

*H-France Salon*  
Vol. 7 (2015), Issue #13, #6

### Calm waters

James C. Collins  
Georgetown University

Fifty years ago, French and American early modernists began the slow process of genuine interpenetration of research agendas and paradigms. The ink on David Pinkney's famous thesis—in which North American scholars would focus on big picture issues and leave in-depth archival research to our French colleagues, for logistical reasons—was barely dry when air travel revolutionized the relationship of North American scholars to European archives.[1] In those days, references in French historiography to works by American early modernists were few and far between; one of the few French scholars who consistently stayed up-to-date with American work was Roland Mousnier. He not only made reference to the work of historians such as J. Russell Major, but he also regularly reviewed the works of American scholars, such as Orest Ranum or Robert Forster, in major French journals. One of the *French Historical Studies* (henceforth *FHS*) forum's authors, Mousnier's academic "grandchild" Hugues Daussy, has consistently maintained that tradition in his own work.

Among French *modernistes* of my generation, surely the two most important figures in Franco-American integration have been Robert Descimon and Denis Crouzet. Their contribution has come through their own work, of course, but their insistence, among their students, that young French scholars read and use Anglophone scholarship has had an inestimable influence on the field. Both Robert and Denis have regularly participated in North American conferences, and they have encouraged their students to do so, as well. These efforts notwithstanding, one cannot ignore the fundamental importance of their standing seminars, at the *École des Hautes Études* and the Sorbonne: American scholars (including this one) have regularly sat in on the sessions and given presentations to them. For purely logistical reasons, American scholars have been far less likely to participate regularly in a seminar out in Rennes or down in Montpellier.

Two of the five authors here come from the EHESS seminar: Élie Haddad, who has taken over coordination of the Friday morning seminar; and Claire Chatelain, who comes from the Christian Jouhaud wing of the EHESS modernistes. In Paris, we might add the stable of researchers who have worked with Nicole Lemaître, represented here by Thierry Amalou. Along with Daussy, who studied at Montpellier with Arlette Jouanna, we have a second author drawn from the lively world of regional universities, Isabelle Luciani, who wrote her thesis with Régis Bertrand and—a Parisian connection well known to Americans—Daniel Roche. Luciani's essay, like her other work, illustrates one of the key contributions of scholars in those regional universities: archival scholarship on outlying regions, in her case Provence. Unsurprisingly, the regions that combine rich archives—above all the capitals of the old *pays d'États*—and contemporary universities have received far more research attention from French scholars than places without the second half of that combination. Those cities—places like Troyes—have provided a fine area of research for Anglophone scholars, such as Penny Roberts and Helen Chenut.[2]

Amalou's essay shows the Francophone-Anglophone connection at its best; he extensively cites Anglophone scholarship. Here we see the legacy of the *seizièmiste* historiography, which traditionally engaged with Anglophones. French scholars working on the seventeenth century, alas, have done so less often. The three essays focusing on the seventeenth century in this forum bear out this pattern, which is odd, given that Haddad and Chatelain, in their other publications, and Luciani, on her website, engage Anglophone scholarship to the full extent.[3] All five of the essays focus on archival and printed primary sources, so we cannot reasonably expect them to have extensive historiographical segments. I do want to point out to colleagues from outside the early modern field that the scholars presented here do extensively engage Anglophone scholarship in other venues.[4]

Luciani has an extraordinarily rich corpus of *livres de raison*: eighty-seven, of which women authored thirty-eight. Her careful reading establishes the writing practices of these authors, most of whom were familiar with the tradition of keeping a family *livre de raison*, and so knew its traditions. Luciani rejects the idea that the *livre de raison* was a genre (p. 532), yet Michel Cassan, in his chapter on private writings about the death of Henry IV, argues forcefully that it was a genre, "obeying a well-regulated formal model." [5] One would like to see a bit more depth on such an important issue.

