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INTRODUCTORY NOTE

One of the problems in writing about the early seventeenth century is the orthography. Not only is the spelling different from modern usage, but it was a matter in which much freedom was exercised. In all quotations, whether in French or English, the original spelling with all its eccentricities has been maintained, except that accents have been added to those French words which normally would have them so that the modern reader will be more able to understand them. In translations from the French, modern English has been used since it would be meaningless to try to reproduce seventeenth-century English. Names and terms that are normally used in French historical works are spelled according to the usage of present-day historians, for example Epernon instead of the seventeenth-century Espernon. In the footnotes and bibliography the original spelling is used, but accents have been added and where applicable y's have been changed to u's and i's to j's. This was done in accord with standard French practice and in order to render the titles more readable.

In the absence of any accepted short-title list for French works, the long titles of some books and pamphlets have been shortened in such a way that the meaning would not be lost, yet the footnotes and bibliography would not be overburdened with unnecessary words. This is in accordance with the French method and was especially necessary because of the length of the bibliography and the number of footnotes. In all cases where there was a shortening this is noted with ellipses.
The abbreviations, other than the usual ones, that are employed in this work are as follows:

A.C. Archives Communales
A.D. Archives Départementales
B.M. British Museum
B. Mun. Bibliothèque Municipale
B.N. Bibliothèque Nationale
B.N. Cinq Cents Bibliothèque Nationale Cinq Cents de Colbert
B.N. MS fr. Bibliothèque Nationale Manuscrits français
B.N. MS fr. NA Bibliothèque Nationale Manuscrits nouvelles acquisitions françaises

All other abbreviations are explained in the footnotes.
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INTRODUCTION

From Colbert and Bossuet to Thierry and Guizot, from the Saint Maurists and the Encyclopedists to Picot and Major, men of affairs and historians have interested themselves in the origins and fate of the Estates General of France. These men turned to the Estates General for many reasons: to glorify and preserve the French monarchy, to exalt the people of France, to sing the praises of the nation, to answer the compelling question of how institutions come to be. Whatever the reason, such study has furnished valuable insights into the history of the development of France, since for more than four centuries the history of this institution was closely related to that of the growing power of the French monarchy and the emergence of the French nation.¹

The present study will attempt to reconstruct the Estates General of 1614 from the documentary sources. This dissertation will examine the historical setting for the calling of the Estates General, the important personalities, forces, and events of the meetings, and their successes and failures. Proceeding from a short account of the France of

the early seventeenth century, this study will trace the course of events from January, 1614, to March, 1615. It will then inquire into the nature and the results of the contribution made by the Estates General of 1614.

Too often this meeting of the Estates General has been dismissed as inconsequential. But coming as it did at the end of a long series of such meetings, an analysis of it reveals much about the nature of the representative institution in France and the course of national development. It affords a valuable cross-section view of the structure of the three orders of society in early modern times and of the interaction of forces and personalities that were to shape France's immediate future. Almost all the important Frenchmen of the time were gathered in Paris from October, 1614, to March, 1615, and the religious, intellectual, social, and political movements they represented were in open conflict. The Estates General met in the period just before absolute monarchy became firmly established in France; the attempts of the three estates to reform the royal government and the reasons for their failure reveal both the growing strength of the monarchy and the conflicting and self-thwarting interests of the orders of French society.

Although the institution of the Estates General has long since vanished, its spirit is still present in France in the form of the National Assembly. So also, long before its first appearance in 1302, roots of the institution were present in the Concilium Trium Galliarum and the Placitum Generale. 1

1 The most valuable sources for tracing the development of the Estates General are: Emile Chénon, Histoire générale du droit français public et privé des origines à 1815 (Paris, 1926). W. F. Church, Constitutional Thought in Sixteenth Century France (Oxford, 1941). Roger
The common-law tradition of assembly together with the Roman concepts of power of attorney and plena potestas provided the legal basis for the form of representation peculiar to the Estates General. It was the late medieval, early modern expression of what has been known as concilium, consent, representation, or legislative power. It was the institution which gave the "people" of the corporate society that existed during the centuries of the decline of feudalism and the rise of the modern state a "voice in government." All three orders of society were more or less represented, but the function of the Estates General was primarily consultative. The institution was viewed by the crown as an instrument not so much for the formation of royal policy as for the consolidation of popular support.

The first three Estates General, those of 1302, 1308, and 1314, were called by Philip IV to serve very specific purposes. A feudal reaction followed his death, but by 1351 the tradition of the Estates General had become established. It had also been established that the Estates General would be called only by the king and only to serve his specified ends. These limitations on the power of the institution were partially superseded between 1355 and 1484 but without permanent results.

The tumultuous meeting of 1484, loud both in criticism of the crown and in demands for regular meetings, convinced the kings that it was necessary to turn to safer expressions of popular support, the Assemblies of Notables and a few other small bodies. Between 1484 and 1560 France was almost the only European nation without some form of general assembly. Francis I and Henry II, absolute monarchs in practice if not in theory, were most responsible for this policy.

The Estates General entered its last phase of activity in 1560. Between 1560 and 1614, years of almost continuous upheaval, the Estates General were again called to assist the monarchy in its struggle against the rebellious elements in society and in its need for money. As long as the Estates General served to lessen these pressures without posing too great a danger, they were called by the crown. When the monarchy became strong enough to act without the Estates General, they were not called. Henry IV had no need for them, and they were not summoned after 1614. In 1649 and 1651, during the Fronde, the Estates General were called but never met. The meeting of 1789 was the revival of an anachronism. The Assembly of Notables and the Parlement, supposedly the creatures of the king, rendered this ultimate disservice to the crown. Louis XVI was willing to try anything, and after furious research the Estates General was re-created. This body soon transformed itself in the only way possible, given the development of legal theory, the nature of government, and society at that time.

The power of the monarchy, however, was not the only reason for the failure of the Estates General. Throughout the existence of this institution provincialism was an important factor in French life. The crown used the Estates General against the provincial estates when this was feasible; in turn the provinces often refused to give plena potestas
to deputies to the Estates General. The opposition of Parlement was also important. This powerful and hereditary body strove to increase its own power and to diminish that of its rival, the Estates General. With the individual orders more concerned with their internal interests than with the development of the national assembly as a powerful institution, provincial and class interests remained dominant.

The Estates General, then, never became powerful enough to oppose the crown. It was simply a royal tool used to achieve the consolidation of power in the person of the king. The institution was no longer necessary once France had passed through the final convulsions of the Wars of Religion, the civil wars of the early years of the reign of Louis XIII, and the Fronde. When the monarchy became absolute in theory as well as in practice the Estates General passed from the scene.
CHAPTER I

FRANCE, 1610 TO 1614

It was l'an de grace 1614. France had emerged from the Renaissance and the Wars of Religion into the age of Galileo and Francis Bacon. Montaigne had lived his life, Shakespeare would soon end his. Le Grand Siècle was close at hand. But little of this was apparent on January 8, 1614.

On that day an astrologer and producer of almanacs, Noël Jean Morgard, was arrested because of certain predictions in the latest of his works. Morgard prophesied that the year 1614 would see many dreadful things; along with war and cholera a great lord would lose his property, and an important lady would die. A king would die. Among the verses at the end of the almanac were the lines:

Janvier verra l'emotion  
Que fevrier tast reparera;  
Mars les armes allumera,  
En avril grand' séditation.¹

The threats of royal disaster were not missed by the readers, and they were immediately applied to France. The Mercure Francois for

¹Noël Jean Morgard, Prédiction de Morgard pour la présente année 1614. ... (n.p., n.d.), pp. 4–6.
1614 notes that this almanac was the subject of many controversies and caused great fear among the French until the King and Queen traveled through France in August, the time predicted for the King's death. Pamphleteers such as the writer of *L'anti Morgard* might try to ridicule the predictions, but the people believed them. Morgard was sentenced to nine years in the galleys on January 30, but the belief persisted.\(^1\)

More than the power of superstition was involved in the credence given to the astrologer. The France of 1614 was uneasy.

Behold the miserable condition of the orders of this state. Behold abandoned France transported to her mourning and regrets. She stretches her hands to Louis, her well loved King, but is dismayed by his youth; to the Queen but is circumvented. She calls her genie, her guardians, but they are deaf. We are horrified by the parricidal conspirators who triumph over the ashes of Henry the Great, who set themselves in defiance to our astonishment. Audacity is proud, the pyramid is thrown down and the great Henry is no more.\(^2\)

The Wars of Religion and the struggles for power among the great nobles had impoverished the country and caused great social upheaval. Henry IV had united and controlled many conflicting interests, but his assassination in 1610 left France in the hands of a child and his foreign


mother. This relaxation of royal power seemed to many an opportune time to enrich themselves and to increase their own power. The princes of the blood, especially the first prince, Henry II de Bourbon Prince de Condé, embittered by exclusion from power, threatened to unite and incite the disaffected elements of the population. The Huguenots were diminished in power by a growing division in their ranks. Many of the great nobles, the high bourgeoisie, and some of the ministers supported the monarchy. But as a group the Huguenots were still threatened and eager to improve their position. From their strongholds in the parlements and some of the faculties of the University of Paris the Gallican party warred against the ultramontanist influence of the Jesuits and the higher clergy.

France was in a period of great social change. The death and impoverishment of many of the great nobles, and the crown's continual financial embarrassment, enabled many wealthy families to rise rapidly. Three generations were often enough for a merchant family to become established nobles of the robe. New wealth and the venality of office allowed many merchants and rich peasants to rise through the ranks of the officer class. Complicated marriage alliances often resulted in one family having members at many different levels. In an effort to maintain stability and loyalty among the nobles the crown continued a policy of paying them pensions, but it was handicapped at every turn by its inability to collect sufficient taxes. ¹

¹Roland Mousnier, La venalité des offices sous Henri IV et Louis XIII (Rouen, 1946), pp. 506-541, 566-568, 622-624.
The confused and conflicting elements of the population threatened the dissolution of the regency government; it had to maintain itself against its enemies in France and guard against external dangers while laboring under financial difficulties. No decisive solution for these internal problems could be found during a regency. Policy was directed toward the prevention of open rebellion, and bribery and intimidation were used to forestall a coalition of hostile forces.

France of 1614 was a corporate society, an assemblage of corps and estates, of towns and pays. First allegiance was usually paid to the most immediate organization—pays or province before country, and corps before order or estate—but in the final resort, in the time of greatest trouble most Frenchmen turned to the King. The King was "life of our lives, upholder of our preservation; horn of abundance which pours out all our good and happiness."\(^1\)

Louis XIII's Jesuit confessor, Père Coton, has left a lengthy description of the King in 1613. The twelve-year-old boy loved honest speech and domestic animals. He gave generous alms. He was attached to the Church and the sacraments and was known for his piety. Of all his studies mathematics and geometry most attracted him. Louis liked to build models of chateaus, boats, and birds. He played tennis and hunted often. His French was correct. But all of these were the activities of a boy. Not until October of 1614 did Louis reach majority,

and even then his mother Marie de Médicis, the regent, continued to di-
rect her son. ¹

Marie de Médicis, who despite the artistry of Rubens favored the
Germanic heritage of her mother the Archduchess of Austria, was
thirty-seven when she became regent in 1610. She had already served
France well by producing a male heir, the first queen to do so since
her kinswoman Catherine de Médicis. She would continue to acquit her-
self well throughout the regency through personal and family ambition
and the press of events, if not through native intelligence and ability. ²

As her official advisors Marie had the members of the Council. It
is difficult to describe this body. Rather than speaking of various di-
visions of council, it is more proper during this period to speak of one
council performing various duties, though at times a council of finances
can be distinguished. The six reforms of the Council proclaimed be-
tween February 5, 1611, and March 2, 1613, were all concerned with
the operation of this division of the Council. The seventh regulation,
that of May 21, 1615, began the attempt to separate the functions. The

¹ The account is quoted in full in Henri Fouqueray, S.J., Histoire
de la Compagnie de Jésus en France, 1582–1762 (Paris, 1922), III, 326–
330. Pierre Coton (1564–1626) was a Frenchman noted for his work
among the Huguenots and his preaching. He became confessor to Henry
IV and remained in court as the confessor of Louis XIII until 1617. In
later years he was a provincial of the Jesuits.

² Victor-Lucien Tapié, La France de Louis XIII et de Richelieu
(Paris, 1952), pp. 65–66. Nicholas de Brichanteau, marquis de Beauvais-
Nangis, Mémoires, eds. Mommerque and A. H. Taillandier (Paris, 1862),
p. 139.
period of great reform of the Council and its separation into distinct bodies did not begin until 1622. 1

There is no means of discovering who attended most of the meetings of the Council because the introduction of the minutes usually mentions only some of those present, while the decisions were signed by only a few, often only the chancellor and one other councilor. Theoretically the Council was a very large body. The princes of the blood, numerous bishops, and other officials including a number of the men who attended the Estates General of 1614 were councilors, but they rarely if ever attended the sessions of the Council. The policy that Marie de Médicis adopted was to discuss important matters with a much smaller group composed of several of the old ministers of Henry IV and then to present the ideas of these men to the regular Council. 2


2 Georges Pagès, Les institutions monarchiques sous Louis XIII et Louis XIV (Paris, 1933), p. 26. Councilors whose names the present writer found most often mentioned in the Council records for 1614-1615 are, besides Sillery, Charles Barentin (died 1620), seigneur de Ville-neuve-en-Brie, councilor at Cour des Aides—1592, master of requests—1605; Jean de Thumery, sieur de Boissise (1549-1625), councilor in the Parlement of Paris—1573, ambassador to England—1598-1602, in Germany 1609, involved in negotiations with Condé—1614, ambassador to Holland—1618; Pierre Brulart, Viscount de Puisieux (1583-1640), ambassador to Spain—1612, secretary of state—1606-1616, 1617-1624; Louis Lefebvre, sieur de Caumartin et de Boissy-en-Brie (died 1623), councilor in Parlement, master of requests, president of the Grand Council, ambassador in Switzerland, guardian of the seals—1622-1623; Jean Bochart, seigneur de Champigny (died 1630), son of a councilor of
Probably the greatest influence on Marie in 1614–1615 was exercised by three men: Nicolas de Neufville-Villeroy, the minister of war and foreign affairs; Pierre Jeannin, president of the Parlement of Burgundy and superintendent of finances; and Cardinal Ubaldini, the papal nuncio. Playing an important but smaller part was the chancellor and keeper of the seals, Nicolas Brulart Marquis de Sillery. The infamous Concino Concini did not have any really significant influence in national affairs until late in 1615.  

Michel de Marillac, sieur du Fayet (died 1632), councilor in the Parlement in 1586, master of requests—1595, councilor of state—1612, superintendent of finances—1624–1626, guardiain of seals—1626–1630; Giles de Maupeou, seigneur de Allorges et la Villeneuve, married daughter of King's Secretary Morely, became a Protestant in 1600, intendant of finances from 1605, a favorite of Henry IV and Sully; Jacques Ollier (died 1632), councilor in the Parlement in 1595, master of requests in 1627, intendant at Lyon, father of the founder of Sulpicians; Jacques Ribier, served Henry IV long in many positions, then in the Council, his brother William, lieutenant general of Bailliage of Blois, was a deputy to the Third Estate in 1614 (Mousnier says he did not enter Council until 1617, but his signature is found often in 1614–1615); Jacques Auguste de Thou (1553–1617), son of First President Christophe de Thou, master of requests, grand master of the librarie of the king from 1595, president à mortier of the Parlement of Paris, involved in negotiations with Condé in 1614; Merry de Vic, sieur d'Ermonville, councilor in the Parlement of Paris, master of requests, ambassador to Switzerland, intendant of justice in Guyenne, guardian of seals—1621–1622. Details of the lives of these men were taken from Mousnier, “Reglements du Conseil,” pp. 196–206. Research into the Council in the time of Louis XIII is open for exploitation by anyone with much time and great patience. Of particular importance are the E and V6 series in the Archives Nationales.  

Nicholas de Neufville, seigneur de Villeroy (1543?–1617), served as a secretary of state under Henry III, Henry IV, and Louis XIII until
External pressures were an immediate problem for the regency, and Marie's foreign policy was an important instrument in preserving her son's inheritance. The Queen felt that during the minority of the King France was not strong enough to pursue the policy to which tradition and Henry IV had committed it. Henry's death left France preparing to enter into an offensive war against Spain in alliance with the Duke of Savoy. But internal dissension was too pressing. The regency needed a free hand to deal with domestic problems. Marie followed a foreign policy in direct opposition to that of Henry IV, one that was extremely unpopular in France, but one that insured peace and freedom from external complications.

Between 1595 and 1610 Henry IV had signed twenty-two treaties that could be construed as inimical to the king of Spain. The most famous was that signed on February 11, 1610, at Hall and ratified in Paris on February 22 of the same year. Henry IV, the electors of the Palatine and Brandenburg, and other princes and states of the Empire agreed to protect the duchies of Julliers, Cleves, and Berg, the county

his death in 1617. Pierre Jeannin (1540–1622) had belonged to the League, was one of the principal councilors of Henry IV. Robert Cardinal Ubaldini was bishop of Montepulciano. Nicolas Brulart, Marquis de Sillery (1544–1624) became chancellor in 1607, disgraced in 1616, regained first place in Council but not the seals in 1617, regained the seals in 1623. For Concini's influence cf. the letter to the French ambassador to Rome of January 26, 1615. A.N. Ab XIX 3197 d'T 8, no. 5. The letters of the English ambassador to France, Thomas Edmondes, to Secretary Winwood of December 12, 1614, January 9 and 30, 1615, point up the plot Concini was developing in early 1615. Thomas Birch, ed., An Historical View of the Negotiations between the Courts of England, France and Brussels, from the Year 1592 to 1617 (London, 1749), pp. 384–386.
of March, and other areas against the claims of the Habsburgs. On April 25, 1610, Henry agreed also to aid the Duke of Savoy to seize the duchy of Milan held by Spain. This treaty ratified the marriage agreement between Henry's daughter Elizabeth and the son of Charles Emmanuel, duke of Savoy. Henry was readiness his forces for this war at the time of his death. 1

Marie and her councilors knew that during the regency France could not engage in an all-out war with Spain. Spain, on its part, was wary of entering into a war with France at this time. The regency government decided on a marriage alliance with Spain in spite of the opposition it would arouse at home. At the same time pressure against Spain was continued; twelve thousand troops were sent to besiege Julliers. France began to ease itself out of its commitments to Savoy and held out the possibility of an alliance with England through the marriage of Christine, another of Henry's daughters, and a son of James I. These negotiations continued through 1615 although the Spanish marriage treaty was signed in August of 1612. 2

These foreign negotiations were an explosive issue. Pamphlet warfare raged; sentiment was strong for and against the Queen's policy.

1 Jacques Bernard, Recueil des traités (Amsterdam, 1700), II, 565a–III, 65b.

The complaints of the Gallicans, the Huguenots, and the princes of the blood were published along with the denunciations of the betrayal of the anti-Spanish tradition, the German Protestant princes, and old Italian allies. Supporters of the policy praised the alliance with a Catholic power and its promise of continued peace. 1

Marie had the support of the Pope and the Jesuits and eventually of the French clergy. Her efforts finally won the approval of the Estates General. But the battle would continue until the Spanish marriages finally took place, and throughout the propaganda continued undiminished. Marie’s policy of keeping the whole of Europe at bay, hopeful of gain and partially satisfied, while the problems of France were being solved, reached a successful conclusion during the meeting of the Estates General and shortly thereafter. 2


2 Fouqueray, Compagnie, III, 331. Instructions for the ambassadors and representatives in Mantua, Rome, Holland, and Savoy for 1613–1614 can be found in B.N. MS fr. 4112. The problems spoken of above and the techniques for settling them are discussed, including at times working with the ambassadors of England and Spain. At this time the instructions were generally pro-Spanish, for the settlement of Julliers in favor of the Habsburgs. Because of this a little hostility is evident in Holland, but Henry IV’s prestige seemed to still help the French there. For an example of Marie’s careful balancing act see the letter to M. de Breves, ambassador to Rome, from Marie de Médicis, of January 28, 1614; B.N. MS fr. 3654, foll. 60r–61r.
The whole procedure was far from simple. In a letter dated February 10, 1612, Marie confided her anxiety about the princes and her concern about the English problem to her Spanish ambassador, Vaucelas. Negotiations for the marriage of Princess Christine to the Prince of Wales were reopened when it became known that the Duke of Savoy was trying to arrange a marriage between his daughter and the English heir.¹

An English alliance was opposed by Cardinal Ubaldini, the papal nuncio, but was supported by Villeroy. The English ambassador to France, Thomas Edmondes, constantly received instructions to negotiate for the marriage, but the French did not appoint an ambassador to England and forced the English to carry on the suit. Louis XIII would eventually reap benefit from this policy of his mother's by marrying his sister to Charles I, a policy that contributed to peace between France and England during most of the seventeenth century.²

Despite the complicated negotiations, there were only seven treaties signed between 1610 and 1615. Most of Marie's accomplishments resulted from procrastination and verbal promises. France, even during


a regency, was a power to be reckoned with in Europe. Marie de Médicis' diplomatic maneuvers kept negotiations open and prevented any power from threatening France seriously. The one big change in policy was the marriage alliance with Spain, but the Spanish were never sure that the negotiations would be successfully concluded until just before the marriages took place in 1615. Although France had initiated the process, Spain found itself as the suitor. The major worry of the Spanish ambassador in 1614 was the completion of the arrangements for the weddings. Once the Estates General had met, and the Queen's policy was assured of approval, he visibly relaxed. 1

It was the problem of finding enough money to run the government and to keep the nobles happy that most bothered Marie de Médicis. Sully had served Henry IV well through his policy of economy, but even he had not been able to reform a taxation system that sold the right to collect taxes to various Farmers General. Marie de Médicis had inherited this system, but was faced with the problem of a restive country. The nobles, especially Condé, had to be kept content during the

1 Bernard, Traitéz, III, 68a-138a. A.N. K 1428, nos. 35-62; K 1429, nos. 6-20; K 1453, nos. 204-232; K 1454, nos. 1-38; K 1469, nos. 1-158; K 1610, nos. 1-20; K 1611, nos. 1-34. Originally and again since 1941 these documents are in the Archives of Simancas. The Archives Nationales has microfilm copies. The diplomatic history of France from 1600 to 1648 remains largely untouched. Professor Tapié has a work on diplomacy on the eve of the Thirty Years' War, but he deals mainly with Central and Eastern Europe. Some of his students are now working on other material, for example the relations with Constantinople, but vast resources remain. For example, B.N. MS fr. 7259 and 7261 are filled with the instructions given to the French ambassadors to Germany, Switzerland, Holland, Constantinople, and Persia for the years 1567 to 1626.
delicate period of the regency, and the support of the royal officials had to be won.

The financial policy of the regency was severely criticized at the time, and such criticism has in general been continued by historians. The evidence of heretofore-unused documents weakens the grounds for such criticism. Financial records found in Paris include the records of the Queen's household and the accounts of the money paid by the treasurer of the Treasury. When used in conjunction with the accounts of Jean Mallet they indicate a financial situation remarkably stable in view of the cost of maintaining internal equilibrium and carrying on foreign negotiations.

Difficulty in studying the financial records is caused by the lax bookkeeping current before Colbert's reform of 1661. However, certain trends over a period of years can be discerned. Except for the year 1614, the expenses of the Queen's household from 1610 to 1615 averaged only 143,000 livres more per year than the average of these expenses from 1600 to 1609. The expenses of the King's household averaged 140,000 livres per year more than the average from 1600 to 1609. It should be remembered that this was an inflationary period.¹

From 1600 to 1609 the ordinary income of the crown varied between fifteen million and twenty million livres, and from 1610 to 1615 it varied between sixteen million and eighteen million livres. The ordinary expenses from 1600 to 1609 ranged between ten million and fourteen

million livres, while they ranged from sixteen million to twenty-one million between 1610 and 1615. There were no deficits from 1600 to 1609, while there was a deficit every year from 1610 to 1615 except 1611. The years with the greatest deficits were 1610, 1614, and 1615. The extraordinary expenses of these years included Henry IV’s war preparations and funeral, a coronation, the revolt, and the royal marriages, while the years 1600 to 1609 were relatively peaceful. Even Sully, who was still in office, could not prevent a deficit in 1610.¹

On January 27, 1611, when Sully was removed from office it was certified that there were five million livres in the treasury of the Bastille. Until the open rebellion of February, 1614, the government operated on ordinary funds without touching the five million livres in reserve. The Bastille was emptied by the end of 1615 as the policies of the regency were brought to a successful conclusion. In addition, on October 16, 1614, when half of the reserve funds had been spent, additional funds were borrowed to pay the wages of soldiers used during the revolt; 440,000 livres were borrowed from Antoine Feydeau, Farmer General of Aides, and 220,000 livres from the Five Great Farms. It was stipulated that the Estates General would be asked to provide means for repaying the loans, but this was not done. The crown found it inadvisable to ask the Estates General for much more than confirmation of its general policy.²

Marie's policy included the granting of gifts and pensions to maintain loyalty among her followers. Many of these came from funds personally allotted to her. They averaged about forty-one a year, ranging from the thirty given in 1614 to the fifty-four given in 1612. Most of the recipients were members of the lower nobility and officials. These occasionally took the form of promotions or exemptions from certain taxes. In November, 1612, the wife of Concini received 24,000 livres. In May of 1614 the Duc de Guise received 273,585 livres. In 1614 and 1615 Villeroy and Philippe Hurault, bishop of Chartes (one of the key delegates to the Estates General, representing one bailliage in the Ile de France and three in Orléans), were each given posts of honor. The Duc de Vantadour and Cardinal Joyeuse, important in royal policy, were also given favors. Those receiving pensions from the Queen in 1614 included, besides the staff of her household, the Marquise de Neufville (6,000 livres), the wife of Concini (6,000 livres), and the chancellor Sillery (2,400 livres). ¹

Despite their continual discrepancies, the accounts of the Treasurer, computed every two weeks, contain some interesting figures. Critics of Marie's manipulation of officers controlling the Estates General were paid handsome sums of money. Most interestingly, the extraordinary sums of money that were used to crush the rebellion are recorded, as well as the sums utilized in arranging the local elections for the Estates General. ²

¹ B.N. Cinq Cents 91, foll. 1r–146r; 92, foll. 1r–215r.

This financial policy was dictated by expediency. It was the Queen's attempt to apply the available funds to control the crisis of the moment. Economy was secondary to the preservation of the crown. As Pierre Jeannin told the Estates General, the money spent could be replaced, but if it had not been spent during the period of the minority of the King the authority and grandeur of the kingdom would have been lost forever.¹

¹Pierre Jeannin, Les négotiations de monsieur le président Jeannin (Leyden, 1695), III, 525.
CHAPTER II

THE REVOLT OF CONDÉ

Marie de Médicis did not lack problems in early 1614; she had her supporters, but criticism of her Spanish marriage policy, her choice of ministers, and her financial policy abounded. A series of verses, probably composed by a Huguenot, advised the Queen, recommending the use of the Prince de Condé, the Comte d'Auvergne, and the Duc de Montmorency in the Council, asking for the reappointment of Sully, criticizing the influence of the cardinals, and pointing out the advantages of a marriage alliance with England.¹ A contemporary poem of twenty-one quatrains summed up all the discontent, and ended with a summary blast at the whole administration:

This troop with joyfulness
Scorning good favor
Will serve their great princess
Without recompense and without honor.

You see then how we are,
To serve our king forbidden
Are the worthy men in our quarter
Where the law is given by women.²


² Ibid., fol. 93r. The reference to women included not only Marie, but the whole administration, which the poet had described with feminine nouns.
Those most dissatisfied with the course of the regency were Condé and several other important nobles, who felt that they should have more voice in the government. The raising of Concini to the post of marshal on the death of Marshal Fervacques in November, 1613, and his appointment to the old marshal's position as governor of Picardy did not help matters.

Condé, who had been maltreated and deprived by his second cousin Henry IV, now had the money from his pensions; with the King coming to majority soon new arrangements would have to be made for governing the kingdom. The time to strike was now. Even though his great ally Soissons, first cousin of Henry IV, was dead, there were many other malcontents whose support could be relied upon. But it would be a mistake to credit the twenty-five-year-old Condé with having devised a complete plan of action before he left court. Condé and his followers were interested in getting everything they could, whatever that might be. His critics have been unmerciful in excoriating his actions, and even his greatest friend among historians, the Duc d'Amaule, who could find much to praise in Condé's last years, speaks harshly of his actions at this time.

---

1 Berthold Zeller, La minorité de Louis XIII, Marie de Médicis et Villeroy (Paris, 1897), pp. 160-161. Concini's new title was Marechal d'Ancre.

Despite the money he was receiving from the crown, Condé had many grievances. His training had been inadequate, rumors had been spread that he was a bastard, Henry IV had stolen the affections of his wife Charlotte de Montmorency, and, as Aumale notes, he had nothing to make him—the first prince of the blood—shine in a court where gallantry was carried to its fullest limits.  

His youthful pride and ambitions, the rise of Concini, and the Queen’s decision on January 9 to dismantle the fortress of Quilleboeuf (which belonged to the Duc de Vendôme) and various other pressures resulted in Condé’s asking permission to leave the court to go hunting. This was granted, and he left on January 13. Others would soon follow him.  

Though at first the pretense that nothing was amiss was kept up, Guillaume Ancel, the French ambassador to the Holy Roman Empire, residing in Orléans at this time, reported to his representative in Germany on January 11, 1614, that there was definite discontent in court, though he was not able to discern why. Condé, on his part, tried to

---

1 René de Cumont, sieur de Fiefbrun, Veritable discours de la naissance et vie de Monseigneur le Prince de Condé jusqu’à présent, ed. E. Halphen (Paris, 1861), pp. xvi–xxviii, 50–51. Fiefbrun was one of Condé’s loyal followers. Aumale, Condé, II, 246, 253–254. Condé’s penmanship when compared with that of other nobles and officials reveals his lack of education.

mask his actions by letters to various dignitaries, among them Cardinal de Sourdis.  

Even though the departing nobles had gone in different directions, Marie was not slow to realize what was happening. On January 15 she wrote to Cardinal de Sourdis that she was beginning to discover how many malcontents there were. The Queen began hastily to take counter-action. The Duc d'Épernon was summoned to court, and the brother of the Duc de Guise was given the governorship of Provence. The Duc de Ventadour and the Sieur de Boissise were sent after Condé, who was heading toward Orléans, to entreat him to return and receive the honors due him. Despite entreaty, Condé refused to wait for these ambassadors and began to move eastward toward Champagne. A letter to him from Marie on February 7 also did no good.

The Duc de Longueville left court on February 10 in spite of the entreaties of Marie. Soon Condé, joined by the Ducs de Longueville, Mayenne, Luxembourg, and Bouillon, met with the Duc de Nevers, who had left Paris on January 8, at the fortress of Mezières, situated on the border of France in Nevers' government of Champagne. For a time they used Mezières as their headquarters, despite its commander's attempts at resistance. From this time until the signing of the treaty of Sainte Menehould in May the rebels, their followers, and their troops

---

1 B.N. MS fr. 4116, foll. 17r–17v. B.N. MS fr. 6379, foll. 167r, 175r.

moved from place to place in the sparsely settled, rolling hills of Champagne.

The Duc de Vendôme, who had been held captive at the Louvre, escaped through the kitchen door just before supper on February 19, as reported by François de Malherbe, who can usually be counted on for the minutiæ of court life. Vendôme, an illegitimate son of Henry IV, did not join the other rebels but went immediately to Brittany which he claimed as his government despite his recent removal from the position of governor.

By the second week in February Marie de Médicis was in full action against the departed nobles. She sent orders to one of her commanders to pursue Vendôme, but he was sent in the wrong direction toward Mezières. There were reports that forces were being raised in various provinces in support of the rebels. Pamphlets were churned out; Paris was filled with talk of war. Through it all Marie seems to have remained in control. On February 20 Concini was sent to Picardy and the Duc de Montbazon to Nantes to secure these areas. In the next few days orders were sent to call back the man who was searching for

---

1 Claude Malingre, Remarques d’histoire, p. 219. Pontchartrain, Mémoires, p. 328. Mercure français, III, part 1, 312–317. Discours de ce qui s’est passé à Mezières (n.p., n.d.). B.N. Cinq Cents 12, foll. 184r, 200r (justifications of Nevers and Condé concerning what happened at Mezières; these were sent to De Thou as noted in his hand). B.M. Stowe MS 174, foll. 261–263 (Bouillon to James I from Sedan and Mezières describing the situation).

Vendôme; the governor of Bourbonnais was ordered to Paris, another official was ordered to return to his government.¹

This activity continued until May, while the army, which was not at full strength, was built up, especially by the recruitment of Swiss mercenaries. Letters in Marie’s hand are filled with orders to various commanders to move the troops here and there in an attempt to keep the rebels contained. Cities in threatened areas, such as Angers, received orders to fortify themselves. The Marquis de Coeuvres was informed on February 12 that no troops could be sent to Italy until Guyenne was safe. Throughout the spring the orders flowed, not only from Marie, but from Louis XIII and other members of the government. Judging from the failure of the nobles to raise substantial troops in France or to stage any important battles, these maneuvers were evidently successful.²


On February 18 Condé had sent letters to Marie de Médicis and the parlements of France. These letters began with the same protestation that would be used throughout the revolts of 1614–1616, that in reality the nobles were loyal and were acting only for the welfare of the King. But the advice of the important nobles should carry more weight than that of the present councilors, and an Estates General should be called during the minority of the King to review the state of affairs and propose reforms as was customary. The Spanish marriage project also displeased the rebels, as did the growing power of Parlement. A number of minor grievances were presented with emphasis on the assertion about 6,500 troops. Others say he had 3,000 to 4,500. The King may have had about 12,000 troops by March 12. François de Malherbe, Lettres de Malherbe, ed. Blaise (Paris, 1822), pp. 354–356. To make clear the status of the Prince, the King issued ordinances on March 4th and 5th forbidding transportation of war supplies and levying of troops without the express permission of the King. Philippe du Plessis Mornay, Mémoires et Correspondance de Duplessis-Mornay... , ed. Pierre René (Paris, 1825), XII, 540–542. The money spent on troops and on special missions to the areas of France that were endangered by Condé or possible disloyalty is detailed in B.N. Collection Dupuy 826, fol. 44r–56r, 68r–83v, 96r–112v, 128r–151r, 159r–189r. These figures confirm that the government action began seriously on February 15, and that February and March were the months of greatest stress. For example, the number of missions sent to the troubled areas rose by steps from thirty-one between February 15 and March 1, to one hundred between April 19 and May 10, then dropped sharply. More clearly, the military expenses began to rise in the first period, reaching a peak in the period of March 15 to April 5 (400,000 livres) and then steadily declining until by early June almost no money was being spent for these purposes.
that no important steps should be taken until an Estates General had met and the King had reached majority.  

Marie had anticipated the demands of the Prince and his followers. On February 12 she wrote to Cardinal de Sourdis that she planned to call an Estates General when the King reached majority. On February 12, 13, and 14 she wrote to the governors, important towns, and parlements of France as well as to some of the important nobles such as Lesdiguères, a Huguenot and vice-governor of Dauphiné, informing them of the course of events and soliciting their support. The governors were told of her plan to call an Estates General and commanded to inform everyone of this.

---

1 Henry II de Bourbon, Prince de Condé, Double de la lettre écrite par Monseigneur le Prince de Condé suivant le vray original. À la royné regente mère du roy, le 19 fevrier mil six cens quatorze (Paris, n.d.). The usual date given for this letter is February 19, but B.N. MS fr. 3654, foll. 62r–64v contains a copy of this letter signed by Condé, dated February 18. Condé, Lettre de Monseigneur le Prince à MM de la cour de Parlement (n.p., 1614). This letter also carries the date of February 18.

2 B.N. MS fr. 6379, foll. 177r–177v (letter to De Sourdis). Marie de Médicis, Copie de la lettre escritte à Monsieur Desdiguie par la Royne (n.p., 1614). Lesdiguères did not condescend to answer this plea until he wrote to Jeannin on May 2nd, but there should have been no worry about the loyalty of the "King of Dauphiné." François de Bonne, duc de Lesdiguères, Actes et correspondance du connétable de Lesdiguères, eds. Douglas and Roman (Paris, 1878), II, 58. Marie de Médicis, Lettre de la royné au Parlement de Bretagne (Paris, 1614). Du 14° jour de fevrier 1614. Avis aux trois états de ce royaume sur les bruits qui courlt a present de la guerre civile (Blois, 1614). B.N. MS fr. 3654, foll. 57r–58v (letter to Breves from Marie de Médicis of February 14). Augustin Thierry, Essai sur l'origine et des progrès du
Upon receiving Condé's letter Marie immediately began to prepare the answer. Jeannin and Villeroy were each asked to write a reply. Marie decided to use Villeroy's, and it was sent from Paris on February 27. This letter promised that the Estates General would be called as the Queen had already decided. The various other grievances were then discussed. Satisfaction was promised, and the admonition added that if Condé wanted anyone to believe he was sincere he should return to the court.\(^1\)

In this crisis Marie, of course, had the advice of her ministers. The advice given by Villeroy, Jeannin, and Sillery is extant; from pamphlets and the memoirs it would seem that Villeroy and Jeannin were the two who encouraged energetic action against the rebels, while Sillery and Concini discouraged it. Villeroy and Jeannin, veterans of the Wars of Religion, used well the experience they had gained. That Marie was more inclined to a policy of action can be seen not only from the course she followed, but in the favor that Villeroy and Jeannin enjoyed.

---

\(^1\) Marie de Médicis, Double de la response de la royné régente, mère du roy, à la lettre escritte à sa majeste, par le Prince de Condé, le 19 de fevrier 1614 (Paris, 1614). Cf. also B.N. MS fr. 3712. Jeannin’s version is to be found in B.N. MS fr. 15644, foll. 12r–18v, and MS fr. NA 7262, foll. 98r–101r. Jeannin’s letter in keeping with his position emphasizes the financial affairs of the kingdom, claiming that during the regency taxes had been lowered.
during this period. Jeannin was most active in carrying out the peace negotiations, and the letters of the Spanish ambassador, Inigo de Cardenas, attest to the confidence which the Queen had in Villeroy.\(^1\)

It would be presenting a false picture to imply that all was serene in the court. There was plainly much worry. From the letters of the Spanish ambassador, the months of February and March seem to have been the most distressing.

In fact, Cardenas reports on March 12 and March 14 that the regency government was negotiating for Spanish support against the rebels' stronghold of Sedan. The Spanish ambassador, though, was most interested in settling the conflict with France over lower Navarre and making sure that the marriage negotiations were completed. Once he was sure that the revolt would not interfere, the space devoted to this declines noticeably.\(^2\)

The French representative in Germany, Etienne de Sainte Catherine, was kept informed by Villeroy's secretary of the events of the revolt. From these letters, often in code, it would seem that the Duc


\(^2\)A.N. K 1428, no. 38. Letters of March 12th and 14th. Records of the Cardenas reports, which this writer went through in detail, are preserved on microfilm in the Archives National; their microfilm number is 21/M1/32; to better differentiate between the sections the older numbers will be cited. Cf. page 12, footnote 1. The treaty on Navarre, which was signed in Madrid on November 21, 1614, and in Paris on December 5, 1614, is to be found in A.N. K 1634, nos. 11–12, 15–16 (signed originals).
de Bouillon kept the court in doubt as to the course he would follow and that the Duc de Rohan had been asked for assistance by Condé. Both these men were important Huguenot leaders.¹

The Duc de Rohan, Sully's son-in-law, doubtful of Condé's prospects of success, refused to join when he found that peace negotiations were already underway. In the meantime he had informed the Queen that he remained united with the body of the Huguenots and that if she gave them contentment she would have no worries from that camp.²

But by the time the Queen received that particular piece of assurance the negotiations for peace were just about completed. During the critical months of February and March there was much fear at court that the Huguenots would join the insurgents. The Huguenots of Languedoc were put under surveillance by the Queen, but at an assembly in Nîmes they agreed to join Condé under certain conditions. Before negotiations could be completed the opposition of a number of the Huguenots and the promises of the Queen forestalled the alliance. M. de la Force, a Huguenot and lieutenant general of Navarre and Bearn, controlled the Protestants in that area, though the court feared trouble in

¹ B.N. MS fr. 4113, foll. 20r, 29r. MS fr. 4121, foll. 70r–85v.

February. Cardinal de Sourdis was negotiating with the Huguenots in Guyenne, and as early as February 12 he sent word that he was making progress though he continued working most of the spring. Farther north things seemed more secure. For example, the town of Vitry à la Reine, a heavily Huguenot town in eastern Champagne, sent the Queen assurance on March 5 of its loyalty. On March 22 Sully told the Queen that he would remain faithful, and in fact when the elections for the Estates General were being held Sully’s representative spoke against the election of one of Condé’s candidates in Berry. So, despite the defection of a few Huguenot nobles such as Bouillon, most of the Huguenots remained loyal; those in the north because they sincerely wanted to, those in the south because they saw no advantage in joining Condé. Most of the leaders—e.g., De la Force, Lesdiguieres, Du Plessis Mor­nay, and Rohan—chose not to join in the dubious battle at that time.1

1Dom Claude Devic and Dom Jean Vaissete, Histoire générale de Languedoc (Paris, 1889), XI, pt. 2, 918, XII, pt. 2, cols. 1635–36. A.N. K 111, no. 1, pts. 170, 195, 196, 209, 218, 231, 232, 234, 238, 246, 292 (documents concerning De la Force). B.N. MS fr. 6379, fol. 180f, 182f, 184f–184v. Georges Herelle, ed., Documents inédits sur le protestantisme à Vitry-le François, Epense, Heilly-le-Maurupt, Nettancourt et Vassy (Paris, 1880), pp. 69–70. B.N. MS fr. 3795, fol. 13 (Sully). The Spanish ambassador reported on February 27, 1614, that the Huguenots said they were staying with the Queen, A.N. K 1429, no. 34. Cardinal de Sourdis and the Marquis de la Force were both involved in mysterious affairs in Bordeaux at this time. Part of the trouble came from demands by Condé for property and power to nominate the mayor, but the difficulties of the Huguenot problem seem to make up much of the rest of it. It must have ended in favor of the government because De la Force was rewarded by being supported by the crown in his personal troubles and Sourdis was warmly congratulated by Marie. Another part of the problem was the supposed reply of the Parlement of Bordeaux to Condé, giving him support. This was later proved to be a
Meanwhile the rebel nobles were busy writing letters to anyone who might give them support. At the same time they kept trying to justify themselves in letters to various important officials and nobles, continually maintaining that they were working for the good of the kingdom and that, therefore, they were forced to do what they were doing. ¹

The Queen sent the first president of the Parlement of Paris, Jacques de Thou, to Condé on March 3 with her answer to his letter and with instructions to arrange for negotiations. De Thou spent most of the month wandering around Champagne trying to find Condé and reporting his failure to Paris. Finally contact was established at Sedan and Condé agreed to negotiate at Soissons. Condé arrived in that town on April 5 with four thousand foot soldiers and about six hundred horsemen. On April 6 the negotiators for the Queen—Vantadour, Boissise, De Thou, Jeannin, and Claude de Bullion—left Paris. ²

forgery and the matter was dropped. Most of the other parlements refused to even open the letters from Condé. De Vic, Languedoc, XII, pt. 2, col. 1632. B.N. MS fr. 6379, foll. 216r–217r, 225r–225v. B.N. Cinq Cents 12, fol. 276v. A.N. V6 1223 (King’s Council—May 12, 1614).


The negotiations began on April 14. But Condé, afraid of the large body of royal troops that were being brought into Champagne, retreated to the town of Sainte Menehould and captured it, leaving the Duc de Mayenne to negotiate. Agreement was soon reached on the main issues, but details and additional small demands by the rebels slowed things down. Also hindering progress was the problem of getting Condé to return to sign the treaty. The Queen first offered to send her negotiators as far as Rethel, but finally Condé at last won the minor victory of having the treaty signed at Sainte Menehould on May 15, 1614. Though the negotiations dragged on for a month, it is evident in the letters from the court that from the time Condé agreed to negotiate the tension and worry began to disappear. Also evident is the fact that Jeannin played the most important part in the negotiations. He was trusted by Condé and Bouillon. ¹


¹ B.N. Cinq Cents 88, fol. 299⁵; Cinq Cents 12, foll. 237⁷–238⁵ (report of De Thou and Condé’s agreement of May 2 to finish matters). Cinq Cents 43, foll. 46⁷–112⁵ (letters of Marie and commissioners on negotiations). Cinq Cents 43, foll. 113⁷–117⁷ (The first president of the Parlement of Paris reports to the Parlement on the meeting of the Council of May 5, concerning the final details of the treaty. The last thing that the Council decided, after much discussion, was to give Condé Amboise.). B.N. MS fr. 3799, foll. 26⁷–27⁷, 29⁷–29⁵, 32⁷–32⁵, 38⁷–49⁷, 55⁷–93⁷, 96⁷–96⁵ (110 letters on the negotiations mostly between Jeannin and Villeroy). B.N. MS fr. 6379, foll. 200⁷–210⁷ (Pontchartrain to De Sourdis), 212⁷, 213⁷–213⁵ (Villeroy to Sourdiss), 210⁷ (Pontchartrain to Sourdiss on April 21, reporting that the end of the negotiations was just about reached, but that the Queen wanted them to drag on to keep things quiet). B.N. MS fr. 3799, fol. 119⁷ (Bouillon to Jeannin, May 27). A.N. K 110, no. 253 (Condé’s declaration of April 14, 1614). A.N. G⁸* 635,
The treaty of Sainte Menehould, which was to bind all the insurgents present or absent, provided that an Estates General would meet in Sens on August 25 (since the King would not reach majority until October 1, this was a seeming victory for Condé). The text of the treaty stated that the Queen and Condé had reached a secret agreement on the Spanish marriages. The citadel of Mezières was to be demolished, but Nevers would be given money to build another residence. Blavet and the new fortifications in Brittany were to be destroyed. Within twelve days the foreign troops of both sides were to be sent home and the French soldiers were to return to their posts. Condé was to be given the Château of Amboise in trust until the Estates General should meet. When Vendôme, who was absent, rendered his obedience to the Queen he would be restored to the governorship of Brittany and his other honors. With a few exceptions the fortifications built since January 1 were to be razed. It was to be officially proclaimed that none of the rebels had acted contrary to the service of the King. There were several smaller concessions, and Condé was given 450,000 livres to be divided as he saw fit.¹

The Duc de Rohan summed up the treaty by saying that the particular interests buried the general. Cardinal Ubaldini was greatly dismayed by the treaty, saying that it gave too much power to Condé and the Huguenots, that the parlements had been permitted to play too big a

role in the negotiations, and that the consummation of the Spanish marriages was in danger. However, Marie de Médicis had other ideas about this.1

Louis XIII approved the treaty on May 25. The Parlement of Paris was thanked on May 31 for its services. The letters patent exonerating Condé and his followers were registered in that same body on July 4. However, on June 7 the Queen began her new series of moves. The letters announcing the Estates General were published throughout the kingdom setting the meeting for September 10 at Sens. The date would later be postponed until October 10 and the meeting would be assigned to Paris. When the Estates General finally met in Paris at the end of October they would be meeting under the direct supervision of the Queen and after the majority of the King.2

---

1 Rohan, Mémoires, p. 503. The dispatch of Ubaldini of May 8 is in François T. Perrens, Les mariages espagnols sous le règne de Henri IV et Marie de Médicis (Paris, 1869), pp. 508–509.

