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This thesis is a social, political, intellectual and religious study of the Paris Observant Franciscans during the latter half of the sixteenth century in France. Living as they were in the largest city in France, the friars were frequent witnesses, and even participants, in many of the most important events and developments of the religious wars. The friary was also an active participant in the urban community. Its members worked among the sick and poor, administered the sacraments, and preached in the parish churches in and around Paris. As a large and wealthy community, the friary was a recognizable presence in the economic life of the city as a consumer, employer and even as a landlord. It was also a highly respected intellectual centre, housing a prestigious theological school which was closely affiliated with the University of Paris.

The spirituality, wealth and intellectual stature of the Paris friary made it an important urban institution -- one which regularly interacted with the other judicial, administrative and ecclesiastic institutions in the city and enjoyed the patronage of many of its most influential residents. How this community understood its spiritual as well as social and political roles, and how the wars affected the Franciscan community's
conception and performance of these roles, are consequently two important facets of this study.

It is clear, for example, that the missionary mandate of the Franciscan order continued to characterize the behaviour of the Paris community throughout the late sixteenth century. Rather than the Holy Land or the New World, however, these friars were preoccupied with the salvation of their own country. During the many years of civil conflict, members of the community wrote, spoke and fought against the spread of Protestantism in France, and the friary administration continued to emphasize its role as a producer of fine theologians and preachers even when the wars threatened to disrupt the training of its students.

The effectiveness of the friars as agents of religious rejuvenation resulted from their adaptability to the changing religious character of France on the one hand, and their particular brand of spirituality on the other. They were skilful at modifying their proselytizing methods in order to appeal to different social sectors and, during the civil wars, these clerics adopted linguistic and stylistic methods associated with humanism in order to counteract the advances of the new religion. The Christocentric emphasis of Franciscan piety and its encouragement of lay spirituality similarly ensured the friars an enthusiastic response in French society.
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INTRODUCTION

This thesis is a social, political, intellectual and religious study of the Paris Observant Franciscans during the latter half of the sixteenth century. The Paris Franciscans are ideal subjects for the examination of relations between a religious community and secular society during this politically and spiritually ebullient period. Living as they were in the largest city in France, the friars were frequent witnesses, and even participants, in many of the most important events and developments of the religious wars. They would have had first-hand experience of the Massacre of Saint-Bartholomew's Day (1572), the Day of the Barricades (1588), and the siege of Paris (1590).

The friary was also an active participant in the urban community outside these times of crisis. Its members worked among the sick and poor, administered the sacraments, processed through the streets on high holidays and preached in the parish churches in and around Paris. As a large and wealthy community, the friary was a recognizable presence in the economic life of the city as a consumer, employer and landlord. It was also a highly-respected intellectual centre, housing a prestigious theological school which was closely affiliated with the University of Paris. Bonaventure, Duns Scotus, and William of Ockham were among the luminaries who had once studied and taught at the Paris Franciscan studium.

The spirituality, wealth and intellectual stature of
the Paris friary made it an important urban institution -- one which regularly interacted with the other judicial, administrative and ecclesiastic institutions in the city and enjoyed the patronage of many of its most influential residents. How this community understood its spiritual as well as social and political roles, and how the wars affected the Franciscan community's conception and performance of these roles, are consequently two important facets of this study.

It is clear, for example, that the missionary mandate of the Franciscan order continued to characterize the behaviour of the Paris community throughout the late sixteenth century. Rather than the Holy Land or the New World, however, these friars were preoccupied with the salvation of their own country. During the many years of civil conflict, members of the community wrote, spoke and fought against the spread of Protestantism in France, and the friary administration continued to emphasize its role as a producer of fine theologians and preachers even when the wars threatened to disrupt the training of its students.

The effectiveness of the friars as agents of religious rejuvenation resulted from their adaptability to the changing religious character of France on the one hand, and their particular brand of spirituality on the other. They were skillful at modifying their proselytizing methods in order to appeal to different social sectors and, during the civil wars, these clerics adopted linguistic and stylistic methods associated with humanism in order to counteract the
advances of the new religion. The Christocentric emphasis of
Franciscan piety and its encouragement of lay spirituality
similarly ensured the friars an enthusiastic response in
French society.

Narrative

In keeping with the traditional historiography of the
religious wars, this thesis considers the year 1559 a
turning-point in the political and spiritual life of France.
In 1559, the first Protestant synod was held in Paris. This
highly visible event agitated Catholics who could not help
but be aware of the degree to which the "new religion" had
entrenched itself in French society. The death of Henry II
in a tournament during the same year introduced political
instability to the already potent mixture of religious
dissension. Three Valois brothers (Francis II [d. 1560],
Charles IX [d. 1574] and Henry III [d. 1589]) succeeded one
another during the decades that followed, each unable to
control either the political factions which quickly formed
around the Guise and Bourbon noble families or the periodic
eruptions of confessional violence.

Violent encounters between Protestants and Catholics in
Paris begin pockmarking the records of the period as early
as April 1561. Protestant evangelizing on University
property\(^1\) during Easter provoked individual and group

---

\(^1\) Jean-Baptiste Crevier, *Histoire de l'Université de
Paris depuis son origine jusqu'en l'année 1600* (Paris:
attacks, and another large-scale encounter between Huguenots and Catholics erupted two days after Christmas outside the church of Saint-Victor.\textsuperscript{2} A year later, the Leaguer curé of Saint-Barthélemei records a riot near Montmartre at the north end of the city.\textsuperscript{3} Outbursts of civil violence during these years only increased as Catherine de Médicis and her son Charles IX attempted, unsuccessfully, to find a compromise between warring factions. The Colloquy of Poissy (1561) failed to resolve doctrinal differences through discussion, just as force failed to bring order following the civil wars of 1562 and 1567.

Barbara Diefendorf brilliantly portrays how mounting distrust between confessional groups led to one of the most famous episodes of civil violence in French history: the Massacre of Saint Bartholomew's Day. Beginning in Paris and quickly spreading to other urban centres across France in August 1572, the massacre claimed the lives of untold thousands of Protestants and suspected Protestants over the period of a few days.\textsuperscript{4} As the Protestant community retreated from further conflict to reorganize its affairs, Paris was...


\textsuperscript{3} Jehan de la Fosse, Journal d'un curé ligueur de Paris ed. Eduard de Barthelemy (Paris: Didier & Cie., 1865): 44-45. Fosse was also the curé of the parish SS. Leu et Gilles-de-Paris.

able to enjoy a few years respite from large-scale civil violence. The succession of Henry III in 1574 seemed to offer Catholics renewed hope for the permanent reestablishment of order in the nation. This was not to be, however. Though healthier than his brother, Henry III was no more able to produce an heir to the throne, let alone control the Guise and Bourbon factions. The escape of Henry of Navarre from the Louvre in 1576 and the emergence of the first Catholic League in December of the same year heightened political instability.

Reading the minutes of the Paris friary during these early years of the conflict, one could easily forget that civil war was raging around the community. The minutes show a house preoccupied with routine administrative affairs -- namely, the management of a large household, the education of its students and dealings with the head of the order in Rome. Matters of state rarely appear in these tri-weekly accounts, and even an important event like the Massacre of St Bartholomew's Day does not earn a mention.

Nevertheless, the memoirs of the period show that the friary was a visible presence in secular society throughout the religious wars. Friars participated in the annual municipal processions as well as the funeral processions organized for prominent individuals. We find them in one accompanying the oath-taking ceremony of royal officers and

---

University officials in 1562, for example, as well as in the funeral processions for Charles IX (1574) and the Cardinal de Birague (1583). The hosting of the general chapter session of the Franciscan order in Paris turned the spotlight on the friars in 1579. This event, attended by thousands of friars from across Europe who gathered to select their new minister general, was an important cultural as well as spiritual occasion in the life of the city. Three days of meetings were accompanied by plays, banquets and a grand procession. The friars appear in the memoirs once again in 1581, though this time a conflict with their minister general was the underlying reason. A contested internal election quickly led to disorder between members of
the friary which escalated once the papal nuncio became involved. By the time order was reestablished eighteen months later, the judicial court of the Parlement of Paris, the King of France, and the papacy had become active participants in the affair.⁹

Even though the friary minutes are silent on political events, we can trace the effects of years of episodic violence and political instability in the increasingly strained economic circumstances of the household, and the difficulty with which the inner council controlled its members. Accounts of friars leaving the friary without permission and behaving in an unseemly fashion litter the minutes, and on a few occasions the civil disorder caused by the wars is directly blamed.¹⁰ Economic problems are also apparent during the early years of the wars. In 1565 the friary requested a special one-time financial levy from the Parlement of Paris because of the "malicia temporis."¹¹ The violence of the wars in November 1567 forced the temporary closing of lectures at the studium.¹² A few years later in 1573, the house still felt financially burdened, and decided this time to send a number of students home for a few

---

⁹ This episode will be discussed in greater detail in subsequent chapters.

¹⁰ This is discussed in ch. 2, 107-110.

¹¹ BNF Coll. Dupuy 215, f. 23r. The document is dated October 4, 1565.

¹² AN LL1515 (November 5, 1567), ff. 22v-23r. "... lectores theologiae propter bella et excubiae interrupte repeterenter ad tardius die ... novembris."
months.\textsuperscript{13}

Of course, not all the friary's economic problems were attributable to the wars. The burning of the Cordeliers church in November 1580 compounded the friary's financial difficulties. An unmonitored candle quickly destroyed the chapels filled with exquisite ornaments, the archives, and the friary's library, which held over 9,000 volumes and was consequently one of the largest collections in France.\textsuperscript{14}

Even with the generous donations of Henry III, members of the royal order of Saint-Esprit,\textsuperscript{15} and the de Thou family,\textsuperscript{16} the friary was still rebuilding its church decades later.

\textsuperscript{13} AN 1515 (July 11, 1573), f. 59v.

\textsuperscript{14} L'Estoile's account of the burning conveys the destructiveness of the event. The fire "... embrasa de telle furie tout le comble de ladite église, qui n'estoit lambrissé que de bois, qu'il fut ars et consomé en moins de trois heures entièrement ...." L'Estoile, \textit{Mémoires-journaux de Pierre de L'Estoile}, ed. M.M.E. Bounet, A. Champollion, E. Halphen et al., 1 (Paris: Librairie des Bibliophiles, 1876-1883): 373. See also Alfred Franklin, \textit{Les anciennes bibliothèques de Paris} 1 (Paris: Imprimerie impériale, 1867): 203-207. The burning of the library is also discussed by Francesco-Scipio Gonzaga in his history of the Franciscan order \textit{De origine seraphicae religionis franciscanae eiusque progressibus de regularis observantiae institutione forma administrationis ac legibus, admirabili eius propagacione} (Rome, 1587): 118-119, and Jacques Du Breul, \textit{Le theatre des antiquitez de Paris} ... (Paris: Claude de la Tour, 1612): 537.

\textsuperscript{15} The Saint-Esprit was an order of the nobility organized by Henry III in 1578. It included the most prominent nobles and princes of the blood, among them the duke of Guise and his brother the Cardinal de Lorraine, the duke of Nevers, and the duke of Joyeuse. François Bluche, \textit{Dictionnaire du Grand Siècle} (Paris: Fayard, 1990): 1384.

\textsuperscript{16} Christophe de Thou and his son Jacques-Auguste de Thou were prominent magistrates during the sixteenth century and important patrons of the Cordeliers. They are discussed in greater detail in chapters 4 and 5.
INTRODUCTION

The economic plight of the friary was little improved by the escalating political instability of the last decade of the religious wars, especially in the city of Paris. The death in 1584 of Henry III's brother, François-Hercule, signalled the approaching end of the Valois dynasty. Henry III remained childless after ten years of marriage, and the next in line to the throne was the Protestant ruler of Navarre, Henry Bourbon. Responding to the threat posed by a Protestant succession was the Catholic League, a zealous political organization which first appeared in Paris in 1585. Unlike previous Catholic Leagues, this urban-centred organisation drew its membership from the Parisian administrative and judicial institutions rather than from the nobility. Its mandate was simple: the preservation of a Catholic monarchy as the essential component of a stable and God-pleasing regime. In the decade that followed, the League quickly gained control of the most important organs of power in the city, and enjoyed the support of the University of Paris and many of the religious institutions in addition to the councillors in the Hôtel de Ville, and a number of magistrates in the courts of Parlement and the Châtelet.17

Among the most ardent clerical supporters of the Holy Catholic League were the parish priests, the Jesuits, the Capuchins, and of course, the Cordeliers. Cordelier involvement with the League was already apparent by 1585, at least to their minister general. The minutes of the inner friary mention a perturbed letter from the head of their order who had heard rumours of their political involvement with the organization.\textsuperscript{18} It is not until 1589, however, that Cordelier involvement with the League seems wholehearted.

Upset by Henry III's assassination of the Duke of Guise and his brother at Blois in December 1588, and perturbed by his continuing negotiations with the Protestant Henry of Navarre, the Cordeliers removed the head of the portrait of the King which was hanging in their church. This dramatic political statement clearly shocked Pierre de L'Estoile, who acidly remarks in his journal that such work was "a fine occupation and amusement for those who have nothing to do, and work, as they say, worthy of monks."\textsuperscript{19} From this point on, the friars were regular participants in League-organized

---

\textsuperscript{18} AN LL1511 (May 21, 1585), f. 31v.

\textsuperscript{19} "Ce jour, les Cordeliers ostèrent la teste à la représentation de la figure du Roy, qui estoit peint à genoux, priant Dieu auprès de la Roine sa femme, au-dessus du maistre-autel de leur église ... Belle occupation et amusement de gens qui n'ont que faire, et ouvrage, disoit-on, digne de moines". Pierre de L'Estoile, Mémoires-journaux 4, 298. This entry is dated July 5, 1589.
processions. Cordelier preachers like François Feuardent, Jean Garin, Maurice Hylaret and Robert Chessé also became notorious for their fiery attacks on the monarchy as well as on moderate Catholics who did not share their attachment to the League. The steps of the Cordelier Church provided the platform from which Madame de Nemours, the mother of the assassinated Guise brothers, preached in favour of the regicide of Henry III in 1589. It was also at the Cordelier friary that the League kept an arsenal of arms in 1593.

The political turmoil in Paris resulting from the activities of the League did little to aid the local economy, especially since these years of political

---


21 These preachers were well-known as pro-League supporters as we can see from the memoirs of the era, and will be discussed in more detail in later chapters.

22 Anne d'Este, Madame de Nemours, was the wife of Francis, the second Duke of Guise (d. 1563), and the mother of Henry (d. 1588) and Charles (d.1588). For this episode, see Pierre de L'Estoile, *Journal de L'Estoile pour la règne de Henri IV* 1 (Paris: Gallimard, 1958): 19.

23 *Arrêts. de la cour de Parlement contre les assemblées illicites et amas d'armes en ceste ville de Paris.* This pamphlet is mentioned in Denis Pallier, *Recherches sur l'imprimerie à Paris pendant la Ligue* (Geneva: Librairie Droz, 1975), pamphlet no. 867. Arms were being collected at the Cordelier friary and at the parish church of Saint-Côme. See also L'Estoile, *Memoires-journaux* 6, 170.
instability were accompanied by periodic food shortages. A bad harvest in 1586 led to a grain shortage which lasted until the middle of 1587, and the siege of Paris by the forces of Henry of Navarre in 1590-1591 similarly affected the supply of food and other essentials to the city. Needless to say, the Cordeliers community suffered along with the other Parisian institutions. Three months after the Holy Catholic League took control of civic administration in May 1588, an episode better known as the Day of the Barricades, friar pensions (expenses charged to the friars) were augmented once again. In May 1590, the minutes warn that friars who did not pay their pensions would lose their right to vote in the election of the guardian. In April 1591, the inner council stated its refusal to accept students de gratia (students supported financially by the Paris

---

24 Fosse, Journal, 200, 204.

25 AN LL1511 (August 11, 1588), f. 57r. Although the Franciscan order was dedicated to a life of poverty, its members were required to provide, at least partly, for themselves. With few exceptions, a friar entered the order with an annual pension, usually from his family or a patron, which would go towards household expenses as well as pay for his education (if he was considered capable). During the religious wars, the friary frequently requested temporary augmentation of his pension and of student fees. Friar pensions and student fees are discussed respectively in chapters 3 and 4.

26 AN LL1511 (May 25, 1590), f. 62r. A few months later, in September, the Cordeliers appear in the registers of the Hôtel de Ville. Along with a number of other religious and charitable organizations, the friars were designated by the municipal government to act as distributors of wheat to the poor of Paris. Registres des délibérations 10, 52-53.
Franciscan house) until the times improved, and a month later requested a further augmentation of the pensions of its members. In August 1592, the convent closed down some sections of the studium once again, complaining about its penury. They blamed their penury, not surprisingly, on the calamity and misery afflicting French society. In October, the friary discussed selling valuable items in its sacristy to one master Gamin, in order to have money to buy essentials like wood and food.

Financial exhaustion may partly explain the community's lower profile during the last few years of the sixteenth century, though political pragmatism may have also played a role. The Cordeliers were not quick to welcome the newly-converted Henry of Navarre in 1594, and nor was Henry readily forgiving.François Feuardent and Jean Garin were forced to flee the country, and the guardian of the friary, Joannes David, is mentioned in a list from 1594 of those

27 AN LL1511 (April 22, 1591), f. 65r.

28 AN LL1511 (May 17, 1591), f. 65r. During the same meeting, the inner council also decided to send money with Italian soldiers (milites Itales) and travelling friars in order to buy food and other necessities for the house.

29 AN LL1511 (August 19, 1592), f. 69r. "Propter summam rerum omnium penuriam qua laborat conventus, publicamque totius huius regni, praevertim vero civitatis Parisien calamitatem et desolationem, quibus fit ut pro consueta pensione fratres iuvenes in copioso numero nutriiri ac retineri non possint ...."

30 AN LL1511 (October 20, 1592), f. 70r. " ... propter extremam conventus necessitatum et indigentiam oppigneraretur quoddam reliquiare recenter donatum eisdam conventui, inter manus Domini Gamin, civis huius urbis, ut quasdam predicto conventui commodet pecunias, quibus et frumentum et ligna possint compar ...."
leaving Paris at the request of the King.\textsuperscript{31} From this point on, the once-politically active friary seems relatively subdued. Even following the issuing of the controversial Edict of Nantes in 1598, the Paris friars are not considered among the most active in opposition. It was their brothers, the Capuchins, who found themselves in prison.\textsuperscript{32}

\textbf{Historiography}

My decision to concentrate on one religious community during the religious wars resulted from several months sifting through ecclesiastic documents in the Archives nationales. Interested in tracing clerical involvement in the Holy Catholic League (1585-1594), I quickly discovered that such a study was impossible until the history of Parisian ecclesiastic institutions was written. The Franciscan community in Paris, therefore, offered the ideal opportunity to begin filling this notable gap in the historiography of the religious wars.

This gap is a significant one, especially when we consider the pivotal role granted to many clerics by

\textsuperscript{31} BNF Coll. Dupuy 88, f. 224.

\textsuperscript{32} A few Capuchins were arrested as a result of their attacks on the edict. Brought to the Conciergerie on April 28, 1599, were the friars Archange de Pius, Alphonse, Brûlart, and Benoît. Arch. de la Préfecture de la Police, series AB, "Registres du greffier de la Conciergerie", 8, f. 272. Brûlart was none other than Jean-Baptiste Brûlart de Sillery, the brother of Nicolas, and then guardian of the Capuchin convent. The Brûlart family were patrons of the Cordelier community (see chapter 4). For Brûlart, see Ubald D'Alençon, O.F.M., "Une page de l'histoire de Paris: le Parlement de Paris et les immunités religieuses en 1599, le p. Brulart" in Études franciscaines 9 (1903): 607-612.
contemporary memorialists and historians in their accounts of these years. Moderate Catholic (politique)\(^{33}\) and Protestant commentators of the period, among them Pierre de L'Estoile, Théodore Agrippa D'Aubigné and Jean-Auguste de Thou, were particularly vitriolic in their attacks on preachers who supported the Holy Catholic League. These preachers, they argued, were dangerous because they encouraged popular sedition. They "occupied the pulpits, and by means of these pulpits they occupied the eyes and heart of Parisians" according to d'Aubigné, who was writing in 1590 during the height of the League's power.\(^{34}\) L'Estoile was even more scathing in his criticism. Commenting on their preaching in favour of Henry III's assassination in August 1589, he remarks that, "it is the judgement of monks and preachers during these times, that parricides and the most horrible assassinations are greeted as miracles and the

\[^{33}\text{The term politique is commonly used by contemporaries and modern historians in reference to moderate Catholics like Jean-Auguste de Thou and Pierre de L'Estoile, who were concerned primarily about political stability, and were worried about the zealous Catholicity of the Holy Catholic League. These individuals were not sympathetic to Protestantism. Rather, they considered any form of religious radicalism dangerous to the security of the country. These individuals are discussed in the monographs of Robert Descimon and Eli Barnavi among others.}\]

\[^{34}\text{Theodore Agrippa d'Aubigné, Histoire universelle de sieur d'Aubigné (1588-1593), ed. André Thierry 8 (Geneva: Librairie Droz, 1981-1995): 175. Among the preachers singled out by d'Aubigné as "emissaires et habiles instrumens" of the League were the friars François Feuardent and Jean Garin.}\]
works of God."

Modern academics similarly acknowledge the influential role played by clerics as preachers, polemicists and even as warriors. Barbara Diefendorf notes in her examination of the Massacre of Saint-Bartholomew's Day that, though deeds make wars, the words of the Paris preachers were crucial to the mobilization of the Parisian population to action. Parisians were being taught not only to hate passionately the heretics that disturbed the peace of the kingdom, but also to question the social hierarchy, the magistracy, and even the monarchy that allowed heresy to persist.

Philip Benedict and Robert Harding both single out the influence of the mendicant orders, the Franciscans and Dominicans in particular, in their respective studies of conflict during the religious wars.

Despite this consensus among historians, however, clerical contributions to the religious wars remain largely uninvestigated. Notable exceptions include Arlette Lebigre's political interpretation of the role of the parish priests

---

35 Pierre de L'Estoile, Mémoires-journaux 5, 4. "C' estoit la jurisprudence des moines et Precheurs de ce temps, auxquels les parricides et les assassinats plus exécrables estoient censés des miracles et des oeuvres de Dieu."


who supported the League,\textsuperscript{38} Frederic Baumgartner's
examination of the French episcopacy,\textsuperscript{39} Philip T. Hoffman's
monograph on the secular clergy in the diocese of Lyon,\textsuperscript{40}
and Emile Pasquier's intriguing study of René Benoist, the
royalist curé of Saint-Eustache.\textsuperscript{41} Even less attention has
been paid to the regular clergy. Lynn Martin's two
monographs on the Jesuits,\textsuperscript{42} and the short but provocative
article by Gerald Chaix on the Carthusian order,\textsuperscript{43} are
lonely exceptions.

Why religious institutions have eluded the attention of
historians of the religious wars is itself an interesting
question in light of the inherently social nature of these
institutions, and the fundamental role they played in the
daily lives of medieval and early modern Christians. I

interpretation places the parish priests of Paris in the
role of proto-revolutionaries who used their pulpits to
promote a transformation of the existing social and
political order.

\textsuperscript{39} Frederic L. Baumgartner, \textit{Change and Continuity in the French Episcopacy 1547-1610} (Durham: Duke University

\textsuperscript{40} Hoffman, \textit{Church and Community in the Diocese of Lyon 1500-1789} (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1984).


\textsuperscript{42} Lynn Martin, \textit{The Jesuit Mind: the Mentality of an Elite in Early Modern France} (Ithaca: Cornell University

suggest that the reason for this oversight lies in deeply-entrenched historiographic trends that have left early modern French ecclesiastic institutions largely ghettoized in recent historical discussions.

The emergence of the Annales school in the 1930s inaugurated a break with traditional approaches to the religious wars. In the formative studies by Lucien Fèbvre and Gabriel Le Bras, the nature and function of spirituality and of spiritual communities became a central axis of historical investigation. Interested less in the actions of a few individuals at the top of society or in the complex theological debates of the period, than in the day-to-day existence of the majority of the population, these historians began viewing religious institutions in terms of their economic, political and social roles in the local community, in addition to their religious function. They became fascinated, furthermore, with the interior spiritual life of the ordinary individual, giving as much validity to these topics as they did to the dictates of the Catholic Church.

Recent monographs show the pervasive influence of the Annales school, among them the regional studies of religious institutions by Claire Dolan, Nicole Lemaitre, Marc Venard, and Hervé Martin, and the slightly older but still essential

---

work on ecclesiastic history by Jean Delumeau.\textsuperscript{45}
Interestingly, however, although the Annales approach has
done much to explain the integral role played by religious
institutions in early modern society, it has also
perpetuated their isolation from mainstream historical
studies -- in particular, studies of the period of the
religious wars.

This has happened, I believe, because of Annales
emphasis upon the long durée and the mentalité of a
particular culture, which has pushed attention away from the
study of crisis points and elite groups, but in consequence
has distracted historians from the study of a particular
culture during a particular period of time. We can see this
with respect to the Wars of Religion, a period which is
usually glanced over quickly in most recent monographs of
religious institutions, when not avoided altogether. Given
that cultures do change over time, and given the
particularly conflictual nature of late sixteenth-century
French spirituality, the conceptions and actions of

\textsuperscript{45} Claire Dolan, \textit{Entre tours et clochers: les gens
d'église à Aix-en-Provence au XVIe siècle} (Sherbrooke,
Quebec: Centre d'études de la Renaissance, 1981); Nicole
Lemaitre, \textit{Le Rouergue flamboyant: le clergé et les fidèles
du diocèse de Rodez 1417-1563} (Paris: Éditions du Cerf,
1988); Marc Venard, \textit{Réforme protestante, réforme catholique
dans la province d'Avignon au XVIe siècle} (Paris: Éditions
du Cerf, 1993); Hervé Martin, \textit{Les ordres mendiants en
Bretagne, vers 1230-1530: Pauvreté volontaire et prédication
à la fin du Moyen-Âge} (Rennes: Institut armoricain de
recherches historiques, 1975); Jean Delumeau \textit{Le Catholicisme
entre Luther et Voltaire} (Paris: Paris Presses
Universitaires, 1971), and \textit{La peur en occident, XIV-XVIIIe
religious individuals and their communities should be regarded as unique to their period and examined with specific relationship to that period.

Furthermore, recent work on the religious impulses underlying the civil wars has concentrated on lay piety and all but ignored the importance of clerical piety. Falling into this category are some of the most interesting historical studies of the late sixteenth century, among them the work of Denis Richet, Philip Benedict, Barbara Diefendorf, and Denis Crouzet. These historians do acknowledge the important role played by clerics in the events of the religious wars but, because of their interest in exploring manifestations of popular spirituality, they are less interested in examining the particular religious impulses underlying clerical actions.

This approach, needless to say, is problematic. Catholicism has a long history of internal accommodation of difference, allowing for an amalgamation of differing religious expressions and traditions which nevertheless share essential points of dogma. Religious communities like

---

the Franciscans, Dominicans and Carthusians, all of whom actively participated in the religious wars, were each unique spiritual expressions. We cannot hope to accurately interpret their behaviour during this period, nor fully comprehend the complexity of early modern spirituality, if we fail to appreciate this variety.

Finally, lay and clerical piety are mutually dependent. This is particularly true of Franciscan spirituality, which defined itself with respect to lay spirituality. To study one in isolation from the other is to misunderstand the essentially dynamic, interactive nature of early modern religiosity. At the very least, the thousands of individuals who attended sermons given by the friars François Feuardent and Maurice Hylaret during the religious wars should remind us about the dangers of leaving these clerics out of any discussion of sixteenth-century lay spirituality.

The sources

One of the key stumbling blocks to historical investigations of religious institutions during the period of the religious wars is the general sparsity of documents. This is certainly true for Parisian institutions, with the notable exception of the Franciscan community, and to a lesser extent, the great abbey of Sainte-Geneviève, and the Benedictine churches of Saint-Germain-des-Prés and Saint-Denis. Even in the archives of these four communities, however, the historian is confronted with the same dilemma
facing those working in the archives of the other Paris houses: documents trail off after 1520 and generally become abundant once again only by the early part of the seventeenth century. Of the documents which do exist from the late sixteenth century, furthermore, notarial contracts seem to be the most in abundance while correspondence, memoirs and administrative records are rare indeed.

The Paris Franciscan community is unusual because it has a greater richness of sources to draw upon than do any of the other communities for the civil war period. Although the fire of 1580 destroyed much of the community's archives, we still have a fair number of documents, both originals and copies. Notarial contracts are particularly abundant. There are seven registers (LL1517, 1518, 1520, 1521, 1522, 1523, 1524) of these contracts at the Archives nationales, composed primarily of donations made to the friary from the early sixteenth century until the Revolution. These registers, the earliest prepared during the middle of the seventeenth century, often repeat one another and are not complete. However, comparisons with the originals located in the Minutier central, the notarial archives at the Archives nationales, show that these copies are accurate. There are also a few original contracts in the collections L941 and L942, specifically contracts concerning the renting of houses owned by the friary and other financial services required by the friary. From the registers, the collections L941 and L942, and foraging in the Minutier central, I have
collected over 100 contracts dating from the period 1560-1600.

Notarial sources are useful for a variety of reasons. They give us insight into relations between the friary and secular society, into the daily life of the household, and of course into the community's finances. These alone, however, cannot help the historian unearth the community situated on the rue des Cordeliers. Fortunately for us, we also have a number of other documents. There are court records of judicial proceedings, for example, involving the friars and various other institutions. Franciscan publications, though not numerous, are revealing about the intellectual and spiritual life of the friars. We can also catch glimpses of the activities of friars in the memoirs of the period, particularly after 1588 when Paris, and its pulpits, were controlled by the Catholic League.

The single most important source for this study, however, are the minutes of the inner council (discrétoire) of the friary. These minutes span a sixty-year period in the history of the house (1550-1608), and are rich in details.

Particularly rare are sermons and polemics from the period of the Catholic League (1588-1594). Frederick Baumgartner attributes the poor survival rate of League polemics to Henry IV's efforts to destroy any traces of League activity after he took control of Paris in 1594. A fire in the Hôtel de Ville in 1871 also destroyed many of the publications which survived the sixteenth century, among them ones which Charles Labitte had used (three decades earlier) in his study of the League preachers. Baumgartner, Radical Reactionaries: the Political Thought of the French Catholic League (Geneva: Librairie Droz, 1975): 18-19.
about the day to day operations of the community. They provide insight into the financial and political structures of the house. Equally important, the minutes allow us to trace the movements of the friars as they arrive and leave the friary, receive training in the studium, and accept punishment for errant behaviour. No other source, furthermore, provides as much insight into the characters of members of this community. Although the vast majority remain shadowy figures at best, a few personalities emerge distinctly from these pages.

As one can appreciate from this discussion of the sources, the archival richness of the Paris friary permits an historical reconstruction which is not as easily achieved for the other Paris communities. A study of inter- and intra-institutional relations such as this one lends itself more easily to a thematic rather than chronological approach. Chapter 1 provides a short introduction to Franciscan spirituality, concentrating in particular on Franciscan interpretation of the friar's role in secular society and the political activism of the Paris Cordeliers during the time of the Catholic League. Chapter 2 examines the political structures in place in the friary by 1560, in order to understand how the friary organized and molded friars into good members of the Franciscan community. Chapter 3 takes a look at relations between the friars and the University. The education of the friars intended for training at the Faculty of Theology is discussed, as well as
conflicts which arose between these two institutions during the civil wars. Chapter 4 is concerned with the patronage of the friary, in particular how this dynamic bonding mechanism fuelled the Franciscan mission against Protestantism even as it encouraged lay spirituality. Chapter 5 explores Cordelier relations with other ecclesiastic institutions, beginning with the local environment of Paris, the Franciscan order and, finally, the Papacy. Franciscan relations with the secular judicial and administrative institutions of Paris, notably the courts of the Parlement and the Châtelet, and the Hôtel de Ville, were also extremely important and deserve serious attention. Unfortunately, these relations were beyond the scope of this thesis and will therefore be examined at a later date.

Before providing a physical description of the Paris friary, a few words should be said about the terminology used in this thesis. For the sake of variety, the terms "convent," "friary" and "house" will be used interchangeably. French Franciscan friaries, it should be noted, were usually referred to as "couvents" during the medieval and early modern periods. Similarly, the Paris friars are also called "Cordeliers" in this thesis because the name was commonly used by contemporaries of the friars. The name Cordelier dates to the early years of the Franciscan order in France.

I have also chosen to preserve the original orthography in quotations taken from sixteenth-century texts. Some sixteenth-century documents, printed works in particular,
used accents. More often than not, however, accents do not appear at all or are used somewhat irregularly.

Physical description

The Paris friary, also known as the "Grand Couvent" because of its stature as an important Franciscan studium within France, was situated on the rue des Cordeliers between the rue de la Harpe and the rue de l'Observance in what is today known as the Latin Quarter of Paris. These streets still exist, though the convent itself has long since disappeared.\(^\text{48}\) A map of the building shows that it was divided into two parts. The core part of the structure, the oldest part, included the central administrative buildings which were arranged around a sizeable cloister. The church, library and sacristy, the salle des actes, and Chapter house were all located here. The library, renowned throughout France until its burning in 1580, was located in the aisle of the cloister joining onto the church.\(^\text{49}\) As is common in

\(^{48}\) The Cordelier friary was one of the first religious houses attacked during the revolution. Today all that exists is a part of the refectory which has been incorporated into the École de Médecine.

\(^{49}\) The library contained an estimated 8000 titles. The collection had emerged from donations by Alexander of Hales in the thirteenth century when he entered the order, Louis IX and Jean Cholet, founder of the Collège des Cholets. See Alfred Franklin, Les anciennes bibliothèques, 214. The convent was without a library from 1580 until 1603, when Jacques Auguste de Thou, the syndic of the friary (1588-1595), arranged for the relocation of the bibliothèque du roi to the friary: "Monsieur le Président de Thou qui aimoit et protégeoit ce convent, procura qu'on y transporte la
medieval church architecture, the sacristy was directly attached to the church, and it was here that liturgical vestments and accoutrements for the mass were stored. Beside the sacristy was the Chapter house, the meeting room for the community. Adjacent to this building was the salle des actes, the former site of the theology school.

The second part of the convent complex, the domestic wing, ran roughly parallel to the main structure and included the refectory, theology school, bachelors' dormitory, and infirmary. The theology school, newly-built during the sixteenth century, was located behind the refectory. The bachelor's dormitory adjoined the refectory, and it was here that students at the theology school were housed. At the end of this wing was the infirmary, first built in 1386 by the widow of Charles IV le Bel. The infirmary was a relatively small, two-storied

bibliothèque du Roy et elle y a demeuré jusqu'à ce que, par les soins de Mr. Colbert, ministre d'Etat, elle a été tirée du cœur de l'Université, ou elle étoit à portée de tous les gens de lettres, pour être jetée au bout de Paris dans la rue Vivienne, ou elle est encore à présent". Bibl. Lyon, Ms. 844, 13.

52 Gonzaga, De origine, f. 127. He estimates that the room was twenty-five metres by fifteen metres. The dozen windows also made it a particularly well-lit school. The theology school was a recent addition to the Paris friary, built during the sixteenth century with the help of royal donations. See also Gilles Corrozet, Les antiquitez, croniques et singularitez de Paris, ville capitale du Royaume de France avec les fondations et bastimens des lieux; les sépulchres et épitaphes des princes, princesses et autres personnes illustres corrigees et augmentées pour la seconde édition (Paris: G. Corrozet, 1561), f. 118.

51 Corrozet, Les antiquitez, f. 118.
structure with a small chapel and an in-house apothecary. From the above description we can see that the Paris friary little resembled the simple, plain structure required in the Constitutions of Narbonne (1260). Rather, this complex network of buildings was designed to house one of the largest communities in the order, as well as to train its friars for preaching. Although the house had become a member of the Observant branch of the order by 1517, the convent retained many of the physical characteristics associated with Conventual communities. First of all, it was largely self-sufficient. In addition to having its own infirmary and apothecary to take care of sick brothers, the friary also had its own brewery and bakery. There were


The Constitutions of Narbonne were the Franciscan regulations formulated during the generalship of Bonaventure. They will be discussed in chapter 1.

The German friar Konrad Pellikan, who visited the friary in 1516, says that there were 350 students living in the friary, which would make the Paris studium the largest one in the order. Das chronikon des Konrad Pellikan, ed. by Bernard Riggenbach (Basle: 1877): 53. Cited in Beaumont-Maillet, Le Grand Couvent, 79. It is hard to find exact estimates for the house during the late sixteenth century. Francesco-Scipio Gonzaga says that there were 150 friars studying theology alone, and another fifty friars who occupied posts within the house. Including the youth school and other friars living in the convent, we can estimate that there were between 400 and 500 friars living in the Paris friary during the entire sixteenth century. Gonzaga, De origine, f. 115.

The bakery was located near the city walls within the convent property. Beaumont-Maillet, 328. She cites
also two gardens, one located just behind the bachelors' dormitory, and the other, known as the doctors garden, was situated between the bachelor's dormitory and the main cloistered structure.

Self-sufficiency was a trademark of monastic communities desirous of fleeing the temptations of the secular world. Equally indicative of this desire was enclosure. The early Observants viewed enclosure as antithetical to Franciscan doctrine because it protected property and reduced the mendicancy of the friars. Conventual Franciscans, on the other hand, considered enclosure necessary for the monitoring of the behaviour of friars as well as protecting the books necessary for their training.

Enclosure involved restricting access into and out of the community. There were three entrances to the convent. The main entrance and the church entrance both faced onto the rue de l'Observance. Another passage known as the "ancienne entrée" led from the rue des Cordeliers and ran

---

document AN LL1524, f. 169r, a decree from the municipal government allowing the Cordeliers to tear down one of the towers along the city walls which bordered on their property. The bakery is specifically mentioned in the document's description of the convent. The date of this decree is October 26, 1618.

56 Because the Paris house belonged to the Conventuals until 1502, its style of construction is not surprising. However, the degree to which the Observants resembled the conventuals by the sixteenth century is evident in their desire not only to maintain but also to develop further the existing structure.
between the church and the refectory. However, friars were expected to leave and enter by the main doors so that their movements were monitored by the community. Doors were locked at night and the keys were kept by the porters, or *janitores*, as well as the guardian. Similarly, strict rules governing the entrance of non-mendicants, or *seculars*, as they are referred to in the statutes of the convent, were reinforced in the regulations of 1502. Women could only be received at the door where the interchange could be closely controlled, or in the nave of the Church when they came for confession.\(^5\)

Desirous of limiting Franciscan access to secular society, the friary nevertheless participated in the economic and social life of Paris. Secular lodgings owned by the convent along the rue des Cordeliers and the rue des Fosses were rented by the order to lay individuals. The Cordelier convent also maintained guest houses to lodge important visitors, mostly nobles or royalty. The bequests made to the friary during the period of this study also show that the community enjoyed close relations with many members of Parisian society. Prior to its burning in 1580, the church featured an elaborate grand altar surrounded by four bronze columns and surmounted by two angels, the gift of a

\(^5\) Celestino di Piana, "Gli Statuti per la riforma dello Studio di Parigi (a.1502)" in *Archivium franciscanum historicum* 52 (1959), ch. 15, sec. 1: 89-90.
generous patron. In *L'art de la peinture sur verre*, Pierre Le Vieil mentions colourful windows commissioned in 1582 depicting scenes from the Old Testament as well as others with "pryans et d'armoyries" of their donors. Stained glass portraying Henry III and Henry, duke of Guise, was also donated to the Church. Portraits of patrons were featured both in the church itself and in the Chapter house. Le Vieil mentions portraits of Henry III, Jacques-Auguste de Thou and other important Parisian donors. Similarly, Guiffrey in his work on painting and sculpture mentions "douze portraits tant de gardes des sceaux que de chanceliers de France" which were placed in the Chapter house. The juxtaposition of these portraits alone is revealing of the degree to which the Paris community was as much a French institution as it was a Franciscan one by the sixteenth century. As subsequent chapters will demonstrate, this potent French-Franciscan mixture played an important role in directing the activities of the Paris friars during the Wars of Religion.

---


60 BNF Coll. Gaignières Oa 17. These windows are discussed in chapter 4.

CHAPTER I: THE FRANCISCAN IDEAL AND POLITICAL ACTIVISM

One must insist, continue, persevere in preaching or writing at all times, in season and out of season... without considering or fearing contrary words or storms. Without fear of winds and clouds, one must sow even in the midst of storms, without thinking that this particular time is convenient, and that one there is vain, they will like it, or they will not like it.

Friar Jacques Berson, *Sermon de l'avenement du Benoist S. Esprit*...

French Franciscans were rarely portrayed favourably in sixteenth-century literature. The friar in the works of Brantôme and Marguerite de Navarre, for example, is usually a thief, a seducer, or even a rapist.¹ For authors writing during the religious wars, he was also a potent threat to


² Navarre recounts several stories involving Cordeliers, including one in which two friars attempted to rape a female ferryman. Marguerite de Navarre, *L'Heptaméron des nouvelles* (Paris: Benoist, Prevost ou Caveiller, 1559; reprinted, Paris: Librairie des bibliophiles, 1879): 62-66. Brantôme writes of Jehan Bourgeois, a Franciscan confessor and preacher in the household of Anne de Bretagne. According to Brantôme, Bourgeois was infatuated with Louise de Bourdeille, a favourite of the King and Queen. He was consequently whipped after giving a sermon on the Passion of Christ which seemed to be addressed to Louise. Pierre de Bourdeille, seigneur de Brantôme, *Oeuvres complètes de Pierre de Bourdeille, seigneur de Brantôme* 7 (Paris: Renouard, 1856-1882): 190-193., ed. by Ludovic Lalanne.
social and political stability. The unifying concern of these authors, of course, is the hypocrisy of a worldly religious order which defined itself as unworldly. The Franciscan ideal of the poor wandering cleric living from alms, preaching, and seeking mystical communion with God seemed far removed from contemporary experience.

Because these accusations of worldliness were also expressed by members of the Franciscan order, it is hard not to find them credible. Michel Menot and Olivier Maillard, for example, two of the better known early sixteenth-century French preachers, were particularly outspoken in their demands for internal reform. And yet, the willingness of friars to critique their own behaviour suggests that the

---

3 The League preachers, among them Franciscans like Jean Garin and François Feuardent, are regularly portrayed as threats to political order in the writings of Jacques-Auguste de Thou, Etienne Pasquier and of course Pierre de l'Estoile. Discussing the friar Robert Chessé, for example, L'Estoile says that the inhabitants of Vendôme accused Chessé of having encouraged them "de prendre les armes contre le roi." Another entry refers to him as "un séditieux cordelier ... qui animait le peuple au sang et à rebellion." *Journal de L'Estoile pour la règne de Henri IV*. 2 (Paris: Gallimard, 1958): 30. François Feuardent and Jean Garin were both preaching against anyone supporting peace by 1593, during the last days of League power in Paris. *Ibid.*, 2: 275.

4 Both Maillard and Menot had been trained in theology at the University of Paris. Michel Menot was nicknamed "lingua aurea," and was considered a prominent opponent of corruption within and without the Catholic Church. See *Sermons choisis de Michel Menot* (Paris: Edouard Champion, 1924): viii-x, ed. by Joseph Nève. Olivier Maillard was similarly known as a staunch reformer and was consequently appointed by the Cardinal d'Amboise to reform the Paris convent in 1502. Maillard enjoyed a variety of high offices within the order, including that of provincial minister and vicar general. For Maillard, see A. Samouillan, *Olivier Maillard sa prédication et son temps* (Paris: Ernest Thain, 1891): 43.
Franciscan ideal was constantly being held up by the order as the appropriate model. This is the inherent dilemma of Franciscanism: the constant desire to live up to established standards even though these standards seemed to be impossible to follow, even, indeed, when these standards seemed to lack unanimous support.

The purpose of this chapter is to examine how sixteenth-century Franciscans understood their spiritual role in society. This is no easy task, given that the order was itself divided over the nature of this role. One thing, however, is clear. Although some friars were genuinely corrupt, the vast majority believed they were being true to their vows. The seeming worldliness of some friars, particularly during the period of the religious wars, stemmed from a broad interpretation of their own role as spiritual reformers in secular society. This broad interpretation explains, among other things, the political activism of the Paris friars during the years of the Holy Catholic League (1585-1594).

In order to understand the political activism of the Paris friars at the end of the sixteenth century, the first part of this chapter will explore Franciscan conceptions of the friar's spiritual role in society as expressed in the writings of Francis of Assisi and Bonaventure. The second part will concentrate on the nature of political activism among members of the order.
Francis of Assisi

Bonaventure argues that Francis of Assisi created the most perfect form of organized spiritual life through his marrying of the contemplative life of the monastery, the austerity of the eremitical existence, and the cure of souls associated with the parish priest. Contemplation, intercessory prayer and the cure of souls were all considered important functions of the Catholic Church, but it was unusual to demand all three functions from one religious order. Contemplation of the divine was considered important for understanding God's goodness and his grace. Prayer was the necessary mode of communication between humans and God, the means by which one could seek advice, the forgiveness of sins, and intercession for oneself and for others. Prayer by a religious community on behalf of society was considered particularly efficacious because of the spirituality of its members. Finally, the cure of souls involved active spiritual ministry to the secular community through the hearing of confession, the granting of absolution, administration of the necessary sacraments, and the guidance of individuals to salvation through exhortation.

Francis insisted upon this three-fold function of his order because he took the human life of Christ as his model

---


6 The practise and importance of divine office is discussed further in chapter 2.
-- the wandering evangelist who also worked with the sick and poor and periodically disappeared into the desert to commune with God. Prayer, exhortation, seclusion from, as well as active participation in, society -- this was the life of Christ, and for Francis the imitation of Christ's life was the road to salvation. Francis' interpretation of Christ's life required taking the vows of poverty, chastity and obedience. Poverty and chastity concerned rejection of one's material and carnal existence in favour of a spiritual one. Franciscans were expected to abandon family and friends when joining the brotherhood, just as did the apostles: "If any one comes to me, without hating his father and mother and sisters, yes, and his own life too, he can be no disciple of mine." The Franciscan, furthermore, was to be a perpetual wanderer who called the haystack home. Homeless and rootless, the friar was also expected to live a life of complete poverty. To survive he must beg for food and clothing but not for money. For Francis, money was valueless, "a shadow's shadow." Clothing prescribed for the order could at best be described as minimalist -- a strip of harsh cloth turned into a tunic, and no shoes. Finally, mortification of the flesh through fasting, chastity, and

---

7 This is taken from the first rubric of the first Rule of St. Francis, as found in S. Francis of Assisi: His Life and Writings (London: A.R. Mowbray & co. Ltd, 1959), trans. by Leo Sherley-Price: 201.

8 Ibid, Rule one, rubric 8.

9 Ibid, R2, r2. Francis assigned the friar a single habit with a hood, as well as a cord and breeches.
corporal punishment was essential for the avoidance of carnal temptation. The individual should be revolted by his body, according to Francis, because through its weakness one could be led to sin.\textsuperscript{10}

Obedience to the Rule was also essential to Francis' understanding of the role played by the Franciscan in the secular world. Obedience required the complete abnegation of individual will before that of God. Francis' conception of the role played by the will in personal salvation is somewhat ambivalent. The will is essential for salvation, because no one can be forced to recognize God and accept his grace.\textsuperscript{11} However, exertion of individual will in certain situations could be considered an affront to God -- a rejection of God's authority. Only God could understand his divine plan; therefore, according to Francis, the individual must bow to events as they occur, even if they seem unjust.

The three vows of poverty, chastity and obedience were predicated upon the importance Francis gave to the humility of Christ. In the gospels Christ says that it is the humble, the simple, who are the chosen of God. Humility involved awareness of one's own insignificance and love of God's goodness. The Franciscan's duty was to be the most humble of all. He was to consider himself the servant of everyone, and the master of none. Francis specifically states in his second Rule that friars were each other's servants as well.

