Huguenot Heritage Conference 1985

Reading Room

PROCEEDINGS OF THE HUGUENOT HERITAGE CONFERENCE HELD AT TRINITY COLLEGE, UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO, 27 APRIL 1985

Edited by : Roger M. Savory

THE HUGUENOT SOCIETY OF CANADA

AND

TRINITY COLLEGE, UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

APOLOGY

Owing to a misunderstanding with the printer, the Conference papers were not retyped before being duplicated. The objective had always been to have the papers available by the time of the Society's Annual General Meeting. Therefore, in order to avoid delay and further expense, it has been decided to distribute this volume "as is". Please accept our sincere apologies for this unfortunate occurrence.

It has been decided to place a notice in "Trails" to determine whether there would be sufficient demand for a retyped edition of the Conference papers. This might also include the text of some of the addresses given in previous years at the Annual General Meetings of the Society. Of course, the publication of such a volume would be dependent on the Society's ability to raise the necessary funding.

Editor.

FOREWORD

The Huguenot Society of Canada, founded in 1966, planned a series of special events in 1985 to commemorate the tercentary of the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes by Louis IV of France. This act deprived Huguenots of their religious freedom, and gave them fifteen days to either recant or depart from French territory, leaving all their possessions behind them. The result was a Huguenot diaspora. Refugees fled to Protestant areas in Europe, to England, North America, and elsewhere. They took with them their 'Protestant work ethic' and numerous skills; they were especially famous as silversmiths and weavers.

The Tercentary Committee of the Huguenot Society of Canada, as part of the special events mentioned above, decided to organize an historical conference on Huguenot themes under the title of "Huguenot Heritage Conference". The Conference was held on Saturday, 27 April 1985, in the George Ignatieff Theatre, Trinity College, University of Toronto, and was attended by about 120 members of the Society and of the general public. The Society wishes to express its grateful thanks to the Provost of Trinity College, Dr. Kenneth Hare, for making available to it the facilities of the College, and for his gracious welcome to those who attended the Conference.

The Proceedings of the Huguenot Heritage Conference are published in response to a widespread demand that the papers delivered at the Conference be made generally available.

Roger M. Savory,
Chairman,
Huguenot Heritage Conference Committee.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

PART ONE: THE HUGUENOTS IN EUROPE.

PART TWO: CANADA AND THE HUGUENOTS.

PART ONE

THE HUGUENOTS IN EUROPE

I. DEMONOLOGY AND RELIGIOUS RIVALRIES IN FRANCE 1560 – 1640

Jonathan L. Pearl (University of Toronto).

Belief in the efficacy of spells and in the existence of demons who worked mischief on humans was virtually universal in Europe in the Middle Ages. When theologians and jurists became interested in these matters, they fashioned a learned science of demons and witchcraft- demonology- which established the relationship between the devil, witches and their innocent victims, the crimes witches committed and the legal action to be taken against them.

Most scholars who have dealt with the demonology of the 16th and 17th centuries have tended to see it as representative of this traditional world-view which, from the 15th century on, inspired widespread persecution of witches that resulted in thousands of deaths. The writers of demonological texts have been portrayed as obsessed bigots, who struck out at women and other vulnerable groups. Furthermore, it has generally been assumed that the judges responsible for hearing witchcraft cases read this literature and took it seriously, using demonological tracts as their guide to the conduct of trials.[1]

When one examines the specific case of French demonology though, several facts become immediately apparent. First, there was no fifteenth-century French demonological tradition. The first French works of this sort did not appear until the late 1560's.The subject was then fairly popular for the next few decades until it died away in the late 1620's. This corresponds roughly to the
period in which most prosecutions for witchcraft took place in France,but there is little solid evidence concerning the number and distribution of trials or the extent to which judges actually

read and followed the advice of demonological texts. In fact, one of the themes that runs through the French demonology books is the complaint that judges were too soft on witches, not taking the dangers of witchcraft seriously enough and not punishing those accused severely enough. There is some evidence for arguing that these perceptions were actually correct.[2]

The central argument of this paper will be that in France demonology books were composed as political works. With a few notable exceptions this literature was composed by zealous Catholic writers, members or sympathizers of the Holy League during the Wars of Religion, or of the "dévot" party afterwards. For these writers, Protestantism was a demonically- inspired heresy, which in turn opened the world to ever-increasing Satanic activity and witchcraft. These writers called for the extermination of witches and heretics.Since only a small portion of the population of France was active Leaguers or "dévots", the demonologists saw themselves as part of a tiny godly minority in a sea of heretics,witches,atheists,libertines and other evil sectarians.

We must remember that this extreme Catholic faction had ~~rather~~ little real power in France. The Valois kings tried their best to stay independent of the League,and of course Henry IV was its declared enemy. In the French legal system, secular courts had jurisdiction over the serious crimes of witchcraft, magic, heresy,blasphemy and other moral and religious offenses.The highest courts of the kingdom were the Parlements,composed of hereditary officials who owned their offices and who heard cases

as boards of judges. As a result the Parlements were fairly free from outside interference and from the influence of the passions of small numbers within. Politically, the Parlements were fiercly royalist and while quite strictly Catholic, were strongly opposed to papal involvement in French affairs .This view is known as Gallicanism and was an important factor in Old Regime French religious politics.

At the centre of political and religious controversies beginning in the early years of the Wars of Religion were the Jesuits. Their role in French affairs and their bitter quarrels with the Parlement of Paris are well-known. What is much less well-known is the extent to which demonology played a part in these controversies. A look at the interplay between historical narrative and the development of demonology will clearly illustrate the connections.

The Religious Wars began in 1561 with the massacre of Protestants at Vassy by troops loyal to the Duke of Guise.In 1564, the still-new Jesuit order entered France to combat heresy and quickly got embroiled in bitter wranglings with the Gallican Parlement of Paris who saw the Jesuits as a foreign force, loyal to the Pope rather than to the King of France. One of the most vexed questions in these quarrels was over the Jesuits' intention to found a college in the University of Paris, which they succeded in doing. The battle lines were sharply drawn between the Catholic zealots, for whom religion should determine policy, and the Gallican Parlement, for whom the defence of tradition and French political independence was more important than confessional differences.

The occasion that focused many complex religious and political issues in the early phases of the Wars of Religion and touched off serious French interest in demonology was the famous diabolical possession case of Nicole Aubrey in 1566. Nicole was publicly exorcised in Laon, a religiously mixed town, in elaborately staged ceremonies attended by thousands. Her exorcists interrogated her possessing devils, the principal of whom was named Beelzebuth. Beelzebuth delivered long sermons on the evils of Protestantism, referring often to "my Huguenots". The Protestant Prince of Conde tried to intervene to shut the exorcisms down as tensions rose in Laon, but was overruled by the King. On 8 February 1566, occured the "Miracle of Laon",as it came to be known to the Catholic League , when Nicole's devils dramatically left her before a huge crowd of excited onlookers. One eyewitness called this exorcism a"Famous miracle, one of the greatest that the human eye has witnessed, and that devils could not obscure"[3]. Some of Laon's Huguenots even reconverted to Catholicism as a result of the exorcism of Nicole.[4]

This case opened the floodgates to demonology in France,and to the political use of witchcraft theory. Fervent Catholic writers argued that the successful exorcism of Nicole and others that followed was clear proof of the Catholic Church's claim to be the true church, the only church that had inherited Christ's supernatural gifts of exorcising devils.All the sacraments and ceremonies of the Church were utilized in the struggle against devils,in such a fashion that their efficacy was confirmed. In a case in 1582, for example, a boy was freed of his possessing

demons by having a Host forced into his mouth and "the cross and holy water, together with holy litanies and the relics of holy martyrs, confessors and virgins fought in this miracle for the Apostolic Church against the heresies and atheism of our time."[5]

In an atmosphere of intense religious rivalry and growing interest in demonological speculation, the distinguished Jesuit Professor of Theology at the College of Clermont delivered what was, according to many contemporary observers, a remarkable series of public lectures on Catholic theology in Paris. Father Jean Maldonat, originally Juan Maldonado of Salamanca, was a fighting theologian. He stated that Catholic intellectuals had not been prepared for the challenges of the Reformation:" When, in the early years of this century, heresy suddenly raised its standard, it caught us poorly prepared to repel its attacks."[6] Maldonat dedicated his life to improving the level of understanding of complex theological issues among Catholics so that they could refute the audacious Protestants who claimed to know the Bible better that the wisest Catholic theologians.[7] Upon his return from a missionary effort in Poitou, recently captured from Protestant forces in 1570, he began a six-year course of lectures in Catholic theology. He drew such large crowds from a broad spectrum of the Paris elite that in good weather, the lectures were moved outside.[8] Among his auditors were Martin Del Rio who later often cited these lectures, Louis Richeome and Pierre de Lancre,famous witch judge and demonologist. For one student, Francois de la Borie, notes from this course of lectures were still important enough to publish in 1605, constituting an invaluble record. Maldonat's biographer cautions us from

considering this book as Maldonat's own work, but it probably gives us a good idea of the content of the lectures and thus of the process through which demonology became central to Catholic theology in France through the efforts of a charismatic teacher.

According to Maldonat, heresy, demons and demonology were tightly related. He stated, "In Bohemia and Germany the Hussite Heresy was followed by such a storm of demons that witches were as busy in Germany as heretics. This was observed well by the German Jacques Sprenger who lived in those days and who wrote a book on it (the famous Malleus Maleficarum)". From there the demons spread to Geneva, and thence to France with the introduction of Protestantism.[9]

Maldonat also developed the line of argument that placed demonology in the theological context of the defence of the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, a crucial notion. According to this view, angels and demons filled the essential function of rewarding or punishing the souls of the departed after death. To doubt or deny any aspect of this picture was to question the most sacred beliefs of the Church. Maldonat also stressed the great power of the devil, who was limited only by God. He discussed the diabolical pact and the witches' Sabbat in detail, often citing the Malleus. For Maldonat, any disbelief in this area was atheistic and an outgrowth of the Protestant heresy.[10] Thus Maldonat introduced themes that existed elsewhere in Europe into the highly charged atmosphere of civil strife-torn France where they took on a political colouration . This political view of the history of demons was evident in France for

several decades.

Only a few years later, Pierre Node picked up these themes. For him , witchcraft was "a true apostasy, a sin of blasphemy a crime of divine treason."[11] He argued "And a storm of men filled with the devil has fallen on the shoulders of this deplorable century (in which) so many men and women have left the faithful troop of true Catholic Christians to fight against them under the banner of I don't know what spirit of error."[12] Satan had cursed France "by the abominable doings of his own members among us, these witches, false Christians and heretics." Node appealed,"Where is the prince, who strongly and for the sole name of God, and for zeal of his ancient religion will wed the cause and take up the fight for his God and His Church...(and) the defence of the paternal faith against these rebellious enemies of God, of the Church, of piety and holiness?"[13] Node also called upon judges to punish witches severely, "The civil law desires their corporal death, the holy Canons order their spiritual death and God commands both against them, so that they are exterminated from Heaven and earth."[14] He repeatedly called for the massacre and extermination of those rebels against God, for the heretics of his time, who" in a short time have broken and overturned all order of justice...and entirely ravaged our France."[15]

This point of view was reflected in a little work by Charles Blendec who called the Huguenots "heretics, (and)children of Satan"[16] .According to this author, God was punishing France through the Devil for having mistrusted the Catholic Church and having refused to receive and register the holy edicts of the Council of Trent of twenty years earlier.[17]

For Pierre Crespet, Prior of the Celestines and a devoted Leaguer, heresy had been used by Satan since early times to challenge the true church. It was Satan who made learned men turn to Calvinism.[18] "Never did the pagans dream",he wrote,"of such cruel and execrable tragedies that are renewed in France and other places by the heretics, evil race and seed of the first Arians."[19] For Crespet the devil's work was evident in the current situation."Today he tries to uproot the faith from our hearts and introduces atheism by means of heresy and the evil arts which are practiced with impunity in France."[20] Many evil sects had come into France. "Some are Huguenots, others Politiques, Machiavellians, Atheists and libertines."[21] He went on,"In France the Huguenots have blasphemed the Virgin Mary, massacred priests,pissed in the holy vessels,left their filth on the holy altars, renounced the Roman Church, condemned all the sacraments and broken images."[22]

Extremely dangerous for France was the weakness of the courts in dealing with these grave crises. "Even our judges are so blind that they deny that there have ever been witches." These judges were "fascinated and controlled by Satan"[23] so that the poison of witchcraft and heresy spread unchecked. This theme of the dangers of judicial incredulity and the resultant softness to witches became a rallying cry of the demonologists as time went on and was clearly related to the conflicts between Parlements and the League.

All the themes discussed so far concerning the connections between religious politics and the development of demonology are

thrown into sharp focus in the career and writings of Jean Boucher. Boucher was born to a wealthy and powerful Paris family in 1548. He could have attended the College of Clermont.He might have attended and surely knew of Maldonat's famous lectures. By 1580 he was a Doctor of Theology and Rector of the University of Paris. He was also a bitter enemy of Henry III and became a primary pillar of the Paris League, closely associated with the radical Sixteen who ran the city in the late days of the civil war. The polemical violence of the Paris League, never moderate, became extremely intense after the murder of the Duke of Guise in 1588. For this faction, all who were not of their party were heretics deserving of extermination.

When Henry IV took Paris in 1594, Boucher was one of the very few who was specifically excluded from a general amnesty. He left Paris with the fleeing Spanish armies and settled in the Spanish Netherlands.[24]

Boucher was a prolific writer who frequently took up the fight against the Protestant heretics and their fellow travellers. In a work from 1594 he denounced Henry IV's conversion to Catholicism as false.In another the next year he came to the defence of a Jesuit seminarian who had tried to assassinate the King. Since Henry then banished the Jesuits from France, Boucher's book is also a defence of the Order. Boucher stated that the Protestants were the worst of all heretics and that Judas had been the first Calvinist.[25] The Huguenots were the "seed of the Devil,(as) Catholics are the seed of the Church". "Catholics were obliged by divine right to league themselves against the heretics. The people of God were a League,

to exterminate Canaanites, Jezubites, Amohrites and all the plague of infidels and precursors of these (modern) heretics.[26] Henry IV was depicted as " a heretic, a relapse, chief of heretics, a sacrilege and burner of churches, a corrupter of nuns, a massacerer of priests, a sworn enemy of the Church, one who has spent his life doing nothing else than making war on the Church and shedding the blood of Catholics."[27] Boucher railed against the Edict of Nantes, which he called "the seminary of all the evils and troubles of France."[28] Furthermore, since it was permitted to kill heretics and to kill tyrants, it was certainly justified to kill a monarch like Henry IV, who was both in the eyes of his enemies.[29] The division of religions that had torn France apart could only be seen as a "diabolical invention, which makes friends into enemies in a war of religion."[30]

Boucher's Jesuit contemporary, Louis Richeome, dealt with many of the same themes in his several works. In an unusually personal passage published many years later, he described his debt to Father Maldonat, who he called one of the great philosophers of his age, " Maldonat (was) renowned in France through his lessons and doctrines and in all Christendom by his writings and his religious virtues, loved and honoured by all who knew him personally. He was my first regent in our Company in his philosophy lessons in Paris, when he began to teach in France in 1564. Also he was my first master in my devotional exercises and my noviciate."[31] Richeome's first work, published in 1598, was a defence of miracles, which he accused the Protestants of not believing in and debunking. He accused Calvin of espousing the

Arian heresy in denying the reality of demons and demonic possession.[32] According to Richeome, the ability to exorcise demons from possessed people was miraculous, was in the sole power of the Catholic Church and thus proved the legitimacy of Catholicism.[33] He stated,"Recognise the truth of our faith by the expulsion of devils."[34] All those who impugned such miracles were "worthy of punishment, not refutation."[35]

In 1603, in a defence of the Jesuit order, still expelled from France, Richeome accused the Order's enemies of being "the most notable calumniators that France has seen since Luther gave birth to monsters extreme in impudence, in ignorance (and) in malice." Opposed to the Jesuits were "many Atheists, Machiavellians and other soulless people, associated and sworn to fight us and in us the Catholic religion."[36]

Clearly, witchcraft, heresy and politics were bound together in this intensely zealous genre of literature. The issues were again brought together in another big exorcism case, one which contemporary observers believed to be an attempt to recreate the Miracle of Laon . This case unfolded in Paris in 1599.The city was still bitterly divided and very tense in the aftermath of the Religious Wars. Henry IV's promulgation of the Edict of Nantes, guaranteeing a measure of religious toleration, confirmed the Catholic zealots' suspicions of his sincerity as a Catholic and their hatred of Protestantism.

Early in 1599, Marthe Brossier began to undergo public exorcisms in Paris, drawing huge crowds.Her possessing demon identified himself as the same Beelzebuth who had possessed Nicole Aubrey thirty-three years earlier, and began to preach

violent sermons against the Protestant heretics. When public order was clearly perceived to be threatened, the Bishop of Paris and the Parlement ordered Marthe examined by a group of physicians who declared her a fraud. The exorcisms were ordered ended, to the great anger of zealot preachers and the ex-Leaguer faction.

One of the examining physicians, Michel Marescot, published a detailed expose of the fraud in which he lectured churchmen on the need to proceed with caution in dealing with claims of diabolical possession. This brought forth a sharp response from the young Pierre de Berulle, who later became a Cardinal, educated at the College of Clermont and closely associated with the leading ex-Leaguers in Paris. According to Berulle, Marescot was an " impertinent and malicious physician". Possession was real and Marthe was genuinely possessed. God permitted demons to possess people in order for it to be a "school for the rebel soul, which not having learned in the school of nature or that of Jesus Christ and not having learned to believe in God (like the Atheists) or to fear His judgements (like the Libertines) have to learn in the school of the Devil."[37] Berulle also specifically stated that possessions occured in order to teach unbelievers that the Catholic Church was the one true church.[38]

Following the disapointing Brossier case, and especially after the assassination of Henry IV in 1610, this zealot group continued to mix anti-Protestantism and demonology. It is worth mentioning that over the same years the Parlement of Paris was punishing fewer and fewer witches with the severe penalties

called for by these writers.