2 A.N. K 110, no. 129 (approval of Louis XIII). Marie de Médicis, Lettre de la royne régnante à Messieurs du Parlement. (Paris, 1614). Lalourecé and Duval, Forme générale et particulière de la convocation et de la tenue des assemblées nationales ou États généraux de France, justifiée par pièces authentiques (Paris, 1789), II, 41–44. A.N. AD+156, July, 1614. This includes a contemporary pamphlet that gives the date of verification as July 4. Cf. also A.N. X1A 8648, fol 43r–44r. Marie used the same stalling process with the Huguenots in their request to hold a political assembly. They first began their requests in 1613, asking that the meeting be in 1614. By one means and another Marie held them off until after the majority of the King, despite Duplessis-Mornay’s wish that it meet before the Estates General so that the Huguenots could send cahiers to that meeting. After the majority the Huguenots argued among themselves about time and place, and this was used as a pretext for postponing the meeting until 1615. It finally met at Grenoble on July 25, 1615. Leonce Anquez, Histoire des assemblées politiques des réformés de France 1573–1622 (Paris, 1859), pp. 261–265.
Marie's next step was to try to get as many of the rebel nobles as possible back to the court. Longueville and Mayenne returned at the beginning of June, and by July 8 Bouillon was writing to Condé urging moderation. Nor did Marie forget those who had helped her during the troubles; during the second week in June she wrote seven letters thanking various people for their aid. The same month she sent her trusted marshal Rosny, the son of Sully, to direct various officials to see that only those loyal to the King were elected to the Estates General.¹

The man most surprised by all this was Cesar de Vendôme. He had not signed the treaty and he felt that he had been betrayed by Condé. Condé was not too dismayed by this, probably because Vendôme had never really been part of his group and because Vendôme was clearly the most touchy and unreasonable of nobles. The Duc de Rohan was approached by Vendôme in hopes of getting support, but Rohan advised him to quit before he ruined himself completely. Nevertheless, Vendôme along with the Duc de Retz spent the summer conducting raids

¹Pontchartrain, Mémoires, p. 331. Henri de la Tour d'Auvergne, duc de Bouillon, Lettre de M. de Bouillon à M. le Prince sur l'affaire de Poitiers (n.p., 1614). B.N. Cinq Cents 43, foll. 143v-145r. B.N. Cinq Cents 89, foll. 252r-253r, 254v-256v (notices to four officials that Rosny was coming; many other examples of direct control will be discussed in Chapter III). On May 25 Bouillon had been one of the nobles of Condé's group to write to the government of Holland explaining their position and pointing out the good they were doing. Bouillon especially pointed out advantages to Protestantism. The States General of Holland refused to be anything but noncommittal. B.N. Collection Dupuy 744, foll. 177r-180r. B.N. Collection Clairambault 364, fol. 367v.
against areas loyal to the King in Brittany and Anjou, claiming, of course, that he was only doing his duty as governor of Brittany.¹

At first Condé placed his hope in securing the election of deputies to the Estates General who favored him, but it must have soon become evident that the Queen was outmaneuvering him. At any rate, an excuse to begin the troubles again came near the end of June at Poitiers over a mayoralty election that involved Condé’s friends. The whole process was very complicated, but in the end, despite Condé’s attempts to interfere, the city was barricaded against him and a battle seemed imminent. At first the Queen only sent a representative to Poitiers, but it soon became evident that something drastic had to be done to stop both Condé and Vendôme, and to secure the loyalty of Brittany and the Loire region.²

It was decided that the King and Queen would make a journey through the Loire country. Later Brittany was added when it became evident that Vendôme would not surrender without the personal intervention of the King and Queen. According to the letter of the English ambassador to James I of August 12, 1614, this was Villeroy’s idea.


Edmonds also stated that Jeannin and Sillery lost some credit with the Queen because of their advice against the trip.¹

Upon hearing of the plan Condé wrote to Marie saying that Vendôme would capitulate and that, therefore, it was not necessary to leave Paris. All that was necessary was the disbanding of the royal army as had been promised. Condé stated that if the trip were made it could only be construed as an attack on him. He implored the Queen not to believe the reports that he was trying to ruin the Estates General.²

Needless to say, Marie was not willing to believe Condé. Villeroy, who was sick, did not make the journey, but the Council and a large entourage accompanied the King and Queen. The personal physician of Louis XIII, Jean Heroard, kept a complete journal of the trip.

¹Birch, Historical View, p. 377. Throughout the summer Jeannin was in contact with Condé, Nevers, and Sully, trying to get Condé to cease his opposition, sometimes going through Sully, and trying to keep Nevers happy. B.N. MS fr. 3799, foll. 6r–18r (seven letters from Condé to Jeannin), 123r–124r, 128r, 135r (Sully to Jeannin). Lesiguieres also wrote to Jeannin three times during the summer (foll. 121r, 126r, 130r). Pontchartrain, Mémoires, p. 334. It seems evident that as late as July 22 Marie was planning to return to Paris after visiting Poitiers; François de Malherbe, Lettres inédites de Malherbe (Paris, 1841), pp. 20–21. The Parlement of Paris was given notification of the plan to continue to Nantes on August 7 and told to remain in session in case something important came up; A.N. X 1A 8648, foll. 102v–103v. The Parlement was finally given permission to take its vacation on October 8, and the vacation began October 10; ibid., 116v–117r. The period of January to June, 1614, including the negotiations, is covered in the letters of John Beaulieu, the French secretary of James I who was in France. These are interspersed in the papers of Thomas Edmondes in the Stowe MSS.

that not only records the official business but also provides a very interesting portrait of Louis XIII acting his age—playing with guns, going fishing and hunting, reviewing the troops whenever the whim struck him, and so forth. However, Louis was taken on this journey for very special reasons, not only to win support for the regency but to prove that the King, contrary to the predictions of Morgard and the stories that abounded, was healthy.¹

The royal party left Paris on July 5 and during the next month visited Orléans, Blois, Tours, Chatellerault, and Poitiers. During August they traveled to Loudun, Samur, and Angers. When it became evident that Vendôme was not sincere in his offer of surrender, the entourage proceeded to Nantes on August 12, where the King and Queen presided over the Estates of Brittany. This maneuver forced Vendôme to capitulate and assured that the deputies elected to the Estates General by the Estates of Brittany would be loyal to the King. Between August 29 and September 16, when the court returned to Paris, Angers, La Fleche, Mans, and Chartres were visited.²

The journey was a complete success. From the letters to and from Marie during the trip it appears that every noble of importance in Orléans and Brittany came to pledge loyalty to the crown. The populace of the towns, Catholic and Huguenot, were won over. Vendôme and Retz submitted, and Condé’s attempts to win deputies for the Estates


General were seriously hindered. The re-entry to Paris was an occasion of great ceremony that lasted for most of the day. Paris belonged to the King, and so did France.¹

But the battle was not yet won. The deputies to the Estates General had not yet met, and if Condé was lacking in ideas of his own he was soon to get help. King James I had long wondered what part he should take in the troubles of France. Having received information previously from Bouillon, Home, and Edmondes, he had the Earl of Somerset write to Edmondes, then in Paris, on September 27, 1614. Edmondes was to point out to Condé through Bouillon (since both of them would soon be coming to Paris) that the treaty of Sainte Menehould was not being carried out since the Estates General was now to be held at Paris under the Queen's control. The deputies who had been elected were favorable to the Queen. The Prince was to be encouraged to "... interest himself and assume that right in managing the effayres, which properly belongs him in ryght of his place, that they fall not back again and into the former absolute government of the ... ministers."²

¹ B.N. MS fr. 4121, foll. 94r–96v, 102r–102v. B.N. MS fr. 6379, foll. 234r–234v, 235r. B.N. Cinq Cents 89, foll. 274v–275r, 277r. Pontchartrain, Mémoires, p. 333. The government of Orléans in which most of this trip took place had a significant Huguenot population and was also an area in which was found much of the support of the rebel nobles. Theodore Godefroy, Le cérémonial français, ed. Denis Godefroy (Paris, 1649), pp. 970–971. Dom Michel Félibien, Histoire de la ville de Paris, ed. D. Guy-Alexis (Paris, 1725), II, 1299–1300.

² B.M. Stowe MS 175, foll. 58r–59r. If Bouillon would not relay the message someone else was to be found. The reason behind the King's interference is, as pointed out by Edmondes, that the regency was in favor of Rome and Spain. Birch, Historical View, pp. 375–377. Condé returned to Paris on September 29; Vendôme also came at about the same time. Malingre, Remarques, p. 225.
CHAPTER III

THE ELECTIONS FOR THE ESTATES GENERAL

In early June, 1614, there was as yet no hint that the English king would meddle in the affairs of France, since Ambassador Edmondes was in England. But the efforts of Marie de Médecis and her advisors during the summer were so effective that any attempt to interfere in the course of events would be severely limited.

Between June 7 and 10 Louis and Marie each sent letters to the governors, baillis, seneschals, lieutenants general, and other important local officials calling the Estates General to meet on September 10 in Sens. The recipients of the letters were ordered to convocate the three estates of their particular jurisdictions in the accustomed manner, and as quickly as possible. Cahiers were to be drawn up, and the traditional number of deputies were to be sent with these to the Estates General. It was emphasized that the deputies should be men of integrity and intelligence who were sincerely interested in the welfare of the King and the people. ¹

¹ B.N. MS fr. 20154, pp. 1251–53 (original, with signature, of the King’s letter). A.C. Marseille AA 118 (original, with signature, of the Queen’s letter). Many other examples of these letters exist in local archives, for example A.D. Somme B 17, foll. 28r–29v; A.D. Seine Maritime A 22, foll. 402r–408r.
These letters initiated a long process that would take most of the summer to complete, and even part of the autumn in some remote areas. Although the process is far too complicated to describe in detail, because of many variations, a simple outline follows. An official, upon receiving the royal letters, notified the officials in the jurisdictions subordinate to his, and so on down the line of authority. Then there began the slow march back upward toward the Estates General. In those rural parishes which were permitted to vote, the assembly, usually of the "greater and saner part" of the male inhabitants, met after the High Mass in front of the church (the curé having announced the meeting during Mass). One or two men were elected to carry the grievances of the parish to the meeting of the next higher jurisdiction, whether town or bailliage. In the towns the officials, and sometimes but not always (especially in the Midi) some of the townsmen, met and chose deputies and a committee to draw up a cahier. The deputies then went to the bailliage assembly or, in areas where there were provincial estates, to those estates, where the process was repeated. The clergy usually met by diocese (most often in the Midi) or by bailliage. The nobles met by bailliage.

Slowly the process of election and refinement of grievances into successive cahiers went on. Sometimes only one or two stages had to be gone through, but the complaints of a rural parish in a secondary bailliage had to be processed three times before reaching the Estates General, where they would go through two more stages of refinement. The result of this is not surprising; the grievances of the rural areas
and small towns, almost solely concerned with local affairs, soon disappeared, as did their deputies, to be replaced by more important men and more important grievances. ¹

One of the major problems in describing the elections for the Estates General of 1614 is determining the electoral districts. The

¹ J. Russell Major, The Deputies to the Estates General of Renaissance France (Madison, 1960), pp. 3–131. This constitutes the best description of the process; however, a number of events and details of 1614 missed by Major can be found in A.N. G8 Dossier no. 8. Information on twenty-six elections for the First Estate are included; a few have some details of elections in the Second and Third estates. In general these confirm Major's conclusions. Interestingly, the procuration of the deputy of the First Estate of Gex is signed by Francis de Sales, who, as bishop of Geneva, was his superior. (This particular procuration has been removed from this dossier and is now in the Museum of the Archives Nationales. The number in the museum, incorrectly cited in the dossier, is AE II 1781.) For further details on Touraine see B.N. MS fr. NA 9752, foll. 50r–79r; for Normandy, B.N. MS fr. 11916, foll. 1r–5r. Cf. also Lalourcé and Duval, Forme générale, II, 90–210. It should be noted that it was not unusual for the deputies to a bailliage meeting to elect someone who was not present. It was definitely not unusual for many who were supposed to come not to show up. In this connection Major is wrong in stating that a great number of clergy and nobles gathered at Rouen for the meeting there. This crowd gathered for the elections to the provincial estates because of the interest generated by the coming Estates General. Cf. Charles Beaurepaire, Cahiers des États de Normandie sous le règne de Louis XIII et Louis XIV (Paris, 1876), I, 268–269.

The easiest process to follow is that of the city of Paris. The original records are in A.N. H 1796, fol. 262v, H 1797, foll. 79r–356r, and H 1798, foll. 26v–255v. The most accessible printed account is in Paul Guerin and Jean le Grand, eds., Registres des délibérations du Bureau de la ville de Paris. Histoire générale de Paris (Paris, 1927), XV. Here again, in the First Estate, the attendance was spotty. The bourgeoisie who were not officials played a part in these meetings, but not a great one. Cf. also A.N. K 675. For the clergy of Paris cf. B.N. MS fr. 9752, fol. 7.
continual growth of administrative subdivisions within France is notorious. Although much of this was to take place in the time of Richelieu and later, there was much confusion in 1614. In calling for the elections in the summer of 1614 the royal secretaries took the easy way out: The letters of the King and Marie de Médicis were sent to all the important local officials. They were told to carry out the elections in the usual manner. They were to decide such details of the complicated protocol as which bailliages and towns could send deputies directly to the Estates General, which other localities if any they were to consult, where provincial estates were to be held, and which localities belonged to which electoral district. In the majority of cases this method somehow worked after a mountain of correspondence had been exchanged between baillis, governors, lieutenants general, bishops, town officials, and so on. When there were disputes, recourse was had to tradition. 1

The serious debates over two elections in one area, the claims of newly important towns, or long-feuding districts usually reached the King's Council. The Council in its decisions of August, September, and October almost always fell back on the procedure followed for the Estates of Blois in 1588. But if the feud was too bitter or, as happened in a few cases, was carried on into October, the Council found a compromise, usually giving a seat to at least some of the deputies of each of the insistent districts or by giving precedence to one deputy over another "for this time only." In other words, when pressed, the

1 Lalourcé and Duval, eds., Forme générale, II, 20–90, gives many examples of the complicated procedure. Only tradition, tightly followed, saved the process from utter confusion.
Council, instead of trying to grapple with the mass of contradictions, merely temporized, adding another bit to the traditional confusion. 1

Part of this attitude was undoubtedly due to the frustration of a busy Council faced with a maze of claims and counterclaims, but another partial reason undoubtedly was to be found in the attitude of the court, guided by Marie de Médicis, toward the Estates General—the meeting was merely for show; the sooner the disputes were settled and the Estates General got under way the sooner they would be over, and the danger of embarrassment lessened.

The confusion over electoral districts—that is, which bailliage belonged to which province or government—extended to those who tried to draw up lists of the deputies in 1614 and in later years. On November 15, 1614, the King settled a long-standing dispute by defining the twelve governments of France and by assigning to them a voting order based on tradition, privilege, and the order in which each area had become "reunited" to France. This was decided in the decree which ordered that voting in the Estates General should be by government instead of by bailliage. For the most part, below the level of governments such questions were not settled. Within the Estates General itself the necessity of moving from procedural questions to the business at hand dictated compromise, different in each order. In the few disputes still

---

1 A.N. E 46B-47A, foll. 166r-166v, 173r-174v, 184r-184v, 274r, 282r, 352r, 353r, 355r-355v, 368r, 387r, 388r-388v, 409r, 410r-410v, 433r, 438r, 478r-478v; E 47B, foll. 18r-18v. Major, Deputies, refers to a number of other examples found in local records.
continuing the Council was again consulted, and again if the precedent of 1588 did not suffice, a temporary decision was rendered.  

In the royal letters calling the Estates General of 1614, those written in the King's name had stressed that it had always been the intention of the government to call the Estates General when the King reached majority, that the Estates General would be free, and that action would be taken on the recommendations of the deputies. The main point in Marie de Médicis' letter was that loyal subjects be chosen as deputies. She lost no time in making sure that this would be the case.

In June, Marie sent the Marquis de Rosny to various lieutenants general and others to pressure them to see that loyal men were elected. She sent letters in her own hand to those to be visited by Rosny and to others, urging them to elect good subjects of the King and hinting that their efforts would not go unrewarded. Many of these letters were sent to Normandy, covering the whole government, while others went to Sens, Castres, and Nantes. Letters to the same localities late in the summer show that Marie's efforts were successful, because she thanks the responsible officials for insuring that loyal deputies were elected.

Another gauge of Marie's effectiveness is the complaint that Condé wrote to her during the summer about the elections in two places—

---

1 Lalourcé and Duval, eds., Recueil de pièces originales et authentiques concernant la tenue des États généraux (Paris, 1789), V, 141-143. A.N. E 47B, fol. 8r, 18r-18v, 24r-24v, 29r, 114r-114v, 116r-116v, 250r, 272r, 329r, 332r-332v, 340r, 526r-527r. These disputes lasted into December.

2 B.N. Cinq Cents 89, fol. 254v-256v, 267v, 273v, 276r-277r, 278r, 282r-282v. There are fifteen letters of Marie de Médicis' on this subject.
Beslosme and la Mousse. Marie’s confidence is reflected in her answer that if Condé were at court where he should be he could counsel her on her conduct. Marie closed the letter with a taunt, saying that she very much wanted to see accomplished the good work that Condé had begun.  

Nor was this the only action taken to insure a complacent Estates General. Pontchartrain, secretary of state for religion, wrote to Cardinal de Sourdis in Bordeaux on July 12 stressing the necessity of electing men with affection for the King and public repose, men who were not swayed by the passions of others. Pontchartrain added that the Queen was sure that Sourdis would be vigilant.  

As it had throughout the year, Bordeaux remained a trouble spot. There had been complaints that the delegation from this town had not been elected fairly, so the Queen ordered a new election. Even though those elected the first time were known to be loyal, it must be remembered, she said, that “the Estates, which must be free Estates,” could only accept delegations chosen by the ancient form. Throughout the preparations and the actual meeting of the Estates General, Marie de Médicis was always careful of this point—that the Estates General appear to be free. That their purpose was merely to serve the crown in time of need she did not doubt, but if this service were to be effective then all the formalities and forms had to be correct. As for the trouble in Bordeaux, Sourdis must have been successful in the end just as he

---

1 B.N. Cinq Cents 88, foll. 305r–305v.  
2 B.N. MS fr. 6379, foll. 227r–228r.
was with the Huguenots in Guyenne, judging from the favor in which he remained at court.  

There are examples in Picardy of Marie’s effectiveness. In Ponthieu Charles de Rambures was elected for the Second Estate despite the attempts of the Duc de Longueville to get his candidate elected. In Amiens Concini came to the aid of the royal officials when the town officials tried to gain Longueville’s support in the elections; the royal officials were elected.

At times Marie directly intervened in an election, though still maintaining the appearance of not doing so. During the meeting of the Second Estate of the bailliage of Berry in Orléans the representative of the Prince de Condé tried to pressure the nobles to elect Henri de la Chastre, Comte de Nancey, but this was forestalled by the representative of the Duc de Sully, who said that Sully would oppose this because it was against the King’s will. The first line of defense of those directing the election was the edict of July 21 forbidding the admission of procurations (representation by proxy). Though the edict was obeyed, the Comte de Nancey was still elected. However, Marie wrote to inform Nancey on August 7 that Guillaume Pot, Seigneur de Rhodes and master of ceremonies of France, was coming to help draw up the cahier. She hinted very strongly that it would be well if Rhodes were also elected

---

1 Ibid., 234r–234v. Additional evidence is to be found in the fact that De Sourdis completely controlled the election and drawing up of the cahier for the First Estate of the Sénéschaussée of Guyenne. Major, Deputies, p. 99.

to go to the Estates General. He was, and so Nancey's vote was canceled.  

A possible coalition of Huguenot deputies with Condé's supporters in the Estates General posed a serious threat to the regency. When the revolt had broken out in early 1614, Marie had feared that the Huguenots would join. Even though the Huguenots had not joined Condé's revolt and had protested their loyalty, Marie was not satisfied. This fear was later justified by the part they took in the revolt of 1615–1616. The Spanish ambassador Inigo de Cardenas reported to Madrid on July 7 and 8 that the Huguenots were demanding more representatives in the coming meeting of the Estates General. Since Condé was supporting their demands, this was a potentially dangerous situation. But by the end of July Cardenas could report that the Huguenots were no longer causing trouble. Cardinal de Sourdis had been hard at work with the Huguenots in Guyenne, while Marie was traveling through Orléans, making a point of stopping at the important Huguenot towns, winning over the people.  

La Mercure François reported that there were many Huguenot deputies in the Second and Third estates. How many there actually were can not be determined. However, some of the Huguenot deputies are known, and a study of the areas from which they came reveals some interesting facts.  

---

1 B.N. MS fr. 3328, fol. 58r–67v.  
2 A.N. K 1428, nos. 46, 49.  
In the Third Estate it is known that Daniel de Gallière, the sole representative of Montpellier, was a Huguenot because M. Trimquare, the chief justice of the government, protested to the King's Council that the Catholics of the government should have a representative also. His request was refused, and he was told to give his cahier to the deputy of Toulouse. ¹

In the Sénéschaussée of Loudunois there was a dispute between the Catholics and the Protestants, each group electing two deputies. The case went to the Council on October 25; since the convening of the Estates General was so close at hand, the Council permitted a compromise, despite the fact that it defied tradition, and one delegate from each deputation was chosen. Unfortunately it is not possible to determine which deputy is the Huguenot. ²

There was also a dispute between the Huguenots and Catholics in Chatellerault. The decision of the Council on October 7 was that one or two deputies should be elected by plurality without distinction of religion. Only one was elected. Since the Huguenots were the ones who asked that the original election be set aside and that one of their number be included, it seems that they were in the minority and thus would lose the second election. ³

¹ A.N. E 47⁷, foll. 504r–505r (December 30). Trimquare did receive 1,500 livres for his trip to and from Paris, A.N. E 48⁴, fol. 338r. He had been delegated by the Catholic inhabitants of the government and town of Montpellier.

² A.N. E 46⁷–47⁴, foll. 410r–410v. The two men were Louis Trincaut and Barthelemy de Burges.

³ A.N. E 46⁷–47⁴, fol. 352r.
More of the Huguenots in the Second Estate can be identified. Near the end of the Estates General eight Huguenots led by the Vidame de Chartes, deputy of Chateau-Neuf en Thimerais, refused to sign the cahier of the Second Estate because it called for the inviolable maintenance of the Catholic religion. They issued a signed protest from which can be determined exactly who they were: René de Tallansac, the deputy of La Rochelle; Jean du Mas, one of the six deputies of Brittany; Jean du Puy, one of the three deputies of Dauphiné; Henri Poussart, one of the two deputies of Basse Marche; Marc Antoine de Dessax, one of the two deputies of Lauragais; Jean Degardieu, one of the two deputies of Montpellier; René de la Tour de Gouvernet, one of the two deputies of Beauregard and Nîmes. Montcassin, the secretary of the Second Estate, says that Odet de la Noué of Poitou was a Huguenot. To this list, though he did not sign the protest, might possibly be added François de Nompar de Caumont. From his name and the locality from which he was deputized (Agenois) it seems certain that he must have been related to the Marquis de la Force, the Huguenot governor of Bearn and Navarre. ¹

Another indication of areas from which Huguenot deputies might come is found in the list of bailliages and sénéchaussées which had no deputy for the First Estate: Albret, La Rochelle, Chatellerault, Chateau-neuf en Thimerais, Calais, Haute-Marche, Puy-en-Vellay, and Lauragais. Since at least one Huguenot deputy came from four of these places, it is highly possible that Huguenots were in the deputations of the others.

¹B.N. Collection Dupuy 323, fol. 192r (original of the signed protest). Lalourcée and Duval, Recueil de pièces, VII, 304–305.
Jean Broca of Albret was identified as consul of the town of Ne­
rac, a lawyer in the Parlement of Bordeaux and the Chamber of Guyenne. This could well mean that he was a lawyer for the Chamber of the Edict; that is, the chamber set up for the Huguenots at a number of the parlements, Bordeaux included. The deputies of the Third Estate from La Rochelle are also definite possibilities. Another possibility in the Third Estate is François Brisson, one of the three deputies of Poitou. He was the seneschal of Fontenay, which was a place de sureté for the Huguenots.

More interesting are the areas from which the Huguenot deputies came. Orléans and Languedoc supplied the greatest number, while there were some Huguenot deputies, or at least evidence of them, from Gu­
yenne, Lyonnais, Picardy, Brittany, and Dauphiné.

Which deputies can be shown to be favorable to the leaders of the revolt? The deputies of Nivernois all favored the Duc de Nevers; Château-Neuf-en-Thimerais was part of Nevers’ territory. The nobles of St. Pierre-le-Moutier were friends of Nevers. Theophile de Damas, the deputy of Charolais, was ensign of one hundred men of arms under the Duke of Mayenne and may have favored him. The deputy to the Second Estate from Gien, Henri de Postel, was a gentleman ordinary of the chamber of the Prince de Condé. Further evidence for the disloy­alty of Gien is seen in the fact that its bailli was Henri de la Chastre, the man whose election Marie wanted to offset in Berry. One other unfriendly deputy can definitely be pointed out—Louis de Montmorency,

Seigneur de Bouteville, who would protest against Marie’s forcing of the election of the president of the Second Estate.¹

This is not an impressive showing of strength, especially when the intrigues of Condé and his allies are remembered. But an analysis of all of Marie’s actions shows why the result was so niggardly. The areas with the greatest potential for causing trouble were those to which Marie devoted most of her attention. Orléans was a center for Condé’s supporters, the place where he spent the summer, and the home of many Huguenots. In Guyenne Condé’s influence was strong, especially in Bordeaux. Brittany was under the control of Vendôme, and both Brittany and Guyenne had significant Huguenot populations. Picardy was the area of influence of the Duc de Longueville.

Particularly important was Orléans. At least part of the happiness that Marie continually expressed on the success of her summer trip through that government must have come from the fact that she had either controlled the elections or influenced the deputies in the areas she visited. The royal party had visited the towns of Orléans, Blois, Tours, Chatellerault, Poitiers, Loudun, Samur, Angers, Mans, and Chartes in the government of Orléans. The delegations for all three estates from these places were controlled by royal officials. There still remained pockets of resistance in Orléans, but when the elections were over they were so submerged that they were rendered powerless in the meetings in Paris. Further proof of the confidence Marie had in her control of Orléans is seen in the decision of the Council on

October 25 that the deputies of the baiiliage of Nivernois, all of whom were followers of the Duc de Nevers, should sit in the Estates General with the deputations of the government of Orléans, even though they were actually from Lyonnais. As a result the votes of Nevers' supporters were swallowed up by those of the loyal delegations of Orléans. Each of the other areas in which Marie intervened was critical. It can be imagined what would have been the result if she had not acted as she did. ¹

Marie's activities had been directed toward obtaining the election of loyal deputies to the Estates General; considerable evidence indicates that a significant number of those she depended on held royal office. A study of the men elected to the Estates General reveals that a large number of the deputies, far more than was the case in any other meeting of the Estates General, were royal officials. The fact that royal officials controlled a deputation to the Estates General does not guarantee that that deputation was loyal to the crown. But the information gained from this study, when combined with all the other evidence, reveals a definite pattern and provides a fuller answer to the question of what areas Marie controlled. ²

¹ Lalourcée and Duval, Recueil de pièces, V, 32. A.N. E 46B-47A, fol. 433r. The evidence of Marie's activity is buttressed by the fact that, between June 21 and September 22, 93,700 livres were spent on 220 trips made to all parts of France by envoys to influence the elections. The treasury accounts note that the King called a number of other people to him for similar purposes during the July and August trip. B.N. Collection Dupuy 826, foll. 277v-287v, 312r-328r, 354r-378r.

² What follows is based on the matter found in Appendices I and II. Other patterns which can be distinguished are that in the governments
In the Third Estate, on the bailliage level royal officials controlled a majority of the delegations in the governments of Paris and Ile de France, Guyenne, Champagne, Picardy, Lyonnais, and Orléans. They were weakest in Dauphiné and Provence. On the government level similar results are obtained by comparing the number of royal offices held by members of each government with the total number of deputies of each government. By this method the royal officials appear strongest in Paris and Ile de France, Champagne, Picardy, and Orléans, while they were weakest in Guyenne, Provence, and Dauphiné. ¹

If the first method is used with regard to the Second Estate it is found that the royal officials were strongest in Paris and Ile de France, Brittany, Languedoc, and Picardy, while they were weakest in Dauphiné, where the most bishops were elected there tend to be the fewest curés elected. In Languedoc and Provence only bishops represented the clergy. By contrast, in the north, especially in the Ile de France, Burgundy, and Champagne, there is a tendency to send more clerics of lower rank. Among the nobles, Normandy, Picardy, and Lyon sent the most lower nobility to the Estates General. From the scanty evidence of degrees held by clerics, the Ile de France, Burgundy, and Champagne sent the best-educated clerics. It is patently evident from the lists that the First Estate was in dire need of reform as far as the plural holding of benefices was concerned.

¹In the Third Estate members of Parlement were not counted as royal officials because of their traditional spirit of independence; neither were those men who only held the title of councilor of the king. This position was for the most part honorary. The exact statistics for the Third Estate are as follows (the number of delegations controlled by royal officials is listed first): Paris and Ile de France, 11-3; Burgundy, 3-5; Normandy, 3-4; Guyenne, 7-6; Brittany, 3-4; Champagne, 5-2; Languedoc, 2-3; Picardy, 7-0; Dauphiné, 0-5; Provence, 0-6; Lyonnais, 6-3; Orléans, 13-1. The bailliages in which there was an even split between royal officials and others were disregarded in this compilation.
Provence, Champagne, Lyonnais, and Orléans. By the second method, the comparison of royal offices against the total number of deputies for each government (counting as royal officials baillis, seneschals, governors, and those listed under the heading of other royal officers, but excluding councilors and military officers), it is found that the royal officials were strongest in Paris and Ile de France, Orléans, Dauphiné, and Picardy, while they were weakest in Guyenne, Champagne, Dauphiné, Provence, and Lyonnais.¹

The first method is not applicable to the First Estate, since not many of this estate held royal office. But the second method does supply some information if the offices of councilor are included (this is more valid in the First Estate since there are many who held the office of councilor of the king in state and private councils). The result of the comparison is that the greatest number of royal offices are found in Paris and Ile de France, Guyenne, Brittany, Provence, and Languedoc, while the fewest are found in Burgundy, Champagne, and Picardy.

The governments which had elected significant numbers of royal officials had all been influenced by Marie either directly or through her letters and representatives. Marie had controlled the election, in Normandy by her letters, in Orléans by her visit, in Brittany by her

¹ This method is harder to use in the Second Estate. At least one bailli, that of Berry, was known to be opposed to the Queen (he was so counted); also it is not safe to count those holding only a royal military office, even though most of these nobles were probably loyal. The figures for the first method, disregarding bailliages in which there was an even split, are: Paris and Ile de France, 6-8 against royal control; Burgundy, 3-9; Normandy, 2-5; Guyenne, 4-11; Brittany, 3-3; Champagne, 1-7; Languedoc, 2-4; Picardy, 2-4; Dauphiné, 0-3; Provence, 0-7; Lyonnaise, 1-6; Orléans, 4-14.
appearance at the provincial estates, in Guyenne through Cardinal de Sourdis, and in Picardy through Concini. When these facts are seen in conjunction with those showing the comparative strength of royal officials in each delegation, each set buttresses the other. For example, the five areas in which Marie took a hand show a predominance of royal officials. The election of these men must have been at least partially the result of her design. This conclusion and the evidence gleaned from the study of the strength of royal officials adds the Île de France to the list of governments controlled by Marie; Champagne may be added as far as the Third Estate is concerned. The Second Estate of Champagne may well have been influenced by Condé, who was active there. In the First Estate Marie had a staunch ally, Cardinal du Perron.

When the Estates General met, Marie could count on six of the twelve governments. What of the other six? If one looks at a map it will be seen that all the areas in which Marie did not make a strong attempt to control the elections were far from the scene of the events of early 1614, with the exception of Champagne. Here Marie may have failed in her attempt to control, especially the Second Estate. But the others were far enough away so that their essential loyalty could be counted on. This especially includes Languedoc. It will be remembered that the Huguenots of the South, meeting in Nîmes, had earlier in 1614 refused to follow Condé. Marie could be sure of this area. So her policy had been to concentrate on the governments that were potentially the most dangerous. In this strategy she was successful. Condé and his allies might possibly count on the Second Estate of Champagne and a few scattered bailliages elsewhere, most of these isolated in Orléans either by location or, in the case of Nivernois,
by decree of the King’s Council. But if the deputies were loyal to the crown this did not mean that they would support all of Marie’s policies. The problem of maintaining loyalty remained.¹

¹George Rothrock in his analysis of royal control of the Third Estate in 1614 uses disputable figures, but most importantly he fails to allow for Marie’s control of the local elections and the election of loyal presidents within the Estates General itself. George A. Rothrock, "Officials and King’s Men: A Note on the Possibilities of Royal Control in the Estates General," French Historical Studies, II (Fall, 1962), 504–510.
CHAPTER IV

THE OPENING OF THE ESTATES GENERAL,
OCTOBER 1 TO NOVEMBER 13

By the time the court had returned to Paris in September, it evidently felt that the crisis was past and that progress was being made in the settlement of pressing problems. The letters sent by Marie and Louis and by various members of the government became less urgent and less frequent. The pressure of foreign affairs was also being relieved. On September 20 the Marquis de Rambouillet was sent to negotiate matters between Savoy and Mantua, and a treaty was signed on November 17. With the assistance of the French and English ambassadors, a treaty was signed on November 12 settling the dispute which had involved the Empire, the princes of northern Germany, and Holland in war throughout 1614. Most importantly, for Marie’s foreign policy, arrangements for the Spanish marriages had been definitely made. Later, in 1615, most of these problems would arise again, but during the meeting of the Estates General France would have peace on its borders. The court could deal with internal problems with only a minimum of pressure from foreign affairs.¹

¹B.N. MS fr. 3711, foll. 35r–39v, 41r–44r, 45r–52r. Malingre, Remarques, pp. 234–235. It was necessary to draw up another treaty
The first step in securing the situation at home was the proclamation of the King's majority. This was confirmed at a lit de justice in Parlement on October 2, with Condé and most of the rebel nobles in attendance. (Longueville had quarreled with Concini and had left the court. By the end of the month Nevers, Sully, and Bouillon would also have returned.) At the ceremony of the proclamation the Parlement of Paris, in spite of its Gallican opposition to the Spanish marriages, voiced its support for the regency government. President Servin's speech praised the King and urged Louis to continue to follow the Queen's counsel. There was no need for the urging. Louis told the assembly that he intended to demand the respect and obedience due him;

on December 1, 1614, to help solve the Savoy problem, and the final treaty was not signed until June 21, 1615, but there was relative peace while the Estates General met. A.N. K 1469, fol. 162. There were some complaints from the Emperor in early 1615 that his subjects in the bishopric of Metz were being molested by the French garrison in the city of Metz and by the attempts of the Parlement of Paris to establish its jurisdiction there, but no action followed. In May of 1614 Marie had had to restrain the Duc d'Epernon from carrying out edicts of 1609 and 1613 empowering him to establish French administration in the bishopric. Gaston Zeller, Le réunion de Metz à la France (1552-1648) (Strasbourg, 1926), II, 221-229. Berthold Zeller is thus wrong when he says that French foreign policy was held in check during November and December, 1614, just as he is wrong in saying that French and Spanish foreign policy was at odds during the meeting of the Estates General, and that the Spanish used this time to make important gains at the expense of France. Berthold Zeller, Marie de Médicis, chef du conseil (Paris, 1898), p. 49.

then turning to his mother he said, 'Madame, I thank you for the great pains which you have taken for me; I ask you to continue to govern and to command as you have before. I wish and expect that you be obeyed in everything and everywhere, and that after me you are to be the head of my Council.'

The first act of the thirteen-year-old king was the renewal of the edicts regarding blasphemy, the protection of the Huguenots, dueling and the formation of leagues, and the pacification of the kingdom. He ordered all to refrain from serving any other prince or lord but himself or from receiving any other form of support. Louis further emphasized his support for his mother and her policies, stating that these policies were in accord with those of his predecessors, and that any attempt to subvert them was contrary to the tradition of France.

In the meantime the date for the meeting of the Estates General had been postponed until after the proclamation of the King's majority, and on the pretext that many of the deputies were already in the capital for that ceremony, the place of meeting was changed to Paris. That this change in plan was dictated by more than impulse is indicated by the fact that James I was well aware of it as early as September 27.

---

1 Isambert, Recueil, XVI, 52. Pontchartrain, Mémoires, p. 336. Louis Servin, Action des gens du roy sur la déclaration de Louys XIII roy de France et de Navarre séant en son lict de justice en sa cour de Parlement au jour de sa majorité (Paris, 1615), pp. 1–27. It should be noted that, though Louis XIII’s name will appear more frequently from now on, Marie, as Louis said, was still in charge. Louis did as Marie decided.

As the time of meeting approached, royal troops were moved close to Paris as a precaution. On October 13 it was proclaimed throughout Paris that the preliminary meetings of the Estates General would begin the next day in the great hall of the Augustins. The formal opening of the Estates General had been scheduled for October 10, but slowness in readying the hall of the Hôtel de Bourbon, or Petit-Bourbon, caused further delays. The deputies were ordered to take care of preliminary details in the monastery of the Augustins. After these preliminary meetings the orders were to separate: the clergy were to continue to meet at the Augustins (across the Seine from the King’s residence in the Louvre), the nobles at the monastery of the Cordeliers (a short distance west of the present Boulevard Saint Michel), and the Third Estate at the Hôtel de Ville. ¹

¹ B.M. Stowe MS 175, fol. 58r–59r (the letter of James I). A.N. K 674, no. 25 (the proclamation of October 13, signed by Louis). B.N. MS fr. 3788, fol. 10r; B.N. MS fr. 3797, fol. 16; B.N. MS fr. 3800, fol. 25r (all on troop movements). Birch, Historical View, pp. 381–382 (Edmondes to James I on October 28, 1614, concerning preparations for the Estates General). A diagram of the Augustins is to be found in Emile Raunie, Epitaphier du vieux Paris, Histoire générale de Paris (Paris, 1890), I, 50–51. Malherbe, Lettres, p. 415. Malherbe reported to his friend Peiresc on October 17 that he was hard at work on the hall of the Petit-Bourbon, but that he did not think that it would be ready for two weeks. Confusion has been rife among writers on the Estates General (e.g., Mayer and Rothrock) as to the location of the Hôtel de Bourbon. Older histories of Paris correctly show that it was a separate building between the Louvre and Saint Germain d'Auxerrois, where today there is a lawn. Michel Félibien, Histoire de la ville de Paris, II, 1301. Adolphe Berty, Topographie historique de vieux Paris, Histoire générale de Paris, 2nd ed. (Paris, 1885), I, 32–39.
The preliminary sessions lasted from October 14 to October 25 and were devoted to the exchanging of formal, complimentary greetings among the orders, accepting and accrediting deputies, and with arranging matters of precedence and procedure. None of the estates had its full complement of deputies on October 14, and there were many disputes among rival claimants from the same bailliage. The nobles did not succeed in getting most of their members accredited and sworn in until November 17, and even after this latecomers would appear. The other orders had somewhat more success, but in general the Estates General moved slowly at first. 1

In following the course of the Estates General of 1614 the accounts of the secretaries of each of the orders were used as the basic sources. The copies referred to in the footnotes are those printed in Lalourcé and Duval, Recueil de pièces, VI, VII, VIII, since these are most readily available. These copies have been checked against all the MSS copies in the Bibliothèque Nationale and the Archives Nationales, the best of which will be found listed in the bibliography. Four other sources have been used to supplement the account of the Third Estate: Florimond Rapine, Recueil très-exact et curieux de tout ce qui s'est fait et passé de singulier et memorable en l'assemblee des États, tenus à Paris en l'année 1614 et particulièrement en chaque séance du tiers ordre (Paris, 1651); B.N. MS fr. 10876, an independent but partial account in a seventeenth-century hand which is particularly good for provincial affairs; MS fr. 18256, an eighteenth-century copy of the Saint Maurists of what is evidently the account of a member of the delegation of the Île de France, which is excellent for determining the actual vote of the governments on most issues; and MS fr. NA 7254, an official copy made by order of the King and Parlement in 1652 of MS fr. 7525, another independent account which gives added information on the deputations the Third Estate sent to the other estates. The account of Claude le Doux, another deputy to the Third Estate, is not cited because it adds nothing of any importance to what is known from the other sources. Also of little use are Journal de ce qui s'est passé aux États généraux de 1614. ... (Paris, 1789), and the account printed in L. Cimber and F.
The clergy held ten preliminary meetings in the period up to October 25. Much of their discussion concerned ceremonies for the procession and formal opening of the Estates General on October 26 and 27. A running debate was held on conflicts over representation and on the order to be followed by the clergy in the procession. The first problem was usually settled by letting both claimants represent the bailliage in question. A definite seating order for the meetings was finally agreed on, and in desperation it was decided that in the procession the clergy below the rank of bishop would just line themselves up without distinction, except for the abbots of Citeaux and Clairvaux, who were heads of orders. It was decided that each Sunday one bishop would say Mass and another would preach a sermon for all the estates in the chapel of the Augustins. They agreed to vote by government rather than by ecclesiastical province, bailliage, or individually. Finally on October 24 the promoters and secretaries were elected. In this hierarchical assembly no formal election for president was held. Cardinal Joyeuse, the reigning cardinal in France, presided, but because of age and illness he was replaced in the actual meetings by the next two ranking cardinals, Rochefoucault and De Sourdis, the favorite of the Queen. The debates over these matters were carried on in the midst of tumult in the cloisters that on October 22 necessitated the ruling that no deputy bring more than one servant or page with

Danjou, eds., Archives curieuses de l'histoire de France, ser. 2, Vol. I. To facilitate footnoting, the account of the First Estate by Behety and De Breteville, the secretaries, will be cited as PV-1; that by sieur de Montcassin, the secretary of the Second Estate, as PV-2; and that of the Third Estate as PV-3. Rapine's account will be cited as Rapine, and the MSS copies from the Bibliothèque Nationale by their numbers.
him, and that these be left in the coaches or on horseback during the meetings.

For the nobles the first piece of business was to secure the aid of the clergy in presenting to the King their petition for permission to continue meeting in the Augustins; the First and Second estates presented the petition on the afternoon of October 14. Meetings were then suspended until October 17 to wait for more members to arrive. Disputes over representation and seating, which depended on recognition of rank and privilege, were constant and heated; at one point swords were drawn. In the midst of one of these violent arguments word was received that a deputation from the Third Estate was on its way to the chamber of the Second Estate. Having heard that the Third Estate had complained that the nobles had not received them as well as the clergy, the nobles decided that they could not be outdone and sent one more emissary than the clergy had to escort the deputies of the Third Estate into their chamber. The delegation asked the Second Estate to help the Third Estate in their petition to the King to permit them to continue to meet in the monastery of the Augustins. After it was ascertained from the clergy that they had agreed to help the Third Estate, the nobles also assented. After many intrigues the Baron de Senecey was finally elected president on October 23 by a vote of eleven governments to one. The next day Louis de Montmorency, seigneur de Bouteville, protesting the election, complained that remarks he had made in a private meeting of Ile de France, when told that Senecey had been the Queen's choice for president, had been reported to the Queen. He demanded that

---

1 PV-1, pp. 2-58.
everything that was said in meetings of the Second Estate be kept secret. In the midst of loud protests that the election had not been influenced by the Queen, Senecéy suggested the election of a second president, stating that there were many more capable than he. Henri de Clermont was elected, but the leadership remained in Senecéy’s hands. The deputies had not been able to reach a decision as to their voting and speaking order, and had finally decreed that, in the interim, no order used implied prejudice to rank. The continuing argument was taken to the Council, where on October 25 it was decided that the procedure of the last Estates General in 1588 should be followed except in very special cases.¹

The roll call for the first meeting of the Third Estate was called according to the method used in the Estates General of 1576. Henri de Mesmes, the lieutenant civil and deputy of the provostship and viscounty of Paris, was in charge until the deputies from the city of Paris arrived. The leader of this delegation, Robert Miron, who as provost of merchants was the mayor of Paris, said that the cahier of Paris was not yet ready but that the King had sent them as interim delegates. After a short argument Mesmes found himself ranked below Miron, who was elected as temporary president. When it was time to elect a secretary, a great uproar arose over the alleged attempt of Paris to dominate the assembly. The field was narrowed to three candidates, but the

¹PV-2, pp. 6-47. There is ample evidence of the exaggerated compliments that each order paid the other during the preliminary sessions, but Montcassin noted that he did not record the praise verbatim so that no scandal would be given to any historian who wanted to write an account of these meetings. PV-2, p. 36.
arguments continued until two o'clock in the afternoon when the meeting was finally adjourned. Miron persuaded the assembly to postpone the next meeting until Friday because Paris would then be ready to send its regular delegation. The next meeting was held on Saturday, when the argument over elections continued. Finally at the third meeting, on Monday, October 20, Miron was elected permanent president and M. Halle, the candidate of Normandy, was elected secretary. Mesmes was to serve as president if Miron were absent. The same day two assistants to the secretary were elected. One of these was Pierre Clapisson, whose account of the meetings became the official one. On October 21 the Third Estate took the oath of fidelity and secrecy devised by the clergy for all three orders. Permission to continue meeting in the same place as the other orders was asked for and received from the King on October 25. The nobles had received such permission on October 17. Much of the time of these preliminary meetings was spent in sending and receiving delegations from the other orders. The remaining business of the Third Estate was concerned with problems of representation and arrangements for the procession for the formal opening. The Third Estate handled problems of representation much more efficiently than the other two estates; each government was to settle all but its disputed cases. The deputies, fully conscious of their own dignity and importance, were much concerned with discussing what should be worn in the procession. Miron said that he had the King's permission to wear his robes as provost of merchants, but Mesmes contended that if Miron did this his own office as lieutenant civil entitled him to first place in the procession. Finally, it was decided that everyone should wear plain serge. The clergy, fearing that the Third Estate might upset the order of the procession, sent the Bishop of Comminges on
October 24 to tell them rather curtly to wear something decent and to follow the orders of the King's master of ceremonies. ¹

The court was also much concerned that week with the details of the procession and formal opening of the Estates General. On Sunday morning, October 26, the procession wound its way from the Augustins to Notre Dame, proceeding by the quai of the left bank of the Seine to rue Saint Jacques and then on to the île de la Cité. First came the royal archers carrying torches, then the representatives of the parishes of Paris, the chapters, the rector of the University of Paris, the King's household and troops, and the deputies carrying candles. The Blessed Sacrament was carried before the King and Marie de Médicis, who were followed by various nobles, the Parlement in red robes, and the important officials of Paris. At Notre Dame, Mass was sung and Cardinal de Sourdis preached a sermon on the text from Saint Peter—"Fear God. Honor the King." The deputies had arrived at the Augustins at eight in the morning, the procession had finally started about eleven, and all of the ceremonies were not completed until four in the afternoon. All of this must have been very impressive for the deputies from the provinces, but according to Malherbe, the blasé courtier, "It was not much at all."²

¹PV-3, pp. 1–17. Rapine, pp. 1–38. There can be no doubt that Miron was the candidate of the Queen. A.N. K 674, no. 32 (permission of the King for the Third Estate to meet at the Augustins).

²Lalourcè and Duval, Recueil de pièces, V, 84–86, 91–94. B.N. Cinq Cents 139, foll. 186r–189r. Two arguments broke out during the procession—the first when the cardinals wanted a place nearer the King, the second among the nobles who wanted the procession to start earlier than arranged because they were afraid that rain might fall and
The next day the Estates General were officially opened in the great hall of the Hôtel de Bourbon. This, the largest hall in the kingdom, 220 feet long and 54 feet wide, was used for important balls, ballets, and spectacles of the royal court. For the opening of the Estates General the vast ceiling (about the height of Saint Eustache) and the walls had been entirely covered with painted fleurs-de-lis. At the head of the hall, on the Saint Germain d'Auxerrois side, was a great raised platform three steps above the floor. In the center of this, elevated two steps, was the platform where the royal family sat. The King sat on a throne, raised three steps above this platform. All of the platforms were covered with violet velvet embossed with golden fleurs-de-lis. The important nobles and cardinals sat on the lower platform. In the hall itself, behind various state officials sat the deputies to the Estates General. Separated by a rail from the main floor, and in the balconies, were many of the courtiers. 1

The King spoke first:

Messieurs, I wished to hold this great and notable assembly at the beginning of my majority to let you hear the present state of affairs, to establish good order by means of which God will be served and honored, my poor people comforted, and so that each person will be able to be maintained and conserved in that which


is his, under my protection and authority. I pray and beseech you
to employ yourselves as you should for such a good work. I sol­
emnly promise you that I will make observed and execute all that
will be resolved and directed by this assembly. You will hear my
will more fully through what the Chancellor will say to you.¹

The Chancellor followed Louis’ words with a speech of an hour,
outlining the handling of affairs since the death of Henry IV. Florimond
Rapine, sitting with the Third Estate in the back of the hall, said that
he could only hear the end of the speech when the Chancellor promised
that the King would give a favorable answer to the cahiers. The Arch­
bishop of Lyon spoke for the clergy, praising the King and the faithfulness
of the clergy. Baron du Saint Pierre spoke for the nobles. Ra­
pine’s comment on this speech was that the Baron was long-winded and
took the opportunity to point out how lowborn were the members of the
Third Estate in comparison with the nobles. Miron’s speech, which as
usual included praise for Paris, ended the ceremony.²

The Estates General were now officially in session and their task
had been set before them. They were to decide what should be done to
put the kingdom in good order. The King had promised to heed their
advice. The traditional rights and duties of the Estates General were
that they should be asked for counsel on general policy, that unusual

¹ Isambert, Recueil, XVI, 53.

cueil de pièces, V, 127–141. B.N. MS fr. 10879, foll. 1r–15v. All was
not serene during the opening. At the beginning the nobles and clergy,
after complaining, moved their benches forward. Journal de ce qui
s’est passé aux États généraux de 1614, pp. 26–27.
subsidies should have their approval; they had some power over the
King's attempts to alienate parts of his domain; they could present their
grievances to the King, but the King could answer them as he would.
The Estates General had not suffered any limitation of its traditional
powers; in fact, they seemed to have been widened by the statement of
the King, but whether this extension would be honored or whether even
the basic rights would be respected was yet to be seen.  

