.¹⁶⁶ Yet why had God permitted the martyrdom of Savinian, his apostle bishop? For Binet, this was a glorious fate, in which the archbishop had been able to emulate Christ, who had willingly shed 'his precious blood to redeem souls'.¹⁶⁷ Martyrdom offered an example of heroic sacrifice to those who had not yet been converted through Savinian's preaching: 'It is virtue which talks by these mouths of blood, and none can resist the rhetoric . . . of the magnanimous and invincible patience of a true servant of Jesus Christ.'¹⁶⁸

Binet presented Savinian's martyrdom in classic terms: patient devotion to the faith and to his people, suffering and persecution, enduring loyalty to Christ until his excruciating death, and a just reward in Heaven for his loyal sacrifice. Still, it is obvious that even Binet did not regard Savinian's death as a literal model for contemporary bishops, a sentiment that was strongly echoed by other reforming writers. They did not wish their bishops to die for the faith, even if the opportunity had been present in seventeenth-century France. Instead, they displayed a pronounced distaste for any kind of physical suffering. This was certainly a departure from the middle ages, when the lives of individual saints had frequently been characterised by acute food and sleep deprivation, as well as corporal punishments. Even in the seventeenth century, these kinds of 'buffeting' disciplines were far from obsolete.¹⁶⁹ Even so, Isaac Le Maistre was able to argue that the austerity of the religious life was not proper for the episcopal, although Martin of Tours and Gregory the Great had transferred their monkish austerities to their episcopal vocation. Borromeo might have followed their example, Le Maistre added, but that was because he too was blessed with an extraordinary 'love for humility and for poverty'.¹⁷⁰ Other bishops were not obliged to take this path.

In contrast, de Sales's interior mortification and episcopal charity were particularly appealing to his French admirers. By raising their profile, he presented a more imitable personal sanctity than Borromeo, an example that most bishops could practically be expected to follow. Camus's emphasis on charity in his writings sprang directly from his close links with Salesian spirituality; this close associate of the bishop of Geneva was one of those most involved in spreading his spirituality and reputation. Pavillon too was particularly influenced by de Sales, whose compassionate charity he was keen to replicate in his relations with others.¹⁷¹ Perhaps nobody, however, articulated the factors driving the Salesian episcopate with more precision than Bossuet, who, shortly before de Sales's canonisation, produced a well-crafted panegyric of the late

bishop that compared the Borromean and Salesian episcopates in order to highlight the best qualities of both. Each man had been of extraordinary and edifying sanctity, Bossuet began, though they were of quite different talents and conduct. For Borromeo had renewed religious life through administrative reforms, while de Sales had done so by his cross, with 'his thorns, his detachment and his sufferings'.¹⁷² But having pinpointed de Sales's particular form of interior mortification, Bossuet then turned to the extraordinary charity that had characterised his episcopate. This virtue, so particular to the bishop, had won him many hearts, when with compassion and patience he had led them towards God: 'Never had a man practised this innocent ruse and this salutary intelligence better than the holy bishop of whom we talk.'¹⁷³

Worried that the conscientious François Fouquet would wear himself out with labour and mortification Vincent de Paul begged the bishop to moderate his extremities so that he would be able to continue to serve God in the long term.¹⁷⁴ He was also acutely concerned when his friend Alain de Solminihac expressed his willingness to expose himself to illness and death by personally ministering to the plague-ridden.¹⁷⁵ Yet, among others, de Paul strongly counselled him against such an extraordinary sacrifice, and wrote that Borromeo's action, which Solminihac hoped to emulate, arose from a very particular divine inspiration and did not have to be imitated by other bishops. Rather, Solminihac should assume a supervisory role, organising and encouraging spiritual assistance as well as providing material aid but avoiding direct exposure to the plague himself as much as possible.¹⁷⁶ Solminihac's high regard for de Paul's opinion, and presumably for the advice of his other confidants, meant that he eventually followed this advice. It is also significant that Solminihac, later presented as a very Borromean prelate, changed his mind, and was prepared to temper his enthusiasm for Borromean austerity and extreme mortifying sacrifice when he felt it necessary: 'I will follow your advice in all; I had been resolved to expose myself only in so much as I knew it was the will of God.'¹⁷⁷

The discussion that took place on this occasion between Solminihac and his associates is particularly interesting for its vivid portrayal of the issues which could and did arise in the development of ideas on episcopacy and reform. It is obvious that the questions of sacrifice and charity were particularly pertinent to reformers of the episcopate and that they received close attention in published texts and private reflections. It is also clear from this episode that, however much Solminihac's advisors admired Borromeo, they did not accept that he was an absolute or definitive example for bishops in all circumstances. Their general conclusion, to which Solminihac submitted, was that the charitable principle did not necessarily need to take the form of extreme physical suffering and mortification: it was as much a progressively

cultivated mental and spiritual state as a corporal one, and love of God and one's flock could be shown in other ways.

Another reformer, Louis Tronson, offered the same advice to one of his episcopal confidants, by concentrating particularly on the primacy of interior spirituality over conventionally pious physical practices like fasting or vigils. Again and again, Tronson warned the bishop of Limoges, Lascaris d'Urfé, to avoid strict mortifications of the body: the bishop's propensity to restrict his rest and food as well as to push himself mercilessly in his work was not only dangerous to his physical health, but would ultimately affect his ability to pray and to perform the spiritual exercises which were the essential bases for the episcopal life.¹⁷⁸ Tronson took the trouble to provide specific instructions for the bishop, including the suggestion that he should merely refrain from indulgent delicacies during his meal if he wished to perform an act of mortification. That seemingly small act would be 'at least as useful as other more brilliant penances',¹⁷⁹ Neither Tronson nor de Paul, therefore, dismissed moderate habits of penance and austerity, but they were loath to counsel the kind of 'arduous' behaviour that would deliberately expose bishops to 'maladies' and even death.¹⁸⁰ A 'long Lent' meant virtually nothing when compared with the virtuous disposition that formed true mortification of the heart. In fact, as Camus observed, it would demonstrate only 'half the virtue' of the interior spirit of charity, sacrifice and abnegation.¹⁸¹ Bishops should adopt equilibrated regimes of work, fasting and rest, leaving ample time to cultivate, through prayer and study, the charitable love that would drive their pastorates.

Salesian episcopacy was hardly an easy road to take but, importantly, it did allow some accommodation between the sacred and the profane in a society where the pressure on bishops to conform to secular values was particularly great, and from which they could not hope to escape even if they wished. Part of the attraction of this brand of episcopacy was the fact that bishops could assuage their consciences by adopting a stringent attitude to their spiritual life and by cultivating the internal spirits of poverty and charity, which compensated for a relatively relaxed exterior. For one of de Sales's greatest admirers, Bossuet, the temptations at court were acute: a man naturally inclined towards material sophistication, he maintained a comfortable, if not ostentatious, household as bishop, but fought to distance himself mentally from his worldly environment through hours of meditative prayer and study that aimed to draw him closer to God.¹⁸² Underpinning this activity was the Salesian dogma that though a bishop might be surrounded by wealth, he could cultivate the inner spirit of poverty appropriate to his office: 'Abandonment to God's will is a more efficacious means than all the extraordinary austerities . . . the doctrine of Saint François de Sales appears very far from approving them.'¹⁸³

De Sales, then, obviously offered particular attractions to the French episcopate: first, an episcopal spirituality that could be cultivated by any bishop. This partially answers the question of why he was embraced so wholeheartedly by French authors and by French bishops themselves, as their repeated requests for his beatification reveal. Of course, this cult of the bishop fed into the process of beatification, for if those who agitated on his behalf could present him as a revered model of episcopal brilliance, then this would strengthen his case in Rome. Second, however, partially because of his links with the French reform school, this francophone bishop could be adopted as a truly French episcopal saint, born 'for the good of France' and for the specific benefit of its seventeenth-century bishops, even though he was not technically French.¹⁸⁴ He offered the French what the Milanese, the Spanish and Portuguese churches had in Borromeo, Martyrs and Villeneuve, and so filled an acutely felt gap. In administration, therefore, he was the French Borromeo, but in his interpretation of episcopal virtue he was a seminal model, whom Caussin termed 'a domestic genius', like 'a mirror of perfection'.¹⁸⁵