\textsuperscript{10} \textit{Ibid.}

\textsuperscript{11} \textit{Ibid.}, R2, r10.
as servants of all clerics outside the order. Friars, therefore, had to respect the authority of other religious and not seek special privileges.\textsuperscript{12} Should a bishop not grant him permission to preach, for example, the friar must leave his diocese rather than question the prelate.\textsuperscript{13} Should anyone choose to quarrel with the friar, he must reply to his attackers "we are servants, worthless."\textsuperscript{14}

Charity within society was similarly a function of humility. Francis himself worked among the lepers, and he urged other friars also to care for the poor and sick in society. He also wandered far and wide preaching his understanding of the word of God. Preaching, in fact, became the defining characteristic of Franciscanism. For Francis, preaching was a two-fold function of interpreting divine truth through both words and deeds. Every friar was to "make his own life a sermon to others."\textsuperscript{15} The Franciscan had to practise what he preached if he was to be believed, and his example would stimulate others to adopt a similar way of living.\textsuperscript{16} Furthermore, he was urged to reach all social groups, and not simply the wealthy. Francis advocated, in consequence, the use of simpler language, speaking in the vernacular, and focusing on the Passion of Christ in order

\begin{footnotes}
\item[12] Ibid., R1, r10.
\item[13] Ibid., R2, r9.
\item[14] Ibid., R1, r9.
\item[15] Ibid., R1, r17.
\item[16] Ibid., R2, r10.
\end{footnotes}
to evoke an emotional response from listeners. Not surprisingly, Franciscan preaching quickly earned a reputation for being passionate, arousing, as well as entertaining. 17

The combination of such varied and demanding functions attracted a wide variety of individuals to the Franciscan life but, not surprisingly, it also carried within it the seeds of disunity, of tension. This tension first emerged during Francis' lifetime for fairly obvious reasons. The ideal spiritual life devised by Francis was, to say the least, a demanding one. Questions quickly arose among members as to how his Rule could be best adapted to a widespread institution. Friars began to wonder how to allocate time to each activity. They debated whether more time should be devoted to prayer and contemplation, since prayer interceded between society and God. As for preaching, they were not sure whether to consider it less important than tilling the field or working among the sick. Brothers also complained that the austerity demanded by the Rule made them

17 There are numerous articles and monographs written on Franciscan preaching. Particularly useful for this thesis are the respective monographs by D.L. D'Avray, The Preaching of the Friars: Sermons diffused from Paris before 1300 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985), and Bernadette Paton, Preaching Friars and the Civic Ethos: Siena, 1380-1480 (London: Centre for Medieval Studies, Queen Mary and Westfield College, University of London, 1992). Although not specifically on Franciscan preaching, the monographs by Larissa Taylor and Hervé Martin on sermons and preaching in late medieval and early modern France emphasize the important contribution made by the friars. Taylor, Soldiers of Christ (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992), and Hervé Martin, Le métier du prédicateur à la fin du moyen âge, 1350-1520 (Paris: Cerf, 1988).
unfit for missionary activity. All of these concerns stemmed, of course, from a questioning of the friar's role in secular society. This questioning of the mandate of the Franciscan order ultimately resulted in the transformation of its character in the decades following the death of Francis. A new understanding of the Franciscan's identity and his role in society emerged, and it was under Bonaventure that this transformation was given an institutional definition.

Bonaventure

In many respects, Bonaventure's tenure as minister general signified a victory for those members trying to redefine the Franciscan ideal along a more traditional monastic format. As a second-generation Franciscan, Bonaventure entered the order after it had been well established in Western Europe. Bonaventure himself arguably represented the new ideal of the Franciscan. He was known for his humility and austerity, and believed, as did Francis, that true understanding of the divine came through faith, led by the heart. Faith was more important than learning in the pursuit of salvation. In his work the *Itinerarium mentis in Deum*, Bonaventure cautions brothers about placing too high a value on learning:

> If you should ask, ask for grace, not learning; desire, not understanding; the sign of prayer, not zeal in study; the covenant, not the master, God, not man; mist, not clarity, not light but
For Bonaventure as well as for Francis, the human life of Christ provided the necessary model for salvation.

In contrast to Francis, however, Bonaventure was a trained theologian and was, therefore, less sceptical of the beneficial nature of learning. He spent several years at the Faculty of Theology in Paris as a student of Alexander of Hales, an experience which convinced him that learning gave the necessary theological foundation for avoiding pitfalls along the path to spiritual enlightenment. He disagreed with Francis, who felt that study only engaged the mind, and instead argued that learning engaged both the heart and mind, and was therefore the most honorable pursuit of the friar.

Bonaventure's inclusion of learning as a necessary skill stemmed from an altogether more radical reconstruction of the nature of Franciscanism, and more specifically, of the friar's function in society. The new ideal was the...

---

18 "Si autem quaereas, quomodo haec fiant, interroga gratiam, non doctrinam; desiderium, non intellectum; gemitum orationis, non studium lectionis; sponsum, non magistrum; Deum, non hominem, caligem, non claritatem; non lucem sed ignem ...." Found in Opera omnia 5 (Ad Claras Aquas (Quaracchi): ex typographia Collegii S. Bonaventurae, 1882): 313.

19 Bonaventure's insistence upon loving God with both the heart and the intellect earned him the title "Seraphic doctor." He received his licentia docendi in 1248. At the young age of 36, Bonaventure found himself minister general of the Franciscan order in the year 1257. See Moorman, History, 140.

20 Ibid.
educated friar. For Bonaventure, learning was essential not only for polemical skill and spiritual enlightenment but also for the production of friars capable of administering the widely-flung order. It was the responsibility of the order, therefore, to provide the discipline and intellectual training required to produce such friars -- in other words, friars of good character possessing a keen grasp of theology. A friar thus armed was considered fit to wage war on heretics, as well as other enemies of the faith.

Bonaventure justifies his reconception of the role of the friar through a reinterpretation of Francis' definition of work. Francis insisted that friars take up a form of manual work in order to maintain their humility, and he mentioned in particular lowly crafts and tilling the soil. Bonaventure rejected this definition as too literal, and instead redefined work to include study, preaching, and contemplation among other activities. He believed that brothers possessed varying capabilities, and for the good of the order, each friar should pursue that track to which he was best suited. Bonaventure clearly considered some tasks to be more important than others, and manual work ranked quite low in his scheme.22

21 A discussion of Bonaventure's views on the organization of the Franciscan order is in chapter 2.

22 Bonaventure, Expositio de Regulam franciscanum, in Opera omnia 8, 419. Bonaventure argues that the greatest work is involved in preparing oneself for preaching. Manual labour was worth little in comparison: "Modus autem laudabilissimus corpori necessaria acquirendi est in praedicationis et doctrinae laboribus exerceri. Labor enim mechanicus condigne certo pretio compensatur ...." Rubric 6,
Bonaventure's reconstruction of the role of the friar responded to perceived conceptions of the function of the Franciscan order in society. The order's rapid rate of expansion convinced its members that its work was blessed by God. This belief that Franciscans had a divinely-recognized mandate to lead a reformation resulted also in a change in perception of their relationship with the Church hierarchy. In contrast to Francis who had urged Franciscans not to quarrel with secular and other regular clergy over jurisdiction because they were the lowest of the orders, Bonaventure defended Franciscan activity by arguing that the secular clergy were often lazy, and that the friars had a duty to minister to parishioners who sought them out. A friar should only leave a parish if scandal would be a potential product of his stay there.

The ideal established by the Constitutions of

sec. 1 of the Constitutions of Narbonne defines work to include studying and copying books: "we ordain that the brothers, both clerical and lay, be put to work by their superiors at copying books, studying, or other occupations at which they are competent." St Bonaventure's Writings Concerning the Franciscan Church, intro. and trans. by Dominic Monti, O.F.M. (St Bonaventure, New York: The Franciscan Institute, 1994): 98. Volume 5 in the series Works of Saint Bonaventure, ed. by George Marcil, O.F.M.

21 In the Expositio, Bonaventure suggests that the secular clergy dislike the friars because they were worried about losing money and because the friars were more diligent in their pastoral duties: "qui nos odiunt, scilicet si plus inhiant lucris pecuniarum a suis subditis quam fructi animarum." Expositio, 355-356.
Narbonne was by no means accepted by everyone. Rather, the interpretations of the two founding fathers introduced a philosophical divide within the Franciscan order which was never successfully bridged by later thinkers. Over the centuries, members continued to debate (at times quite fiercely) the true nature of Franciscanism. Was it, in fact, characterized by learning and greater institutionalization or by wandering, austerity and mystical piety? Was it rather a mixture of these different conceptions? The earliest threat to Franciscan unity appeared in the thirteenth century, when friars dissatisfied with the Bonaventurean model sought to return the order to its original simplicity. The spirituals, as these friars were called, were influential enough by the fifteenth century to bring about the official division of the order into two parts -- Observant (formerly the spirituals) and Conventual.\(^2\)

--

\(^2\) The Constitutions of Narbonne (1260) represented a pivotal stage in the growth and development of the Franciscan order. Under Bonaventure's direction, the regulations governing virtually every aspect of Franciscan life were codified and disseminated among the far-flung order. These regulations reflected the Bonaventurean model of Franciscan -- educated as well as pious. *St Bonaventure's Writings*, 71-74.

\(^2\) The two orders remained under the same minister general, though each had separate constitutions. The Spirituals were called the Observants because of their emphasis on strict enforcement of the Rule, whereas the others earned the label conventual, referring to their greater emphasis on learning and the cloistered life. Thaddeus MacVicar, O.F.M., *The Franciscan Spiritual and the Capuchin Reform* (St Bonaventure, New York: The Franciscan Institute, 1986): 65-66. Volume 5 in History Series, Franciscan Institute Publications, ed. by George March, O.F.M.
similar spiritual movement in the sixteenth century resulted in the emergence of the new order of friars minor, the Capuchins, and this was by no means the last division in the order.  

Political activism

The variety of opinions within the Franciscan order explain why the friars have been among their own severest critics. One particularly contentious issue throughout the history of the order was that of political activism. Though Francis and Bonaventure articulated somewhat different understandings of the friar's role in society, they did agree that the friar should be apolitical. The role Francis envisioned for his followers was that of a missionary, a spiritual guide who led individuals along the path to salvation using the life of Christ as the model. Even those who did not join the order were encouraged to lead a penitential life involving austerity, prayer and good works -- hence the order's willingness to support lay penitential organizations such as that of the Third Order.  

---


27 Moorman, 417-420. This lay order, also known as the Tertiaries, began flourishing in the fourteenth century. Originally it comprised laymen who participated in secular society but chose to meet periodically for prayer and
However, neither Francis nor Bonaventure was willing to view political activity as an extension of the missionary activity of the friars. The only responsibility, the only worthy function of the individual in society, according to Francis, was to achieve personal spiritual rejuvenation which he felt was not affected by local let alone national political, social or economic issues. Bonaventure similarly believed that the friars should restrict their involvement to the spiritual needs of their flock and leave politics to temporal leaders.

However, it was never easy for friars to follow the injunctions of Francis and Bonaventure against political involvement. The political and spiritual realms of activity were not so neatly divided in the medieval and early modern mind as they are in Western society today. Medieval and early modern political rhetoric, for example, usually linked political and economic stability to a community's spirituality and moral rectitude. "A state which did not protect religion would perish," according to the friar Jacques Suarez in his funeral oration for Henry IV, "just as religion would perish without the protection of the state."28 One was dependent upon the other. This sentiment

worship. By the fifteenth century, many of these communities had become more formalized, some even becoming enclosed.

28 "... l'Estat conservast la religion, & la religion se trouvast tousiours florissante, au milieu, d'iceluy: car l'un d'iceux perit, l'autre ne peut durer ...." Suarez also compares Henry to other spiritual and political leaders, among them Solomon, who built his own house near the temple. Jacques Suarez, Sermon funebre fait aux obseques de Henry IV (Paris: Nicolas du Fosse, 1610): 57-58. Jacques Berson
is also echoed in the writings of Suarez' contemporary, the jurist Jean Bodin:

... there is nothing which better supports and maintains states and republics than religion, and it is the principal foundation of the power of monarchs and lords, of the law, of the obedience of subjects, of reverence for magistrates, of the fear of sinning, and of mutual love. It is well to take care to preserve something so sacred, in case through disputes it is misunderstood or thrown in doubt. 29

Complicating this mixing of the secular and sacred, was the common perception that the spiritual vibrancy of the state was contingent on the moral probity of its individual members. For this reason, salvation was regarded as a communal as well as personal matter, since godly societies were more likely to produce godly individuals. Larissa Taylor has pointed out that one of the most common late medieval and early modern sermon themes encouraged the

similarly equates political stability with spiritual vitality in his oration to the Cardinal de Bourbon in 1586. Addressing members of the Church, Berson ends his oration with the statement: "Somme, que pendant qu'il n'y a eu d'Evesques & bons Prelats, il a falu des gens d'armes, ou il y a de bons Pasteurs & Evesques, il ne faut point d'armes." Berson, Saincte et tres chrestienne resolution de monseigneur l'Illustrissime & Reverendissime cardinal de Bourbon, pour maintenir l'Eglise Catholique & Romaine (Paris: Chez Guillaume Julien, 1586): 39.

29 "... il n'y a chose qui plus maintienne les estats et Republiques que la Religion, et que c'est le principal fondement de la puissance des Monarques et seigneuries, de l'exection des loix, de l'obeissance des sujets, de la reverence des Magistrats, de la crainte de mal faire, et de l'amitie mutuelle envers un chacun, il faut bien prendre garde qu'une chose si sacree, ne soit mesprisee ou revoquee en doute par disputes: car de ce poinct la depend la ruine des Republiques ...." Jean Bodin, Les six livres de la République 4 (Lyon: Gabriel Cartier, 1593; reprinted Paris: Fayard, 1986): 206.
stronger members of the "Church militant" to aid the weaker ones, thereby facilitating the salvation of everyone.\textsuperscript{30}

Franciscan sermons articulated a similar conception of the mutual dependency of individual and communal salvation. Bernadette Paton found the Franciscan sermons of fifteenth-century Siena riddled with concerns about the city's role in preserving the "common good."\textsuperscript{31} Christophe Cheffontaine, the minister general of the order between 1571 and 1579, defended the recent formation of penitential confraternities in Paris as spiritually efficacious organizations. The mortifications of the "hommes de bien & de vie reprehensible" in these societies set a moral example for the rest of the community to follow.\textsuperscript{32} Of the friars closely associated with the Catholic League, the Italian François Panigarolle makes a particularly strong statement of the relationship between communal and individual salvation in his pamphlet, \textit{Malheurs et Inconveniens qui adviendront aux Catholiques faisant paix avec l'heretique} (1590). Denouncing religious toleration, Panigarolle, and his co-author, Pierre Christin,\textsuperscript{33} argue that conformity within a community was

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{30} See Larissa Taylor, \textit{Soldiers of Christ}, 121. The monastic community was itself a manifestation of this dynamic between individual and communal pursuit of salvation.
\item \textsuperscript{31} Paton, \textit{Preaching Friars}, 91.
\item \textsuperscript{32} Christophe Cheffontaine, \textit{Apologie de la confrairie des pénitents...} (Paris: M. Julian, 1583): 25.
\item \textsuperscript{33} Pierre Christin was one of the most vocal League preachers. He was from Nice, according to Charles Labitte. Labitte, \textit{De la démocratie chez les prédicateurs de la Ligue} (Paris: Joubert, 1841): 76.
\end{itemize}
essential to achieve union with God. "Man alone cannot aspire to this union." For these preachers, sharing the same rituals and the same doctrine helped maintain and improve one's spirituality. When all countries observe the Christian religion, "one can find the means to serve God, honour him, praise him and pray to him in the same fashion ...." Using this ideological framework, one can understand why friars often defined their role in society in the broadest possible terms. They wished to establish godly societies on earth, and a godly society by definition was politically stable as well as virtuous.

Providing an unlikely support for Franciscan political activity was another aspect of Franciscan piety. Francis of Assisi's distrust of self-will and insistence upon complete obedience to existing ecclesiastical authority was counteracted by his assertion that the friar must ultimately follow his own conscience, even if this led him to disregard a superior's commands: "The man who renounces all his possessions and loses himself body and soul is the man who

34 "Car ceste union & conformité d'actions nous unit avec Dieu mesme, & nous rend participants de sa divinité, d'autant qu'il se communique avec nous dés ceste vie terrestre, afin de nous unir à luy, c'est à dire à sa beatitude éternelle, & l'homme en son particulier ne peut aspirer à ceste Union divine ...." Panigarolle and Christin, Malheurs et inconveniens qui adviendront aux Catholiques faisant paix avec l'heretique (Paris: Nicolas Nivelle et Rolin Thierry, 1590): 6.

35 Panigarolle, Malheurs, 12.

36 Bernadette Paton argues that friars were influenced by Thomist conceptions of the polity as a virtuous community, and the role of the friar within it to promote the common good. See Paton, Preaching, 94.
surrenders himself to obedience in the hands of his superior," Francis says, but "should a superior give an order which is against the conscience of a subject, he is not obliged to obey ...." Implicit in his conception of an ideal spiritual community was a tension between obedience and independence, and correspondingly, tension between the individual conscience and that of the larger Franciscan community. In other words, a friar might be justified, in the name of spiritual reform, in defying his superiors.

From the thirteenth century onward, we find friars actively participating in the social, economic and political lives of their parishioners in order to create societies that best met the spiritual needs of their flock. Most friars may not have become so involved as to moderate elections like those in Daniel Lesnick's study of fourteenth-century Florence, or to act as royal ambassadors like the sixteenth-century French preachers Olivier Maillard and Jacques Hugunis. However, friars

37 See section 3 "on perfect and imperfect obedience" in "The Counsels of the Holy Father Saint Francis," S. Francis of Assisi, 170. Duncan Nimmo argues that Francis was insisting on the inherent supremacy of the will of God over ecclesiastical authority in particular. The role of the friar was to fulfill the will of God. In certain situations, he suggests, the perfect obedience to the will of God required by Francis would "engender a freedom of action practically without limit." Duncan Nimmo, Reform, 36.

38 Daniel Lesnick, Preaching in Medieval Florence (Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 1989): 60-62. Lesnick's friars also served as ambassadors, oversaw public works, and regulated communal councils among other secular civic activities.

39 For Maillard, see Oeuvres francaises: sermons et poésies (Geneva: Slatkine Press, 1968): iii, introd. by
never lacked opinions on social behaviour let alone governmental policy, nor were they shy about expressing them in public when the behaviour or policy seemed to threaten their spiritual mission. There are innumerable examples of this throughout the history of the order. The friars of fifteenth-century Siena attacked political factionalism in their city from their pulpits because, they argued, division was the root of sin. The French preacher Olivier Maillard was forced into exile when he spoke too critically about the annulment of Louis XII's marriage to Jeanne de France.

If anything, the friars living through the French religious wars were even more outspoken, particularly during the period of the Holy Catholic League. Contemporaries, the friars among them, were overwhelmed by the disorder and violence of the period, which was of a greater magnitude than had been known in recent memory. "Depuis douze ans ...," Hilaire Coquy remarks in 1573, "en pitieus estat, l'Eglise Françoise enceint & crie comme celles qui sont en travail d'enfant, & en travaillans souffrent tormens pour

Arthur de la Borderie. For Hugonis, see Bibl. Lyon Ms. 844, f. 27. Hugonis was sent on an embassy to Spain by Henry II, according to the memoir of the Paris convent. Hugonis was a prominent preacher in his day, and held the office of prédicaccent du roi. This office is discussed in chapter 4.

40 Paton, Preaching, 98.

41 Olivier Maillard, Oeuvres françaises, iii. Maillard was also in trouble with the two previous monarchs because of his outspokenness, according to La Borderie.
enfanter!"  

The increasing willingness of the Paris friars to become more politically involved by the late 1580s stemmed from their distrust of royal policy. The friars had heralded the Massacre of Saint Bartholomew's Day in 1572 as a sign of divine favour. However, the increasing disorder in subsequent years suggested less a country on the road to spiritual renewal than one still riddled with sin. As the divinely anointed leader of France, Henry III was held responsible for the disorder. The King owed all his authority to God, Panigarolle says in a sermon before Henry III in 1573. His laws are God's laws, and God's laws are "his commandments, his scriptures, apostolic traditions and the decrees of holy councils." A state operating on the basis of these laws was a stable one as well as spiritually vibrant.

Henry III's apparent willingness to negotiate with the

42 Hilaire Coquy, Triomphe glorieux de l'Eglise Chrestienne, contre ses ennemis. Et du iuste iugement de Dieu, contre ung nommé Gaspard de Coligny, qui fut seigneur de Chastillon, & Admiral de France. Le tout sur le Pseaume, 128 (Troyes: Jean Moreau, 1573): Ci3i.

43 Coquy's sermon Triomphe glorieux celebrates the anniversary of the massacre, saying that Coligny's death was a just judgement for his seditious actions, and another sign that God favoured the Catholic cause. See the preface, Di.

Protestants during the wars was, not surprisingly, viewed as an important contributing cause to the disorder. Catholic consternation about these negotiations was intensified by the death of the last Valois brother in 1584, an event which left the Protestant Henry of Navarre next in line to the throne. However, the turning point in Franciscan political activity was Henry III's assassination of the titular leaders of the Catholic faction, the duke of Guise, and his brother, the Cardinal of Lorraine, in December 1588. This event confirmed the worst fears of the friars -- that Henry III would support a Protestant succession. From 1589 onward, they worked to ensure that the spiritual integrity of France was not further compromised by royal policies. Their removal of the head from the King's portrait in July 1589 powerfully symbolized the religious community's willingness to reject royal authority when it seemed to jeopardize the spiritual health of their flock. It was in itself a powerful philosophical statement on the nature of kingship. A king who did not preserve the faith, this action stated, was not a legitimate king.

Even though their minister general had expressed his disapproval of their involvement with the Catholic League as early as 1585, by 1589 the most important preachers in the community were recognized as close associates of the organization. Among them were François Feuardent, Jean

45 See above page 11, nt. 19.

46 The fiery League preacher Feuardent (1539-1610), or "Feu-Ardent" as contemporaries liked to pun, was guardian of
Garin, Maurice Hylaret, Robert Chessé and the Italian, Panigarolle, mentioned earlier. These friars regularly

the Paris friary during the high period of League power in the city, 1590-1593. In addition to being a famous preacher in his day, however, Feuardent was also a respected theologian and author of numerous exegetical treatises. He was forced to flee Paris following the collapse of the League, and died in the Netherlands in 1610. His work as a theologian will be discussed in chapter 3. Pierre-Yves Féret, La Faculté de Théologie de Paris et ses docteurs les plus célèbres. Époque moderne 2 (Paris: Picard, 1901): 247.

47 The Savoyard Jean Garin was considered a fiery orator, and one of the most intransigent of the Leaguer preachers. Garin received his licentiate in 1590, and the same year was made a lecturer in theology at the Paris studium. Garin eventually became a doctor in theology. He fled Paris in March 1594 following the disintegration of the League. L'Estoile, Journal de L'Estoile pour le règne de Henri IV 2 (Paris: Gallimard, 1958): 407. For his licentiate, see BN Ms. LAT 15440.

48 Maurice Hylaret (1539-1591), the son of a merchant in the region of Angoulême, joined the Cordelier community there in 1551. He studied theology in Paris, earning his licentiate in 1570 and later his doctorate. During the period of the League, Hylaret was based in the city of Orléans where he helped establish two confraternities -- the Nom-de-Jesus, and Cordon-de-Saint-François. Hylaret was a powerful orator. Following his death in 1591, he was given a magnificent funeral by the city of Orléans. Féret, 2, 239-240. See also Anniversaria oratio, Mauricii Hylareti engolmensis, doctoris theologi celeberrimi... (Paris: 1593).

49 Prior to becoming guardian of the friary at Vendôme in 1589, Chessé was a prominent preacher among the Paris Franciscans. Chessé hid Jacques-Auguste de Thou in the friary during the Day of the Barricades, when politque Parisians were being attacked by the League. Though de Thou was appreciative, he nevertheless criticized his saviour for being a religious fanatic. Chessé was one of the most ardent preachers affiliated with the League, and was ultimately executed by Henry of Navarre in 1592 because of his involvement in a conspiracy to hand the town of Tours over to the League. Jacques-Auguste de Thou, Histoire universelle de Jacques-Auguste de Thou (1543-1607). 1 (London: 1734): 144, and Michaud, Biographie universelle 8 (1811-1828; reprinted, Graz, Austria: Akademische, 1966-1970): 103-104.

50 François Panigarolle (b. 1548) was from a patrician family of Milan. He became a Cordelier in 1567 in Florence,
preached from the many parish pulpits in Paris in addition to their own, attacking Henry III and Henry of Navarre, while praising the work of the Catholic League. In July 1589 Pierre de l'Esteoile noted that Franciscans were among the preachers who greeted the news of Henry III's assassination with joy, pronouncing tributes to his assassin, the Jacobin Jacques Clément.\textsuperscript{51} They encouraged the Parisians to resist Henry of Navarre during his siege of the city in 1590.\textsuperscript{52} According to L'Esteoile, an assembly of zealous preachers met in Garin's room at the Cordelier friary, where they swore an

and was soon sent to study in Paris. Although Panigarolle returned to Italy after his studies, he accompanied the papal legate to Paris in 1589. Labitte includes a translation of a memoir Panigarolle sent to Charles-Emmanuel, the duke of Savoy, about the troubles in France in 1589. Labitte, Démocratie: 8-9, 100-101.

\textsuperscript{51} Labitte says that Jean Porthaise, a friar from Poitiers and one of the commissioners sent by the minister general to the Paris friary in 1581, was particularly supportive of regicide in the name of religion. He compared Jacques Clément to the biblical figures Samson and Judith among others to justify Clément's actions. Labitte, Démocratie, 210. Porthaise's role as commissioner is discussed in ch. 5, pp. 332.

\textsuperscript{52} D'Aubigné mentions Feuardent and Garin as particularly supportive preachers of the League during the siege. He bitterly comments that the preachers ensured that they themselves were well-fortified with food, so that they would have the energy to encourage the beleaguered population of Paris to resist Henry IV: "Ce conseil avoit pour emissaires et habiles instrumens Geincestre, Feu-Ardent, Peletier, le Petit-Feuillant, Christi et Garnier; tous ceux-là, bien munis de vivres pour eux, possedoyent les chaires, par les chaires les oreilles et les coeurs des Parisiens, en prenant garde surtout que les convenus fussent bien munitionnez, de peur qu'ils ne preschassent pas bien la tolerance de la faim s'ils la sentoyent." Agrippa D'Aubigné, Histoire universelle 8 (Geneva: Librairie Droz, 1993): 176-177. Ed. by André Thierry.
oath never to recognize Navarre as King. When the pope showed signs of supporting Navarre's conversion in 1593, they criticized him as well.

Nor was their political activism restricted to preaching. They published polemics attacking Protestantism and Protestant rule, and participated in League-organized processions. During the siege of Paris, the friars and a number of the other religious orders formed an ad hoc militia to protect the city. The military life must have agreed with the friars, given that two years later, during the dying days of League power, Garin organized another

---

53 L'Estoile, *Journal de L'Estoile* 2, 199. L'Estoile says that Mayenne was annoyed about this independent assembly.

54 De Thou mentions Jean Garin along with the secular cleric Jean Boucher, as two particularly vehement preachers attacking the conversion of Henry IV in 1593. Garin "eut l'impudence, après avoir prononcé un discours sur le même sujet, d'exhorter ses auditeurs à prier Dieu de ne pas permettre que le Pape qui étoit toujours ... conduit par le S. Esprit, & qui ne pouvoit jamais errer dans la foi, se laissat fléchir par les prieres de Bearnais, & lui accordât absolution." *Histoire universelle*, 12, 35. L'Estoile records Feuardent also attacking Henry IV throughout 1592 and 1593. *Journal de l'Estoile* 2, 164, 219, 263, 275, and Garin reportedly preached on March 8, 1593 that the Pope would be declaring himself to be a heretic if he absolved Henry IV: " ... mais quand le Pape voudrait absoudre le Béarnois, il ne pourrait, d'autant qu'il se déclarait hérétique lui-même." L'Estoile, *Journal*, 2, 377.

55 The literary production of the Paris Cordeliers is discussed in chapter 3.

56 Charles Labitte, *Démocratie*, 117. Of the religious orders, Labitte says that all but the Celestines, the Benedictines and the canons of Sainte-Geneviève and Saint-Victor refused to join this militia.
monastic militia. Robert Chessé's involvement in a conspiracy to hand the town of Tours over to the League in 1592 also suggests that friars were not above direct political intervention in affairs of state.

The politicization of the Paris friars during the last decade of the sixteenth century was unusual to say the least, and it reveals the profound fear of many Catholics during this period that the political and spiritual health of the country was being undermined at the top of the structure. Since the only true moral kingdom was a Catholic one, according to Catholic contemporaries, a Protestant succession meant the damnation of all members of society. "Ultimately the Catholics want a monarch, a good and certain Catholic ...." Panigarolle says, in a letter to the duke of Savoy in 1589 about the troubles in France. Protestants should be killed, Franciscan preachers argued, because they were disrupting the stability of society, and consequently

57 "Garinus arma tous les moines, et les anima à prendre le corselet et la pique pour la cause de Dieu; cria comme de coutume contre ceux de la justice, et dit que tout n'en valait rien; et que si on ne mettait bien fort la main aux couteux, que les politiques nous égorgeraient...." Journal de l'Estoile 1, 376. The date of this entry is March 1594.

58 His subsequent execution at the orders of Henry IV in 1592 shows that clerical garb provided no protection from a threatened ruler. L'Estoile, Journal de L'Estoile 1, 374. His execution (by hanging) is also mentioned by d'Aubigné, Histoire universelle 8, 157.

59 "Enfin les catholiques veulent un monarque, bon et sûr catholique ....": Labitte, 100-101. Labitte provides a French translation of an Italian letter, sent by Panigarolle to his master, Charles Emmanuel. The original citation is Lettere di Panigarola (Milan, 1629): 233.
threatened the salvation of their brethren. In his pamphlet Malheurs, Panigarolle argues that Protestants were "away from the road to salvation" and therefore should be "punished to the death, and burned," regardless of status, sex or age. Calvinists were dangerous schismatics, according to Hilaire Coquy:

These intransigent French sinners, and Calvinist heretics ... take pleasure in bathing their daggers, knives, lances and swords in the innocent blood of their nation ....

For Maurice Hylaret, heretics were rebels, and seducers of the minds and spirits of good Catholics. Heretics, in order to seduce their listeners, whom they charm, bewitch, enchant, and in the end attract them and drag them by means of faith into eternal damnation with sweet and honeyed words, seducing the hearts of the simple and innocent, who do not protect themselves.

That the Paris friars considered themselves ideally suited to lead a spiritual reformation is evident in their writings. Referring to the turmoil of the period, Jacques Berson says in his preface to a sermon of the Italian friar Cornelio Musso, "never was there a greater need for sermons

---

60 Panigarolle, 8.

61 "Ces hardis pecheurs François, & heretiques calvinistes, lesquelz prenoyent plaisir à bagner leurs daggers, cousteaux, lances, & espees au sang innocent de leur nation ...." Coquy, Triomphe glorieux, Ciii.

62 " ... pour seduire les auditeurs, lesquels il charme, ensorcele, & enchante, les attirant à la parfin & trainant avec foy en damnation eternelle, par douices & emmiellees parolles, seduisant les coeurs des simples & innocens, qui ne se donnent garde d'eux." Maurice Hylaret, Deux traitcez ou opuscules, l'un en forme de remonstrance, De non conveniendo cum haereticis, l'autre par forme de conseil et advis, De non eundo cum muliere haeretica a viro catholicco conjugio (Orléans: Boynard, 1587): 4-5.
Cornelio Musso, "never was there a greater need for sermons and preaching." He continues on to say, "Blessed is the land which has good ministers of God." The fact that Berson and the majority of the other Paris Franciscan preachers were doctors in theology was part of the reason for their self-confidence. Berson refers to himself in the same sermon as a "predicateur d'office, & philosophe par condition." Arguing that preachers were not as respected as they were in days past, he points back to a time when theologians were nourished by the cities, and governments consulted them about political affairs:

I miss the wonderful times of our fathers ... when the cities were the nurseries of preachers and doctors, when the courts governed by means of evangelical remonstrances, when evangelical clerics were received among the nobles, as embassies of peace ....

Maurice Hylaret, another doctor, remarks in the preface of a tract thirteen years later that the duty of the theologian was to tell the truth, without seeking adulation. He compares the friar, furthermore, to a warrior who, through writing, and with "armes spirituelles" renders the enemies

---


64 Berson, *L'avènement*, Biii. "Je ne regretteray jamais assez le beau temps de nos peres ... Alors que les villes estoient tutrices des Predicateurs & Docteurs, alors que les cours se gouvernoient par les remonstrances Evangeliques, alors qu'estoient receus les Religieux Evangeliques entre les nobles, comme ambassades de paix ...."

65 Maurice Hylaret, *Deux traictez*. "Le theologien principalement doit en toute simplicité rondement, loing de toute espece ou soupçon dadulation, dire la verité."
of the Catholic faith helpless.  

Conclusion

The political activism of the Paris Franciscans during the period of the League was unusual, to say the least. However, the extreme turmoil of the period, and in particular the remarkable strength of the Protestant faith and the threat of a Protestant succession to the throne combined to transform these friars into true political activists. The willingness of the Paris friars to participate more actively in political affairs after 1589 reveals their conviction that political change was required to secure a spiritual reformation of their country. Their removal of the head from the portrait of Henry III also shows that they considered themselves legitimate judges of kingly behaviour. This conviction of the Paris friars that they were ideally suited to lead a spiritual reformation of their country during the religious wars, and how they organized themselves to do so, will be the focus of subsequent chapters.

---

66 "De mesme maniere celuy, qui par escrit & avec armes spirituelles debellera et rembarrera l'ennemy de la religion orthodoxe & catholique ...." Found in the dedication to Hylaret's sermon.
CHAPTER 2: POLITICAL STRUCTURE AND THE EXERCISE OF POWER.
THE CREATION OF A FRANCISCAN COMMUNITY

The political activism of the Paris Franciscans after 1589 was an extreme expression of Franciscan reforming zeal but it was genuine nonetheless, and it points not only to the missionary mandate of the order itself but also to the Paris friary's conception of itself as a corporation of spiritual leaders. This conception is understandable. For centuries the Paris friary had nurtured its reputation as a producer of fine preachers and theologians. Its members were frequently called upon to fill high administrative posts within the order as well as to act as confessors and preachers in royal households.

The perpetuation of its status as an elite Franciscan community was consequently one of the chief preoccupations of the Paris friary, and an examination of the structure of authority which had emerged in the house by the sixteenth century suggests that, for these friars, the molding of generations of friars into successful, effective spiritual leaders was equally dependent upon their transformation into devoted members of the Franciscan body.

The power structure in the friary is therefore an important point of departure for an investigation of the nature of the community contained within its walls. The amorphous and polyvalent nature of power, however, explains why historians seeking to understand the ebb and flow of
authority within an institution rarely confine their search to official channels of influence. The established hierarchy of offices, and the constitutions and privileges the offices sought to protect, were frequently interfered with, obviated or bypassed altogether by other sources of authority within and without the structure.

Unearthing channels of power in a Franciscan friary is an especially complicated affair. The concept of authority sat uncomfortably with the friars who, as spiritual descendants of Francis of Assisi, associated political power with the secular world. The only important power for the Franciscans came from God, and their task was to be His most humble and dutiful servants. The flow of power within the house is often difficult to discern, screened by declarations of corporate decision-making and the language of consensus.

The period of the civil wars affords an unusual opportunity to peer into the political life of the friary, since the inordinate pressure placed upon the Franciscan hierarchy to exercise control over its community made the tensions within the brotherhood visible. It is evident, for example, that though the Parisian friary could never fully realize its ideal of a consensual community, it had created

---

a political structure which could mediate between differing conceptions of community and, consequently, between differing conceptions of the ideal friar.

The first part of this chapter will discuss the philosophical and constitutional underpinnings of the structure of authority which existed in the Cordelier house during the sixteenth century. The second part will concentrate on the functioning of this structure, in particular its management of the major issues facing the religious community. The chapter concludes with an analysis of the events of 1581/82, when tensions between obedience and individual conscience exploded into stone-throwing factionalism.

Communitas versus hierarchy

The community designed by Francis was premised upon spiritual equality and a shared conception of the religious life. For Francis, the community was a fundamental component of the Franciscan way of life because it provided the necessary spiritual guidance for its members. Since individual will was fallible, it was the duty of the community to supervise the spiritual progression of each member, by ensuring the inculcation of Franciscan values and the correction of transgressions of the Rule. Since moral authority resided in the community, it was the duty of the member to conform his will to that of the common will, and conse-

---

2 This aspect of Franciscan doctrine is discussed in chapter 1, pp. 40-41.
Francis' resistance to the development of a hierarchical structure of authority within his order reflects this insistence upon the inherent spiritual equality of his followers, as well as Francis' profound desire to distance himself from values which he considered secular in nature. Francis developed a conception of community which was premised upon the rejection of existing society, a rejection which entailed a negation of status and hierarchy, inseparable from a repudiation of property. Victor Turner argues that Francis was trying to institutionalize a form of community which was in a permanently "liminal" state. This liminality, this desire to retire from general society, is expressed in Francis' insistence that friars call each other "brother," recognize no "prior" in their community, and take the title "friars minor" as an indication of their

3 However, there is evident ambiguity in Francis' thought concerning the relationship between the individual and the community. Individual will is distrusted, but in fact it is only by means of the individual will that salvation could ultimately be achieved. The community can guide the member, but the member must choose salvation. As Francis says, conscience could not be forced. Leo Sherley-Price, ed. S. Francis of Assisi: his life and writings as recorded by his contemporaries (London: Mowbray & Co. Ltd, 1959). See the first Rule, rubric 5.


5 The priorship, second in command to the abbot in a Benedictine monastery, was a post occupied in perpetuity. Francis uses the position of prior to highlight his unwillingness to recognize a permanently assigned office within his order.
status as the lowliest of the religious orders. They were to be "strangers and exiles" during their lifetimes, moving through the secular world without being tied down to it in any tangible way.⁶

In at least one respect, Bonaventure's insistence on a hierarchy of offices was an outgrowth of Francis' understanding of the role of the community. Bonaventure shared Francis' concern about creating good Franciscans. However, as mentioned in the previous chapter, he believed that good friars could only be formed in a more hierarchically structured community. The order was expanding rapidly during the thirteenth century, generating concern about how to "Franciscanize" shoals of new recruits. To ensure that the necessary Franciscan values were inculcated, qualified individuals were given jurisdiction over the spiritual development of the community -- thus the origins of offices.

The office structure first established by the Constitutions of Narbonne in 1260, during Bonaventure's generalship, tried to ensure that offices were institutionalized but individuals were not. Whereas the abbot in other monasteries was appointed for life, the guardian served for only two years. By rotating offices, the order hoped to prevent the association of specific individuals with specific roles. Offices were, therefore, an expression of the moral authority of the community, and in theory, at least, underperforming or corrupt members could

⁶ "Testament" of Francis of Assisi, found in Leo Sherley-Price, S. Francis of Assisi, 202.
be replaced through the will of the community.  

In a fundamental way, this implantation of an hierarchical office structure transformed the existing understanding of the community, because, even though offices remained the property of the order, occupation of the offices required specific skills, and therefore generally fell to those trained. Increasingly, those considered to be properly trained were friars possessing a university degree. Long before the sixteenth century, an oligarchy premised upon education was emerging within the order. Offices did continue to rotate among members, but, especially in the larger communities, they rotated within a small group of people.

---

7 A fundamental difference between the friars and the cloistered orders such as the Benedictines, was this emphasis upon the Rule above all individual authority. A guardian could be deposed if he transgressed the Rule or tried to force other friars to do so. However, the prior of a Benedictine abbey held his post for life and was not to be disobeyed. For a comparison between the Franciscan and Benedictine orders, see Jane Sayers, "Violence in the Medieval Cloister" in the Journal of Ecclesiastical History 41 (1990): 536. For further information on the early development of the Franciscan hierarchy of offices, see Rosalind Brooke, Early Franciscan Government: Elias to Bonaventure (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959), especially pages 274-282.

8 This process appears even before the Constitutions of Narbonne of 1260. The Constitutions merely recognized and regulated a practice which was already well underway. Bonaventure himself is an example of a learned Franciscan who quickly rose to govern the entire order. See John Moorman, History of the Franciscan Order from its Origins to the Year 1517 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968): 147-150.
Section I: The governing structure

What we know about the political structure of the Paris convent comes from the Delphine statutes of 1502, which replaced the formerly Conventual Franciscan organization with an Observant one. Two subsequent revisions, those of Jean Pisot of Parma in 1533 and Jean Calvi in 1543, further refined the responsibilities of the various offices within the structure. From these collections of statutes, we can see that both Francis' and Bonaventure's conceptions of community continued to play a role in the political life of the Paris friars. Officially-sanctioned distribution of power within the friary was divided between the brotherhood as a corporate body represented by the Chapter, and a complex web of "offices" occupied by certain members of the community. The Chapter was the meeting of the entire local community during which, at least in theory, every professed friar could voice his opinion. The office structure, in contrast, was predicated on a notion of authority which pivoted around the deconstruction and delegation of the authority within the community. Offices were available only to friars with certain stated qualifications and for specified periods of time, and the authority attached to an office existed independently of the individual who occupied it.

The Chapter still met three times a week throughout the
sixteenth century, and all friars were expected to attend.\(^9\)

In its earliest incarnation, this body served a political as well as a spiritual function, during which the community as a whole could discuss concerns of the house, as well as hear the public confessions of their brothers. By the sixteenth century, the authority of the Chapter concerning political matters had declined, though the minutes show that major issues were still being brought before the Chapter meeting for discussion, and it was here that friars new to the community were introduced to the other members.\(^10\) Most importantly, the Chapter still remained the prescribed forum for the public reproof of erring members.\(^11\) Friars found guilty of misbehaviour were routinely brought by the guardian before the Chapter to acknowledge their culpability and receive admonition from their brothers. The continuing importance of this organization for members of the house is evident in the enormous size of the Chapter house itself.

\(^9\) Piana, "Gli statuti per la riforma dello Studio di Parigi (a.1502)" in Archivum franciscanum historicum 52 (1959): 94. The minutes of the Cordelier house also show that this body continued to meet regularly throughout the latter part of the sixteenth century.

\(^10\) One of the complaints of a friar during the conflict of 1581/1582 was that the then-visiting minister general was not consulting the friars in Chapter meetings. See AN X2B 1175.

The room was twenty-five metres by eighteen metres, the same size as the refectory. According to Pignaniol's Description historique, it was also the most ornate of all the rooms. Paintings of cardinals, patriarchs and saints of the Franciscan order filled the walls, marking the Paris friars as members of a much larger, and distinct, spiritual community.\(^\text{12}\)

The office structure of the convent existed alongside that of the Chapter and was largely concerned with the management of house affairs. At its core, this structure comprised a central administrative hierarchy headed by the inner council, to which other subsidiary hierarchies were responsible. The two most important of these subsidiary hierarchies were those of finance and education. We know from Gonzaga that there were approximately fifty offices within the Paris structure by the sixteenth century, though he is not specific about the nature of these offices.\(^\text{13}\) The Delphine statutes on the other hand are far more enlightening. Named after the minister general who presided over the establishment of the Observants in the Paris house, Gilles Delphin, the Delphine statutes required the house to have at least twenty-five priests in order to staff


\(^{13}\) Gonzaga, De Origine seraphicae, f. 128.
administrative offices, perform divine office, and provide lectures.\textsuperscript{14} Twelve were specifically required for divine office. Of those remaining, one priest was to be the guardian, two were to be vicars, one appointed as commissioner, two as \textit{janitores} (porters)\textsuperscript{15} and four as \textit{quaestores} (alms-gatherers)\textsuperscript{16}. The theology school, or \textit{studium}, also required one priest to act as \textit{regens}, and two lecturers -- one as lecturer of theology, one of philosophy. Similarly the youth school required two priests to be lectors, again one for theology, and one for philosophy, as

\textsuperscript{14} Piana, "Gli statuti": 77: " ... quoad numerum fratrum, sacerdotum, magistrorum tam pro divino officio quam pro officiis et lecturis ordinat Rm pater viginti quinque fratres esse in conventu parisiensi sacerdotes."

\textsuperscript{15} The porter observed the movements of friars into and out of the convent, thereby monitoring contact between the convent and the secular community. He was also listed in many contracts of donations along with the \textit{procureur} and \textit{syndic} as a friar allowed to receive the money for the house because of his mediating status. It was therefore a position involving a great deal of trust. The importance given to this office is evident in the severity of the punishment for breach of duty. The minutes of 1561, for example, threaten expulsion for porters neglectful in closing the doors. For Piana, see ch. 1, 78. For the minutes, see \textit{Bibl. Maz. Ms. 332}, f. 341.

\textsuperscript{16} The question of alms was always an important one for the Franciscans, because the right to collect alms was a privilege granted by the King that formed a necessary part of the financial life of the convent. According to the Rule, all brothers were to collect alms to support themselves. Brothers were still doing so in the sixteenth century, especially during the trying times of the religious wars. However the convent wished to control this activity to some degree, no doubt to ensure that friars brought back all the money which they collected. As a result, four priests of good character were appointed as official alms collectors by the guardian and worked under the direction of the sacristan. Piana, "Gli statuti": ch. 1, 78.
well as a magister (master of study), and a confessor.

The Bonaventurean character of the friary's office structure is evident not only in its complexity, but in its bias towards officers possessing University diplomas. All of the many offices in this complex bureaucracy were occupied by priests, and the most important offices were the de facto property of doctors in theology.¹⁷ In a house like that of Paris, clerical members exercised tremendous influence, as the career of François Feuardent shows. Feuardent first appeared in the office structure as regens (regent master) in the studium,¹⁸ a post which he occupied for two years (1576-1578). He remained a member of the inner council (discrétoire), the governing body of the house, for the next fifteen years, during which time he held the position of lecturer of theology (1583-1589), and guardian (1590-1593).¹⁹ Feuardent's rise to power within the community was

¹⁷ The Delphine statutes forbade non-priests from sitting on the inner council, also known as the discretoire. Celestino di Piana, "Gli Statuti per la riforma dello Studio di Parigi (a.1502)" in Archivum franciscanum historicum 52 (1959): 43-122., ch. 1, 77. However, it would appear from examination of the inner council minutes, that those who were studying at, or were graduates of the University of Paris, were favoured above other priests. The guardian with one exception (Mathew Le Heurt, 1583-1585) was always a doctor of theology, and the two vicars were always bachelors.

¹⁸ The studium generalium was the Franciscan school which trained young friars in theology and canon law. There were several of these in France alone. The studium associated with the Paris friary specialized in theology. It will be discussed in more detail in chapter 3.

¹⁹ The minutes show this progression in office. AN LL1515, AN LL1511.
typical of the University-seasoned friars. Needless to say, such a pattern of rotation meant that from year to year the names in the discretoire changed only slowly.

A description of some of the more important offices within the friary will illustrate the complexity of the political structure within this religious institution.