The beginning of the Estates General produced the usual flood of
pamphlets expressing popular opinion. Typical examples of advice and
argument were contained in Foucades aux Estats by Gabriel le Bien Venu
Gentilhomme Angoumoisin, Advis au roy sur la réformation générale,
Copie de la harrangue fait en la présence du roy à l'entrée des Estats
par les députéz de la Rochelle pour les églises réformées, and Discours à messieurs les députéz aux États généraux de France. The last
of these reminded the deputies that they were advisors, not judges, that
they were to present remedies for such problems as venality, finances,
offices, pensions, and the overabundance of fortresses and garrisons.
The King would judge whether or not the remedies were good ones.
The author of Advis au Roy spoke in a similar vein, summing up the
thoughts of many Frenchmen in 1614:

Be advised then Sire and begin to see that God is served in
this kingdom, chastize the evil clergy, judges, and financiers.
Then you will see how the torrent of divine grace will overflow
on all sides on the people of your kingdom. On this subject, with
all the extent of my soul, I pray the King of Kings that he will

1 Olivier-Martin, Histoire du droit, pp. 373–377. Andre Lemaire,
pour forth the sacred dew of His love on your head, so that loving Him you will love His Church, render justice to everyone without charge, and in fine comfort, throw out, and raise up his poor people from the evil state to which the great subsidies have reduced them.¹

Along with these pleas for reform there were pamphlets such as Foucald aux Estats and Copie de la harrangue which pleaded the special case of the nobles, Huguenots, and other groups. The problem for the deputies was to reach unanimity of thought and action.²

The deputies who had been charged with these responsibilities represented a cross section of the most important elements of French society in the early seventeenth century. These 471 men from all the provinces of France were a varied lot differing widely in interest and experience.³

¹Discours à messieurs les députéz aux États généraux de France (n.p., n.d.), pp. 3–8, 42, 59. Advis au Roy sur la réformation générale des abus ... en son royaume (n.p., 1614), p. 16. The crown kept a close watch on the Estates General and what was influencing them. Villeroy's secretary wrote to the Sieur de Sainte Catherine on October 21 that it was well known that there were those who were trying to make the Estates General work against the King and to fabricate grossly the evils of the kingdom. B.N. MS fr. 4121, fol. 106r. Jeannin told Edmondes that James I was meddling too much in French affairs. Birch, Historical View, p. 382.


³The following analysis of the deputies of 1614 is based for the most part on material to be found in Appendices I and II.
The 142 deputies of the First Estate represented the most able and prestigious segment of the best organized of the orders. Nothing was left to chance; though not elected, Cardinal Joyeuse, long a leader of church and state, was invited to take part in the meetings, as were Cardinal Bonsy, Archbishop la Valette, and Prince Louis de Lorraine, Duc Archevêque de Reims. Also invited were the two general agents of the clergy, the men whose task it was to represent the First Estate in Paris when the clergy were not meeting in one of their assemblies.

The reform of the Church had been gaining ground since 1589; in fact, in 1614 it was on the eve of the greatest surge forward. The leadership of the reform was in the hands of the bishops, especially men like Cardinal Du Perron, Bishop Jean Pierre Camus of Bellay, and the twenty-nine-year-old Bishop Armand Jean du Plessis of Luçon, better known as Richelieu. Much work remained to be done, especially among the lower clergy, though the higher ranks were affected by plurality of benefice and absenteeism.

The experience and competence of the deputies of the clergy is reflected in their positions and titles. Ten archbishops and fifty bishops, including five cardinals, were the leaders of the meetings of the clergy. Present also were the master generals of the Cistercians.

and Carthusians, a Benedictine and a Victorine abbot, an Augustinian prior, and many others who held as one of their benefices an abbey or priory. In all, seven religious orders were represented by one of their brethren. Diocesan officials comprised the second largest group, next to the bishops. Only fourteen deputies had the title of curé; only seven of these were simple curés without other office, and only two of these did not have an academic title. Sixteen of the clerical deputies held the title of doctor of theology, and five held law degrees.

If secular prestige was necessary, the First Estate in 1614 was represented by a prince, three dukes, and five counts, including five peers of France. But this prestige was not needed. Thirty-five members were councilors state and private of the king, a number of whose names are to be found in the Council records as in attendance during the meeting of the Estates General. Twenty-six other clerical deputies carried the lesser, honorary title of councilor of the king.

In contrast to the clergy, who had a tradition of national assembly dating back to 1560, the other two estates had very few men with similar experience; six nobles and seven members of the Third Estate who were present at the meeting of 1614 had served in previous Estates General.¹

The most striking result of a study of the nobles in 1614 is that few of the important nobles sat in the Estates General. J. Russell Major points out that it was not the custom for the really important nobles to even consider election to the Estates General, that the percentage of higher nobility (princes, marquises, and counts) who sat in the Estates

¹ Major, Deputies, p. 166.
General increased from 2.9 per cent in 1588, the last full Estates General, to 16.9 per cent in 1614, while the percentage of lower nobility (barons, seigneurs, and equerries) fell from 90.2 to 77.9 during the same period, and that many of the nobles elected to the Estates General were from locally important families. However, when the nobles are compared with the clergy their lack of organization and their failure to utilize their most competent and powerful men becomes painfully evident.

The nobles of France in 1614 were, in theory, leaders of the secular life of the nation. Yet while members of the Third Estate were moving into the ranks of the nobility at what must have seemed an alarming rate, the nobles found themselves cut off from all the important administrative, judicial, and financial offices by the practice of venality of office which raised the price of offices beyond their means, limited by feudal dues and inflation, as the offices were sold and resold, each time at a profit. At the same time many of the important appointive offices of the court were held by clerics. Left to the nobles were such positions as gentlemen of the bedchamber and military offices. Commoners were even making inroads into the higher echelons of the army. The nobles could complain, which they did, attempt a revolt, which some had, or depend on their feudal incomes and subsidies from the crown and live the life of the courtier or local grandee.

Out of a total of 135 members from the Second Estate in 1614, twenty-seven were baillis or seneschals, but this position had lost its

---

1 Ibid., 137-138.

importance; the lieutenants general and governors were now the most important local royal officials. None of the noble deputies of 1614 held the former office; only eleven were governors. Left to the nobles were their social and tax privileges, which at times were threatened, and their pride.

The lowly Third Estate sent as deputies in 1614 one viscount, two barons, fifteen seigneurs, six equerries, and fifty-one sieurs out of a total of 194 deputies. Also present were twenty-six men who signed themselves as noble homme, which in the fluid society of the time meant that they were just below, if not partly in, the ranks of the nobility.

Judicious marriage alliances explained part of this rise to the status of nobility, as it explains the speed with which all three orders knew what the others were doing in 1614—some families had members in all three estates. But the basic reason is to be found in the practice of buying and selling offices which enabled the prosperous merchant to secure positions for his sons which would add to the family fortune and yet replace the onus of mercantile background with that of the officer class and thereby prepare the way for a marriage into a noble family. The officer also had a chance to become a noble by buying an office that carried noble rank with it or by attracting the favor of the King.¹

But if the important members of the Third Estate were moving into the ranks of what would be called the nobles of the robe, they had not

¹Birch, Historical View, pp. 434–435. Mousnier, Venalité, pp. 506–541. The meeting in Normandy for elections to the Estates General of 1614 shows the conflicts that arose over who was noble and who was not, and how officers took on titles. B.N. MS fr. 11916, fol. 1r–5r.
left behind them their practical abilities. The Third Estate was by no means as well organized before the meeting of the Estates General as the clergy, nor equipped with a tradition of experience in national assemblies. But a great number of the deputies in 1614 came prepared with valuable experience. Seventy deputies were lieutenants general, particular, civil, or criminal, or presidents of presidial seats. Eighteen were members of one of the parlements of France. Four held royal financial offices, eleven were mayors, and twenty-nine were town councilmen. Only nineteen members held no administrative, judicial, or financial office, and nine of these were lawyers. Five of the remaining ten called themselves bourgeoisie, one was a merchant, one a rural inhabitant, and three were listed only as sieurs.

The course that the members of each of the estates were to follow began to be apparent in the next few weeks. Meetings were few; time was devoted to battling over representation and in beginning the process of drawing up the provincial cahiers, the compilations of the cahiers of the bailliages of each government that in turn would be used as the basis for the general cahiers. The clergy invited the other two estates to join them in receiving Communion at Notre Dame on All Saints' Day. The nobles again took the opportunity to abuse the Third Estate, trying unsuccessfully to prevent the clergy from arranging seating space for them in the church.1

On Friday, November 7, the clergy voted to ask the King to accept the decrees of the Council of Trent. At the insistence of the

---

delegates of chapters this was modified the next day to include the statement that the acceptance of the decrees of the council was in no way to interfere with the rights of the Gallican Church. On November 6 the clergy had requested the King’s permission that matters of special importance to all three orders be discussed jointly and then presented to the King. In the interim before the King’s refusal was received on November 8 this request of the clergy for general meetings and special petitions to the King caused the Third Estate great anxiety. They were afraid that the clergy were beginning a general campaign for the acceptance of the Council of Trent and were visibly relieved when the King replied that he wanted no special requests. The Estates General should proceed separately and quickly with their traditional work, the preparation of their cahiers. However, through the influence of Cardinal Joyeuse, who visited Villeroy, who in turn spoke to the King and Queen, the clergy won permission to present some special pleas, and if their majesties and the Council thought it proper, they would look into them.  

On Saturday, November 8, the Second Estate discussed two proposals that were also to have repercussions. The King was to be asked to delay the payment of the paulette until February so that the Estates General would have time to discuss it, and a commission was set up to discuss financial abuses.  

Much of the debate in the Third Estate centered around Miron and the undue influence of Paris in the assembly. There was great objection

---

1 PV-1, pp. 82-107.

2 PV-2, pp. 61-69.
to Miron's taking orders from the Queen as to what should be discussed by the Third Estate. Then on November 7 the deputies decided to ask the First and Second estates to join them in a request for the suspension of extraordinary commissions and some new offices while the Estates General studied them. The next day the nobles agreed to back them, but the clergy said they needed more time to study the problem.\footnote{PV-3, pp. 22-39.}

The following week the nobles asked the clergy to support them in asking for the suspension of the paulette. The clergy decided first to inform the Third Estate. This request of the nobles first reached the ears of the Third Estate on the following day, November 14, and all of a sudden the Estates General were jolted into full action. The details of representation and precedence fell far into the background as the Estates General grappled with their first real issue.\footnote{PV-1, pp. 104-107. PV-2, pp. 69-71. PV-3, pp. 39-44.}
CHAPTER V

OFFICES AND FINANCES, NOVEMBER 14 TO DECEMBER 14

The French government in the last centuries of the Old Regime was a government by officers. The kings in effect, though not consciously, gave up part of their sovereign power to a new caste of administrators and judges. This caste eventually separated the king and the people and helped precipitate the French Revolution.

Originally an officer simply served as an administrator of part of the king's domain. But as the notion of the "state" became more precise the officer was considered to have been delegated part of the public power by the king. The turning point in the development came in the Ordinance of 1467, which provided that an office returned to the disposition of the king only in case of the death of the officer, his resignation, or forfeiture of the office. Despite all attempts to modify the provision of the ordinance, it stood. But in the process a new form of office was created by the kings, one over which they had more power—the commission, or, as it was known in 1614, the extraordinary commission. The commissioner was given a special task for a limited time by the king; his function and office could be revoked at any time at the will of the king. These officers became more and more common in the sixteenth century as judicial commissioners, as representatives of the
king at provincial estates, and most notoriously as collectors of various taxes. When extended to administrative affairs, as was done, the precedent that resulted in the appointing of intendants by Richelieu was established.

The usual reason behind the surrender of royal power was the crown's need for money, as the state became more centralized and complex. The practice of selling offices originated in the Middle Ages and was not limited to France, but with the growth of power of the French officials venality had a singular effect in France; buying and selling of offices became a profitable business and a means of social advancement, while the welfare of France suffered and many of the powers of the king were exercised by unworthy men.

Developing along with venality was a usage adapted from ecclesiastics, that of resignation of benefices. It became the custom that a man could resign an office to a person of his own choosing without interference from the king. As a logical extension of this, survivance (reversion) became common, whereby the officer could pass his office on to someone in his will. An office became a personal possession.

In the fourteenth, fifteenth, and sixteenth centuries there were almost continual protests and a number of laws against this system, especially when judicial officers more and more were permitted to avail themselves of these practices near the end of the fifteenth century. However, Francis I's pressing need for money led him to take another step, the creation and selling of large numbers of offices. In an attempt to regulate resignations and reversions, which accounted for most of the traffic in offices, Francis I forbade the latter and proclaimed what became known as the "provision of forty days," that if a man who resigned an office died within forty days of this resignation the office
reverted to the disposition of the king. The growing need for money and the nature of law enforcement in the Old Regime continually interfered, however, with the attempts at reform by Francis I and the efforts of the Estates General to reduce the number of officers.

In 1568 it was proclaimed that all officers who paid a tax of one-third the value of their office within two months (or one-half after that) would have the right to resign any time they wished without fear of the provision of forty days, and if they died without making provision for passing on their office, their heirs were to be permitted to freely dispose of the office. By the end of the sixteenth century there was a vast complex of contradictory laws applicable to venality. Sully, despairing of reforming the system and himself in need of money, devised with the Council in 1604 a new system known as the droit annuel or paulette, after the name of the finance official Paulet, who was placed in charge of the collection of the new tax. Instead of paying a tax equal to one-third of the value of the office all at one time, the officers were now to pay a tax equal to one-sixtieth the value of the office each year. On resignation a tax of one-eighth of the value was to be paid. The provision of forty days was revoked, and if the officeholder did not resign before his death his family was allowed to dispose of the office as they wished.¹

¹For the best discussion of the paulette and offices see Doucet, Institutions, I, 403–420. The English ambassador George Carew wrote in 1607 that France was prosperous because of the wise rule of Henry IV, but that it would be more so “. . . were it not that all offices being vendible in this kingdom, the merchants employ their money rather in buying offices than in exercising traffick because officers wives go before merchants wives.” Birch, Historical View, pp. 434–435.
From 1608 Henry IV carried out a policy of suppressing unnecessary offices. This was continued under the regency. The execution of numerous edicts of creation of office was delayed, and more were revoked on July 22, 1610. In an attempt to keep the officers happy, the annual law was extended to higher offices on September 27, 1611 (first presidents of the Cour des Comptes and Cours des Aides, lieutenants general civil of presidial seats), and by dispensation from the "forty days" when these officers gave the position to a son or one of his family.

But one of the policies of the regency was to aid the poorer nobility, whose support was needed. In an effort to help them the rules for passing on an office were liberalized, and in the case of death it was provided that the office was to be sold at a much lower price. This of course lessened the advantages of the paulette for the officers, who made a great profit in selling their offices. Parlement was quick to object, and since the loyalty of the provincial parlements was especially necessary the old conditions were restored on March 29, 1612. This satisfied the officers but not the gentlemen, who were practically excluded because of the continually rising price of the offices. The complaints of the numerous "clients" of the great nobles was one of the reasons for the break between the government and these men in February, 1614.

The monarchy of the Old Regime had never been able to reorganize its finances because it was faced every day with the shortage of

---

1 Mousnier, Venalité, pp. 566-568.

2 Ibid., 622-624.
money and therefore the necessity of credit. There never was a breathing space to allow a reorganization. This fact of life forced Henry IV to institute the paulette. Always there was the need for men to advance credit; it would not have been wise to pay too close attention to how these men got the necessary money. The grant of tax collection to the Farmers General, the abuses of the officers, and the speculations of the royal collectors had the same underlying cause: the absence of solidly established credit and the absence of a national bank, which would have given the treasury money free from the machinations of the financiers and businessmen. The complaints of the French people were centered on these middlemen, the so-called "partisans," especially their indirect taxes and fiscal monopolies, but the basic problem was that France was becoming a centralized national state without those two necessary prerequisites—public credit and a national bank. There had been an attempt to set up a national bank in 1608, a year before the Bank of Amsterdam was founded, which was approved by the royal council, but the man who had proposed the idea, Pierre de Fontenu, was not able to raise the prescribed capital of 1,500,000 livres. There would be other attempts in 1644 and 1674. These failed also. Small wonder; those who benefited from the old system and who had the necessary money to back the ventures—the officers—were very much opposed.

The general situation in France in the first third of the seventeenth century was that prices continued to rise, though not as sharply as they had in the sixteenth century. Those that suffered most were of course the nobles, and payment to them of subsidies by the crown was one of the basic causes of trouble in 1614—the nobles insisted that they were not receiving enough; the Third Estate felt that they were receiving far too much. 1

On Friday, November 14, the clergy informed the nobles that, although they would prefer to take up the problem of the paulette in the cahiers, they would join in a request that it be suppressed during the deliberations of the Estates General. However, they insisted on informing the Third Estate of this decision. Later in the day the clergy agreed to add to the original request a protest against the irregularities of the gabelle, the salt tax which required that all the inhabitants of France, except those in the border provinces, buy a certain amount of salt from royal storehouses. The nobles claimed that the collection of this tax was ruining many of them. 2

In the meantime the Third Estate had also been discussing the problem of the paulette. On the previous Thursday Pierre Rival,
of Montbasson, a deputy from Lyonnais, had introduced a plan to abolish the paulette and had been shouted down by the other deputies. On Saturday, November 15, Raymond de Montagne, lieutenant of the Sénéchaussée of Saintonge in Guyenne, rose to offer a modification of Rival’s plan which together with abolition of the paulette called for revocation of all pensions and reduction of the taille, the principal direct tax, to the level of 1576. Just as he was making this proposal, a delegation from the nobles entered the chamber to inform the deputies of their plan to suppress the paulette. The Third Estate spent the rest of the morning in a furious debate over the proposal and finally informed the clergy and the nobles that if they wanted support then the Estates General would have to give united support to Montagne’s plan with the modification that pensions and venality of office be suspended and the taille be reduced by one-fourth during the meeting of the Estates General. The nobles refused point-blank to listen to such a proposal, and the clergy tried futilely to convince the enraged deputies of the Third Estate that for the moment it was unwise so to enlarge the issue. At noon the Estates General were at an impasse. 1

All three orders met again at three o’clock to continue the argument. The deputations they sent from chamber to chamber became so stormy and confused that the chroniclers’ accounts vary in reporting the order they followed. The nobles stood their ground. The clergy, in the privacy of their own chamber, admitted the justice of the Third

---

1 PV-1, pp. 112–117. PV-2, pp. 74–77. PV-3, pp. 44–49. Rapine, pp. 99–100, 103–110. B.N. MS fr. 10876, foll. 21r–25r. MS fr. 18256, pp. 35–37. Miron had not wanted an afternoon meeting because he was supposed to attend a meeting on money reform at the Hôtel de Ville.
Estate's position, but tried desperately to convince the deputies that only the nobles' requests should be presented to the Queen at that time. They were fearful that nothing could be gained unless the Estates General proceeded carefully.

The clergy were able to persuade the Second and Third estates to remain in session far beyond the usual time in an attempt to reach agreement. But any hope of agreement had already been killed earlier that afternoon by a speech delivered by Jean Savaron, the voluble deputy from Bas Auvergne, in the chamber of the Second Estate. In presenting the case for the Third Estate he freely expressed the strong emotions felt by those deputies. He further infuriated the nobles by presenting his own version of history. The French people had overthrown Roman rule when taxation became too heavy; once again the people were too heavily taxed, and it was feared that once again the people would arise.

The Third Estate continued to maintain that if it must sacrifice its prerogative in the matter of the paulette (as most of the deputies had been commissioned to do), then the Second Estate must sacrifice their pensions, and the people must be freed of part of their tax burden. The nobles countered that the arguments regarding their pensions were fallacious. Finally at eight o'clock in the evening the clergy abandoned its efforts to reconcile these opposing interests and recessed until Monday. They were followed shortly by the other two orders.  

1 PV-1, pp. 117–122. PV-2, pp. 77–78. PV-3, pp. 49–51. Rapine, pp. 112–118. A large number of pamphlets, written by nobles, lawyers, and officers, on the subject of the paulette appeared in 1614–1615. Among them were: Advis, remonstrances et requestes aux Estats généraux tenus
The morning of November 17 was filled with further negotiations among the orders. Cardinal Du Perron explained to the Third Estate that the nobles were so insistent about the paulette that the clergy had been forced to support their request, but that this would not prevent them from later joining the Third Estate in its requests. The nobles refused to discuss the matter further. The Third Estate, through Savaron, maintained that if some venality were to be done away with all must be, including pensions.  

At eleven o'clock in the morning representatives from the three orders went across the Seine to the Louvre. Cardinal de Sourdis spoke to the King and Queen. He asked that the paulette be suppressed until the Estates General had fully discussed the matter. He also complained of the salt tax provisions. Then Savaron spoke for the program of the Third Estate and again widened the breach between the orders. He repeated his comments of November 15 and added, "But some ask

à Paris par six paysans (n.p., n.d.); Advis au Roy sur la réformation générale des abus ... en son royaume (n.p., 1614); Anatomie des trois ordres de la France sur le sujet des estats (n.p., 1615), most probably by a jurist; Le Censeur (n.p., 1615); Le conseiller fidèle à son roy (n.p., n.d.); Discours pour la conservation de l'annuel des offices (n.p., n.d.); Discours sur l'droit annuel (n.p., n.d.); Libre discours et véritable jugement sur l'heredité des offices insinuée en France, dans le doux venim du droit annuel (Paris, 1615), the anonymous author claimed to be a deputy to the Estates General.

1 PV-1, pp. 123-125. PV-2, pp. 78-79. PV-3, pp. 51-53. Among the six pamphlets that Savaron wrote in 1614-1615 was one on the paulette and venality. Starting with a long historical analysis he finished by saying that if the paulette were abolished all venality must be done away with or nothing would be accomplished. Jean Savaron, Traicté de l'annuel et venalité des offices. ... (Paris, 1615).
you, Sire, to abolish the paulette, which fills your coffers with the 16,000 livres your officers pay you each year; however, they do not ask that you suppress the excess pensions that are so outrageous that there are great and powerful kingdoms which do not receive as revenue what you give to your subjects to buy their loyalty. Is it not wrong to ignore and to misunderstand the law of nature, of God, and of the kingdom to serve one’s king for money ... ?” The King and Queen answered that the Estates General should hasten the preparation of their cahiers and that within a few days contentment would be given in what had been asked. They also promised that the Estates General would be presented with an account of finances for the period of the regency.

On Thursday, November 20, the Estates General were notified by the clergy—who throughout the meetings seem to have been in close contact with the Queen and Council, probably through the cardinals De Sourdis and Rochefoucault—that the King had granted the suspension of the paulette during the meeting of the Estates General.

The Third Estate had spent Tuesday and Wednesday working on the preparation of their provincial cahiers. By the time they met again in full session on Thursday the nobles had lodged a complaint with the clergy demanding that the Third Estate make amends for Savaron’s remarks. The clergy sent Richelieu, bishop of Luçon, to the Third Estate

---


to ask them to repair the situation. By four o’clock in the afternoon of Monday, November 24, an acceptable formula had been found, but the delegation from the Third Estate, accompanied by the clergy, did not appear before the nobles until eight o’clock that evening. Henri de Mesmes, speaking for the Third Estate, repeated the bland statement that his order had meant no offense. But he did not pass by the opportunity to reply to a remark made by one of the nobles to the effect that Savaron was no better than a lackey. He also replied to the aspersion that the members of the Third Estate were only the cadets of France. He said that all three orders were brothers and it sometimes fell to the youngest to fulfill duties left undone by its elders. After Mesmes had left, the nobles complained that they had again been insulted—they were not the brothers of the Third Estate! The clergy agreed that they, too, had been insulted by this statement. The First and Second estates recessed their meetings in righteous indignation at ten o’clock that evening.¹

On November 26 the Third Estate learned that the King and Queen had been informed of the trouble in the Estates General and had asked the clergy to make peace. By this time they were heartily sick of the whole business and agreed to make satisfaction. The quarrel had

become so vexing that at one point some of the members had wanted to stop sending deputations to the nobles, because they took offense so easily that soon all members of their assembly would have been used in the business and would be personally involved in quarrels with the nobles. The clergy, too, had almost given up in their attempts to pacify the nobles, but they continued to strive for a settlement. By December 3 they had worked out a formula. The Third Estate, upon hearing it, again broke into argument as to whether it was too servile since they had never intended any offense in the first place. But Mesmes admitted that his words had not been well chosen, and finally on December 5 peace was restored. A delegation from the Third Estate was sent to the nobles to thank them for the support they had given to one of the Third Estate’s most vital projects. On December 4 the nobles had joined with the Third Estate in presenting to the King a petition for the revocation of extraordinary commissions and the suspension of one-fourth of the taille. To their expression of gratitude the delegates added some general remarks on the greatness of the nobility, without, however, mentioning their alleged offenses. This was enough for the nobles, not because their pride had become less, but because they now needed support from the Third Estate for a project of their own.¹

The deputies were absorbed in their internal quarrels and in their struggles to reform the financial and administrative structure of the kingdom, but the city of Paris paid little attention to them. As Pontchartrain describes the situation, the great subject of interest in Paris

during the second half of November was the affair of the Duc d’Epernon. The activities of Epernon had recently threatened to precipitate a war between the Empire and France, and now in Paris he seemed to be about to provoke further trouble involving Condé. A soldier, Jean Scaron, had been charged with dueling and had been placed in the prison of the Faubourg Saint Germain des Près. Epernon had freed him by force on November 14 on the grounds that as a member of the Guards he could be tried only by the provost of troops. The case was taken to the Parlement of Paris for consideration; on November 19 Epernon, with fifty or sixty of his followers in boots and spurs, marched up and down in the courtyard of Parlement as the members were leaving for the day. The members of Parlement interpreted this action as hostile to their authority. Their resentment was encouraged by Condé, who appeared in Parlement almost every day. The King, however, feared more serious trouble and prevailed upon Parlement to drop the matter. If Scaron were returned to prison and Epernon presented his excuses, the question of jurisdiction could be settled through regular procedures. Such arrangements were completed on November 28. To conciliate Condé the regency Council of Direction was suppressed and he and Bouillon were made members of a newly organized Particular Council of Finances which was to meet once a week. The court also began negotiations to gain re-entry to the town of Poitiers for several of Condé’s followers, a right finally granted at the end of January.  

1 Pontchartrain, Mémoires, p. 337. Epernon had been one of Marie’s supporters in 1610 and continued to support the Spanish marriages. Since then he had fallen from favor and several years later would cause trouble. But he and Condé were implacable enemies. Mouton, Le duc,
Paris and the author of Gazette des Estats et de ce temps may have dismissed the Estates General and concentrated their attention on Epernon and Condé, but it is evident that the court did not. In a letter dated December 1, 1614, Villeroy's secretary reported to the Sieur de Sainte Catherine in Germany that the Estates General were becoming insolent and questioning the affairs of the King and Queen and their ministers. In spite of their continuing disagreements, the Estates General were moving forward in their attempts to reform the kingdom. ¹

The Second and Third estates continued to press for reforms of offices and finances. Between November 20 and December 1 the nobles worked out a plan to ask the King for establishment of a chamber of justice on finances to look into the activities of the financiers. They then sought to exert influence to persuade the other orders to join them in this plea. On December 1, when a deputation from the nobles visited the clergy, Cardinal de Sourdis pointed out that the financiers had powerful friends. Even Henry IV had not been able to bring about their

¹ Gazette des Estats et de ce temps du Seig'gio seritour, de Pieragrosa. Traduite d'ltalien en François le premier janvier 1615 (n.p., n.d.). B.N. MS fr. 4121, fol. 111r.
reform. The nobles persisted, and on December 5 the clergy and the Third Estate agreed to meet with them to discuss the financial investigation.

At this meeting held in the chamber of the First Estate on Saturday, December 6, the nobles presented their plan for the chamber on finances to representatives of the other estates and promised that it could save the King 12,000,000 livres. On December 10 the First and Third estates agreed to join in asking for the chamber. The request was presented to Louis and Marie and was refused on December 12. The deputies declined to abandon their project. On December 16 they again presented their plea, this time adding the request that deputies to the Estates General sit in the chamber. The Queen replied that when the cahiers were finished the Estates General would receive satisfaction. If such a chamber were organized at present, it would impede the progress of the Estates General. The nobles, however, continued to plead for their chamber. 2

---

1PV-1, pp. 175–176, 194–196. PV-2, pp. 88–106, 111–114. PV-3, pp. 74–76. A chamber of justice was set up to investigate the methods of the financiers on January 17, 1607, but it was abolished by September. The requests of the nobles in 1614 had no results. A chamber was again set up in October, 1624. The same year exceptions began to be made, and on May 16, 1625, the chamber was abolished because too many were found to be guilty. B.N. MS fr. 4310, fol. 97r–303v, 304r–414v. It would seem that even men like Sully and Richelieu were not completely above making a profit at the expense of the Treasury. Tapie, Louis XIII, pp. 77–78.

In the meantime the Third Estate had been absorbed in working out its own plan for reform, a memoir asking for the suppression of extraordinary commissions and new offices. The clergy agreed to join them in presenting the memoir to the King, if they in turn would support the clergy in their particular requests. But Henri de Mesmes reported to the Third Estate on November 29 that Chancellor Sillery had informed him that, instead of presenting the memoir to the King, six representatives should be sent to confer with him. Each of the estates was to send six representatives to the meeting, but the Third Estate insisted that it should be represented by double that number since it had the greatest interest in the affair. In what might be called a fore­shadowing of the events of 1789, the Third Estate won its point and sent twelve deputies to the meeting. This course may have been prompted by the threat of the nobles during the debate over the pau­lette that the clergy and nobles together could outvote them. Miron had replied that they would see about that when a disagreement arose.1

The representatives of the estates met with Sillery on December 4, but little was accomplished at this first meeting. On December 5 the Third Estate was informed that the King would enforce the edict of 1610 suppressing certain commissions and edicts, but that it was impossible

---

to reduce the taille by one-quarter. The Third Estate immediately began again to ask for the reduction of the taille and continued to do so throughout the Estates General, sometimes alone, sometimes with the support of the other orders, in spite of Miron’s warning that this might so exasperate the King that he would not grant anything. On December 10 and 11 Sillery again met with the representatives of the estates who gave him a complete list of suppressions desired. This was presented to the King and accepted. At this meeting Jeannin gave a short account of the state of finances and told the deputies that he would be glad to provide further information. The deputies were empowered only to discuss the suppressions of extraordinary commissions but told the Superintendent of Finances that the Estates General would like more information. The Chancellor pointed out that the King was not required to give information, but that he would do so to show his good will. The next meeting was set for December 13.¹

¹PV-1, pp. 186, 197, 215-216. PV-2, pp. 109, 118. PV-3, pp. 72-73. Rapine, pp. 170, 179, 188. On December 20, 1614, the Cour des Aides registered an edict of the King of the preceding June that contained thirty-one regulations reducing and stopping exemptions from the taille. Various lesser royal officials were affected: greffiers, taille collectors, and masters of the mines. Edict du Roy sur le règlement et retranchement des exemptes des tailles (Paris, 1615). The Cour des Aides had tried to resist registering this edict. The King published the edict promised on December 5 on December 16. Articles présentées au roi par les députés de la chambre du tiers État de France avec les réponses de sa majesté (Paris, 1615), pp. 16-31. There were some further concessions in a series of articles dated between December 16, 1614, and January 12, 1615. Articles accordés par le roi aux trois ordres des Estats de ce royaume (Lyon, 1615).
Work on the provincial cahiers had been progressing while the various schemes for financial reform were being debated. Each of the estates had also turned its attention to its own particular concerns. The clergy had gained the King's promise that investigation of franc­fiefs would be halted for three months. On November 29 agreement was reached on the wording of the article of their cahier on the Council of Trent. The reformers yielded to those, especially the members of cathedral chapters, who insisted that the rights of the King and the Gal­lican Church were not to be prejudiced by the decrees of Trent. On December 3 they decided that the meeting of the Assembly of Clergy should begin on March 1, 1615.1

The nobles had continued to appoint small groups to evaluate the stream of petitions and pleas for reform that were presented to them. They also interested themselves in trying to find a means of seeking satisfaction in affairs of honor without resorting to dueling; the marshals of France were asked for assistance, but they replied that they could not act without the King's permission. The nobles made some progress in making heard their complaints on the gabelles and the proposed re-evaluation of money.2

The Third Estate had spent its time in debating the quarrel with the nobles and in preparing the memoir on extraordinary commissions.


2 PV-2, pp. 78-132. The reform of monetary values had already been started by the officials of Paris on the orders of the King. On December 31 the King would augment the wages of the councilors, greffiers, secretaries of the king's household and crown, and other officers, taking the money from the revenues of the salt tax. Edict du roy sur la règlement et retranchement des exemptes des tailles, p. 18.
Evidently feeling that the Estates General were drawing to a close, on December 12 they elected Miron to speak and present the cahiers at the closing of the Estates General. The debate over this election was bitter. At first Mesmes was to have a place in the ceremonies, but Miron, through intrigues, the force of his office, and the intervention of Marie de Médicis, who warned Mesmes to withdraw from the race, was elected as the sole representative of the Third Estate. 1

The clergy had begun the reading of their provincial cahiers on December 5. Instead of reading each cahier separately, they decided on six general topics and then read all of the relevant articles from each of the provincial cahiers concerning each topic. On December 12 Cardinal de Sourdis interrupted the regular work to push through articles for the general cahier supporting the rule of Marie de Médicis, including support for her foreign policy and the Spanish marriages. The First Estate also worked on a proposal to be presented to the King asking for a reform of the Council; they wanted the membership of the Council permanently reduced to a stipulated number of men drawn from all three estates. 2

Early in December the nobles had also begun to read the cahiers of each government in full assembly prior to drawing up the general cahier. On December 13 the Third Estate was ready to begin reading its provincial cahiers. However, Miron and Mesmes were absent at the time, conferring with the nobles concerning the chamber on finances. Israel Desneux, a deputy of Paris, tried to preside, but the other

---


2PV-1, pp. 174–226.
members refused, saying that Paris had taken too many honors already. Claude Mochet, deputy of Dijon, was elected. At this the deputies of Paris, whose cahier was to be read first and form the model for the general cahier, stalked out of the chamber, cahier in hand. It was impossible to continue with the planned business, but the Third Estate continued the session so that the election of Mochet would be confirmed. The members listened to a report by Pierre Marmiesse of Toulouse, who was gaining quite a reputation as an eloquent speaker. He described the speech he had delivered to the Second Estate on December 10—a speech that had repaired most of the damage Savaron had caused.  

But if the breach between the Second and Third estates had been healed, the Third Estate was about to take a step that would alienate the First Estate. This time the argument would be much more serious. When the Third Estate began to read the cahier of Paris and the Ile de France on Monday, December 15, and unanimously approved the first article of that cahier calling for the proclamation, as a fundamental law of France, that the king had no temporal or spiritual superior within his kingdom, the whole controversy over Gallicanism, the Jesuits, the sovereignty of the king, and the power of the clergy would be opened.  

---


CHAPTER VI

THE FIRST ARTICLE OF THE THIRD ESTATE,
DECEMBER 15, 1614, TO JANUARY 16, 1615

By the afternoon of Monday, December 15, the clergy began to hear rumors about the action taken by the Third Estate that morning regarding the first article of its general cahier. On the grounds that it was not within the province of the Estates General to discuss the power of the pope, the clergy decided to ask the Queen to suppress this article. But they learned the specific details only gradually, and the full effects of what came to be known as the "First Article of the Third" were not felt for another week.¹

During that week the Estates General continued their regular business. The Third Estate went on with the preparation of its general cahier. On the afternoon of December 15 Claude le Doux, lieutenant general of Everux and author of one of the accounts of the Estates General, proposed two articles for the introduction of the general cahier. The first expressed approval of the Spanish marriages. This caused a spirited debate. Finally a compromise proposed by representatives from Orléans was accepted. In the cahier the Queen was to be thanked in general terms for her efforts toward peace, and the King

¹PV-1, pp. 239–240.
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was to be asked in person to carry out the plans for the Spanish marriages. The second article asked the Queen to answer the cahiers without modification by Parlement and before the deputies left Paris. This article was accepted, although the reference to Parlement was deleted for fear of offending that body which, in spite of its hostility, many of the deputies thought could be helpful. ¹

The bargaining within the Estates General continued, with each order trying to secure support from the other orders for its particular requests in return for its promise of support. The Third Estate was still trying to gain a reduction of the taille. The clergy wanted reform of the King’s Council and new regulations for nomination to benefices. The nobles were still petitioning the King for the establishment of a chamber of finances. ²

On December 20 the chief financial officers of the kingdom led by Jeannin came to each of the estates to assure the deputies that the chamber of finances would be granted, but that it would be made up of members of the sovereign courts. The nobles immediately proposed the plan that the Estates General choose these members of the courts and that one-half of the number be from the estates. They asked Jeannin also to petition the King to publish an edict permitting the Estates General to remain in session until the cahiers were answered.³

Jeannin read his promised report on finances to the First and Second estates, but the Third Estate refused to hear him because the

¹PV-3, pp. 92–102. B.N. MS fr. 10876, foll. 45r–48r.
³PV-2, pp. 132–156.
report was not detailed enough. This greatly irritated the court, but Jean Nin was permitted to inform the orders that a more detailed financial report would be given to a select committee from each order. The Third Estate continued to demand a written report until December 22 when, without stating any reason, they permitted Jean Nin’s report to be read to them.¹

The Estates General, however, went on asking for a more detailed financial report to be given openly to all the deputies and negotiating to obtain their particular requests in spite of their growing preoccupation with the debate over the First Article of the Third. As yet the other estates had not seen a copy of the article with which the Third Estate had agreed to begin its general cahier, but information about its wording and its implications had been spreading among the deputies. Although the deliberations of each order were supposedly private, information about the activities of each circulated rapidly by word of mouth. Tension was growing in the Estates General; it seemed evident that the Gallican sentiments of the Third Estate were about to clash openly with the ultramontanist spirit and philosophy current in this assembly of the First Estate. Under the influence of reform bishops such as Du Perron the clergy deviated from their usual Gallican position on the very fundamental question of clerical versus temporal power.²

¹B.N. MS fr. 18256, pp. 136–143. B.N. MS fr. 10876, foll. 54v–57v. The court’s position was that the matter of finances was too delicate and too important for a full public report to be made.

The First Article of the Third declared, as a fundamental law of the kingdom, that the King was sovereign over all powers, spiritual and temporal, within his kingdom. The Third Estate, the King's pauvre sujets, so long abused in spirit and pride by its "betters," displayed its strength and arrogance in the defense of its article. In their wording of the article the deputies did nothing to mollify the sentiments of the clergy:

That, to arrest the course of the pernicious doctrine which was introduced several years ago by seditious spirits against kings and sovereign powers established by God and which troubles and subverts them: the King shall be asked to declare in the assembly of his Estates as a Fundamental Law of the Kingdom, which shall be inviolable and known to all: that since he is known to be sovereign in his state, holding his crown from God alone, that there is no power on earth whatever, spiritual or temporal, which has any authority over his kingdom, to deprive the sacred persons of our kings, nor to dispense nor to absolve their subjects of the fidelity or obedience which they owe for any pretext whatsoever. That all subjects, of whatever quality or condition they might be, shall hold this Law to be holy and true as conforming to the word of God, without distinction, equivocation or any limitation. This shall be sworn to and signed by all the deputies of the Estates and in the future by all who hold benefices and all officers of the kingdom before they take possession of their benefices or receive their offices. All tutors, regents, doctors, and preachers shall teach and publish this. That the contrary opinion, that it is lawful to kill or depose our kings, to rise up and rebel against them, to shake off the yoke of their obedience, for whatever reason, is impious, detestable, against truth, and against the establishment of the State of France, which is responsible only to God. That all books which teach such a false and pernicious opinion shall be held to be seditious and damnable. All foreigners who shall write and publish such are sworn enemies of the crown. All subjects of his Majesty who hold to this, of whatever quality and condition they might be, shall be rebels and violaters of the fundamental laws of the kingdom and guilty of treason in the first degree. And if any book or discourse is found which contains a proposition
directly or indirectly contrary to this law written by a foreigner, cleric or not, the ecclesiastics of the same orders established in France will be obliged to respond to it, impugning and contradicting it incessantly without deference, ambiguity nor equivocation, under pain of receiving the same punishment as above, as abettors of the enemies of this state. And this first article shall be read each year in the Sovereign Courts and in the courts of the bailiages and sénéchaussées of this kingdom at the opening of the sessions so that it will be guarded and observed with all severity and rigor.¹

Most of the wording of the article came from the provincial cahier of Paris and the Ile de France, the strongest center of Gallicanism. But during the voting for the acceptance of the article, three other governments pointed out that their cahiers contained similar provisions. In the cahier of Normandy the third article in the chapter on the church stated that the king was sovereign in his state and that no power on this earth had any control over the temporal power of the king. The fifteenth article of the cahier of Champagne and articles in the cahiers of the bailliages of Troyes and Vitry declared that the king's power was absolute and that the rights of the Gallican church should be upheld. An article in the cahier of Lyonnais defended the king against any attack on his life. Of the twelve governments, only Guyenne and Orléans expressed any objection to the article. Guyenne, however, withdrew its inquiry about terminology. Orléans' only objection was to the designation fundamental law.²

¹Rapine, pp. 205–206.

²Ibid., 207–211. B.N. MS fr. 18256, pp. 103–108. The cahier of the city of Lyon does not have an article similar to the First Article of the Third, A. Mun. Lyon AA 146, foll. 1r–22v. The cahier of the nobles
The most controversial sections of the article had originated with the Third Estate of Paris. Cardinal Ubaldini and other opponents of the article accused the former syndic and the rector of the University of Paris of responsibility in the formulation of the ideas. The syndic, Edmund Richard, had written an anti-Jesuit, pro-Gallican book in 1611, *Libellus de theologica et politica potestate*. The Parlement of Paris was definitely suspect. Even though Parlement had officially refused to participate in the meetings of the Third Estate of Paris, some members of the sovereign courts, Parlement included, had attended the meetings during the summer of 1614, and had been on the committee drawing up the cahier. The pamphlet published by the Third Estate to justify its action claimed that ecclesiastics had helped to choose the men who drew up the cahier of Paris and that a number of the citizens of Paris had expressed their support for the sovereignty of the king in the memoirs placed in the suggestion box set up outside the Hôtel de Ville. The final form of the article was drafted by M. de Lys, advocate general of the king in the Cour des Aides. These claims are true enough except that examination of all the memoirs left in the box outside the Hôtel de Ville, as well as those presented to the committee by the guilds of Paris, reveals that only two anonymous petitioners gave support to the sentiments expressed in the First Article of the Third, and this support was limited. However, it is true that the Archdeacon of Paris was on of the city, provostship, and viscounty of Paris includes an article saying that the king has no superior in his kingdom and is subject to no temporal power, A.N. H, no. 747². The provincial estates of Provence of June, 1615, supported the First Article of the Third, B.N. MS fr. 4131, foll. 106r–109r.
the committee that drew up the **cahier** (most of the other members were from the sovereign courts, though city officials and bourgeoisie were also included). The final **cahier** was accepted by the full assembly of Paris, which included representatives of the Bishop of Paris and seven religious orders.

On December 20 the Third Estate was informed for the first time of the displeasure of the clergy by Paul Hurault de l’Hôpital, archbishop of Aix. The burden of the speech given by the Archbishop was that the Third Estate should confer with the First Estate before putting any article concerning religion in its **cahier**. In return, the clergy would confer with the Third Estate about any article in their **cahier** concerning justice. Miron replied that the Archbishop was speaking in generalities. If a specific problem arose he promised that the Third Estate

---

1Prat, Compagnie de Jésus, III, 631–632, letter of Ubaldini. Ubaldini was referring especially to the **cahier** of the University of Paris which was finished on December 13, 1614. The article in this **cahier**, similar to the First Article of the Third, was formulated by Claude le Pretre, a councilor in Parlement; the full **cahier** was drawn up by Georges Turgot of the College d’Harcourt. It was later repudiated at a full meeting of the faculties of the university and withdrawn. The university was unable to gain admittance to the Estates General, so on January 21, 1615, they presented the new **cahier**, without the article of Le Pretre, to the First Estate. The **cahier** of the university that Rapine reprints is that of Turgot, not the one actually presented. Charles Jourdain, Histoire de la Université de Paris, au XVIIe et XVIIIe siècles (Paris, 1862, 1866), pp. 79–81, pièces justificatives, nos. 40–43. Procès verbal de tout ce qui s’est passé en la chambre du Tiers Estat touchant le premier article de leur cahier présenté au Roy (n.p., 1615). A.N. K 675, nos. 1–215. A.N. H 1797, foll. 79r–356v. An amplification of Ubaldini’s thoughts on the First Article of the Third can be found in B.N. MS Italien 1200, foll. 34r–35r, 35v–38v, his letters to Cardinal Borghèse of December 30, 1614, and January 17, 1615.
would give the clergy a specific answer. That afternoon the Third Estate, fully aware of the reason for the clergy's concern, decided that the first article of their cahier concerned the sovereignty of the king—not religion—and that the clergy should be so informed. As for the matter of communication in general, the Third Estate decided that it was considering only the external discipline of the Church, and not its doctrine, and since conferences would take up too much time they would not be worth while. The Third Estate would trust the clergy to formulate good articles on justice.¹

The answer was returned to the First Estate by Pierre Marmiesse, but his eloquence failed to satisfy the clergy. On the twenty-third the bishop of Montpellier, Pierre de Fenouillet, spoke to the Third Estate and was able to convince them that a copy of the article should be sent to the clergy, who as yet knew its contents only by hearsay. Champagne and Picardy objected to sending the article, but Languedoc, Provence, and Orléans wanted the Third Estate to discuss all matters touching on religion with the clergy. Pierre Marmiesse took the article to the clergy. That a significant part of the Third Estate, however, had no intention of giving up their article is evident in Rapine's worry that Marmiesse's flowery language might give the clergy the impression that the Third Estate would abide by the First Estate's decision regarding it.²

¹PV-3, pp. 102–104. On December 22 the nobles agreed to an exchange of articles with the clergy on matters that affected their respective orders. PV-2, pp. 156–157.