Even though, however, episcopal advisors removed self-inflicted physical suffering from their formula for episcopacy, they did not encourage a mellow life for bishops. Moderation of habits was the catchphrase in every treatise and manual, with virtually all authors identifying three particular dangers for contemporary bishops: first, the calls for favours made on them by relatives; second, the risk of becoming a crown servant rather than an ecclesiastic; and, finally, the temptation to spend diocesan income on frivolous luxuries.¹⁸⁶ There was nothing worse than either a spendthrift, mercenary or *politique* prelate, and each was roundly condemned for his failure to distance himself literally and emotionally from material wealth and honour. Jean-Pierre Camus was one of the most outspoken, for as a bishop with quite a plain mode of living, he could not understand why other prelates presumed to use the church's goods as their own personal pot of gold. Riches and worldly honour meant absolutely nothing to a true bishop, so that he had no need for sumptuous clothing, food or fittings. The only way to honour the episcopal ministry was through virtue, which would ultimately earn the genuine respect of princes and paupers alike.¹⁸⁷ Bishops were not courtesans who sold their integrity as God's ambassadors for earthly rewards and who allowed themselves to be tainted by politics, 'and possessed by this spirit that dominates at court'.¹⁸⁸ Unfortunately, it seemed that for reformers too many bishops acted in just that way, so that their diabolically 'unregulated conduct' had nothing in common with the examples of Christ, his Apostles and Saint Paul.¹⁸⁹ These were not true bishops, suggested Jean Le Noir, for not only did they fail to reside amongst their flock and attend to their pastoral cares; they lived scandalously debauched lives obsessed by the devilish perversions of lust, gambling or luxury.¹⁹⁰

Equally, Godeau condemned the pomp that he believed to be destroying the episcopate. In particular, he argued that it was actually self-defeating, for if bishops acted like *grands seigneurs*, then the crown and laity were bound to treat them as such. If these were outwardly sycophantic, they inwardly scorned bishops for their profane ‘concupiscence of the flesh’.¹⁹¹ With the same incisiveness, Godeau remarked that the seventeenth century predisposed bishops to extravagance, since they often felt obliged to follow the habits of the laity in order to avoid accusations of singularity and pride. He recommended that bishops adopt a way of living that struck a happy balance between decadence and exceptional frugality: simple eating habits, an avoidance of excessive sleeping and inactivity. Even the Assembly of Clergy issued guidelines on the simple life appropriate to a bishop, for ‘that which is eminent before men is [an] abomination before God’.¹⁹²

No one, however, condemned all material comfort. Rather, it was a question of using a degree of ornamentation and luxury which was consistent with the hierarchical dignity of the episcopal office. Yet no bishop should become a slave to secular and fleshly extravagances, since he should always be focused on God and on his spiritual charge. This was the stabilising ‘poverty of the spirit’, so apparent in the life and teaching of François de Sales, a complete emotional detachment from worldly surroundings.¹⁹³ Of course, poverty is a relative concept in any century, but, in practice, it is obvious that a notable number of seventeenth-century bishops strove to combat the temptations of greed and immoderate consumption. Solminihac, Pavillon, Caulet, Hardivilliers and many other bishops were well known for their simple lives and their efforts to cultivate what they described as ‘poverty of the body and soul’.¹⁹⁴ Other bishops shared the same goal: a government official who visited Conserans in 1667 found a fine episcopal palace recently built by the hospitable Bishop Marmiesse, but recorded that the prelate actually lived routinely in plain chambers, ‘without luxury or sumptuousness’. In this way, Marmiesse reconciled the public trappings of the episcopal office with the theological ideals of piety, temperance and humility.¹⁹⁵

For every bishop famous for his moderate habits, there existed a comrade renowned for his conspicuous consumption and courtly lifestyle. How did prelates like Pierre de Marca and Anthime-Denis Cohon reconcile their extravagance with the ideal then pushed in every publication and personified in the lives of men like Solminihac? Some, of course, never tried to reconcile that contradiction; there is no evidence to suggest that the *politique* Pierre de Marca ever felt at all uncomfortable with the fruits of his role as advisor to the Mazarine government.¹⁹⁶ But for some, like Bossuet, the stark discrepancies between indulgence and the contemporary episcopal vocational ideal simply became too disturbing to ignore and they had to find means of satisfying their consciences.

The son of a mere candle merchant, the ambitious and resourceful Cohon climbed to episcopal status thanks to his prowess as a royal *prédicateur* under Louis XIII, and quickly became notorious for his love of wine, women and song.¹⁹⁷ Not only did he indulge himself; he also coaxed bishops of a more austere turn to soften the demands which they made upon themselves: in 1638, he did not shy from urging the archbishop of Lyon, Alphonse Richelieu, to abandon his flock when plague overran the city. This advice was based purely on common sense, Cohon admitted, and a natural, rather than a moral, philosophy, that placed personal interests above any 'holy fury' or 'sentiment'.¹⁹⁸

Cohon's persuasive effort was unsuccessful, for Richelieu resolutely refused to leave his see during this crisis. Yet before many years had passed, Cohon failed to follow his own advice: when his diocese (Nîmes) was threatened by plague, he remained in residence to bolster his clergy and to organise relief for the victims of plague. He was also a generous donator to charitable foundations, and has been identified as a conscientious Tridentine administrator, usually resident in Nîmes, and a regular convenor of synods and visitations.¹⁹⁹ This was a complicated episcopate, therefore, in which an equally complex man of instinctively sybaritic tastes assuaged his conscience by making concerted efforts to temper elements of his life in accordance with the prevailing climate of episcopal reform. He might never reach the Spartan heights of men like Pavillon, Caulet or Pierre d'Hardivilliers of Bourges, but his was perhaps the workable, if flawed, variant that most bishops could realistically hope to achieve: an episcopate that compensated for particular frailties through superlative efforts in other aspects of the ideal presented in didactic works and by exemplary prelates.²⁰⁰

Even Fénelon found it difficult to avoid the trappings of a life at court, and it was not until he took up permanent residence in Cambrai, after his banishment from Versailles during the Quietest controversy,²⁰¹ that he was free to indulge his taste for simplicity and frugality.²⁰² He was so appalled at the extravagances of some bishops that he was moved to write to Colbert, archbishop of Rouen, to complain of the 'building frenzy' sweeping France; how could this be curbed, he asked, if bishops did not give an example of simplicity and modesty in their living arrangements? 'Show the heart of a bishop', he urged, 'who is no longer tied to the world, and who brings the reign of Jesus Christ.' Instead, Fénelon saw in Colbert a disciple of Christ who had fallen prey to the deadly sins of pride and greed: 'The Gospel is in [your] mouth, and social glory is in [your] works.'²⁰³ However, even in the career of a devout churchman like Fénelon, the tension between episcopal ideals of ecclesiastical service and secular temptation is evident; this bishop did not reside in Cambrai for the first two years of his appointment because Louis XIV requested that he continued to tutor the duke of Bourgogne at the royal court.²⁰⁴

Given the imprint that non-French bishops made on the development of French episcopal ideals, it is not altogether surprising that no native bishops emerged to dominate hagiography. Probably the sheer supremacy of de Sales, and indeed of Borromeo, discouraged attempts to further the hagiography of contemporary French bishops. This does not imply that efforts were not made to promote the cult of individual members of the French episcopate. A number of hagiographic works dealing with French bishops were produced during this period, and we have referred to them during the course of this chapter. Those bishops were all well-known reformers: François de La Rochefoucauld, Donadieu, Cospeau, Solminihac, Gault, Villazel and Pavillon. Excepting Solminihac and La Rochefoucauld, all benefited from just one work each. Godeau also included Solminihac, along with Jean-Baptiste Gault, in his *Éloge des évêques*. These were, however, the only two of his contemporaries whom he felt to be deserving of his attention.²⁰⁵