Martin Del Rio's important demonology work was translated into French and published in 1611. For Del Rio, witchcraft was worse in his time than ever before because of the " laxness and mistrust of the Catholic Religion among us...Where the faith was weak the Devil grew stronger, as in Africa and Asia,among the Mohammedans;in Germany, France and England among the heretics; in Italy and other countries among careless Catholics called Politiques: in all these places, I say, Magical superstition has planted its roots."[39] " Certainly the filth of Magic accompanies heresy and follows it like a shadow follows a body: whoever doubts this doubts the day and makes the night into high noon... Switzerland, England, Scotland and Flanders have been poisoned with this venom by Calvinism."[40] Furthermore," anyone who denies that there are demons...is impious and a heretic."[41]

Jean Boucher's later works, written in exile, were less directed at specific events than his earlier ones, and were thus a bit more philosophical. However, he was still consistently concerned with the evils of Protestant heresy, attributing it to the work of the Devil. Boucher had lost none of his bitter violence, still calling for the extermination of heresy and heretics. In Le Mystère de l'Infidélité(1614) Boucher connected the coming of the Reformation with the coming of the Apocalypse, a fairly common argument at the time. " For the Devil, having resolved in recent years a great effort against the Christian Church and to attack this time the highest and most holy mysteries of religion...needed to pull Luther out of the Augustinian cloister of Wittenberg" Reformers like Zwingli,

Ochino, Calvin, Beza, Knox and Vermigli"seemed to Satan to be the most appropriate for the execution of his plan."[42] In La Coronne Mystique(1624) Boucher reiterated his often stated view that a multiplicity of religions contravened God's law. He stated that the heretics of his day were Atheists who denied the authenticity of miracles and the immortality of the soul and thus Heaven and Hell. He called magic and witchcraft "the horror of horrors, the crime of crimes and the impiety of impieties" and blamed their growth directly on the schisms and divisions caused by Luther and Calvin in league with the Devil.[43]

In 1621 Louis Richeome published his important L"Immortalité de l'Ame, in which, like Boucher and others, he laid all the troubles of his age at the feet of the Protestants. The Lutherans held, he stated, that the soul was mortal,a profound and dangerous heresy "sown by Satan quietly in the fields of the Earth from the beginning and freely advanced during the dark days of paganism." To disbelieve in the immortality of the soul "is injurious to God through its incredulity and should be dealt with by torture and fire just as for one who says there is no God." Calvin also participated in this heresy:" Certainly...I believe that the impudence of Calvin surpasses that of the Devil."[44]

This was one of the last demonological works of the generation which had gone through the religious wars. By the mid-1620's, demonology seemed to begin to lose its appeal in France and few new titles appeared. The Parlement of Paris was progressively tightening its rules in witchcraft prosecutions, and executions for witchcraft virtually ceased in the large area

of its jurisdiction. The most important factor in the decline of demonology was, I believe, the coming to power of Cardinal Richelieu in 1624. His personal views on demons and witches are not known, though he undoubtedly played a role in the execution of Urbain Grandier in 1635. However, Richelieu acted decisively to put strict controls on the presses of France. Extreme views which did not reflect government policy became rare during his long ministry. Forces that diverted from the unity of the nation and loyalty to the monarch were curbed. The violent nature of [redacted] demonological polemic, directed at a group that Richelieu had decided to tolerate as long as they played his political game, brought it clearly under this heading. In this context, it is not surprising that demonological literature dwindled away significantly before general interest in demons died away.

Notes.

1. Hugh R. Trevor-Roper, "The European Witch-Craze of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries" in Religion and Social Change (London, 1972); Robert Mandrou, Magistrats et Sorciers en France au XVIIe Siècle (Paris, 1968).

2. Albert Soman, " Les Proces de sorcellerie au Parlement de Paris (1565-1640), Annales 32 (1977).

3. Florimond de Raemond, Histoire De La Naissance, Progrez et Décadence De L'Hérésie de Ce Siècle (Paris, 1605), p.140.

4. Jehan Boulaese, Le Trésor et Entière Histoire De La Triomphante Victoire Du Corps De Dieu sur l'esprit malin Beelzebub, obtenue à Laon (Paris, 1578), f.192v.

5. Charles Blendec, Cinq Histoires Admirables (Paris, 1582), f.29v.

6. J. M. Prat, Maldonat et l'Université de Paris au XVIIe Siècle (Paris, 1856), P.183.

7. Prat, p.183.

8. Prat, p.187.

9. R.P. Maldonat, Traicte de Anges Et Demons (paris, 1605), fols. 156v, 157v.

10. Maldonat, fols. 179r, v.

11. Pierre Node, Déclaration Contre L'Erreur Exécrable Des Maléficiers, Sorciers, Enchanteurs... (Paris, 1578), p.4.

12. Node, pp.25-6.

13. Node, p.35.

14. Node, p.54.

15. Node, p.60.

16. Blendec, pref.

17. Blendec, fols.23r, v.

18. Pierre Crespet, Deux Livres de la Hayne de Sathan et Malins Esprits Contre l'Homme, (Paris, 1590), fol.54.

19. Crespet, fol.7r.

20. Crespet, fol.42r.

21. Crespet, fol.83v.

22. Crespet, fol.66r.

23. Crespet, fol.115.

24. Elie Barnavi, Le Parti de Dieu, (Louvain, 1980), pp.21, 168; Dictionnaire de Biographie Français (Paris, 1954) Vol.6.

25. Jean Boucher, Sermons de la Simulée Conversion, Et Nullité De La Prétendue Absolution De Henry De Bourbon (Paris, 1594), p. 36.

26. Boucher, Sermons, pp. 90-91.

27. Boucher, Sermons, p.321.

28. Jean Boucher, Apologie Pour Jehan Chastel (Paris, 1585), p. 35.

29. Boucher, Apologie, p. 75.

30. Boucher, Apologie, p. 104.

31. Louis Richeome, L'Immortalité de L'Âme (paris, 1621), intro., n.p.

32. Louis Richeome, Trois Discours (Bordeaux, 1598), p. 204.

33. Richeome, Discours, p. 193ff.

34. Richeome, Discours, p. 212.

35. Richeome, Discours, p. 245.

36. Louis Richeome, Plainte Apologétique (Toulouse, 1603), pp. 9, 15.

37. Leon D, Alexis (Berulle), Traicte Des Energumenes (Troyes, 1599), fol. 251.

38. Berulle, Traicte, fol. 36v.

39. Martin Del Rio, Les Controverses Et Recherches Magiques (Paris, 1611), pp. 5, 6.

40. Del Rio, Controverses, pp.3, 8.

41. Del Rio, Controverses, p. 109.

42. Jean Boucher, Le Mystère D. Infidélité (Chalons, 1614) pp. 70, 71.

43. Jean Boucher, Couronne Mystique (Tournai, 1625) pp. 90, 534, 537.

44. Richeome, Immortalité, pp. 34, 82, 354.

II. WHY DID THE FRENCH CROWN IN THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY ATTEMPT TO DESTROY PROTESTANTISM?

BY

Julian Dent

~~JULIAN DENT~~

(Professor of History
University of Toronto)

PEOPLE WHO THINK about the Edict of Nantes and its Revocation seem to share a widely disseminated view about both. It was taught to me from my earliest youth, and did not change much down to the end of my undergraduate studies, much of whose final phase involved learning about French intellectual history in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

The standard view has much to recommend it. It is simple, and morally coherent, for the evil that it describes is comfortably confined to a few easily recognized bad people. On the other hand, much has been learned about French society by historians in the last forty years, most recently about the way ideas permeated down from the level of the high culture to popular belief. It seemed to me that it might be useful for today's purposes to consider how well the standard view maintains itself in the light of recent research.

The standard view is perhaps best expressed by the late David Ogg in his influential work, Europe in the Seventeenth Century.[1] Here is his eloquent and powerful summary of the significance of the Revocation:

"To violate a fundamental law of the kingdom and undo the most noteworthy achievement of the reign of Henry IV, was the climax of Louis's absolutism. Historians may dispute whether the blame rests with the French church or the Jesuits, or Louvois or Mme de Maintenon; perverters of facts, anxious to make a case for some person or institution, may even try to show that the Huguenots were dangerous or seditious. But whoever were his advisers, Louis XIV must take full responsibility before the tribunal of history for an act which is strikingly characteristic of his mentality. The unrelenting bigotry of Philip II and Philip III is sometimes condoned by pleading extenuating circumstances in the ideas of the age, but these can hardly be urged on behalf of their descendant Louis, because since 1629 the Huguenots had ceased to have any political activities; they had been distinguished for their loyalty during the Fronde, they had produced many eminent public servants, they were admittedly the most enterprising and industrious section of the community and were protected by a law frequently confirmed and regarded as practically irrevocable. Moreover public opinion in 1685 was different from that which earlier in the century had condoned the expulsion of the Moriscoes, for the period of the great religious wars was ended; nations were gradually realizing that it is better to retain a tax-paying population than to expel it; with the progress of scientific inquiry, a less narrow view of the universe was coming into favour, and at last religion was beginning to be dissociated from wrangling and butchery. The ideal of absolute doctrinal uniformity in the State was fading away..... Louis revived one of the most sinister things in a bad past, hoping by this manifestation of orthodoxy to condone his own irregularities and to conciliate a deity which was supposed to share his outlook on life...."[2]

There are a number of objections that one could make. The most obvious is that the Edict of Nantes was not a fundamental law. Fundamental law in France is rather tricky, as Dr. G.D. Kerr has

shown: such a title was given in France to a series of so-called Fundamental Laws, the most important of which were rules pertaining to the succession to the throne which were formulated and even invented during the Hundred Years War to keep the English from making good their claim to the French throne by descent in the female line. The most famous Salic Law (no. 59) thus denied the crown to anyone so descended.[3] The Edict of Nantes had nothing to do with any of these rules.

Furthermore, Mr Ogg is at best only half right, even on the narrative-political level, when he pins responsibility for the Revocation on Louis XIV. Jean Orcibal showed long ago that responsibility was shared, and that a major part rests squarely on the shoulders of that strange and very brutal man François-Michel Le Tellier marquis de Louvois de Courtenvaux et de Barbézieux, Minister and Secretary of State, aided by particularly tough Intendants like Marillac in Poitou, Foucault in Béarn and Lamoignon de Baville in Languedoc.[4]

But these things are not central to Mr Ogg's argument, which seems to concentrate on two points of more general significance: first, that the Revocation was an example of an absolutely evil thing, religious intolerance; and that such an act was anachronistic in the historical context of the seventeenth century. Progress had happened, scientific enquiry had changed the way people thought, religious intolerance belonged to an earlier age. This idea of anachronism and of the supererogatory wilfulness of Louis XIV

is what most people take away from reading this part of Mr. Ogg's book. Unfortunately such a view makes it difficult to come to terms with what is now known about French society. Mr. Ogg assumes that developments in the history of ideas in the seventeenth century towards greater tolerance, had an effect on the state and society at large. He does not mention any names here, but one may plausibly assume that he is thinking of Locke and Bayle, and perhaps of the earlier Jurieu.[5] There has been a great deal of modern research on Bayle, by, among others, Elisabeth Labrousse and Walter Rex. Mr. Rex in particular shows the extraordinary intellectual power of the Huguenot tradition (especially the École de Saumur) within which both Bayle and Jurieu wrote.[6] On the other hand, it would be rash to assume that Bayle moved France in the seventeenth century in the direction of toleration. There may have been some effect - one would like to think so - by brilliant Huguenot polemic as the waters closed over its authors' heads. Possibly the Crown delayed the Revocation a little because it feared that polemic was a reflection of Huguenot power in society. But research in social history indicates that ideas of toleration had no observable effect at all in their own time. It seems that Bayle wrote more to implore pity from a nation that had long since of its own will hardened its heart against his cause.[7]

On the political level, it is now clear that the Edict of Nantes advocated no great new principle, but was merely a truce between warring factions. The French Crown had to stabilize its

position vis-à-vis the two most serious forces that threatened to destroy it in the sixteenth century - Huguenot guerrillas and the Guisard Catholic Ligue financed by Spain.[8] The extreme Catholic and Spanish threat was dealt with by the Treaty of Vervins of 2 May 1598, which gave France time to organize for the resumption of her direct military struggle against Spain after 1635.[9] The Edict of Nantes (13 April 1598) itself essentially recognized that a military solution of the Huguenot problem was impossible at that time. The Edict was by no means uniformly successful, and the military problem remained until the early 1630s, when Richelieu completed a process that lasted for most of a decade, remorselessly destroying the strongholds of Huguenot nobles in the South - the most famous example being the detonation of the Brobdignagian mountain fastness of Les Baux in 1632.[10] Thereafter the Huguenot problem seems to recede. Conventional wisdom has it that the siege and capture of La Rochelle (1628) and the Peace of Alais (1629) saw an end to Huguenot restiveness, and that from then until 1685 they formed a loyal and acceptable part of the state.[11] That indeed is the appearance of the political history of France, and it is supported by Huguenot behaviour, for example that of Pierre Bayle, who remained even in exile ostentatiously loyal to the King of France.[12]

And yet, if we look outside the realm of politics, we see a very different picture. The Catholic Church continued to wage a merciless and unremitting struggle against Huguenotism which was at times a great embarrassment to French foreign policy, engaged as it was in

attempts to gain and maintain alliances with Protestant states in northern Europe in the fight against the Habsburg. This is an important divergence, for it indicates that at least one major group in French society was far more eager than those who led the Absolutist state, to achieve a final solution to the Huguenot question.[13]

This leads on to more general matters. Though Mr. Ogg seems to want to see the seventeenth century as a progressively more reasonable age, in the conventional Cartesian and later Enlightened meaning of Reason, it has been clear to historians of Catholicism for many years that for France - as indeed for much of Europe - the seventeenth century was par excellence the Age of the Catholic Reformation, which almost everywhere seemed to be regaining sixteenth-century losses to Protestantism: Poland, Bohemia, Southern Germany, the Spanish Netherlands. Part of the success was ideological, for example the work of the Jesuits in Poland. Part, however, was the result of the more or less judicious application of force: for example, the dispossession of the indigenous Bohemian nobility by reliably orthodox German-speaking Catholics.

For France, the subject of the Catholic Reformation is a huge one which will take many books and lifetimes of historians to treat.[14] But one can say that the French Church became much more organized and formidable. The education of the parish priest, the disciplining of the hierarchy, the elaboration of a coherent and monolithic theology, the foundation of uncounted new communities

of religious, the spread of modern Catholic education by Jesuits, Oratorians, Ursulines and others, all transformed the Church into a vigorous and confident body, certain of its truth and righteousness.[15] For France in the seventeenth century, we should speak not so much of the dawning of the Age of Reason, as of the high noon of a second Age of Faith.[16]

The Huguenots never formed more than a small proportion of the French population; Voltaire guessed perhaps a maximum of one-twelfth, others, like Robin Gwynn guess one-eighth.[17] But no one is sure. The Huguenots faced a terrible threat from the Catholic Church, which always treated their continued existence as an appalling anomaly, and which was resolved by any means to eradicate them, calling again and again for Kings to fulfil their coronation oath to protect the Church by destroying the Huguenot viper.[18] What made the danger more pressing and immediate was the close relationship of the reformed Catholic Church with the Absolute Monarchy. There are many areas in which this relationship was manifest: the two most immediately obvious to me are those of personnel and political philosophy.

