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Abstract

My dissertation connects the Jesuit missions in Canada to the global Jesuit missionary project in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries by exploring the impact of French religious politics on the organizing of the first Canadian mission, established at Port Royal, Acadia, in 1611. After the Wars of Religion, Gallican Catholics blamed the Society for the violence between French Catholics and Protestants, portraying Jesuits as underhanded usurpers of royal authority in the name of the Pope—even accusing the priests of advocating regicide. As a result, both Port Royal’s settlers and its proprietor, Jean de Poutrincourt, never trusted the missionaries, and the mission collapsed within two years. After Virginia pirates destroyed Port Royal, Poutrincourt drew upon popular anti-Jesuit stereotypes to blame the Jesuits for conspiring with the English. Father Pierre Biard, one of the missionaries, responded with his 1616 Relation de la Nouvelle France, which described Port Royal’s Indians and narrated the Jesuits’ adventures in North America, but served primarily as a defense of their enterprise.

Religio-political infighting profoundly influenced the interaction between Indians and Europeans in the earliest years of Canadian settlement. The initial failure of the Jesuits to entrench themselves in Canada allowed an increasing number of Huguenots to trade in New France without a strong missionary presence to counter them. Although we often
imagine French Canada as a place where Indians primarily interacted with Jesuit missionaries, the entire first generation of Indians in constant contact with French settlers operated without missionary pressures. In places where there was a limited missionary presence, such as at Port Royal in 1611-13 and Quebec after 1615, the Indians, acutely aware of divisions among the French, struggled to balance secular proprietors who taught them that baptism merely represented a diplomatic alliance and missionaries who believed it meant giving up native cosmologies.

My work uncovers an essential link connecting the origin of the Jesuit missions to North America, Jesuit missionary activity within Europe, and confessional conflict. In contrast to other historians who assert that the early Jesuits used religion as a means to conquer Indians for France, I show that Jesuit conversion of Indians should be seen as a means for vanquishing heresy by renewing Catholicism worldwide. Through archival research at the Bibliothèque nationale de France, the Bibliothèque municipale de Lyon, Archivum Romanum Societatis Iesu, and the Vatican Film Library in St. Louis, I found that after evangelizing Indians, Biard used this training in his attempt to combat Calvinism in southeastern France. Port Royal’s other Jesuit missionary, Fr. Enemond Massé, instructed future missionaries and accompanied them when they returned to New France in 1626. Under Massé’s guidance, the younger missionaries overcame the anti-Jesuit sentiments that persisted among Canada’s proportionally large Huguenot population when Cardinal Richelieu excluded Protestants from settling in French America in 1627. They opened the collège de Québec—North America’s first college—to educate elite Canadians, instruct
Indians, and promote the mission’s longevity by providing institutional support for the Jesuits as their colleges had done throughout Europe in the preceding century.
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A Note on Translations and Citations

None of the primary source material used for this project originally appeared in English. Most Jesuits wrote their annual reports and penned correspondence to their superiors in Latin, while published reports and letters to lay officials appeared in French. I consulted all documents in their original language in either archival or print form. For the sake of consistency, all direct quotes follow published English translations, where available. These translations include the works of Champlain and Lescarbot, translated by H. P. Biggar, all Jesuit Relations, translated by Thwaites, Campeau’s introduction, translated by George Tropp and William Lone, and the documents Poutrincourt included in his Factum (but not the Factum itself), also translated by Tropp and Lone. Other direct quotes reflect my own translations. For clarity, I standardized Biard’s various spellings of Poutrincourt and Biencourt’s names. Footnote citations of Campeau’s introduction all include an asterisk next to the page number, which is how Monumenta Novae Franciae distinguishes between introductory material and the primary documents in each volume.
Introduction: “If the temporal is considered…”: The Atlantic Context for the Origin of the Jesuit Missions to Canada

In 1616, Jesuit Pierre Biard, serving as a missionary among Protestants in southeastern France, reflected upon his failed attempt to establish a mission in North America between 1611 and 1613. In the final chapter of his Relation of 1616, “Reasons why the Cultivation of New France ought to be Undertaken in Earnest,” he encouraged the Society to rebuild its mission in Canada, perhaps hoping he might one day also return. “I am obliged to set down some reasons which agitate my soul, when I consider how we are letting this poor new France lie fallow,” for “how great would be our ingratitude, and how horrible the chastisement it would bring with it, if we do not try to enhance the value of [God’s] grace by communicating it to our fellow-men in proportion to our means and opportunities?” “But let it be enough to keep before our eyes the vision of these poor natives,” he pleaded, “these images of our God as we are, and as capable of enjoying him, these companions of our own species, and almost the same quality as we, who are upon the edge of the horrible gulf of the fires of hell, many of them even precipitated every day into eternal torments, and profound depths of everlasting punishment, without hope of deliverance.” “O God!”, he added, “The blood of this so cruel execution is upon our hands, who do not exert ourselves to prevent it; upon our feet, which do not move to remedy it; upon our houses, which we build so magnificently without caring for the
eternal dwellings of our brothers; upon our purses, our possessions, our wealth, and our hearts, which are so little moved by such spectacles and contribute so little to that for which the Son of God, our Savior did not spare even his life.”

Despite his rhetorical zeal, Biard’s appeal addressed more than just spiritual matters. “If the temporal is considered,” he began, “this country is another France in the influences and conditions of the heavens and the elements.” According to Biard, France wanted to build upon the explorations of the preceding century, when traders obtained “the good will and intimacy of the people—a gentle people, who extend to us their hands with an incredible longing.” These Indians, however, would always remain disappointed, “with a profound grief to see us defeated.” In New France, “the enterprises which have been undertaken to the present, having been almost entirely sustained by private individuals, have sunk … under the burden and the expenses which such a great work requires.” Those traders who sought wealth “either on whaling expeditions, or [fishing] cod … or [trading] in furs of the Beaver, Elk, Marten, Seal Otter, etc.” had altogether incompatible goals with the missionaries, and Jesuits “must not expect to have a share in any of this.” Instead, successful Jesuits would have to operate independently.

Biard’s emphasis on temporal matters stemmed from his tumultuous tenure as a missionary at Port Royal, Canada. Located on the west coast of the Acadian peninsula


2 Biard, Relation of 1616 in JR 4:111-3.
along the Bay of Fundy opposite the St. John River, Port Royal was the location of France’s first real attempt to permanently settle in New France. After years of serving traders looking to become wealthy obtaining beaver furs, Port Royal became the site of the first Jesuit mission in 1611 when Louis XIII upheld his father’s order licensing the Society to evangelize the local Micmac Indians. Plagued by disagreements between missionaries Pierre Biard and Enemond Massé and the colony’s proprietor Jean de Poutrincourt and his son Charles de Biencourt, the mission collapsed after only two years. Biard’s attempt to re-establish his mission further south along the Penobscot River ended in disaster when Virginia pirates led by Samuel Argyll destroyed his settlement at Saint Sauveur in 1613 and then eliminated Port Royal.

Although Biard’s ethnographic observations of the Indians have aided historians in reconstructing Indian histories, the mission itself has served as little more than a footnote in the broader history of Canada’s Jesuit missions. In demonstrating why Port Royal’s mission failed, this dissertation will explain the transfer of the politics of the Wars of Religion across the Atlantic, the impression they had upon shaping Jesuit missions, and the lasting impact these disputes left on New France.

A Brief Historiography of the Canadian Missions

We can organize the historiography of the Canadian missions into three broad chronological categories. Jesuit mission history began with Jesuit historians chronicling the triumphs they perceived in the New World, with these narratives as extensions of either European history or Catholic history. Accounts dated to the missions themselves as
each year, the Society demanded that one member in each of the Society’s provinces submit letters know as *annuae litterae*. These reports to the Superior General were to be official records of everything that had occurred during the prior year in the respective missions. Although usually written in Latin and sent directly to Rome, Jesuits in New France annually published their accounts in French to bolster support for their mission among prospective Catholic donors. These *Relations* appeared regularly throughout the seventeenth century and sporadically into the eighteenth century until the British seized Canada after the French and Indian War.⁵ Even while the Jesuits were still evangelizing Indians in Canada, Jesuit historians like Joseph Jouvency began to include these histories of the earlier generations in their more general histories of the Society. In 1744, P.F.X. Charlevoix, a Jesuit stationed at Quebec who had previously written accounts of the Jesuits in Japan, wrote his *Histoire et description générale de Nouvelle France*, considered to be the first history dedicated entirely to the Canadian missions.⁴

As now professional historians working in the middle of the nineteenth century, members of the Society continued to chronicle their own past. Jesuit Camille de Rochemonteix became the preeminent historian of New France and his work culminated with his 1895 *Les jésuites et la Nouvelle-France au XVIIe siècle*.⁵ While his three-volume grand narrative remains one of the most comprehensive accounts of the Society in

---


Canada, it provides a triumphalist interpretation of Jesuit successes over perceived savagery, overlooking Indian agency and depicting individual Jesuits in hagiographic tones. Rochmonteix’s study dovetailed nicely with the work of Jesuit historian Henri Fouqueray, who wrote *Histoire de la Compagnie de Jésus en France des origines à la suppression: 1528-1762*. Fouqueray’s *Histoire* envisioned the French Jesuits in Atlantic terms, incorporating *missions étrangères* into the broader project of French Jesuit expansion in the sixteenth century.

As French Jesuits recounted their history in France, Anglophone historians took an interest in early New France and the Jesuit missionaries. With the notable exception of Francis Parkman, who dedicated an entire volume of *France and England in North America* to the Jesuit missionaries in 1867, most scholars in the English-speaking world confined themselves to translating documents. John Gilmary Shea translated Charlevoix’s *Histoire et description générale de Nouvelle-France* between 1866-72, and the Champlain Society employed Henry Percival Biggar to translate the works of Marc Lescarbot in 1907 and Samuel de Champlain throughout the 1920s. The most significant of these translations was Reuben Gold Thwaites’s *The Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents*. Thwaites and his team collected and translated every Jesuit *Relation* published between 1610 and 1791, providing prefaces to each document, historical

---


7 Francis Parkman, *The Jesuits in North America in the Seventeenth Century* (Boston: Little Brown and Company, 1867). Parkman is a good example of a historian who footnoted Port Royal, opting to begin his story in 1632, which was technically the third attempt by the Society to establish themselves in Canada. By contrast, my story ends with Parkman’s “first” missionaries.
footnotes, and bibliographic data.\textsuperscript{8} The Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents altered the historiographical landscape: by providing the Jesuits’ ethnographic data in English, Thwaites made it possible for future historians in the United States to study in earnest Jesuit interactions with North America’s Indians.

Greater accessibility to the Relations refocused the way historians approached Jesuit missions in the latter half of the twentieth century, allowing those interested in North America to use Jesuit testimony to understand the earliest years of exploration. After several decades, many scholars sought to understand North American history before Columbus, but without written primary sources from native Americans themselves, this was a particularly difficult task. As new methodologies emerged to address the problem, scholars began to study the discursive prejudices embedded in ethnographic observations of “the Other.” In The Invention of America, Edmundo O’Gorman argued that “the historical appearance of America lay in considering the event a result of an inspired invention of Western thought.” The “discovery” of lands beyond the Atlantic challenged the European world system in 1492, and in the following centuries, navigators, explorers, philosophers, and theologians slowly came to terms with the idea that something existed outside of their cultural frame of reference. Suddenly, two unpleasant realities faced Europeans: either they dispense with and reconstruct their world system or find a way to insert their “discovery” into a pre-existing foundation. In order to preserve their cosmological order, “a ‘New World’ now had to be incorporated

into their cosmographical, geographical, and, ultimately, anthropological understanding.”

Most Europeans opted for this latter course. In a sense, these scholars concluded that Christian evangelization was more about the conquest of cultures than about genuine belief. Throughout the latter half of the twentieth century, a rich literature that spanned the former colonial world emerged and included the works of O’Gorman, Stephen Greenblatt, Karen Ordahl Kupperman, Anthony Pagden, Tzvetan Todorov, and others.  

Within this movement, the Jesuit Relations played an important role in understanding North America’s Indians. Historians such as Neal Salisbury, James Axtell, William Cronon, Richard White, and Kenneth Morrison all used the Jesuit Relations to reconstruct histories of the encounter between Europeans and Indians in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.  

By combing through the Relations, these scholars read between the lines of Jesuit ethnographic data to remove biases against Indians and

---


recover precious information about native societies before European contact. After centuries of focusing on the Jesuits themselves, these authors were uninterested in writing a history of priests, and instead used their research to shift New World missions out of European historiography and firmly into the literature on North America.

In recent years, this focus has begun to change as historians have started examining the broader global context in which the Jesuits operated. Dauril Alden pioneered this interpretation in 1996 with his monumental *The Making of an Enterprise*, a nearly 700-page volume chronicling the Portuguese Jesuits in Europe, Asia, and the New World. In 2005, Nicolas Cushner wrote a comparative study of the Jesuits in the New World, focusing on New Spain, Brazil, Maryland, and Canada. Two more recent works exemplify the future of historiographical interpretations of Jesuit missions. Luke Clossy’s 2008 *Salvation and Globalization in the Early Jesuit Missions* examines the missions as a “transregional phenomenon,” analyzing Jesuit methods of Christian renewal in Germany, Mexico, and China. Rather than comparing the Jesuits from place to place, as Alden and Cushner did, Clossy believed that the Jesuits fundamentally understood Christianity as a universal religion. Cultural interaction with global salvation varied from region to region, but the overall Jesuit understanding of their role during the Reformation remained consistent wherever the Society went. More recently, Takao Abé’s *The Jesuit Mission*

---


to New France: A New Interpretation in the Light of the Earlier Jesuit Experience in Japan traced the ways Jesuits used correspondence from earlier missionaries to shape their methods in North America. Unlike Clossy, Abé admitted his work to be comparative, but he similarly concluded that the reliance of New France’s Jesuits on their predecessors’ work offers evidence of an international Jesuit mission: “what appears to have been original to New France may already have been experienced and narrated by Iberian missionaries, who worked unceasingly in sixteenth-century Japan.” Abé chastised earlier histories of New France as considering only one point of view. “Once these interpretations are placed in an international perspective,” he argued, “accepted interpretations … will be seen to be inappropriate.” Although he studied New France in the context of Japan, his work provides “a first important step toward an international perspective of the French Jesuit mission,” and he believed that “there may be more points of view.”

The New France, the Jesuits, and the Atlantic World

Three important late-fifteenth and early sixteenth-century events serve as a global backdrop to Jesuit missionary work in Canada. First, the age of exploration and Europeans’ inadvertent ‘discovery’ of the Americas opened up new routes that connected early-modern Catholic mission seriously as a macrohistorical phenomenon … most historians have treated the Jesuit project as a disjointed collection of homomorphic regional missions directed and supported from centres of power in Rome, Madrid, and Lisbon,” 3. To Clossy, this meant that most works—perhaps even Alden’s Making of an Enterprise—read more like encyclopedias of regional missions.

Europe to Africa and Asia and brought millions of new people into a rapidly globalizing world. This influx of new peoples and ideas coincided with the onset of the Protestant Reformation. During the Reformation, theologians like Luther and Calvin questioned the religious authority of the Catholic Church, formulating new Christianities that appealed directly to lay people. In 1540, Ignatius of Loyola founded the Society of Jesus with a philosophy oriented toward active ministry. Unlike their Catholic contemporaries, the Jesuits sought to administer a stronger sense of direct communication with God to the community. Although Ignatius did not create the Society of Jesus to serve the Counter-Reformation, the Jesuits soon became an important part of Rome’s program to prevent the spread of Protestantism. Jesuit theologians discovered a dearth of doctrinal understanding among rural populations, and believed that people had been swayed by Protestant ministers because they did not adequately understand their faith. Their enterprise became more focused on missionary work as Jesuits sought to re-catechize populations before they could fall prey to heretical ideals. As Protestants and Catholics—the latter influenced strongly by the growing Society—scrambled to solidify the allegiance of their adherents in Europe, explorers continued to bring more souls into more direct contact with European powers. In these people—Chinese, Japanese, central and south Asian, and American Indian—Catholic missionaries (particularly Jesuits) saw populations ripe for Christian conversion, in part because they held false beliefs stemming from their ignorance of Christianity but also because missionaries feared the spread of Protestantism into places that lacked sound Catholic doctrinal education. Exploration, the Reformation, and the establishment of the Society were all interrelated
for the Jesuits, and without both the discovery of new worlds and the rise of Protestantism, the Society would not have developed the way that it did.

This dissertation will advance Clossy’s and Abé’s international interpretation in a new way: instead of putting New France into the context of other Jesuit missions, I will instead demonstrate that the Canadian missions essentially found their origin in sixteenth-century politics surrounding the Reformation and the French Wars of Religion. Port Royal seemed unimportant to prior historians because it failed, and Biard’s writings only appear in histories of North America because of his ethnographic material. Those who have mentioned Port Royal argued that economic problems—the colony was unprofitable and the Jesuits would not baptize mass numbers of Indians in order to bolster fundraising—caused both the mission and the colony to collapse. By setting the events that unfolded in Acadia between 1611 and 1613 against the backdrop of the Reformation and Wars of Religion, a new interpretation shifts into focus. In France, two separate groups of people came into conflict with French Jesuits. The first were Protestants who were acutely aware of the Jesuit program to extirpate their beliefs from the realm (and ultimately bring them all back to Catholicism). This problem was particularly serious in France, which had just experienced nearly a half-century of violence between the two Christian confessions. Secondly, Gallican Catholics—those who believed that the pope was not necessarily supreme over all Catholics and instead argued that the authority of the French episcopacy and his “most Christian king” best served France—believed that the Jesuits put the needs of the papacy before the needs of France. These two groups often converged in obstructing the Society. By closely examining sources produced in the aftermath of Port Royal’s collapse, these issues rise to the forefront.
This interpretation redirects our understanding of New France’s missions by demonstrating the transference of French religious politics from Europe to North America. When Biard and Poutrincourt resumed their argument upon returning to France in 1614, they wove Canada into preexisting debates over the role of the Society in Europe and the authority of the pope in France. The failure of Port Royal had long term consequences: without a permanent missionary presence in Canada, Huguenot sailors and traders operated unopposed in New France for decades, which minimized the success of sporadic missionaries ventures by Recollect and Jesuit missionaries throughout the 1620s. This meant that American Indians fostered ties with French traders without expectations of religious conversion, at least until Cardinal Richelieu expelled Protestants from New France in 1627. Richelieu’s action opened the door for the Jesuits finally to construct a permanent mission that would extend into the continent’s interior and last well into the eighteenth century. Always aware of the influence of both French Huguenots and English Protestants in North America, the Jesuits sought to convert Indians by providing a thorough education that would prevent them from falling to Protestantism. Jesuit conversion of Indians should therefore be seen as a means for vanquishing heresy in the renewal of Catholicism worldwide.

This dissertation contains four parts. The first chapter discusses the origin of the Society of Jesus in France, their role in the Wars of Religion, and their battle to retain legitimacy in the face of Gallican opposition. It shows the volatile philosophical, theological, and political situation in France when the Society first decided to send missionaries to the New World. The second chapter analyzes the sequence of events that led to Port Royal’s collapse, highlighting the tensions between priest and proprietor that
developed from anti-Jesuit political stereotypes long brewing in France. The third chapter deconstructs the works of Poutrincourt and Biard to confirm that Poutrincourt interpreted the Jesuits through Gallican eyes and that Biard was devoted to the stereotypical Jesuit goal of exterminating Protestant belief while renewing the Catholic faith. Finally, the last chapter focuses on religious tensions that existed in Quebec between 1608 and 1635, proving that the failure of Port Royal had wider-reaching effects while arguing that the Jesuits could not firmly establish themselves until France removed the Society’s political opponents from Canada. Chapter four ends with the construction of the *collège de Québec*, which became the permanent foundation for the Society to flourish in New France.
In late 1604, Fr. Pierre Coton, Jesuit Provincial of Paris, excitedly informed his Superior General, Claudio Acquaviva, that “The king wishes very much that two of our fathers be sent with the fishing ships, which are accustomed to setting sail in the month of March from La Rochelle, Bordeaux, and other port cities.” French cod fishermen had fished in the North Atlantic since the early sixteenth century, and they “stay through six months, without the sacred, without sacraments, without any discernment of days and with clearly pagan mores,” worried Coton. Yet the spirituality of the fishermen was not his only concern: “with this plan,” he told Acquaviva, “it might be possible to open a door for the conversion of the most vast peoples of this continent called New France.”

Acquaviva responded positively. Since the port cities of La Rochelle and Bordeaux were not under the jurisdiction of the provincial of Paris but in the Jesuit Province of Aquitaine, he contacted Fr. Jean Gentil, Aquitaine’s provincial. He reminded Gentil that the request carried royal authority and asked him to select two priests to “work for the spiritual edification of the passengers” of the fishing ships, because they “are said to lack all holiness.” But like Coton, Acquaviva saw the request as an

---

opportunity to lay the groundwork for foreign missions, adding that “with this plan not only might we assist the small number of souls mentioned, but also communicate some light of the Gospel at length to the tribes of savages who live on those shores.”

As Superior General, Acquaviva hoped to extend the Jesuit missionary reach; he already oversaw Jesuit missions from Peru to Japan, hosted primarily by the Spanish and Portuguese but staffed by priests from various parts of Europe. He informed Coton that he had placed the project in Gentil’s hands, undoubtedly delighted to see Catholic France contribute more fully to the missionary endeavor. Coton considered the deal done, proclaiming shortly thereafter that “two of our Jesuits will sail toward American shores, which they call New France, by the eagerness of the king and the piety of they who press on, so that they might bring faith to those widely scattered nations.” But Gentil did not share Coton’s enthusiasm, and he rejected the project in 1605.

Gentil asserted that the colony was too far away for the king to enforce Catholicism as Canada’s official religion, as he had done in France. At the time, Henry IV had put New France under the jurisdiction of one of his former Calvinist allies, Pierre du Gua, Sieur de Monts. Monts, Gentil believed, would certainly bring his own Protestant ministers to “do the worst they can do to undermine Ours and harm them.” He maintained

---


6 Two unnamed Jesuits had already been selected.
that French Catholics, where they were a majority in France, had curtailed the free practice of Protestantism despite the Edict of Nantes, and French Calvinists would certainly do the reverse in Canada. Gentil also felt that the religious tensions within France had left the Jesuits in a precarious position that would be jeopardized by a Canadian mission. He reminded Acquaviva that “the fruits we hope to achieve in this matter are not to be compared to those which are made on this side [of the Atlantic] … 

With two fathers subtracted, we will lose one or two missions in France, where the fruits are assured and great, while the other is small and uncertain.” Not only would a Canadian expedition remove two Jesuit missionaries from France at a time when the monarchy was increasing Jesuit missions among French Protestants, but a failed mission in Canada would diminish the Society’s reputation among a French populace that already distrusted them. It would be better, Gentil averred, to wait several years and then reassess the situation. 

Reflecting upon Gentil’s letter, Acquaviva concluded that the plan to missionize in New France “was judged to be insufficient.” He delayed the project indefinitely.

In an era of rapid Jesuit missionary expansion, Gentil’s arguments might seem surprising, but his reasoning reveals the impact of late sixteenth- and early seventeenth-

7 Jean Gentil, “Mémoire sur le projet de mission Canadienne” in MNF 1:10-3. Gentil also argued that without a proper government established to protect and administer the faith, the Jesuits would have no way to control the religious behavior of colonists seeking to exploit America’s resources. He understood that Mont’s true goal was “getting rich,” an aim “more powerful than advancing the Glory of God and the Salvation of Souls.” His men would be no better: “those who the Lieutenant must lead there are ruffians, tired of prison and condemned to the galleys; and consequently, they are more inclined toward preventing the good enterprises, travels, and help of Our Society, as they are of ordinary people with no piety or religion.” This suggests that Jesuit administrators also considered the clash of interests between financially motivated explorers and evangelical Jesuits while planning missions.

century French religious politics on French Jesuit mission planning. At the dawn of the seventeenth century, three major political and religious problems stood in the Society’s way. First, although the Wars of Religion had tentatively ended when Henry IV converted to Catholicism, accepted the French throne, and promulgated the Edict of Nantes to guarantee limited Protestant freedom of worship in 1598, French society still reeled from the effects of conflict.\(^9\) As one of the papacy’s chief Counter-Reformation assets, the Society of Jesus actively sought to re-convert France’s Protestants through a rigorous domestic missionary program. But after decades marred by bloodshed, France’s two confessional camps maintained a mutual mistrust, with Protestants particularly wary of the Society. Second, the return to political authority by those adhering to the Gallican Church—Catholics who believed in the supremacy of the entire body of bishops over the whole Church alongside the relative autonomy of the French sacral monarchy rather than complete adherence to the papacy—caused additional problems for the Jesuits. Gallicans considered the Jesuits to be instruments of the pope and widely blamed them for the warfare that had torn the kingdom apart in preceding years. After Jean Chastel attempted to assassinate Henry in 1594, Gallicans in the parlement of Paris convinced Henry to expel the Society from France. To their dismay, the king re-admitted the Order in 1603, 

\(^{9}\) 1598 is a traditionally accepted date for the end of the wars. The Wars of Religion were a series of wars, however, and the Edict of Nantes hardly marked the end of fighting between France’s confessions. In *The French Wars of Religion*, Mack Holt argued that the Wars of Religion continued until 1629, when Cardinal Richelieu and Louis XIII negotiated the Peace of Alès, which re-affirmed Protestant religious freedoms while stripping Huguenots of political rights. By claiming that the Edict of Nantes was not an attempt to foster a permanent peace but a temporary solution meant to help bring French society back under the pre-Reformation status of *un roi, une foi, une loi* (one king, one faith, one law), Holt found continuity between Henry IV and his son Louis XIII. By finding the influence of religious politics on Canadian shores in the formative years of the Jesuit missions in North America, I believe that Holt’s periodization is a more adequate interpretation. Mack Holt, *The French Wars of Religion, 1562-1629*, 3\(^{rd}\) ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005).
and the Jesuits’ subsequent and rapid rise to prominence in Henry’s court sparked vehement opposition to their activities from Gallican Catholics. As these tensions brewed, the Society grew in France, building colleges and establishing missions throughout the first decade of the seventeenth century. Third, strains between the Gallican Church and the Jesuits finally exploded when François Ravaillac assassinated Henry IV in 1610. The regicide undermined everything for which the Society had worked as Gallican suspicion of Jesuit disloyalty erupted into a pamphlet war that threatened the Jesuits’ future within one of Europe’s strongest remaining Catholic nations. Amid this turmoil, Coton and Acquaviva finally launched Canada’s first Jesuit mission—only months after Henry’s death.10

The Jesuits and Religious Politics in France before the Catholic League

Ignatius of Loyola did not technically create the Society of Jesus in order to combat Protestantism, but the coinciding rise of each in the first half of the sixteenth century made Jesuits and reformers into natural enemies. The papal bull Regimini Miltantis Ecclesiae established the Society in 1540 and in 1550, Exposcit debitum confirmed the Formula of the Institute of the Society of Jesus, drafted ten years prior as a general framework for the new order.11 The Formula outlined the Society’s mission as

10 I am indebted to Dale Van Kley for giving me a clear understanding of anti-Jesuit sentiments in France; see Van Kley, “The Genesis and Trajectory of Anti-Jesuitism, 1540-1761.”

11 Without the latter, membership would have been capped at 60 and the Society would certainly have taken on a different shape.
“to strive especially for the defense and propagation of the faith and for the progress of souls in Christian life and doctrine … according to what will seem expedient for the glory of God and the common good.” As the Society’s charter, drafted by its founding members, the *Formula* established important precedents. It called for members not only to administer sacraments but to show themselves “no less useful in reconciling the estranged, in holily assisting and serving those who are found in prisons or hospitals, and indeed in performing any other works of charity, according to what will seem expedient for the glory of God and the common good,” free of charge. Furthermore, the *Formula* asked Jesuits to go “to whatsoever provinces [the Society] may choose to send us … whether among the Turks or any other infidels, even those who live in the region called the Indies, or among any heretics whatever, or schismatics, or any of the faithful.” The

---


13 *Formula*, 67; The emphasis on apostolic service and the origins of the Jesuit missionary vow can be traced to Ignatius’s original spiritual conversion and subsequent *Spiritual Exercises*. While recovering from a battle wound, Ignatius underwent a spiritual transformation at Manresa, in Spain, in 1521. He spent his retreat in quiet reflective prayer, during which he claimed God communicated with him personally. From this retreat experience, he crafted the *Spiritual Exercises*, which provided Jesuits with a method of prayer emphasizing personal interaction with God. The *Exercises* formed the basis of Jesuit spirituality. By engaging in them, one made a conscious choice to give up a prior life of sin and accept God’s love. From there (in constant conversation with God), one moved through a reflection of life and then death. Instead of engaging in strictly rigid rituals, as monastic orders had done for centuries, Jesuit worship was personal and appealed to emotion, emphasizing direct communication with God. The *Exercises* provided Catholics with a specific means of performing a retreat and teaching the multitudes to pray. Although the majority of people were not expected to proceed through the entirety of the *Exercises*, Jesuits were encouraged to use the early parts as a means of bringing populations into closer communication with God’s love. For more on the *Spiritual Exercises*, see Loyola, *Autobiography*, ed. J.F.X. O’Conner, S.J. (New York: Benziger Brothers, 1900); John W. O’Malley, S.J., “How the First Jesuits Became Involved in Education,” in *The Jesuit Ratio Studiorum: 400th Anniversary Perspectives*, ed. Vincent J. Duminuco, S.J. (New York: Fordham University Press, 2000), 59-62; O’Malley, *The First Jesuits* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1993), 4, 37-50; O’Malley describes the *Exercises* as “the document that told Jesuits on the most profound level what they were and what they were supposed to be.” Furthermore, he argued that the Jesuit understanding of education can be traced to the *Exercises* more than to any other source.

14 *Formula*, 68.
General Examen, which outlined the Society’s purpose to all new recruits, made this goal abundantly clear: “The end of this Society is to devote itself with God’s grace not only to the salvation and perfection of the members’ own souls, but also with that same grace to labor strenuously in giving aid toward the salvation and perfection of the souls of their fellowmen.” From the beginning, then, the Jesuit goal of “helping souls” required them to perform works of charity. To save souls, they enacted a strategy of cultivating elites to secure funding and establish strong networks while simultaneously traveling the countryside catechizing the poor.

The Society sent its missionaries to places deemed to best serve the universal good. From the beginning, the Society’s founders envisioned a global missionary effort whose workers traveled wherever the “superior thinks it more expedient to send them,” at the discretion of the pope. Newly trained missionaries went where they might achieve the greater glory of God, manifested through the “greater aid of souls,” whether “among the faithful … or among the unbelievers, especially where there is a colony of believers, as in Greece and elsewhere.” In places with no existing community of Catholics, however, the

15 Ignatius Loyola, Constitutions of the Society of Jesus, trans. George E. Ganss (St. Louis: Institute of Jesuit Sources, 1970), 3, [this number denotes section number, consistent with all editions of the Constitutions].

16 O’Malley sought to “to understand the early Jesuits as they understood themselves” by “studying what they said about themselves to each other and to outsiders and especially by looking at how they translated that understanding into action in their many ministries and in the style of life they adopted” and “to discover the origins of the Jesuits’ self-understanding and to take account of the contexts into which they inserted themselves that furthered their process of self-definition.” He argued that the ultimate goal of the Society was not to serve the Counter-Reformation, but to serve through their ministries as “mediators of an immediate experience of God that would lead to an inner change of heart or a deepening of religious sensibilities already present.” O’Malley’s analysis challenges the older historiographical interpretation of the Jesuits which portrayed them as originating and operating solely in response to the Reformation. For a complete overview of the first decades of the Society, see O’Malley, The First Jesuits, quoted on pages 3, 19.

17 Constitutions 622, 605; “The more universal the good is, the more is it divine.”
Society required that “the superior should ponder seriously”—as Gentil had done—whether or not to send missionaries. It gave first preference to places in which the population already familiar with Catholicism, “where one sees the door more widely open and a better disposition among the people.” But the Jesuits felt a special obligation to those places where they were indebted to the people, specifically communities with a Jesuit college provided by local benefactors. They emphasized locales where the service of God was deemed more urgent, such as towns with no other means of spiritual aid, with direct orders to prefer “preaching and lecturing” over ministry to individuals.

The budding Society differed markedly from its contemporaries in various ways. By the late sixteenth century, the Jesuits had become committed to serving their neighbors, but this emphasis forced them to reject many common principles of other orders: deprivation, flagellation, saying canonical hours, and contemplation became secondary to fighting the enemies of the Church through apostolic service. To create an effective active apostolate, the Society adopted a centralized authority and established various grades of membership. They instituted vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience—with a special obedience to perform missions in the name of the pope. This fourth vow set the Jesuits apart, but it also plagued them for centuries, as their critics—

18 Constitutions 618, 621; the intention “was not to designate a particular place but to have the members distributed throughout the various parts of the world”; Gentil apparently took this directive quite seriously when he questioned the utility of sending Jesuits to Canada when they were needed in France.

19 Constitutions 622.

20 Constitutions 623; additionally, the Constitutions stipulate the number of missionaries as well as their ideal character traits. The Constitutions leave the procedure by which the missionaries establish themselves in a place to the discretion of the Superior, therefore Jesuit French Provincials relied on Superiors Acquaviva and Mutio Vitelleschi when planning the missions to Canada.

especially French Gallican Catholics—denounced their supposed blind obedience to papal authority.

Since the time of Charlemagne, France had developed a special Gallican Catholicism that evolved separately from Rome. Since the Councils of Constance and Basel had decreed in the first decades of the fifteenth century that God directly empowered the council of Catholic bishops to reign supreme over the Church, Gallicans believed that the pope did not carry ultimate religious authority. In 1516, Francis I and Pope Leo complicated matters by negotiating the Concordat of Bolognes. Although the concordat confirmed the king’s power to nominate men to ecclesiastical positions—offices which Francis I and Henry II (1547-1559) filled with their own political allies throughout the early sixteenth century—the king officially denounced the conciliar movement, the movement within Catholicism that professed the supremacy of the council of bishops over the papacy. Although the conciliar movement ended with the concordat, Gallican Catholicism continued to evolve. Although Gallicans maintained the authority of the French ecclesiastics until the reign of Louis XIII, the Gallican church began slowly to emphasize instead the significance of the king as head of the Gallican Church.

22 “In France the monarchy was itself an object of something like religious veneration, the sacramental center of la religion royal. … The roots of this royal religion lay deep in the pagan past, on the Germanic side in the notion of a kingly family or reges criniti descended from Woden and from which kings had to be chosen, and on the classical side in the gradual divinization of emperors during late Roman antiquity. Early Frankish kings had deftly exploited both traditions, being at once Germanic chieftans and the agents of declining imperial authority. The conversion of Clovis around A.D. 500 did not so much displace as Christianize these traditions … Charlemagne may or may not have thought of himself as Christlike or as a partly divine person, a gemina persona, but he most certainly acted the role of agent or vicar of Christ and effective head of Christendom, convening and presiding over local church councils, taking a hand in the formulation of Christian doctrine, and forcibly ‘converting’ Arian Germans and pagan Saxons to Nicene orthodoxy. The title of Roman Emperor, revived for his benefit by Pope Leo III in 800, continued the confusion between classical and Christian as well as Germanic precedents.” Dale Van Kley, The Religious Origins of the French Revolution: From Calvin to the Civil Constitution, 1560-1791 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996), 15-31.
Coronation ceremonies were highly ritualized to demonstrate the marriage of religion and politics embodied by each new monarch, to the point where one king’s death and his successor’s coronation reflected a language of Christ’s death and resurrection.23

Because member of the Society took an oath of obedience to the pope, Gallican Catholics feared the Jesuits. Although Ignatius founded the Society with several students at the University of Paris in 1540, French authorities at the University and in the parlement of Paris who were staunchly opposed to papal authority over French interests initially refused to acknowledge the papal bull establishing the Order.24 Gallicans accused the Society’s Constitutions of demanding Jesuits blindly to obey orders from Rome. In part, this criticism might have been unfair, because while the fourth vow did imply obedience, Regimini Militantis Ecclesiae clearly states “So that whatever the present or other Roman pontiffs order that concerns the saving of souls and the spread of the faith, and to whatever provinces he shall wish to send us … let us strive to accomplish [this], without any turning back or excuse.”25 The fourth vow, therefore, gave the Society a missionary impulse and an obligation to travel the globe to bring glory to God through ministry to his people.26

24 Pope Paul III established the Society formally in Regimini militantis ecclesiae on September 27, 1540. Pope Julius confirmed the ruling and allowed them to expand in Exposcit debitum on July 21, 1550.
26 O’Malley, “How the First Jesuits Became Involved in Education,” 60; O’Malley argued that the fourth vow, “often misunderstood as a kind of loyalty oath to the pope,” was really “a vow to be a missionary,” which “obligated them to travel anywhere in the world where there was hope of God’s greater service and the good of souls.”
To facilitate their missions, the Jesuits became catalysts for the growth of Catholic education, and their educational program differed from the monastic and mendicant orders established centuries earlier. Unlike their contemporaries, the Jesuits made education a priority; one of their key duties was staffing their colleges. The Society developed a comprehensive program and worked to ensure the success and continuation of its educational ministry. While other orders focused on colleges as tools for training their clergy, the Jesuits sought to educate a broader population of young men that included non-clergy who would perform apostolic service for the greater glory of God, which became their most fundamental founding directive. On the surface, they sought only to renew Catholicism and strengthen the faith of its adherents. But as the Reformation spread across Europe, the Society’s active ministries put them at odds with Protestant Churches, which challenged Catholic hegemony. In the 1560s, the papacy went on the offensive, militantly reinvigorating Catholicism through evangelization, which meant clarifying Catholic doctrine in order to stunt the popular spread of Protestantism. Jesuits, who interpreted the fourth vow as a commitment to papal

27 Ad Maiorem Dei Gloriam, or for the greater Glory of God, was the founding axiom of the Society and still serves as the underlying principle of Jesuit schools today; O’Malley, “How the First Jesuits Became Involved in Education,” 57; “No group in the church, or in a society at large, had ever undertaken an enterprise on such a grand scale in which these three factors coalesced.”

28 Martin attributed this militant approach to Pius V, Gregory XIII, and Sixtus V: “Pius V was elected as the leader of the rigid party in the Church. He did not disappoint his supporters. He increased the power of the Roman Inquisition and republished the bull In Coena Domini. In 1569 he congratulated the Duke of Alva on the efficiency of the “Council of Blood” and sent a papal army to France. Elizabeth of England was excommunicated the following year, and plans were laid for a crusade against the Turk. Gregory XIII celebrated the news of the Saint Bartholomew’s Day Massacre with a Te Deum, fomented rebellion in Ireland, and gave encouragement to the French Catholic League. During the pontificate of Sixtus V support was promised to Philip II for the Armada, the Duke of Savoy was encouraged to attack Geneva, and Henry of Navarre was excommunicated,” in Henry III and the Jesuit Politicians (Geneva: Librairie Droz, 1973), 23.
obedience, became the pope’s most invaluable Counter-Reformation tools, but in so doing confirmed the fears of their Gallican critics.

The Society grew in an era when the kingdoms of Europe faced a rapid growth in what historians have come to call “confessionalization.” In the face of reformed ideas, both new Protestants and the Catholic Church established written confessions of faith, essential to differentiating between the churches. To force adherents strictly into their camp, churches required oaths, utilized propaganda, censored dissent, employed missionaries to educate rural populations, punished nonconformists, and distributed the sacraments. Since religion permeated daily life, amplified control over practice led to a more general disciplining of social behavior, and stricter religious identities increasingly correlated with cultural and then national identities. As a result, the state gained a stronger level of control over churches in Protestant and Catholic countries alike. One of the chief side effects of confessionalization was the decline of traditional folk religions.29 When there had been only one Catholic Church, there was little impetus to suppress the incorporation of regional practices into Catholic doctrine.30 The beliefs of the rural


30 I base my understanding on the paradigm of “confessionalization” that grew out of a Catholic reaction to the anti-modern connotations of “Counter-Reformation” in the late 1950s and 1960s. Originally a religious idea, Ernst Walter Zeeden argued that in the latter half of the sixteenth century, Catholics, Lutherans, and Calvinists all built modern churches centered on confessions of faith. Wolfgang Reinhard and Heinz Schilling, of Catholic and Protestant backgrounds, respectively, turned Zeeden’s concept into a paradigm through which early modern Europeans organized their societies. Since early modern church and state were inherently intertwined, the confessionalization of churches proposed by Zeeden influenced early modern state formation, often resulting in the policy of cuius regio, eius religio (the religion of the king as the religion of the people); confessionalization was thus a precursor of the rise of absolutism. Both Reinhard and Schilling argued that Catholic and Protestant confessional states were therefore modernizing, despite an older historiography that characterized the Catholic reactive Counter-Reformation as obstructive to modernity. Scholars have made several criticisms of the paradigm. Some argued that religion was not a
population, which had professed Catholicism for centuries without necessarily understanding its fundamental tenants, needed renewing. Unless Catholic missionaries clarified doctrine and belief through the catechism, Catholic officials feared, Protestantism could more easily overtake the rural population.

The first Jesuits imagined themselves to be contemporary versions of Christ’s disciples: their mission was to travel from place to place preaching the fundamental tenets of their faith. Ignatius emphasized evangelization of “those places where the enemy of Christ our Lord has sown cockle, and especially where he has spread bad opinions about the Society.” To heed this call, some Jesuits became military chaplains, but a great many more became missionaries. In regions that remained Catholic, the Jesuits focused on strengthening the faith of the poor, but in places fraught with heresy, a fundamental force strengthening the state, rather than the disunity of the Reformation led to increasing secularization. Others have debated the periodization. One of the most convincing criticisms claims that in emphasizing the state, the paradigm neglects theology, ignoring the possibility that belief may have played a substantial role. Finally, social historians have criticized the model for its top-down approach, arguing that social discipline was not really imposed by the state, but self-imposed at the local level, where “competing processes of confessionalization” resulted in conflict. For an overview of the paradigm and its criticisms, see Ute Lotz-Huemann, “The Concept of “Confessionalization: a Historiographical Paradigm in Dispute,” in Memoria y civilización: anuario de historia de la Universidad de Navarra, no. 4 (2001), pp. 93-114; Wolfgang Rienhard, “Reformation, Counter-Reformation, and the Early Modern State: A Reassessment” in The Catholic Historical Review, vol. LXXV, no. 3 (July 1989), 383-404; Roger Châtelier, The Religion of the Poor: Rural Missions in Europe and the Formation of Modern Catholicism, c. 1500-c. 1800, trans. Brian Pierce (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 13, 19; Châtelier argued that the new emphasis on ensuring a thorough understanding of basic Christian tenants was “a major turning point in the history of Christianity” and that “henceforth, in order to be saved, one had to know.”

31 In the Matthew 28:19, after the Resurrection, Jesus commanded his disciples: “Go therefore and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.” In his Relation of 1632, Fr. Paul Le Jeune described his astonishment when he discovered that the Gospel assigned to the first mass he celebrated in New France happened to be Matthew 28:19: “I took these words as a good omen, although I clearly saw that they were not addressed to so poor a person as I,” in JR 5:19.

32 Constitutions 622.
new tactic took shape. Although there was no scriptural basis for it, most societies in
western Europe lived under an unstated practice of *cuius regio eius religio*, by which
rulers dictated the beliefs of their populations. Many Jesuits therefore championed a
strategy of suppressing Protestant beliefs by cultivating ties with elite families. Ignatius’s
strategy for selecting missionary destinations reflected this sixteenth-century premise:
“spiritual aid which is given to important and public persons,” he stipulated, “ought to be
regarded as more important, since it is a more universal good.” Such worthies, he
clarified, were “princes, lords, magistrates, or ministers of justice” as well as “persons
distinguished for learning and authority.” Winning over the elites, then, would open the
doors to re-converting the rural populations of Europe.