As Luciani points out, a *livre de raison* could be introduced as evidence in a court of law, so we would expect a basic familiarity of juridical practices among those writing such documents. She particularly emphasizes the use of mercantile practice, essential in documents that contained so many details about a family's financial life. Jean-François de Cambis, whose father, a financial official, had also kept a *livre de raison*, was the only person in her sample to discuss an annual budget, and for those of us who have worked on state finance, this simple detail goes a long way toward explaining the monarchy's inability to create its own budget, in a modern sense.[6] The de Cambis family also illustrates another common element: *livres de raison* ran in the family, so that several generations would maintain this framework. In this case, in the middle of the seventeenth century, Laure de Cambis, Jean-François's niece, kept a lengthy *livre de raison*. That she did so should not be surprising: women from the legal and business worlds could write and often maintained financial control over most of the household's expenses, aside from long-term investments. Here we see a place where coming over to the dark (Anglophone) side might be some help, with the works of Jim Farr (and his students) and Julie Hardwick coming immediately to mind.[7]

Luciani's research raises some fascinating examples of the nature of personal purchases, particularly by women, but she essentially elides gender as a category of analysis of this exceptional database. We get bogged down in discussions of the "self" at any given moment and in any given text. I found nothing unusual about the use of the word "my," as in "my grandfather": countless letters or *livres de raison*, whether from the sixteenth or seventeenth centuries, use this term. The "I note" construction—specific to very few of the *livres de raison*, to judge from the examples—offers some interesting insights into changes in locution, but can we presume that such a change indicates the rise of a "self" in some sort of modern sense? Luciani begins with Barbara Rosenwein's fine essay on the notion of "moi" in the High Middle Ages—an essay that appeared in *Revue Historique* in 2005, but which was based on a paper given at the AHA Annual Meeting in 2003—yet never seems to engage the complex analysis

Rosenwein sets forth. Rosenwein raises a key point in her discussion of the historiography on “me” [moi] in the Middle Ages: does “me” have to be “our” me? As Rosenwein points out, the accusation of dissimulation in a seventh-century text clearly indicates the awareness of an inner self held back from others.[8] With respect to the sixteenth century, Michael Randall has recently suggested that the distinction with the type of individual relates to the sphere of political consciousness: he argues that individualism once turned outward, toward the “public space of the community,” whereas modern individualism turns inward.[9]

Luciani’s work raises the fascinating question of the evolution from a culture in which the individual, as a distinct person, certainly existed—both in reality and in theory—to one built on the principle of individualism. The contrast between individuality and individualism, unlike the false dichotomy of a society (ours) with a “me” and one without such a construct (theirs), does offer extremely fruitful lines of inquiry. Like Luciani, I have always been struck by the odd patterns of reference to non-familial events in *livres de raison*. Why does an author mention one event and not another? Can we take such references to be evidence of a need for “ontological reaffirmation?” (I think not.) The sparse comments on national events offer yet further uncertainty. Why do some writers mention the assassination of Henry III or Henry IV, while others do not? Given the intensity of reaction to the two assassinations—attested by many other documents, both public and individual—the absence of a mention of a royal assassination seems profoundly puzzling in a *livre de raison* that makes mention of far less momentous national events.[10]

Much as I find some of Luciani’s speculation to be troubling, I fundamentally agree with her larger interpretation of the rise of an “I” in a new sense evident in these sources. The tone does change in the *livres de raison*, just as the tone changes in more detailed writings by members of the elite. A self-reflexive “I” becomes more present: I do not take this visible presence to be certain proof of the new existence of such an “I”—such *may* be the case, but I remain agnostic. It seems rather to be clear proof that the writers felt comfortable expressing the reflections of an “I”. The cultural norm of the twentieth century, widespread in much of Europe and the U.S., that one did not trumpet one’s own success was not evidence that individuals did not revel in their success nor that they did not have a highly developed sense of self. We now live in a world of self-promotion—think Donald Trump or the excessive celebrations, by athletes, of minor accomplishments—and the earlier reticence seems quaint. Taking it to be evidence of a less-developed sense of self, however, would be a mistake, in my view.

Chatelain, like Luciani, deals with interior life. In her case, she focuses on the poet “Tristan” de l’Hermite, whose real name was François. Young François’s choice of the name “Tristan” seems to me to merit greater investigation, since he seems to be following the principle that any publicity is good publicity. The original Tristan de l’Hermite, *prévôt de l’hôtel* of Louis XI, was one of the most universally reviled figures in French history. This Tristan arrested many of the leading nobles of France at his master’s bidding and played a direct role in the deaths of several great aristocrats and many lesser nobles, often by gruesome means, and invariably outside the “forms of justice,” as the judges would have said. A small number of early modern writers rehabilitated some aspects of Louis XI’s reign, but mainstream opinion—even as expressed by the *historiographe du roi*, Eudes de Mézeray—held a remarkably low opinion of the spider king.[11] Consider the poem Mézeray quotes about him: “Louis upended all to follow his