It can fairly be said that in keeping with the spirit of the age, French monarchs of the seventeenth century were far more conscious of the importance of religion than their predecessors at least for most of the sixteenth century had been. The experience of the Civil Wars was salutary to both Crown and Church. The Ligue, the name of Catholicism, had tried to destroy the monarchy, while the Church had seen fulfilled its nightmare of the succession of a monarch who was leader of a heretic minority.[19]

When Henry IV converted for the last time to Catholicism, it was because he recognized that only a Catholic king could claim authority to rule the vast majority of his countrymen. His successors made their Catholicism part of the peculiar ideological amalgam that is called Absolutism, eagerly allying themselves even in death with the cutting edge of the Catholic Reformation. While both Louis XIII and Louis XIV had their bodies buried according to ancient tradition in the basilica of Saint-Denis, their hearts were ostentatiously preserved in Paris in the church of Saint-Louis on the rue Saint-Antoine, home of the Jesuit noviciate in France.[20] Louis XIII's consort, Anne of Austria, Louis XIV's, Maria-Theresa, and his morganatic wife Mme. de Maintenon, were all strong believers.[21] And where the monarchy led, society followed. The Condé, First Princes of the Blood - once such fierce champions of <u>la religion prétendue réformée</u> - now buried their hearts in proximity to their kings'.[22] Slightly lower down the social scale, enormous and even crippling benefactions to the Church dominate the wills of the high nobility, though few perhaps could equal the pious intentions of the last duchesse de Guise, who died in 1688 bequeathing sums that were later shown to be embarrassingly in excess of what remained of her family's assets.[23] In life, religious enthusiasm amongst the highly placed expressed itself in what seems to have been the only serious opposition to Richelieu's foreign policy, that of the <u>Dévôts</u>, whose objection to Richelieu's fighting foreign wars allied with Protestant powers was based on their concern for eliminating the heretic enemy within.[24]

The religious impulse was clearly shown by other levels of society. The examples that I have selected show with particular clarity the link between Reformed Catholicism and the State. First, the level of royal ministers. Richelieu's elder brother became a Carthusian monk, and Richelieu himself was a highly successful Reforming bishop before he ascended, or even guessed that he might hope to ascend, to high state office.[25] Most of the sisters of Nicolas Fouquet, last Surintendant des Finances, and of his conqueror, the great Jean-Baptiste Colbert, became nuns.[26] One of the sons of Michel Le Tellier, Secretary of State for War and later Chancellor of France, was Louvois, Secretary of State and chief architect of the Huguenots' doom; another of Michel's sons, Charles-Maurice, became Archbishop of Reims.[27] Second, the level of men who became Intendants. Olivier Lefebvre d'Ormesson, arguably one of the finest lawyers of seventeenth-century France, wrote delightedly in his famous Journal of the ecclesiastical exploits of his own sons and of the sons of his acquaintance, passing rites of passage often of some intellectual nature into the regular clergy, whither they could not have gone had they not demonstrated beyond doubt religious vocation.[28] Study of the genealogies of several thousand noble families confirms quantitatively the fact of a ruée vers le cloître throughout the seventeenth century.[29]

As for political philosophy, religion played a critical role in the theory of the Absolutist State. From where we sit, we tend to view this askance; my own introduction to it came from the hardly friendly opinions of Locke, Bayle, Montesquieu and Voltaire,

who, in their various ways, tried to discredit it. But as far as seventeenth-century France was concerned, the centre of gravity of political theory was the identity of interest of the Catholic Church with Absolute Monarchy. From Charles Loyseau, writing at the beginning of the century, to Bishop Bossuet, active through most of the reign of Louis XIV, the virtual congruence of Church and State was the only guarantee that society had against disintegration, against a return to the chaos of the sixteenth century. Loyseau lays out a picture of a pyramidal society in which everyone has his or her own place and in which the activating will is that of the King. Bossuet merely added the clarity and distinctness of expression that he had learned from reading Descartes. Dissidence of any kind became sacrilege, and could not be tolerated.[30]

The result of all this was a deliberately undertaken transformation of social relationships, not in basic economic terms but in the way in which and the extent to which authority operated. Historians of popular culture have examined the old autonomous cultures of pre-modern France, in which, for example, women played a key role in the transmission of tradition in legends, and in ways of treating disease, and have shown how these things were equated with heresy and witchcraft, and brutally persecuted almost to the point of extermination. The combination of Church and State, of bishop, priest and intendant, strove mightily to replace the traditional culture with a new patriarchal system in which lines of authority were simply and deeply drawn, and in which the pyramidal pattern proposed by Loyseau could become a reality. One authority, M Muchembled, believes that this endeavour very largely succeeded.

The old spontaneous earthy popular culture of the Middle Ages was replaced by a disciplined, puritanical, absolutist one by some time in the early eighteenth century. Muchembled exaggerates, I think, the extent of the Church-State's success. But there is no doubt that it tried.[31] Nor is there any doubt at all of its readiness to use force. Consider the way royal officials collected taxes in newly-conquered territories. Standing operating procedure was to hang prisoners until the population at large paid up. Local military officials who protested were admonished. Intendants who were slow were subject to Louvois' terrible rage, of which this is an example:

> «...ne croyez pas que j'en attribue le retardement à personne qu'à vous....je vous feray connoistre de quelle manière je scay faire obéir aux ordres que je vous donne de la part du Roy.»

Certainly Dragonnades do not seem so unexpected in such a context - indeed they were commonly used long before the 1670s for affairs other than those of the R.P.R.[32]

The answer to the question that forms the title of this paper becomes discernible. The French Crown tried to destroy Protestantism because the structure of French governing institutions and of society itself could not tolerate deviance of any kind. The wonder is that the Revocation had not happened long before 1685. Voltaire reflected on this in his chapter on Calvinism in the Essai sur les moeurs: he thought Richelieu was close to such a move about 1630. The reason for the delay lies probably in the concerns of foreign and civil war that convulsed France around the middle of the century.[33] Probably too there was an element of caution involved: until the bulk of the descendants of the Huguenot nobles who had waged such successful guerilla warfare in the later sixteenth century, had converted back

to Catholicism, it was not safe to revoke. That it was safe by 1685 is indicated by the pathetic leadership of the Camisards of the early eighteenth century: Abraham Mazel, visionary son of a Huguenot farmer; Jean Cavalier, peasant; Daniel Roux, illiterate agricultural labourer; and others whom their opponent the maréchal de Villars would later describe simply as des fols.[34]

And so the perplexity as to why Louis XIV, Louvois and the others in the chain of command could do so evil a thing, loses its mystery. The question with which I started is superseded by another: why, given the structure and ideology of French society in the seventeenth century, did French Kings take so long to fulfil the demands of their bishops and of French society at large?

Notes

1. D. Ogg, Europe in the Seventeenth Century (London, 1925).
2. Op. cit. (6th edition, revised, 1956), p. 301.
3. G.D. Kerr, "The French Monarchy in the Fifteenth Century, as seenthrough the eyes of its propagandists: a study of some contemporary royalist writers" (University of Toronto Ph.D. thesis, 1973); see particularly Chapter VII, 'The Monarchy and the Salic Law', pp. 143-66.
4. J. Orcibal, Louis XIV et les protestants (Paris, 1951), pp. 70, 89-90, 157. On Louvois, see J.M.W. Dawson, "An Institutional and Sociological Study of the French Intendants (1652-1715)"(University of Toronto Ph.D. thesis, 1978), pp. 126-7, 153-4. On Intendants and the suppression of Protestantism, see Dawson, pp. 210-20. A summary of Louvois's career is in le P. Anselme de Sainte-Marie, Histoire généalogique et chronologique de la maison royale de France (2 vols. Paris, 1712), vol. I, pp. 480-1.
5. J. Locke, A Letter concerning Toleration (2nd. edition, 1690); P. Bayle, Commentaire philosophique sur ces paroles de Jésus-Christ Contrains-les entrer...(1686); -----, Dictionnaire historique et critique(1697); -----, Critique générale de l'Histoire du Calvinisme de M. Maimbourg (1682). On Jurieu's espousal of violence after 1688, see W. Rex, Essays on Pierre Bayle and Religious Controversy (The Hague, 1965), pp. 216-225.
6. J. Delvolvé, Religion, critique et philosophie positive chez Pierre Bayle (Paris, 1906); E. Labrousse, Bayle (Paris, 1963); W. Rex, Essays on Bayle, esp. pp. 77-193.

7. Rex, pp. 165-6, 170-2.
8. N.M. Sutherland takes a slightly different though highly authoritative view: "Thus, in spite of everything that happened from 1560 to 1598, the consistent policy of the Crown was the maintenance of peace....The essential struggle in sixteenth-century France was not - as has been commonly thought - between the Huguenots and the Crown, but rather between the Crown and the Catholic extremists." See N.M. Sutherland, The Huguenot Struggle for Recognition (New Haven, 1980), p. 3.
9. D. Buisseret, Henry IV (London, 1984), pp. 69-74.
10. R. Mandrou et autres, Histoire des Protestants en France (Toulouse, 1977), esp. Vogler, "La peau de chagrin (1598-1685)", pp. 117-150; on the destruction of Les Baux, the only reference I could find was Pneu Michelin, Provence (Paris, 1967), p. 67.
11. Ogg, p. 194.
12. Rex, p. 170.
13. P. de Vaissière, L'affaire du maréchal de Marillac (1630-1632) (Paris, 1924), pp. 13-41.
14. The outstanding short modern treatment is J. Delumeau, Le Catholicisme entre Luther et Voltaire (Paris, 1971).
15. On the Oratorians, see S.J. Wagley, "The Oratory of France 1629-1672: a social history" (University of Toronto Ph.D. thesis, 1976).
16. R. Muchembled, Culture populaire et culture des élites dans la France moderne XVe - XVIIIe siècles (Paris, 1978).
17. F.-M. Arouet dit de Voltaire, Essai sur l'histoire générale et sur les moeurs et l'esprit des nations depuis Charlemagne jusqu'à nos jours (8 vols. n.p., 1757), vol. VI, p. 285; ~~W.C. Scoville, The Persecution of the Huguenots and French~~

(17. cont.

R.D. Gwynn, Huguenot Heritage: the history and contribution the Huguenots in Britain (London, 1985), p. 11.

18. C.A. Dent, "The French Church and the Monarchy in the Reign of Louis XIV: an administrative study" (University of London Ph.D. thesis, 1967).

19. N.M. Sutherland, The Massacre of Saint Bartholomew and the European Conflict 1559-1572 (London, 1973); -----, The Huguenot Struggle for Recognition (New Haven, 1980); -----, Princes, Politics and Religion 1547-1589 (London, 1984).

20. Y. Christ et autres, Le Marais (Paris, 1974), p. 108.

21. J.B. Wolf, Louis XIV (New York, 1968), pp. 25-6, 287, 336.

22. A(rchives) N(ationales) K. 543, No. 71: Document of 28 March 1709, Codicil to Will of Henri-Jules de Bourbon prince de Condé, who orders that after his death his heart be placed in the church of the Jesuits of the rue Saint-Antoine "avec celui de son père, dans la chapelle où est le coeur de feu Monseigneur le prince son ayeul".

23. Anselme, vol. II, p. 1212; A.N. K. 543, No. 1, Testament olographique of Marie de Lorraine duchesse de Guise... (6 February 1686); cf. also Liquidation of claims of legatees, M(inutuer) C(entral) des A(rchives) N(otariales), Étude CXIII, 188, Liquidation of 19 April 1701.

24. Vaissière, loc.cit.

25. D.P. O'Connell, Richelieu (London, 1968), pp. 12-19, 136-41.

26. R. Kerviler, Repertoire général de Bio-Bibliographie Bretonne (17 vols. Rennes, 1886-1908), vol. XIV, p. 278; P. Clément (ed.), Lettres instructions et mémoires de Colbert (7 vols. Paris, 1861-82), vol. I, pp. 467-86.

27. Anselme, vol. I, pp. 480-1

28. O. Lefebvre d'Ormesson, Journal (ed. by P. Chéruel, 2 vols. Paris, 1860-1), vol. II, pp. 368, 374, 483, 516, 555-6, 580.

29. Anselme, passim.

30. C. Loyseau, Cinq livres du droit des offices (Paris [Châteaudun], 1613; J.B. Bossuet, Oeuvres choisies (5 vols. Paris, 1903), vol. I, pp. 159-430, Discours sur l'histoire universelle; vol. II, pp. 290-466, vol. III, pp. 1-394, Histoire des variations des églises protestantes; P. Hazard, La crise de la conscience européenne 1680-1715 (New edition, Paris, 1961), pp. 182-217.

31. Muchembled, op. cit.; F. Le Brun, La vie conjugale sous l'ancien régime (Paris, 1975).

32. Dawson, Intendants, 261-6; the quotation from Louvois is in Archives de la Guerre A^1 1069 pièce 41, Louvois to La Goupillière, 21 January 1691, quoted by Dawson, p. 262.

33. Voltaire, vol. VI, pp. 289-91.

34. E. Le Roy Ladurie, Les paysans de Languedoc (2 vols. Paris, 1966) vol. I, pp. 620-7.

III. THE HUGUENOT REFUGEE COMMUNITY IN STRASBOURG

L. J. Abray
Scarborough Campus
University of Toronto

In the course of the sixteenth century tens of thousands of Huguenots had to flee their native towns and villages, running for their lives in a desperate search for havens in Protestant territories. Geneva, of course, is the best known refuge, and logically so, since it was both the Calvinist capital and a francophone city. Geneva's fame has obscured the stories of other havens, including that of Strasbourg, a German-speaking and eventually Lutheran city. Yet Strasbourg was the first refuge of the French Protestants, home of the mother church of the Presbyterians, and the succourer of legions of Huguenots in the dark decades of persecution and war.

It is impossible to give the full tale of the Huguenot refugee community in Strasbourg in a short paper. A thorough airing of the topic would require a discussion of the city's place in Calvinist church history, an explanation of the deteriorating relations between the local refugee parish and the Lutheran church of Strasbourg, an analysis of the city's role in the French wars of religion, an account of the internal affairs of the refugee parish, a prosopography of the refugees, a look at the Strasbourg careers of some of the great figures of Huguenot history (Condé, Calvin, and Hotman, to name only three), discussion of the attitudes of the Strasburghers toward the refugees, an examination of Franco-Imperial politics, and more besides. To compress all this into one paper could only render it meaningless. Let us focus instead on three questions: who were the Huguenot refugees, why did they come to this German and Lutheran city, and what sort of life did they find here?

First a bit of background.[1] In the sixteenth century Strasbourg, along with the rest of Alsace and most of Lorraine, was part of the Holy Roman Empire. About 20,000 people lived within the city walls, and their city was practically independent: it had its own government, its own money, and its own foreign policy. The reformation began here around 1518, and by the mid-1530s Strasbourg had its own protestant church. This local church at first tried to steer a middle course between the Swiss and the Saxons, but from the 1530s on, was becoming more and more Lutheran.

French Protestant refugees began to arrive in Strasbourg very early, in 1525.[2] The first to come were individual clergymen in trouble for preaching the new doctrines — men like François Lambert, a defrocked monk from Avignon, Jean Védaste, who had been arrested in Metz, and the better known Guillaume Farel. The first mass arrival, also in 1525, consisted of five members of the Group of Meaux, including Lefebvre d'Étaples. Members of the nobility, a class later to play a crucial role in Huguenot history, began to appear in significant numbers in 1534, after the Affair of the Placards. By the end of the 1530s the migration had broadened to include ordinary families, followers rather than leaders.

By 1538, when Jean Calvin took shelter in Strasbourg after his initial false start in Geneva, there were enough refugees in the city to justify the creation of a refugee parish. Calvin was its first pastor, and it was here in Strasbourg that he passed his practical apprenticeship as a reformer. The parish he helped to [redacted] survived until 1563, providing a centre for the Huguenot community. The parish was an embattled centre; throughout the quarter century from 1538 to 1563 its history was one of confrontation after confrontation between successive pastors and successive sets of elders. In 1563 the Strasbourg magistrates, sick of having to

referee these squabbles and under mounting pressure from their own Lutheran clergy, fired the parish's pastor and closed the church.

1563 is thus the second major turning point in the history of the Huguenot refugee community in Strasbourg. Or rather, the second major turning point came in 1562/63, for the refugee parish closed just as the religious wars were getting underway in France. In 1562/63 curious decisions were being made in the Strasbourg city hall: the same magistrates who closed the refugee parish also voted to supply the Huguenots with moral and material support, and confirmed their willingness to welcome refugees. The " poor, persecuted Christians," as the magistrates called them, could find shelter here, and after 1577 they would again formally be allowed to hold prayer meetings, although they were still not able to resume celebrating the sacraments. This compromise, which satisfied neither the refugees nor the Lutheran clergy, endured until 1597.

In 1597 the magistrates outlawed even the prayer meetings, and forbade people under their jurisdiction to attend Calvinist services outside the city walls. By now there were very few Huguenots left in Strasbourg, for the acute phase of the religious wars was effectively over. Those who remained had by and large integrated themselves into the local population, adopting both the German language and the Lutheran faith. The 1597 decrees can thus serve as our benchmark for the end of the refugee community in Strasbourg.

To recapitulate, we are dealing with a community which began to form in the mid-1520s, had its own parish organization between 1538 and 1563, continued to flourish for another quarter century after that, and died out in the 1590s.

Let us turn now to the composition of the refugee community. Who were the Huguenots in Strasbourg? I can answer that question fairly precisely on the basis of a sample of just over 1000 adults.[3] While

no one has ever calculated the total number of Huguenots who found shelter in Strasbourg, I believe my sample accounts for about one third to one half of the community; certainly it is large enough to give us an accurate overview of the refugees.

The first thing that stands out about the community is that it was made up of families. A maximum of about 15% of the Huguenots arrived in Strasbourg alone and apparently without knowing anyone already in the city. The overwhelming majority came with spouses, children, other kin, or friends, and many knew people who were already here. My sample includes more than 250 households, many of them interconnected by blood, marriage, or business ties with other families.[4] The most common household forms were nuclear families (parents and their child or children), with or without servants.[5] The median household size was five. Slightly more than one third of the adult refugees were women.

The Huguenot refugee community in Strasbourg spanned a range of social classes and occupational groups, forming a city within a city. There were aristocrats at the top — for example, the families of Condé and Coligny. About 4% of the Strasbourg Huguenots were aristocrats. Royal and municipal officials, most of them from Champagne, accounted for another 3% of the male population.[6] Numerically more important than either the aristocrats or the officials were the intellectuals and professionals — preachers, teachers, lawyers, doctors, printers, and so on. About 10% of the men can be classed in this group, which outnumbered merchants by about 3 to 1. The largest occupational group in the community was its servants; something like 30% of the refugees were servants or apprentices. Mistresses of households were the second largest group and it is perhaps startling to realize that almost a quarter of the refugees were what we might today call housewives. Artisans (a category that takes in everything

from rich goldsmiths to poor weavers) made up the bulk of the male population and accounted for almost a fifth of the community at large. My sample also includes a handful of unskilled male labourers, barely 1% of the community. Taken as a whole, the Strasbourg Huguenots seem to have been, in class and occupation, quite representative of the general Protestant population of northern France: the upper ranks of society were well represented, as were intellectuals, and the community had a solid bourgeois and petty bourgeois core.

I have compared the refugees to the Huguenots of northern France for the simple reason that most of them came from that part of the kingdom. It is true that there were a handful of refugees from the south, from places like Avignon, Montpellier, and Toulouse, as well as a few from the Auvergne, but these people were a very small minority. At this point I must make a confession: I have been treating my 1000-odd refugees as if they were all Protestant subjects of the king of France. This is misleading. I know the places of origin of about two-thirds of my sample, and nearly 60% of them really were Huguenots by the strict definition. The other 40% were francophones from border territories that are now French, plus others from the southern Netherlands. The largest contingent of these "honorary Huguenots" came from Lorraine, about 30% of the total sample.[7] Another 3 or 4% came from Savoy and Franche-Comté, while the remainder were Netherlanders. To remove these honorary Huguenots from the sample would not much alter the general description of the community given above, but it would give a false impression. It is important to realize that the Huguenots had ties to francophone Protestants outside France (and I should add that the refugee community in Strasbourg also included a sprinkling of Swiss, Italians, and even English people, although I have left all these out of the sample).