Each of these bishops was a prominent prelate of his day, and, three years after his death in 1643, the Assembly actually suggested that Gault be canonised.²⁰⁶ Although, however, he was considered a 'saintly' bishop, the only two individuals who came close to a hagiographic tradition around their episcopates, even before their deaths, were Alain de Solminihac and Nicolas Pavillon. Contemporaries were fulsome in their praise of their administrations and personal characteristics; they were not regarded as wholly original in the character of their vocation but were considered to express fully the accepted French ideal of the *bonus pastor*. Solminihac's canonisation was raised in the Assembly of 1670, though not discussed at length, following an enquiry into his life and miracles under Nicolas Sévin.²⁰⁷ Even before he died in 1659, many who knew him regarded him as a saint: his friend Vincent de Paul remarked that, even in the midst of turmoil, he managed to maintain a spirit of inner peace. He was able to do so because he persistently kept his eyes fixed on God, striving to please him rather than men. De Paul concluded that the bishop's soul was intimately linked to the divine.²⁰⁸

Others commented favourably on Solminihac's untiring administration in Cahors and his personal virtue. When his admirers described these, they painted the bishop as a classic mixture of Borromeo's rigour and institutional genius and Salesian sacrifice and charity. Chastenet, his chief biographer, presented Solminihac as a zealous bishop motivated by the charitable impulse, patiently suffering hardship for love of flock and God, and persistently fulfilling his administrative duties until finally overtaken by terminal illness.²⁰⁹ Moreover, a number of bishops, like Salignac of Sarlat, Marmiesse and Vialart declared themselves heavily influenced by his example. According to Vialart, 'The memory of the late monsignor bishop of Cahors is in great benediction not only in France but even in the whole church, and all good people conserve great veneration for the examples

which he left, of penitence, poverty, charity, untiring work in the functions of his charge.²¹⁰ Solminihac's advice was sought on administrative matters by a number of bishops; Philibert de Brandon, a bishop particularly admired by Solminihac as an 'apostolic man',²¹¹ sought his counsel when he wished to establish a seminary in Périgueux shortly after the Mercuès conference.²¹²

Pavillon was likewise credited with inspiring his fellow bishops. Besides his close links with Étienne Caulet, his advice was sought on administrative matters by prelates such as François Bosquet, Pierre Fenouillet, François Fouquet, Jerome de Grimaldi, Nicolas Sanguin and Felix Vialart.²¹³ The bishop's virtue was also the subject of praise, both before and after his death in 1677; his charity, piety, doctrine and humility were all considered to be of superb quality and worthy of imitation. Antoine Godeau was highly impressed by Pavillon and expressed his hope of visiting the bishop of Alet 'to renew my interior, to open my heart to him, and to edify myself by his examples'.²¹⁴ Pavillon's personal life was as simple as Solminihac's: each shunned luxurious furniture, clothing and food, spent two hours in prayer daily and devoted the bulk of his revenues to the poor. This was material simplicity, but also the 'poverty of the spirit', that detachment from worldly goods and values, so beloved of the French episcopal ideal.²¹⁵

There were aspects of Pavillon's and Solminihac's episcopates with which other bishops were not entirely content. Étienne Le Camus certainly revered Pavillon, calling him 'a saint on earth', with 'a humility, a divine presence and a charity which delight me'. Even so, he was not absolutely comfortable with Pavillon's style and went on to add a single cautionary note to his assessment, discerning in the bishop of Alet that same characteristic that he identified in Caulet: 'He is inflexible when he believes that he sees his obligations clearly and he has a surprising condescension . . . it is terse and unlikely to convert all and he has no tolerance for the expedients and dispositions that are necessary.' Le Camus did not doubt that this approach had been successful in Alet because it had been adopted in proportion to the needs of the diocese, but he felt, for temperamental reasons, that he could not assume it himself in Grenoble. He would have preferred more tactful diplomacy in the bishop's intercourse, but, even so, he conceded that 'men have weaknesses whatever virtues they might have; I did not recognise any in [Pavillon]; it is a masculine piety, firm, uniform, charitable, always in order.'²¹⁶

There were those, chiefly clerics with whom Pavillon clashed in Alet, who accused the bishop of excessive austerity in his conduct,²¹⁷ but it was, apparently, differences in personal taste and personality, rather than a profound clash of principles, which prevented Le Camus from wholeheartedly endorsing Pavillon's episcopate. Pavillon himself actually found Solminihac's style a little too rigorous for his liking, and Caulet commented that both had sometimes

displayed too much rectitude in their discipline.²¹⁸ In general, however, these were criticisms of the style rather than the substance of these bishops' tenures, and were a function of the individual personalities which made up the episcopate. The shrewd Godeau made precisely this point when he compared Solminihac with de Sales in 1665. A firm admirer of both bishops, he admitted that Solminihac's personality had made him seem more severe than the naturally temperate de Sales. For Godeau, Solminihac's instinctive rigour was a flaw in his otherwise excellent character, but he had managed to overcome it with a generosity of spirit that mirrored de Sales's charitable love.²¹⁹ Yet many other bishops did not even complain that Pavillon or Solminihac had been too tactless or inflexible and, in fact, they admired their resolution through their long careers. Indeed, even when contemporaries occasionally criticised 'saintly' bishops, they invariably highlighted the fact that their natural character traits had not smothered that most crucial of episcopal qualities: charity. Like Godeau, Le Camus was careful to distinguish and approve Pavillon's selfless love of God and his flock, before praising his humility and dedicated leadership. This distinction explicitly identified charity as the superior virtue that bound de Sales, Solminihac and Pavillon, and it was this common quality that made them so special to their admirers.

The fact that Pavillon, Solminihac and several other French prelates were presented as personifications of an episcopal ideal that combined elements of the pastorates of Borromeo and de Sales and linked them to the bishops of the early church demonstrates the blending and reworking of traditions and ideas that took place in the evolution of seventeenth-century pastoral ideals, as well as in other aspects of episcopacy. De Sales brought charity particularly to the fore, and provided a more humane focus for the bureaucratic or legislative pastorate of the Borromeo school, which French bishops did not consider to be adequate for their requirements or fully representative of the spiritual and pastoral role of prelates in the church. His spirituality obviously fulfilled an episcopal need, that of articulating an updated spiritual inspiration and framework for the complicated realities thrown up by bishops' administrative work and personal lives. For these men and those who advised them sought a workable pastoral ideal, one that was demanding but possible to apply, and they managed to formulate it by weaving together the ideas and lives of venerable prelates, past and present. No French prelate emerged as a dominant paragon during this period, but the composite model crafted from older traditions was thought to be admirably fulfilled by a number of celebrated bishops. Yet François de Sales towered above all these, adopted as a French example of episcopal brilliance, perfectly blending the Borromeo administrative style with his own less austere ideas of interior mortification and charity.