caprice/Bad son, bad father, unfaithful husband/Unjust brother, ungrateful Master, and dangerous friend/He reigned without counsel, without pity, without justice/Fraud was his game, artifice his virtue/And the Provost Tristan his greatest Favorite.”[12] Louis XI was virtually the only French king of the Valois dynasty whom public speakers—for example, at an Estates General—could openly criticize. Why did François/Tristan want to associate himself with an odious villain, particularly given that he was, in fact, not really descended from him?

The family clearly took a great interest in its own history. François’s brother, Jean-Baptiste, wrote genealogical treatises about the nobility of Poitou, their home region. Their father, Pierre, bore the name of a supposed ancestor, known in English as Peter the Hermit, who preached the First Crusade (p. 552).[13] Chatelain identifies the obsessive desire to tie the family to this Pierre as part of a process in which nobility came increasingly to be defined in patrilineal terms. In their case, emphasis on patrilineal descent made sense, but if one’s distinguished ancestor came from the female line, noble families were perfectly happy to stress that lineage instead. One of Jean-Baptiste’s genealogical works focused precisely on prominent French families who had emigrated from Spain: one such family was that of their own mother, Isabelle Miron.

Chatelain might pursue one of Luciani’s methodological insights: to consider why a given author uses a given strategy. Chatelain seeks explanation in the speculative realm of psychology, which can offer useful insights, but she might consider that someone like Tristan was seeking to obtain some practical benefit, too, and that he—like other authors of his time—used rhetorical strategies best suited to achieve such ends. One of the great insights of the Descimon-Haddad investigations into definitions of nobility is precisely the astounding practicality of that “self” defining. Colbert’s investigations of the 1660s changed the rule, solidifying larger cultural shifts already in motion, and strategies of creating a “maison” had to adapt accordingly.[14]

In Chatelain’s essay, what was particularly jarring for an Anglophone reader was the absence of any discussion of contemporary historiography on the history of emotions.[15] Rosenwein, for example, warns us that “[t]he historian must keep in mind that the emotions depicted in the sources are unlikely to be windows onto an objective external reality, but they do help to reveal the subjective reality of the writer of the source.”[16] Chatelain rightly points out that the success of Tristan’s play *La Mariane* illustrates the extent to which his personal narrative touched the lives of many in his (large) audience. *Mariane* shared success with another tragedy of the moment, Corneille’s *Le Cid*. Quite apart from other factors, the period of 1625-1631, just prior to these two successes, had been exceptionally difficult in France, with the worst outbreak of plague in the seventeenth century and a sustained famine in the western provinces in 1629-1631. Leaving aside the ability to identify with characters, such as Richelieu, crying at *La Mariane*, having lost both his father and his beloved brother, Henri, at an early age (p. 561), the climate of 1635-1636, after so many hard years, and the start of a war, certainly lent itself to tragedy. According to L’Hermite’s biographer, his mother played virtually no role in his upbringing, so Chatelain’s psychoanalytical approach to his rationale offers the potential for some innovative future scholarship on the interplay of L’Hermite’s own life and the *Zeitgeist* of his times.

In the *Épreuves* volume to which Chatelain contributed, Martine Bennini tells a wonderful anecdote about Charles d’Hozier, the royal herald-of-arms of Louis XIV. Commenting on the genealogy presented by President Pierre de Bragelongne of the Parlement of Paris, d’Hozier

contemptuously noted “When one continues one’s reading, there is no respectable [*honnête*] man who must not be indignant at the ridiculous vanity with which this genealogy is filled.” Crossing out the word “*maison*,” and scoffing at this “odious” text, d’Hozier noted that “the simple bourgeoisie must content itself with the word, family.”[17] Haddad’s essay turns on this key word, “*maison*” (house), and the polyvalent nature of its meanings in early modern French society. His own work has focused on the Belin family, a “secondary” noble family, and the Parisian robe, and their particular relationships to the changing definitions of nobility in French society.[18] In the Belin book, as in his brief introduction to the *Épreuves* volume, Haddad lays out the thesis that two contradictory forces can be seen at work: the emphasis on purity of noble “blood” and the reality of social fusion.