Guardian

The guardianship was the most important post within the convent structure. Following the reform of 1502, this office was rotated every three years rather than every two. The guardian's responsibilities were divided between acting as the house's representative in secular society, and supervising the internal administration. He was involved in every activity of the house, whether policy-making decisions, imposing penance on a member, or visitation of dormitories at night. In many respects, the guardian was the embodiment of the moral authority of the house, for he was expected to be omnipresent. Not surprisingly, the guardian was also a profoundly respected spiritual leader. François Feuardent, Denis Rollot and Stephen Fidel were respected preachers in their day as well as former guardians of the convent.20

The authority of the guardian was extensive, and seemingly more so because it was not clearly defined. Having

20 Etienne Fidel was guardian between 1566 and 1569, and Denis Rollot held this office between 1578 and 1581.
such broad areas of responsibility meant that the guardian frequently stepped into the breach when jurisdiction of authority between other offices appeared to be in conflict. A case in point is the conflict which arose over an appointment of one of the two vicars in 1560. The province of Turonne neglected to nominate a vicar for the Paris convent by the assigned time. The inner council therefore declared that the guardian could choose the vicar himself -- albeit from the same province. The minutes reveal a willingness on the part of the council to enhance the power of the guardian, temporarily or otherwise, especially when it was at the expense of external authorities.\footnote{Bibl. Maz. Ms. 332 (Nov 28, 1560), f. 339.}

Commissioner

The commissioner, who was the representative of the minister general in Rome, was an outsider who occupied an ambiguous role in the power structure, in principle equal to that of the guardian. Transformed into a permanent representative by the reforms of 1502, his primary responsibility appears to have been overseeing the election of the guardian, although the Delphine statutes also state that the commissioner should be active in the general administration of the convent. To facilitate this latter role, the statutes subjected the Paris friars to the commissioners' authority, and forbade them to meet together or exercise authority without the agreement of both the
guardian and the commissioner during the commissioner's stay in the house. The statutes insisted, in particular, that the commissioner play an active role in the moral reform of members, and he was told to be particularly diligent in monitoring the training of the youth. The commissioner's extensive authority over the friary on behalf of the minister general explains the resentment which began to grow during this period, and which manifested itself in the periodic claims made by the house to the minister general that the commissioner imposed a financial burden too great for them to bear.

---

22 Piana, "Gli statuti," ch. 43, sec. 29: 117. "... declaratur quod nec minister franciae nec aliquis commissarius, qui mitteretur ad provinciam, habeat aliquam auctoritatem super fratres, qui semel fuerunt accepti de familia huius conventus, nec transmutandi, nec mandandi, nec gratias conferendi, nec congregandi fratres super capitulo faciendo, nisi in quantum commissarius cum guardiano voluerint."

23 "Insuper ordinamus ut commissarius et guardianus, simul vel divisim, possint illos substituere et quos viderint aptos sine contradicione, mandantes omnibus iis quos instituerint per sanctam obedientiam et ... videlicet praesidentiae, impositum assumant et fideliter exerceant, nisi manifestam haberint excusationis causam ... sed etiam disciplinis et religiositati laborareque debeamus secundum gratiam a Domino nobis datam." Piana, "Gli statuti," ch. 43, sec. 20: 114. The council minutes also make it clear that the commissioner frequently presided over the convent during the absence of the guardian.

24 There are numerous examples of commissioners found to be burdensome by the convents they were visiting. The Paris community itself wrote to the minister general requesting that no more commissioners be sent in 1577 and later in 1586, and rejected the commissioner sent in 1581. These incidences are discussed in more detail in chapter 5.
**Inner council (discrétoire)**

The guardian, according to the 1502 statutes, should not "presume" to make weighty decisions without consulting the discretoire. This advisory body had no more than twelve members, and most of these members held major offices, namely the two vicars, the sacristan, at least one lecturer, one president, the regent master and of course, the guardian. Jean Calvi's reforms of 1543 ensured that each reformed province could have a student on the committee known as a "discret.":

The inner council met regularly, usually every few weeks, but important matters could force it to meet more frequently. The case of Christophe Blaiseau clearly worried

---

25 Piana, 41, secs 1-3. Chapter 2 is particularly explicit, telling the guardian not to perform arduous tasks without consulting the discretoire or the commissioner: "Sine quibus [patribus] et vicario seu commissario Rmī Patris ardua tractare non praesumat; sed illos vocet in arduis tractandis ... secundum eius rectum iudicium et exigentiam materiae."

26 Laure Beaumont-Maillet *Le Grand Couvent des Cordeliers de Paris* (Paris: Librairie Honoré Champion, 1975): 90. The exception to this until 1571 was the province of Aquitaine which was reformed later than the original three great provinces. The prejudice in favour of the three reformed provinces of France is demonstrated by Aquitaine. Although Aquitaine joined the Observant branch in 1532, Sérant argues that it had trouble sending students to the house because it was not part of the reform of 1502. That it could not send a discret to the council before 1571 is also indicative of the unwillingness of the three provinces to relinquish their hold over the friary offices. For a discussion of the province of Aquitaine, see Antoine de Sérant, "Les statuts des quatre provinces des cordeliers en 1539" in *Revue d'histoire franciscaine* 7 (1930): 11. It was not until 1618 that the inner council, the discret, took on its definitive form, that of guardian, four lecturers, two vicars, two bachelors, a "père antique," and the six "discrets" of the provinces.
the council, prompting it to meet three times in a matter of days in 1567. Blaiseau was denied entrance into the theology cursus and threatened to appeal to the minister general.

In addition to its regular meetings and crisis sessions, we also find it forming ad hoc subcommittees periodically to investigate incidents of disorder in the house as well as to negotiate on behalf of the discretoire with outside institutions. More often than not these subcommittees were comprised of the more important members of the convent -- the guardian and the two vicars -- though occasionally we find the regent master, the president and even the sacristan included as well, depending on the nature of the matter.

The principal role of the inner council was to act as another monitoring agent of the morality of fellow friars, and the Delphine statutes urge the discretoire to punish erring brothers with great zeal. Concern about the morality of the friars clearly gave the council a fairly wide-

---

27 AN LL1515 (August 21-23, 1567), ff. 17v-19. This particular case is interesting because it reveals the extent to which brothers were willing to appeal to outside jurisdictions to gain access to the University. Blaiseau's threat to call upon the minister general clearly shook the council, which threatened to disclose his vices if he persisted.

28 For example, the sacristan was part of a subcommittee delegated to investigate a potential theft from the sacristy. The entire convent was searched. AN LL1511 (June 25, 1593), f. 73r.

29 "Iurabunt insuper praedicti patres discreti et guardiano ... quibus parere tenebuntur et eorum substitutionem acceptare, honestati conventus intendere die ac nocte tam in conventu quam extra conventum, guardianum informare, prout poterunt commode, de agendis zelo caritatis sive in correctionibus faciendis et punitionibus sive aliis rebus." Piana, "Gli statuti," ch. 41, no. 55: 109.
ranging jurisdiction, and from the internal council minutes we can see that this body was involved in virtually every facet of Cordelier life. With respect to internal administration, the council evaluated students and bachelors as they advanced through the studium and into the university curriculum, and ratified -- or rejected -- appointments to offices within the political structure.\textsuperscript{30} The discretoire also played an advisory role in the financial life of the convent, and the members of the council signed all notarial documents involving donations and other financial arrangements.\textsuperscript{31} Furthermore, the approval of the council was required for judicial proceedings pursued by the convent, whether the perennially necessary defence of the order's privileges at the University of Paris or the removal of unwanted tenants from one of the convent's houses, as occurred in 1559.\textsuperscript{32}

\textsuperscript{30} The case of Blaiseau is an example of rejection.

\textsuperscript{31} There are numerous examples of this, especially with respect to foundations. A foundation refers to donations by patrons to the house establishing yearly services for the soul of the departed patron or of family members. These are discussed in chapter 4.

\textsuperscript{32} There are numerous surviving petitions to Parlement from the house involving a range of issues. One particularly interesting set of documents is a case brought against three women tenants of the convent who refused to leave the house. The dispute began as early as July 17, 1559, when the friary petitioned the Parlement of Paris to enforce the removal of the women. The women responded with a petition to stay on September 22, 1559. Five years later, the friary was still trying to secure their removal. See AN S4161: 1-2.
The vicars

The vicar of youth and vicar of priests were responsible for the intellectual and moral development of the youth and students studying in the two schools. Rooted in these essential jurisdictions, the authority of the vicars extended beyond the confines of the studium and into the general Cordelier community, making their offices the most powerful after that of the guardian. One of the vicars usually presided over the administration of the house in the absence of guardian and commissioner. Even when these officers were present, however, the vicars' continued presence on ad hoc committees shows that they were considered important moral authorities in the community. We see this authority exercised in the council minutes on a number of occasions, especially with respect to the misbehaviour of friars. One example is the case of Friar Le Dreulx who was suspected of mishandling funds. The discretoire on November 5, 1581 records that the guardian, along with the two vicars, planned on visiting him in order to obtain a confession.\(^3\)

Because the vicariate was an important position, only priests in the theology curriculum were eligible, and the appointments made during the late sixteenth century suggest that a bachelor's diploma was required. Furthermore, the reforms of 1502 ensured that candidates could only come from the three larger reformed provinces of Turonne, Saint

\(^{3\text{a}}\) AN LL1511 (November 17, 1581), ff. 3v-4.
Bonaventure and France. The guardian's choice was further limited by an apparently accepted practice of provincial nomination of a candidate. We can see this in the previously mentioned case of Nov 28, 1560, when the province of Turonne neglected to nominate a vicar. The guardian, with the sanction of the inner council, chose Jean Guellian.

President (praeses)

Originally the president supervised divine office. In 1534, the statutes instituted four presidents, ranked first through fourth, who would work in pairs on alternate weeks. The two presidents scheduled for the week stood on

---

34 The province of France extended north and east of Paris, whereas Saint Bonaventure encompassed regions further south. It included much of modern-day Burgundy and parts of Switzerland. The province of Turonne, in contrast, stretched south and west from Paris, incorporating convents located in the cities of Tours, Provins and Angers amongst others. For the geographical boundaries of the three provinces, see Moorman, History, 161. See also H. Lemaître, "Géographie historique des établissements de l'ordre de Saint-François" in Revue d'histoire franciscaine 4 (1927): 446-514. Prior to 1502, there were no such restrictions on the provenance of the vicars. This change reflects Delphin's concern that only other Observant houses should be allowed to participate in the administration of the house. This practice continued throughout the sixteenth century.

35 Bibl. Maz. Ms. 332, f. 339. Guellian was from the province of Turonne, which suggests that the guardian of the Paris convent had no intention of contradicting the Delphine statutes. This particular case is interesting because it suggests not only that provinces were recognized as having a right to nominate the vicar, but also that they rotated the office among themselves. The guardian's selection of Guellian, a member of the provinces of Turonne, is a tacit recognition of the province's right to have a candidate for that particular year.

each side of the Choir and recorded the names of friars who were delinquent during the performance of the divine office, reporting these friars at the next Chapter meeting for public reproof. Like the vicar's, however, the president's authority extended outside the established parameters of his office. The delphine statutes say that during the president's assigned week, he was also to be recognized as a moral authority in the choir, school and the community in general.  

In the absence of vicars, the commissioner and the guardian, the president exercised authority.

**Choir**

According to the statutes, the choir was comprised at any given time of twelve priests, and all of the youths, who together were expected to perform divine office day and night.  

To a large degree, the performance of the divine offices defined the monastic role as spiritual mediator between society and God. The performance of divine office was a privilege granted by the pope to certain religious orders who were believed by virtue of their religious fervour to provide more efficacious prayer on behalf of society, thereby earning God's favour.  

---


36 Piana, ch. 4, no. 1: 81.

39 There are numerous works, particularly ones concerned with Medieval Europe, which discuss the nature and function of the divine offices. Among them are Marie-Thérèse Lorcin, *Vivre et mourir en Lyonnais à la fin du moyen âge* (Paris: C.N.R.S., 1981), and Michel Vovelle, *La Mort et*
office of chorister was considered to be extremely important, and a substantial portion of the friary's regulations was devoted to its holder's performance. The statutes of 1502 and 1533, for example, discuss in detail concerns about the dress of friars in the choir, exiting and entering the church, manner of prayer, and superfluous noise.12

**Economic Structure: the officers**

**Sacristan**

The sacristan held the highest economic office in the convent and was, therefore, one of the most important office-holders in the political structure. He was responsible for guarding and enhancing the convent's collection of liturgical vestments, and the accoutrements which had been donated by patrons over the years, and, thus, worked closely with the other financial officers, in particular the procureur,41 the receveur,42 and the ami

---


12 The office of chorister was also more demanding in an important friary like that of Paris, given that lay foundations also required priests and acolytes to perform private services in their private chapels on specified days of the year. For the statutes of 1502, see Piana, 81-87, 92-93. For the 1533 statutes, see AN LL1514.

41 The procureur worked with the syndic in arranging donations for the convent. This position, like those of the
spirituel (discussed below). The level of trust required of this post ensured that only the most respected members of the community held this office. Furthermore, unlike the guardian and vicars, the sacristan could occupy his office for an unspecified period of time. Therefore, it was more common than not for a sacristan to keep his post for a period of several years. Lucien Batteau, for one, was continuously sacristan from 1570 to 1578. Friar Masserre similarly served for a long time, from 1588 to 1593.43

Syndic (ami spirituel or amicus spiritualis)

The position of syndic was part of the compromise established by Bonaventure in the Constitutions of Narbonne porter and sacristan, does not seem to have had any term limitations, perhaps a reflection of the importance placed upon finding trustworthy friars to occupy financial posts. Friar Mathew de la Haye, for one, occupied this office for a period of several years, as did his predecessor. De la Haye's name is attached to virtually every notarial document involving convent finances during the 1580's and into the 1590's.

42 The receveur was a cleric but not a friar. Like the procureur, he was also involved in transactions involving donations to the house. This office was usually held by a secular cleric who received food, clothing, wood for fire, and an annual fee for managing the convent's financial transactions. This position also had no time limit. Perhaps the longest-running incumbent of this office was Jean Picart, a canon of the church Sainte-Opportune. He accepted this office in 1573.

43 See AN LL1511 and AN LL1515. One can trace office-holding terms through the signatures attached to the minutes, because office holders often indicated which office they held.
and restated in the regulations of 1502. A prominent member of the lay community, the syndic managed economic arrangements between the house and the outside world in order to enable the friars to lead their life of poverty. However, financial duties alone did not define this office. The spiritual friend acted as an intermediary between the house and other Paris institutions on a variety of matters, in particular pursuing legal matters in the name of the Cordeliers. The Paris Cordeliers had a succession of powerful "friends," perhaps the most illustrious being Jacques-Auguste de Thou (1588-1595), one of the presidents of the Parlement of Paris.

Hefele points out that the position of syndic was initially provided by papal bull in 1247. The underlying argument was that these secular individuals were administering the property of the Church on behalf of the friars who could not own property. Karl-Josef Hefele Histoire des Conciles d'après les documents originaux 2 (Paris: Librairie Letouzey et Ané, 1912-1952): 700. The origin and evolution of the office of spiritual friend is examined in a thesis by Marguerite-Marie Clément entitled "L'administration des biens chez les frères mineurs des origines au milieu du XVI siècle" (Ph.D. diss, Nogent-le-Rotrou, 1943). I have yet to consult the original, though a shortened version of the thesis is available at the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris. Clément argues that as early as the fourteenth century, the Franciscans sought out members of the "bourgeoisie" to hold the office of spiritual friend. Because of the debate concerning the ownership of property, the office of syndic was a controversial one. Nevertheless, it managed to survive the waves of reform sweeping the Franciscan order during the fifteenth century, becoming a fixture of Observant as well as Conventual houses by the sixteenth century. Clément, 42-44.

Other syndics included Charles de Dormans and Jean Séguier. This office is discussed in more detail in ch. 4, pp. 252-253, nt. 121.
Educational Structure

Regent master (regens)

The holder of this office supervised the entire studium. This was a prestigious position, occupied by friars who were already bachelors at the Faculty of Theology. This post was similar in its responsibilities to those of the guardian and other high offices, and the regens was expected to oversee the moral and intellectual progress of the students.

Studium

The structure of the studium in the fifteenth century as discussed by John Murphy remained largely intact throughout the sixteenth century. In brief, the studium was comprised of the "major" or "student" school, and the "minor" or "youth" school. The youth school was dedicated to the study of the classic arts programme, which provided the preparatory training necessary for friars proceeding to the study of theology. The major school was a theology school, and it produced priests who would then be sent on to the University if they were to be judged qualified.\(^4\)

\(^4\) See John Chrysostom Murphy, O.F.M. A History of the Franciscan Studium Generale at the University of Paris in the Fifteenth Century (Notre Dame: Indiana, 1965). The structure of the studium will be discussed in more detail in chapter 3. See in particular, pp. 149-154.
The Officers

The major (theology) school:

Two lecturers were chosen to give public lectures on philosophy and theology. Their term of office lasted three years, though they could be renewed.47 The lecturers were appointed by the guardian and the discretoire, along with the commissioner, and were engaged in the University cursus at the same time. A new office in the theology school as of 1583 was that of a secular master appointed to teach Greek and Hebrew.48 The studium also had a master (magister) who organized weekly theological disputations (disputationes) which were followed by repetitiones, discussions of these theological disputations.49 The master was responsible for both the intellectual and moral progress of his charges, and was directly accountable to the guardian.50 On his recommendation, for example, a student could be given permission to travel outside of the city or advance in his studies at the convent.

---

47 Beaumont-Maillet, 94-95. She is working from Bibliothèque de l'Assemblée nationale, Ms. 372, f. 397, no. 13.
48 AN LL1511 (May 26, 1583), f. 11v.
49 The disputations were attended by the bachelors, masters and students unless exempted by the guardian. Piana, ch. 43, no. 23: 115. As shall be discussed in chapter 3, the core of the Franciscan programme was Scotist theology.
50 Piana, ch. 43, no. 4-5: 111.
The youth (iuvenes) school:

The office hierarchy of this school included the master who was in charge of the school, two lecturers and a confessor. The master oversaw training in logic, grammar, physic and theology. Lectures were held every day, and involved at least one discussion of logic or physic (medicine).\textsuperscript{51} The Delphine reforms of 1502 also introduced new repetitiones during the repast,\textsuperscript{52} and the youth similarly attended weekly disputations and repetitiones. The confessor was specifically responsible for overseeing the moral progression of his charges, and it was his report, along with that of the regent, which was sent to the discretoire when the youth sought admission as a student.\textsuperscript{53}

The character of the Paris Franciscan community

The structure of offices outlined above provides some insight into the operations of the Cordeliers friary, but equally important, it articulates a conception of community which was distinctive to the Parisian friary. Specifically, it reveals a community which was as much French as it was Franciscan in origin. The Franciscan character of the community is understandably the defining feature of the Paris

\textsuperscript{51} Piana, ch. 43, no. 1: 110.

\textsuperscript{52} Piana, ch. 43, no. 21: 114.

\textsuperscript{53} Piana, ch. 1, no. 11: 78.
house. The elaborate political structure found at the Paris friary was an attempt to provide a community which was mendicant by nature with a permanent administration so that it could retain coherence as a spiritual community, even as members disappeared to different parts of the globe. The guardian and the inner council dominated the hierarchy, but exercise of executive power at a given time depended on whoever was then present in the convent. The overlapping of jurisdictions of the offices, therefore, provided a more flexible power structure which could accommodate such a transient membership. Not surprisingly, such flexibility in a structure resulted in jurisdictional conflicts from time to time. The minutes give us periodic glimpses of this, for example, in the case of Pierre L'Enfant. The minutes tell us little about the conflict, saying only that the president, L'Enfant, was recognized above the vicars as having the right to preside in the convent.\footnote{Bibl. Maz. Ms. 332 (September 26, 1561), f. 345.} Apparently the vicars had challenged his right to do so in 1561, and L'Enfant's authority was subsequently reinforced by the discretoire.

The overlapping jurisdiction of the offices also enabled the hierarchy to safeguard more closely the moral integrity of members, since every friar was subject to the jurisdiction of one or more offices. The youth, at the bottom of the structure, were the most carefully monitored. In addition to the watchful eyes of guardian, vicar and inner council, the youth were subject to the school hierar-
chy of magister and confessor. However, even the most powerful office, that of guardian, was limited by the power of the commissioner, and at least in theory, by the authority of the community in general as embodied in the Chapter.

Although the Franciscan nature of the community was its predominant feature, the local and regional character of the house became increasingly apparent over the course of the sixteenth century. The office of spiritual friend was a long-established one by the sixteenth century, but the selection of prominent members of the Parisian community as syndics embedded the Franciscan community in the fabric of Parisian, and therefore French, life. More important, however, the composition of the community was overwhelmingly French by the time of the civil wars. The friary's shift from the Conventual to the Observant branch of the order in 1517 was at least partly responsible for this development, since to ensure that only "reformed" friars were allowed access to the University, the Delphine statutes, and later those of Jean Calvi, sought to curb the autonomy of the Paris inner council. The Delphine statutes allowed for the access of all French friars to the Paris studium, but made the proviso that the three major reformed provinces of Touronne, Saint Bonaventure and France be favoured.\footnote{Piana, ch. 2: 3. Each province could send two students "de gratia" and two "de debito," whereas Touronne and Bonaventure (Burgundy) could send three of each kind. The province of France could send as many students as there were custodies (provincial administrative units).} Other French provinces slowly obtained the right to send students
to the Paris friary, but the Calvi reforms of 1543 ensured that the three great provinces retained control of the major offices.\textsuperscript{56} The vicars were to be chosen by the guardian, but could only come from these provinces. Furthermore, the guardian, the most important officer, was elected by a mixed committee which was comprised of representatives from the provinces as well as the major office holders at the Paris convent. The Delphine statutes also state that, in order to be eligible, the individual must also have lived elsewhere for the three previous years. Control over the election by the Paris friary was further limited following the convent's dispute with their minister general in 1581-1582, as we can see from the flurry of new regulations emanating from the discretoire in 1584. Theology students were not allowed to vote, for example, if the election occurred during an interruption of their studies -- even if they were living in Paris at the time.\textsuperscript{57}

The intention of this and the previous measures was to assure Observant control of the Paris studium but it was also designed to ensure that brothers lingering in Paris

\textsuperscript{56} Beaumont-Maillet, 132-135.

\textsuperscript{57} Preceding the election of 1585 we find a series of regulations in the minutes controlling who had "vocam activam," a legitimate right to vote, as well as added control over the supervision of voting. For example, brothers who had interrupted their theology studies but were still living in Paris could not vote, and the commissioner and two vicars were expected to oversee the voting process. That the discretoire should be producing these regulations is not surprising, given that presiding over the convent was Pierre Bourgogne, the minister general's commissioner. See AN LL1511 (June 2, 1584), f. 22.
could not establish a power base, thereby undermining provincial (and Roman) influence in affairs. By restricting access to the friary offices, the order was trying to prevent the emergence of an independent community in Paris. One of the consequences of this restriction, however, was to make access to the University of Paris the specific property of the French branch of the Franciscan order -- or at least of the three reformed provinces. This access was all the more jealously guarded, according to Antoine de Sérent, because access to other French universities was severely limited by the Observant order. The French character of the Paris house would have been further reinforced by the 1536 decree of Francis I which limited foreign enrollment in the studium to eighteen, thereby ensuring that the house was

---

57 Piana, ch. 44: 2. Although Delphin and Calvi do limit the power of the Paris convent, they do not altogether remove it. Delphin for one allowed the house some say over who will be allowed to hold office. He laid down that no one could seek office from the minister general or other prelates in the Paris convent, unless through mediation of guardian, commissioner or visitor and with consent of the discretoire: "... nullus possit petere a gaenerali Ministro aut aliis preelatis aliquod officium in hoc conventu, nisi medio commissarii aut guardiani et visitatoris cum consilio discretorrum." He goes on to say that those not found sufficiently skilled could be turned away.

59 Sérent points out that the Observant branch, always more suspicious of education than the Conventuals, had tried to limit access to other universities on the grounds that they were not appropriate for the reformed friars. Paris was the only one which was undeniably acceptable. Needless to say, such a decision placed added pressure on the different provinces to gain access to Paris. See Sérent, "Les statuts des quatre provinces Français des Cordeliers en 1539", 10-11.
Section II: The exercise of power

The political structure discussed in the previous section is suggestive of the complex nature of the Franciscan communal ideal. In the practical world, however, constitutions such as those of Narbonne or the Delphine statutes at best provide guidelines for political action. Not infrequently, the wielding of power seems to contradict the very ideals and values held by the institution. For this reason, it comes as a surprise to notice how conscientiously the Cordelier office-holders tried to fulfill the mandate of their offices. Despite the intrusions of the civil wars and periodic pressure from their minister general among others, the office-holders continued to hold their meetings, manage their schools, and, above all, oversee their brothers.

Matters which particularly preoccupied the discretoire

63 AN L941, no. 3, and LL1523, 353. The eighteen friars were to be composed of the following nationalities: six from Spain and Portugal, six from Italy, and six from other Franciscan provinces which were "non sujettes du Roy." The number was later increased to 24. The decree also states that the foreign friars could not leave the friary unless accompanied by a French friar: "... aux charges et conditions que lesd etrangers ne sortiront du convent, qu'ils soient accompagnez d'un religieux françois." Beaumont-Maillet argues that this limiting of foreign access signalled the consequent decline of the house as a great teaching institution. However, this decline was not yet apparent during the sixteenth century. A more immediate and visible effect of the reforms was the transformation of the character of the Paris house from a cosmopolitan, international institution into one which serviced the needs of the French Franciscan brotherhood. Beaumont-Maillet, 92.
during this period centred on governance of the studium, preaching, and adherence to the Franciscan code of communal conduct. Although each issue, each case, which appeared before the council was managed as a separate affair, it is clear that the determining factor in its decision-making was concern about creating effective spiritual leaders and, equally important, a unified community. These conceptions could not be separated from one another, since to be a good Franciscan was to be a humble servant of the order. The wielding of power within a Franciscan community, therefore, was understood to be implicitly as well as explicitly a force for moral reformation and rejuvenation.

The sociologist W.G. Runciman defines power as the "capacity of persons to affect through either inducements or sanctions what is thought, felt, said or done by other persons." Of the three types of power he identifies, two were particularly important in the creation of the moral community of the Paris Cordeliers: coercive and ideological,

---

61 W.G. Runciman, *A Treatise on Social Theory* 2 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983): 11-13. Power of course is an extensively studied field, and it is impossible not to recognize the contribution of individuals like Foucault and Althazar among others. Foucault's conception of power as an ambivalent force was particularly influential in the shaping of the thesis of this chapter. For the purposes of this investigation, however, I have found Runciman's approach to the study of power particularly useful. Runciman's two-volume monograph on social theory conceives of society as a set of power relations, hence his interest in the organization and exercise of power within society. In addition to providing a model of power relations which can be adapted to different social structures, Runciman is sensitive to the impact of the individual personality within a given power structure.
with the latter referring to modes of persuasion that play on the values, ideals, the emotions of an individual. Both can use fear, playing upon the psyche and the intellect, as well as the corporal self, through fear of eternal damnation, or of the betrayal of one's convictions, as well as the fear of physical pain and discomfort.

The interdependence of these forms of power is one of the striking characteristics to emerge from the discretoire minutes. Ideological power was used, first and foremost, to ensure the systematic inculcation of Franciscan values in members of the Cordelier community. This training process began during the novitiate, when core Franciscan texts such as the Rules of Saint Francis and the writings of Bonaventure were absorbed by the new member. The novice friar thus adopted a distinct set of values which marked his inclusion in an exclusive community, and which consequently

---

62 Runciman's definition will serve as a starting point for a discussion of forms of power. Runciman identifies three types: economic, ideological and coercive. Economic power concerns access to, and control of, means of production; ideological, access to means of persuasion; coercive, the employment of methods of coercion. Economic power will not be discussed in this chapter because it was less relevant to the creation of a Franciscan community than coercive and ideological power. Nevertheless, economic power was used periodically in a coercive manner, in particular, to threaten students unable to pay their fees with removal from the house. The prestigious reputation of the Paris studium made this a powerful threat, and it is to be expected that fear of removal played some role in maintaining a certain type of community. Runciman, *Treatise*, 12-13.

63 Hilarin de Lucerne, *Histoire des études dans l'ordre de Saint François depuis sa fondation jusque vers la moitié du XIIe siècle...* (Paris: Picard, 1908). Trans. from German by Eusèbe de Bar-le-Duc. The education of the friars is discussed more fully in chapter 3.
came to govern his behaviour. Throughout his career, the friar was reminded of the Franciscan ideal through both word and deed. The structured life of the friar, defined as it was by praying and eating together, sleeping in the same dormitory, as well as the wearing of a specified habit, provided daily reminders of the distinctiveness of the Cordeliers community. Weekly lectures on theology and philosophy further reinforced essential Franciscan dogma by reminding friars of their special mission as spiritual leaders.

Offering further inspiration to adhere to the Franciscan ideal on a daily basis was the communal recognition of role models. The role model was an outstanding mendicant, an individual who embodied the Franciscan ideal, exceeding even the expectations of the community. Characteristics which typically aroused praise centred on a friar’s zeal against heresy, his profound spirituality, and his insensitivity to bodily suffering in the service of God. We see this recognition of role models in the obituaries and epitaphs of members of the order. Former guardian Denis Rollot is described in 1620 as a "fameux predicateur de son temps, le fleau des heretiques." Another guardian, Simon de Porta, is lauded for his fervent preaching in the diocese of a bishop who had

---

64 Molinier, *Obituaires de Sens*, 3, 303. May 15, 1620. Rollot, member of the convent of Rheims, obtained his doctorate in 1571. He was guardian of the Paris convent from 1578 to 1581, and provincial minister as well as commissioner general for the province of Saint Bonaventure in 1582. He was buried in Rheims.
turned Calvinist. That guardians in particular were singled out for praise is not surprising. Although one does find ordinary friars and lay friars recognized for their piety, the higher office-holders were more frequently celebrated because they were perceived to embody the twin Bonaventurean ideals of knowledge and spirituality as well as their moral capacity.

One could take this imposition of a hierarchy within the Franciscan ideal one step further by arguing that the office system itself represented the institutionalization of role-modelling, since promotion into office was dependent upon the intellectual and moral capacity of the friar. Office-holders were expected to embody the ideals which they were enforcing through their office. We see this understanding of the relationship between office and morality in the council minutes, which refer to friars found

---

65 Molinier, Obituaires de Sens, 3, 298. Simon de Porta became a doctor of theology in 1557. Subsequent to that he was guardian of the convent of Troyes in 1560, 1561, 1567, 1570, 1574. He became minister general in 1564, and custode in 1567. He died in 1575, still preaching.

66 The few references to ordinary friars which I have found in the obituaries used in this study are usually of friars who died before fulfilling their promise. For example, the friar Jean Veneil, a native of the town of Chartres, is described as a "religieux fort et paisible." He died at the young age of sixteen in 1533 before he could go to study in Paris. "Nécréloge des Frères mineurs d'Auxerre" in Archivum franciscanum historicum 3 (1910): 544. I have found references to the spirituality of particular lay friars in the seventeenth century, one example being Philippe Baranger. A professed friar of Laon in the province of Picardy, he is described as "religieux fort laborieux" in his obituary entry dated 1673. "Nécréloge", 548. Unfortunately, I have no such references from the late sixteenth century.
worthy for office or the theology cursus, as "probus," a term which refers to the moral character as well as the intellectual capacities of the friar.

To a large extent, coercive power was contingent on ideological power. In particular, it represented the failure of ideological power to control and direct member behaviour. Erring friars, once their misbehaviour was discovered, were labelled "wicked" and "scandalous" by the hierarchy rather than "probus," and were treated to a potpourri of punishments which varied in severity, and in number, depending on the nature of their crime. Dining separately in the refectory on bread and water, imprisonment, deprivation of office, and even expulsion were a few of the more common options meted out by the discretoire.

Though coercive power was itself a response to the failure of ideological power, it was nevertheless informed by ideological power. The function of coercive power was didactic rather than simply punitive, since punishment was merely the means to achieve the reformation of the erring friar and to warn other members of the community. By

---

67 Runciman argues that the use of coercive power requires a political structure premised upon the acceptance of command and obedience within a society. For Franciscans, obedience was one of the central tenets of the Rule. Complete obedience was originally owed to the guardian and other prelates, though it was expanded later on to a recognition of the authority of the office structure more generally. Those who did not obey were forced to conform.

68 Benedict Unisse, for example, was called rebellious. LL1515 (July 5, 1567), f. 15.
singling out individual members for condemnation, the convent was reminding members of the community about what behaviour and what values were unacceptable. In consequence, coercive authority was also a restorative force, an agent of spiritual healing. Fear of physical suffering and expulsion served to bolster the friar's attachment to the Franciscan ethos and to reintegrate errant brethren into the communal fold.

Given that the Paris friary was determined to produce excellent spiritual leaders, it is hardly surprising to find the guardian and inner council particularly preoccupied by two issues: preaching, and social control.

1) Preaching

The Cordeliers took their reputation as preachers very seriously, which is not surprising because they were in great demand. Their popularity was such that, especially during the holy seasons of Lent and Advent, the Paris Cordeliers could be found preaching not only in pulpits across France but in the Netherlands and in other receptive territories.⁶⁵ The renown of the convent was dependent on

⁶⁵ AN LL1515 (April 17, 1574), f. 65. No fewer than five of the convent's most important preachers are recorded as preaching in various Paris churches during Advent in 1574. The discretoire says that the guardian was to preach at St André-des-Arts, Father Faniere in the Church of Saint-Barthélemy, Jacques Berson at the Church Saint-Jacques (probably Saint-Jacques-de-la-Boucherie), Chessé at the Church of Saint-Paul, and Father de Arnco at the church of Saint-Michel. Of course, many friars were travelling outside Paris as well to preach -- hence the inner council's insistence that friars bring back a letter testifying to the
its connection to the University and the convent was therefore conscientious about ensuring that applicants for the few designated positions were capable. For this reason, much of the house business revolved around the appointment of lecturers, the gathering of money from students and the youth, and the examination of students ready for the theology cursus at the University -- all in an effort to prepare skilled preachers.

Because of the importance placed upon learning, the community had few qualms about removing unsatisfactory students from the studium or refusing to endorse a friar's candidacy for the theology cursus. The convent was even willing to pass over candidates proposed by the minister general, though this was not a frequent occurrence. Reasons for the rejection of a candidate were usually vague. Occasionally, they are described as insufficiently trained, though more typical is a case like that of Philibert Marron, who was not admitted in 1568 "pro causis certis." At times the minutes have a more acerbic edge to their denunciations. Christophe Blaiseau was singled out as a friar of dubious morality. The minutes are silent as to the details of his misbehaviour, though they state cryptically that his vice was well known to members.⁷²

orthodoxy of their sermons. This will be discussed later in this chapter.

⁷⁶ AN LL1515 (July 24, 1568), f. 30.

⁷¹ An LL1515 (August 23, 1567), ff. 18v-19. Blaiseau appears again in the records of the convent in 1588 as the guardian of the convent of Troyes. AN LL1524, f. 86.
The case of Blaiseau reveals that moral character weighed as heavily as learning in the inner council's evaluation of a student. It was on the basis of moral character as well as learning that brothers could advance from student to the Faculty of Theology, and consequently into the convent hierarchy. Students and priests alike were expected to produce letters from their guardian and/or provincial minister upon arriving at the Paris studium. These letters of "obedience" identified its bearer as a member of a particular Franciscan community, and authorized his stay at another convent for a period of time. The student was forced then to undergo an examination from the discretoire of the Paris community before he was accepted. Furthermore, students were subject to periodic evaluations by their teachers throughout their stay in the house. These evaluations played an important role in determining the academic as well as political future of the aspiring preachers.

Upon entering the theology cursus, friars still had to face certain restrictions with respect to preaching. A ruling of October 1566 decreed that only students in their second year or later in the theology curriculum could leave

---

72 Virtually every meeting of the discretoire witnessed a friar presenting his letter of "obedience." Most of the time it was accepted, though there were exceptions. Two friars were returned to their province in 1566 because the diffinitors (provincial chapter representatives) of their province had not signed their letters. AN LL1515 (November 15, 1566), f. 6.
the friary to preach, and only if judged worthy. Before going to preach, the friar also required a letter of obedience from the Paris guardian in order to be received at the church. Without it, he would be turned away by the resident priest. Similarly, the friar was expected to return to the convent bearing a letter from the cleric attesting to the worthy nature of his preaching.

These precautions -- good training, constant supervision and frequent evaluation -- were considered essential for the creation of effective preachers and, from all appearances, the discretoire monitored the behaviour of the preachers closely. Suspicions of dangerous, careless or unlicensed preaching, for example, were immediately investigated according to the council minutes.

Though few friars seem to have been found culpable of these charges, warnings are consistently issued to the charged friars to be more careful. Furthermore, the repeated declarations of the discretoire against unlicensed preaching suggest that the council was not completely confident in its ability to control the views of its members. Following the "unlicensed" preaching of the friars Coret and Perdreau in May 1583, for example, the friary once again warned its members returning after Advent and Lent that they would only be received if they brought the necessary testimonials of

---

72 AN LL1515 (October 15, 1566), ff. 3-3v. Doctors of theology were also supposed to be appraised by their community, though there is no evidence in the minutes of such individuals being rejected for incapacity.
their sound conversation.74

2) Unity and Social Control

A concern of equal importance to preaching was that of house unity. The community went to great lengths to instill Franciscan values in its members and to develop within them a shared sense of belonging. Brothers were repeatedly warned in the regulations and minutes to eat and sleep together as a community as well as to be respectful of one another.75

Concern about obedience to the inner council in particular surfaces with such regularity in these sources that the documents seem to pulsate with anxiety. This anxiety was probably not misplaced, since the Franciscan ideal was more than a little ambiguous about the nature of fraternal obedience. Francis demanded that the friar renounce himself "body and soul" to the superiors of his

74 "Ordinatum quoque est ut post hac non recipientur amplius patris reverentis a praedicationibus adventualibus et quadragesimalibus nisi adferant testimonium suae conversationis a gardiano conventus in quorum sermonis praedicaverunt atque fidem faciunt literae tales de consensu gardianorum et provinciae conventus discretorum." Perdrea and Coret, who were accused in 1583 of preaching "against the peace of the province and against the statutes of the Paris convent" during a visit to the province of Turonne, were harshly punished according to the minutes. See AN LL1511 (May 2, 1583), f. 11.

75 Several sections of the Delphine statutes are concerned with living as a community. For example, chapters 22 and 23 discuss eating in the refectory. Friars were forbidden to eat separately from the community unless they had permission from the guardian. Chapters 24 and 25 provide explicit instructions on a friar's behaviour in the dormitory. Once again, friars were forbidden to sleep outside the dormitory.
order, in particular the guardian, because absolute humility before the will of God was a prerequisite of salvation. As discussed in chapter 1, however, Francis was equally convinced that that pursuit of divine truth was an internal, personal journey, and individual conscience ultimately had precedence over all other authorities. This emphasis upon the individual conscience meant that friars were encouraged to disobey superiors who were compromising their spiritual relationship with God. Implicit in Francis' conception of an ideal spiritual community, therefore, was a tension between obedience and independence, and correspondingly, tension between the individual conscience and that of the larger Franciscan community. 6

This tension was never adequately resolved by subsequent Franciscan thinkers, Bonaventure among them, and the language of disunity which pervades the inner council minutes shows that the same tension also permeated the Paris Cordeliers community. The frequent use of such terms as "dissension," "disobedience" and "rebelliousness" to refer to Franciscan behaviour reveals a deep-seated fear, at least among the office-holders, that the fellowship of their

6 See section 3 "on perfect and imperfect obedience" in "The Counsels of the Holy Father Saint Francis," St. Francis of Assisi, 170. Duncan Nimmo argues that Francis was insisting on the inherent supremacy of the will of God over ecclesiastical authority in particular. The role of the friar was to fulfill the will of God. In certain situations, the perfect obedience to the will of God required by Francis would "engender a freedom of action practically without limit." Duncan Nimmo, Reform and Division in the Franciscan Order 1226-1538 (Rome: Capuchin Historical Institute, 1987), 36.
community was constantly under attack. Behaviour considered anti-communal and anti-social varied considerably, from eating independently from the community, to sexual misconduct, to theft. At its core, however, such behaviour was perceived to be divisive because it separated the individual from the community, and therefore threatened the community itself. Among the more threatening types of behaviour were transience, mendicancy, apostasy, and sedition.

Transience

The Paris community by its very nature was a transient one. A preeminent Franciscan theology school, the Paris house was composed largely of members who came from other convents and who were expected to return to these convents following their studies. Their stay in Paris was intentionally temporary, even though many remained for several years. Such a transient membership jeopardized house unity given that many of the Paris Cordeliers owed allegiance to another Franciscan community in addition to that of Paris. In order to avoid potential conflict, Gilles Delphin insisted that students while at the Paris convent be subjected to its authority. Should the friar's

77 Piana discusses this same issue in the introduction to his edition of the Delphine statutes. According to Piana, the order was concerned about formulating regulations which would adequately manage the diversity within the house, "... dove affluivano studenti appartenenti a provincie e nazioni diverse, ciascuno con una propria mentalità e con proprie abitudini." "Gli statuti", 43.
provincial guardian want him to return to the house before his time was finished, even for a brief visit, he had to make a formal application to the Paris guardian. Further laying the groundwork for corporate identity, the friar was forced to adopt the Paris habit, thereby marking his membership in the Paris community. 76

Despite efforts to ensure that the community was a united one, conflict between the twin pulls of province and Paris flared periodically. Such conflict usually took two forms: friars unwilling to return home, and access to the Paris house. The case of Jean Le Cornoystier is an example of a friar unwilling to return home. According to the minutes of 21 August, 1567, Le Cornoystier was called by his province to preach during Advent. Upon his return he requested that a substitute replace him in subsequent years since he was too busy with his duties as the vicar of the youth to leave the convent. 77 Unfortunately, we do not know how the discretoire responded to this request, but clearly Le Cornoystier was not alone in preferring to remain in Paris. The repeated insistence in the inner council minutes that friars return to their provinces immediately after finishing their studies suggests that many may have been tempted to stay indefinitely in the rarified academic

76 The Franciscan habit was grey, a symbolic rejection of colour and therefore of the profane life. However each community altered their habit to mark them as a member of that particular convent. The type of habit worn at Paris is outlined in ch. 28 of the Delphine statutes. See Piana, "Gli statuti", 97-98.

77 AN LL1515 (August 21, 1567), f. 17v.
atmosphere of Paris."

Cases of friars playing off their respective loyalties were quite rare. The minutes of July 5, 1561 record a dispute involving the friar Volant, who questioned the jurisdiction of the Paris guardian. Volant claimed that his obedience was first owed to the Province of Touronne. Although the minutes give little information, this dispute concerns Volant's petition to enter the Faculty of Theology at the University of Paris. It would appear that the Paris convent had rejected him as a candidate, and he was seeking redress by calling upon his membership in another province."

Volant's assertion of his obedience to another provincial jurisdiction is unusual, given that most friars deliberately associated themselves with the Paris community because of its prestige. And yet, it was a desire to be associated with the Paris Cordeliers which fuelled Volant's claim. Volant was using his dual status to remain a member

66 The Delphine statutes similarly insist that friars return home under threat of being labelled apostates: "Ordinat Rmus Pater quod nullus, adepto gradu magisterii et termino regentiae suae completo, in studio Parisiensi et conventu nec in aliquo collegio aut alio loco in villa ... sub apostasiae et carceris commorari audeat." However, an exception was made for a friar "quem Ordo scientia et doctrina aut lectura celebrior fieret." The premium placed upon intellectual abilities explains why many of the most important Franciscan thinkers and preachers during the sixteenth century spent most of their time at Paris even after finishing their studies. Piana, "Gli statuti," ch. 34, 104.

81 Bibl. Maz. Ms. 332, f. 332. From a later account it is clear that Volant did finally obtain entrance into the Faculty of Theology.
of the Paris convent. To study at the Paris community was clearly a mark of honour, so much so that the provincial obituaries routinely note any connection with the great convent. Friar Louis Hébert of the convent of Meaux is referred to as the "fameux docteur de Paris," in addition to being confessor to Henry III.\(^2\) Other "celebrated" Paris doctors were Hilaire Coquy, Hugues de Bray, Guillaume Fournier (d. 1580) and the former Paris guardian, Denis Rollot (d. 1620).\(^3\) Not only doctors were linked to the Paris community. The obituaries of the friars Gandart and Sébastien d'Avron mention that they were students at the theology school in Paris,\(^4\) and Friar Vernillat who died in August 1587 was in his second year of study at the youth school.\(^5\) Clearly association with the Paris school was remarked upon because it shed reflected glamour on to the provincial convent as well, and was, therefore, valued by both friar and convent.

\(^2\) Hébert died on March 12, 1580. In addition to being a royal confessor, Hébert was also named bishop of Meaux by the duke of Nevers. See Molinier, *Obituaires de Sens*, 3, 297.

\(^3\) Molinier, *Obituaires de Sens*, 3, 303.

\(^4\) Molinier, *Obituaires*, 3, 317. He died on July 25, 1587. Gandarit came from Provins, and died while returning to his studies. Friar Sébastien d'Avron's death by plague on August 25, 1562 is noted in his convent's obituary, as is the fact that he had been studying in the Paris theology school.

\(^5\) Molinier, *Obituaires de Sens*, 3, 315. Claude Vernillat is noted as a native of Auxerre.
Mendicancy

Despite a tendency towards enclosure, the friars were frequently on the road. The minutes record the friars collecting alms and working among the sick as well as preaching. Mendicancy was a necessary part of the Franciscan life, but it was also considered a potential threat to the unity of the house. Too much wandering could undermine the effective internal administration of the house by draining it of much-needed manpower. Preaching at Lent and Advent, and the periodic outbreaks of plague in the city were two regular occurrences which saw friars leaving the house in large numbers. A flexible power structure was one way of ensuring that the administration carried on in the absence of some members, but the inner council in 1562 also felt it necessary to decree that at least fifty priests must stay within the community at any given time to perform divine service and the convent's sacramental duties.96

Mendicancy was also considered a threat to house unity because the friar, once outside the convent door, could not be easily monitored. This fear surfaces frequently in the minutes. Concern about where a friar slept is a constant refrain in the examinations of the discrétoire, as is the mention of the door by which the friars left and re-entered. In 1566 two friars, fathers Bourgeois and de Crure, reportedly slept in the town and returned by the church door

96 Bibl. Maz. Ms. 332 (August 8, 1562), ff. 350v-351.
rather than by the main entrance to the convent which was monitored by the porter. The discretoire declared that they were to admit publicly where they slept, as well as by which door they returned.\textsuperscript{87} Similarly, the friars Amadeus Gay and Marc Hamel left the convent on the feast of Saint Stephen to go to a funeral. They returned late, also by means of the church door.\textsuperscript{88}

One can sense the underlying perturbation of the Franciscan hierarchy about brothers who escaped their surveillance, even for one night. Much of this fear stemmed from often well-founded scepticism about a friar's strength to resist temptation. The city was as a Babylon, a den of iniquity which drew men into its web of vice. Not surprisingly, most examples of wandering misbehaviour were associated with accusations of incontinence, sexual and otherwise. There are many examples of this association. In 1567, two priests went to the town of Saint-Marcel and were accused of doing "wicked things" there.\textsuperscript{89} Thomas Gillelus was seen in the suburbs of Paris in 1571, dressed in secular habit, and dissolute in behaviour.\textsuperscript{90} There are also two cases of friars in 1566 being sent to seek wine as alms and returning empty-handed, even though witnesses testified that they had indeed collected the wine. One of them was De Crure, who had been

\textsuperscript{87} AN LL1515 (Oct 15, 1566) f. 3.
\textsuperscript{88} AN LL1515 (December 9, 1562), f. 355.
\textsuperscript{89} AN LL1515 (August 5, 1567), f. 16v.
\textsuperscript{90} AN LL1515 (July 10, 1571), f. 51.
in trouble just a month earlier for leaving the convent without permission.\textsuperscript{91}

The Franciscan order tried to reduce the threat posed by the mendicant life in a variety of ways. To leave the convent, friars required the permission of the guardian in writing which they then presented as their identification on their travels. No friar could leave, or be admitted, without such letters. Furthermore, a friar could only leave, and one would assume reenter, the convent by the main door [per portam consuetam].\textsuperscript{92}

Travelling was also limited, at least in theory, to those of good character. Not surprisingly, those who travelled most frequently were the senior office-holders, and the guardian above all. We know, however, that many others were permitted to travel as well. Students, for example, were expected to spend the summer months in their own convent, and were on the road at least two times a year. Family matters could draw out other friars.\textsuperscript{93} Since travel was a part of mendicant life, even for the newer members, house statutes insisted that brothers not travel alone. Each friar

\textsuperscript{91} "Antonius de Crure qui etiam missus fuerat ad vinam colligendem tempore vindemarium, ad oppida de Juvisy et Savigni: i[n] duo dolia ././ deux muys, fuerent illi data: Supranominatus de Crure nec vasa nec vinum ordinavit ac curavit reverti, immo delatus fuit ad discretorium ...." AN LL1515 (November 26, 1565), f. 8. Both of these cases are recorded on the same day. The other friar was André Chaperon.