Notes

- 1 For the dramatic development of hagiographic scholarship outside France during this era, see Simon Ditchfield's study of Tridentine Italy: *Liturgy, Sanctity and History in Tridentine Italy. Pietro Maria Campi and the Preservation of the Particular* (Cambridge 1995).
- 2 Jean Baptiste Possevin, *Discours de la vie de Saint Charles Borromée cardinal du tiltre de Sainte Praxède, et archevêque de Milan*, trans. A. C. (Bordeaux 1611); Jean-Pierre Giussano, *Histoire de la vie, vertus, mort et miracles de Saint Charles Borromée, cardinal prêtre du titre de Saint Praxède, archevêque de Milan*, trans. Nicolas de Souffour (Paris 1615); Jean Lemarie, *Abregé de la vie, miracles, et canonisation de S. Charles Borromée, cardinal du tiltre de Sancte Praxede, et archevêque de Milan* (Saint-Malo 1618).
- 3 See, for example, Jean-Pierre Camus, *Les Devoirs paroissiaux* (Paris 1642); Jean-Pierre Camus, *Les Emplois de l'ecclésiastique du clergé* (Paris 1643).
- 4 Molinier, *Donadieu*, p. 8.
- 5 Noulleau, *Villazel*. Noulleau (1607–72) enjoyed excellent relations with Villazel, to whom he owed his position as diocesan *théologal*: Brémond, *Histoire*, vii, pp. 197–214.
- 6 Peter Burke, 'How to Become a Counter-Reformation Saint', in Kaspar von Greyerz (ed.), *Religion and Society in Early Modern Europe* (London 1984), pp. 45–55; Rudolph Bell and Donald Weinstein, *Saints and Society. Christendom, 1000–1700* (Chicago and London 1982), p. 14.
- 7 See Ditchfield, *Liturgy*, pp. 273–360, for a detailed discussion of the local ecclesiastical histories produced by Italian scholars during the seventeenth century.
- 8 Binet dedicated his *L'Idée des bons prélats et la vie de Saint Savinian, primat et premier archevêque de Sens, et de ses saints compagnons* (Paris 1629) to Bellegarde.
- 9 Étienne Binet, *De la sainte hiérarchie de l'église, et de la vie de Saint Aderald, archidiacre et chanoine de Troyes, restaurateur de la communauté des chanoines* (Paris 1633), pp. 12–19: 'vicaires de Dieu . . . qui brûlent d'amour de Dieu, . . . Image du Dieu vivant, son Lieutenant sous le ciel . . . Peut on rien concevoir de plus eminent?'
- 10 Nicolas Lescapier, *Le Protecteur de la maison de Dieu. Contre l'impieté, et l'ambition* (Paris 1636), p. 306: 'Quelle puissance a un père sur ses enfants, et quel respect et obéissance doivent les enfans à leur père; de quelque condition que soient les hommes, ils sont enfans des Évesques.'
- 11 The only detailed treatment of Noulleau's theology and spirituality is found in Brémond, *Histoire*, vii, pp. 214–65.
- 12 Noulleau, *Villazel*, pp. 12, 19–20.
- 13 Leonor d'Etampes, *Advis de l'assemblée générale du clergé de France. À messieurs les archevêques et évesques de ce royaume* (Paris 1625), pp. 5–9.
- 14 *Ibid.*, p. 23.
- 15 Camus, *Hiérarque*, preface (unpaginated): 'remarquer ce que vous avez de bon pour en rendre grâces au Père des lumières, . . . et ce qui vous manque, afin que vous tascherez d'avoir cet or pur que l'ange dans l'Apocalypse conseille à un Évesque d'acheter afin de se rendre riche pour l'éternité.' The biblical reference is to Rev. 3:18.
- 16 *Ibid.*, pp. 16, 18.
- 17 *Ibid.*, pp. 111–12, 432.
- 18 Camus, *Considérations*, pp. 91–2.
- 19 Camus, *Hiérarque*, p. 237; Camus, *Considérations*, p. 64–5; Camus, *Unite*, p. 39.
- 20 Camus, *Hiérarque*, p. 649; Camus, *Esprit*, ii, p. 11.
- 21 Camus, *Hiérarque*, p. 140; Camus, *Considérations*, p. 151; Camus, *Unite*, pp. 94, 147.
- 22 BN, Ms. Fr. 14428(i).
- 23 *Ibid.*, fos 5v–7r: 'Nous sommes comme la victime qui doit estre immolée pour tous les peuples de nos dioceses, et nous en approcherons avec cet esprit de victime.'
- 24 *Ibid.*, fos 66r–v.
- 25 Antoine Godeau, *La Vie de S. Augustin évesque d'Hyponne* (Paris 1652), p. 373: 'la Dignité la plus sainte qui soit en la terre, . . . la participation de toutes les grandeurs et de toute la puissance du Fils de Dieu'; Godeau, *Lettres*, p. 126, Godeau to Chappelain, 12 September 1639:

- 'plus élevez au dessus du peuple par leurs vertus que par leur caractère'. Bishop Arnould noted that the virtues of priesthood 'doivent se trouver dans un degré plus éminent dans les Pontifes de Jésus-Christ': quoted in Bonnot, *Arnould*, p. 153.
- 26 Camus was consecrated bishop in 1609 and Etampes in 1621.
- 27 Ch. 2, pp. 59–65.
- 28 Camus, *Hiérarque*, pp. 94–5.
- 29 Antoine Godeau, *La Vie de Saint Charles Borromée, cardinal du titre de Sainte Praxède, et archevêque de Milan* (Paris 1657), preface (unpaginated). This was reprinted in 1663 and 1684.
- 30 *Ibid.*, preface (unpaginated), pp. 566–7.
- 31 Antoine Godeau, *Éloge des évêques, qui dans tous les siècles de l'église ont fleury en doctrine et en sainteté* (Paris 1665), pp. 735–7: 'Le plus haut degré de Grace en la terre est celui de l'Épiscopat; et le Père Gault en fut entièrement pénétré.'
- 32 Lefebvre, *Pavillon*, p. 274.
- 33 Isaac Le Maistre de Sacy, *La Vie de Dom Barthélemy des Martyrs religieux de l'ordre de S. Dominique, archevêque de Braga en Portugal* (Paris 1663), pp. 574–5. Two editions of this work appeared in 1663, followed by editions in 1664 and 1678. All were published in Paris.
- 34 François de Sales, *Les Oeuvres du bienheureux François de Sales évêque et prince de Genève*, 2 vols (Paris 1641), ii, p. 22.
- 35 Etampes, *Advis*, pp. 84–6, 105.
- 36 Godeau, *Augustin*, pp. 448–50: 'Les troupes de secours ne veulent point reconnoître les Chefs legitimes . . . Que quand la soumission est seulement en paroles et en révérences . . . on change le privilege de pouvoir servir en prétentions de commander.'
- 37 Godeau, *Borromée*, pp. 526–32.
- 38 Noulleau, *Villazel*, pp. 32–5: 'laisser à tous les Saints Évesques . . . la iurisdiction Épiscopale sur toutes les consciences de leurs Diocèses'.
- 39 Camus, *Hiérarque*, p. 83: 'Quant à l'institution de l'Épiscopat, qu'elle ne soit de droit divin, ie ne voi personne qui le contredire, non seulement quant à l'ordre mais aussi quant à la Jurisdiction.'; Camus, *Esprit*, i, pp. 155–6.
- 40 Almeida Rolo, *L'Evêque*, p. 92.
- 41 Godeau, *Évesques*, pp. 571–2.
- 42 Alexandre-Louis Varet, *Relation de ce qui s'est passé dans l'affaire de la Paix de l'église sous le pape Clément IX*, 3 vols (n.p. 1706), ii, p. 383.
- 43 Noulleau, *Villazel*, p. 30.
- 44 Ch. 5, p. 144–62.
- 45 Camus, *Borromée*, p. 31; Claude de La Chambre, *Panegyrique de S. Charles Borromée cardinal et archevêque de Milan prononcé en l'église de Saint Jacques de la Boucherie* (Paris 1670), p. 40.
- 46 Lemarie, *Borromée*, preface (unpaginated).
- 47 Binet, *Idée*, pp. 186–91: 'L'Évesché [est] un vray apprentissage du Martyre . . . passer le cousteau par la gorge, et verser tout nostre sang sur l'Autel préparé.' See also Camus, *Hiérarque*, p. 371.
- 48 Le Maistre, *Barthélemy*, pp. 597–8.
- 49 Godeau, *Évesques*, p. 588; Simplician Saint Martin, *La Vie de S. Thomas de Villeneuve, dit l'aumosnier, de l'ordre des Hermites de S. Augustin, archevêque de Valence* (Toulouse 1659), p. 99.
- 50 Antoine Godeau, *Éloge historique du bienheureux François de Sales, évêque et prince de Genève* (Paris 1663), pp. 150–3.
- 51 Camus, *Hiérarque*, pp. 87–8: 'Quoi que les Évesques soient attachez à la garde de certains limites, que l'on appelle Diocèse . . . ils ne perdent pas pourtant le soin de l'Église en général, au bien de laquelle ils doivent travailler de toutes leurs forces.'
- 52 *Ibid.*, pp. 89–90, 447.
- 53 Noulleau, *Villazel*, pp. 31, 50.
- 54 Sales, *Oeuvres du bienheureux François*, ii, p. 25: 'le Pasteur non seulement d'un peuple et d'un païs, mais le Père commun de tous les peuples, et de tous les païs . . . le chef, l'oeil, le coeur, et la main du monde, et de l'Église'.