The Society as a whole believed that Protestant theology was particularly
dangerous to uneducated peoples. As master theologians, Jesuits could easily argue the
doctrinal deficiencies of Martin Luther or John Calvin, but they considered “heresy” to be

---

33 Châtellier, *Religion of the Poor*, 13, 19.
34 Châtellier, *Religion of the Poor*, 1; Without scriptural backing, Höpfl states that “this line of
argument instead led into a political and theoretical minefield,” 83.
35 *Constitutions*, 622; the Jesuit cultivation of the elite was well-known to scholars of late sixteenth-
and early seventeenth-century Europe. In *Working in the Vineyard of the Lord: Jesuit Confraternities in
Early Modern Italy* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2005), Lance Gabriel Lazar showed how Jesuits
in three specific Italian confraternities brought new devotions to rural Europe: “Theirs was a message the
people wanted to hear. And the people were, first of all, the elites, especially where an institution had
substantial financial responsibilities.” At the same time, “the Jesuits opened themselves to a broader
constituency. The Jesuits inherited a class-based society, and rather than trying to alter societal relations at
the core, they accepted the status quo and worked to produce the most moral and religiously committed
individuals as possible within each social class. Each person should be the best according to his or her state
in life and in the world,” 149-150. Martin, *The Jesuit Mind* and Châtellier, *Religion of the Poor* both argue
that the cultivation of the elites through schooling became the underlying strategy of the new order.
36 Châtellier, *Religion of the Poor*, 19-21; Châtellier briefly recounted the confrontation between
missionary François de Sales and the Duke of Savoy. The Duke eventually acceded to the Jesuit, who was
pressuring him to enforce Catholicism throughout his realm. De Sales celebrated the victory, claiming “by
this means many will avoid suffering banishment from Paradise so as not to incur banishment from their
homeland.”
more than a simple series of incorrect beliefs. Instead, a true heretic committed a crime by making a conscious choice to refuse Catholic doctrine and espouse something else under the guise of Christianity. Jesuits believed that heresy required a certain amount of stubbornness and pride, almost as if they understood Protestants to be contrarians merely for the sake of contrarianism. Protestant pride also rendered unity impossible; since they allegedly put nothing above their own judgment, no central authority could impose a coherent set of beliefs, thus beginning a downward spiral of religious and political divisiveness. The Jesuits feared that as Christianity continued to subdivide, believers would become increasingly indifferent to religion and might eventually abandon it.\(^{37}\)

They also thought that heresies promoted worldly pleasures, which allowed the rapid spread of Protestantism through the temptation of the poor. The Jesuits judged less harshly those corrupted by Protestant preachers only because their faith had rested on a weak foundation. Although favoring gentle treatment of such well-meaning but pliable Christians, Jesuits hoped to more stringently punish stubborn Protestants who intentionally spread heretical beliefs. To their frustration, however, since since active Protestants ceased to be members of the Church, the pope no longer had jurisdiction over them.\(^{38}\)

Since the Church could not inflict ecclesiastical punishments on non-adherents, it instead put pressure on secular authorities in Catholic nations to repress heresy.

---


\(^{38}\) The best summary of Jesuit philosophical thinking about heresy appears in Harro Höpfl’s *Jesuit Political Thought: The Society of Jesus and the State, c. 1540-1630* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), particularly the fourth chapter, “The Church, the Society, and Heresy,” 64-83.
Catholic realms. This need became especially apparent to Church authorities when Protestant rulers such as Elizabeth of England or Gustavus Adolphus of Sweden showed active support for Protestants in the Netherlands and German states. If Catholic rulers did not counteract their Protestant counterparts, heretics might win toleration in Catholic countries. Jesuit writers Bellarmine, Mariana, Becanus, Scribani, Ribadeneira, Auger and others all posited the same general argument: heresy was politically dangerous. They branded heresy as a civil crime in addition to a religious one, for it undermined social unity and promoted rebellion. Drawing upon Machiavelli, the Jesuits contended that all successful societies rested upon the civil obligations inherent in religion and which prompted people to obey the law.³⁹

Protestantism, they claimed, did the opposite, undermining social order in a number of ways. First, pride—the foundation of Protestant thought, according to the Jesuits—prevented Protestants from submitting to secular authority. Second, anticipating the arguments of Edmund Burke, the state legitimized itself through continuity. Catholic thinkers defended the state’s claim to present power by invoking its unique ability to preserve traditions of the past and uphold the certainty of the future. Tolerating changes to Catholic doctrine set a dangerous precedent by encouraging people to question the ancient foundations upon which the state also rested. Jesuits feared that such a decline in authority would almost certainly lead to a breakdown of obedience and civic virtue.

Violence in England, Germany, and France only proved to the Jesuits that heresy changed the political consequences of religion. United under Catholicism, religious

³⁹ Höpfl, *Jesuit Political Thought*, 114-5. The Jesuits acknowledged Machiavelli’s belief that Christianity was a poor civic religion, but they did not agree.
doctrine promoted virtue and obedience, but Protestant divisions encouraged a multiplication of dissenting opinions. Jesuits argued that religious dissenters could prove even more dangerous to the realm. Even under a regime that tolerated their existence, dissenters would divide their loyalties between their secular rulers and their co-religionists in other countries. Protestant rulers such as Elizabeth were, in turn, more likely to intervene in states where religious discord provided a ready-made fifth column. Heresy, then, weakened the state’s stability not only internally but externally as well. Jesuits therefore concluded that even the basic demands of keeping civic peace, to say nothing of saving souls, obliged the state to extirpate heresy.

Such an attitude fit especially well in Gallican France, where the sacral monarchy already carried with it the implied policy of *un roi, une foi, une loi*—one king, one faith, one law. The rise of Calvinism in mid-sixteenth-century France posed a significant challenge to the concept of a sacral monarchy. Because the Gallican Church rested upon a foundation that ritualized the king, surrounded him with Catholic relics, and traced his lineage to two Catholic Saints, any attack on Catholicism might be interpreted as an attack on the legitimacy of the entire political and social structure of France.

Consequently, many French Catholics became particularly suspicious of Protestantism,

---

40 There were exceptions, of course. Toleration was preferable if it were impossible to remove heretical beliefs without destroying Catholicism. Höpfl cited Becanus, who gave three cases in which toleration was permissible: “first, when it is done for the sake of a greater good; second, when it is done in order to avoid a greater evil; and third, when the person permitting evil to be done cannot prevent it,” 138, 78-83, 112-139. Ironically, Jesuit detractors used similar arguments against the Jesuits; I will explore this in the second-to-last section of this chapter.

believing that it led to rebellion. As Francis I understood Protestantism as a threat to his authority, he drove a young John Calvin from France in 1535. Calvin, who fled to Geneva, fused church and state through the consistory, that is to say, the Calvinist state legitimized the Church while the opposite was true in Gallican France, where the Church legitimized the state. Protestants had reason to fear the Gallican monarchy. As the leader of France’s Catholics, one of the king’s foremost aims was to root out heresy and therefore a good Gallican king theoretically could not permit Protestant worship. French Protestants were fully aware that a French Catholic monarch’s chief purpose was to bridge church and state, and the “most Christian Kings” believed they held a special relationship with God.

The papacy further complicated the issue when it called the Council of Trent to its first meeting in 1547 to unite Catholic Christendom against the spread of Protestantism. Henry II, who had just taken the French throne, believed that the pope and the Council were pro-Habsburg and refused to allow French bishops to attend the Council. Pope Julius III responded by threatening to “excommunicate and depose” Henry and replace him with Prince Philip of Spain. His threat confirmed Gallican fears of papal authority

---

42 In 1534, a broadside published by exiled French Protestants appeared throughout Paris. It outlined four arguments against the Catholic mass, ending with a diatribe against the Catholic ecclesiastical hierarchy. Holt argued that this incident was the first to reveal to the French people the social implication of Protestantism: the Catholic mass legitimized the monarchy and therefore the social system, therefore any attack on the Church was an attack upon the State. See Holt, *The French Wars of Religion*, 17-9.


and international Catholicism, and the king took strenuous measures to uphold his duties as defender of Catholicism in France by refusing to register the decrees of the Council in his kingdom. His Gallican policies culminated in the Edict of Châteaubriand in 1551, which not only banned Protestantism in France independently of the Council of Trent, but also authorized rigorous persecution of its practitioners.

Despite the edict, in 1555 two Calvinist Churches opened in France, one in Poitiers and one in Paris. Within seven years, over one thousand congregations of “Huguenots,” a pejorative for members of the “Religion Prétendue Réformée,” existed in a broad network across the kingdom. Protestant membership cut across class lines, and although it tended to be over-represented in the middle class, since a large number of elites remained Catholic while much of the rural peasantry held little interest in reformed ideas. Protestants in reformed cities seized Catholic properties and replaced Catholic mass with more communal, vernacular services. Theology schools proliferated in these communities, and pastors sought to become better educated. Religious communities moved to eliminate elements of Catholicism while creating a society in which all members looked after one another’s material and spiritual well-being. The reformed churches established consistories, local governing bodies that enforced Protestant values and policed the behavior of church members. Consistories reprimanded them for immoral

46 Holt retold the story in The French Wars of Religion, 26-7.
acts, settled disputes between neighbors, and eliminated all remnants of Catholic traditions.49

Although early monarchs like Henry II easily repressed many of these groups and forced their members into hiding, the rapid expansion of Calvinism in France after 1560 made it logistically impossible to credibly punish practitioners. Tensions continued to mount until the first of the Wars of Religion broke out in 1562 and continued sporadically throughout the decade. Understanding the escalating volatility of the situation, Catherine de Medici, who became regent after Henry II’s death in 1559, overturned the 1551 edict with the Edict of Saint-Germain in January 1570, declaring that Protestant worship was legal, although limited, in the kingdom. This momentarily halted the violence.50

The Edict of Saint-Germain rendered clear a fundamental division that existed within French Catholicism: some valued peace, stability, and the preservation of the monarchy as the most prudent course of action, while others believed that the total extermination of Calvinism from the kingdom, whatever the cost, was the only way to preserve the monarchy in the long term. Gallican French Society remained wary of both the Jesuits and Rome, but violence between Catholics and Calvinists began to make the Jesuit presence tolerable to extreme Catholics. If missionary work could defeat the Huguenots and restore France to a state of un roi, une foi, une loi, the hard-liners believed, toleration of the Society would be worthwhile. To help pressure a monarchy

49 Benedict and Reinburg, “Religion and the Sacred,” 144.
50 Ibid, 140-6.
wavering between the desire for Catholic unity and the need for stability, the Jesuits reminded the young King Charles IX of his sacral duty to uphold Catholicism and uproot heresy. After the Edict of Saint-Germain, the militant Catholics led by the Cardinal of Lorraine fell out of favor with the court. With the Catholic parties divided between those favoring a peaceful maintenance of the Gallican monarchy and those clamoring for the extermination of Protestantism, the Jesuits had to decide: should they ally themselves with a monarchy that had accepted terms with the Huguenots, or maintain their objective of re-Catholicizing all of France by allying themselves with Lorraine?

The Jesuits and the League, 1572-1587

Despite the Queen Mother’s attempt to broker a peace, militant Catholics refused to register the Edict of Saint-Germain in the parlements. Renewed violence broke out in 1572 when Henry, Duke of Guise, a devout Catholic and one of the influential voices at court, led a wide-scale massacre of Protestants as they worshiped. After the St.

---

51 “The principal goal of every good war was a good peace, and to [prominent Jesuit Edmund] Auger this meant the exercise of only one religion. There could be no exceptions,” in Martin, *Henry III and the Jesuit Politicians*, 35.

52 The Saint Bartholomew’s Day Massacre took place in late August, 1572. Although historians have argued about the role Medici played, N.M. Sutherland, Barbara Diefendorf, and Mack Holt all agreed that the Guises likely unintentionally orchestrated the event when they attempted to assassinate Admiral Gaspard de Coligny, a Calvinist noble and leader of the Huguenots in France. Fearing a counter-strike from a Protestant army they feared existed outside of Paris, the Guises preemptively followed their failed attack on Coligny with a systematic assassination of several key Protestant nobles, including Coligny, in Paris. Because of religious tensions within Paris, the murder of these Protestants sparked a general massacre of Parisian Protestants by civilian Catholics that lasted for three days and spread throughout the kingdom. The killings were gruesome displays of violent murder, rape, and plundering that cut across class lines and showed that French Catholics feared Protestantism as a threat to the social order and their way of life. Major works on the massacre include N.M. Sutherland, *The Massacre of St. Bartholomew and the European Conflict, 1559-1572* (London: MacMillan, 1973), Philip Benedict, “The Saint Bartholomew’s
Bartholomew’s Day Massacre, the Guise family, particularly François, the Duke, and Charles, the Cardinal of Lorraine, became the leaders of a powerful militant Catholic lobby in Medici’s court. As radical French Catholics sought an alliance with Spanish Catholics, Protestant leaders organized and clamored for war. The next thirty years of French history were consumed by violence, as several episodes of fighting were followed first by failed attempts to mediate peace and then a quick renewal of warfare. The bloodshed turned many Catholics more militantly anti-Protestant, but also marginalized their influence with a French monarchy seeking to broker peace within the kingdom.

When the more combative Catholics, led by the Guise family, fell out of favor in Paris, they formed the Catholic League in 1576. The members of this organization sought external support and allied with international Catholicism—the papacy, the Habsburgs, and religious orders that included the Capuchins, the Feuillants, and the Jesuits, who were an essential part of the Catholic Reformation embodied by the Council of Trent. League members believed that Catholic support for the monarchy had waned, suggesting an opening for a more Catholic alternative to the ruling House of Valois and its weak stand against heresy. 53

53 Claiming to trace their lineage to Charlemagne, the Guises believed that


53 The classic work on the League is Frederic J. Baumgartner, Radical Reactionaries: the political thought of the French catholic League (Genève: Librarie Droz, 1975). Also see Ann W. Ramsey, Liturgy, Politics, and Salvation: The Catholic League in Paris and the Nature of Catholic Reform, 1540-1630 (Rochester: University of Rochester Press, 1999), which analyzes “the civic experience of the liturgy and the ability of the liturgy to link highly politicized but distinct social groups,” 2. Her first chapter provides a succinct history of the League, its origins, and its demise in 1594. Also see Kevin Gould, Catholic Activism in South-West France (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), which argues that in southwestern French cities like
they could provide that alternative. The Gallican monarchy, with support from moderate
nobles in the parlement of Paris, fought to retain legitimacy and control of the kingdom
while the Catholic League and their Protestant opponents continually threatened to topple
the government from either side.

During the warfare, France’s Jesuits became popularly associated with Catholic
extremism. When the violence of the St. Bartholomew’s Day Massacre spread to
Bordeaux, one anti-Catholic pamphlet accused Jesuit Edmond Auger of inciting
Catholics to kill over 250 Calvinists. Auger had been provincial of Aquitaine in the 1560s
and spent much of that decade allied with the Cardinal of Lorraine at the royal court in
Paris. Disagreeing with the Edict of Saint-Germain’s toleration of Protestants, Auger
retired to Bordeaux but continued to associate with the extreme Catholics led by the
Cardinal and the Duke of Anjou, Charles IX’s younger brother, who would become
Henry III. When the massacres reached Bordeaux, Auger stood accused of preaching
“sermons and discourses, full of invectives, [that] had no other goal: and in public and
private he incessantly solicited the men to do at Bordeaux as had been done at Paris.”54

Auger made a habit of ignoring his Jesuit superiors in favor of participating in
campaigns against Huguenots. Rather than represent France in electing a new Superior
General in 1573, Auger accompanied the Duke of Anjou to La Rochelle, one of France’s

Bordeaux, Agen, and Toulouse, the strength of Protestant support made Catholic activism occur as early as
the 1540s, 35 years before the Catholic League formed in Paris, and that activists during the Wars of
Religion acted independently of League influence.

54 Cited in Martin, Henry III and the Jesuit Politicians, 48; for the original, see “Massacre de ceux de
la religion à Bordeaux le 3. jour doctobre 1572,” in Simon Goulart, ed. Mémoires de l’estat de France sous
Charles Neufiesme (Meidelbourg: Par Heinrich Wold, 1579), 1:380v-81.
strongest Protestant cities.\textsuperscript{55} During the siege, Anjou was elected king of Poland.

Meanwhile, Catherine de Medici convinced her other son, Charles IX, to arbitrate peace with the Calvinists. Auger left for Rome and Anjou traveled to his new position in Poland. Months later, Charles IX died. When Anjou returned to France as Henry III, Auger traveled from Paris to Lyon to greet him. Auger hoped to pressure Henry III to pursue a more hostile policy toward the Huguenots, but the Jesuit’s friendship with the aggressive Catholic extremist Cardinal of Lorraine, who had died in December of 1574, made Henry hesitant to follow Auger’s advice.\textsuperscript{56}

A joint effort to re-Catholicize England brough the Jesuits together with the Guises and the League.\textsuperscript{57} In 1579, the Duke of Guise offered to fund a new Jesuit college at Eu, situated on the English Channel.\textsuperscript{58} The Jesuits intended to use this college as the launching point for their efforts in England, but needed to find a benefactor for the project. Supported by money from Philip II of Spain, who hoped to overthrow the excommunicated Protestant Queen Elizabeth and restore Catholicism to England, Guise funded the college in the hope of using Jesuit activity across the channel as part of a more general assault on the Protestant kingdom. Moreover, Guise hoped that a Jesuit presence in England would help him rescue his Catholic cousin, Mary, Queen of Scots, from her

\textsuperscript{55} Martin quoted Auger, who allegedly called the Calvinist ministers at La Rochelle “the shit of the world,” \textit{Henry III and the Jesuit Politicians}, 50.

\textsuperscript{56} Henry also balked at appointing Auger as his confessor.

\textsuperscript{57} Although his book delineates the relationship between the Jesuits and the League in great detail, Martin’s two chapters on the effect that re-Catholicizing England had upon Jesuit League involvement are perhaps the most interesting, see Martin, \textit{Henry III and the Jesuit Politicians}, 63-74, 105-14.

\textsuperscript{58} Guise had become Count of Eu when he married Catherine de Clèves, heiress of the town. Guise worried that Eu’s citizenry would fall prey to Protestant propaganda, and hoped the Jesuits would secure the town for the Church. See Pierre Delattre, S.J., \textit{Les Établissements des Jésuites en France depuis quatre siècles, 1540-1940}, Vol. 1 (Enghien: Institut Supérieur de Théologie, 1949), 411-14.
captivity by Queen Elizabeth. Elizabeth’s government knew the Society sought to overthrow the Anglican Church and therefore did not permit Jesuits to operate in England. Although two English Jesuits arrived safely in England in 1580, their mission did not last long. Elizabeth feared that the Jesuits might convince James VI of Scotland to convert to Catholicism, prompting her to clamp down on Catholicism. The English captured one of the Jesuits, Edmund Campion, and executed him in 1581. Upon hearing the news, the other, Robert Persons, fled to France, where he reported to the newly-elected Superior General Claudio Acquaviva that a strong Jesuit presence in Scotland would give militant Catholic leaders—particularly Mary, Guise, Philip, and Pope Gregory XIII—a stronger platform for invading England.

The mission d’Ecosse was one of the first Jesuit foreign missions planned by Acquaviva and launched from France. After convening with Guise at Eu, Persons and Jesuit missionary William Creighton departed for Scotland, joining other Jesuits whom Acquaviva had already sent. The Duke of Lennox, James VI’s cousin, drew up an invasion plan that Creighton and another Jesuit carried back to Eu and then Paris, where it was delivered to Guise and Claude Matthieu, the Provincial of France. Since allying himself with Phillip meant breaking his oath of loyalty to the French monarch, Guise hesitated, but the Jesuits assured him that re-Catholicizing England was a moral issue that warranted action. The Jesuits had become the diplomatic core mobilizing Catholics in Rome, Spain, France, and Scotland against Anglican England. Guise sent Creighton to Rome and Persons to Spain to negotiate the alliance, but papal politics foiled his plan. In 1582, the pope made his support conditional on Philip II and Spain leading the invasion, a role Guise wanted for himself. Gregory’s delay closed the window, as potential allies
fell away. Protestants soon took control of the Scottish court and drove out the Jesuits.\textsuperscript{59} Henry III refused to support an invasion of England, which further alienated Guise and more radical Jesuits from the court and forced them to continue planning the operation themselves.

Although Edmond Auger abandoned his association with the Guise family in order to remain influential with the increasingly moderate Henry, many prominent French Jesuits coalesced around Guise and involved themselves with the emerging Catholic League.\textsuperscript{60} Like many other Catholics, France’s Jesuits did not believe that Henry III had upheld his duties as head of the Gallican Church: not only had he obstructed French efforts to overthrow Elizabeth, but he also upheld tolerance for Protestants and protected Calvinist Geneva. Henry believed that his policies prevented more bloodshed by allowing peaceful coexistence, but the Jesuits (and the papacy), who accused Henry of ignoring the decrees of the Council of Trent, thought that short-term toleration would inevitably \textit{cause} future warfare.

The rift between the monarchy and the radical Catholics led by the Duke of Guise fractured when Henry’s last brother, Francis, died in 1584, leaving Henry of Navarre as heir to the French throne. Originally a Protestant noble who led Huguenot forces against his predecessors until they all died in rapid succession, Navarre became an unlikely heir to the throne. Catherine de Medici inadvertently put him into that precarious position.


\textsuperscript{60} The best work on the Jesuit role in the Catholic League is Martin’s \textit{Henry III and the Jesuit Politicians}. According to Martin, prior works on the topic cannot be trusted: most were written during the 1760s when the Jesuits faced expulsion. Rather than archival sources, these works focus on popular anti-Jesuit polemics. For a more complete synthesis, see Martin, 15.
After her husband Henry II died in 1559, Medici wielded considerable power throughout France’s religious wars as she presided over the reigns of three of her sons. As was customary in many royal families, Medici believed that marriage alliances were the key to maintaining power. In an attempt to broker peace between Catholics and Protestants in France, she arranged the marriage of the Protestant Navarre to her daughter, Margaret of Valois, in 1572, unable to foresee the death of all four of her sons.\(^{61}\) The Duke of Guise instead suggested that the Cardinal Charles of Bourbon be named heir, arguing that it was impossible for a Calvinist to become head of the Gallican Church. To win support for his claim, Guise hoped that Henry’s former Jesuit confessor, Provincial Claude Matthieu, would lobby the pope to persuade the legitimacy of the Cardinal.\(^{62}\)

When Henry III upheld his support of Navarre, the Duke of Guise organized militant Catholics for war and sent Matthieu to Rome to seek papal approval for the Catholic League. On Matthieu’s return trip, he and Jesuit Henri Samier sought League support in Switzerland. Meanwhile, the Duke of Guise secured an alliance with Philip II of Spain, decreeing that they would eliminate heresy in France and force the king to abide by the Council of Trent. Jesuits like Matthieu and Samier were essential to the League’s success. They not only provided access to a broad network of priests throughout both France and the rest of Europe, but had already demonstrated dedication to overthrowing Protestant monarchs in England and wielded powerful influence in Rome. Through Matthieu, Guise continued to seek papal support for the League when Sixtus V succeeded


Gregory in 1585. Forced to negotiate with the growing power of the League, Henry III revoked his policy of tolerance for Huguenots. France’s Jesuits quickly factionalized. On the one hand, Matthieu led many radical Jesuits into compliance with the Catholic League. On the other, Auger continued to support the monarchy in opposition to Matthieu. Aquaviva was stuck trying to balance both sides, wishing that all of France’s Jesuits would simply adhere to Loyola’s original demand that the Society refrain from participating in political affairs.  

Renewed warfare presented a peculiar problem for the monarchy: its authority was now undermined by the League, and its future hung in the balance between the opposing forces of Protestant armies on one side and the Catholic League on the other. When Henry III had lain siege to La Rochelle in 1575, he believed that defeating the Huguenots would strengthen the monarchy. Ten years later, he knew that defeating Navarre’s Protestants would only strengthen the League by making the monarch into Guise’s puppet. Guise understood that he had the upper hand, believing that Rome would channel any financial support for the war against Navarre through the League rather than through Henry III. The “war of three Henries”—Henry III, Henry of Navarre, and Henry, the Duke of Guise—became the longest and bloodiest of the Wars of Religion. It was also the most international: the Catholic League still hoped to liberate Mary, Queen of Scots and restore England to Catholicism, and Leaguers distracted Henry III from intervening in the English Channel when Philip II launched his Armada in 1588. The League also hoped to subdue Calvinism in the Netherlands and Geneva, but Henry III

---

refused to support war with Geneva. Although Henry was a pious man, the pope wished the king would display it by focusing on the extermination of heresy.\textsuperscript{64}

Much like French politics, which now consisted of warfare between militant Catholics, Huguenots, and the weakened Gallican monarchy, the Society of Jesus split into three factions. At one extreme, Jesuits such as Matthieu believed that western Europe needed a strong Catholic France in order for the Church to retain hegemony; these Jesuits began preaching against the monarchy for its toleration of Protestants. Allied with the League, they championed the papacy and supported the Church internationally while Matthieu and Samier traveled abroad as diplomats for the League. At the other extreme were Jesuits such as Auger who had developed strong ties to the king. Although they opposed Protestantism’s encroachment, these Gallican-leaning Jesuits believed that a strong independent monarchy would best facilitate their goal of re-Catholicizing France. Caught in the middle were men such as Paris’s Provincial Odon Pigenat and Jesuit Alexandre Georges, who grumbled to Acquaviva about the factionalism that impeded the Society’s work. To reunite the divided Society, Acquaviva had already removed Matthieu and Samier from France. He then turned to Auger, hoping that recalling the Gallican faction’s leadership to Rome would alleviate the internal stresses of the Society. In reality, however, removing Matthieu and Samier had not curtailed Jesuit support for the League. Moreover, Henry III interpreted Acquaviva’s recall of the Gallican Auger to mean that the Society’s leadership, which vowed obedience to the pope and supported the Council of Trent, sympathized with the Jesuits who supported the League. The Gallican

magistrates in the parlement of Paris already suspected as much, and with the exception of Auger, Henry became hostile to the Society.\(^6^5\)

Auger left Paris in 1587, and although Henry became overtly cordial to Acquaviva afterward, the damage had been done. Gallican Catholics could now legitimately point to the recall of Auger as evidence that the Society supported the League. One year later, Guise marched his forces on Paris to distract Henry and allow Phillip II’s Armada to enter the English Channel and invade Elizabethan England. With Guise’s forces threatening Paris, Henry signed a radical treaty that affirmed Catholic power and renounced Navarre as heir to the French throne. Henry III’s situation had become dire, and he responded by orchestrating the murder of the prominent members of the Guise family. His plan backfired, driving the popular support of many Parisians into the League’s hands, for not only had he murdered popular Leaguers, but he had also assassinated a Cardinal, forcing both the Gallican and Roman Churches to turn on him. Unable to wage war with both sides, the monarchy had no choice but to make peace with Henry of Navarre and focus instead on fighting the League. The Sorbonne, reflecting the position espoused in several pamphlets, responded by calling for Henry III’s deposition.

\(^6^5\) Martin, *Henry III and the Jesuit Politicians*, 178-9; 203. Martin argued that these divisions were, in part, caused by nationality: Auger was French, while Matthieu was from Lorraine. Matthieu’s faction attracted many non-native French Jesuits while Auger’s was almost entirely French-born, and Auger supported Acquaviva’s initiative to prevent non-native French Jesuits from holding administrative positions in France. Martin also argued that this factionalization disproves the traditional myth that Jesuits were the political branch of the Counter-Reformation because Auger’s political allegiance was to the French kingdom, not the papacy. Furthermore, Acquaviva’s position was that the Society remain neutral during the wars, going so far as to re-assign Matthieu and Samier. He did not discount the political affiliations of individual Jesuits, rather he noted that the Society at large did not carry a uniform political message. The fact that Acquaviva had such difficulty reining in the French factions also proves that individual Jesuits hardly exhibited blind obedience to Rome. For some of their own writings, see Auger, *Pedagogue d’armes*, and Matthieu, *Declaration des causes qui ont meu mgr. le cardinal de Bourbon et les princes, pairs, prelates, seigneurs, villes et communautez catholiques de ce royaume de France, de s’opposer a ceux qui veulent sueverir la religion catholique et l’estat*.
In August 1589, a monk named Jacques Clément heeded their advice and assassinated the king, clearing the way for Navarre’s coronation.66

Navarre posed an unprecedented problem by bringing two laws into conflict. Salic law—the early medieval law that determined the order of royal succession—mandated that he become King of France, but the law of Catholicity required that French kings be Catholic. Without clear delineation of which law superseded which, Navarre’s supporters and enemies argued over the legality of succession. Furthermore, his opponents argued that a non-Catholic could not uphold the duties of the sacral monarchy and its mandate to protect the interests of the Catholic Church. Navarre, enlisting the help of English troops, waged war on the League and its Spanish allies in Paris while the League convened an Estates-General to elect a new king.67 Before they could, Navarre converted to Catholicism in 1593, and minus a Calvinist heir to the French throne, popular support for the League (which was largely based on Navarre’s religion) disintegrated. After his conversion, Henry IV hoped to achieve peace by appealing to both moderate Catholics and Protestants in an attempt to build patron-client relationships on each side, but the long history of France’s sacral monarchy and its relationship with Protestant churches made pleasing both religious groups impossible. Henry forced the parlements to register the Edict of Nantes in 1598, providing for limited toleration of Protestant worship in France, but this only further inflated Catholic distrust.


67 Philip II proposed marrying his daughter—the granddaughter of Medici and Henry II—to a French Prince, but even the Leaguers thought this too radical of a plan. See Holt, *The French Wars of Religion*, 150.
The Gallican Backlash against the Jesuits

The Society of Jesus had encountered opposition from Gallican Catholics ever since Henry II formally recognized the Jesuits in a series of *lettres patentes* issued throughout the 1500s. The Gallican Church had a long tradition of opposing mendicant religious orders, which they understood to be inherently tied to papal interests. Because of Henry IV’s efforts to re-unite French Christendom under *un roi, une foi, une loi*, the Gallican Church regained influence after the defeat of the Catholic League. The Gallicans saw little difference between the Jesuits and the mendicants, and they perceived the Society as ultimately supporting the international Catholicism espoused by the Catholic League in preceding decades. Since Gallicans in the 1590s began to argue that the French king was accountable only to God—a belief that would evolve into absolutism under Louis XIII and XIV—they feared Jesuits obstruction of the Gallican traditions that the parlement of Paris sought to re-establish after the end of the religious wars. 68

The Jesuits struggled to maintain legitimacy in the face of Gallican opposition between 1562 and 1594, when the Gallicans, with royal approval, successfully drove the Society out of France.

When the Wars of Religion ended, Gallicans sought to frame a Jesuit-allied

---

68 The Jesuits argued that they ought to be recognized in France *because* of the rights and privileges granted to them by the papacy. Eric Nelson argued that this was their biggest mistake: “French magistrates defined the Society of Jesus as another active religious Order with special privileges granted by the pope that conflicted with the rights and privileges already established in the French Catholic Church,” Nelson, *The Jesuits and the Monarchy: Catholic Reform and Political Authority in France (1590-1615)*, (Hampshire: Ashgate, 2005), 21.
international Catholicism as a scapegoat for the violence. Originally, Henry had hoped that providing clemency to his former enemies in the Catholic League would be the quickest way to restore peace in France. Gallican magistrates felt that such mercy would undermine Henry’s power by allowing the most radical of his opponents in the League to escape unpunished. Instead, magistrates in the parlement of Paris maintained that the only effective way to restore peace was through the strict enforcement of ancient traditions of French law—which included the royal authority of the sacral monarchy—and thus any group introduced to the kingdom more recently had no place in France’s future.

Although France’s Jesuits swore allegiance to Henry IV early in his reign, the Gallican ministers still believed that the Society was a threat to peace for several reasons. The Society’s hierarchy started with an international leader, the Superior General, stationed in Rome. Gallican Catholics argued that the Jesuits could not maintain loyalty to Henry IV while taking orders from Jesuit Superior Claudio Acquaviva, who owed his authority to the pope. Furthermore, anxiety about a renewed war with Spain plagued the kingdom. Spain had allied itself with the Catholic League and saw Henry IV as its enemy. Many magistrates believed that Spain was preparing for war, one which Jesuit sympathies would lay with their Iberian neighbors. Not only had the Society of Jesus originated in Spain, several Gallican scholars argued, but it also had not adequately incorporated Frenchman into its ranks. Even in France, the Jesuits maintained an international, if not specifically Spanish, flavor. Many of the kingdom’s Jesuits were

---

from either Italy or Iberia, the first five Superior Generals of the Society had been Spanish, and all of their missionary activity in the New World had been in the service of Spain’s or Portugal’s respective empires. Gallican officials thus considered the Jesuits as dangerous to French traditions as had been the Protestants they had fought for decades.70

As anti-Jesuit sentiments rose in the early 1590s, some Gallicans accused the Jesuits of causing France’s religious warfare.71 Pamphlet literature depicted the Jesuits as acting behind the scenes to execute vague secret plots while covertly aiding France’s enemies, both internal and external. The Jesuits, Gallicans argued, placed the Church hierarchy above the king and radicalized conservative Catholics throughout previous decades, encouraging them to enter the Catholic League and betray the succession of monarchs who struggled to defeat it. Pamphleteers like Antoine Arnauld had difficulty producing concrete examples of Jesuit treachery, but they argued instead that the Jesuits “only whisper” in their colleges to train the children to oppose the crown, producing the generation of Catholics who had formed the foundation of the Catholic League.72 Perhaps most damningly, pamphlets held the Jesuit colleges responsible for escalating the

70 Nelson cited Etienne Pasquier, who had been arguing these points since 1564. His accusations served as the foundation of 1590s Gallican opposition through men such as Jacob Amboise, rector of the University of Paris, who in 1594 argued in front of the parlement of Paris that the Society “showed itself wholly partial to and promoter of the Spanish faction to the desolation of this kingdom not only in the whole city of Paris but throughout the whole kingdom of France and beyond,” The Jesuits and the Monarchy, 23-4, 27.

71 These accusations originated in four pamphlets published by Antoine Arnauld, an avocat for the University of Paris who hoped to prevent the Jesuits from opening the competing college of Clermont within city limits. This particular legal case originated in 1564, but had fallen dormant during the wars, only to be renewed thirty years later. Nelson recounted the precise narrative of the proceedings, arguing that “the case pleaded in the parlement of Paris had become a platform on which the new anti-Jesuit rhetoric focused,” and that Arnauld sought to reinterpret the confrontation between the University and the college as proof that “good Frenchmen had identified and understood the Jesuit danger when the Society first arrived in France,” The Jesuits and the Monarchy, 23-38.

tyrannicidal theologies espoused during the Wars of Religion. Jesuit detractors found evidence for this claim in 1593, when Fr. Jacques Commolet called for the assassination of Henry IV in a Paris sermon. Later that year, French officials arrested a former Leaguer named Pierre Barrière for plotting to assassinate Henry IV. He was executed four days later, but not before Etienne Pasquier, whose anti-Jesuit writings dated to 1564 and formed the foundation of Jesuit opposition in the 1590s, interviewed Barrière, fueling the belief that the Jesuits secretly thought to overthrow the government. Pasquier published Barrière’s private testimony in which he claimed that his Jesuit confessor, Father Varade, had encouraged the assassination plot.

The following winter, Jean Chastel, a young militant Catholic, unsuccessfully followed through on an attempt to murder Henry IV. The parlement decided a strong punishment at Chastel’s trial would put a stop to the regicidal conspiracies swirling through France. Years of pamphleteering, particularly by Antoine Arnaud, had firmly placed the Jesuits at the center of the debate by linking the Society to a great number of assassination attempts in the preceding decades. To the parlements and the general public, the Jesuits appeared to be the primary promoters of tyrannicide. When the parlement convened, the magistrates put the Society of Jesus as a whole on trial as an accomplice to Chastel. The guilty verdict resulted in the execution of Chastel, the exile of the Jesuits from the parlement’s jurisdiction, and a ban on sending Parisian children to

73 Boucher, after all, was a product of Jesuit colleges.
Jesuit colleges. By shifting blame for League actions to the Jesuits, Henry could pursue his policy of clemency to former League members while still maintaining his authority. Henry, hoping to show Protestants who were leery about his conversion that he was still their ally, acquiesced to the parlement’s decree, issuing a royal order for other jurisdictions throughout the kingdom also to expel the Jesuits. With the Society removed, Gallican officials could finally begin to reconstruct the sacral monarchy.

By 1599, however, Jesuits began returning to France. Henry reconsidered his decision to expel the Society for a number of reasons. First, after the political victory he achieved with the Edict of Nantes in 1598, he felt prepared to exert his power as king and establish his legitimacy as monarch. Throughout the rest of Europe, the Jesuits were becoming well known for building alliances with elite families, especially through their colleges. Henry hoped to build patronage with elite moderate Catholics by harnessing the influence of Jesuit colleges. This, he hoped, would maintain his own legitimacy and build a lasting peace in France. Second, without civil war tearing the kingdom apart, France was poised to reemerge on an international stage, and Henry hoped that he could spread French influence by strengthening his ties to Rome. Before the Wars, the papacy

---

76 Most followed suit, but Bordeaux, Aix, and Toulouse all failed to register the order, allowing the Society to continue to exist in limited parts of the kingdom, Nelson, The Jesuits and the Monarchy, 53.
78 Most early modern Europeans understood that the religion of a ruler would become the religion of the people. This was particularly important to Jesuits missionizing in the rural countryside of Europe. This phenomenon is best explained in Châtellier, The religion of the poor and Martin, The Jesuit Mind.
opposed Gallican French monarchs and instead favored the Spanish, but in the 1590s, Clement VIII hoped that strong ties with Catholic France would prevent the Spanish from totally dominating Italy. The Jesuits were a favorite organization in Rome, and Henry knew that a stronger alliance with the pope would require a rehabilitation of the Society. Finally, he knew that the passage of the Edict of Nantes had aroused the suspicion of former Leaguers who had only reluctantly pledged their allegiance to him. To placate these conservative Catholics, Henry provided that limited Protestant worship would be complemented by active Catholic missionary work within France. By 1600, the Jesuits had emerged as leading missionaries in Protestant communities, and Henry hoped that readmitting them into his kingdom would convince wary conservatives that he sincerely sought to reunite Protestants and Catholics in the kingdom. In September 1603, Henry issued the Edict of Rouen, formally reintroducing the Society to France with full recognition.  

In less than a decade, the Jesuits had gone from expelled and suppressed to one of France’s most powerful organizations, alarming Gallicans who had called for the Society’s dismissal ten years prior. While the Gallican magistrates believed that a return to traditional French laws was the only way to achieve peace, Henry redefined the Gallican monarchy: a proper Gallican king, he suggested, made decisions based on circumstance and personal deliberation rather than tradition. Gallicans such as Etienne Pasquier and Antoine Arnauld argued that while the king had not over-stepped his

80 Nelson argued that the rehabilitation of the Jesuits was primarily a means through which Henry sought to re-define the French monarchy. He “drew upon medieval royal attributes, neo-stoic thought, ideas about the royal use of force and the Baroque sensibilities of his audience to assert his will over this issue,” *The Jesuits and the Monarchy*, 62-6.
authority by extending clemency, he had demonstrated his ineptitude and clear ignorance of the extent of Jesuit subversion. Clemency for the Jesuits was dangerous not only to the king, whose authority the Jesuits sought to usurp, but to the French people. Many Gallican opponents therefore dismissed Henry’s claim that personal decision-making was a valid feature of the sacral monarchy. The parlement of Paris, after hearing many defenses by the king himself, finally registered the Edict in 1604.81

When the Jesuits returned, their influence proliferated. Henry commissioned Jesuits to build colleges throughout France with the hope that the Society would train virtuous nobility.82 In addition, Jesuit missions became Henry’s primary tool for converting Huguenots. He assisted the missions by sponsoring the Society’s preachers in Protestant areas and promoting Jesuit theological literature aimed at engaging Protestantism in debate.83 The expansion of Jesuit missionary activity in France over such a short period of time increased France’s influence on the international Catholic stage by making France a front-runner in Rome’s quest to stop the spread of Protestantism through missionary work. To further bolster his budding relationship with Rome, Henry commissioned a French Jesuit mission to Constantinople in 1607 and supported plans to

81 Nelson, The Jesuits and the Monarchy, 80-3, 95. Despite the hesitation from many members, the parlement’s acquiescence confirmed the king’s right to act on his own judgment. Thus the debates surrounding the re-introduction of the Jesuits were an important step toward French absolutism that would emerge under Henry’s grandson, Louis XIV.

82 The most important of these schools was the collège Royal Henri le Grande at La Flèche, which produced many of the early Jesuit missionaries to Canada, including Enemond Massé. When the monarchy expelled the Jesuits from France again in the 1760s, La Flèche became Pyrantée National Militaire, a military school that still stands today. For more information on the expansion of Jesuit education in France in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, see Martin, The Jesuit Mind.

83 Coton claimed that Henry had encouraged his Institution Catholique, a critique of Calvin, after it was published in 1610. Nelson, The Jesuits and the Monarchy, 116.
send Jesuit missionaries to Canada. To formalize his relationship with the Society, Henry appointed Fr. Pierre Coton, the Provincial of Paris, as spiritual advisor to his son, the future Louis XIII. While France’s rising status in Rome was a boon to the Jesuits, it came at the cost of further alienating the Society’s Gallican enemies.  

Jesuits, Regicide, and the Assassination of Henry IV

The Wars of Religion left a series of religiously informed political problems in their wake, but one of the most immediate legacies was the theory of regicide that many theologians espoused during the conflict. Theological belief in the justification of deposing kings turned tyrants had been gaining popularity throughout the sixteenth century. Contemporary authors looked to the republican principles of the classical world and their treatises glorified men like Brutus as warriors against tyranny. Stephen de Boetie’s *Le Contr’Un, ou Discours de la Servitude Volontaire*, originally written in the 1540s but published at the height of religious violence in 1578, was a reaction to the tyranny he saw in contemporary rulers, particularly the persecution of Protestants by Henry II. Boetie argued that kings were merely humans, and therefore no better than their subjects. By supporting tyrannical kings, citizens were “receivers of the robber that

---

84 For more about the expansion of Jesuit activity under Henry IV, see Nelson, *The Jesuits and the Monarchy*, 95-145.

85 Most notably, scholars contend that the disorder from the civil war was one of the primary causes of the rise of French absolutism in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

86 See Henry Hallam, *Introduction to the Literature of Europe in the Fifteenth, Sixteenth, and Seventeenth Centuries* (London: John Murray, 1879) for an in-depth overview of this philosophy. Hallam’s book samples many of the major authors.
plunders you, accomplices of the murderer who kisses you, and traitors to your own selves; you furnish your houses, that he may pillage them; you rear your daughters, that they may glut his wantonness, and your sons, that he may lead them at the best to his wars, or that he may send them to execution.” Boetie encouraged subjects to claim their rights: “You may deliver yourselves, if you but make an effort … once resolve to be no longer slaves, and you are already free.” Despite this stance, Boetie did not support regicide in the 1540s, arguing, “I do not say that you should assail him, or shake his seat; merely support him no longer, and you will see that, like a great Colossus … he will fall by his own weight, and break to pieces.” Boetie died in 1561, as French Protestants began to act on of tyrannicidal thought.  

Many of the early pamphlets came from other parts of the Protestant world, originating in England and Scotland before filtering to France. Scottish philosopher George Buchanan argued that the relationship between a monarch and his or her people was a mutual agreement. When a ruler broke this pact, he or she forfeited the right to rule and became an enemy of the people, who had the right to conduct a just war against the crown. The standard punishment for just war captives was death, and therefore tyrannical monarchs, according to Buchanan, ought to be executed. John Poynet, the Bishop of Winchester, questioned the legitimacy of tyrannicide in 1558 but concluded that the deposition of kings was a central theme in the Old Testament. Regicide was not a man-made law, but one “ordained of God” and “grafted into the hearts of men.”

87 Boetie’s treatise as quoted in Hallam, 133-4.
88 Cited in Hallam, 137-8. Poynet’s arguments were republished in 1642 as civil war broke out between Charles I and Parliament.
power of the French monarchy turned against them, Protestants latched on to these principles as they increasingly saw only two legitimate options: fight against an oppressive government or allow themselves to be subjected to its persecution. In the midst of warfare in the 1570s and 1580s, it became the duty of Huguenot ministers and lawyers to promote the protection of religious liberties. One Protestant lawyer, François Hotman, published a pamphlet undermining the sacral nature of the monarchy by arguing that the earliest French monarchs ruled by consent of the people rather than the grace of God. An anonymous 1579 pamphlet argued that kings often propagated false idols and that monarchs who refused to defend the liberties of his people should be justly deposed. As the sixteenth century wore on, these authors increasingly associated the theory of just regicide with Protestantism.  

As the Wars of Religion reached their height in the 1580s, radical Catholics adopted and acted upon the theory of tyrannicide. Catholic support for regicide peaked in the months leading up to and following the assassination of Henry III. Borrowing from the Protestant authors in prior decades, Sorbonne theologian Jean Boucher advocated the regicide of Henry III in De Justa Henrici III: Abdicatione a Francorum Regno in the spring of 1589. A passionate member of the Catholic League, Boucher took the theories regarding tyrannicide and applied them to the unfolding political situation. Like prior authors, Boucher made reference to the classical and medieval tradition of deposing tyrants. He characterized the people of France as akin to those of the Roman respublica, ...
and claimed that the sacred contract existed between God and his people rather than between God and the king. By placing the people above the monarch, Boucher argued that it was not only just to depose Henry, but necessary. Henry had offended God by murdering the Guises and by recognizing Henry of Navarre as his heir. Boucher published the treatise immediately after Henry III’s death, and it served as an important defense of Clément’s actions.  

With Henry III’s death, other reactionary Catholics turned the policy of regicide against Navarre. In his 1590 pamphlet *De Justa Republicae Christianae in Reges Potestate*, Guillame Rose, Bishop of Senlis and a staunch advocate of the League, affirmed Boucher’s argument that leaders derived sovereignty from the people, who relied on them primarily to defend their rights and properties. Historically, people who unquestioningly bent to authority usually fell prey to tyranny. Such tyrants not only intruded on the rights and properties of their people but corrupted Christianity, making heretics of their subjects. Echoing Boucher, Rose proposed that the pope ought to have the authority to remove them. Calvinism, the religion of Henry of Navarre, was the worst offender to Christianity, and therefore Navarre would be a tyrant by nature.  