\textsuperscript{92} Piana, "Gli statuti," ch. 30, no. 2: 101.

\textsuperscript{93} Funerals were a common reason given for travel, as in the case of Amadée Gay and Marc Hamel. See above.
had a socius, a companion, to ensure the other's good behaviour.\textsuperscript{94} Friars were also expected to stay at other friaries on their travels, even if these houses belonged to different orders, to ensure that their independence in secular society was constrained.\textsuperscript{95}

Despite these precautions, misbehaviour did occur as we can see from the examples mentioned above. The Delphine statutes imposed a punishment of incarceration and bread and water on friars who left without permission.\textsuperscript{96} However, cases which involved accusations of particularly scandalous behaviour were treated far more harshly by the discretoire. The two priests who went to Saint-Marcel were flagellated and then expelled, and a student charged with misbehaving in the city of Paris in 1575 was similarly thrown out of the Paris convent.\textsuperscript{97} The minutes of Nov 17, 1581 also mention the harsh disciplining of Jacob Hocart, who left during the

\begin{itemize}
\item The socius had to be of good character, of course, but as an added precaution, the Delphine statutes advised changing companions frequently. Ch. 30, no. 4 states: "Varietur socii eorum...." Piana, 102.
\item However, the order was never comfortable with friars visiting or staying with other religious houses. The Delphine statutes insist that they could only do so "in causa necessitatis" and only if they could demonstrate this to the superior of the house when they arrived, and if they obtained written permission. Piana, ch. 30, no. 6: 102.
\item "Qui vero in aliquo istorum deprehensus fuerit, incarceretur in pane et aqua sine misericordia." Piana, ch. 30, no. 5: 102.
\item AN LL1515 (January 24, 1575), f. 71v. This student was later dispensed from this expulsion by the minister general, so that he could finish his studies there. Evidently he was a strong student -- or well-connected.
\end{itemize}
feast of All Saints, even though he had been denied permission to do so. A search of his room produced a falsified letter of obedience in the name of the guardian which was found concealed in his bed.\textsuperscript{98}

\textbf{Apostasy}

Fear of the wandering friar stemmed from a fear of incontinence, but perhaps a more pressing fear was that of losing members. Brothers who sinned and returned could be reformed, but those who chose not to return were another matter. Letting friars out the door entailed the possibility that they would never return. The loss of members was a legitimate fear. Over the course of the forty years covered in this study, many brothers attempted to leave or succeeded in leaving the convent.\textsuperscript{99} In fact 1568 must have been an especially stressful year for the house because no less than three friars were accused of apostasy: the friars Lubin, Joly and Tranchant.\textsuperscript{100}

\textsuperscript{98} AN LL1511, f. 4.

\textsuperscript{99} I have found at least twenty-three instances of friars referred to as apostates or threatened with being labelled one. In each case, the friar had left the friary without permission, and was seemingly unwilling to return. In 1561, the minutes denounce brother de Monter as an apostate. Bibl. Maz. Ms. 332 (April 24, 1561), ff. 341-342.

\textsuperscript{100} See AN LL1515 for Tranchant and Joly. Egidius (Gilles) Tranchant was mentioned on October 23, 1568, f. 34; Joly on July 24, 1568 (f. 30). The minutes do not mention when either individual left, though they do mention that they have returned. Friar Josse Lubin escaped to Saint-Germain and was similarly called an apostate. LL1515 (May 22, 1568), ff. 26-27v.
Why brothers chose to leave the convent is not always clear. The minutes are usually silent concerning this matter, though the discretoire members were clearly curious about the causes of such discontent. In each case, the returned apostate was questioned as to his reasons for leaving.¹⁰¹ Christopher Harper-Bill suggests that most brothers who fled did not really want to leave the order and soon returned.¹⁰² They may have wanted to flee impending punishment, he argues, and rashly decided to leave. This explanation may account for a number of the cases in Paris, but not all of them. Though many of the Paris apostates did ultimately return, a sizeable portion of friars who fled the community did so to leave the religious world altogether, while others are known to have joined other religious communities. Of the friars who joined other religious communities during this period, one became a Carthusian,¹⁰³ and another briefly became a Protestant.¹⁰⁴ Friar Lubin, who left the

¹⁰¹ According to the minutes, Joly was to be interrogated while in prison, and then appropriate penance would be assigned. This suggests that Joly's answer would have some bearing on the type of penance issued.


¹⁰³ Father Louis Anquert apparently had a letter from the pope which allowed him to leave the order and join the Carthusians. AN LL1515 (August 23, 1567) f. 18v. His departure would not have raised resistance from the Franciscan community, since canon law permitted clerics to leave their own order for a more rigorous one.

¹⁰⁴ The Cordelier who became Protestant in 1603 was a man named Boucher, who was "fort ignorant" according to
house sometime prior to May 1568, was found acting as cantor in the great Benedictine Church in Paris, Saint-Germain-des-Prés.\(^{105}\) The apostasy of Pierre Deschamps was a particularly irritating loss for the Paris Cordeliers. In 1565 he left the Paris house without permission. A few years later news arrived that he had joined the Capuchins in Rome, a far more rigorous branch of the Franciscans, and enemies of the Observants in particular. By 1574, he was back in Paris, trying to establish a Capuchin community.\(^{106}\)

The fear which apostasy aroused among Franciscans is not really surprising because it involved a rejection of the order, and in a very public fashion. The apostate was breaking a secondary vow which was considered binding until


\(^{105}\) The account of this incident is unusually detailed. Two members of the discretoire were sent to talk to the dean of Saint-Germain and told him Lubin was an apostate and excommunicated. They also threatened to go to the Parlement of Paris if he was not returned to them. AN Ll1515 (May 29, 1568), f. 27.

\(^{106}\) BN fr 25044. Philippe de Paris, "Chronologie historique de ce qui s'est passé de plus considérable dans la province de Paris depuis lan 1574 jusques a lannée commencement de la Reforme des peres Capucins en France" (1635), ff. 3-4. Deschamps' arrival in Paris in 1568 to help establish a Capuchin house must have been particularly galling for the Cordeliers, a fact born out by the verbal abuse he suffered upon his arrival. Another friar who joined the Capuchins was Noël Taillepied, one of the most prominent Franciscan authors during the last decades of the sixteenth century. He joined the order on October 2, 1587. See Pierre Moracchini, "Noël Taillepied: Franciscain et controversiste" in *I Francescani in Europa tra Riforma e Controriforma* (Perugia: Università degli studi di Perugia, 1987): 130. Atti del XIII convegno internazionale Assisi, 17-19 ottobre 1985.
death. Saint Benedict himself referred to apostates as the worst kind of monk, and the papacy from early on gave its full authority to tracking them down.  

Discussions about apostasy were understandably a regular feature of the general chapter sessions of the order as we can see from the statutes of 1571 and 1587. The general chapter of 1571 forbade convents from accepting friars without permission from other provinces, and instead ordered them to send such friars back to their native provinces. The statutes of 1587 concentrated rather on the form of punishment meted out for apostasy, setting different punishments for first, second, and third-time offenders.

Punishment was much greater for those who did not return quickly. At best the friar would find himself incarcerated and flagellated, as well as shut out of office. This was the experience of both Joly and Tranchant upon their return quickly. At best the friar would find himself incarcerated and flagellated, as well as shut out of office. This was the experience of both Joly and Tranchant upon their

107 Harper-Bill, 10. The papal bull Ne religiosi made by Gregory IX ordered convents to seek out fugitive brethren once a year, and subsequent popes renewed their support for this decree. This decree was issued in the thirteenth century but was still recognized in the sixteenth century.


return to the Paris house. All friars who left without permission, furthermore, had to be reeducated (edocti et enutriti) according to the general chapter statutes of 1587. The friar who never returned risked excommunication and even execution, since apostasy was punishable in the secular courts. However, there is only one reference in the minutes to a friar executed for apostasy. In fact, in virtually every case involving the Paris house, the returning apostate was absolved by the friary's government. Brother Michel da Ramanchos from the province of Toledo, for example, had clearly been away from the order for a long time long enough to be officially proclaimed an apostate. Nevertheless, he was received by the Paris Cordeliers and absolved of apostasy.

Joly's punishment is discussed on August 14, 1568 in the minutes. AN LL1515, f. 30.

Apostasy was considered a secular matter as well as an ecclesiastical one, and the Parisian religious communities frequently turned to the courts of the Châtelet and the Parlement to hunt down missing friars. The Paris friary was no different. On at least three occasions, the minutes mention seeking the aid of the Parlement of Paris to track down missing brothers. Fathers Le Dreux in 1569 (f. 42v), Peshot in 1577 (f. 86v) and Renaud and Capard in 1578 (f. 84v). AN LL1515.

The minutes mention a youth named Lendorin, who was allowed to be buried in their cemetery because he had been purified of his apostasy by fire. AN LL1515 (May 29, 1568), f. 25. Unfortunately, the minutes do not mention how he came to be executed nor by which secular judicial authority. Religious institutions did not have the authority to order and carry out executions, even of their own members.

The minutes note that he arrived in secular habit, but was given a Franciscan one from the house. Bibl. Maz. 332 (December 12, 1562), f. 355.
Such leniency suggests that the Franciscan order was more worried about finding its members than enforcing the stringencies of its statutes. Even with the cooperation of secular jurisdictions, it was not easy to track down friars who had left, let alone to make them return. This problem was intensified by the internecine conflict of late sixteenth-century France. Friars travelled in secular clothes because of the troubles, according to the minutes of July 14, 1562. However, suspicions were also voiced in the same entry that too many friars were living "in civitate," and furthermore, that many individuals in secular clothing were, in fact, friars. A particularly colourful example of the association made between immorality, wandering, and secular clothing is that of Michel Pechot, who was reportedly discovered bearing arms, dressed in secular clothing and keeping company with women. Not surprisingly, he was considered a scandal to his house.

Repeated emphasis on friars going out in secular clothing reflected a growing fear during this period that the number of apostates was on the rise and, furthermore, that the friary felt powerless to control it. Adopting secular habit was a pragmatic response to a dangerous

114 Bibl. Maz. Ms. 332 (July 14, 1562), f. 349.

115 LL1515, (July 14, 1562), f. 349. Another friar caught in disturbing circumstances was father Bougeris, who was spied in secular habit on the sabbath in July in the suburbs of Saint-Jacques. AN LL1515 (July 10, 1577), f. 51.

116 AN LL 1515 (July 10, 1571), f. 51. The council decided that he should come to the Chapter for disciplining, and then return to his own province.
situation but, in consequence, it allowed the friar the possibility of acting out other roles because he would not necessarily be recognized as a Franciscan. It helped friars evade danger from secular society, but it could also help them evade detection by their own order. The willingness of secular jurisdictions to aid the pursuit of the escaping friar may have stemmed from a similar uneasiness about a friar out of habit.117 A friar out of habit was a friar outside his understood role in society, and therefore an unknown quantity, in the same way that women dressing as men were regarded with suspicion and as potentially anti-social.118

117 The religious orders were reliant on secular judicial and policing institutions to track down apostates because they lacked the power to do so. From all appearances, secular institutions were usually cooperative. Patent letters from August 20, 1532 ordered all judges to arrest apostates "lesquels en seront requis par les provinciaux et autres superieurs." LL1523, 349. This commitment to the pursuit of apostates was reiterated by an ordinance from the court of Châtelet in 1595, which states that the court would do so at the request of the guardian of the Paris friary: " ... par lequel il est ordonné que les apostats et vagabonds seront arrestez a la requeste de Mons. le procureur du roy par les commissaires des quartiers et conduits au couvent pour estre punis." AN LL1523, 349. As the friary minutes show, the Paris Cordeliers frequently turned to secular institutions to find errant brethren.

118 According to Vern and Bonnie Bullough, medieval and early modern European societies distrusted female cross-dressing because it enabled a woman to escape her subservient role within society. Clothing was one way to mark differences between the sexes. A female wearing men's clothing was suspected of trying to adopt the role of a superior sex, a form of fraud. Vern L. Bullough and Bonnie Bullough, Cross Dressing, Sex, and Gender (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1993): 50-51. Clerics in secular clothing were similarly seeking to escape the social boundaries imposed upon them by their chosen profession.
Heresy and sedition

Heresy and sedition were threatening to the community for an obvious reason: they challenged the existing order. Heresy questioned Catholic theology, and it was concern about unorthodox ideas which led the Franciscan order, and the Paris convent in particular, to insist on the regular scrutinizing of the preachers. As mentioned earlier, friars preaching outside the community required a letter from the prelate or priest of the other church attesting to the orthodoxy of his sermon before returning to his own convent. Perhaps it is because of this regular scrutinizing that we find few examples of perceived heresy among the Franciscan membership. There are no references to outright heresy in the minutes. More common are accusations of blasphemy, such as those made against a student, friar Boullon, in 1575, \(^{119}\) and against three youths in 1583. \(^{120}\) Also implying some deviation from orthodoxy is the description of "erring." A magister in the theology school, Quentin Boutier, was told in 1581 to "free himself from errors" in front of his students, if he wanted to be renewed in his office. \(^{121}\) Accusations of blasphemy and doctrinal error clearly disturbed the discretoire but, interestingly enough, punishment for ac-
sations of erring were often relatively light. The offending individual was given the opportunity to modify or clarify his statements before any punishment was laid, and from what evidence we have, it seems that most individuals managed to evade further punishment.

Sedition, in contrast, was not so favourably treated. The term "sedition" is one of the buzzwords of sixteenth-century France as every seiziémitiste knows. It is hard to find a pamphlet, treatise, chronicle or sermon from the period of the religious wars that is not liberally sprinkled with this term. Much as in these writings, the members of the discretoire applied the term "seditious" to behaviour which seemed to directly threaten the order and stability of the community, and thus it was often used in conjunction with the terms "rebellious" and "defamatory" among others. By this definition, apostasy and heresy were also forms of sedition, but the convent officials tended to reserve this latter term for specific incidences of conflict within the house. Conflict took different guises. It could involve one person or several, and it could also be verbal or physical in nature. We find it applied to the insults levelled at Jacques Berson by Father De la Haye in 1571, for example, as well as to many of the fistfights which broke out among the youth and students throughout this period. However, its specific application to certain incidences of conflict and not others suggests that it was used to single out direct attacks on the existing hierarchy.

Perhaps because they were challenges to the existing
authority, the numerous incidences of sedition in the house together provide considerable information on political relations among all members of the house. Two characteristics of these relations are particularly striking. Foremost, it is clear that behind the harmonious fraternal veneer lay a community which was as divided and as fractious as any other. Second, ongoing within the friary was a debate concerning who had a legitimate voice in political affairs -- in other words, where political authority resided within the community.

With respect to the fractious nature of the community, the minutes show that the Paris friary contained numerous distinct corporate personalities within its walls. The manner in which cases of sedition among the youth and the students are discussed, for example, shows that these sectors of the Cordelieri community were remarkably cohesive. In 1567, four students were brought in chains into the refectory and then publicly flogged by the magisters for fighting in the aula of the convent.122 A year later, the "fratribus logici" were found guilty of perpetrating "rebellion and scandal inside and outside the refectory" and were similarly punished.123 Four students in the youth school were also implicated in seditious and rebellious behaviour in 1584.124

---

122 The incident was taken seriously by the discretoire as the two entries suggest. AN LL1515 (May 22 and May 28, 1567), ff. 12v-13v.

123 AN LL1515 (October 15, 1568), f. 32.

124 AN LL1511 (February 14, 1585), f. 29v.
Office-holders of the friary also seem to exhibit a similar corporate sensibility, or at least certain groups among them. Members of the choir who were from the province of France were expelled from the convent in 1591 because of numerous crimes, ranging from violent acts, through fornication to blasphemy. The case of father Despins, who was chastised for insulting the friends of his fellow choristers, also suggests that those in the choir socialized together outside of their performance of the divine office.

The emergence of these corporate personalities within the Paris house is not surprising, but rather the natural product of an administrative system which sought to monitor and control the behaviour of the friars as much as possible. The youth, the students and the University doctors lived in the same convent, but even within the friary the day-to-day rhythms of life shaped by study and religious activity usually circumvented regular interaction between these groups. The youth, for example, studied together, ate together and slept in the same dormitory together, and the

125 AN LL1511 (April 22, 1591), f. 65. "... decretum fuit ut patres Choristae provinciae franciae custodis Campanae et Remensis magno iure expulsi fuerint ex hoc conventum propter horribiles nostris divini blasphemias, percussiones violentas, et laetales scortationes .... et multa alia scelera ab eisdem tum in conventu cum in civitate commissa."

126 AN LL1511 (December 10, 1582), f. 10. "Deliberato sit a camera discipline frater et pater Despins chorista qui inclusus fuerat propter ea nominum quod fecerat in refectoris adversi soci alii choristani ...."
students and bachelors were similarly segregated. Movement within the friary was also as circumscribed as was movement outside, and friars were strictly warned to stay out of the rooms or dormitories of other friars without permission from the guardian. The intention of such legislation was no doubt to ensure the more careful surveillance of members, but in consequence it contributed to the emergence of groups bound by particular ties of habit, affection and mutual interest.

One of the central dangers of such fragmentation, of course, was the periodic emergence of concerted political voices which might mobilize against the existing hierarchy. A fascinating case from 1594 involves eight members of the youth school who approached the discretoire with accusations against one of its members, the vicar of youth, Masseboeuf. The charges may have been sexual in nature given that the boys were called to his room at night where, according to their testimony, things "horrendo et innominando" happened. Perhaps because of the particularly distasteful nature of this affair, the discretoire responded quickly to the accusations, and Masseboeuf was forced to leave the

---

127 Piana, "Gli statuti," ch. 25, 98.
128 AN LL1511 (October 17, 1594), f. 80. "... auditae sunt depositiones octo fratrum iuvenum (quorum nomina etiam particulariter nostr. rationibus hic non describantur) unanimiter deponentium quod M. Franciscus Masseboeuf vicarius iuvenum eos in cameram dormitorii sigillatium variis viribus diu nocta quae evocaverit ... quosdamque horrendo et innominando scelere partim causas jurocarit, partim adhuc sit."
More often than not, though, outspoken criticism of office-holders, or of the administration in general, was not tolerated. The discretoire's response to such behaviour depended on the degree of the sedition, though it seems clear that it was particularly nervous about the formation of groups of friars. In fact, it is usually hard to tell from the minutes whether the sedition being discussed by the discretoire refers to the actual behaviour of a group of friars, or whether the inner council was reacting to the formation of the group itself. Regardless, such corporate misbehaviour was almost always harshly punished.

Treatment of sedition was also partly determined by the friar's status within the community. Virtually all incidents of sedition among the youth and the students resulted in imprisonment, flagellation and not infrequently expulsion. With few exceptions, however, the more senior members of the household and the office-holders in particular, received lighter punishment. Friar Despins was confined to his room in 1582 because he responded to the guardian and the president "sine polita facultate" in the refectory. He was also

---

129 The minutes do not indicate where Massebeouf went, though the usual procedure in cases involving discipline problems was to send friars home to their own convent after being punished in the Paris friary.

130 The only case I can find of a friar being lightly treated following "rebellious" and "injurious" behaviour is that of Benedict Unisse on July 5, 1567. He was confined to his room and afterwards made to eat lunch at the feet of the guardian as punishment. See LL1515, f. 15v.
warned to be more prudent in the future. Another friar received a harsher sentence in 1570 for his rebellious behaviour. It was serious enough that he was told that he could remain in the house until the time of Euphemia, but could not be a sworn member of the community or the discretoire. The case of Christophe Robert is particularly illuminating about the discretoire's treatment of its own members. Robert was repeatedly in trouble with the hierarchy because of his outspokenness but seems to have escaped any serious punishment at the hands of the discretoire. He was found guilty of defamation in 1563, but there is no indication of flogging, imprisonment or any similar form of punishment. Furthermore, the discretoire successfully petitioned for his reinstatement to the theology cursus at the University in 1583 from which he had been ejected for his political activities. Robert was continually reintegrated back into the community by the other members of the council, and he was not the only one to be so treated.

The discretoire's willingness to punish rigorously non-

131 AN LL1511 (December 2, 1582); f. 10r.

132 The feast of Saint Euphemia (September 16) was an important occasion in the Franciscan calendar, because it marked the beginning of the regular term at the University. It was also the time when doctors of the Faculty gave a lecture and received fees. This is discussed further in chapter 3, pp. 190-191.

133 AN LL1515 (August 5, 1570), f. 46v. Apart from the sentence, no details are provided on the friar Jean's behaviour.

134 AN LL1511 (July-August, 1583), ff. 13v-14v. The minutes include a synopsis from the general chapter regarding Robert.
office-holders accused of sedition while showing leniency to its own members demonstrates that it was often unwilling to acknowledge the political voices of other sectors of the friary. And yet from the incidents of conflict discussed above, it is clear that many friars believed that they were entitled to such a voice.

The co-existence of these seemingly opposed philosophical understandings of the nature of the Franciscan community is particularly pronounced during the dispute over the election of the guardian in 1581-1582. The document trail which survives concerning this dispute is remarkable. In addition to the usually curt and often ambiguous entries in the minutes, we have evidence from the Parlement decrees (arrêt), correspondance, and a procès-verbal from the height of the dispute in August 1582. A complete reconstruction of the political and social dynamics within the house is impossible, but we can detect the existence of distinct communities within the friary and can follow the permutations of their interactions.

On the surface, this dispute evolved from concerns about the unorthodox election of Jean Duret as guardian in June 1581. The discretoire had elected the guardian without the presence of the commissioner of the minister general. Furthermore, Duret was then provincial minister of Turonne, and thus disqualified from being the guardian according to
the statutes of the order. For these reasons, a number of bachelors and students in the house protested his election, and threatened to appeal to judicial authorities. The discretoire responded to the discontent in the usual way: through suppression. A few weeks after the election, the inner council threatened punishment to friars found guilty of libelling the new guardian. Ultimately, however, these censures had no effect except to accelerate the turmoil which quickly expanded to engulf the entire community.

The evolution of the conflict in the friary over the subsequent sixteen months makes it quite clear that concern about the legitimacy of the election was the language used to mask numerous other disputes within the house as well. Dissatisfaction with the office-holders was clearly one issue, which explains why certain of its members, like Christophe Robert, were routinely singled out for abuse throughout these months. Personal dislike of Jean Duret in particular may have been important since, as Victor Martin suggests, Duret was not a popular figure within the commu-


136 AN LL1511 (June 2, 1581), f. 1. "Quodam facta est electio Gardiani novi sine R.P. Generali Ministro, et sine illius Commissario, quodam statuto in favorem aliquorum facto, quod alteri papyro inscriptam est, contra quod aliquid ex R.M. Bachalaurei et patribus reclamerunt et ad judiciam redendam appellarunt."

137 AN LL1511 (July 18, 1581), f. 2. "... quod qui fecerit libellum diffamatorium, et apposuerit juxta ostium magistri R. Gardiani, a nullo possit absolvi Ille fore consciencia sine licentia praesidis aut vicarii."
nity.

Other levels of conflict evident during these months seem to reflect existing rivalries or tensions between members of the community which emerged into the open once central authority within the friary had disappeared. The procès-verbal from August 1582 is revealing about the disintegration of the friary into increasingly intransigent factions. Not surprisingly, many of the more visible factions that emerged were groups that already had a distinct corporate character. Here we find the youth, for example, carrying stones in their mouths into the refectory which they then used to then throw at the students. The corporate cohesiveness of the younger members of the house is also testified to by the vicar of priests, Robert, the regent master, and the magister, who attributed the violent outburst in the friary in August to "les novices et la jeunesse des estudians, qui excede le nombre des presbtres." For these office-holders, it was a generational conflict, and of a remarkably violent form.

Factions also appear within the cadre of officers and senior members. The papal legate Giovanni Battista Castelli

138 According to Martin, Duret was a wealthy and powerful friar within the French branch of the order, and was perhaps for this reason not well-liked. Victor Martin, Gallicanisme, 188-189.

139 AN X2B 1175. The date of this document is August 3, 1582.

mentions that the president of the house was threatened with imprisonment by the "fratri seditiosi" in August 1581, an indication that the office-holders were by no means united. The most prominent officer faction to emerge during the dispute was led by Jacques Berson, and included Christophe Robert and a future guardian of the house, Robert Chessé. This group continued to resist efforts by the minister general to restore order after his arrival in March 1582, long after other members of the discretoire had submitted themselves to his authority.

The increasing factionalization of the house was accompanied by intensified levels of violence. Violence in the religious communities was not unusual, but the intensity of the conflict in 1581 was shocking even to contemporaries. No friar, regardless of rank, was spared. As early as August 1581 the papal nuncio, Castelli, complained that they were throwing stones at one another. A year later, the Parlement committee investigating the trouble at the friary found "aucuns blesses de coups de pierres, bastons, quelques-uns d'espées ou dagues." In the months in between we have numerous accounts of roaming gangs of friars

---


142 Correspondance du nonce 7, 173. The letter from Castelli to Cardinal Côme, the papal secretary, is dated August 21, 1581.

143 Félibien, V, 15.
assaulting one another, and even an account of the minister general attacking the sacristan in order to obtain the keys to the sacristy.

The factionalism which emerged in the wake of the disputed election of 1581 is interesting because it reveals the existence of coherent groups within the fraternal body who were willing and able to mobilize themselves to challenge the existing regime. Though the officials of the convent disagreed, these friars clearly believed that they had a legitimate political voice in the affairs of their community, especially when their leaders seemed to be abusing their authority. The case of Masseboeuf, the vicar of the youth, shows the mobilization of the youth as discussed earlier. The controversial election proceedings of 1581 brought even more sectors of the community into political action. Clearly Francis of Assisi's notion of the community as the moral watchdog of its members continued to fuel the imagination of the Paris Cordeliers into the sixteenth century, and no friar, regardless of status, was above the censure of the corporate body. Just as the office-holders monitored their behaviour, so was the rest of the community monitoring theirs.

To a large extent, the unwillingness of the inner council to acknowledge questions about their use of power in 1581 was the trigger that led the friars in large numbers to refuse to obey the council's directives. By denying the moral authority of the community, the council violated one of the fundamental tenets of the Franciscan brotherhood. The
violence which accompanied the rejection of central authority was symptomatic of deep unease with the existing hierarchy. Sayers argues that large-scale violence often represented a cathartic release for a group which was feeling powerless within the community. However, this interpretation does not adequately capture the complexity or the intensity of this particular dispute. The violence might have been cathartic on one level, but on another level it served to ensure the survival of a vision of the community which was at heart consensus-based. The ability of the discretoire to manage tensions within the house was only possible as long as there was a general acceptance of its authority. Once this consensus was gone, as happened following the election of Duret, so was the foundation of the council's authority.

Conclusion

From this study of power relations within the friary we can see that the ability of the office-holders to create a unified, effective, spiritual community during the late sixteenth century was complicated by both external and internal pressures. External pressures included the lure of the secular world with all its known sensual temptations. Internal pressures revolved around the historic, tortuous questioning of the nature of the Franciscan community.

The conflict of 1581-1582 shows that the effectiveness of the friary's government in the face of these pressures was ultimately dependent on its ability to create consensus within the community. Despite the enhanced power of the office-holders within the Franciscan organization by the sixteenth century, a persistent belief in the righteousness of the individual conscience and in the moral authority of the community led many friars to oppose policies which seemed to violate their understanding of the Franciscan ideal. The inner council could suppress individual attacks but was incapable of enforcing its will when large segments of the community united in opposition.

As the following chapters will show, however, the spiritual righteousness which fuelled division among the Paris Franciscans also fuelled their reforming activity. As Franciscans they were members of a distinct religious organization; but, as members of the Paris convent affiliated to the University, they were also unusually well-educated. The friary represented the Bonaventurean ideal of a learned Franciscan community, and its members were confident in their abilities as theologians and preachers as well as ministers to uproot heresy and stimulate piety. This confidence buoyed the friars even when their reforming endeavours were questioned by superior authorities, and even their activities brought them into conflict with other institutions.
CHAPTER 3: THE UNIVERSITY IN THE LIFE OF THE PARIS FRIAR

Arriving in Paris to begin his studies, the young Franciscan scholar must have found his first sight of the University overwhelming. The University of Paris was one of the most prestigious European academic institutions during the medieval and early modern periods, especially renowned for its faculties of Theology and Arts. It was here that some of the most venerated members of the order had received their training, among them Bonaventure, Duns Scotus, and Alexander of Hales. A license from Paris opened pulpits across Europe, and the prestigious doctorate in theology recognized its holder as a member of an international elite.

The theological training, and the reflected glamour which a Paris diploma shed upon the order, explain why the Franciscans were so insistent upon protecting their privileges with respect to the Faculty of Theology in the centuries following their admission to its degree in theology. The Faculty, however, was never comfortable with the presence of the mendicant clerics in its corporate body and struggled equally fiercely to prevent them from gaining further ground.

This chapter will examine relations between the friars and the University during the late sixteenth century. Although the conflicts which arose between the friars and the Faculty after 1560 lacked the vitriol of earlier centuries, they were real nonetheless, and were clearly the continuations of long-standing grievances on both sides. But
if relations between the friars and the University had taken on the contours of a tired, well-known balletic routine by the sixteenth century,¹ the importance of the institution in the formation of the Franciscan preacher and theologian remained as vital, as integral, as ever.

This vitality, I will suggest, stemmed not only from the traditional training in lecturing and disputation which the Faculty provided, but also from Franciscan exposure to other intellectual currents at the University. Particularly useful to the Paris friars in the sixteenth century was the programme of studies labelled humanism,² because it provided them with the methods and linguistic skills necessary to take on their most recent, and dangerous, adversary: Protestantism.

The first part of this chapter will discuss the intellectual formation of the friars at the University

---

¹ One particularly difficult period in secular and mendicant relations at the University occurred at the beginning of the sixteenth century. See Andrew G. Traver. "Secular and Mendicant Masters of the Faculty of Theology at the University of Paris, 1505-1523" in Sixteenth Century Journal 26 (1995): 137-157.

² I am aware of the ongoing historiographic debate over the meaning of humanism. For the purposes of this chapter, I am relying on Kristeller's definition of humanism as a programme of studies rather than a unifying ideology. Humanists, according to this definition, were grammarians and linguists interested in new approaches to textual criticism. They also shared an interest in resuscitating and reinterpreting ancient classical texts. These same individuals were also often practitioners of other fields of study. Among the many works of Paul Oscar Kristeller deserving a mention are Renaissance Thought, The Classic, Scholastic and Humanist Strains (New York: Harper, 1961), and Medieval Aspects of Learning: Three Essays (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1974).
during the late sixteenth century. The second part will discuss the conflicts which emerged between the friary and the University.

The University of Paris and the Faculty of Theology

The product of centuries of royal and ecclesiastic endowments, this sprawling institution comprised four linguistic groupings called "nations," as well as numerous quasi-independent colleges and satellite institutions which clustered together in the Latin Quarter of sixteenth-century Paris. The complex, eclectic physical structure of the University was matched by an equally complex administrative structure. Since students and masters were usually affiliated with a specific college or similar institution during their years of study, courses were by necessity dispersed among the different institutions. For example, the Faculty of Theology, the focus of this chapter, supervised the training of clerics at secular colleges such as Navarre and the Sorbonne, as well as at the studia associated with the Dominicans, Franciscans and the other regular orders.

Because of its size and prestige, the University

---

3 The four nations were France, Picardy, Normandy and Germany.

4 A report from the Venetian ambassador in 1546 estimates that there were between sixteen and twenty thousand students at the University. Relations des ambassadeurs vénitiens sur les affaires de France au 16e siècle, ed. and trans. M.N. Tommaseo (Paris: Imprimerie Royale, 1838), 1: 263. This account is also cited by James Farge Le parti conservateur au XVI siècle: l'Université et Parlement de Paris à l'époque de la Renaissance et de la Réforme (Paris: Diffusion les belles lettres, 1992): 45, and
loomed large in the life of Parisians. Its Faculty members were immediately recognizable by their distinctive robes as they paraded through the streets of Paris during civic and University processions. The large student population stimulated demand for food, housing and paper, and (if contemporary tales of student misbehaviour are reliable) also contributed to the coffers of the judicial system. As a respected academic centre, furthermore, the University was also frequently consulted by other institutions about jurisdictional conflicts and other political matters affecting Parisian, and French, society.

The influence which the University enjoyed within Paris stemmed to some degree from its international renown as an academic institution, above all for its Faculty of Theology.


The memoirs and chronicles from the period are full of accounts of students in trouble with judicial authorities. Du Boulay mentions one episode involving disorderly student behaviour in 1557, which saw the Parlement of Paris get involved at the request of the great Benedictine abbey of Saint-Germain-des-Prés. Several students were placed in jail for a period of time, before returning to their Colleges. This episode was only the most recent in a long series of disputes between the abbey and the University over possession of the Pré-aux-clercs, a large field to the left of the abbey of Saint-Germain-des-Prés. César-Égasse Du Boulay, *Historia Universitatis Parisiensis* 6 (Paris: Petrus de Bresche, 1665-1673; reprinted Frankfurt am Main: Minerva, 1966). For the conflict in 1557, see pp. 515-517. For the fourteenth-century origins of the dispute, see pp. 406-427.

During the period of the civil wars we find the University consulted about sending members to the Estates of Blois (1588), for example. Jean-Baptiste Crevier, *Histoire de l'Université de Paris depuis son origine jusqu'en l'année 1600* 6 (Paris: Desaint & Saillant, 1761): 405.
The Faculty of Theology at the University was the preeminent theological centre in Europe during the medieval period. Although its intellectual stature was somewhat diminished by the sixteenth century, James Farge has shown that it continued to be considered one of the finest nurseries of theologians in the Catholic Church, and its regent doctors were still consulted on important spiritual and ecclesiastic matters by the papacy, secular rulers and other important figures.

The spiritual authority wielded by the Faculty explains part of its attraction for the Franciscan friar. As a regent doctor, the friar was a member of the Faculty's deliberative council. During the latter part of the sixteenth century, the council offered opinions on such weighty concerns as the reformation of the Gregorian calendar, the orthodoxy of René Benoist's version of the Bible, and even on the

________________________________________________________________________

7 James K. Farge, Orthodoxy and Reform in Early Modern France: The Faculty of Theology of Paris, 1500-1543 (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1985).

8 Farge, Orthodoxy, 35. Farge points out that two friars were eligible for the license in every jubilee year but only one was allowed to become a regent doctor. He was known as the praesentatus. Although Faculty constitutions allowed only one member of a regular order to be a regent doctor in any licentiate year, all doctors could sit in on deliberations and voice their opinions.


10 AN MM249, ff. 143-146. The Faculty register also contains a list of books censured by the Faculty, beginning on folio 170. René Benoist was a well-respected preacher in Paris, one of three parish priests in the city who did not support the Catholic League. He ran into trouble with the
nature of French kingship.\textsuperscript{11} Here and there, we find traces of individual Franciscans directly involved in these and other matters. Jean Benedict is mentioned as one of four delegates sent on Faculty business in 1561,\textsuperscript{12} and Jacques Hugonis and Benedict were both among the twelve delegates sent to the Council of Trent in 1562.\textsuperscript{13} Hugonis' name appears again in the Faculty register when he, along with Joannes Mabille, signed the register condemning René Benoist's translation of the Bible in 1569.\textsuperscript{14}

Course of studies

As members of the Faculty, Franciscan regent doctors enjoyed a degree of influence in political and spiritual matters which they would not be able to do as easily within the confines of their own order. Equally important, with respect to the Paris friary, however, these friars were


\textsuperscript{11} The Catholic League consulted the Faculty about the biblical basis of French kingship in order to deny the Protestant Henry of Navarre the right to succeed Henry III. In May 1590, the Faculty argued that a Protestant could not succeed to the throne. D'Argentré, \textit{Collectio}, 2, pt. 1, 490.

\textsuperscript{12} AN MM249 (January 17, 1561), ff. 133v-134r.


\textsuperscript{14} AN MM249, f. 143r.
instrumental in ensuring the Faculty's production of skilled, orthodox Franciscan preachers. Scanning the minutes of the Faculty, we most commonly find the regent doctors assigning bachelors to masters, presiding over disputation and ensuring the orthodoxy of their students as well as of each other.\textsuperscript{15}

The profound desire of the Paris friary to produce qualified preachers explains why the inner council minutes, when not preoccupied with discipline problems, are concerned with the preparation of friars for the theology curriculum at the University. This preparation, as Murphy among others has noted, began long before the friar arrived in Paris.\textsuperscript{16} Gifted students were sent by their friary to a provincial studium (studium particulare) where they completed their studies of the classical arts curriculum comprising logic, 

\textsuperscript{15} AN MM249. Unfortunately, the registers for the period of this study cease after 1567 and recommence at the end of the century. There is, however, an extended discussion of Benoist's Bible at the end of the entries from 1567.

\textsuperscript{16} Since the educational programme of the French Franciscans has been well-studied in recent years, the following section will provide only a brief sketch of this programme. Essential reading on Franciscan theological studies at Paris includes: the dissertation of John Chrysostom Murphy, \textit{A History of the Franciscan Studium Generale at the University of Paris in the fifteenth century} (Indiana: Mediaeval Institute, Notre Dame, 1965); James Farge, \textit{Orthodoxy and Reform}, Augustin Renaudet, \textit{Préréforme et humanisme à Paris pendant les premières guerres d'Italie} (1494-1517) (1916; reprinted, Paris: Librairie d'Argences, 1953); and Hastings Rashdall, \textit{Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages} (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1895; revised 1936). See also Hilarin de Lucerne, \textit{Histoire des études dans l'ordre de Saint François depuis sa fondation jusque vers la moitié du XIIIe siècle ...} (Paris: Picard, 1908). Trans. from German by Eusèbe de Bar-le-Duc.
physics and metaphysics. After two to three years here, those who excelled at their studies were allowed to move on to more advanced studies at a studium generale. Because of its affiliation with the University of Paris, the theology school at the studium associated with the Paris friary was one of the most important, if not the most important, theological centres in the entire Franciscan order. It is for this reason that the various Franciscan provinces jealously guarded their privileges with respect to this institution, above all their right to send there a certain number of students each year.

The young friar fortunate enough to be chosen for the Paris studium arrived before the beginning of the ordinary term (October-June), usually during the months of July and August. He was then immediately examined by members of the inner council, among them the guardian, the two vicars and the regent master of the theology school. If he was found sufficiently grounded in the necessary subjects (and morals), he was admitted to the theology school and assigned lodging in the student dormitory.

For the next few years, he spent his days listening to lectures on the Bible, the Sentences of Peter Lombard, and

---

17 Murphy, 11.

16 By 1467 there were thirty-eight Franciscan studia across Europe. The French studia were located in the larger urban centres, notably Toulouse, Lyon, Dijon, Bordeaux, and of course, Paris. Murphy, 19, note. 30.

19 This was discussed in ch. 2, pp. 88-89.
on commentaries by Franciscan luminaries like Duns Scotus, Alexander of Hales, and Bonaventure as well as lesser known Franciscan scholars. These lectures, given by bachelors under the close scrutiny of the Franciscan doctors, were pivotal in ensuring the student's full immersion in the then-dominant Franciscan theological tradition: Scotism.

Scotism was the theological tradition associated with the brilliant thirteenth-century Franciscan scholar, Duns Scotus, who married Augustine and Aristotle, and in the process created the definitive Franciscan scholastic theological tradition. Scotus was best known for his commentaries on Peter Lombard's *Sentences* as well as for a series of lectures he gave while at Paris and later at Oxford. In these writings, he expounds a view of relations between the individual and God which were true to traditional Franciscan beliefs even as they showed the influence of contemporary currents of thought. Certainly more than Bonaventure, Scotus assigned a place for reason in

---

20 Murphy, 13-18. Among the lesser known commentators frequently used by the Paris friars were William of Ware (d. ca. 1300), Francis Mayronis (d. ca. 1328), and Nicolas de Orbellis (d. 1472/1475). Murphy, 132. A more general discussion of the curriculum in the mendicant studia can be found in Renaudet, *Préréforme*, 44.

21 Duns Scotus died in 1308 in Cologne, having received his doctorate only three years earlier at Paris. The Scotist tradition which was dominant at Paris in the sixteenth century was not officially established until the end of fifteenth century. It was officially confirmed at the general chapter session held in 1633 in Toledo, Spain. The golden age of this tradition at European universities was between the sixteenth and eighteenth centuries. B.M. Bonansea, O.F.M. *Man and his approach to God in John Duns Scotus* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1983): 227-230.
the individual's pursuit of divine understanding. However, he always distanced himself from Thomas Aquinas by emphasizing the essentially intuitive, even mystical nature of the bond between God and the individual. Reason had limitations. Slow in gaining acceptance, by the end of the fifteenth century Scotism was the reigning Franciscan intellectual tradition throughout Europe. It remained such throughout the following two centuries, managing to withstand even the challenge of nominalism, a school associated with another great Franciscan scholar, William of Ockham.

---

22 Bonansea, 11-12, 51-52. Thomism, the theological school associated with the Dominican Thomas Aquinas, placed greater emphasis on the ability of humankind to apply reason in the pursuit of divine understanding. Scotus, in contrast, felt that reason had limitations, and that knowledge of God required intuition. He also assigned greater agency to human will in the pursuit of salvation than did Aquinas.

23 William of Ockham was an early fourteenth-century Franciscan scholar. Our understanding of Nominalism, the theological school most closely associated with his work, has undergone revision lately, largely through the efforts of William J. Courtenay and Heiko Oberman among others. Courtenay in particular is wary about viewing nominalism as a unified school of thought. That being said, he does identify certain characteristics in the work of Ockham and his followers. According to Courtenay, nominalists emphasized the role of observable experience at the expense of metaphysical interpretations of the divine, considered intuition the basis of knowledge (43-44), and stressed God's independent will to act (potentia absoluta versus potentia ordinata, 37-43). Courtenay, "Nominalism and Late Medieval Religion" in The Pursuit of Holiness in Late Medieval and Renaissance Religion (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1974), Charles Trinkaus and Heiko Oberman eds., 26-58. See also Heiko Oberman, The Harvest of Medieval Theology: Gabriel Biel and Late Medieval Nominalism (Durham: The Labyrinth Press, 1983). Renaudet argues that nominalism, or at least variants of nominalism, did become extremely important by the end of the fifteenth century at the University of Paris, and were the most influential theological perspectives among secular
Having absorbed the principles of the Scotist tradition, the majority of the friars returned home to their own friary after three years. This was the normal span of time spent at the studium. Regulations established for the friary in 1500 set the duration of stay in Paris at four years for the youth, and three for the students. The Faculty allowed only one Franciscan into its theology curriculum each year, and the order believed, furthermore, that a few years of theology training at the studium was sufficient for preaching in the community.

Students continuing on to the next level, however, often stayed longer. The reasons for this vary. Murphy argues that the mendicant orders were always anxious to produce qualified preachers as quickly as possible, and consequently attempted to shorten the time required for the licentiate. Other factors also affected the duration of a member of the Faculty of Theology. Murphy, however, says that the Franciscan theologians never understood its appeal. He quotes one, a student of the famous Paris Scotist theologian Stephen Brulefer, as saying: "It displeases me that worthy minds study the poverty of Ockham; I desire to see them within the school of Scotus...." Murphy, 131. Renaudet, Préréforme, 60.

Celestino di Piana, "Gli statuti per la riforma dello studio di parigi" in Archivium franciscanum historicum 52 (1959): 63-64.

Murphy, 12-13.

The students were required to gather ten credits (cedulae) testifying to their attendance at the four years of Bible lectures and six years of the Sentences. Farge, Orthodoxy, 16. However, when it is possible to follow the path of a friar through the entire course, it does seem as though four years was the average.
friar's stay in the studium. A friar who was not yet twenty-five might be held back until he was the right age. His place in the provincial rotation also determined the date of his advancement. Quentin Morelet was admitted into the studium in 1590, for example, and the minutes indicate that his turn as biblicus would come three years later in 1593. However, a four-year diploma awaited Jean Bromand, who entered the studium in 1594 and was not going to be presented for reading the Sentences until 1598.

Theology curriculum

Those marked out for higher studies faced another rigorous examination by the regent master and the other Franciscan doctors before leaving the studium, just as they would after every subsequent stage of their studies at the University. The timing of this examination varied a little, though more often than not it seems to have occurred during the month of August, and therefore just a few weeks before the ordinary term began. The minutes give little information on the questions posed in these examinations, but it is

---

27 The age limit for entering as biblicus was set both in the University regulations and also in those of the order. Pressure to push friars through more quickly resulted in challenges to the age limit, but it does seem as though the order was supportive of this ruling for the most part. The minutes from October 10, 1581, for example, reiterates this age limit. AN LL1511 (June 21, 1582), f. 4r. See also Farge, Orthodoxy, 17.

28 AN LL1511 (May 25, 1590), f. 62.

29 AN LL1511, f. 76.
clear that their concern was to ensure that the more important points of Franciscan doctrine were grasped by the student. The worthy friar was then presented to the University for admission at the stage known as the *biblicum*. The mendicant friar was consequently referred to as a *biblicus ordinarius*.\(^\text{10}\)

The first duty of the *biblicus* was to request a regent master (*magister*) from among the doctors in the Faculty to supervise him during his studies. The regent master was virtually always a member of the student's order, and it was a privilege which the mendicant houses were ever eager to protect. One friar's attempt to have a Dominican preside, for example, clearly upset members of the discretoire, and they moved quickly to block this dangerous precedent.\(^\text{11}\)

As a *biblicus*, the friar had his first taste of

---

\(^{10}\) In cases where additional students were allowed in from a regular order than was allowed by the constitutions of the Faculty, these students were referred to as entering the *lectura extraordinaria* or the *primus cursus* rather than the *biblicum* in the friary minutes. Farge notes that the Faculty refers to these individuals as *cursores*, the same name as the secular priests, but it is not a term used by the friars in their own documents. Farge, *Orthodoxy*, 18.

\(^{11}\) AN LL1515 (September 22, 1572), f. 56v. Friar Copin requested to have a Dominican preside over his *vesperia* rather than the regent doctor. Interestingly, it seems to be the regent doctor who initiated the attack on Copin. The discretoire found in favour of the regent doctor, not surprisingly, and stated furthermore, that only another Franciscan doctor could replace the presiding doctor in his absence: "Conclusus est quod in alias et in posteram in dictibus vesperiis praesidebit magister noster regens huius domus, et in sua absentia alius doctor eiusdem ordinis ...."
disputation as well as of lecturing. In addition to taking part in reading the Bible in the Paris studium over a period of three years, he was expected to dispute regularly under the guidance of his master. During his third and final year, he was required to give a solemn disputation known as the tentativa. If successful at the tentativa, the friar was allowed to return for the next stage of the theology degree known as the baccalarius sententiarius, a one-year period during which he lectured regularly on the four books of the Sentences by Peter Lombard in the Paris studium. Once again, only one friar was allowed to enter at this phase, and he was expected to give a solemn elocution known as the principium before beginning to read each book of the

---

32 He was expected to give this before the feast of Saints Peter and Paul (June 29) which marked the end of the ordinary term. Farge says that the friars occasionally chose to do a second tentativa rather than do a course on the Bible. It is difficult to know how common this practise was by the middle of the sixteenth century, however, since neither the friary minutes nor the (incomplete) Faculty registers for this period specifically mention a second tentativa for any friar. Farge says that the biblicus was also expected to make one formal intervention in one of two formal disputations (magna ordinaria), the vesperia of a licentiate, or the resumptiva of a new master (parva ordinaria). These interventions, which are discussed in note 35, are never mentioned in the late sixteenth-century registers of the Faculty of Theology, and only rarely in the Franciscan council minutes. Farge, 18-20.

33 According to Murphy, readings of both the Bible and the Sentences began after the feast of Saint Francis (Oct 4) and continued for eight months to finish before August 1. Murphy, 18.