The Christmas recess interfered at this point. Outside the chambers of the Estates General the signs of the coming explosion were not yet apparent. Writing to the French representative in Germany on December 23, Pierre Brulart's only reference to the Estates General was a laconic comment that they were lasting too long. Malherbe wrote to a friend on December 26 that the belief was growing that nothing of importance would happen in the Estates General. The calm was misleading; the pressure was so great that the six-day Christmas vacation did not alleviate it.¹

On December 29 a debate in the Third Estate found half of the governments willing to take the first article out of their cahier, but Ile de France continued to lead the battle against this. At the end of the session it was decided to send a copy of the article to the Second Estate. The next morning the nobles took the article to the clergy, who then opened their official discussion of the article and continued it throughout the afternoon. The clergy concluded that the article approximated a theory of the Jesuit Martin Becanus that had been condemned as heretical in 1613. The protection of the king had been provided for by the decrees of the Council of Constance against regicide. The king's power was too dangerous a subject to be discussed in the Estates General. Cardinal Du Perron was appointed to speak to the Third Estate. He at first declined because he said he was unworthy, but finally accepted. On December 31 the Second Estate announced that it would follow the clergy's lead in regard to the article if some

provision for the kings' safety were made in the cahiers. The clergy
told them of a plan to republish either the decree of the Council of
Constance or similar measures to protect the king. Since the Third
Estate would not meet again until January 2, that day was chosen for
Du Perron's speech. 1

Ironically, the greatest debate of the Estates General broke out
just at the time when a number of the protagonists in the Third Estate
were willing to withdraw. But once the conflict was brought out into
the open and the lines of battle were drawn, not only France, but Eng­
land and Rome as well, became involved in a debate over the relative
powers of pope and king. In 1614 the clergy of France were led by
ultramontanists like Cardinal Du Perron, Bishops Jean Pierre Camus of
Bellay, Dinet of Mâçon, Fremiot of Bourges, and Du Plessis of Luçon,
all of whom were present at the Estates General. They were supported
by the papal nuncio Cardinal Ubaldini. The leaders of the ultra-Galli­
can party came from the sovereign courts, especially the Parlement of
Paris, and from among the royal officers. Parlement was supported by
the University of Paris on the question of the Jesuits and, to some ex­
tent, on Gallicanism. The tradition of Gallicanism was firmly rooted in
France; powerful elements among the clergy still voiced some support
for it as seen in the reservations placed on the acceptance of the
Council of Trent. The Third Estate’s article united it to the even
more potent tradition of loyalty to the king and his supremacy.
Throughout the sixteenth century a theory of the absolute power of

Rapine, pp. 266–271.
the king had been slowly developed by French jurists. This was a burning issue for the generation that had survived the religious and civil upheavals of the Wars of Religion and the assassinations of Henry III and Henry IV. The writings of such Jesuit theologians as Bellarmine, Suarez, and Mariana, which give a more definite formulation to the medieval theory of the right to revolt and to kill a tyrant, made the Society of Jesus highly suspect. The condemnation of Jesuit books by Parlement was continual; as recently as June 26, 1614, that body had condemned Suarez's book Defensio fidei catholicae et apostolicae adversus anglicanae sectae errores. In the center of the controversy stood Marie de Médicis, ultramontanist and pro-Jesuit in sympathy, but not daring to risk a break with her officers and Parlement.  

The Third Estate was working on its general cahier on January 2 when Cardinal Du Perron entered, followed by a large number of deputies from the First and Second estates, some of whom were official delegates, most of whom were curious spectators. The Cardinal was carried in on his chair because of illness, but in spite of his condition he spoke for two and a half hours to the effect that matters of religion belonged to the clergy, who were as zealous for the protection of the king as the Third Estate. In the rhetorical fashion of the times his

---

speech began with references to classical history and the customs of the Gauls. He used history throughout the discourse to prove the points he was making. Du Perron said that three points of disagreement existed between the clergy and the Third Estate in regard to the first article of their cahier. First, a problem would arise if the king became a heretic. Second, laymen did not have the power to make decisions concerning religion and to impose their decisions on the clergy. Third, the article could be construed as schismatic since the pope and the rest of Christendom held to another opinion. The Cardinal concluded that since so much good and bad were combined in the article, it had to be suppressed. ¹

President Miron immediately answered that the Third Estate would be willing to change a few words in the article, but that it would not change the substance. Cardinal Du Perron retorted that he had the assurance of many notable persons in the chamber of the Third Estate that they did not want to advance a schism. He then lectured the deputies of the Third Estate for going beyond their field of competence. As soon as the Cardinal had left the chamber with his crowd of followers it was evident that he had won support in the Third Estate, even though he had not definitely said that the Third Estate would be guilty of schism. Actually he had hinted that the whole question of the power of the pope had not really been settled. A number of the deputies were also incensed by Miron's speaking for the entire Third Estate without

first conducting a debate. However, after a long discussion the Third Estate voted to support Miron’s answer to the clergy. The Third Estate then recessed until January 5.¹

This was not all that happened on January 2. Parlement, which had been meeting since Christmas on the question of the suspension of the paulette, chose that date to give its public support to the provisions of the First Article of the Third. Its decree of that day also renewed eight edicts of 1561, 1594, 1595, 1610, and 1614 against the Jesuits and their books and in support of the provisions of the First Article. This decree was speedily published by Morel and Mettayer, a leading printing firm which usually handled the official publications of the king.²

On January 5 Gaspard Dinet, bishop of Mâcon, came to the Third Estate with the clergy’s proposal that section fifteen of the decrees of the Council of Constance be renewed to insure the protection of the king. The Third Estate replied that the Council of Constance dealt with the religious aspects of the question, but that a civil law was now needed. After a discussion, the Third Estate also refused the invitation to join the clergy in their complaint to the King about Parlement’s

¹PV-3, pp. 111–118.

decree of January 2. When the Third Estate's deputation arrived to inform the clergy of the decision, they found that the First and Second estates, expecting a negative reply, had already sent their delegation to the Louvre. At the clergy's insistence the Council had met on January 4 on the subject of Parlement's decree. On January 6 the King ordered the decree of Parlement rescinded and forbade Parlement to discuss the matter again. ¹

The Prince de Condé had not been idle while this was going on. He had long since given up hope of gaining anything through the Estates General and had shifted his attention to the Parlement of Paris. He had at first supported the Third Estate's article, but when the strength of the united opposition of clergy and nobles became apparent he changed his position. Possibly hoping to gain some advantage, he supported the suppression of the decrees of Parlement in the Council, making sure, however, that his speech liberally praised the loyalty of Parlement. It would not be long before Condé began in earnest to cultivate Parlement.²

The whole affair of the article and the decrees provoked a storm of pamphlets. The Third Estate published a pamphlet defending its


action. The First Estate answered in a work entitled Copie d’une let-

tre d’un prélat. Jean Savaron wrote two treatises on behalf of the

Third Estate; these were criticized by yet another pamphlet; this in turn

was excoriated in a work of 278 pages by Savaron published in 1616.
The large number of pamphlets defending the Third Estate’s article at-
tacked the clergy on several major points. The clergy favored the

Jesuits, who were not to be trusted; the Third Estate’s article pro-
tected the sovereignty of the king better than the measures proposed by

the clergy; and France, through the clergy, was bowing to the court of

Rome, which was not the Catholic Church. The supporters of the

clergy, in answer, pointed to the duty of the First Estate to protect

the Church. Parlement overstepped its bounds in trying to act as a legis-

lature; what the Third Estate wanted was the doctrine of heretics

like Luther, Melancthon, and Calvin; and the clergy were loyal French-

men who were deeply concerned with protecting the sovereignty of the

kings.

1

1 Procès verbal de tout ce qui s’est passé en la chambre du Tiers

Estat touchant le premier article de leur cahyer présenté au Roy (n.p.,

1615); Copie d’une lettre d’un prélat député du clergé à l’assemblée des

Estats sur ce qui s’est passé touchant l’article contentieux employé pour

le premier au cayer du Tiers Estat (n.p., 1615); Jean Savaron, Traicté
de la souveraineté du Roy et de son royaume à messieurs les députéz
de la noblesse. ... (Paris, 1615). Jean Savaron, Second traicté de la
souveraineté du Roy. ... (Paris, 1615). Jean Savaron, Les erreurs et
impostures de l’Examen du traicté de M Jean Savaron De la souverai-
neté du roy. ... (Paris, 1616). Representative of the pamphlets pub-
lished on the First Article of the Third controversy are: Viole d’Athys,
Reponse à la harangue fait par l’illustrisimé Cardinal Du Perron (n.p.,
n.d.). Guillaume Ribbier, Apologie de l’article premier du Tiers Estat
(n.p., 1615). Les canons des conciles de Tolède, de Meaux, d’Oxford et
de Constance ... par lesquels la doctrine de deposer et user les roys
There was one heretic yet to be heard from—King James I of England. Cardinal Du Perron was an old enemy of his. In 1612 they had engaged in a debate as to whether or not Anglicans were Catholics. Du Perron had made some references to James in his speech, and when word of this reached the English king he answered in a pamphlet of his own. The pamphlet, first published in French and later translated into English, dwelt on his friendship with Henry IV and his interest in the welfare of France. Though King James admitted Du Perron’s learning, he called him “the man to whome France is least oblied.” He accused him of interfering with the freedom of the Second Estate. James seized on the weak point in Du Perron’s speech: his admission, though guarded, that the matter of the pope’s power was problematical. The development of these arguments in the French version was far more civil than in the highly insulting English translation. James harped on the contradictions in Du Perron’s speech, a speech that was “like a bladder full of wind, without any soliditie of substantiall matter.” James directed many of his remarks to the nobles, who, he said, should be the king’s protectors, and taunted the French, saying that they did not have a very powerful

est condamné (n.p., 1615). Discours remarquable advenus à Paris, pendant des Estats (n.p., 1615). Manifeste de ce qui se passé dernièremen aux Estats généraux entre le clergé et le Tiers Estat (n.p., 1615). Raisons pour l’opposition de messieurs du clergé et de la noblesse à l’article proposé par aucuns en la chambre du Tiers Estat (n.p., 1615). Les résolutions et arrestez de la chambre du Tiers Estat touchant le premier article de leur cahier présenté au Roy (Paris, 1615). Other examples will be found in the bibliography.
king if "... Popes may tosse the French King his throne like a tennis ball."  

In the meantime the clergy were insisting that the First Article of the Third be revoked by the King. On January 7 they informed the Chancellor that they would not carry on their work in the Estates General until their demands were complied with. When the Chancellor refused to act, the clergy went to the King on January 8. They persuaded the nobles to join forces with them but only at the price of including their demands for more information on finances. Louis told them to go back to work on their cahiers. The clergy spent the next two days in discussing what steps to take next and in venting their anger against the Huguenots on the Council whom they conveniently blamed for the King's refusal. The clergy were worried about the public misinterpretation of the affair and decided that prayer was necessary. On Monday

---

and Tuesday of the next week the clergy refused to hold their sessions. Cardinal Joyeuse, dean of the College of Cardinals, came to court from Conflans, in spite of his great age and illness, to use his influence with the Queen. He impressed upon her the gravity of the situation, emphasizing the danger of schism. The task of finding a solution was entrusted to the ministers Sillery, Jeannin, and Villeroy on January 14. Finally on January 16 the King sent word to the clergy that the First Article of the Third had been revoked the preceding day. Parlement had been forbidden to discuss the matter further, and the printer responsible for publishing its decree had been jailed. However, the King stood firm on one point—only a small number of deputies would be permitted to hear the report on finances.  

The Queen felt compelled to accede to the clergy's demand if the Estates General were ever to finish their work. But steps had to be taken to pacify the Third Estate and Parlement. On January 19 she thanked the Third Estate for its affection and informed them that, although the article had been revoked, they could consider it as having been presented to the King, and the King would answer it. However, the Third Estate was far from satisfied. The next day Miron was the center of the storm that rocked the Third Estate. Deputy after deputy accused him of bowing to the King rather than supporting the interests of the Third Estate. There was an attempt to force a head vote, which, in Rapine's opinion, would have favored keeping the article. To prevent the vote from being taken, Miron walked out of the chamber and went to the Louvre to inform the Queen that the article would not be

1PV-1, pp. 320–355. Cardinal Joyeuse was to die during 1615.
used. A means of circumventing Miron's action was proposed by Guillaume Ribbier, lieutenant general of Blois. He suggested presenting the article in the cahier using a roundabout formula. The next day the fight to overrule Miron's opposition to this proposal was led by Savaron. The Île de France, Lyonnais, and Orléans supported the proposal. Guyenne opposed it. Picardy still held out for the placing of the full article in the cahier. Burgundy offered an alternative proposal, a formula referring to the original article without specifying its nature. Normandy, Brittany, Dauphiné, and Provence supported this compromise. This formula was finally adopted by a majority vote after Champagne and Languedoc had left the chamber and had been refused readmittance. ¹

The first article placed in their cahier by the dissatisfied deputies of the Third Estate read: "The first article taken from the procès-verbal of the Chamber of the Third Estate, and signed by its Secretary and Registrar, has been presented to the King in advance of their present cahier on the fifteenth day of January, 1615, by Monsieur the President of the Third Estate assisted by one deputy of each government, by the commandment of His Majesty, who has promised to answer it with the articles of this present cahier, and to do this he is copiously begged."²

The court had not reacted kindly to all this pressure. Villeroy's secretary had complained to the Sieur de Sainte Catherine on January 9


²Lalourçé and Duval, eds., Recueil des cahiers généraux des trois ordres aux États généraux (Paris, 1789), IV, 273.
that the Estates General were asking embarrassing questions, always the case when such an assembly was called. But Rome was pleased. Pope Paul V reconfirmed the decrees of the Council of Constance on January 24. On January 31 he wrote to the clergy and nobility praising them for protecting the authority of his office. He sent a personal letter to Cardinal de Sourdis with the same message. Cardinal Ubaldini, who had kept the Pope informed throughout the controversy, wrote to Cardinal Borghèse in Rome assuring him that the cahiers of the clergy and nobles would not contain any articles against the Jesuits and that the Council would not act favorably on the anti-Jesuit articles in the cahier of the Third Estate. He announced his final success on February 14 in another letter to Borghèse. After much hard work on his part, articles favoring the Jesuits would be given an important place in the cahiers of the clergy and nobles.

During the first two weeks of January, the Second and Third estates had continued their work. The Third Estate was informed on

---

January 7 of the King's desire that the Estates General be finished by the end of the month. The other estates received the same message. Work on the cahiers progressed. The Third Estate set up a committee of twelve to formulate all but the most important articles for the general cahier. The cahier of Paris and Ile de France was still to be read in its entirety in the general assembly. The nobles continued to work to reduce the number of offices and to gain more offices for nobles. They gained the support of the other orders in petitioning the King to suppress all offices that had been vacated by death since the beginning of January, 1615. The Third Estate again petitioned the King on January 12 for the reduction of the taille and again were refused. They were beginning by now to lose hope that any good would come to the people from the Estates General. But with the dispute over the First Article of the Third officially ended, the deputies of all three estates turned their attention to the reforms they thought necessary for France.¹

The bad feeling aroused by the arguments over the issue of sovereignty and the Jesuits never really subsided. The court was disturbed by the course events were taking, and the Queen had only one interest in the Estates General—to end them before more trouble could break out. To achieve this she was willing to make several concessions, especially to the Third Estate. Increased activity from Condé and Bouillon was adding to the unease, and as the terrible winter settled over Paris and the Lenten season approached the court sought to divert itself with ballets and other amusements. But the deputies went doggedly on hammering out their program of reform.

Between January 17 and 21 the three orders reached an understanding with Jeannin about his report on finances. The court unexpectedly announced that it would permit twelve deputies (one from each government) from each estate to hear a detailed report on the finances of the regency. That same week the First Estate drew up a list of the most important articles to be included in its cahier and set out to persuade the other orders to place similar articles at the heads of their cahiers. As a result of the ensuing negotiations the clergy determined
to ask for a conference with the King to draw up a formula precisely defining and limiting the liberties of the Gallican Church. ¹

All three estates carried on discussions about the towns and fortifications that had been granted to Condé in May by the terms of the treaty of Sainte Menehould as a guarantee that the Estates General would be held. The clergy strongly urged that these strongholds be returned to the King, and although the nobles argued violently over Condé’s rights to retain these places, in the end they agreed with the clergy. The Third Estate decided not to express an opinion but to leave the matter to the King’s discretion. ²

On Wednesday, January 21, the University of Paris sent its representatives to each of the estates trying to obtain a hearing as it had done on numerous occasions during the meetings of the Estates General. This time the rector and eight members of the arts faculty appeared, stating that since the university was not allowed to have a seat in the Estates General, they wished to present its cahier. President Miron referred them, as clerics, to the First Estate, but the deputies of the Third Estate liked their article on the power of the king and several of their articles on universities, so their cahier was given to Savaron, who was compiling the chapter on universities for study. The nobles received the cahier with the vague promise that they would try to help the university, while the clergy merely promised to study it and let the university know their decision. But as soon as the rector and his committee left their chamber, the clergy decided that since the whole

university had not drawn up the cahier it was of little value. The Bishop of Paris nevertheless was appointed to study it.  

On January 22 the clergy announced to the nobles that they had decided to propose a plan to suppress the paulette and venality of office and to give more offices to gentlemen. The nobles considered this plan, but decided, in spite of the King’s request that the cahiers be ready by February 3, to seek the support of the other orders for their own plan to suppress venality and the paulette and at the same time reimburse the officeholders. This plan had been presented to the nobles by the sieur de Beaufort and discussed by the nobles as early as December 22. The Third Estate refused to support this plan which they condemned as “rotten at the core” because of Beaufort’s prejudice against their estate. The nobles and clergy, however, went on debating the merits of the plan.  

The clergy had also taken up the question of dueling and sent the Bishop of Montpellier to petition the King that immediate steps be taken to end the practice. The First and Second estates finally agreed on the twenty-ninth to present Beaufort’s plan to the King with some additions proposed by the sieur de Juvigny. Beaufort’s plan, which had been championed by the Vidame de Chartes, called for the reduction of the number of officials of Parlement, the abolishment of lieutenant generals in presidial seats, abolishment of the Cour des Aides, and the Chambre des Comptes of Rouen and Blois, plus the reductions of other


offices. The former officeholders were to be reimbursed and nobles were to be given a substantial number of the remaining offices. Juvigny wanted the King to tighten up the collection of his feudal dues. On the same day the Estates General received the reports of the deputies who had heard the financial report from Jeannin. The report had been detailed enough to make clear that the expenses of the regency had risen greatly over those of Henry IV, especially in 1614. But the deputies were not permitted to examine the accounts closely themselves.¹

During this period the meetings of the Third Estate were anything but peaceful. The deputies demurred at showing the First Estate the chapter of their cahier on the clergy, using the excuse that not enough time remained to carry on any more discussions. Violent arguments were provoked by the Second Estate’s plans for abolishing venality and offices. Tempers were also flaring over the Council’s failure to keep its promise of December 16 to revoke a number of extraordinary commissions. On January 30 representatives of the Third Estate sought an audience with the King to protest this failure, but were unsuccessful because the King was out hunting. On January 31 they were asked to delay the audience until after the Feast of the Purification since the King was preparing to lay his hands on the sick. Marie de Médicis also was not available. She was preparing for the feast as she was said to have a special devotion to the Blessed Virgin. The Third Estate chafed under the obvious evasion but had no choice except to wait. Finally on February 3 the Council did order the enforcement of the

program of the Third Estate. In general the revocations, including that of the commission for reformation of hospitals headed by Cardinal Du Perron, were to be effective until the cahiers were answered. As work on the cahiers progressed and the pressure on the deputies increased, all three orders grew more fearful that the Estates General would be dismissed before the cahiers were answered. This they wanted to prevent at any cost. At one point on January 30 a number of the deputies in the Third Estate wanted to suspend all further meetings in protest against such a contingency. Proposals and counterproposals followed in all three orders. Finally on February 5 the Estates General received assurance from the court that some of their members, at least, would be permitted to sit on the commission that would answer the cahiers.¹

The Queen was greatly angered by these debates over the dismissal of the Estate General and by the deputies' agitation to gain a place on the committees that would answer the cahiers. She warned Sourdis that she wanted no innovations. If the deputies would only finish their cahiers, they would receive contentment before they were sent home. The tension between the court and the Estates General at this time was undoubtedly aggravated by the effect of a speech made on January 30 by Charles Miron, bishop of Angers, a brother of the president of the Third Estate. He proclaimed that a clear protest must be made, and since no one had paid any attention to what he had said up to this time, he was going to state his protest again. The two major

aims of the Estates General must be reform of the Council and regulation of the finances of the kingdom. The King should be asked for a full financial report. The Chancellor was a good man, but he alone could not withstand the Huguenots in the Council. Things would be even worse if Jeannin and Villeroy retired, as was rumored.¹

Although the three estates were in general agreement that they should remain in session until the cahiers were answered, they disagreed over such issues as Beaufort’s plan, the establishment of institutions to make loans to the nobles, and the sharing of information among the estates about articles of mutual concern. The conflicting interests and antagonisms underlying these quarrels were about to be further aggravated by a personal incident involving members of the Second and Third estates.

On February 3 the long-standing quarrel between Henri de Bonneval and Jacques Chavaille, sieur de Fougieres, lieutenant general of the Sénéschaussée of Bas Limousin, exploded into open fighting. Seigneur de Bonneval, a deputy to the Second Estate from Haut Limousin, had opposed Chavaille’s election to the Third Estate from Bas Limousin. His animosity increased as the Estates General continued, and he ended by breaking his cane over the Lieutenant General’s head in the streets of Paris. When Chavaille reported the outrage to the Third Estate on February 4, the deputies clamored for redress. They decided that such an insult to the Estates General, to Paris, and to Chavaille’s office could be dealt with only by the King. Miron set out for the Louvre accompanied by such a crowd of furious deputies that

¹PV-1, pp. 409–419.
the session had to be suspended until the afternoon. The King's answer, when they finally found him, was to turn the case over to Parliament.¹

The next day, Wednesday, the clergy, in a flurry of anxiety, sent Claude Gélas, bishop of Agen, to the Third Estate with an offer to mediate the quarrel. But Miron announced that this time the Third Estate had had enough. The Bishop left and the deputies again fell to discussing the insult to their honor. The deputies reached the decision that it was time to stop the clergy's attempts to control the Estates General through mediation of the disputes between the Second and Third estates. At this point the Duc de Vantadour arrived from court to announce to all the estates that they were to have representatives on the commission set up to answer the cahiers, but that the King thought it a dangerous precedent to reply to the request on venality before the cahiers were presented. The King bade the deputies to concentrate on finishing their work soon. There were some protests at this, especially from the clergy, who blamed the Third Estate and its many petitions for the delay in their own work. However, the significance of Vantadour's remarks was lost in the tumult over the Bonneval affair.²

The nobles asked the clergy to join them in preventing the case from going to Parliament. They claimed that the Third Estate had already committed two offenses against them, by asking Parliament to intervene and by enlarging a particular offense into a general one. In spite of their protests, the case was eventually tried before Parliament, and


nothing was done to spare the nobles’ feelings. Parlement sent a crier to the vicinity of the Augustins to announce the coming trial and returned the verdict on March 11 that Bonneval was guilty of a crime of _lèse majesté_ in the city of Paris. He was to be beheaded and all his property confiscated. However, this sentence was carried out only in effigy, probably because of the intercession of the First and Second estates. The Third Estate, for its part, seems to have relaxed once it became certain that Parlement would try the case. ¹

The orders were drawn a little closer together by their common condemnation of Condé’s behavior toward the Queen on February 6. Condé was accused by the Queen of complicity in an armed attack on an officer of the King’s Guard on February 5. The group of horsemen involved had been led by one of Condé’s followers. There was bad blood between Condé and the officer Marsilliac. Once a follower of Condé, he had revealed some of Condé’s secrets to the Queen, been dismissed by Condé and rewarded by the Queen with a royal office. It was no secret that Condé wanted Marsilliac punished. Condé admitted his responsibility but claimed that it was his business and no concern of the court. Whe Marie accused Condé, he replied, “Your anger and your animosities only drive me away from the King.” To Louis he said, “I beg you say nothing to me.” He then turned on his heel and stalked out of the room. ²


There was more to the affaire than appeared on the surface. As early as January 21 Villeroy's secretary had reported that Condé and Bouillon were involved in some sort of intrigue. The Queen had asked Bouillon to tell Condé not to take action against Marsillac, but Bouillon claimed that he never relayed her message. He said that he had been unable to do so because he was suffering from gout at the time. It seems probable that Thomas Edmondes, the English ambassador, was also involved in their plotting. After one last attempt to gain favor by giving up his claims to Amboise, which he held in trust as a guarantee from Marie that the Estates General would be held, Condé set out seriously to ally himself with Parlement. His first move was to carry on a campaign in Parlement to free his accomplice Rochefort, who had been imprisoned for leading the attack on Marsillac. On February 22 he presented a ballet before the Queen, which to many seemed intended as a peace offering. However, only the younger members of Parlement were asked to participate, rather than the usual courtiers, and the performance was evidently meant to ingratiate the Parlement rather than the court.¹

The Estates General, in the meantime, had again turned their attention to their major concerns. There was a dispute as to whether the

King should be requested to provide more specific information on the commission which would answer the cahiers. On February 10 the Third Estate once again was ready to break off all communications with the clergy after Cardinal de Sourdis lashed out at one of their delegations for their preoccupation with their own particular program. But finally the Third Estate, in spite of reservations about setting bad precedents, joined the others in presenting a united petition to the King. On Saturday, February 14, representatives of the three orders went to the Louvre with petitions requesting the establishment of the chamber on finances, the acceptance of Beaufort’s plan, and the continuation of the Estates General until the cahiers had been answered. As had happened so often in the past month, the King was not available. The Queen informed them that she wanted the cahiers presented the following Thursday. The Council would then decide whether the Estates General were to continue in session until the cahiers were answered. But, she assured them, the committee that would study the cahiers would be so well chosen that the Estates General could have no complaints. She warned the delegation that no consideration would be given to any more new ideas or proposals.¹

On February 17 the closing date for the Estates General was set for Monday, February 23. Also on February 17 the King’s Council agreed to place several more restrictions on extraordinary commissions in line with the decrees of December 16 and February 3. Between February 16 and February 19 the nobles were called upon to defend

¹PV-1, pp. 448–469. PV-2, pp. 244–264. PV-3, pp. 175–188. At this time there is some disagreement among the procès-verbaux on the exact sequence of events.
Beaufort's plan. The financial program, which they were having published as a book, was seized by royal finance officers while in the process of publication, on the pretext that the book was inimical to the King's service. The Estates General protested the seizure. Jeannin replied that he would read the book, *Le trésor des trésors de France*, and if it were a good work he would permit it to be printed. In the meantime he had copies of it sent to the Estates General. Several deputies reported, at this time, various intrigues to induce the Estates General to adopt programs inimical to the government. One work, *Le financier*, had been published which was considered libelous. A member of the Second Estate, Theophile de Damas, Baron de Digoyne, of the bailliage of Charolais and an officer of the Duc de Mayenne's troops, had demanded that anyone who had something to propose for the good of the country be permitted to speak without fear. All of this served to confuse matters, but the Queen's control prevented any fresh outbreaks.

The clergy were insisting that the most urgent work of the Estates General now was to draw up a common cahier containing all the most important articles. The nobles finally appointed a committee for this purpose on February 17. But the members of the Third Estate, although they could be persuaded to support the plan of the nobles to seek aid for disabled soldiers or the plan of the clergy to protest the appointment of a Huguenot to a new office in Parlement, would not agree to any form of common cahier. They used the excuse that not enough time remained, but the reason for refusal was much more fundamental.

---

The Third Estate knew very well that the main concern of the clergy was unanimous support of the Council of Trent; the Third Estate wanted no part of this. 1

Throughout the meetings of the Estates General the clergy had been working for the inclusion in all of the cahiers of an article calling for the admission of the decrees of the Council of Trent into France. The arguments over the council had been long and bitter. For many years the major opponent of the clergy in this matter had been the Parlement, and the conflict, under the leadership of President de Thou and Antoine Arnauld, had become increasingly bitter since 1610. The issues of Gallicanism, the Jesuits, and related questions were again involved. In 1614 the situation differed from that which had prevailed at the Estates General of 1576. The clergy now solidly supported the admission of the decrees of the Council of Trent. But Parlement, angered by the condemnation of Richer's book in 1613 and by the clergy's hostile reaction to their censures of Jesuit works, was more adamant than ever. The Third Estate was in complete agreement with the Parlement. Neither Ubaldini nor anyone else could sway them. 2


2 Martin, Gallicanisme et réforme catholique, pp. 345-399. Many of the reforms of the council had been incorporated into the ordinances of Orléans and Blois. Though the decrees of the council were never formally accepted in France, the Assembly of the Clergy of 1615 accepted them on behalf of the clergy. The Council of Trent was a live subject for pamphleteers in 1614-1615. Some examples are: Discours sur la réception du Concile de Trente en France (n.p., 1615). Extraict des registres des Estates sur la réception du Concile de Trente au royaume de France (n.p., n.d.). For other examples cf. Martin, Gallicanisme et
On February 19 René Potier, bishop of Beauvais, went to the Third Estate to try to persuade them to accept the decrees of the Council of Trent. President Miron’s reply expressed both the Third Estate’s determination to maintain their Gallican position and the animosity that continued to separate the First and Third estates. He told the Bishop that, unfortunately, the Third Estate had already completed its cahier; this matter should have been brought to the deputies’ attention earlier. “The confused times . . . make it necessary to reject the publication of the Council of Trent. . . . Nevertheless the clergy could begin among themselves the execution and observation of the Council, taking it for the rule and model of customs and actions. . . .” Later he added, “. . . that the company nevertheless embraces the faith it contains, but are not able to understand the administration of it, because it is prejudicial to the state, that the clergy can themselves guard and observe the Council and thus give the first example. . . .”

The clergy’s protests that the rights of the Gallican Church would be protected were of no avail. The Third Estate formally voted on the acceptance of the council on February 20; only Provence, Dauphiné, and Brittany voted for it. The clergy made another attempt to win the Third Estate on the afternoon of February 21, but it, too, failed. 1


Though they failed with the Third Estate, the First Estate managed to complete their other work; this they did down to the minutest instructions to the general agents for storing the furniture and tapestries of their chamber until the approaching meeting of the Assembly of the Clergy. They reached agreement on February 19 with the nobles as to the articles to be emphasized in the cahiers and the Second Estate gave its very reluctant approval to the acceptance of the Council of Trent. However, on February 20 eight Huguenots among the nobles walked out of the chamber in protest against the article calling on the King to preserve inviolably the Catholic religion. They refused to sign the cahier, and on February 21 they signed a formal protest. In hopes of smoothing over the difficulty, the Queen asked the Second Estate to modify the article to state that nothing should be done to violate the Edict of Nantes. The nobles refused to do this, saying that they had acted in accord with their consciences. The nobles still remained loyal, though. On February 21 they sent unopened to the Queen the letter from Pope Paul V, given to the Baron de Senecéy by Cardinal Ubaldini, which congratulated the nobles for opposing the First Article of the Third. The Queen returned the letter with thanks after reading it. During that final week the Estates General engaged in the usual exchange of formal courtesies, and by the morning of February 23 all work was concluded.  

---

1PV-1, pp. 495–545. PV-2, pp. 278–305. B.N. MS fr. NA 7254, foll. 187V–191R. B.N. Collection Dupuy 323, fol. 192R (the signed original of the protest of the eight Huguenots). The King renewed the Edict of Nantes on March 12. They were also promised that they could hold an assembly in 1615. B.N. Collection Moreau 1427, fol. 82V. The Sieur de la Tremoille was sent among the Huguenots of the Midi during April
The formal closing of the Estates General on the afternoon of February 23 can only be described as farcical. Although the Queen's desire for a speedy ending grew out of a fear of possible trouble, the actual date for the closing was determined by the necessity of preparing the Salle de Bourbon, where the final ceremonies were to be held, for the ballet to be presented by the King's sister Elizabeth. Condé, who just a year before had so confidently insisted that the Estates General be called, did not even appear at the closing. He pleaded fatigue, his highly successful ballet having been presented the night before, but it is probable that he had no desire to hear speeches which certainly would not be in his favor. Pleased with the success he was having with Parliament, the value of the Estates General was negligible. The deputies to the Estates General now received a minimum of consideration from any source. So many spectators were admitted to the closing ceremonies that the deputies had difficulty in finding seats.

When the hall was finally quieted, the King appeared and the speakers appointed by the three orders presented their last official words. Richelieu, speaking first, traced the causes of the major problems of France to excessive expenses, to pensions, and to the selling of offices. Because the nobles did not hold the offices that should be theirs, they were forced to depend on revenues that belonged to the Church. The clergy, too, should be given their rightful place in the

by the King. B.N. Collection Clairambault 365, foll. 54r-54v. A list of the articles agreed on as the most important by the nobles and the clergy is to be found in B.N. MS fr. 3718, foll. 1r-9r.

government and rendered all that was their due. Their rights should be respected without interference from laymen who should not go beyond their own province. The best remedy for the evils that troubled France was the enforcement of existing edicts, old and new, not just for a day but perpetually. Only the King could do this; only he had the power and grace to bring reform to France. Richelieu admitted that the clergy were guilty of abuses which they themselves must reform, but there were many evils in the Church that could be cured only by the King. The method he should choose was the enforcement of the decrees of the Council of Trent. Richelieu's speech praised Marie de Médicis for preserving peace and for arranging the Spanish marriages. He expressed the confidence of the deputies that the Queen would bring the work of the Estates General to a fruitful conclusion. He suggested that one way of doing this was to allow the Estates General to remain in session until the cahiers were answered. ¹

The Baron de Senecéy spoke next for the Second Estate. He called the King the hope of France who alone could bring good out of the work of the Estates General. He praised Marie de Médicis but did not pass up the opportunity to point out the excellence of the nobles. He insisted that venality be done away with. Merit alone should determine appointment to the offices of the government. Because all else had

been taken from them, he declared, the nobles could not surrender their pensions. The oppressed people, too, should be helped. He urged that the cahiers be answered.

Of the three speakers, only Miron followed the old custom of addressing the King and Queen from a kneeling position. Beneath the surface rhetoric of praise for the King and Queen and apology for the presumption of the Third Estate, his speech voiced a strong appeal for the program drawn up by that estate. Complaining that the ecclesiastics abused piety and the officers abused justice, he listed the faults of the clergy, nobles, and officers. He then summarized the cahier of the Third Estate. He dwelt on the need to abolish venality of office and the paulette. His speech returned to the abuses of the nobles and then he pleaded for the reduction of the taille. He ended with praise for the virtues of the Third Estate—especially its humility—and slipped in a reminder that the members of the Estates General wanted to remain in session until the cahiers were answered.

When the speeches were over and the cahiers had been officially presented to the King, Louis, Marie, and their entourage rose and without ceremony left the hall. The Estates General of 1614 had officially ended.

On February 24 the deputies found that they had been locked out of the monastery of the Augustins. They were told that they could meet

---

1 Lalourcé and Duval, Recueil de pièces, VIII, 240–249. Senecey’s speech was the only closing speech that was not later reprinted as a pamphlet.

2 Robert Miron, Harangue prononcée devant le roy et la reyne ... à la présentation du cahier du Tiers Estat. ... (n.p., n.d.).
but only at the houses of their presidents. They were not to take up any new business. The three estates did hold some meetings, and the Third Estate, at least, continued its debates. However, members of the Estates General were not permitted to sit on the committees discussing the cahiers. The Third Estate managed to present its ideas to Jeannin and other committee members. The Third Estate was especially worried about reports that new salt and wine taxes were to be devised to pay the wages of the deputies. Sixty-six members of the Third Estate protested this on March 20. The King made the final ruling on March 26: Each order was to be taxed separately to support its own deputies.¹

The final dismissal of the Estates General on March 24 gave little comfort to the deputies. After they had been ordered home the court sent letters throughout the kingdom announcing the closing of the Estates General and explaining the reasons for dismissing the deputies. As soon as the five committees appointed to study the cahiers had begun their work, it had become evident that preparation of suitable answers would take a long time. The expense of keeping the deputies in Paris was exorbitant, so, at the request of some of the deputies, the leaders of the Estates General were summoned to the Louvre on March 24 to

hear the answers to the most important parts of the cahiers. The deputies were promised that the paulette, venality, and unnecessary offices would be abolished. A chamber of justice would be established to look into financial abuses. Pensions would be regulated and moderated. The other articles in the cahiers would be answered as soon as possible.¹

The court was evidently gratified by its success in closing the Estates General. Villeroy’s secretary, writing to the Sieur de Sainte Catherine on March 6, 1615, announced jubilantly that the Estates General had ended well, no matter what anyone said. But if Florimond Rapine’s reaction can be taken as at all typical, it is evident that the deputies themselves were bitterly disappointed. “Nevertheless they were not disposed to accord us what we asked, we received nothing but an equivocal and ambiguous response and were forced to leave without hope of coming near our design...”²

The court was busy with many other matters. On April 2 the first stone of the Palais de Luxembourg was laid. The University of Paris, against Ubaldini’s protests, was demanding that the Jesuits not be permitted to reopen their Collège de Clermont, located across the street from the Sorbonne. The Huguenots had to be reassured by a formal reaffirmation of the Edict of Nantes. In May the recruiting of troops for Parma or Savoy within France had to be forbidden. On May

¹B.N. MS fr. 18256, pp. 390-392. B.N. MS fr. NA 7254, foll. 191v-192r. De par le roy (notification to the Seneschal of Albret of the dismissal of the deputies). B.N. Collection Moreau 1427, foll. 82r-82v, 84r-85r. A.D. Somme I B 17, foll. 28r-29r.

30 an edict exiling all Jews from France was published. But two matters of especial importance absorbed the court and pushed the Estates General farther into the background: preparations for the coming royal marriages, and Parlement's attempt to set itself up as a new Estates General.¹

The committees were still working on the answers to the cahiers on April 3, but after that date no records of further work on the grievances of the Estates General of 1614 are to be found for many years.²


²B.N. MS fr. 4121, foll. 121⁰-121⁰.
CHAPTER VIII

THE CAHIERS

The deputies of the three estates left a Paris which had forgotten them. They returned to the provinces, unhappy because of their failure to obtain their special requests, a little fearful of the accounting that would be demanded of them by the people they had represented. But they had presented their cahiers. They had worked long and hard to compile the manifold complaints and requests of the people of France into three documents that would criticize the evils of France and point the way to reform—documents filled with special pleading, but yet the sincere work of the men the three estates of France had chosen to present their thoughts to the King.

The traditional and most important function of the Estates General was the presentation to the King of cahiers which embodied their advice on the reforms that were needed in the kingdom. In fact, strictly speaking, the Estates General had met on only two occasions in 1614 and 1615: at the opening and closing ceremonies, when the King had told the deputies what he wanted; and when they had given their reply. In 1302 this process had taken only hours; in 1614–1615 it took months. In the final analysis the Estates General can best be judged only on the results of their primary activity—the cahiers, what they contained, and what influence they had. The details about the intervening sessions, the
debates, the intrigues, while they reveal much about France and its people and the reasons for success and failure of the Estates General, remain of secondary importance when an Estates General is being judged.

The First Estate presented the King with a cahier of 302 articles, to which were appended thirty-six articles dealing with church administration. The main body of the cahier was divided into eight chapters: "On Religion and the Ecclesiastical State," "On Regulars and Monasteries," "On Universities," "On the State and the Administration of the Kingdom," "On the Nobles," "On the Third Estate," "On Justice," and "Infractions."

The first chapter, made up of ninety-eight articles, concerns both spiritual and temporal matters. It shows the close relationship existing between church and state in such requests as those asking the king for support in forcing bishops to found seminaries and requiring benefice holders to repair churches. The clergy were very insistent that their own rights be protected or restored. There are twelve articles on the jurisdiction of clerical courts, including a petition that these courts be permitted to sentence clerics to the galleys for very serious crimes.

1 In 1649 Mazarin wanted to study what had happened at the Estates General of 1614. However, no copy of the procès-verbal or cahier of the clergy could be found. After much searching one copy was found in a bookseller's shop. This was printed, and today two copies of the 1649 printing exist, one in A.N. G 632 B , pp. 1–216, 1–66; the other, the cahier alone, in B.N. MS fr. 10876, fol. 280r–312v. The cahier printed in Lalourcé and Duval, eds., Recueil des cahiers généraux des trois ordres aux États généraux (Paris, 1789), IV, 1–165, was checked with these, found accurate, and used since it is more available. The abbreviation L&D will be used to designate Lalourcé's and Duval's work.
Sixteen articles supported clerical exemption from taxation. There were two articles, one a long one, on clerical rights to the tithe; four on the feudal rights of the clergy; and seven on the returning of ecclesiastical property, especially that lost as a result of the Wars of Religion and grants to Huguenots. The first part of the chapter is concerned with the reforms the First Estate wanted. Of primary importance were the introduction of the decrees of the Council of Trent, the re-establishment of Catholicism in France, the papal renewal of the decree of the Council of Constance against regicide, and the protection of papal power. Ten articles dealt with the reform of the granting of benefices, including restrictions on the king’s power and examinations for knowledge and behavior, and with the reform of episcopal elections to allow clerics other than members of cathedral chapters to vote. Prohibition of confidences and simony was desired. Six articles called for protection of the rights of benefice holders. Throughout, the power of the bishops in reform matters, even over religious orders, was emphasized. 1

1 L&D, IV, 1-68. Articles 37, 31; 20–21, 24–30, 33–34, 92; 58–64, 66, 70, 77–79, 83–86; 51–52; 55–57, 97; 1–5; 6, 8–10, 13–15, 46, 94–95; 72–76, 88. (Articles cited specifically in the text will be noted in the footnotes in the order in which they are mentioned.) One of the requests of the clergy (Article 46) was that hospitals and poorhouses be under ecclesiastical administration. In a series of edicts between 1561 and 1593 hospitals and charitable institutions had for the most part been placed under the control of city officials and inhabitants of towns. The Council of Trent called for supervision of these institutions by the bishops. The kings from 1519 had entrusted their power in this matter to their grand almoners. Beginning in early 1614 Cardinal Du Perron, who was grand almoner, had been attempting to reform charitable institutions. This caused opposition from laymen as seen for example in
Nineteen articles were devoted to the regular clergy and monasteries. As in the first chapter, reform was synonymous with the decrees of the Council of Trent. Again the power of the bishops was emphasized. Royal officials were to help visitators, but *Parlement* was not to attempt to legislate reform. Each monastery was to send some members to the universities to study; the students were to be supported by those who held abbotships and priorships *in commendam*. Various rules were laid down for the filling of vacancies and for safeguarding elections from interference. Members of any monastery of an order were to be eligible for election as prior in all houses of that order. The pope was to be asked to make sure that there would be no discrimination against Frenchmen in foreign countries in these elections. All religious houses were to be reformed, but the Benedictines and nuns working in hospitals were signed out for special mention, as were the monasteries which did not have titular abbots living on the premises.\footnote{\textit{Ibid.}, 68-74. Arts. 105-106; 111, 108; 100-102, 117; 103; 104, 107, 114, 110.}

\textit{Article one of chapter two of the cahier of Burgundy.} Doucet, \textit{Institutions}, II, 807-810. B.N. MS fr. NA 7255, fol. 174\textsuperscript{r}. Jacques Davy Cardinal Du Perron, \textit{Règlements faits par monsieur le Cardinal du Perron ... et messieurs les juges ordonnéz par le roy pour la générale réformation des hospitaux, maladeries et autres lieux pitoyables de ce royaume} (Paris, 1614). See also the general cahier of the Third Estate, L&D, IV, 292-296. In 1626 the King gave the clergy an extension of five years in which to buy back property sold or lost during the Wars of Religion. B.N. \textit{Cinq Cents 4}, fol. 264\textsuperscript{r}. In their cahier the nobles asked that this privilege not be extended and that they be given the same rights as the clergy. L&D, IV, 183, 197. The Third Estate was opposed to either the nobles or the clergy having this right. L&D, IV, 288.
A general reformation of the universities, especially that of Paris, was called for in the first of sixteen articles of the third chapter. Three articles applied to law faculties where conditions were so bad that degrees could be bought with money and a good name. Jesuits were to be readmitted to the faculty of the University of Paris, to be allowed to teach in their Collège de Clermont, and to receive protection and permission to carry out their work throughout the kingdom. Three articles were concerned with the prohibition of books against God, the king, the pope, and religion. Only approved printers were to be allowed to exercise their craft. Again, the bishops were to play a paramount part in enforcing these regulations. University professors were to be required to teach at regular times, take fewer vacations, and account for their teaching time.¹

The thirty articles on "The State and Administration of the Kingdom" begin with a request that the Spanish marriages be carried out. Eight articles are connected with the troubles of the regency with the rebel nobles; all of them are a repudiation of Condé and his followers, pointing out that no one is exempt from the king's justice, that no one should be permitted to have troops during peacetime but the king, queen, and the king's brother; leagues were to be forbidden, chateaus and fortresses which were not necessary for defense or which were "dangerous" were to be razed; no one was to have a position of authority in a

¹Ibid., 75–83. Arts. 118; 119, 121, 126; 118, 128; 127, 129, 130; 123, 129, 130; 130. The printing of breviaries had been a question that occurred a number of times in the deliberations of the First Estate. In article 132 the problem was resolved by asking that printers in cities other than Paris be permitted to print breviaries so that the cost would be lower.
place where he or a relative had attacked the king's sovereignty. Seven articles concerned relations between Huguenots and Catholics, calling for reunion of Bearn and Navarre to France and re-establishment of Catholicism there, the protection of Catholics in Pau, and the suppression of the Huguenot's villes de sécurité since the time limitation on them had run out and since they were no longer necessary. The development and protection of French sea commerce was discussed in three articles calling for agreement with Spain and the Turks to protect French sailors, regulations to prevent privateers from becoming pirates, and investigation of an offer to provide to France armed and fitted vessels for three years' service. Requests for reform of the administration of the kingdom were presented in ten articles. Experienced army officers were to be chosen, while the number of officers and soldiers was to be cut. Money spent on roads and bridges was to be curtailed, as were unnecessary pensions. The King's private Council of State was to be reduced in membership so that it would function better. The Council should concern itself only with administration, and the Parlement should concern itself only with justice. The Chamber on Finances was to be quickly constituted, and members of the Estates General were to be given a place on it. Money for this project would come from that saved by abolishing unnecessary offices. Tax collectors also were criticized, especially those who collected special taxes.¹

The nobles were the subject of a chapter of eighteen articles. Eleven of these articles called for the maintenance of noble privileges.

