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Research on the aftermath of the Wars of Religion in France over the past twenty-five years has become increasingly attuned to the pragmatic contexts in which postwar reconciliation was both formulated and experienced in the seventeenth century. Gregory Hanlon’s 1993 study of Layrac brought everyday provincial and urban concerns to the fore, as a set of procedures on the ground that provided a framework for peaceful coexistence in spite of policies of segregation.[1] This perspective has been pursued by Olivier Christin and others.[2] Keith Luria’s more recent exploration of the social ties that continued to bind French Protestants and French Catholics after the wars suggested that many of the “sacred boundaries” posited by religious authorities tended in practice to be blurred or negotiated rather than clear and inviolable.[3] In the broad vein of work like this, the collection under review (originally published in 2011 by the Presses Universitaires de Laval) approaches the postwar reconciliation of Henri IV with his subjects via a series of case studies that highlight the role of tactical negotiation on the part of a monarch who could not unproblematically impose either his own authority or the provisions of the Edict of Nantes. Unlike the earlier works, however, this volume pays little attention to specifically confessional contexts, opting instead to examine the many facets of royal administration that contributed to the pacification of the realm under the first Bourbon monarch.

In his introduction to the volume, Michel de Waele suggests that the collection shows the degree to which Henri IV avoided claims to innovation, seeking rather to re-establish royal authority on traditional bases (this is also one of the major theses of de Waele’s recent monograph, Réconcilier les Français: Henri IV et la fin des troubles de religion [4]). While not all of the contributions appear to be invested in this point, de Waele’s observation that the relative détente of the early seventeenth century depended to a large extent on Henri IV’s personal negotiations, and therefore was quickly threatened after his assassination, is powerfully substantiated by the examples considered in the individual essays.

Mack Holt’s essay examines Henri’s approach to lingering postwar popular and political opposition in Dijon, concluding that the king was able to win over the populace, the Hôtel de Ville, the provincial parliament, and finally, the Duc de Mayenne, via the practical exploitation of a politique de clientèle. Olivia Carpi looks at the case of the Ligue stronghold of Amiens. The delicate postwar negotiations around the city’s municipal liberties, which initially saw the king show his willingness to accept Amiens’s traditional independence in spite of its rebellious wartime conduct, were dramatically reoriented when the Spanish attacked it in 1597. The king and his troops had to rush in to liberate the Amienois, who had earlier refused royal interference in their military affairs. This crisis gave the king leverage to reduce local control and to reform Amiens’ city government, which according to Carpi afforded him the opportunity to establish an exceptionally strong basis for reconciliation on new political terms. Daniel Hickey’s study of the commissions sent to enforce the Edict of Nantes at La Rochelle in 1599 underlines the crown’s administrative flexibility: Henri IV’s insistence on nominating commissioners from both confessions, a departure from previous practice, and his willingness to allow commissioners to make concessions to local elites, were compromises that ultimately extended the reach of royal justice.
Penny Roberts assesses the role of the Estates General during the period 1560-1614. Notwithstanding their idealization as either an instrument for the confirmation of royal authority, on the one hand, or—particularly during the Wars of Religion—as the privileged means of checking that authority, on the other, the Estates General rarely served as a site of meaningful exchange between the crown and its subjects. Roberts names the Parliament of Paris, provincial assemblies, and clerical assemblies as bodies with which the monarchy actually consulted; this practice of personal consultation with what we might call local interest groups positioned the king as the sole representative of the national interest as a whole.