- 55 Godeau, *Augustin*, p. 406.
- 56 Godeau, *Borromée*, p. 572.
- 57 Godeau, *De Sales*, p. 118.
- 58 Godeau, *Évesques*, p. 570.
- 59 Godeau, *Discours sur les ordres sacréz, où toutes les cérémonies de l'ordination selon le pontifical romain sont expliquées* (Paris 1653); Godeau, *Traité des séminaires* (Aix 1660).
- 60 Marc Fumaroli, *L'Âge de l'éloquence* (Geneva 1980); Bruno Neveu, *Religion et érudition aux xvii^e et xviii^e siècles* (Paris 1994), p. 336.
- 61 Saint Martin, *Villeneuve*, p. 99.
- 62 Claude Morel, *La Conduite de Saint Augustin contre les Pelagiens, suivie par les evesques de France contre les Jansenistes* (Paris 1658), p. 8.
- 63 The early church bishops were Savinian of Sens, Fulcran of Lodève and Augustine of Hippo. Hagiographic works on contemporary French bishops were produced on Philippe Cospeau (one), Barthélemy Donadieu de Griet (one), Jean-Baptiste Gault (one), François de La Rochefoucauld (two), Nicolas Pavillon (one), Alain de Solminihac (three) and Étienne Villazel (one).
- 64 Louis Abelly, *Episcopalis sollicitudinis enchiridion ex plurimorum ecclesiae catholicae antistitum sanctitate, ac pastorali vigilantia insignium, et praesertim D. Caroli Borromaei S. R. E. C., archiep. Mediolan. theoria et praxi accurate collectum, complectens summatus omnia* (Paris 1668), p. 11; Camus, *Hiérarque*, pp. 148–51, 226; René Le Mee, *Le prélat accompli, représenté en la personne d'illustrissime seigneur Philippe Cospéan, évesque et comte de Lisieux* (Saumur 1647), pp. 205–6; Molinier, *Donadieu*, p. 165; Noulleau, *Villazel*, pp. 17–18; de Paul, *Correspondance*, ii, p. 625, Solminihac to de Paul, 31 July 1646.
- 65 Camus, *Hiérarque*, pp. 74–81.
- 66 *Lettre de l'assemblée generale du clergé de France: au pape Urbain VIII sur la desirée beatification de feu Mr. de Sales, évesque de Genève*, trans. Pelletier (n.p. 1625); *Procès-verbaux*, ii, pp. 70–6, 187; *ibid.*, iii, pp. 37, 91; *ibid.*, iv, p. 131. The process for de Sales's canonisation opened in 1627. He was beatified in 1662, and canonised three years later.
- 67 Camus, *Esprit*, i, pp. 21, 73; *ibid.*, ii, pp. 66, 90; *ibid.*, iii, p. 32; Étienne Cavet, *Pourtraicts racourcis de Saint Charles Borromée, Sainte Thérèse, Soeur Marie de l'Incarnation, et du B. H. François de Sales, évesque de Genève* (Lyon 1632), p. 278; Godeau, *De Sales*, p. 78; Sales, *Oeuvres du bienheureux François*, ii, pp. 47, 51.
- 68 Molinier, *Donadieu*, pp. 275–85.
- 69 Camus, *Hiérarque*, p. 317: 'Que si tous les Chrésiens sont appelez une nation sainte, combien plus saints doivent être ceux qui les gouvernent au spirituel.'; Etampes, *Advis*, p. 7.
- 70 Camus, *Hiérarque*, p. 320: 'autant qu'il est possible à l'humaine fragilité la copie à son prototype . . . Jésus-Christ.'; Le Mee, *Cospéan*, pp. 10, 17.
- 71 Le Maistre, *Barthélemy*, p. 543: 'Que soit tellement adonné à l'oraison, qu'il sçache désja par expérience qu'il pourra obtenir de Dieu ce qu'il luy demande.' See also Jean Le Noir, *L'Évesque de cour oppose a l'évesque apostolique. Second entretien* (n.p. 1674), p. 124.
- 72 Olier, *Lettres de M. Olier*, ii, p. 520, Olier to unnamed correspondent, (n.d.); Camus, *Hiérarque*, p. 52; Camus, *Esprit*, ii, pp. 288–93.
- 73 Claude Maubourg, *Éloge historique, ou la vie de Saint Thomas de Villeneuve, religieux de l'ordre de Saint Augustin, archevesque de Valence, surnommé l'aumônier* (Paris 1666), p. 111.
- 74 Camus, *Borromee*, pp. 10–15.
- 75 Godeau, *Augustin*, p. 496; Maubourg, *Villeneuve*, p. 114.
- 76 BN, Ms. Fr. 14428(i), fos 3v, 40v.
- 77 Quoted in Sol, *Solminihac*, p. 96: 'Je seray fort réservé à parler de moy . . . je m'abstiendray de tous discours qui pourroient tourner à notre louange . . . Je ne parleray point des fautes des autres, si je n'y suis obligé . . . L'humilité et la douceur seront mes deux chères vertus.'
- 78 Solminihac, *Lettres*, ed. Sol, pp. 137–8, letter to Louis XIII, June 1636. Solminihac had previously refused the bishopric of Lavaur for the same reasons: *ibid.*, p. 135, letter to Riche-lieu, 20 April 1636; *ibid.*, letter to François de Sourdis, same date; *ibid.*, p. 136, letter to

- Jean Barrault (bishop of Bazas), same date. Godeau rejected accusations that he sought a bishopric for personal advancement: Godeau, *Lettres*, pp. 132–3, Godeau to Richelieu, (n.d.).
- 79 Quoted in Raymond Darricau, *Au coeur de l'histoire du Quercy. Alain de Solminihac évêque de Cahors (1593–1659)* (Chambray-lès-Tours 1980), pp. 24–5; quoted in Sol, *Solminihac*, p. 96: 'Nos discours seront le plus que nous pourrons de choses spirituelles et de ce qui me pourra enflammer . . . à l'amour de Dieu . . . me tenant toujours en la présence de Dieu . . . je ne veux avoir autre volonté que celle de mon Dieu, et de ne faire aucune action que je ne me sente meu d'icelle.'
- 80 Solminihac, *Lettres*, ed. Sol, pp. 80–1, Barrault to Solminihac, 12 March 1629.
- 81 Chastenet, *Solminihac*, p. 758.
- 82 Abelly, *Episcopalis*, pp. 289–91, quoting Heb. 6:12; Camus, *Hiérarque*, pp. 190, 256–61, 270–1; Saint Martin, *Villeneuve*, p. 91.
- 83 Camus, *Esprit*, ii, p. 91; Le Mee, *Cospéan*, p. 129.
- 84 BN, Ms. Fr. 14428(i), fo. 9v; Godeau, *Évesques*, p. 752; Jean Le Noir, *L'Évesque de cour, opposé à l'évesque apostolique. Quatrième entretien* (Cologne 1675), pp. 132–5, 150–3.
- 85 BN, Ms. Fr. 14428(i), fo. 53r; Camus, *Hiérarque*, pp. 188–9; Godeau, *Augustin*, pp. 401, 421, 426–7; Symphorien Guyon, *Histoire de l'église et diocèse, ville, et université d'Orléans*, 2 vols (Orléans 1647–50), ii, p. 491; Noulleau, *Villazel*, p. 30.
- 86 Darricau, *Coeur*, pp. 35–6; Jacques, *Cospeau*, pp. 97–9; Taveneaux, *Jansénisme*, p. 59; Jean de Viguierie, 'Les Evêques d'Angers et la réforme catholique (1540–1758)', *L'Evêque dans l'histoire de l'église* (Angers 1984), pp. 91–108. See Bergin, *Episcopate*, pp. 110–12, 114, for lists of episcopal revenues.
- 87 *Documents sur M. de Caulet évêque de Pamiers et sur le schisme de la régale dans ce diocèse*, ed. Jean-Marie Vidal (Castillon-en-Couserans 1936), pp. 9–14; *Extension*, ed. Dubruel, pp. 30–5, Le Camus to Caulet, 21 August 1679.
- 88 Le Sauvage's will is printed in M. Fougeray du Coudrey, 'René Le Sauvage évêque de Lavaur 1630–1677', *Extrait du Bulletin du Pays de Granville* (1909), 33–5; Darricau, *Coeur*, p. 52; Jean Jenny, 'Un archevêque réformateur: Pierre d'Hardivilliers, archevêque de Bourges (1639–1649)', *Bulletin de la Société d'Emulation du Bourbonnais* (1971), 608.
- 89 E. K. Sanders, *Fénelon. His Friends and his Enemies 1651–1715* (London 1901), pp. 418–20; 'Documents inédits', ed. Philippe Tamizey de Larroque, *Revue de Gascogne*, 8 (1867), 91–6.
- 90 Darricau, *Coeur*, p. 52; *Testament de feu monseigneur l'évesque de Ballay, touchant sa sepulture* (Paris 1652).
- 91 Camus, *Esprit*, ii, p. 159; Chastenet, *Solminihac*, p. 758; Sales, *Oeuvres du bienheureux François*, ii, p. 23.
- 92 Godeau, *Lettres*, pp. 127–31, letter to Chappelain, 12 September 1639: 'qu'on les charge d'injures, que l'on donne un mauvais sens à leurs actions les plus innocentes, qu'on leur dresse des pièges, qu'on se moque de leurs remontrances, et qu'on les persecute.' See also Godeau, *Borromée*, pp. 361–3.
- 93 Godeau, *Borromée*, preface (unpaginated).
- 94 Godeau, *Lettres*, p. 129, Godeau to Chappelain, 12 September 1639.
- 95 Camus, *Borromée*, p. 38; Godeau, *De Sales*, p. 96; Henri Cauchon de Maupas Du Tour, *La Vie du vénérable serviteur de Dieu François de Sales* (Paris 1657), p. 16.
- 96 Etampes, *Advis*, p. 42; Godeau, *Lettres*, pp. 124–31, letter to Chappelain, 12 September 1639; *ibid.*, pp. 132–3, letter to Richelieu, (n.d.).
- 97 *Ibid.*, p. 132, letter to Richelieu (n.d.).
- 98 *Ibid.*, pp. 359–61, letter to Abbé de Cerisy (n.d.); Camus, *Esprit*, iii, p. 230.
- 99 Godeau, *Évesques*, pp. 757–9.
- 100 De Paul, *Correspondance*, iv, pp. 145–7, Solminihac to de Paul, 25 January 1651; *ibid.*, p. 154, de Paul to Solminihac, 18 February 1651; *ibid.*, pp. 219–20, Solminihac to de Paul, 2 July 1651; *ibid.*, pp. 634–5, Solminihac to Anne of Austria, same date.
- 101 Camus, *Hiérarque*, p. 386; Godeau, *Évesques*, p. 735; Molinier, *Donadieu*, p. 193.