We might harken back here to Chatelain’s article on L’Hermite, in which she suggests that the Miron were “socially superior” to the L’Hermite (p. 557). If she means superior in access to power in the early seventeenth century, there can be no question that the Miron carried vastly greater weight than the L’Hermite. If we think about categories of those ennobled by service (in the Miron case, doctors, judges, *prévôt des marchands* of Paris, administrators), and those of incontestable “blood” (sword) nobility, however, the L’Hermite had a house, but the Miron just a family, bourgeois to the core. I would think François L’Hermite’s decision to become “Tristan” represented a clear repudiation of his “bourgeois” mother’s family, from whom I would guess he got his first name (from François Miron, her first cousin, *prévôt des marchands* of Paris), and an attempt to reassert his belonging to the *maison* of the L’Hermite, even though the connection in question was based on a lie.

Haddad rightly insists on the cognatic inheritance of almost all leading houses. We might wonder about the astonishing fervor of the assault on women’s legal rights and the exceptional obsession with traditionally defined masculinity in late sixteenth-century France: what role did those currents play in the establishment of the cult of the patrilineal family?[19] In real life, as Haddad shows, families/houses happily absconded with the reputations of matrilineal ancestors, as well as their property. No one hesitated for a moment to tie oneself to a distinguished male ancestor who happened to be related through the female line, indeed often through several female transmissions. In the case of the Vassé house, we must recognize as exceptional the persistence of father-to-son transmission.[20] Women’s loss of their family name in the late seventeenth century seems, in light of the legal developments of the previous century, a final insult, yet we must also consider the long tradition of women taking on the interests of the “house” into which they married. The letters of Alessandra (Macinghi) Strozzi, from mid-fifteenth-century Florence, show her thinking in precisely that way, so the phenomenon was hardly new in the 1700s.[21]

Those familiar with the books of Hugues Daussy and Thierry Amalou need no reminder that a fair analysis of their contributions to contemporary scholarship must begin with those much longer works.[22] Among his other contributions, Daussy definitively (in my view) establishes the connection between Philippe Duplessis-Mornay and the *Vindiciae, contra Tyrannos* (1579). Amalou’s prize-winning study of Senlis takes its place alongside the extensive literature on sixteenth-century French towns, much of which comes from Anglophone scholars.

Daussy takes on a question that has always troubled the (alas, all-too-rare) historians who wonder about the logistics of the Wars of Religion: where did the Protestants get the money for their armies? Any consideration of war finance in this period must begin with the rather obvious point that the armies of both sides were notoriously underpaid (or simply not paid at all). During the War of the Catholic League (1588-1598), peasants and small-town bourgeois called the conflict the “*guerre des vaches*” (the war of the cows) because it seemed to consist of soldiers from each side stealing their animals.[23]

Can we express surprise at Daussy’s findings that ad hoc measures in early 1562 evolved into more stable and routinized ones by the end of that year, and even more clearly by 1567? Hardly, but we can revel in the fact that, at long last, we have some empirical evidence to buttress the material used by Mark Greengrass in his fundamental article of 1999 (duly cited by Daussy, p. 593, n. 2.) Daussy’s source package evolves along with the Huguenots’ financing methods: in the opening segments, he must rely primarily on letters because the lack of institutional structures means no records. The Protestants got initial funds from melting down Church treasures and levied taxes on some areas they controlled, particularly the large towns such as Orléans and, especially, Lyon, during their brief period of control there. They did not blanch from seizing royal tax revenues or money paid to the Catholic Church, and their armies (like Catholic ones) sometimes ransomed communities, from villages up to entire cities. Daussy shows this technique became more common as time went on. By late 1562, Protestant assemblies were voting actual taxes, and the Protestants—like the king—seized and sold Church property to pay for war. In the late 1560s, these techniques continued, abetted by the extensive privateering from La Rochelle: the Estates of Brittany voted special taxes to raise a navy to put a stop to this ruinous activity, which provided large sums to the Protestant cause.

Daussy documents localized income in the tens of thousands, and rarely, low hundreds of thousands of *livres*, but these sums did not come close to covering the cost of maintaining a large military force over the years of fighting. He documents the loans made by foreign (Protestant) princes, to whom French Protestants owed 3.6 million *livres* in 1571. All the money raised, all the loans taken out, paled in comparison with expenses. Here again, we can see the utility of a voyage across the Atlantic: Daussy’s conclusions could profitably be compared to those of James Wood with respect to the problems faced by the royal army.