When he accepted the French throne and became Henry IV, Navarre put himself in a risky position. On the one hand, regicidal tracts that had ultimately aided in the demise of his predecessor claimed that a legitimate monarch had to uphold the sacred

---

92 A summary of Rose’s pamphlet appears in Hallam, 140-1. Hallam admitted that the author used the pseudonym *Rossaeus*, and there is no way to know for sure that Rose is the author. Other authors have attributed the piece to various other French writers.
tenets of Christianity. In the case of France, this meant that Henry IV had to accept Catholicism and his sacral duty as head and protector of the Gallican Church. On the other hand, these same treatises required that he defend the liberties of all French people, and as a former Calvinist, he knew that this meant somehow incorporating Protestantism into the kingdom. To solve the first problem, Henry, who had been baptized Catholic at birth, re-converted to Catholicism in July 1593. With the Guises dead, his conversion to Catholicism ushered in the demise of the League and its plots to elect a new Catholic king.93 His former Protestant supporters also feared what his conversion would mean for their status in France. To build a lasting peace, Henry began an appeal to Catholic moderates, slowly building confidence among Catholic communities in Paris. To combat his declining popularity among Protestants, he adjusted his policy of Catholic appeasement to include the passage of the Edict of Nantes in 1598. He hoped that all French people—Protestants as well as former Leaguers and advocates of international Catholicism—would return to the Gallican Church, thus ending decades of warfare and restoring unity to France.94 The Edict was a tenuous solution to an impossible task.

93 Holt argued that the rapid collapse of the League proves that most of its supporters were religiously, not politically, motivated. Additionally, this does not imply that Henry IV’s conversion was meant to solidify his own power by satisfying Catholics. Although that was certainly one of his motives, Holt argued that the conversion was authentic, evidenced by his measures to strengthen Catholicism during his reign. See The French Wars of Religion, 161-5. In another prominent study, Michael Wolfe argued that Henry understood that the political atmosphere in Paris would have prevented him from ascending the throne as a Protestant, and his conversion was therefore calculated. See Michael Wolfe, The Conversion of Henri IV (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1993).

94 Holt cited a conversation the Cardinal of Florence had with Henry in August of 1598, claiming that Henry hoped to re-convert all of France’s Protestants by 1606. However, the Cardinal’s letter claims that Henry “hopes, if he lives another six years, to extirpate heresy from his whole kingdom,” which places Henry’s projected date in 1604. I am not sure how serious to take Henry’s alleged claim; the Cardinal had just told Henry that the pope was not pleased with the Edict and Henry, who hoped to foster an alliance with Rome, may have sought to placate him with the claim. The Cardinal seemed happy with the response, stating that France’s Protestants would go to great lengths to improve their social status, and France’s
Although it pacified dissenters in the short term, it did not end religious turmoil in the kingdom. Radicals on both sides continued to distrust him, and the peace Henry had secured remained fragile. When François Ravaillac assassinated Henry IV in May 1610, many in France feared that a wider conspiracy was afoot. Although the regency of Marie de Medici proved as supportive of the Jesuits as Henry had been, her power was far more limited than her husband’s and she was unable to protect the Society from its Gallican enemies in the parlement of Paris. Although Ravaillac was not associated with the Jesuits, the Society’s opponents immediately assigned them blame. Those who had spent years warning Henry that the Jesuits secretly worked to subvert him suddenly appeared vindicated.


Holt redefined the periodization of the Wars of Religion. Prior scholars argued that the Edict of Nantes was established as a lasting peace, but Holt argued that it was only meant to be temporary. Moreover, he considered the renewal of warfare in 1610 as evidence that the Wars of Religion were hardly over in 1598. My research shows how the issues brought from France during reached Canadian shores in 1611, providing more evidence that Holt’s periodization makes better sense.

Ravaillac was a conservative Catholic who believed that Henry’s hostility to Catholic Spain served as evidence of his continued Protestant loyalties.
tyrannicide. In the sixth book of *De Rege et Regis Institutione*, published in Toledo, Spain, ironically dedicated to Philip III, and approved by the Spanish censor, Mariana reflected upon the circumstances surrounding the assassination of France’s Henry III ten years prior. Although Mariana concluded that a hereditary monarchy was the best form of government, he claimed that political philosophers and theologians alike agreed that it was just for either communities or individuals to take up arms against a tyrant. The real problem was deciding what constituted a tyrant. Mariana concluded that any king who governed to the detriment of either the common good or proper religion was a tyrant, and any government that did not act with consent of the people was tyrannical. Rather than stressing religious heresy in his definition of tyranny, Mariana emphasized the necessity of laws prohibiting monarchs from infringing upon rights and liberties. Even though Ravaillac assassinated Henry IV for not upholding his sacral duties as a defender of Catholicism, Jesuit detractors in France pointed to Mariana’s work to implicate the Jesuits in the murder.97

Between May and July 1610, the Society combated this new propaganda campaign. Claudio Acquaviva upheld the parlement’s condemnation of Mariana while French Jesuits published tracts upholding their own loyalty to the monarchy. As Paris’s Provincial, Fr. Coton, whom Medici had reconfirmed as confessor to her son, the new King Louis XIII, had the most to lose. To maintain legitimacy for himself and the Society, Coton published a *Lettre Déclaratoire*, in which he argued that Mariana’s book

97 Hallam, *Introduction to the Literature of Europe*, 142-4. Although the Society was popularly associated with Mariana’s work, the parlement did not outright condemn them alongside the tract, fearing that they were not in a political position to do so. Instead, the parlement focused on asserting its authority against the papacy in this matter. Nelson, *The Jesuits and the Monarchy*, 162-6.
contained only his individual beliefs, not those of the Jesuits. He cited other Jesuits who had previously written against tyrannicide, maintained that the Society as a whole opposed the theory, and confirmed the French Jesuit dedication to upholding French law. Coton hoped that his open refutation of regicidal theories would calm the fears of most of France’s population, but attacks from the parlements continued. An anonymous letter entitled *L’Anticoton* soon followed accusing Coton of lying about the Society’s views on regicide and arguing that all Jesuits followed Mariana’s doctrine. The pamphlet’s five chapters reflected all of the key arguments lobbed against the Jesuits by their Gallican detractors.

*L’Anticoton* maintained that the entire Jesuit organization ought to be held responsible for Mariana’s doctrine, because regicide was always a fundamental tenet of Jesuit doctrine. The Jesuits believed it necessary to slay a monarch “for the good of the Church” or when “his Regal power degenerates into Tyranny.” Jesuits such as Ribadenera, Scribanus, Bellarmine, Tolet, and Mariana, *L’Anticoton* argued, had all advanced this theory, while many subsequent Jesuit authors had commended Mariana.

---


99 Although anonymous, the author was probably Antoine Arnaud, who had already opposed the Jesuits in his *Le franc et véritable discours du Roi sur le rétablissement qui lui est demandé des Jésuits*, published in 1602.


101 Coton cited Jesuit Father Robert Bellarmine as proof that the Jesuits did not support tyrannicide, but *L’Anticoton* argues that since Bellarmine believed in preserving the sanctity of the confessional, he implicitly supported the doctrine: “if a man disclose unto them his purpose to kill the King, he ought to conceal it, and rather suffer the king be killed, and the Kingdom to be ruined, than to break up the Seal of
Jacques Clement, Henry III’s assassin, and Jean Chastel, Henry IV’s would-be murderer, both approached Jesuits for advice. In its second chapter, *L’Anticoton* demonstrated that Jesuits in other countries were similarly culpable for assisting plots against their monarchs: in Scotland, Jesuit Alexander Hayes allegedly said that “he wished if the King came along by their college, he [Hayes] might fall out of the Window upon him [the king], and break his Neck”; in England, the plots against Queen Elizabeth “always found that some Jesuits or other had the tempering of them”; in Poland, “the Jesuits do absolutely possess the King” and “have carried him into such violent Courses that the Country, by their means, is risen up against him”; in Transylvania, Jesuits conspired against princes. In Austria and Venice, which had both driven the Jesuits out, princes faced far fewer conspiracies.\(^\text{102}\)

*L’Anticoton* accused the Jesuits, particularly Coton, of direct involvement in Henry IV’s murder in a way that appealed to Gallican fears. According to the pamphlet, Coton worked constantly working to undermine Henry behind his back, betraying the trust the king had placed in the Provincial. “It is not above a year ago that Father *Cotton* wrote unto a Provincial of Spain diverse things which our King had uttered in secret, and revealed in Confession,” it declared. Upon examination before his execution, Ravaillac allegedly described “skillfully” a brand of regicide espoused in previous Jesuit works, and claimed to have killed Henry because “the King would make war against the Pope, and that the Pope was God, and by consequence, that the King would make war against Confession: an Opinion which the Sorbonne holds not, it being the Law of God to be loyal to our Sovereign.”

\(^\text{102}\) *L’Anticoton.*
God.” Thus Ravaillac placed the pope above the king, which ran counter to Gallican sensibilities and implied Jesuit influence. Ravaillac further implicated the Jesuits when he claimed to have heard many Jesuit sermons espousing the doctrine, adding that it was a Jesuit who encouraged him to follow through with the heinous resolution. Ravaillac’s confession seemed proof enough, but *L'Anticoton* also purported to prove that Coton visited Ravaillac in prison, begging Ravaillac to not assign any blame to the Society.\(^\text{103}\)

The pamphlet took great pains to appeal to Gallican fears. According to *L'Anticoton*, the *Lettre Déclaratoire’s* assertion that Mariana’s doctrine was merely one man’s opinion was a ruse, for the Jesuits were known to be masters of rhetoric and equivocation. Although Coton claimed to renounce Mariana, he also argued that all Jesuits must adhere to one set of doctrines. Furthermore, Coton’s *Lettre* continually upheld the authority of the papacy in spiritual affairs and maintained that the pope could depose a king when necessary. He concluded that Coton ought not be allowed near Louis XIII or his mother, Marie de Medici.\(^\text{104}\)

Coton, Medici, and supporters of the Jesuits quickly disproved the specific accusations in *L'Anticoton*, but its general arguments had already taken root in the public mind. With allegations of regicide serving as a backdrop, the Jesuits remained deadlocked with Gallican opponents for two years. Neither side could agree about the role of the papacy in the French Church. The pope’s nuncio in France, Roberto Ubaldini, argued that the Jesuit constitutions mandated that members of the Society strictly adhere

\(^{103}\) Ibid.

\(^{104}\) Ibid.
to papal authority in all matters while Gallicans in the parlement of Paris asserted that the Jesuits could only continue to function in France if they submitted themselves to the authority of the Gallican Church. As Gallicans continued to accuse Jesuits of subverting the monarchy and obstructed the opening and operating the Society’s colleges, the Jesuits finally decided to compromise. In February 1612, a delegation of Jesuits took an oath in front of the parlement of Paris, and promised to uphold the sacral monarchy, accept the traditions of the Gallican church, and promote Gallicanism in their French colleges. This decision upset both Acquaviva and Ubaldini, but it allowed the Society to remain active in France. The oath did not end the pamphleteering against the Jesuits, and most Gallicans continued to mistrust them, but they removed themselves from the middle of the debates between the Gallican and Roman churches.105

Coton, Acquaviva, and Mission Planning in a Time of Turmoil

In 1607, merchants from Rouen sued Sieur de Monts, the Calvinist Viceroy of New France, thus liquidating his company and voiding his contract. When Monts returned to France to settle his legal troubles, one of his lieutenants, the Catholic Jean de Biencourt, Sieur de Poutrincourt, hoped to take up the project. Without money, Poutrincourt returned to France to seek financial support. Henry IV showed no interest in funding another failed trading outpost, but he offered instead to provide an annual

105 These debates stemmed primarily from the Gallican church’s continued obstruction of the opening of a Jesuit college at Clermont. For a full account of the politics surrounding this decision, see Nelson, The Jesuits and the Monarchy, 191-207.
subsidy to promote a Jesuit mission in Canada. In their correspondence, Coton and Acquaviva rejoiced that Monts, the “heretical Vice-Roy” that Gentil feared might corrupt the missionary enterprise, no longer reigned in Canada. If the “infamously Catholic” Poutrincourt—“who has absolutely no heretics with him”—took charge, they believed the king’s missions would surely flourish in Canada. Their first obstacle—the inability to effectively spread Catholicism under a Protestant administrator—had been removed.

In the first decade of the seventeenth century, the Jesuits viewed their enterprise in Canada, which targeted Indians, as part of a larger movement of global Catholic renewal through missionary work. While Poutrincourt petitioned potential benefactors for his colony, the Society focused on planning missions to Constantinople, Scotland, and various communities within France. They sent Christopher Baltazar, who had replaced Gentil as Provincial of Aquitaine, to Rome to ask for support from the General Congregation for an American mission. As rumors of Baltazar’s project circulated among the Jesuits, Acquaviva fielded several letters from potential volunteers who wished to travel abroad. Among these were Joseph Dumonteil and Raymond Pelleport, who were originally assigned to Canada but later replaced; Jacques Quentin, whom the Society would later send to Acadia as backup when relations soured in 1612; Jean de Villars and Paul Benoit from the college of Billom; Pierre Lamart, Pierre Arnaud, and Jerome Queyrot from the collège de la Trinité in Lyon; Gilluame Jacob and Antoine Suffren from

La Flèche; Enemond Massé, who was eventually selected; and Pierre Biard, Canada’s first superior, who had been requesting an assignment in North America or Constantinople since 1602.¹⁰⁷

The willingness of so many would-be missionaries to travel to such distinct locales shows that these missions all served the same purpose for the Jesuits: to renew Catholicism worldwide and to make people less susceptible to the spread of Protestantism. When Roberto Ubaldini, the papal nuncio in Paris, reported news of the Canadian subsidy to Rome, he also added, “and what matters most, he [Henry] ordered that they should be [also] received in Béarn,” the southwestern principality where Henry

¹⁰⁷ Like Biard, many of these men indicated that either mission would suffice. Lamart, for example, requested to be sent to Peru in 1608, but when Acquaviva replied that France needed Jesuit missionaries, he instead requested Canada, Constantinople, or even Béarn. T.V. Cohen’s “Why the Jesuits Joined, 1540–1600” argues that aspiring Jesuits actually knew little about the Society or their future role in it, instead joining because it offered a certain future in a turbulent era. Using over 700 questionnaires given to novices in the Spanish, Portuguese, and Polish Provinces, Cohen found that only 11 hoped to “go to the Indies” and only 3 wanted to combat heresy (perhaps not surprising given that most of the documents were Iberian and therefore did not encounter Protestants as often). Because recruits were usually in their late teens, Cohen painted Jesuit novices as anxious youths looking to focus their energies. This energy, he argued, helped make the Jesuits more assertive in the world, which prompted many Jesuits to desire foreign missions after their admission to the Society. The requests exist in the documentary record, however, they offer us little insight into real motives, offering only vague platitudes concerning Jesuit zeal and desire to offer apostolic service to barbarian peoples. Acquaviva, “Le P. Claude Aquaviva, Gén., au P. Pierre Biard, Rome, 15 juillet 1602—à Tournon,” in MNF 1:3; Acquaviva, “Le P. Claude Aquaviva, Gén., au P. Joseph Dumonteil, Rome, 6 mars 1607—à Rodez,” in MNF 1:16; Acquaviva, “Le P. Claude Aquaviva, Gén., au P. Jacques Quentin, Rome, 25 avril 1607—à Charleville,” in MNF 1:16; Acquaviva, “Le P. Claude Aquaviva, Gén., au P. Énemond Massé, Rome, 9 juin 1608—à Lyon,” in MNF 1:26; Ignatius Torens, “Le P. Ignace Torens au P. Claude Aquaviva, Gén., Nevers, 3 juillet 1608—à Rome,” in MNF 1:28; Pierre Lamart, “Le P. Pierre Lamart au P. Claude Aquaviva, Gén., Lyon, 29 septembre 1608—à Rome,” in MNF 1:33-4; Pierre Arnaud, “Le P. Pierre Arnaud au P. Claude Aquaviva, Gén., Lyon, 13 octobre 1608—à Rome,” in MNF 1:35-6; Paul Benoit, “Le P. Paul Benoit au P. Claude Aquaviva, Gén., Béziers, 5 janvier 1609—à Rome,” in MNF 1:43; Jerôme Queyrot, “Jerome Queyrot au P. Claude Aquaviva, Gén., Lyon, 9 février 1609—à Rome,” in MNF 1:46-7; Guillaume Jacob, “Guillaume Jacob au P. Claude Aquaviva, Gén., La Flèche, 1er avril 1609—à Rome,” in MNF 1:48-50; Acquaviva, “Le P. Claude Aquaviva, Gén., au P. Antoine Suffren, Rome, 28 avril 1609—à Lyon,” in MNF 1:50; Acquaviva, “Le P. Claude Aquaviva, Gén., au P. Claude Chambon, Prov., Rome, 26 mai 1609—à Bordeaux,” in MNF 1:51; Acquaviva, “Le P. Claude Aquaviva, Gén., au P. Christophe Baltazar, Vis., Rome, 26 mai 1609—à Bordeaux,” in MNF 1:51-2; For reference to the rumors circulating among the Jesuits, see Jean de Villars, “Le P. Jean de Villars au P. Claude Aquaviva, Gén., Billom, 3 février [1608]—à Rome” in MNF 1:19.
IV had ruled as King of Navarre and his mother, Jeanne d’Albret, had become an influential Protestant leader during her regency as Queen of Navarre. Before the Reformation, Béarn had been a devoutly Catholic region, and according to the Jesuits, the majority of the population remained so in the early seventeenth century. Its parlements, however, had become overwhelmingly Protestant—Jeanne d’Albret even opened a Calvinist college in the town of Orthez—and to the Society, the mission to Béarn became one of liberation. Henry ordered Béarn to accept two Jesuits, Guillaume Bayle and Jean de Bordes in February 1608, and at the same time he offered to subsidize the Jesuit mission to Canada. He feared that the religious protections he had given to Protestants minorities needed to exist for Catholics in principalities ruled by Protestants. Gentil had argued that this would not be possible across the Atlantic, but in Béarn, the Jesuits hoped that an official Catholic presence would ensure freedom of Catholic worship. The Protestant Conseil de Béarn cautioned that they would only accept four Jesuits, and they would not be allowed to engage in local politics or acquire any personal property.

Amid this explosion of domestic missionary activity, the Society planned its voyage to Acadia. When the mission finally launched in 1611, the religious tensions plaguing France for decades followed the Jesuits across the Atlantic. During their brief tenure in Canada, Jesuits Biard, Massé, Quentin, and Gilbert du Thet experienced the same obstacles the Society faced at home. The first came from Protestants, both French

Calvinists and English Puritans, who vehemently hated the Order. The second came from the increasingly Gallican Poutrincourt, who, believing that the Jesuits sought to usurp power both in France and at his colony, accused them of allying themselves with Spain while condemning the Society of conspiring in Henry IV’s murder. Finally, English Virginians, aware of the Jesuit involvement with the Catholic League that had sought to topple Elizabeth’s Protestant government decades earlier, ended the Jesuits’ initial activity in New France by capturing the missionaries along the Atlantic coast of Maine in 1613. The ordeals faced by the Jesuits in Canada proved that the fallout from the Wars of Religion lasted well into the seventeenth century and extended into the Atlantic, hindering the Society’s missions at home and abroad.¹¹⁰

Chapter 2: “To Drive him Out of his Broad Seigneuries of Canada”:
Anti-Jesuitism and the 1612 Collapse of the French Mission at Port Royal, Acadia.

In the summer of 1613, an English ship piloted by Samuel Argyll discovered Jesuit Fathers Pierre Biard, Enemond Massé, Jacques Quentin, and Brother Gilbert du Thet constructing a new mission at St. Sauveur, on the coast of present-day Maine. The English captured the Jesuits as well as the French settlers who accompanied them to the new colony. Argyll and his men offered to repatriate a majority to France—if a small group of hostages, including Biard and Quentin, would travel to Jamestown as prisoners of England. At Jamestown, Sir Thomas Dale, Marshall of the Virginia Company, urged their execution but, after conferring with Argyll, decided that French settlements had encroached too far down the coast and ordered the prisoners to help the ships return to New France to demolish St. Sauveur, St. Croix, and Port Royal, the Acadian colony to which Biard originally had been posted. Two ships, one commanded by Argyll and another by his lieutenant William Turnell, returned to St. Sauveur and burned it to the ground. They then destroyed the initial French settlement at St. Croix. Argyll commanded Biard to lead them next to Port Royal to eliminate the French presence along the Atlantic
coast, but Biard refused to comply. Argyll located the colony without the Jesuit’s help, but when he arrived, he found the settlement deserted.¹

The English were fed up with Biard. Turnell chastised Argyll for seeking guidance from a member of the Society so loathed in England. Another “English Puritan,” “more malicious than the others,” advised Argyll to abandon Biard on shore, for “he did not deserve that the English should give him food since,” by refusing to direct them to Port Royal, “he had tried to prevent [the English] from obtaining it.” While they deliberated on Biard’s treatment, several of Port Royal’s French settlers, desperate for food, appeared on shore, hurling insults at the Jesuit. Leading the charge against Biard was Charles de Biencourt, whose father, Port Royal proprietor Jean de Biencourt, Sieur de Poutrincourt, had left in charge of the colony while he negotiated for supplies in Paris. Biencourt addressed Argyll, “very much surprised indeed that he had not already rid the world of the pernicious Jesuit,” whom he accused of treason. Biard, he asserted, “was a true and native Spaniard, who, having committed several crimes in France, on account of which he was a fugitive from Justice, had also been the cause of a great deal of scandal at Port Royal, and there could be not the slightest doubt that he would do something still to the English.” Biard protested that neither he nor his parents had ever even been to Spain, and Argyll admitted that Biencourt’s claim seemed improbable. To convince him, six French settlers signed a written statement confirming Biencourt’s testimony, and they urged Argyll to take Biard to Jamestown for execution. Since Biard had obstructed English attempts to locate the colony, Argyll had little ground to protest Biencourt’s

¹ Biard, Relation of 1616, in JR 3:19-281; 4:5-169. Massé’s annotations are in MNF, vol. 1, doc. 162.
suggestion. He ordered Turnell to take the Jesuit to Virginia, but a storm blew Turnell’s ship off course. When they instead landed in the Portuguese Azores, Biard negotiated for his life and a safe passage home.²

The encounter between Biencourt, Argyll, and Biard on the Acadian coast demonstrates the anti-Jesuit sentiments that had migrated from France and England to the New World in the early seventeenth century. By the time Biard returned to France in 1614, he had encountered in the Atlantic all three major obstacles that the Society faced within France. First, French Calvinists, who knew the Jesuits actively sought to extirpate their faith, worked to prevent their departure from France. Second, Poutrincourt and his son Biencourt, believing Gallican propaganda about Jesuit ambitions to usurp power, constantly tried to prevent Biard from carrying out Jesuit objectives in Canada. The Gallican conflict at Port Royal reached its height when L’Anticoton, which supposedly proved that the Jesuits had orchestrated the 1610 assassination of Henry IV, reached Biencourt in 1613, forcing the Jesuits to leave Port Royal and found their own mission in New France. Finally, the broader early seventeenth-century association between the Society and Spanish interests endangered the Jesuits several times after the English (led by Argyll) attacked French settlements and later resupplied among Spanish and Portugeuse ships in the Azores.

² Ibid.
Founding Port Royal, 1603-1608

Before Samuel de Champlain founded Quebec in 1608, he served as a deputy to Pierre du Gua, Sieur de Monts, who initially settled at Port Royal, Acadia, in 1603. Monts located his colony on the southwest coast of the peninsula where the Rivière du Dauphin meets the French Bay, or Bay of Fundy. After a failed attempt to settle at St. Croix, on the opposite side of the Bay, Monts sought to establish a monopoly over the fur trade, envisioning Port Royal as a major commercial port town for the French in the New World. Henry IV granted him the monopoly, but the colony underperformed, and, failing to meet expectations, the traders returned to France to regroup.

When they decided to try again in 1605, Monts stayed in France to protect the company’s monopoly at court, leaving the colony in the hands of Champlain, Poutrincourt, and François Gravé, sieur du Pont, a St. Malo noble who already had established himself as a brilliant trader at the French outpost of Tadoussac at the mouth of the St. Lawrence River. Monts appointed Poutrincourt lieutenant governor and put Pont in charge of facilitating commerce and expanding the fur trade. Poutrincourt, who envisioned the settlement as a European agricultural feudalist utopia, commanded roughly fifty settlers, which included men from various parts of French society. At the

3 The present site of Annapolis Royal, Nova Scotia. The Rivière du Dauphin is now the Annapolis River.

4 Pont became a mentor to the younger Champlain; see David Hackett Fischer, Champlain’s Dream: The European Founding of North America (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2008), 125.
top were titled men such as Poutrincourt, his son, several of his cousins, and Louis Hébert, a pharmacist. Under the ennobled leaders were the officers, including Champlain and Robert Pont Gravé, Pont’s son. Marc Lescarbot, an historian and close friend of Poutrincourt, also helped establish Port Royal, an experience he later recounted in *L’Histoire de la Nouvelle-France*, published in 1609. Because of the amicable relations they had with the local Micmac Indians, the colony survived their first winter, but a French ship arrived to retrieve them in spring 1607. The vessel brought bad news: Monts had lost his monopoly. He had not acquired enough furs to offset burgeoning demand, and the price of beaver skins remained high in Parisian markets. Moreover, French traders who had “taken the liberty to trade to a country which they had frequented from time immemorial” showed outrage at their sudden exclusion from the trade, and, over the course of three years, Monts “had as yet made not a single Christian.”

---

5. The 1618 edition of the *Histoire* summarized Poutrincourt and Biencourt’s allegations against the Society; According to Fischer, Lescarbot was drawn to Acadia as a field for literature. “With much encouragement from Poutrincourt and de Monts, he hoped to be the Virgil of this colonizing venture, and sought to compose an Acadian *Aeneid* in modern poetry and prose,” 208. If Lescarbot was to be New France’s Virgil, Poutrincourt’s encouragement signaled his desire to be Canada’s Aeneas. While at Port Royal, Lescarbot also wrote *Le Théâtre de Neptune*, the first theatrical performance in New France’s history—complete with music, costumes, and various props, 212-14.

6. The Micmac hoped to use their relationship with the French to establish hegemony in the region. Neal Salisbury pointed out that “once the French undertook a serious colonial policy they realized that the continued flow of furs depended on direct political control of participating Indian groups.” For the political re-alignments that occurred in Indian country as a result of Monts’s voyages, see Salisbury, *Manitou and Providence: Indians, Europeans, and the Making of New England, 1500-1643* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982), 60-72.

Poutrincourt, and Champlain all hoped to re-negotiate the company’s contract and quickly return to Canada.8

During the early years of Port Royal, both Champlain and Poutrincourt sought to establish themselves as leaders in the colonial project. Since Henry IV subsidized the Canadian enterprise in part to produce more furs for Parisian markets, Monts’ two deputies had to quickly establish expansive trade networks among New France’s Indians. They envisioned a process by which the French would travel along the coast and into the interior to solidify alliances with individual groups with whom they would trade directly. This was an unrealistic expectation obstructed by native politics. The French relied on the local Micmac, led by an Indian named Membertou, for protection. The Micmac hoped to use their symbiotic relationship with Mont’s men to establish their own hegemony over the region, making it much more difficult for Champlain and Poutrincourt to expand France’s trade network by forming alliances beyond Membertou’s authority. Between 1604 and 1606, both men explored New France in search of skins. Champlain led a voyage to the north, exploring around Mount Desert Island, along the coast to the Kennebec River, and up the Penobscot River as a diplomat to the Etchemin Indians. Poutrincourt headed as far south as Cape Cod to trade with the Armouchiquois. Champlain seemed to have a natural talent for Indian diplomacy, as he did not carry weapons, brought few men, and made generous gifts to his trade partners. His approach

8 For more information on the relationship between trade associations, monopolies, and French colonies in North America, see Campeau, “Introduction,” in *MNF* 1: 184-91.
resulted in amicable relations that he would build upon throughout his career in New France.⁹

Poutrincourt’s strategy proved to be a disaster. Although Champlain accompanied Poutrincourt, the captain made several missteps. He brought together several warring leaders that he could not control, he commanded a ship in such disrepair that he had to stop several times, and he antagonized Indians by setting up camps without first receiving their approval. At each encounter, Poutrincourt exhibited his discomfort with large groups of Indians, and attempted to exert his authority by displaying his superior weapons. In one episode, faced with 500 to 600 adult males near present day Gloucester, Massachusetts, Poutrincourt fired his weapons and claimed the harbor with a large cross. The Indians withdrew into the woods, and Poutrincourt, fearing that they would return to retaliate, retreated to his ship. The next morning, Indians attacked the five men who had stayed on shore, killed three of them, tore down the cross, and taunted the French with obscene gestures from the shore. Poutrincourt declared the area unsafe for settlement.¹⁰

Because of Poutrincourt’s difficulty negotiating with Indians, Champlain proved himself to be a more effective leader than Poutrincourt, and Poutrincourt, although appointed

---

⁹ David Hackett Fischer claimed that Champlain’s biggest strength was that he “took an interest in their ways, honored their customs, and treated them with respect.” Perhaps more importantly, when the Indians told him about the fabled golden city of Norumbega, he “was quick to dismiss that report as a fable. Gold was not his object in North America. He was more interested in the rivers themselves,” in Fischer, *Champlain’s Dream*, 181, 198.

¹⁰ Salisbury, 65-6; Fischer argued, “Poutrincourt’s relations with the Indians were a disaster. He could not control his men and alienated the Indian nations of Norumbega. He was fearful of them and insensitive to their feelings. Poutrincourt went among the Indians heavily armed, marched his men across their lands without warning, took crops from their fields without permission, and erected crosses that were perceived as emblems of possession ... The Indians were terrified of him,” and “The result was a total rupture of relations” that “put an end to French colonization south of the Penobscot River and marked the beginning of English hegemony in this region,” 193-200.
lieutenant governor of Port Royal, gradually lost influence in New France. Despite his waning authority, he remained in charge until Argyll destroyed the colony in 1613, during which time he sought to re-assert his own power in Canada—an enterprise that continually frustrated him, particularly by the time Biard and Massé arrived in 1610.

Poutrincourt was an opportunist. Born in 1557 to a long-ennobled family from Picardy, he grew up alongside the rise of Protestantism in the 1560s and 1570s. His devoutly Catholic family held close ties to the House of Guise. His sister served Mary Queen of Scots, and two of his brothers died fighting Protestant armies. He originally fought alongside the Catholic League against Henry IV during the siege of Paris, but switched sides when Henry converted to Catholicism. Poutrincourt had lost much of his personal wealth fighting against Henry during the wars, and hoped that allying himself with the new king and renouncing the Catholic League and its allies would allow him to recoup his losses. His decision proved shrewd (and Henry rewarded him with several titles), but it was not enough for him to completely recover financially. His increased influence in Henry’s court, however, granted him with the ability to travel to Canada, and he hoped that leading expeditions in New France would provide him the means to re-establish his affluence.11

In 1607, Poutrincourt seized an opportunity to become Port Royal’s proprietor. When Monts successfully negotiated another return to New France, he decided to

---

abandon Port Royal in favor of Quebec, where he sent Champlain, not Poutrincourt, to establish the colony. Although left out at Quebec, Poutrincourt made preparations to return to Port Royal as governor. He believed that his prior tenure provided him enough experience to quickly attain wealth if he could obtain a monopoly over the fur trade. Monts, no longer interested in Acadia, granted Poutrincourt the right to re-settle there. But Poutrincourt faced one major obstacle in securing his new colony: he could not finance the project himself, and although the king granted him permission to return to Canada to colonize Port Royal, Henry refused to allocate any royal funds to the outpost.

With nowhere else to turn, Poutrincourt recalled a promise the king had made to the Society of Jesus: if they went to North America, he would provide a stipend for their mission. On top of providing royal funding, Jesuit missionaries made excellent fundraisers. Poutrincourt knew that many Catholic investors had withdrawn their support for Monts’ company because he was Protestant and his settlement did not seek to convert Indians. A missionary presence, Poutrincourt hoped, would draw these benefactors to his settlement, providing him with enough resources to make Port Royal an entrepôt for Canada’s burgeoning fur trade.13

Launching a Jesuit Mission

12 For more on the development of Quebec during this time, see chapter four.
13 Pierre Biard, Relation of 1616, in JR 3:121; Campeau, “Introduction,” in MNF 1:21*.
Upon receiving Henry’s request that missionaries be sent to Canada, Fr. Coton sent word “through all the colleges of France” and “many offered themselves to take part in the work ... in which there is a great deal of work and little honor.”

Coton believed Poutrincourt would depart immediately, and began sending candidates to Bordeaux to await further instructions. Among these men was Joseph Dumontiel, attached to the college of Rodez, who already had twice requested a foreign assignment and been selected in 1607 to go to New France in the event that the Society was able to launch a mission there. He also selected Pierre Biard, a theology professor at the Jesuit college in Lyon, and Enemond Massé, a Lyon native who served as an administrator to Coton in Paris. But at Bordeaux, the Jesuits “were very much surprised when they heard why they had come there. There was no news of any embarkation for Canada .... No preparation, no reports, no tidings,” for Poutrincourt had failed to secure enough money to finance his colony.

Increasingly desperate for financiers, Poutrincourt became more vocal about his missionary intentions and appealed directly to Pope Paul V in 1608. “As a lover of the religion of my sires and its constant defender,” Poutrincourt assured the Pope that unlike

14 Biard, Relation of 1616, in JR 3:123.
15 Even though Coton and Acquaviva planned the mission, it was under the authority of the provincial of Aquitaine, Christopher Baltazar.
other explorers who sought wealth in the New World, he would devote himself to the salvation of Canada’s Indians. “Nor indeed,” he proclaimed, “do I ask a land rich in silver and gold, nor is it my desire to lay waste to strange nations,” nor “the lands granted to me by the gifts of the King, and the yearly harvest of the sea,” but instead he hoped to “win the peoples for Christ,” for “the harvest truly is plenteous, but the laborers are few.” Poutrincourt’s letter officially sought to “implore the favor of Your Holiness by the bowels of the tender mercy of our God,” but he knew that the Pope’s sanction would also impress wealthy Catholic families in France. By appealing to the papacy for support, Poutrincourt hoped benefactors would flock to his cause, allowing him the financial flexibility to operate without the help of the Jesuits.19

Poutrincourt became even more desperate in 1609. Henry IV, who “supposed that he had crossed the sea immediately” in 1607, discovered that Poutrincourt was still in France. In order to assuage the king’s anger, Poutrincourt promised that he would depart immediately—with the king’s Jesuit missionaries—after gathering sufficient supplies. However, popular pamphlets depicting the Jesuits as usurpers of secular authorities made Poutrincourt wary of them, and he still desperately hoped to fund the settlement without their help. Since the king had already granted the Society a pension for their mission, Coton scrambled to appoint two missionaries. Dumontiel (although he still hoped to go to Canada) had been assigned to the Jesuit college at Toulouse, so Biard accepted the position of Canada’s first superior. While the Jesuits busied themselves with preparations, Poutrincourt continued to hope that he would still find independent

investors. He informed Coton that it made more sense for him to return to Port Royal alone and re-establish the settlement without the Jesuits, whom he would send for later that year. He promised to send his nineteen-year-old son, Charles de Biencourt, back to France to retrieve the missionaries soon after his arrival at Port Royal.20

Although he never admitted it, Poutrincourt likely never intended to bring Jesuits to Port Royal. Unbeknown to the Society, he left France in 1609 with his own secular priest and missionary, Fr. Jesse Fléché, from the diocese of Langres. This was Poutrincourt’s final gamble to avoid Jesuit influence in New France: if Fléché could convert a large number of Indians, Poutrincourt would be able to fulfill the king’s stipulation that Port Royal serve as a center for spreading Christianity while using the converted Indians as propaganda for would-be financiers in France. When Poutrincourt arrived in Port Royal, he found all of the buildings from his original settlement intact, proof of Indian loyalty to the French. It would be easier, he thought, “to make them pliant to our wishes, especially so in regard to Religion ... they seemed to wish for nothing better than to enroll themselves under the banner of Jesus Christ.” In earlier iterations of the colony, Poutrincourt argued, the French were unable to spread Christianity because they did not have consistent donors. “It would have been unwise,” he claimed, “to administer baptism to people whom it was necessary afterwards to abandon.” Fléché set to work, immediately baptizing over twenty Micmacs most closely allied with the French, including their leader, Membertou, and his children. Each Indian took the name of a French noble meant to indicate their rank in native society, although these names

probably only reflected the social standing the French attributed to them: Membertou became Henry Membertou, after Henry IV, while his wife was named Marie, after Marie de Medici, the Queen. Membertou’s eldest son became Louis Membertou, after the Dauphin, Membertou’s granddaughters took the names of various royal women, and another of his sons was named Paul, after Pope Paul V.21

Poutrincourt recounted the conversions in a letter to his close friend Lescarbot, who remained in France.22 Although Lescarbot never returned to New France, he became Poutrincourt’s mouthpiece against the Jesuits, particularly Biard. Poutrincourt remembered that he promised to allow the Jesuits to come to Port Royal with his son in 1610, and time was running out. Lescarbot quickly drafted a letter to Marie de Medici, now Queen Regent in the aftermath of Henry’s assassination, lauding the great advances Poutrincourt made in propagating the Catholic faith with two stories. In the first, he recounted the conversion of Membertou and the willingness of the Indians to receive Christianity as evidence of Fléché’s success and the importance of continuing his work. The second was a warning: “The devil, who never sleeps, has shown the jealousy which he felt at the salvation of these people ... by inciting a wicked Frenchman, not a Frenchman but a Turk, not a Turk but an Atheist, to divert from the path of righteousness several savages,” including Chkoudun, “a man of great influence,” who had “once

21 Lescarbot, “The Conversion of the Savages who were Baptized in New France during this year, 1610, with a brief narrative of the voyage of Sieur de Poutrincourt,” in JR 1: 47-111; Lescarbot, Histoire, 3: 43-6.

22 The letters have not survived, but Lescarbot wrote, “I have letters from Sieur de Poutrincourt about it, dated the eleventh day of July following,” in “The Conversion of the Savages,” in JR 1:75. These letters likely arrived with Poutrincourt’s son, Biencourt, who had returned to France for supplies, and ostensibly to retrieve the Jesuits.
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erected crosses in his village” but had been turned away from Catholicism. Moreover, Lescarbot warned Medici that the English could potentially corrupt all of America’s Indians with their Protestant faith, which had just caused decades of warfare within France. Fléché had demonstrated the willingness of Indians to accept Christianity, but if unsupported with additional funds, the devil—or worse, Protestants—would prevail in Canada.

The real purpose of Lescarbot’s letter was to convince Medici to rescind Henry IV’s order that the Jesuits accompany Poutrincourt. “There are in that country some men of the Church, of good scholarship, whom nothing but their religious zeal has taken there, and who will not fail to do all that piety requires in that respect,” he said of Fléché, but “there is no need of any learned Doctors who may be more useful in combating vices and heresies at home.” Although he never mentioned the Jesuits explicitly, he argued that “there is a certain class of men in whom we cannot have complete confidence, who are in the habit of censuring everything that is not in harmony with their maxims, and,”—here revealing Poutrincourt’s true fears—“wish to rule wherever they are.” He lambasted the Society: “It is enough to be watched from abroad without having these fault-finders, from whom even the greatest kings cannot defend themselves”—an allusion to the rumors that the Jesuits were complicit in her husband’s recent assassination. To drive home his point, he again reminded her of the allegations later in the letter: during his return voyage to France, Biencourt “met a ship from Rochelle and another from Havre de Grace, when he heard the news of the lamentable death of our late good King, without knowing by whom or how he was killed. But afterwards he met an English ship from which he heard the same thing, certain persons being accused of this parricide whom I will not name here.”
Clearly, Poutrincourt, Biencourt, and Lescarbot all dreaded the Society because of popular depictions of its members as power-hungry usurpers and feared that they might wrestle power from Poutrincourt in Canada. Instead of Jesuits, Poutrincourt needed more priests like Fléché who were under his jurisdiction and could travel under the authority of his men to various settlements in New France, working with traders to evangelize Indians while forging trade networks.23

Fléché’s baptisms attracted the attention of an important potential donor, Antoinette de Pons, Marquise de Guercheville. Aware of her interest in New France, Poutrincourt wrote to her for support in 1610, and, pleased to hear about his successful conversions, Guercheville wished him well. It is possible that Poutrincourt believed she could convince the Queen Regent to rescind Henry’s demand that Port Royal’s missionaries be Jesuits. After her husband’s death in 1586, Guercheville had become a prominent maid of honor to Catherine de Medici in Henry III’s court, allegedly shunning the advances of Henry of Navarre. She maintained influence at court despite the assassination of both Henry III and Henry IV, and remained close to Marie de Medici, serving as governess to the Regent’s daughters. In retrospect, Guercheville was a poor choice for Poutrincourt. She strongly advocated the Society of Jesus, telling Poutrincourt “I hope that you will be greatly consoled by the arrival of two Jesuit Fathers, one of whom was my spiritual father.” Since Massé served as her personal confessor, the missionaries provided her with an opportunity to extend her own influence. “It would be superfluous to recommend,” Guercheville informed Poutrincourt, “knowing your zeal ...
[that you] take care of them as their virtues deserve and you assure them that I will heartily employ the means I have to serve you in any occasions.” The wealthy marquise offered happily to fund Poutrincourt’s colony, but only in service of the Society’s mission.24

Lescarbot’s letter backfired. Not only did it arouse interest from the pro-Jesuit Guercheville, but it also reinforced Medici’s dedication to Henry’s decree that the Society join Poutrincourt. The Queen Regent interpreted Fléché’s success as evidence that Jesuit missionaries would be particularly successful in Canada. Medici congratulated Poutrincourt “about the good work that you have made there, regarding your obligation for the conversion of the barbarians to our holy religion.” She commanded, “You will continue this service that is most agreeable to the King [Louis XIII] ... and to me,” but “especially because soon you will have there Jesuit fathers, who will assist you in this good work.” The young king Louis XIII reinforced her message, warning Poutrincourt, “I kindly recommend by this letter that you, in all occasions, assist [the Jesuits] with your protection and authority in order to promote their good and holy teachings, assuring you that I consider it a very important service.” Not only did both reaffirm the late Henry’s commitment to the Jesuit presence in North America, but Louis also made it clear that the Society was to operate under royal authority rather than Poutrincourt’s.25

24 Poutrincourt reprinted her letter as testimony in his Factum du procés entre Jean de Biencourt et Les PP. Biard and Massé in 1614; see Poutrincourt, Factum, in MNF 1:328-9.

25 We have two letters addressed to Poutrincourt from Louis XIII and two from Marie de Medici because Poutrincourt submitted both in the Factum; See Poutrincourt, Factum, in MNF 1:326-8.
The king’s warning did not prevent Biencourt from making one last attempt to rid his father of the Jesuits. While in Paris, Biencourt secured a contract to provide furs to the Hatters of Paris, a partnership that could bolster the colony’s chances of succeeding. He enlisted the help of Thomas Robin, sieur de Coloignes, a young explorer who had gone to New France with Poutrincourt in 1610, but returned with Biencourt to help spread the news of Fléché’s baptisms. Robin, whose father recently had been given the lucrative job of collecting France’s salt tax, promised to furnish supplies to Port Royal for five years in exchange for a share of the colony’s profits. Robin’s father refused to fulfill the arrangement and only loaned Biencourt a modest sum. With options running thin, Robin and Biencourt concocted an underhanded plan to accept Guercheville’s financing while still preventing the Jesuits from departing for Port Royal.

Growing impatient, Guercheville asked Coton why the Jesuits had not yet been summoned. When Coton could not answer, she took the issue directly to Robin, whom Biencourt placed in charge of the ship’s embarkation. Robin simply told Guercheville that he had no commission to accept Jesuit passengers. To placate Guercheville, Robin assured her that Poutrincourt would surely benefit from a Jesuit presence in Canada, and that Biard and Massé should meet Biencourt at Dieppe in October. Guercheville returned to court satisfied; not only did she commit herself to contribute to Poutrincourt’s project, but she actively sought additional donors in Medici, Madame la Marquise de Verneuil,

---

26 The ship was *La Grâce de Dieu*; Biard, “Lettre au Christophe Baltazar, June 10 1611” in *JR* 1:143.
27 Biencourt clearly charged Robin with loading the ship so that he could feign ignorance to the marquise while they continued to buy themselves more time.
and Madame de Sourdis.\textsuperscript{28} Guercheville earmarked the money specifically for the Jesuits, but Biencourt still hoped he could take her investment while leaving the Jesuits behind. Weeks before their intended departure, Biencourt learned that the crown had not granted his father a monopoly over the fur trade, thus nullifying his contract with the Hatters of Paris. Without money and without a secured monopoly, the struggling young entrepreneur conferred with Biard and Massé, who loaned him 737 livres from Guercheville’s fund. Having obtained Guercheville’s money, Biencourt only needed a means of preventing the Jesuits from boarding the ship.\textsuperscript{29}

To stop them, Robin hired Abraham Duquesne and Jean Dujardin, two Calvinists who hated the Jesuits, to “attend to the repairing and loading of the ship, under promise to remunerate them for their time and expense, and to form a partnership with them to divide the profits which would be derived from the trade in skins, and from the cod fisheries.” Biard complained that his and Massé’s arrival caused “great excitement among those of the Reformed Religion” in Dieppe. “From then on,” Duquesne and Dujardin “were very obstinate, swearing with their loudest oaths, that, if [we] had to enter the ship, they would simply put nothing in it; that they would not refuse all other Priests or Ecclesiastics, and would even support them, but as to the Jesuits, they would not abide them.” The merchants had clear cause to obstruct the Jesuits: as Protestants, they knew

\textsuperscript{28} The precise details of Biencourt, Robin, and de Guercheville’s financial dealings are laid out rather clearly by Campeau in his introduction to \textit{Monumenta Novae Franciae}, 1:200-6; Biard, \textit{Relation of 1616}, in \textit{JR} 1:130-37.