Their tax exemptions were to be maintained, two Catholic nobles of the short robe should sit in each parlement, when the King filled a vacant benefice or judicial post he should appoint a noble if he had qualifications equal to the other applicants, and certain positions such as that of bailli and seneschal were to be reserved for the nobility. There was to be a severe fine for pretending to the rank of nobility, and the King was asked to enoble only men who had given long and remarkable service. Four articles placed limitations on the nobility. No officer or pensioner of the King was to accept any wages or positions from a foreign ruler. In accord with the Ordinance of Blois, no lord should usurp the rights of his vassals; all those who claimed the right to collect tolls had to post the rate of that toll and keep the roads and bridges in good repair. More than two full pages were devoted to an article against dueling. Anyone who participated in a duel in any way was to lose all honors, offices, and property. There was to be no forgiveness by the King for this crime. An article was included asking that the buying and sellings of offices be forbidden; another called for the reduction of the number of marshals of France to four, the traditional number. 1

1 Ibid., 96–105. Arts. 172, 174, 177, 167, 168, 166, 165, 173, 171; 179–181; 169–170. The provision concerning the marshals could have been a slap at Concini, Marechal d’Ancre, who had received his post in 1613. The nobles and the Third Estate also wanted the same reduction. Ibid., 199, 306–307. Cf. Seianus français au roy (n.p., n.d.) attributed to 1615. The citation of the Ordinance of Blois was quite common in the First Estate’s cahier. The other orders cited the other ordinances of the sixteenth century, especially that of Orléans, with much more regularity than the clergy, but they too often referred to Blois.
The clergy in the forty articles devoted to the King's "poor subjects" had little bad to say about the members of the Third Estate except the tax collectors, and most of the members of the Third Estate shared the hatred of that class. The deputies of the Third Estate would have reacted strongly to the First Estate's description of them as pauvre sujets. Seventeen of the articles concerned taxation, all beneficial to the Third Estate. Four of these articles concerned the taille, asking that it be reduced to the rate of 1576. One of the remedies proposed to enable the taille to be reduced was reuniting the domain of the King that had been alienated. Four other articles called for regulation of the gabelle, asking that the price of salt be reduced to that of the year 1588. Three of the articles on taxes asked for the abolition of temporary taxes whose time limit had expired. Ten complaints were registered against tax farmers, extraordinary commissioners or partisans, asking for regulation of their salary, prohibition against search by collectors of the aides, and elimination of as many middlemen as possible. Seven of the articles were in support of what would come to be called mercantilism. The export of money should be limited, French wool should be made into cloth within France, there should be no tariff between provinces, restrictions should be placed on the importation of precious stones by foreign merchants. The rights of towns were supported in three articles, and a standard system of weights and measures throughout France was called for. Clerical concern was shown in an article calling for protection of widows and orphans from town councilmen and in two articles against luxurious living,
including one that called for restrictions on the number of people permitted to wear silk stockings.¹

Twenty-one of the forty-nine articles on justice concerned the administration of justice, including limitations on the jurisdiction of the Council, prohibition of courts with half or more Huguenot members from trying cases involving ecclesiastical rights, protection of the rights of seigneurial and ecclesiastical courts, lowering taxes involved with judicial administration, and doing away with venality and unnecessary officials, as well as combining smaller royal jurisdictions. Custom-house taxes as well as those on meat sellers coming into Paris should be lowered. Three articles called for decent wages for judicial officials so that they would not charge money for carrying out their duties. Twenty articles were directed against the abuses of judicial officials, especially those brought about by close relationship among judges or judges and plaintiffs; lawyers were to be modest in their pleas, and no official was to overcharge for services. Collectors of the gabelle, who were too numerous, should not have the right to search houses. The crime of forgery was to be curtailed by forbidding masters of penmanship from teaching a standard form of writing. The King was asked not to listen to the Third Estate in matters concerning the reform of the clergy,

¹L&D, IV, 105–117. Arts. 182, 184–185, 204–205, 214–217, 192–193, 206; 199, 213, 183; 203, 202, 207–208, 220; 197–199; 201; 218; 221. The reason the King was called upon to buy back or reunite his domain, or feudal lands, was that the taille had originally been levied to make up for the money the King had lost through alienation of his domain. The gabelle too had supposedly been a temporary tax. Meuvret, “L’Impot,” pp. 60–61. The Third Estate supported the clergy in this request. On the contrary, the nobles wanted those parts of the royal domain with little revenue to be given to nobles. L&D, IV, 227, 373–376.
since the deputies of the Third Estate had not conferred with them on this matter and since the introduction of the Council of Trent into France would take care of the reform.\(^1\)

All of the thirty-two articles of the chapter on infractions were devoted in some way to the Huguenots except the last two. Eighteen of these dealt with restrictions that should be placed on the Huguenots: They were not to be permitted to have any seminaries or colleges, no non-Catholic foreign teachers were to be permitted in France, Huguenots were not to have anything to do with benefices. Their courts were accused of being too lenient. The royal officials were to be permitted to attend the Huguenot assemblies, all preaching was to be in French and only in restricted areas. Huguenots were not to be buried in ordinary cemeteries. In fact, the clergy called for the banning of *La religion pretendue réformée* in France, and if this was not possible, as they seemed to realize, then the Huguenots were not to have any more rights than they had at the death of Henry IV. Seven articles were concerned with such matters as those who became Huguenots, especially those who did so for tax purposes or those clerics who did so to escape ecclesiastical punishment. The King was asked to send commissioners to check into the many local complaints against Huguenots. The Huguenots were to return church property and rebuild the churches they had destroyed since 1598. The chapter ended with two articles asking

that everything the King decreed in accord with the cahier be observed.¹

In the first of thirty-six articles of the Règlement Spirituel which the clergy appended to their cahier, the First Estate admitted that their order, too, needed reforming. The keys to reform were frequent provincial assemblies and observance of the canons of the Council of Trent. Seventeen articles were concerned with the reform of the episcopate, the bishops were to live in their sees, carry out the prescribed visitations of their parishes, attend services as often as possible, introduce the reforms of Trent in their diocese, ordain only those of age, who knew Latin and had means of support, and make sure catechism and Christian doctrine were taught in all parishes of their dioceses. Bishops were also to work especially hard at reforming the Benedictines, Augustinians, and orders of nuns within their jurisdiction. Independent Benedictine houses had to join one of the three congregations within six months or come under episcopal jurisdiction. The nuns were to be cloistered, have capable confessors, and the bishops were to examine all girls who were to take vows. Benefice holders were to be ordained at twenty-two, attend diocesan synods when required, and see to the spiritual and temporal upkeep of their benefices. Curés had to reside in their parishes, or if dispensed provide a competent vicar. Huguenots and those who died on the field while dueling were not to be buried in

¹Ibid., 137-149. Arts. 295, 281, 285, 294, 299; 287, 289, 278, 280, 283, 273; 271; 279, 286, 272, 300; 296; 301-302.
churches or cemeteries. On the whole this chapter was a summarization of the decrees of the Council of Trent as modified by the rights of the Gallican Church.  

The general cahier of the nobles was written in 436 unnumbered paragraphs. At the end of the cahier particular requests of the nobles of Normandy, Marseille, Arles, and Toulon (speaking for the nobility of Guyenne) were added, asking for maintenance of privileges and solutions of border problems. The first twenty paragraphs, covering twelve ordinary sized pages, presents an excellent program of reform. These pages were a result of the conference between the First and Second estates to decide on what were the most important articles—a conference that the Third Estate had declined to attend.  

After a long section of praise for the King and Queen and the regency government and a protestation that they were presenting the cahiers only as counsels, remonstrances, and supplications, followed by a reminder of how loyal the nobility had always been and how well they had served the King, the nobles got down to business.  

The Queen should be kept as head of the Council, regicide was detestable. The Catholic religion should be maintained and the Council of Trent should be published and received in France (always preserving the rights and privileges of the Gallican Church). The Spanish

\[\text{1} \text{Ibid., 150–165. Arts. 1–3; 4–6, 11, 22, 32–33, 35–36; 31, 8, 7, 10, 27; 13.}\]  

\[\text{2} \text{The only signed contemporary copy of the cahier of the Second Estate is one made by Jean Hurault de l'Hôpital, seigneur de Gommerville, who was the deputy from Nemours. B.N. MS fr. 3716, foll. 1r–63v. An original autograph of the cahier is to be found in B.N. Collection Moreau 1427. Again L&D was checked, found accurate, and used.}\]
marriages should be carried out and the present alliances maintained. The private and state council should have sixteen members—four ecclesiastics, eight nobles, four nobles of the long robe. There should be no selling of offices in the army or royal household, survivances should be abolished, as should the paulette. The judicial offices should be reduced to the number at the time of Francis I. The number of the treasurers of France should be reduced to two in each province because their wages were depleting the treasury. The job of the élus, collecting aides and taille, should be taken care of by the officers and ordinary judges. The officers should be given wages, but the judges' fees should be eliminated. In providing for all this the nobles asked that the proposals of Claude Beaufort be considered. Extraordinary commissions should be revoked as well as the new edicts. Surcharges should be diminished. The gabelle should be replaced. Since the King had agreed to set up a chamber of justice to look into the abuses in the management of finances, this should be started immediately. Some of the members of this chamber should be from the Estates General. To pay for the investigation the money ordinarily given to the unnecessary officers, whose positions were to be abolished, should be utilized. The expenses of the King's household were not to be increased. The companies of soldiers were to be reduced to the number that existed at the beginning of the year 1609. The officers that Louis XIII had as Dauphin should be given to his brothers and sisters. One-half of the money destined for roads and bridges should be set aside for unexpected projects; then ordinary and extraordinary tallies could be reduced by one-quarter. Pensions of ladies and gentlemen of merit should be equitably regulated and those given to officers of justice and finance should be suppressed for the benefit of the people. So that the nobles
could serve the King, the companies of ordinance should be maintained at the same strength as in the time of Henry II. Only officers or soldiers with the rank of captain were to be admitted to these companies, and they were to be supported by the taillon. Gentlemen of extraction should always be considered first, and one-third of the sovereign courts and other offices should be filled with these men. The Jesuits should be allowed to teach in their Collège de Clermont and to build other colleges as long as they submitted to the laws and statutes of the universities and towns. Anyone who proposed new means to impose on and charge the people or to create new offices or edicts should be declared a criminal and punished as such. The nobles felt that one of the greatest evils was the diminished value of the sol. The clergy and nobility had been especially hurt by this because they possessed the right of quit-rent (censive). In the last two hundred to three hundred years this had diminished in value by one-fourth. The value of all money should be regulated and kept at the same value forever. All merchandise, wages, and rents should be priced in proportion to the écu, and quit-rent should be paid according to the new values. ¹

After this fine summary the cahier of the nobles wanders around from subject to subject. On the whole their cahier is a fight for feudal privileges, especially against the judicial power of the Third Estate.

¹L&D, IV, 166–177. The text above is a paraphrase of the cahier itself. It shows the way all the cahiers jumped from one subject to another and back again. Money regulation was a major concern for the Second Estate in 1614. A serious reform of monetary values was in progress during 1614–1615. A.N. X¹A 8648, foll. 145v–148r (money regulations of the King of January 15, 1615, registered in Parlement on January 26). The regulations were based on those of the Ordinance of
The Second Estate wanted the commoner judges and officers to be put in their proper place, far below the nobility. When the cahier of the Second Estate mentions the salt tax and the abuses of the collectors of this tax, any sort of demand or request is replaced by deeply felt pleading that they be spared. All of the articles of the introduction are repeated in the other chapters, sometimes with a loss of force or with implicit modification, showing that the first section was grafted onto the cahier.

The first chapter of the main body of the cahier, de l'Église, is much more critical of the clergy than is the introduction. The first of the fifty-two paragraphs was the one that had caused so much trouble. It asked for the maintenance of the Catholic religion as called for in the King's oath at his coronation. Ten paragraphs concerned the abuses of holders of benefices. No one should hold more than one benefice with care of souls. Holders of benefices should see to the instruction of the people, and should make the necessary repairs of the buildings entrusted to them. Archbishops were to carry out ordinations on prescribed days and personally examine the candidates. Seminaries were to be established and supported by ecclesiastical benefice holders. There should be no charges for the administration of sacraments. Nine paragraphs were devoted to the rights of the nobles. Only nobles were to be admitted to royal foundations, one-third of all benefices in cathedral

1609. Instruction sommaire à Poulain allant en Espagne pour le règlement général des monnayes de France. B.N. Cinq Cents 102, fol. 277r–282v. Louis XIII, Ordonnance du roy sur le faict et règlement de ses monnoyes (Paris, 1615). This ordinance was registered in the Cour des Monnaies on February 4, 1615; it depicts and gives the value of all the pieces of money used in France.
and collegiate churches were to go to noblemen, and the poorer nobility were to be given oblateships in the monasteries. No mendicants were to be given benefices, nuns were to be closely supervised, all abbots were to live in their monasteries, and the excess funds of the monasteries were to be devoted to the care of the poor. The Jesuits were to be permitted to reopen their Collège de Clermont. A close accounting of the records of the receiver of tithes was to be maintained.¹

The nobles used eighty-four paragraphs to discuss their own order. There is no criticism of the nobility; rather, there is a sense of desperateness in their requests that their privileges be maintained (twenty-eight paragraphs). The nobles were always to be first in honor, those living in towns were not to be taxed as the inhabitants were, and they should be given their rightful places in the King’s household. One-third of all officers of justice and finance should be nobles, all baillis and seneschals were to be nobles, and, most importantly, the nobles should hold all significant military positions. The navy was to be enlarged and the command positions given to the nobility. Eighteen paragraphs were devoted to the re-establishment of the power of the baillis and seneschals. Seven paragraphs were directed against those who pretended to nobility, including those who bought land formerly belonging to nobles. No one was to pretend to the title of equerry, knight, or messire. Officers of justice and finance were not to be made nobles. Interestingly, another paragraph holds that appointive positions were not to be passed from father to son because the son

¹L&D, IV, 178–187. The emphasis on the bishops found in the clergy’s cahier is not to be found in that of the nobles.
is not necessarily as good as the father. A long paragraph complained of the hunting rights pretended to by the inhabitants of the towns. Though the article against pensions found in the introduction is repeated in this chapter, it is made clearer that only those pensions which hurt the people should be done away with. The King was asked to pay no attention to what the Third Estate had to say about the nobles, because what the nobles possess they possessed through merit. On duels the Second Estate said that they needed some system of making reparation and satisfaction for injuries to their honor. The marshals of France should devise the system, but even then dueling should be permitted when the offense was very great. The King was also asked that the nobles be permitted to engage in large trading ventures without forfeiting their nobility. ¹

In the eighty paragraphs of the chapter entitled “On Justice and Administration” the greatest emphasis is placed on the sums of money that the judges make from their cases and the violations of the edicts involved in some of their practices, such as hearing cases of near relatives, or hearing cases without a full complement of judges present. Parlement’s violations of the law were discussed five times. Parlement was to be forbidden to discuss the decisions of the King’s Council without the permission of the Council. Two nobles of the sword were to be admitted to each parlement. The nobles seemed to trust royal courts more than Parlement and nonroyal, nonnoble courts, but royal judges were to be forbidden to interfere with the rights of nobles possessing “high justice”; nor were judges to buy seigneurial land within their

¹Ibid., 188–205.
own jurisdictions. Concern was expressed for the preservation of inheritance laws. The universally hated sergeant, the lowest man of authority in carrying out the decrees of the courts, was accused of misdeeds four times. Officials' salaries were to be lowered, the number of offices diminished, extraordinary commissions abolished, and the paulette revoked. Limitations on the power of the procureurs, advocates, and other officials were detailed. Presidial seats were to be done away with because they served no real purpose. The nobles felt that the best means of saving the nobles and people from the money grabbing and tricks of the judicial officials was to appoint more nobles to these offices.  

The last chapter of 180 paragraphs entitled simply "On Administration" is a vast hodgepodge of requests arranged with little logical order, that had the intention of protecting all the privileges of the nobility, especially feudal privileges, calling for a multitude of reforms of royal officials, protesting excessive taxation, and attacking the

---

1 Ibid., 205–222. A procureur was a prosecutor or plaintiff's lawyer; an advocate (avocat) was the defendant's lawyer; presidial seats (sièges présidial) established in 1552 were organized in some of the bailliages and sénéchaussées and consisted of lieutenants general and particular, civil and criminal and seven councilors. These courts could handle small civil cases and the same criminal cases as a bailliage court. They also could receive appeal cases from inferior tribunals and the bailliages. The purpose of their existence was to serve as a step between the bailliage and parlements, to cut down the number of appeals to the latter body, and to limit the intervention of the sovereign courts. Because of the limitations of this court, for example, they could not try questions of feudal law, and because appeal was often possible from them, they did not work as had been hoped, but often simply added another part to an already complex judicial system. Doucet, Institutions, I, 264–267, II, 529–530, 537.
"pretended" privileges of the officer class of the Third Estate. Inter-
spersed with these are various provisions for moral reform, including
means for protecting the young from places of debauchery, enforcing
stringent rules on hostelries, and putting vagabonds to work in the
King's galleys. Disabled veterans were to be given support, and the
poor were to be cared for. The feudal rights of seigneurial justice,
banalities, and rights over common land were mentioned, among others.
The nobles' rights to such positions as baili were emphasized. The
royal officials were not to have exemption from the taille, though the
farmers of the nobles were to be free of it, as were nobles who bought
common land. Officers were to be qualified, the number of offices re-
duced, fees for services to be lowered. Anything of recent origin that
harmed the nobles was an abuse, but any privilege, exemption, or right
the nobles had held for thirty years was to be uncontestable. The no-
bles were interested in provisions, such as free trade within France
and using boats on all navigable rivers, that would aid internal com-
merce, but they were not interested in foreign commerce. For example,
they wanted more galleys along the coasts of Provence only to add to
the grandeur of the King and to protect the commerce of Provence.
Taxation—especially the gabelle, to which they devoted twenty para-
graphs—was the source of much complaint. The nobles' attitude toward
taxation and to the whole state of affairs which they found confronting
them is summed up in a long dirge addressed to the King. It is a
strange thing that your nobles are hauled before commissioners like
criminals to render account of the number of children and servants they
have, the pigs that they have killed each year, to have to take salt from
storehouses in whatever quantity it pleases the commissioners. "Your
nobles were not treated in this manner under Clovis, Philip Augustus,
and Louis XII.'’ The best way of keeping the loyalty of the nobility is to let us live in our old liberties or at least let us not be reduced to wearing a yoke to enrich "certain harpies, partisans and enemies of this state and those that favor and support them." 1

The large, very detailed cahier of the Third Estate, like the cahier of the Second Estate, is divided only into chapters and paragraphs. The first five of the 609 paragraphs are set apart as "Fundamental Laws of the State." The other chapters are: "Of the State of the Church," "Of Hospitals," "Of the University," "Of the Nobles," "Of Justice," "Of Finances and Domain," "Of Suppressions and Revocations," and "Of Administration and Commodities." 2

The refusal of the Third Estate to be dictated to is seen even in the introduction to their cahier. The King and Queen are praised, but it is immediately pointed out that there are troubles in the kingdom and that it has been thirty years since the Estates General last met to reform the country. The deputies of the Third Estate asked forgiveness if they spoke somewhat boldly, but felt the situation demanded it. Only after this were the Spanish marriages and Marie’s foreign alliances supported, but in weak terms. 3

1 L&D, IV, 222–260. The quoted words are to be found on pp. 248–249. The particular requests of the nobles of Normandy, Marseille, Arles, and Toulon are on pp. 260–269.

2 The best MS copy of the cahier of the Third Estate is one made and signed by Hallé, the secretary of the Third Estate. A.N. K 674, no. 15, foll. 1r–118r. L&D was again found accurate and is used below.

3 L&D, IV, 270–273. The other orders supported both the marriages and the alliances more wholeheartedly.
The *cahier* proper begins with the five “fundamental laws,” the first of which was the article on the authority of the King which, in accord with the King’s command, was not included. But it is noted that the King had already received the article and had promised a reply when he answered the other requests of their *cahier*. The Third Estate called for a meeting of the Estates General every ten years. All leagues and associations with foreign princes or lords without the consent of the King were to be forbidden, and there was to be no forgiveness for joining such a league. No one was to hold a pension from a foreign prince under pain of *lèse majesté*, and none of the King’s domestics or officers were to receive pensions from any prince, seigneur, or community. Finally there was to be no levying of troops or gathering of arms without the King’s permission under pain of *lèse majesté*. This first chapter ended with a request that the *cahiers* be answered before the deputies left Paris.¹

In the chapter on the Church, the Third Estate agreed fully with the First Estate that there was need for reform of the clergy. But the Third Estate in its seventy-two paragraphs relied on its own experience and the provisions of the ordinances of Orléans and Blois rather than the decrees of the Council of Trent—with the same general results; for example, that seminaries should be built (article twenty-four of the Ordinance of Blois), prohibition of clandestine marriages (article forty of Blois). The major difference between the reforms asked for with regard to the clergy by the First and Third estates was that the Third Estate put more emphasis on reform of the *curés*, their education, payment, and

their attention to the education and care of the people. Enforcement of the necessary edicts was to be entrusted to royal judges rather than to ecclesiastical courts; it was felt that the latter were failing to do their job well. Another difference was the frequent request that benefice holders, priors, etc. be French. The Jesuits were mentioned, but in a different context—it was to be pointed out that they were to follow the same civil laws as all other religions. The clergy were also to be reminded that hunting, business, tax collecting, and law, other than canon law, were not their concerns. Nor were the clergy to be permitted to regain the church property that had been alienated. Better records were to be kept, business was to be forbidden on Sundays, and several marriage regulations were to be instituted. 1

The thirteen paragraphs of the Third Estate on the subject of hospitals supported control and administration of these institutions by local judges and officials except where royal foundations were concerned. The King's grand almoner was to have his power restricted. The sick and poor were to return to their place of origin where they were either to support themselves by work or, if this was impossible, they were to be taken care of by local officials. Benefice holders were also to pay what was required of them for the maintenance of these

---

1 Ibid., 274–292. The Third Estate was as interested in marriage regulations as the Second Estate was in inheritance laws. The greatest concern was marriage without parental consent. Ibid., 284–285. Cf. the decree of Parlement of January 29, 1615, on this matter in A.N. AD+ 158, no. 7.
people. Oblateships in monasteries were to be given to poor gentlemen, captains, and wounded soldiers without their having to live in the monasteries. 1

When the Third Estate turned its attention to the universities in a chapter of thirty-two paragraphs, their biggest complaints centered around the re-establishment of the laws of good order, administration, and teaching (fourteen paragraphs). Professors were to be retired after twenty years of public teaching, but they were to retain their privileges and be given a benefice for their support so that they could turn their attention to public administration or writing. The eternal complaint of the bourgeoisie against the rowdiness of students is repeated in this chapter. Most of the trouble, the deputies thought, came during the election of student officers, which should be forbidden. The students were to be formally registered, be given regular examinations, and be forbidden to carry swords, guns, or knives. The Third Estate also called for preliminary education in the humanities before entrance to the faculties of law, medicine, theology, or arts. No minors were to be permitted to study outside of France without the permission of the King. Four articles were included on regulations for printing books, including the necessity of imprimaturs by royal and ecclesiastical officials and the inclusion of the name and location of the publisher. Magicians and astrologers were to be punished, and the King's first doctor was to be shorn of his power to appoint a barber and a surgeon in each town of the kingdom. 2

1 L&D, IV, 292–296.

2 Ibid., 296–304.
The fifth chapter concerns the nobles (sixty paragraphs). The Third Estate was willing that the rights and privileges of the nobility be maintained, even the feudal rights, as long as they were not abused, since the nobles were protectors of the kingdom. But a noble had to be able to prove his rights, he had to follow all the edicts limiting these rights, and no noble was to be permitted to enter business. The deputies of the Third Estate also presented four regulations against those who pretended to noble rank. The chapter contains seventeen limitations on the nobility, including nine very strict ones concerning dueling. Illegal corvées, hunting on sown land, and the keeping of gypsies to scare the people were among the abuses of the nobility singled out. The King was asked to reduce the expenses of his household, keep stricter accounts, and abolish a number of posts held by the nobles, including the governors and captains of nonfrontier towns that had been established since the beginning of the Wars of Religion. Nine paragraphs were devoted to administrative regulations, mostly with regard to governors and their lieutenant generals; for example, these men were to live in their jurisdictions, they were not to try to impose a corvée, requisition supplies, nor to allow gold and silver to leave the kingdom when prohibited by edict. There were six military regulations, including raising the number of troops to the prescribed levels to take care of the nobles and old soldiers. Troops were to be taken into the field only at the King’s command, and they were to be kept moving from place to place. Four articles called for the destruction of chateaus and fortresses not on the frontiers. The King was also asked to take back the garrisons and territory given to the rebels at Sainte Menehould.¹

¹Ibid., 305-322. All the estates wanted soldiers in the field to keep on the move. Dueling was a serious matter to all three estates. Cf. Jean Savaron, Traicté contre les duels, avec les ordonnances et
The main burden of the chapter on justice (167 paragraphs) was that the jurisdiction of the lower or ordinary and local judges be respected and that local authorities be not unduly interfered with. In all cases the edicts and local customs were to be followed. All recent abuses especially should be done away with. Since there was such confusion in these matters, a committee composed of the King’s Council, members of the sovereign courts, and other judges and officers should settle the conflicts and draw up in one volume the most necessary and useful laws. The same should be done for all customary law. The various offices from the Council (five paragraphs) through the sovereign courts (twenty paragraphs) and all the way down to the lowly, hated sergeant were brought under scrutiny and reforms proposed for each. The Council should be reduced in number, and each of the twelve governments was to be represented in it. The Council was not to interfere in the judicial process. The King himself was to attend the Council meetings and should grant a public audience twice weekly, as Louis IX had done. The sovereign courts’ right to confirm the royal edicts was affirmed, and the King’s officers were admonished not to interfere in the proceedings of these bodies. The sovereign courts were to speed up their work, make clear statements, and respect local judges and laws. Judges were not to have relatives serving in the same court. Seigneurial justice was also to be reformed. Most importantly, the nobles had to prove their rights in this matter. But the Third Estate did not take up the fight against seigneurial justice with the same

arrests du roy sainct Loys. ... (Paris, 1614). Jean Savaron, Discours abrégré avec l’ordonnance entière du roy sainct Loys contre les duels. ... (Paris, 1614).
determination and at such lengths as had the nobles in trying to protect it. The other judges and judicial officers were to be required to follow residence regulations. The number of offices was to be reduced, and there were to be provisions for sufficient wages, with all other forms of income limited. The rank of judicial officials was to be determined once and for all. There were many other minor regulations on procedure. Seventeen articles concerned marriage and inheritance laws and contracts. Arrears in feudal dues were to be uncollectable after ten years, as were most other debts. Vagabonds and pickpockets were to be condemned to flogging, branding, and six years’ servitude in the galleys for the first offense, hanging for the second. Those who robbed at night, stole from churches, or who picked pockets in churches or courts were to be punished by death for the first offense. Even the number of syllables per line and the number of lines per page that registrars were to use in certain documents were provided for. More importantly, all main-morte and serfdom was to be abolished. Compensation was to be given to the nobles involved by the people freed. Most importantly, the Third Estate agreed that there should be no venality of judicial offices. They added that all these offices should be provided with sufficient salary and that their holders should not be taxed. Pointedly, the Third Estate said that the same rules about venality should hold for the judicial officers of courts of the First and Second estates, provosts of merchants, assistant baillis and seneschals, and the lieutenants criminals who were nobles of the short robe. 1

---

1L&D, IV, 323–373. The process of codification of customary law had been in progress throughout the sixteenth century.
The Third Estate needed 187 paragraphs to treat the royal domain and finances. The subject of the royal domain was quickly dismissed. The King should do all in his power to retrieve all of his domain lost during the troubles of the sixteenth century; Navarre and Bearn should be declared to have been a part of France since the time of Henry IV. Any former royal land held by a noble could be bought from him for the price he paid by the people of that land. If they did not have enough money, the King should give them half of the sum needed. However, no one was to try to unite to the royal domain any land that had always been allodial. Several restrictions were placed on the selling of wood from royal forests. The payment of the *franc-fief* was to be greatly diminished. As for the rest, the key was that the taxes and many of the wages of the important officials should be reduced to the level of 1576. The number of financial officers should be reduced. The lesser officials should be particularly curtailed and controlled. The whole tax system needed reform, a chamber of justice should be established to investigate finances, and the financial system should be thoroughly investigated every five years. Better records should be kept, and stricter laws should be enacted and enforced against tax collectors, including prohibition of search without the approval of the local judge. There should be closer supervision at all levels from the council on finances to the treasurers, the Farmers General, down to the partisans who were called the real villians. For example, tax farmers had bought the right to collect a tax that the city of Lyon had been collecting since 1552 on merchants passing through that town; the tax farmers were now collecting this tax in neighboring provinces. No minister of state, councilor, or member of the sovereign courts was to be permitted to receive any gift or pension from a tax farmer or partisan. Only
native-born Frenchmen were to be officers, and since all in France were concitoyens, there should be no tariffs between parts of France.
The two most important sections of the chapter had to do with the paulette and the taille. The King was asked to revoke the paulette. Those presently holding office would still be freed of the law of forty days, and they were to be permitted to resign their offices to capable persons. When the offices became vacant, then elections should be held for them according to the ordinances of Orléans and Blois. As for the taille, it along with the aides, gabelles, and many other taxes was to be reduced to the level of 1576. A means for making up the money lost was proposed. First the "great and excessive" pensions and gifts should be abolished. The number of governors should be reduced to the traditional level. There should be fewer soldiers and generally all "superfluous and extraordinary" expenses should be abolished. When pensions were given they should only be given at the end of the year after all other expenses were paid, and only to those who had earned them. Also, many of the lesser officials were not to be excused from the taille. There was a complaint that the exemptions of certain towns and villages from the taille put a burden on the rest of the country. Further on the Third Estate asked that these privileges be maintained, but people who moved to these towns were not to have the exemption until they had lived in that town for ten years. The taille was the most hated tax, and after it the aides and gabelle bothered the Third Estate the most. Salt was to be sold in smaller lots for the sake of the poor. The power of the townsmen in the chamber of the Third Estate is exemplified in the request that all exempt from the taille who lived in towns, including nobles and clergymen, should be taxable for such things
as fortifications, bridge and street repairs, and the maintenance of colleges and hospitals. ¹

The eighth chapter, "Of Suppressions and Revocations," is almost a list, composed of fifty paragraphs, asking for suppression of offices. The Third Estate complained that other Estates General had asked for this but that nothing had been done. The list started with certain officers in the King’s household such as secretaries of the King’s chamber, and went from there to the sovereign courts, whose officers were to be reduced to the number called for in the Ordinance of Blois, to the chancellery, and on down to the registrars and notaries. All provosts of marshals and assistant baillis and assistant seneschals as well as all the officials in their jurisdictions were to be abolished. All offices abolished by the edict of July, 1610, were to be done away with. Finally, in desperation the Third Estate said that it could not possibly name all offices that should be suppressed; the King was simply asked to abolish all new offices. And anyone who tried to establish a new office or re-establish one that the Third Estate had already mentioned

¹Ibid., 373–438. The Third Estate specifically called for the dismissal of Denis Feydeau from his post as farmer general of Aides; however, he had passed this office on to his brother Antoine in 1611. Heumann, "Antoine Feydeau," p. 183. The word partisan was equivalent to traitant and meant a person who held one of the tax farms of the king. Meuvret, "l'Impot," p. 75. In 1614–1615 the word partisan was applied to the lower-echelon tax farmers—those closely connected with the actual collecting of taxes. In a letter Jules Gassot, the King’s secretary, has preserved a maxim that was applied to the treasurers of the early seventeenth century, Reçoy avant que tu escrive,/ Escry avant que tu delivres,/ A recevoir fais diligence/ Et fais tardive délivrance. Gassot, Sommaire memorial, p. xv.
was to be put to death as "an enemy and disturber of the general peace of all your subjects."\(^1\)

The last chapter of the cahier has sixty-seven paragraphs on administration and commodities. It begins with regulations for the officials of towns, including that they all be elected and reside in the town. Money was to continue at the same value, roads were to be maintained at their former width despite attempts at encroachment, and navigable rivers were not to be blocked with mills. There then follows a spate of articles against gambling and frequenting taverns in the best Puritan tradition. For example, inhabitants of a town were not to be allowed to eat or drink in the cabarets or taverns of that town. Limitations were to be placed on the wearing of silk, gold cloth, pearls, and diamonds. The rest of the chapter is taken up with the problems of the merchants. There were to be limitations on the guilds, fair privileges were to be protected, and the activity of foreign merchants was to be restricted. Protection of French commerce and merchants is called for throughout the chapter. Foreign glassmakers in France were to take French apprentices. The French ambassadors were to seek the same privileges for French merchants as foreign merchants had in France. The French merchants were to have more protection at sea, especially against Mediterranean and English pirates. The Mediterranean galleys particularly were to be more active. All French merchants were to have the right to trade throughout France, in Canada, and elsewhere inside and outside the kingdom. Within the kingdom there was to be improvement of roads and navigation. The import of merchandise made of gold, silver, or

\(^1\)L&D, IV, 438–454.
cloth was to be forbidden. Blasphemers, pickpockets, and vagabonds were to be put to work in the mines that had been discovered in France. The system of measures used in Paris was to be adopted throughout the kingdom. Money exchange rates were to be standardized, as were the sizes and quality of things made of cloth. Even the materials to be used to dye wool black and the conditions under which a butcher could sell his meat within a city were set down.¹

At first reading the cahiers of the three estates, or of any one of the estates, seem to be a vast confused mass of requests. Not even within any one chapter is there a really logical order. The cahiers were the result of committee work, and they show it. But it soon becomes evident that the chapters and the cahiers of each estate have underlying themes. Upon close comparison a program supported by all three estates emerges. It is true that the First Estate was convinced of the necessity of accepting the decrees of the Council of Trent and of

¹Ibid., 454-475. The demands for what became known as mercantilism, evidence of which is found especially in the cahiers of the First and Third estates, received some attention from royal officials. In 1613 restrictions were placed on the import of spices and drugs from the Levant and Spain. Arrest du conseil d’estat du roy partant règlement pour les espiceries et drogueries qui sont transportées par mer de la Rochelle à Rouen, du quatorzieme mars 1613 (n.p., n.d.). Extrait des registres du conseil d’estat (n.p., n.d.), both in A.N. AD IX 473, nos. 29, 30. On August 3, 1614, the King named three commissioners to visit the ports and harbors of the kingdom to re-establish the navy. Lettres patentes du Roy Louis XIII donnée a Paris le 3 Aout 1614 (n.p., n.d.) in A.N. K 110, no 46². Jacques Fresneau had tried to interest the Second Estate in schemes for the betterment of sea trading but with no success. He printed some of his suggestions. Jacques Fresneau, A messieurs des Estats en la chambre de la noblesse (n.p., 1615).
giving a free hand to the Jesuits and that they were opposed in this by
the Third Estate, that the clergy looked upon the Third Estate only as
the King’s pauvre sujets, and that the nobles did not even deign to
grant the Third Estate a separate chapter in their cahier. The First
Estate wanted to protect its benefices and tax privileges; the Second
Estate wanted to reassert its feudal, honorary, and official rights; and
the Third Estate wanted to maintain the status quo in these matters,
wanted to assert its control over town institutions, and to be freed of
part of its tax burden at the expense of the other estates. Yet despite
all the disagreement coming from these contrary aims, despite all the
quarrels, the deputies to the Estates General of 1614 were agreed upon
many things.

Most evident in the cahiers is the support that the regency gov­
ernment won in its opposition to Conde. The final statements of all
three estates show absolutely no sympathy for Conde; pensions were
decried (despite some reservations of the nobles), the destruction of
chateaus and fortresses not on borders was called for, and Conde was
to be required to give back the territory given him as security until the
Estates General should meet (the nobles said nothing specific supporting
this, but they said nothing to oppose it). Most importantly, the Spanish
marriages and the alliances formed by Marie de Medicis were specific­
ally approved, as was her regency (the Third Estate was a little reluc­tant, but yet supported these policies).

Marie de Medicis had been successful in her gamble to defeat Conde
by giving him what he wanted. She had anticipated his request for an
Estates General, manipulated the elections, and arranged to put the
Estates General under the control of her picked leaders: De Sourdis,
Senecey, and Miron. But beyond this repudiation of Conde the Estates
General had other ideas. The kingdom needed reform, and it had needed reform, so the estates felt, ever since the Wars of Religion had begun, even since the death of good King Louis XII. They were determined to provide that reform.

All three estates were convinced that the Church needed reforms. Despite the Third Estate's rejection of the Council of Trent, all the orders wanted better-trained clergy, who performed their spiritual duties; they wanted worthy holders of benefices who were clerics and who saw to the education and care of the people. It was agreed that the charitable institutions needed better management, though there was disagreement as to who should provide this. The clergy and Third Estate saw the need for reform in education and the regulation of universities, and the nobles said nothing to oppose this. That the rights and privileges of the nobles should be protected was agreed upon, though there was difference of opinion as to the extent of these rights and privileges. All the estates called for the abolition of extraordinary commissions, the paulette, and venality of office in general, especially the selling of judicial offices. The Third Estate insisted throughout the Estates General that abolishment of venality should be accompanied by abolishment of pensions, which was agreed upon, and by lowering of taxes, which the other two estates also agreed with, especially as regarded the taille and the gabelle. The three orders even agreed in general on the plan that should be followed to reduce taxes: unnecessary offices were to be abolished, the treasury officials and tax collectors were to be investigated and compelled to be honest, and as many middlemen as possible should be removed from the tax-collection hierarchy. The deputies wanted a better organized state, a centralized state with clearly defined organs of government that respected the
privileges of its components parts, but a state that would take active measures against its enemies and against wrongdoers; they wanted a state that controlled trade (though the nobles showed little interest in foreign trade), that protected the rights of Frenchmen. They wanted a better army, and they wanted peace. And above all they wanted their reforms to be enacted and to remain in force.

The deputies to the Estates General were acting for the members of their estates in the twelve governments of France. These people had given the deputies cahiers to take with them to Paris, and it was by this cahier that they were to have guided themselves. To find how closely the deputies followed their mandate it is necessary to study the few preliminary cahiers still in existence.

On the bailliage level only one cahier of the clergy remains, that of Troyes in Champagne. This document is only thirty-one pages in length. The clergy in Paris did not ask for anything that this cahier specifically opposed, except possibly that the clergy of Troyes placed more emphasis on the necessities of the curés. But its scope is much more limited, centering mostly around condemnation of the Huguenots, calling for the enforcement of the Council of Trent, and bemoaning the fact that the other two estates did not fulfill their duties as they should.¹

On the government level two cahiers of the First Estate remain, those of Champagne and of Paris and the Ile de France. Again there are no overt discrepancies. The government cahiers were compiled in

¹George Hérelle, Documents inédits sur les États généraux (Paris, 1879), pp. 109–139.
Paris so they show more awareness of national affairs and abuses, but again the concerns of the clergy are predominant.  

A few more cahiers of the Second Estate are extant. The preliminary cahiers are those of the bailliage of Chaumont-en-Bassigny in Champagne, those of Angers and Berry in Orléans, and of Lauragais in Languedoc. All except that of Angers specifically support the Queen; Chaumont included support of the Spanish marriages; the rights of the nobles figure conspicuously. Berry and Chaumont have the longest list of articles, and they include some strictures against judicial and financial abuses. The gabelle was complained about. Trent and the Jesuits were not mentioned. In general the cahiers were far less comprehensive than the general cahier.

All of the governmental or provincial cahiers of the nobles prepared in Paris by the deputies are available except those of Brittany and Dauphiné, where all three estates met together to draw up one provincial cahier. There are no great differences separating these cahiers from the general cahier, except that that of Paris had an article which came close to the first article of the Third Estate (next to it is a note in the margin saying that it was judged unnecessary to put this in the general cahier). The cahier of Paris served as the model for the general cahier, but various requests came from other provincial cahiers. The Norman nobles were the only ones with the request for

---

1 Paris, A.N. G8, no. 635. Champagne, A.D. Aube G 140 (2 Mi 40).

permission to let the nobles enter business. The chamber of finances
idea was raised by Picardy. The cahier of Languedoc, which was the
one most concerned with provincial matters, held the request that any
right held for thirty years should be incontestable. Nowhere in any of
these cahiers is support for Trent or the Jesuits to be found.¹

The preliminary cahiers left are more numerous for the Third
Estate, but they are restricted to four governments. In Paris and the
Île de France the cahier of the bailliage of Beauvais remains; for Paris
we have the cahier of the parish of Colombes, the grievances of the
guilds of Paris, and those of the people who deposited theirs in the box
set up outside the Hôtel de Ville, as well as the cahier of Paris itself.
From Guyenne the cahier of Agenais remains; from Lyonnais that of the
city of Lyon; from Orléans that of the Sénéchaussée of Saumur which
was subordinate to the Sénéchaussée of Anjou, and the Bailliage of
Bourges which was subordinate to the Bailliage of Berry. On the next
level there remain the cahiers of the Sénéchaussée of Anjou and the
bailliages of Touraine and Vendôme.

The Third Estate of Beauvais called for acceptance of the Council
of Trent, reorganization of the financial system, and in general for a
well-ordered government in the hands of the King. The parish of Co­
lombes emphasized rules for moral living, giving the Church a free hand

4083, foll. 66r–76r. Normandy, B.N. MS fr. 11916, foll. 6r–29r. Gu­
yenne, B.N. MS fr. 4782, foll. 46r–79r. Languedoc, De Vic, Histoire
84r–91v. Provence, B.N. MS fr. NA 5174, foll. 90r–100v. Lyonnais,
B.N. MS fr. 4083, foll. 1r–1v, 1r–40r. Orléans, B.N. Collection Clai­
rambault 742, foll. 17r–39r.
in religious matters, but calling for ecclesiastical reform, and complained of the restrictions put on their wine selling by Paris. The guilds and private citizens of Paris emphasized local conditions and prerogatives of the guilds, but there was strong support for doing away with venality of office. There was also a definite anti-Jesuit and anti-Huguenot feeling in Paris as well as criticism of benefice holders. In none of the cahiers of Paris and the Ile de France is there to be found what became the first article of the Third Estate, except in the final cahier of the city of Paris itself, though there were two anonymous articles that gave limited support in the group from the box in front of the Hôtel de Ville. This cahier, which was approved by all three estates of the city, served without doubt as the model for the general cahier of the Third Estate; the chapter division is the same, except that there is not one on hospitals or suppressions. There were definite additions to the various chapters, but nothing contrary to what the cahier of Paris held. The cahier of Paris was especially influential in the chapters on the Church, universities, and finances and domain, while it paid relatively little attention to such things as the hunting rights of the nobles and other matters that would not interest city dwellers.  

Despite emphasis on local conditions, the cahier of Agenais supported strongly what the Third Estate would have to say on the nobles and finances. There was a request to abolish the paulette, but no reference to the article on the King's power. The Third Estate of Lyon asked for the abolishment of venality, but did not mention what became the First Article of the Third. On the whole this cahier called for more strict reform of the abuses of justice and administration than the general cahier, though it was preoccupied with local problems. ¹

The cahier of Saumur emphasized church reform, giving power in some cases to royal courts. Venality of judicial offices was to be abolished, but the King's absolute power was not mentioned, while the taille was to be reduced to the level of the time of Louis XII. The very short cahier of Bourges calls mainly for the suppression of gifts and pensions, the maintenance of the privileges of cities, and the holding of an Estates General at the beginning of each reign. The cahier of Anjou supported especially the decisions of the Third Estate on the universities, justice, finance, and commerce. The editor of the cahier of the Third Estate of Touraine notes that the twelve cahiers of the subordinate towns and parishes that he found were in general concerned with local matters, though they opposed the taille, gabelle, and tithes, expensive justice, and the necessity of reform of the clergy and nobles. He also notes that the meeting held in Tours to draw up the cahier for

Touraine paid little attention to these cahiers. Touraine supported the complaints of the Third Estate on hospitals, nobles, and justice. The cahier of Vendôme emphasized reform of the curés, even calling for their election by parishioners, supported the decisions of the Third Estate on justice and the nobles, and called for the destruction of fortresses and chateaus not on the frontiers. ¹

Only two of the governmental cahiers of the Third Estate remain, those of Burgundy and Lyonnais. The cahier of Burgundy is similar to the general cahier in its demands, though it is much shorter; it seems to have been especially influential in the matter of hospitals and suppressions, to which it devotes separate chapters. The cahier of Lyonnais contains an article similar to the First Article of the Third and also has a separate chapter on hospitals and suppressions. ²

In Brittany and Dauphiné the deputies of the three estates met together to draw up a single governmental cahier; both of these exist, as well as one preliminary cahier in this classification other than Paris,


that drawn up by the three estates of the city of Rouen. The citizens of Rouen opposed venality, favored mercantilism, and favored puritanical laws. Brittany supported the Queen, opposed venality and the paulette, and supported reforms of the Church and of judicial matters. It did not mention the Council of Trent. The cahier of Dauphiné which was drawn up before the deputies came to Paris was not too demanding on the Church and did not mention the Council of Trent; it did support the privileges of the nobles, call for administrative and tax reform, and complain of abuses in custom taxes.  

From the scraps of information left, a definite pattern emerges. In the First Estate the final cahier places more emphasis on Trent and the Jesuits and less on the plight of the curés; also it supports the regency more forcefully. All of this shows the influence of Marie de Médicis and the episcopal reformers in the Paris meetings. The nobles' general cahier was strongly influenced by the clergy in the matter of Trent and the Jesuits. The deputies in Paris seem to have devoted more mature attention to national affairs, though the complaints that the nobles were being mistreated predominate in both preliminary and general cahiers. The general cahier of the Third Estate was heavily influenced by Paris, though support for the first article came from Normandy, Champagne, and Lyonnais. The general cahier of the Third Estate was for the most part a compilation of the complaints of all the subordinate jurisdictions. The deputies of all three estates followed the

---

wishes of the people who had sent them to Paris in most things. Many local complaints were not mentioned in the general cahiers, many complaints about the government were made more precise, and the affairs of France as a whole were given more predominance; the requests added by the deputies in Paris, especially concerning Trent, the Jesuits, the chamber on finances, and the First Article of the Third, had at least some support in the provinces. The deputies had used their time in Paris well. They had studied the evils existing in France, they had learned from their compatriots in other parts of the nation, and they had presented a comprehensive program of reform.
CHAPTER IX

THE PAMPHLETS

Valuable records of the events of 1614–1615 remain in the hundreds of anonymous pamphlets printed both before the Estates General were called and during the meetings. These pamphlets reflect the discontent of various segments of society, analyze the causes of the evils afflicting the kingdom, and propose the remedies most beneficial to the groups whose interests they seek to promote. They debate, often vituperatively, all the important and controversial issues which the Estates General of 1614, if it did not resolve, at least brought into clear and public view. As the author who styled himself Le Conseiller Fidèle warned the King, the kingdom was divided into mutually hostile groups: the princes, the officers of justice, the officers of finance, the townsmen, and the Huguenots. Everywhere pamphlet wars raged over the Spanish marriages, the Jesuits, and the rebellious activities of Condé and his followers. The rival claims of Gallicanism and ultramontanism were debated. The Huguenots pleaded their cause and in turn were blamed for most of the evils of the kingdom.\(^1\)

When the Estates General were called, the pamphleteers demanded a reform of the kingdom, a return to the good old days, the time of Henry IV, the time before the Wars of Religion, or the time of Louis XII, depending on the particular group to which the suppliant belonged. When the deputies arrived in Paris they were greeted with a flood of advice. As the meetings continued, each order sought to enlist support for its projects. Each of the estates found pamphleteers eager to plead its particular causes and condemn its enemies.¹

The pamphlets written by members of the First Estate were aimed primarily at refuting the arguments set forth by proponents of the first article of the Third Estate and in seeking to obtain acceptance of the decrees of the Council of Trent. The clergy were also eager to effect the incorporation of Bearn and Navarre into France. Of special interest are three pamphlets authored by Jean Camus, bishop of Bellay.

¹Cf. below; and above, pages 68; 69; 84, footnote 1; 111, footnote 1; 129, footnote 2. B.I. Brief discours dedie au roy sur la tenue des États en sa ville de Paris (Paris, 1614). B.L.D. Franc et libre discours ou advis aux députés des trois estats pour la réformation d'iceux (Paris, 1614).
Delivered as sermons to the assembled members of the three estates and quickly published by Claude Chapplet, these pamphlets contain the most balanced criticisms of the Estates General to be found among contemporary writings. In some of the plainest language to be heard through the Estates General, Camus spared no order and no one. The “Homily of the Three Simonies” excoriated the First Estate for selling church offices (confidences), the Second Estate for allowing those without noble blood to obtain military office, and the Third Estate for selling justice by permitting the venality of office. The remedies for these abuses fell only partially within the competence of the Estates General, but they should ask the King to end venality of office, and the King should listen. The “Homily of the Three Scourges” attacked the clergy for heresies caused by the ignorance and evilness of the pastors and recommended the Council of Trent as the remedy. As for the nobles, they profaned the peace with greater carnage than there was in war with their dueling. And the Third Estate, which complained so loudly about taxes, increased the taxes by the multitude of their offices. The King was the one who must cure these evils. The “Homily of the Disorders of the Three Orders of This Monarchy” criticized each estate for its way of life. The clergy did not wear their full habit and always wore soft garments next to the skin. The nobles, confused as “rats in a frying pan,” spent all their time in playing, hunting, dancing, and singing, and had no military discipline. And the Third Estate: What was to be done with them, Camus asked, these nobles gathered around him, these poor people in robes of silk? Let
them go into the Second Estate where they belonged and stop pretending to be men of the people. As for the problems of justice and finances, these were too great to be discussed in one sermon. ¹

The nobles who turned to the writing of pamphlets usually did so to defend the privileges of their class or to protest against the officers of the Third Estate. Typical of their attitude is Genti-homme Français, who addressed his pamphlet to the First and Second estates to urge them to maintain the privileges of the nobility. He pointed to the officers of justice and finance as the cause of all the woes of France. Another anonymous author joined him to complain to all three estates that these officers took all the best land for themselves and raised the prices of offices beyond the reach of those who deserved them. The various branches of the government must be investigated. Tax collectors must be kept under tighter control, and tailles and pensions must be lowered. The lengthy pamphlet Advis, remonstrances et requestes aux Estats généraux tenus à Paris, 1614 par six paysans is especially interesting for its fine expressions of the nobles' fierce pride in class and hereditary privilege and their determination to bar all newcomers from entering their ranks. For themselves, the nobles demanded more offices, the re-establishment of the importance of the offices of bailli

and seneschal, and the downgrading of officers from the Third Estate. The only reforms proposed for the nobility were the stamping out of dueling and the abolishing of some military offices. The pamphlet is generous with proposals for reforming the Third Estate and also has some for the First Estate.