Amalou’s look at preachers and prophets or rather *as* prophets, brings to mind the regular articles in *cahiers de doléances* (local, regional, and national) about prophecy. These articles often tied those predicting the future to blasphemers and called for the rigorous enforcement of Saint Louis’ legislation against them (which included piercing tongues with a hot iron). The blasphemer article served political ends of the Catholics: the original legislation referred to blasphemy against Mary and the saints, as well as God, and so made many Protestant phrases into blasphemy. In other cases, the blasphemy article tied in other “immoral” behavior, like drinking in taverns: drunken artisans, in particular, blasphemed terribly, if we are to believe the cahiers.[24] The situation of the late 1580s had changed, in that the prophecy came now from Catholic preachers, surely encouraged by the eschatological impulses emanating from the many white penitent processions.

The “implicit right of resistance” of which Amalou speaks (p. 627)—for example, in the preaching of the radical Jean Boucher—had two elements that might receive further development in his work. First, we must emphasize that the resistance concerned was to an illegitimate ruler, a tyrant, not a king. Boucher himself, in his defense of Jean Chastel (after the assassination attempt on Henry IV in December 1594), was at great pains to emphasize that Chastel, at his trial, admitted that he believed it was licit to kill a *tyrant*; Chastel, Boucher emphasized, had **never** said it was licit to kill a *king*. Second, Amalou, if he is going to develop this research further, might profitably consider this preaching within the larger context of the quarrel about Papal superiority over secular rulers. The infamous *mercuriale* at the Parlement of Paris in 1559, at which Henry II banned eight judges for their defense of religious toleration (and had one of them, Anne du Bourg, executed for his defense of Protestantism), involved men who themselves, or through their sons, would still be involved in the conflict in the 1580s and 1590s and again in 1606-1615. Arnauld, de Thou, Pibrac, de Mesmes, Ferrier, de Foix, Séguier—members of each family played a critical role in 1559. The dramatis personae of the Belleramine controversy of 1610 included the sons (and one grandson) of many of the principals of 1559. Antoine Arnauld, father of the Jansenist, would play a fundamental role in the struggle against the Jesuits in 1593-1595 and again in 1614-1615. The shift in Catholic preaching in the 1580s was not only about religion, but equally about fundamental principles of the French monarchy and polity.

These five heavily empirical articles give us a look into the research paths of a new generation of French modernistes. The pieces by Luciani and Chatelain suggest that Francophone and Anglophone research paths may be diverging with respect to what we call the history of emotions. Haddad gives just a small taste of the truly innovative work being done at the EHESS on social definition: in the *Épreuves* volume, their *équipe* sets forth a new paradigm for defining the early modern nobility in terms of elements such as culture and social capital: personally, I think that approach offers enormous potential for a re-conceptualization of early modern French society. Luciani touches indirectly on one of the great vistas it will open up: the role of women in weaving the social web. The heavily empirical work of Amalou and Daussy brings to mind, for me, the remarkable publications emanating from the Presses Universitaires de Rennes, which brings out one monograph after another, almost all of them about provincial France, not Paris.[25]

In such a small selection of articles, we also miss out on some fundamental recent (post-2010) work by other young French scholars, such as Marie Houlemare, author of a remarkable book on the Parlement of Paris. Houlemare’s many achievements are beyond my purview in this short piece, but I would bring up one that I view as particularly relevant here: she has conceptualized the nature of the monarchy within a framework that integrates fully Anglophone scholarship.[26] Her work is particularly strong in its willingness to engage the political thought of the late sixteenth century on its *own* terms, rather than constantly treating everything as a prologue to seventeenth-century developments. We do not yet have the early modern equivalent of Léonard Dauphant’s innovative *Le royaume des quatre rivières*, with its splendid use of mapping to define the real limits of the kingdom between 1380 and 1515.[27]

The focus on individuals in these essays, however, does illustrate an important current in today’s Francophone scholarship: the painstaking reconstruction of real social networks. Collective prosopographical works, such as the volumes on the councilors of Francis I and on royal

councilors throughout Europe, edited by Cédric Michon, provide a gold mine of resources for all researchers.[28] Careful reconstruction of actual social and political networks is essentially if we are to move forward in our understanding of early modern France, in part because institutions like the Court played such an important political role. In the 1356 *Act of Accusation Against Robert Le Coq*, the anonymous author lays out the duties of a king. One of the key duties was effective distribution of *dons*, what someone in Henry III's France would have called *bienfaits*, in return for good service.[29] That duty alone should bring our focus to the Court and to topics such as the distribution of religious benefices, one of the king's most important sources of patronage (indeed, arguably **the** most important one).