- 102 De Paul, *Correspondance*, ii, p. 389, Solminihac to de Paul, 3 May 1643; *ibid.*, pp. 624–5, same to same, 31 July 1646.
- 103 Solminihac, *Lettres*, pp. 575–6, Solminihac to Villers la Faye, 5 November 1654.
- 104 Camus, *Hiérarque*, p. 386.
- 105 Etampes, *Advis*, pp. 50, 65, 118; Jean-Marie de La Mure, *Histoire ecclésiastique du diocèse de Lyon* (Lyon 1671), pp. 214–17.
- 106 Abelly, *Episcopalis*, pp. 130–60; Le Maistre, *Barthélemy*, p. 574: ‘L’Évesque communique sa présence et sa charité à tout le corps de son Diocèse, et qu’il répand les graces et les bénédictions du Ciel sur tous ceux qui en sont les membres.’
- 107 Godeau, *Évesques*, p. 569; Le Maistre, *Barthélemy*, pp. 574–5; Saint Martin, *Villeneuve*, pp. 90–3.
- 108 Bibliothèque de l’Arsenal, Ms. 6042, fos 363r–366v: ‘Je scay que selon l’Evangile, l’Evesque est la lumiere qui doit éclairer toute l’Eglise; selon St. Paul il est le pere qui doit instruire ses enfans.’
- 109 Camus, *Borromee*, pp. 144–57; Camus, *Hiérarque*, p. 376; Godeau, *Augustin*, p. 502. In Godeau’s *Évesques*, every bishop was praised for his zeal in preaching; see Le Mee, *Cospéan*, p. 199, citing 1 Tim. 3:2 and Tit. 1:8.
- 110 Fumaroli, *Eloquence*, p. 140.
- 111 Camus, *Borromee*, pp. 144–57.
- 112 Godeau, *Augustin*, p. 502.
- 113 Godeau, *De Sales*, pp. 112–14.
- 114 Camus, *Hiérarque*, preface (unpaginated). In his Borromean homilies, Camus again used this metaphor for bishops but also described the divine word as salt which bishops used to season and preserve souls: Camus, *Borromee*, p. 136; Godeau, *Évesques*, p. 560; Le Maistre, *Barthélemy*, preface (unpaginated); Sales, *Oeuvres du bienheureux François*, ii, p. 44. Guyon, *Histoire*, i, preface (unpaginated), characterises the 112 bishops of Orléans as the ‘salt of the earth’. Antoine Arnauld also used this traditional phrase to describe prelates: Arnauld, *Oeuvres*, xxi, p. 207.
- 115 BN, Ms. Fr. 14428(i), fo. 144v.
- 116 Bergin, *Episcopate*, pp. 280–1.
- 117 Camus, *Borromee*, p. 158; Camus, *Hiérarque*, pp. 236–7.
- 118 BN, Ms. Fr. 14428(i), fos 7v–8r; Etampes, *Advis*, p. 29; Godeau, *Augustin*, pp. 513–14; Godeau, *De Sales*, pp. 111–12; Le Mee, *Cospéan*, p. 199; Pierre Nicole, *L’Idée d’un évêque qui cherche la verité* (n.p. 1666), p. 7.
- 119 BN, Ms. Fr. 14428(i), fos 3v–4r: ‘un grand detachment de toutes choses, un aneantissement de nous mesmes, une profonde humilité, une grande patience . . . s’abandonnans aux mouvemens qu’il plaira a Dieu nous donner, et a tout ce qu’il voudra faire de nous.’
- 120 Sol, *Solminihac*, pp. 95–6; BN, Ms. 14428(i), fos 8v, 138r–v. Solminihac and Pavillon practised all three types of prayer. Scripture, the Council of Trent and the lives of bishops were the most popular recommendations for meditation and contemplation.
- 121 BN, Ms. Fr. 14428(i), fo. 8r.
- 122 Camus, *Hiérarque*, pp. 248–9; Godeau, *De Sales*, pp. 85–6; Le Maistre, *Barthélemy*, p. 556.
- 123 BN, Ms. Fr. 14428(i), fo. 138r–v; Sol, *Solminihac*, p. 95. See also *Documents*, ed. Vidal, p. 9, for Caulet’s habit of frequent prayer.
- 124 Saint Martin, *Villeneuve*, preface (unpaginated).
- 125 François de Sales, *Introduction à la vie dévote* (Arras 1610) (2nd edn Paris 1641); François de Sales, *Traicté de l’amour de Dieu* (Lyon 1616); François de Sales, *Les Oeuvres de Messire François de Sales évêque et prince de Genève* (Toulouse 1637); Sales, *Oeuvres du bienheureux François*.
- 126 Jean-Jacques Olier, *Oeuvres complètes de M. Olier*, ed. Jacques-Paul Migne (Paris 1856), col. 1255.
- 127 Cavet, *Pourtraicts*, p. 431.
- 128 Maupas du Tour, *De Sales*, p. 25. Maupas was successively bishop of Le Puy (1643–61) and Evreux (1661–80); Bergin, *Episcopate*, pp. 668–9.