\textsuperscript{29} According to Biard, “For the Queen had sent to them the five hundred écus promised by the late King, and had added a very favorable recommendation by word of mouth. Madame la Marquise de Vernueil furnished them amply with sacred vessels and robes for saying Mass; Madame de Sourdís furnished them liberally with linen, and Madame de Guercheville granted them a very fair viaticum. Thus provided for, they reached Dieppe at the time appointed,” in Biard, \textit{Relation of 1616}, in \textit{JR} 1:129-30.
the Society took a hard line against Calvinism and actively sought to extirpate it. The association of Biencourt with Calvinist merchants makes less sense, but Biencourt likely intentionally sought out devout Protestants who would not carry Jesuits under any circumstance.\textsuperscript{30}

The merchants held firm. “It was a remarkable exhibition of malice,” Biard told Acquaviva, “especially when the Catholics informed them that they were in duty bound not to reject the Jesuits, since it was a formal order of the Queen.”\textsuperscript{31} Moreover, “the matter was apparently in a desperate condition,” he added, for “only this one ship was that year being fitted out for New France.”\textsuperscript{32} To salvage their investment, the various Catholic donors appealed directly to Medici to intervene on the Jesuits’ behalf. She wrote to Dieppe’s governor, Charles-Timoléon de Beauxoncles, sieur de Sigonges, whom Biard called “a zealous and pious Catholic,” and ordered him to force the merchants to accept the missionaries. Sigonges convened Dieppe’s Calvinist consistory to remind the Protestant community that since the Queen Regent remained steadfast in Henry IV’s desire to send Jesuits to Canada, obstructing their voyage implied disloyalty to the monarch. The consistory, aware of the lingering suspicions against Protestants, pressured

\textsuperscript{30} Biard recounted this incident several times. He wrote to Acquaviva before departing Dieppe, Baltazar upon his arrival in New France, and again to Aquaviva in 1612. He described the incident in an anonymous pamphlet when he returned to France in 1614, and again in his \textit{Relation of 1616}, which I cited here. See Biard, “Lettre de P. Pierre Biard, au T. R. P. Claude Aquaviva, Dieppe, Janvier 21, 1611,” in JR 1:129-35; Biard, “Lettre du P. Biard, au Christophe Baltazar, Port Royal, Juin 10, 1611,” in JR 1:139-43; Biard, \textit{Missio Canadensis}, in JR 2:81-3; Biard, \textit{Relatio Rerum Gestarum in Nova-Francia, Annis 1613 & 1614}, in JR 2:211-15; also see Lescarbot, “Last Relation of what took place in the voyage made by sieur de Poutrincourt to New France, twenty months ago,” in JR 2:173-5. Lucien Campeau argued that the entire situation was a farce, that “all happened as if Biencourt and Robin had colluded with the Calvinists in a game of comedic sectarian obstruction, to force the patrons to disburse.” See MNF 1:525, footnotes 6, 7.


\textsuperscript{32} Biard, \textit{Relatio Rerum Gestarum}, in JR 2:213.
Duquesne and Dujardin to capitulate. The merchants, however, “would not permit themselves to be moved in any respect,” claiming that the consistory could not command them to accept the missionaries.\(^{33}\) Biard and Massé had no formally written contract, and, conceding defeat, they retired to the Jesuit college at Eu to await further instructions from their superiors.\(^{34}\)

Guercheville, unwilling to watch Biencourt leave France with her money and without the Jesuits, broke the deadlock. Acting through Catholic supporters in Dieppe, she assured Duquesne and Dujardin that the priests would only embark if they first paid for the entirety of the ship’s contents. The two merchants dismissed the possibility that supporters of the two missionaries would ever be able to raise the money required for such a feat and resumed loading the ship. Guercheville “did not disdain to ask a contribution from all the greatest Princes and Grandees of the Court,” and quickly raised the 4,000 livres required to buy out the ship’s contents from the “churlish Heretics.”\(^{35}\)

With support from the Queen, she sent the money to her Catholic allies in Dieppe. Duquesne and Dujardin had to choose: either they relent and accept the Jesuits on board their ship, or they fulfill their promise to accept the 4,000 livres and relinquish control of the ship to Guercheville and the Jesuits. The dismayed merchants chose to give up their

---


34 They had no written contract because “agreements of this kind among noblemen are not usually put upon paper. Therefore they could not prosecute these heretics”; Biard, “Lettre au Aquaviva, Jan 21, 1611” in JR 1:131-5; Biard, *Relation of 1616*, in JR 3:175. Campeau laughed at Biard’s naiveté, believing that Robin and Biencourt told him that, but in actuality had no formal association with the Calvinist merchants; see Campeau’s footnote 7, *MNF* 1:119.

35 “Now Madame la Marquise de Guercheville ... decided justly that they ought to be punished in a way that would hurt them most; namely, that they should be set aside”; Biard, *Relatio Rerum Gestarum*, in JR 2:213; Biard, *Relation of 1616* in JR 3:175.
stake in the vessel. “At first we only asked a little corner in this vessel at their price,” Biard boasted, “Now we are the masters of it.”

While Biencourt and Guercheville understood the encounter as purely circumstantial, Biard saw it as a part of his Society’s more general goal of defeating Protestantism: “We were forced to enrich the Calvinists by spending a portion of our alms but now they—of their own accord—refuse to profit from a venture that was to benefit them.” Boasting that while “I believe that the great source of their grief is nothing else than the triumph of the Lord Jesus,” the confrontation meant that Dieppe’s Calvinists “will no doubt be more active and furious toward us in the future.”

Biencourt had brilliantly enlisted Protestant fears of Jesuit treachery in order to assuage his own Gallican ones, but his gambit failed.

Guercheville intended her investment to influence the mission in two important ways. First, it provided the Jesuits with independent funds so that they could operate freely and without becoming “a burden to sieur de Poutrincourt, or anyone else, nor would it be necessary to repeat every year the taking up of collections for them.” This was precisely what Poutrincourt feared, for unless they relied on him to sustain them, he had no way to control the missionaries. The second intention of Guercheville’s investment scared Poutrincourt even more: rather than putting the colony’s profits into the pockets of merchant investors in France, the profits would instead return to Acadia, to “be used for the maintenance of Port Royal and the French residing there.” But since the

36 The most detailed and least defensive version of this story appeared in a letter he wrote to Acquaviva before leaving Dieppe in January 1611; Biard “Lettre au Aquaviva, Jan. 21, 1611” in JR 1:131-5.

37 “That is to say, they were paid a value of the goods, which was hard for Jesuits to do for Calvinists, but at the same time they are now deprived of any profits the voyage might make,” Ibid.
Jesuits had bought a share of the ship, Guercheville insisted, “the Jesuits should participate in the business with sieurs Robin and Biencourt, and should share with them the profits.”

Robin, Biencourt, and the Jesuits signed a contract that officially granted the Jesuits rights to “half of all merchandise, food, advances, and generally all of the cargo in the ship named *La Grâce de Dieu*” and officially recognized the 737 livre loan the Jesuits had given to Biencourt. Over the terms of the contract, according to Biard, Robin and Biencourt “cried until they [were] hoarse.”

Gallican Tensions in New France

*Le Grâce de Dieu* left Dieppe on January 26, 1611, six days after the Jesuits and Biencourt finally agreed to terms for the voyage, three months after Biard and Massé arrived in Dieppe expecting to depart, one year after Poutrincourt promised to bring Jesuit missionaries to New France, and three years after the king granted Coton official sanction for a Canadian mission. Biard expressed dismay that “the sailors were mostly heretics,” which perhaps implied to him that there would be a large number of Calvinists trading at Port Royal. Responsible for performing ecclesiastical services on board the ship, Biard spent some time engaging in disputations with the ship’s Calvinist crew. Since he considered the extirpation of heresy a major component of his life’s work, he

---

39 “Contrat des Jesuites avec Charles de Biencourt, Dieppe, 20 janvier 1611” in *MNF* 1:112. This contract appears as evidence in one of the University of Paris’s *plaidoyés* against the Jesuits in 1612.
41 Ibid.
boasted “we brought the Heretics, who, evidently through the preaching of their own Pastors, regarded us as monsters, to recognize the malice of these impostors ... so that afterwards on many occasions [they] stood up to proclaim our praises.”

Le Grâce de Dieu experienced eight days of violent storms as they approached the Azores, and Massé suffered nearly forty days of sickness due to extreme temperatures, but the voyage proceeded safely toward New France. The two Jesuits shared a cabin with Biencourt, whom Biard referred to positively as “a very accomplished young gentleman” in his initial reports. They arrived on May 22, 1611—the Feast of the Pentecost—to find Port Royal in disarray.

Unaware of the holdup at Dieppe, Poutrincourt and his men worried about Biencourt, whom they expected to arrive with provisions in November 1610. “They had been, during the entire winter, reduced to sore straits,” Biard explained, adding, “the joy of Monsieur de Poutrincourt and his followers, at our arrival, is indescribable.”

Years later, he recalled that “our arrival caused great joy on both sides—great on the part of those arriving, because ... the tediousness of so long a voyage; but more than double was that of sieur de Poutrincourt who had been in great distress and apprehension during the entire winter.”

The great happiness everyone celebrated on that festive occasion was

42 Biard, Missio Canadensis in JR 2:84-5.
43 Biard, “Lettre au R.P. Christophe Baltazar, June 10, 1611” in JR 1:143. Biard never slandered Biencourt or Poutrincourt outright, even in 1616. In his earliest letters, Biard actually spoke quite highly of them: “M. de Poutrincourt, a mild and upright Gentleman, brave, beloved, and well-known in these parts, and M. de Biencourt, his son, who reflects the virtues and good qualities of his father, both zealous in serving God, and who honor and cherish us more than we deserve, also encourage us in devoting all our energy to this work.” Biard, “Lettre au R.P. Christophe Baltazar, June 10, 1611” in JR: 1:180.
44 Ibid, 143-50.
45 Biard, Relation of 1616, in JR 3:186.
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short lived, as it masked Gallican tensions boiling beneath the surface. Supplies were low, and since Biencourt had failed to secure a trade monopoly with the Hatters of Paris, Poutrincourt returned to France less than three weeks later to lobby for an agreement. In his place, he left his son Biencourt. Although Biard initially spoke highly of Biencourt, his behavior at Dieppe certainly weighed heavily on both of their minds. As leader of Port Royal, Biencourt obstructed Biard in two significant ways. First, he impeded Biard’s mission by demanding that Biard baptize large numbers of Indians, which ran against Jesuit missionary philosophy. Second, since he feared that Biard sought to overthrow him at Port Royal, Biencourt prevented Biard from working closely with any of his French rivals, particularly Robert Pont Gravé.

Within a year, their relationship deteriorated beyond the point of repair. Even the Indians sensed the tensions. After observing an argument between Biard, Poutrincourt, and Pont Gravé, one Indian complained, “You Frenchmen are always fighting and quarreling among yourselves whereas we live peaceably. You are envious and are always slandering each other. You are thieves and deceivers. You are covetous, and are neither generous nor kind. As for us, if we have a piece of bread, we share it with our neighbor.” Biard could not understand why “they are saying these and similar things constantly,” laughing the accusation off by reporting that “they consider themselves ... what is difficult to believe, richer than we are,” and claiming that “they do not see how much worse their own vices are,” and that “the better part of our people do not have even

46 Because Argyll destroyed Port Royal while Poutrincourt was in Paris, Poutrincourt only returned to Canada long enough to retrieve what was left of his colony. He died before he could return permanently.
these defects.” Biard did not see that his relationship with Biencourt was one of the chief reasons that Port Royal’s Indians viewed the French as slanderers.47

When he arrived at Port Royal, Biard wasted no time in surveying the work Fléché had done. He conferred with Fléché, who “has shown great friendliness toward us,” but Fléché happily returned to France with Poutrincourt, leaving Biard to build upon his foundation without any guidance. Although Lescarbot’s letter had only indicated about thirty converts, Biard estimated that Fléché had baptized approximately one hundred Indians. “The trouble is,” Biard noted, Fléché “has not been able to instruct them as he would have wished because he did not know the language with which to support them.” Even before he spoke to the Indian converts themselves, Biard uncovered the reality of Fléché’s baptisms: “there has not yet been any success in translating into the native language the Creed, the Lord’s prayer, the commandments of God, the Sacraments, and other principles quite necessary to the making of a Christian.”48

When Biard met Fléché’s converts, he realized that they interpreted their baptisms as a ritual of alliance rather than as a religious statement. When he asked them to make the sign of the cross, he “was very much astonished—the Christians understood almost as little about it as the unbaptized.” After he inquired what their Christian conversion meant to them, the Indians replied that Fléché had “made us like the Normans.” “There is scarcely any change in them after Baptism,” Biard lamented, “The same primitive life and the same manners ... the same customs, ceremonies, usage, fashions, and vices

48 Ibid.
remain.” Fléché’s Indians had sought to strengthen their alliance with the French by participating in French rituals without understanding the religious meaning behind their actions. Unsurprisingly, Poutrincourt had not complained, for he welcomed as many allies as he could find. By the time he submitted his first annual report to Acquaviva in January of 1612, Biard recognized what Fléché’s purpose had been, informing the Superior General that “neither [Fléché] nor any one else knew the language, except some words that pertain to the most basic needs of social intercourse and trade” and the Indians only “accepted Baptism as a sort of sacred pledge of friendship and alliance with the French.”

Biard refused to baptize Indians as Fléché had, telling Aquaviva, “we have restrained this eager inclination to administer this sacrament without discrimination, and we insist that no adult person shall receive it unless he had the necessary faith and his profession.” He reported that conversions without adequate catechesis “increased peril to their soul.” Although un-baptized Indians lived in sin, they were at least unaware of it. Fléché’s converts, in contrast, became Christian sinners, and Biard believed that it was a far graver transgression for a Christian to offend God by worshipping idols than it was for the uninitiated (who might be redeemed later). His hard-line against mass baptisms fit into a wider trend in pastoral missionary work that had developed among the Jesuits in sixteenth-century France. While traveling in their early missions throughout the first half

49 Biard, “Lettre au R.P. Claude Aquaviva, 31 janvier 1612” in JR 2:87; it is important to note that this document was written shortly before the arrival of agents of Guercheville and Poutrincourt from France caused a major confrontation and breakdown of relations between Biencourt and the Jesuits, which I will describe later. However, it did not leave Port Royal until six months later, after the episode ended and both agents returned to France. Biencourt tried to prevent it from ever leaving Port Royal.

of the sixteenth century, many Jesuits discovered that rural subjects still practiced ancient folk rituals while remaining nominally Catholic. Men like Ignatius Loyola linked the rapid spread of Protestantism to the fact that many rural Catholics did not fully understand their faith. Counter-Reformation reformers at the Council of Trent sought to rectify this deficiency by developing a strong catechism and obliging adherents to fully learn what exactly it meant to adhere to Catholicism. As prominent Counter-Reformation missionaries, the Jesuits were among those who traveled the countryside to catechize, preach, and establish schools. Biard, a Grenoblois who lived his entire life within close proximity to Calvinist Geneva, knew the need for proper catechesis quite well. If he baptized everyone, as Fléché had, Canada would remain ruled by Satan, which meant it might one day be open to the encroachment of heresy.\footnote{Châtellier, \textit{The Religion of the Poor}, 9-13; Martin, \textit{The Jesuit Mind}, 19-28; One of the perceived strengths of later Jesuit missionaries was their belief that making doctrinal sacrifices in the short term would foster total conversion in the long term. But in the early seventeenth century, with the Wars of Religion fresh in French minds, the initial impulse was different. Biard spent most of his career serving the Catholic community in Grenoble and Lyon. This included working in colleges, founding rural missions—including ones aimed directly at re-Catholicizing Protestants—and engaging in disputations with Calvinist ministers. In chapter 3, I will further illustrate his career as a missionary against French Protestants.}

To Biard, the Indians demonstrated the same characteristics as those who abandoned the Church during the Reformation. After all, the Society accused Protestants of valuing individual judgment over doctrinal unity. Biard complained that “[i]n France we see people who have deviated from the Faith holding themselves higher and boasting of being better than Catholics, because they see many faults in some Catholics, but they consider neither the virtues of other Catholics nor their own still greater imperfections.” Pride, the fundamental flaw of the Protestant, plagued the Indians of New France, who
according to Biard believed themselves to be “superior to all Christians. It is self-love that blinds them, and the Evil One who leads them on to [profess their cultural superiority], no more nor less than in our France.” Biard bolstered his argument by noting that the paucity of doctrinal instruction among the French at Port Royal made the French settlers poor examples for would-be Christian Indians. One of his duties was to say daily mass and minister to the French settlers, an essential task since “sailors, who form the greater part of our parishioners, are ordinarily quite deficient in any spiritual feeling, have no sign of religion except in their blasphemies, nor any knowledge of God beyond the simplest conceptions which they bring with them from France.” Moreover, he found their religious beliefs “clouded with licentiousness and the cavilings and revilings of heretics,” at once blaming the Reformation for weakening Catholicism while confirming the need for Counter-Reformation education. The irreligiosity of the sailors undermined his work among the Indians: “Hence it can be seen what hope there is of establishing a flourishing Christian church by such evangelists,” he stated sarcastically. “The first things the poor Savages learn are vile oaths and insulting words,” he observed, “not knowing the meaning of them, but only because they see that when such words are used there is generally a great deal of laughter and amusement.” Defeated, he asked “What remedy can there be for this evil in men whose abandonment to evil-speaking is as great as or greater than their insolence in showing contempt?” In France, the Society

53 Confirming one of the major obstacles Gentil predicted the Jesuits would face years earlier.
54 Biard, Missio Canadensis, in JR 2:6-7; One of the duties of a mission’s superior was to draft an annual report detailing the major events that had transpired over the course of the prior year. In most cases, these were called Annuae Litterae, although after Biard drafted his Relation of 1616, other Jesuits in
blamed Protestant ministers for corrupting the unknowing rural populace; in New France, Biard blamed the French workers, believing he could only rectify the situation with proper and thorough instruction.55

Biard described the environment and climate of New France as being similar to that of northern Europe and concluded that Canada’s Indians should therefore be easily Christianized. “For verily all this region, though capable of the same prosperity as ours,” he observed, “nevertheless through Satan’s malevolence, which reigns there, is only a horrible wilderness.” In the Indian’s behavior, Biard saw evidence of Satan’s influence everywhere. Like many early European observers, he obsesssed over their dress and romanticized their appearance, remarking that “they are of a lighter build than we are; but handsome and well-shaped, just as we would be if we continued in the same condition in which we were at the age of twenty-five. You do not encounter a big-bellied, hunchbacked, or deformed person among them.” Throughout his writings, Biard expressed displeasure at Indians who “greatly underrate us, regarding themselves as our

55 By 1612, he had only baptized three people, all of whom lay ill. One girl—the Jesuits gave her the Christian name Antoinette de Pons, after their benefactor—approximately nine years old, was beyond recovery and died days later. Shortly afterward, Biard found an opportunity “not so dissimilar” when Actodin, the unbaptized second son of Membertou, became sick enough for Biard to proclaim him “already at death’s door.” The Indians had already begun the death ritual, singing “death-songs” and sacrificing dogs. In his 1612 letter to Acquaviva, Biard gave few details about this ritual, but he included a detailed account in his Relation of 1616: the Indian medical practitioner, “identical with those who are at the head of their Religion, whose office is the same as that of our Priests and our Physicians,” performed a ritual to determine how long the patient would live. Biard skeptically declared that “he is not so foolish as to say that he will live, if the symptoms are not encouraging. He will then, say, for instance that he will die in three days. Hear now in what a fine fashion he verifies his prophecies” by dowsing the patient with water to ensure the anticipated result. Biard ordered the ritual be performed elsewhere, and brought Actodin into one of the cabins, where “God’s right hand exerted its power; he did not die.”; Biard, “Lettre au R.P. Claude Aquaviva, Jan 31, 1612” in JR 2:91-7; Biard, Relation of 1616, in JR 3:111-127; Biard, “Lettre au R.P. Christophe Baltazar, Jan 31, 1612,” in JR 2:13.
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superiors.” He could not understand why natives would oppose European ideas or prefer their own customs to those brought from France. He described their faith in dreams, dance, and incantations as “the whole of their religion.” Biard perceived Indians as beholden to medicine men who made arbitrary predictions and then made sure they came true. “Of one supreme God,” said Biard, “they have a slender notion, but they are so perverted by false ideas and customs, that, as I have said, they really worship the Devil.”

Biard stubbornly ignored Biencourt’s pleas to baptize large numbers of Indians without catechesis, and Biencourt grew increasingly impatient; after all, he remembered the impression that Lescarbot’s long list of converts left upon wealthy donors in Paris. It became clear that both men valued baptism for different reasons when Henry Membertou, the Micmac leader baptized by Fléché and allied with Poutrincourt, fell ill shortly after Poutrincourt departed for France. Biard and Biencourt provided him with

56 Biard, Missio Canadensia, in JR 2:75.

57 This debate over baptism divided other missionaries as well. When the Spanish first evangelized in the Americas, they aimed to convert large numbers of Indians. Spanish friars had fought the Moors for centuries, and they believed that Christ could not return to Earth until Christians conquered the world in his name. As early as Cortés’s conquest of Tenochtitlan, Franciscans actively engaged in a massive evangelizing project. Rather than instructing them in the faith, they baptized them quickly, happy to expand Christ’s world of followers. Later Spanish missionaries questioned the wisdom of this approach, as Biard did in New France. English Protestants rejected this model as well. In the seventeenth century, Protestant missionaries like John Eliot focused on thoroughly catechizing those Indians who had experienced “spiritual regeneration” by the grace of God. English missionaries instructed those few who God had chosen and expected these Indians to spread the message of Christ to their communities. See John Leddy Phelan, The Millennial Kingdom of the Franciscans in the New World (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1956); Georges Baudot, Utopia and History in Mexico: The First Chroniclers of Mexican Civilizations, 1500-1569, trans. Bernard Ortiz de Montellano and Thelma Ortiz de Montellando (Boulder, University of Colorado Press, 1995), 71-120; James Axtell, The Invasion Within: The Conquest of Cultures in Colonial North America (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985); for a comparison of missionary strategies of Jesuits in northern Mexico and Christian missionaries of late antiquity, see Daniel T. Reff, Plagues, Priests, and Demons: Sacred Narratives and the Rise of Christianity in the Old World and the New (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005).
warmth and comfort within the Jesuits’ cabin, but both knew that Membertou’s death was imminent. The old Indian leader inadvertently exposed the rift between the young trader and the Jesuit when he privately asked Biencourt to bury him at his ancestral burial site. Biard recoiled, for “it was not lawful for him, a Christian, to wish to be buried with Heathens whose souls were to be lost.” Moreover, Biard feared that when other Indians saw Membertou’s reluctance at being buried with the French Catholics, they would consider his conversion to have been merely superficial. Biencourt, however, without conferring with Biard, promised Membertou that the Jesuit would bless the ancestral site, honoring Membertou’s request. Biard refused.58

Membertou’s decision put all parties in an untenable predicament. If Biard capitulated, he would jeopardize his missionary legitimacy by undermining Catholic religious doctrine. Because his goal was to properly catholicize the Indians, he could not relent. Biencourt likely saw his entire network of trade hanging in the balance; if Biard did not bless the ancestral burial ground, the Micmac might turn on the French, not only refusing to trade furs, but also withholding supplies and protection; the French had no alternative source for these things. Perhaps Membertou regretted the predicament he had put them in, and, fearing that his people might lose their French allies, he withdrew his request. “God looked kindly upon his good intention,” Biard rejoiced, “for the next morning the Savage, of his own free will, changed his mind, and said that he wanted to be buried in the common burying ground of the Christians.” Biard, of course, attributed the

58 Biard gave several versions of this story, from which I have drawn the consistent facts. Biencourt also gave an account, which I describe in chapter three.
reversal to Membertou’s strong Christian faith, rather than any practical concerns the
dying leader might have held.\textsuperscript{59}

As tensions between priest and proprietor mounted in the background, Biard
sought to overcome the biggest obstacle to his mission: the language barrier. To talk to
the Indians, Biard found himself at the mercy of Biencourt, “for he is almost my only
interpreter.” This caused logistical problems for Biard. Biencourt used the native tongue
to facilitate trade and foster alliances, but neither Biencourt nor his Indian allies
possessed the fluency to express abstract Christian ideas. “As soon as [he] begins to talk
about God he feels as Moses did—his mind bewildered, his throat dry, his tongue tied,”
Biard said of Biencourt. Rather than recognizing why Biencourt might not possess the
required vocabulary to preach religion, Biard instead inferred that “the savages have no
definite religion, magistracy or government, liberal or mechanical arts, commercial or
civil life.” He concluded that “all their conceptions are limited to sensible and material
things,” and, “there is nothing abstract, internal, spiritual or distinct ... they will name for
you a wolf, a fox, a squirrel, a moose ... but as to words expressing universal and generic
ideas, such as beast, animal, body, substance, and the like, these are altogether too
learned for them.” Conveying religious doctrine required abstract language such as
“fidelity, justice, mercy, gratitude, piety, and others,” rendering Biencourt wholly unable
to relate Biard’s faith to the Indians. Biard resigned himself, claiming that they “will
always remain in a perpetual infancy as to language and reason ... they are children.”\textsuperscript{60}

\textsuperscript{59} Biard, \textit{Missio Canadensis}, in JR 2:75.

\textsuperscript{60} Biard, “Lettre au R.P. Christophe Baltazar, 31 janvier, 1612” in JR 2:8-10, 19.
Since Biencourt was the only person at Port Royal who spoke enough of the native language to interpret, Biard was completely dependent upon him. For Biencourt, this was a convenient way to keep Biard under his control. This became apparent in the summer of 1611, when Biard accompanied Biencourt on a journey from the settlement to the St. John, St. Croix, Penobscot, and Kenebec Rivers. Biencourt undertook the voyage for two reasons: to scout the coast for any potential threats to Poutrincourt’s authority in New France—English or otherwise—and to obtain enough corn to supply the colony through winter. Biard had altogether different goals: to minister to Biencourt and his men and to “observe and to study” the Indians outside of Port Royal. But he also hoped to find a better interpreter—Indian or French—to help him educate Port Royal’s Indians. Biard and Biencourt clashed during the journey.\footnote{Ibid, 29-31.} Trouble began during the first part of the voyage, when Biencourt’s party visited a small group of French traders from St. Malo camped along the St. John and St. Croix “so that he might exact from [them] a tax Upon their Canadian traffic.”\footnote{Biard, \textit{Relatio Rerum Gestarum}, in \textit{JR} 2:227.} Among these French was Robert Pont Gravé, the young son of François Gravé, sieur du Pont.

Biencourt remembered Pont Gravé as an obstinate renegade who had challenged his father’s authority one year prior. In the summer of 1610, while Biard and Massé patiently waited at Bordeaux, several Indians traveled to Port Royal to complain that Pont Gravé had raped, kidnapped, and murdered one of their women. They begged Poutrincourt, with whom they had already established a trade alliance, to punish the man.
Poutrincourt charged Robin to try Pont Gravé. When called to testify, Pont Gravé allegedly stated that he “recognized sieur de Poutrincourt as a gentleman, but not as a judge, nor did he have the power to investigate him.” Robin, having no recourse but to send the trial to France, imprisoned Pont Gravé on board his ship. Days later, Pont Gravé, “evaded us and crossed the river,” escaping into the forest.\footnote{We only know this story through the exaggerated testimony of Poutrincourt written against the Jesuits in 1614. While much of this Factum is too vitriolic to take at its word, Biard confirmed that Pont Gravé escaped imprisonment from Poutrincourt in his Relation of 1616. Even as early as 1611 Biard vaguely stated that something transpired between Pont Gravé and Poutrincourt, but never indicated what. I am therefore inclined to believe that Pont Gravé was accused of rape, tried, and, unwilling to bend to Poutrincourt’s authority, had been imprisoned indefinitely before escaping. See Factum, in MNF 1:340-1; Biard, Relation of 1616, in JR 3:183-5; Biard, Relatio Rerum Gestarum, in JR 2:219; Biard, “Lettre au R.P. Christophe Baltazar, 10 juin 1611,” in JR 1:169.} He spent an entire year eluding Poutrincourt’s wrath.

Shortly after Biard and Massé arrived in New France, Biard had met Pont Gravé when he accompanied Poutrincourt on a brief voyage up the St. Croix to speak with the Etchemin Indians. Poutrincourt’s men came upon four ships at Pierre Blanche, a small Indian trading post. One of the ships hailed from St. Malo and belonged to Pont Gravé. While Poutrincourt conferred with the captains of each ship, Biard discovered Pont Gravé on shore, having passed “the entire year with the Savages, living just as they did.”\footnote{“Having been for some reason frightened away” from Port Royal, according to Biard.} After hearing Pont Grave’s testimony, he “begged sieur de Poutrincourt to have some consideration for the great merits of sieur du Pont, the father,” who served with Poutrincourt in 1606. Pont Gravé “was very much afraid of M. de Poutrincourt,” Biard recounted. Poutrincourt certainly remembered Pont Gravé’s earlier challenge to his authority, and took the opportunity to reinforce his status as Governor of Acadia, forcing
Pont Gravé and each captain present to recognize not only Poutrincourt as vice-roy, but Biencourt as vice-admiral. Afterward, Biard brokered an apology from Pont Gravé and “peace was declared.” Why did the Jesuit intercede for a man who defied authority and allegedly raped native women? Pont Gravé offered a rare opportunity for Biard: he had lived among the Indians for an entire year, and Biard was astounded by the young man’s “ability to speak their language.” When Biard approached Pont Gravé’s camp with Biencourt, he was probably excited to meet Pont Gravé again, perhaps hoping to enlist the young man who seemingly understood the Indians so well. “One hope remained” to convert Canada’s Indians, Biard later recalled, “in a young Frenchman, fluent in the native tongue …. This was Pontgravé.”

Despite the peace, Biencourt remained hostile to Pont Gravé and approached the camp with contempt. He was feeling paranoid and insecure. During the expedition, a meteor shower erupted in the night sky. “The red glow was so brilliant that the whole river was tinged and made luminous by it,” Biard exclaimed, and “there was not one of us who did not consider this meteoric display prophetic.” His Indian guides declared that war was imminent. The next morning, the group cautiously proceeded to the camp, but both Pont Gravé and his lieutenant, a man Biard called Captain Merveille, had left the area three days prior. Biencourt brought his men into the settlement, and secured it with several soldiers. That night, Merveille, unaware of the sentinels placed around his camp, returned. When Biencourt’s men ordered him to identify himself, Merveille, “thinking it

---

was one of his own people, answered mockingly, ‘But who goes there thyself?’ Biencourt’s guard did not appreciate the joke, and fired his musket. Although he missed the captain, “everything turned topsy-turvy; confusion, discord, rage, uproar reigned between our people and those of St. Malo.” The guards delivered Merveille to Biencourt. In Biard’s telling, one of Biencourt’s men noticed a loaded gun near the captive Merveille. “Oh, the traitor!” the man shouted, “He wanted to get hold of this carbine and have a few shots from it.” “In truth,” Biard noted, “M. de Biencourt’s goodness and prudence seemed much shaken by this tempest.”

As a young trader himself, Biencourt likely regarded Pont Gravé, who was operating independently, as a threat to his own ambitions—particularly if Pont Gravé strained French relations with Indians by kidnapping a native woman. Although Pont Gravé ostensibly took an oath to Poutrincourt and Biencourt before Poutrincourt left for France, Biencourt’s excursion to collect a tax from Pont Gravé appears to have been a power play, especially considering the proprietor’s treatment of Merveille. But as Biencourt observed the interaction between Pont Gravé and Biard, he increasingly feared a potential alliance between his rival and his missionary.

In all of his writings—both letters penned from Port Royal and his two accounts written after his return to France—Biard made clear his affinity for the young Pont Gravé. While the behavior of Biencourt’s men proved to Biard that “if fire and arms were once put into the hands of badly disciplined men, the masters have much to fear and

---

66 Biard, Relation of 1616, in JR 3:211.
68 Ibid, 27.
suffer from their own servants,” Merveille and his men “showed unusual piety.”
Eventually, Pont Gravé returned to the camp and, despite the tension, for “two days afterwards they confessed and took communion in a very exemplary manner.” Biard exclaimed, “For in truth, I love these honest people with all my heart.”69 He incorrectly believed that he had “succeeded in reconciling Biencourt to Pont Gravé,” and hoped that he “had acquired the greatest influence over them both.”70 Before Biencourt’s party left the Maloïin camp, Pont Gravé and Merveille “begged Father Biard to consent to remain with them.” Biard knew that this was impossible; after all, he feared Biencourt needed a clergyman on such a dangerous voyage, and he wanted to continue exploring the region to learn what he could about its people. He promised Pont Gravé that rather than remaining at Port Royal, he would return to winter with them so that he might compose a proper indigenous catechism. In the interim, he suggested that Pont Gravé learn as many words “which might correspond to those of our language and Religion.”71

While Biencourt considered the perceived threats to his authority from Pont Gravé and the Jesuit missionary, his men encountered a more tangible threat as they continued their survey: English explorers. Earlier that year, two English ships captured a French captain named Plâtrier along the Kenebec. They ransomed Plâtrier, and allowed his release upon the condition that the French give up their right to trade in the area, “[f]or the English want to be considered masters of it, and they produced letters from their King to this effect.” Biencourt knew that Henry IV had granted the lands

70 Biard, Relatio Rerum Gestarum, in JR 2:229.
71 Biard, Relation of 1616, in JR 3:217.
surrounding the Kenebec to Monts in 1604, but English adventurers continually scouted the area beginning in 1608. Fortunately for Biencourt, the Armouchiquois Indians, “afraid of such neighbors,” pushed them out each time. Biencourt fumed upon discovering the English claim, bringing his party to the island in order “to leave there some memento in assertion of [Poutrincourt’s] rights”—in this case, a cross.\(^{72}\)

As they prepared to return to Port Royal, Biencourt considered all that had transpired, and the inexperienced leader now understood how difficult it would be to establish his authority while independent French traders worked outside of his watch and English explorers consistently challenged French claims in Canada. In addition, he was unable to persuade any Indian leaders to provide him with food for the upcoming winter, which undermined his legitimacy among his own men. Feeling threatened on all sides, Biencourt recalled his distrust for the Society when Biard reminded Biencourt of his promise to Pont Gravé that Biard would winter with the Maloïn traders. It was already November, and Biard requested they stop at the Maloïn settlement on the return voyage. He “endeavored to persuade him and even begged him, to send him to Pontgravé from that place ... for the purpose of composing a Canadian catechism.” Although Biard argued that it “certainly made no difference to him” where he wintered, Biencourt refused. Using the same tactic he employed at Dieppe, he told the missionary that unless Biard agreed to feed until spring all of the men who brought him to Pont Gravé’s settlement, he could not go. This time, Biard could not produce the money, and “he was

\(^{72}\) The following year, the English ship piloted by Argyll took its revenge, destroying Biencourt’s monument.
disappointed of the opportunity of learning the language of the natives, and was compelled to lead an almost inactive existence in the fort, to his great vexation.”

“The snow began on the 26th of November,” Biard wrote in his 1616 Relation. That winter might not have been particularly severe to those accustomed to Canadian weather, but the onset of colder temperatures was enough to cause Fr. Biard alarm. “The provisions were already almost exhausted,” the missionary noted, adding that “no tidings were received from France; and what aid they might have obtained by hunting was cut off by the deep snow that covered the ground.” For months, they endured a strict decrease in rations, difficult weather, and little contact with the Indians, “except rarely some of Membertou’s family.” Biard reflected that the greatest hardship was simply the knowledge that Canadian winters lasted for many months, and their lifestyle would not improve until the weather did. In truth, we know very little about how Biard, Massé, Biencourt, and the other settlers passed their time that winter. On January 24, 1612, the ship carrying provisions finally arrived. It should have been cause for celebration among the starving colonists, but as the weather grew colder, so had the relationship between Biard and Biencourt. The ship carried more than supplies: Guercheville sent Jesuit brother Gilbert du Thet with money and equipment specifically for the mission, and

---

73 Biard, Relation of 1616, in JR 3:227; Biard, Relatio Rerum Gestarum, in JR 2:229-30.
74 Biard, Relation of 1616, in JR 3:227-9; Biard, Relatio Rerum Gestarum, in JR 2:231.
Poutrincourt, wary of Guercheville and the Jesuits, sent his own liaison, Simon Imbert. Thet and Imbert quarreled about the colony’s finances, each accusing the other of mismanagement. The argument spun out of control, exposing Biencourt’s Gallican fears of Jesuit treachery and dooming Port Royal’s mission to failure.

After leaving Port Royal to gather supplies and secure a trade agreement with Parisian hatters, Poutrincourt found his estate was “greatly exhausted” after years of “ruinous voyages,” and he desperately sought new investors for his enterprise.75 He “searched on all sides for ways and means of being able to help his people,” Biard recounted, “who he knew could not continue long without reinforcements and fresh food.”76 After discovering that Guercheville “had already procured some donations for the Jesuits,” Poutrincourt approached her, hoping that “she might readily favor this good work.” She offered to formally enter into the financial partnership with Poutrincourt’s other investors. Still wary of her intentions, Poutrincourt stipulated that all of the “Seigneuries, Capes, Harbors, and Provinces” that he had acquired in New France still belonged to him. At this moment, Guercheville saw an opportunity to advance her own cause and requested that he produce the title to the lands he claimed to possess. Poutrincourt objected, telling her that he left his deeds in New France. Suspicious of Poutrincourt, Guercheville met with Monts, who had granted the lands to Poutrincourt in 1607. After some negotiations, she arranged that Monts “should give up to her all rights, claims and pretensions that he had, and ever had had, in new France, based upon the deed

75 Lescarbot, Histoire, 57.
76 Biard, Relation of 1616 in JR 3:231.
of gift made to him by the late Henry the Great.” Louis XIII, now reigning monarch, signed a deed granting Guercheville “all the lands, ports, and harbors of New France from the great river to Florida, with the sole exception of Port Royal.” Years later, Biard triumphantly wrote of Poutrincourt, “in this way he, who was thought to be so shrewd, found himself, against his choice, locked up and confined as in a prison within his Port Royal; because, in truth, he has not and never has had, other lands, Capes, or harbors, Islands or continent, except Port Royal and its coasts.”

The Society sent Thet to Acadia to help Biard and Massé, and Guercheville, “fearing her money might be wrecked before it had embarked upon the sea,” entrusted her finances to him so “he might use it in the purchase of food, merchandise, and freight.” Poutrincourt, hoping to maintain control of the situation, sent Imbert, a Parisian inn-keeper hoping to make some money, as his agent. Imbert faced his own financial troubles, and sought “in the woods of New France something with which to pay his creditors.” When the ship, piloted by Nicolas l’Abbé, arrived at Port Royal, the settlers rejoiced, believing that their long, difficult winter might finally end. “But this joy did not last long,” wrote Biard, “sieur Biencourt being ill at ease on account of the news brought by Simon Imbert about the partnership formed with the Marquise de Guercheville.”

To Biencourt, Guercheville’s acquisition proved the Jesuits to be usurpers of his father’s authority, validating his fears of a possible alliance between Biard and Pont Gravé.

---

77 Biard, Relation of 1616 in JR 3 3:231-5. In his Histoire, Lescarbot scorned Biard’s joyful 1616 description of Poutrincourt’s situation, sarcastically lamenting it as “a goodly recompense indeed for so many losses and labours!” He then added, in Poutrincourt’s defense, that Biard forgot to mention that “said title-deeds declare that the King gives to said gentleman ‘Port Royal and the adjacent lands, as far and as wide as they may extend.’ So that if he has the requisite force he will soon have all,” 57-8.

“The Jesuit Fathers are very haughty men who want to subject us under their yoke,” Biencourt wrote to his father, “they have been trying every trick that they can think of to make me discouraged.” He complained that the Jesuits bragged to the settlement that the Society, not Poutrincourt, was responsible for providing them with food, and “they keep on saying that my men are their servants and that they themselves are their masters and consequently, that everything belongs to them,” even putting Biencourt “in the ranks of their servants.” He expressed rage at Biard’s unwillingness to baptize Indians without first instructing them, accusing the missionaries of intentionally withholding the sacrament to undermine Fléché’s, and by extension Poutrincourt’s, successes.79

Imbert fed Biencourt’s fury, using popular Gallican stereotypes about the Jesuits to confirm Biencourt’s greatest fears. Thet confided in Biard that he had allowed Poutrincourt to take an unsecured loan from Guercheville’s funds. Moreover, Poutrincourt had charged Imbert with the ship’s embarkation, but Imbert kept scant records of what cargo boarded the ship, nor did he differentiate what belonged to Guercheville and the Jesuits from Poutrincourt’s contributions. Imbert appropriated Guercheville’s cargo for himself and sold much of it at Dieppe. Since Thet held no records of Poutrincourt’s loan nor of Guercheville’s cargo, he could not prove Imbert’s guilt. Biard hoped Biencourt would preside over a formal investigation. Instead, Biencourt “reported the whole affair to Simon Imbert, adding that the Jesuit lay brother

79 Biencourt, “Charles de Biencourt à Jean de Poutrincourt, Port-Royal, 13 mars 1612,” in MNF 1:251; we have this letter because Poutrincourt submitted it as evidence in his Factum, in MNF 1:372-5.
had accused him.”

Imbert lashed out, telling Biencourt that the partnership with Guercheville “was a means invented by the Jesuits to drive [Poutrincourt] out of his broad seigneuries of Canada.” In addition, Imbert accused Thet in front of the entire settlement of “many words spoken on shipboard ... which had a very ill-sounding and unpatriotic ring.” During the voyage, Imbert claimed, Thet boasted “that France would never surrender except to the Spaniard.” More damningly, he alleged that the Jesuit brother confided in him that they had orchestrated the assassination of Henry IV. As evidence, Imbert submitted a copy of the infamous *l’Anticoton*, which he brought with him from France.

The Jesuits finally had enough of Biencourt’s obstructions, and the new accusations sent Biard into a rage. Biard called the ship’s captain, Nicholas Abbé, to testify in front of Biard that Thet had not made the statements Imbert claimed. To save face, Imbert admitted that he was intoxicated when he accused the Jesuit brother. Biencourt ignored Imbert’s confession, instead asking him to sign a written testimony against Thet, which he intended to send along with Imbert to his father in Paris. Biencourt forbade Thet entry to the ship, ordering him to remain under his jurisdiction at Port Royal. Having spent most of his life with the Society during the Wars of Religion

81 Ibid, 241-3.
83 Biard made no mention of this in any of his accounts, preferring to make vague claims against Imbert. After Biard’s death in 1622, Massé began to revise the *Relation of 1616* to fill in details that the Society’s censor removed before its publication. To Biard’s account, Massé added that Imbert “had not forgotten to bring with him *l’Anticoton*.” The history of censorship, anti-Jesuit politics, and the *Relation of 1616* will be one of the topics discussed in chapter three.
and the Gallican crisis, Biard knew that Imbert’s testimony would have farther-reaching consequences if allowed to spread throughout Paris. He approached Abbé, adamant that he overrule Biencourt and take Thet to France to defend himself: “There will be obvious danger of discredit to our Society, if no one is sent to remedy this situation,” he pleaded.84 Stuck in the middle of the feud, Abbé maintained Biencourt’s decree and the Jesuits remained detained at Port Royal. Desperate, Biard and Massé secretly boarded the ship, “with the intention of going back to France without my knowledge, leave, or permission,” Biencourt told his father. “Fearing that there might be some conspiracy between them and the said Abbé,” he added, echoing his earlier fears about Jesuit conspiracies, “I detained the captain on shore until he had them returned to the place where they had been picked up by his ship.”85

Biencourt ordered Louis Hébert, his apothecary, and several of his men to order Biard to disembark, granting them permission to use force if necessary. In a statement signed by over ten witnesses, Hébert claimed that Biard “replied that he did not recognize de Biencourt to be anything but a thief and that he will do nothing of the kind; moreover that he will dismember him piece by piece, and will excommunicate anyone who touched him, along with a few more atrocious words.”86 Afterward, Biard wrote an official warning to both Biencourt and Abbé, arguing that the Jesuits had never been under

86 Louis Hébert, “Procès-verbal du sieur Hébert contre le P. Biard, 13 mars 1612,” in MNF 1:378-9; according to the laws of the Church, Biard was within his rights to excommunicate anyone who attempted violence—even forced removal—of a Catholic priest. Gallecians did not believe that priests held this power (particularly Jesuits, who had in principle ceded it in order to remain in France), and Biencourt likely would not have recognized such an excommunication. For a more complete overview of excommunication, see Campeau’s footnote 163 in MNF 1:366.
Biencourt’s jurisdiction for several reasons. First, not only was their purpose in New France different, it was more important. He reminded them that Poutrincourt only obtained the right to settle Port Royal under the condition that the Jesuits be allowed to evangelize there, indicating to Biard that their mission superseded the economic needs of the colony. Second, the decrees of Henry IV, Marie de Medici, and Louis XIII all granted the Jesuits freedom of movement; preventing their departure directly violated royal decree. Third, the Jesuits owed nothing to Biencourt for they did “not hold any land or dwelling in fief,” but had paid for everything themselves. If anything, Biard claimed, Biencourt actually owed the Jesuits money, as Biencourt never paid the Jesuits a return on their investment per the contract signed at Dieppe. Fourth, Biard warned Biencourt and Abbé that Madame de Guercheville held far more power than either Poutrincourt or the captain and that she would surely hold them accountable for their actions. Finally, Biard protested that Thet must be allowed to defend himself against Imbert’s charges and that Imbert, who manipulated Guercheville’s finances once already, required oversight during the return voyage.87

Biencourt ordered his men to ignore Biard’s threats, commanding one of the settlers, Jean Pointel, to remove the priests from the ship. When Pointel broke down the door to their cabin, Biard immediately excommunicated him, but Massé, perhaps grasping the futile deadlock the two missionaries put themselves in, agreed to meet with

87 Of these fears, Campeau believed that the latter was the root of the problem: the reason Biencourt did not want the Jesuits to leave the colony was because if Biard knew that Biencourt was stealing from the Society, the Jesuit would certainly report him. This is probably true in the short term, but Campeau’s explanation ignores the broader context from which Biencourt’s fears stemmed. See footnote 181 in MNF 1:371.
Biencourt while Biard remained on board the ship. During the meeting, Biencourt asked Massé why the Jesuits had attempted to escape Canada. According to Biencourt, Massé replied that he did not recognize Biencourt as commander of New France and that “he [Massé] had more authority from the King than I had in this country; he added that he was excommunicating me and was lodging a complaint about the wrongs that had been perpetrated on himself and his companion, Fr. Biard.” While Massé’s answer merely echoed what Biard had already written, his concurrence certainly validated all of the fears Biencourt had held about the Jesuits’ motives since they first met at Dieppe. Biencourt arrested Massé and continued to send men to remove Biard from Abbé’s ship while Biard continued to excommunicate anyone who touched him.88

After several attempted removals, Biard told the ship’s master, Jean Biorel, that he would voluntarily disembark with him as long as it was not at the command of Biencourt or his men. Biard “appeared before me in a furious state,” Biencourt reported, and “ordered me to free the said Abbé,” who Biencourt refused to let sail for France with Jesuits on board. After Biencourt released Abbé, Biard “asked me [Biencourt] whether or not he had permission to go to the ship or to wherever he wanted. I told him to go and get some rest, because he was distraught, and that is what he did.” Biencourt, Biard, Massé, Abbé, and the others, worn out from the ordeal, retired to their cabins. Biencourt ordered Abbé not to visit the Jesuits alone or deliver their letters, and the Jesuits refused to say Mass in front of the excommunicated. Although he allowed Thet to return to France, Biencourt kept both Biard and Massé under house arrest “until the King, their Provincial

or General orders me to send them back.” He speculated that “they could have engaged in some play aboard the said ship to take them where they wished,” and warned his father “to make known these Jesuit machinations and to avoid them yourself as much as possible.”