34 The first principium took place between September 14 and October 9, and all bachelors were expected to attend. Subsequent principia were to be given in January, March and May as each book was inaugurated. This oration is rarely
Following the submission of reports on their lectures in July, these individuals became known as *baccalarii formati* (3-4 years) and continued to develop their skills as debators and theologians. They gave three major disputationes, the most important being the *sorbonica*, which was considered the epitome of the gruelling, intellectual disputation.\(^{35}\) An additional disputation was also required of only the mendicants known as the *disputation de quolibet*, one which the mendicants viewed as unnecessary and abusive by the sixteenth century.\(^{36}\)

If all went well, the friar was ready to be received for a license in theology, a degree conferred by the bishop of Paris. He had to be at least thirty-five years old and in mentioned in the friary minutes, unlike the *tentativa* or the *Sorbonica*, but its mentioning in documents complaining of Faculty abuse shows that it remained an important part of the theological programme for all clerics. See AN LL1524, ff. 9r-9v.

\(^{35}\) The other two disputationes were the *magna ordinaria*, held in the ordinary term, and the *parva ordinaria*, which was held in the summer term. A Franciscan was always the first to do the *sorbonica* and a Dominican the last. Farge, 23. The mendicants, furthermore, often gave two disputationes compared to the one by the seculars. Murphy mentions a papal decree from 1442 which recognized this practise. Murphy: 15. Murphy is referring to Henricus Denifle et Aemilius Chatelain, *Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis* 4 (Paris: 1889-1897), no. 626.

\(^{36}\) AN LL1524, f. 11v. The date of this petition is January 1567. The seculars were exempt from this disputation. In consequence, the mendicant orders viewed this practise as a financial abuse by the Faculty, since every disputation brought in revenue from the student. See also Farge, *Orthodoxy*, 25.
holy orders. Only one friar was allowed this privilege each year, and licensing took place only every second year (Jubilee), which meant that the maximum number of friars conferred with the license was two during any given presentation. With this license, the friar was now allowed to teach anywhere in the Catholic world. The doctorate of theology required another three disputations (vesperia, magisterium, and resumptiva). Following completion of these, the friar received, at long last, the much-coveted doctoral biretta.

The new doctor could look back on his thirteen to fifteen years in Paris with some satisfaction, for he was now a member of an international elite. The Franciscan order would have been equally gratified to have yet another highly-skilled theologian and preacher in its ranks. The importance of the doctoral diploma for the Franciscan order cannot be overestimated, which is why the Paris friary exercised enormous influence over the student’s intellectual 

---


38 The introduction of the extraordinary or special student (additional students allowed in the programme) altered this practise somewhat, and at times six friars received the license in the same year. The status of the special student will be discussed later in this chapter.

39 Farge, 27. The doctoral biretta was the cap which the new doctor would wear from this point on to indicate his status. It should not be confused with the other "biretta," the gift of one-half écu d’or soleil which the new doctor gave to each doctor who attended his final disputation, the magisterium. Farge, 29.
development throughout his stay there. The inner council's authority was extensive, and it is clear from the minutes that its members took their supervisory role very seriously.

At every stage of his studies in the studium, the friar was subjected to the public scrutiny of the council in the presence of the community. The biblicus and sententiarius were no more free from the scrutiny of their brothers either, since they lectured and disputed within the confines of their own convent.

It is noteworthy that, though the Faculty of Theology had the right to reject candidates recommended by the Franciscans and the other mendicants, there is no evidence of this happening to the Franciscans during the period in question. The reluctance of the Faculty to reject their candidate might reflect a desire not to antagonize the friars but it may also suggest a degree of trust in their recommendations since these were by no means pro forma. The friars did hold back individuals who were not sufficiently prepared for the theology cursus, and those who failed to live up to their potential were often sent home. Granted, it is more common to find friars held back at the student stage, but at least one friar near the end of his studies

---

40 I have not found any Franciscan friar rejected by the Faculty during the period of the civil wars, though a Dominican was refused in 1560. AN MM249, f. 118r. Farge similarly found that mendicant candidates were almost always accepted by the Faculty. See Farge, *Orthodoxy and Reform*, 17-18.

41 See ch. 2, pp. 99-100.
was forced to repeat his year because his elocution was considered somewhat questionable.\textsuperscript{42}

The most important concern of the friary, of course, was ensuring the orthodoxy of their preachers. For the most part, the community was successful. After their years in the studium, friars left for the Faculty or for their own convents well-versed in the Scotist theological tradition. However, it would be naive to assume that the Paris friars were immune to other theological perspectives during their stay in Paris. The mobile nature of theological studies at the University, combined with the inherent sociability of academic life, ensured that other intellectual traditions also left their mark on successive generations of Franciscan theologians and preachers.

Historians to date have downplayed what must have been a formative part of the friar's intellectual development during the sixteenth century -- his participation in the scholarly life of the University outside his own studium. Although the Faculty of Theology and the friary convent both attempted to minimize contact between regular and secular clerical students during their years of study -- the

\textsuperscript{42} AN LL1511 (November 10, 1588), f. 59r. The council heard complaints from other members of the house about friar Pigne's principium. Pigne was told to remain in his place in the cursus for a secund Jubilee year. There is at least one more example of this occurring during the sixteenth century. In 1534, the controversial sermons of friar Pierre de Nuptiiis led to his removal from both the convent and the theology cursum. This decision was reached by Pierre de Cornibus, the guardian, and the regent master of the theology school. Farge, \textit{Registre des conclusions}, 32, sec. 37c.
University going so far as to forbid the attendance at each other's lectures -- contemporary sources show that complete segregation was resisted on all sides. James Farge has found secular clerics attending lectures at the Franciscan studium during the first decade of the sixteenth century and the minutes of the friary's inner council from 1568 reveal that friars were independently attending secular classes.

Attending lectures would have provided exposure to other currents of thought since colleges were often associated with specific intellectual traditions. The Scotism of the Franciscans was of course one such tradition, and students could also expect a Thomist perspective among the Dominicans, or a type of nominalism in some of the secular colleges. The stimulation provided by the lectures was intensified by the constant mingling of students outside the lecture halls as well, since students were routinely in contact with one another at public disputations, banquets, processions and at other ceremonial and scholarly occasions.

---

13 The Faculty's attempt in 1575 to crush forcibly the popularity of Jesuit Maldonat's lectures among non-Jesuits is particularly well-known. Du Boulay, Historia, 6, 739.

14 Farge, Orthodoxy, 15, note 30. Jacques Merlin is the cleric discussing this practise. Merlin is speaking in 1537, but he is referring to the first decade of the sixteenth century.

15 AN LL1515 (July 7, 1568), f. 28.

16 Augustin Renaudet, Préréforme, 29. Renaudet argues that nominalism made greater inroads during this period in the secular colleges at the University than it did at the Franciscan studium.
The paranymphes are a perfect example. By the sixteenth century, these orations honouring recent licentiates were held at four different locations: the convents of the Jacobins and the Cordeliers, and the secular colleges of Navarre and the Sorbonne. The friary minutes also note the presence of "friends" at the convent for major disputations. These friends included not only companions from the same degree ("sociis suae licentiae") but also secular friends ("amicis secularibus"). Clearly mendicant and secular clerics moved between their institutions with greater ease than usually thought.

Humanism

For students and masters alike, the opportunity to be influenced by new intellectual currents was clearly ever-present. Although the writings of the Paris friars show that they are still working within the parameters of their own intellectual tradition throughout the sixteenth century,

47 Crevier, 6, 237-238. Crevier is discussing the paranymphes from January 8, 1570. He notes that this elocution, which initially honoured recent bachelors of theology, had degenerated by the sixteenth century into usually satirical attacks on the bachelors.

48 AN LL1511 (May 12 1588), f. 54v. The minutes refer specifically to the tentativa, principium and the sorbonica disputations.

49 Many of the theological texts produced by the Paris friars during the sixteenth century illustrate the continuing power of this tradition. There are a number of treatises on free will and the role of the individual in salvation such as Christophe Cheffontaine's Assertio catholica de libero arbitrio (Antwerp, 1575), and Simon
we can nevertheless detect the influence of some other contemporary schools of thought. The most immediately recognizable and intriguing, of course, is that of humanism.\(^5\)

To talk about humanism and the friars in the same breath after 1520 may seem confusing, especially since many of the early humanists were tarred as proto-lutherans following the emergence of a coherent Protestant movement.\(^5\)

Fontaine's *Summa des pechez et le remede d'iceux* (Lyon: Carolus Peinot, 1584). Other types of work which were considered typical of the scholastic Franciscan tradition included the compilation of Concordances such as Jacques Berson (d. 1589), *Concordantiae bibliorum utriusque...* (1610-1611), and collections of sermons and homilies. Examples of these latter types include Cheffontaine, *Sermones de BB Virgine* (Paris: 1586), François Panigarolle, *Sermones de caresme...par luy prechez à S. Pierre de Rome l'an 1577* (Lyon: 1599), François Feuardent *Homiliaes de immaculata conceptione Virginis* (Petrus de Alva, n.d.), and Maurice Hylaret, *Sacrae aenneades adventuales numero quatuor homiliae sex et triginta in universum complectens* (Paris: 1587).

\(^5\) Murphy shows quite clearly that the Paris friars were attracted to humanism during the late fifteenth century. Franciscan students were attending Guillaume Fichet's lectures on ancient authors, adopting humanist rhetorical conventions in their letters, and Stephen Brulefer, the prominent Scotist theologian, corresponded with the noted humanist Robert Gaguin. Murphy, 110-127. His argument, however, that the arrival of the Observants after 1517 ended Paris Franciscan flirtation with humanism needs to be moderated somewhat. I suggest that we see a pause rather than a cessation in Franciscan interest, which resurfaces by the beginning of the civil wars because of the flourishing hellenistic field and Protestant continuation of the humanist tradition of textual criticism.

\(^5\) Erasmus and Jacques Lefèvre d'Étapes were among the Christian humanists tarred as proto-lutherans by the 1530's. Many of Erasmus' books, and a few of Lefèvre d'Étapes as well, were censured by the University of Paris as well as the papacy. See J.M. De Bujanda, James K. Farge and Francis M. Higman, *Index des livres interdits 1* (Sherbrooke, Quebec: Éditions de l'Université de Sherbrooke, 1985): 67.
It is odd, nevertheless, that little historical interest has been generated in humanist-Franciscan relations during the sixteenth century given the obvious similarities between these two intellectual traditions. This neglect is all the more surprising in light of the new direction Renaissance scholarship has taken over the past few decades. Charles Trinkaus has been particularly instrumental in propagating a view of humanism (or at least of certain religious thinkers among the humanists) as one of many parallel traditions responding to the perceived sterility of traditional scholastic theology. These traditions coexisted and influenced one another in an intellectual environment which was fluid rather than rigidly segregated or hierarchical.

The University of Paris, of course, was just such a fluid environment. Although the traces are at times faint, we nevertheless can find evidence of Franciscan participation in scholarly activities that are usually associated with early Christian humanists like Jacques Lefèvre d'Étappes and his circle, Josse Clichtove, and, of course, Desiderius Erasmus. We know, for example, that the Paris friars were keenly interested in studying Hebrew and

---

52 He compares, in particular, Petrarchan humanism and Ockhamism. Both schools, he argues, were responding to scholastic efforts "to forge a unity between revelation and reason, to build an ever more refined Aristotelian metaphysical structure out into the non-perceptual space of faith and theology." Charles Trinkaus, "The Religious Thought of Italian Humanists" in The Pursuit of Holiness, 339.
Greek during the sixteenth century. The secular lectures mentioned in the inner council minutes from 1568 were for these two languages. The minutes must be referring to the Royal lectures (two Greek, two Hebrew) established at the University in 1530 at the instigation of Guillaume Budé and other humanists. Linton Stevens suggests that hellenist humanism at the University reached its apogee of brilliance between 1545 and 1575, and he bolsters his argument by pointing to the group of poets collectively known as the Pléiade, as well as the scholars Adrien Turnèbe, Florent

53 AN LL1515 (July 7 1568), f. 28r. Franciscan interest in studying these languages was of course not limited to the Paris friary. A famous French example is Rabelais, who studied Greek at his convent of Fontenay before coming to Paris in 1528. Also renowned was the German Hebraist Conrad Pellikan, a master linguist who read Hebrew, Greek and Chaldean in addition to Latin, French and, of course, German. For Rabelais, see A.J. Krailsheimer, Rabelais and the Franciscans (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1963): 7, 86. For Pellikan, see John Moorman, The History of The Franciscans (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968): 541. Pellikan applied his linguistic expertise to study of the Old Testament in particular.

54 The first recipients of these lectureships were Pierre Danès and Jacques Toussaint (Greek), and François Vatable and Agathias Guidacier (Hebrew). These lectureships formed the basis of the future Collège Royale which emerged later in the century, and which became a vibrant centre of hellenist and Hebrew studies. James Farge, Le parti conservateur au XVIIe siècle: Université et Parlement de Paris à l'epoque de la Renaissance et de la Réforme (Paris: Documents et Inédits du Collège de France, 1992): 36-46. See also Linton Stevens, "A Re-evaluation of Hellenism in the French Renaissance" in Werner Gundersheimer, ed., French Humanism 1460-1600 (London: MacMillan & Co. Ltd, 1969): 183.


56 This was the name given to a group of seven poets associated with a revival of classical poetry during the middle of the sixteenth century. Pierre de Ronsard and
Chrestien (1541-1596), and Pierre Ramus (1515-1572) among others.

Many of the Paris friars mentioned in this thesis were studying Greek when it was enjoying unprecedented vitality. They were doing so, however, without the sanction of their order as we can see from the same minutes entry from 1568. The council forbade friars from going to these language lectures, perhaps because these were held at secular colleges. Its warnings went unheeded, however, since a number of the Franciscan doctors educated during this period

Joachim du Bellay were among its members. They are discussed in Otto Benesch, "The Ancient and the Gothic Revival in French Art and Literature," in French Humanism 1460-1600: 215-216.


* Chrestien was influenced by Henri Estienne, a student of Turnèbe and a respected humanist in his own right. Chrestien is primarily known as a translator of Greek texts, according to Stevens. He was also the tutor of the young Henry of Navarre before he became Henry IV of France. Stevens, "Re-evaluation", 192-193.

* R. Hooykaas, Humanisme science et réforme: Pierre de la Ramée (1515-1572) (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1958): 3-29. Ramus was known both as a humanist philosopher and mathematician. During his long academic career at the University of Paris, Ramus was the principal of the Collège de Presles (1545-1572) where he championed a humanist programme of studies. In 1551 he was made the professor of philosophy and rhetoric at the Collège Royale. He converted to Protestantism in 1561 and was killed during the Massacre of Saint Bartholomew's Day in 1572.

* " ... quod nulli fratrum studentum fierent potestas eundi ad lectores publicas qui sunt in civitate tam graecas quam hebraeas." AN LL1515 (July 7, 1568), f. 28. The council's disapproval appears to be directed less at their study of these languages, than their attendance at secular lectures. These lectures are also mentioned earlier in this chapter, nt. 45.
were familiar at least with Greek. François Feuardent (1539-1610) was a highly respected Greek scholar in France and was also conversant with Hebrew. His fellow Leaguer, Maurice Hylaret (1539-1591), was also knowledgeable in these languages as was the one-time minister general of the order, Christophe Cheffontaine. The friary must have decided to stop fighting its members when it agreed to establish a lectureship in the two languages in 1583.

Franciscan desire to study ancient languages during this period was clearly linked to the order's interest in producing critical editions of early Christian texts. A number of the most prominent Franciscan theologians after 1560 were publishing new editions of the gospels, psalms, and patristic commentaries in addition to the collections of sermons, penitential treatises and liturgical texts traditionally produced by members of the order. Noël

---


62 For biographical information on Hylaret, see ch. 1, p. 54, nt. 48.

63 Cheffontaine (b. 1532) would have been studying at Paris during the 1550's and 1560's. He also knew Latin, Italian, French and Breton. Michaud, Biographie universelle 8 (1811-1828; reprinted, Graz, Austria: Akademische, 1966-1970): 69-70. Cheffontaine is discussed in more detail in ch. 5, pp. 326-328.

64 LL1511 (May 26, 1583), f. 11v. One secular master was to be hired to teach the two languages.

65 Marie-Madeleine Fragonard's comparison of early and late sixteenth-century Franciscan publishing shows that friars at the beginning of the century were writing in order of preference: pietistic tracts, sermon collections, theological tracts, and scriptural commentaries. Only one
Taillepied, for example, produced at least two works on patristic authors.  

François Feuardent was easily the most prolific of the Paris friars. He wrote commentaries on the epistles of Peter and on the books of Esther and Ruth. He also produced a new edition of Marguerin de la Bigne's *Bibliotheca veterum patrum* in collaboration with the famous humanist-trained Hebrew scholar Gilbert Génébrard, and Jean Dadré.  

History was produced by these early friars, and three editions of patristic texts. Fragonard, "Les publications des Franciscains: une mutation d'identité" in *Poi, fidelité, amitié en Europe à la période moderne: Mélanges offerts à Robert Sauzet*, 2, ed. Brigitte Maillard (Tours: Université de Tours, 1995): 178. In general, Fragonard finds the Franciscans less active than the Dominicans during this period. The second group, in which she includes Cheffontaine, Capitis, Taillepied, and Feuardent among others, is very different. Polemics and commentaries outweigh any other form of output. Fragonard, 182.  

---  

66 *Collectio quatuor doctorum: Ambrosii, Hieronymi, Augustini, et Gregorii, super triginta articulis ab haereticis modernis disputatis* (1574, 1577) in *Compendium rerum theologicarum* of Jean Bunderen. This anti-Calvinist document discusses thirty major doctrinal errors. He also wrote *Brevis resolutio sententiarum S. Scripturae, ab haereticis modernis in suarum haereseon fulcimentum perperam adductarum* (1574).  

67 *Johannes-Hyacinthus Sbaralea, O.F.M., Supplementum et castigatio ad scriptores ordinum minorum* 1 (Rome: S. Michaelis ad Ripam, 1806): 268-269, and Péret, 251. Feuardent wrote *Divi Iacobi epistola commentariis explicata authore P. F.P. (1599), F.P. commentarius in epistolam sancti Petri* (1600), *R.P. Fr. F.P. in librum Esther commentarii* (Cologne, 1594), and *Commentarii in librum Ruth* (1582), among other commentaries. He also revised the *Glosse ordinaire* of Nicolas de Lyre and additions of Paul de Burgos (Paris, 1590), and produced collections of homilies, sermons and numerous anti-Protestant polemic tracts.  

68 Gilbert Génébrard (1537-1597), a Benedictine cleric, was perhaps the most renowned Hebrew scholar of his generation in France as well as a respected linguist in other biblical languages including that of Greek. He received his doctorate in theology on June 10, 1563 at the
Feuardent's interest in resuscitating early Christian writings is nowhere more evident than in his translation of a fourth-century work by Saint Ephrem known as the Divins opuscules et exercices. The title explains the linguistic origins of the work, which was translated first from Syriac to Greek and then, through the agency of Feuardent, into French.⁷⁰

Franciscan authorship of these exegetical treatises is not in itself suggestive of humanist influence given the religious order's historical interest in this form of scholarship. Alexander of Hales and Bonaventure were two early advocates of close textual analysis of the scriptures

University of Paris and continued to teach there at the Collège Royale. He was a prominent student of the well known humanist Greek scholar, Adrien Turnèbe, who also taught another renowned humanist, Henri Estienne. For Génébrard, see Féret, 2: 342-355. He is also mentioned in Irena Backus, La Patristique et les guerres de religion en France: Étude de l'activité littéraire de Jacques de Billy (1535-1581) Q.S.B., d'après le MS. Sens 167 et les sources imprimées (Paris: Institut d'Études Augustiniennes, 1993).

⁷⁰ Féret, 2, 282. Jean Dadré (1550-1617) was a doctor in theology of the University of Paris. Following his studies, he was given a canonry at the Cathedral of Rouen. He was considered an erudite scholar, and edited a number of texts including La vita christi of Ludolphe le Chartreux (1580) and an edition of the bible (1590). Like Génébrard and Feuardent, Dadré was also an ardent Leaguer. See Dictionnaire de biographie francaise 9 (Paris: Librairie Letouzey et Ané, 1929-1995). Dir. by J. Balteau, A. Rastoul, and M. Prevost.

and patristic commentaries. Hilarin de Lucerne points out, furthermore, that the Sentences of Peter Lombard, which along with the Bible formed the basis of Franciscan theological training throughout the medieval and early modern periods, contained a high percentage of patristic references. Even after scholasticism took hold of the University in the thirteenth century, the friars maintained an interest in exegetical scholarship.

Tradition aside, however, Franciscan application of their newly-acquired knowledge of Hebrew and Greek to produce more accurate translations of early Christian texts suggests that, like the Christian humanists, they believed these languages unlocked knowledge which was valuable to their contemporaries. Jacques Berson is expressing this very sentiment when he praises translators of Greek texts for making available the contents of these "secrets cabinets." France, he goes on to remark, had never had so many learned men before who were capable of revealing these secrets."


Hilarin de Lucerne, Histoire des études, 513.

"Seulement diray, que iamais nostre France ne fut mieux pourvue d'hommes doctes ... qui entendent les
This shared desire to reinterpret early Christian texts is remarkable but not surprising in light of the obvious similarities between Franciscan spirituality and that of Christian humanists. These similarities were profound rather than superficial in nature, stemming from similar theological interpretations of the relationship between God and the individual, and the role of the individual in the divine plan. Both traditions posited a christocentric theology based on the Christ found in the New Testament. For the Christian humanists and for the friars, furthermore, the value of the scriptural commentaries by Augustine, Chrysostom, Tertullian and the other early Christian fathers lay in their proximity to the early church. The simpler, more emotional, even mystical piety which these texts


Larissa Taylor makes a similar point in her article examining sermon literature between 1530 and 1560, "The Influence of Humanism on Post-Reformation Catholic Preachers in France" in Renaissance Quarterly 50 (1997): 116. Taylor argues that many post-Reformation preachers were influenced by humanism even as they publicly rejected it, because they shared similar philosophical perspectives and were "nevertheless changed by it in ways that separated them inexorably from the formal scholastic past."

Francis of Assisi was a noted critic of the power of reason as already discussed, and both Duns Scotus and William of Ockham, though willing to concede reason a role in the pursuit of divine understanding, nevertheless emphasized its limitations. The union of God and the individual was an ultimately mystical bond forged out of love and faith. Franciscan interest in mysticism is therefore not surprising, and we can find a similar fascination with it among some of the French humanists, in
evinced was for both a more accurate reflection of true Christian spirituality. Placed in this philosophical context, we can appreciate why friar Feuadent believed even a relatively obscure fourth-century text like that of the bishop Ephrem had something to say to sixteenth-century French individuals.  

Doctrine aside, we cannot forget that the friars were successful missionaries throughout the medieval period because of their versatility. Whether in the form of printed polemic, spoken word or role modelling, the Franciscans were masters at marketing their spiritual message for different particular those associated with Lefèvre d'Étaples. Lefèvre was deeply influenced by the famous thirteenth-century Franciscan mystic, Ramon Lull. Augustin Renaudet, "Paris from 1494-1517 -- Church and University; Religious Reform; Culture and Humanist critiques" in Gundersheimer, ed., French Humanism, 68. Lull, a tertiary in the order, was a student of Bonaventure at Paris. His most important mystical works are The Art of Contemplation and The Book of the Lover and the Beloved. He was eventually martyred during missionary work to the Holy Land. See Moorman, History, 248-249, 264-265. We know from the work of Eugene Rice, furthermore, that the French humanists regularly printed medieval mystical texts in addition to new editions of patristic works and the New Testament. Rice, "The Humanist Idea of Christian Antiquity: Lefèvre d'Étaples and his Circle" in Gundersheimer, ed., French Humanism, 163.

The early Christian humanists were seeking the reformation of Christian spirituality through the examination of the scriptures, with the intended consequence of ending once and for all inconsistencies and debates among theologians. They were seeking a unified, universal Church. In this regard, the friars were pursuing a similar goal to that of Erasmus and his contemporaries since they too believed that the same scriptures offered the true religion. Although the humanists arguably spawned what they feared -- more dissention -- their desire for a unified Christianity remained at the centre of both Protestant and Catholic concerns throughout the sixteenth century. Seeking a Christian consensus lay at the base of Franciscan scriptural analysis and for this reason we must view it as an important component of their missionary programme.
interest groups. François Feuardent's authorship of both learned Latin theological texts and simpler French anti-protestant diatribes, for example, reminds us that the friars viewed these varied literary products merely as different weapons from the same arsenal, all aimed at the same target: heresy.

The appeal of exegetical scholarship for the sixteenth-century friar lay in its usefulness as a weapon against Protestantism in particular, the most powerful heresy then confronting Catholic France. After all, Protestant theologians like Beza and Calvin were humanists by training, and like Erasmus and other Christian humanists, they reinterpreted the scriptures to bolster their particular spiritual conceptions. Protestant reliance on the scriptures in their sermons and theological treatises was matched by Franciscan refutations using the same texts. The title to Noël Taillepied's 1574 study of four patristic fathers, Collectio quatuor doctorum: Ambrosii, Hieronymi, Augustini, et Gregorii, super triginta articulis ab haereticis modernis

*Noël Taillepied (1540?-1589) was born in Pontoise and entered the friary there. Although he never became a doctor of theology, he did study theology and spent a great deal of time in the Paris friary -- in part because he was a confessor at the Franciscan women's convent, the Ave-Maria. Between 1578-1586 he was a lecturer of theology in the friary at Pontoise. He earned a reputation, not only as a teacher but also as a preacher. He moved to the Observant friary at Rouen in 1587, and later the same year (October), became a Capuchin. He died on November 13, 1589. Moracchini, "Noël Taillepied, Franciscain et controversiste" in I Francescani in Europa tra Riforma e Controriforma. Atti del XII convegno internazionale Assisi, 17-19 ottobre 1985. Perugia: Università degli studi di Perugia, 1987" 127-130.
disputatis, is explicit: he is using these patristic works to counteract thirty major errors in Calvinist doctrine. Feuardent is similarly direct in a later treatise which relies upon the work of Tertullian and Cyprian, and Frémin Capitis' controversial polemic Briefve Apologie contre Calvin et ses complices takes issue with Theodore de

---

76 This work is found in Jean Bunderen, Compendium rerum theologicarum quae hodie in controversia agitantur, ad sensum et consensum verae catholicae Ecclesiae: scripturae sacrae testimoniiis ac C. Patrum sententiis confectum, recens auctum ac locupletatum (Paris: Allardus Julianus, 1574, 1577). Taillepied also wrote Brevis resolutio sententiarum s. scripturae, ab haereticis modernis in suarum haereseon fulcimentum perperam adductarum, Ex antiquissimorum neothericorumque Pontizarensem (Paris: Jean Charron, 1574). For a discussion of Taillepied's work, see Moracchini, "Noël Taillepied," 117-163.

79 Feuardent, Confessio Tertulliana et Cypriana in quatuor digesta libros. authore F. Theodoro Petreo, Accessore antidota pro eadem confessione adversus impias Lutheranorum et Calvinistarum criminationes (Paris, 1603).

80 Little is known about Capitis beyond the fact that he received a doctorate in theology from the University of Paris. We know of several works by Capitis, including La sauvegarde et protection de la foy catholique contre les principaux heretiques de nostre temps (Reims, 1579), a straightforward polemic aimed at arousing Catholic fervour, and a work defending the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary. De immaculata conceptione virginis Marieae (Paris, 1579). The full title of his polemic against Marot and Beza is the following: Briefve apologie contre Calvin et ses complices touchant l'administration des sacremens et la maniere de faire les prieres en l'Eglise, et que les traductions de Marot et Beze ne doivent estre appelées Psalmes de David (Reims, 1563). Féret, 2, 228-230. The Briefve apologie became controversial when a known Protestant preacher in the city of Metz, Jean Taffin, wrote a response to it. Capitis replied to Taffin in 1564 with an expanded discussion of his original tract, entitled Antidote a la responce qu'a fait Jean Taffin Calviniste, contre l'Apologie de F. Frémint Capitis. Contenant en brief, la maniere de celebrer la Messe etre extraite de la saint escriture. Avec Plus example demonstration qu'auparavant, que les traductions de Marot et Beze: sont faulsement appellees Psalmes de David. (Jean de Floigny (Reims) and Nicolas Bacquenois (Verdun), 1564). Shared edition. For this
Bèze's and Clément Marot's translation of the psalms of David. 91

Exegesis was clearly one important part of the Franciscan campaign against Protestantism, but the polemic possibilities offered by the humanist programme of studies was not limited to close textual analysis and the mastery of ancient languages. Larissa Taylor has already noted the simpler, more direct sermon format emerging from the pens of a few prominent preachers in the decades following the Reformation, a stylistic change which she convincingly attributes to the influence of humanism. 82 Other characteristics include the publication of sermons in the vernacular, quotations in Greek and Hebrew, and a heavier reliance on a wider variety of scriptural and patristic sources than those traditionally used. Taylor cites the sermons of the secular cleric François LePicart as an example of the latter point. According to Taylor, LePicart favoured Chrysostom over Augustine, the latter a favourite of medieval scholastic scholars, and used the New Testament three times more than the Old. 83

Taylor's argument concerning the influence of humanism controversy, see Morracchini, "Noël Taillepied, Franciscain et controversiste": 119, note 11.


83 Taylor, "Influence," 124.
holds particularly true for the late sixteenth-century Franciscan preachers. The sermons of Maurice Hylaret, Jacques Berson, and Feuardent are written in simple but eloquent vernacular language, and all three show a penchant for using Greek quotations in their work. The friars just mentioned were also borrowing from a greater variety of sources than had the pre-Reformation preachers, a fact which similarly suggests humanist influence. In addition to the requisite quotations from the Bible and the Fathers, however, they were also freely adapting non-Christian classical texts. Hylaret and Berson both make references

---

84 There are a number of examples of this. Hylaret, for example, quotes from the work of the Greek poet Aeolus in his tract against inter-marriage between Catholics and Protestants. Remonstrance catholique, sur la trop familière & privée communication & fréquentation avec les Heretiques interdite aux Catholiques adressée à un amy surnommé Hert, par un Theologien. This tract is one part of a longer pamphlet, entitled Deux traiictez ou opuscules, l'un en forme de remonstrance. De non conveniendo cum haereticis. l'autre par forme de conseil et avis. De non eundo cum muliere haeretica a viro catholico conjugio (Orléans: Boynard, 1587): 91. Berson's translation of Cornelio Musso's sermon l'avénement du Benoist S. Esprit similarly includes Greek passages.

85 Beryl Smalley, English Friars and Antiquity in the early Fourteenth Century (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1960). Franciscan appreciation of classical texts was by no means new to the sixteenth century, as Beryl Smalley's study of fourteenth-century English friars illustrates. Smalley argues that the English friars in particular were more interested in classical works than others during the same period. However, she does not find as extensive a use of classical rhetorical conventions as we find among the sixteenth-century Paris friars. These friars were interested primarily in classical morality tales (moralitates) and, therefore, found Ovid's Metamorphoses useful. They also quoted from patristic texts like Augustine's De civitate Dei. See in particular, chapter 3.
to classical figures and places, mythological (Diana) as well as historical (Hannibal, Sparta). Maurice Hylaret also mentions the Greek playwrights Euripides and Aristophanes along with the philosopher Seneca in the preface to two polemics directed against Catholic and Protestant intermarriage. "La leçon des bons auteurs, & forest des bonnes sciences & disciplines," he says, aided him in his writing of these two tracts. Neither Aristophanes nor Euripides, it should be noted, were commonly used by clerics prior to the period of the Renaissance.

---

8. Hylaret mentions Diana as well as other mythological figures in his work *Remonstrance catholique*, 1.

2. Berson compares the nuncio, Frangipani, to Hannibal in his funeral sermon. *Le regret funèbre contenant les actions et derniers propos de Mgr. fils de France, frère unique du roi* (Paris: P. L'Huillier, 1584): 23. One of his many sermons given at Saint-Jacques-de-la-Boucherie during Lent in 1574 compared Sparta to Protestant-beleaguered France: "Sparre fut forte par accord, Et pour nous ses murs avoit soldats vaillants, Ainsi s'en vont noz Royaumes faillants si entre nous se nourrit le discord." This synopsis is included with Berson's translation of *l'aveneement du Benoist S. Esprit*, Dii.

8. Maurice Hylaret, *Remonstrance catholique*. The full text is the following: "Ainsi ce que i'ay peu chasser et rechercher en la forest d'Orleans (ou est de present nostre bibliothèque ou librairie) en la leçon des bons auteurs, & forest des bonnes sciences & disciplines touchant ces deux susmentionez discours ...."  

89. In her monograph on preaching, Larissa Taylor found that all but one quarter of the literary allusions used in sermons prior to the Reformation were taken from the Bible. Latin and Greek references were taken from patristic works, and from classical historical and philosophical texts. With respect to these latter texts, Taylor mentions in particular Livy, Suetonius, Cicero and Plato. Taylor, *Soldiers of Christ: Preaching in Late Medieval and Reformation France* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992): 74-75.
authors and their recent imitators is similarly evident in his funeral oration for the nuncio Fabio Mirto Frangipani in 1587. Berson remarks that Frangipani was a product of Naples, the home of "les doctes anciens et modernes." He mentions, in particular, the ancient authors Titus Livius and Horace as well as the fifteenth-century humanist Lorenzo Valla.  

Franciscan willingness to make use of pagan texts is itself telling of the degree to which humanist scholarship had made inroads into sixteenth-century culture, and humanist appreciation for classical literature in particular had come to govern tastes among the educated social groups. Berson is making such a statement when he defends the usefulness of Christian as well as non-Christian classical texts for the preacher, citing their erudition and, equally important, their appealing rhetorical style. Orthodox friar that he was, Berson is careful to add, however, that though these texts cannot be surpassed as literature, they can be "adapted" and "adjusted" to suit modern needs.  

The final example of humanism to be discussed in this section, and by no means the least interesting, is a Franciscan predilection for writing histories of towns,  


91 "Il est impossible d'inventer mieux que les anciens, mais il est facile d'adjoister, ou à la disposition, ou à la maniere ...." Berson, Sermon de l'avènement du Bencist S. Esprit le jour de Pentacoste, traduit d'Italian en Francois par M.I. Berson (Paris: chez Pierre l'Huilier, 1574): Bvi.
churches and even nations. Noël Taillepied's authorship of several histories\textsuperscript{92} as well as biographies of the major Protestant theologians Luther, Beza and Calvin,\textsuperscript{93} places his work squarely in a humanist literary tradition which rejected the medieval chronicle and hagiographical forms in favour of new ones. These new forms embraced both classical narrative structures as well as the genre of curiosity writing which was itself a peculiar product of the early modern period.\textsuperscript{94} Taillepied was not alone in his literary tastes, since that jack-of-all-trades, Feuardent, also produced two histories.\textsuperscript{95} Taillepied's and Feuardent's

\textsuperscript{92} Two of the histories concerned the cities of Rouen and Pontoise (Les antiquitez et singularitez de Rouen. Avec un progresz des choses memorables y advenues depuis sa fondation jusques à present. Par F.N. Taillepied, lecteur en théologie (Rouen: Raphael du Petit, 1587), and Recueil des antiquitez et singularitez de la ville de Pontoise. Ville ancienne du pays de Vequecin francois. Par F.N. Taillepied, lecteur en théologie (Rouen: George l'Oiselet, 1587), and another discussed the origins of the Catholic Church: Le trésor de l'Eglise catholique, contenant l'origine des institutions, statutz, et ordonnances, & estatz d'icelle... (Paris: Jean de Bordeaux, 1578, and Nicholas Bonfons, 1586). Even more indicative of humanist interest in writing histories of nations, however, is Taillepied's work Histoire de l'estat. et Republiques des Druides, Eubages, Sarrovides, Bards, anciens Francois, gouverneurs des pais de la Gaule, depuis le délude universel, jusques à la venué de Jesus Christ en ce monde (Paris: Jean Parant, 1585).

\textsuperscript{93} Histoire des vies, moeurs, actes, doctrine et mort des trois principaux heretiques de nostre temps, a scavor Martin Luther, Jean Calvin et Theodore de Beze, jadis archiministre de Geneve (Douai, 1616).

\textsuperscript{94} Taillepied's Les antiquitez et singularitez de Rouen is a good example of the curiosity genre of historical writing. It is descriptive, filled with anecdotes and more antiquarian than classically historical in its approach to the history of Rouen.

\textsuperscript{95} Feuardent, Historiae fundationis ecclesiae. et abbatiae Montis S. Michaelis (1611), and Antiquitates
utilization of these narrative forms is revealing of Franciscan willingness to adopt new rhetorical strategies in pursuit of their spiritual mission, in this case choosing literary forms which were popular among educated classes in particular.

From the previous discussion we can begin to appreciate the formative role played by the University in the development of the sixteenth-century Franciscan preacher and theologian. The friar who arrived with trepidation and excitement to begin his studies at the studium emerged from his many years of study a confident spiritual leader. His exposure to humanism and other intellectual traditions prepared him, in particular, for the challenges posed by the order's most pressing concern -- Protestantism.

What the young friar perhaps did not immediately realize before embarking upon an academic career, however, was that the University itself would prove to be almost as great a challenge. The University was never comfortable having mendicants in its corporate body, as its tortured historic relationship with the friars demonstrates. During the late sixteenth century, a few deep-seated conflicts rocked relations between the friary and the University, and in consequence jeopardized the friar's successful completion of his studies.

Harflerii oppiddi in Normandia (1611).
Conflicts with the University

The contours of the Paris friary's combative relationship with the University are already visible by the middle of the thirteenth century. Shortly after a papal bull (1250) granted the mendicant orders the right to receive the licentia docendi, the University formally excluded the Franciscans and Dominicans from their society. The mendicants fought back, and although they remained banned from the arts curriculum as before, the friars managed to hold onto their places at the faculties of Theology and Canon Law.

During the fourteenth century, the University managed to place a few more strictures on mendicant privileges. Perhaps the most far-reaching measure was its insistence on an oath of obedience (1318), an oath which the friars were still making to the institution in the sixteenth century.

Relations between the friars and the Faculty were especially

---


97 In fact, they were expelled by the University three years later in 1253, only to be reinstated through the agency of the pope a few years later. Rashdall, 1, 376-379.

98 Rashdall, 1, 392.

99 Rashdall, 1, 393. Although, as Andrew Traver points out, the University sought consistently to control mendicant authority, particularly within the Faculty of Theology. Andrew Traver, "Secular and Mendicant Masters of the Faculty of Theology at the University of Paris, 1505-1523," 140.
problematic during the middle of the fifteenth century, when friars attempted to ensure that more of their members were allowed annually into the theology curriculum. They obtained papal bulls in support, but these bulls were rejected by an angry Parlement-supported University. ¹⁰⁰ Although the battles were somewhat tamer after 1560 than they had been in previous years, the age-old struggle regarding mendicant privileges continued all the same. Two issues in particular dominated discussions between the friary and the University during these years: mendicant access to the theology cursus, and fees.

Extraordinary students

It perhaps seems odd to use the lectura extraordinaria as an example of ongoing conflict rather than cooperation, since the number of mendicant students entering the theology curriculum was increasing throughout the sixteenth century as a result of this ad hoc procedure. "Extraordinary" or special students were just that -- friars allowed into the theology curriculum at the Faculty above the number of places already allotted to each order. Between 1564 and 1594, the Faculty accepted twenty-one Franciscans alone through this procedure. ¹⁰¹ This was a remarkable increase

¹⁰⁰ AN LL1524, f. 2. Dated 1552, this document recounts the historical conflict between the friary and the Faculty of Theology. The papal bull was received in 1442.

¹⁰¹ See the minutes of the friary (AN LL1511, LL1514, LL1515), and the Faculty of Theology register (AN MM249).
(70%) in the production of Franciscan scholars when we consider that the constitutions of the Faculty accepted only one Franciscan annually through the regular (ordinary) programme.

The process for entering extraordinary students was well-established by the middle of the sixteenth century. The Faculty never officially recognized this status as a privilege of the regular orders, however, and openly resisted its institutionalization. Special students entered on the sufferance of the Faculty and, as the register clearly indicates, each case was treated as a special, one-time occurrence. These friars also required the support of powerful individuals to secure a place for themselves in the cursus, and even by the 1560's, this support did not guarantee them immediate access. One particularly interesting exchange of letters reveals Charles IX's mounting anger over the Faculty's refusal to enter two Dominican candidates, Jean Coustier and Jean Fourré. The pleasant tone of the first letter dated October 21, 1564 gradually gives way to a much more irate one from June 21 1565. The Faculty similarly resisted the efforts of the Franciscan Jacques Berson. Notwithstanding the support of the Cardinal of Lorraine and Anne de Montmorency, the Faculty delayed his entrance into the theology curriculum.

102 Du Boulay, 6, 555. Charles IX was extremely angry, and went so far as to threaten the privileges of the Faculty if they continued not to cooperate. However, they still had not been accepted as late as December 12, 1565. See also d'Argentré, 2, pt. 1, 338-339.
for over a year.\textsuperscript{103}

Although clearly reluctant, the Faculty eventually did admit these students. Perhaps the pressure from prominent individuals was sufficient to break down its resistance, especially since it would have been to the Faculty's advantage to gain the favour of these patrons. It is also possible that the Faculty recognized the need for more trained preachers during such a spiritually confused time. Certainly this is the argument made by Louis de Bourbon, the duke of Montpensier, on behalf of friar Denis Rollot in 1566: "... the evil of the times are such that we must select worthy individuals to administer the word of God and push away the heresies which we see pulling us apart each day."\textsuperscript{104}

\textsuperscript{103} AN MM71 (November 9, 1565) This letter is from the Cardinal de Lorraine, who says of Berson: "d'autant qu'il est mon Ecolier, & religieux de bonne & grande esperance; je vous ais bien voulu ecrire la presente pour vous prier bien fort le vouloir recevoir extraordinairement, & pour l'amour de moi lui faire tous les plaisirs & faveurs qu'il vous sera possible en cet endroit ...." The letter from Anne de Montmorency is dated several months later, 28 May 1566. AN MM71. "frere Jacques Bression ... lequel appartient à aucuns mes principaux amis, m'a fait entendre qu'il desire entrer en cours en votre Faculté, & se rendre capable par la diligence & peine qu'il meritra en l'étude de la Baccalaureation où il s'achemine." These are both reprinted in d'Argentré, 2, pt. 1, 337. Jacques Berson finally entered the Faculty sometime between 1566 and 1568. He was licensed in 1574. BN Ms. Lat 15440.

\textsuperscript{104} AN MM71 (June 8, 1566). "Et aussi que la malice du temps auquel nous sommes merite bien de faire election de personnages ausquels on puisse voir esperance pour administrer la parole de Dieu & repousser les heresies que nous veoyons pulluller chacun jour ...." This letter was written by Bourbon on behalf of his sister, madame the Countess of Brené who was clearly a longtime supporter of Rollot: "laquelle l'a toujours nourri & entretenu aux études."
Generosity aside, the Faculty's toleration of the special student was probably pragmatic at base. After all, these students were forced to pay double the fees of the ordinary students, thereby adding significantly to the Faculty's coffers. During the period of the civil wars, the Faculty's need for money may have been as great as its need for preachers. The special status was also useful because it temporarily defused mendicant efforts to claim more places in the theology curriculum. The mendicants were never satisfied with the compromise reached in the fifteenth century that limited their places in the Faculty. With the exception of the botched reform programme developed in 1567,\textsuperscript{105} however, which attempted to increase the allotted number, the Faculty's efforts seemed to have had at least some success. At the very least they delayed officially granting the mendicants further places until the end of the century.\textsuperscript{106}

For both financial and political reasons, then, the status of special student served the interests of the Faculty even more, perhaps, than it served the needs of the friars. Other issues beyond the question of access to the theology curriculum, however, disrupted friar-University relations during this period. Among the long-standing areas

\textsuperscript{105} AN LL1524, ff. 4v-8.

\textsuperscript{106} AN LL1524, ff. 20-22. The reform was implemented in 1598, the same years as the publishing of the Edict of Nantes.
of dispute was the segregation of lectureships. This long-established practise was tested by the friars in 1584 when one member of the community, Claude Richard, was hired to give public lectures in philosophy and theology at the Collège de la Marche.\textsuperscript{107} The University reacted quickly. During a session held on January 9, the University's deliberative body proposed bringing the matter to the Parlement for resolution. Eleven days later, the University told the Collège de la Marche to replace Richard with a secular lecturer.\textsuperscript{106} The College must have complied, since we have no further extant discussion of this issue.

Another dispute had erupted between the friars and the Faculty a few years earlier. This time, however, the dispute was over the privileges of the bedel and the aggressor was the Faculty. A secular bedel, Pierre Le Goulx ("le petit bedeau"), was accused by the friars in 1559 of blocking the mendicant bedels from carrying the conclusions\textsuperscript{109} of their own bachelors. Another incident, involving a Carmelite this

\textsuperscript{107} Du Boulay, 6, 785. Crevier mentions that a Jesuit was also in trouble for holding public lectures during the same year, but Du Boulay makes no mention of this. Crevier, 6, 378-379.

\textsuperscript{106} "In Comitiis ... decretum l. admonendum Gymnasiarcham Marchianum ne pateretur amplius Fratrem Claudius Ricard Regularem profiteri Philosophiam publicè; sed eius loco secularrem Professorem sufficeret." Du Boulay, 6, 785.

\textsuperscript{109} The conclusions were the essential points which would be covered by a bachelor during an upcoming disputation. These conclusions were delivered to each college and studium by the bedel of the order prior to the disputation.
time, is mentioned in 1560. The position of bedel was a prestigious one at the University, playing an important ceremonial role by conducting priests from the convents, directing processions and carrying conclusions for the bachelors among other duties. By the sixteenth century, each order was allowed two bedels to perform the necessary tasks of the office. However, the statutes of the Faculty insisted that mendicant bedels be accompanied by the secular bedels when delivering conclusions. Le Goulx's decision to interfere with the privileges of the mendicant bedel was considered a violation of the privileges of the Franciscan community at the University, and it was also an attack on the livelihood of the friars since the bedel was one of the best paid positions in the University. For these two reasons, the friars quickly sought the support of the Parlement. The Parlement favoured their cause, and by all appearances the matter was settled quickly once the rector

\footnotesize

110 Du Boulay, 6, 533-534.
111 Rashdall, 1, 192.
112 For example, see the following entry in the Faculty register dated March 1, 1529. "Et injunxit facultas regentibus collegiorum in quibus legitur Biblia ordinaria ut precipiant sui bidellis ex parte facultatis quod servent statutum et conclusionem facultatis." James Farge ed., Registre des procès-verbaux de la Faculté de Théologie (Janvier 1524-Novembre 1533) (Paris: Aux Amateurs de Livres, 1990): 226, sec. 283 F.

113 A bedel was as well paid as regent doctors for his duties. A reform proposed by Charles IX in 1567, for example, would have allowed the two bedels thirty-six livres together for attending the principia of their own bachelors and other assemblies involving the doctors. This amount, eighteen livres each, was the same as that allotted to the regent doctors. AN LL1524, f. 6.
of the University promised that no further interference would occur.¹¹⁴

A more pressing and continuous problem facing Franciscan-Faculty relations concerned the economic privileges of the regent doctor. As a member of the Faculty's council, the regent doctor was entitled to certain financial benefits, among them fees for supervising disputations and students' studies, and receiving a "biretta" from new doctors.¹¹⁵ The doctor could only claim these privileges, however, and that of the euphemie, the small annual fee received on the feast of Saint Euphemia (September 16),¹¹⁶ if he fulfilled the basic requirements of his office, namely, that he give the annual mandatory lecture on the feast of Saint Euphemia and that he spend the greater part of the previous year in Paris.