In our five essays, however, engagement with new Anglophone currents, like the scholarship on the history of emotions or the heavily Anglophone scholarship on the French military, seems curiously missing —curious in that all five authors do engage such scholarship in their other work. That absence reflects the authors' choices to remain deeply empirical in the *FHS* forum, and, alas, means they avoid some great opportunities to take on big issues. Michael Breen's introduction refers to the "currents" of contemporary French scholarship (p. 526); these essays avoid the rapids and stick too much to the calm waters. The river of French scholarship is flowing faster and more intrepidly than these essays might suggest, as the longer works of these scholars amply shows. For those reading this forum, particularly Ph.D. students, I would urge you to plunge into those swifter, more swirling channels.

#### Notes

[1] David Pinkney offered this essay, we might recall, in the first issue of *French Historical Studies*. "The Dilemma of the American Historian of Modern France, *French Historical Studies* 1 (1958): 11-25. Pinkney revisited his comments several times, perhaps most delightfully in "Time to Bury the Pinkney Thesis?" *French Historical Studies* 17 (1991): 219-223. He answered his question in the affirmative.

[2] Penny Roberts, *A City in Conflict: Troyes during the Wars of Religion* (Manchester, U.K.: Manchester University Press, 1996); Helen Chenut, *The Fabric of Gender: Working-Class Culture in Third Republic France* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2005). This relationship goes back to the 1970s and Lynn Hunt's doctoral thesis, published as Lynn Hunt, *Revolution and Urban Politics in Provincial France: Troyes and Reims* (Stanford, Cal.: Stanford University Press, 1978).

[3] I have been unable to get access to the many articles Professor Luciani has written. Her website, which has links to her publications, provides abstracts in both English and French. Let it be said that her superb website puts most of us (me first in line) to shame: accessed October 17, 2015, [http://telemme.mmsh.univ-aix.fr/membres/Isabelle\\_Luciani](http://telemme.mmsh.univ-aix.fr/membres/Isabelle_Luciani).



[4] In the case of Chatelain, her essay in the *Épreuves* volume [cited below] shows her to be deeply grounded in both Francophone and Anglophone scholarship and engaged with fundamental issues of gender, economics, and politics.

[5] Michel Cassan, *La Grande Peur de 1610* (Paris : Champ Vallon, 2010), pp. 165-167.

[6] Luciani suggests the Cambis family's Italian origins likely had something to do with its familiarity with modern accounting, which had long been practiced in Italy (p. 531).

[7] Julie Hardwick, *The Practice of Patriarchy: Gender and the Politics of Household Authority in Early Modern France* (University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1998); James R. Farr, *A Tale of Two Murders: Passion and Power in Seventeenth-Century France* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 2005); and *idem*, *Authority and Sexuality in Early Modern Burgundy, 1550-1730* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995).

[8] Barbara Rosenwein, "Y avait-il un « moi » au haut Moyen Âge ?" *Revue historique* 633 (January 2005): 31-52, accessed October 17, 2015, [www.cairn.info/revue-historique-2005-1-page-31.htm](http://www.cairn.info/revue-historique-2005-1-page-31.htm). Using the online page breaks, the discussion of "moi" is on "page" 20 and the seventh-century quotation on p. 27.

[9] Michael Randall, *The Gargantuan Polity: On the Individual and the Community in the French Renaissance* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008), pp. 3-4. He further argues that a culture of consensus allowed individuals to criticize the monarch. Having done extensive research on late medieval and sixteenth-century French political culture in recent years, I would say people rarely criticized the actual monarch but did openly criticize monarchical practices they disliked, citing examples from earlier kings or Classical history. I am far from convinced that the "noisy polis" of earlier times was being destroyed (Randall, 17), but Randall's insights deserve a mention in an essay like Luciani's, or Chatelain's, that touches upon his central theme.

[10] Cassan, *La grande peur de 1610*, chapter seven.