In general the writers of the Third Estate, whether deputies or not, begged that the people be freed from excessive taxation, violence, and restrictions on business. Royal officials added their part to the controversy in replying to the numerous attacks on the abuses of their class. Often the defense was the rather weak one that there were other abuses in France. Their most telling points were made against the pensions received by the nobles. But the Third Estate had its Camus in the person of the prolific writer Jean Savaron, deputy from Bas Auvergne. In his view, there were three steps that must be taken. The King must fulfill his duty in disciplining the Church, justice must be re-established, and in the future reforms must be strictly enforced. Benefices and simony were great causes of evil, as was venality.

1 Disser d'un genti-homme français à la noblesse de France, sur l'ouverture de l'assemblée des Estats généraux dans la ville de Paris en ceste année 1614. ... (n.p., n.d.). Mémoires adresséz à messieurs des Estats pour présenter à sa majesté, contenant les fautes, abus, et man- versations comises par les officiers de finance, partisans et payeurs des rentes en l'estendue de ce royaume (n.p., n.d.), pp. 1-7. Advis, remonstrances et requestes aux Estats généraux tenus à Paris, 1614 par six paysans (n.p., n.d.), pp. 21-35. This was reprinted in another edition with only these pages, the introductory material being deleted. Despite the title, there can be no doubt that this was written by a noble. Gabriel le Bien-Venu, *Foucade aux Estats* (n.p., 1615).
Taxation was too great; consequently, pensions and gifts must be reduced.  

Even the King was not exempt from advice and criticism. The series of pamphlets, with the name Caton in the title, bitterly criticized the regency, its councilors, and its policies, especially the Spanish marriages. The government found supporters in Diogenes, Guillaume san Peur, and others, who directed the public wrath toward the Huguenots, Condé, and the followers of Richer. Also typical was the attitude of the pamphleteer who warned the deputies that they were in Paris to advise the King on disorders; they were not to act as judges, nor were they to decide whether the remedies they proposed were the best ones.


When the Estates General were ended and the deputies sent home without having achieved any of their aims, the pamphleteers expressed the popular disappointment and indignation. Protected by anonymity, their criticism of the failure of the Estates General often degenerated into vicious personal attack. The deputies had reason to fear such attack. Jules Gassot noted that throughout the meetings of the Estates General there had appeared "... libels, discourses and placards ... songs and jokes and puns in verse and prose. ..." There was no defense for this kind of anonymous attack, as the rebel nobles had learned when they returned to Paris in June of 1614. Their return occasioned the most vicious pamphlet preserved from 1614, *Discours véritable des propos tenus entre deux marchâdes du palais*. This is a dialogue between two women, one a seller of linen, the other a seller of hats. They speak of their happiness now that the nobles have returned to court since these nobles often use a room at the rear of the linen shop for purposes other than the buying of linen. As the hat merchant put it, "... where assuredly you can show the entire display of your merchandise." The two women are particularly happy that the princes have returned at that time because they are beginning to be approached by various scoundrels offering their "services," thinking that the two were "going to waste."1

---

There was little protection against this kind of libel. There were restrictions on publication, and each of the three estates had asked that the laws on censorship and the prohibition of anonymous printing be enforced, but with little result. Between 1610 and 1615 most of the official condemnations were directed against books dealing with the power of the pope and the king and the Jesuit controversy. These included works by the Jesuits Mariana, Suarez, and Cardinal Bellarmine, the Anti-Coton written against the Jesuits, a book written in favor of Anti-Coton, a work of the Huguenot Du Plessis Mornay, Richer's work (and a counter condemnation by Parlement of those who condemned this work), Morgard's work, and a book on magic. To this could be added the condemnation of the arrêt of Parlement of January 2, 1615, which had been printed by Morel and Mettayer. The condemnations were delivered by the faculty of theology of the University of Paris, Parlement, or the King. The faculty of theology supported the pope and the Jesuits, the Parlement and the King's Council supported the power of the king, with Parlement leading in this fight.¹

Little can be learned about the publishing of the anonymous pamphlets, but often the punishment was directed against the publisher rather than the author. The names of the publishers of the pamphlets have been included in the bibliography whenever their names were given. This was done in order to permit a study of the publishers active in Paris in 1614–1615. The names of twenty-seven publishers are found. Most often they give their address as rue St. Jacques,

¹A.N. AD III 20, nos. 48–70. Several other books were condemned on abstruse theological grounds.
though some also had their shops on rue St. Honoré or in the court of the palace. The names of three publishers occur most frequently: (1) F. Morel and P. Mettayer seem to have specialized in edicts of the Council and Parlement and other matters concerned with the government; they carried the title of printers to the king. (2) Antoine de Brueil published pamphlets on a wide variety of subjects of contemporary interest, generally in favor of royal policy, but taking the opposition in a mild way at times; the works he published were very definitely opposed to Condé and his followers. (3) Pierre Chevalier specialized in printing the letters of those involved in the affairs of 1614–1615, though he also published two works by Jean Savaron.

In 1614 French opinion no longer agreed with the author of Le reveille-matin des françois who in 1573 stated "... that these three estates are as sovereign magistrates above the king in this area...." In fact, the provincial estates had been held almost as if there were no meeting of the Estates General at all. The Estates of Quercy met as they did each year. The Estates of Vivarais met twice in 1614 and on February 23, 1615, and none of the deputies to the Estates General of 1614 from Vivarais ever took part in a provincial assembly. The Estates of Normandy met in September, 1614, after deputies had already been elected to go to the Estates General, and proceeded to draw up their own cahier which they presented to the King on January 29, 1615.

1 Cf. bibliography. The firm of Morel and Mettayer had a long history; Mettayer was at first in business with another publisher, then for awhile by himself; he was then joined by Morel, and in 1624 Morel is found carrying on the business alone. Sometimes Mettayer published pamphlets separately in 1615.
The provincial estates of Languedoc met on November 24, 1614, and took up the problems of that province. In June, 1615, the Estates of Provence met and unanimously supported the first article of the Third Estate and the rejection of the decrees of the Council of Trent, instructing the King to disregard, in so far as Provence was concerned, any statement to the contrary made by their deputies to the Estates General. The Huguenots, too, at their assembly in the summer of 1615, presented their own requests to Louis XIII. They supported the First Article of the Third, opposed the adoption of the decrees of the Council of Trent, and even asked the King to consider the latest claims made by Condé.¹

But more had been expected of the Estates General than it had accomplished, and the pamphleteers let the world know the disappointment of the people. As the author of Le Patois Limosin, addressing himself to Condé, expressed it:

And generally all three orders together produced only disorder and confusion. For have you seen, my prince, that they talked of finding out the truth about the murder of Henry the Great? Have you seen that they concerned themselves with hunting out the larceny of the most eminent people? Have you seen that they tried to banish the Spanish from the council of our king? Have you seen them taking offense at the transporting of our money to Italy? Have you seen them complaining about the tyrannical taking of the most important places for the preservation of France from our nobles and the giving of them to a harlequin who has never drawn a sword? No, my prince. They say that these are affairs too delicate, that this would be to wish to knock down the towers of Notre Dame by throwing boiled potatoes, or like giants to pile mountains one on top of the other to drive Jupiter from his throne and take the thunder from his hand. In brief (they say) they would have to attack a marquis, the Duc d’Epernon, the Chancellor, Villeroi, the greatest persons of the kingdom. O good God! Who should be seized other than those who are the cause of our troubles.\(^1\)

Though this was the attitude of the opponents of the regency, which most of the deputies essentially supported, the deputies were only too well aware of the failure of their efforts. They had drawn up a program of reform, but the court’s summary dismissal of the petition that the cahiers be answered before the deputies were sent home held little hope for the future. Rapine said as much at the end of his account of the Estates General. In later years Richelieu summed up the end of the Estates General of 1614:

Thus the Estates ended as they had begun. The proposition to hold them had been under specious pretext, without any intention of taking advantage of them for the service of the king and public, and the conclusion was without fruit, the whole assembly

\(^1\) *Le patois Limousin* (n.p., 1615). Some of the reprints of this pamphlet are entitled *Le matois Limousin*. 
having no effect except to overburden the provinces with the tax they had to pay to their deputies, and to let the whole world see that it is not enough to know evils if one does not have the will to remedy them, which God grant when he desires to make the kingdom prosperous, and let not the great corruption of the centuries bring anything to stop it.¹

Pierre Robert, a deputy from Basse Marche prevented from coming to Paris by illness, summed it up more succinctly. He was not sorry he had not been able to attend, since "... the deputies did nothing in return for the great expense they had caused the whole province, for which they received only the maledictions of the people."²

The deputies might well be worried about the reaction of the people. Most of the small, particular requests of the provincials had been sifted from their general cahiers. This was a practical necessity, but that would do little to placate those who were taxed to support the deputies. Some groups of deputies, like the nobles of Dauphiné and Champagne and the three estates of Brittany, had addressed special requests to the King concerning local problems, but the replies had not been given when they left Paris.³

¹ Richelieu, Mémoires, p. 92. Rapine, p. 505.


³ B.N. Collection Clairambault 365, fol. 41r–41v (nobles of Dauphiné). Harrangue faicte par la noblesse de Champagne et Brie inserée en ses cayers et presentée à sa Majesté (n.p., 1615). Lettres patentes du roy données sur les remonstrances des gens des trois estats du pays et duché de Bertaigne avec les responces de sa Majeste sur icelles (Rennes, 1614). As an example of the time it would take for the
The court was aware that there would be a general outcry over the expense of holding the Estates General. It had tried to cloak its curt dismissal of the deputies under the pretext of preventing further expense for the people. The court had to turn its attention to the immediate problems posed by Parlement and Condé. With a promise that the cahiers would soon be answered, it left it to the pamphleteers to place the blame for failure on the deputies.

If the court had indeed planned to divert blame for the failure of the Estates General from itself to the deputies—and this seems to be the case—the scheme worked admirably. Bouillon saw through it; writing to Jeannin on June 9, 1615, he said that he and Jeannin both knew that the Estates General had had little liberty and less satisfaction and that dissatisfaction was now spreading throughout the provinces. Indeed, dissatisfaction was spreading. The complaints of the deputies were being overwhelmed by the barbs of the pamphleteers and by the loyalty to the crown that Marie de Médicis had already won.¹

The biggest complaint voiced by the pamphlets was that the Estates General had accomplished nothing lasting concerning venality, reduction of taxes, financial and judicial abuses, or the Council of Trent. In short, the Estates General had accomplished nothing. A pompous city official such as Balthazar de Vias of Marseille might publish a speech he had supposedly made to the King, saying that all was well

deputies to get home, the journey from Paris to Orléans took two days, from Paris to Amiens was a journey of three days, and from Paris to Lyon required eleven days. Tapié, Louis XIII, p. 54.

¹B.N. MS fr. NA 7262, fol. 116v.
with the kingdom and going to be better. But the people did not share his opinion. The Estates General had failed to remedy serious evils. The only reaction befitting such failure was scorn and satire. ¹

In spite of long months of hard work and their program of reform, the deputies were mocked at for having come to Paris to learn the royal ballet. Taunted with their weakness and lack of authority, they were laughed at for their petty haggling and their self-contradictions. They had come to Paris to restore peace to the kingdom, but had achieved only silence, and everything would go on as it had before. All their oratory was only the singing of idle songs and the crying of women. ²

Such were the contemporary judgments of the achievements of the Estates General of 1614. But soon attention was diverted by other events and personalities as France moved toward absolutism and world power. The work of the Estates General and the part they played in


the transformation of France were never understood. When historians looked back, they missed the importance of the period between Henry IV and Richelieu. The Estates General of 1614 and the regency were quickly dismissed. They were judged by the contemporary cries of disappointment rather than by what really happened. This misjudgment was becoming firmly established by the second quarter of the seventeenth century, and it has yet to be dispelled.
CHAPTER X

CONCLUSION

The departure of the deputies of the Estates General did not mark the end of the threats that faced Marie de Médicis' government. The Parlement of Paris still had to be dealt with. Condé's flattery of and intrigues in Parlement, when added to its dissatisfaction over the suppression of the paulette, provided the background for this body's bold step toward equality with its English namesake.\(^1\)

On March 28, with all chambers assembled, the Parlement invited the princes, prelates, and other seigneurs who had a deliberative voice in that assembly to come to Parlement so that they could advise the chancellor of what should be done to reform France. Marie again faced a crisis. Despite what Richelieu says, the evidence of the action that Marie took and the comments of Molé show that she was plainly worried. It must be remembered that Parlement had already suffered one rebuff from the court; a second could well fatally antagonize a group of men who were vitally necessary to Marie's government. Their importance is revealed in the way Marie had cultivated them during Conde's revolt. The court's anxiety was underlined by a letter to the Sieur de Sainte

Catherine on June 11, 1615. Pierre Brulart nervously hoped that the trouble with Parlement would soon be at an end. ¹

On March 30 Marie and Louis called some of the leaders of Parlement and complained of their action. They agreed to discuss the matter. On April 9 Parlement was called to the Louvre and there received orders from the Queen, King, and Chancellor to stop. However, Parlement continued to make plans. The Council, on May 13, decreed that the paulette would be re-established. Though the reasons given were couched in general terms—to ease the burden of sudden change that the officers faced—the fact that the paulette was continued until 1618 indicates that more than a breathing space for royal officials was intended. ²

At first this concession by the Queen had no effect on Parlement. Pontchartrain states that Condé still urged Parlement on. It is hard to say whether it was this or simply the momentum of events. On May 19 Parlement had drawn up a list of complaints; these were approved by the whole body on the following day and presented to the King on May 22. Parlement claimed that it was within its rights in what it was doing. Their greatest regret was that the First Article of the Third had been rejected. The alliances of Henry IV should be maintained. The princes of the blood and the former secretaries of state should be


given a part in government. Important positions were not to be given to foreigners. A strong plea for preservation of the rights and privileges of the Gallican Church was made. The rest of the remonstrance sounds like a summary of the cahier of the Third Estate. Molé reports that the Queen was so angry that she was forced to break off in the middle of her answer to the delegates of Parlement. Nevertheless, Sillery promised that the Council would deliberate the matter and reply.¹

The answer came quickly. On May 23 an edict was published annulling Parlement's decree of March 28 and its remonstrances of May 22. When Parlement heard of this they began to prepare a new remonstrance. On June 7 the King insisted that the edict of May 23 be registered. Tempers began to cool after this; and on the request of Parlement, which stated in conciliatory tones that no offense was meant to be given to the Queen, the King announced on the condition that no attempt was made to call together the peers the Council would consider the reforms desired by Parlement. Needless to say, this was never done; Marie had won another battle by compromise and delay.²

The Prince de Condé was not done yet, though. He left court late in May, again protesting to Marie in a letter of June 5 that he had only the service of the King in mind. Bouillon wrote to Jeannin on June 9


from Sedan stating his and Condé’s complaint. The remonstrances of the Parlement were just. There is great worry throughout the provinces that the cahiers of the Estates General would not be answered. If a reply had been given to the complaints of Parlement, then there could be no grievance. It was not wise to break the promise to the Estates General to do away with venality and the paulette. Most of all, the Spanish marriages were a matter of concern—exactly what was to happen was being kept a secret. Also the Spanish alliance was not a good one. France would lose its old allies and the balance of affairs in Europe would be ruined.\(^1\)

There was good reason for not telling Condé of the exact plans for the marriage. He gathered his old allies around himself, continually refusing to be reconciled despite the entreaties of Villeroy and Pontchartrain, who were sent to him to promise that his complaints would be listened to and asking him to join in the trip to Guyenne for the marriage ceremonies. Negotiations were finally broken off on July 29, and once again all the towns in dangerous areas were warned to be on their guard. On August 3 Condé sent out letters calling for troops. After debate on whether Condé’s forces being raised in Champagne and the Ile de France should be attacked before the marriage journey, the court departed Paris on August 17 for Bordeaux.\(^2\)

\(^1\)B.N. Collection Dupuy 365, fol. 164\(^r\) (original of Condé’s letter).
B.N. MS fr. NA 7262, fol. 116\(^r\)-118\(^r\).

A delay at Poitiers, caused by Princess Elizabeth becoming ill, gave Condé a chance to organize his troops. This time he was supported by a number of the Huguenots of Guyenne, led by the Duc de Rohan and the Marquis de la Force, who were willing to try anything to stop the Spanish marriages, once the appeal from the assembly of Protestants at Grenoble to the Queen to defer the marriages had failed. The marshal Boisdauphin cut Condé’s troops off from Paris. Elizabeth recovered by September 25, and after debate on whether the journey should be continued because of the risk of injury to the King, all available troops were gathered and the royal party set out on September 28. They arrived in Bordeaux on October 7 without incident, because Rohan and his followers found that they did not have a sufficient force. On October 18 the marriage ceremony for Elizabeth was performed, with the Duc de Guise serving as proxy for the Infante. A similar ceremony was carried out at Burgos with the Duke of Lerma acting as proxy for Louis XIII. Though the insurgents were still in arms, the exchange of princesses was made on November 9 at the Spanish border without incident. 1

Marie had finally achieved the aims of her regency government. The rebellion dragged on for a time, but it was settled by a treaty at Loudun on May 3, 1616. Condé was received as a hero in Paris, but was imprisoned by Marie. The situation began to decay as Concini moved to take as much power as possible. But on April 24, 1617, Louis, influenced by Albert de Luynes, surprised everyone by taking

---

matters in his own hands, having Concini arrested and shot, and begin­
ning the era of his personal rule.  

Despite the mistake of permitting Concini's greed for power full
sway in 1616, Marie de Médicis had served France well during the re­
gency. Marie was not the greatest of rulers nor of women. When the
pressure was taken off in 1616 she relapsed into what was more natural
for her and was an easy mark for Concini, a man who had helped her
control northern France in 1614, and more, a fellow Italian among all
the troublesome French and the husband of one of her closest friends.
This can not detract from the fact that until then the press of events
and ambition for herself and her family had made Marie de Médicis a
successful regent.

She had benefited from the counsel and insight of her ministers,
without whom she most probably would have been unsuccessful. But she
had chosen them from among many others in 1610, had refused to dis­
miss them despite repeated attacks, and always retained control of the
final result of their actions. The memoirs and letters of the time, as
well as the proceedings of the Estates General, clearly show that the
ultimate power in France always remained with Marie.

With the aid and advice of Villeroy, Jeannin, Sillery, and a few
others Marie met the problems posed by the nobles, the Huguenots, the
Gallicans, and especially by foreign relations and financial necessity.
In the crisis of 1614–1615 it was Marie who took direct action in mini­
mizing the rebellion of Condé, in postponing the final settlement until

1Birch, Historical View, pp. 389–390. Edmondes was involved in
the negotiations at Loudun. Pontchartrain, Mémoires, pp. 419–446. Ta­
the most opportune time, in defeating the attempts during the summer of 1614 by the rebels to gain further support, in influencing the elections so that men loyal to the crown would attend the Estates General. She continued her action by arranging for the election of the presidents of the three estates, by refusing or not really acting on any of the special pleas of the Estates General, and by sending the deputies home without satisfaction and burdened with the guilt of failure. Parlement's attempt at opposition was halted, and despite the real danger of rebellion and possibly death she managed to carry out the Spanish marriages. Throughout this central crisis the long-term policy of the regency was continued and brought to a successful conclusion. Marie made tactical errors between 1610 and 1617; her strategy was not always worked out in advance, and most of the problems she faced were only temporarily solved. But when Louis XIII came to power he was presented with a loyal, powerful, well-allied France, a France that he would wisely entrust to a discovery of Marie's—Cardinal Richelieu. Even though Marie was in disgrace after Louis took power, it was essentially the policy of Henry IV and Marie de Médicis that Richelieu would perfect.

In the meantime, the Estates General had been forgotten. Their program of reform had received the crowning blow on May 13, 1615, when the paulette was re-established. In theory the concessions granted to the Third Estate with regard to extraordinary commissions went into effect, but there is no proof that the edicts were ever enforced. The chamber of justice on finances, the Council of Trent, and all the other plans of the Estates General—these were swallowed up in the administrative morass of the Ancien Régime.
But this should not be surprising. The Estates General had not been called to reform the kingdom, but to foil Condé and to gain the approval of the country for the policies of the regency. An analysis of the activities of the King’s Council and Parlement in 1614–1615 shows the attention given to the wishes of the Estates General for reform. The Parlement registered eight ordinances between January, 1614, and the end of March, 1615, that were in accord with the wishes of the Estates General, and none of these was important. On the other hand, there were seventeen ordinances registered which were in direct opposition to the desires of the Estates General, including five granting naturalization and privileges to foreigners and five violations of the reform of waters and forests that was connected with the unanimous request of the Estates General that the King retain and regain his personal domain so that the taille could be lowered. ¹

The collection of the printed edicts of the King show that between January 4, 1614, and May 23, 1615, five edicts were published favoring the wishes of the deputies, while twelve were in opposition, including three creating new offices and four imposing new taxes. Clearly it was business as usual. ²

¹ A.N. XIA 8647, foll. 466r–511v; XIA 8648, foll. 1r–171r. It is interesting to note that during this period seven patents or monopolies for the use of new manufacturing processes were granted. A study of this aspect of royal power over a longer period might well reveal much of interest to economic historians.

² A.N. AD+ 156; AD+ 157; AD+ 158. The records of the King’s Council, A.N. E 43 Ä–E 48A, fol. 338r, of which the Parlement records serve as an excellent summary, reveal the same pattern. Similarly, A.N. AD IX 4; AD IX 416; AD IX 470; AD IX 490 (collections of edicts
The deputies had come from every part of France; some traveled for several weeks to get to Paris. Those without connections in Paris had to trust to the inns, and all had to put up with a rise in prices during the meetings. Matteo Bartolini, the ambassador of Venice, was glad to see the Estates General ending because living became less expensive once more. For more than five months they were separated from home and their own affairs. They worked hard, and when all was said and done they had produced three remarkable documents: the cahiers. 1

These men who had been chosen to present the grievances of the people of France truly represented and were representative of the French of 1614. Among the deputies to the First Estate were to be found not only bishops, but more curés than had ever before sat in an Estates General. In fact, the group which lost in percentage of membership comprised the chapters and diocesan officials. The higher nobility had greater representation than usual, though the lesser nobility clearly dominated in the Second Estate. Every level of society was represented among the members of the Third Estate—even the peasants. Besides the one deputy who was simply listed as a rural inhabitant there were eleven syndics—that is, elected representatives of rural areas—present in Paris. 2


2. Cf. Appendix II.
Because of the practice of voting by government and the lack of procès-verbaux for the governmental meetings within the Estates General, not much can be learned of the influence of the individual deputies beyond those who spoke out in the full meetings. But the result of the procedure was the cahiers. These show not only the direction of the government, bishops, and interested officials, but the desires of the leaders and representatives of all segments of French society in 1614–1615. And the basic desire of the French was reform of the existing society and government.

Marie de Médicis sacrificed the proposed reforms for the sake of maintaining the sovereignty of the King. Nevertheless, the reforms proposed in 1614 were slowly accepted in France, though the Estates General received small credit. In 1617 an Assembly of Notables was called, ostensibly to carry on the work of 1614, this time through a safer medium. This limited assembly, a number of whose members had served in the Estates General of 1614, presented thirty-six articles to Louis XIII on November 24, 1617. The assembly asked for exemption from taxes for the clergy and nobles, a reduction of the taille, suppression of many offices, revocation of the paulette, and the ending of a number of local abuses. A month later the Assembly of Notables presented the King with its answers to twenty propositions he had given them. In these answers they called for reorganization of the King's Council, tax reforms, reduction of the army, destruction of the fortresses, reduction of pensions, and abolition of the paulette. This last was granted, only to be again revoked; it was necessary to keep
the loyalty of the sovereign courts. The King had an edict drawn up incorporating the reforms of the assembly and the Estates General of 1614, but it was never published.\footnote{Boullée, Histoire complète, II, 199–204. Mousnier, Venalité, pp. 590–597. Picot, Histoire des États généraux, IV, 300. B.N. Collection Dupuy 35 (Edict of 1618).}

In 1626 there was another Assembly of Notables, and again some of the deputies of 1614 were called to the meeting. Again the pleas of 1614 were repeated, this time to open ears. Richelieu called the meeting to gain backing for his reforms. At the conclusion of the assembly Michel de Marillac was ordered by Richelieu to draw up an ordinance containing the asked for reforms. Marillac and his advisors did this, and on January 15, 1629, the body of 461 articles, since known as the Code Michau, was proclaimed by the King. The Parlement of Paris resisted registering the ordinance until August 29, and then refused to enforce it. However, it was accepted in the provinces. The subsequent disgrace of Marillac and the nature of the Ancien Régime hindered somewhat the application of the code, but through the influence of Colbert some of the reforms were incorporated into the Ordinance of 1667. In the eighteenth century more of the reforms, especially those concerning jurisprudence, found their way into practice, even in Paris. Belatedly and anonymously the Estates General of 1614 had its way, at least in part.\footnote{Jeanne Petit, L’assemblée des notables de 1626–1627 (Paris, 1937), pp. 227–229. Picot, Histoire des États généraux, IV, 300–302. Glasson, Histoire du droit, VIII, 169–179. The full title of the Code Michau was Ordonnance du Roy Louis XIII, roi de France et de Navarre, sur les plaintes de son royaume, convoqués et assemblés en la
The Estates General of 1614 had an even greater influence in other ways. Very justly it can be said that the Estates General of 1614 settled nothing. Richelieu would find the solutions to the problem of the power of the Huguenots and the nobles. Louis XIV developed these solutions and enforced the first article of the Third Estate. The eighteenth century would see the curtailing of the power of Parliament. In a sense the Estates General of 1614 was in the middle of a longer development. The deputies of 1614 studied the ordinances drawn up as a result of the meetings of the Estates General of the sixteenth century; parts of these ordinances, especially the parts dealing with administrative reforms, were incorporated into the cahiers; this was only sensible, for many of the problems of the Ancien Régime were long-standing ones.

But the Estates General of 1614 summed up all the reforms that France needed in the early seventeenth century—abolishment of clerical abuses, unjust claims of the nobility, venality of office, supernumary officials. It pointed to the problems that faced the government—disloyal elements within the state, a poorly organized system of administration, lack of freedom of trade within France, and a reasonable government policy for foreign trade. Though one or another of this complex of abuses and problems would dominate at different times, all of them were present during the remaining 175 years of the Ancien Régime.

The great proponents of the monarchy found in the Estates General of 1614 the bases of their programs. Richelieu had his first political experience within that Estates General; his program after taking charge of the government of France must have been influenced by what he learned—his program of action was too similar to the program of the Estates General to be mere coincidence. Colbert made a special study of the Estates General of 1614; this directed him in forming the Ordinance of 1667 (Could not the ideas of the Estates General on mercantilism, for example, also have influenced him?). Bossuet also studied the Estates General of 1614 and knew well the first article of the Third Estate. This must have influenced his formulation of the theory of the divine right of kings. To dwell on this a moment longer—by 1614 the theory of absolutism had been developed; the Third Estate summarized it and brought the issue into the open. Richelieu learned among other things in 1614 the dangers of consulting large numbers of subjects, and he never made that mistake himself. In fact, he began to apply the ideas of the Estates General in such a way that the King’s power would be strengthened to the point of absolute rule. Colbert and Bossuet, the other students of the Estates General of 1614, completed this work and added the theoretical niceties. The Estates General of 1614 was not the only inspiration of these men, but it played a very definite part.

The opponents of absolutism also hearkened to the Estates General; Fénélon and Malesherbes both called for another meeting of this body. By 1789 the problems of the monarchy had become more acute, the critics more insistent, but the actions and cahiers of 1614 still summed up the basic issues, and it was to 1614 that France turned in 1789 when there was no other answer. The Assembly of Notables and
Parlement called for an Estates General; all of France studied what had happen 175 years before, and when the deputies met it was to deal with the problems faced in 1614. The answer of 1789 was not that of reform; perhaps it was too late—the Third Estate had gone unanswered too long. The answer was revolution, but the end result was to carry out the program of 1614 in a new society.
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7526 Recueil journalier. ...
A copy from the Petits-pères. Seventeenth century.

7527 Procès verbal concernant les propositions, délibérations et résolutions prises et arrestées en la chambre de la noblesse de France ... 1614. ...

7533 Recueil de ce qui s'est observé et passé durant la tenue des Estatç généraux à Paris ... 1614.
Includes an account of the Assembly of Notables of 1617.

9225 Recueil de vers et de pièces historiques.
This includes many originals. Many of the verses are satiric.

10876 Recueil en form de procès verbal de tout ce qui s'est fait et passé aux Estats généraux, tenus en la ville de Paris, en l'année 1614, en la chambre du tiers Estat ... le tout recuilly, jour par jour et datte pour datte par ung des députéz de lad. chambre.
This is an original account, evidently by an unknown deputy.
Bibliothèque Nationale

Manuscrits français

10877 Estatz Gñaux à Paris 1615 et 1616 contenant les cahiers de la noblesse et ce qui s’est passé. ... Volume I.
   This volume also includes some pamphlets.

10878 Estatz Gñaux à Paris 1615 et 1616 contenant les cahiers de la noblesse et ce qui s’est passé. ... Volume II.

10879 Recueil des principalles harangues prononcees aux trois chambres des Estatz tenus à Paris l’an 1614 comprenans les pointcs et résolutions prisés par les trois ordres avec un Journal de ce qui se passé dans la chambre de la noblesse.
   This volume was edited by the president of the Second Estate, Baron de Senecey.

11916 États généraux de Normandie.
   Includes an original cahier.

11976 Cahier des plaintes et remonstrances de la noblesse de la province et gouvernement d’Orléans, faict aux Estatz tenus à Paris ... 1614.

15644 Recueil de pièces, manuscrites et imprimées, lettres, mémoires politiques, etc., se rapportant quelques unes aux derniers années du règne de Henri IV et le plus grand nombre au règne de Louis XIII.
   The years covered are 1606 to 1643.

16116 Dépêches originales adressés à la cour par divers ambassa- deurs et agents français en Espagne. Volume V.
   This volume covers the years 1614 to 1616.

16266 États-généraux de 1614–1615.
   Containing cahiers and procès-verbaux, this volume comes from St. Maur.
Bibliothèque Nationale

Manuscrits français

18256 Procès verbal du tiers Estat aux Estats généraux assemblées à Paris en 1614 et 1615. This is another independent account of the Third Estate. The volume originally came from St. Maur.

18259 Recueil de ce qui se passa en l'assemblée des Estats de l'an 1614 et 1615. Extrait sommaire de ce qui s'est fait chaque jour ès assemblées du clergé de l'an 1626. ...

18472 Traités et mémoires concernant la justice. These are seventeenth-century treatises.

18474 Traités et mémoires concernant la réformation de la justice et de l'administration du royaume. Seventeenth-century manuscript.

18513 Recueil sur le Cérémonial formé en grand partie par les soins de Théodore Godefroy. Volume I. 1323–1654. There are 21 volumes in this collection.


23159 Mélanges sur l'histoire de France. A seventeenth-century manuscript.

23396 Journal des Estatz généraux tenues à Paris en 1614 et 1615. This is a seventeenth-century copy of Clapisson. It also includes the cahier of the nobles in 1614, the cahier of the Assembly of Notables in 1617, and the edict of July, 1618.

23700 Procès verbal contenant les propositions, délibérations et résolutions ... chambre de la noblesse ... 1614. Account of Montcassin even though his name is nowhere used.
Nouvelles Acquisitions françaises

1395 Procès verbal de ce que s'est passé en la chambre de tiers-estat par Mr Le Doux Lieutenant général d'Evreux. A copy.

2808 États généraux de Louis XIII.

5174 Papiers de Peiresc. 6. Papiers divers du cabinet de Pie- resc.

7254 Procès verbal contenant les propâons, délibérations et résolu­ons prinsés et arrestées en la chambre du tiers Estat de France ... 1614.
This MS is the same as MS français 7525. This copy was made in 1652 and signed as an official copy.

7255 Recueil journalier de ce qui s'est négotie et arresté en la chambre et compagnie du tiers Estat. ...
This is an official copy of 1652 also. It includes the cahier of the deputies of the Third Estate of Burgundy.

7259 Instructions baillées par le roy à plusieurs ambassadeurs tant ordinaires que extraordinaires envoyée en Angleterre, Hollande, Constantinople et en Perse.

7260 Divers discours et lettres de Monsieur de Villeroy, Secre­ taire d’Estat.
These are MS copies of printed copies made in 1652.

7261 Instructions baillées par le roy à plusieurs ambassadeurs tant ordinaires qu'extraordinaires envoyez en Allemagne, en Suisse, et aux Grisons.
This is a copy of 1652, made by order of the King and Par­ lement.
Bibliothèque Nationale
Nouvelles Acquisitions françaises

7262 Divers discours d'estat et lettres de Monsieur le président Jeannin.
This is a MS copy of printed copies made in 1652 by order of the King and Parlement.

7794 Louis XIII. 1610-1614.

7795 Louis XIII. 1614-1636.

7853 Matières de gouvernement et politiques.
This is a collection of pamphlets and notices on books.

9752 Extraits des archives du chapitre de Paris pour les États généraux, de 1483 à 1651.

Collection Brequigny

47 Melanges historiques et litteraires. Notices de divers manuscrits.

Collection Clairambault

364 Documents originaux et copies, mémoires et extraits tirés de la Bibliothèque du Roi ... pour servir aux études d'histoire du Dauphin sous la direction de Bossuet, et concernant les règnes de François Ier à Henri III avec une suite de Henri IV à Louis XIV. Volume LIV. 1614.

365 Documents originaux. ... Volume LV. 1615.

742 Meslanges pour servir à l'histoire et aux généalogies. Volume CCCXXXI. Estats généraux de 1614 et 1615.

1128 Recueil pour servir à l'histoire de l'Ordre et des Commandeurs, Chevaliers et Officiers du St. Esprit. Règne de Louis 3e chef et Souverain Grand Maistre. Volume XLV.
Bibliothèque Nationale

Collection Clairambault

1129 Recueil pour servir ... du St. Esprit. ... Volume XLVI. 1612-1619.

Cinq Cents de Colbert

1 Diverses lettres et mémoires concernans l'histoire de France. Volume I. 1278-1616.

12 Mémoires pour l'histoire de France depuis l'an 1600 jusques en l'année 1616.

13 Estats généraux et assemblées des notables depuis 1560 jusqu'en 1627.

17 Meslanges de divers lettres, pièces et mémoires concernant les affaires de France. Volume II. 1609-1628.

43 Mouvementz du Prince de Condé, 1614 et 1615. All the pieces are copies, but the volume comes originally from the library of J. A. de Thou, who was involved in the negotiations with Condé.

88 Registres de lettres missives de la Reine Marie de Médicis. Volume III. 1610-1614.

89 Registre de lettres missives de la Reine Marie de Médicis. Volume IV. 1612-1617. Volumes III and IV are in Marie's hand. Autograph, original, signed.

90 Registres administratifs de la reine Marie de Médicis. Volume I.

91 Registres administratifs de la reine Marie de Médicis. Volume II.

92 Registres administratifs de la reine Marie de Médicis. Volume III.
Bibliothèque Nationale

Cinq Cents de Colbert

102 Instructions et mémoires pour ambassadeurs et envoyez tant de dedans de la France qu'aux princes estrangers, et des dits princes estrangers à autres. Seventeenth-century copies.

139 Divers mémoires concernans les rangs entre les grands, et autres personnes, les ceremonies observées aux processions, Te Deum, jurement de paix, pompes funèbres. Les personnes à qui le Prevost des Marchands doit faire le serment le Roy absent et les differends pour rangs des ambassadeurs.

143 Processions d'après des registres de Sainctot, maître des ceremonies de la cour, les registres de l'Hotel de Ville et ceux du Parlement. 1571-1684.

307 Traictéz avec les Ducs de Bourgogne, Archiducs d'Autriche et Cantons des Suises. Seventeenth-century copies.

Mélanges de Colbert

83 Mémoires de Jean Baptiste Colbert, marquis de Seignelay, sur les juridictions du royaume, les ordonnances, les États généraux. les lettres de sceau, les origines du droit français, le clergé. This MS is in Colbert’s own handwriting.

Collection Dupuy


76 Recueil de pièces concernant les ceremonies observées dans les lits de justice, dans les mariages royaux et princiers ... 1378 à 1630.
Collection Dupuy

91 Recueil de pièces concernant le fin du règne de Henri IV et le règne de Louis XIII. Volume II. 1614–1615.

94 Recueil de pièces concernant la fin du règne de Henri IV et le règne de Louis XIII. Volume V. Meslanges depuis l’année 1610 jusques en 1629 et les années 1630 et 1631. Some of the pieces are copies.

209 Recueil de pièces concernant le Barrois. Volume I. Compiled in 1627.

323 Edicts, actes et mémoires concernans ceux de la religion pretendue réformée depuis l’an 1598 jusques en l’année 1620. Volume II. Compiled in 1629.

658 Lettres et mémoires depuis le Roi François I jusques au Roi Louis XIII. Compiled in 1648.

744 Titres et actes touchant l’histoire de France. Compiled in 1650.


853 Recueil de divers mémoires. Concerned with dons, capanages, contrats, etc. 1548–1617. A few copies.
Collection Dupuy

950 Mémoires de ce qui s'est passé en France concernant le premier article du cahier de la chambre du tiers Estat, assemblée aux Estats généraux tenus à Paris, ès années 1614 & 1615.
Compiled in 1615.

Manuscrits Italien

866 Registro di lettere della Nuntiatura di Francia di Monsignor Ubaldini dell'anno 1613 e 1616.

1200 Lettres tirées des registres de la Nonciature d'Ubaldini depuis 1608 jusques à 1616 touchant la doctrine et les sentiments du royaume.
These letters are in Italian.

Collection Moreau

307 Archives du Cabinet des Chartes. 23. Congrégation de Saint Maur. Travaux executés III.

1427 Recueil de pièces sur les États généraux. ...
This MS includes an original autograph of the cahier of the Second Estate in 1615.

British Museum

Stowe Manuscripts

174 Edmondes Papers. Volume IX.

175 Edmondes Papers. Volume X.
Archives Departmentales

Aube

G 140. Cahier du clergé de Champagne et lettre adressée à l'évêque de Troyes ... 1614-1615.

Maine et Loire

1 Mi 11 (R1). Minute supposée du cahier ... noblesse d'Angers ... 1614.

Seine-Maritime

B 564.

C 2109. Observations sur les États généraux du royaume et particulier de la Normandie et de ce qui a eu lieu à cet égard en l'hôtel de ville de Rouen pour l'élection des députés. 1788.

D 110.

La Somme

I B 17. Registre.

Archives Communales

Amiens

BB 59. Registre aux délibérations, 1610-1615.

Lyon

AA 146. Registre.

BB 150. Registre.
II. PAMPHLETS

Advertissement a la France. n.p., 1614.
Contains excerpts from Condé's letters to Marie de Médicis.


Advis à Monseigneur le Prince. n.p., 1614.

Advis au roy. n.p., n.d.
Attributed to 1615.

Advis au roy sur la réformation générale des abus ... en son royaume. n.p., 1615.

Advis au gens de bien. n.p., n.d.
Attributed to 1615. The nobles are the cause of the troubles of France. Evil spirit of times, too much luxury, etc.
Advis au trois estats ... de la guerre civile. n.p., 1614.
Published on February 14 in two anonymous editions. Pro-royal authority.

Advis de Caton en l'assemblée des chambres ce II de Mars 1615. n.p., 1615.
On the paulette.

Advis, remonstrances et requestes aux Estats généraux tenus à Paris, par six paysans, 1614. n.p., n.d.
Attributed to 1614.

Pro King and Queen.

Les alarmes. n.p., n.d.

Anatomie des trois ordres de la France sur le sujet des Estats. n.p., 1615.


Apologie pour Monsieur le Prince de Condé sur son départ de la cour. n.p., 1614.


Article de l'église apporté au tiers Estat par monseigneur l'évesque de Mascon le matin 5. jour de janvier 1615. n.p., n.d.
At least three different editions were published.
Article et conventions arrestées en Espagne le mercredy 20 d'aoust 1612... sur le mariage du Roy Louys XIII. avec l'infante, Dame Anne, Princesse d'Espagne. n.p., 1614.


Articles de la paix establie entre la majesté du roy catholique et le serenissime duc de Savoye, le 21 de juin 1615. Paris: Jean Petit-Pas, 1615.


Articles et conventions arrestées en France le mercredy 20. aoust 1612. ... Sur le mariage de Dom Philippe Prince d'Espagne et Madame Elizabeth de France. n.p., 1614.


Articles presentées au roy par les députés du Tiers État en attendant la résolution du cahier général des États assembléz en ceste ville de Paris. n.p., n.d. This carries the date of February 17, 1615.

Athys, Viole d'. Reponse à la harangue fait par l'Ilustrisime Cardinal du Perron. n.p., n.d. Athys was a conseiller au conseil d'état.

Au clergé. n.p., n.d. A collection of four essays, two addressed to clergy, one to the nobles, and one to the King.

De l'authorité royale. n.p., 1615. Pro-royal authority.


Le bon françois contre les libelles. n.p., 1615.

Bouillon, Henry de la Tour, duc de. Lettre au président Jannin par Monsieur de Bouillon. n.p., n.d.
The letter carries the date June 19, 1615.

——. Lettre de M. de Bouillon à M. le Prince sur l'affaire de Poi-tiers. n.p., 1614.
The letter carries the date of July 8, 1614.


Cahyers généraux des articles resolus et accordés entre les députés des 3. états. Paris, 1615. The last two pamphlets, one with 40 and the other with 42 pages, illustrate the differences in spelling and editions that often existed.
This was a sermon given on the fifth Sunday after Epiphany, 1615.

Sermon of Sunday within Octave of Christmas—December 28, 1614.

Sermon of first Sunday of Advent, 1614.

Les canons des conciles de Tolède, de Meaux, d'Oxfort et de Constance... par lesquels la doctrine de deposer et user les roys et princes est condamné. n.p., 1615.

Le Caton françois au roy. n.p.: Haron, 1614.
MS. Clairambault 364 notes that Barbir attributes this to Jacques Gillot.

Le cayer général des remonstrances que l'université de Paris a dressé, pour presenter au roy nostre souverain seigneur en l'assemblée générale des trois ordres de son royaume. ... n.p., 1615.
The cahier carries the date of December 13, 1614.

Le Censeur. n.p., 1615.
Points out how the King is badly served.


Commission extraordinaire du roy. ... n.p., 1615.
Parlement given jurisdiction in the case of Henri de Bonneval.
This carries the date of March 11, 1615.

Conclusion de la derniere assemblée faicte par ceux de la religion pretendu réformée dans la ville de Montauban au pays de Quercy.
Paris: Jean Bourriquont, 1615.

Condé, Henri II de Bourbon, Prince de. Advis donné au roy en son conseil par Monsieur le Prince. n.p., n.d.
Déclaration faite par Monsieur le Prince de Condé à tous les ordres et compagnies de la France, des causes qui le meuvent à demander la réformation de l’estat et changement des mauvais conseillers. n.p., n.d. This carries the date August 9, 1615, signed by Condé at Coucy.

La dernière lettre de Monsieur le Prince envoyée à la royne, sur la confirmation des articles accordées à Sainte Menhoult. n.p., n.d. Sent by Condé from Dissay on June 5, 1614.

Dernière lettre écrite à la royne par Monseigneur le Prince. n.p., 1614. This edition carries the date of July 6.


Lettre de Monseigneur le Prince à MM de la cour de Parlement. n.p., 1614. This carries the date of February 18.

Lettre de Monseigneur le Prince au Parlement de Paris presentée par le sieur de Fiefbrun, le vingt-deuxiesme fevrier 1614. n.p., 1614.

Lettre de Monseigneur le Prince de Condé sur le refus qui luy a esté fait par Messieurs de Poictiers. n.p., n.d. The various editions carry either the date June 22 or 25, 1614.

Recueil des lettres de Monseigneur le Prince de Condé et autres. n.p., n.d.

Condé, Henri II de Bourbon, Prince de, and Bouillon, Henry de la Tour, duc de. Le manifeste de M. le Prince envoyé à M. le cardinal de Joyeuse. Ensemble le lettre de M. de Bouillon, envoyée à Madame de la Trimouille. n.p., 1614.
Le Conseiller fidèle à son roy. n.p., n.d.
Attributed to 1614.

Copie de la harrangue fait en la presence du roy a l'entrée des Estats, par les députéz de la Rochelle, pour les églises réformées au rapport de Mathoul. n.p., 1615.

Copie d'une lettre d'un prelat député du clergé à l'assemblée des estats, sur ce qui s'est passé touchant l'article contentieux employé pour le premier au cayer du Tiers Estat. n.p., 1615.

Copie d'une lettre sur la remontrance faite au roi sur la conclusion des Estats le samedy 21 fevrier par M. l'archevéques de Lyon. n.p., 1615.

D.C., sieur. Advertissement à la France touchant les libelles qu'on seme contre le gouvernement de l'estat. n.p., n.d.
This was first published in 1600 and dedicated to President Jean-nin, and then published anonymously in 1614 or 1615.

Le décret du Concile de Constance. ... n.p., n.d.
This was published by the deputies of the First Estate.

Discours à la royné régente ... sur les désordres ... en ce royaume. n.p., n.d.
This is cast in the form of a poem.

Discours à Messieurs les députéz aux Estats généraux de France. n.p., n.d.
The author claims to be a deputy to the Estates General; he appears to be a noble.

Discours de ce qui s'est passé à Mezières. n.p., n.d.

Discours d'un genti-homme français à la noblesse de France, sur l'ouverture de l'assemblée des Estats généraux dans la ville de Paris en ceste année 1614. Avec deux advertissements particuliers à Mrs les députéz du clergé et de la noblesse. n.p., n.d.

Discours pour la conservation de l'annuel des offices. n.p., n.d.
Discours pour la seureté de la vie et de l'estat des roys. n.p., n.d.

Discours d’est passé en la présentation, des remonstrances par écrit, que le Parlement alla faire en corps au roy, le mardy 22. may 1615. n.p., n.d.
This exists in at least two editions.

Discours sur la lettre de Monsieur le Prince. n.p., n.d.

Discours sur l’alliance faicte par le roy tres-chrestien, avec le roy catholique. n.p., 1615.
This pamphlet is in favor of the alliance.

Against the reception of the decrees of the Council.


Discours sur les mariages de France et d’Espagne contenant les raisons qui ont meu Monseigneur le Prince a en demander la sur-séance. n.p., 1614.

Discours sur l’droict annuel. n.p., n.d.
Against the paulette.

Discours remarquable advenus à Paris, pendant des Estats. n.p., 1615.
On the first article of the Third Estate.

Discours veritable de ce qui s’est passé au Parlement, en suite de l’arrest de la cour du 28. mars dernier, et des remonstrances. n.p., n.d.


—. Lettre de Monseigneur le Cardinal du Perron à Monsiegnieur le Prince. Rouen: Jean Osmont et Jean Bertelin, 1614. This and the last entry are the same letter of March 3, 1614. This is an illustration of the spreading of a work through France in different editions.


—. Règlesmenfs faits par Monsieur le Cardinal du Perron ... et messieurs les juges ordonnëz par le Roy pour la générale réformation des hospitaux, maladeries et autres lieux pitoyables de ce royaume. Paris: Antoine Estienne, 1614.


Entrée royale faite en la ville de Poitiers. Paris, 1619. This concerns the entry in the summer of 1614.

Des Estats généraux de France. n.p., 1615.


Extraict des registres de la cour touchat ce qu s'est passé en l'affaire de Monsieur d'Espерnon. vingt-quatriesme novembre 1614. n.p., 1615.
Extract des registres des estates sur la réception du Concile de
This contains extracts from the accounts of the Estates General of 1576 and 1593.

F.D.M. Advis à tous les bons et fidèles français de l'une et l'autre religion. n.p., n.d.
Attributed to 1614. The author calls himself a Vermandois.

Le financier à messieurs des Estats. n.p., 1615.

The work concerns navigation.

De France et de Espagne. n.p., 1614.

Gabriel le Bien-Venu. Foucade aux Estats. n.p., 1615.
The author signs himself as Gentilhomme Angoumoisin.

Gayraud, I. de. Discours présenté au roy à son arrivée à Paris.
Paris: Joseph Bouillerat, n.d.