The euphemie in particular was an old source of dispute between the mendicants and the University, so it is not surprising to find the Paris friary accusing the Faculty of denying its members this privilege during the late sixteenth century as well. A royal patent letter dated November 3, 1554 addresses Franciscan concern about payment of the

¹¹⁴ Du Boulay, 6, 534. An arrêt from the chambre de conseil at the Parlement of Paris (May 27, 1560) prohibited le Goulx from interfering with the privileges of the mendicant bedels.

¹¹⁵ Farge, Orthodoxy, 35.

¹¹⁶ Farge, Orthodoxy, 34. See also AN LL 1524, ff. 11-12. The term "euphemie" appears in the legal contracts in reference to this annual payment.
euphemie to its regent doctors. Five years later, the friar Jean Garnerat is mentioned in another document as a particular complainant. Garnerat claims the right of euphemie even though he is not a regent doctor. According to the courts, however, Garnerat's claim was legitimate, since the Faculty constitutions granted this privilege to all doctors of theology who fulfilled the basic requirements of the office.

Economic crisis

The willingness of the Franciscan community to go to Parlement to protect the rights of their bedels and regent doctors shows how important these privileges were to the order. These offices were prestigious, but they also entailed financial entitlements which the friars could ill afford to lose. The friars may have been particularly sensitive to such attacks during the late sixteenth century because of the perilous situation of their own finances and the inflated costs of study at the University. However, the University was clearly experiencing financial difficulties as well. The increasing popularity of Protestantism, and the periodic outbursts of violence, plague and famine, wreaked havoc on the economic infrastructure of the city during this period, and created tremendous disorder both in the friary and in the University.

117 AN LL1524, September 20, 1559, ff. 15-16. The letter, dated November 3, 1554, is in the name of Henry II.
The major chronicles of the period allow one to trace the mounting disorder at the University. Horrified by their sacrilegious use of University land (the Pré-aux-clercs), students along with other inhabitants attacked a group of Protestant worshippers in 1561. These efforts did not prevent the infiltration of Protestantism into the ranks of students and masters, however. Crevier notes that several masters converted during the early 1560's, among them the famous philosopher and mathematician, Pierre Ramus. These individuals added to the turmoil by preaching publicly about their new faith and encouraging iconoclasm on University property.

Attempts in February 1562 to seek a compromise on ritual between the Protestants and Catholics failed and, by June 1562, the University moved to take a harder stance against the new religion. Students and masters alike were forced to take an oath testifying to their orthodoxy, and then join an expiatory procession on July 14, 1562 to the great abbey church of Sainte-Geneviève. Ever zealous, the

116 The Pré-aux-Clercs is discussed in this chapter, nt. 5.

119 Crevier, 6, 130.

120 A council was held at Saint-Germain-en-Laye in February 1562 to try and seek accommodation between the two factions. Crevier, 6, 130.

121 D'Argentré, Collectio 2, pt. 1: 318-319, 321-322. This oath was first taken by the Faculty in 1543, and it was rejuvenated again on July 9, 1562. The names of the friars who took this oath are listed: Ambrose Milley, Jacques Hugonis, and François Volant.
Faculty of Theology also stated its intention at this time to augment its catalogue of censured books.\(^{122}\)

Throughout the civil wars, the University continued to oppose Protestantism. However, its efforts to maintain a purified body were continually undermined by the seesawing truces formulated at the top of France's political hierarchy. Protestant masters were alternately removed from their positions and then permitted back into the structure from treaty to treaty.\(^{123}\)

No doubt this lack of certainty partly fuelled the hostility which led to the slaughter of many Protestant professors during the Massacre of Saint Bartholomew's Day, among them Ramus himself.\(^{124}\) It was during the period of the League, however, that disorder in the University increased exponentially. In 1587, the Parlement in the name of Henry III called for a reform of the University, and authorized the door-to-door search of all colleges to seek out

\(^{122}\) D'Argentré, 2, pt. 1, 335-340, and Du Boulay, Historia 6, 556-558. The catalogue referred to was of course the catalogue of prohibited books which the Faculty of Theology had been augmenting and publishing since 1544. The history of the Faculty's censorship of published works of course began much earlier in the century. For a discussion on Faculty censorship of printed works, see J.M. De Bujanda, et al., Index des livres interdits 1, 51-76.

\(^{123}\) Crevier, 6, 136. All officers of the state were subjected to a profession of faith or could be removed from their office by a decree of the Parlement of Paris. Ramus lost his office in 1562, but returned in 1565, as animated as ever.

\(^{124}\) Théodore Agrippa D'Aubigné, Histoire universelle 3 (Geneva: Librairie Droz, 1985): 343. According to D'Aubigné, Ramus was thrown from the window and his body subsequently whipped by young students.
unorthodox material. Fear of heresy also led the University administration actively to support the League by 1588, and the disorder within the institution only increased from this point on. Students were involved in the day of the Barricades, and active clerics like Guillaume Rose fanned the flames of political agitation in the University.

The financial effects of the disorder of these years is everywhere apparent in contemporary memoirs. In 1591, the University is complaining to Mayenne about the billeting of

---

125 D'Argentré, 2, pt. 1, 460-461. This demand for reform came at the request of the rector of the University, who sought royal support to effect this reform. Henry III authorized the rector of the University to search all colleges for evidence of heresy. According to the document, he was to be accompanied by a royally-appointed commissioner: "... se transporter esdits Colleges, Chambres, & maisons, & en icede voir, visiter, chercher, découverir, prendre & saisir tous les papiers, placarts, livres pernicieux, hérétiques & scandaleux, tant contre notre Etat que contre l'Eglise Catholique, Apostolique, & Romaine ...." The concern was clearly about order as much as it was about orthodoxy. The King advises the rector to watch out not only for other doctrinal errors, but also for blasphemy, and "introduction de femmes, armes & autres voyes de fait ...." This document is dated March 6, 1587.

126 Crevier, 6, 401-402. The regent doctors took the oath to the Union.

127 Crevier, 6, 399.

128 Guillaume Rose was one of the most prominent preachers in Paris during the period of the League as well as an influential regent doctor at the University. He was named Grand Master of the College de Navarre in 1583, one of the most prestigious colleges at the University. He was also chosen to be one of the prédicateurs du roi, clerics chosen to preach at important royal ceremonial occasions. Rose's activity during the civil wars is discussed in Charles Labitte, De la démocratie chez les prédicateurs de la Ligue (Paris: Joubert, 1841): 64-66. See also Crevier, 6, 317-319.
soldiers in its colleges, and by 1592, the University was in serious disarray. Its student body had been depleted by the internecine conflict, and those students who were still registered were not attending classes according to Crevier.

The rising disorder which afflicted the University affected the Paris friary as well, as we can see from the convent's financial accounts. The Paris friary was already complaining of hardship by 1560. As an Observant house, the Paris friary was reliant on the collection of alms for a substantial part of its yearly income. However, this source alone could not sustain a community of its size and complexity. Annuities received from landholdings in the city, the foundations provided by patrons, and Franciscan pensions, were used not only to manage the household and

\[129\] Du Boulay, 6, 807. The letter also requested that University officials be exempted from standing guard as well.

\[130\] Crevier, Histoire 6, 412.

\[131\] The issue of poverty was one of the key points of contention during the split of the order into Conventual and Observant branches during the fifteenth century. The collection of alms was considered by the Observants to be the only legitimate source of income. By the sixteenth century, however, the standards regarding poverty had relaxed sufficiently in the Observant order to allow its houses more variety in sources of income. Individual friars, however, were still barred in Franciscan statutes from enjoying personal wealth. The issue of poverty is discussed in a number of works, among them Moorman, History, 185-186, 307-19, and Duncan Nimmo, Reform and Division in the Franciscan Order 1226-1538 (Rome: Capuchin Historical Institute, 1987).

\[132\] Pensions were annual sums provided usually by a friar's family or the province to cover the costs of room and board at a friary. For a discussion of Franciscan
provide spiritual services but also to fund the education of the numerous students "de gratia."

The cost of theological education was enormous. One of the biggest expenses was books, but the friars also had to be fed, clothed and housed. Upon entering the Faculty at the University, furthermore, friars were also subject to another range of fees which, by the sixteenth century, were far out of the financial reach of most individuals. Every stage, from biblicus through to the licentiate and the receiving of the doctoral biretta was accompanied by a complex tariff of fees and "gifts" owed to the doctors and other University officials in attendance.

A reform proposal from 1567 provides some idea of the extraordinary fiscal demands placed upon all students, the mendicants in particular. The controversial banquet paid by a licentiate might cost as much as 300 livres. Another fifty livres was demanded for the principium, and 100 livres seven sous six deniers for the vespería in addition to other fees.¹³³ The new doctor also paid an additional 80 livres in "sugar" (sucre) and "draguées" to gain the favour of their supervisors.¹³⁴ Pierre Ramus estimated in 1562 that the

¹³³ AN LL1524, ff. 8v-9r. Of course, efforts to curb University abuses with respect to fees began much earlier. Farge mentions one particular reform attempt initiated in 1532 which was finally implemented two years later, in 1534. Farge, Le parti conservateur, 136-139.

¹³⁴ The terms "sucre" and "draguée" were old ones, referring to a Christian belief that education could not be
doctorate of theology, the most expensive diploma at the University, cost the student an astonishing 1002 livres by the end of the programme.  

Even during the most peaceful and prosperous periods, then, the financial drain of studies at the University was a cause of considerable concern for the Paris Cordeliers. During the period of the civil wars, the costliness became an insupportable burden. We have seen that the Cordelier community was already in financial trouble by the 1560's.  

The violence of the wars in November 1567 forced the temporary closing of lectures at the studium "until a later date." Feeling burdened by the number of "studentia de gratia" in the household in 1573, the inner council decided to send a few home in August. Students in their third and fourth year, and those who went rarely to lectures (clearly a punitive measure) were told to return at Easter unless the times improved before that. If the conditions worsened, bought. It was, rather, a gift. From early on in the history of the Faculty of Theology, however, these forms of gifts became standard and expected means of payment for Faculty regent doctors from their students. For a discussion of the origins of these terms, see Gaines Post, K. Giocarnis and R. Kay "The Medieval Heritage of a Humanistic Ideal: Scientia donum Dei est, unde vendi non potest." Traditio, 2 (1955): 196-234.

135 Crevier, 6, 90-91.
136 See the Introduction, p. 6.
137 AN LL1515 (November 5, 1567), ff. 22v-23. The original text for this episode is found in the introduction to this thesis.
138 " ... vel si conventus pro ad meliorum fortuna et panguorem providerit." AN 1515 (July 11, 1573), f. 59v.
the council proposed sending home students (in proportion) by province.

From all appearances, conditions did worsen. The burning of the church and the friary's library in 1580 was an unforeseen disaster, and times clearly were still difficult three years later, because the friars were asked for money once again. Next to the disastrous years of the 1560's, however, the period of the Holy League was most difficult for the community's studium. Even more than before, the minutes discuss the difficulties of the time. In 1591, the discretoire refused to accept bachelors "de gratia" until the times improved. On July 19 1591 the house decided that students studying physics be sent home immediately. Later in September, another personal levy was proposed from members of the community. By 1594, the pensions for the youth, students and bachelors had more than doubled since the early days of the civil wars. Bachelors were being asked now to pay fifty livres, the students thirty-seven, and the youth studying the liberal arts

---

139 The pensions of students were raised to twenty-three livres for students, eight for physics, and fifteen for others. AN LL1511 (April 28, 1583), f. 10. The bachelors were expected to pay thirty-five livres according to a subsequent entry dated May 3, 1583, f. 10v.

140 AN LL1511 (April 22, 1591), f. 65. "... patres studentes qui cum obedientis de gratia pretendunt ad ordinem baccalauriorum, non recipientur, donec melior regni, civitatis, y conventus huius fortuna occurrerit."

141 AN LL1511 (July 19, 1591), f. 66.

142 AN LL1511 (September 12, 1591), f. 66v.
programme were paying between twelve and twenty livres depending on their programme.¹⁴³

Needless to say, the increasing cost of study in the studium, and the burden this placed on the individual friars, forced many to interrupt their studies for periods of time. Unlike the secular clergy, friars were unable to hold benefices,¹⁴⁴ and were therefore reliant upon the generosity of family and friends as well as on fees for preaching¹⁴⁵ to support them through the more costly stages. Although the friary minutes never mention members interrupting the cursus for economic reasons, they do mention the constant problem of friars in financial arrears as well as friars staying in Paris even though they were not officially studying there at that time. The financial strains were such that the house tried increasingly punitive measures to force payment, even depriving the delinquent the right to vote in the election of the guardian.¹⁴⁶

¹⁴³ The fees were apportioned in the following way: twelve (physics), sixteen (logic), eighteen (dialectic), and twenty livres (grammar). AN LL1511 (January 27, 1595), f. 81.

¹⁴⁴ Farge, Orthodoxy, 31.

¹⁴⁵ Preaching was one recognized way for a student to raise funds. This was particularly true during the periods of Lent and Advent when preachers were in high demand across France. The importance of preaching, for financial as well as spiritual reasons, explains why the friary was willing to accommodate the exodus of so many of its members during these times of the year. For a discussion of preaching, see chapter 2. Farge also mentions this practise. Orthodoxy, 33.

¹⁴⁶ AN LL1511 (June 9, 1584), f. 23. "... nihil solueruit a Paschate careant voto si ante eam non solueruit."
The financial hardships suffered by both the University and the friary during this period explain why most incidents of conflict between the two institutions revolved around the cost of studies. For the friars, the doctoral diploma was even more expensive than it was for the secular clergy because of various extra costs accruing to the mendicants. A Dominican petition to the Parlement from the 1560's concerning the inflated costs of a theology degree is found among the papers of the Franciscans. According to this document, the Dominicans had petitioned the Parlement of Paris several times already about the Faculty of Theology's violations. These violations are listed in some detail. Bachelors were being forced to do an additional tentativa, according to this document, and four Dominicans were also forced to do the disputatio de quolibet, a disputation which had been discontinued for the seculars by the sixteenth century but which continued to be expected of the mendicants. They also complained that their members entering as special students were forced to pay double the fees despite injunctions from the Parlement, and that their doctors were being denied the rights of euphemie. The convent was also irritated by the Faculty's seeming disrespect for their participation in important Faculty rituals, claiming that the Faculty often did not call them to visit and assist "aux Rooles de ceux qui doibvent estre
licentiers ...."^{147}

The Franciscan friary's preservation of this document amongst its own papers shows that the Dominicans were not alone in feeling victimized by the Faculty. Following this petition is a paper trail of Parlement documents involving two Franciscans, Jean Guinard and Jacques Le Dreulx, which begins November 25 1566 and is still continuing in 1571.^{148} These bachelors say that after two years in the theology curriculum, having completed the tentativa and other required disputation, they were refused for the license until they paid double the fees of the secular doctors. The friars complained that they had no money and that the statutes did not require them to pay double the fee, even though they entered the Faculty as extraordinary students.

Reform

The mendicants did not have to search hard for support in their battle against rising costs and during the civil wars. At least three serious reform efforts were initiated after 1560,^{149} both within and without the University structure, to reduce the financial burden of the bachelors and licentiates, seculars as well as mendicants. Pierre

---

^{147} AN LL1524, ff. 11-12.

^{148} AN LL1524, ff. 17v-18. The two friars were forced to appear before Parlement as late as January 30, 1571 with their documents.

^{149} These three reforms were not the only ones of the sixteenth century. A general reform of the University was legislated as early as 1536. See Farge, Le parti conservateur, 133-140.
Ramus was eager to reform the entire system as early as 1562, and five years later Charles IX tried unsuccessfully to force a reform of the Faculty's "abusive" fee structure.\textsuperscript{150} This detailed document, which mentions also the future appointment of royal commissioners to oversee the implementation of the reforms, attempted to abolish the banquet of Saint-Pierre and introduce a more moderate tariff of fees.\textsuperscript{151} Doctors, for example, were to be paid thirteen livres for presiding over the principium and eighteen livres for attending meetings where bachelors would be examined to be admitted. They would each also receive three livres for attending services honouring dead faculty members. Bachelors reading the Sentences could expect to distribute a total of twenty-two livres during their three years of study,\textsuperscript{152} and licentiates would pay on average forty-eight livres during their stage of studies.\textsuperscript{153} For the doctorate, the cleric was

\textsuperscript{150} The letter takes particular issue with both the excessive nature of the fees and their unequal distribution among Faculty doctors: "Nos intention et vouloir sont que dicy en avant icexui deniers soient par esgalle portion donner et distribuez seulement et a tous docteurs indifferemment qui feront profession publique et lectures ordinaires, en ladicte faculté, soient seculiers Religieux mandians ou autres ...." AN LL1524, f. 5.

\textsuperscript{151} AN LL1524, ff. 4v-7. It mentions in particular abolishing the traditional banquet of Saint-Pierre expected of the licentiates, and "tous dons de sucre et dragees."

\textsuperscript{152} Three livres given to each doctor attending their lectures, and another three livres six sous each time they read the Sentences. AN LL1524, ff. 4v-7.

\textsuperscript{153} Seven livres 6 sous to each doctor for assisting their disputations during the four years, including the tentativa, the small and great ordinary disputations, and the sorbonica and vesperium. 10 livres 16 sous also given to the two bedels for attending their disputations. AN LL1524,
to pay each doctor and bedel twenty livres to attend the
disputation of the licentiate in addition to other fees.\textsuperscript{154}

This reform, however well-intentioned, was never
implemented during the civil wars.\textsuperscript{155} Another, proposed by
Charles' brother Henry in 1587, may have been a little more
successful.\textsuperscript{156} Like the reform of 1567, the 1587 reform
proposed a specific tariff of fees, though this merely
represented one part of a more over-reaching reform of the
entire structure of the University. Interestingly for the
mendicant orders, this reform plan increased the number of
mendicants entering the ordinary theology curriculum each
year.\textsuperscript{157}

It was not until 1598, four years after Henry IV
obtained the throne and the same year that the Edict of
Nantes was published, that a far-reaching reform of the
Faculty was fully implemented. Unfortunately for the

\begin{flushleft}
\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item[154] AN LL1524, ff. 6-7.
\item[155] D'Argentré, 2, pt. 1, 462-481.
\item[156] The silence of the Faculty of Theology registers
after 1567 makes it difficult to judge the success of these
reforming measures. However, the lack of Franciscan
litigation during these last decades may be attributable to
the implementation of the reforms. It is equally possible,
however, that increasing disorder in the city temporarily
drew the attention of these clerics away from their ongoing
dispute.
\item[157] It proposed that the number of mendicants be
increased in the following proportion: seven Dominicans, six
Franciscans, four Augustinians and four Carmelites. Other
measures included the enforcement of certain ancient
linguistic usages, conservative dress and comportment for
the doctors, and age limitations. Crevier, 6, 395.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
\end{flushleft}
mendicant orders, however, these reforms substantially reduced the number of mendicant clergy admitted for the license. The Dominicans had to be content with five places rather than seven after 1598, and the Augustinians and Carmelites with three rather than four each. Granted six places in 1587, the Franciscans were now only allowed four places in the licentiate class.\footnote{AN LL1524, ff. 20r-22v.}

**Conclusion**

Both the friary and the University managed to survive the vicissitudes of the civil war period with their respective reputations intact, and it is probable that the continuing vitality of each owed something to the battling nature of their relationship. On the one hand, the constant vigilance of one against the encroachments of the other forced both institutions continually to justify their own rights and privileges. On the other hand, the regular interaction of Scotism and the other intellectual traditions was responsible for the remarkable vibrancy of the University's scholarly community. For the friars discussed in this study, the University played a particularly vital role. Both through the traditional training programme provided by the Faculty of Theology, and through the friar's exposure to different intellectual traditions like that of humanism, the University helped to produce preachers and theologians who were ready and willing to lead the members of war-torn French society to salvation.
CHAPTER 4: PATRONAGE, LAY PIETY AND
THE CREATION OF A CATHOLIC COMMUNITY

As we have seen in the previous chapters, the training which the friars received at the University of Paris was an important part of their preparation for the war against heresy, as was their indoctrination in the Franciscan spiritual tradition. Another key component in their campaign for general spiritual rejuvenation was the relationship the friars forged with secular society. Their effectiveness as agents of reform in society was ultimately dependent upon society's acceptance of the Franciscans as spiritual leaders.

One way that lay society demonstrated its acceptance was to provide the religious community with gifts, financial and otherwise, and to demand spiritual services from the community in return. Examination of the relationship between the Paris friary and its patrons therefore provides another vantage point from which to examine the friary's interpretation of its spiritual role during the period of this study. The potential richness of patronage as a source of historical investigation has been proven by the flurry of excellent studies in recent years. The monographs of Sharon Kettering, Arlette Jouanna, William Beik and Kristen Neuschel among others have underscored the usefulness of patronage studies for exploring political, social and economic ties binding noble to noble, and noble to prince. The formation of political elites, the exercise of power at
the regional as well as the national level, the development of concepts of honour -- these and other facets of early modern society have been opened to investigation through the reconstruction and analysis of patronage relationships.

Patronage however was not the unique perogative of the elite sectors of society, though one might be excused from thinking so given the preponderance of work on these particular social groups. Sharon Kettering has recently bemoaned the dearth of work on ties between noble and non-noble, as well as those between different social groups in the urban context. This list of neglected areas should be expanded to include that of lay patronage of religious institutions. Patronage was an all-pervasive bonding agent which brought disparate individuals and groups of individuals together into a community. It was also in consequence an agent of change, one means by which new ideas and new individuals could be incorporated with relative ease into the existing political, social, intellectual and economic structure of society. The process of incorporation was a process of transformation, for the individual and the

---


community could not but find themselves altered by the experience.

To understand early modern society we must therefore seek a more complete understanding of patronage at all social levels, and the Paris Cordelier house presents an opportunity to do just this. The friary was firmly embedded in the social fabric of Paris and enjoyed the goodwill and support of individuals from a variety of different social milieux, providing us with evidence on which to examine the operation of patronage throughout Parisian society. More specifically, lay patronage of the friars allows us to examine the relationships between lay and religious individuals. Lay patronage of religious institutions has already been studied to some extent, but curiously, it has been viewed through a remarkably secularist lens, ignoring religious impulses to patronage. Church patronage has been seen by historians primarily as an extension of the political and economic privileges of the elite social groups, a necessary protection for this dumping-ground for younger sons and daughters. For these reasons, bishoprics, important abbeys and canonries have garnered the most attention.  

\[\text{There are of course exceptions. A number of regional studies attempt to provide some understanding of patronage ties between religious institutions and the community during the sixteenth century, among them Claire Dolan's work on Aix-en-Provence, Entre tours et clochers: les gens d'église à Aix-en-Provence au XVIe siècle (Sherbrooke: Les Éditions de l'Université de Sherbrooke, 1981), Marc Venard's Réforme protestante, réforme catholique dans la province d'Avignon, XVIe siècle (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1993), and Nicole Lemaitre's examination of the diocese of Rodez, Le Rouergue} \]
The influence of the Annales school has done little to broaden our understanding of connections between lay and religious sectors of society. Annaliste fascination with unearthing a popular mentality has gone far in revealing the complexity of early modern spirituality, but this fascination has stopped short of the institutions of the Church. Religious institutions, in particular the regular orders, have been considered somehow separate from "popular" society even though their members were products of that same society.¹

For a variety of reasons, then, lay-clerical relations have largely escaped historical investigation for sixteenth-century France. And yet we cannot hope to grasp the full complexity of early modern spirituality without understanding these relations. Patronage of religious institutions was one of the most important ways by which lay people could exercise some control over their own spiritual flamboyant:


¹ The divide within the field of religious history between historians of ecclesiastic institutions and historians of lay spirituality is nowhere more apparent than in studies on the Massacre of Saint Bartholomew's Day. None of the classic works on the event examine the role played by the religious orders, even though many were active participants. See among other works, the now classic Tocsin pour un massacre (Paris: Editions du Centurion, 1968) by Janine Estèbe, and the more recent work of Denis Crouzet, La nuit de la Saint-Barthélemy (Paris: Fayard, 1994).
life, as well as the spiritual life of secular society, in addition to exercising political and economic influence. However, the religious institutions were not merely serving the needs of their patrons. This study of a Cordeliers community reveals the extent to which lay and religious piety were mutually dependent. The Cordeliers and their patrons sought a spiritual rejuvenation of society in order to preserve it from the lure of Protestantism. They used each other to achieve this end, and in the process they molded one another into urban missionaries.

A brief discussion of the social and economic background of the Cordeliers and their patrons, followed by analysis of the forms of patronage and how they functioned, will reveal the aspects of sixteenth-century spirituality and conceptions of community which were essential to the forging of this missionary alliance.

THE CORDELIERS: A PROFILE

Surviving documents provide little biographical information beyond indicating the place of origin of the friar, offices held and university diplomas received. Paris friars who did not hold posts or attend the university, the majority in effect, are all but untraceable. Those who did any one of these things are marginally more visible. Nevertheless, conceptions of status permeated religious institutions as much as lay society at this time, and so one generally finds individuals of higher social status.
occupying the higher posts.\(^5\) Since guardians and office-holders in the Paris friary generally came from the middling ranks of society,\(^6\) we can assume that the majority of the friars came from the middling and lower social groups rather than from the great noble and merchant families. The remarkable preacher Pierre de Cornibus did manage to scale the heights of office politics even though he was "extraict de parens pauvres & de fort basse condition."\(^7\) However he was the exception rather than the rule. Equally unusual were friars of noble background. Jacques Hugonis was a product of

\(^5\) Consciousness of status as a defining factor is evident in the 1502 statutes, which in various clauses pointedly state that all were subject to the rules, regardless of social position or status. In chapter 23, section 1, for example, friars were forbidden to eat outside the fellowship of the community without the permission of the guardian: "Nullus culiuscumque gradus aut conditionis fuerit audet comedere extra communitatem nisi de licentia guardiani aut alterior praesidentis obtenta ...." Celestino di Piana, "Gli statuti per la riforma dello studio di Parigi (a. 1502)" in Archivum franciscanum historicum 52 (1959): 95.


\(^7\) Jacques Fodéré, Narration historique et topographique des convents de l'ordre S. Francois. et monasteres S. Claires. erigez en la province de Bourgogne (Lyon: Pierre Pigau, 1619): 446. Cornibus (d. 1549), a native of the town of Beaune, was a famous preacher in his day and was honoured by the King as councillor and royal preacher. He was guardian of the Paris convent between 1528 and 1532. According to Fodéré, Cornibus was a recognized Greek scholar during his day. However, James Farge argues that he was apparently hostile to humanists as well as to reformers. Farge, Biographical Register of Paris Doctors of Theology 1500-1536 (Subsidia Mediaevalia. 10. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1980): 112-113.
a noble family from the city of Gap in the region of Dauphiné, and Othon de Pavie tells us that Christophe Cheffontaine, one-time student at the Paris house and future minister general of the order, was of ancient Breton noble lineage.

More typical examples are Jacques Belin, François Le Roy, and Marin Le Peuple. Le Peuple clearly came from a substantial Paris merchant family. A contract dated December 8, 1588 recognizes a foundation at the Cordelier convent established for Le Peuple, who wished to join the community. His father Nicolas is described as a marchand bourgeois, a vague expression which provides little indication of his actual status. However his brother Jacques is referred to as a chancelier, a designation which suggests an association

---


8 Christophe Cheffontaine (1532?-1595) is also referred to by the Latin version of his name, Capite Fontium, and by the Breton version, Penfentenioù. He became minister general of the Franciscan order in 1571, and bishop of Cesarea in 1586. Othon de Pavie L'Aquitaine séraphique 3 (Auch: 1905): 299. See also the entry on Cheffontaine in Michaud, *Biographie universelle* 8 (Paris: Michaud, 1811-1828): 69. Cheffontaine's career in the Franciscan order is discussed in more detail in ch. 5, pp. 326-328.

10 There were many chancelleries in Paris, the most prestigious being the "la grande chancellerie" which was directly affiliated with the royal court. Among the most important responsibilities of the various chancelleries was the transcription of judicial decisions and motions. Le Peuple's designation as "chancelier" is vague, but he was probably affiliated with one of the smaller sovereign courts since he is not identified as "secrétaire du roi" and thus as a member of the great chancellery. Nor is he found in Hélène Michaud's study of the chancellery *La grande chancellerie et les écritures royales au XVIe siècle* (Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1967). See also Barbara Diefendorf, *Paris City Councillors in the Sixteenth Century*
with an office in one of the chancelleries affiliated with the numerous sovereign courts based in Paris. The guardian Jacques Belin's status may have been somewhat lower, though he clearly came from a well-to-do family of Paris merchant-artisans. His nephew, buried in the Cordelier Church along with his children, was Henri Cappon, "tailleur des habits du prince de Condé."¹¹ François Le Roy appears to have come from a similar social milieu, what Philippe Sagnac has labelled the "middling bourgeois."¹² In a contract establishing a pension for his continued studies at the University, Le Roy gives away his goods to Jacques Prevost, who is described as "aussi marchand" living in the region of Bray-sur-Seine.¹³

The meager representation of the high nobility among the mendicant orders is not at all surprising. Membership in such an order did not confer high status, nor did it usually provide substantial economic remuneration, let alone

---

¹¹ AN LL1525, f. 48. Belin was not a member of one of the six great corporations in the city but he was clearly quite successful, as his connection to the Prince de Condé suggests. Philippe Sagnac suggests that the Paris merchant-artisans like Belin occupied a higher status than found outside the city, largely because of their association with the production of fine-quality goods. See Sagnac, La formation de la société moderne 2 (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1945): 69-71.

¹² Sagnac, 2, 64. Sagnac includes here such occupations as doctors, professors, and writers as well as well-to-do members of the great artisan corporations.

¹³ AN MC ET/XXIX/12, f. 416.
political clout. Some friars could and did amass substantial sums of money during their lifetime and even enjoyed some political influence. Nevertheless these individuals, if not rare, were not the norm. Their achievements had as much to do with the force of their personalities as well as their political connections. Certainly most friars did not amass money on the scale of canons or abbey office holders, nor were guardians as politically powerful as abbots or bishops. The lower economic and political status can be attributed in part to the vow of poverty taken by the order, which saw much of individual friar's wealth absorbed by the community. It was also perhaps a result of the elaborate rotating office system discussed in chapter 2, which made sustained control or influence of an individual or family over an office more difficult to accomplish (albeit not impossible). For these reasons, then, nobles were drawn to the cathedrals and abbeys of France rather than to the mendicant orders.

---

14 The more prominent preachers amassed substantial sums. Jacques Hugonis, for example, had accumulated over 800 livres tournois by the time of his death, according to his will which was drafted on December 10, 1574. AN MC ET/LXXXVII/39. Cheffontaine also owned some property, for in his will of January 3 1584 he left all his goods in the Faubourg Saint-Marcel, "meubles et immeubles", to the Paris friary in return for a foundation. AN LL1523: 231. Similarly, the preacher Bonaventure Brosse, a bachelor in the Paris house in 1588, enriched the sacristy of his friary in Auxerre with "un beau calice, deux burettes, une boete a pain a chanter, une croix et deux chandeliers, le tout d'argent doré cizelé." This amounted to the sizeable sum of 280 escus. He also gave many books as well. See Auguste Molinier, Obituaires de la province de Sens 3 (Paris: 1906): 325.

15 Many of the most important French benefices were controlled by the great noble French families for several generations, such as Gondi control of the archbishopric of
The appeal of the Franciscans for other social groups is, however, understandable. For younger sons, the order offered financial security if not vast wealth, an active life working in the community, and an education if desired (and merited). Convents regularly took in novices who were then raised to be friars. The cosmographer André Thevet, patron of the Paris Cordeliers and close friend of the Cordelier preacher Maurice Hylaret, was certainly not the first younger son to find himself in a Franciscan habit at the urgings of his family, and the reasons were clearly economic rather than spiritual. Thevet by his own admission had no taste for the friar's life and left the Angoulême convent as soon as he could, obtaining secularization in 1558. In contrast, François Le Roy was a friar by personal Paris and Guise occupancy of the archbishopric of Rheims. Frederick Baumgartner, Continuity and Change in the French Episcopacy. See also J.A. Bergin on the Cardinal de Rochefoucauld, Cardinal de la Rochefoucauld: Leadership and Reform in the French Church (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1987), and his still important article "The Decline and fall of the House of Guise as an Ecclesiastical Dynasty" in The Historical Journal 25 (1982): 781-803.

16 André Thevet, "the cosmographer of four kings", was a colourful and controversial character. Thevet travelled across Europe, the Middle East and the New World, and in the process wrote several books on the cosmography of foreign lands. However he is perhaps best known today for his work Les vrais pourtraits et vies des hommes illustres, published in 1584, which is considered an important Renaissance collective biography. Although Thevet was not suited to the Franciscan life, he clearly felt strong ties to the order. One of his best friends was Maurice Hylaret, a well known preacher in the Paris friary. Thevet was also a member of the Confraternity Saint-Sépulchre-de-Jérusalem based at the Paris convent and was buried in the Church in 1592. See Frank Lestringnant, André Thevet, cosmographe des derniers Valois (Geneva, 1991). Roger Schlesinger also provides a compact introduction of Thevet's life in his edition of
volition, interested in studying theology at the university. 17

THE PATRONS

The Cordeliers themselves may have been drawn from humble stock, but their most important patrons were not. From their arrival in the thirteenth century, the Paris Cordeliers enjoyed substantial support not only from the French royal family, but also from the great Parisian noble and merchant families as well. This situation had not changed by the sixteenth century. Though the financial stress of the religious wars was being felt by all social classes after 1560, the Cordeliers continued to find themselves the recipients of generous donations from important families and individuals.

Defining the "patron" has been an ongoing historiographic concern. For the purposes of this paper, a distinction will be made between occasional patrons -- those who provide funding and other assistance to the religious community on an ad hoc basis -- and those who provide continuous support over a sustained period of time. It is not always easy to distinguish between the two types, but there are typical forms of support which indicate a more

---


17 AN MC ET/XXIX/12, f. 416. Le Roy's pension also included a trip to Rome.
profound attachment to the house: foundations and inhumations, repeated gifts, and acceptance of the office of syndic, or ami spirituel. This type of patron will be the focus of rest of the chapter.

i) Royal Patronage

The Cordeliers enjoyed substantial royal support in the sixteenth century, as they had throughout their history. Nevertheless royal aid was by its nature generalized rather than specific, because the Cordeliers were one of many religious institutions protected by the King. Religious institutions in France were regarded de facto as, if not the property of the King, at least under his wardship. As such they were granted specific rights including exemption from secular juridical jurisdiction and from certain forms of taxation such as the gabelle and specified customs duties.\(^{18}\) The King also provided financial aid in the form of alms and donations. Despite such signs of favour, however, one could not say that royal patronage of the Cordeliers was particularly pronounced during the latter part of the sixteenth century. The only foundation established by a royal family member around this period came from Marie de

---

\(^{18}\) Exemption from the salt tax (gabelle) for all mendicant orders is mentioned in a patent letter dated January 31, 1516. AN LL1523, f. 309. Another privilege was the right to have nine livres worth of wood ("un batteau de bois"). Arrêt du Parlement, December 12 1559. AN LL1523, f. 341.
Médicis in 1604. Furthermore, the yearly royal contributions to the friary were generous but not immoderately so. When we do find more sizeable royal contributions to the house, it is clear that they were provoked by a special occasion or some other unusual occurrence. A foundation established by Charles V in 1370, for example, provided funding to help rebuild the convent following its devastation during the previous wars. Similarly, the financial desperation of the house in 1565 resulted in royal pressure on ecclesiastical and secular institutions to raise money for the house. The hosting of

---

19 Marie de Médicis gave a donation to the convent, which provided an annual rente for the house from a principal of 900 livres. This was a generous bequest by the standards of the time. In return, the friary was asked to "chanter le 15 décembre, une messe haute de la conception et tous les lundis de la semaine une messe basse de trespasser." See AN LL1523: 206, and BNF fr. 14477, "Rolle des fondations et rentes des couvens de Paris", f. 25v.

20 If the accounts from Charles IX from 1569 are representative of royal alms-giving, the Paris Cordeliers would have received a token sum of ten livres a year. This is the sum they receive in April 1569, along with the other three mendicant houses. It must have been the standard amount set aside for the religious orders, since other institutions across France received the same donation. "Despence de ce presente compte Charles IX (1569)." AN KK 137.

21 AN LL1523, 202-203. This document, an excerpt from the provincial chapter of France from the same year, notes that Charles V was moved by compassion to help the convent. The convent had been damaged so badly by the wars that "les religieux n’avoient ny dortoir pour coucher ny pour les religieux aucunes escoles pour estudier."

22 See BNF Dupuy 215 "Extraict du Parlement." Dated October 4, 1565, the King in conjunction with the Parlement of Paris demanded specific sums of money from numerous religious institutions to aid the financially-strapped Cordeliers.
the general chapter of the Franciscan order at the Paris convent in 1579 and the burning of the Cordeliers Church in 1580 were two more occasions which prompted substantial royal donations to the convent.²³

ii) Sword nobility

The sword nobility comprised an important segment of the Cordeliers patrons. Of the ninety-five individuals buried in the friary Church between 1560 and 1610, nineteen (20%) were from the high nobility. We also find eight (12.25%) high nobles among the sixty-four patrons requesting masses said for themselves or loved ones but no burial.²⁴ Among the more important French noble families giving support to the friary were the Guise and Joyeuse. There is only one member of the Joyeuse family buried in the Cordeliers crypt: Catherine de Nogaret, wife of the king's favourite, Henry of Joyeuse, the Count of Bouchage, and sister of another

²³ Jacques Du Bruel, *Le théâtre des antiquitez de Paris* (Paris: Claude de la Tour, 1612): 537-540. Du Bruel says that Henry III provided the money for rebuilding the Choir of the Church, including many of the windows. Henry III and his brother Alençon also gave the friary substantial sums towards the cost of holding the chapter. According to Franklin, Catherine de Médicis also gave generously towards the rebuilding of the friary's library. *Les anciennes bibliothèques de Paris*, 204.

²⁴ These figures indicate minimum numbers in all cases. For example, the Guises have been calculated as one donor for the windows in the church, simply because it is impossible to find individual donations from members of the clan.
favourite, the duke of Epernon.\textsuperscript{25} Although none of the Guises chose to be buried in the Church, their connections with the community, and with particular members of the friary, is nevertheless notable. In addition to supporting the preachers Jacques Berson, Pierre L'Enfant and Jacques Hugonis among others, the Guise also provided substantial financial aid to the house following its burning in 1580. Several windows were dedicated to the family as a result, each bearing images of the more prominent members of the clan: Henry, the duke of Guise and his brother Charles, the Cardinal of Lorraine, the dukes of Mayenne and Elboeuf among others.\textsuperscript{26}

Other prominent noble patrons included Jean de Beauquaire, seigneur of Peguillon, and a chevallier in the prestigious order of Saint-Michel.\textsuperscript{27} He gave the friary

\textsuperscript{25} Catherine was the daughter of Jean Nogaret, Baron de la Valette, lieutenant-général in Guyenne. She died in August 1587, and was buried in the chapel of 11,000 virgins. See Pierre L'Estoile, \textit{Mémoires-journaux} 3 (Paris: Librairie des Bibliophiles, 1876--). Edited by M.M.E. Bounet, A. Champollion, E. Halphen et al.): 59.

\textsuperscript{26} The designs for the windows can be found in the Collection Gaignières at the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris. Among the Guise members depicted are the following: Louis de Lorraine, the Cardinal of Guise (+1588) Oa17, #1004; Henry, the duke of Guise (+1588) Oa17, no. 1005; the Prince of Mercoeur, Philippe-Emmanuel of Lorraine (+1602) Oa17, no. 1007, f. 32A; Charles of Lorraine, the Duke of Aumale (+1631) Oa17, no. 1010, f. 35A-36G. These individuals were all members of the royal order, Saint-Esprit, and it seems likely that their donations came at the urging of Henry III.

\textsuperscript{27} The order of Saint-Michel was the oldest French chivalric order. It was formed by Louis XII in 1469 and, originally at least, was comprised of members of the most important noble families. François Bluche, \textit{Dictionnaire du Grand Siècle} (Paris: Fayard, 1990): 1395. This order was
thirty livres annually to provide shoes for "des plus pauvres enfans religieux" in 1572. Although Beauquaire did not choose burial at the Cordelier Church, many other prominent families did. The list of inhumations compiled by Raunié includes members of the Hémard, Laval, Thizon, largely superseded by the more exclusive order organized by Henry III in 1578: the order of Saint-Esprit. 

28 AN LL1517, f. 43; AN LL1523, 76. Jean also held the royal military post of seneschal of Poitou and Guienne du Brueil. Jean's brother, François Beauquaire de Puy-Guillon, bishop of Metz (1555-1568) was preceptor of Charles of Lorraine whom he followed to the Council of Trent. He was also an author of a Latin history on the council. See François Alexandre Aubert de La Chesnaye-Desbois, Dictionnaire de la noblesse 2 (Paris: 1863-1877): 610. Jean is also mentioned by Père Anselme, Histoire généalogique et chronologique de la maison royale de France des pairs, grands officiers, de la Couronne et de la Maison du Roy... (3rd edition, Paris: la compagnie des Libraires, 1726-1728; reprinted, Paris: Editions du Palais Royal, 1967): 738.

29 Louise de Hémard was the daughter of Marguerite- Jeanne Fresnière and Pierre de Hémard, seigneur de Denonville. Pierre also held a position in the royal household as a gentilhomme de la chambre du Roi. Louise was buried in the church on September 23, 1590. She died early on in the sixteenth century. There is also a Charles de Hémard, a councillor in the Parlement of Paris (1529), bishop of Mâcon (1531) and ambassador of France to Rome (1534-1537). He died in 1540 at the age of 47. See La Chesnaye-Desbois, 10: 534. For Charles, see also Pierre de Bourdeille, seigneur de Brantôme, Œuvres complètes de Pierre de Bourdeille seigneur de Brantôme. 3 (Paris: Mme Ve Jules Renouard, 1856-1882): 99, ft. 2.

30 Anne de Laval, dame de Rissé, was the widow of Georges de Crequy, seigneur of Rissé, the oldest son of Georges, seigneur of Rissé & de Baigneux, councillor and chamberlain of the duc d'Anjou. Her parents, both members of illustrious French noble families, enjoyed close connections with the court of Henry III. Her father was René de Laval, seigneur of Bois-Dauphin, Precigné, Louailé, d'Aulnay, S. Aubin, les Coudrayes, la Mousse, S. Mars, Roupierreux, vicomte de Bresteu, and gentilhomme ordinaire de la chambre du roi. Her mother was Jeanne de Lenoncourt, one of the ladies-in-waiting of Louise de Lorraine, the wife of Henry III, and. Anselme, 3, 650-651. For Crequy, see La Chesnaye-
Blosset\textsuperscript{32} and Le Hardy\textsuperscript{33} families, and even the wife of a
member of the ancient Rochefoucauld dynasty, Jeanne
d'Estissac.\textsuperscript{34}

\textsuperscript{31} Louis Thizon, baron de Rochandry, was the young son
of Cybard Thizon, chevalier seigneur d'Argence et Fissac,
councillor and chamberlain to the King. He died in 1587 and
was buried in the Choir. His epitaph reads: "tres noble et
adolescent Louis Thizon, baron de Rochandry, fils de noble
et puissant seigneur messire Cubart Thizon, chevalier
seigneur d'Argense et de Fissac, conseiller et chambellan du
Roy." Raunié, no. 1259; Arsenal Ms. 5403, 159; BNF
nouv. acq. fr. 1946, 131.

\textsuperscript{32} Jean de Blosset IV, seigneur of Torcy-le-Grand and
Torcy-le-petit-du-Plessis-Paté was the governor of Paris and
the Ile-de-France in 1578. As governor of Paris, Blosset had
a right to sit in the Grand Chambre of the Parlement of
Paris. He died unmarried in November 1587 and was buried in
the Cordelier Church. Arsenal, Ms. 5403; Raunié, no. 1232.
For genealogy, see La Chesnaye-Desbois, 3, 358. He is also
mentioned in Anselme, 1, 224.

\textsuperscript{33} The Le Hardy de la Trousse family originally came
from the region of Brie. Nicolas Le Hardy, seigneur of la
Trousse and chevalier de l'ordre du roi occupied a variety
of royal offices, including the most prestigious office in
the royal household -- prevôt de l'hôtel du roi (1558) and
grand prevôt de France. He was buried on 11 June 1599 in the
chapelle de Saint-Bonaventure. Arsenal, Ms. 5403, 26. His
wife, Madeleine Le Clerc, the daughter of Jean Le Clerc,
seigneur of Tremblay, was buried in the same chapel on 22
July, 1607. Arsenal Ms. 5403, 26. For Le Hardy de la
Trousse, see also Chesnaye-Desbois, 10, 339.

\textsuperscript{34} Jeanne D'Estissac was the wife of François IV de
Vendome, the count of Rochefoucauld, and as such the member
of one of the most important French sword families. However,
the connection with the friary would seem to have come from
Jeanne's family since Louise de la Beraudière, wife of
Louis, the baron of Estissac, was also buried at the friary.
Louise died on September 22, 1608, and was buried in the
Chapelle de St-Jérôme. This is not the same Louise who was
in Catherine de Médicis' notorious flying squadron, but her
cousin, the daughter of Gilles de la Beraudière. For the
Estissac family, see Chesnaye-Desbois, 7, 552. For La
Beraudière, see Coll. Baluze, no.55, f. 136, and Arsenal Ms.
5403, 37. An interesting discussion of the two women is
found in Roger Trinquet, "En marge des Essais: la vraie
The sizeable non-French contingent among the noble patrons buried at the friary testifies to the cosmopolitan character of sixteen-century Paris as much as it does to the trans-cultural appeal of the friars. The exiled claimant to the Portuguese throne, Antoine, chose the Cordelier friary as his final resting place in 1595. More interesting from the perspective of the social history of sixteenth-century Paris, however, is the appearance of numerous Italian names among the list of those interred, or as patrons of those

figure de Madame d'Estissac ou les pièges de l'homonyme" Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et de la Renaissance vol 16 (1956): 23-36. Perhaps also related to Jeanne is Sidonie Guy, the daughter of Jean Guy, ecuyer, seigneur of Puy Robert and Dame Jehanne de la Beraudière. She was buried the same year as Louise de la Beraudière. Arsenal, Ms. 5403, 118; Raunié no. 1266, and La Chesnaye-Desbois, 10, 155.

Antoine was the bastard son of Louis of Portugal, the Duke of Beja, and Yolande Gomez. His fight to prove his legitimacy brought him into open conflict with Sebastien, the ruling monarch of Portugal. Despite the support of many Portuguese regions, and of England and France, Antoine never obtained the throne. He died in France on August 26, 1595. Arsenal, Ms. 5403, 1232, and Anselme, 1, 610-611. Later joining him in the Cordelier convent was one of his followers, the nobleman Diego Botelho (d. 1607), and Antoine's son (d. 1638).
interred, at the friary. The Gondi supplying and Gonzaga supplying families are familiar to seiziémistes, and their successful transformations respectively from Florentine bankers and Mantuan nobles to members of the high French nobility during this period has been well-documented. One member of the Gondi family, Jérôme, was buried in the friary. No members of the Gonzaga family found their way into the Cordelier crypt during this period, though the association of a number of Gonzaga clients and servants with the friary would have,  

36 Antoine de Gondi (1486-1560) was a prominent Florentine banker before moving to France and entering into the service of Henry II. Gondi was given the title maître de l’hôtel du roi, a title which was usually honorary. The next generation secured the position of the family as members of the French nobility. Antoine's son Albert became constable (connétable) under Henry III in 1573 and through royal favour he was later given the title baron de Retz. His brother Pierre was the first of several generations of the Gondi to hold the bishopric (later archbishopric) of Paris. For the Gondi family, see François Bluche, Dictionnaire, 663-664.

37 Like the Gondis, the Gonzaga family had its origins in banking, though it was well-established in the Mantuan nobility by the beginning of the sixteenth century. Frederigo Gonzaga was made Duke of Milan in 1530 by the Holy Roman Emperor Charles V, and the Gonzagas continued to control the ducal state for another two centuries. Louis Gonzaga, the third son of the first duke of Mantua, Frederick II, entered the French elite through his marriage to the only heir of the Duke of Nevers, thereby taking possession of one of the most powerful noble estates in France. François Bluche, Dictionnaire, 665, and La Chesnaye-Desbois, 9, 453. Ludovico (Louis) Gonzaga was also cousin to another Gonzaga who played an important role in the life of the Cordelier convent -- Francesco-Scipio, the minister general of the Franciscan order.

