

---

H-France Review Vol. 14 (October 2014), No. 160

David Garrioch, *The Huguenots of Paris and the Coming of Religious Freedom, 1685-1789*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014. xii-296 pp. bibliography and index. \$95.00. (hb). ISBN 978-1-107-04767-9.

Review by Xavier Marechaux, SUNY--College at Old Westbury

David Garrioch's book on the Calvinist Parisians (Huguenots) from the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes to the eve of the French Revolution is a welcome one. In a clear and easy to read style, Garrioch brings us a much-needed study of Protestant Parisians in the eighteenth century. So far, most studies have mainly focused on heroic figures of Protestantism such as the Camisards from the *église du desert*. Studies of Protestants tend to focus on a large minority, which is easier to study than the few Protestant families who are believed to have survived with great difficulty in Catholic-dominated Paris. [1] Indeed, until Garrioch's book, Protestants in Paris were seen as a very small minority (around 2 percent of the Parisian population) who never took a stand against persecution and kept a low profile in order to pursue their business. Paris Protestants were therefore not a very interesting group, certainly not deserving of research, except for a few key figures before the Revolution like Necker.

Garrioch's book lays out how Parisian Protestant families inserted themselves into the life of the city and managed to thrive, but he goes beyond the social analysis of a crucially overlooked group. The second goal of this book, and maybe the most important one from a historiographical point of view, is its analysis of tolerance. Garrioch studies how Paris, the center of League activity and theater of the infamous massacre of the Saint Bartholomew's day in 1572, a city where Protestants were still forbidden to celebrate their cult publicly after the Edict of Nantes, slowly ended persecutions at the beginning of the eighteenth century, promoted civil tolerance in the 1750s, and then allowed religious tolerance with the transformation of a Catholic church into a Protestant temple in 1791.

The first five chapters focus on how the Parisians managed to overcome intolerance and eventually thrive in an increasingly tolerant city. The author's extensive use of police archives brings to life individuals and their families and their strategies to survive the very harsh measures (imprisonment, galleys, children removed from their family and sent to monasteries) taken by the government to force them to convert and to follow the rites of the Catholic Church after 1685 and to prevent their emigration or the renewal of a clandestine cult. The persecution did take a toll on the Parisian Protestants: by the end of seventeenth century, half of them had emigrated (p. 40). Nevertheless, persecutions were less harsh than in other parts of France and ended earlier. The main reasons were economic and political. The authorities feared that repression would encourage the flight of those with means, undermining the economy of the city. The memory of the *Fronde* was still fresh, and avoiding disorder seemed more important than forcing Parisian Protestants to convert. Therefore, the infamous and very successful *dragonnades* (forced quartering of troops in Protestant households) were never used in Paris.

As the result, the "eighteenth-century history of Paris Protestantism is one of growing de facto toleration" where an "official, through unpublicized, policy of toleration" (p. 46) was put in place as soon as 1708 with Louis XIV's approval. This policy still entailed some periodic crackdowns but was nevertheless much less severe than in other parts of the realm. De facto toleration moved toward an

---

“official acceptance” (p. 65) with the opening of burial grounds for French Protestants as soon as 1736, and their admission to official positions (academies, farmer-generals...) by the 1760s.

The author tracks the Huguenots’ success throughout the eighteenth century. If initially they dominated the manufacturing and retail trades and banking and finance, by the end of the century, they were “to be found in every sector of the Parisian economy” (p. 91). This economic integration went hand in hand with their geographic integration. There was no Protestant ghetto in Paris, and the tendency of some families to congregate in certain areas of the city was usually linked to their trade (goldsmiths and jewelers in Ile de la Cité, wood merchants in Quai Saint Bernard and Quai de la Tourelle).

Nevertheless, Parisian Protestants had to pretend to be Catholic. Marriage was only acceptable within the Catholic Church, and Catholic baptism—essential for valid legal status—was accepted by the Reformed Church as a necessity. These public acts of deception were more easily borne because the intimate practices of Protestantism, such as reading Scripture and singing psalms, allowed parents to transmit their religion to their children within the household walls. Huguenots were also able to keep their faith alive in the eighteenth century thanks to active networks maintained through “work, endogamy and through forms of voluntary sociability” (p. 130) within the city but also with the provinces and foreign countries. Protestant states with established embassies in Paris, such as Britain, Sweden and the Netherlands, all had their own Protestant chapels in the city, and some even provided services in French. These played an important role in connecting different groups of Protestants with each other (Parisians and foreigners, Parisians from different trades or different confessions such as Lutherans and Calvinists).

As a minority group, an official but unacknowledged policy of toleration would not have been enough for the Parisian Protestants to survive. They also required acceptance from the majority population of Catholic Parisians. Garrioch’s last four chapters trace this crucial evolution within the population of Paris from hostility toward a heathen sect to an acceptance of Protestants and religious freedom.

In the seventeenth century, Parisian Protestants, “for whom the memory of the St Bartholomew’s Day massacres was all too fresh” (p. 156) were often subjected to violence or the threat of violence, and Parisian guilds added more rigorous religious requirements in the second half of the century to prevent their admission. Nevertheless, contemporary accounts of the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, confirmed by more recent studies, indicate that Catholics had a certain degree of sympathy for their Protestant counterparts for having to endure such hardships and that “peaceful coexistence was the norm in everyday relationships” (p. 164).<sup>[2]</sup> After the Revocation, denunciations of Protestants to the police were not frequent. Tolerance was no doubt strengthened by the mix of Catholics and Protestants in both neighborhoods and trades and increased in the eighteenth century, especially since, as Garrioch notes, “the Protestants were now too vulnerable to assert any religious rights” and therefore “kept a lower profile than before the Revocation” (p. 169). The only part of the Parisian population that did not adopt a “tolerant position” was the Catholic clergy (p. 181). They were the main denunciators of suspected Protestants.