Now that we know about whom we are thinking, we can take up a puzzling question: what drew these French-speaking Calvinists to a German and Lutheran city? Geography had a great deal to do with their choice. Protestantism was legally established in territories to the east of France, and Strasbourg was the closest of these centres. The highway network, such as it was, tended to channel people toward Strasbourg, which controlled the most northerly bridge across the Rhine river. Strasbourg was a natural crossroads, unlike Geneva, which was cut off by mountains. The route from Paris or Champagne to Strasbourg was flat for most of the way, and fairly easy going. Traders had been moving back and forth along this route ~~for~~ since time out of mind: it was common knowledge in northern France that there was a large, wealthy city to the east.

Moreover, Strasbourg had been involved in the diffusion of Protestant ideas into the French-speaking lands since the early days of the reformation. Strasbourg's original group of reformers, particularly Martin Bucer and Wolfgang Capito, had taken up the task of translating Luther's German writings into Latin, and the city's numerous printers published these translations, which enterprising pedlars then smuggled west. Later, in the 1560s and 1570s, secular writers and the printers joined forces to compose and issue French resistance tracts.[8] It was thus also common knowledge in northern France that the city to the east was militantly Protestant.

Furthermore Strasbourg, German though it was and Lutheran though it became, had rapidly established itself as a place where francophones and Calvinists could find a refuge from persecution. In 1525 when Geneva was still obscure, poor, and Catholic, Strasbourg was already welcoming dissidents from France. Between the beginnings of the reformation and the

beginnings of the wars of religion, the news about Strasbourg that reached French Protestants was almost entirely favourable: the government here seemed immune to Valois, Guise, Hapsburg, and Roman influence; Jean Calvin had founded a refugee church here; and at least until the 1550s the city's clergy and intellectuals joined the magistrates and the mass of the inhabitants in welcoming French refugees.

Even after the local Lutheran clergy turned against the Calvinists, the lay Strasburghers continued to accept the refugees. The magistrates might worry that the influx of French subjects threatened the city's German character, but they continued to be charitable to the endangered. Nor was the official welcome limited to the issuing of residency permits. The refugees were allowed to work, and if necessary provided with money, housing, and food while they settled in, all at public expense.[9] According to the refugees themselves, more than anything else it was Strasbourg's celebrated toleration and charity that drew them.[10] The fact that so many of the refugees fled to Strasbourg during a crisis, then returned home when things were safe, helped to spread the word about this haven.

Strasbourg was certainly not the best imaginable place of refuge for Huguenots thinking of flight. For one thing, there was the language barrier. For another, there was the problem of the hostility of the Lutheran clergy in the second half of the century, and thus the prospect of being second-class Christians even in a place of refuge. Furthermore, as we shall soon see, no one could be really sure how long the German Lutherans of Strasbourg would welcome people who were alien in their language, their faith, and their political allegiance. Yet the other places of refuge to the east of France usually shared these disadvantages, as well as being farther away. As for Geneva, it was physically difficult

to get to, and the tensions there between natives and refugees were also serious. Moreover, Geneva was poor: could one earn a living there? if not, would there be charity?[11] Strasbourg may not have been the best imaginable place of refuge, but for our one thousand refugees it was the best real place to go.

And so they came. What did they find here? What were their lives like? As you will have gathered by now, life in the exile community in Strasbourg was a mixture of experiences both good and bad. One fact to bear in mind while evaluating this is that for the most part the refugees expected their sojourn in Strasbourg to be temporary, and for most of them it was so in practice.[12] The Huguenots did not conceive of themselves as displaced persons; they had run away but fully intended to return home to pray — or fight— another day. Whatever they met with here, they could expect it to be only a passing moment of their lives.

On the positive side was the reassuring discovery that the Strasburghers in person were as charitable as they were in reputation. They heard out the refugees' stories and rarely denied admittance to those they took to be bona fide religious refugees. Those people who had fled with little more than the clothes on their backs found they could get help from a welfare system which was exemplary by the standards of the day.

It was possible to find work to support oneself or one's family. Housewives and servants of course brought their work with them, but the artisans and labourers must have been relieved to find that they could affiliate themselves with the guilds and earn a living. More than 90% of the artisans in my sample exercised their trades in Strasbourg. For clergymen and lawyers there was less hope of finding work and two-thirds of them seem to have been unemployed; royal and municipal officials, of

course, faced unemployment to a man. These men and their families may have come with ready cash, although this was unlikely to be the case for the preachers.

Newcomers to Strasbourg found a range of secular services available in French. In the 1560s, when the numbers of arrivals began to peak, at least one local lawyer expanded his practice to act as an intermediary between the exiles and the officials who decided whether or not to admit them to the city.[13] Children, who were numerous, could go to French-language schools.[14] At least three francophone doctors had practices in the city. Most of the married women refugees were of childbearing age, and not a few of them were in the last stages of pregnancy when they reached their new home. One can easily imagine their relief at finding a French-speaking midwife in the city in the 1560s.[15]

Relgious services, as we have seen, were more of a problem, but even after 1563 the refugees could meet for sermons and prayers. Those who could not bring themselves to accept the sacraments from the Lutheran clergy could find Calvinist pastors outside the city and not too far away.

Strasbourg, because it was both a crossroads and an intellectual centre, offered the refugees one truly vital commodity: news from home. For men and women anxious to hear that it was safe to return to their places of origin, or worried about the friends and relatives they had left behind, few things could have been more important than a steady flow of information.

~~Yet there were also bad sides to the refugees' lives in Strasbourg. They were saf~~

Finally, and most obviously, what the refugees experienced in Strasbourg was a welcome sense of physical safety. As long as they stayed within the city's walls they were free of the fear of arrest, interrogation, torture, and excruciating death.

However, there were also unpleasant sides to the refugees' lives in Strasbourg. They were safe only as long as they could stay in the city, and therein lay the roots of continual insecurity for most of them. Strasbourg's ruling class, which wished to keep the city imperial in allegiance and German in culture, was reluctant to grant either citizenship or permanent residencey permits to the refugees. Few of the refugees really wanted to settle permanently in the city but undoubtedly all of them would have preferred to be able to control the length of their stay themselves. Most, however, were admitted either "at milords' pleasure" or for fixed and relatively short terms. People in the latter category had to reapply, perhaps several times a year, for permission to remain. That permission was not always forthcoming.

The refugees also had to confront a pervasive local prejudice against what the Strasburghers called "the Welsch" — that is, the speakers of romance rather than Germanic languages. By and large the Strasburghers were willing to suspend this prejudice in the case of religious refugees, but again the refugees could never be sure how long this willingness would last. One way to protect oneself against this prejudice was to emphasize that one was a religious refugee, but that entailed its own risks, namely those of offending Lutherans by displays of conspicuous Calvinism.

Practicing the Calvinist faith was obviously difficult after 1563, but even before then the internal life of the refugee parish had been fractious. In the 1540s and 1550s the parish was riddled with tensions among

Calvin's successors and between the clergy and the laity. This sort of internecine conflict, however, seems to be typical of exile life in all times and places, and was not peculiar to the Strasbourg Huguenots.

How did these pluses and minuses add up? The letters of a student from Lille who lived in Strasbourg between 1545 and 1547 give us a good answer.[16] While we have plenty of testimony from the Huguenot clergymen in Strasbourg — Calvin's correspondence is a gold mine for their accounts — Hubert de Bapasme was the only lay refugee to have left us an extended commentary. Not surprisingly, de Bapasme emphasized the spiritual life of the Huguenots in exile, a life he found sweet and fortifying. He admired pastor Jean Garnier's sermons, and the congregational singing of the psalms brought tears to his eyes. De Bapsme claimed to be "truly joyful" in exile and he could hardly praise his city of refuge enough. Strasbourg, he wrote, "is the best-run city you ever saw and [has] good people who love the Gospel and those who are persecuted for it." The young man knew that some of his co-religionists had abandoned large fortunes for their faith, and yet, he noted, they "greatly praise the Lord who called them hither."

Well they might. For all the difficulties of the exile life, the Huguenots who made their way to Strasbourg knew they were living their faith, and they found hope here in a city renowned for its charity.

Notes

1 For a fuller discussion of sixteenth century Strasbourg see L. J. Abray, The People's Reformation: Magistrates, Clergy, and Commons in Strasbourg, 1500-1598 (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1985).

2 The best sketch of the refugee parish is Jean Rott, "L'église des réfugiés de langue française à Strasbourg au XVIe siècle: aperçu de son histoire, en particulier de ses crises à partir de 1541," Bulletin de la Société de l'histoire du protestantisme français, 122 (1976), 525-550.

3 N = 1063. The information comes from manuscript government records held in the Archives municipales de Strasbourg (AMS).

4 N = 256

5 20% and 32% of household respectively.

6 For the refugees from Champagne, an important proportion of the community, see Roger Zuber, "Les champenois réfugiés à Strasbourg et l'église réformée de Châlons. Echanges intellectuels et vie religieuse (1560-1590)," Mémoires de la Société d'agriculture, de commerce, science, et arts du département de la Marne, 79 (1964), 31-65.

7 The bulk of the Lorrainers came from Metz.

8 The city was also a major centre for German-language propaganda aimed at bolstering Lutheran support for the Huguenots, for example the works of Johann Fischart published by the Jobin firm. See Miriam Usher Chrisman, Lay Culture, Learned Culture: Books and Social Change in Strasbourg, 1480-1599 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1982), chapters 7 and 13.

9 The magistrates managed to have most of the financial costs paid by the city's surviving Catholic institutions. See AMS, Minutes of the Senate and XXI, 1568, ff. 321r-323r.

10 Ibid., 1571, ff. 1015r-v and 1572, f. 905v.

11 See E. William Monter, Calvin's Geneva (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1967), chapters 1 and 7.

12 This pattern of comings and goings is clear in Zuber's account of the Champenois.

13 Minutes of the Senate and XXI, 1560s, passim.

14 Carl Zwilling, "Die französische Sprache in Strassburg bis zu ihrer Aufnahme in den Lehrplan des protestantische Gymnasiums," Festschrift des protestantischen Gymnasiums (Strasbourg: Heitz und Mundel, 1888), p. 260.

15 AMS parish registers, N213, f. 151r and N26, p. 467.

16 Philippe Denis, "La correspondance d'Hubert de Bapasme, réfugié lillois à Strasbourg, 1545-1547," Bulletin de la Société de l'histoire du protestantisme français, 124 (1978), 84-112.

GREGORY HANLON

17

CATHOLICS AND PROTESTANTS IN 17th CENTURY AQUITAINE

Gregory Hanlon (Glendon College)

When studying Reformation society, Catholicism is usually relegated to the periphery, we are assumed to understand it simply as a foil to the Reformers. My purpose here is to bring to the forefront observed behaviour of Protestants in 17th-century Aquitaine and how it relates to that of their Catholic neighbours. I stress the qualifier of 'observed' behaviour, for one of the common shortcomings of Reformation history is to assume that doctrinal obligations and positions had a direct impact on the way people thought and behaved. To some extent, they did. But rather than assume, it is better to analyse, and where possible, measure. We know, and this is the core of our argument and the theoretical base of our research, that people behave according to different principles in different contexts : that one may be devout and yet not always act on principles compatible with their religion, and that this is completely normal. It is especially rewarding to study these relations on the scale of the region, which is the basic geographical unit of pre-industrial societies. Ideally we may eliminate any ethnic variations when both Catholics and Protestants coexist in the same communities, and in theory, once social or class distinctions are accounted for, cultural differences may be with some confidence ascribed to confessional influences . The following is drawn from my study of culture and behaviour in the towns of the Agenais-Condomois as a whole and reflects some of its findings.

(italics)

BACKGROUND: The dense implantation of Calvinism at the confluence of the Lot and Garonne rivers has been since the

outset one of the bastions of Calvinism in France. The Nérac court of Jeanne d'Albret, Queen of Navarre and sister of François I, was a haven for both Calvin and Théordore de Bèze. Calvinism spread very rapidly throughout the years 1550-1575, among the nobility and the literate town-dwellers ; aristocratic Calvinism had the effect of converting entire parishes and implanting the Reformation in rural areas around the towns of Nérac, Sainte-Foy-la-Grande and Tonneins. The civil wars were especially brutal in this region, home to the Catholic leader Blaise de Monluc, and the wave of conversions to Calvinism probably broke during the 1570's. Those towns which remained Catholic, such as Agen and Condom soon became active centres of the Counter-Reformation, and only the conversion of Henri IV disarmed them.

When the dust settled after 1594, perhaps 30% of the population was Calvinist, or some 70,000 people. A large minority of this population was densely packed in parishes almost entirely Calvinist, along the Nérac - Tonneins - Castelmoron axis. Other Calvinists formed compact social élites in many of the small towns, constituting a half or a third of the community. These groups, even when a minority, controlled municipal governments and exercised patronage over their Catholic neighbours. Finally, there were unknown numbers of Calvinist families spread over the countryside (where settlement was in isolated farms), who gravitated each Sunday to the nearest town or village with a temple.

After the proclamation of the Edict of Nantes in 1598, Calvinist leaders thought that the Catholic Church would rapidly wither away, but this illusion faded rapidly as the two confes-

sions were fairly evenly matched. The first serious setback to the Protestant cause came with the renewal of the religious wars after 1621 : the Catholic victory proved that the Roman Church was stronger than ever, and local notables converted to Catholicism in substantial numbers. After 1621 we see a slow process of encroachment in which isolated Protestants are converted : by 1665 they account for 20-25% of the regional population, with the dense area remaining intact. There, Calvinists no doubt absorbed those Catholics who settled amongst them. Losses were restricted to the outlying settlements and there was some shrinkage in the urban élites as militant priests rallied the remaining Catholics behind them.

Real pressure was applied only after 1661, with the strict application of the Edict of Nantes by Louis XIV and his Intendants. It is worth noting that while on the level of the community, Catholics seemed to assent to this pressure, they may have remained passive on the whole, the persecution being perpetrated by agents of the state and the Church, judges and priests, who although acting as leaders of the Catholic community, originated outside of it. The period between 1598 and 1660 may therefore be considered as one of relatively peaceful co-existence, and is rich in lessons both in the study of society per se, and in the ways Protestantism adapted to the Catholic presence.

DOCTRINE AND CULTURE: As Janine Garrisson has noted elsewhere, Calvinism is a simplification of Catholicism - fewer sacraments, elimination of saints and liturgy, of clergy and pious works. What Calvinism did not remove was the symbolism that constituted

the ladder between heaven and earth. In Catholicism the liturgy provided communication with heaven, but laymen had religious activities - confraternities, civic observances, pilgrimages, interpretation of uncommon events - which were only marginally influenced by the clergy. Indeed, Calvinism simply expanded upon this semi-autonomous devotion. In Protestantism there were no mediaries in the clergy, but it was assumed that prayer and fasting, if it could not compel God to act, might have a prompting effect. Over time, more stress was laid on outward devotion by Calvinists as a bonding effect, or as we say today, as a morale-booster. Meteorological phenomena were commonly construed as being messages : in this sense, Protestant mentalities could be as magical-oriented as those of Catholics. If Protestants rejected Catholic miracles and exorcisms, they certainly believed in the powers of the devil and in the existence of witches. Our sources show the permanence of cunning-men and women in Protestant communities and magical healers who replaced saints (few Protestants went on pilgrimages to shrines, although cases were not unknown). Ministers and consistories tried to keep such activities under control : with their removal after 1685 we see some outbreaks of the ecstatic and apocalyptic types of behaviour more common in the Cevennes, in England and in North America. Demons, spirits, magical healing and divine intervention are archaic aspects of religion which have not been emphasized enough in the study of post-Reformation societies. The similarities in religious sentiment with Catholics are also subtler : prayers for the souls of the dead, elaborate funeral ceremonies and eulogies, admiration for the ascetic monks of the Franciscan orders and for

the Penitent brotherhoods, all denounced by Calvin and Protestant theologians, are frequently found at the local level. A study of consistorial archives and personal journals on the regional level would no doubt transform much of our thinking about Protestant piety.

There were undoubtedly some aspects of Calvinism which had little equivalent in the Roman Church : lay members played a much greater role in the policing of the church, deacons led prayer meetings, Protestant heads of families kept private journals more frequently than did Catholics, which may indicate a greater degree of introspection than was common amongst Catholic laity, where they commented on sermons and recorded their sentiments. Where Catholicism stressed the importance of submission to the teachings of the Church, Protestantism encouraged searching and seeking peace of mind, through personal study of the sacred texts.