38 Buried in the Chapelle-de-l'Assomption in the Cordelier church is Jérôme, ambassador to Catherine de Médicis, Henry III and Henry IV, and chevalier d'honneur in the household of Marie de Médicis. Jérôme was a cousin of Pierre and Albert, brought over by his uncle, Jean-Pierre, from Valencia in 1550. Anselme, 3, 891.
at the very least, made this family a presence in the life of the friary.¹⁹

Less well known but more important as patrons of the friary was the D'Elbene family. The first members of the Elbene family to patronize the Cordeliers were Albisse D'Elbene and his wife Lucretia Cavalcanti. Albisse was a Florentine who entered the service of the Kings of France as *surintendant des finances*, one of the most important -- and lucrative -- financial offices in the kingdom.⁴⁰ His wife bore the weighty title of *dame ordinaire de la reine* in

---

¹⁹ Louis Gonzaga was not a particularly active patron of the Cordeliers of Paris, and only one rather paltry donation can be traced. Along with the other three mendicant orders, the Cordeliers are included in a small bequest of March 25, 1579. One écu is given to each convent so that two friars would participate in a service at the Augustinian Church on behalf of the Nevers family. A more tangible link was the relationship between Gonzaga followers and the house. Jean-Baptiste Galiaci, ambassador of the duke of Mantua Guillaume Gonzaga, was a client of the Gonzagas in Mantua and his brother Hercule held the position of chamberlain (chambellan) in the household of Louis Gonzaga, the duke of Nevers. Jean-Baptiste was buried here on March 13, 1573, at the age of 39. His brother Hercule, seigneur of Salva, was buried near his brother much later, on 26 August 1620. For Jean-Baptiste, see Arsenal Ms. 5403, 130; Raunié, no. 1280; For Hercule, see Arsenal Ms. 5403, 130, and Raunié, no. 1280. Another bequest came from a servant of the Gonzaga family, damoiselle Suzanne de la Jarousse, who was the nanny of the Duchess of Nevers. AN L11517, Oct 24 1572, ff. 36-38.

⁴⁰ The *surintendant des finances*, along with the Contrôleur-général and the Conseil des Finances, supervised and administered the spending and receiving of royal revenue. Julian Dent has shown how this office could catapult merchant and lesser noble families into the high nobility by the seventeenth century, and the d'Elbene are an example of this. See Julian Dent, *Crisis in Finance* (Newton Abbot: David & Charles, 1973): 27. Unfortunately, I have yet to find dates for d'Elbene's years in office.
honour of her position in the Queen's household.41

D'Elbene's sons similarly held important offices. François (d. 1573), guidon des gendarmes under the duke of Mayenne, was also gentilhomme ordinaire de la chambre du Roy, a title signifying his membership in the King's household, and an honour usually reserved for the great noble families. His brother Pierre (d.1590) was the abbot of Eu, and held the position of aumônier-général in the household of Charles IX in 1568.42 All told, five members of the Elbene family found a resting place in the Cordelier Church including Albisse, Lucretia, and François in the Chapelle Sainte-Claire.43

iii) Robe nobility/councillors

The largest contingent of Cordelier patrons were drawn from the Paris magistrate families. Sixty-six of eighty-five

41 Lucretia Cavalcanti made a sizeable foundation at the friary following the death of her husband, Albisse. 100 livres was given in 1572. AN LL1517, f. 19; BNF fr. 14477, f. 49.

42 The office of aumônier-général (almoner-general) was an important position in the royal household. The position was held only by prominent clerics, usually bishops, and its occupant was responsible for organizing the charitable activities of the King as well as dispensing the necessary sums to the institutions and individuals being supported. See Doucet, Les institutions, 1: 126. The d'Elbene daughters also were integrated into the French nobility. Catherine married Gabriel, Seigneur d'Arbonville and de Sain-et-Val, and Geneviève married the Baron de Baux. For the d'Elbene foundation at the Cordelier house, see AN LL1517, f. 19.

43 See the foundation of Lucretia Cavalcanti, AN LL1517, f. 19v; La Chesnaye-Desbois, 7, 201. She was buried in 1573. Thomas D'Elbene (d. 1593), seigneur of Villeceaux, and his wife Clémence Janvier were buried in the chappelle des martyrs. See Raunié, no. 1219.
Patronage

(77.6%) Franciscan patrons from this social cadre sought burial at the Cordeliers, while nineteen (22.4%) requested masses. Perhaps geographic proximity played a role in securing the support of the Paris robe families, for they were rooted in the urban environment of Paris rather than on seigneuries outside the gates. For whatever reason, these families were usually the most financially generous and consistent of the Cordelier patrons. Among the more important families were the Auroux, Aymerec, Arquinvilliers, Doujat, Amy, La Roziere, Le Maistre, and...

44 These percentages are calculated with respect to the types of donations as in the previous section. 61.1% of the 95 buried in the Church; 28.1% of those requesting services but no burial.

45 Nevertheless, the great magisterial families were quick to purchase seigneuries, a necessary part of gaining noble status in the early modern period. See Barbara Diefendorf, Paris City Councillors in the Sixteenth Century (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983): 43.

46 Among the Arquinvilliers buried here during the sixteenth century were Louis Arquinvilliers, councillor in the Parlement from 1546, his wife Marthe Alleaume, and his children Louis and Anne. François Blanchard, Les conseillers du Parlement ..., (Paris: C. Besongne, 1647): 70. This work is bound with Blanchard’s treatise Les présidents à mortier du Parlement de Paris, leurs emplois, charges, qualitez, armes, blasons, et généalogies, depuis l’an 1331 jusques à présent (Paris: C. Besongne, 1647).

47 The Doujats were a noble family from Berry originally, which established itself in Paris early in the sixteenth century. Jean Doujat was avocat-général in the Parlement de Paris (d. 1527). Jean Doujat II (d. 1581), was both avocat-général and maître des requêtes in the household of Catherine de Médicis. He was married to Marie Doé, the daughter of Robert Doé, a councillor in the court of Parlement, and Marie Brinon. See Chesnaye-Desbois, 7, 4.

48 The Rozière ou Rouzière (de la) were originally from Auvergne. Two members of this family were buried at the friary, Anne who married Jean Turquan (d. 1584) and Jeanne,
de Thou, though there were many others.

The Longueil family can serve as a case study for this social cadre of Cordelier patron. The Longueils were one of the great robe noble families who first rose to prominence among the Paris magistracy during the fifteenth century. By the sixteenth century, this family still continued to place members in the sovereign courts and marry into other robe families. However, like many other families in their social milieu, they were also accumulating both seigneuries and royal offices on the road to ennoblement.

Constantin de Longueil is typical of his generation of Paris magistrate. His father, Jean de Longueil, son of Charles, the founder of the de Grange lineage, became a councillor in the Parlement of Paris in 1585. In the years to follow, Jean's political ascendancy was marked by his inclusion as councillor in two of the councils composing the Conseil du Roi (the conseil d'état and the conseil privé), and by his occupancy of the post maître des requêtes ordinaires (1601) in the King's household. His son

the wife of Jérôme Auroux (d. 1557). Both were buried in the chappelle de Saint-Claude. Arsenal, Ms. 5403. For the de La Rozière family's connection to the Parlement, see Blanchard, Les conseillers, 56.

45 The branches of the Longueils most closely associated with the Cordeliers were the de Maisons, de la Grange, de Rancher and de Bou. The various titles were divided among the sons of Jean VII. Constantin's father's full title was vicomte d'Argeville, baron d'Erisse, seigneur of la Grange, la Noue, Villaynes, Preaux,Forges, and Saint Mammett. Jean died in 1607. François Blanchard, Les présidents, 480-481, and La Chesnaye-Desbois, 12, 306. The du Rancher branch was pro-League, according to La Chesnaye-Desbois, Nicolas de Longueil in particular. The son of Jean
dutifully contributed to the family collection of titles and
offices. Before dying at the young age of twenty-five in
1611, Constantin obtained the position of councillor in the
Parlement of Paris, the military post of capitaine du
régiment de Champagne, and the royal office of premier
gentilhomme de la chambre in the household of the Prince of
Condé. 50

According to Raunié and other sources, the Longueil
family first began burying its members at the Cordeliers in
the fifteenth century. During the period 1558-1611, no less
than ten members of the Longueil found a resting place in
the chapelle de Saint-Esprit. 51 Among them were the sons of

VII and founder of the du Rancher lineage, Nicolas was
buried at the Cordeliers in 1622. La Chesnaye-Desbois, 12,
302.

50 Constantin was also "nourry page de la Chambre du
Roy Henry III." He was interred in the Cordelier Church in
1611, dying without issue at the age of 25. See La Chesnaye-
Desbois, 12, 306, and Blanchard, Les présidents, 481.

51 Two sons of Pierre de Longueil mentioned below were
also buried here during this time. Mathieu Longueil was a
censeiller clerc in the Parlement of Paris, prior of Ozay in
Poitou, and a canon of the cathedral churches of Chartres,
Afürn, Meaux, and Senlis (d. 1590). His brother Pierre,
seigneur of Bou, was not only a councillor in the Grand
Conseil of the Parlement of Paris but also a doyen of the
Chambre des Enquêtes (d. 1607). Other Longueils buried at
the convent were: Jehan Longueil, sieur of Sevres,
censeiller du roi and premier président in the Chambre des
Enquêtes in the Parlement of Paris; Marie de Longueil,
daughter of Jean de Longueil VI and Marie de Normans;
Elisabeth de Longueil, daughter of Charles de Longueil and
Isabelle Hubert.
Louis de Longueil IV, who became the founders of the more important branches of the house. Guy de Longueil, seigneur of Chevreville and de la Brosse, and councillor in the Parlement of Paris, Pierre de Longueil, the founder of the de Bou lineage, and his brother Charles de Longueil, "seigneur de la Grange, de la Noue & de la Villaine", also a councillor in the Parlement.

The burial patterns of the Longueil show that the social cohesiveness and marital interconnectedness which we associate with the Parisian magistrate elite in the sixteenth century characterized this social group in death.

---

52 Louis de Longueil, seigneur of Bou, was the second son of Jean IV and Marie de Marle. He was a councillor in the Parlement of Paris, and was married first to Catherine Piedefer and secondly to Catherine Brûlart. La Chesnaye-Desbois, 12, 305.

53 Guy was the son of Louis de Longueil and Catherine Piedefer. He died in 1569. Blanchard, Les présidents, 471, 480, and La Chesnaye-Desbois, 12, 305. He died in 1558.

54 Pierre's brothers gave the friary 250 livres in accordance with the will of Pierre de Longueil, their brother, "a la charge de dire tous les jours une messe basse dans leur chappelle qui est celle de St Esprit." Tuesday November 27, 1607, AN LL1523: 23. Pierre was the son of Louis de Longueil and Catherine Brûlart, the second wife of Louis. He was a councillor in the Parlement of Paris as well as premier président in the Parlement of Bordeaux. He was married to Denise l'Alloyeau, and died on November 28, 1581. Blanchard, Les présidents, 480-481.

55 Charles was the third son of Louis, seigneur of Bou and Catherine Piedefer. He married Isabelle d'Hubert, sister of Etienne, seigneur of Argeville, and governor of the city of Melun. Their children included Jacques, seigneur of Villaines (died without children), Jean and Jean-Baptiste, seigneur de la Noue (without heirs). See La Chesnaye-Desbois, 12, 306. His brothers were Guy, seigneur of Chevreville, a councillor in the Parlement (m. Marie de Mare), and Pierre, who started the de Bou branch. La Chesnaye-Desbois, 12, 306.
as well. The Longueils were accompanied into the hereafter by the same individuals who had accompanied them through every important stage of life. Their children found playmates among the Brûlart, De Dormans and Le Maistre families among others. The sons studied together at university and worked alongside one another in the sovereign courts. They married each other's sisters, and grew to be parents to another generation of magistrates. At the end of their prosperous lives they found final resting places in

---

56 Catherine Brûlart, wife of Louis de Longueil, was the daughter of Jean Brûlart, seigneur of Héez and Courtieux. He was a councillor in the Parlement of Paris as of 1502, and died in 1519. Her siblings included Pierre II (d. 1584), seigneur of Berni, président des enquêtes, and Jacques, baron de Héez-en-Aignets. See Chesnaye, 4, 361, and Blanchard, Les présidents, 360-361. Her nephew, Nicholas Brulart-Sillery was an important royalist councillor in the Parlement during the time of the League and received a marquisat for his efforts in 1619. For Nicholas, see La Chesnaye-Desbois, 4, 362-363.

57 Representing the Le Maistre clan was Marthe Le Maistre (d. 1565), wife of the seventh Jean de Longueil (d. 1558). Marthe Le Maistre was the daughter of Gilles le Maistre, premier président in the Parlement of Paris, and Marie Sapin. They had two sons and one daughter. Her husband, Jean de Longueil, seigneur of Maisons et du Rancher, was also councillor in the Parlement of Paris and of Rennes. Both he and Marthe were both buried at the Cordeliers. See Blanchard, Les présidents, 469. The Le Maistres, like the Longueils, had been patrons of the friary since the fifteenth century and consequently had several generations interred within the walls of the Cordelier Church. Among the many Le Maistre buried at the friary during this period was Gilles I Le Maistre, seigneur of Cincehour and Monthilon-lez-Monthléry, premier président in the Parlement of Paris. He died on December 5, 1562. AN LL 1523, 208; La Chesnaye-Debois, 12, 932; Blanchard, Les présidents, 340. Gilles son, Gilles II, was also prémier président during his lifetime and died in 1587 at the age of 63. He was married to Marie Hennequin, daughter of Claude Hennequin and Magdelaine Séguier. La Chesnaye-Debois, 12, 932-933 and Blanchard, Les présidents, 341.
the family chapels alongside the chapels of their friends. The social cohesiveness of the judicial elite meant that, though wives usually sought refuge in their husbands' chapel, they were rarely far away from their own family. Marie de Dormans, for example, was the wife of Jehan de Longueil, sieur of Seurre. She was buried with her husband, but also buried nearby was her father Charles de Dormans, royal councillor and maître ordinaire in a sovereign judicial court, the Chambre des Comptes.\textsuperscript{58}

iv) Merchants, artisans and the bourgeoisie

There is no easy way to categorize the complicated social groupings associated with the levels of society below that of the magistrates. Much of this difficulty is a question of terminology. For example, the term "bourgeois" remains a problematic designation for the modern historian, largely because it was problematic for contemporaries as well. "Bourgeois" had several different meanings and therefore could encompass quite a range of individuals depending on its usage. The title "bourgeois de Paris" was a

\textsuperscript{58} Marie was buried in the Longueil chapel. See Raunié, #1205. Blanchard, \textit{Les présidents}, 468. Charles de Dormans died on October 8, 1572. His full designation in this document was "noble homme sage, seigneur dudit lieu de Nozay, St Remy, sieur Martines Voix-sur-barbuise, Harpon Villonray et Bellouard en Argonne, conseiller en Parlement, et ami spirituel du couvent." The de Dormans family was an old magistrate family, originally from Burgundy. Like Jacques-Auguste de Thou, de Dormans also held the office of syndic in the Cordelier friary. For de Dormans, see La Chesnaye-Desbois, 8, 955.
juridical phrase, reflecting privileges accorded to those "who resided in the city at least a year and who owned property, paid taxes and served in the militia ...."59 According to this definition, magistrates, merchants and even substantial artisans could bear this title. At the very least it connoted a comfortable financial situation, if not much more. Diefendorf points out, however, that the term bourgeois of Paris was at times used in a narrower sense, to refer to members of Parisian society who lived off their seigneuries and not from trade. This definition was used to distinguish between those suited for municipal office from those who were not. Similarly vague is the description "bourgeois marchand," a designation which does little more than suggest that the merchant is not a member of one of the six great corporations, since there is no mention of a particular trade.60

These concerns of nomenclature aside, however, we can still appreciate the breadth of patronage enjoyed by the Cordeliers from the middling and lower levels of society. Only nine Franciscan patrons (9.5%) from this social cadre found resting-places in the Cordelier crypt. However this social group was responsible for thirty of sixty-four (46%) foundations involving masses. Furthermore, the sizeable

59 Barbara Diefendorf, Paris City Councillors, xxiii. Julian Dent also discusses this term. See Crisis in Finance, 121.

60 Sagnac, 2, 69. Sagnac uses the phrase "petite bourgeoisie" to refer to this vast group of individuals, which included those designated as "marchands" and "marchands ouvriers" among others.
nature of many of the bequests suggests that a good number of these merchants and artisans were very wealthy individuals indeed while others were financially comfortable. The professions of these patrons varied tremendously, ranging from membership in the prestigious Six Corporations (cloth merchants, goldsmiths, grocers, haberdashers, hosiers, and furriers) to much humbler craftworkers and labourers. Among the middling ranks of the merchants were Jean Thibaut, self-styled as "cordonnier de Henry III," and Pierre Lambert a "marchant poissonnier."

Most of merchants, however, found among the patrons bore the ambiguous designation "bourgeois marchand" with no more specific information provided. Among these individuals

---

51 Most bequests from this social group provided between ten and twenty livres a year for masses said in perpetuity. The merchant Jean Arnoult was able to match the offerings of his social superiors, leaving the friary 100 livres annually in 1570. For his foundation, see AN LL1518, f. 143, and LL1525, f. 18.


54 His wife, Marguerite Massolier was his sole heir. He set up a foundation of 19 livres 10 sols in 1601. See BNF fr. 14477, f. 23.
are Jehan Dolu, Bénigne Pastey, Nicolas Le Peuple, Jean Le Gros, Closeau (Clauseau), Cosme Carrel, Leon de Caen, Pierre Berthault, and Jean Arnoult. The lack of

65 Dolu is mentioned in a series of contracts involving his wife Catherine Pichonnat. His wife set up a foundation for herself on November 14, 1572. See AN LL1523, 59; AN LL1517, f. 2; AN L941, "livres de rentes."

66 AN LL1518, f. 33. Married to Charlotte Turquan, he died on January 7, 1601. Pastey's marriage to a Turquan suggests that he was a member of a group that bridged the magistrate and merchant social groups.

67 Le Peuple's son, Marin made his profession to the Cordeliers friary in 1588. AN LL1518 ff. 74-76v.

68 Le Gros was a member of the confraternity in the friary, the confraternity of Saint-Sépulchre-de-Jérusalem. Raunié, 3, no. 1304.

69 AN LL1523, 5; LL1517, BNF fr. 14477, f. 42.

70 There are a series of contracts involving Carrel, who died in 1602. His wife, Catherine Dantac, was also buried at the Cordeliers. For Cosme, see AN MC ET/XXXIX/15, f. 88 and Bibl. de l'Arsenal 5403, 34. For Catherine Dantac, see Raunié, 3, no. 1291. Cosme held the municipal office of quartenier in his district of Paris. His son Jean did much better, obtaining the coveted, ennobling position of secrétaire du roi in the royal administration. The position of secrétaire du roi is discussed in Doucet, Institutions, 109-111.

71 There are four contracts spanning fifteen years involving Caen. He first established a foundation on July 14, 1579 and it was out into effect in 1589. See LL1517, ff. 29-30v.

72 Berthault (d. 1574) was another member of the confraternity of St-Sepulchre, See Raunié, 3, no. 1305. He was married to Jeanne de Saingal, who died in 1578. Arsenal Ms. 5403, 169. He established a foundation of forty livres de rente for the confraternity.

73 Jean Arnoult was married to Rachel Le Conte. He established a foundation for himself and his wife on April 22, 1570. It is quite a generous one -- 100 livres annually in addition to a one time donation of 200 livres to the Cordeliers, 100 livres from each of them on day of his death to hold special service during the octaves. This foundation
specific designation, however, did not necessarily imply lower status. Berthault and Jean Le Gros were both members of the confraternity of the Saint-Sépulchre-de-Jérusalem at the Cordeliers friary, and left the friary sizable foundations, forty livres and twenty livres respectively. Cosme Carrel and Jean Arnoult were probably even wealthier if their donations are any indication. Arnoult left the house one hundred livres per annum, a bequest that matched any given by the noble patrons.

With respect to the craft guilds, we do find members from the more prestigious ones. Jean de Carnay and Claude Barillet's husband, Jacques Villain, were both referred to as "maistre orfevre de Paris" in their respective bequests." Thomas Rousseau was a master mason," Thomas Le Conte was a "maistre Tourneur en Bois," Antoin Marchand was later reduced to 40 livres by a decree of the Parlement. See AN LL1518, f. 143; LL1525, f. 18.

71 AN LL1523: 222. Villain died 1609. Claude Barillet's foundation provides sixty livres annually for a mass every Friday of the year and a service of three high masses and vigils the Friday after Assumption during her life and on the same day after her death.

75 See AN LL1517, a contract dated 4 July 1563; AN LL1521; BNF fr.14477; AN H5 5939-original; AN LL1523: 49.

76 Le Conte may be related to Rachel Le Conte, wife of Jean Arnoult who is also buried in the Church. His wife is Geault Thienette, who was buried in the church on February 13, 1601. The foundation was initially established in a contract dated September 2, 1590, and Le Conte appears to have died in 1598. See LL1517, f. 117, and LL1523, 238. All told, there are three contracts involving the foundation for both Le Conte and his wife.
was a "maistre couvreur de maisons," and Arnoul Mullot was a "maistre patissier." Vincent Veslier was a "compagnon boucher." The ambiguity of the title "marchand" is apparent once again in the contract of Françoise Ganeron, who refers to herself as the widow of Antoine Guerin, "marchand laboureur" at the farm of Villeroy.

There are a few more unusual occupations. Guillaume Chouart was a doctor. Jean Roger was a "maistre crieur," who left all of his goods to the Cordeliers in a will dated October 25, 1564. Thevet, the famous cosmographer mentioned above, was buried in the Church on November 23.

He set up foundation in 1598 of twenty-five livres annually in exchange for a low mass each month, and two services. See AN LL1523: 200.

Mullot's contract was dated July 27, 1585. AN LL1517, f. 22. Another contract dated September 11, 1586 is for the execution of Mullot's testament. Mullot left four écus ten sols of a rente for a mass, epitaph and sepulchre in the church. See AN LL1520, for Mullot's testament. For the document executing his will, See AN MC ET/XI/432.

See AN LL1518. Philippe Sagnac says that the designation "compagnon" was used for workers in craft shops. Being a companion in Paris had a higher status than in other French cities because of the city's association with the production of fine-quality goods. See Sagnac, La formation 2, 71.

The foundation was established in 1618.

AN LL1523: 127; BNF fr. 14477. Chouart left a foundation of sixty livres to the four mendicant orders. This rente was later reduced to twenty-five livres in 1596 through a decree of the Parlement on behalf of his brother.

According the the Cordelier records, nothing was ever received from this foundation even though it was executed by his inheritors in a contract dated December 21, 1574. See AN LL1523: 229.
v) Religious Patrons

Although the vast majority of patrons were drawn from lay society, a sizeable minority were members of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, both secular and regular. Patrons drawn from the secular clergy included Jean Picart, who was the procuror of the Cordelier friary as well as a canon of the church of Sainte-Opportune in Paris, and Nicolas Chrestien, vicar of les Saints-Innocents in Paris. Perhaps the most prominent ecclesiastic to patronize the house next to the Cardinal of Lorraine was Jean de Hangest, who as comte-évêque of the diocese of Noyon occupied one of the rare bishoprics in which temporal and spiritual jurisdiction were concentrated in episcopal hands. Members of the regular orders included Pierre Loudon who was the prior of the abbey d'Issy et Saint-Aubin-de-Maine and who was buried

53 Thevet was a member of the confraternity of Saint-Sépulchre-de-Jérusalem. See Arsenal Ms. 5403, 48.

54 Picart became the procureur of the Paris friary on December 17, 1573. AN LL1511, f. 63v. In a will dated July 3, 1585 he left 100 livres annual rente to the house for "jeunes escoliers malades." AN LL1523, 25.

55 Chrestien died 15 December 1590. He left an annuity of 10 livres to endow an annual mass. See AN LL1523, 241, and BNF fr. 14477, f. 15.

56 The Hangest were an old Breton family. He was buried in the Church in February 1577. Anselme, 2: 420; La Chesnaye-Desbois, 1: 246. See also Poitier de Courcy, Nobiliaire et armorial de Bretagne 2 (Mayenne: Joseph Floch, 1970, 4th ed.): 6-7.
in the friary sometime during the religious wars. M. de la Mothe, the abbot of the monastery of St-Prys, made two foundations: one in 1579 of 2 livres 10 sols for an annual service for Charles IX, and another for ten livres providing for two masses for Loudon and his mother. A member of a rival order, the Capuchin Augustin Champion, left money for the rebuilding of the Cordelier Church in 1580. The sole female religious patron was Louise Hémard, a Cordelière from the community of Saint-Marcel and daughter of Pierre Hémard, seigneur of Denonville and gentilhomme du Roi. An important relationship clearly existed between the religious

---

" Arsenal Ms. 5403, 99. Pierre Loudon was the son of Claude Loudon, seigneur of Troucher (Troncher)-fontaine, and Marie (d. 1552). Loudon's family may also have been buried here. He knew de la Mothe as well, since de la Mothe dedicated a plaque in the church to Loudon's family, and established a foundation for them. Evidently, they had treated him kindly at one time.

" AN LL1523, and L941 "livres des rentes." For the Loudon foundation, see footnote 85.

" This bequest was part of Augustin's renunciation of property upon entering the Capuchin order. Frère Jérôme, as Augustin was called following his profession of faith, gave the Cordeliers eleven écus forty sols for their church following its burning. Augustin also gave money to the other three major mendicant orders, a variety of charitable foundations such as the Hôtel Dieu, his parents, and of course to his order. See MC ET/LXXXVI/16. Dated October 25, 1580.

" Hémard died September 23, 1590. Arsenal 5403: 49. The Hémard family was an important robe family in Paris along with the Longueil, Luillier and others. Louise had joined the order of Sainte-Claire at the age of fifteen. The Cordelières de Saint-Marcel were a community of conventual nuns in Paris, dating from the late fifteenth century. See F. Gratien, O.M.C., "La fondation des Clarisses de l'Ave Maria 1478-1485" in Études franciscaines 27, 28 (1912): 504-516, 605-621, 272-290.
community Sainte-Croix-de-la-Bretonnerie in Paris and the Cordeliers. In addition to paying for a service in a foundation established in 1598, the house also paid Franciscans to preach on a regular basis. Finally, we cannot ignore the Franciscans who patronized their own house. The minister general of the Franciscans, Christophe Cheffontaine, left a foundation to the Paris house as did Jacques Hugonis, Jacques Berson, and many others.

Part II: Patronage

The list of patrons gathered above illustrates the broad-based support network of the Paris Cordeliers. They found patrons among the sword as well as robe nobility, among the merchant and artisanal classes and even among other religious communities. Their appeal also spanned gender lines. Approximately one-third of their patrons were

---

51 Friar Gallesius for one was a regular preacher for the convent. The foundation of a service is found in AN MC XXIX/11, f. 415. For Gallesius' connection to the house, see his will dated May 20, 1602, which refers to funds raised by preaching at two churches and paid by Saint-Croix-de-la-Bretonnerie. AN MC XXIX/15, f. 378 and BNF fr. 14477, f. 1.

52 AN LL1523, 231. Cheffontaine made his will in 1584. His bequest to the house, which involved all his goods and property in the faubourg Saint-Marcel, was to be exchanged for burial in the convent in the Choir, as well as three services as year. Although Cheffontaine was never buried here, the bequest was being honoured in 1595 according to a contract involving the house and one Laurens Cheffontaine. For this later contract, see AN MC ET/XXIX/8, f. 248.

53 The elaborate ceremony was paid for out of an annuity of sixty livres. See MC ET/LXXX/VII/39.

54 The original will was dated February 9 1589, and is found in MC ET/XXI/55, f. 48.
women, many of whom were acting upon their own initiative and not simply as executors of a husband or brother's estate.\textsuperscript{95}

The broad-based nature of lay support signifies the high value placed upon the Cordelier community by Parisian society. What the Cordeliers offered their patrons is therefore an obvious starting point for any investigation of religious patronage. Equally essential, however, is to place the expectations of the friars under the historian's microscope, since patronage was by nature an institution premised upon mutual exchange. Patronage of the friars reveals quite clearly that, though their intentions and desires often differed, the friars and their patrons both manipulated lines of patronage to expand their own power and influence in French society.

This conception of patronage as a channel of power and influence underlies recent studies of patronage relations. Sharon Kettering, Kristen Neuschel and Arlette Jouanna are

\textsuperscript{95} Although it is not always easy to tell how independent bequests were in reality, a number of the wills left by the female patrons indicate strong preferences for certain types of services and, furthermore, are specifically concerned with their own passing. Among those that evidence a distinctive voice are the foundations made by Anne de Laval, Suzanne de la Jarousse, Jeanne d'Estissac, Lucretia Cavalcanti, and Françoise de Ruffec from the sword noble cadre. Among the lower social groups, there are even more independent bequests. Ten of the eighteen women mentioned from this social cadre made personalized bequests to the friary. Magdeleine Le Prestre was one. She requested a service celebrated on the feast of Saint Mary Magdalene. Interestingly, it is most difficult to discern independent foundations among women from the robe noble families. With few exceptions (Catherine Bourgeois, Charlotte Turquan) these women found themselves buried in the chapels of their own families or that of their husband.
among the historians who view patronage as an institution organized around vertical ties between individuals of different social and economic groups, based upon some form of reciprocal exchange. This exchange was frequently economic and/or political in nature: an exchange of services for money, position, or both. Nevertheless this economic and political relationship often reflected an existing personal relationship, and/or led to the creation of one. I am using the term "personal" to refer to emotional, sentimental bonds which united patron and client.

Kettering and Jouanna both distinguish between the more informal type of patronage, such as that between a patron and an artist or scientist, and patronage concerned with the construction of a clientèle. A clientèle was a complex, hierarchical network of relationships premised on fidelity to an important lord. This structure pivoted around "brokers," intermediary powerful individuals who solicited the support of other individuals for the patron. The durability of this structure was dependent on the "credit" of the patron, in other words, his/her ability to distribute rewards to supporters.

96 Jouanna differentiates between "amitié" and ties of "fidélité." "Amitié" bound nobles to one another in reciprocal ties which were neither unequal nor dependent. Ties of fidelity refer rather to ties involving dependence. For Jouanna's discussion of this distinction, see Le devoir: 60-75.

97 Jouanna provides a clear discussion of credit. Le devoir, 65-70. Credit was not simply financial at its source. It also stemmed from a possession of a large reserve of "amis"-- supporters.
In contrast, informal patronage was a simpler, more immediate form of reciprocity between a patron and an individual or institution. Like bonds of fidelity, this relationship involved a degree of dependency. Unlike fidelity relationships, however, it was not as closely tied to the exigencies of power. Informal patronage was as frequently subject to the whims of altruism and aestheticism, as it was to politics and the extension of a family's domaine.

This fluid, more ambiguous form of patronage perhaps best explains lay patronage of religious institutions. Patrons of religious institutions, and the Cordelier patrons were no different, were motivated by power, piety, charity and even civic spirit to varying degrees. The recipients of patronage similarly sought patronage for a variety of reasons. The inherent complexity and flexibility of such a relationship perhaps accounts for its durability as well. One of the most remarkable characteristics of Cordelier patronage during the civil wars was its ability to survive the ideological and political contests which were then

---

Kettering, "Patronage", 843. Kettering argues that this model of patronage also took two forms: one involving a very personal and close relationship in which the individual was richly rewarded in return for his exclusive services; the other which involved a less personal and thus less dependent relationship. This latter model is more useful in understanding the relationship between the Cordeliers and their patrons because it allowed for a multiplicity of patronage ties. Guy Lytle has dubbed this the "Maecenas" model. See "Religion and the Lay Patron in Reformation England" in Guy Lytle and Stephen Orgel eds., Patronage in the Renaissance (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981): 65-114.
tearing apart families and communities.

Structure of Cordelier/patron relationship

We should distinguish to some extent between patronage of individual Cordeliers and that of the Cordelier community more generally, because the relationships were not necessarily the same. Patronage of the community usually did involve some sort of direct exchange of services for money, land or other items most commonly in the form of donations or foundations. Donations in the strictest sense were bequests provided once, with no promise of continuing aid. These gifts were often made to commemorate special occasions, or during times of crisis such as the burning of the convent church in 1580. Foundations could involve a one-time gift, but most often they were bequests involving long-term financial relationships with the religious institution. The majority were established in perpetuity though we do find some patrons demanding more specific time constraints. Money, land or goods were exchanged for spiritual services on behalf of the soul of the donor or a loved one. Spiritual services most frequently took the form of prayers for the dead, masses, the singing of psalms and even processions. The financial provisions of these bequests were detailed in contracts before notaries and witnesses. The relationship formed was therefore legal as well as economic, and binding on both parties.

Violation of the contract brought with it the threat of
court action, a threat which was by no means an idle one. The family of Jeanne Georges, for example, brought the Cordeliers community before the Châtelet\(^9\) in 1588 because of the community's failure to meet its obligation to George's foundation. The family of Georges wanted to know why services for her had ceased. Although the response of the convent is unknown, the family was clearly satisfied because they provided another foundation shortly after.\(^{100}\) Far more common among the surviving documents are arrêts or legal acts, forcing heirs to fulfill contracts made by deceased relatives to the friary or forcing the friary to reduce the amount of annual payment (rente) owed by the heir. The reduction of a rente did occur from time to time and we have three examples from the period of the religious wars. The three foundations, those of Guillaume Choart, a doctor, and the merchants Jean Arnoult and Pierre Closeau, were reduced by the courts of the Châtelet upon the request of the heir.

\(^9\) The Châtelet was the prévôté of Paris and as such it was responsible for maintaining order in the city. In addition to being responsible for the policing of Paris, the Châtelet was also the home to courts governing civil as well as criminal matters. At the head of the structure was the prévot des marchands who owed his authority directly to the king. Below him were the lieutenant-civil and lieutenant-criminel. The chambre civile had jurisdiction over civil cases covering smaller financial disputes including the non-payment of rentes. See Richard Andrews, *Law, Magistracy, and Crime in Old Regime Paris* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994): 56.

\(^{100}\) Georges' foundation was first established in 1563. The contract from 1588 continues the relationship first established by Georges. The family agrees to pay the friary eight livres a year from the rent of a house on the street faubourg Saint-Antoine. See AN LL1523, 229.
At least in the case of Arnoult, the impact of the wars is given as the explanation.\textsuperscript{101}

Patronage of individual Cordeliers was not necessarily formalized in the same way as was patronage of the community, and was therefore not as binding. In fact rarely is the relationship traceable, because it was confined to word of mouth or letters rather than contracts. We do however have a few examples of Cordeliers and their patrons. We know of Jacques Berson's ties to Charles of Guise, Cardinal of Lorraine, because his name appears on a list of pensioners from October 31, 1565.\textsuperscript{102} Lorraine was also patron to two other Cordeliers, Nicolas Raulin\textsuperscript{103} and Pierre

\textsuperscript{101} An arrêt of Parlement from 1608 announces the reduction of the Arnoult rente from 100 livres to forty livres annually because the family had been "ruinee et demolie par les guerres civiles." For the Arnoult legacy, see AN LL1525, f. 18, and AN LL1518, f. 143. For Choart, see AN LL1523, 127. For Closeau, see AN LL1523, 5.

\textsuperscript{102} BNF Ms. Dupuy 591, dated 1570. I have to thank Joanne Baker of Oxford University for bringing my attention to this document. We also know of Berson through a letter dated the same year from Lorraine to the Faculty of Theology at the University of Paris seeking Berson's entrance into the course.

\textsuperscript{103} I want to thank Joanne Baker for drawing my attention to a letter from the Cardinal of Lorraine's creature Pothier to the Cardinal, that mentions that "le pauvre homme est en grand soin et vient chacun jour chez mois pour en avoir nouvelles." The news Raulin was seeking was confirmation of the "lieu" of Montfaucon. Pothier was urging the Cardinal to confirm what had apparently previously been agreed upon but never carried out. The letter is undated except for the day, August 29, though it was most likely written during the reign of Henry III. BNF Ms. Dupuy, 549 f. 92.
L'Enfant. 104

The close relations enjoyed between friars and their patrons should not lead us to assume that these ties were in any way exclusive. Mirroring practices in the secular realm, friars often had more than one patron. Jacques Berson for example, enjoyed the support of no less than three prominent patrons at varying times during his career. In addition to being a pensioner of the Cardinal of Lorraine and almoner in the household of the duke of Anjou, Berson was also connected to the house of Montmorency. This connection to a prominent Guise enemy is evident in a letter sent to the Faculty of Theology in favour of Berson from the Constable of France himself, Anne, duke of Montmorency. In this letter, Montmorency describes Berson as a good friend of a mutual friend.105 It is unlikely his "mutual friend" was the Cardinal. The multiplicity of ties binding the prominent Cordelier are also apparent in Charles IX's patronage of Hugonis. In addition to a pension, Hugonis was also given beautiful rooms ("beau logis") in Paris.106

Patronage clearly was not exclusive. It was also not binding, if the Cordeliers are to be taken as an example. The demands of fidelity which brought other nobles into battle on behalf of a more important lord are not so

104 For L'Enfant, see AN M71 no. 157. The letter from Lorraine on his behalf is dated May 25, 1554.

105 AN M71, no. 67.

106 Fodéré, Narration, 898.
apparent with respect to the friars.\textsuperscript{107} We do find friars defending their patrons both in print and sermons. Berson's eulogy of his patron Alençon, for example, was to be expected given his years of service to the royal brother.\textsuperscript{108} But such support was not automatic. We see this especially during the time of the League when Paris found itself polarized between leaguers and non-leaguers. Parisians were forced to take sides, and, while patronage may have had some influence, it was not the determining factor. The prominent preacher Robert Chessé was a supporter of the Holy League. Nevertheless, it was Chessé who hid Jacques-Auguste de Thou in the friary following the assassinations of Blois, when people labelled royalist or "politique" were being killed.\textsuperscript{109} Similarly, the best known Franciscans associated with the League were François Feuardent and Maurice Hylaret, and yet there is little evidence linking these individuals with specific League members.

The seeming independence of the Cordeliers with respect to political issues is mirrored in the corporate behaviour of the religious community. The patrons of the community

\textsuperscript{107} Jouanna argues that clients enjoyed more political independence within the context of patronage than previously recognized. However, she sees significantly less freedom in the relations of fidelity, as long as the "credit" of the great noble remained solvent. See Jouanna, \textit{Le devoir}, 70-77.


\textsuperscript{109} De Thou, \textit{Histoire universelle} 1, 144. De Thou "fut caché dans ce Couvent, par le père Robert Chessé, Prédicateur, célèbre parmi le peuple ...."
were a mixture of League supporters, moderates (politiques), and royalists. The Guise and Auroux families, and at least one member of the Le Maistre dynasty, were among the patrons associated with the Holy League. However many of the Cordeliers' most prominent supporters were royalist or at least politique in inclination, notably the de Dormans, de Thou, Gondis, and Arquinvilliers. Despite close ties to these families, the community did not hesitate in giving its support to the League following the assassinations of the Guise brothers at Blois in 1588, nor in venting its fury on Henry III in their sermons and in defacing his portrait in the Church. No doubt some patrons could influence the political behaviour of the friars, but there is little evidence to suggest that the Cordeliers were bound as political supporters to a particular patron or set of patrons. Their support of the League should more readily be attributed to religious zeal or civic spirit than to political manipulation.

---

110 Two of the Auroux were listed as "ligueurs" by Robert Descimon: Barthélemy Auroux (d. 1591) was a councillor in the chambre ardente as well as "avocat et banquier expéditionnaire en cour de Rome", and Nicolas Auroux (d. 1590), also "banquier expéditionnaire à Rome." See Descimon, Qui étaient les Seize? published in the series Paris et Île-de France 34 (Paris: 1983): 103.

111 Robert Descimon includes Pierre Le Maistre, sieur of Vaux, as a ligueur. Pierre was a councillor in the courts of Châtelet, then in the Parlement of Paris, and finally was a president in the chambre des enquêtes in the Parlement. Descimon, Seize, 177-178.

112 This incident is also mentioned in ch. 1, p. 11.
i) The community

Since the Cordeliers were not bound politically to support their patrons, we have to assume that other interests underlay motivations to religious patronage. For the friars, the political influence and economic power of the patron was essential to the perpetuation of their spiritual mission in society. The political and economic relationship between friar and lay patron has a long history and certainly pre-dated the sixteenth century. By forbidding ownership of property and the accumulation of wealth, Francis of Assisi had hoped to create a community free of the bondage of material considerations. However he managed to accomplish much the opposite, since his insistence that friars live off the generosity of others (through the collection of alms) ensured the economic dependency of the friars on society. By the sixteenth century, more liberal interpretations of the Franciscan Rule and an acquiescent papacy enabled the Observant as well as Conventual branches of the order to enjoy greater material wealth resulting from lay economic support of their spiritual mission, and led to an acknowledged acceptance of the importance of the patron to the financial health of the order. We find this acknowledgement of the patron's role in the statutes of the Paris friary itself, which explicitly state that incoming students to the convent should seek funding from their
The economic responsibilities of the patron were straightforward as far as the Cordeliers were concerned: to fund the religious community so that it could fulfill its spiritual activities. Though simple, the Franciscan way of life still required a surprising amount of money. A substantial part of this expense at the Paris friary was of course education. Families of the friars were expected to provide an annual pension which would go towards their maintenance in the convent. However, these pensions were rarely enough. As we have seen, years of study at the convent school had to be supported and, for the gifted few, several more years would be spent at the Faculty of Theology at the University of Paris.

---

"Harum autem eleemosynarum summam procurare poterunt fratres venientes ad studium Parisiensem per amicos spirituales aut per suos conventos sive provinciam." Chapter 35 of the statutes of 1502 states that the friars were expected to provide sixteen scuta (aureos) for their "communitate" and living -- in other words, room and board -- each year that they were at the house. Twelve scuta were to be provided on arrival, and the other four paid in the middle of the year. See chapter 35 of the 1502 statutes. Celestino di Piana, "Gli statuti", 105. The "ami spirituel", or syndic, was the name given to the lay patron responsible for managing the secular affairs of the house. Here, however, it seems to have the more general connotation of lay patron, since the spiritual friends of a house could not be expected to fund several students.

We have the pension contracts for both Marin Le Peuple and François Le Roy. Marin Le Peuple's father provided four and two-thirds écus annuity to the friary in a contract dated December 8, 1588. AN LL1518, 104. Le Roy's pension was substantial enough that he expected to take a trip to Rome as well. AN ET/XXIX/12, f. 416.

James Farge, *Orthodoxy and Reform in Early Reformation France* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1985), 28-31. James Farge's work on the Faculty is revealing about the
Economic aid aside, the patron played a crucial role in mediating between the friary and other institutions, both secular and religious. Patrons could wield their influence to seek privileges for the religious community. Given the friary's interest in preparing preachers, it is not surprising to find its patrons were particularly active in trying to defend and/or extend the privileges of the community with respect to the Faculty of Theology. We have already discussed, for example, letters written by illustrious nobles trying to secure places for their Franciscan clients in the cursus. The Faculty accepted only two Franciscans a year into the theology cursus and was reluctant to allow any more. Petitioning from influential patrons could, however, secure places for one or two other friars as "extraordinary" students. The Cardinal of Lorraine was a particularly avid promoter of the friars as his letters to the faculty supporting the candidacy of Berson, Raulin, and L'Enfant reveal. Kings could also be costliness of studies. Regular as well as secular priests were subject to a variety of fees which covered courses, books, examinations, and the controversial banquet after completion of the doctoral programme. The celebrated humanist Pierre Ramus estimated that the doctorate of theology, the most expensive of the diplomas, could cost as much as 1002 livres. The fees involved in studying at the University are discussed in ch. 3, pp. 196-197.


117 "Extraordinary" (special) students were students allowed in to the theology curriculum at the Faculty of Theology beyond the number allotted for the religious order. The Franciscans were allowed to send one friar each year into the curriculum. During the sixteenth century, however, the number of special students was increasing. The status of the special student is discussed in ch. 3, pp. 184-188.
active promoters of the mendicants in the Faculty of Theology, as we see from the survival of a letter from Henry II on behalf of the Franciscan Estienne Fidel, and from a series of letters from Charles IX on behalf of two Dominicans.\footnote{AN M71, 71. The letter from Henry II is dated June 26, 1550. For the letters of Charles IX on behalf of the Dominicans, see D'Argentré, \textit{Collectio} 2: 338.} All of the individuals mentioned above did finally enter the cursus, though the number of letters required from different patrons shows that they did so only with some difficulty.

Patrons could also be relied on to rally to the friary's service when it was in conflict with other religious orders or even with its superiors, as we see in Christophe de Thou's vigorous defence of the Cordeliers against the claims of both the papacy and their minister general during the 1581-1582 conflict.\footnote{Naturally, de Thou's involvement was sparked by gallicanist concerns but the result of his support was to insulate the friars, at least temporarily, from the interference in their affairs of both the papal legate and their minister general. De Thou's involvement in the affair infuriated Giovanni Battista Castelli. Writing to the papal secretary on March 3, 1582, Castelli refers to de Thou as "Il primo Presidente del Parlamento, da qual è venuto tutto il male." Castelli attributes de Thou's involvement to his "affecttione particolar" for the friars. See Robert Toupin, ed. \textit{Correspondance du nonce en France: Giovanni Battista Castelli (1581-1583)} 7 (Rome: École française de Rome: Presses de l'Université Grégorienne, 1967): 273. This incident was first discussed in chapter 2, pp. 124-129, and receives more attention in chapter 5, pp. 332-337, and 345-348.} The de Thou family first appear as important patrons of the friars in 1580, when they gave a sizable donation to the restoration of the
Cordelier Church following its burning in the same year.  

The family's connection to the house was further solidified when Jacques-Auguste de Thou, the son of Christophe, became the **syndic** of the Paris house in 1588. As syndic, Jacques-Auguste became the acknowledged representative of the friary in all temporal matters, political, financial as well as juridical.  

**ii) The friar**

Just as the community as a whole used the patron to defend and extend its authority in society more generally,  

---

The donation was sizeable enough to attract the notice of the minister general, Francesco-Scipio Gonzaga, who mentions the bequest in his history of the order *De origine seraphicae religionis franciscanae eiusque progressibus de regularis observantiae institutione forma administrationis ac legibus, admirabilique eius propagatione* (Rome: 1587): 119: "Deinde sequentis ... D. Christophoro Thuano summo senatus Parisiensis Praeside, omnium maxime negocium procurante, primoque fundamentorum iaciente lapidem, instaurata fuit & constabilita prima lapidea columna ..." Members of the de Thou family were buried in the Church St André-des-Arts and not at the Cordeliers, though a plaque placed by the family in the Cordelier Church testified to their close relationship with the friars. Christophe de Thou died in 1582. Arsenal Ms. 5403, 40-41. Jacques Auguste died in 1617. Arsenal Ms. 5403, 40.  

Jacques-Auguste de Thou held the post of syndic from 1588 until his death in 1595. Two other prominent magistrates who were syndics during the period of the civil wars were Charles de Dormans (1563-1572), and Jean Séguière (1595-1616). The name Séguiere is particularly familiar to historians of the seventeenth century. Antoine Séguière, the son of Jacques, chevalier seigneur of Villiers and Fourqueux, rose through the magistral ranks to become président à mortier upon the death of Denis Riant in 1597. He was a noted royalist, and was sent on an embassy by Henry IV to Venice in 1598. He died in 1624 and was buried at the church St-André-des-Arts near his parents. Blanchard, *Les présidents*, 367.
the gifted friar could similarly find protection as well as new avenues of influence open to him through the agency of a patron. A friar who proved successful at his studies and earned a reputation for being a good orator could find himself brought into the personal service of a patron as a confessor, preacher or almoner (aumônier). Given the reputation of the Franciscans as both confessors and preachers, it is hardly surprising to find a number of them singled out for such offices. The status of the Paris community, furthermore, meant that not a few entered into royal households.