The Jesuits in the English Atlantic

“Reconciliation was effected afterward, and everything calmed down,” Biard later recounted. The two missionaries tried to continue their ministry. Massé “began his novitiate in this Nomadic life,” following Louis Membertou to live among the Indians while Biard stayed at Port Royal to learn the native tongue from one of the Indians. As autumn approached, Biard even accompanied Biencourt on another voyage, hoping to hear word of Massé. When the ship bearing supplies from Poutrincourt failed to arrive, the settlers feared they might not survive the upcoming winter. Considering the dire circumstances, Biard and Massé turned from their evangelical efforts to help construct several small boats so that the settlers could “go for acorns, shells, roots, or fish … for the roads in that country are the rivers and the sea.” As winter wore on, the settlers—

89 Ibid.

90 Here we learn of the distrust the Jesuits had for the Indians. While with Membertou, Massé fell ill. Membertou approached him privately, asking Massé—who Membertou feared was near death—to write a letter to Biencourt verifying that the Indians had not killed him. “I shall take care not to do that,” Massé responded, “for possibly after I had written this letter, thou wouldst kill me.” “Well then,” Membertou replied, “pray Jesus that thou mayest not die.” “Indeed, I am doing so, do not fear, I shall not die,” said Massé. See Biard, Relation of 1616, in JR, 3:245-7.

91 The settlers apparently found the image of the Jesuit shipbuilders to be hilarious: “When they began to carry out this plan of constructing a boat they were both laughed at,” Biard remembered. “Father
including Biencourt—dispersed, seeking food, refuge, or whatever aid they might find. A French ship finally arrived in May, but instead of carrying supplies from Poutrincourt, it bore the coat of arms of Madame de Guercheville.

When Imbert and Thet returned to France with their respective reports, Guercheville feared the worst. She immediately broke off her partnership with Poutrincourt, and, with title to the rest of Monts’s lands in Canada, outfitted a new voyage to establish her own colony. Under the command of Captain René le Coq de la Saussaye, Guercheville envisioned an agricultural settlement designed to cater to a Jesuit mission. Believing Biard and Massé to be dead, she persuaded Coton to send Thet and Fr. Jacques Quentin to replace them, ordering the two Jesuits promptly to return to France in the event that Biard and Massé had survived both Biencourt’s fury and the Canadian winter. When Saussaye reached Port Royal, he found only five French there: among these were Biard, Massé, one of their servants, and Hébert, who Biencourt had left in charge of the settlement. Saussaye presented a royal order commanding Biencourt to release his two Jesuit prisoners. Hébert obeyed, “so the Jesuits took away their property in great pace.” They intended to settle near the Penobscot River, but a storm blew them off course and they eventually landed on the opposite shore from Mount Desert Island, just north of their destination. They planted a cross, naming the “large and beautiful port” that stretched before them Saint Sauveur. Persuaded by local Indians whom Biard had met two years prior, they decided to remain there. The new settlers immediately broke into

Enemond can do anything… But of what use will Father Biard be in such work?” one colonist asked. “Dost thou not know,” another retorted, “that when the boat is done he will give his blessing?” See Biard, Relation of 1616, in JR 3:255.
factions, with some wanting to begin planting while others felt it more important to build
houses and construct a fort. “From these disputes sprang others,” a frustrated Biard
reported, “until the English brought us all to an understanding with each other.”

For several years, English fishermen from Virginia had traveled north to fish for
cod. In 1613, only one month after Saussaye’s group reached Saint Sauveur, a storm
knocked an English fishing vessel captained by Samuel Argyll farther north than it
intended to go. Unsure of where they landed, Argyll’s crew hailed a group of Indians
near the shore. Believing the fishermen to be French, the Indians gestured to the English
that a French ship docked nearby. The English pressed the Indians for more information
and then returned to their ship to surprise the settlers at Saint Sauveur. Most of the French
crew busied themselves on shore; when the English ship appeared, the few men on board
the French ship did not have time to prepare for battle. The English artillery fire killed
Gilbert du Thet and wounded several French, making it easy for English sailors to board
and seize the ship.

England and France were not at war in 1613, and Argyll knew that he acted
illegally. When his men reached the shore, they demanded that the French show Argyll
their royal commission, lest he consider them pirates. Saussaye, however, had ventured
away from the settlement before the attack, giving Argyll’s men a chance to pick the
locks on his trunk and remove his papers. When Saussaye returned the next day, he failed
to produce the king’s license. “You give us to understand that you have a commission

93 That was Biard’s explanation, at least. There is no evidence to say otherwise, but it is impossible to
deduce the motive of the Indians who guided the English.
from your King, and you cannot produce evidence of it,” Argyll accused. “You are Outlaws and Pirates, every one of you, and merit death.” They captured the French ship, the colonists’ supplies and belongings, and took those who had not fled as their prisoners.94

The encounter split the French at Saint Sauveur into three groups. According to Biard’s estimate, roughly 15 had escaped into the woods. This group’s leader, a Calvinist who Biard referred to only as “the Pilot,” approached Biard under cover of night, asking him for advice. Argyll’s men actively hunted this group, so Biard recommended that they flee. After negotiations with the remaining settlers, Argyll permitted them to keep one of their small boats and “go where God directed.”95 The boat, captained by Saussaye, only seated fifteen men, so Argyll cautioned them to choose wisely: the remaining group would return to Jamestown as prisoners. Several among the French actually volunteered to go to Virginia, hoping to find there the prosperity that they originally sought in the New World. The Jesuits also volunteered their seats, but decided it was prudent to send one Jesuit to minister to the men and then give an account to the Superior. Biard chose Massé, “whom they favored the most,” leaving Quentin and himself at the mercy of the English. After departing Saint Sauveur, Saussaye and Massé reconnoitered with the Pilot and his group of sailors, sailed back to the Bay of Fundy, obtained provisions from local Indians and pillaged a salt storehouse Biencourt had erected. Adequately supplied, they

94 Biard, Relation of 1616, in JR 3:273-81, 4:7-9, 11-3. The English recognized the missionaries to be priests, but not Jesuits. Biard approached Argyll with the truth, gambling that the Jesuit reputation as missionaries to foreign nations would convince him of Saussaye’s innocence. “I am very much astonished at you Jesuits, being here in the company of pirates,” Argyll responded.

95 Biard, Relation of 1616, in JR 4:13-5, 17, 21.
found Louis Membertou, who welcomed his friend Massé and brought the French refugees to Pont Gravé. Safely aboard two French trading ships, Massé, Saussaye, and the other French settlers safely returned to St. Malo. “You may imagine their joy in recalling to memory the dangers from which they had escaped,” Biard later speculated, adding “Father Enemond Massé and the whole company greatly praised the kindness and welcome they received in the city of Saint Malo, from my Lord the Bishop, from the Governor, the Magistrates, Merchants, and all the citizens in general.”

As prisoners of the English, Biard and Quentin faced no such greeting when Argyll’s ship arrived at Jamestown. Argyll promised Biard that despite English intolerance of Jesuits, Thomas Dale, the Marshall of Virginia, served as a soldier and pensioner for Henry IV, and would therefore treat the priests well. But “this charming Marshal,” when he learned that French Jesuits landed in the colony, “talked about nothing but ropes and gallows.” Argyll protested that he had promised to deliver the Jesuits to safety, but when Dale refused to reconsider, Argyll produced the commission stolen from Saussaye, unmasking his deception. Fortunately for the Jesuits, after “seeing these warrants of his most Christian Majesty, and the determination of the Captain,” Dale relented, sparing Biard and Quentin. He convened a council of Virginia’s leaders and decided that Argyll should return to New France to destroy all of the French settlements there, recapture Saussaye, and plant crosses bearing the name of James I, King of England. With Biard and Quentin as potential navigators, Dale believed that Argyll

---

would have no problem locating the various French fortifications. They went first to Saint Sauveur, expecting that Saussaye had returned. Finding it deserted, they planted a cross and moved to Mont’s original settlement at Saint Croix, despite Biard’s refusal to navigate them. Using an Indian guide, Argyll’s three ships headed for Port Royal.98

Deserted of all settlers, Port Royal was an easy target for Argyll’s men, who plundered it of whatever possessions the French had left behind. Despite the rapid conquest of Poutrincourt’s colony, bad weather forced the English ships to remain anchored there for four days. During their layover Biard twice found himself in danger. First, several of the English became annoyed with the Jesuit. William Turnell, Argyll’s lieutenant, was already irritated with Biard. During the voyage, the priest convinced him that the journey to Port Royal would not render enough booty to make their efforts worthwhile—particularly since winter approached. When Turnell acted on Biard’s advice and suggested to Argyll that they return to Virginia, Argyll reprimanded him for taking counsel from a Jesuit by reducing his share of the plunder. “The Lieutenant was very angry,” Biard regretted, “as he had always had the reputation of being a man of intelligence and good judgment, which he had now forfeited.” As the ship sat in the harbor, one of the English crewmen—a Puritan—saw an opportunity to injure the Society that he detested. Feeding off of popular stereotypes of Jesuits, he suggested that Biard’s refusal to guide them to Port Royal proved that he could not be trusted. He proposed to

98 Biard constantly confirmed that he refused to lead the English. It is possible that Argyll used an Indian guide, but equally plausible that Biard invented the Indian as a defense against the later accusations of Poutrincourt. See Biard, Relation of 1616, in JR 4:33-9.
Turnell that they leave Biard on shore for deceiving the crew and undermining Turnell’s authority. Fortunately for Biard, Argyll excused the missionary. ⁹⁹

The more dangerous attack on Biard, however, came not from the English, but the French. When Biencourt emerged from the woods to find Biard with the English party, he accused Biard of Spanish allegiances. This strategy made sense; England had only negotiated peace with Spain in 1604. Furthermore, English Protestants hated Jesuits for the same reason that many Frenchmen did, particularly because many members of the Society had so closely allied themselves with the pro-Spanish Catholic League against England decades earlier. Having already established Biard’s dangerous ties to Spain, Biencourt conferred privately with Argyll, recounting the many challenges he believed Biard had posed to his authority at Port Royal and suggesting Biard be left on shore to survive the winter alone. Although initially unconvinced by Biencourt, written testimony signed by Biencourt’s men convinced Argyll of Biard’s guilt. Argyll promised to return the priest to Jamestown where Dale would certainly order the Jesuit’s execution. Biard lamented that Lieutenant Turnell, who commanded the ship carrying Biard and Quentin, had once “openly shown his esteem and love for him,” but “having seen the testimony in writing of so many Frenchmen, who assured him that he was a native Spaniard, and a wicked man,” now “only looked upon Father Biard as an abominable rascal: he hated him still more.” Given the change in attitude among his English captors, Biard surely feared the fate that awaited him at Jamestown.

⁹⁹ Biard, Relation of 1616, in JR 4:39-41.
Argyll safely arrived in Virginia to recount details of the voyage to an angry Thomas Dale, but Turnell’s ship, carried by “so fearful a tempest,” never reached its destination. The storm lasted three weeks, and Turnell, fearing they might run out of fresh water before reaching Virginia, instead headed for the Portuguese Azores. As they approached, the English crew “began to reflect that they were lost if priests and Jesuits appeared,” worrying that the Catholic Portuguese would free the Jesuits and punish them as “persecutors of priests.” Some suggested throwing Biard and Quentin into the sea, but Turnell instead called Biard into his quarters to negotiate. Biard knew that his life might now be spared, and he told Turnell that he found putting the lives of sixteen men in danger to be a “greater peril.” Some of the more sympathetic English crewmen had suggested hiding the priests, and Biard agreed that if Turnell opted to do so, that he and Quentin would not betray him. Turnell, who had once urged that Biard be sentenced to death, now relied on his cooperation in order to survive. He questioned the Jesuit at length: “Father Biard,” he began, “it is strange that your countrymen from Port Royal should accuse you thus.” Biard pointed out that despite Biencourt’s slander, the priest had never retaliated in front of their common English enemy. Turnell acknowledged Biard’s unwillingness to vilify Biencourt, but “persuaded by the false charges of the French at Port Royal,” he believed Biard to be Spanish, and “the great good you desire for the French is not on account of the love you bear them, but on account of your hatred of the English.” Biard protested, but Turnell refused to believe one Jesuit against six French settlers who ostensibly had no reason to accuse one of their own in front of an enemy. Yet Turnell surprised Biard when, after weighing his options, he promised to allow the Jesuits safe passage to France if they remained concealed below the ship’s deck. “With
what idea did God inspire him, to make him believe me?” Biard wondered, answering, “I know not, truly.”

English apprehensions about landing in the Azores proved well founded. Weeks earlier, a French pirate raided one of the Portuguese ports, heightening security around the islands. Turnell approached the island too quickly and collided with a Spanish sugar ship. Fearing English pirates, the Spanish crew mobilized their arms, spreading alarm through the port. Turnell surrendered, apologized for the incident, and protested his innocence. The Spanish, however, took him captive and brought him on shore so that their crew could search his ship, a prospect that likely terrified the English captain who believed that he illegally held a Spanish captive. The Jesuits did not betray their captor, playing “hide and seek, from top to bottom, from dungeon to hold, always finding some new hiding place,” at one point holding their breaths in order to remain concealed. The Spanish boarding party never discovered the Jesuits, and later apologized to Turnell for holding him captive. When he returned to his ship, Turnell “praised the Fathers for this their fidelity.” After three weeks stationed at the Azores, Turnell, who had little money left, decided that he could not afford to return to Virginia and directed his ship instead toward England. As a reward for their loyalty, he reiterated his promise to allow the Jesuits safe passage to France.

---


101 “For if they even breathed a little loud, or moved hand or foot, they would have been discovered,” Biard, Relation of 1616, in JR 4:63.

102 Ibid, 61-5; Biard, Relatio Rerum Gestarum, in JR 3:269.
Another storm brought the ship to Pembroke, in Wales. Since Turnell had no commission and captained one of Saussaye’s French-built ships, city officials arrested him as a pirate. Maybe this was a fair claim. After all, he and Argyll duplicitously captured Saint Sauveur and its settlers, destroyed St. Croix and Port Royal, and carried French captives despite the peace that existed between England and France. But to prove his innocence, Turnell recounted the story of his separation from Argyll, but the city Magistrate doubted him, forcing the captain “to produce, as witnesses of his honesty, the two Jesuits whom he had in his ship.” Brought before the Court, the Jesuits again declined the opportunity to retaliate against their English captors, and verified Turnell’s account. Instead of accusing Turnell of complicity in destroying French settlements, Biard believed that matter “reserved for the King.”

While the Court waited for a judgment from London, the Jesuits remained at Pembroke where, to Biard’s surprise, the population took great interest in the Jesuits as curiosities. Instead of sleeping on the ship, the Mayor lodged the two in his home, where Biard received several guests. One of the Lords of the Council arranged a disputation between Biard, Quentin, and several Anglican ministers, including an Archdeacon. Biard, whose training near Geneva caused him to equate Protestantism with Calvinism, expressed astonishment at the similarities between Anglicans and Catholics. One of these similarities likely resonated with the Jesuit who had lived through France’s religious wars: Anglicans also faced “those who condemn [their rituals], as the Calvinists of France and Scotland do, and call them damnable superstitions, and inventions of the
Antichrist.” This group, which “the English called Puritans … are detested by Anglicans] as abominable plagues.”

Nine months after their capture by Argyll at Saint Sauveur, the French ambassador to England arranged for their release, and they arrived at the college of Amiens in May of 1614. During their tumultuous three-year journey, Biard, Massé, Thet, and Quentin encountered a wide range of obstructions that stemmed not from North American circumstances but from European anti-Jesuit stereotypes: Gallican pamphleteers depicted the Jesuits as regicidal usurpers, Protestants feared the Society’s intentions, rumors circulated of international intrigue between the Society and Spain. The surviving Jesuits’ ordeal did not end with their safe repatriation to France, as Poutrincourt, livid that he lost the colony he had dedicated nearly a decade to building, went on the offensive. In 1614, he published his own pamphlet against the Jesuits, blaming the priests for Port Royal’s collapse while using Biard and Massé as examples of more general Jesuit treachery. Biard returned to Lyon to help combat the encroachment of Calvinism from Geneva, engaging in disputations and publishing a defense of papal authority while simultaneously striking back at Poutrincourt’s claims. Massé became a professor at the college de La Flèche, where he used his experience at Canada’s first mission to prepare the next generation of missionaries bound for New France not only to evangelize America’s Indians, but also to overcome the anti-Jesuit sentiments they would encounter when the Society returned in 1632.

103 Biard, Relation of 1616, in JR 4:71-3.
“Historians who have attempted to explain the unpleasant relationship that existed between the Jesuits and the Biencours at Port Royal have had a difficult task,” wrote historian Lucien Campeau in 1967. Campeau compiled the first edition of Monumenta Novae Franciae, a nine-volume series designed to assemble and publish all known archival sources pertaining to the Jesuit missions in Canada. Himself a Jesuit, Campeau collected and annotated hundreds of sources relating to the Port Royal mission in his first volume, including Poutrincourt’s testimony against the Jesuits, Factum du procès entre Jean de Biencourt et les PP. Biard et Massé, and Massé’s annotated version of Biard’s Relation of 1616.1 In the Monumenta’s introduction, he sought to explain the breakdown of relations between the Jesuits and their proprietors. “We can obviously disregard writers who are manifestly biased,” he began, correctly pointing out that generations of

1 Poutrincourt, Factum du procès entre Messie Jean de Biencourt Chevalier sieur de Poutrincourt, Baron de S. Iust, appellant d’une part, Et Pierre Biard, Euemond Massé & consorts, soy disans Prestres de la Société de Jesus, intímez. The Factum was written and published anonymously, but the content matches other sentiments harbored by Poutrincourt, and no one else would have had either enough motive or knowledge of the situation. Because it makes references to legal and classical texts and resembles his writing style, Lescarbot possibly edited the document. However, even though Lescarbot opposed the Jesuits’ activity in New France in his 1618 Histoire, the piece is uncharacteristically hostile for him, and Lescarbot was in Switzerland when it was published. It is possible that Lescarbot’s friend Nicolas Desnoyers, an avocat in the anti-Jesuit parlement of Paris, might have helped Poutrincourt instead. For details, see Campeau’s preface to the document in MNF 1:321; Biard, Relation of 1616, in JR 3:19-281; 4:5-169. Massé’s annotations are in MNF, vol. 1, doc. 162.
anti-Jesuit authors “found in the documents stemming from the seigneurs of Port Royal … all that was needed to satisfy their activity as hostile pamphleteers.” Instead, Campeau thought his readers “surely expect to be offered an objective and fair-minded account.”

Given the magnitude of his research, Campeau’s introduction provides a surprisingly unsatisfying explanation. “If we place, side by side, the things written by Poutrincourt or at his behest, we have the inescapable impression that he was really obsessed with animosity toward the Jesuits,” wrote Campeau. “This obsession of his was one of long standing,” he added, describing Poutrincourt’s early distaste for Coton and deliberate attempts to exclude Paris’s provincial from influencing his enterprise. Campeau was correct, and Poutrincourt clearly distrusted the Society, but Campeau’s explanation of why Poutrincourt hated the Society falls somewhat short. “The failure of the mission was caused above all by the disagreement between the Biencourts and the Jesuits; it was important to study the main sources of the disagreement,” specifically those pertaining to two problems: “economic relations” and “the psychology of the antagonists.” In the Monumenta, Campeau concluded “It is probably difficult to find any historical documentation which furnishes more signs of psychological disorders than that of the Biencourts. Self-deceptions, blunders, suspicions, excessive flights of imagination, all these defects abound in the Factum. In the Spring of 1612, subsequent to the embarrassment into which l’Abbé’s return to France had plunged him, Poutrincourt became [mentally] ill.” “The two Biencourts,” he added, “given their state of mind, were

---

2 Campeau, 223*.
3 His archival work is truly overwhelming, and this entire study would have taken decades without his research.
scarcely capable of objectivity ... it was impossible for them to understand and appreciate the most obvious and simplest reasoning." Having established his psychoanalytical explanation, he moved into his narrative, beginning “Let us move on to the practical difficulties which the Biencours’ psychological state caused the missionaries.”

Obsessed with constructing a factual narrative that filtered out biases rather than an interpretive explanation, Campeau thereby dismissed anything written by Poutrincourt or Biencourt to formulate his story, and relied instead solely upon Biard, the Jesuits’ “principle spokesman.” While Poutrincourt and his son represented to Campeau the best historical example of a psychological disorder, Campeau’s treatment of Biard was at times hagiographic. “The Jesuit, who had received an excellent intellectual training ... seems to have had austerity and zeal as his dominant characteristics.” “As far as we know,” he added, “he was a man with an extremely intense temperament,” who “took

4 Campeau, 229*-38*. Unfortunately, this means his piece is openly hostile to Poutrincourt and Biencourt and apologetic to the Jesuits. Although he gives examples of incidents that he believes might show evidence of psychosis, he relies on one line to concretely make the case: “The extant text of the Factum contains, on this point, a textual deletion (at the parenthesis) that seems to be quite important. It reads: ‘Even though he was filled with annoyance when he saw that his work, his property, and his honor were rendered useless by the calumny of those people he had trusted (...) after the sickness of the said sieur, the Jesuits …”. Some seriously imprudent expression in the manuscript must certainly have been deleted, since the sentence remained incomplete and unintelligible.” There is no way to confirm or deny this claim, however, Campeau attributed mental disorder to both father and son. This fact seemingly contradicts his main piece of evidence, which applies only to Poutrincourt. Although Poutrincourt bears responsibility for the Factum, even Campeau acknowledged the essential influence of Biencourt: “we must mention, in defense of Biencourt senior, that the reports he received from his son ... were very capable of nourishing his obsession. The young man had the same prejudices as his father, and he was also influenced by the collective ... who in turn stirred him up against the Jesuits ... Furthermore, was it not the young Biencourt who made Argyll believe that Biard was a Spanish spy capable of subversive activity and urged the English to abandon the priest on some deserted shore?”

himself very seriously”, “was not naturally inclined to be concerned about the opinions of others,” but “had a very demanding awareness of his duty to which he brutally sacrificed his own person.” Despite those strengths, Campeau’s Biard did have some flaws: he might have benefitted from a friendlier disposition, and “even though he managed to suppress his impatience for long periods of time, as is frequently the way with introverted personalities, he occasionally erupted with excessive violence.” “This brought him some painful humiliations,” said Campeau, “but he bore them with great strength of soul.” Despite his lack of experience in business, he “had a keen sense of observation and lucidity which compensated for the defects of his aristocratic education.” Perhaps most importantly, “There is no indication that these character-defects in any way affected the truthfulness of this man. In Biard, indications are that integrity was enhanced by his passionate search for religious perfection.”

The story of Port Royal’s aftermath is a tale of conflicting testimonies, with Poutrincourt and Biencourt on one side and the Jesuits, primarily Biard, on the other, and we might never know exactly how events unfolded. Campeau’s explanation—the only detailed modern account of the mission—privileged the testimony of one party while completely dismissing the other. In truth, Poutrincourt’s account is too biased to use in formulating an objective story. But while the Factum might not provide an accurate

6 Campeau, 223*-4*. In his biographical supplement, he also conjectured that Biard suffered from depression, 662-3.

7 Campeau argued that the Factum did serve one important purpose: it legitimated Biard’s 1616 account. “For it was when the Jesuits had lost any usefulness to him that he foolishly allowed Lescarbot to publish Biencourt’s contract with the Jesuits and then to allow publication of the Factum. Above all, his problem was a kind of stupidity or lack of self-serving foresight, for without the contract and the Factum, what means would we have to verify and confirm Biard’s version of events in the face of Lescarbot’s adverse testimony?”, 229*.
narrative of Port Royal’s collapse, it does confirm the nature of Poutrincourt’s anti-Jesuit sentiments, and, by extension, the ultimate source of the Port Royal dispute. Given Campeau’s knowledge of Jesuit history and extensive archival research, it seems surprising that his narrative overlooks the influence of vigorous anti-Jesuit pamphleteering during the Wars of Religion and the Gallican crisis in formulating Poutrincourt’s biases.

Poutrincourt’s Factum represents the culmination of decades of anti-Jesuit sentiments in French politics. Although he certainly intended the Factum to blame the Jesuits and provide an outlet for his frustrations following the failure of his colony, a thorough reading reveals the ways in which popular anti-Jesuitism became a lens through which Poutrincourt and his son came to interpret Biard and Massé in New France. This new interpretation reorients our understanding of the origin of French Jesuit missions in significant ways. First, the Factum conclusively demonstrates the transfer of anti-Jesuit religious politics to North America in the first decades of the seventeenth century. By definitively proving Poutrincourt’s Gallican anti-Jesuitism, the real underlying cause of Port Royal’s failure shifts into focus. Second, the Factum forces historians to reconsider Biard’s 1616 Relation de la Nouvelle-France, the first of Thwaites’s Jesuit Relations and a common source used by historians of early contact-era Native Americans. While the Relation details many of Biard’s observations of native life, he wrote it primarily as a defense of Massé and himself against the accusations of Poutrincourt’s Factum and the Relation is therefore a part of the pamphlet war that raged between the Jesuits and their detractors in the early decades of the seventeenth century. As such, Poutrincourt and Biard wove Canada into political debates in France concerning the nature of both
political and religious authority. Furthermore, Biard’s missionary activities after returning to France only reaffirm his involvement in religious disputes that destabilized the kingdom in the aftermath of the Wars of Religion. By strictly adhering to the Jesuit goal of extirpating heresy and arguing on the record for the supremacy of the Papacy, Biard aligned with those believing that the good of Catholicism superseded the secular needs of the French monarchy. These reinterpretations point to a singular conclusion: Poutrincourt, Biencourt, Biard, and Massé were all produced by the politics of religious warfare, and in those debates we uncover the origin of the missions to Canada.

Poutrincourt’s *Factum* as “Bon François” Anti-Jesuit Pamphleteering

Jean de Poutrincourt’s anonymous *Factum du procez entre Jean de Biencourt et les PP. Biard and Massé* first appeared in early 1614, in time for the editor to add a brief chapter about Argyll’s destruction of Port Royal to the narrative. Although he called it a *Factum*—a legal testimony given to judges—Poutrincourt’s pamphlet was only intended to persuade the court of public opinion. His immediate goal was to convince the crown to restore his title to Acadia, and to do so he had to undermine the Jesuits whom he believed now held power in New France. However, Poutrincourt’s visceral assault on Biard and Massé had other far-reaching consequences. By factoring Canada into familiar political debates, he thought he might convince the Queen Regent to forbid Jesuit involvement in

---

8 However, Poutrincourt must have delivered it to the printer before he left France for Port Royal in late 1613. Given the *Factum*’s timing, the brief section on the destruction of Port Royal must have been added by the editor based only on preliminary accounts.
colonization indefinitely, something he had tried to do himself in 1609. He organized the
Factum into two parts. In the first part, which comprises the bulk of the document,
Poutrincourt outlined his account of the events that unfolded between himself, his son,
and the Jesuits in Acadia. Since Poutrincourt’s time in Canada barely overlapped with the
Jesuits, he relied upon two major sources to construct his narrative: written testimony in
the form of letters sent to him or seized by Biencourt, which he attached to the Factum,
and secondhand testimony probably filtered through Simon Imbert, who relayed the story
to him when he returned to France in late 1612. Based primarily upon hearsay and written
for a specific purpose, the factual accuracy of the Factum remains suspect, but its vitriolic
mastery of Gallican anti-Jesuit rhetoric uncovers the underlying cause of Port Royal’s
failures.9

Poutrincourt began the Factum by outlining Port Royal’s early successes. He
highlighted his own evangelical ambitions and applauded Fléché’s baptisms. From the
outset, his account manipulated facts, drawing upon popular stereotypes. “The fame of all
of these conversions spread. Good people rejoiced,” Poutrincourt exclaimed, but “as the
Jesuits take every opportunity to do their business and make more noise than make a
good name for themselves,” he cautioned, “Fr. Coton addressed sieur de Poutrincourt to
beg him to take with him men of his Order.” Poutrincourt claimed that he refused the
request, citing a lack of proper accommodations.10 In reality, Coton acquired permission

9 For a discussion of the Factum’s authorship, see Campeau’s introduction to the document in MNF
1:320-22, as well as his description of the source in MNF’s introduction, 229*-30*.
10 “The said sieur apologized, at first, saying that the kitchen had not even yet been built,” in MNF
1:325
from Henry IV to send Jesuits before Poutrincourt and Fléché left Europe, but inverting the chronology made it appear that the Jesuits sought to insert themselves into Poutrincourt’s already successful enterprise and claim credit for his achievements.\textsuperscript{11} When Biencourt returned to Paris, Poutrincourt charged, the relentless Jesuits “took this occasion [of Henry IV’s death] to obtain letters of favor from their Majesties, recommending under the authority of the said sieur two Fathers, one named Pierre Biard, and the other, Enemond Massé, from Lyon.” By accusing the Jesuits of manipulating the young king so soon after Henry’s death, Poutrincourt played on the theme of Jesuit ambition for power, implying that they controlled the monarchy while undoubtedly implicitly supplying a motive for the supposed Jesuit involvement in the regicide.\textsuperscript{12}

According to Poutrincourt, the Jesuits terrorized the Huguenot crew during the voyage to New France. At the outset, Duquesne and Dujardin, the Calvinist merchants who tried to prevent the Jesuits from departing, allegedly warned Biencourt that the missionaries conspired to deliver the ship, \textit{la Grâce de Dieu}, to Spain. The captain and the pilot, also Calvinists, protested that their largely Huguenot crew refused to sail because they anticipated quarrels with the priests. Biard assured them that “they would live as in France,” honoring the Edict of Nantes, and the ship departed. According to the \textit{Factum}, Biard did not fulfill his promise. One night, while sailing through the English Channel, \textit{la Grâce de Dieu} passed what Biencourt thought to be an English vessel. “To

\textsuperscript{11} Poutrincourt’s overall chronology does not match Biard’s at all. This is one of the main reasons Campeau dismisses the source as factually unreliable. For specifics, see Campeau’s annotations in \textit{MNF} 1, doc. 137, footnotes. For my purposes, the chronology is irrelevant, and Poutrincourt’s manipulation of the order of events proves his intention to frame the Jesuits as usurpers.

\textsuperscript{12} \textit{Factum}, in \textit{MNF} 1:324-6.
arms! To arms!” Biard supposedly cried, “it must be had!” “But coming nearer,” wrote Poutrincourt, “we recognized it to be a Spanish ship; and this changed the language of the Jesuit, who began to say that we should leave in peace.”¹³ “But,” Biencourt continued, one of the sailors asked, ‘had we more right against the English?’ ‘Yes,’ responded the Jesuit, ‘because they are heretics.’”

The largely Huguenot crew on *la Grâce de Dieu* most likely provided Poutrincourt with ample complaints with which to continue his narrative. Instead of honoring his promise to tolerate Protestant worship, Biard “took their Psalms and New Testaments and threw them into the sea,” and Biencourt mediated between the Huguenot sailors and the Jesuits, who were “at each others’ throats.” The Jesuits caused other problems. On one occasion, for example, the *Factum* claimed that Biard became belligerently drunk after dining with Biencourt on board a Dutch vessel. Rather than fast during Lent, the Jesuits ate their fill, and the *Factum* quoted Massé as justifying himself on the grounds that “there is a great difference between our Order and other men. We are Universal, recognizing neither castle nor king, neither curates nor bishops … we have no need to fast.” After scandalizing the crew by eating the sailor’s rations, Biard caused further problems when he prevented Biencourt from trading with unbaptized Indians as they sailed along the coast of New France toward their destination. When they arrived,

---

¹³ Since Poutrincourt wrote anonymously, the pronouns often do not match the author. He was not present during this voyage, or for most of the events recounted in the *Factum.*
the Huguenot sailors had become so disillusioned with Biard that they refused to remain at Port Royal.  

“On Pentecost 1611, they arrived at Port Royal with great joy on both sides,” said Poutrincourt of his first meeting with Biard and Massé, but while “[o]utwardly, they tried to display reverences to make believe that they would serve the King in New France,” they instead sought only to enrich themselves by undermining the work of Fléché and aligning themselves with Poutrincourt’s rival, Robert Pont Gravé. Poutrincourt decided to return to France for supplies, first hoping to solidify his son’s authority over Pont Gravé and the small group of Maloûin traders who had admonished him months earlier. Although they apprehended Pont Gravé with Biard’s help, Poutrincourt did not include the Jesuit when he and Biencourt prepared to transfer authority from father to son. According to Poutrincourt, the exclusion greatly irritated Biard. Furthermore, the Jesuit, who had originally faulted Pont Gravé for challenging Poutrincourt’s authority, had changed his opinion after learning that the young trader “had married a woman in Spain.”  

Left out of the arrangements, the Jesuits “prepared a rebellion against Poutrincourt and his son, because Poutrincourt had firmly recognized justice and they were not flexible in their passions, as bon François”—good Frenchmen—“desirous of the glory of the king.”

---

14 Poutrincourt was not present on the voyage and would have relied on testimony from Biencourt and the sailors to construct his allegations. For his account of the voyage, see Factum, in MNF 1:335-9.

15 There is no evidence of Biard having Spanish ancestry, see MNF 1:341, footnote 79.

16 Factum, in MNF 1:342.
To Campeau, this particular line in the *Factum* evinced that Poutrincourt experienced hallucinations—after all, there is no evidence of a conspiracy—but Poutrincourt’s use of the phrase *bon François* indicates another explanation.17 By the time of Henry IV’s 1610 assassination, two competing ideological factions (although they simply reflected sixteenth-century religious and political debates) solidified in France. One, the pro-Jesuit *parti dévot*, remained dedicated to Rome and promoted a pro-Spanish foreign policy; in essence, the *parti dévot* represented the remnants of the radical Catholic League. Members of the opposing Gallican faction called themselves the *bon François*—men dedicated to the good of France over all other matters. To *bon François* who remained suspicious of Spanish hegemony in Europe and papal influence in Paris, the Jesuits represented everything they stood against and threatened the relative autonomy of the French monarchy. Like their forebears throughout the latter half of the sixteenth century, they believed the Jesuits to be tyrannicidal usurpers, and sought to remove the Society from French politics, and hopefully, the kingdom itself. Throughout the 1610s, these groups constantly attacked one another in the public sphere by producing politically charged pamphlets. By anonymously referring to himself as a *bon François* in the third person, Poutrincourt in a single phrase admitted his Gallican loyalties. He did not imagine a Jesuit conspiracy at the Maloüïn camp in the summer of 1611 because of a

17 “Another of Poutrincourt’s obsessions was that of seeing Jesuits stationed everywhere setting traps against him … there are many examples. An interesting episode: The Biencourts, walking together at a distance, imagine that Biard is annoyed at them and that he suspects them of taking precautions against him,” in *MNF* 1:219*, footnote 75.
mental disorder, but because his own political identity predisposed him to expect Jesuit treason at every turn. 18

The Jesuits “take all occasions to favor their [opponents’] enemies after they have recognized them,” Poutrincourt continued, and he believed Biard had taken note of the hostilities brewing between Pont Gravé and Poutrincourt and worked to exploit them. 19

Once Poutrincourt left for France, however, Biard allegedly began a campaign in earnest to wrest control of Port Royal from its proprietor. Although Poutrincourt did not witness anything Biard did after leaving Canada in June 1611, he used testimony from his son and ostensibly from other settlers and combined them with popular Gallican fears to demonize the Society. Left alone at Port Royal, these pre-existing anti-Jesuit stereotypes probably weighed even more heavily upon Biencourt. At roughly twenty years old, the young proprietor had little leadership experience and had not developed diplomatic skill. Charged with feeding his father’s habitation and defending the colony from foreign powers while maintaining friendly relationships with the Indians, Biencourt felt insecure in his authority and therefore especially wary of perceived power-hungry missionaries. “With hatred, the Jesuits continued their ways of sowing mad impressions of the sieur and his son, saying that the Patriarch Fléché had operated poorly in the baptism of the savages,” Poutrincourt wrote. Biencourt, seeking to rein in the supposedly unruly priests,

18 “In the view of the ‘bon français,’ the Jesuits remained an inassimilable presence in France due to this vow of “blind obedience” to another Prince” who, whether the pope or the King of Spain, made that vow incompatible with the “Royalty of France…, with the doctrine of the Gallican Church and the University, and with being subjects of the State, in view of the unique obedience owed by them in all things to their prince.” If he had to choose between the Jesuit and the Huguenot, the “bon français” preferred the Huguenot “who had at least never renounced his patrie.” See Dale Van Kley, “The Genesis and Trajectory of Anti-Jesuitism, 1540-1761.”

“did not find the Jesuits willing to give up their ways of doing things.” Moreover, “given the age of Biencourt,” the Jesuits “say that they nourish his body and soul and minister to all of the inhabitants … that they were all [the Jesuits’] servants.”

The Factum identifies two major attempts by Biard and Massé to usurp power at Port Royal. In Poutrincourt’s account, Biard, “knowing that sieur de Biencourt had made a map of the port of the Arnochiquois, demanded it from him; and asked that he wished to go there” in order to conspire with Pont Gravé. Biencourt refused, reminding Biard that the proprietor took orders only from his father or the king. Biard then directly demanded that the young trader lead him back to the Maloûën encampment. “But knowing that this was to plot with them and give advice to the Spanish” and deprive him of his power, Biencourt held firm. In the face of what he perceived as overwhelming opposition, Biencourt determined to travel the region himself and reinforce his authority among all French operating in New France, including the Maloûëns, who he called “predisposed toward rebellion.” Still hoping to unite with Pont Gravé, Biard urged Biencourt to bring the Jesuit with him, claiming that French Huguenots led by Jean Plâtrier and possibly English colonists might have established settlements in the area.

“My Father,” said Biencourt of Plâtrier, “we must live here under the edicts of France.” The Factum does not explain why Biencourt relented, but he took the Jesuit with him, and when they arrived at Plâtrier’s settlement, the Huguenot trader welcomed them unarmed and vowed to aid them against not only any potential English threat, but also

20 Ibid, 343-4.
21 Established at St. Croix, MNF 1:345, footnote 93.
against Pont Gravé. Poutrincourt’s version of the story, then, mirrored the French political divide: under a policy of toleration Gallican Catholics allied with Huguenots to defend the supremacy of French against the usurping Jesuits and their supporters who sought to bring the world under the dominion of Catholic Spain and the papacy.

The *Factum* seeks definitively to prove Biard’s favoritism toward Pont Gravé and their “machinations against Biencourt.”22 While with Plâtrier at St. Croix, Biard supposedly asked to travel by himself to see Pont Gravé “so that he might use his rhetoric to pacify all.” Biencourt allowed Biard to go, but sent Louis Hébert and seven other armed men with him. As Biard later testified in his *Relation*, they found neither Pont Gravé nor his deputy Merveille at the encampment. The camp’s sentinel, in a moment of drunken stupidity, revealed that the two men had gone to the Indians to “warn them of the arrival of the said sieur so they could seize him, and he boasted of killing the Vice-admiral [Biencourt].” Biencourt arrived at the Maloüïn camp shortly thereafter, and the group, searching for the two missing traders, stumbled upon Merveille tending his garden. Merveille cried out to them in desperation, complaining that the hungry Maloüïns had been reduced to savagery and feared they would not survive the winter. In anguish, he confided that he was dying and asked Biard for absolution. Biard moved between Merveille and Biencourt to administer the sacrament, and as the Jesuit obstructed Biencourt’s vision, the *Factum* claims that Merveille pulled out a hidden gun, planning to fire upon Biencourt as he walked away. One of Biencourt’s men noticed the weapon and shouted to the Vice-admiral, who seized Merveille and wrestled his firearm away, foiling

---

22 These are literally the two chapter titles: “Where we prove the biases of Biard for Du Pont” and “Jesuit machinations against Biencourt,” *MNF* 1:323.
the would-be assassin. Although the *Factum* certainly implied Jesuit collusion in the attempted killing, Poutrincourt did not outright accuse Biard of premeditated complicity. However, the Jesuit did beg Biencourt take mercy on his assailant. Biencourt, ostensibly fed up with the Jesuit for defending Merveille, offered to leave Biard at Pont Gravé’s settlement. Instead, Biard opted to continue the voyage with Biencourt, “because he wished to learn everything he could [about French claims] so that he could give advice in Spain.”

According to the *Factum*, the Jesuits constantly overstepped their authority within the confines of the colony. “Other malice was recognized in these men who practiced all sorts of tricks to incite hatred between the Vice-admiral and his men, who they flatter on one side, making them small gifts of rosaries, images and Agnus Dei, and on the other exciting them to berate and threaten the said sieur,” wrote Poutrincourt. “At the same time they flogged their own servant, because … he had not served them as required,” he said, adding “then they told him they were very sorry, and said that the said sieur was the reason that he had been called to them.” The Jesuits complained that Biencourt mistreated them, accusing him of confining them to the settlement without enough food or drink. “The said sieur responded that at times he was [hungry] as well, that they had the same treatment that he had, that he had been an example of sobriety to all of those in the habitation, and he considered himself as one of the ordinary people,” wrote Poutrincourt of his son. The Jesuits, on the other hand, acted “as if they were enslaved by their own mouths … always, they were filling their mouths more than ordinarily” at the expense of

---

23 *Factum, MNF* 1:345, 354.
the other inhabitants. The more the Jesuits took for themselves, the less Biencourt could
provide for his men, undermining his authority within his own habitation. “This,” alleges
the *Factum*, “was not the promise Père Coton made to sieur de Poutrincourt.”

In another instance (according to Poutrincourt) Biencourt, Hébert, and the Jesuits held a council to
discuss methods of best protecting the colony. “One member of the Society,” wrote
Poutrincourt, “said that Biencourt must demand help from the pope. Immediately, Biard
approved this proposal and said: ‘For then at least, if we have an emergency, we will
have much help from Spain.’” Biencourt, “seeing clearly what they intended with such
overtures, ended the council and said: ‘we will not discuss that here, if it pleases God’.”

The Jesuits focused their efforts so closely on attaining power that they neglected
their own evangelical mission. “But even as these men show themselves to embrace
assassins,” Poutrincourt wrote, “they show themselves to be cruel and inhumane toward
the sick and faltering in charity to those who have need of relief from a pastor.” On one
trek, an Indian named Antoine Betnain, who had been baptized by Fléché, requested that
Biard baptize his wife and young daughter. To undercut Biard’s typical argument that he
could not administer the sacrament without catechism, Poutrincourt claimed that Betnain
had first properly instructed his family in the faith. “Biard would not do this for him,
holding to the maxim that the savages must be instructed and catechized according to
their method, which in turn discourages all the poor savages in this area, who ardently

---


25 *Factum*, *MNF* 1:360.