[11] Adrianna E. Bakos, *Images of Kingship in Early Modern France: Louis XI in Political Thought 1560-1789* (London: Routledge, 1997), presents examples of apologists of royal power rehabilitating Louis XI's reputation, but mainstream political discourse treated him as a tyrant.

[12] « Louis renversa tout pour suivre son caprice/Mauvais fils, mauvais pere, infidèle mari/Frere injuste, ingrat Maître, & dangereux ami/Il régna sans conseil, sans pitié, sans justice/La fraude fut son jeu, sa vertu l'artifice/Et le Prévôt Tristan son plus grand Favori » E. de Mézeray, *Abrégé chronologique de l'histoire de France*, v. 2 (Amsterdam, 1740), p. 563, my translation.

[13] Peter the Hermit led a ragtag "army" of thousands of ordinary people to Constantinople, just prior to the arrival of the actual Crusaders. Many people in seventeenth-century France believed that Pierre l'Hermite had preached the First Crusade before Urban II and credited him with the idea, so he was a particularly prestigious ancestor. Jean-Baptiste de l'Hermite insisted in his

genealogical works on the family's descent from Pierre. He also (wrongly) claimed their connection to Louis XI's Tristan.

[14] The monarchy regularly carried out investigations of nobility—often at the urging of provincial or general Estates—but the commission appointed by Colbert in the 1660s brought a level of exactitude and a standard of proof unknown in the earlier inquests. On the importance of the shift, see the introduction by Robert Descimon and Élie Haddad to their *Épreuves de noblesse. Les expériences nobiliaires de la haute robe parisienne (XVI<sup>e</sup>-XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle)* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2010) ; and in the same volume, Martine Bennini, “Introduction,” 159-160.

[15] For example, William Reddy, *The Navigation of Feeling: A Framework for the History of Emotions* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001).

[16] Barbara Rosenwein, “Problems and Methods in the History of Emotions,” *Passions in Context: International Journal for the History and Theory of Emotions* 1 (2010): 16, accessed October 17, 2015, [http://www.passionsincontext.de/uploads/media/01\\_Rosenwein.pdf](http://www.passionsincontext.de/uploads/media/01_Rosenwein.pdf).

[17] Bennini, “‘L’audace’ de la généalogie des Bragelongne,” in *Épreuves de noblesse*, 161-62. Claire Chatelain also contributed an essay on the Pommereu family to this volume (pp. 107-124).

[18] On the special genealogical needs of a robe family, see Élie Haddad and Camille Le Fauconnier, “Une contre-généalogie imaginaire: l’‘énigme’ Geneviève Le Sueur et le destin social des Sublet des Noyers,” in *Épreuves de noblesse*, pp. 191-206; on the Belin family, see Élie Haddad, *Fondation et ruine d’une «maison ». Histoire sociale des comtes de Belin (1582-1706)* (Limoges : Presses Universitaires de Limoges, 2009). See also the review of the latter by Jonathan Dewald in *Revue d’histoire moderne et contemporaine* 60, no. 2 (2013): 167-169, accessed October 17, 2015, <http://www.cairn.info/revue-d-histoire-moderne-et-contemporaine-2013-2-page-167.htm>.

[19] In my current research into local political life, the importance of this issue in the period from the 1550s to the 1590s is evident in all the sources. Nobles, in particular, invariably had articles in their cahiers de doléances about marriage rules, inheritance by women, re-marriage, etc. The rhetoric of this time is obsessed with masculinity, traditionally defined.

[20] The inheritance of women took on special importance in Anjou because of an unusual clause in the customary law. In noble succession, the oldest son (or oldest female, if there were only daughters) received the main residence and two-thirds of the rest of the landed property; the remaining children, male and female, received equal shares. Angevin customary law treated younger noble daughters and sons differently: the daughter received her share in full property, whereas the younger sons received only life use. A son's share reverted back to the head of the family at his death. See M. Trottier, *Des Coustumes d’Anjou et du Maine* (Angers, 1783), part 7, on successions, especially pp. 167-169.

[21] *Selected Letters of Alessandra Strozzi*, ed. H. Gregory (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997).