We should not forget, however, that there are similarities. Even outside the sphere of sociability, Catholics and Protestants shared common traits. If Protestantism encouraged study of the Bible, we know from personal inventories after death, and inventories of booksellers that Catholics read a wide range of devotional literature, although much of it was of an archaic nature such as the lives of the saints. Protestants were not more literate. The frequency of signatures on marriage contracts in Protestant towns corresponds roughly to that of Catholic towns of similar dimensions, with very low levels among unskilled workers and women of all classes. Protestant boys received virtually the

same education as Catholics, although there may have been a greater stress on languages. A result of this was that many young Calvinists were sent to the nearest college, usually Jesuit, to pursue their studies under the watchful eye of the local minister. Political attitudes of Protestants do not seem to have diverged from those of Catholics. Huguenots were blindly loyal to the Catholic absolutist monarchy, at least among the literate élite which formed the backbone of all Reformed communities. Finally, the key to the similarities in outlook can be found in the relations between the two communities. Mixed marriages were very common. In Layrac, where Protestants constituted a third of the thousand inhabitants, there were as many as four or five a year until the 1660's, with a yearly average of at least two. Most marriages were based upon material considerations, and the religion of the other party, although undoubtedly an important factor, was frequently not the decisive one. After all, the Catholic spouse-to-be was still a neighbour. Conversions were common, but so were reconversions : often one would convert when young, or at marriage, and reconvert later on in life. As Elisabeth Labrousse has pointed out in her study of the town of Mauvézin in nearby Gascony, conversion was no great leap for many people, and in communities of this type, propaganda issued from the various hierarchies had only a limited impact. Complete orthodoxy was the affair of an élite, among Calvinists as among Catholics. Most people found themselves somewhere in the middle, and did not think in dogmatic terms. It may be possible that people sought to conform more to religious precepts only after pressure was put on them to abandon Calvinism.

RELIGION AND SOCIABILITY What impact did being Protestant have on interpersonal relations ? The question may seem simple but it has seldom been raised in terms of concrete comparisons with Catholics living in the same community. At the base of interpersonal relationships was the honour system or code, and the exteriority of behaviour with a more restricted 'private' life. The aristocratic ethic had great appeal for Catholics and Protestants alike, and we find few traces of the attitude that work sanctifies. Judicial archives and inventories after death suggest however that Calvinists were somewhat more austere in their lifestyles. An exception to this would be their participation in community festivals - especially Carnaval, in spite of sanctions by the minister and church elders. Certainly they were more sober. This may have had an influence on relationships inside the family (less wifebeating, for example). On the other hand, Calvinists were extremely touchy about their public reputation : this was generally the pretext for widespread violence in society as a whole and among Protestants in particular. Our evidence, which may only be of local value, suggests that Protestants were more violent than their Catholic neighbours. Nor was this confined to spontaneous outbreaks. All sorts of litigiousness split peer groups into warring factions, as the consistory records and judicial archives reveal for Layrac. Certainly the church elders spent most of their energies trying to patch together reconciliations between sworn enemies. It is not certain why this hostility should be so common, although we know that factionalism was rife in most communities, Catholic and Protes-

tant alike. Another facet of this was the striving for rank and precedence which poisoned relationships even among church elders. Relationships fell into several compartments and were governed by specific rules : one could contrast the 'private ethic' based upon public reputation and a certain aggressiveness, with the official Christian ethic requiring meekness and forgiveness. The distance between these two models of behaviour has probably varied over time. Certainly we see fewer breaches of discipline in consistorial records as time went on, although this may be increasing discretion so as not to provoke members of the flock to cross the frontier to Catholicism. The inquisitorial methods of the Consistory seemed to evolve towards a type of confession before a small group of church elders sworn to discretion, something akin to Catholic confession.

TERMS OF COEXISTENCE: As intriguing as these aspects are, we know rather little about how the two groups co-existed within the same community, and that is the point of departure for my present research. The monograph would be the ideal framework since we could observe the interaction of individuals. Source material abounds in the case of Layrac-en-Brulhois, just south of Agen. The abundant notarial archives with their marriage contracts and testaments enable us to enter into family histories, with all of their complicities and quarrels. The key document is the marriage contract, used by every level of society : it situates each couple in their family origins, their economic level, their geographical origin, usually the religion of the wedding ceremony, the signatures of the spouses and finally the identity of the witnesses, friends and patrons of the family. When it is possible to slot each person according to religion, we can see the place of each confession in the community and their degree of association and interaction. Consistory registers note hundreds of emnities among Protestants. They record as well the frequentation of Catholic services by members of the Church and occasional lapses of orthodoxy. Wills and testaments, with their pious clauses and their donations provide a way of measuring the impact of theological notions and religious affinities. We may put their evolution on a time-scale and possibly isolate key people, such as the parish priest, who imparted key notions to his parishioners, and identify those groups and individuals who were the most receptive. Business documents such as obligations can tell us whether or not the two groups were tied economically, or whether they were divided. Municipal proceedings can tell us who controlled the decision-making processes : Protestants were excluded at an early date (before 1620) but there is evidence that the municipal council was dominated by conciliatory Catholics who had to be goaded into more restrictive policies by priests and Intendants. Finally, a judicial register for the year 1661 lists hundreds of civil lawsuits for the Brulhois as a whole, and one could identify those individuals involved. In short, it is possible to observe a multitude of personal relationships over the better part of a century.

This type of study should tell us something of the reality of Reformation France, where pockets of Calvinists lived in contact with the religion from which they had split, and which

they were supposed to despise. This type of situation is not inhabitual in traditional societies as in our own, and we only hope that this type of approach to the study of a divided community may lead to conclusions more universal in nature.

NOTES

Our outline of Protestantism in 17th-century Aquitaine relies almost entirely upon manuscript sources, most of which are conserved in the Archives départementales du Lot-et-Garonne in Agen. The most interesting documents are in the Série B, Sénéchaussée d'Agen, the série E Supplément, dealing with specific Protestant towns such as Clairac, Tonneins, Casteljaloux, etc. The série J contains family archives, many of which have journals and letters written by Huguenots. The série G and H are Catholic ecclesiastical archives, or the surveillance of the Reformed Church and its repression by Rome. Many of our findings can be linked with recent research on Protestant communities, most of which are located in Southern France. The following list details the most important of those studies.

Garrisson-Estebe (J), Protestants du Midi, Toulouse, Privat, 1981.

Garrisson-Estebe (J), "Quelques aspects originaux de la Réforme dans le Midi," Actes du 96e Congrès national des Sociétés savantes, 1971, Toulouse : France du Nord et France du Midi : Contacts et influences réciproques, t.1, 1978, pp.213-221.

Garrisson-Estebe (J), and Vogler (B), "La Genèse d'une société protestante : Etude comparée de quelques registres consistoriaux languedociens et palatins vers 1600," Annales : Economies, Sociétés, Civilisations, 1976, pp.362-388.

Labrousse (E), "Les Mariages bigarrés : Unions mixtes en France au 18e siècle," pp.159-176, in Le Couple interdit : entretiens sur le racisme, Paris, Collogue de 1977, Paris, 1980

Labrousse (E), "La Conversion d'un Huguenot au Catholicisme en 1665," Revue d'histoire de l'Eglise de France, 1978, pp.55-68

Labrousse (E), "Conversions à Mézin au 17e siècle," Actes du Collogue de Marseille sur la Conversion au 17e siècle, Marseille, 1983 I am beholden to Mme Labrousse for kindly having sent me the manuscript of her article, previous to its publication.

Léonard (E), Histoire générale du Protestantisme, t.2, 1564 - 1700, Paris, PUF, 1961

Ligou (D), Le Protestantisme en France, 1598 - 1715, Paris, SEDES, 1968

Mours (S), Le Protestantisme en France au 17e siècle, Paris, Librairie Protestante, 1967.

Pittion (J-P), "Le Collège réformé et l'apprentissage des valeurs : la formation des étudiants à l'Académie de Saumur avant la Fronde," Les Valeurs chez les Mémorialistes du 17e siècle, Collogue de Strasbourg et Metz, 1978, Paris, 1979, pp.353-369.

Sauzet (R), La Contre-Réforme et Réforme catholique en Bas-Languedoc : le diocèse de Nîmes au 17e siècle, Paris, Sorbonne, 1979.

PART TWO

CANADA AND THE HUGUENOTS

Canada and the Huguenot Connection, 1577-1627

John S. Moir
(Scarborough College, University of Toronto)

Canadian awareness of the Huguenot connection in the early history of this country scarcely exists. The primary cause of this near-silence is simply the shortage of clear historical evidence. Few records have survived from that period and those that did were written by unsympathetic Roman Catholic observers. Another factor in this dearth of Huguenot history is probably the historians' habit of emphasizing "majoritarian" history--that is, of concentrating attention on larger elements or forces in history whose records are more readily available, and so overlooking smaller elements such as minority groups or movements. Nevertheless, it is a fact of Canadian history that during the first quarter of the seventeeth century, when trade, colonization and missions drew the attention of Old France to North America, Huguenots were dominant in the development of New France.

The year 1577 does not in itself specifically mark the entry of the Huguenots into France's enterprises in the New World--it is the date of the Peace of Bergerac or Poitiers which brought an armistice to the wars of religion in France and was the occasion and the reason for renewed French interest in trade and colonization in northern America. D.B. Quinn, compiler of the recent monumental five-volume documentary on exploration and settlement in America comments that, "In the earlier phase, 1577-1603, the personalities encountered are too vaguely defined, their motives too mixed to

show us a clear way ahead."[1] The re-activation of French ambitions in 1577 is the starting point for a generation of colonial undertakings leading directly to extensive Huguenot involvement in the history of early New France.

This renewed impulse to colonial development came primarily from Troilus de Mesgouez de la Roche, a Roman Catholic who convinced King Henry III that France would benefit from colonization in northern America and who was consequently named "Governor and our Lieutenant-General and Viceroy of the said Terres neuves and countries which he shall conquer and take from these barbarians."[2] De la Roche was involved in the religious wars until 1584 when his Company of St. Malo brought back five shiploads of furs from Canada. Thereafter two further expeditions were aborted and de la Roche spent seven years in jail as a political prisoner. The year of that isolated trip, 1584, Jacques Noël, companion of his uncle Jacques Cartier on the famous 1535 voyage, revisited the St. Lawrence, probably with de la Roche's expedition.[3] Two years later Noël's two sons were trading in the St. Lawrence and in 1588 Noël received from Henry III a reactivated version of Cartier's 1540 commission, with the interesting proviso that only Roman Catholics could work in the officially approved fur trade.[4] By implication it would appear that Huguenots already had been active in the trade.

Noël's monopoly was immediately challenged in the courts by St. Malo merchants who wanted to continue to share in the profits of the fur trade, but not in the costs of colonization. Before the wheels of justice even got into motion Henry III revoked the monopoly in July 1589, just three weeks before his assassination.

Noël now abandoned all interest in the valley of the St. Lawrence, but Henry IV continued the policy begun by Henry III, emphasizing trade more than colonization. Trade was profitable--experience was to show that colonization was not. Despite the requirement of royal charters for the founding of settlements and despite such royal encouragements as a free supply of settlers from the prisons of His Most Christian Majesty, company after company found the expense of maintaining settlers in the New World consumed much of the profit from the trade. Successive settlements were abandoned or reduced to summer-only trading posts. So the rivalry of trade versus settlement persisted through more than a century until 1663 when Louis XIV cut this Gordian knot by making New France a province of Old France and by throwing the full resources of his kingdom behind the development of this North American colony. By that date the population of New France numbered only some 2000 souls, but the English colonies on the Atlantic seaboard already contained an estimated fifty times as many settlers.

Historically the Huguenot connection with the early history of New France begins with Henry IV's proclamation of the Edict of Nantes in 1598, an event that ushered in a quarter-century of reconstruction and expansion for France. Although Henry was assassinated in 1610, this second decade of his twenty-one year reign appears as a period of religious tolerance when many of Henry's Huguenot supporters and former companions-in-arms shared in Henry's plans for a renewed France. The first chapter of the Huguenot connection in New France opens in 1599 when Henry transferred de la Roche's monopoly to the Huguenot Pierre Chauvin. Chauvin de Tonnetuit

(to distinguish him from the contemporary ship captain Pierre Chauvin de Pierre) was a resident of Dieppe and later of Honfleur where he was captain of the Huguenot town guard. Because of his outstanding war service and his influential position at Henry's court, Chauvin was encouraged by the Roman Catholic François Gravé Du Pont, a trader and explorer in the St. Lawrence before 1599, to seek royal approval for a trading venture there. When Chauvin was given a ten-year monopoly, however, de la Roche protested, claiming that neither Chauvin nor his Huguenot associate, Pierre du Gua de Monts, had ever been to New France.[5]

King Henry relented his decision to the extent that he re-commissioned Chauvin only as a lieutenant of de la Roche, but this was sufficient authority for Chauvin to send his four ships and settlers to found a short-lived colony at Tadoussac. With Chauvin sailed Du Pont, his partner and lieutenant, and also de Monts who came as a passenger. Only five of the sixteen settlers survived that first winter and although the post was used for trade for another two years, no more colonists were sent, which Samuel Champlain later attributed, without any justification, to the fact that Chauvin was a Huguenot.[6] In 1602 Chauvin's monopoly was about to be opened up to rival traders from St. Malo and Rouen but when Chauvin died early in 1603 the monopoly passed to Admiral Aymar de Chaste, governor of Dieppe and one of the royal commissioners investigating Chauvin's failure to colonize. De Chaste in turn sent a survey expedition to the St. Lawrence--one ship was captained by Du Pont, with Samuel Champlain as a passenger--but de Chaste died that summer

and so the coveted monopoly was again available from the king. This time Henry granted it to de Monts, with the requirement that trade must be accompanied by the settlement of sixty colonists per year and the Indians must be won to Christianity.

De Monts, the central figure in the Huguenot history of New France, was born about 1558 near the town of le Gua, south of La Rochelle, where his family had held land for centuries. Only recently has de Monts' important role in the story of early Canada been appreciated, probably because Champlain, his contemporary and associate from Brouage, the seaport just twenty kilometres from de Monts' properties, has traditionally been hailed as the 'Father of New France'. In his article on de Monts for the Dictionary of Canadian Biography George MacBeath emphasizes de Monts' central place in building New France.

> Despite the tremendous contribution made by this far-seeing and broadminded individual to the development of Canada, he has seldom been accorded his rightful place in accounts of its history. Here is the man who made possible so much of what Champlain accomplished. He it was who, inspired with the noble impulse of making a new France in America, founded the first permanent colony here. With his interest in trade simply as a necessary source of funds for colonization and discovery, he sacrificed personal gain for the greater goal, one in which Champlain was his staunch ally. . . . It was de Monts who proved that people from Europe could live here permanently and that agriculture could be carried on successfully. . . . Had his monopoly been enforced and maintained by the French government, the undertaking of de Monts in Acadia and Canada might well have succeeded in full measure instead of falling short of the goals he had set.[7]

De Monts had already visited the inhospitable shores of the lower St. Lawrence so now, with the monopoly in his own hands, he directed his efforts towards the Atlantic coast in search of a more promising site for his trading and colonizing venture. On his first expedition,

in 1604 (when the brief settlement at St. Croix Island in Passamaquoddy Bay was built), de Monts was accompanied by his partner Jean de Biencourt de Poutrincourt and by Samuel Champlain, both Roman Catholics, but also by a priest and a Huguenot minister. During the trans-Atlantic voyage the two men of God engaged in theological disputes that led to blows. Once ashore the priest, Nicolas Augry, managed to get lost in the woods. The minister was suspected of having murdered him but two weeks later the priest was found and their quarrel was apparently resumed where they had left off.[8] Both men remained in the settlement that first winter and must have died almost simultaneously of scurvy. Sagard, the Récollet missionary, later reported that, "the sailors who buried them put them both in a single grave, to see if they would be at peace when dead, since living, they had never been able to agree."[9] Unfortunately this very human and humourous story-ending is not supported by first-hand information.

De Monts' colonies, first on the St. Croix River and then from 1605 to 1607 at Port Royal on the Nova Scotian shore of the Bay of Fundy, seems to have reflected the religious tolerance introduced by the Edict of Nantes. Probably a sizable proportion of the settlers were Huguenots and, except for the unlucky minister, lived in peace with the Roman Catholic colonists. After 1607, when financial difficulties caused by the high cost of supporting a non-productive colony provided the occasion or the excuse for cancelling the de Monts-Pontchartrain monopoly, the Huguenot story in Acadia is seemingly at an end. After de Monts' withdrawal from Acadia in 1607 his lobbying won him a new monopoly of the more lucrative

trade in the St. Lawrence. With Champlain as his principal helper de Monts succeeded in establishing a permanent trading post at Quebec in 1608. When the Acadian colony was revived by Pontchartrain in 1611 with Roman Catholic settlers only, the efforts of the pious and wealthy Madame de Guercheville to send out two Jesuit missionaries were stalled for a season by the refusal of Huguenot shipowners at Dieppe to transport the Jesuits across the sea.[10]

Trade, not colonization, was the main aim of de Monts' venture at Quebec, but from this small outpost grew France's permanent interest in northern America and Canada's oldest city. Religious controversies do not seem to have disturbed the early years of settlement at Quebec, but the assassination of Henry IV in 1610 was bound to have a destabilizing effect on the political and religious situation in both Old and New France. Henry's imperious and Roman Catholic widow, Marie de Médici, became regent for the nine-year old Louis XIII, but political rivalries prevented any sudden revolution in national policies. The process of change began with the removal from power of Henry IV's Huguenot first minister, the Duc de Sully. Sully had openly opposed overseas ventures which might add to the financial plight of the monarchy, but the large reserves he had hoarded for Henry were soon dispersed by the Dowager Queen and her favorites. Even when Queen Marie was exiled from court after the declaration of young Louis' majority in 1614, her influence on policy was diminished very little.

Amidst the swirl of court rivalries and intrigues the rising star in France's political firmament was Armand-Jean du Plessis, Cardinal-Duc de Richelieu, who proved his usefulness in 1619 by bringing peace between the queen mother and the clique that dominated the impressionable young king. Although Marie and Richelieu soon quarrelled, Richelieu's influence over Louis and his virtually absolute control of royal policy was complete after his return to the Council of State in 1624, just one year before the last Huguenot revolt began. This final war of religion ended in total defeat for the Huguenots in 1628, giving Richelieu the opportunity to impose unity under a Catholic monarch by cancelling those military, legal and political powers that had been confirmed to the Huguenots by the Edict of Nantes. As for New France the Huguenot revolt provided a chance to prevent, in New France at least, those religio-political divisions that Richelieu and like-minded persons blamed for France's weakness and disunity.