26 Even if Betnain had claimed to have done this, it certainly would not have been sufficient instruction
in the missionary’s eyes.
wished to receive baptism so that they might be recognized through the sacrament and exempt from diabolical torments and dreams.” Poutrincourt lamented, “And so the Jesuit was at Pentégoit, but refused to say Mass in the presence of the Indians, especially, he said, because they did not wear any ornate clothes.”

Biard also ignored the needs of Port Royal’s Indian converts, particularly Membertou, the Indian leader most closely allied with Biencourt’s settlement. As he lay dying in the Jesuit cabin in September 1611, Biencourt tended to his medical care while the Jesuits “got tired of the inconvenience that he was causing them.” The impatient Jesuits drove the bedridden Membertou from their lodging, even though his firm desire to profess Christianity ought to have prompted the missionaries to consider him a gateway toward evangelizing the local Indians. When Biencourt and Membertou concluded that the Indian would not recover, they requested that Biard administer last rites. Poutrincourt attached a letter Biencourt wrote in 1612 to the Factum, which claimed that Biard, upon hearing Membertou’s requested burial with his own people, “flew into a rage against Membertou, saying that if he was buried anywhere else than behind the storehouse with our people, he would abandon him.” Membertou persisted, and Biard “left the cabin in a rage, saying that he did not want to have anything to do with his soul and that he would not attend his funeral.” As a result, Membertou told his son “I urge you to love Monsieur de Biencourt, just as I loved Monsieur de Poutrincourt, my brother … he will be a father to you and you will be his son … I command you always to honor the great living God, and to be strong in the father you have received, and live as good Christians.”

27 Factum, MNF 1:354-5.
relented and requested that he be buried with the French out of respect for Poutrincourt. In Biencourt’s telling, the Indians despised the Jesuits, but accepted the Christianity as presented to them by Fléché.  

The *Factum*’s purpose was to blame Jesuit treachery when Poutrincourt lost control of the Atlantic coast to Madame de Guercheville in 1612. Nearly half of the pamphlet relates to the second falling out between Biard and Biencourt when Gilbert du Thet and Simon Imbert arrived at Port Royal on Nicolas l’Abbé’s ship in January 1612. But instead of writing his own account, Poutrincourt largely settled for appending testimonies by Biard and Biencourt written in March 1612.  

In the few paragraphs he did compose himself, Poutrincourt elaborated on the accusations Imbert made against Thet during the voyage. “In the chamber of Captain l’Abbé and in the presence of sieur Imbert,” Thet “began to say that there was a grand coup leading to the assassination of the king, without which Christianity would have perished, that the Most Christian King [Philip III of Spain] trembled with fear, that the Archduke [Albert VII of Austria and regent of the Netherlands] had been forced to deliver the keys to his country and that France would never surrender to anyone, except to Spain,” he wrote. Additionally, Thet allegedly outlined a comprehensive Jesuit plan to use their colleges to manipulate

---

28 *Factum*, MNF 1:348; Biencourt, “Lettre du sieur de Biencourt au sieur de Poutrincourt, Port Royal, mars 1612,” in MNF 1:348-51; Biard acknowledged that he would not permit Membertou to be buried in his ancestral site, but clarified this dispute in his several writings, including his *Relation*. My account in chapter two reflects Biard’s testimony.

29 These documents informed my narrative in chapter 2. Here I will limit my discussion to what Poutrincourt wrote in the *Factum* itself in 1613.
France’s youth into submitting to the Society’s authority: “A great number of young people are sent to our colleges; why should they not serve us?”

“But what escalated the hatred openly between [the Jesuits and] sieur Imbert was that, confessing to Père Emond Massé,” wrote Poutrincourt, Imbert “said to him other things that had been revealed to sieur de Biencourt that the Jesuit Gilbert du Thet have said … concerning the assassination of Henry the Great.” Imbert’s accusation of Jesuit involvement in the regicide put the three Jesuits on the defensive. Poutrincourt claimed that Massé, fearing the Society’s great conspiracy revealed, immediately reported to Biard, and the two “plotted a means by which to defame Imbert.” Together, they invented a crime, claiming that Imbert had sold cargo belonging to the Madame de Guercheville and the Jesuits at Dieppe. They confronted Imbert, and accused him of lying about the ship’s finances and reminded him that “[t]hou shalt not bear false witness.”

“Never had the priests before projected an accusation more calumnious,” says the Factum, for “by their actions, we see that they are truly devils.” Denying the accusations, Imbert asked, “where is the piety and charity that these religious people should have? It is easy to see that it is only ambition and hypocrisy with these men here.” Imbert challenged Massé, “Do you live here as Christians? Is this how you plant your religion? Your behavior puts me in great doubt of your credence. Our Lord has no false witness of your Society.”

While Massé again conferred with Biard, Imbert sought out Biencourt. Biencourt suggested that Imbert stop arguing with the Jesuits and warned him of the collusion

30 Factum, MNF 1:359-9.
31 From Deut 5:20.
32 Factum, in MNF 1:361-3.
between the missionaries and Pont Gravé. Biard, livid at what Imbert had said to Massé, confronted the two and demanded that Imbert repeat his testimony to the mission’s superior. “And why?” asked Imbert, “I expected that you would come to me with satisfaction of the false accusation that you have made and plan to use against me at my trial.” In responding to Imbert, Biard not only lost his temper, but also revealed his conception of Jesuit power. “But who do you think we are?” he asked. “Is it not we who are the judges? Who is it who makes magistrates and councilors, if not us?” Louis Hébert, witnessing the “cries and violence” made by the Jesuits, interrupted and “said that the behavior of the Jesuits was worse than that of that of heretics and that they would never convert the savages.” Thet, who had also joined the conversation, directed his reply toward Biencourt: “Is it not true that we fed all of you and that consequently, you and your people are our subjects?” “Don’t you see, monsieur?” Hébert asked Biencourt, “these newcomers would willingly lay down the law?” “Yes,” Thet interrupted, citing the words of Jesus, because “the first shall be last.” “But,” added Biard, “when the good Gilbert had allegedly said that if the king is not killed that Christianity would be lost, that it had been a blow from heaven, and that France would never surrender except to Spain, are these words atrocity?” “Ha!” Biencourt cried, “I do not hear your rhetoric. I will send all of this to the king and the gentlemen of his council, who can interpret them better than I.” Imbert offered to return to France and “make a report of all of their behaviors to the king” and to the anti-Jesuit “parlement of Paris, and to the Sorbonne.” Massé, “afraid of the parlement and the Sorbonne,” demanded that Imbert recant his testimony, but “Imbert said there was nothing he could do.” The Jesuits decided to escape the settlement and sneaked on board l’Abbé’s ship. Instead of narrating the story further, Poutrincourt
submitted testimonies from Biencourt and letters seized from Biard as evidence of the encounter and the underhanded “machinations” of the Jesuits.33

In the end, Poutrincourt concluded that Jesuit perfidy had ruined him. When l’Abbé’s ship, carrying Imbert and Thet, came to port in Dieppe, “the Jesuits of Rouen and of Eu came out to seize not only the merchandise, but also the clothes of Poutrincourt’s servants, in the name of the Marquise de Guercheville.” It is interesting that Poutrincourt blamed the Jesuits rather than the marquise herself, considering she was the one who deprived him of his titles. Coming from a bon François, however, who believed the Jesuits manipulated elites to their own ends, the Factum’s interpretation is less surprising. “Here is the charity of good Fathers as they transform the alms of the poor into nautical usury and as their Society’s commerce is more profitable to their negotiators than their Society’s religion is to Christians,” he sarcastically wrote. The conspiracy ran deeper than the two Jesuits in New France. While Biard and Massé conspired against Biencourt in Canada, the Society worked to keep Poutrincourt from recovering his colonial possessions. “The Jesuits, who never give up power unless by force, advised each other to set up a trap for the sieur de Poutrincourt, so as to imprison him and his son and everyone at the habitation,” the Factum alleged. In league with Coton, the Society planned to construct a rival colony to undermine Port Royal and prevent Poutrincourt’s enterprise from turning a profit. Poutrincourt intended to confront Coton and contest his decision, believing he might still persuade the Jesuit Provincial and Guercheville that a mutual enterprise was in everyone’s best interest. Instead,

33 Factum, MNF 1:364-5; I use these pieces of evidence in chapter 2.
Poutrincourt found himself in jail. According to the *Factum*, Thet arrived in Dieppe, and immediately brought word of the dispute at Port Royal to Coton. Thet exaggerated conditions at Port Royal, claiming that Poutrincourt could not even afford to feed his own settlers, many of whom died of hunger. According to Poutrincourt, Coton subsequently rejected the request and instead ordered Saussaye to travel to New France without him and construct a rival colony. Poutrincourt, "seeing the danger facing the poor French," went to Dieppe to retake his ship, which the Jesuits had commandeered. "But he did not arrive quickly enough," lamented the *Factum*, "and the Pères, who have men disposed everywhere, arrested him and took him prisoner in order to obstruct such a good work."

Poutrincourt did not remain imprisoned long, because the bailiff mistrusted the Jesuits, because the sentence was "founded solely on alleged reasons," but most importantly, because of "consideration for the poor French abandoned on the other side of the sea."

Despite his release, he returned to the port too late to prevent Saussaye from departing for Port Royal.34

Poutrincourt left France in December 1613 to catch Saussaye, resupply Port Royal, and reassert his authority. When he arrived, he found his settlement destroyed by Argyll and its colonists starving. Given the wreckage of the fort and his dwindling finances, Poutrincourt decided to momentarily abandon his enterprise. Using what furs Biencourt’s men collected after Argyll left for Jamestown, Poutrincourt brought the hungry traders back to France. A small number, including his son, opted to stay and trade along the coast, but although Biencourt inherited Poutrincourt’s title to the settlement

---

34 *Factum*, in *MNF* 1:390-4.
after his father’s death, he never managed to rebuild it as Quebec eclipsed Acadia in importance.\textsuperscript{35}

Although Poutrincourt wrote the \textit{Factum} before anyone in France knew about Argyll’s attack, the editor did manage to include a brief section about Jesuit involvement in the English conquest as news trickled into Paris in the early months of 1614. In the \textit{Factum}, the Virginians admonished the missionaries, asking them “with what zeal of the Catholic faith did you transport yourselves across the sea only to ruin the labor of a gentleman, to scandalize the poor savages, new Christians, to abandon without a pastor those for who you were supposed to dedicate your lives? Our pastors, who you call heretics … they do not abandon their troops, they share in their misery as well as rejoice in their prosperity.” The English demanded that Massé stay with the French settlers to minister to them, but took Biard and Jacques Quentin hostage, promising that they would be spared in Virginia. The \textit{Factum} further maintained that “[a]fter having secured clemency and the goodness of the English captain,” the Jesuits “begged the captain to take them all to Virginia and, to persuade him, said to him that … he had twelve or fifteen good artisans, that he must take them and employ them.” According to the \textit{Factum}, then, it was Biard who urged Argyll to take French captives.\textsuperscript{36}

According to the \textit{Factum’s} editor, probably either Marc Lescarbot or Nicolas Desnoyers (a friend of Lescarbot who managed Poutrincourt’s affairs while he was in New France), the Jesuit conspiracy in Canada had far-reaching implications not only for

\textsuperscript{35} This is the subject of chapter 4. For a biography of Biencourt after the destruction of Port Royal, see Huguet, \textit{Jean de Poutrincourt}, 445-510.

\textsuperscript{36} \textit{Factum}, in \textit{MNF} 1:396.
France but for the entire Catholic world.\textsuperscript{37} Using examples from the preceding text, the editor generalized Biard’s alleged actions to definitively prove twenty-five pre-existing anti-Jesuit stereotypes.\textsuperscript{38} “The Jesuits are quick to interfere in a place they think worthy of pursuing their ambition and avarice,” he wrote, claiming that Fléché’s baptisms became so renowned that the Jesuits, always jealous of non-Jesuit clergy and willing only to overtake already successful enterprises, had to intercede. Good missionaries, according to the \textit{Factum}, did not need letters of approval to perform their work. If the Jesuits did not manipulate authorities—in this case the Queen Regent—to secure letters, “their actions would not be endured.”\textsuperscript{39} Others had little choice but to endure them, as the merchants in Dieppe learned in dealing with Jesuit interference with commerce at Dieppe. Sailors on the vessel, too, learned that the Society ultimately disrupted the social fabric.\textsuperscript{40} Jesuit self-promotion presented an imminent danger to France. “You see the affection that they have toward the Spanish,” the editor pointed out, highlighting Biard’s

\textsuperscript{37} “This \textit{Factum} was given to me to correct the defects of its printing, and I have found it appropriate to fill the rest of the blank pages with the implication of these facts, as they have been told,” \textit{Factum}, \textit{MNF} 1:397; because it’s style matches other works by Lescarbot, Campeau believed that Lescarbot did the bulk of the \textit{Factum}’s writing, even though the narrative clearly came from Poutrincourt. However, at the time of its printing, Lescarbot was in Switzerland. We cannot know for sure who the “Correcteur” of the \textit{Factum} really was, but given Desnoyers’s close association with Lescarbot and Poutrincourt and his knowledge of Poutrincourt’s North American misfortunes, he is another likely candidate. See Campeau’s preface to the \textit{Factum} in \textit{MNF} 1:321.

\textsuperscript{38} The \textit{Factum} numbers these offenses. Many are redundant, so I have instead excerpted the major themes.

\textsuperscript{39} He quoted 2 Cor 3:1-3, which states “Are we beginning to commend ourselves again? Or do we need, as some do, letters of recommendation to you, or from you? You yourselves are our letter of recommendation, written on your hearts, to be known and read by all men; and you show that you are a letter from Christ delivered by us, written not with ink, but with the Spirit of the living God, not on tablets of stone but on tablets of human hearts.”

\textsuperscript{40} \textit{Factum}, in \textit{MNF} 1:397.
embrace of the Spanish ship that he originally condemned as English. Biard’s drunken behavior on board the ship became evidence of the Society’s purported “false sobriety”; by reneging on his promise to live under the Edict of Nantes, he proved that Jesuits were liars. Jesuits defamed religious and secular authority as well—not only did Biard sow discord among Biencourt’s servants, but he “mock[ed] services and masses.” Moreover, Jesuits were “enemies of the cross and poverty,” and by demanding that they eat their fill, they set an example of entitlement among populations with whom they dwelt. To gain adherents, the Society “debauch[ed] the children of good families, in the sight of the king and parlements, who have no power to chastize them.” These devious underlying character traits all pointed to a more tangible threat, “horrible and nonetheless familiar to the Jesuits, because it concerns the assassination of kings, which according to their books, they support.” Although Jesuits in Paris might deny involvement in Henry IV’s death, Biard and Massé proved otherwise. Not only did Massé supposedly confess involvement to Biard, but “in the presence of twenty people, Biard said equivocating things and asked if it was atrocious to have said that the assassination of Henry the Great had been a blow from heaven.” They professed this regicidal theory not because of a belief in the rightful overthrow of a tyrannical monarch, but because “they despise royal authority,” preferring instead to establish themselves through their own power. Their “end goal is growth abroad and the weakening of the French state within.”

41 A clear reference to Mariana.
42 Factum, in MNF 1:397-401
The Factum then, should not be read as a stand-alone pamphlet about New France, but as part of a larger body of bon François anti-Jesuit pamphleteering that proliferated in the 1610s. “They are all bad,” the Factum concludes. “This is why the cities that were most supportive of the League, such as Orléans, Chartres, Troyes, Châlons, Sens and other capitals, recognizing that such a sect was born in order to raise the people up against legitimate magistrates, did not wish to receive them in their territories.” The Factum took the side of all of the good Catholic Orders who hated the Jesuits and still managed to obey the pope without undermining secular authority. The Factum ends with a scriptural call for divine retribution, “It remains that good men demand that God take action against these equivocators and inhumane men as he promised in his words:43

*L’homme pervers en son langage*
*Sur terre estably ne sera;*
*L’homme adonné à faire outrage,*
*Le mal qu’il fait le chassera*

Let not the slanderer
Be established in the land;
Let the addict of insults
Be driven out by the evil he does

Because

*Le siège malencontreux qui travaille le peuple soubs prêtexte de la loy n’a point de communion avec toy?*

*Can wicked rulers who frame mischief by statute be allied with thee?*44

In July 1614, when the ship carrying the remnants of his colony arrived at La Rochelle, Poutrincourt wrote one final pamphlet against Biard. Since the Factum went to

---

43 From Psalms 140:12, in Factum, in MNF 1:405.
press before anyone in France really knew how the English managed to destroy all of New France’s coastal settlements, Poutrincourt’s *Plainte de Jean de Poutrincourt Contre le P. Pierre Biard*, later published by Marc Lescarbot in 1618, served to prove Jesuit complicity. 45 Englishmen from Virginia, Poutrincourt argued, “at the persuasion of Pierre Biard, Jesuit” sent a large navy to Port Royal. Since Biencourt and his men had left the settlement to deal with local Indians, Biard led the English through the settlement, allowing them to plunder the fort. “The said English pillaged all that had been in the settlement,” he complained, “and not content with this—pushed and driven by Biard—they broke the arms of the king with a mass of swords.” According to Poutrincourt, Biard here showed that his true objective was to capture Biencourt and allow the English to imprison him at Jamestown. Without the backdrop of Gallican pamphleteering, Poutrincourt’s narrative is comical: why would a duplicitous Spanish Jesuit lead a Protestant English army against a helpless French settlement simply to capture the proprietor’s son, against whom he held a personal grudge? 46

At the same time, Poutrincourt wrote to Lescarbot in Switzerland to tell him the fate of the colony they had both worked to build in 1606. Poutrincourt characterized the English who destroyed his colony as “good men” corrupted by Biard, who intended to turn on them as soon as they destroyed Biencourt. Argyll, “told that my son was a gentleman, said that he regretted what had happened, but these perverts [the Jesuits] had

45 Marc Lescarbot published these documents as part of an update to his *Histoire de la Nouvelle France* in 1618, which he revised in response to Biard’s *Relation of 1616*.

put the general [Thomas Gage] of Virginia up to perpetrate this evil act,” Poutrincourt charged. “You know full well how envious and greedy for power these men are. … Remember the story of Laudonnière’s voyage,” added Poutrincourt of the failed French colony in Florida, and “how those who wanted to get rid of him summoned the Spaniards to their aid.”

Poutrincourt never regained his fortune and died in 1615, but even in death, Poutrincourt adhered to the principles of a *bon Français*. That spring, warfare broke out between factions of the Queen and militant Catholics in Champagne. Although the Wars of Religion had ended, the peace between remnants of the League, French Protestants, and Gallican Catholics remained tenuous. The Prince of Condé and the Dukes of Nevers, Mayenne, Bouillon, and Longueville, dissatisfied with the rule of Marie de Medici, left court and traveled north along the Seine to move the people to revolt. Condé demanded money from various lords along the countryside to sustain his revolt. Poutrincourt, who had returned to France after finding Port Royal in ruins, worried that his neighboring barony of Saint-Just might fall to the ambitious Condé. His wife compounded his problems by filing for a separation, taking much of what remained of his finances.

Poutrincourt wagered his financial future on his Gallican beliefs. Desperately hoping that Port Royal might be returned to him, he believed that Marie de Medici and her son would ultimately reward his loyalty by taking the titles from Guercheville and the

---

48 Through their parents and children, we can link these men to both the preceding Catholic League and the later *Fronde* rebellion in the late 1640s and early 1650s.
49 Campeau argued that she must have separated from him over mental health issues: “Did the wife deem him unfit to manage her children’s patrimony?”
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usurping Jesuits and returning them to him. Commissioned with supporting royal forces in Champagne, Poutrincourt joined the marquis de La Vieuville in defending the French town of Méry in December of 1615. The marquis’s troops defeated Condé, but as they entered the town in victory, Poutrincourt and his men inexplicably attacked the marquis’s regiment. This is the closest case Campeau comes to demonstrating that Poutrincourt suffered from a mental illness. The episode alone certainly raises questions of motive. While we cannot know what prompted the attack on an ally, there are several plausible explanations. Finally out of money, Poutrincourt may have felt that his own nearby possessions might be taken from him during the conquest. It is also possible that he was confused by the defeated army of Condé, which had lined up to receive the marquis as victor. Here we cannot mental breakdown, but even if that was the case, there is no evidence to prove that one existed prior to this event. Regardless of Poutrincourt’s motives, Condé’s surprised troops fired upon Poutrincourt, who allegedly cried out, “Long live the king and Poutrincourt!” before taking a fatal musket wound in his chest. After killing most of Poutrincourt’s men, the marquis took Poutrincourt’s son Jacques captive. Poutrincourt’s supporters carried his body to rest in the barony of Sainte-Just, where his children erected a monument that they called The Cross of Poutrincourt.50

Biard’s Relation of 1616 in Context

50 See Adrien Huguet, Jean de Poutrincourt, 427-44; Campeau, “Introduction,” in MNF 1:238*.
In the introduction to volume three of *The Jesuit Relations*, Reuben Gold Thwaites described Pierre Biard’s *Relation de la Nouvelle-France*, published in Lyon in 1616. “Biard’s *Relation of 1616* opens with an historical sketch of French discoveries … the climate of the country, its forests, and its inhabitants … the savages, their dwellings, tribal organization, polity, women, marriage, medicine, practices of witchcraft, burials, etc.,” Thwaites began, before identifying what he understood to be the purpose of the document, namely to “advocate the establishment of a colony which shall be properly supported in France, and to this end appeal to the sympathies of Catholics at home.” Although he acknowledged that “much space is devoted to answering the attacks on the Jesuit mission of New France, made by an anonymous pamphleteer,” Thwaites said little else about the *Factum* and instead emphasized the ethnohistorical nature of Biard’s *Relation*. In the century following Thwaites’s comprehensive translation of the *Jesuit Relations*, Biard’s *Relation* has been used by notable scholars of early America such as James Axtell, William Cronon, and Dominque Deslandres to understand Indian cultures and the nature of the contact between Indians and Europeans.51

Although Biard devoted the opening chapters of his *Relation* to the Indians he observed in his short tenure in Canada, the document served primarily as a defense of his behavior:

“We have discoursed above upon the country and peoples of New France,” wrote Biard, “and in speaking of the means of aiding these Nations, we stumbled upon the *Factum*, written and published against the Jesuits. Now inasmuch as this slanderer and factionist (which I shall call him hereafter), beginning with the

51 In Biard’s entry in the *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, Campeau wrote, “In the works cited below will be found Father Biard’s writings, which are of great interest for Canadian history and for Indian ethnology.”
embarkation of the Jesuits, pursues them, dogging their footsteps in Canada through woods and rivers, upon sea and land, day and night, in all their travels and dwelling places—everywhere spying them out, to draw upon them, covertly and treacherously, his impostures and calumnies; for this reason we must of necessity go back upon our route, to defend the innocent and to give a true account of their actions and conduct…”

In setting the record straight, Biard hoped to do three things. First, he thought that an accurate description would help the reader “understand much better what these countries are … and the vicissitudes of such expeditions and enterprises.” Second, by providing thorough details (which the Factum lacked), Biard would convince the reader to believe his account over Poutrincourt’s. And finally, by illustrating his small successes and demonstrating his credibility, he would prove that God favored the Jesuits and their work. Biard’s intended audience, then, was not necessarily the wealthy donors of France—although he certainly believed that his account would bolster fundraising for future foreign missions—but also readers of the Factum. By directly responding to the Factum, Biard made it clear to the French public that the political debates that dominated the 1610s extended to North America.

Biard’s narrative follows the chronology of the Factum precisely, and some of the smallest details in the text respond directly to the accusations of Poutrincourt. He began his narrative in 1607, reminding the reader that it was Catholic demands for missionary work that prompted Henry IV to commission the Jesuits. Correcting the

52 Biard, Relation of 1616, in JR 3:155.
Factum’s chronology, Biard made clear that Henry ordered Poutrincourt to bring Jesuits before Fléché had even left France. He dedicated an entire chapter to the voyage (even though he described it as completely uneventful) because Poutrincourt had emphasized Jesuit misbehavior during the journey. “Let us say a word about the way in which the Jesuits lived during the voyage. For although these are things of little consequence, they are, nevertheless, necessary to close the mouth of falsehood,” he explained, adding that the Jesuits brought with them no servants, they never tried to “meddle with any one’s authority,” and while they did say Catholic Mass every day, “captain Jean d’Aune and the pilot, David de Bruges, both of the Pretended Religion, have often expressed their approval of [Jesuit behavior on the ship] to sieur de Poutrincourt; and frequently since then, in Dieppe and other places, have affirmed that they then found the Jesuits quite different from what had previously been pictured to them, namely, honest and courteous men, of good conduct and pure conscience.”

Like the Factum, the Relation next discussed Poutrincourt’s apprehension of Pont Gravé and the quarrels that followed. Without context, it seems as though Biard only included the four chapters describing his various attempts to visit Pont Gravé in order to convey the difficulties of the language barrier. In context, however, Biard’s extensive discussion of his problems learning the native tongue actually served to defend him from the accusations of the Factum by providing the reader with an alternative explanation for

---

55 Biard, Relation of 1616, in JR 3:179-181; “sieur de Biencourt was in everything, sole and absolute master.”
his affinity for Pont Gravé. In first meeting Pont Gravé, Biard claimed that he begged Poutrincourt to forgive the young man out of respect for Pont Gravé’s father, who wielded influence at the new French settlement of Quebec. In the second visit—when the Factum alleges Merveille attempted to assassinate Biencourt—Biard told an altogether different story. Although Biencourt claimed that an Indian had alerted him to an assassination plot beforehand, Biard said instead that the Indians only vaguely predicted war. In Biard’s telling, after Biencourt captured Merveille,

“[Merveille] threw himself on his knees in front of the said Father; and, although he had never before spoken to him, said: ‘My Father, I pray you confess me, I am a dead man.’ Father Biard got up to console him, seeing clearly that he was troubled; [Biencourt’s] bodyguard likewise turned their eyes upon them, and each one looked about him to see if there was anything to fear. By chance or design, whichever it was, I know not, a certain madcap [Biencourt] stepped forward and picked up, at two good paces from Merveille, a carbine, all loaded and primed, with the trigger down, and cried ‘Oh, the traitor! He wanted to get hold of this carbine and have a few shots from it.” The Maloüïn answered that that could not be, because since his arrival he had always been in their hands; and so it was impossible for him to have prepared or even seen this carbine; and, if he had seen it, he was too far away to get hold of it without being prevented. But in spite of all he said, he, and three others of his men, who seemed to be the worst, were bound.”

56 As described in chapter 2, Biencourt had learned enough language to trade, but had no ability to speak abstractly. Pont Gravé had lived among Indians for a year and had achieved better fluency.

57 “Now, as we were sailing up the river, being already about a league and a half from the Maloüïn settlement, towards nightfall a phenomenon appeared to us, which filled us with terror. For the heavens became wonderfully red over the Maloüïn habitation, and then the glow, separating into long rays and flashes of light, moved on and melted away over this settlement. This appeared twice. Our Savages, when they saw this wonder, cried out in their language: Gara gara: Maredo. ‘We shall have war, there will be blood.’ The French also made some Prophecies thereupon, each according to his own idea.” Perhaps here one of them suggested that Pont Gravé planned to kill Biencourt and attributed it to the Indians’ premonition, but perhaps Biard’s vagueness indicates that the Indian actually said more. We cannot know for certain.

58 Biard, Relation of 1616, in JR 3:213; the “certain madcap” is surely Biencourt, who Biard cautiously referred to anonymously whenever making an accusation.
It is impossible to reconcile factually Biard and Biencourt’s versions of this encounter, but from them we can draw one certainty about power dynamics in the region. Both Biencourt and Pont Gravé were young sons of Monts’s former lieutenants and neither of them had much experience. With the prior generation of leadership either in France or Quebec, the two clearly struggled for trade supremacy against one another along the Atlantic coast, while at the same time maintaining small numbers of colonists surrounded by larger groups of Indians. This encounter was absolutely irrelevant to Biard’s missionary work, but the competition between the two ambitious men became a pretext for Poutrincourt to attack Biard and the Jesuit had no choice but to address it.

Biard’s recommendations for future missionary directly addressed Biencourt’s obstruction of his efforts. In his ninth chapter, “On the means available to aid these nations to their eternal salvation, Biard argued, “There is no probability of ever being able to convert or really help these Nations to salvation, if there is not established there a Christian and Catholic colony,” and “it is a great folly for small companies to go there, who picture themselves Baronies.” “It would be still worse if this foolish idea would occur to people who flee from the ruin of their families in France,” Biard said of Poutrincourt, for “such covetous people … would found a den of thieves, a nest of brigands, a receptacle for parasites, a refuge for rogues, a hotbed of scandal and all wickedness.” “Who would then be more afflicted,” he asked, in referene to his own experience in Canada, “the honest and God-fearing people finding themselves surrounded by such company, or such company, finding itself hemmed in and restrained by the presence of honest people? There would undoubtedly be some friction among them, and God knows what would be the result thereof.” Instead, he promoted the standard Jesuit
model by suggesting that elite investors finance missions. Without the *Factum*, this seems like a vague recommendation, but in this passage Biard is clearly attacking Poutrincourt. Because Biard could not think beyond his frustrations with Biencourt, this chapter—ostensibly the most relevant to future missionaries—barely mentions the Indians he sought to convert.59

Biard’s true intention is not necessarily apparent to readers of Thwaites’s translation or the remaining manuscript editions of the *Relation of 1616*. Biard outlined the *Relation’s* purpose in a narrative arc that follows his description of North America’s Indians and began with chapter ten, “The necessity of thoroughly catechizing people before baptism,” and stretched through chapter twelve, “The occasion on which the Jesuits went to New France.” But the *Relation* skipped a chapter; chapter twelve follows chapter ten. Likewise, the *Relation* skipped chapter twenty-two, jumping directly from “The beginning of the disputes between Sieur de Biencourt and the Jesuits, and the causes thereof; the accusation made against Gilbert du Thet, and his defense” to “A Journey made by Father Enemond Massé, and another by Father Biard.” Thwaites explained, under “peculiarities of the text,” that “Chap. xi. is wrongly numbered xii.; succeeding chapters are consecutively numbered therefrom, xiii., xiv, etc., except that Chap xix. in this arrangement, is wrongly numbered xxi.; but this transposition of letters has not affected the numbering of subsequent chapters.” In his footnotes, he observed that nineteenth-century historians dealt with these discrepancies in various ways, but that

59 Biard, *Relation of 1616*, in *JR* 3:135-7; his following chapter, “The necessity of thoroughly catechizing people before baptism,” outlines his suggestions for dealing with Indians directly. I covered this material in chapter 2.
ultimately, the confusion was merely a “typographical error” common to seventeenth-century pamphlets.\textsuperscript{60}

Thwaites’s rationalization does not explain the major lapses in Biard’s narrative. Regarding baptism in chapter ten, Biard argued that traders in New France who expected to reap immediate financial gain without first building a foundation of settlers, trade networks, and investors, had unrealistic expectations akin to “wishing to have children born with teeth and ears, and introducing mothers without breasts or milk.” The same held true of Christian evangelization, and any future missionaries would need to “catechize, instruct, educate, and train the Savages properly and with long patience, and not expect that in one year, or in two, we can make Christians of people who have not felt the need of either a Priest or a Bishop.” For several pages, he reflected upon a multitude of reasons, used examples from Peru and Mexico, and finally described the limited knowledge of Christianity that Fléché’s converts could recount.\textsuperscript{61} At first glance, this argument merely reflects late sixteenth-century Jesuit educational philosophy. If read more deeply, it represents a response to the \textit{Factum}’s accusation that Biard withheld baptism to undermine Biencourt. “Meanwhile, many complaints arose among our French people because no one was being baptized,” he said, adding in regards to Poutrincourt, “for we live in an age in which any one who knows how to read is, in his own opinion, a great Theologian; and whoever had the least care for his own soul, believes himself to be

\textsuperscript{60} Thwaites, endnotes in \textit{JR} 3:287; it is important to note that Biard’s original manuscript probably did not have chapter divisions, which were likely added later by an editor.

\textsuperscript{61} With the exception of Membertou, “for he truly was a Christian at heart, and desired nothing better than to be able to receive thorough instruction so he could teach the others.” For his full argument, see Biard, \textit{Relation of 1616}, in \textit{JR} 3:141-5.
the most proper person to rule the Church of God.”\textsuperscript{62} Citing the \textit{Factum}’s accusation that glory-seeking Jesuits withheld baptism, Biard then quoted the reply he allegedly gave Biencourt while in Canada:


doublequote
```

```

He continued with such language for several pages, concluding “[t]hese, and other similar reasons, were at that time deduced by the said Father Biard, and have often been repeated since, but they have never carried conviction: an infallible sign, that something else besides reasons was sought for.” Biard’s defense of catechism ends there, but the chapter contains an additional paragraph.

\begin{quote}
W]e have stepped down … to the defense of the Jesuits … For since we have mentioned the \textit{Factum} written against the said Jesuits, and as we must from now on expose, one by one, the lies therein contained, it is for us here to explain what the \textit{Factum} is, who was its Author, and what are said to have been the causes for its being issued to the world.
\end{quote}

Biard never completed that thought, never revealing the \textit{Factum}’s author, nor its purpose, and moved instead into an account of how the Jesuits obtained a commission from Henry IV in chapter twelve.\textsuperscript{63}

\footnote{62 This was also certainly a more general statement about the Reformation, and Biard echoed this sentiment about Protestants in his \textit{L’Autorité de Nostre S. Père le Pape}, which I will describe later in the chapter.}

160
A similar lapse occurs between chapter twenty-one and chapter twenty-three, where the text egregiously downplays the vitriolic breakdown of relations between Biard and Bienécourt when Imbert and Thet arrived in 1612. Given the *Factum*’s ample testimony—especially the appended documents that ostensibly verified Poutrincourt’s attacks—one would expect Biard to focus on this particular incident. Instead, he devoted a few vague paragraphs to it, claiming only that Imbert had kept poor financial records, that the Jesuits brought the matter to Bienécourt “delicately,” and that Imbert responded by accusing the Jesuits of conspiring with Guercheville to overpower Poutrincourt at Port Royal. He ended the chapter, “Twice in the presence of sieur de Bienécourt and of the whole settlement, [the Jesuits] convicted the said Imbert of duplicity …. The second time they pressed him so hard that he was compelled to say he had been drunk when he had spoken thus. Of their truth and innocence in this, there are good and authentic records and proofs.” The next chapter begins, “A reconciliation was effected afterward, and everything calmed down,” and then discusses Massé’s journey to live with Louis Membertou and learn the native tongue, leaving the reader to speculate as to what really occurred in the spring of 1612.  

While compiling *Monumenta Novae Franciae*, Campeau put forward an alternative explanation of the skipped chapters that fundamentally alters the way historians should read the *Relation*: Jesuit censorship. During his research, Campeau uncovered an edition of the *Relation* annotated by Enmond Massé after Biard’s death in

63 Chapter twelve starts with the long quote cited by footnote 52.

162. In his annotations, Massé clarified some of the vague portions of the text.\(^{65}\) The best example of this comes when Biard described Simon Imbert’s accusations:

Now what counsels were held thereupon, and what underhanded dealings or claims, I know not. However, as from little exhalations and vapors, which at first amounting to nothing, arise dense clouds, furious winds, and horrible tempests, which suddenly sweep over and destroy fields and harvests; so from this slight cause, through the agitation of the evil spirit, the trouble increased to a mischievous whirlwind of discord, which has scattered and ravaged all the fruits and hopes of this first clearing. For Imbert represented to him that the partnership formed with Madame la Marquise de Guercheville was a means invested by the Jesuits to drive him out of his broad seigneuries of Canada.\(^{66}\)

This cryptic passage is the only thing Biard said about the dispute between Biencourt that occurred in the early months of 1612. In the margin of his copy of the *Relation*, Massé added, “this chapter deserves to be expanded upon by a book, if we are to respond to the calumnies of Lescarbot … [and the] slanderer among the French, who had not even forgotten to bring with him [to Canada] the *Anticoton*.”\(^{67}\) That Imbert brought *L’Anticoton* to Canada as evidence of Jesuit perfidy would have been notable to Biard, and it is unlikely that he chose not to include it in his testimony.\(^{68}\) Instead, Campeau

\(^{65}\) Campeau, “Introduction,” in *MNF* 1:260*-*, 271-6*.


\(^{67}\) This annotation was reprinted with the text in Campeau’s edition of the *Relation of 1616*, in *MNF* 1:554.

\(^{68}\) It is particularly surprising that Campeau blamed a mental illness for Poutrincourt and Biencourt’s attitude given what he said about Massé’s annotation: “Thus, the action taken by the Jesuit censors is not the least mysterious or suspicious. After all, ever since 1610, the Society of Jesus had been defending itself against calumny alleging that they had played some part in the assassination of Henry IV. These accusations gave rise to controversies, publications and countless ordinances, which tended to embitter peoples’ minds rather than put them at ease. Among the libels, the *Anticoton* had received the most notoriety … Excitement concerning this question of regicide had subsided somewhat in France by 1616, the year when the *Relation* was published. It is understandable, therefore that the Jesuits of the Lyon Province, who were given the task of reviewing Biard’s book, did not want to leave anything in it that would give anyone a pretext for any renewed public agitation.” Campeau understood the grave
argued that Jesuit censors removed the substance of his statement.\textsuperscript{69} By 1616, Henry IV’s assassination had begun to fade into French history. The Jesuits, in Campeau’s understanding, remembered the trouble that \textit{L’Anticoton} had caused them throughout 1611 and preferred not to reopen the subject. As such, the \textit{Relation} never mentions the accusation of regicide, nor does it ever indicate that Biencourt feared Jesuit usurpers.\textsuperscript{70} Moreover, Biard went to great lengths never to attack Poutrincourt or Biencourt by name, making it very difficult for him to formulate a proper defense. From Massé’s revelation, Campeau concluded that “[i]n France, the Jesuit censors of Biard’s \textit{Relation} suppressed chapters of the book” and therefore “acted unwittingly to the advantage of the father and son by suppressing documentation unfavorable to them.”\textsuperscript{71}

In response to the \textit{Relation}, Lescarbot updated his \textit{Histoire de la Nouvelle-France} in 1618. Originally covering Lescarbot’s tenure at Port Royal a decade prior, the new consequences \textit{L’Anticoton} had in France, but still never singled out Gallican fears of Jesuit usurpation as a possible root of the problem. Campeau, “Introduction,” in \textit{MNF} 1:228*-29*.

\textsuperscript{69} Censorship was common in both early modern France and within the Society of Jesus, which had its own internal censorship office. For censorship in seventeenth-century France, see Henri Martin, \textit{The French Book: Religion, Absolutism, and Readership 1585-1715} (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996); Alfred Soman, “Press, Pulpit, and Censorship in France before Richelieu,” in \textit{Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society}, Vol. 120, No. 6 (Dec. 29, 1976), pp. 439-63. During the Reformation, the Catholic world used censorship to slow the spread of heretical doctrines. Early Jesuit and Catholic Saint Robert Bellarmine actually served as a censor for the Holy Roman and Universal Inquisition and the Congregation for the Index of Prohibited Books. Widespread censorship in both France and Rome was part of the reason why the Jesuits established their own censorship office, for, as Peter Godman pointed out, “Better censura praevia from a Jesuit expert … than condemnation by the Inquisition or Index for doctrinal error.” According to Godman, “The Index of Prohibited Books … had become a monster that devoured its own children.” In 1589, while Bellarmine traveled to Paris to help unite France’s divided Catholics, Pope Sixtus V censored Bellarmine for having expressed doubt in papal perfection. See Peter Godman, \textit{The Saint as Censor: Robert Bellarmine Between Inquisition and Index} (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 101, 130-1.

\textsuperscript{70} Censorship might also explain why Biard never accused Biencourt or Poutrincourt of any wrongdoing at any point in the text, keeping Biencourt’s name anonymous during the encounter with Merveille and even protecting his identity when describing how Biencourt encouraged the English to execute him in 1613. Campeau credited Biard’s personality for exhibiting such restraint, and used the missionary’s prudence to conclude that Biard’s account was more credible than Poutrincourt’s.

\textsuperscript{71} Campeau, “Introduction,” in \textit{MNF} 1:227*. 163
edition included several chapters on Poutrincourt’s 1610 attempt but primarily served to rebut Biard’s 1616 testimony.\textsuperscript{72} Since Lescarbot had not been in Canada between 1610 and 1613, however, he instead drew his narrative from the \textit{Factum} and Poutrincourt’s letters and therefore simply rehashed earlier accusations, this time emphasizing Biard’s role in encouraging the English to ransack Port Royal. More damningly, Lescarbot referenced a larger Iberian Jesuit conspiracy, arguing that Poutrincourt’s complaints against the Jesuits rang worldwide and that the Society harbored Portuguese spies. He quoted the complaints of Chinese elders living among Jesuit missionaries: “[The Jesuits] may be the spies of others [the Portuguese] by means of whom they endeavour to spy out [French] secrets.” Sympathetic to this theory, Lescarbot cited the Dieppe merchants’ concern that the French Jesuits were merely servants of Spain.\textsuperscript{73}

Biard, perhaps frustrated that Jesuit censors prevented him from definitively setting the record straight, took Lescarbot’s bait. He believed that if he and Massé were not allowed to make their case, the accusations against the Society would never cease, and in 1620, he wrote to new Superior General Mutius Vitelleschi asking for permission to respond.\textsuperscript{74} “I think it is clearly not a thing to be neglected,” replied the Superior General, “on account of the notable lies and calumnies painted against us, which hinder

\textsuperscript{72} Campeau maintained that Lescarbot was always the brains behind Poutrincourt’s propaganda, claiming that “Wickedness does not deserve a name when it is not accompanied by some kind of intelligence which assure the effectiveness of its blows and forestalls any backlash. Without some intelligence, wickedness is stupidity or despair.” He implied that Lescarbot’s decision to update his \textit{Histoire} in 1618 stemmed directly from the Jesuit decision to censor the \textit{Relation}. Knowing that the Society had muzzled Biard and that the \textit{Relation} only vaguely defended the Society from the \textit{Factum}, his rebuttal required little effort. See Campeau, “Introduction,” in \textit{MNF} 1:229*.

\textsuperscript{73} Lescarbot, \textit{Histoire}, 59, 60, 72.

\textsuperscript{74} This letter is missing, but we know it existed because we have Vitelleschi’s response.
the greater good of all men and prevent the salvation of souls that might be received from us.”75 He sent a letter to Fr. Barthélemi Jacquinot, the provincial of Lyon, demanding that he give Biard “some three months to finish the work,” which “is important to the divine glory and the good opinion of our Order, and that this great deal of slander might be minimized.”76 Biard must have confronted opposition from his Rector, Fr. Louis Michaelis, because the following year, Vitelleschi reassured Biard, reminding him of the importance of his *Apologie* and encouraging Biard to not be “stirred by the words of the Father Rector, who has seemed to disapprove of this task.”77 Biard completed his manuscript in the spring of 1622, and Vitelleschi received it in August.78 But despite the Superior General’s support, the Jesuit censors determined that Biard’s *Apologie* “hurt the reputation of the Company.” “The style, which consists of words which are obsolete and often uses unusual ways of saying things, was an advocate against him,” Vitelleschi told Fr. Jean Fourier, who had succeeded Jacquinot as Lyon’s provincial, “and it is often too harsh” and immodest for a Jesuit author. With the *Apologie* suppressed—and no longer extant for historians to study—Vitelleschi instead suggested that the Society instead reissue the *Relation*, “adding some things that seem to strategically defend the Society,


but observed in a style of modesty belonging to a writer of the Society.” That Biard was too vitriolic in his *Apologie* supports Campeau’s conjecture that he might have written more about his dispute with Biencourt in his original *Relation*, only to have the more acerbic sections removed by sensitive Jesuit censors. The new edition of the *Relation* never materialized. When Biard died in 1622, Vitelleschi asked Massé to take over the project, and although Massé began by annotating a copy of the original, he never wrote a revision.

While it is essential to understand the *Relation of 1616*’s real purpose, we must also consider the document in light of its author. If Poutrincourt’s behavior proved him to be a *bon François*, an analysis of Biard’s life in France confirms that he followed the *parti dévot*. Born in Grenoble in 1567, Biard grew up only 120 km southwest of Calvinist Geneva. Before traveling to Canada, he received education as a Jesuit novice in Tournon from 1583 to 1585, and continued his studies at the college of Billom until 1591. He completed training in philosophy at Tournon from 1591 to 1594 and theology at Avignon from 1596 until 1600, during which time the Society ordained him as a priest. After ordination, he returned to Tournon to receive a master’s of arts degree in 1602. Afterward, the Society stationed him at the college of the Trinity in Lyon, where he taught theology and Hebrew from 1604 until 1608, when Coton called him (along with others) to Bordeaux as a potential missionary to Canada.

---


80 The same year he first applied for foreign missions in either New France or Constantinople; Biard, “Le P. Claude Aquaviva, Gên., au P. Pierre Biard, Rome, 15 julliet 1602—à Tournon,” in *MNF* 1:3.