- 129 Cavet, *Pourtraicts*, p. 432.
- 130 Broutin, *Réforme*, i, pp. 73–95; Paul Broutin, ‘Les Deux grands évêques de la réforme catholique’, *Nouvelle Revue Théologique*, 75 (1953), 282–99, 380–98.
- 131 Lemarie, *Borromée*, preface (unpaginated).
- 132 A further edition appeared in 1683: Venard, ‘Influence’.
- 133 Bibliothèque Sainte-Geneviève, Paris, Ms. 2131, fos 2, 4, 14; Godeau, *Lettres*, p. 432, Godeau to Thomassin, 29 October 1671; Solminihac *Lettres*, ed. Sol, p. 380, Sevin to Solminihac, 19 November 1648.
- 134 *Ibid.*, pp. 211, 215–16, 219; *Documents*, ed. Vidal, p. 9; Dejean, *Pavillon*, pp. 47–9; P. Dumoulin, ‘Les Visites pastorales d’Alain de Solminihac’, in Pierre Pommarède (ed.), *Alain de Solminihac* (Périgueux 1993), pp. 18–29; Peyrous, *Réforme* i, p. 200; Vidal, *Caulet*, pp. 114–23.
- 135 Solminihac, *Lettres*, p. 380, Sevin to Solminihac, 19 November 1648.
- 136 BN, Ms. Fr. 14428(i), fos 19v–25r, 30r–31r; Bonnot, *Arnould*, pp. 197–227; Gaillard, *Choart*, pp. 47–9; Dumoulin, ‘Visites’.
- 137 These were district congregations of parish priests, established for the purposes of discipline, education and support. See BN, Ms. Fr. 14428(i), fo. 145r; Solminihac, *Lettres*, p. 47, Solminihac to Buzenval, c.1652; *Relation de ce qui se fait dans le diocèse de Cahors, par monseigneur l’illustrissime et reverendissime évesque dudit lieu, pour remettre la discipline ecclesiastique dedans son clergé, et les devoirs de la vie chrestienne dedans son peuple* (Paris 1640), p. 2.
- 138 Peyrous, *Réforme*, i, pp. 120–4.
- 139 Peyrous, ‘Réforme’, 16, 23.
- 140 ‘Documents’, ed. Ducaunnes-Duval, 481; Peyrous, ‘Réforme’, 19–22.
- 141 Ravenez, *Sourdis*, p. 219.
- 142 The text became required reading for many parish priests and seminary students: Marcel Bernos, ‘Saint Charles Borromée et ses “Instructions aux confesseurs”. Une lecture rigoriste par le clergé français (xvi^e–xix^e siècle)’, *Pratiques de la confession* (Paris 1983), pp. 185–200; Bernard Plongeron, ‘Charles Borromée, exemple et modèle: son influence en France (xvi^e–xix^e siècles)’, *San Carlo e il suo tempo* (Rome 1986), pp. 493–525.
- 143 Paolo Prodi, ‘The Application of the Tridentine Decrees. The Organisation of the Diocese of Bologna during the Episcopate of Cardinal Gabriele Paleotti’, in Eric Cochrane (ed.), *The Late Italian Renaissance, 1525–1630* (London 1970), p. 229n; Anthony Wright, *The Counter-Reformation: Catholic Europe and the Non-Christian World* (London 1982), p. 218.
- 144 Logan, *Venetian Clergy*, pp. 250–1.
- 145 In a letter to the queen mother, Bérulle also highlighted Borromeo’s admirable sacrifices of austerity and humility: Bérulle *Correspondance*, i, pp. 210–14, letter to the queen mother, 3 November 1615.
- 146 Camus, *Borromée*, pp. 14–28.
- 147 Cavet, *Pourtraicts*, pp. 42–6.
- 148 Camus, *Hiérarque*, pp. 188–9: ‘Nous ne sommes plus que les froides cendres dont nos predecesseurs estoient les charbons ardans.’
- 149 Jean-Jacques Olier, *Discours sur Saint François de Sales*, printed in Olier, *Oeuvres complètes*, cols 1253–72.
- 150 Godeau, *Borromée*, pp. 587–92: ‘La vie de Saint Charles n’est pas un exemple regulier que tous les Evesques doivent suivre.’
- 151 *Ibid.*, pp. 581–4.
- 152 Godeau, *Augustin*, pp. 568–75.
- 153 Camus, *Esprit*, iii, pp. 307–8, 337–9; Godeau, *De Sales*, pp. 94–6. Étienne Cavet supported this view of de Sales’s ‘temperate’ sobriety: Cavet, *Pourtraicts*, pp. 312–17.
- 154 Olier, *Oeuvres complètes*, cols 1268–72.
- 155 Nicolas Caussin, *Traicte de la conduite spirituelle selon l’esprit du B. François de Sales, évesque de Geneve*, printed in Sales, *Oeuvres du bienheureux François*, ii, pp. 48–9. Camus concurred: Camus, *Esprit*, ii, pp. 254–5.

- 156 Caussin, *Traicte*, in Sales, *Oeuvres du bienheureux François*, ii, pp. 52, 121.
- 157 Camus, *Esprit*, ii, p. 295; *ibid.*, iii, pp. 237–9, 483.
- 158 De Paul *Correspondance*, ii, pp. 3–4, letter to Abelly, 14 January 1640.
- 159 Olier, *Quatre*, ed. Blazy, p. 15, letter to Caulet, January 1648, quoting 1 Peter 1:7.
- 160 Olier, *Lettres de M. Olier*, ii, p. 520, letter to one of the disciples of Saint-Sulpice.
- 161 Olier, *Oeuvres complètes*, cols 1266, 1269.
- 162 Sales, *Oeuvres du bienheureux François*, ii, p. 49.
- 163 Godeau, *Borromée*, pp. 581–92; Godeaux, *Évesques*, ii, p. 755.
- 164 Binet, *Idée*, pp. 7–11. Antoine Godeau lauded several ‘martyr bishops’, including Timothy and John Fisher, in his *Évesques*.
- 165 Binet, *Idée*, p. 53.
- 166 *Ibid.*, p. 60.
- 167 *Ibid.*, pp. 85, 219.
- 168 *Ibid.*, p. 170: ‘C’est la vertu qui parle par ces bouches de sang, et nul ne peut resister à la Rhetorique . . . de la patience magnanime, et invincible d’un vray serviteur de Jesus-Christ.’
- 169 Caroline Walker Bynum, *Holy Feast and Holy Fast. The Religious Significance of Food to Medieval Women* (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London 1987), p. 42; Bell and Weinstein, *Saints*, pp. 154–6, 233–4.
- 170 Le Maistre, *Barthélemy*, pp. 677–8.
- 171 Gaillard, *Choart*, pp. 5, 37.
- 172 Olier, *Oeuvres oratoires*, iv, pp. 327–8.
- 173 *Ibid.*, pp. 335–9: ‘Jamais homme n’a mieux pratiqué cette ruse innocente et cette salutaire intelligence, que le saint évêque dont nous parlons.’
- 174 De Paul, *Correspondance*, ed. Coste, viii, pp. 94–5, de Paul to Fouquet, 29 August 1659.
- 175 *Ibid.*, iv, pp. 495–6, Solminihac to de Paul, 17 October 1652.
- 176 *Ibid.*, pp. 520–2, de Paul to Solminihac, November 1652.
- 177 *Ibid.*, p. 528, Solminihac to de Paul, 21 November 1652: ‘Je suivray vos avis en tout, je ne m’estois resolu de m’exposer qu’en tant que je onnus que c’estoit la volonté de Dieu.’
- 178 Tronson, *Correspondance*, ii, pp. 398–9, letter to Lascaris d’Urfé, 27 June 1677; *ibid.*, p. 429, same to same, 22 October 1678.
- 179 *Ibid.*, pp. 434–5, letter to Lascaris d’Urfé, 23 December 1679: ‘Pour le manger, il me semble que les mortifications de retrancher à chaque repas quelque morceau de bon goût, de ne rien manger de trop délicat dans les festins, de s’abstenir de mille petites friandises, etc., vous seroit au moins aussi utiles que d’autres pénitences de plus d’éclat.’ See also pp. 443–5, same to same, 15 June 1680.
- 180 *Ibid.*, pp. 423–4, same to same, 21 January 1679.
- 181 *Ibid.*, p. 434, same to same, 23 December 1679; Camus, *Esprit*, iii, pp. 192–3, 372, 435.
- 182 J. Calvet, *Bossuet. L’homme et l’oeuvre* (Paris 1941), pp. 66–7.
- 183 Bossuet, *Correspondance*, vi, p. 421, letter to Madame Corneau, 10 October 1694: ‘L’abandon à la volonté de Dieu et un moyen plus efficace que toutes les austérités extraordinaires . . . la doctrine de saint François de Sales . . . paraît très éloigné de les approuver.’ See also François de Sales, *Introduction to the Devout Life*, trans. John Ryan (New York 1989), pp. 43–5.
- 184 Nicolas Talon’s judgement in Sales *Oeuvres du bienheureux François*, ii, p. 20.
- 185 *Ibid.*, p. 121.
- 186 Diocesan revenues varied enormously from the huge incomes of Paris, Toulouse and Rouen to the eight dioceses worth less than 5,000 livres during the seventeenth century. The majority of dioceses produced revenues of 10,000 to 15,000 livres annually: Bergin, *Episcopate*, pp. 110–15.
- 187 Camus, *Hiérarque*, pp. 158–9, 189, 225–30, 370–1, 667–8; Camus, *Esprit*, ii, p. 90; *ibid.*, iii, p. 121; Jean Le Noir, *L’Evesque de cour opposé à l’Evesque apostolique. Premières entretiens sur l’ordonnance de monsieur l’Evesque d’Amiens. Contre la traduction du Nouveau Testament en François, imprimé à Mons* (Cologne 1674), pp. 15, 21.