The impact of Henry IV's death on events in New France appeared only slowly, but two separate and seemingly unrelated developments were moving the colony, the trade and religious relations towards a confrontation. By 1612 de Monts' company was in such financial trouble that in an effort to get a strong friend at the royal court several nobles were successively given the title of viceroy and a generous share of the trade profits. Unfortunately for the company, one viceroy died three weeks after his appointment and another, the Huguenot Prince Henry Bourbon de Condé, spent over three years in the Bastille. De Monts was still a major share-

holder but his authority was gradually being challenged as more traders entered the syndicate. More serious than the frustrating search for political friends, however, was the internal struggle for control of the trade growing between a group from La Rochelle (that controlled one-third of the business), and the merchants from Rouen and St. Malo.[11]

There is no evidence that religion was involved in this rivalry, but religious controversy did constitute the second force for change. In 1615 four Récollet friars had been recruited as missionaries to the Indians by Champlain. According to Champlain the Huguenot merchants agreed to transport and maintain the Récollets because the king wished it.[12] When returning to France, however, after a year in the field, Fathers Joseph Le Caron and Denis Jamet convened a meeting at Quebec attended by Champlain who described the state of the trade in Quebec as "a house divided."[13] The proposed solution was the exclusion from New France of the Huguenot who, according to Le Caron, had "the best share in the trade" and whose "contempt" for the Roman Catholic faith endangered the spiritual future of the colony. A resolution to this effect was presented to the king but no action followed.[14] Roman Catholics who advocated colonization would not risk their capital in New France, and Huguenots who would take that risk showed little interest in colonization.

Meanwhile the administrative picture in New France becomes progressively more confusing. For reasons unstated de Monts withdrew from the trade in 1617, and Champlain was prevented by the company from returning to the colony in 1619. The following year

the monopoly was given to a new syndicate operated by some members of the de Caën family of Dieppe. Although the nominal head of this company was the Duc de Montmorency, the leading figure was the Huguenot Guillaume de Caën, chosen, so Champlain says, in the expectation that he would convert to Roman Catholicism.[15] The new monopolists were required to support six Récollet missionaries, a heavy enough financial burden in itself, but the old Rouen-St. Malo company was so firmly entrenched in New France it proved impossible to exclude it from the trade.

Obviously the situation in the colony was not improved by this rechartering, so the Récollets returned to their plan of 1616 to exclude the Huguenot connection. Father Georges Le Baillif arrived in 1620 and participated in another assembly of notables the following summer. Not surprisingly Le Baillif was chosen to lay the assembly's complaints at the foot of the throne.[16] These complaints included charges that the Huguenots had supplied firearms to the Indians. Back in France Le Baillif was received twice at court, where he had influential friends. Louis XIII and his Privy Council examined Le Baillif's documents and as a result de Caën was forbidden to send any ship to New France.[17] Le Baillif's documents proved to be forged letters, supposedly from Champlain and other colonists, but this did not deter the missionary from publishing a vicious pamphlet attack on de Caën.[18] Le Baillif's religious superior also asked the king to prevent Huguenots from trading or living in New France. All these efforts produced little result for the moment, since de Caën was now given an exclusive

charter in return for compensating the merchants from Rouen and St. Malo. Calm seemed to return to New France, perhaps because Le Baillif did not!

The Huguenots continued to be a visible--and vocal--presence in the colony. Some had actually settled at Quebec and nearly two-thirds of the crew members in de Caën's ships were Protestants.[19] In 1622 de Caën was accused of holding prayer meetings in his cabin while the Roman Catholics had to gather on the bow for religious observances.[20] Later, when Huguenot sailors were ordered not to sing psalms in the St. Lawrence, they complained of being "deprived of their liberty", but they did agree to confine themselves to praying.[21] No sooner was their Roman Catholic commander out of sight than the singing began again, and so loudly that the Indians on shore could hear them. "There is no use in talking to them," remarked Champlain, "it is their great zeal for their faith that impels them."[22] Perhaps some of the sailors' zeal was intended only to annoy Roman Catholics.

At the same moment some boats came downriver to Quebec where Roman Catholic crew members grumbled that Huguenot companions had been holding unauthorized prayer meetings, which Champlain said must cease at once.[23] Not long after, an Algonquin chief complained that since the coming of the missionaries many of his tribe had died. Champlain indignantly blamed the Huguenots for putting such "impious words" into the heads of the Indians.[24] This litany of grievances against the Huguenots continued, and the documentary accounts suggest some repetition of evidence because of confused

dates. In 1626 it was charged that Roman Catholic sailors had been forced to attend forbidden "sacrilegious" Calvinist services. De Caën condemned this story as a "spiteful fiction."[25] By this date the religious conflict in New France had been intensified by the arrival of three Jesuit missionaries whom de Caën refused to shelter at either the habitation or the fort of Quebec.[26]

The Jesuits, however, had two strong advocates at the king's court--Cardinal de Richelieu and the pious young Duc de Ventadour, the most recently appointed viceroy of New France whose Jesuit confessor Philibert Noyrot returned from a summer visit to the colony and appealed to the cardinal and the duke for an end to the Huguenot monopoly.[27] In response Richelieu organized in 1627 a new company, the One Hundred Associates, all Roman Catholics, and revoked the Edict of Nantes as it applied to New France. Henceforth none but French Roman Catholics could legally trade or settle in the colony. The royal signature for these documents was given by Louis XIII in the siege lines encircling the doomed Huguenot stronghold of La Rochelle. The Huguenot connection with New France was officially at an end--fifty-seven years later what Richelieu had done for New France the Sun King Louis XIV achieved for Old France by his revocation of the Edict of Nantes.

Huguenot ~~footnotes~~ Notes

1. D.B. Quinn, ed., New American World, (New York, Arno Press, 1979), IV, 299.
2. Quoted in Marcel Trudel, The Beginnings of New France, 1524-1663 (Toronto, McClelland and Stewart, 1973), p. 56
3. Dictionary of Canadian Biography (DCB) (Toronto, UTP, 1966), I, 520
4. Trudel, op. cit., p. 60
5. Quinn, op. cit., IV, 311
6. H.P. Biggar, ed., The Works of Samuel de Champlain, 6 v. (Toronto, Champlain Society, 1922-36), III, 311
7. DCB, I, 294
8. Marc Lescarbot, The History of New France, trans. by W.L. Grant, 3 v. (Toronto, Champlain Society, 1907-14), II, 232
9. Gabriel Sagard-Theodat, Histoire du Canada, 4 v. (Paris, 1866), I, 26
10. R.G. Thwaites, ed., The Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents, 73 v. (Cleveland, 1896-1901), I, 135
11. Robert Le Bant and M. Delafosse, "Les Rochelais dans la Vallée du Saint-Laurent, 1599-1616", Revue d'Histoire de l'Amerique Française, X, 1956-7, 333-63
12. Champlain, Works, IV, 357
13. Ibid.
14. Sagard, op. cit., II, 92; Christian Le Clerq, First Establishment of the Faith in New France, trans. by J.G. Shea, 2 v. (New York, 1881, reprint AMS Press, 1973), I, 111 ff.

15. Champlain, Works, V, 15

16. DCB, I, 433

17. Robert Le Bant and René Baudry, eds., Nouveaux Documents sur Champlain et son époque, I, 1560-1622 (Ottawa, Public Archives, Publication No. 15, 1967), p. 429

18. Trudel, op. cit., p. 132, gives the fullest and most critical account of Le Baillif's operations

19. Le Clerq, I, 253; Champlain, Works, V. 194-5

20. Champlain, Works, V. 85-6

21. J.B. Conacher, ed., The History of Canada or New France by Father François du Creux, S.J., 2 v. (Toronto, Champlain Society, 1951), I, 33; Champlain, Works, V. 194-5

22. Champlain, Works, V. 206-7

23. Ibid., 207

24. Ibid., 258-9

25. Du Creux, I, 31

26. Sagard, op. cit., III, 788

27. Du Creux, I, 33-6

Caps VI

Identifying Huguenots in the Canada Trade, 1663-1763

J.F. Bosher
(York University)

Who owned the ships that sailed to Canada before the British conquest? Who managed these trans-Atlantic ventures, assembled cargoes and crews, bought marine insurance, took profits and losses? Usually these questions are answered according to vessels' ports of origin. We learn of La Rochelle merchants from Marcel Delafosse and John Clark, of Rouen merchants from Lionel Laberge, Dale Miquelon and Pierre Dardel, of Bordeaux merchants from Paul Butel and Christian Huetz de Lemp, and of Montréal merchants from Louise Dechene and José Igartua.[1] In J.S. Pritchard's statistical summary, shipping ventures are classified port by port. For instance, he says most ships sailing to New France came from La Rochelle except during the last twenty years when more came from Bordeaux; but many of them originated at smaller ports and only picked up cargoes at La Rochelle or Bordeaux.[2]

Identifying shipping ventures by place is certainly worthwhile, but closer study shows it to be superficial and sometimes misleading. Let us demonstrate this point with an example, unusual perhaps but not unique. On 21 April 1695, Le

Saint Louis of Québec (140 tonneaux) was registered at Bordeaux, destined for Québec and the West Indies. A certain Guillaume Jung signed the admiralty registers for her. The venture looks straight forward enough to classify as a Bordeaux venture in a Québec vessel, a return cargo perhaps, until we discover that she was also entered in the admiralty registers at La Rochelle that spring as Le Saint Louis of La Rochelle, and that one of her owners, Jean Jung de Saint Laurent, was a Rochelais merchant. It was his uncle who signed for her at Bordeaux and loaded some of her cargo there.

This information makes Le Saint Louis look like a joint Bordeaux-La Rochelle venture, until we discover that a one-third share in the vessel was owned by the royal governor at Québec, Buade de Frontenac.[3] Investigating the principal shipowners, the Jung family, we discover that they came from Fleurance, well inland from Bordeaux; that Guillaume Jung's wife was the Canadian widow of a French merchant from Orléans, whom Jung married at La Rochelle.[4] In the end, we can no longer think of Le Saint Louis as a Bordeaux venture. The same would be true for many other vessels if we looked at them closely. The more we learn about merchants and their shipping, the more we feel obliged to give up the usual classification port by port and to seek another. The shipping merchants at Québec, Montréal and Louisbourg nearly all came from somewhere in France, and some of the firms at La Rochelle, Rouen and Bordeaux originated in Canada. [5]

Grouping merchants and their shipping ventures by family and religion is more satisfactory. In that age merchants traded in

family firms, enlarging them by marriage alliances with other families of the same religion. Commercial credit, on which all trade then depended, was based on personal trust. A merchant had confidence in his own kith and kin and in his own church members. This was why the Portuguese Jewish merchants at Bordeaux and Bayonne, such as the Gradis and Alexandre families so busy with the Canada trade, married within their own community and treated their many relations as business associates. They traded with Catholics, Protestants or anyone else, but organized their firms and their families among themselves. Their foreign and colonial agents were often kinsmen and Portuguese Jews like themselves. Such a trading partnership as the one they formed in 1748 with the Canadian Intendant and Controller, François Bigot and Jacques-Michel Bréard, was exceptional.

Roman Catholic and Protestant merchants can also be grouped more satisfactorily by family and religion than by the places they came from. Those trading between France and New France can rarely be pinned down to one port. They moved about, formed alliances with families of their own religion at other trading centres, and sent their sons or cousins to represent them overseas.

Grouping merchant families by religion brings out a fundamental difference between Roman Catholic families and others: Catholics were part of the approved society of the monarchy because they were Catholic. They had the possibility and the habit of forming marriage alliances with royal officials, magistrates, financiers or military officers, and of placing their sons and daughters in the established church. They were

part of that hierarchy of families that had grown up around Louis XIII (1717-42) and Louis XIV (1661-1715). Jewish and Protestant merchants were not. Catholic merchants could buy the royal officers of Secrétaire du Roi and Trésorier de France and so move out of trade and up into the ranks of the lower nobility. Jewish and Protestant merchants in general could not.

As a result, Catholic merchants in Paris and in every provincial and colonial capital of the French empire moved in that mixed ruling class of magistrates, officials, noblemen, clergy and financiers which modelled itself on the official society of Paris-Versailles. This was the ruling élite that Cameron Nish has aptly called the bourgeois-gentilshommes of New France. This élite was entirely Roman Catholic, but Professor Nish apparently did not think its religious identity had any social importance.[6] It is true, of course, that the notorious affaire du Canada, which exposed the corruption of Québec official society, involved a Huguenot, François Maurin, and would have involved a Jew, Abraham Gradis, if the Minister Choiseul had not protected him, but these are irrelevant exceptions. The Huguenot and Jewish communities were not part of Bourbon official society at Québec or anywhere else.

So far were Huguenot merchants outsiders that they were virtually outlaws unless they pretended to be Roman Catholic converts. As a result, unless they fled abroad they were obliged to conform to Catholic practices to satisfy the authorities of church and state. Most recanted and became New Converts. Most married in Catholic churches and brought their children to

priests for baptism. By adopting a Roman Catholic disguise to avoid persecution, Huguenot merchants created a problem for today's historian much like the problem facing government and church in Bourbon times: who truly converted, who remained secretly Protestant, and who was ambivalent or indifferent in matters of religion?

Identifying Huguenot merchants has not interested Canadian historians much. This is partly because only people who lived in Canada are thought to be of any interest in our history. By focussing attention upon the merchants established at Québec, Montréal or Louisbourg, the Canadian historian has been able to ignore the Huguenots because they were forbidden to settle here in families. They remained merely a fraction of the marchands forains, outsiders or intruders in New France, almost as insignificant as the Jews. Also, most economic and social historians assume a merchant's religion to be irrelevant, in the belief that human behaviour is determined by economic circumstances.[7] Anyone who interprets merchants as part of a bourgeois class engaged in a struggle with the feudal nobility is likely to overlook families and religious groups. He is unlikely to notice that religious groups were also social groups. Most of all, a historian who tries to identify Huguenots can so easily appear to be bigoted, and few historians are willing to run that risk.

Marc-André Bédard's efforts, for instance, seem bigoted to Marcel Trudel, who writes: "In his book, Les Protestants en Nouvelle-France, Marc-André Bédard...persists in classifying as Huguenots some immigrants who, after recanting, signed Catholic

acts (of baptism etc.) He supposes these converted Huguenots were able to keep their religious principles secretly. The thing is not impossible, but how can the historian prove it in individual cases? The impossibility of seeing into the private conscience in no wise troubles this author, who goes on adding to his lists of names with total unconcern."[8] As these remarks of Trudel suggest, anyone who wishes to argue that Huguenot merchants were in fact Catholic has only to produce all the proofs of Catholicity which French authorities used to wring from the Huguenots.

Identifying Huguenots is difficult for the historian who, like Professor Trudel or Monsieur Bédard, tries to identify individuals in Canada without tracing their ancestry. But whoever makes a special study of Huguenot families, clans and communities, following them wherever they went, tracing the marriages that kept them together generation after generation, will see most of them clearly enough. In the 17th century, it appears, merchant families often dispersed according to a plan, leaving certain members in France to keep the family property until better times. Those who sacrificed themselves by staying in France for this purpose tended to recant as required and to lapse into "heresy" when the immediate danger had passed. Some families could not afford to settle abroad: shopkeeping families, whence certain Canada merchants came, survived by remaining in large communities. All these wore Catholic disguises, conforming as required, marrying into other families of New Converts like their own, and remaining a discreet or even secret Protestant minority

in an oppressive Catholic theocracy.

Some merchants appear in documents [redacted] proving their Huguenot identity. The best of these are lists drawn up by the Intendant at Québec. In 1741 he named nine Protestant merchants representing five French firms and a Québec firm.[9] In 1754 his successor drew up another Liste des Protestants qui sont en Canada showing twenty-six merchants representing fourteen firms.[10] Now, all or nearly all of these merchants had been baptized Roman Catholic.[11] Parish registers in France prove this. Like all travellers to French colonies they had most certainly been required to submit Catholic birth certificates to admiralty authorities in France when applying for their passports. Were it not for the official lists, the historian in Canada would have to regard them as Roman Catholic on Marcel Trudel's principles.

Fortunately, the historian in France has other documents. At Bordeaux and La Rochelle, Protestant registers of births, marriages and deaths were kept until the revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685 and revived in the middle of the 18th century. Entries for merchants families are particularly abundant in them.[12] Card catalogues summarizing the Protestant registers were established long ago at the municipal archives of Bordeaux. At La Rochelle, Le Grand livre des Protestants ostensibly records the deaths of foreign Protestants' for the period 1731 to 1781, but it is in fact studded with references to the many Huguenot families that intermarried with these Protestant foreigners. Protestant registers also survive at many of the small towns in the southwest of France whence came an astonishing number of Huguenot merchants.[13] At Marennes, for instance, Protestant

registers survive for the period 1757-89, at La Tremblade for the year 1752, at Bergerac from the middle of the 18th century, and so on.