[22] Hugues Daussy, *Les huguenots et le roi le combat politique de Philippe Duplessis- Mornay (1572-1600)* (Geneva: Droz, 2002); idem, *Le parti huguenot. Chronique d'une désillusion (1557-1572)* (Geneva: Droz, 2014); Thierry Amalou, *Une concorde urbaine: Senlis au temps des réformes (vers 1520-vers 1580)* (Limoges: Pulim, 2007) ; idem, *Le Lys et la mitre. Loyalisme monarchique et pouvoir épiscopal pendant les guerres de Religion (vers 1580-vers 1610)* (Paris: Comité des travaux historiques et scientifiques, 2007).

[23] James B. Wood, *The King's Army: Warfare, Soldiers, and Society during the Wars of Religion in France (1562-1576)* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), p. 185, points out that the German mercenaries in the prince of Condé's army outside of Paris in December 1562 had not been paid. Burgundian sources show the same complaints within the army Condé's son brought through eastern France in 1575-1576. Wood, table 8.1, shows that the soldiers' pay made up only about 20% of the total cost. Most of the money went to food and forage, both of which, of course, could be seized from unfortunate peasants.

[24] See, for example, the remarkable cahier prepared by a small group of Third Estate deputies from the county of Champagne, while at Blois in October 1588, in Duval and Lalourcé, *Recueil de pièces originales et authentiques, concernant la tenue États Généraux ...*, v. 9 (Paris, 1789), pp. 95-96, article 1 on the clergy and article 4 (p. 97). In contrast, a similar group, meeting in December 1560, brought up blasphemy in their article 68 (p. 91), in conjunction with laws about taverns and cabarets, and tied to a request to forbid festivals in town and village alike. The cahiers of the Estates Generals of 1560 and 1576 both requested that the king ban blasphemy against "God, Mary, and the saints"; the king replied simply that he would publish and ask judges to enforce the existing law, which dated from the time of Saint Louis and which did, in fact, mention all three. The people in the Third Estate making this demand of the king were overwhelming the very judges who would have had to enforce such laws.

[25] See, accessed October 17, 2015, <http://www.pur-editions.fr/catalogue.php?idDom=2>.

[26] Marie Houlemare, *Politiques de la parole. Le parlement de Paris au XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Geneva: Droz, 2011). Denis Crouzet was her thesis advisor, which certainly plays a role in her consideration of the Anglophone scholarship.

[27] Léonard Dauphant, *Le royaume des quatre rivières. L'espace politique française (1380-1515)* (Seysssel: Champ Vallon, 2012). As pointed out in the fine review by Daisy Delogu, Dauphant, alas, does fall into the "État royal" trap avoided by Houlemare: *H-France Review*, vol. 14 (June 2014, No. 93, accessed October 17, 2015, <http://www.h-france.net/vol13reviews/vol13no87delogu.pdf>).

[28] Cédric Michon, ed. *Conseils et Conseillers dans l'Europe de la Renaissance v. 1450 – v. 1550* (Tours and Rennes: Presses Universitaires François Rabelais and Presses Universitaires de Rennes, 2012) ; idem, *Les conseillers de François Ier* (Rennes: Presses Universitaires de Rennes, 2011).

[29] L. Douët d'Arcq, "Acte d'accusation contre Robert le Coq, évêque de Laon," *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes* (1841): 350-387, p. 380. In my view, the likeliest author is Simon de

Bucy, sworn enemy of Le Coq and one of the royal councilors singled out by Le Coq for disgrace. Sixteenth-century speakers always brought up the duality of the obligation of the loyal *serviteur* to seek the good of his prince and the equal obligation of the prince to reward his loyal *serviteurs*.

James C. Collins  
Georgetown University  
[collinja@georgetown.edu](mailto:collinja@georgetown.edu)

Copyright © 2015 by the Society for French Historical Studies, all rights reserved. The Society for French Historical Studies permits the electronic distribution of individual reviews for nonprofit educational purposes, provided that full and accurate credit is given to the author, the date of publication, and the location of the review on the H-France website. The Society for French Historical Studies reserves the right to withdraw the license for redistribution/republication of individual reviews at any time and for any specific case. Neither bulk redistribution/republication in electronic form of more than five percent of the contents of H-France Review nor re-publication of any amount in print form will be permitted without permission. For any other proposed uses, contact the Editor-in-Chief of H-France. The views posted on H-France Review are not necessarily the views of the Society for French Historical Studies.

*H-France Salon*  
Vol. 7 (2015), Issue #13, #6