81 For a brief timeline, see *MNF* 1:662-3.
A product of southeastern France in the last quarter of the sixteenth century, Biard had been profoundly influenced by religious warfare and the Gallican crisis. His first six years at Tournon were particularly tumultuous in the region. The Cardinal of Tournon originally opened the college there in 1552, but fearful of the influx of Huguenot ideas from Geneva, the Cardinal gave his college to the Jesuits in 1561, hoping that the Society would defend Tridentine decrees in the area. During the Wars of Religion, Protestants attacked Tournon, destroyed its churches, and twice forced the Jesuits to flee to the nearby college of Billom. In 1594, after Henry IV expelled the Society from France, the Gallican parlement of Paris attacked the college for illegally harboring Jesuits, presumably including a young Biard. Under authority from the court, the parlement declared that all Jesuits vacate Tournon and threatened to punish any family that sent their children to the college. At Tournon, then, Biard learned firsthand that two groups actively obstructed Jesuit missionary work: Calvinists who preached heretical doctrines and Gallicans who sought to remove the Society from the kingdom. This undoubtedly became foundational for his understanding of the world and predisposed him toward mistrust of both Huguenots and Gallicans like Poutrincourt.  

After Biard returned from Canada in 1614, the Society sent him back to southeastern France. Although the Wars of Religion had supposedly ended under the Edict of Nantes, tensions simmered between Catholics and Protestants. Biard spent 1615 and 1616 at the college of Embrun, located nearly 250 km southeast of Lyon near the 

82 For a summary of the Jesuits at Tournon, see Delattre, Établissements 4:1407-35. For the annuae litterae of Tournon during Biard’s tenure, see Litterae ann Provinc. Lugdun. Ann 1583, 1585, 1592, 1600, 1603, 1604, at ARSI, Lugd. 28.
Italian border. At Embrun, Biard dedicated his time to penning his *Relation of 1616* while surrounded by Calvinists who had populated the town in the latter decades of the sixteenth century. There is no information regarding Biard’s activities at Embrun, but between 1604 and 1628, many of the college’s students professed Calvinism, and the Jesuits successfully converted some of them to Catholicism. In 1616, the Society again deployed Biard as a missionary, this time to a small community of Dié to the northwest of Lyon, which had become a strong Huguenot enclave during the early years of the Reformation in France. Unable to build a college in such a town, the Society instead established a mission there that was officially attached to the college of Tournon. Since he had been superior of the mission at Port Royal, the Society named Biard superior at Dié, where he constantly engaged in public disputations with Protestant ministers.84

His three years debating Protestants at Dié prompted Biard to write his only other publication, *L’Autorité de nostre S. Père le Pape, efficacement & clairement verifiee par l’authentique tefmoignage de S. Iérofme, & autre Pères. Et la réfutation de tout ce que Jean Martinet, Miniftre de Saillans a peu contover au contraire.* Biard wrote the work

---


84 According to Michaelis, the mission resulted in “the strengthening of the Catholic faith, the removal of many heresies, and the amending of certain Catholic mores.” After the revocation of the Edict of Nantes by Louis XIV in 1685, Dié, like all of France, became exclusively Catholic and received its own bishop; Delattre, *Établissements*, 2:10-1. For the *annuae litterae* during Biard’s tenure, see *Litterae ann Provinc. Lugdun. Ann 1616, 1617, 1618, 1619*, at ARSI, Lugd. 29. Also see *Observanda circa missione in Prov. Lugdun.* in ARSI, Lugd. 29; *Informatio de missione Diensi*, at ARSI, Franciae, Fundationes, 2; *Missio Diensis: institutio, incrementa, status praesens*, at ARSI, Lugdunensis, Fundationes, 37.

85 The title alone indicates Biard’s position on papal authority. Biard, *L’Autorité de nostre S. Père le Pape, efficacement & clairement verifiee par l’authentique tefmoignage de S. Iérofme, & autre Pères. Et la réfutation de tout ce que Jean Martinet, Miniftre de Saillans a peu contover au contraire* (Lyon: Jean Lavret, 1619). In 2011, I consulted this source at the Bibliothèque Municipale de Lyon, which holds one of the few remaining manuscript copies. While there, archivist Yann Kergunteuil informed me of a partnership between the Bibliothèque Municipale and Google Books to digitize all materials in their
to rebut Protestant Jean Martinet, who had “published a blasphemous thesis against our Holy Father, the Pope.”

On the surface, the book represents a mere theological dispute, refuting Martinet with hundreds of pages defending theological doctrines of St. Jerome and other Church Fathers concerning papal authority. Years earlier, Martinet had argued that the pope was a false inheritor of Christ, a standard Protestants. Martinet cited a line in Jerome’s Letter 146 to Evangelum, which stated “Wherever there is a bishop, whether it be at Rome or Engubium, whether it be at Constantinople or at Rhegium, whether it be at Alexandria or at Zoan, his dignity is one and his priesthood one. Neither the command of wealth nor the lowliness of poverty makes him more a bishop or less a bishop. All alike are successors of the Apostles.”

This sentiment reflected a popular argument also made by Gallicans who, citing St. Cyprian rather than Jerome, argued that the bishop of Rome had mere oversight of the Church while possessing otherwise equal ecclesiastical authority with all other Catholic bishops. Protestants and Gallicans, then, both drew upon similar arguments to refute papal supremacy.

---

archive. As of 2012, Biard’s L’Autorité de nostre S. Père le Pape is available as a high-quality digital scan for download in the Google Play store.

86 Biard, L’Autorité, 5.

87 St. Jerome (347-420) was a Church Father known for the Vulgate, the definitive Latin translation of the Bible used by the Catholic Church. According to Biard, one “particularly violent” accusation from Martinet: “And then [Martinet said] that the Pope was a heretic, a sorcerer, a necromancer, and in fact dedicated entirely to the devil,” L’Autorité, 127.


89 This became a foundational argument in the eighteenth century, when the Jansenist international sought to defeat the ultramontane Society of Jesus using St. Cyprian: “while possessing a primacy of honor and authority by divine right, the pope is nonetheless not alone in receiving God’s spiritual authority, and though the highest, his power is … not the only one instituted by God, seeing that its unity is such as to be held by many [although exercised] as though by one.” In other words, all bishops inherited their authority.
In his book, Biard complained that the “reformers of Christianity … seduce by tickling the senses,” and that “to us who are children of the light, a lie will be a lie, and those who lie will be called liars; and the works and effects of Martinet will be called, as they must be, frauds, forgeries, insolence, ignorance, malice, opinion, and blindness.” The entire work uses the writings of Jerome to deny the stance attributed to him by Martinet, concluding, “Saint Jerome, grand servant of God, Doctor of the family of Jesus Christ, authentic witness to the beliefs of Christianity, authorized interpreter of Holy Scriptures, and miraculous Professor of Sacred Theology, recognized the Bishop of Rome as the successor of Saint Peter, having authority over the entire Church, which has recognized him and professed him with public submission.” In order to rebut the minister, Biard had also to affirm his belief in papal authority, confirming that he harbored ultramontane principles typically attributed to the Society and despised by good Gallican adherents.

Conclusion

After a brief tenure at the Jesuit college at Carpentras, Biard resumed his missionary work at Paray-le-Monial, another small town to the northwest of Lyon.

___________________________

from Christ directly. See “memoire dated 30 July 1773 for Moñino and Anton de Haen,” in Hets Utrechts Archief, R86-1, Ms 164.

90 Biard, L’Autorité, 2.

91 Ibid, 130.

Paray-le-Monial was new territory for the Jesuits. Opened in 1619 at the urging of the Marquise de la Magdelaine de Ragny, the Society promised to furnish two missionaries to the small town of less than two thousand. Unlike Dié, Paray-le-Monial had remained thoroughly Catholic until the late sixteenth century, when several influential locals converted to Calvinism. Ragny hoped that Jesuits would educate the Catholic children so they might grow up to fill positions otherwise held by Protestants. Paray-le-Monial was Biard’s last mission.

As warfare between Catholics and Protestants escalated through Europe in what would later become known as the Thirty Year’s War, Biard had again become a champion for Catholic hegemony. In the spring of 1622, a German Protestant army led by Ernest von Mansfield entered Lorraine and French Catholics mobilized under Louis XIII to repel the attack. During the campaign, the Marquis de Ragny raised a regiment to assist the king. Biard offered his assistance as military chaplain who administered last rites to Catholic soldiers. As Mansfield retreated into the Spanish Netherlands, the forces of Louis XIII’s traveled southward to put down a Protestant uprising in the Mediterranean town of Montpellier. After two months, Montpellier surrendered to Louis XIII in October. The siege took its toll on Biard, who died in 1622. According to his eulogy, attached to the annuae litterae for Avignon, Biard, who was accustomed to hunger because of his time serving in Canada, shared his rations with starving soldiers.
Without proper nourishment, he became ill in the autumn and retreated to the Jesuit noviate in Avignon, where he performed the *Spiritual Exercises* until his death.\(^{93}\)

We cannot know how history might have played out had Biard lived beyond 1622, but it is possible that he might have returned to Canada.\(^{94}\) He wrote to Vitelleschi twice in 1616 and once in 1617 requesting that the Superior General send him back to the New World. “Concerning the Canadian mission, which your Reverence mentioned, nothing is being planned,” Vitelleschi told Biard in October of 1617, adding “If, however, a means of returning is ever opened, by no means will [your request] be ignored.” He continued, “In the meantime I hope that your reverence is blessed from heaven for your desire to collect and harvest souls.”\(^{95}\)

In his life, Biard demonstrated that he had one distinct vision: renewing Catholicism worldwide and strengthening the authority of the Pope in order to prevent the continued spread of Protestantism, and his time in Canada was merely one part of this ultimate goal. In France, the *parti dévot*, which also professed Catholic unity against Protestantism’s spread, turned to Jesuits like Biard to undertake its work. For *bon François* like Poutrincourt, this hard line against Protestantism implied an imposition of Catholicism by an external power. In their view the Jesuits opposed French autonomy

\(^{93}\) This is a particularly interesting explanation of his death, given Poutrincourt’s accusation that Biard and Massé typically ate their fill at the expense of others. The *annuae litterae* for Avignon in 1622 can be found at *ARSI*, Lugdunensis, 29, doc. 47, ff. 225-225v. Other eulogies include “Notice Necrologique du P. Pierre Biard,” in *MNF* 2:47-8, “Éloge de P. Pierre Biard,” in *MNF* 2:47-52, and Jouvency’s 1710 “Eulogy and Life of Father Pierre Biard,” in *JR* 1:195-99.

\(^{94}\) As will be discussed in the next chapter, Vitelleschi valued Biard and Massé’s experience and sent Massé to Quebec in 1625. However, Biard would have been 58 in 1625, and plausibly too old to return to Canada.

and, by extension, the good of the kingdom. It was impossible to include Jesuits in France’s colonial enterprise without extending the consequences of such a fundamental debate over the nature of religious and political authority—that is to say, fear of Jesuit political ambitions—to North America. By removing the Society from Canada in 1613, Argyll unwittingly assured that Huguenot traders would continue to prosper unopposed in New France, setting the stage for the problems that would face the Jesuits when they returned in 1625.
Chapter 4: “Catholic Devotion Does Not Easily Accommodate the Mood of the Huguenots”: Huguenot Traders, Richelieu, and a Permanent Jesuit Mission in Canada, 1608-1635

Shortly after the Jesuits returned to New France in 1626, Fr. Charles Lalement, a pupil of Enemond Massé, wrote to his brother about the frustrations the Jesuits found in re-establishing themselves in Canada: “after having striven by my exhortations and our conversation to correct the impressions concerning our Society that exist in this country,” he began, “can Your Reverence believe that we have found here the ‘Anti-Coton,’ which was circulated from chamber to chamber, and which was finally burned, about four months after our arrival?”¹ That L’Anticoton had gained traction among the French at Quebec shows not only the lasting prejudices held against the Society of Jesus, but also that the first problems the Jesuits faced came from the French settlers in addition to the indigenous population. Lalement wrote to Samuel de Champlain, telling him that the Caëns—a Huguenot family in charge of Quebec—would not allow the Jesuits to establish a residence there, instead forcing them to take up lodging with the Recollect fathers—Franciscan priests already missionizing Quebec’s Indians.² Even in 1626, the atmosphere of religious distrust had not dissipated in New France: “The heretic holds as complete


dominion here as ever,” Lalement complained to his brother.3

Between 1626 and 1635, the Jesuits struggled to re-launch their mission in New France. Constrained in Quebec by Indians on one side and secular interests and anti-Jesuit sentiments—this time those of Protestant merchants—on the other, they fought to construct a mission, maintain legitimacy, and spread their influence. In France, the changing political climate finally allowed the Jesuits to succeed when Richelieu blocked future Protestant settlement in Canada, simultaneously removing the missionaries’ French obstacles and securing stable and adequate support for establishing a permanent presence among Canada’s Indians. The Jesuits eventually overcame obstructions to their project when they opened the collège du Québec, which served as a base of operations and launching point for missionaries to distant parts of Canada. It also duplicated the same institutional structure that Jesuit missions within France enjoyed.

The Fur Trade and the Founding of Quebec

The settlement at Quebec evolved separately from the one Poutrincourt developed at Port Royal. After the king recalled Samuel de Champlain, Poutrincourt, and the rest of Monts’s men from New France in 1607, Champlain desperately hoped to return. Convincing the king proved difficult. At court, the Protestant duc de Sully, one of Henry IV’s closest advisors, continually dismissed French settlement in the Americas as a drain

on the kingdom’s resources. Merchants also opposed Monts. As fashion tastes shifted toward beaver-skin hats at the end of the first decade of the seventeenth century, French merchants resented his monopoly and pressured the monarchy to open trade. Monts’s company hemorrhaged investors and he teetered over whether or not he ought to fight for his enterprise, but an ambitious Champlain encouraged him to approach Henry’s court and renegotiate his monopoly. Convinced by his former lieutenant, Monts informed the king that the English had recently established a foothold in Virginia. If the French did not act, Monts argued, English (and possibly Dutch, who considered establishing a colony) would control North America, cutting French merchants off from the fur trade entirely.

Persuaded by Monts, Henry granted Monts a one-year monopoly to resettle in New France in January 1608. After raising the requisite funds for his new colony, Monts appointed Champlain as governor. They decided that rather than resettle at Acadia, with exposed bays easily accessible to enemy fleets (as Biencourt would discover in 1613), they would locate the colony inland along the Saint Lawrence River. Not only did this location provide better protection, but it also put the French into close contact with Indians, allowing them more opportunities to expand both the fur trade and spread Christianity to more distant peoples. Upon arriving in the Saint Lawrence Valley in the summer of 1608, Champlain chose to settle at Quebec, a point along the river where a rocky promontory provided ample defense from sieges but also offered access to trade

---

4 Instead, he thought French interests lay in working the land: “farming and herding are the two breasts from which France is fed,” in Fischer, Champlain’s Dream, 72.
along the river. Champlain’s long-term vision for his settlement made Quebec the center of France’s Canadian empire until it fell to England in 1759.\(^5\)

As in previous years, the monarchy eventually revoked Monts’s monopoly—this time after only one year. Growing agitation among French merchants prompted Henry to open trade to the public in 1609, which in turn promoted population growth in New France.\(^6\) The new policy and resulting influx of traders solved Champlain’s early difficulty in recruiting, but the increased competition drove up the price of furs. Most small traders, who had much lower overhead costs than Poutrincourt at Port Royal or Champlain at Quebec, could better bear the cost of competition.\(^7\) Monts could not, and the losses incurred because of the open trade policy help explain why he gave such generous titles to Guercheville when she entered into partnership with Poutrincourt in 1612. Champlain knew that unless the crown revoked free trade, he could not maintain Quebec for very long. He proposed a compromise in which the crown would organize the best independent traders into a large trading company under the leadership of a member

---


\(^6\) This is why Poutrincourt returned to Port Royal in 1609. Understanding the new policy of open trade as a temporary mandate, he believed that he could eventually convince the king to grant a monopoly to him were Port Royal to succeed.

\(^7\) It was during this period that Biencourt was constantly antagonized by Pont Gravé’s independent operation.
of the Court. This policy would allow the company to better control prices while still expanding the number of traders. In 1613, the crown enacted Champlain’s proposal, closing trade to the public.

The new monopoly company divided Canadian profits between merchants in La Rochelle, Rouen, and St. Malo. Although some small-time traders—including Pont Gravé, who remained influential at Quebec for decades—continued to trade along the Atlantic coast, Champlain sought to centralize the bulk of the trade. He traversed vast parts of Canada and successfully encouraged scattered groups of Indians to come to Quebec with their furs. These initial successes were not enough to overcome Champlain’s early difficulties: many merchants in France opposed the new company, growing English and Dutch settlements in Virginia and New Netherland threatened Quebec militarily, and, perhaps most importantly, Champlain struggled to find prospective Canadian settlers. Without colonists, he feared that traders at Quebec would become completely dependent upon the Indians to supply food. Meanwhile in Paris, the company changed leadership several times and eventually became the responsibility of

---

8 His first choice was Charles de Bourbon, Comte de Soissons, uncle of the late Henry IV. Soissons died shortly before the monopoly went into effect, and it was instead passed to his nephew, Henry de Bourbon, third Prince de Condé; Biggar, *Early Trading Companies*, 86-7.

9 Biggar, *Early Trading Companies*, 70-93.

10 See Champlain’s *Voyages* for his account. Fischer’s *Champlain’s Dream* provides a modern in-depth narrative of his voyages.

11 The Company coaxed Louis Hébert, the chemist and physician who accompanied Poutrincourt to Port Royal in 1606 and 1609 and helped Biencourt negotiate with Biard during Biard and Massé’s attempt to escape Port Royal in 1612, to bring his family to settle Quebec. Although they offered to pay him a large sum, they later stipulated that he would only receive compensation if he agreed to submit to the authority of the Company. He remained at Quebec, but the example deterred other would-be settlers. In the 1610s, Quebec remained a largely unsettled trading post; Biggar, *Early Trading Companies*, 110-11; Fisher, *Champlain’s Dream*, 350-2.
the French Navy Board. It fell into the hands of Henry, the second duc de Montmorency and the Admiral of France and Brittany, who conferred closely with Champlain and ultimately decided that the Company had not fulfilled its duties. Although the monopoly legally lasted until 1625, Montmorency canceled it in 1620.\textsuperscript{12}

Many investors from the original company applied to lead the next attempt when Montmorency sought candidates for a new monopoly in 1621. The duke settled upon Guillaume de Caën, a Calvinist merchant from Rouen, to lead the expedition, with Caën’s Catholic cousin Ézéchiel and nephew Émery as his lieutenants. The son of a Protestant merchant and ship owner who traded in Holland and Newfoundland as early as 1583, Caën grew up as an Atlantic merchant and became a naval captain in 1619. Although the risk was considerable, Caën invested his time and capital—his entire future—on the potential windfall that might befall him in the fur trade. In exchange for a bulk of the profits, the contract obligated Caën to pay Montmorency and Champlain an annual salary, maintain ten company men to use as workers or soldiers, retain six Recollect missionaries to evangelize Indians, and bring six families of at least three people to settle. Despite his Protestant faith—of which the Jesuits and their Recollect colleagues were acutely aware—Caën cared foremost about profit and religion rarely shaped his behavior as leader in New France.\textsuperscript{13}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Biggar, \textit{Early Trading Companies}, 94-114; Fisher, \textit{Champlain’s Dream}, 310-6, 345-78.
\item Marcel Trudel argued that Caën cared about nothing but profiting from the fur trade. He was not the cause of religious tensions—though they existed—and he “did not concern himself with colonization.” Instead, “Guillaume de Caën saw in New France nothing more than a base of the fur trade; and the fur trade could produce a handsome yield.” Caën’s gamble failed: after being forbidden to trade in New France after Richelieu banned Protestants from Canada, he resorted to suing his successor, the Catholic Compagnie des Cent-Asssociés, to recover the money he lost. For more, see Trudel’s entry in the \textit{Dictionary of Canadian}
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
The Caëns’ company, officially commissioned as the Compagnie de Montmorency but often called the Compagnie de Caën, initially struggled to impose its authority. Members of the old company, jealous of the new contract and unwilling to relinquish their share of the lucrative fur trade, sent their own ships to Quebec to compete with the Caëns in 1621. Since the Caëns—and their orders from the king—had yet to arrive, Champlain allowed members of the old Company to operate in the region; they dispersed up the St. Lawrence to meet potential Indian trading partners. With investors in the old company mounting opposition to the Caëns, the king’s council permitted both companies to trade in 1621 provided that the Compagnie de Montmorency absorb the remnants of the old Company at the end of the summer trading season. Guillaume de Caën, arriving in New France after Champlain had already permitted other traders to capture the best markets, considered pursuing and capturing his rivals. Instead, when he learned that the opposing company had no supplies for winter, he offered to support them—for the price of one thousand beaver skins.

The threat of growing international opposition forced Caën to settle his differences with his rivals. After Argyll eliminated France’s permanent settlements along the Atlantic coast in 1613, England asserted its jurisdiction over those lands. In 1609, a

\[\text{\textit{Biography.} Caën’s Catholic cousin and nephew surely helped legitimize him in the eyes Catholics at the French court.}\]

\[\text{\textsuperscript{14} One of the ships belonged to François Gravé, Sieur du Pont. The Sieur du Pont—Robert Pont Gravé’s father—outranked Champlain as a lieutenant with Monts and Poutrincourt during their 1606-07 explorations of New France and replaced Champlain as Governor of Quebec during a brief period in which the original Company relieved Champlain of his duties in 1619. Reinstated as Quebec’s leader, Champlain prepared defenses at Quebec in case Pont decided to fight for the old Company. Fortunately, Pont promised to retrieve the Company’s men and return them to France if the King so decreed; Biggar, \textit{Early Trading Companies}, 117.}\]

\[\text{\textsuperscript{15} Biggar, \textit{Early Trading Companies}, 114-8.}\]
Dutch voyage led by Henry Hudson explored modern-day New York, and the Dutch established a trading post in New Netherland in 1614. In 1620, English religious separatists landed at Plymouth, Massachusetts—much closer to New France than Virginia—and began trading with nearby Indians. One year later, King James I of England (who also reigned as James VI of Scotland) declared that the entire region between the St. Lawrence River and the Atlantic Ocean comprised New Scotland. Recognizing the necessity for unity among French traders in the face of increasing international competition, Caën negotiated a settlement. In exchange for combining the two companies, Caën promised to pay one twelfth of his profits to shareholders from the old company. King Louis XIII sanctioned the agreement by extending the Company’s monopoly until 1635. With a deal in place, all parties finally looked forward to building a strong, stable, and permanent trading empire that stretched into the vast North American interior and converged at Quebec.

Early Religious Tensions among Quebec’s Settlers

As the Caëns managed opposition from rival traders, growing geopolitical concerns, and an inability to recruit settlers, another problem boiled beneath the surface in New France: religious conflict. Although increasingly considered enemies of the state

---

16 This included Port Royal, where Biencourt still hoped to become a wealthy trader. In 1623, he finally gave up this endeavor, and “ceded his rights at Port Royal to a friend, young La Tour, … here La Tour and a few of his friends continued the same half-trading, half-roving life which [Biencourt] himself had been leading since the destruction of his home in 1613”; Biggar, *Early Trading Companies*, 123. After the English captured Acadia in 1710, it officially became *Nova Scotia, Nouvelle Écosse, or, New Scotland.*

by their Catholic detractors, Protestants were leading organizers, investors, sailors, and traders in France’s colonial enterprise. To some French Protestants, New World exploration offered an opportunity for long-term refuge from future persecution. From the crown’s perspective, allowing Calvinists to lead colonial enterprises made for sound political strategy during tumultuous times, giving the king an opportunity to expand France’s New World empire while removing influential Protestant dissidents from the metropole. Catholics would never have allowed the monarch officially to support an exclusively Protestant colony, but the policy of toleration mandated by the Edict of Nantes allowed such religious refuges to exist—after all, why would Catholics choose to settle in predominantly Protestant colonies? Although the Edict mandated that the colonies, like France, be formally Catholic while remaining tolerant of Huguenots, Protestants made up a large portion of emigrants to the New World before 1630. The considerable number of Calvinists in New France made missionary endeavors much more difficult than in exclusively Catholic colonies such as New Spain or Portuguese outposts in the Indian and Pacific Oceans.

To successfully establish a foothold in the New World, France relied on ship owners with a sound financial background but, this posed a particular problem during the Wars of Religion: many of the wealthiest and most knowledgeable French merchants and sailors had become Huguenots. Jean-François de La Rocque de Roberval, who in 1541

---

unsuccessfully had attempted to settle Canada as the first Lieutentant-General of New France, was an early Calvinist, as were his successors Pierre de Chauvin in 1600, Monts in 1604, and Guillaume de Caën in 1621. Protestant activity was not limited to Canada. French Protestants collaborated with Nicolas Durant de Villegaignon—who hoped to find a place where his coreligionists could freely practice and continue to reform their faith—in exploring Brazil in the 1550s. Villegaignon, in partnership with Calvin, brought Genevan missionaries to establish his faith in the New World. Portugeuse Jesuits, alarmed by the introduction of Calvinism to Brazil, urged their governor to attack Villegaignon’s colony in 1560. In the 1550s, the idea of emigrating to Brazil became popular among many Protestants, but the French settlement’s destruction by its Portuguese rivals eliminated the possibility.

Believing that a Calvinist colony in the New World might lead to a grand exodus and protection from persecution, Huguenots led by Jean Ribaut and René de Laudonnière founded a new Calvinist settlement in Florida between 1562 and 1564. This attempt was also short-lived, and the settlers’ religion served as a convenient excuse for a Catholic Spanish fleet led by Pedro Menéndez de Avilés to massacre them in 1565. The Huguenot Admiral Gaspard II de Coligny, whose 1572 assassination helped spark the St. Batholomew’s Day Massacre that plunged France back into religious warfare, had helped

19 Monts owed his experience to Chauvin, his predecessor. Monts accompanied Chauvin when he led an expedition to settle in Canada in 1599. Winter proved difficult for the 500 men Chauvin brought with him to the St. Lawrence, and Chauvin died soon afterward. Chauvin did not bring any Catholic priests, but he did bring Calvinist ministers. Champlain wondered why the king had “givien a commission to a man of the contrary religion for propagating the Catholic faith.” Charles Baird, History of the Huguenot Emigration to America, vol. 1 (New York: Dodd, Mead & Company, 1885), 84. Caën was the last Protestant to lead New France.
both Villegaignon and Ribaut organize their expeditions. Keenly aware of the militant forces that would eventually take his own life, Coligny strongly believed that Protestants would one day need a safe haven from Catholic persecution.20

Despite these attempts to establish a religious safe haven, most Huguenots engaged in colonization as organizers, financiers, merchants, and sailors not because of their religious affiliations, but because disproportionately filled the occupations dependent on maritime commerce.21 Their concentration in these trades stemmed in part from the geographical distribution of Protestants in the kingdom, with France’s leading port cities such La Rochelle, Dieppe, and Rouen embracing Calvinism beginning in the 1530s. As Protestantism spread rapidly through the provinces of Saintonge and Normandy, Huguenot fishermen dispersed from Protestant port cities into the North Atlantic cod fisheries.22 The monarchy forbade Protestant emigration to Canada between 1569 and 1588, but re-admitted them when religious warfare ended after Henry IV’s


21 As Charles Washington Baird so eloquently put it, “Many of the ships that visited the fishing banks, or cruised along the shores of the gulf of St. Lawrence, were owned by Huguenot merchants, and manned by Huguenot sailors, whose loud voices were often heard, in port and at sea, to the indignation of all good Catholics, as they joined lustily in singing [Poet and Calvinist sympathizer] Clement Marot’s psalms,” Baird, Huguenot Emigration, 81.

22 It is interesting to note that while Saintonge contained the Protestant stronghold of La Rochelle, it also produced Samuel de Champlain, from the smaller port town of Brouage. There is some debate about Champlain’s origins, as his father’s identity remains unknown. It is possible that he Champlain was born Protestant and converted to Catholicism. David Hackett Fischer argued that Champlain was actually the illegitimate child of Henry of Navarre, which might explain the early opportunities given to the young explorer; Fischer, “Henry IV and Champlain,” in Champlain’s Dream, 42-60.
conversion.\textsuperscript{23} Commerce helped Protestants maintain legitimacy after the Edict of Nantes: they used trade to build wealth and constructed information networks with Protestant communities in other parts of Europe. Unsure that toleration would be maintained, many Protestants saw colonies as an insurance policy in case they needed a refuge from future Catholic oppression.\textsuperscript{24}

The Edict of Nantes originally formed the basis of religious policy in New France, positioning the colony as one in which Protestants could practice their faith relatively unmolested. While the conversion of Indians to Catholicism remained an essential stated goal for the enterprise, the law mandated that \textit{French} in New France would enjoy the same religious protections guaranteed to them at home. This made it far easier for Monts to recruit men from Protestant port cities such as La Rochelle, but toleration cut both

\textsuperscript{23} The Protestant due de Sully, although he opposed colonization, became Henry IV’s sole financial minister.

\textsuperscript{24} Since 1950, almost all of the literature on Protestant merchants in New France covered the period after 1627. The standard on New France’s merchants is Louise Dechêne’s \textit{Habitants et marchands de Montréal}; J.F. Bosher argued that Protestant merchant connections helped keep international Protestant communities in constant contact with one another. These ties later formed an essential link between Protestant intellectuals during the Enlightenment: “Letters between merchants were humdrum exchanges of information about prices, commodities, and transactions, but behind them were family relationships that formed the heart of the Protestant International.” See Bosher, “Huguenot Merchants and the Protestant International in the Seventeenth Century,” in \textit{The William and Mary Quarterly}, Vol. 52, No. 1 (Jan 1995), 77-102; Baird, \textit{Huguenot Emigration}, 79-84; Dale Miquelon provided an excellent historiographical summary of major 20\textsuperscript{th} century works in “The Merchants in the History of the ‘First Canada’,” in \textit{Habitants et Marchands Twenty Years Later: Reading the History of Seventeenth- and Eighteenth-Century Canada},” edited by Sylvie Dépatie, Catherine Desbarats, Danielle Gauvreau, Mario Lalancette, and Thoman Wien (Montreal: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 1998), 32-68; In 1685, Louis XIV’s revocation of the Edict of Nantes prompted the emigration of nearly 160,000 Huguenots from France. While many went to Protestant cities throughout Europe, others traveled to North America. In a sense, this mirrors the behavior of an earlier generation, but this time, they went to the British colonies in what Jon Butler described as “the first major Continental European refugee group to settle in the British colonies of North America since the arrival of the Puritans half a century earlier.” Primarily settling in Boston, New York, and South Carolina, they were economically successful (particularly in South Carolina, where they benefitted from generous government land policies) and English settlers treated them relatively well. For this reason, their communities disintegrated by the middle of the eighteenth century as they assimilated into their respective American societies. See Jon Butler, \textit{The Huguenots in America: A Refugee People in a New World Society} (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1983).
ways, meaning that Monts also could not forbid Catholic emigration. As a result, the group of sailors and adventurers that accompanied him to New France in 1604 comprised both Catholics and Huguenots. The king also recommended that Monts bring not only a mix of professionals and nobles—including the Protestant Lescarbot and the Catholic Poutrincourt—but unemployed wanderers and criminals he hoped to remove from the kingdom. This diverse make-up of Canada’s early explorers seemed to predispose the colony toward religious and social disarray, but the Protestant Monts and the Catholic Champlain firmly enforced a policy of religious toleration and freedom of worship in the spirit of the Edict of Nantes. Given decades of warfare in France, this lofty goal was impractical and not always attainable.

In one instance, Father Nicolas Aubry, a Catholic priest that Monts brought on one of his early expeditions, disappeared into the wilderness. Monts and his men scoured the surrounding area, hoping to recover the young clergyman, but the search party failed to find him. Monts worried about the consequences Aubry’s disappearance would have on the colony’s fragile religious peace. Throughout the voyage, the priest had engaged in heated debates with one of the unnamed Calvinist pastors Monts intended to have minister to Huguenot settlers. Some of the colonists recalled that the disputation between Aubry and his foe had devolved into threats. Rumors swirled and several men contended that Aubry had been last seen with the Calvinist minister, implying that he had murdered his Catholic colleague and hidden the body in the forest. Monts knew that regardless of what had actually happened to Aubry, the upset Catholic settlers might

retaliate against the minister, and for over two weeks he worried that his settlement might erupt into religious violence. Fortunately, after seventeen days of desperate wandering and subsisting on nothing but roots, Aubry, who had lost his voice shouting for help, emerged from the woods and flagged down one of Mont’s ships. Aubry’s reappearance staved off any impending crisis, but it also reminded Monts of the mutual distrust that remained between the two religious factions in his colony.26

In the end, enforcing the Edict’s policy of toleration did not resolve New France’s religious tensions. At home, some Catholics rejected Mont’s authority. Not only did the Jesuit provincial Jean Gentil cite Mont’s Protestantism as a reason not to send Jesuits to Canada in 1608, the Catholic parlement of Rouen refused to register Mont’s commission on the grounds that it stipulated that New France be “Christian” rather than “Catholic.”27 In Canada, the disputes between Aubry and Monts’s Calvinist minister escalated. “I have seen the Minster and our curé get into fistfights over the difference in religion,” Champlain remarked, adding, “Two conflicting religions never produce any great results for the Glory of God in the conversion of the unbelievers … the Savages were sometimes on one side, sometimes the other, and the French, mingled according to their diverse belief, said abominable things of both religions, although sieur de Mons made peace as

26 Baird, *Huguenot Emigration*, 90-92; Lescarbot mentioned this division in his *Last Relation* with more details appearing in his *Histoire de la Nouvelle-France*; it also appears in Champlain’s voyages, but Champlain did not include anything about the religious tensions—instead it is a comedic story; Fisher treated it similarly in *Champlain’s Dream*.

27 Dominique Deslandres argued that this stipulation, combined with Monts’s decision to bring both a Catholic priest and a Calvinist minister, shows that “the imperative was to christianize before Catholicizing or ‘Calvinizing.’” See Deslandres, *Croire et faire croire*, 212. This might have seemed practical to Monts, but to Catholic missionaries, the vague foundation was dangerous.
best he could." Eventually, Calvinism indeed became the de facto religion in the earliest settlement when both Aubry and the Protestant minister died of scurvy, leaving religious instruction in the hands of the lay Protestant Marc Lescarbot. Although the 1608 group that founded Quebec was equally diverse and governed by the Catholic Champlain, Protestants captained many of the vessels that traded in the Saint Lawrence Valley. Some brought Protestant ministers to perform Calvinist services on board the ship and required all passengers, regardless of their religious affiliation, to attend.

Religious Tensions and the Recollect Mission

Before the arrival of the Jesuits in 1625, a group of Franciscan missionaries known in France as Recollects immediately succeeded Biard and Massé in 1615. Champlain chose the Recollects because of the reputation the Franciscans had built

---


29 Baird cited Lescarbot: “Being requested by the Sieur de Poutrincourt, our chief, to give some portion of my time to the Christian instruction of our little community, in order that we might not live like the beasts, and that we might afford the savages an example of our way of living, I did so every Sunday, and also upon some extraordinary occasions, nearly all the time when we were there. And it happened well that without anticipating this, I had brought with me my Bible and a few books; for else the duty would have wearied me greatly, and I might have been compelled to decline it. As it was, the labor was not without fruit; for several persons have testified to me that they had never heard so much said and well said concerning God, having been previously unacquainted with the principles of the Christian doctrine … A condition in which the mass of Christendom is living,” said Lescarbot, invoking the popular stereotype that Catholics did not fully understand their own faith. Regarding Poutrincourt’s urging, Baird argued that Poutrincourt, “if nominally a Roman Catholic, appears to have been in full sympathy with his Huguenot associates, de Monts and Lescarbot.” Poutrincourt, who had once allied himself with the Catholic League, certainly shelved any radical Catholic sentiments he may have once harbored to garner support from the King and from Monts. I think it is inaccurate to make him out to be a Protestant sympathizer, as Baird does, and we ought rather paint him as an opportunist with Gallican beliefs. Baird, *Huguenot Emigration*, 94.

evangelizing Indians in Spanish America. Pope Paul V, King Louis XIII, and the Company shareholders confirmed a budget to support a mission for six Recollect priests. Although the Recollects were less hated than Jesuits within France, they still vigorously opposed the spread of Protestantism in the kingdom. In Canada, they believed merchant greed significantly hindered their evangelical efforts, explaining that “the land was not cultivated, the country not inhabited, and in hearing the merchants you would have said they aspired nothing to the glory of God or the conversion of the Indians.” “I want to believe that they had some goodwill and would have been glad to aide in [Christianity’s] advancement, but they achieve no effect, because of the temporal interests to which they are principally attached,” complained Recollect Fr. Gabriel Sagard of New France before the Recollects arrived.\footnote{Sagard was a lay friar who journeyed to Canada in 1623 and returned to France in 1624. He published an account of a voyage he took to the Hurons entitled Le grand voyage au pays des Hurons in 1632. He combined his own experience in New France with accounts he took from his fellow Recollects to publish a more comprehensive L'Histoire du Canada in 1636. Although a secondhand account, Sagard used letters, official documents, testimonies from his colleagues and the Jesuits, as well as Champlain and Lescarbot’s histories to construct his narrative. His work primarily served as evidence of their missionary success, for Sagard hoped to convince the king to allow the Recollects to return to Canada after the monarchy granted the Jesuits full license to evangelize there. He also published a dictionary of the Huron language. See Jean de la Croix, “Gabriel Sagard,” in Dictionary of Canadian Biography, vol 1.}

For ten years the Recollects were the only Catholic missionaries in Canada, and they struggled in the face of a Huguenot majority. In his memoire on the Recollect mission published in 1636, Sagard highlighted the tensions he perceived between his Order and the Protestant merchants. Taking aim at the missionaries’ morale, Sagard recalled that during his voyage to New France “many Huguenots made sure that they decried the repulsiveness of the country.”\footnote{Sagard, L’Histoire du Canada, 37.} “Huguenots and heretics profit equally with
Catholics;” Sagard wrote, adding, “if Catholics had a priest, the Huguenots had a minister, and while they amused themselves with their disputations, the Indians remained confirmed of their irreligion.” Because of the high proportion of Protestant merchants, the Recollects perceived the differences between merchant and missionary as essentially linked to religion: “Catholic devotion does not easily accommodate the mood of the Huguenots,” he warned, and after the death of Aubry and his Calvinist counterpart, Sagard described New France as a place where “the mischievous heretics maintained their libertine lives, with no obstruction or impediment to their tyranny which has even forced Catholics to attend their prayers and the songs of the sailors, otherwise they were not admitted into their vessels nor permitted to use their factories.”

According to Sagard, the king sent the missionaries because he “recognized the defects of the Company” in supporting religious conversion and “proposed that without clergy, they would neither be able to nor hope to advance [France’s] principal duty, being the glory of God and the conversion of the Indians.” Although Sagard’s anti-Huguenot worldview surely exaggerated his rhetoric, the fact that he linked perceived debauchery to Protestantism rather than the more common New World culprit—life among uncivilized Indians—demonstrates the gravity of religious tensions among Quebec’s earliest missionaries.


34 Although it is possible that Louis XIII’s ministers said this, it is unlikely that the monarchy believed missionary work was more important than constructing an empire that could compete with their rivals. See Sagard, L’Histoire du Canada, 27.
After traveling extensively to various Indian groups across the St. Lawrence Valley, the priests collectively penned several recommendations based on their earliest observations. The Recollects wanted mobile bands of Indians to become sedentary societies in order to learn European customs and better accept Christianity, while the traders preferred Indian groups who migrated seasonally because they promoted more expansive trade networks and a wider array of furs.⁴⁵ These traders were dangerous to the missionaries’ objectives, according to the Recollects who complained that “the Protestants, or Huguenots, having the best share in the trade, it was feared that the contempt they showed for our mysteries would greatly retard the establishment of the faith.” While “[i]t finally appears that … [the missionaries] would not progress unless the colony was increased by a greater number of settlers, mechanics, and farmers,” the Recollects stipulated that they meant Catholic ones: “In the future, Huguenots should be excluded.”³⁶ “Our merchants,” wrote Fr. Joseph le Caron, another frustrated Recollect, “are always plunging into greater disorders. They give us a Huguenot as clerk and intendant of their stores; the powder-magazine keeper is of the same religion as this Protestant who commands this post.”³⁷ “If possible,” he requested, “the king ought to put a Catholic lord in these parts … who would give what is necessary to build a seminary.”³⁸ “I gave absolution to a Huguenot who, by the Grace of God, has entered into

---

³⁵ Neither side considered what the Indians thought; missionaries could not imagine that Indians might not want to settle.


³⁷ When calling them “our merchants,” the Recollect implied that merchant really meant heretic.

³⁸ Le Clecq, First Establishment, 134-5. Caron, like the Jesuits who succeeded him, believed that their mission would not succeed without a college. They needed a strong base of operations as well as a place.
himself and abjured his heresy in my hands,” rejoiced Caron before he rued that his convert “begs earnestly to remain with us at Quebec this year, but I do not know whether our merchants will let him.”

When the Protestant Caëns arrived with their re-organized company in 1621, the Recollects grew anxious. They sent a delegation to Paris with an official petition outlining the problems facing the Recollects and requesting “a remedy to the many evils that threaten these lands.” Officials in Paris were already growing weary of the Recollects. When they compared reports coming out of Franciscan missions in Mexico and Peru to those coming from Canada, they found a startling disparity in the number of converts, and many wondered if New France was worth evangelizing at all. Recollect Fr. George Baillif, whom the missionaries sent to France to represent them at court, hoped to rebut that conclusion by blaming the toleration of large numbers of Protestant merchants operating throughout the Saint Lawrence Valley for their failure to produce converts. The Recollects, Baillif averred, could not succeed because they lived in constant fear. Canada was so abundant with resources, he claimed, “who would not run the risk of coming to possess so rich a land?” His fear of foreign invasion, “whether New Holland, New Flanders, or New England,” was driven by more than just trepidation about increasing international competition, for Baillif urged the king to take into account “the

that might tie Indians to a particular spot and thus encourage them to settle. “I kept open school in our house at [Tadoussac], in order to attract the Indians and render them sociable with us, to accustom them to our ways of living,” but although he had some success on his own, “I would have had a great many children to instruct in the mysteries of our holy faith, if I had anything to give them to eat.”

39 Le Clecq, First Establishment, 137.

40 In reality, the Spanish missionaries were far less concerned with thorough catechization and often baptized with little discretion. For more on Franciscan missionaries in the New World, see Phelan, The Millennial Kingdom of the Franciscans in the New World.
plots and enterprises of the merchants of [the Protestant French port city of La] Rochelle, who every year carry arms and munitions to the Indians, inciting them to massacre the French and destroy their settlement, which is by no means inconsiderable.” In New France, Baillif felt surrounded not by merely European rivals, but by specifically Protestant ones, be they English, Dutch, or French. While Baillif asked the king to fortify the colony’s defense and administer punishment more strictly to those who “committed thefts, murders, assassinations, pillage, blasphemy, and other crimes,” he stressed a more pressing religious need: “that all your Majesty’s subjects professing the pretendedly reformed religion be forbidden to settle or maintain there any persons of any nation whatever of said pretendedly reformed religion, under such penalties as shall be judged reasonable.” The letter bore the signatures of various political and ecclesiastical leaders in New France. 41

Another False Start: The Jesuits in New France from 1625-1629

The Recollects lost their exclusive right to Christianize Canada’s Indians to the Jesuits, who joined them in Canada in 1626. When Claudio Acquaviva died in 1615, the Society elected Mutio Vitelleschi to become their sixth Superior General. During his administration, Vitelleschi, who had previously been a theology and philosophy instructor, provincial of Naples, and assistant provincial of Italy, oversaw a great expansion of the Society—particularly in France. As the Society’s influence spread, he

41 This letter appears in Le Clercq, *First Establishment*, 164-72.
became an ardent champion of foreign missions. Instead of simply attaching a handful of priests to a trading outpost as they had done in 1611, Vitelleschi envisioned a Canadian mission mirroring those that the Society had established in Europe: operations funded by Catholic elites that revolved around the establishment of a college that could serve as a base of missionary operations for decades. But in 1625, as in 1611, the Jesuits faced opposition not only from Gallican propaganda such as L’Anticoton, but increasingly from the growing number of Huguenots traders who despised Jesuits.