Wills, before 1685, prove the Huguenot identity of such merchants as Étienne D'Harriette, one of the founders of the Canada trade at Bordeaux, and of his wife from the Théroulde family, both originally from La Rochelle.[14] Another Huguenot the Bordelais, Étienne Sigal, made a will leaving 100 livres to the church of "the reformed religion of Bordeaux of which by the grace of God I make profession."[15] Not only wills but interrogations are recorded. The admiralty papers at Bordeaux record interrogations of Huguenot merchants who tried to escape abroad. A four-page interrogation of December 1685 proves the Huguenot identity of the Canada merchant, Jacob Rattier, originally from Coutras, and another that year proves the identity of Daniel Albert, whose children had fled to England.[16] There is a particularly dramatic interrogation of Jacob Garrisson of Montauban who was captured with his brother and two members of the Minvielle family of Bordeaux while trying to escape on 8 May 1705 aboard a Dutch vessel.[17]

Most of these documents are earlier than 1685 or later than about 1750. In the intervening period it is not easy to identify Huguenots. "Have they recanted?", we wonder/ knowing a family to be Protestant earlier. Here and there a source reveals a firm Huguenot family. For instance, in 1722 Susanne Oualle, aged 15, was imprisoned in the convent of the Nouvelles Catholiques de la Providence at La Rochelle by an official lettre de cachet. Her

father, Jean-François Oualle, tried to rescue her but could not, and five years later she became a nun under the name, Sister Saint Laurent.[18] In 1730, a daughter of another family, Paillet of Marennes, was imprisoned in the convent of Notre Dame at Saintes.[19] In 1736 Robert Dugard was accused of living in sin with a woman to whom he was not married, which was duly reported by the Parlement of Rouen to the authorities in Paris.[20] In fact, the woman named was his wife married by notarial contract of 27 January 1735, and in illegal Protestant rites, not in the Catholic church.[21] Many surviving parchments granting royal permission to sell pieces of property are proof of Huguenot identity, not only because it was Huguenots who needed such permission, but also because these parchments usually described the family in question as being of the reformed religion.

Links with Protestant friends or relatives abroad are other clear signs of Huguenot identity. Robert Dugard began his business career in Amsterdam and had strong connections there, for instance through his Huguenot friends, Le Boucher de Neuville, established as bankers at Rouen and Amsterdam.[22] In 1720, we find Jacques Thouron of La Rochelle and Bergerac trading with his brother, Jean Thouron "a merchant of Amsterdam."[23] In 1738, the Dutilh family of Montauban was in touch with Jacques Dutilh of Rotterdam.[24] In 1747 Pierre Garrisson of Bordeaux was trading with Jacques Garrisson and Etienne Garrisson et fils of Amsterdam.[25] Connections abroad do not, of course, always prove religious identity: we know that certain families divided on the religious question, one branch remaining Protestant, another turning Catholic. Usually, however, the pattern of marriages

makes religious affiliations clear.

We now come to the most comprehensive and satisfactory method. Tracing a genealogical chart of marriages and births shows who remained Huguenot and who turned Catholic by marking out lines of religious affiliation. For, let us remember, the issue for the social historian is not whether people were sincerely Catholic or Protestant in their hearts, but whether they belonged to Catholic social and business circles or to Protestant ones. After several years of compiling genealogies of merchant families, I am convinced that a ramifying series of marriages between two or more families of New Converts is proof of continued Protestantism, especially when no priest, magistrate or other royal officer turns up.

Conversely, a series of marriages with established Catholic families showing a sprinkling of priests, nuns, magistrates in various royal courts, or financial officials, is reasonable proof of conversion. By this method, certain large clans can be declared Huguenots: the Rocaute-Boudet-Delacroix-Admyrault clan, or the Garesché-Mesnardie-Paillet-Bonfils clan. The clans of merchants from Montauban, with members scattered through all the French Atlantic ports, were undoubtedly Huguenots, their Catholic baptisms notwithstanding. Furthermore, it is precisely this clannishness that makes their religion important to us. For they traded in clans, and their common religion was the basis of a social difference between them and Roman Catholics.

Certain cases, it must be confessed, leave us still in doubt. To what social and business circles did Jean-Baptiste Chevallier

(c. 1714-1762) of Québec and La Rochelle belong? The son of Gilbert Chevallier and Catherine Dumade of Terraja, diocese of Moulin in Bourbonnais, he made a Catholic marriage at Québec with Marie-Angélique Pelletier (widow of Pierre Gaudet) by contract of 9 September 1740 (Me Barolet). But when she died in September 1758, he left their two children at Québec and returned to La Rochelle where he made a second marriage with a cousin, Marie-Anne Vatable, born to François Vatable, a merchant at Guadeloupe, and his Huguenot wife, Jeanne Rullet. The contract for this marriage was signed by two of his Huguenot friends from Québec, Jean-Isaac Thouron l'ainé and François Jacquelin as well as various Catholic friends. His wife's aunt, Marie-Anne Rullet, was the wife of a firmly Huguenot relative of the same name, Jean-Baptiste Chevallier. Some Huguenot cousins, Jean-Baptiste, Louis, and Marie (wife of Louis Pillet) Chevallier, were established in trade at Trois Iles, Saint Domingue. All of these Chevalliers were related, moreover, to the Huguenot Allaret family of Geneva, Bordeaux, Hamburg and La Rochelle, and to the Protestant Danish families of Noordingh and Woyett settled in France. And yet on 25 November 1762 our Jean Chevallier, "marchand négotiant, ci-devant à Québec, agé de 48 ans ou environ..." was buried at St. Nicolas Catholic church.[26]

Further research may clear up the Chevallier case, but there remains, nevertheless, a shadowy marchland of Huguenot families that blended so well with the Catholic landscape as to baffle the authorities of Bourbon France as well as the historian today. These were usually wealthy Huguenots who recanted in return for a high office, or a post with authority, or an advantageous

marriage. Did Jean Massiot really convert when he was rewarded with an appointment as Commissaire général de la Marine at La Rochelle in the late 17th century? As early as 1691, several Catholic merchants in the Canada trade, Arnauld Peré, Blaise Busquet and Antoine Grignon, complained that Massiot, like other New Converts, abused his power to favour merchants "of his own religion", that is, the Calvinist religion. They accused him in a formal petition of finding pretexts for holding up the departure of Catholic merchant ships in order to give Protestant ships an advantage in the race to be first at Québec and the West Indies.[27]

The Huguenot Mouchard family of La Rochelle presents another puzzle. In the 17th century, two Mouchard brothers, Abraham and Isaac, were wholesale cod merchants deeply engaged in shipping to Newfoundland, Canada, and elsewhere. After the revocation, several of Abraham's children recanted and prospered by official patronage. François in particular became a Deputy of Commerce for La Rochelle in July 1715 and was raised to noble rank in 1720. In 1718 he was serving the Indies Company "for relations with Canada".[28] He and his brothers and sister look like genuine Catholic converts except that they kept in touch with their elder brother, Abraham, who was established as a well-known Huguenot banker at Amsterdam throughout these years. He served for instance as the Amsterdam correspondent of the Indies Company in which François was a Director from 12 November 1717. This was John Law's Indies Company, and as J.M. Price argues, it had close relations with foreigners and Huguenots such as Mouchard, who was

one of John Law's friends.[29] In October 1719, François Mouchard was one of five directors entrusted with the tobacco monopoly along with another Huguenot New Convert, Elizée Gilly de Montaud. It would be risky to describe Mouchard as Roman Catholic in spite of his "conversion". He lived in that cosmopolitan no-man's-land of Protestant banking which Herbert Luthy describes.[30]

An intensive study of such ambivalent families of merchant bankers leads to three conclusions. First, that the Bourbon authorities needed rich bankers enough to overlook their Huguenot background and their foreign connections. Louis XIV and his ministers, even in the century of the Catholic Counter Reformation, were obliged to make use of such prominent Huguenot bankers as Barthelemy Herwart (1606-1676), Samuel Bernard (1651-1739), and Jean-Henry Huguetan (1665-1749). Both the official patrons and their Huguenot "clients" stood to gain by doing business together. An atmosphere of discretion, ambiguity, even perhaps hypocrisy, prevailed at that high level, the same level at which Jewish bankers had often served royal courts which otherwise persecuted Jews.

A second conclusion is that as the 18th century wore on, the Bourbon government was less and less inclined to lead the Roman Catholic crusade against heresy. The Crown lost its crusading ardour as Holland, Great Britain, Hanover, Prussia and Russia, all hostile to the Counter Reformation, rose in wealth and power. Protestant trading society came to dominate Atlantic trade more and more. Little by little, the Crown and its officials extended a measure of informal toleration to the great merchant bankers and even to ordinary shipping merchants in the Atlantic ports,

though French society at large did not become tolerant during the Age of New France. Near the end of it, in the middle of the 18th century, the royal government at last abandoned the dévot cause.

This change came out of necessity, not virtue. If Canada and the West Indies were to be supplied with troops and supplies, government shipping contracts had to be awarded to Huguenot, Jewish and Catholic merchants alike. In the 1740s the ministers befriended the Jewish family of Gradis and the erstwhile Huguenot family of Beaujon, who both began to send ships and cargoes to New France. In the 1750s, government shipping contracts were awarded to such Huguenot merchants as Pierre Desclaux, Simon Jauge, Pierre Baour, Nicolas Paillet, Pierre-François Goossens and Gabriel Courrejolle's widow. These and other Huguenots were probably doing most of the Canada trade then.

A third conclusion is that the favoured Huguenot families remained discreetly in touch with merchant bankers of both religions. Once the government ceased to support the Roman Catholic dévots, the Huguenots, too, could pretend that religion was irrelevant in business. Herbert Luthy and Claude-François Lévy have shown how they slowly penetrated the great world of business in Paris.[31] Along with Swiss, Dutch, German and British bankers, they began to invade the field of Bourbon state financing, competing with the Farmers General, the Receivers General and the other Catholic financiers with venal offices.

A good example of Huguenot presence among the great Canada merchants is Pierre-Gabriel Admyrault (1723-). Although he

never visited Canada, he went into business at Québec in 1752 through the agency of a partner there, Jean-André Lamalétie, a Catholic merchant originally from Bordeaux.[32] In 1754, he extended his business to Montréal in association with one of Lamalétie's Catholic cousins, Jean-Patrice Dupuy, also from Bordeaux. When these partnerships ended in 1757, Admyrault sent his Canadian shipments to a Canadian Catholic merchant, Jean-Baptiste Amiot. In the course of trading to Canada he somehow befriended a clan of well-connected Catholic officials and merchants at Québec. This is clear in a marriage contract he and his wife signed in Paris on 18 January 1771 as a friend of the groom. The groom was Jean-Baptiste Tropez Martin, a Marseille merchant banker who had lived at Québec during the 1750s, and the bride was the sister of the last Treasurer General's agent at Québec, Hillaire de la Rochette.[33] Both bride and groom were related to the family of René-Nicolas Levasseur, the former chief royal shipwright at Québec, and through him to a large clan of great financiers, nobles and clergy. Also present at this splendid Paris wedding were Admyrault's daughter and son-in-law, Louis Vincent, intéressé aux affaires du Roi, who since their marriage in July 1762, had resided in the rue Vivienne, parish of Saint Eustache, near the centre of naval and maritime enterprise in Paris.

With all these connections, it is perhaps astonishing to find that Admyrault and his family were part of a well-known Huguenot clan whose Protestant identity is not in doubt. In the 17th century the family had produced a distinguished professor of theology at the Calvinist academy of Saumur (Moise Admyrault,

1596-1664) and at least one pastor who fled to Holland at the revocation (Abel Admyrault, seigneur de Beausoudun, pastor at St. Agnès (1623) and at Surgères). Pierre-Gabriel had, of course, been baptized at St. Barthélemy's Catholic Church in La Rochelle. But he married a daughter of another Huguenot merchant, Elie Giraudeau, which linked him directly with the Huguenot families of Oualle, Bonfils and Rasteau, all in the Canada trade at one time or another.

The family has the same identity wherever we trace it. Indeed, it would be hard to find anyone more deeply entrenched in the world of Huguenot business than Pierre-Gabriel Admyrault. One of Pierre-Gabriel's sisters in 1745 married a Huguenot merchant prominent in the Canada trade, Jean-Isaac Thouron (1711-81). Another in 1751 married the Huguenot merchant, Paul Fleuriau, whose brother, Aimé-Benjamin Fleuriau founded the sugar refinery of Bellevue in Saint Domingue. That same year a third sister married a Huguenot merchant banker in Paris, David-Pierre Rocaute (1721-63). Their contract was signed by Huguenot kith and kin from the great banking world of Paris, including Jacob Dangirard and family, Theodore de la Croix, and members of the de la Coste family.[34] Pierre-Gabriel Admyrault is thus one of those who links the Canada trade with the large cosmopolitan networks of Huguenot bankers described by Herbert Luthy.

Admyrault perfectly illustrates the problem of identifying Huguenots. He might have been mistaken for a Catholic. But he was undoubtedly Protestant. Part of the problem is that the status of Huguenots had changed by the middle of the 18th

century. Admyrault's career shows the Huguenot merchant at the end of the French régime in Canada when, faced by defeat and decline, the Bourbon monarchy decided it could no longer afford a policy of Catholic imperialism and finally gave up the Counter Reformation altogether. In the 1750s it began to stop its old policy of religious discrimination. In 1762-4 it drove out the Jesuits, those shock troops of the Counter Reformation. At the same time, in 1763, it gave up New France, that great Roman Catholic imperial venture. The Crown's Catholic crusade and New France disappeared together. As for the Huguenot merchants, when Canada became a part of the British empire, they no longer needed to hide their identity. At Québec, Huguenot merchants from La Rochelle, Montauban and Normandy were free to meet Huguenot merchants from Albany and New York, and Huguenot officers in the British army. For the historian, the problem of identity suddenly melts away.

Notes

~~NOTES~~

For "~~Identifying Huguenots in the Canada Trade~~"

~~J.F. Bosher~~

1. M. Delafosse, "La Rochelle et le Canada au XVIIe siècle", La Revue d'Histoire de l'Amérique française, vol. IV (1950-51), pp. 469-511; E. Trocmé & M. Delafosse, Le Commerce rochelais de la fin du XVe siècle au début du XVIIIe siècle, Paris, 1952; J.G. Clark, La Rochelle and the Atlantic Economy during the Eighteenth Century, Baltimore, 1981; Lionel La Berge, Rouen et le commerce du Canada de 1650 à 1670, L'Ange-Gardien, 1972; Dale Miquelon, Dugard of Rouen: French Trade to Canada and the West Indies, 1729-1770, Montréal, 1978; Pierre Dardel, Navires et marchandises dans les ports de Rouen et du Havre au XVIIIe siècle, Paris, 1963, and Commerce, industrie et navigation à Rouen et au Havre au XVIIIe siècle: rivalité croissante entre ces deux ports: la conjoncture, Rouen, 1966; Paul Butel, La Croissance commerciale bordelaise dans la seconde moitié du XVIIIe siècle, thesis, University of Paris, Lille III, 1973, 2 vols.; C. Huetz de Lemps, Géographie du commerce de Bordeaux à la fin du règne de Louis XIV, The Hague, 1975; Louise Dechene, Habitants et marchands de Montréal au XVIIe siècle, Paris & Montréal, 1974; José Igartua, "The Merchants of Montréal at the Conquest: A Socio-Economic Profile", Histoire sociale (Ottawa), vol. VIII (1975), pp. 275-293.

2. J.S. Pritchard, "The Pattern of French Colonial Shipping to Canada before 1760", Revue française d'histoire d'outre-mer, tome

LXIII (1976), pp. 189-210.

3. A.D.Gir., Cazenave (Bx.) 30 Apr. 1695 (this abbreviation means,"Archives départementales de la Gironde, minutes of the Bordeaux notary, Cazenave, for 30 April 1695"); A.D.Gir., Lalanne (Bx.) 4 June 1695; A.D.Gir., 6 B 297 (22 Apr. 1695); A.D. Charente-Maritime, B 235 fo. 336 (22 June 1695).

4. J. F. Bosher, "Une famille de Fleurance dans le commerce du Canada à Bordeaux (1683-1753): les Jung", Annales du Midi, tome 95 (1983), pp. 159-184; the dowry cited on p. 167, line 16 should read 4,000 livres and is printed as 44,000 livres in error.

5. Merchants in France with roots in Canada included Étienne Lemoyne (d. 1732) at Rouen; Charles Fleury Deschambault, Pierre Charly, Simon Lapointe, and the Pascaud family at La Rochelle; Jean Jung (1698-1753), and Antoine-Pierre Trottier Désauniers (1700-1757) at Bordeaux.

6. Cameron Nish, Les Bourgeois-gentilshommes de la Nouvelle-France, 1729-48, Montréal, 1968.

7. For example, Lionel La Berge, Dale Miquelon, and Pierre Dardel in works cited in note 1 above.

8. Marcel Trudel, Histoire de la Nouvelle-France, vol. III, tome 2, "La société", Montréal, 1983, p. 31.

9. Archives nationales de France (hereafter A.N.), Colonies C^{11a} vol. 75, fol. 27.

10. A.N., Colonies D^2C, vol. 53.

11. For some of these see the results of my research in parish records, J.F. Bosher, "French Protestant Families in Canadian Trade, 1740-1760", Histoire sociale (Ottawa), vol. VII (1974),

pp. 179-201.

12. Arch. de la Ville de Bordeaux, GG 863 etc.; A.D. Char. Mar. 2 J 94 fichier de mariages protestants, 1760-92; the fichier at the Bibl. municipale de La Rochelle is for registers of 1668, 1670 to 1684, 1731 to 1781, and 1761 to 1792; see also J.F. Bosher, "Les débuts cosmopolites du commerce canadien à Bordeaux", Etudes canadiennes (Bordeaux), 10e année, no. 17 (Dec. 1984), pp. 29-36.

13. These registers of what they mistakenly call l'état civil (a term and an idea invented in the French revolution) are normally kept at the town halls, except for registers of towns with fewer than 3000 inhabitants which are kept at the archives départementales. Also at the A.D. are second or extra copies, when there are any.