Gazette des Estats et de ce temps du Seig'gio seritour, de Pieragrosa. Traduite d'Italien en Français le premier janvier 1615. n.p., n.d.

Harrangue de l'amateur de justice aux trois estats. n.p., 1615.
On the reformation of the judiciary.

Harrangue faitce par la noblesse de Champagne et Brie insérée en ses cayers, et présentée à sa majeste. n.p., 1615.
At least two editions of this exist.


L'Hermaphrodite de ce temps. n.p., n.d.
Attributed to 1615. Exhortation to Louis XIII to be like his father and crush all rebels.


L'Image de la France représentée à messieurs des Estats avec la réfutation d'un libelle intitulé Le Caton François, fait contres ceux qui maintiennent la religion et l'estat le tout divise en trois parties. n.p., n.d.
Attributed to 1615. Written by a Jesuit.

L'italien français. n.p., n.d.
Defends the loyalty of the Italians in the King's service.

The author signs himself only with his initials but identifies himself as "un Gentil-homme Champenois, cy devant depute aux Estats pour la noblesse de Champagne." Jacques de Brouillart, deputy of Troyes, is the only man who fits this description.


——. A Remonstrance of the Most Gratious King James I King of Great Britain, France and Ireland for the Right of Kings and the Independance of their Crownes Against an Oration of the Most Illustrious Card. of Perron. Pronounced in the Chamber of the Third Estate January 15, 1615. Translated out of His Maisties French Copie. Cambridge: Cantrell Legge, 1616.
This is a translation; James originally wrote the work in French.

Attributed to 1614. Anti-Condé.
La justice que Monseigneur le Prince demande à la royne, de la rebellion de Poictiers. n.p., 1614.

Le Forgeron, Alexandre. La Harrangue d'Alexandre Le Forgeron prononcée au conclave des réformateurs. n.p., 1614.

Lettre d'Espagne présentée à la royne régente par le Sieur Philotée Elian de Mont Alto. Paris: Jean Brunet, 1614.

Lettre de Guillaume sans Peur envoyée aux désbandés de la cour. n.p., 1615.
A tract of the cycle "Le Soldat François," attributed to Maistre Guillaume, who champions the Spanish alliance which will bring eventual peace to France.

Lettre de Jacques Bon-Homme, paysan de Beauvoisis à messieurs les princes retirés de la cour. Paris: Jean Brunet, 1614.

Lettre de messieurs de Bordeaux à Monseigneur le Prince. n.p., n.d.
Attributed to 1614. This is the reply of the Parlement of Bordeaux to Condé.

The anonymous author claims to be a deputy to the Estates General.

Louis XIII. Articles accordés par le roi aux trois ordres des Estats de ce royaume. Lyon, 1615.
The articles carry dates between December 16, 1614, and January 12, 1615.

——. De par le roy. n.p., 1615.
The account of the dismissal of the Estates General.


Another edition was published by the same house in 1615. The date of the verification in the Cour des Aides is given as December 20.

Edicts du roy. n.p., 1644.

Contains twenty-seven edicts of Louis XIII, eight of which fall between 1610 and 1616.

Lettres de déclaration du Roy pour le rétablissement du Sieur Duc de Vendosme, en son gouvernement de Bretagne avec l’arrest de la cour, portant verification et publication desdites lettres. Jouxte la coppie imprimé à Rennes par Tite Haran, 1614.


The date of the ordinance is March 5, 1614.

Lettres du roy contenant le mandement de sa majesté, pour la convocation des Estats généraux du royaume en la ville de Sens. Troyes: Pierre Chevillot, 1614.

Dated July 23, 1614.
Lettres patentes du roy donnés sur les remonstrances des gens des trois estats du pays et duché de Bretaigne, avec les respon-

ses de sa majesté sur icelles. Jouxté la copie imprimée à Rennes par Tite Haran, 1614.

Lettres patentes du roy du mois de juillet 1614 contenants sa déclaration sur ce qui s'est passé durant et à l'occassion du mouvement fait par l'entremise et recherche de Monsieur le Prince de Condé, et des princes, officiers de la couronne, seigneurs et autres qui l'ont assisté et suivi, depuis le premier de janvier dernier. Verifiées en Parlement le 4 dudit mois de juillet 1614. Paris: F. Morel & P. Mettayer.

Lettres patentes du roy portans défenses ... de n'enlever au-
cuns soldats hors de ce royaume, pour aller servir aucun prince estranger. Tresclaustres: Antoin Blanc, 1614.
The letters carry the date of September 22, 1614.

Lettres patentes du roy portant confirmation des privileges,
exemptions de tailles, subsides et autres empruntes, au prevot général et provincial d'Anjou, ses lieutenans, assesseurs et autres officiers y dénomnéz. Paris: Frederic Morel, 1624.
The act dates from 1614.

Mandement du roy et lettre de la royne régente sa mère, pour
la convocation des Estats généraux du royaume en la ville de Sens aux dixiesme de septembre de l'année présente, 1614. Bour-

Carries the notation Cour des Monayes Fevrier 4, 1615.

Résponse du roy, faicte aux remonstrances présentées à leurs majestéz par le Sr Edmondes ambassadeur du roy de la Grande Bretagne. n.p., 1615.

The preface carries the date June 8, 1615. The work is pro-
Catholic and pro-Jesuit.
Manifeste de ce qui se passè dernièremenent aux Estats généraux, entre le clergé et le tiers Estat. n.p., 1615.

Marie de Médicis. Copie de la lettre escritte à Monsieur Desdiguie par la royne. n.p., 1614.

—. Double de la réponse de la royne régente, mère du Roy, à la lettre escritte à sa majesté, par le Prince de Condé, le 19 de fevrier 1614. Paris: Jean de Bordeaulx et Jean Millot, 1614. The date of the letter is February 27, 1614.


—. Lettre de la royne à Messieur de Roquelaure ... lieutenant général du roy en Guienne. Touchant ce qui s'est passé n'a guieres à Poictiers et en Bretagne. Bordeaux: S. Millanges, 1614.


—. Lettres de la royne régente, mère du Roy, escripte à Orléans le 14 juillet 1614. A messieurs de la Court de Parlement à Rouen. Rouen: Martin le Mesgissier, 1614.

—. ... La réponse de la royne régente mère du Roy à la lettre escritte ... par ... Condé, le 19 de fevrier 1614. n.p., n.d.

Marguerite de Valois. Lettre de la Reine Marguerite à M de Nevers. n.p., 1614. The letter is dated August 10, [1614].

Marmiesse, Pierre. Remonstrances sur l'execution des délibérations prises en la chambre de tiers Estat pour le retranchement des tailles, communication des cahiers entre les trois chambres et pour la poursuite d'une chambre de justice contre les financiers. ... Paris: Denys Langlois, 1615. Marmiesse was an advocat au Parlement de Toulouse and a deputy to the Third Estate in 1614.
Marquemont, Denis Simon de. Harangue prononcée par Monsieur l'ar¬
chevesque de Lion à l'ouverture des Estats tenus à Paris en la

Mathault. Libre harangue faicte par Mathault en la présence de Mon­sieur le Prince en son chasteau d'Amboise, le seiziesme jour de
juin, 1614. n.p., 1614.

Les maux que cause le droit annuel en l'estat et raisons pour la révo­
cation d'iceluy. n.p., n.d.
Attributed to 1614.

Mémoires adresséz à messieurs des Estats, pour presenter à sa ma­
jesté, contenant les fautes, abus, et malversations commises par
les officiers de finances, partisans et payeurs des rentes en
l'estendue de ce Royaume. n.p., n.d.

Miron, Robert. Harangue prononcée devant le roy et la reyne ... à la
présentation du cahier du tiers Estat. ... n.p., n.d.

Morgard, Noel Jean. Prédiction de Morgard pour la présente année
1614. ... n.p., n.d.

Nervèze, sieur de. Lettre escrite à M. le Prince par le sieur de
The letter carries the date of March 26.

La noblesse française au chancelier. n.p., n.d.

Ode à la royne sur l'heureux succèz de la conference de Soissons.

Ordre des bailliages observé en la convocation des Estats généraux de
ce royaume, en l'année mil six cens quatorze, en la ville de Paris
et les noms, surnoms et qualitez des députéz du Tiers Estat des­
dits bailliages en douze gouvernemens, pour opiner en ladite
At least one other edition, that of Melchior Mondiere, was pub­
lished.
Le patois Limousin. n.p., 1615.
Addressed to Condé.

Paul V. Lettre du nostre S. père le Pape, escrite à messieurs de la noblesse députéz aux Estats généraux de ce royaume. n.p., n.d.

—. Lettre de nostre S. père le Pape escrite à messieurs du clergé députéz au Estats de ce royaume avec la réponce faicte par L.E.D. n.p., 1615.
The letter to the clergy was printed in the original Latin, while that to the nobles was presented in a French translation.

The letter carries the date of May 17 [1614].


This satirical pamphlet refers to March 16, 1615.

Le premier article du cahier général du Tiers Estat de France, assembléz à Paris aux Augustins en l'année 1614. n.p., 1614.

Procès verbal de la revolte faicte par messieurs de Poictiers à leur Gouverneur, monsieur le Duc de Roanes. n.p., 1614.

Procès du Pape contre le roy. n.p., n.d.
Attributed to 1615.

Procès verbal de tout ce qui s'est passé en la chambre du Tiers Estat touchant le premier article de leur cahyer presenté au roy. n.p., 1615.
Du 14e jour de février 1614, avis aux trois états de ce royaume sur les bruits qui courent à présent de la guerre civile. Blois: Phillipes Catlercou, 1614.

Raisons pour l'opposition de messieurs du clergé et de la noblesse à l'article proposé paraucuns en la chambre du Tiers Estat. n.p., 1615.

La rencontre du Caton et Diogène ... sur le sujet des Estats tenus à Paris en l'année 1615. n.p., n.d.

Recueil concernant les Estats tenus sous plusieurs roys de France avec figure, harangues, ordres et cérémonies observées en ices. Paris: Martin Gobert, 1614. The work carries the date of October 24, 1614. Very possibly it was compiled by the publisher.

Recueil des principaux traitéz escrits et publiez pendant la tenue des Estats généraux du royaume assembléz à Paris l'an 1614 et 1615. n.p., 1615. The five pamphlets included are Le Premier article du cahier général du Tiers Estat ...; Le Caton français, au Roy; Advis, remonstrances et resquestes aux Estats généraux tenus à Paris l'an 1614, par six paysans; Le serviteur fidèle, et homme d'estat; Les alarmes.

Recueil d'une réponse du Tiers État rendue à la chambre de la noblesse et le compliment à Monseigneur le Chancelier par messieurs les présidens et lieutenants généraux, après la tenue des Estats. Paris: Joseph Bouillerat, 1615.

Réfutation du discours contre les mariages de France et d'Espagne. n.p., 1614.

Remonstrances presentées au roi par nosseigneurs de Parlement le 21 mai 1615. n.p., 1615.


Requeste presentée au roi par les députés du Tiers État. n.p., 1615.

Requeste presentée au roy par les députez du Tiers Estat. n.p., n.d.


Ribbier, Guillaume. Apologie de l'article premier du Tiers Estat. n.p., 1615.


Discours abrége avec l'ordonnance entière du roy sainct Loys contre les duels. ... Paris, 1614.

Second traicté de la souveraineté du roy. ... Paris, 1615.

Traicté contre les duels, avec les ordonnances et arrests du roy sainct Loys. ... Paris: Pierre Chevalier, 1614.

Traicté de l'annuel et venalité des offices. ... Paris, 1615.
Traicté de la souveraineté du Roy et de son royaume à messieurs les députéz de la noblesse. ... Paris: Pierre Chevalier, 1615.

Séance des Estats généraux de France, tenue à l'Hostel de Bourbon. n.p., n.d.

   An anti-Marechal d'Ancre pamphlet. Attributed to 1615.

Serment de Fidélité. n.p., 1615.


Le serviteur fidèle, le homme d'estat, dialogue. n.p., 1614.

   Written from Bordeaux in March of 1614.

Les terreurs panniques de ceux qui pensent que l'alliance d'Espagne doive mettre la guerre en France. Paris: Chez Nicholas Alexandre, 1615.

   This is a preface to a historical work by De Thou.

Très humbles remonstrances faictes au roy par les thrésoriers de France ... sur la continuation du droict annuel. Paris, 1615.

   Dated from Ancenis, March 1, 1614.
The letter was written on June 18, 1614.

The date of the letter is March 1, 1614.

The letter was dated March 27, 1614.

Les veritables intentions de la noblesse française. n.p., n.d.


III. BIBLIOGRAPHIES AND GENERAL COLLECTIONS OF DOCUMENTS


Lelong, Jacques. Bibliothèque historique de la France, contenant le catalogue de tous les ouvrages tant imprimés que manuscrits qui traitent de l'histoire de ce royaume ou qui y ont rapport, avec des notes critiques et historiques ..., edited by Fevret de Fontette. 5 vols. Paris, 1768–1778.


The last two works form a catalogue of the French pamphlets of the Ancien Régime available in Newberry Library of Chicago.

IV. PRIMARY SOURCES—BOOKS

Advis des affaires de France. ... n.p., 1615.


This edition was published from the one remaining copy of the first edition.


Birch, Thomas, ed. An Historical View of the Negotiations between the Courts of England, France, and Brussels, from the Year 1592 to 1617. Extracted Chiefly from the MS State-Papers of Sir Thomas Edmondes, Knight Ambassador in France and at Brussels. ... London, 1749.


Bongars, Jacques. Lettres. ... The Hague, 1695.


These memoires cover only the period 1555–1586.


Collection des procès-verbaux des assemblées générales du clergé de France, depuis l'année 1560 jusqu'à présent. ... Vol. II. Paris, 1768.
Collin, M. Relation imprimée par un contemporain de tout ce que s’est passé aux États généraux convoqués en 1614. 2 vols. Paris, 1789.

This is a reprint, with the same errors, of the account of the Mercure françois.

Condé, Henri II de Bourbon, Prince de. Remarques chrestiennes et catholiques sur le Livre de la frequente communion. ... Paris, 1644.

The period covered is from 1585 to 1610.


This concerns the period 1610–1617.


No trace of Intrigue du cabinet has been found.


Duiay, Theophile. La grandeur de nos roys et de leur souveraine puissance. Paris, 1615.


Grandmaison, Charles de, ed. *Plaintes et doléances de la province de Touraine aux États généraux.* Tours, 1890.


Legrain, Baptiste. Decade commençant l’histoire du roi Louis XIII. ... Paris, 1618.


—. Oeuvres de Malherbe, edited by Napoleon Choix. Paris, 1865. This is a defective edition; all the letters are not included.


Malingre, sieur de Saint-Lazare (1580–1653), was a prolific contemporary historian who, despite his fanciful title of “historiographe extraordinaire,” was accurate in his accounts. His Histoire de Louis XIII published in 1616 seems to no longer exist.


Remonstrances, discours et arrêt interlocutaire du conseil privé du roy pour la réformation et règlement des officiers et ministres de justice et advocats audit conseil privé. ... Paris, 1621.


Minge includes the sermons of Bishop Camus at the Estates General of 1614.


Mornay was usually known as du Plessis-Mornay.


These memoirs are the most valuable for the period of the regency.


Savaron, Jean. Les erreurs et impostures de l'examen du traité de M. Jean Savaron De la souveraineté du roy. ... Paris, 1616.
De la souveraineté du roy et que S.M. ne la peut soumettre à qui que soit, ny aliéner son domaine à perpétuité, avec les preuves et authoritez contre un auteur incogneu. Paris, 1620.

Serres, Juan de. Inventaire générale de l'histoire de France. Paris, 1647.

Not only does this work provide routes and distances, but even comments on important sites.

Though biased, this work does provide information, especially of dates of important men.


Villeroy, Nicolas de Neufville, seigneur de. Mémoires d’estat. ... Sedan, 1623.

V. SECONDARY SOURCES—BOOKS


This is a well-balanced, well-founded study. It is pro-Protestant, but fair.


——. Le Louvre sous Henri IV et Louis XIII. Paris, 1930. The first and third books by this author are light, but provide authoritative background material. The second work is an excellent study of Marie de Médicis.

Beaupré. Essai historique sur la rédaction officielle ... d'États de la Lorraine. ... Nancy, 1845.


Cauvin, Th. États du Maine, députés et sénéschaux de cette province. Le Mans, 1839.


Coup d'œil rapide, ou, notice historique sur les assemblées des États généraux du royaume. ... Amsterdam, 1788.


De Vaissière, P. Curés de campagne de l'ancienne France. Paris, 1933.
The former of these two books is more useful.


Formes observées en 1614 pour parvenir à l’assemblée des citoyens du bailliage de Rouen à l’effet d’élire leurs députés aux États généraux de la même année 1614. n.p., 1789.


——. *Tableau de la France en 1614*. Paris, s.d. [1898?].


Of little value.


Journal de ce qui d'est passé aux États-généraux de 1614. ... Paris, 1789.

The major value of this work is the list of deputies to the Estates General of 1614 it contains.


——. Traicté de la loy salique. ... Paris, 1614.

Marion, Marcel. Dictionnaire des institutions de la France aux XVIIe et XVIIIe siècles. Paris, 1923.


——. Le gallicanisme politique et le clergé de France. Paris, 1928. Martin's works remain the classics in their field.

Mercier, B. Notice du cahier original de la noblesse. ... n.p., n.d.


This series of articles was originally published in XVIIe Siècle in 1955 (nos. 25–26).

Mousnier, Roland. La venalité des offices sous Henri IV et Louis XIII. Rouen, 1946.

This is a masterpiece.


This is the most authoritative work on the subject.


The Estates General seen by a royalist.


——. *Les mariages espagnols sous le règne de Henri IV et la régence de Marie de Médicis.* Paris, 1869.


Picot, Georges. Les élections aux États généraux ... de 1302 à 1614. Paris, 1874.


These volumes cover the years 1564 to 1626. Volumes III and V are most pertinent for this study. A number of important letters are included.


Included is the most complete listing of the deputies to the Estates General of 1614.


Rathery, E. J. B. Histoire des États généraux de France. ... Paris, 1845.


Savaron, Jean. Chronologie des Estats généraux. ... Paris, 1615.
This contains a number of inaccuracies.


Excellent work.


Good, but leans too much toward the Huguenot cause.


—. La minorité de Louis XIII, Marie de Médicis et Sully. Paris, 1892.

—. La minorité de Louis XIII, Marie de Médicis et Villeroy. Paris, 1897.


VI. PERIODICALS


APPENDIX I

The twelve governments of France, arranged in the order of precedence proclaimed by Louis XIII on November 15, 1614, were: (1) Paris and the Île de France, (2) Burgundy, (3) Normandy, (4) Guyenne, (5) Brittany, (6) Champagne and Brie, (7) Languedoc, (8) Picardy, (9) Dauphiné, (10) Provence, (11) Lyonnais, and (12) Orléans. ¹

The order or the bailliages and sénéchaussées presents a much greater problem. The source that has the most information on the deputies, that by Quinet, uses a very original and very confusing arrangement, one that defies all logic. The other sources do not solve

¹This list is compiled from the various lists in B.N. Collection Dupuy 684, foll. 3r–9r; M. De Landine, Des États généraux ou histoire des assemblées nationales en France (Paris, 1788), pp. 254–269; Henri Grelin, Livre contenant l'ordre tenu par messieurs de la noblesse aux Estats généraux de France ... avec leurs noms, surnoms, et qualités (Paris, 1615), pp. 3–20, in A.N. K 674, no. 16; Lalourcé and Duval, Recueil de pièces, V, 141–143; Ordre des bailliages observé en la conversation des Estats généraux. ... (Paris, 1615), pp. 98–104; Toussaint Quinet, Recueil générale des États sous les rois Charles V, Charles VIII, Charles IX, Henri III et Louis XIII (Paris, 1651), pp. 221–283; Rapine, Recueil, pp. 506–508. Grelin, in listing the deputies, uses a different order. Rapine and others use several different listings. This undoubtedly stems from the differences of opinion as to which of the governments actually had precedence outside the Estates General. The list of the King had only nine governments. It agrees with the list given above, but omits Normandy, Guyenne, and Brittany. Lalourcé and Duval, Recueil de pièces, V, 141–143.
the question because they fail to agree. After a comparison of the various lists it has been decided to use the government and bailliage order followed by the Second and Third estates in voting, in so far as this can be determined. In the spirit of 1614 it should be added that this is by way of provision and expediency alone. 1

THE DEPUTIES TO THE FIRST ESTATE

Paris and Ile de France

Provostship, Town, and Viscounty of Paris

Henri de Gondi: Bishop of Paris; Councilor of the King in Council of State and Private Council; Master of the Oratory of the King. (1597)²

Louis Dreux: Canon and Grand Archdeacon of the Church of Paris.

Charles Faye: Councilor of the King in Parlement; Prior of Gournai; Canon in the Church of Paris.

¹The list of deputies and their offices is taken from B.N. MS fr. 4131, foll. 82r–105v; MS fr. 18513, fol. 157r; Collection des procès verbaux des assemblées générales du clergé de France depuis l’année 1560. ... (Paris, 1768), II, 58–65; De Landine, Des États généraux, pp. 254–269; Grelin, Livre contenant l’ordre, pp. 3–20. Henri Grelin, Ordre observé en la convocation et assemblée des États généraux de France ... avec les noms, surnoms et qualitez des deputez des trois ordres. ... (Paris, 1615); Lalourecé and Duval, Recueil de pièces, V, 2–52; Quinet, Recueil, pp. 221–283. Place names and the names of deputies have been modernized in accord with the usual practice. English has been used whenever common usage or common sense dictated this. French words have not been underlined to prevent making the text unreadable.

²The dates in parentheses in entries concerning bishops indicate the dates of their episcopal consecration. Lalourecé and Duval, Recueil de pièces, V, 2–8. Bishop Gondi died in 1622.
Paris and Ile de France

Provostship, Town, and Viscounty of Paris


Adam Oger: Prior of the Chartreux of Paris.

Antoine Fayet: Canon of the Church of Paris; Curé of Saint Paul.

Roland Hébert: Doctor of Theology; Penetentiary of the Church of Paris; Curé of Saint Cosme, of Paris.

Bailliage of Vermandois

Benjamin de Brichanteau: Councilor of the King (Private and State); Bishop and Duke of Laon; Peer of France and Count of Anisi. (1608)

Jean Aubert: Grand Archdeacon of Rhiems; Councilor, Almoner, and Preacher Ordinary of the King; Abbé of Saint Jean of Laon.

Bailliage of Senlis

François Cardinal de la Rochefoucault: Bishop of Senlis. 1

Bailliage of Clermont en Beauvoisis

Étienne de Ruptis: Doctor of Theology; Monastic Prior of the Church and Abbey of Notre Dame de Froidmont (Cistercian).

Bailliage of Chaumont en Vexin

Jacques Jacart: Prior of Magny.

Bailliage of Valois

Jean Berthier: Councilor of the King (Private and State); Bishop of Rieux (chose to sit with Toulouse). (1603)

Pierre Habert: Abbé de la Roche; Councilor of the King (Private and State); Master of Requests of the King’s House; Prior of Saint Arnould of Crespy en Valois.

1 Cardinal Rochefoucault (1558–1645), a partisan of the league and then of Henry IV, was a patron of letters. He became a cardinal in 1607.
Paris and Ile de France

Bailliage of Melun
Antoine Chauveau: Licenciate in Law; Councilor of the King in the
Bailliage; Canon and Chanter of Notre Dame de Melun; Prior
of Chatillon.

Bailliage of Nemours
Francois Le Charron: Protonotary of the Holy See; Abbé Com-
mendataire of the Abbey of Notre Dame de Cercanceau.

Bailliage of Montfort—Lamaury
Philippines Hurault: Councilor of the King (Private and State);
Bishop of Chartes. (1607)
Jean Le Roy (Leroy): Bachelor of Decretals; Curé of Montfort.

Bailliage of Mantes and Meulan
The Bishop of Chartes.

Bailliage of Dourdan
Jacques du Lac: Councilor of the King; Almoner Ordinary of the
King; Prior of Notre Dame de Louye.

Bailliage of Beauvais
René Potier: Councilor of the King (Private and State); Bishop
and Count of Beauvais; Peer of France; Vidame of Gerbroy.
(1595)

Bailliage of Soissons
Dreux Hennequin: Sieur of Villenoze; Councilor of the King in
Parlement; Canon and Treasurer of the Cathedral Church of
Soissons.

Bailliage of Dreux
Felix Vialart: Prior of Beu; Canon in the Cathedral of Chartes.

Bailliage of Magny
Charles des Boues: Sieur de Rauces; Protonotary of the Holy
See; Councilor and Almoner of the King; Grand Vicar of
Pontoise and Vexin le François.
Government of Burgundy

Bailliage of Dijon
Nicolas Boucherat: Doctor of Theology; Abbé of Citeaux; Master General of the Cistercians; Councilor of the King in the Parlement of Dijon.

Bailliage of Autun
André Venot: Canon and Chanter of the Church of Autun; Official and syndic of the clergy of the diocese of Autun.

Bailliage of Châlons-sur-Saone
Cyrus de Tyard: Councilor of the King (State and Private); Bishop of Châlons. (1595)

Bailliage of la Montagne
Robert Corderam: Curé of Buncey.

Bailliage of Mâcon
Gaspard Dinet: Councilor of the King; Bishop of Mâcon. (1599–1600)

Bailliage of Auxois
Lazare Morot: Abbé of the Abbey of Saint Pierre de Châlon; Dean of Avalon.

Bailliage of Auxerre
François de Donadieu: Councilor of the King (State and Private); Bishop of Auxerre. (1599)
Herard de Rochefort: Abbé of Vezelay; Dean of the Cathedral of Auxerre.

Bailliage of Bar-sur-Seine
Guillaume Minet: Religious of the Order of Trinitarians; Minister of the Maison-Dieu of Bar-sur-Seine.

Bailliage of Charolais
Legier des Molins: a Cordelier; Doctor of Theology; Curé and Theologal in the Church of Notre Dame of Paroi.
Government of Burgundy

Bailliage of Bugey en Bresse
Jean Pierre Camus: Councilor of the King; Bishop and Seigneur of Bellay. (1609)¹

Bailliage of Gex
Maximian de Molins: Superior of the Capuchins of the Mission of Gex for the conversion of the Huguenots.

Bailliage of Bresse
Albert de Grillet: Abbé de la Chassaigne; Prior of Ompsierre.

Government of Normandy

Bailliage of Rouen
François Cardinal de Joyeuse: Dean of the College of Cardinals; Archbishop of Rouen; Primate of Normandy.²

Alphonse de Breteville: Official of Rouen; Canon and Chancellor of the Metropolitan Church of Rouen; Prior of Saint Blaise de l'Huy; Syndic General of the clergy of the province of Normandy.³

¹Jean Pierre Camus (1582-1652), consecrated bishop by Francis de Sales, was active as a reformer, preacher, and author of more than two hundred pious novels, which he wrote at the request of Frances de Sales.

²Cardinal Joyeuse (died 1615), recognized as the leading ecclesiastic of France, was invited by the First Estate to take part in the Estates General as part of the delegation of Normandy and to preside at the meetings of the First Estate. Also added to the delegations were Cardinal Bonsy, bishop of Beziers, and Archbishop La Valette of Toulouse, both added to the clergy of Languedoc, and Prince Louis of Lorraine, duke archbishop of Rheims, added to the delegation from Picardy. The general agents of the clergy were also present at the invitation of the First Estate.

³Elected secretary of the First Estate.
Government of Normandy

Bailliage of Caen
Jacques d'Angennes: Councilor of the King (State and Private); Bishop of Bayeux. (1607)

Bailliage of Caux
Antoine de Banastre: Seigneur and curé d'Arcenville and sieur of Saint Sulpice.
Guillaume Helie: Doctor of Theology; Professor of the Abbey of Sainte Cathérine du Mont of Rouen; Almoner Ordinary of the King; Prior and Seigneur of Cléville.

Bailliage of Cotantin
François de Péricard: Councilor of the King (State and Private); Bishop of Avranches. (1588)

Bailliage of Evreux
François de Péricard: Councilor of the King; Bishop of Evreux. (1612).

Bailliage of Gisors
Claude de Bauquemare (Bocquemare): Prior of Sausseuze and of Crasville.

Bailliage of Alançon
François de Ronxel de Medavi: Councilor of the King (State and Private); Bishop and Count of Lisieux. (1604–1606)
Jacques Camus: Councilor of the King (State and Private); Bishop of Séez. (August, 1614)

Government of Guyenne

City of Bordeaux and Sénéchaussée of Guyenne
François Cardinal de Sourdis: Archbishop of Bordeaux; Primate of Aquitaine. ¹

¹ Francis d'Escoubleau Cardinal de Sourdis (1575–1628).
Government of Guyenne

City of Bordeaux and Sénéchaussée of Guyenne

Pierre de Périssac: Canon and sub-Dean of the Metropolitan Church of Bordeaux.

Sénéchaussée of Bazadois

Jean Jaubert de Barrault: Councilor of the King (State and Private); Bishop of Bazas. (1612)

Sénéchaussée of Perigord

François de la Berauderiere: Councilor of the King; Bishop of Périgueux. (July, 1614)
Jean de Carbonières de Jayac: Dean and Canon of the Cathedral Church of Sarlat; Councilor and Almoner Ordinary of the King.
Jean Tricard: Canon and School Master of the Church of Périgueux.

Sénéchaussée of Rouergue

François de la Vallette Cornusson: Councilor of the King (State and Private); Bishop of Vabres. (1600)

Sénéchaussée of Saintonge

Nicolas le Cornu de la Courbe: Councilor of the King (State and Private); Bishop of Saintes. (1576)
Michel Raoul: Dean and Canon of the Cathedral Church of Saintes.

Sénéchassée of Agenois

Claude Gélas: Councilor of the King (State and Private); Bishop of Agen. (1609)

Pays and County of Cominges

Octave de Bellegarde: Councilor of the King; Bishop of Couserans; Deputy of the Estates of this pays. (May, 1614)
Gilles Souvré: Bishop of Comminges; deputy for the clergy of the pays. (1614?)

Jugerie of Rivière-Verdun

The Bishop of Comminges.
Government of Guyenne

Sénéschaussée of Landes and Saint Sever

Bertrand D'Echaux: Councilor of the King (State and Private); First Almoner of the King; Bishop of Bayonne. (1598)

Jean Jacques du Sault: Councilor of the King (State and Private); Bishop of Aqs; Dean of the Collegial Church of Saint Severin in Bordeaux. (1598)

Sénéchaussée of Albret

[No deputy for the clergy.]

Sénéchaussée of Armagnac

Léonard de Trapes: Councilor of the King; Archbishop of Auch.

Jean de Tresses: Councilor of the King; Bishop of Laodicée; Coadjutor Bishop of Lectoure. (1609)

Sénéschaussée of Condomois and Gascogne

Antoine de Caux: Councilor of the King; Coadjutor Bishop of Condom; Bishop of Aure. (1604)

Sénéschaussée of Haut Limousin and Town of Limoges

Henri de Lamartonie: Councilor of the King (State and Private); Bishop of Limoges. (1587)

Sénéschaussée of bas Limousin

Jean de Ginouilhac: Councilor of the King; Bishop, Viscount, and Seigneur of the town of Tulles. (1607)

Sénéschaussée of Quercy

Claude Antoine d'Ebrard de Saint Sulpice: Abbé de la Garde-Dieu; Grand Archdeacon and Canon in the Cathedral Church of Cahors.1

Pays and County of Bigorre

Saluat d'Iharce: Councilor of the King; Bishop of Tarbes. (1602)

1 Elected promoteur of the First Estate.
Government of Guyenne

Pays and County of Bigorre
Gratian d’Iharce: Canon, Archdeacon in the Cathedral Church of Tarbes; Grand Vicar of the Bishop of Tarbes.

Government of Brittany

Deputies of the Estates of Brittany
François Laihnier: Councilor of the King; Bishop of Rennes. (1602)
Guillaume le Gouverneur: Councilor of the King; Bishop of Saint Malo. (1611)
Artus d’Espinay: Abbé of Rhédon; Councilor of the King (State and Private).
Pierre de Cornulier: Councilor of the King in the Parlement of Brittany; Abbé of Saint Méen.
Sebastien de Rosmadec: Abbé of Peimpont.
Claude de Gouault: Archdeacon of the Cathedral Church of Rennes.

Government of Champagne

Bailliage of Troyes
René de Breslay: Councilor of the King; Bishop of Troyes. (1604)
Michel Roté: Doctor in the Faculty of Theology and Canon of the Collegiate Church of Troyes.

Bailliage of Chaumont en Bassigny
Denis Largentier: Doctor of Theology; Abbé of Clervaux (Cistercian).
Pierre Pietrequin: Dean of Chaumont; Licentiate in Decretals.

Bailliage of Meaux
Jean de Vieux-Pont: Councilor of the King (State and Private); Bishop of Meaux. (1603)

Bailliage of Provins
Charles Moissy: Doyen de la Chretienté in Provins; Canon of Notre Dame du Vale and Curé of Saint Ayoul.
Government of Champagne

Bailliage of Sézannes

Hierémie le Mère: Doctor of Theology; Doyen de la Chretienté of Sézannes.1

Bailliage of Sens

Jacques Cardinal Du Perron: Grand Almoner of France; Archbishop of Sens; Primate of the Gauls and Germany.2

Sebastien Zamet: Abbé of July; Duke Bishop designate of Langres and Peer of France; Count of Monthageon.

Bailliage of Vitry-le-François

François Lepicart (le Picart): Councilor, Almoner Ordinary of the Queen; Commendataire of Notre Dame de Chartreuve; Prior of Notre Dame Chastel en Porcien.

Bailliage of Château-Thierry

François Palmarot: Doctor of Theology, Curé of Dormans-sur-Marne.

Government of Languedoc

Sénéchaussée and town of Toulouse

Jean Cardinal de Bonzy: Bishop of Beziers.
Louis de la Valette: Archbishop of Toulouse.
Jean Berthier: Councilor of the King (State and Private); Bishop of Rieux. (See Ile de France, Bailliage of Valois).
Alphonse d’Elbène: Councilor of the King (State and Private); Bishop of Alby. (1607)

1 Died December 8, 1614.

Government of Languedoc

Sénéschaussée of Carcassonne and Beziers
Christolphe de l'Estaing: Councilor of the King (State and Private); Bishop of Carcassonne; Chapel Master of the Music of the King. (1578)

Sénéschaussée of Beaucaire and Nîmes
Charles de Rousseau: Councilor of the King; Bishop and Seigneur of Mende; Count of Gevaudan. (1607)
Paul Antoine de Perault: Councilor of the King; Bishop of Léonopoly; Coadjutor bishop of Usez. (July, 1614)

Sénéschaussée of Puy and Vellay
[No deputy for the First Estate.]

Town, Government, and Sénéschaussée of Montpellier
Pierre de Fenouillet: Councilor of the King (State and Private); Bishop of Montpellier. (1608)

Sénéschaussée of Lauragais
[No deputy for the First Estate.]

Sénéschaussée, Pays, and County of Foix
Joseph d’Esparbes Lussan: Councilor of the King (State and Private); Bishop of Pamiers. (1608)

Government of Picardy

Bailliage of Amiens
Prince Louis de Lorraine: Archbishop and Duke of Rheims; First Peer of France.
Raymond de Lamartone: Prior Commendataire of Saint Jean de Colle; Provost and Canon of the Church of Notre Dame of Amiens.

Sénéschaussée of Ponthieu
Jacques Saumont: Doctor of Theology; Canon of the Church of Saint Vulfran; Prior of Saint Croix; Curé of the Church of Saint Gilles in Ponthieu.
Government of Picardy

Sénéchaussée of Boulonnais

Antoine Clugnet: Licenciate in Laws; Canon, Archdeacon, and Official of the Church of Notre Dame of Boulongne.¹

Calais and Pays Reconquis

[No deputy for the First Estate.]

Provostship of Péronne

Antoine Thuet: Doctor of Theology in the University of Paris.

Provostship of Montdidier

Raymond de Lamartonie of Amiens.

Provostship of Roye

Antoine Thuet: Deputy of Péronne.

Government of Dauphiné

Jean de la Croix: Councilor of the King (State and Private); Prince Bishop of Grenoble; President of the Estates of Dauphiné. (1607)

François Armuet: Dean of the Church of Notre Dame of Grenoble; Prior of Renesty.

Government of Provence

Estates of Provence

Paul Hurault de l’Hôpital: Councilor of the King; Archbishop of Aix.

Toussaint de Glandesves: Councilor of the King; Bishop of Cisteron. (1606)

Town of Marseille

[The same deputies as the Estates of Provence.]

¹ Died November 30, 1614.
Government of Provence

Town of Arles
[The same deputies as the Estates of Provence.]

Government of Lyonnais

Sénéschaussée of Lyon
Denis Simon de Marquemont: Councilor of the King (State and Private); Count Archbishop of Lyon; Primate of France.
Antoine de Gibertes (Gilbertet): Canon and Archdeacon in the Church of Lyon.

Sénéschaussée of Forêz
[The same deputies as Lyon.]

Sénéschaussée of Beaujolais
[The same deputies as Lyon.]

Bas Pays of Auvergne
Joachim d’Estaing: Bishop designate of Clermont.
Gabriel du Croc: Provost of the Church of Clermont.

Bailliage of Saint Flour and Haute Auvergne
André Pons, de la Grange (de la Grand): Archdeacon of the Cathedral of Saint Flour.
Christophle Verdier: Seigneur; Abbé de Saint Pibrac and de Saint Rozi.
Jean d’Apchier: Sieur and Prior of la Volte.

1 The proper order of the electoral districts of Lyon is the most disputed of all. Another order often used in the lists was: Lyon, Auvergne, Bourbonnais, Forêz, Beaujolais, Basse Marche, Saint-Pierre-le-Moutier, Saint Flour, and Haut Auvergne. In these lists the Sénéschaussée of Haute Marche is not mentioned because there was no deputy for the First Estate from there in 1614. Lalource and Duval, Recueil de pièces, V, 26–27. Collection des procès-verbaux du clergé, II, 60–65.
Government of Lyonnais

Sénéschaussée of Bourbonnais

Pierre du Lyon: Sieur of la Cane; Abbé of Saint Mélène and Me­nat; Dean of the Church of Saint Nicolas of Mont Lusson; Councilor of the King (State and Private).

Antoine Aubery: Canon of the Church of the Notre Dame of Moul­ins.

Nicolas Doutré: Doctor of Theology; Cure of Yssure-les-Moulins.

Sénéschaussée of the Haute Marche

[No deputy for the First Estate.]

Sénéschaussée of the Basse Marche

Gabriel Marand: Abbé of the Secular and Collegiate Church of Saint Pierre of Dorat.

Bailliage of Saint Pierre-le-Moutier

Eustache de Chery: Treasurer and Canon of the Cathedral Church of Nevers.¹

Government of Orléans

Sénéschaussée of Poitou (Fontenay and Nyort)

Armand Jean du Plessis: Bishop of Luçon; Councilor of the King (State and Private). (1606)

Philippe Cacand: Dean and Canon of Saint Hilaire le Grand of Poitiers.

Sénéschaussée of Anjou

Charles Miron: Councilor of the King (State and Private); Bishop of Angers. (1588)²

¹ Eustache de Chery was the only deputy honored with the title noble et scientifique personne.

² Charles Miron (1570–1628) was the brother of Robert Miron, president of the Third Estate.
Government of Orléans

Sénéschaussée of Anjou

Léonor d’Estampes de Vallancay: Councilor and Almoner of the King; Abbé and Baron of Borgueil en Vallée.¹

Louis de la Grésille: Canon of the Church of Angers; sieur of Neliampart.

René Ponthery: Grand Prior (Claustral Prior) of the Abbey of Saint Aubin of Angers.

Bailliage of Touraine and Amboise

François de la Guesle: Councilor of the King (State and Private); Archbishop of Tours.²

Amanion le Houx: Canon of the Church of Tours; Secretary Ordinary of the Archbishop.

Jean Chatard: Canon of Saint Martin of Tours.

Sénéschaussée of Loudunois

The Bishop of Luçon.

Gouvernement of la Rochelle and Pays Aunis

[No deputy for the clergy.]

Sénéschaussée of Angoulême

Antoine de la Rochefoucault: Councilor of the King; Bishop of Angoulême. (1608?)

Sénéschaussée of Maine

Charles de Beaumanoir: Councilor of the King (State and Private); Bishop of Mans. (1610)

Guillaume Richer: Abbé Regulier of Monastery of Saint Vincent of the Congregation of Chesau-Benoit.

Claude Lefevre: Chanter and Canon of the Church of Mans.

¹ Leonor d’Estampes (1588–1651), a Benedictine abbot, would later be bishop of Chartes (1620) and then archbishop of Rhiems (1641).

² Died October 30, 1614. Chatard was appointed by the First Estate to take the Archbishop’s place.
Government of Orléans

Bailliage of Berry
André Frémiot: Councilor of the King (State and Private); Councilor in Parlement; Patriarch Archbishop of Bourges. (1604)
Guillaume Foucault: Abbé of Chalivri; Canon and Grand Archdeacon in the Church of Bourges.¹

Bailliage of Chartes
Philippe Hurault: Councilor of the King (State and Private); Bishop of Chartes.

Bailliage of Orléans
Gabriel de l’Aubespine: Councilor of the King (State and Private); Bishop of Orléans. (1604)
Charles de la Saussaye: Doctor in the Faculty of Theology and in the Laws; Councilor and Almoner of the King; Dean of the Church of Orléans.
Charles Fougeu: Councilor and Almoner of the King; Abbé Commandataire of the Abbey of Saint Euverte of Orléans.

Bailliage of Blois
The Bishop of Chartes.

Bailliage of Étampes
Guy de Verembroys: Doyen de la Chretienté and of the Church of Sainte Croix of Étampes.

Bailliage and County of Gien
Melchior Sonnet: Doctor of Theology; Curé of the town of Ozoer (Ozay).

Bailliage of Montargis
Daniel Bonnet: Augustinian; Doctor of Theology; Prior and Curé of Montargis.

¹Died in November, 1614. Frémiot lived from 1573 to 1641.
Government of Orléans

Duchy and Bailliage of Vendôme

Michel Sublet: Cardinal Abbé of the Abbey of Sainte Trinité of Vendôme.
Francois Gérard: Curé of Saint Amand.

Bailliage of Perche
Francois le Moine: Promoter in the Officality of Seez at the seat of Mortagne; Provost of the Church of that place; Curé of Saint Céronne.

Bailliage of Nivernois
Jean Genest: Protonotary of the Holy See; Doctor of Theology; Grand Archdeacon and Official of the Church of Nevers.

Bailliage of Chatellerault
[No deputy for the First Estate.]

Bailliage of Chateau-Neuf en Thimerais
[No deputy for the First Estate.]

General Agents of the Clergy

Martin de Racine de Villegamblain: Abbé of la Vernusse; Treasurer of the Sainte Chappelle of Bourges; General Agent of the Clergy of France.¹
Pierre de Behety: Abbé of Saint Grace; General Agent of the Clergy of France.²

¹Elected promoteur of the First Estate.
²Elected secretary of the First Estate.
THE DEPUTIES TO THE SECOND ESTATE

Paris and Ile de France

Provostship, Town and Viscounty of Paris

Henri de Vaudetar: Chevalier; Baron of Persen; Councilor of the King (State and Private); Deputy for the Viscounty.

Bailliage of Vermandois

Eustache de Conflans: Chevalier of the Two Orders of the King; Viscount of Auchy; Captain of Fifty Men of Arms of the Ordnance of the King; Councilor of State.

Bailliage of Senlis

Louis de Montmorency: Chevalier; Seigneur of Bouteville; Bailly and Governor of Senlis; Vice-Admiral of France; Councilor of State.

Bailliage of Clermont en Veauvoisis

Jacques de Longueval: Chevalier; Seigneur of Haraucourt; Bailly and Governor of Clermont en Beauvoisis and of le Chatelet; Councilor of the King (State and Private); Cornet of the Light Horse of the Queen.

Bailliage of Chaumont en Vexin

Pierre de Roncherolle: Chevalier; Seigneur and Baron of Pont Saint Pierre; Gentleman Ordinary of the Chamber of the King; Seneschal of Ponthieu.

Bailliage of Valois

René Potier: Chevalier; Seigneur and Count of Tresme; Captain of the Body Guard of the King; Bailly of Valois.¹

¹Grelin, who was the sergeant of arms for the Second Estate, adds that Potier (1579–1670) was captain ensign of the Duke of Vendôme.
Paris and Ile de France

Bailliage of Melun
Antoine de Brichanteau: Chevalier of the Two Orders of the King; Councilor of State; Captain of Fifty Men of Arms of the King’s Ordnance; Seigneur and Marquis of Nangis, Millan, and Ligueres.

Bailliage of Nemours
Jean Hurault de l'Hôpital: Chevalier; Seigneur of Gommerville and Fay; Gentleman Ordinary of the Chamber of the King.

Bailliage of Montfort—Lamaury
Charles de Cocherel: Chevalier; Seigneur of le Parc; Bailly of Montfort and Houdan.

Bailliage of Mantes and Meulan
Louis de Tilly: Chevalier; Seigneur of Blaru; Lieutenant of One Hundred Gentlemen of the Household of the King.

Bailliage of Dourdan
Anne de l’Hôpital: Chevalier; Seigneur of Sainte Mesine (Mesme); Bailly of Dourdan.

Bailliage of Beauvais
François de Boufflers: Chevalier; Seigneur of that place; Viscount of Ponche; Bailly of Beauvais.

Bailliage of Soissons
Henri de la Marque: Chevalier; Seigneur and Count of la Marque; Colonel of One Hundred Swiss of the Guard of the King.

Bailliage of Dreux
Henri de Balsac: Chevalier; Councilor of the King in his Councils; Gentleman Ordinary of the King’s Chamber; Baron of Clermont d’Antragues; Seigneur of Messiere.

Bailliage of Magny
[No deputy for the Second Estate.]
Government of Burgundy

Bailliage of Dijon
Claude de Saulx: Chevalier; Seigneur and Count of Tavannes; Bailly of Dijon.

Bailliage of Autun
Leonor de Rabutin: Chevalier; Seigneur and Baron of Piry and Bussy; Gentleman Ordinary of the Chamber of the King.

Bailliage of Châlons-sur-Saone
Henri de Bauffremont: Chevalier; Seigneur and Baron of Senecey; Captain of Fifty Men of Arms of the King; Governor of Town and Chateau of Ausonme; Bailly of Châlons; Lieutenant for the King in Pays and County of Mâconnais.¹

Bailliage of la Montagne
Hercules de Villars la Faye: Chevalier; Seigneur of Ville-neuve.

Bailliage of Mâcon
Leonard de Scemur: Chevalier; Seigneur of Tremont; Lieutenant of the Company of Men of Arms of Monsieur le Grand.

Bailliage of Auxois
Louis Danlezi: Chevalier; Seigneur of Chazelle.

Bailliage of Auxerre
Aymar de Prix: Chevalier; Baron of Toney; Captain of Fifty Men of the Ordnance of the King.
Olivier de Chasteleu: Chevalier; Seigneur of Coulange and Val de Mercie.

Bailliage of Bar-sur-Seine
Antoine de Lenoncourt: Chevalier; Seigneur of Marolle; Councilor of the King in his Councils; Gentleman of the Chamber of the King; Bailly of Bar-sur-Seine.

¹Elected president of the Second Estate (1576–1622).
Government of Burgundy

Bailliage of Charolais
   Théophile de Damas: Chevalier; Seigneur and Baron of Digoyne; Ensign of One Hundred Men of Arms under the Duke of Mayenne.

Bailliage of Bugey en Bresse
   Antoine de Champier: Chevalier of the Order of the King; Gentleman Ordinary of the Chamber of the King; Seigneur of Faverge, Feilleve, and Mantueram.

Bailliage of Gex
   Pierre Chevalier: Chevalier; Seigneur of Fernaix.

Bailliage of Bresse
   Clériadus de Colligny: Chevalier; Seigneur of Cressia.

Government of Normandy

Bailliage of Rouen
   Louis de Mouy: Chevalier; Seigneur of Maillerais.

Bailliage of Caen
   Jean de Longaunay: Chevalier; Seigneur of Damigny and Sainte Marie du Mont; Gentleman of the Chamber of the King; Captain of Fifty Men of Arms; Governor of Carantan.