Initially, Vitelleschi hesitated before sending Jesuits to Canada. In late 1619, Fr. Jean Arnoux, who later succeeded Coton as confessor to Louis XIII, inquired about Vitelleschi’s plans for strengthening the Jesuits’ status in France. While the text of his letter has been lost, Vitelleschi’s response indicates Arnoux’s curiosity about the Society in Canada. The Superior General skepticism about returning to North America demonstrates the lingering problems facing the Jesuits. “Regarding the Canadian mission,” he wrote, “before you might vigorously urge anyone, explore the sense of our fathers who are familiar with the state of these lands.” In a place “which is well known for the unremitting incursions of heretics and barbarians, not the firm protection of his most Christian King,” the Jesuits might continue to find opposition similar to what Biard and Massé had faced.\footnote{Vitelleschi must have known something of the developing Huguenot demographics at Quebec.} Remembering the destruction of Port Royal at the hands of Samuel Argyll, Vitelleschi concluded, “indeed at least until England and France are at peace, you might not consider it prudent to set our men out working in such evident danger with such small hope for fruits.” But despite reservations, “otherwise for this
mission … my zeal is everlasting.” Thus the Superior General outlined the future of the Jesuits in Canada: he found the enterprise most important, “especially for the unbelievers,” but religious politics and international conflicts (driven in some respects by the same religious politics) needed to be eliminated before the Society could achieve real success.43

Between the return to France of Biard and Massé in 1614 and the re-establishment of a Jesuit mission in Canada in 1625, various Jesuits expressed interest in traveling to New France as missionaries, prompting Vitelleschi seriously to reconsider the Society’s options.44 By 1625, the Superior General began organizing the mission with the duc du Ventadour, who had succeeded Montmorency as Vice-Roy of New France, and Pierre Coton and Ignatius Armand, the incoming and outgoing provincials of France. Founding missions was already a priority for Coton, who had brought Vitelleschi and the monarchy together in backing a broad development of Jesuit missions throughout France, and Coton was eager to repeat his domestic successes by expanding their presence to Constantinople and New France.45


Vitelleschi’s correspondence with Coton reveals the global scope that he and the Provincial envisioned for France’s Jesuits. In 1625 he discussed each mission in the same correspondences, commanding Jesuits be sent to Constantinople and the Levant while he awaited orders on the Society’s status in New France. Moreover, he wanted the Society to approach foreign missions in the same manner as domestic ones. “I await news about the mission to Canada and [the French town of] Bourges,” he told Coton in the spring of 1625. In Bourges, Vitelleschi hoped the Prince of Condé would designate funds to build a college.\footnote{Vitelleschi, “Le P. Mutius Vitelleschi, Gén., au P. Pierre Coton, Prov., Rome, 5 mai 1625—à Paris,” in \textit{MNF} 2:72.} Jesuit colleges became the lynchpin of Vitelleschi’s program, and they featured prominently in his vision for \textit{all} French missions, whether at home or abroad. In a series of letters to Coton about places both domestic and foreign, Vitelleschi outlined “a common system for founding missions in the Society.” The process began with a wealthy benefactor, who “might leave money from his estate with a pious declaration of his will … with prudence and with the highest charity and without civil obligation,” and the Society “owe[d] indeed these foundations to these simple donations.” Upon approval by the Superior General, the endowment would fund the construction of a college, where “each year [the rector of the college] will have the responsibility of sending fathers to help and lift up the people, especially in those places where their help might bring
support for the mission.” “For they will bear plenty of fruit,” Vitelleschi declared, “and the salvation of souls shall be procured.”

Vitelleschi instructed Coton to begin preparations for erecting his two foreign missions. Along with two missionaries destined for Constantinople, Vitelleschi ordered the provincial to select five Jesuits for Canada. Coton chose Fr. Charles Lalemant, from the collège de Clermont, to serve as Superior of the mission. He also sent Fr. Jean de Brébeuf, from the collège de Rouen, Brothers François Charton from Rouen and Filbert Burel from La Flèche, and Fr. Enemond Massé, who had been teaching theology at La Flèche since returning to France over ten years earlier. The five Jesuits departed Dieppe in April 1625. Since Champlain was in Paris negotiating with Ventadour and shareholders in the Compagnie de Caën, Emory and Guillaume de Caën greeted the Jesuits when they landed at Quebec in June. Because their company’s contract stipulated only that they support Recollect missionaries, the two leaders easily turned the Jesuits away. Lalemant wrote to Champlain that “[a]fter having told us that it was impossible to give us lodging either in the settlement or in the fort, and that we must either return to France, or withdraw to the Recollect Fathers obliged us to accept the latter offer.”

---


49 The Jesuits did not complain about this, nor did they fault Caën. Marcel Trudel used their acceptance as evidence that although Huguenots often antagonized Catholics in Canada, Caën did not. See his entry for Guillaume Caën in Dictionary of Canadian Biography.

50 Lalemant, “Letter to Champlain” in JR 4:169. The fact that the Jesuits and Recollects shared quarters was an aberration in the early seventeenth century. A joint Jesuit-Recollect project would not have crossed
the outset, it appeared that the new missionaries would face the same obstructions from colonial authorities that Biard and Massé had faced years earlier.

But Canada’s new Jesuits missionaries were determined to avoid the obstacles that had plagued Port Royal. Like Biard, Lallement quickly found that the language barrier prohibited thorough catechism: “During the past year we have devoted ourselves almost entirely to learning the dialect of the savages, excepting a month or two spent in cultivating the soil,” Lallement wrote to Vitelleschi in 1626. But Lallement, keenly aware that Biard struggled to learn the language without institutional support from Biencourt, hoped to secure independent funding to finance his new project as early as 1625.51 Lallement took heed of his Recollect colleagues’ frustrations with Quebec’s merchants, but he attributed the Recollects’ fundamental problem to their license. Unlike the Jesuits, the Recollects did not hold an independent commission. Instead, the king stipulated in Champlain’s 1615 charter and the Caëns’ 1621 charter that Quebec pay to support the missionaries. This put the Recollects at the mercy of Canada’s merchants, and by

the minds of these missionaries, because seventeenth-century religious orders forbade such collaborative efforts. It is interesting to note the way partisan historians of both groups portrayed the alliance: according to Campeau, the Recollects were “confined to the role of chaplains of the trading post and traders of the company.” LeClercq, on the other hand, portrayed the Recollects as leading all of the Jesuits’ early missionary endeavours. He also claimed that the Recollects, not Le Jeune, compiled the first Indian Dictionary, and even argued that it was the Recollects’ idea to bring the Jesuits back to Canada in the first place. Later historians addressed this rivalry. Charles Laverdière, while compiling the works of Champlain in middle of the nineteenth century, believed that the Jesuits had altered Champlain’s original *Voyages de la Nouvelle France* to discredit the Recollects. H.P. Biggar argued instead that Champlain had merely lost faith in the Recollects. See *MNF* 2:94-5; LeClercq, *First Establishment*, 229-41, 248-50; Fischer, *Champlain’s Dream*, 593-4.

51 Campeau, “Preface to Document 39” in *MNF* 2:94-95. Lallement’s original letter is missing. We have a general knowledge of its contents because Vitelleschi referred to the letter in multiple correspondences to Coton and Seguiran. These three letters can be found in *MNF* 2, Documents. 37, 38, and 39. Of the latter, Campeau claims “Since the letter of P. Lallement is missing, this letter is especially important to us. It reveals in effect the first projects of the superior, after several weeks of observations of the country.”
Without financial independence, the Recollects, like Biard and Massé at Port Royal, found it nearly impossible to maintain a functional mission.

After discussing the obstacles facing the Recollects with his coreligionists, Lalement specifically requested that Vitelleschi find a benefactor to open a Jesuit college in Canada. Although Jesuit colleges already formed the basis of emerging missions, the Recollect experience influenced Lalement’s appeal. Frustrated by the nomadic hunting patterns of the local Indians, the Franciscan missionaries continually wrote about their desire to open a seminary for young Indian boys. This Recollect school would tie the Indians to a place and give them a stable life under which the Recollects could teach Christian morality, but they could not afford to build one. After several weeks observing the territory in New France and exchanging ideas with the Recollect priests, Lalemant agreed with the Recollects’ general strategy. The Jesuits chose to construct their mission outside of Quebec proper, on the banks of the Saint Charles River, facing the Recollect convent. There they wished to erect both a Jesuit residence and a seminary to encourage the Indians to live a more sedentary lifestyle where they could be instructed in matters of faith. The duc de Vendatour had covered the cost of transporting the Jesuits who, as a result, were not bound to Canadian merchants (as the Recollects were) who might oppose the college. Unfortunately, Vendatour’s endowment was not enough to finance the mission and the Jesuits thus needed to look elsewhere for funds.  

—–

52 Ibid.  
53 Ibid.
The Society’s support structure made it easy for them to finance a college in Canada. Lalemant’s appeal fit into Vitelleschi’s preexisting model of successful missions, and after years of raising money through the cultivation of Europe’s elite, Vitelleschi knew precisely how to manage such a request. From his headquarters in Rome, Vitelleschi wrote to Coton and Jesuit Fr. Gaspar Seguiran, who had once served as confessor to Louis XIII, in search of aid. He advised Seguiran that if Lalemant constructed a seminary, it would provide a fixed location for the instruction of “those things which pertain to faith and good morals.” He asked Seguiran to solicit additional funds the king, the queen regent and the duc de Vendatour, “who … already from the beginning ardently embraced this mission.”54 Establishing a fixed base as “a means of helping these barbarians” and instructing Christian doctrine “seems to me to be an opportune decision,” he advised Fr. Coton, asking him to petition the same potential benefactors.55 Although Coton’s response is no longer extant, he must have answered quickly. By the end of the month, Vitelleschi wrote to Coton again, applauding his support of Lalemant’s plan for a seminary. Vitelleschi was confident that “a great gratitude will come from the barbarians of this region, and especially from God himself, who was able to obtain that which seems to be opportune to the propagation of the faith.”56

Within three months, the Jesuits had found a benefactor for the Canadian mission. Vitelleschi had actually rejected the first proposed endowment, which required the Jesuits to admit an unqualified novice into the Society. The Society deemed this benefactor’s son “neither able to be a priest nor follow the public ministry” because he did not possess the appropriate linguistic talents required by the Jesuit Constitutions, which required students to perform their studies in Latin. Not until René de Rouault, the son of the marquis and marquise de Gamache, applied to the Jesuit novitiate in March, did Coton realize his opportunity. In exchange for their son’s education, the marquis promised an endowment of forty-eight thousand livres followed by an annual payment of three thousand livres. The contract stipulated that the “condition is that these fathers will give to us and to our successors by authentic act the privileges and titles of founder or benefactor,” and that the money “be employed to a college, novitiate, or professed house” in Canada. Coton died only days after securing the endowment, which provided the sole support for the Canadian mission until 1637. Lalemant’s wish had been fulfilled, but it was nearly a decade before he benefited from the endowment.

Between 1627 and 1629, two major political events rocked the French Atlantic, thus ensuring the longevity of Canada’s Jesuit enterprise. In 1625, power shifted in the court of Louis XIII. The late 1610s and early 1620s had been tumultuous for Louis and the Queen Regent, Marie de Medici. Medici ruled France since her husband’s death in 1610, but her grasp on power remained tenuous. As she fostered alliances with Spain and Italy, she faced challenges from members of her son’s court that reflected the lingering tensions between proponents of the papacy and strict partisans of the Gallican Church. Moreover, the young king resented that his mother had excluded him from power during childhood. Medici’s trusted advisor, Bishop Armand de Plessis Richelieu, urged her to assert power proactively and put down challengers to her authority and she did so at the expense of many of her son’s political allies. In doing so, she alienated the young king. As he grew older, Louis XIII created political alliances with many of his mother’s enemies and wrestled control from her, sending both the Queen Regent and Richelieu into political exile. Like his father, Louis XIII steadfastly believed that the best way to maintain peace in his kingdom was to adhere to the Edict of Nantes while extending French power across the continent. Religious toleration remained the official policy in New France as Champlain, with support of the king and his ministers, toiled to expand France’s presence in Canada through the 1610s and 1620s.

60 One of her detractors was the Prince of Condé, who in 1616 served as Viceroy of New France.
In 1620, Louis XIII released his mother from exile and, as a courtesy to her, brought Richelieu to court as an adviser. Richelieu became a cardinal in 1622 and by 1625 a top minister to the king. Historians consider the cardinal to be a central figure in French political history, credited with expanding the power of the monarchy at the expense of the nobility. He also sought to strengthen France internationally, but France’s confessional tensions made this goal difficult. In the late 1618, the violent Thirty Years’ War erupted between Europe’s Catholics and Protestants.

The re-emergence of religious warfare put Richelieu in a difficult geopolitical bind. Given the nature of religious tensions within the kingdom, Richelieu hesitated to align France with Protestant princes, but France’s key rivals, the Habsburgs, controlled the other major Catholic powers within Europe. With Louis XIII unwilling to pursue a pro-Spanish foreign policy and Richelieu hoping to establish French rather than Habsburg hegemony over the Catholic world, the First Minister risked domestic unrest by fostering alliances with Protestants, particularly in the Netherlands. Such a move, Richelieu hoped, would advance French rather than Habsburg hegemony over the Catholic world.

Several Jesuits lashed out at the king’s policy, reviving anti-Jesuit stereotypes from prior decades across the kingdom. In *Admonitio ad regem*, for example, the Jesuit André Eudaemon-Johannes argued that the secular goal of besting Spanish hegemony was not worth the destruction of Roman Catholicism in Europe. Since Spain fought for the preservation of Catholicism, it waged a just war. According to *Admonito*, Richelieu’s position inherently subjected French Catholics to heresy and France therefore fought an unjust war. Moreover, *Admonitio* warned that Richelieu might force the Pope to retaliate.
against France by excommunicating any minister or monarch who opposed Spain. Through the *Admonitio*, old fears about the Society as being filled with Spanish usurpers resurfaced in France as supporters of Richelieu and French continental hegemony likened Jesuit detractors to the regicidal Jesuit Leaguers of the late sixteenth century. Hoping to prevent the re-emergence of anti-Jesuit pamphleteering and a loss of favor at court, the French Jesuit Jacques Pelletier denied Jesuit authorship of works such as *Admonitio*.\(^{61}\)

During the latter half of the 1620s, Richelieu’s domestic policies moved the kingdom toward absolutism. Richelieu hoped not only to diminish the influence of the nobility but to subjugate the Huguenots. Although the latter professed loyalty to the king, they also believed Louis XIII to be bound to the guarantees granted to them by treaties such as the Edict of Nantes. In the 1610s and 1620s, various Huguenot communities, including the port city of La Rochelle, went into uprising when they felt their rights were not being protected.\(^{62}\) Richelieu increasingly understood these Protestant rebellions as dangerous to the realm. He already opposed them on religious grounds, but Richelieu began to believe—like many Jesuit philosophers—that Protestantism encouraged political dissension. When Protestant rebellions peaked in the late 1620s, Huguenots decried the monarch for failing to uphold promises made to them under various treaties, including the Edict of Nantes. The Calvinist stronghold at La Rochelle fortified its city defenses in defiance of the crown. Richelieu, particularly annoyed that La Rochelle would cause

\(^{61}\) William F. Church, *Richelieu and the Reason of State* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1972), 103-172. Such writings prompted a second generation of anti-Jesuit pamphleteering throughout the kingdom. One particularly egregious example was Italian Jesuit Antonio Santarelli’s *Tractatus de Haeresi*, which reiterated the Pope’s authority over Catholic kings and the Papal right to justly depose them.

\(^{62}\) Because of these uprisings, Mack Holt argued that the Wars of Religion did not end until 1629. Holt, *The French Wars of Religion*, 4-6.
trouble amid turbulent international warfare, took the offensive and crushed the rebellions. After La Rochelle fell in 1629, the Peace of Alais asserted the king’s position as supreme sovereign who derived power from God and therefore owed nothing to France’s Protestants. Although the Edict of Nantes still technically applied, a new policy emerged under which Protestants were tolerated but subjugated.63

While Richelieu juggled violence against Protestants at home and the Spanish abroad, he also rethought the role of the colonies. In part because he hoped to expand French influence, Richelieu became a leading advocate of Champlain and his enterprise in New France. As part of his program of weakening the French nobility, the cardinal removed Montmorency from power and replaced him with Henri de Lévis, duc de Ventadour, who helped Vitelleschi and Coton plan their missions.64 Richelieu and Ventadour held a very different vision of New France than had their predecessors, with both men hoping to reshape the colony into an exclusively Catholic enclave that would help stunt Protestantism’s spread. Richelieu prioritized re-establishing Catholicism in parts of Europe where Protestantism had become dominant, viewing Canada as a battleground in that effort. Ventadour, for his part, was a devout Catholic who detested Huguenots and had fought them as a young man.65 Ventadour supported the Recollects, and his spiritual adviser was Fr. Philibert Noyrot, a Jesuit who later traveled to Canada.

63 Church, Richelieu and the Reason of State, 187-96.
64 Montmorency was a powerful noble, while Ventadour was young and his family had only been recently enobled. Shifting power to the latter allowed Richelieu to appoint Ventadour while still diminishing the power of the nobility more generally; Fischer, Champlain’s Dream, 392.
65 He was so devout that he separated from his wife to live a life of chastity. He became a priest in 1643; Fischer, Champlain’s Dream, 393. Charles Washington Baird, a Huguenot partisan who disliked the Jesuits, painted the new policy as a Jesuit conspiracy: “But the time was now drawing near, when the
After Ventadour revoked Caën’s monopoly, Richelieu replaced it by forming the Compagnie de la Nouvelle France in 1627. The new company, often called the Compagnie des Cent-Associés after the number of investors, looked much different than those that had preceded it. Under the new company, Richelieu removed Ventadour from power and installed himself as titular head of New France while delegating authority to Champlain (who continued to hold New France together amid so many changes in leadership at home). To promote growth, the new company offered to bear the cost of settling Quebec, but under advice from the Recollect and Jesuit missionaries, the company forbade Protestant settlers. Because Quebec depended upon La Rochelle’s merchants, the policy was difficult to enforce completely, and Protestants continued to trade at Quebec. As Catholic settlers filtered into the colony, the influence of Huguenot merchants waned, since they could not settle. In principle, New France had become exclusively Catholic.

Immediately after Richelieu established the Compagnie des Cent-Associés, French Canada experienced a second great change as alliances shifted in Europe during the Thirty Years’ War. Originally, Louis XIII allied France with its ancient enemy England against Spain—an alliance strengthened by the marriage of Louis’s sister Henrietta Maria to England’s King Charles I—but Richelieu’s hard line against French powerful Society of Jesus could carry its plans into effect, and Canada, closed against heresy, could be an exclusive field of missions for the Church of Rome … [T]he new viceroy, who was a devoted friend of the Jesuits, sent over five members of the order. A few months later, the monopoly of trade was withdrawn from the Huguenot de Caën,” Huguenot Emigration, 108. He made no mention of the constant cries from the Recollects to remove the Huguenots from the New World.

66 Baird, Huguenot Emigration, 107-8; Fischer, Champlain’s Dream, 404-5.

67 The ban on Protestant settlement actually helped France’s rivals by encouraging would-be settlers to take refuge in New Netherland, which later became New York.
Protestants jeopardized the coalition. As Richelieu campaigned against Huguenot communities, the Anglican Charles took action, eventually sending English troops to reinforce La Rochelle. Although France repelled England at the Isle of Ré, these religious conflicts destroyed the alliance and plunged France and England into war in 1625.68

Since the English worked to expand their territories in North America in the 1620s, Charles I decided to attack New France. Mired in the French campaign, he could not commit forces to Canada, so he instead commissioned Jarvis Kirke, an English businessman who lived in Dieppe, to raid and capture French ships in the St. Lawrence. Privateering had become a common way for European powers to diminish the profitability of their rivals’ Atlantic colonies, and Charles believed that if he could eliminate the French from their North Atlantic fisheries, English fishermen could take their place. Kirke outfitted his sons David, Thomas, and Louis with nearly eighteen vessels for an expedition against the French, providing them with a French Huguenot pilot from La Rochelle who hoped to take revenge for Richelieu’s policies. At the same time Kirke’s expedition was launching, Richelieu commanded the Compagnie des Cent-Associés to send its vessels to Canada. Huguenot merchants from La Rochelle, angry at their exclusion from the colonial enterprise, attacked the fleet as it departed France, crippling several ships and slowing their approach. Because of the delay, the English arrived in New France first, captured Tadoussac, and blockaded the Saint Lawrence River, preventing the company’s supply ships from reaching Quebec. Although Kirke did not besiege Quebec—he incorrectly believed Champlain to be better supplied than he

---

68 For a more detailed modern narrative of the conquest of Canada by the Kirkes, see Fischer, Champlain’s Dream, 406-26.
actually was—he did capture the company’s fleet when it arrived, earning himself a knighthood and leaving French Canada with dwindling resources. Deprived of supplies, the remaining French at Quebec struggled to maintain the settlement. Some of their Indian allies contributed food and resources, but it was not enough.69

The spring of 1629 brought a second Kirke expedition. With supplies decimated, Champlain immediately surrendered to the English brothers, ceding all of New France to England. In exchange, he asked that the English spare the settlers—including the reviled Jesuits—and return them safely to France. Sagard recalled that Caron, “having learned of the surrender of Quebec, promptly sent one of his Religious to the fort, to beg Captain Louis [Kirke] to give to them a soldier to guard their house as they had promised … and also to [Jesuit] Father Brébeuf, two or three for their house.” Instead, the English demonstrated their lingering animosity toward the Society by making “a raffle of the better booty that they found at the house of these poor [Jesuit] fathers” while leaving the Recollects’ belongings undisturbed.70 Although geopolitical concerns drove England’s attack on the colony, the missionaries remained acutely aware of the underlying religious causes and defined the English by their Protestant affiliations. In negotiating the surrender, Champlain requested that the Recollects be permitted to say Mass. “[Kirke] allowed them to say the Holy Mass every day in our chapel,” said Sagard, “and no longer having any wine the Captain, Louis his brother, did not want us to use any of it other than his” and “he checked on us often.” The Protestant Kirke’s behavior surprised the

70 Sagard, L’Histoire du Canada, 904.
Recollects, leading Sagard to conclude that “he was a bad Huguenot.” The Recollects and English privateers distrusted each other explicitly because of their religion affiliations: “There were even some English who helped with the Holy Mass, but in secret because such a sin such as rejoining us filled them with fear of there being surprised and discovered to be Catholic.”

After securing Quebec, Kirke’s ships sailed to England by means of the Plymouth colony. From Dover, the missionaries found safe passage to France. Lalemant, who had left New France in 1626 for supplies but had not returned before the English conquest, became a rector at the College of Eu and then Rouen. Brébeuf became a preacher at Rouen, where he finished his vows, and then worked at the College of Eu. Massé returned to La Flèche. As in 1613, the Jesuit missionary project ended at the hands of international, conflict spurred this time in part by religious differences between the two rival kingdoms.

From the point of view of the missionaries, their worst fears manifested themselves in England’s conquest of Canada. The Jesuits journeyed to America in hopes that bringing Catholicism to Indians would prevent the spread of Protestantism and the Recollects consistently petitioned both Champlain and the king to remove the obstructive Huguenots from the New World. Instead, English Protestants routed Catholicism, leaving the entire continent north of New Spain open to heretical doctrines. The missionaries

---


72 All three returned to New France after it reverted to French control in 1632. For more details on their activities in France between 1629 and 1632, see their respective entries in the *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*. 209
worried about their converts. “[I]t was with quite a sad face to see the poor Catholics miserably driven out, and the savages abandoned,” Sagard lamented. The Jesuits requested that the English allow two Indian girls to accompany them to France, as the children “wished with passion.” “But there was no way to get to them,” said Sagard, because a “disloyal Frenchman prevented it by saying that it would not be expedient, and that it would be better to retain them in Quebec.”73 Instead, they bemoaned the fate of Indians who had to remain under the jurisdiction of Protestants.

Fortunately, the Kirkes’ second expedition occurred six months after France and England negotiated the Peace of Susa, ending hostilities between the kingdoms and rendering Kirkes’ conquest illegal.74 Despite the unlawful outcome, it took Champlain three years to regain New France. Louis XIII, concentrating his attention on the European war, gave little consideration to recovering Quebec. The king’s lack of interest worried

---

73 Sagard, L’Histoire du Canada, 909-10. Sagard maintained that the four Frenchmen who joined the English rather than return to France did so because they were Protestant. Fischer pointed out that one was a Catholic. That Sagard understood it that way, or at least purported to, further demonstrates the tensions between Catholic and Huguenot in the eyes of the missionaries. In the nineteenth century, Le Clercq told this story in a much more dramatic fashion: “The mere thought that they left helpless the few Indian Christians whom they had begotten in Christ by the preaching of his holy Gospel, made them feel keenly the sense of that great misery of which the apostle feared the deplorable results when they considered that the English had already entered like ravishing wolves into this little flock of the faithful, which was all the fruit of their apostolic labors, and that they would not except any Indian from the resolution they had taken to draw them into their errors. They saw too affecting a proof already in the case of the Indian girls, whom we have already mentioned, Faith, Hope, and Charity, whom Monsieur de Champlain earnestly desired to carry to France with him to take care of their education. The English would not let them embark, in spite of the entreaties of the reverend Jesuit Fathers … and the tears which those good girls shed abundantly to obtain of the English permission to go to France in order to preserve the sanctity of Christianity which they had received from our first missionaries. They were obliged to return from Tadoussac to Quebec and retire to Madam Hebert’s, who took care of them, in order to protect them from the persecution of these heretics, who expected only to establish in New France a Babylon of error and confusion by the exercise of a religion as detestable in its followers as it is impious and sacrilegious in its principles,” in First Establishment, 307-8.

74 Champlain knew the conquest had been illegal immediately, because an English settler at Plymouth mentioned it during their stopover.
Champlain, as did France’s seeming inability to protect Canada from foreign invasions.\textsuperscript{75} The English conquest had been too easy and Champlain worried that if France did not recapture it within a reasonable amount of time, an influx of English settlers might place New France into England’s domain forever. Champlain pressured investors from the Compagnie des Cent-Associés, still in debt from their ruinous voyage, to petition the king so that they could return to Canada to recover their property. After revising his *Voyages de la Nouvelle France* as propaganda in support of regaining the settlement, Champlain persuaded the king to act. Louis XIII negotiated the Treaty of Saint-Germain-en-Laye in 1632, whereby England returned Canada to French jurisdiction. Despite attaining this important victory, Champlain still feared the French might not be able to maintain the colony. New France continually lacked stability since he began his voyages in 1604. Power shifted from proprietor to proprietor, various investors (such as Poutrincourt in 1610) sought to obtain monopoly control, viceroys came and went, and companies replaced one another every few years. Without continuity, Champlain worried France would never people Quebec.

To implement the treaty, Richelieu sent the Catholic Émery de Caën and Jesuit Father Paul le Jeune to Quebec with orders for the English to vacate the settlement. In restructuring New France, Champlain prioritized the stability the previous attempts lacked. He recommended that the Compagnie des Cent-Associés’s role be shifted from one of direct engagement to one of support for smaller subsidiary companies, thus

\textsuperscript{75} This was the most significant conquest before 1759, but throughout the first few decades of the seventeenth century, England claimed large parts of Canada and violence erupted between French and English on more than a few occasions, as it did when Argyll ransacked French coastal settlements in 1613.
allowing smaller traders to operate in New France within an overarching monopoly. After Richelieu reappointed him governor, Champlain redirected his own efforts toward promoting permanent settlements, and after 1632, Quebec enjoyed relatively unwavering leadership and steady immigration. It would remain French until Great Britain conquered it at the Plains of Abraham in 1759.  

Beginning Anew

For the Jesuits, political instability in Canada had meant that they never acquired the institutional support they required to carry out their mission. Vitelleschi, Coton, and Lallement all envisioned a Jesuit enterprise that revolved around a well-established infrastructure. Vitelleschi had emphasized that a Jesuit presence in New France would deter the influence of Protestantism among the Indians.  

When the Jesuits finally returned to Canada, the new mission superior Paul Le Jeune understood the importance of curtailing the encroachment of English Protestantism. In 1633, his native interpreter, Pierre Pastedechouan, had been “ruined by drunkedness” by Englishmen at Tadoussac.  

“If this Savage were intelligent,” Le Jeune argued, “corrupted as he is by these miserable heretics, he would be a powerful obstacle to the spread of the faith; even now, he will

---

76 Fischer, Champlain’s Dream, 427-41.
78 Although the Jesuits returned, the Recollects were not permitted to resume their mission. See “Mémoire des Recollects demandant de retourner au Canada,” in MNF 3:158-65.
cause only too much injury to it, if God does not touch his heart.” Pastedechouan proved to Le Jeune that, as in Europe, the pastoral societies of Canada would fall victim to heresy if they were not properly catechized in the Catholic faith.

With a sense of urgency, the Jesuits concluded that education was the best strategy for spreading Catholicism to the Indians of New France. In his first Relation, Le Jeune, who became superior of the mission to Canada, expressed his initial horror at the brutality he witnessed among the Indians, yet he conceded, “[M]ind is not lacking among the Savages of Canada, but education and instruction.” The means of assisting them, in my opinion, is to build seminaries,” he added, “and to take their children, who are very bright and amiable. The fathers will be taught through the children.” With Gamaches’s funding, they began to plan a college that would provide Canada’s Jesuits with institutional support from which they might establish a permanent presence, learn Canadian languages, and write their Jesuit Relations. More importantly, a college would allow them to turn their attention away from disputes with Gallican or Protestant

---

79 Le Jeune, Relation of 1633, in JR 5:213.

80 After 1632, these Relations became standard annual reports from the Jesuits in New France, and were often published to raise money for the Society. Post-1632 Relations focus almost entirely on their missionary endeavours. See Thwaites, Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents. In this particular story, Le Jeune told his readers about the murder of two French sailors by Indians: “As they came to double a point of land, thirty or 40 Hiroquois, who were in ambush, fell upon them with horrible cries; they killed the two men first encountered, with blows from their hatchets, then discharged a storm of arrows so suddenly and unexpectedly that our Frenchmen did not know which way to turn, not having foreseen the attack. They even dared to try to board the shallop in their canoes; and, had it not been that a Frenchman took aim at them with his arquebus, and that the bark, which was not far away, speedily equipped a boat to come to the rescue, having heard the cries of the combat, it is probable that not one of them would have escaped. The Hiroquois, seeing the arquebus, and the other boat coming to their help, fled, first skinning the heads of those whom they had killed and bearing away the scalps by way of bravado”, Relation of 1633, in JR 5:211-213.

authorities and toward the evangelical work that Jesuits attached to European colleges performed. In short, Jesuits planned to renew Catholicism in French North America by instructing both Indians and French settlers in the basic principles of the Catholic faith.82

In New France, a major barrier to instruction and catechization among the Indians was language, and the meticulous attention to the specifics of Latin, Greek, and Hebrew grammar stressed by Jesuit colleges in Europe surely gave an advantage to the Canadian missionaries. The Jesuits networked with Indians around Quebec and Tadoussac, and throughout 1632 and 1633, Le Jeune studied the native languages with exceptional rigor, for, like Biard, he did not believe he could instruct the Indians otherwise.83 Through an Indian interpreter who had spent his childhood in France with the Recollects, Le Jeune painstakingly applied the linguistic skill required by the Constitutions and the Ratio Studiorum, teaching himself the Indian tongue by making “conjugations, declensions and some little syntax, and a dictionary, with incredible trouble.”84 Although Le Jeune lamented the difficulty of the language barrier, he was adept enough to recognize the emergence of a trade language, which “is neither French nor Savage; and yet when the French use it, they think they are speaking the Savage Tongue, and the Savages, in using it, think they are speaking good French.”85 Because few spoke the native tongue, he justified the low number of converts in the early years of his mission: “Some are astonished that they hear nothing about the conversion of Savages during the many years

82 Le Clercq, 347-75.
83 Le Jeune, Relation of What Occurred in New France in the Year 1633, in JR 5:83.
that we have been in New France. It is necessary to clear, till, and sow, before
harvesting.” Reflecting upon his linguistic training in France, Le Jeune boldly claimed
“There is no place in the world where Rhetoric is more powerful than in Canada,” for “he
who knew their language well would be all-powerful among them.” 86

Le Jeune wrote of the satisfaction he found in instructing the Indian children.
“The other day,” Le Jeune wrote, “I had a little Savage on one side of me, and a little
Negro or Moor on the other, to whom I taught their letters. 87 After so many years of
teaching, behold me at last returned to the A, B, C., with so great content and satisfaction
that I would not exchange my two pupils for the finest audience in France.” 88 By 1633,
Le Jeune was instructing twenty indigenous students. He boasted “My pupils come to me
from a distance of half a league to learn what is so new to
them.” 89 As he became
proficient in their language, he began to compose a vernacular catechism, and taught
them familiar prayers—*Pater Noster, Ave Maria,* and the *Credo*—in their native
tongues. 90 Le Jeune struggled to maintain the number of Indian students he instructed.
Still without a seminary in 1634, he wrote a lengthy letter to his provincial in Paris
outlining the needs of the mission: “As to the Seminary, alas! If we could only have a
fund for this purpose!” “If we cannot make them stationary,” he said candidly of the

86 Ibid, 193.

87 I am still puzzling over the presence of this “Negro or Moor,” who “was left by the English with this
French family which is here.” Later, Le Jeune baptized the young boy, who claimed to have been taken
from Madagascar by the English. Le Jeune interrogated him, wondering if “the inhabitants of his country
were Mahometans or Pagans.” When the boy was unable tell Le Jeune what a “Mosque” was, Le Jeune
determined that he was not Muslim.


90 Ibid, 185.
Indian population, “it will be difficult to convert them.” Without a permanent structure to ground the children to a new lifestyle, preferably away from the influence of their parents, Le Jeune believed that their only hope was to send children to France for schooling. This strategy had obvious benefits, as Indians “will return with a knowledge of the language, and having already become accustomed to our ways, [they] will not leave us.” Champlain, however, vetoed this plan because of the considerable expense involved. According to Le Jeune, although some children had been successfully educated in France, too many had been “ruined” there.91

Although Le Jeune asked for a seminary for Indian children—originally boys, but later girls, as well—Vitelleschi instead built a college in Quebec. Originally, the Jesuits planned to use Gamaches’s endowment to open six Jesuit residences throughout New France, but Vitelleschi decided that the construction of a college better satisfied the Society’s obligations to its patrons and could also function as a seminary. By the summer of 1635, Le Jeune signed off on the plan, claiming that because Vitelleschi “has keen vision and weighs his options prudently,” he would obey his Superior’s judgment “if we must expect the maximum good for God.”92 The official contracts acknowledged Le Jeune’s desire to educate both Indians and French, and permitted him both a college and a seminary. In addition to accepting his son into the Society, the Jesuits granted to the marquis de Gamaches the title of formal benefactor of the college.93 Vitelleschi wrote to

Le Jeune in December, rejoicing in the progress the Jesuits had made in Canada. In Vitelleschi’s mind, the construction of a college could supply the Jesuits with a means of establishing relationships among the French settlers in Canada, a training ground for Canadian clergy, and still offer Le Jeune a base of operations from which the Jesuits could plan their missions and study native languages. From Rome’s point of view, the administration of New France fit into a pattern consistent with the development of their emerging global missions: cultivate elite benefactors, build colleges, and use the colleges to build influence in the community.  

Since Vitelleschi had upheld his obligation to the benefactors, Le Jeune could mold the project to fit his practical needs. Satisfied with the plan the Society had forged with the Gamaches, Vitelleschi stepped aside and Le Jeune became the primary administrator of the mission. Le Jeune opened a small school in 1635, setting to work using the college to his best advantage: “I go once to those two places where we might build and establish classes,” Le Jeune wrote to Vitelleschi in 1636. “One [will be] for the children of the French,” he said, while “another will serve the interest of teaching the

94 In his Relation of 1635, Le Jeune described his Society’s three immediate goals for the “glory of the Lord” in New France: first, they insisted upon “the erection of a college for the education of the children of the families,” second, “to establish a Seminary for the little Savages, to rear them in the Christian faith,” and finally, “to give powerful aid to the Mission of our Fathers among the Hurons and other stationary Tribes.” Of these three goals, Le Jeune quite candidly stated his preference: “the Mission among the Hurons and other stationary Tribes, it is of the greatest importance for the service of our Lord,” and “if some fund cannot be found to maintain it, I would almost willingly give up the care both of a College and of a Seminary, to make it succeed.” At this point, he had been in New France for several years and the Jesuits planned to undertake extensive traveling in earnest. Considering that the Society already acquired funding for the college, it is probable that Le Jeune’s bold statement about giving it up was a rhetorical device meant to garner more funds from devout readers.

children of the forest.” 96 The next year, he again wrote to Rome: “There is only one grade, only a small number brought up at this time,” though the college grew as French ships arrived with more young French men. Furthermore, the curriculum fulfilled Le Jeune’s basic need to learn Indian languages: “the tongues with which praise God here have tripled, no indeed quadrupled.” The college taught Latin and French, but the Jesuits also used the college to study Montagnais and Huron. At the school, Le Jeune told Vitelleschi, both French and Indian children studied religion together. 97 Orchestrated by authorities in Rome, funded by the French elite, and administered by a French priest, the college served Canadian children, European and Indian alike.

The college also served the Jesuits, providing them with institutional support to advance their evangelical cause, and as the years progressed, it provided the Jesuits with a place to improve their own learning and become important contributors to the community. From its opening, the college offered courses in catechism, scripture, and Latin. In 1659, it added classes in theology, philosophy, reading, writing, grammar, rhetoric, humanities, and mathematics, and by 1664, François Xavier de Montmorency-Laval, who became the first Bishop of Canada after studying at both La Flèche and the Jesuit collège de Clermont in Paris, boasted that Quebec’s institution rivaled any college in France. At the college, the Jesuit superiors oversaw the missions throughout French Canada, missionaries penned their famed Jesuit Relations while mastering native

languages, Jesuit instructors dabbled in various scientific projects, and Pierre-François-Xavier Charlevoix wrote his famous *Histoire et Description Générale de la Nouvelle France*. Writing in the nineteenth century, Jesuit historian Camille de Rochemonteix celebrated the college, claiming “education was the principal life of the entire colony … the college was to the colony what the water source is to rivers.” Because understanding water travel was essential to Canadian life, the college became famous for its expertise in hydrography, the study of maritime topography to better aid in navigation. The course in hydrography required Canada’s Jesuits to be competent in arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, geography, and hydrography, as well as proficient in using a compass and astronomical tools. The study of hydrography helped the Jesuits expand their missions in the eighteenth century, but it also expanded knowledge of Canada’s water systems more generally, enabling the French to extend their empire deep into North America’s interior. Through the college, the Jesuits contributed to the fulfillment of secular objectives in Canada, despite the fact that proprietors and merchants had considered them to be an obstacle before 1635.

100 Rochemonteix’s celebratory tone is not surprising, as most pieces about the college were written by Jesuits using Jesuit sources and therefore spin the college in the best possible light. For a brief history of the college, see Laramee, P. Jean, S.J. *Le Vieux Collège de Québec: en marge d’un troisième centenaire (1635-1935). L’Ouvre des Tracts*, vol. 195 (Sept. 1935), Montreal: Messenger. See also François Xavier de Charlevoix, S. J., *Histoire de la Nouvelle-France*, 3 vols. (Paris, 1744); Louis-Philippe Audet, *Histoire de L’Éducation au Québec* (Montreal: Centre de Psychologie et de Pédagogie, 1966); Audet, *Programmes et professeurs du Collège de Québec (1635-1763)* (Montreal: Les Editions des Dix, 1969); Audet, “Hydrographes du Roi et cours d’hydrographie au Collège de Québec , 1671-1759,” *Cahier des Dix*, no. 35 (1970), 13-37. After the conquest of Canada in 1759, the college became a military barracks for British troops, and was eventually torn down in the 1870s. For a particularly triumphalist piece, see Faucher de Saint Maurice, *Relation de ce qui s’est passé lors des foilles faites par ordre du gouvernement dans une
Le Jeune wrote to Richelieu in August 1635 to update him on the status of their mission. “Families are beginning to multiply, and these already urge us to open a school for the education of their children, which we will soon,” he said as they prepared their new college. He thanked Richelieu for allowing their success: “All of France owes her recovery to you, who dissipated the poison”—heresy—“which was creeping to her heart,” Le Jeune said, adding “Alas, what misfortunes would have befallen her in these past years, if this poison had retained its strength in the midst of the State!” In rooting out Protestants, Richelieu “joined the New France to the old.” Upon arrival in 1632, Le Jeune described his “sadness in seeing this country in such a deplorable state, after so long a time as our French had been in possession of it,” criticizing the Huguenot traders who preceded him, adding that the Catholic “Gentlemen of the New Company have done more good here in one year than those who preceded did in all their lives.” To increase the number of settlers, Le Jeune suggested Richelieu encourage the “very great number of people” that left France every year and “cast themselves among foreigners because they have no employment in their own country” to instead settle in Canada. “A large part of the artisans in Spain are Frenchmen,” he said, adding that “the son of a French artisan born in Spain is a Spaniard; but, if he is born in New France, he will still be a Frenchman.” The burgeoning settlement needed additional men to clear the land so that the Jesuits could “give spiritual life to a great number of barbarous people, who die every day in slavery of Satan for lack of preachers of the Gospel.” Despite this request, he believed that “The Gentlemen of the Company are doing wonders in this regard.” For the

*partie des donations du Collège des Jesuites de Quebec précédée de certaines observations* (Quebec: C. Darveau, 1879), written on the eve of the college’s demolition.
first time, the Jesuit outlook was optimistic. “We have already, in our first stammerings, sent some souls to heaven, bathed in the blood of the lamb.” With a missionary infrastructure independently funded in the fashion of domestic Jesuit missions and with the support of colonial authorities that no longer held either Gallican sentiments or Protestant allegiances, the 1632 Jesuit mission succeeded where its predecessors had failed.\textsuperscript{101}

\textsuperscript{101} Le Jeune, “Lettre de Paul le Jeune à Cardinal de Richelieu, Kebek, Aoust 1, 1635,” in JR 7:235-43.
In 1710, Jesuit Fr. Joseph Jouvency offered a brief history of the Society of Jesus’s project in New France. “While we are writing these things, there are numbered in this formerly solitary and unexplored country more than thirty very prosperous and well-equipped Missions of our Society,” the Jesuit wrote. Jouvency counted the Society’s missions stretching through the expanse of French America from the St. Lawrence to the Mississippi. Describing each, he mused that one day the Society might “break through the barriers of dangers and toils” facing Europeans in the “immense portion of Canada, beyond the Mississippi River … plunged in snows and frosts” and “afflicted by more weighty ills.” “There remains unknown to Europeans, up to the present time, an immense portion of Canada” that “calls to the generous soldiers of Christ.” He bolstered his confidence in the Society’s Canadian future by comparing their newfound difficulties to those overcome by their predecessors one hundred years earlier. The original missions did not “all at once attain its full development,” he argued, “through sixteen years did it stick in a rough road.” Although many had considered the earliest Jesuit mission in Canada to be a failure, Jouvency considered it an important precedent, “the natal days,
full of hardships and dangers,” and proof that the Jesuits would ultimately succeed in expanding into central Canada.¹

Jouvency’s account begins with a surprising eulogy of Biard. Although Jouvency acknowledged that Biard “had journeyed to the barbarous Canadians … with the desire of propagating religion,” the eulogy gives little detail about his time among the Indians. Instead, Jouvency emphasized Biard’s work evangelizing France’s Protestants, where “he entirely devoted himself to the service of his countryman … that he might provide for their salvation,” particularly at Paray le Monial, where he served as superior of the mission. Jouvency highlighted Biard’s work as a military chaplain against Protestant armies during the early years of the continental renewal of warfare between Protestants and Catholics in France that preceded the Thirty Years’ War. To reinforce his depiction of Biard as primarily a warrior against heresy, Jouvency cited Jesuit historian Philip Alegambe, who described Biard as “a laborer of great zeal … in the dreadful and pathless forests of the Canadian tribes of North America” who “experienced nothing more brutal than the Heretics.” “The barbarous race, forgetting its savageness, was learning to venerate the character of this most righteous man,” Alegambe said, “when behold, Heresy, hostile to holiness and ignorant of God, burst, together with the English, upon the shores of Canada.” In France, Biard “took a vengeance in a holy manner for the injury inflicted by the Heretics,” until he died in November of 1622.²

¹ Jouvency, Joseph, “An Account of the Canadian Mission from the year 1611 until the year 1613, with the condition of the same Mission in the years 1703 and 1710,” in JR 1:217-23. He also added that the mission “scarcely born, was almost exterminated in its cradle by the English.” Later in his history, Jouvency credited Coton for finally firmly establishing a permanent presence by securing the college.

² Ibid.
If the origin of the Jesuit enterprise at Port Royal found itself disrupted by anti-Jesuitism in the early seventeenth century, its remembrance by Jouvency demonstrates its connection to the broader history of anti-Jesuitism in France. Using exaggerated and emotional language, Jouvency and Alegambe highlighted the influence that the French Wars of Religion played in Biard’s life. Jouvency, a historian himself, wrote his summary of Biard’s mission as part of a larger project on the history of the Society of Jesus, which he submitted for publication in 1713. In a volume focusing on the Wars of Religion, the coronation, conversion, and assassination of Henry IV, and early seventeenth anti-Jesuitism, Jouvency affirmed the Society’s innocence of any assassination attempts while disavowing Gallican accusations that the Jesuits advocated regicide. Jouvency attacked the parlement of Paris for accusing the Society of tyrannicide, and the Gallican parlement responded by condemning and burning his *Histoire* later that year.

As the eighteenth century progressed, these Gallican tensions continued to mount throughout the kingdom. The rise of the Jansenists—Augustinian Catholics who had adopted a belief in salvation by efficacious grace—exacerbated anti-Jesuit sentiments in France by providing a theological platform through which Gallicans could oppose the Society. Anti-Jesuit sentiments expanded at a more rapid pace in the middle of the eighteenth century and culminated in the early 1760s, when the parlements dissolved the Society in France and in 1773, when the pope dissolved the Society internationally.

The political debates that began during the Reformation and Wars of Religion plagued the Jesuits throughout their experience in France, following them to Canada and
providing a framework through which colonists understood the Jesuits and the missionaries understood their own project in New France.  
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