14. A.D.Gir., Cazenave (Bx.) 15 Sept. 1681, fol. 647.

15. A.D.Gir., Bassibey (Bx.) 9 July 1648, fol. 864.

16. A.D.Gir., 6 B 1031 & 1040.

17. A.D.Gir., 6 B 1113 (11 May 1705).

18. A.D.Char.Mar., 4 J 7, Notes Garnault, "Oualle".

19. Victor Bugeaud, La Chronique protestante de l'Agenais aux XVIe, XVIIe et XVIIIe siècles, p. 312.

20. A.N., TT 264.

21. A.D. Seine-Maritime, 7 F 83, registre d'insinuations vol. number 40, S.S.P. 27 Jan. 1735: "Contrat de mariage entre le Sieur Robert Dugard, marchand à Rouen, et Damoiselle Marie Laurens, par lequel les apports de la future monteraient à 26,000 livres dont il y en a le tiers en don mobil sans évaluation des biens du futur" (controlé le 2 aout 1735).

22. A.D.Seine-Maritime, Lefebvre (Rouen) 10 Dec. 1759; Dardel, Commerce, industrie et navigation, p. 151; Miquelon, Dugard of Rouen, pp. 19-23 and 42.

23. A.D.Gir., Parrans (Bx.) 29 Mar. 1721, with an appended copy of an Amsterdam notarial act, Marolles 10 Oct. 1720.

24. A.D.Gir., Faugas (Bx.) 7 May 1749, inventory for Pierre Doumerc.

25. A.D.Char. Mar., Rivière & Soulard (L.R.) liasses 20 Apr. 1730; A.D.Gir. Roussillou (Bx.) 20 Mar. 1747.

26. A.D.Char.Mar., B 1796 (24 Nov. 1762); De la Vergne (L.R.) 10 Feb. 1760 marriage and 8 Feb. 1764 scellé; Nouveau (L.R.) 1 Feb. 1764; Tardy (L.R.) 11 Nov. 1765.

27. A.N., TT 263 B fols. 1056-1073, Mémoires des choses qui se sont passés et se passent contre les ordres de Sa Majesté (31 May 1691).

28. Marcel Giraud, Histoire de la Louisiane française, vol. III, Paris, 1966, p. 28; also Herbert Luthy, La Banque protestante en France de la révocation de l'édit de Nantes, Paris, 1959, vol. I, pp. 299, 309 note 23; and Claude-François Lévy, Capitalistes et pouvoir au siècle de lumières, tome 2, The Hague, 1979, pp. 322 note, 343, & 348 note.

29. J.M. Price, France and the Chesapeake, Ann Arbor, 1973, vol. I, pp. 216, 253 & 535.

30. Luthy, La Banque protestante, vol. I, pp. 111 ff.

31. See works cited in note 28 above.

32. J.F. Bosher, "A Québec Merchant's Trading Circles in France and Canada: Jean-André Lamalétie before 1763", Histoire sociale

(Ottawa), vol. IX (1977), pp. 24-44.

33. A.N., Minutier central des notaires, étude IV 693, 18 Jan. 1771, the marriage contract of Jean-Baptiste Tropez Martin and Barbe-Magdeleine D'Hillaire de la Rochette.

34. A.N., Minutier central, étude XCIII (Ribes), 19 July 1751, the marriage contract of David-Pierre Rocaute and Jeanne Admyrauld; A.D.Char. Mar. B 1796 (14 Sept. 1762); A.D.Char.Mar., 4 J 5, notes Garnault, "Admyrauld".

VII

QUEBEC CANALS AND HUGUENOT ENGINEERING

Sylvia Du Vernet
(School of Continuing Studies, University of Toronto)

The canals to which I will be referring in this paper are those built on the Ottawa River from 1819 to 1834 namely the Grenville, the Carillon and the Blondeau. They were all constructed under the engineering supervision of a Huguenot descendant, Captain, later Lieutenant Col. Henry DuVernet of the Royal Staff Corps. Theoretically I suggest that a very special relationship developed between Henry and the exigencies surrounding the construction of these canals. This relationship is dramatized by the opportunity for significant interface with the various nationalities and religions represented by Indians, French Canadians, Scottish settlers and British military families all resident in the areas of canal construction. There were as well migrant traders, trappers and lumbermen. The requirements of humanism transcended the ritualistic exclusivity of religion. Henry was not merely a British military organizer operating under the patronage of the British Crown. Nor was he even remotely mindful of his ancestry as a French Huguenot of noble family supportive of and blessed by the patronage of the French Protestant Crown. Here in Canada in the Ottawa Valley from 1819 to 1834, he was a man among men seeking to assist and understand them in the everyday world of work surrounded by problems of physical, economic and psychological planning.

The role that Henry performed was not only that of preliminary documenting and obtaining permissions for procedure and for payment, but as well that of appreciation and encouragement, arbitration and assistance in sociological adjustment. Spirituality expressed in terms of the church was psychologically ritualistic and surfaced only when a travelling rural clergyman was called upon to perform services for appropriate payment.

There was in the lineage of Henry DuVernet a military tradition which stretched back over two hundred years. In France, the family name is to be found on the register of the St. Cyr Military Academy. As Huguenot military nobility, Henry's ancestors had been welcomed as defenders of the Court of Henry IV and had continued in a position of patronage until the impending Revocation of the Edict of Nantes. At this time four DuVernet brothers left France and transferred their loyalty to William of Orange who was assembling Protestant forces preparatory to the invasion of England where he had been offered the Crown if he was successful in his role as Protestant conqueror. Two DuVernet brothers accompanied William to England in 1688. Jean DuVernet, Marquès de Roquefort de Nemours was killed at the Battle of the Boyne in 1690. Henry Jacques de la Vallée became a naturalized citizen of England. He married Madäleine Sarran D'Arrengence

in 1700. His third son Charles William was born in 1704 and christened at the Church of Le Carré in London. Charles William had six children of whom Abraham born in 1760 was one. Abraham was the father of Col. Henry DuVernet born April 4, 1787. Upon arrival in England the military tradition continued in the DuVernet family and with it once again the pleasures of Royal patronage. Abraham became a member of the Royal Artillery as a young man. He also became a close friend of Prince William. The 1886 visit of Prince William to Halifax where a lively evening's entertainment was provided by Captain DuVernet is recorded in archival and literary sources. Thomas Raddal tells us in Halifax, Warden of the North* that one of Prince William's "boon companions was a dissipated young subaltern of the garrison named Dyott, who in his more sobre moments kept a diary." In this diary is recorded the following notation: "His Royal Highness dines with Captain DuVernet commanding the artillery, who gave us a most excellent dinner and a good deal of wine. In the evening H.R.H. was amused with a set of fireworks designed by DuVernet which was very pretty. Also he ordered a number of live shells to be thrown which had a good effect." The claims of Huguenot ethics seem somehow to have evaded the conscience of Abraham DuVernet. The question arises, were Abraham's ancestors sincerely dedicated Huguenots or were they somewhat opportunists, as he had become, playing the game

*p.102

for pleasure, opportunities and promotion. This is an ugly thought but one which simply must be considered.

Abraham's three sons Henry, Frederick and John Francis also became military men, attaining for themselves positions in the Royal Staff Corps. Although Protestantism, military affiliation and Royal patronage had gotten him to Canada and had facilitated his appointment as officer in charge of the canal-building project on the Ottawa River, Henry, however, was on his own and the supports of church and State fell away in favour of the contributions which his own personality could make to smooth out the exigencies which he encountered. He was not only the chief engineer in charge of the construction of the Ottawa River canal system but in the phrase coined by Stalin and Skvorecky, he was "the engineer of human souls", this time however in a problem-solving rather than a domineering sense.

Turning our attention from Henry to the Ottawa River, we remember that although it had been used for years by Indians, missionaries and explorers, it had been the scene of many tragedies and much time-consuming portaging around rapids especially those of the Long Sault. We remember too that Champlain nearly lost his life here on June 1, 1613. In the early 1800's, as many as 70 persons, lumbermen on rafts or travellers in canoes could die each year coping with the rapids.

In the winter of 1800, Philomen Wright, founder of the settlement which later became Hull, travelled over the ice of the Ottawa River by sleigh to the mouth of the Gatineau River. He and a large group of settlers came with millenarian aspirations from Woburn, Massachusetts, to establish a self-supporting settlement. The group found the soil suitable for farming and the success of the settlement was assured. Wright added in quick succession the amenities of village life, a grist mill, a saw mill and by 1804 a blacksmith shop with four forges whose bellows were powered by water. A bake-house, a tannery, a shoemaker's shop and a tailoring business also soon came into existence.

In 1806, Wright accompanied by three lumbermen and his nineteen-year-old son Tiberius set off along the Ottawa on a raft built of logs and boards which were to be sold in the port of Quebec for shipment abroad. The trip was an experiment in export possibilities. Wright concluded that the river trip was time-consuming and dangerous. Some easement such as canal-building seemed imperative not only for use by Wright but by other traders and suppliers as well. Increased immigration had brought urgent need for supplies to be brought up the river. In 1823, Henry DuVernet painted a water-colour picture entitled Philomen Wright's Mill and Tavern which is in the National Archives of Canada.

Aside however, from facilitating the distribution of trade goods and supplies, canals were considered necessary on the Ottawa River as a defense measure. After the War of 1812, it was deemed important to have a water-route from Montreal to Kingston that avoided possible contact with the American border. This route could also, with canals, be used to travel westward much more quickly without the portages which had been so laborious and time-consuming.

In 1818 when three hundred settlers destined for Richmond tried to ascend the Ottawa River, the hazards of the Long Sault Rapids became strategically viewed as a formidable impediment to both defense and to settlement. It was at this point that the Duke of Richmond ordered Captain F. W. Mann to begin construction at once on the Grenville canal. In 1819 Captain Mann returned to England and was replaced by Captain Henry DuVernet. The season of 1820 was spent clearing the brush and it was not until the summer of 1821 that the digging preparatory to the actual construction of the dam could begin. The Long Sault Rapids are no longer visible having been covered by the waters backed up by the new dam built by the Quebec Hydro in 1963. However, up until the commencement of canal-building, over a distance of six miles serious obstacles consisting of five or six small rapids and one large one had existed. In his novel Philip Musgrave, Reverend Joseph Abbot, first Anglican clergyman to settle in the area, tells of a

canoe containing a husband, wife and three children which was overturned in the rapids. Two children died instantly. One survived, having been grabbed by the father who found his wife clinging unconscious to the underside of the overturned canoe. This sort of accident happened often.

We have mentioned that Henry DuVernet was a Captain, Major and then Lieutenant Colonel of a group of men known as the Royal Staff Corps who had been chosen to build the Ottawa River canals. The Royal Staff Corps had been formed by the Duke of York, Commander-in-Chief of the British Army on January 15, 1800. The Duke had required additional support for military engineering and could not obtain it from the Royal Engineers. Under the Duke of Wellington the regiment proved itself intensely efficient in Egypt and in the Peninsular War. One of its talents was bridge-building. It had also, however, engineered the construction of the Royal Military Canal situated on the south coast of England between the Shorncliffe Battery and Rye. The Royal Staff Corps had been in Canada as early as 1815 working on the earliest canals constructed on the St. Lawrence. Self-contained, with its own artisans, engineers and workmen, the Royal Staff Corps was multi-purpose and was designed to perform under varying conditions of constructional necessity. It was totally independent of the Royal Engineers. In 1819, Captain DuVernet took over the command of the group working on the Ottawa River

canals and continued in command to the completion of the project with the exception of a period of leave extending from 1825-27. He was promoted to Lieutenant-Colonel in 1829 and to Colonel when he went on half-pay in 1841.

When construction began on May 30, 1819, about 100 men were involved in the project. With the arrival of Colonel By in 1826, the canals at Carillon and Chute à Blondeau were added to the plan in order that a river-route suitable for joining the newly conceived Rideau route might be created along the Ottawa. It was not until 1828, however, that notation was made that the Rideau canal had been built 33 feet wide while the Grenville canal was in some sections twenty-three feet wide at the most. The smaller canal permitted only the passage of two Durham boats with no provision having been made for the possibility of steam-boats. When the question of widening the narrow Grenville canal areas arose, Henry DuVernet replied that it would be fabulously expensive. Henry did pay attention to costs whereas Colonel By did not. The Carillon and Blondeau canals were built according to the wider specifications however. When steamboats came into use, the Grenville canal was later rebuilt.

The Ottawa canal system took fifteen years to construct, the Rideau system six. The Rideau canal did represent flagrant overspending on the part of Colonel By.

Furthermore, life in the Ottawa River area was much more rugged. Work proceeded only during the months of good weather. Except for two or three men left to look after the buildings and equipment, the men went to Montreal or Chambly for the winter. They undoubtedly assisted somewhat with the canal-building at Chambly. This shift in address explains why many of Henry DuVernet's letters are written from Chambly or Montreal. Gradually a military village grew up at Grenville and a post-office was opened. A date-stone still existing in the wall of the original lock No. III at Stonefield record the accomplishments of the Royal Staff Corps in 1827. From Henry's letters we learn of the constant problems and decisions which daily beset progress on the canals. Groups of large boulders blocking the channel had to be moved manually, by horses or with the assistance of explosives. Property rights had to be dealt with by arbitration. The British Crown did not possess the same property rights as [redacted] the King of France (had had). The case of Archibald MacMillan with his unjustified property payment claims provides a major example of the problems encountered while that of Owen Owens who objected to the removal of an access bridge suggests the time-consuming nature of more minor negotiations. Even when the Royal Staff Corps was disbanded as such in 1829 and the men placed in the resident regiment of the Royal Engineers, Henry DuVernet was still responsible for negotiations.

Up for discussion was the right of forage or of alternative payment for temporarily unemployed personnel as well as for regular Staff Corps personnel. The question of the location of the new Anglican Church in Grenville was, in 1832, a difficult one to find a solution for. Henry did, however, remain adamant that it should not be located on property which might be needed for military purposes. A location was designated for the church on the Plan of the Crown Reserve Township of Grenville drawn up by Henry on November 22, 1833. The church was built there and the first service was held on March 30, 1834, Easter Sunday. Perhaps the worst problem of all was the cholera epidemic of 1832 which killed many men and drove others away from the area. In addition to the men of the Royal Staff Corps, workmen had been drawn from amongst the recently arrived immigrants looking for employment as a source of income. Much of this human resource material was lost because of the cholera epidemic. In addition, accidents were always happening in connection with the drilling and the use of explosives, in addition of course to the rapids.

Through it all, Henry remained the concerned, helpful negotiator. He was constantly writing letters to Montreal explaining situations and requesting both money and permissions. Never did he spend money he did not have. He and his wife, Martha Maria Ignallin, daughter

of Admiral Van Kamper of the Dutch Service, were popular and well-liked in the community. They were happy, kindly people who entertained travellers at their home in the village of Chatham, now Cushing, Quebec. Martha acquired a considerable reputation as an attractive, spritely lady. Robert Leggett comments in his book Ottawa Waterway*: "Many of those using the north bank of the Long Sault would stop for a visit at the camp of the Royal Staff Corps: there are some happy references in travellers' records to the welcome they received from Henry DuVernet...".

Henry DuVernet was in Canada as early as 1816. There is on record a letter which he wrote from Coteau du Lac with regard to his pay. Another early letter dated September 9, 1810 to Colonel Harvey D.A.G. requests that steps be taken to prevent the Militia U.C. from concealing disasters. However, Henry DuVernet's past goes back much further. It can be traced to a still-existing medieval castle inland from the coast on the border between France and Spain. Eventually, after conflict, it became French and the decision was made to follow Henry of Navarre into Protestantism. As border territory, Vernet-les-Bains, rejoicing for a time in independence, did not join France but separated it from Spain. With Protestantism came the elitism of court appointments especially since the family had been of the military and had its own cavalry which each year raided the vineyards

*p.144

below. Henry's ancestral past had demonstrated an exclusivity which he personally transcended with his border-crossing behaviour on the Ottawa. He was busy building canals to facilitate communication. These canals were on the Ottawa River which itself communicated with both Ontario and Quebec provinces. We may say that it joins the peoples of these two provinces as well as facilitating connections with waterways and peoples to the west. Casting an eye backwards, I suggest that Henry emerged from an inherited anti-Roman Catholic stance to a Quebec-Ontario, Roman Catholic-Protestant interface necessitated and encouraged by the nature of the settlement, by immigration and by the travel situation in the Ottawa River area. The River flowed as both fact and metaphor of communication and negotiation. Interface.

There was never at any time a live-in pastor with the Royal Staff Corps. Arrangements were made when desired and when necessary for services, baptisms and funerals with the nearest available travelling clergyman who was paid accordingly. I suggest that Henry DuVernet, a Huguenot descendant, passed in the pluralism of his Canadian experience, from the ideology of religion as a stepping-stone to exclusivity with its accompanying possibilities for patronage and promotion, to a recognition of the religion of humanism, a religion which is broader than sectarianism, a religion which is life, the understanding and arbitration of which

is living. Sectarianism would overtake the area with the building of St. Matthews Anglican Church, a Presbyterian Church and a Roman Catholic Church, but the period from 1819 to 1834 provided an opportunity for a Huguenot descendant to experience and understand the economic, sociological and psychological needs of men and women outside his own tradition. For fifteen years, Henry DuVernet had the privilege of appreciating and responding to the pluralism which we treasure so much in Canada today.

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

Lambart, Helen.
St. Matthews on the Ottawa, the story of the Anglican Parish of Grenville, Quebec.

Lambart, Helen H. and Rigby, G. Reginald.
"Submerged History of the Long Sault", in Canadian Geographical Journal, v. LXVII, no 5, Nov. 1963, pp. 146-157.

Legget, Robert.
Ottawa Waterway, gateway to a continent, University of Toronto Press, 1975

National Archives of Canada.
[redacted]

National Archives of France,
[redacted]

Nicholson, Col. G. W., C.D.
The Gunners of Canada, McClelland and Stewart, 1967.

Raddall, Thomas.
Halifax, Warden of the North, McClelland and Stewart, 1971, reprinted 1984.

Rigby, G. Reginald and Legget, Robert F.
"Riddle of the Treadwell Trenches," in Canadian Geographical Journal, v. 88, no 3, March 1974, pp. 38-42.