The second half of the eighteenth century saw what Garrioch claims is an increasing acceptance of Protestants, with “growing evidence of cordial contact between the two religious groups and more sympathetic Catholic attitude.” (p. 189). By mid-century, Protestant-led salons of Germaine Larrivée and Madame Necker in 1757 and 1760 welcomed key figures of the Enlightenment. Parisian Protestants became members of freemasonry lodges in the mid-1770s, evidence of a new form of sociability for Protestant elites. Proof of strong friendships between Catholics and Protestants showed up in the marriage registry of the Swedish chapel where, starting in the early 1770s, more and more Catholics witnessed the wedding of Protestant spouses. By this time most guilds were also removing their anti-Protestant restrictions on membership. In the realm of public opinion, the image of the Huguenot as a heretic during the period of the massacre of Saint Bartholomew’s day was thoroughly transformed, most obviously by Voltaire’s writings on the Calas Affair, into that of an innocent victim, resulting eventually in the Edict of Tolerance in 1787. These changes were backed up by most of the local *cahiers de doléances* from Paris, with the exception of those from the

clergy. Political integration was achieved in 1789 with the election of two “prominent and openly Protestant bankers” to represent the Paris district at the Estates General. Popular acceptance of the transformation of a former Catholic church to Reform in 1791 was the coup de grace to the intolerance that was so virulent a century before.

The move from hostility to tolerance did not only happen in Paris, but it appeared there earlier than in other areas of France. In the eighth chapter, Garrioch tries to explain this Parisian particularism. He downplays the role of the Enlightenment, noting that the changes happened before the key works of the *philosophes*, even if those works were important in promoting tolerance after 1750. The author also rejects (perhaps too quickly) the possibility of an increase in religious indifference, which could have made the difference of faith less important. He presents the “shifts” in “Catholic religious culture and sensibilities” (p. 218) brought about by Catholic reform at length, focusing on Jansenism and Enlightened Catholicism and how they enhanced tolerance by emphasizing a more personal and individual faith. Nevertheless, Garrioch does not really explain why these movements would have affected Paris before the rest of the country. The only real explanation—one that could use more development—is that Paris was a center of Jansenism and its repression. Parisians were therefore more likely to draw a parallel between Protestants and Jansenists and thus more inclined toward religious tolerance.

Garrioch is more persuasive in describing how Paris became one of “the most secular” cities in Europe, where “many aspects of Paris society became more secular and less sacred” (p. 242).<sup>[3]</sup> While the Catholic reformation strengthened the “Catholic character of the public domain of Paris” (p. 242) in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, the clear distinction made by the Church authorities between the sacred and profane in order better to protect the most sacred places (cemeteries, Church...) and events (mass, main saint processions...) had the side effect of limiting the presence of the Church by reducing its social and institutional presence. This move was particularly evident during the 1770s when a number of parish graveyards and the vast Cimetière des Innocents in the center of the city were suppressed as well as some churches. This was followed by a concomitant drop in the number of processions organized by local parishes or confraternities. As a result, many aspects of city life became more secular. Law, trade, education, and hospitals were increasingly freed from religious restrictions and were guided by secular goals in the practice of their professions. Garrioch notes that already Paris was a center of tourism (mainly British) and that immigration had the effect of encouraging Parisians to be more open to diversity and therefore more tolerant. These changes affected public identity. Parisians defined themselves less by their religious practice and faith and more by their profession and secular “civic virtue.” All these changes allowed “the appointment of numerous Protestants to various offices in the final decades of the Old Regime” (p. 256).

Davis Garrioch’s book is not just about the analysis of one religious group, but is in the end a significant portrait of the population of Paris. The author paints in vivid detail a fascinating city and its significant cultural transformation from 1685 to 1789. In mixing anecdotes, *tranches de vie*, tables and analytical statistics, Garrioch provides an in-depth and lively account of how and why the large Catholic majority of Paris united with its Protestant minority. His study fills an important gap in the cultural history of Paris that traces the development of a diverse and tolerant city, a reflection of the economic and intellectual changes that marked the eighteenth century as a whole.

## NOTES

[1] Hubert Bost and Claude Lauriol (eds.), *Entre désert et Europe, le pasteur Antoine Court (1695-1760)*, actes du colloque de Nîmes, (Paris: Champion, 1998); Philippe Boutard, ed., *Les Cévennes de la montagne à l’homme*, (Toulouse: Privat), 1979; and Yves Krumenacker, *Les Protestants du Poitou au XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècle (1681-1789)*, (Paris: Champion, 1997).

---

[2] Catherine Bergeal and Antoine Durrleman, eds., *Eloges et condamnation de la Révocation de l'Edit de Nantes* (Carrières-sous-Poissy : La Cause, 1985) and John McManners, *Church and Society in Eighteenth-Century France*, 2 vols, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), 2 : 573-84.

[3] Garrioch uses the term “secularization” to argue that “large parts of the life of the city were now felt to lie outside the religious domain” (p. 242), but according to the author, it does not mean that Parisians were less religious.

Xavier Marechaux  
SUNY-College at Old Westbury  
[marechauxx@oldwestbury.edu](mailto:marechauxx@oldwestbury.edu)

Copyright © 2014 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 edistribution/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.

ISSN 1553-9172