James Collins asks whether agriculture under Henri IV reverted to traditional feudal structures or took a strong turn in the direction of capitalism. Synthesizing research on Burgundy, Normandy, and Brittany, Collins concludes that the expansion of capitalistic practices such as tax farming in the first part of the seventeenth century ultimately exposed those who were able to invest to significant losses, whereas peasants who were obliged to work under essentially feudal conditions were spared such risks and in some cases prospered as a result. In the longest article in the collection, Philippe Hamon’s wide-ranging examination of French finances in Henri’s reign explicitly sets aside the “myth” of Sully as crafty architect of an orchestrated program of fiscal centralization. As do other contributors for the domains they address, Hamon underlines the role of compromise, contingency, and expediency in shaping the administration of royal finances in the wake of the Wars of Religion. Rejecting the idea of a centralized bureaucracy in favor of that of intersecting networks that coalesced and dissolved according to the specific actors and circumstances involved, Hamon, following William Beik, characterizes the French fiscal “system” under Henri IV and Sully in terms of negotiated collaboration with a range of actors rather than as a coherent program imposed by the monarchy.

Robert Descimon’s multifaceted account of socioeconomic change in Paris between the end of the Ligue and the 1615 Estates General highlights the relative decline of bourgeois manufacturing and a corresponding increase in bankers, luxury merchants, and government bureaucrats in the capital after the wars. Descimon offers two case studies to illustrate the “social mutation” that created a gulf between bourgeois merchants and the expanding noblesse de robe in the latter part of the reign of Henri IV: that of the Voiture family, wine merchants who moved to Paris from Amiens in 1599 and became suppliers to the court, but whose financial success was short-lived; and that of the Parfait family, cloth manufacturers who became involved as both merchants and financiers in the royally-sponsored luxury cloth workshop established in 1603. While the merchant wing of the family saw their fortunes stagnate, the financiers enriched themselves both socially and financially via public offices, which became reliably heritable after the instauration of the paulette tax in 1604. The tax generated revenue for the crown at the same time that it consolidated loyalty to the monarch and curbed social mobility; Descimon concludes by stating “Ce que fonda Henri IV, c’est tout simplement l’Ancien Régime” (p. 212).

In the only contribution that addresses the representation of confessional conflict, Sara Chapman reads Marc Lescarbot’s Histoire de la Nouvelle France as a conciliatory history of French New World enterprises that deliberately eschews the religious polemics of previous accounts. Focusing on the presentation of French initiatives in Florida and Brazil, Chapman suggests that Lescarbot frames the failure of early French colonial efforts in terms of nationalistic and courtly rivalries, rather than as the Protestant-Catholic conflicts that sixteenth-century writers such as René Laudonnière, André Thevet, and Jean de Léry emphasized when recounting the same events.

After considering the ways in which the legitimation of royal bastards compromised the reputation of the Bourbon lineage, even as it served the consolidation of an absolutist régime, Fanny Cosandey observes in the collection’s last chapter that “dans ce domaine comme dans bien des autres, Henri IV poursuit la politique de ses prédécesseurs et innove en même temps” (p. 223). As a foil to a narrative of consciously orchestrated royal absolutism, this characterization of Henri IV’s politics is unquestionably
persuasive. As a judgment of Henri’s reign in and of itself, however, it is perhaps too generic: what political régime does not, all things considered, take up some aspects of the structures it inherits and change others?

The aims and the methods of the different articles in *Lendemains de guerre civile* vary greatly; my sense is that most readers will want to consult individual contributions rather than the entire volume. Indeed, the strength of this collection lies in the individual analyses; for this reason, the whole is more or less equal to the sum of its parts. Happily, one can turn to Michel Cassan’s conclusion to the volume, which capably sums up most of the essays, for a useful guide to its contents. Cassan’s powerful closing reflections also serve to remind us that, the positive accomplishments of the first Bourbon king detailed in the preceding contributions notwithstanding, Henri IV never really did reconcile French Catholics and French Protestants (indeed, Cassan asserts that this was never the king’s intention). The Catholic Church reasserted its dominance over public spaces, and confessional differences continued to define many aspects of daily life as the seventeenth century unfolded. In the end, suggests Cassan, “le règne d’Henri IV correspond à un irresistible processus de pacification qui bute sur l’impossible réconciliation des Français” (p. 254). Certainly, the rhetoric of the 1685 revocation of the Edict of Nantes, by positing the fiction of a France now peacefully reconverted to Catholicism, would appear to confirm Cassan’s perspective.
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