Bailliage of Caux
   Samuel de Boullinvilliers: Chevalier; Seigneur of Saint Cère.

Bailliage of Cotantin
   Henri Anquetil: Chevalier; Seigneur of Saint Vast.

Bailliage of Evreux
   Adrian de Breaute: Chevalier; Seigneur of that place.

Bailliage of Gisors
   Philippe de Fouilleuze: Chevalier; Seigneur of Flavacourt; Bailly of Gisors.
Government of Normandy

Bailliage of Alancon
Francois de Vauquelin: Chevalier; Seigneur of Bazoches; Bailly of Alancon.
Francois Anzeray: Chevalier; Seigneur of Fonteville; Gentleman Ordinary of the Chamber of the King.

Government of Guyenne

Town of Bordeaux and Sénéchaussée of Guyenne
Charles de Durefort: Chevalier; Seigneur of Castel-Bayart; Baron of Cuzagues.

Sénéchaussée of Bazadois
Antoine Jaubert de Barrault: Count of Blaignac; Councilor of State; Seneschal and Governor of Bazadois; Vice-Admiral in Guyenne.

Sénéchaussée of Perigord
Armand de Hedie: Chevalier; Seigneur and Count of Riberac; Councilor of the King (State and Private).
Hector de Pont-Brian (Ponbrian): Seigneur of Montreal, Councilor of the King in His Councils.

Sénéchaussée of Rouergue
Francois de Nouaille: Chevalier; Seigneur and Count of Ayen.
Francois de Buissé: Chevalier; Seigneur of Bournazel.

Sénéchaussée of Saintonge
Francois de Sainte More: Chevalier; Seigneur of Monac (Mornac); Councilor of State.

Sénéchaussée of Agenois
Francois de Nonpart de Caumont: Equerry; Seigneur and Count of l'Auzon; Councilor of the King (State and Private); Captain of Fifty Men of Arms of the King's Ordnance.
Francois de la Goute: Baron du Buisson; Chevalier; Seigneur of Cours; Prast and Pujade.
Government of Guyenne

Pays and County of Cominges

Jean Denis: Chevalier; Seigneur of la Hélierre; Gentleman of the Chamber of the King.

Jugerie of Rivière-Verdun
[No deputy for the Second Estate.]

Sénéschaussée of Landes and Saint Sever
Antoine de Gramont: Chevalier; Seigneur and Count of Gramont; Councilor of State; Seneschal and Governor of Bayonne.

Sénéschaussée of Albret
Remond de Montcasin: Chevalier; Seigneur of that place.¹
Jean de Chastillon: Chevalier; Baron of Mauvoizin.

Sénéschaussée of Armagnac
Giles de Leaumont: Chevalier; Seigneur and Baron of Puygaillard; Captain of Fifty Men of Arms of the King’s Ordnance.

Sénéschaussée of Condomois and Gascogne
Jean de Buzet: Chevalier; Seigneur and Baron of Poudenas; Gentleman Ordinary of the Chamber of the King.
Jean Pol de Moulezin: Chevalier; Seigneur and Baron of Meillan.²

Sénéschaussée of Haut Limousin and Town of Limoges
Henri de Bonneval: Chevalier; Seigneur of that place.

Sénéschaussée of bas Limousin
Charles de Saint Marceau: Chevalier; Seigneur of Courson; Viscount of Verdier.

¹Elected secretary of the Second Estate.

²Grelin, though agreeing on the title of Meillan (Melien), uses the name Regnault Dansan instead of Jean Pol de Moulezin.
Government of Guyenne

Sénéchaussée of Quercy

Antoine de Loisiere (Loifiere): Chevalier; Seigneur and Marquis of Themines; Seneschal and Governor of Quercy.

Pays and County of Bigorre

Henri de Prez: Marquis of Montpezat; Viscount of Aste; Baron Dezanges and Pinedor; Councilor of State; Captain of Fifty Men of Arms; Governor of the towns of Muret and Grenadec.

Government of Brittany

Deputies of the Estates of Brittany

François de Cosse: Chevalier; Seigneur and Count of Brissac; Councilor of the King (State and Private); Lieutenant General for the King in Brittany.

Tomas de Gaymaduc: Chevalier; Baron of that place and of Blos-sac; Governor of Fougeres; Grand Hereditary Equerry of Brittany.

Jean du Mas: Chevalier; Seigneur of Monmartin; Captain of Fifty Men of Arms; Marshal of the Camp; Governor of Vitray.

Artus de Caydeu (Laydeu): Chevalier; Seigneur of that place; Captain of Fifty Men of Arms of the King's Ordnance.

François de la Piguelaye: Chevalier; Seigneur and Viscount of Chainait; Captain of Fifty Men of Arms of the Ordnance of the King.

Jean de Gegado: Chevalier; Seigneur of Querholin; Guardian of the Coast of the Bishopric of Cornuaille; Master of Camp of a regiment of French Foot Soldiers; Captain of Fifty Men of Arms of the Ordnance of the King.

Government of Champagne

Bailliage of Troyes

Jacques de Brouillart: Chevalier; Seigneur and Baron of Coursan, Racine, and Saint Cire; Gentleman Ordinary of the King's Chamber.

Bailliage of Chaumont en Bassigny

Juste de Pontalier: Chevalier; Seigneur and Baron of Pleurs.
Government of Champagne

Bailliage of Meaux
Michel de Reillac: Chevalier; Seigneur of Lignere, of Mareul, and of la Grand du Mont Magnis and Saint Loup.

Bailliage of Provins
Jacques de l’Hopital: Chevalier of the Two Orders of the King; Captain of Fifty Men of the Ordnance of the King; Councilor of the King (State and Private); Marquis of Choisy.

Bailliage of Sézannes
Claude Dansienville: Chevalier; Seigneur and Baron of Reuillon.

Bailliage of Sens
Charles de Seneton: Chevalier; Seigneur of la Verriere; Bailly of Sens.

Bailliage of Vitry-le-François
Charles d’Amboise: Chevalier; Seigneur and Baron of Bussy en Champagne; Marquis of Renel; Baron of Sexefontaine.

Bailliage of Chateau-Thierry
Emanuel d’Anglebermer: Chevalier; Seigneur of Lagny; Gentleman Ordinary of the Chamber of the King.

Government of Languedoc

Sénéschaussée and Town of Toulouse
Jean de la Valette: Chevalier; Sieur of Cornuson and other places; Councilor of the King (State and Private); Captain of Fifty Men of Arms; Seneschal and Governor of the Town and Sénéschaussée of Toulouse.

Sénéschaussée of Carcassonne and Beziers
François de la Jugerie: Chevalier; Seigneur and Count of Rieux.

Sénéschaussée of Beaucaire and Nimes
Antoine Hercules de Budes: Chevalier; Seigneur and Marquis of Portes; Councilor of the King (State and Private).
Government of Languedoc

Sénéschaussée of Beaucaire and Nîmes

René de la Tour de Gouvernet: Chevalier; Baron of Chambaut; Viscount of Prinast; Councilor of the King (State and Private); Master of Camp of a Regiment of Foot Soldiers.

Sénéschaussée of Puy and Vellay

Gaspard Armand: Chevalier; Seigneur and Viscount of Polignac.

Town, Government, and Sénéschaussée of Montpellier

François de Monlore: Chevalier; Seigneur of Meurles and Precor; Councilor of the King (State and Private); Captain of Fifty Men of Arms; Governor and Seneschal of the Town of Montpellier.

Jean Degardieu: Seigneur of Saint André; Gentleman Ordinary of the Chamber of the King; Captain of One Hundred Light Horse; Governor for the King in the Town of Montpellier.

Sénéschaussée of Lauragais

François de Roger: Chevalier; Baron of Fairail; Seneschal of Lauragais; Superintendent General of the Affairs of Queen Marguerite in her County; First Equerry of Her Household.

Marc-Antoine (de Dessax): Chevalier; Seigneur of Saint Romme.

Sénéschaussée, Pays, and County of Foix

Jacques de l’Ordat (Lordat): Chevalier; Seigneur of Castagnac.

Government of Picardy

Bailliage of Amiens

Charles de Haluin: Seigneur of Mailly; Councilor of the King (State and Private); Governor of the towns and citadels of Ruë; Captain of the Bodyguard of the King’s Brother.

Sénéschaussée of Ponthieu

Charles de Rambures: Chevaller; Seigneur of that place; Councilor of State; Captain of Fifty Men of Arms of the King’s Ordonnance; Governor of the Towns and Chateaus of Dourlans and Corotoy.
Government of Picardy

Sénéschaussée of Boulonnais
  Jean de Monchy: Chevalier; Seigneur of Moncaverel; Governor of Ardres.
  Charles de Belloy: Chevalier; Seigneur of Landretum.

Calais and Pays Reconquis
  Marc Foucault: Seigneur of Foucault.

Provostship of Péronne
  Charles d’Estourmel: Chevalier; Seigneur of Plainville; Captain of the Bodyguard of the Scots Guard.

Provostship of Montdidier
  Charles d’Estourmel.

Provostship of Roye
  Charles d’Estourmel.

Government of Dauphiné

Estates of Dauphiné
  Henri de Clermont: Chevalier; Seigneur and Count of Tonnerre; Councilor of the King (State and Private).  
  Jean de Puy: Chevalier; Seigneur of Montbrun; Councilor of the King (State and Private); Captain of Fifty Men of Arms of the King’s Ordnance.
  Laurens de Plovier: Seigneur of Plovier and of Quaiz; Baron of Assieu and Surieu; Gentleman Ordinary of the King’s Chamber.
  Jean de Murines: Chevalier; Seigneur of Bozancier.

1 Clermont was elected as a second president of the Second Estate during the early days when there were complaints that Senecéy had been the Queen’s candidate. He soon resigned, however, saying that he was given no chance of exercising his office.
Government of Provence

Estates of Provence

Arnault de Ville-neufe: Chevalier; Seigneur and Marquis of les Arts.1
André d'Oraison: Chevalier; Seigneur and Count of Boulbon.
Roland de Castellanne: Chevalier; Seigneur of Monmejen.
François de Vins: Chevalier; Seigneur of that place.
Jean de Castellanne: Chevalier; Seigneur of la Verdiere.
Palamedes Fabry: Chevalier; Seigneur of Valavés; Baron of Rians.

Town of Marseille

Theocrenes de Glandèves: Chevalier; Seigneur of Cuges.
Léon de Valbelle: Equerry.

Town of Arles

Gabriel de Varadier: Chevalier; Seigneur of Saint André.

Government of Lyonnais

Sénéchaussée of Lyon

Claude de Cremiaux: Chevalier; Seigneur of that place and of Chemousset; Baron d'Antragues.

Sénéchaussée of Forêz

Jacques Paillard d'Ursé: Chevalier; Seigneur and Marquis of Bauge; Count of Ursé; Councilor of the King (State and Private); Seneschal of Forêz.

Sénéchaussée of Beaujolais

Philebert de Serpent: Baron of the Baronies of Goudras, Lourdes, and Saint Saturnin.

Bas Pays of Auvergne

Jean de la Guelle: Chevalier; Seigneur of la Chault; Baron of Nesle.
Claude de Chauvigny: Chevalier; Seigneur of Belot l'Eglise.

1 Died December 14, 1614.
Government of Lyonnais

Bailiage of Saint Flour and Haute Auvergne
Jacques d’Apchon: Chevalier; Seigneur of that place and of Joille.
Jacques de la Rocque: Chevalier; Seigneur of that place.

Sénéschaussée of Bourbonnaïs
Gaspard de Coligny: Chevalier; Baron of Saligny; Gentleman Ordinary of the Chamber of the King.
Jean d’Apchon: Chevalier; Seigneur of Erezat; Governor for the King in the Town of Cuset.

Sénéschaussée of the Haute Marche
Geoffroy de la Roche Aymont: Chevalier; Seigneur of Saint Messan; Seneschal of Haut Marche.
Gabriel de Malic: Chevalier; Seigneur of that place and of Chastelu.

Sénéschaussée of the Basse Marche
Henri Poussart: Chevalier; Seigneur and Baron of Fors and le Vigen.
Gaspart Frottier: Chevalier; Seigneur of la Messelière.

Bailiage of Saint-Pierre-le-Moutier
Flormiont de Dormes: Chevalier of the Order of the King; Bailly of Saint-Pierre-le-Moutier.
Thomas de Bonnay: Chevalier; Seigneur of Bessay.

Government of Orléans

Sénéschaussée of Poitou (Fontenay and Nyort)
Charles de Vivonne: Chevalier; Seigneur of la Chateigneraye.
Odet de la Noué: Chevalier; Councilor of State.

Sénéschaussée of Anjou
Martin du Bellay: Chevalier; Seigneur of that place; Prince of Yvetot; Councilor of the King (State and Private); Marquis of Touarsay; Baron of Commequiers; Captain of Fifty Men of Arms of the King’s Ordnance.
Government of Orléans

Bailliage of Touraine and Amboise
René d'Argy: Chevalier; Seigneur of Pons.

Sénéchaussée of Loudunois
[No deputy for the Second Estate.]

Gouvernement of la Rochelle and Pays Aunis
René de Tallansac: Chevalier; Seigneur of Loudriere; Governor and Seneschal of the Town of La Rochelle and Pays Aunis; Councilor of the King (State and Private).

Sénéchaussée of Angoulême
Josias de Bremont: Chevalier; Seigneur of Ars; Councilor of State.

Sénéchaussée of Maine
René de Bouillay: Chevalier; Seigneur and Count of Créance; Councilor of State; Captain of Fifty Men of Arms of the Ordinance of the King.
Jean de Vaussay: Chevalier; Seigneur of Rocheux.

Bailliage of Berry
Guillaume Pot: Chevalier of the Orders of the King; Councilor in the King's Councils; Grand Master of Ceremonies of France; First Carver and Crown (Cornette) Bearer of the King; Seigneur of Rhodes.
Henri de la Chastre: Chevalier; Seigneur and Count of Nancey; Councilor of the King (State and Private); Bailly of Gien.

Bailliage of Chartes
Charles d'Angennes: Chevalier; Seigneur of Maintenon; Councilor of State.

Bailliage of Orléans
François de l'Hôpital: Chevalier; Seigneur of le Hallier; Councilor of State; Ensign of the Company of the King; Captain and Governor of Fontainbleau.
Government of Orléans

Bailliage of Blois
Francois de Racines: Chevalier; Seigneur of Villegomblain.

Bailliage of Étampes
Paul de Cugnac: Chevalier; Seigneur of Inmouville.¹

Bailliage and County of Gien
Henri de Postel: Chevalier; Seigneur of Dormois, Couberon, Corvoz, and Escruiudiers; Gentleman Ordinary of the Chamber of the Prince of Condé.

Bailliage of Montargis
Antoine des Hayes: Chevalier; Seigneur of Cornemin and Courtin; Bailly and Governor of Montargis.

Duchy and Bailliage of Vendôme
Elisée d’Illiers: Chevalier; Seigneur of les Radraits; Baron of Bourdoeil; Gentleman Ordinary of the Chamber of the King.

Bailliage of Perche
Étienne l’Hermite: Chevalier; Seigneur of la Salle Rougeris; Councilor of the King; Gentleman Ordinary of the King’s Chamber; Bailly of Perche.

Bailliage of Nivernois
Jean Andrault de Langeron: Chevalier; Seigneur of that place; Bailly of Nivernois and Donziers; Gentleman Ordinary of the Chamber of the King.

Adrian de Blanchefort: Chevalier; Seigneur of that place; Baron of Danois.

Bailliage of Chatellerault
Emanuel Philibert de la Braudiere: Chevalier; Seigneur; Baron of l’Isle and of Rouet; Councilor of the King (State and Private); Captain of Fifty Men of Arms.

¹Died December 30, 1614.
Government of Orléans

Bailliage of Chateau-Neuf en Thimerais
Prejen de la Fin: Vidame de Chartes; Councilor of the King (State and Private); Captain of Fifty Men of Arms of the King’s Ordnance; Marshal of Camp in the King’s Army; Chevalier; Seigneur of Beaussac la Ferté de Beauvoir.

THE DEPUTIES TO THE THIRD ESTATE

Paris and Ile de France

Town of Paris
Robert Miron: Councilor of the King (State and Private); President of Requests in Parlement; Provost of Merchants of Paris.¹
Israel Desneux: Grenitier of the salt stores of Paris; Sieur of Menières; Échevin (Alderman) of Paris.
Pierre Clappisson: Councilor of the King at the Chatelet of Paris; Échevin of Paris.²
Pierre Sainctor: Seigneur of Vemars; Councilor of the Town of Paris.
Jean Perrot: Seigneur of Chesnart; Councilor of the Town of Paris.
Nicolas de Paris: Bourgeois of that town.

Provostship and Viscounty of Paris
Henri de Mesmes: Seigneur of Irval; Councilor of the King (State and Private); Lieutenant Civil of the Provostship and Viscounty of Paris.³

¹Elected president of the Third Estate. Robert Miron (1569–1641), member of a prominent Paris family, would later serve as ambassador to Switzerland and then as intendant in Languedoc.

²Elected evangelist of the Third Estate.

³Elected to be president in the absence of Miron. Henri de Mesmes (died 1650) would later be provost of merchants of Paris and president à mortier of Parlement.
Paris and Île de France

Bailliage of Vermandois
    Étienne de Lalain: Sieur Despuissar, Roquinicourt and la Suze; Advocate (Advocate or Defense Attorney) in the Bailliage of Vermandois and Presidial Seat of Laon.

Bailliage of Senlis
    Philippe Loisel: Equerry; Councilor of the King; President, Lieutenant General, Civil and Criminal of the Bailliage and Presidial Seat of Senlis.
    Gabriel de Montierre: Equerry; Sieur of Saint Martin; Councilor of the King; Lieutenant of the Bailly of Senlis at Pontoise.

Bailliage of Clermont en Beauvoisis
    Pierre le Mercier: Councilor of the King; Lieutenant General of the Bailliage of Clermont.
    Simon Vigneron: Sieur of Monceau; Councilor of the King; Lieutenant Particular, Civil and Criminal of the Bailliage of Clermont.

Bailliage of Chaumont en Vexin
    André Jorel: Equerry; Sieur of Saint Brice; Councilor of the King; Lieutenant General, Civil, and Criminal of Magny.

Bailliage of Valois
    Charles Therault: Seigneur of Vuaremal and Sery; Councilor and Master of Ordinary Requests of Queen Marguerite, Duchess of Valois; Lieutenant Particular of Crespy and Pierre-Fond.

Bailliage of Melun
    Pierre de Jau: Equerry; Sieur de Giroles; Councilor of the King; Lieutenant General of the Bailliage and Presidial Seat of Melun.

Bailliage of Nemours
    Jean le Beau: Councilor of the King; Lieutenant General, Civil and Criminal of the Bailliage and Duchy of Nemours.
    Guillaume le Gris: Captain of the Château of Nemours.
Paris and Ile de France

Bailliage of Montfort—Lamaury
Noël Rafron: Councilor of the King; Procureur (Prosecutor) of the King in the Bailliage and County of Montfort.
Nicolas Philippes: Justice in Eyre of Waters and Forest of Neufle-le-Chatel; Collector (Receiveur) of the Land and Seigneurie of Pontchartrain.

Bailliage of Mantes and Meulan
Jean le Couturier: Councilor of the King; Lieutenant General, Civil and Criminal of the Bailliage and Presidial Seat of Mantes.
Antoine de Viot: Equerry; Councilor of the King; Lieutenant Civil and Criminal of the Royal Seat of Meulan.¹

Bailliage of Dourdan
Pierre Boudet: Advocat in the Bailliage.

Bailliage of Beauvais
Robert Darry: Equerry; Sieur of la Roche and Dernemont; Councilor of the King; Lieutenant General, Civil and Criminal in the Bailliage and Presidial Seat of Beauvais.

Bailliage of Soissons
Pierre de Chezelles: Equerry; Sieur of la Forest and Grizolles; Councilor of the King; President and Lieutenant General of the Bailliage and Presidial Seat of Soissons.

Bailliage of Dreux
Thibault Couppé: Sieur of la Plaine; Licenciate in Laws; Advocat in the Bailliage of Dreux.

Bailliage of Magny
Porguier and Jorel, the deputies of Chaumont en Vexin.

¹L&D does not give Viot the title of equerry.
Government of Burgundy

**Bailliage of Dijon**
- **Claude Mochet**: Seigneur of Azu; Advocat in the Parlement of Dijon and Council of the Three Estates of the pays.
- **René Gervais**: Councilor of the King; Lieutenant General of the Bailliage of Dijon.
- **Antoine Jolly**: Councilor of the King; Recorder of the Parlement and Estates of Burgundy.

**Bailliage of Autun**
- **Philibert Venot**: Advocat in the Bailliage of Autun.
- **Simon de Montaigu**: Lieutenant General in the Chancellery of Autun; Virq of Autun.

**Bailliage of Châlons-sur-Saone**
- **Guillaume Prisque**: Sieur of Serville; Lieutenant Criminal of the Bailliage of Châlons.
- **Abraham Perrault**: Councilor of the Bailliage; Mayor of the Town of Châlons.

**Bailliage of la Montagne**
- **Claude François le Sain**: Councilor of the King; Lieutenant General of the Bailliage of la Montagne at the Principal Seat of Chatillon-sur-Seine.

**Bailliage of Mâcon**
- **Hugues Fouillard**: Councilor of the King; Lieutenant General of Mâcon.

**Bailliage of Auxois**
- **Claude Espiart**: Councilor and Secretary of the King; Court Crier of the Chancellery of Burgundy.
- **Jacques de Cluny**: Councilor of the King; Provostship Judge in the town of Avalon.

**Bailliage of Auxerre**
- **Claude Chevalier**: Councilor of the King; Lieutenant General of the Bailliage and Presidial Seat of Auxerre.
- **Guillaume Berault**: Sieur of le Sablon; Juge-Consul-Echevin of the town of Auxerre.
Government of Burgundy

Bailliage of Bar-sur-Seine
  Lazare Coqueley: Master Particular of Waters and Forests; Mayor of Bar-sur-Seine.

Bailliage of Charolais
  Claude Maleteste: Advocat in the Bailliage of Charolais.
  Claude de Ganay: Sieur of Monté-guillon; Lieutenant of the Bailliage of Charolais.

Bailliage of Bugey en Bresse
  Charles Monin: Advocat in the Bailliage of Bugey.
  Pierre Passerat: Castelan of Stillon de Michailhe.

Bailliage of Gex
  Jacques Tombel: Bourgeois of Gex.

Bailliage of Bresse
  Charles Chambard: Advocat at the Presidial Seat of Bourg; Syndic (Representative) of the pays.

Government of Normandy

Town of Rouen
  Jacques Hallé: Seigneur of Cantelou; Councilor and Secretary of the King, Household, and Crown of France; Ancien Conseiller and Second Échevin of Rouen.¹
  Michel Mariage: Sieur of Montgrimont; Councilor and Secretary of the King; Comptroller in the Chancellerie of Normandy; Councilor and Échevin Moderne of Rouen.

Bailliage of Rouen
  Jacques Campion, of Anzouville sur Ry: Bourgeois.

¹ Elected secretary and recorder (greffier) of the Third Estate.
Government of Normandy

Bailliage of Caen
Guillaume Vauquelin: Equerry; Seigneur of la Fresnaye; Councilor of the King; President and Lieutenant General in the Baili- liage and Presidial Seat; Master of Ordinary Requests of the House (hôtel) of the Queen; Deputy for the town of Caen.
Abel Olivier: Sieur of la Fontaine; a Syndic of Falaize; Deputy for the Bailliage.

Bailliage of Caux
Constantin Housset, of the parish of Flamamville.

Bailliage of Cotantin
Jacques Germain, of Arcanville: Advocat in Carentan; Seigneur of la Conté.

Bailliage of Evreux
Claude le Doux: Equerry; Sieur of Melleville; Councilor of the King; Master of Ordinary Requests of the Queen; President and Lieutenant General, Civil and Criminal of the Bailliage and Presidial Seat of Evreux.

Bailliage of GISORS
Julian le Bret: Councilor of the King; Viscount of GISORS.

Bailliage of Alançon
Pierre le Rouillé: Councilor of the King; Advocat of the King in the Bailliage and Presidial Seat of Alançon.

Government of Guyenne

Town of Bordeaux and Sénéschaussée of Guyenne
Jean de Claveau: Councilor of the King; First Substitute of the Procureur Général; Advocat in Parlement; Jurat of Bordeaux (alderman).
Issac de Boucaud: Councilor of the King in the Sénéschaussée and Presidial Seat of Guyenne.
Government of Guyenne

Sénéchaussée of Bazadois

André de Lauvergne: Councilor of the King; Lieutenant General of the Sénéchaussée of Bazadois.

Sénéchaussée of Perigord

Pierre de la Brousse: Councilor of the King; Lieutenant General and Criminal at the Seat of Sarlat.
Nicolas Alexandre: Advocat at the Presidial Seat of Perigueux.
André Charron: Councilor of the King; Lieutenant General of the Presidial Seat of Bergerac.

Sénéchaussée of Rouergue

Jean Julles Fabry: Doctor; First Consul of Rodez; Judge of Concours.
Antoine de Bandinel: Seigneur of la Roquette; First Consul of the town and bourg of Rodez.
Foulcrand Coulonges: Consul of Ville-Franche.
Jean Guérin: Doctor; Lieutenant in the Royal Magistracy of Creissel; Consul of Milhau.
Jacques de Fleires: Sieur and Baron of Boason; Doctor; Syndic General in Sénéchaussée of Rouergue.

Sénéchaussée of Saintonge

Raymond de Montagne: Seigneur of Saint Genes, Combrac, la Vallée, and other places; Councilor of the King; Lieutenant in the Sénéchaussée of Saintonge.

Sénéchaussée of Agenois

Jean Vilemon: Councilor and Procureur of the King in the Sénéchaussée of Agenois.
Julien de Cambefort: Equerry; Sieur of Selves; First Consul of the town of Agen.
Jean de Sabaros: Sieur of la Motherouge; Advocat in the Parliament of Bordeaux; Syndic of this pays.

Pays and County of Cominges

François de Combis: Equerry; Sieur of Combis and of la Mothe.
Government of Guyenne

Jugerie of Rivière-Verdun

Louis de Long: Councilor of the King; Judge General of this pays.

Sénéschaussée of Landes and Saint Sever

Daniel de Barry: Councilor of the King; Lieutenant of the Sénéschaussée of Lannes at the Seat of Saint Sever.

Arnaul de Coisl: Syndic General of the pays and Seat of Saint Sever.¹

Sénéschaussée of Albret

Pierre du Roy: Councilor of the King; Lieutenant Civil and Criminal in the Sénéschaussée of Albret.

Jean Broca: Consul of the town of Nerac; Advocat in the Parliament of Bordeaux and Chamber of Guyenne.

Sénéschaussée of Armagnac

Samuel de Long: Councilor of the King; Lieutenant General and Chief Justice in the Sénéschaussée of Armagnac.

Sénéschaussée of Condomois and Gascogne

Guillaume Pouchalan: First Consul of Condom; Sieur of la Tour.

Raimond de Goujon: Bourgeois and Jurat of Condom.

Sénéschaussée of Haut Limousin and Town of Limoges

Leonard de Chastenet: Sieur and Baron of le Murat; Councilor of the King; Lieutenant General of the Sénéschaussée of Limousin and Presidial Seat of Limoges and other towns of the plat pays.²

Gregoire de Cordes: Sieur of Saint Ligourde; Bourgeois of Limoges.³

¹ Elected as a substitute for Barry in case of necessity.
² Elected evangelist of the Third Estate.
³ Elected as a substitute for Chastenet in case of necessity.
Government of Guyenne

Sénéschaussée of Bas Limousin

François du Mas: Sieur of the noble house of la Chapoulie and in the dependencies of Pradel la Gane and la Gauterie; Councilor of the King; Lieutenant General in the Sénéschaussée of Bas Limousin and the Presidial Seat of Brives la Gailarde.

Pierre de Fenis: Sieur of le Theil; Councilor of the King; Lieutenant General in the Sénéschaussée of Bas Limousin.

Jacques de Chavaille: Sieur of Fougieres and le Pouget; Lieutenant General, Criminal Assessor, and Commissioner of Examining (Commissaire examineur) in the Sénéschaussée of Bas Limousin, at the seat of Uzerches.

Sénéschaussée of Quercy

Pierre de la Fage: Doctor of Laws; Advoca at the Presidial Seat of Cahors; First Consul of Cahors.

Pays and County of Bigorre

[No deputy for the Third Estate.]

Government of Brittany

Deputies of the Estates of Brittany

Guy Gouault: Equerry; Sieur de Sénégrand; Councilor of the King; Provost and Judge Ordinary of Rennes.

Julien Salmon: Sieur de Querbloye; Councilor of the King; Procureur of the King at the Presidial Seat of Rennes.

Raoul Marot: Sieur de la Garraye; Councilor of the King; Seneschal of Dinan.

Jean Perret: Sieur of Pas-aux-Biches; Councilor of the King; Lieutenant in the Jurisdiction of Ploërmel.

Jean Picot: Sieur of la Giclaye.

Mathurin Rouxel: Sieur of Beauvais; Procureur-Syndic of the inhabitants of Saint Brieux.

Jean de Harouys: Sieur de Lespinay; Procureur-Syndic of the Estates of Brittany.
Government of Champagne

Bailliage of Troyes

Pierre le Noble: Councilor of the King; President and Lieutenant General of the Bailliage and Presidial of Troyes.

Jean Bazin: Equerry; Sieur de Bouilly and Besènes; Mayor of Troyes.

Bailliage of Chaumont en Bassigny

François de Grand: Councilor of the King; Lieutenant Criminal of the Bailliage of Chaumont.

François Julliot: Councilor of the King at the Presidial of Chaumont; Mayor of Chaumont.

Bailliage of Meaux

Louis Barré: Advocat at the Bailliage and Presidial Seat of Meaux.

Jacques Chalemont: Ancien Advocat and Échevin of Meaux.

Bailliage of Provins

Pierre Retel: Councilor of the King; Lieutenant Particular Assessor of the Bailliage and Presidial Seat of Provins.

Bailliage of Sézanne

Jacques Champion: Procureur of the King in the Bailliage of Sézanne.¹

Bailliage of Sens

Bernard Angenoust: Equerry; Sieur de Trencault; Councilor of the King; Lieutenant General of the Bailliage and Presidial of Sens.

Bailliage of Vitry-le-François

Jacques Rolet: Sieur des Brestans; Councilor of the King; Provost and Judge Ordinary of Vitry-le-François.

François Rouyer: Advocat in the Parlement of Paris; Resident of Saint Menehould.

¹ Died during the meeting of the Estates General.
Government of Champagne

Bailliage of Chateau-Thierry
Claude de Vertu: Equerry; Sieur de Macongny; Councilor of the King; President and Lieutenant Criminal of the Bailliage and Presidial Seat of Chateau-Thierry.

Government of Languedoc

Sénéchaussée and Town of Toulouse
Jean de Louppes: Councilor of the King; Criminal Judge of the King in the Sénéchaussée of Toulouse.
Pierre Marmiesse: Doctor of Laws; Lawyer in the Parlement of Toulouse; Capitoul (alderman) of Toulouse.
François de Boriez: Doctor; Advocat in the Parlement of Toulouse; Capitoul and Head of the Consistory of the Hôtel de Ville of Toulouse.

Sénéchaussée of Carcassonne and Beziers
Philippe le Roux: Seigneur d'Alzonne; Councilor of the King; President, Chief Justice, Lieutenant né and General in the Sénéchaussée of Carcassonne and Beziers.
David de L'Espinasse: Equerry; First Consul of the town of Castres and its deputy.

Sénéchaussée of Beaucaire and Nimes
François de Rochemore: Councilor of the King; Lieutenant General of the Sénéchaussée of Beaucaire and Nimes.
Louis de Gondin: Consul of the town of Uzez.

Sénéchaussée of Puy and Vellay
Hugues de Filère: Councilor of the King and Principal Lieutenant in the Sénéchaussée of Puy.
Jean Vitalis: Doctor of Medicine; First Consul of Puy.

Town, Government, and Sénéchaussée of Montpellier
Daniel de Galliere: Councilor of the King; Treasurer General of France; First Consul and Provost (Viguier) of Montpellier.
Government of Languedoc

Sénéschaussée of Lauragais
   Raimond de Cup: Counselor of the King; Chief-Justice of Castel-naudary.

Sénéschaussée, Pays, and County of Foix
   Bernard Meric: Doctor; Advocat in the Sénéschaussée; Procureur of the King in the town of Foix.

Government of Picardy

Bailliage of Amiens
   Pierre Pingré: Councilor of the King; Lieutenant General of the Bailliage and Presidial Seat of Amiens.

Sénéschaussée of Ponthieu
   Philippe de la Vernot Paschal: Equerry; President; Lieutenant General and Criminal in the Sénéschaussée and Presidial Seat of Ponthieu.

Sénéschaussée of Boulonnais
   Pierre de Vuillecot: Sieur Despriez and of le Faux; Advocat of the King in the Sénéschaussée and County of Boulonnais.

Calais and Pays Reconquis
   Louis le Beaucler: Equerry; Councilor of the King; President and Judge General of Calais and Pays Reconquis.

Provostship of Péronne¹
   Robert Choquel: Councilor of the King; Procureur Général in the Government and Provostship of Péronne; Mayor of Péronne.

Provostship of Montdidier
   Antoine de Berthin: Equerry; Lieutenant General, Civil, and Criminal in the Government of Peronne, Montdidier, and Roye.

¹The three provostships of Peronne, Montdidier, and Roye were given only one vote among them. A.N. E 46B–47A, fol. 173r.
Government of Picardy

Provostship of Roye

Jacques de Neufville: Equerry; Sieur de Fontaines; Councilor of the King; Lieutenant General, Civil and Criminal of the Government of Roye.

Government of Dauphiné

Estates of Dauphiné

Louis Masson: Doctor; Advocat in Parlement; First Consul of the Town of Vienne.
Etienne Gilbert: Advocat in Parlement.
Gaspard de Ceressault: First Consul of Ambrun.
Claude Brosse: Seigneur of Serifin; Syndic of the villages of Dauphiné.
Antoine Basset: Secretary of the Estates of the pays of Dauphiné.

Government of Provence

Estates of Provence

Jean Louis de Mathaon: Sieur of Salignac and Entrepierre; Advocat in the Court; Assessor in the town of Aix; Procureur of the pays.
Thomas de Feraporte: Advocat in the Court of Parlement of Provence; Syndic of the Third Estate of the pays.
François de Sebolin: Sieur of la Mothe; First Consul of the town of Hières.
Antoine Achard: Recorder (Greffier) of the Estates of Provence.

Town of Marseille

Baltazard Vias: Doctor of Laws; Advocat in the Court of Parlement of Provence; Assessor of the Town of Marseille.

Town of Arles

Pierre d’Augières: Advocat in the Parlement of Provence; Assesseur of the Consuls and Communities of the town of Arles.
Government of Lyonnais

Sénéschaussée of Lyon

Pierre Austrein: Seigneur of Jarnosse; President of the Parliament of Dombes; Lieutenant in the Sénéschaussée and Presidial Seat of Lyon; Auditor of Camp (Auditor of Accounts?) of the Government of Lyon, pays of Lyonnais, Forez and Beaujolais; Provost of Merchants of Lyon.

Charles Grollier: Equerry; Seigneur Descouviri: Advocat and Procureur Général of Lyon.

Jean de Moulceau: Advocat in the Private Council of the King.

Jean Goujon: Advocat in the Sénéschaussée and Presidial Seat of Lyon.

Philippe Tixier: Captain and Castelan of Dargoire; Syndic of the plat pays of Lyonnais; Deputy for the plat pays.

Sénéschaussée of Forêt

Pierre Rival: Assesseur in the Provostship and First Échevin of the town of Montbrison.

Claude Greysolon: Syndic of the pays of Forêt.

Sénéschaussée of Beaujolais

Claude Charreton: Seigneur of la Terrière; Councilor of the King; Lieutenant General, Civil and Criminal of the Bailliage of Beaujolais.

Bas Pays of Auvergne

Antoine de Murat: Councilor of the King (State and Private); Lieutenant General in the Sénéschaussée and Presidial Seat of Riom.

Jean Savaron: Sieur de Villars; Councilor of the King; President and Lieutenant General in the Sénéschaussée and Presidial Seat of Clermont.¹

Guillaume Maritan: Échevin of the town of Clermont.

¹ In the original records, followed by Quinet, Murat and Savaron were listed simply as the two lieutenants general of the Sénéschaussées of the pays. This was done because of a dispute started by Savaron as to which should have the precedence. The dispute was sent
Government of Lyonnais

Bailliage of Saint Flour and Haut Auvergne

Pierre Chabot: Councilor of the King; Lieutenant General, Civil and Criminal in the Bailliage of Haut Pays d’Auvergne, established at Saint Flour.

Pierre Sauret: Second Consul of the town of Saint Flour.
Jean Montheil: Advocat in the Bailliage of Saint Flour.
Jean Sauret: Advocat in the Parlement of Paris and living there.¹

Sénéschaussée of Bourbonnais

Jean de Champfeu: Seigneur of Garannes; Councilor of the King; President of the Bureau of Finances at Moulins.
Jean de l’Aubespin: Equerry; Bailly and Governor of Montaigu-les-Combrailles; Treasurer General of France at Moulins.
Gilbert Balle: Sieur de Petit-bois; Lieutenant Civil and Criminal in the Chatellenie of Aïnay.
Jean Berauld: Lieutenant General, Cosnes [sic]; Advocat in the Sénéschaussée of Bourbonnais.²

Sénéschaussée of the Haute Marche

Jean Vallenet: Sieur of la Ribière; Councilor of the King; Lieutenant Particular in the Seat of Gueret.

Sénéschaussée of the Basse Marche

François Reymond: Sieur de Cluseau; Councilor of the King; Lieutenant General of the Sénéschaussée of the Basse Marche in the town of Bellac.

to the King’s Council. The decision of the Council remains unknown—possibly the thorny question remained unsolved. Jean Savaron (1566–1621) held degrees in canon and civil law, and was a writer, jurist, and public official.

¹ Jean Sauret was elected to fill the place of his brother Pierre Sauret, if he should be absent.

² De Landine refers to Balle and Berauld simply as Bourgeois.
Government of Lyonnais

Bailliage of Saint-Pierre-le-Moutier
  Etienne Gascoing: Councilor of the King; Lieutenant General in the Bailliage and Presidial Seat of Saint-Pierre-le-Moutier.
  Florimond Rapine: Sieur de Semxi; Councilor of the King; Advocat Général of the King in the Seat of Saint-Pierre-le-Moutier.

Government of Orléans

Sénéchaussée of Poitou (Fontenay and Nyort)
  René Brochard: Equerry; Sieur des Fontaines; Councilor of the King in the Presidial Seat of Poitiers.
  François Brisson: Equerry; Sieur of le Palais; Councilor of the King; Seneschal of Fontenay.
  Coste Arnaut: Merchant of Poitiers.

Sénéchaussée of Anjou
  François Lanier: Sieur of Saint Jame; Councilor of the King; Lieutenant General of Anjou.
  Etienne du Mesnis: Ancien Advocat of the Seat of Anjou; n'agueres Mayor and Captain of the Town of Angers.

Bailliage of Tourraine and Amboise
  Jacques Gautier: Councilor of the King in the Parlement of Brittany; President of the Presidial of Tours.
  René (de) Sain: Councilor of the King; Treasurer General of France; Mayor of town of Tours.
  Jean Dodeau: Councilor of the King; Lieutenant General in the Bailliage of Amboise.
  Claude Rousseau: Procureur of the King in the Election and Ancien Échevin of Amboise.

Sénéchaussée of Loudunois
  Louis Trincaut: Procureur of the King in the Sénéchaussée of Loudunois.

1 In the Third Estate it seems that both Tourraine and Amboise were given a vote.
Government of Orléans

Sénéchaussée of Loudunois
Barthélemy de Burges: Receiver of Aides and Tailles in the Election of Loudon.

Government of La Rochelle and Pays of Aunis
Daniel de la Goutte: Councilor and Advocat of the King at the Presidial Seat of La Rochelle; one of the Peers of that town, a deputy from that corps.
Gabriel de Bourdigalle: Sieur of la Chabosssiere; Councilor of the King; Procureur of the King in the Presidial Seat and other jurisdictions of that town and Government of Aunis and la Rochelle.
Jean Tharay: Merchant; Bourgeois; Procureur-Syndic of the Bourgeois and inhabitants of La Rochelle; Deputy of the Bourgeois and inhabitants and the Third Estate.

Sénéchaussée of Angoulème
Philippe de Nemond: Equerry; Sieur of Brie; Councilor of the King; Lieutenant General in the Sénéchaussée and Presidial Seat of Angoulême; Master of Requests of the Queen.

Sénéchaussée of Maine
Michel Vasse: Lieutenant General and Criminal of the Sénéchaussée of Maine.¹
Julien Gaucher: Premier and Ancien Advocat of the King in the Sénéchaussée of Maine.

Bailliage of Berry
Louis Foucaut: Equerry; Sieur of Chamfort; Councilor of the King; President of the Presidial Seat of Berry; Mayor of Bourges.
Philippe le Bègue: Advocat of the King; Councilor at the Presidial Seat of Berry.
François Carcat: Councilor of the King; Procureur of the King at the Royal Seat of Issoudun.

¹ Died during the meeting of the Estates General.
Government of Orléans

Bailliage of Berry
Paul Ragneau: Councilor of the King; Lieutenant General, Civil and Criminal in the Bailliage and Royal Seat of Mehun-sur-Eure.

Bailliage of Chartes
François Chavayne: Councilor of the King; President at the Bailliage and Presidial Seat of Chartes.
Jacques de Essarts: Councilor at the Presidial Seat of Chartes; Councilor of State.

Bailliage of Orléans
François de Beauharnois: Councilor of the King; President and Lieutenant General in the Bailliage and Presidial Seat of Orléans; Deputy for the Castellenies Royal and non-Royal of the Bailliage.
Guillaume Rousselet: Bourgeois of the town of Orléans.
Augustin de l’Isle: Councilor of the King; Lieutenant of the Bailly of Orléans at the Seat of Chateau-Regnard.1

Bailliage of Blois
Guillaume Ribier: Equerry; Sieur of le Hauvignon; Councilor of the King; President and Lieutenant General in the Bailliage and Presidial Seat of Blois.
Jean Courtin: Sieur de Nanteuil.

Bailliage of Étampes
Jacques Petau: Councilor of the King; Lieutenant General, Civil, and Criminal of the Bailliage and Duchy of Étampes; Mayor of Étampes.

1 L’Isle was elected to take a place in the Estates General if Beauharnois were absent or sick.
Government of Orléans

Bailliage and County of Gien

Daniel Chaseray: Sieur de Beauxnoirs; Councilor of the King; Lieutenant General, Civil and Criminal in the Bailliage and County of Gien.

Pierre le Piat: Councilor of the King; Provost and Judge Ordinary, Lieutenant Civil, Assessor and Criminal of the town, County, Provostship, and jurisdiction of Gien.

Bailliage of Montargis

René Ravault: Sieur of Monceau; Ancien Advocat in the Bailliage of Montargis-le-Franc.

Duchy and Bailliage of Vendôme

Jean Bautru: Sieur of les Matrats; Bailly of the pays and Duchy of Vendôme.

Mathurin Rateau: Recorder (Greffier) of the Bailliage of Vendôme; Echevin of the town of Vendôme.

Bailliage of Perche

Isaye Petigars: Seigneur of la Garenne; President in the Election of Perche.

Bailliage of Nivernois

Henri Bolarie: Lieutenant General in the Bailliage and Peerage of Nivernois.

Guillaume Salonnier: Councilor and Master of Accounts of the Duke of Nivernois.

Bailliage of Chatellerault

François Ferand: Councilor of the King; Procureur of the King in the Bailliage of Chatellerault.

Bailliage of Chateau-Neuf en Thimerais

[No deputy for the Third Estate.]
## APPENDIX II

### CLERGY TABLE ONE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardinals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archbishops</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishops</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prototnotaries</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand vicars</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archdeacons</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapters</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deans</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officials</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provosts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almoners</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penententiaries</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The numbers at the top of the tables refer to the governments or provinces: (1) Paris and Île de France, (2) Burgundy, (3) Normandy, (4) Guyenne, (5) Brittany, (6) Champagne and Brie, (7) Languedoc, (8) Picardy, (9) Dauphiné, (10) Provence, (11) Lyonnais, (12) Orléans. "GA" stands for the general agents of the clergy. In all the tables except the first concerning the nobles, the totals of offices or positions of each deputy were counted. This is one of the reasons for the differences in these figures and those of Major. Major, Deputies, pp. 163–165.
Because of multiple representation in five governments, the actual number of men present is less than the number of deputies theoretically elected. For example, Richelieu represented two sénéschaussées and so was counted twice since he had two votes. There were actually ten archbishops, fifty bishops, ten archdeacons, twenty-seven members of chapters, three provosts, sixteen doctors of theology, twenty priors, thirty-five councilors (state and private), and twenty-six councilors present. Deaths during the meetings reduced the following categories by one: archbishops, archdeacons, chapters, deans, officials, doctors of theology, law degrees, councilors (state and private). Jean Chatard of Touraine in Orléans was counted as a member and a canon even though he had a seat only after the death of the Archbishop of Tours.
### CLERGY TABLE TWO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councilor, S &amp; P . .</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councilor .</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councilor, Bailliage .</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parlement .</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master of requests . .</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals . . 13 5 5 15 4 3 7 0 1 6 4 14 0 77

Number of deputies . . 23 13 10 23 6 11 9 7 2 6 16 28 2 156

Actual number of deputies . . 22 13 10 22 6 11 9 5 2 2 12 26 2 142

1 See page 320, footnote 1.
### NOBLES TABLE ONE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princes</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dukes</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marquises</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counts</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viscounts</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vidames</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barons</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seigneurs</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sieurs</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chevalier only</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equerry only</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>135</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baillis or seneschals</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councilors, S &amp; P</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councilors, State</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councilors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other royal office</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military office</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-royal office only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of deputies</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹There is no problem of multiple representation in the Second Estate since Charles d'Estourmel, the only deputy representing more than one area, was entitled to one vote for all three of his constituencies—Peronne, Mondidier, and Roye in Picardy—and was counted only once. Two deaths during the meetings lowered the number of marquises to seven and the number of seigneurs to seventy-two.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baillis or seneschals</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenants to baillis or seneschals</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenants general, civil, particular, criminal; presidents of presidial seats</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provosts and judges of subordinate seats</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocats at presidial seats</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procureurs and advocates of the King</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax, finance, and treasury officials</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designation</td>
<td>Location 1</td>
<td>Location 2</td>
<td>Location 3</td>
<td>Location 4</td>
<td>Location 5</td>
<td>Location 6</td>
<td>Location 7</td>
<td>Location 8</td>
<td>Location 9</td>
<td>Location 10</td>
<td>Location 11</td>
<td>Location 12</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other royal officials</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parlement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councilor of the king (state and private)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councilor of the king</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Échevins</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syndics (rural)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other town or local officials</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocats</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bourgeoisie</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchants</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctors of medicine</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designation</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officials of estates</td>
<td>0 2 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officials of nobles</td>
<td>1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total royal officials</td>
<td>27 11 7 17 4 9 7 7 0 0 19 33</td>
<td>141¹</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total nonroyal officials</td>
<td>5 8 3 12 2 3 7 1 4 6 6 8 65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total deputies</td>
<td>28 20 10 30 7 12 12 7 5 6 23 38</td>
<td>196²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Parlement officials and councilors of the king are excluded. Cf. page 52, footnote 1.

² Porquier and Jorel of Chaumont en Vexin of Ile de France have been counted twice. Coisl and Cordes of Guyenne, Sauret of Lyonnais, and L'Isle of Orléans were included in the above table even though they were substitutes. If none of them officially took part in the Estates General (this is not known) then there were only 192 deputies (190 if Porquier and Jorel are counted only once). Jacques Champion of Sézannes in Champagne and Michel Vasse of Maine in Orléans died during the meetings. All of this would reduce the number of lieutenants to baillis to two, lieutenants general, etc., to sixty-nine, procureurs of the king to seventeen, parlement officials to seventeen, councilors of the king to eighty-three, syndics to ten, bourgeoisie to four.
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