- 188 Camus, *Hiérarque*, pp. 555–6; Jean Le Noir, *L'Évesque de cour, opposé à l'évesque apostolique. Troisième entretien* (Cologne 1675), p. 155.
- 189 Le Noir, *Evesque. Premier*, p. 46; Le Noir, *Evesque. Troisième*, p. 155.
- 190 Le Noir, *Evesque. Quatrième*, pp. 137–45.
- 191 Camus, *Borromée*, pp. 7, 18; Camus, *Hiérarque*, pp. 182–3; Godeau, *Borromée*, p. 519; Molinier, *Donadieu*, p. 322; Noulleau, *Villazel*, p. 22; Saint Martin, *Villeneuve*, p. 82.
- 192 Etampes, *Advis*, pp. 30, 35–40: 'Ce qui est eminent devant les hommes, est en abomination devant Dieu.'
- 193 De Sales, *Introduction to the Devout Life*, pp. 161–9; Godeau, *Augustin*, pp. 420–6, 557–60; Godeau, *Évesques*, pp. 565; Le Noir, *Evesque. Second*, p. 168; Le Noir, *Evesque. Quatrième*, p. 144.
- 194 *Autre relation plus recente et plus ample du progres dont il plaist à Dieu de benir les soins et travaux de monditi seigneur l'illustrissime et reverendissime evesque de Cahors* (n.p. n.d), pp. 1–4; BN, Ms. Fr. 14428(i), fos 3v, 9v–10r, 133v, 136v.
- 195 Personal belongings remaining at the bishop's death were bequeathed to the poor. The diocese's annual income at the time was approximately 14,000 livres: Henri Bégouen, *Les Couserans aux xvii^e et xviii^e siècles* (Foix 1901), pp. 3–14; Bergin, *Episcopat*, p. 110.
- 196 Gaquère, *Marca*. Bergin estimates that the revenues of Conserans and Toulouse amounted annually to 18,000 livres and 53,000 livres respectively under Marca's tenures. Both were amongst the wealthiest dioceses in France: Bergin, *Episcopat*, pp. 110, 112.
- 197 The only biographical studies of Cohon are: the out-dated Charles Robert, *Anthyme-Denis Cohon* (Rennes 1895); François Duine, *Un politique et orateur au XVII^e siècle, Cohon, évêque de Nîmes et de Dol. Essai de bio-bibliographie avec documents inédits* (Rennes 1902); François Duine, *Avant Bossuet. Cohon évêque de Nîmes et de Dol. Précepteur des neveux de Mazarin. Prédicateur du roi* (Paris 1908). Sauzet's *Contre-réforme* also includes a discussion of Cohon's episcopate, pp. 216–44.
- 198 *Nouveaux manuscrits de Cohon, évêque de Nîmes*, ed. M. Bligny-Bondurand (Paris 1910), pp. 17–18.
- 199 Sauzet, *Contre-réforme*, pp. 311–19.
- 200 Like several other bishops, including Le Sauvage and Marmiesse, Hardivilliers lived in just one room of his archepiscopal palace and left all his worldly goods to the poor and the church. On Hardivilliers, see Jenny, 'Hardivilliers'. On Le Sauvage, see Fougeray du Coudrey, 'Le Sauvage'. On Marmiesse, see Bégouen, *Couserans*, pp. 14–15.
- 201 Louis XIV considered Fénelon's *Explication de maximes des saintes sur la vie interieure* (Paris 1697) to be too close in doctrine to the mysticism (Quietism) of Jeanne de Guyon. Fénelon submitted to the papal condemnation of his semi-Quietist work in 1699. On the Quietist controversy, see Jean-Robert Armogathe, *Le Quiétisme* (Paris 1973), and Ély Carcassonne, *Fénelon. L'homme et l'oeuvre* (Paris 1946), pp. 25–74.
- 202 Carcassonne, *Fénelon*, pp. 139–40; Sanders, *Fénelon*, pp. 244–8, 323–6. See also the remarks by Saint-Simon (generally not the most sympathetic of commentators) on the archbishop's strict daily routine of prayer and administration and his simple eating habits in Louis de Rouvroy, duc de Saint-Simon, *Écrits inédits de Saint-Simon*, ed. M. P. Faugère, 8 vols (Paris 1880–93), iv, p. 461.
- 203 Fénelon, *Correspondance*, ii, pp. 242–3, Fénelon to Colbert, 8 April 1692: 'L'Évangile est dans [votre] bouche, et la gloire mondaine est dans [vos] ouvrages . . . montrez un coeur d'évêque qui ne tient plus au monde, et qui fait régner J. C.'
- 204 Fénelon resided in Cambrai from August 1697: Carcassonne, *Fénelon*, pp. 59, 139.
- 205 Godeau, *Évesques*, pp. 730–61.
- 206 *Ibid.*, p. 739.
- 207 Sol, *Solminihac*, p. 410.
- 208 De Paul, *Correspondance*, ed. Coste, ii, pp. 434–5, letter to unnamed bishop, between 1643 and 1652.
- 209 Chastenet, *Solminihac*, pp. 475–763, especially pp. 583–92, 659–71, 718–30 and 758–61.

- 210 Quoted in Sol, *Solminihac*, pp. 399–400: ‘La mémoire de feu Monseigneur l’évesque de Cahors est en si grande bénédiction non seulement en France mais même dans toute l’Église, et tous les gens de bien conservent une telle et si grande vénération pour les exemples qu’il a laissés, de pénitence, de pauvreté, de charité, d’un travail infatigable dans les fonctions de sa charge.’ See also Fénelon, *Correspondance*, i, pp. 48–9.
- 211 De Paul, *Correspondance*, ii, p. 344, Solminihac to de Paul, 22 July 1648.
- 212 Solminihac, *Lettres*, pp. 428–9, Brandon to Solminihac, 28 December 1650.
- 213 Letters from all to Pavillon cited in Gaillard, *Choart*, pp. 138–9, 142n–143n, 149; Lefebvre, *Pavillon*, i, p. 273.
- 214 *Ibid.*, i, p. 274.
- 215 BN, Ms. Fr. 14428(i), fos 133r–147v; Sol, *Solminihac*, pp. 95–7. Witnesses confirmed that the bishops lived according to the practices outlined in their rules: *Les Diocèses d’Alet et de Pamiers d’après une relation contemporaine*, ed. Marc Dubruel (Foix 1913); *Autre relation*, pp. 1–4.
- 216 Étienne Le Camus, *Lettres du cardinal Le Camus*, ed. P. Ingold (Paris 1892), p. 205, letter to Abbé de Pontchâteau, 1675: ‘C’est un saint sur terre, c’est une humilité, une présence de Dieu et une charité qui me ravit. Il est inflexible quand il croit voir ses obligations clairement et il a une condescendance surprenante . . . elle est sèche et peu propre à convertir le monde et il n’a aucune ouverture pour les expédients et les tempéraments nécessaires . . . les hommes ont les faibles quelque vertueux qu’ils soient; je n’en ai reconnu aucun en lui, c’est une piété mâle, ferme, uniforme, charitable, toujours en règle.’
- 217 Barcos, *Correspondance*, p. 544.
- 218 Solminihac, *Lettres*, pp. 661–2, Caulet to Sevin, 5 January 1661.
- 219 Godeau, *Évesques*, pp. 755–6.