Some of the friars to find service as royal confessors during the early part of the sixteenth century include the famous preacher Olivier Maillard, who was confessor and preacher to Charles VIII, and friar Bernardin, confessor of Louise of Savoy, the mother of Francis I. Jacques Berson was similarly employed in the household of François-Hercule Alençon, the duke of Anjou and brother to Henry III, and Jacques de L'Auverge became the confessor of Marie de Médicis early on in the seventeenth century.

122 Almoners were responsible for distributing charity on behalf of a noble or prince. The King had several almoners working in his household. The Grand Aumônier was an office of particular distinction, since it supervised the numerous charitable activities of the King. For this reason it was usually reserved for a bishop. See Doucet, Institutions, 126.

123 Bibl. de Lyon, Ms. 844. "Memoires touchant le Grand Convent de l'Observance de St. François de Paris", 27.

124 Ibid, 27. Marie's connection with the Franciscans was a strong one. In addition to being a patron of the Paris
The position of royal confessor was a particularly privileged one during the early modern period. In an age when proximity to a prince meant access to power and influence, the close relations between a confessor and a prince would not have gone unmarked. Access to the heart and the mind of an ordinary individual, let alone a ruler, was a powerful position, as de Thou points out in his *Histoire universelle*. De Thou blames much of the accelerating violence and turmoil in France during the period of the Holy League not only on preachers but also on the unwise advice of confessors, who abused the "secret de leur ministre, n'épargnoient ni le Roi, ni les Ministres, & les Officiers, qui lui étoient le plus attachés." For this reason, the position of royal confessor could be a controversial one, and Henry III was not the first King criticized for paying too much attention to the counsel of priests.\(^{125}\)

Less controversial but also politically important was the position of almoner. Like the confessor, the almoner was a member of the personal household of a lord. As almoner the friar was in the unusual position of managing a portion of a house (See bequest from 1604, BNF fr 14477, f.25, and AN LL1523, 206), she hired a succession of friars as confessors. Following de L'Auverre, Marie hired Jacques Toricelly, a native of Tuscany and future bishop of Marseilles. He in turn was later replaced by François Girardy.

\(^{125}\) A common perception during the reign of Henry III was that the Jesuit Edmond Auger had too much influence over royal policy. Lynn Martin argues that this perceived influence may have ultimately convinced many French Catholics to support the Catholic League rather than their own monarch. Lynn Martin, *Henry III and the Jesuit Politicians* (Geneva: Librairie Droz, 1973): 209-210.
noble's finances, since he was responsible for administering the charitable donations of the lord. The most prominent almoner to come from the Paris house during the sixteenth century was Etienne Le Maingre de Boucicaut, grand almoner of Marguerite of Valois, but two other friars, Jacques Berson and Pierre Besse, were almoners respectively to the duke of Anjou and the Prince of Condé.¹²⁶

As for the position of royal preacher, this again was an office supplying the fortunate friar with both financial support and public recognition. The royal preacher did not give up his other pulpits, but rather was expected to preach before the Court on specified state and religious occasions. The friars chosen for this office, not surprisingly, had already developed a reputation for themselves as excellent orators. Jacques Hugonis was known throughout France for his eloquence, therefore his appointment as royal preacher for Henry II is not surprising. His ability to maintain this post throughout the succeeding three Valois reigns is remarkable, however, and perhaps suggests that he was equally adept at social relations.¹²⁷

¹²⁶ Le Maingre became grand almoner in 1595, according to the biography of the Paris friary. Bibl. Lyon Ms. 844, 28; Pierre Besse was a doctor of theology like Le Maingre and Berson. No doubt he became almoner to Condé following the latter's conversion after 1594. Besse died in 1614. See Raunié, 3, no. 1282, and BHVP Ms. 11479, 1073.

¹²⁷ Hugonis was royal preacher successively for Henry II, François II, Charles IX and Henry III, and Jacques Suarez was royal preacher under Henry IV. Jacques Foderé, Narration, 898. Other friars who acted as royal preachers included Jacques Berson and Jacques Suarez. For Berson, see P. Ubald Berson D'Alençon, O.F.M., "Jacques Berson, Cordelier parisien, confesseur de François D'Alençon" in
The positions of personal confessor, preacher and almoner were lofty heights for the friars, and Berson was an exception to occupy all three of these posts. Very occasionally, however, one of the friars would find himself singled out for an even higher honour, becoming a bishop. Bertrand de Marillac, brother of Charles de Marillac, the archbishop of Vienne, became bishop of Rennes in 1565.\textsuperscript{128} His noble status would have made such a promotion possible if not probable since bishoprics, with few exceptions, were granted by the King to those of noble lineage. For similar reasons no doubt, Etienne Le Maingre was given the bishopric of Grasse in 1595.\textsuperscript{129} A few friars like Jacques Suarez and Pompé Perille did obtain sees on the basis of their reputations as spiritual leaders.\textsuperscript{130} More common, however, were the more honorific titles of bishops "in partibus infidelium" like those of Jacques de Montracher, the bishop

\textsuperscript{128} The de Marillac family was an old noble one from Auvergne. Bertrand became vicar general and took charge of the spiritual reform of the diocese while his brother was away on affairs of state. Bertrand died in 1572, the last day of December. Bibliothèque de Lyon, Ms. 844: 43.

\textsuperscript{129} Bibl. Lyon Ms. 844, 28.

\textsuperscript{130} The famous preacher Jacques Suarez became bishop of Séez in 1611, and Pompé Perille received the bishopric of Apt in 1587. See Arsenal Ms. 5403, 142, AN LL1523, 171. Suarez left 100 livres fifteen sols to the friary. Joseph Bergin also discusses Suarez in his work \textit{The Making of the French Episcopate 1589-1661} (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996). Perille is mentioned in the house chronicle, Bibl. de Lyon, Ms. 844, 43.
of Philadelphia, Cheffontaine, the bishop of Cesarea, and Joannes Henrici, the bishop of Damascus. Bishop in name only, these individuals were also usually given in addition the less prestigious but more substantial office of suffragant in a diocese. Montracher for example, was also the suffragant of François de Dinteville, the bishop of Auxerre, and Henrici was similarly a suffragant, though the convent's memoir does not indicate in which diocese he held this post. As suffragant, the friar fulfilled the political and spiritual duties of the bishop within his diocese during his frequent absences, and hence exercised substantially more authority than he would have as a mere friar.

**Patronage: the perspective of the patron**

From the previous discussion we can appreciate the pragmatic nature of Franciscan pursuit of lay patronage, and so it is hardly surprising that many of the reasons propelling patrons to support the Cordeliers were equally pragmatic. True, the patron did not expect any immediate

---


132 Bibl. Lyon Ms. 844, 44.

133 Bibl. Lyon Ms. 844, 44.
financial gain from his patronage, at least not in the short
term. Any economic advantage he sought was part of a
broader, longer term plan to expand the power and influence
of his/her family in the community of Paris, and France more
generally. The patronage of a religious house was a well-
trodden route to personal and dynastic advancement, and it
was not uncommon for this relationship to extend over
several generations and for families to think of the
community as an extension of their patrimony. The ritual
celebration of a birth, death or marriage by members of the
religious community, the depiction of armorials and of
individual family members in the stained glass windows or in
sarcophagi in the Church, donations to the sacristy for the
performance of private services -- these were tangible signs
of possession, of influence, and therefore of power,
specifically the power of the family to patronize the
religious community, and consequently their power over those
dependent on the community.

This power was also clearly linked to the patron's
conception of his/her authority in society more generally.
Rona Goffen finds such a dynamic at work behind the
patronage of the Pesaro family chapel in the Franciscan
Church of the Frari in Venice. The chapel, according to
Goffen, was "the personal and private domain of the Pesaro
family," but it was also simultaneously a visual declaration
of the social and political authority of this important
Venetian dynasty.\textsuperscript{134}

The decorated chapels ringing the choir in the Paris Cordelier church similarly articulate patrons' claims to social and political importance, and by the sixteenth century these private worship spaces were broadcasting the power and authority of one social group above all: that of the robe nobility. Burial patterns at the Paris friary reveal a direct connection between the rise in social and political prominence of the robe families late in the fifteenth century, and their accelerated infiltration of the Cordelier necropolis during the same period. Prior to the fifteenth century, the majority of the individuals buried at the Cordeliers were of royal or sword noble stock. Among the more illustrious royal residents were Blanche of France, daughter of Philip the Long (d.1358), Marie of Brabant, wife of Philippe "le Hardi" (d.1321), and Pierre of Bourbon (d.1342), grandson of Saint Louis.\textsuperscript{135}

Although we find robe families entering the necropolis by the latter part of the fourteenth century, it was not

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{134} Rona Goffen, \textit{Piety and Patronage in Renaissance Venice} (Yale: Yale University Press, 1986): 37-38. The lavishly-decorated chapel, which prominently displayed the family emblem, boasted a commissioned painting by Bellini and a handsome sacristy.
  \item \textsuperscript{135} For Blanche of France, see Raunié, 3, no. 1188; for Marie of Brabant, see Raunié, 3, no. 1182; For Bourbon, see Abbé Jean Lebeuf, \textit{Histoire de la ville et de tout le diocèse de Paris...nouvelle édition annotée et continuée jusqu'à nos jours} 6 (3rd ed., Paris: Honoré Champion, 1890; reprinted, Brussels: Culture et Civilisation, 1969-1970): 300. Cited in Beaumont-Maillet, 372. Other royal family members included Marie of France, natural daughter of Philippe of France, the duke of Orleans (d. 1333). See Anselme, 1, 104; Raunié, 3, no. 1179.
\end{itemize}
until the end of the sixteenth century, after the royal and great noble families found resting places elsewhere, that they became the predominant social group in the church crypt. The robe were also clearly more interested than the sword nobility in developing strong, dynastic links with the Franciscan community. True, the d'Elbene family buried several members here during the period, but these can hardly compare to the many generations of robe families buried in family crypts. The Longueil family alone buried their members in the friary over a period of four hundred years.¹³⁶

Spirituality: lay piety

Pursuit of power was clearly an important function of religious patronage, but the bequests of patrons show that their concern about the afterlife was more than just a pretext to embellish their chapels. For patron and friar alike, the pursuit of salvation was as tangible and natural a goal as wealth and status, and during the religious wars, this pursuit of the hereafter became a particularly pointed, and poignant, one. True, the formulaic nature of the bequests tended to conceal individualistic impulses towards

¹³⁶ The Longueil and the Le Maistre families had chapels renamed after their families. For example, the Auroux were buried in the chapelle Sainte-Claude, and the Arquinvilliers and the Aymerets shared space in the chapel Saint-Michel. The earliest member of the Arquinvilliers family buried in the Cordelier church was Olivier d'Arquinvilliers, seigneur of Auvilliers and of Saint-Rivault (1504). See Arsenal, Ms. 5403, 149 and Raunié, 3, no. 1226. The earliest Aymeret was Guillaume, buried in the chapel of Saint Michel in 1515. Raunié, 3, nos. 1226-1227, and Arsenal, Ms. 5403, 14.
spirituality. More often than not, foundations varied only according to the number of low masses required. Nevertheless, this unremitting sameness of the bequests is itself revealing about early modern Catholic spirituality.

The practice of giving donations to several houses rather than just one suggests, for example, that, despite rivalry among religious institutions, lay and clerical patrons alike believed there were a variety of routes to heaven. As long as they stayed within certain theological parameters, different religious communities could exist and find support. The association of the mendicant orders together in bequests was particularly common, and not difficult to understand. Though distinct forms of spirituality, each of these orders emphasized an active life in the community involving preaching and offering solace to the sick and poor.

The "four" orders were the Dominicans (Jacobins), the Carmelites, the Augustinians and of course, the Franciscans. At least six of the bequests during this period involved donations to the four orders, including those of Jean Arnoult (AN LL1518, f. 143), Guillaume Choart (AN LL1523, 127), the merchant Estienne Hunn (AN LL1517, and LL1523, 78), Catherine Pichonnat (AN LL1523, 59), the Duke and Duchess de Nevers (AN LL1523, 84) and August Champion (AN MC ET/LXXXVI/116). Pichonnat and Nevers specifically requested a joint mass. The Nevers foundation requested that "deux religieux de chaque couvent assisteront au service qui se dit pour lesdits fondateurs dans l'Eglise des Augustins le 25 Aoust."

The association of the four orders was common even in civic life. Processions organized by the city council as well as those organized by the parish churches regularly called upon the four orders to participate. Traditionally they were grouped together at the front of the procession. Descriptions of the elaborate funeral processions of the Cardinal of Birague and Charles IX, and processions organized during the League by the city all refer to the
Bequests were just as frequently made jointly to a parish church and the friars. Every Parisian belonged to a parish. Association with a religious order was an option to some extent, but one frequently made. The close ties of the de Thou and Séguier families with the friars, for example, did not diminish their attachment to their parish church of Saint-André-des-Arts. The Cordeliers were also in regular contact with the parish churches of Saint-Opportune, Saint-Nicolas-des-Champs and Saint-Paul as a result of shared foundations.

From the examples given above, we can see that the patron played a significant role in assuring not only the survival of different forms of religious life but also the ongoing interaction between the different forms, both secular and regular. Seeking his or her own salvation, the patron brought together disparate religious communities into a partnership based upon spiritual service to the lay community. The patron could not eradicate tensions which naturally existed between the different communities, but he

"four orders." For royal obsequies, see BNF Dupuy 324. For Charles IX, see ff. 127-135. For René, Cardinal of Birague, see ff. 161-163. Religious processions are discussed in chapter 5, pp. 286-288.

139 Both the De Thou and Séguier families had family crypts at Saint-André-des-Arts.

140 The foundation for sermons at the Church of Saint-Opportune appears in the foundation of Jehan Boulenger, 1588 (AN L941, no. 37). Saint Nicolas-des-Champs is cited in the foundation of Jean DuranteI (AN LL1523, 142). A foundation in 1594 established by Hierosme Bureau left money to help rebuild the Church of Saint-Paul, AN LL1518 and LL1523, 90.
or she could force the communities to co-exist by bringing them together in divine service. In fact, force may not have been necessary, as we can see from the number of bequests coming to the Cordeliers from both regular and secular priests. Some understanding of mutual cooperation and coexistence was clearly shared by the different religious communities.

Beyond demonstrating the multi-faceted nature of Catholic spirituality, the bequests of the Cordelier patrons also reveal a profound interest in personalized devotional activity in the form of processions, pilgrimages, fasting, praying and other rites codified by historians under the term "lay piety." Lay piety was always a matter of concern for the Catholic Church which feared that such devotional enthusiasm, lacking proper direction from the clerical hierarchy, would quickly swerve into heresy.

The Franciscans, however, were less sceptical than many in the Church. They believed that the simpler, more emotional piety associated with lay individuals was efficacious in bringing about the moral reformation of the individual, which was an essential precondition to salvation.141 This interest in lay piety was of course a legacy of Saint Francis himself, but even as the order became more formalized over time, it continued to recognize such spirituality as an important vehicle of moral regeneration. We see this acknowledgement in the

141 See chapter 1 for a discussion of Franciscan spirituality.
preservation of the position of lay brother among the
Observant Franciscans and the Capuchins, and in Franciscan
authorship of devotional manuals for the lay individual as
well as the cleric.\(^{142}\) Similarly, although a more cynical
observer might consider it another sign of lay patronage
influencing ecclesiastic policy, the burial of supporters in
the Franciscan habit was also an indication to some
adherents of Franciscan respect for lay piety.\(^{143}\)

Franciscan willingness to support and encourage lay
devotion explains to a large extent why friars were so
popular throughout their history as confessors, preachers
and priests, and why their churches, and those of the other
mendicant orders, were often the most important necropolises
in the urban centres. Patronage of a friar or of a
Franciscan community was one means by which individuals
could participate more directly in their own salvation and
in that of their family. It also did not harm Franciscan
popularity that their form of spirituality was particularly

\(^{142}\) Franciscans were among the most prolific authors of
devotional manuals and psalters for lay people. See Thomas
N. Tentler, *Sin and Confession on the Eve of the Reformation*

\(^{143}\) Jean Standonck, the great religious reformer of the
late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, is one
prominent example from the sixteenth century. Although we
have few other examples of this occurring in the Paris
house, the practise was quite common -- common enough to
attract the satirical tongue of Erasmus, who directed the
colloquy entitled "The Seraphic Funeral" (1531) against this
Franciscan practise. See Desiderius Erasmus, *The Colloquies
of Erasmus* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1965):
500-515. Trans. by Craig Thompson. For Standonck, see Marcel
Godet, "Jean Standonck et les frères mineurs" in *Archivum
franciscanum historicum* 2 (1909), fasc. 3: 403.
accessible. Patrons could follow independently the rigorous rounds of prayers and exercises found in the Franciscan-authored manuals, and imitate the life of Christ which the friars had adopted as their own model for redemption.

Not surprisingly, wealth made such lay devotional participation more possible. Personal confessors and household preachers were luxuries of the elite and were beyond the reach of most families. A more popular, and at times more affordable, way to exert influence was by means of the foundation. The patterns of bequests show that the patron could choose from a pre-established list of rituals, so his or her control over the funded liturgy was far from complete. Services ranged greatly, from a modest one like that of Suzanne de La Jarousse, established in 1573, requesting "prayers et oraisons" by the novices, to the much more elaborate, and costly foundations involving a high mass. It is somewhat ironic that two of the most generous

\[\text{\textsuperscript{144} Hervé Martin points out that the complexity of the service was directly proportional to the amount of money donated. He has determined some rough categories of bequests, the equivalent of "package deals", available to lay patrons. To a large extent this model holds true for the Cordeliers. The more elaborate services usually were accompanied by larger grants of money. Martin, \textit{Les ordres mendiants}, 230-237.}\]

\[\text{\textsuperscript{145} This foundation gave money to the "petits novices dudit couvent et destre participant aux prières et oraisons diceux...." See AN L941, "livre des rentes", 7, and LL1521, ff. 57-60.}\]

\[\text{\textsuperscript{146} A typical example of a more elaborate ceremony is that of Catherine Bourgeois, who in 1585 requested a mass in perpetuity, two complete services each with vespers "vigilles a neuf psalms et neuf lecons, laudes ... libera de profundis salve Regina" and other accustomed "oraisons" on Saint Martin's day. AN L941, no.12, f. 1.}\]
and elaborate foundations established during this period were made by the Franciscan preachers Jacques Hugonis and Jacques Berson. Though bound by an oath of poverty, Berson and Hugonis both managed to fund foundations involving three masses with vigils and a procession around the Cordeliers Church involving all the friars.\footnote{147}

The penitential confraternity

Individual tailoring of divine services did allow some degree of control for the lay patron. However, even more control could be exercised through the creation of a new spiritual collectivity such as that of the penitential confraternity. The penitential confraternity's emphasis upon the moral reformation of the individual through imitation of the life of Christ explains why the mendicant houses in particular, and the Franciscan ones above all, were the most popular hosts of these spiritual associations.\footnote{148} Of the

\footnote{147} Hugonis' will from December 14, 1574 was an elaborate one, involving an "obit solempnel qui se dyroict y cellebroict par chacun an au couvent." All the doctors and bachelors were expected to attend. Hugonis also had a "chappelle dargent dore tottte complette hors" and "deux bassins" made by the goldsmith Richard Trem. These were to be used in the service. AN MC ET/LXXX/VII, f. 39. Berson's will, dated February 9, 1589, left 100 livres annually to the friary for a service similar to that of Hugonis. MC ET/XXI/55, f. 48.

\footnote{148} Cheffontaine says that Saint Francis established a confraternity as early as 1220 AD in Assisi. Cheffontaine, Apologie de la confraire des pénitents... (Paris: M. Julian, 1583), 13. The preface to this pamphlet is dedicated to Henry III, who was then undergoing serious criticism for his enthusiastic participation in a variety of penitential
twenty-one confraternities founded in Brittany between 1450 and 1550, Hervé Martin found that eleven were associated with the Franciscans in comparison to six with the Jacobins, three with the Carmelites and one with the Augustinians.\textsuperscript{146} The minister general, Cheffontaine, was himself responsible for the establishment of a confraternity in Lyon six years previously, and the extension of another into France known as the confraternity of the Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist.\textsuperscript{155} A confraternity established in Orléans during the time of the league was also the work of a Cordelier, the Paris-trained preacher Maurice Hylaret.\textsuperscript{151}

organizations.


\textsuperscript{150} Othon de Pavie, \textit{L'Aquitaine séraphique} 1 (Auch: 1900): 313. Cheffontaine won permission from the Pope in 1575 to direct the confraternity of the Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist in any French church. Another Franciscan-sponsored confraternity to appear was the Cordon of Saint Francis, which was extended into France in 1585 through the agency of the Franciscan pope, Sixtus V. This confraternity was initially only conceded to the conventuals, although Observants outside of Italy were also allowed to establish this confraternity. See Du Brul, \textit{Le théâtre des antiquités de Paris} (Paris: Claude de la Tour, 1612): 526.

\textsuperscript{151} Hylaret was involved in founding a branch of the penitential confraternity Saint-Nom-de-Jésus in 1589. This confraternity was associated with the Franciscan order from its inception in Italy during the fifteenth century but did
The confraternity associated with the Paris Cordeliers is revealing about the degree to which the patron could play a role in effecting his or her own salvation. Like the penitents blancs, rouges, and the other confraternities forming during this period, members of the confraternity of Saint-Sépulchre-de-Jérusalem participated in devotional

not arrive in Paris until 1590. Symphorien Guyon describes Hylaret as "le principal auteur & directeur de cette nouvelle devotion establie sans autorité legitime ...." Guyon says that neither the bishop nor the clergy of Orleans supported this organization because "elle tendoit insensiblement à une espece d'anarchie contraire à l'Estat." This confraternity was closely associated with the Catholic League. Guyon, *Histoire de leglise et diocese ville et universite d'Orleans* (Orléans: Claude & Jacques Borde, 1650): 443.


153 The confraternity Saint-Sépulchre-de-Jérusalem had its roots in a pilgrimage society formed in the thirteenth century during the reign of Saint Louis (1254). Abbé Jean Lebeuf says that this confraternity began much earlier, in 506, and was rejuvenated by King Baudouin I, King of Jerusalem, in 1103. The Paris version of this confraternity owed its foundation to Louis XII. Initially they were referred to as the "Croisez" or "Paulmiers." On route to Jerusalem, the pilgrims wore a cross of Jerusalem in red cloth on their coat, and returned bearing palm branches. According to Du Bruel, conflict prevented eight pilgrims from going to the Holy Land in 1336. These eight in reaction formed a confraternity in association with the Cordelier convent in Paris. Statutes were formalized in 1434 under the guidance of the Cordeliers, and received papal recognition a year later. Du Bruel suggests that the confraternity remained at the convent from this time on, though the first
rites which they organized under the direction of the friars. Private penance was as important as participation in the confraternity public rituals. The latter entailed specific services held at the Cordelier Church, including one high mass each week in their chapel at 8:00 in the morning and a low mass each Friday of the year. One high mass of the Requiem was also to be celebrated each year on Easter Sunday in honour of dead confrères. A typical contract is that of Le Gros, who requested a

grande messe diacre soudiacre, acolite, douze enfans chantes qui se chantera et celebrera en ladicte chapelle chacune sepmaine de lan heure de huit heures Que une basse messe par chacune vendredi de chacune sepmane de lan Ou au commencement se dira le passion Que une grande messe de Requiem qui se dira une foys par chacun an le landemain du dimanche des octaves de pasques Pour le remede et salut des ames des voyagers dudict St Sepulchre Que leurs amyes les a liez confederez ....

known foundation was not made until early on in the sixteenth century when Jean de Monceaux, seigneur of Monceaux and la Court, obtained the chapelle de Saint-Sépulchre de Jérusalem for the confraternity. Monceaux died on October 8, 1505, so the chapel must have been bequeathed to him in the few years prior to his death. Monceaux was governor of Artois under the duke of Burgundy. Du Bruel, Le theatre des antiquitez, 529-537. For Lebeuf, see Histoire de la ville et de tout le diocèse de Paris 6, 300.

154 Arch. dépt. de la Seine, D-Q (10), 95=2500, nos. 1299-1317. The original donation was made in 1550 (this particular document gives a later date: June 9, 1557). This was the second donation from a member of the confraternity, and it seems to have inspired a minor avalanche of donations. Le Gros left an annual rent of twenty livres tournois. Other foundations were made respectively by the merchant Pierre Berthault in 1559, and the "marchand drappier" Maurice de Launay in 1566 (Arch. de la Seine, D-Q (10) 95=2500, December 1566), Philippe de Noyen "seigneur prestre et non voyageur" in 1568 (AN LL1523, 237, Arsenal Ms. 5403, 13, and Raunié, 3, no. 1294), Anthoine Regnault in
A rather unusual facet of the contracts was the repeated request for prayers in both Arabic and Greek, which may have functioned to remind the confreres that they were members of spiritual community which had origins associated with the East.155 As in the other confraternities, fellowship in the confraternity of the Saint-Sépulchre brought with it the enjoyment of special indulgences which were awarded by the Pope for the performance of the necessary liturgical rituals.156

1578 (Arch. de la Seine, D-Q (10) 95=2500, nos. 1299-1317), and André Thevet in 1582 (Lestringant, 29). François de Monceaux, the son of Jean, also provided money to help rebuild the chapel following the fire of 1580. Monceaux's donation notes his family's long connection with the Cordeliers, and claims the right to bury his family for a period of one hundred years. AN LL1523, 169.

155 The majority of bequests from the late sixteenth century request Arabic in particular. Greek is specifically mentioned by Du Bruel. Psalms were to be sung in Greek "en la manière accoustumée" during the celebration of the confraternity's feast day. Du Bruel, Le théâtre des antiquitez, 532. The choice of these two languages is puzzling. Greek and Arabic were languages associated with non-Christian cultures, and outside the small group of humanist scholars, may have been regarded with some suspicion. Furthermore, it is unlikely the members of the order as a group could speak one of these languages let alone both. It seems likely, however, that these languages were incorporated in the ceremonies as mnemonics; they provided atmosphere, a flavour of the exotic to remind themselves that they were in fact voyagers as much as they were warriors. They were members of the Paris community, but they were also members of a spiritual brotherhood that traversed geographic boundaries, and had its roots in the Levant. The languages then functioned as a bond linking brother to brother in a uniquely spiritual and temporal union.

156 All confraternities which attended the celebration of the mass on Fridays and on the feast day of their organization received twenty years indulgence, for example. There were also plenary indulgences for special days, such
By defining the types of rituals desired and what was required of each member, members of the confraternity played an important role in creating a particular and peculiar form of spiritual life for themselves. This devotional life had the sanctioning of the friars who accepted the members as a form of lay brotherhood, and who provided the necessary spiritual services throughout the lives of the penitents and beyond. The friars administered the sacraments at their masses, accompanied their funeral processions and buried the members in their church. They also participated to some degree in the ritualistic creation of the member, for it was through the blessing of the Cordeliers guardian in the holy land that the member was transformed into a chevalier. The rituals governing the incorporation of new members into the community, and the passage of old ones into the hereafter, were marked by the communal presence and supervision of the friars.

Patronage and societal reformation: a partnership

Clearly the Paris Cordeliers considered the confraternity a useful spiritual tool, but their interest in promoting such associations, and other forms of devotional activity, went beyond a quest for the salvation of the individual. Individual salvation was simply the necessary

as Christmas, Pentecost, and Easter. Cheffontaine, Apologie, 18.
precursor to the salvation of all of society. The relationship between the friars and their patrons shows that the friars attributed to the patron a crucial role in the fulfillment of their mission for reasons which were entirely consistent with Franciscan dogma. On the one hand, the patron could provide the financial and political support necessary to Franciscan spiritual activity which, as humble friars, they could not provide for themselves. On the other hand, by undergoing a reformation themselves and by leading spiritual lives according to the life of Christ, their patrons could influence others to similarly seek salvation. This conception of the patron as spiritual role model is expressed in Cheffontaine's pamphlet defending the penitential confraternities. He argues that these organizations performed good works and mortified their own flesh in public in order to influence other members of society:

> Is it not a good thing to pray to God, fast, praise, give alms generously, marry poor girls, visit prisoners and the sick and console them in their adversity, pray for the living and for the

---

157 Megan McLaughlin suggests that foundations involving the liturgy of the dead expressed a widely-held view of the Christian church as community comprising both the living and the dead, the lay and the clerical. The patrons establishing specific foundations for themselves, and their loved ones, were consequently, articulating a desire to participate in the fellowship of that particular spiritual community, and the intent was not only their own salvation but that of all of its members. McLaughlin is talking about medieval France but her ideas apply to the early modern period as well. Megan McLaughlin, *Consorting with Saints. Prayer for the Dead in Early Medieval France* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1994): 158.
dead, take frequent communion .... 158

Given the hierarchical nature of early modern society, one can understand why the Cordeliers patrons were particularly suited to act as spiritual role models. The more prominent the individual, the more influential would be his/her redemption. We can see this assumption expressed in the dedications of sermons and theological treatises by the friars which, though they follow conventional modes of praise to obtain publication, nevertheless reiterate a conception of nobility premised upon spirituality as well as social caste. In a treatise from 1587, Maurice Hylaret praises the Marquis of Entragues for playing the warrior in the holy war against heresy. Far more elaborate is Jacques Berson’s tribute to the duchess of Lorraine in his preface to an edition of a sermon by the Italian Cordelier Cornelio Musso. Berson praises devout, noble women like the duchess who were "quasi comme deesses & divines." 159 The duchess was never remiss in her spiritual exercises, was generous to the poor and supported the work of the friars, all of which proved her worthiness as a spiritual leader and model in society. Berson compares the sermon to an hors d’oeuvre

158 "Car n’est-ce pas une bonne chose que prier Dieu, ieusner, veiller en oraison, donner force aumonies, marier les pauvres filles, visiter les prisonniers & malades, & les consoler en leurs adversitez, prier pour les vivans & pour les trespassez, ouyr & souvent communier le sainct Sacrement ...." Cheffontaine, Apologie, 33.

which, if she approves, will stimulate others: "le nom de vostre grandeur ouvrira l'appetit aux autres."\textsuperscript{160}

This conception of the patron as an agent of societal reform was not merely something shared by the friars. The importance placed by members of the confraternity of the Saint-Sépulchre upon the public performance of their rites is explicable if one understands that they believed their rituals would be efficacious to others. This sense of public mission found expression in their oath as well, which bound them to protect the Catholic faith in addition to widows and orphans.\textsuperscript{161}

This profound desire to effect a generalized spiritual reformation explains why so many confraternities appeared in France in the wake of Luther and continued to gain momentum throughout the century. Faced by increasing confessional strife, lay individuals clearly felt a need to participate in the spiritual rejuvenation of society, and were not relying solely on clerics to pursue this mission. Not surprisingly, many of these penitential organizations were attracted to the Catholic reform programme offered by the Holy Catholic League,\textsuperscript{162} and the Saint-Sépulchre seems to have been no exception. We know that at least one of its

\textsuperscript{160} Ibid, Aiii.

\textsuperscript{161} Du Bruel, \textit{Le theatre des antiquitez}, 545.

\textsuperscript{162} Harding and Pecquet have both found a number of penitential confraternities in the south of France which were pro-League. In Paris, the Nom-de-Jésus became extremely important during the League, and was actively promoted by it. Harding, "The Mobilization of Confraternities" and Pecquet, "Des compagnies de pénitents."
members, André Thevet, was an active Leaguer. Furthermore, the growing popularity of this confraternity during the second half of the century suggests that its quasi-militaristic image, and its specifically stated intention to safeguard the Catholic religion, appealed to zealous reformers who believed they were involved in a holy crusade. As "chevaliers voyageurs," they were not only pilgrims but also warriors and missionaries, and Paris was the beleaguered Jerusalem requiring their intervention.

The desire of lay patrons to participate directly in a spiritual reformation of Paris society cannot be separated from an equally fervent desire to encourage Franciscan activity in the same direction. Promotion of communities and individuals known for their piety was one recognized way to

162 Du Bruel, *Le théâtre des antiquitez*, 543 and 532 respectively. The structure of the confraternity was perhaps its most distinguishing feature. It was quasi-militaristic in form. Membership was divided between the "confrères" and the "chevaliers voyageurs." The title "chevalier" was in theory earned by members who made the arduous journey to the Cordelier church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem at least once during their lifetime. Here they were recognized and awarded the title of chevallier by the guardian of the house in an elaborate ceremony reminiscent of knighthood. However social rank in society clearly determined one's rank within the confraternity. Du Bruel notes that chevalliers of the order had to be noble. Furthermore, the government of the confraternity was in the hands of four masters and governors "Palmiers et confrères", according to their rank and quality.

164 Another military-style confraternity has been discussed by Robert Harding, who sees similarities between the Mâcon-based confraternity of the Holy Ghost, formed in the sixteenth century, and certain medieval ones formed during the Albigensian Crusades of the thirteenth centuries. He mentions in particular the White confraternity of Toulouse (1209) and the Militia of Jesus Christ. See Robert Harding, "Revolution and Reform", 86.
facilitate spiritual regeneration of society, since the greater piety and virtuousness of the few could mediate with God on behalf of the many who were less virtuous. This view was encompassing enough to include pious lay individuals, but those who entered into the religious orders were considered especially capable of such mediation because of the rigours of their chosen (or designated) life.\textsuperscript{165}

The spiritual activities of the Cordeliers promoted by the patrons were numerous. Franciscan work among the sick and the poor was highly valued, for example. Charity was considered beneficial, in part because it alleviated human suffering but also because it facilitated the expiation of sin.\textsuperscript{166} The bequests of the Cordeliers also show that the order's effectiveness as a producer of preachers and polemicists was also respected by their lay patrons during the late sixteenth century. Many patrons used their financial and political influence to support the education of the friars which was a prerequisite for the preparation of the preacher. The efforts of the Cardinal of Lorraine and

\textsuperscript{165} The performance of the divine offices became the most important symbol of this mediatory role. See chapter 2.

\textsuperscript{166} Bequests frequently list other charitable organizations along with the friars, such as the will of Charles de Harlay, seigneur of Montglas, which provided twenty-five livres tournois to each of the four mendicant orders, the women's order at the Ave Maria convent, and the "hospital de la Trinité." AN LL1517, f. 44v. The foundation made by the Capuchin Auguste Champion was even more inclusive, leaving money to the four mendicant orders, the Hôtel Dieu, the Bureau des Pauvres, the Enfants de la Trinité, the Enfants du Saint-Esprit, and of course to his own order. See AN MC ET/LXXXVI/116.
other prominent patrons to pressure the University into accepting more friars has already been mentioned earlier in this chapter. However, we also have four foundations from the years 1579-1606, those of the sieur of Villeroy, Marie Clausse, Jacques Suarez and Jean de Beauquaire, which specifically provide money for poor but promising students.167

More immediately indicative of patron interest in a spiritual revival was the establishment of two separate preaching foundations in 1588 and 1591 respectively, years during which the power of the League in Paris was at its peak. The bequest of the merchant Jehan Boulenger in 1588 required the friars and the other three mendicant orders to preach in the church of Saints-Innocents every Friday of the year. Boulenger is explicit about the purpose of the foundation. The sermons were to "Instruire et enseigner le peuple en ladite eglise tant de ladite paroisse que dautres parroisses a vivre selon les commandements de dieu ouyr et entendre sa parolle ...."168 Jean Durantel's foundation of 1591 called for the friars to preach three times a year in the Church Saint-Nicolas-des-Champs, also in rotation with the other three mendicant orders.169 Other ongoing preaching arrangements clearly existed. We know of one through the

167 For Jean de Beauquaire, see AN MC ET/VIII/101, f. 51; Marie Clausse, AN LL1523: 173; Volleroy, AN LL1523: 89 and AN LL1518; The Cordelier preacher Suarez AN LL1523: 171.

168 AN L941, no. 37. The foundation was made March 30, 1588.

169 Durantel's bequest is found in AN LL1523, 142.
foundation of the Cordeliers Claude Gallesius. Gallesius's legacy to the convent came from preaching in two different churches in Paris which were paid for by another religious community, Sainte-Croix-de-la-Bretonnerie.¹⁷⁰

To a large extent, friars and patrons both, especially during the perilous times of the religious wars, viewed their relationship as a partnership.¹⁷¹ The Franciscans helped to mold their patrons into active agents of reform by providing them with the necessary spiritual guidance. Patrons in turn supported the Franciscan way of life as a means of bringing about the desired reformation. The elaborate conceits found in the dedications to the Marquis of Entragues and the Duchess of Lorraine mentioned above explore this notion of partnership. Hylaret speaks to Entragues as a fellow warrior, who "par escrit & avec armes spirituelles debellera et rembarrera l'ennemy de la religion orthodoxe & catholique."¹⁷² Less warlike but equally

¹⁷⁰ Gallesius' foundation was notarized on May 20, 1602. See AN MC ET/XXIX/15, and BNF fr. 14477.

¹⁷¹ Lytle finds an altogether different relationship existing in England following the Reformation. Lytle argues that patron and cleric were in conflict as each tried to reform the other. He attributes this conflict to the decline in status of the clergy following the reformation and clerical perception of lay patronage as corruption. Guy Lytle, "The Lay Patron in Reformation England" in Patronage in the Renaissance, 72-73.

¹⁷² "De mesure maniere celuy, qui par escrit & avec armes spirituelles debellera et rembarrera l'ennemy de la religion orthodoxe & catholique: qui est le mystique Tebuseen, interpreté conculcation, ou celuy qui foule au pied, titre propre à l'heretique, qui conculque, & met souz les pieds les choses sacrees, comme les pourceaux sont coustumiers de fouler aux pieds les perles & pierres precieuses (comme il est dit en l'Evangile) ne merite peu des bien-zelez roys
evocative is Berson's cooking metaphor which articulates the essential and dependent relationship between the chef (Berson), and the taster (the duchess).^173

Conclusion

Lay patronage played an important role in the creation of a spiritual community in Paris. By providing the necessary financing and political influence, patronage facilitated the emergence of new forms of spiritual life as well as helped to sustain these forms throughout their lifespans. Patronage also encouraged the interaction between religious communities in Paris, both lay and secular, and between lay and religious members of society. In some respects, then, it functioned as a social glue. However it was not necessarily viewed as such by contemporaries. Lay patronage was the exercise of power. It could be used tres-Chrestiens, grands Seigneurs Catholiques, & des gouverneurs des provinces bons Chrestiens s'il fait louablement c'est exploit de militie Chrestienne & guerroye vaillamment l'heresie. Maurice Hylaret, found in Deux traitcez ou opuscules, l'un en forme de remonstrance, De non conveniendo.cum haereticis, l'autre par forme de conseil et avis. De non eundo cum muliere haeretica a viro catholico conjugio (Orléans: Boynard, 1587). See preface.

^173 Berson, L'avenuement, Aiii. The image of the preacher as a cook which Berson develops here deserves a full recitation: "Or donc, Madame, comme le cuisinier fait les saulces & bouillons qu'il scait estre agreables à sa maistresse, le chasseur offre le gibier qu'il scait estre plaisant: Ainsi moy predicateur d'office, & Philosophe de condition, ie vous offre un sermon & discours de l'avenuement du Benoit S. Esprit le iour de le Pentescoste assaisonné d'une langue Francaise."
beneficently by the patron, perhaps to contribute necessary services to lay society through the agency of the religious institution. In such instances, this exercise of patronage may have been as much an expression of civic duty as it was an expression of power. Patronage could also be used to control and/or direct the religious life both of the patrons, and of society more generally. Especially during the Wars of Religion, the importance of both personal and societal spiritual reform were high on the agenda of many of the Cordelier patrons.

But it is limiting to view patronage simply from the perspective of the patron. The relationship between patron and religious individual or institution was reciprocal. Power flowed in both directions because each had something valuable, something necessary to the other. The Cordeliers as we have seen offered specialized services in return for the financial and political support of the patron. It was not an equal partnership but it was a partnership nonetheless, and during the Wars of Religion especially, this partnership flourished because both patron and Cordelier shared the same vision of a reformed society.
CHAPTER 5: THE FRANCISCANS AND THE CHURCH

The Paris friars were fortunate to find powerful patrons for their ministry in France because their endeavours were threatened by forces both from within, and from without, their own order. As we have seen in earlier chapters, the Paris friars willingly took on the challenge of Protestantism and were among its most enthusiastic opponents. However, their reaction to the waves of reform sweeping the Catholic Church in the wake of the Council of Trent, in particular to the increasing intervention of Rome in their affairs and to the changing landscape of French religiosity, was at best ambiguous. While the friars clearly welcomed a frontal assault on heresy and consequently worked more closely than usual with many of the existing Parisian religious institutions, they were also hostile to the new orders appearing in their city, and were especially irritated by the efforts of their minister general and the papacy to monitor more closely the regular houses.

The ability of the Paris Franciscans to survive the ideological and political confusions of the late sixteenth century and remain an important spiritual force throughout the period demonstrates the resiliency of the community. Buoyed by a profound sense of their own suitability to lead a reformation, and aided by the political turmoil raging through the country, the friars were able to survive competition from the new religious groups as well as resist
many of the changes being imposed upon them by their ecclesiastic superiors. Key to their success were their abilities as missionaries, their formation of alliances with other religious communities, and most important of all, their willingness to challenge authority.

In order to make our study of ecclesiastic relations manageable, this chapter will examine the communities and individuals with whom the Paris friars most frequently interacted -- the secular parochial structure of Paris, the regular orders in Paris, the Franciscan Order and finally, the papacy.

THE SECULAR CHURCH

The Bishop

The immediate ecclesiastical milieu for the Paris Franciscans was the diocese of Paris. Paris was one of the wealthiest and most important bishoprics in the country. At the geographic, spiritual and political centre of the diocese sat the Cathedral Church of Notre-Dame. From his location on the Ile-de-la-Cité, the bishop of Paris surveyed a diocese which by the end of the sixteenth century stretched well beyond the city walls and comprised over 470 parishes. The diocese was divided into three smaller geographical and administrative units known as archdeaneries, which were then subdivided into deaneries or
"doyennés." However, the size of Paris meant that the city itself and its immediate suburbs were held under a separate jurisdiction. These parishes were administered by the archpriests of Saint-Séverin (the left bank, where the Cordeliers friary resided) and La Madeleine (Île de la Cité, the right bank and its immediate suburbs).\(^2\)

The fiscal, judicial and spiritual administration of the diocese of Paris was in the hands of the bishop, aided by two vicars-general and the cathedral chapter.\(^3\) Despite


\(^2\) See Plongeron, *Le diocèse de Paris*, 117-121. See also Jeanne Ferté *La vie religieuse dans les campagnes parisiennes (1622-1695)* (Paris: Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin, 1962): 13. The authority of the archpriests would have been mitigated by the authority of other spiritual authorities in their districts. For example, much of the left bank was under the jurisdiction of the abbot of Sainte-Geneviève. Like the other regular clerical communities, the abbey of Sainte-Généviève was not subject to the bishop's authority. In fact, the abbot owed immediate obedience only to the pope. According to Lebeuf, the University colleges and the Carmelite community both resided on its territory, and therefore owed the abbey various services. Abbé Jean Lebeuf, *Histoire de la ville et de tout le diocèse de Paris* 1 (Paris: Honoré Champion, 1890; reprinted, Brussels: Culture et Civilisation, 1969-1970): 240.

\(^3\) The vicar-general, the second most important officer in the diocese, looked after the diocese during his frequent absences, while the chapter was a council composed primarily of the cathedral canons who also occupied the diocesan offices of chancellor, dean, archdeacon, provost, and sacristan, among others. The dean presided over the chapter, the provost was responsible for the disciplining functions, and the sacristan was both treasurer and archivist. However, the structure varied somewhat from diocese to diocese, depending on its size and wealth. See Timothy Tackett, *Priest and Parish in Eighteenth Century France* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1977): 31-32, and Plongeron, *Paris*, 105-125. Also informative are the diocesan studies of Marc Venard *Réforme protestante, réforme catholique dans la province d'Avignon au XVIe siècle* (Paris:
attempts at clarifying the jurisdictions of each over the course of several centuries, the relationship between the friary and the bishop was ambiguous. From the previous chapter we know that the bishop could and did exert a significant amount of informal authority over regular houses in the role of patron. Nevertheless, prior to the Council of Trent the canonical authority of the bishop over a mendicant house was minimal. Regular orders were subject solely to the jurisdiction of their own order and to the Pope, not to the bishop or his courts. Therefore, disciplinary problems in regular houses were managed within the house. More serious problems would involve the provincial minister and even the minister general of the regular order, especially if they involved disagreements between houses within the order, or with other religious establishments. In this latter instance, the bishop might participate but as an advocate of the secular clergy or as a mediator, not as an adjudicator.†

The Council of Trent sought to increase episcopal authority over both the regular and secular establishments within the diocese. According to Hubert Jedin, bishops were expected to visit the mendicant houses regularly and to

---

† Marc Venard provides an example of this in Réforme protestante: 191. The establishment of a Dominican house in the town of Cavaillon provoked the cathedral canons and bishop to protest in 1529.
scrutinize candidates to the order. Although this practice was readily adopted by the papacy in subsequent decrees, and the councils of Poissy (1562) and Melun (1579) endorsed a more active episcopate, the French episcopacy was largely uninterested in taking a more direct role in monitoring the religious houses. This lack of interest may reflect the widespread episcopal hostility to the reception of Trent, a hostility sparked by Gallican sentiment if not by self-interest. Certainly the Paris bishopric made little effort to increase its control over the friars. Eustache du Bellay (1551-1568) and his successor Pierre de Gondi (1568-1616)


6 Reform of the clergy preoccupied the monarchy even earlier than the Colloquy of Poissy. Frederick Baumgartner notes that Henry II in 1551 and 1557 ordered bishops to preach in their own diocese unless absent on royal business. Francis II similarly attempted to stimulate a more active episcopacy, again with limited success. See Baumgartner, Change and Continuity in the French Episcopacy 1547-1610 (Durham: Duke University Press, 1986): 108.

7 Jedin 1, 54, and Baumgartner, 107-115. However even reforming bishops like Amyar de Rochechouart, the bishop of Sistéron, seemed little interested in extending their authority over the mendicant houses.

8 Eustache du Bellay, baron of Thouarcé and Commemquier was the son of the Marquis of Laval. He was archpriest of the Paris church Saint-Séverin and held many priories before becoming bishop in 1551. Denis de Saint-Marthe, Gallia Christiana in provincias ecclesiasticas distributa 7 (Paris: V-Palme, 1856-1899): 163-166.

9 Pierre de Gondi (1533-1616) was the confessor of Charles IX and grand aumônier (grand almoner) of Elisabeth of Austria before becoming bishop of Paris in 1570. He
provided only a distant (albeit constant) presence in the life of the Paris Cordeliers. There is no evidence to suggest that either bishop visited the house on a regular basis or scrutinized its novices. If anything, they remained aloof from the internal affairs of the house. Since both bishops were known Gallicanists, they were unwilling to become more directly involved in disputes on behalf of the papacy or any other external ecclesiastical authority.

Gondi's behaviour during the protracted dispute of 1581/1582 that set the friary against its minister general supports this contention. The violence which shook the community over a disputed election in 1581 continued to escalate, and by 1582 individuals on both sides of the controversy were seeking outside aid for resolution. Gondi was sympathetic to reform, yet he rejected appeals to intervene in the

remained a royalist throughout the period of the League, and played a key role in diplomatic relations with the papacy on behalf of Henry IV's succession to the throne. For his role as bishop, see Plongeron, Paris, 265. For his diplomatic role, see Ludwig Pastor History of the Popes 23 (London: Kegan Paul, 1930): 86-113.

The incident was outlined in chapter 2 with respect to internal order. It will be developed more fully later in this chapter with respect to relations within the Franciscan order.

In a letter to the papal secretary, Cardinal Côme, on October 2 1581, the papal nuncio to France, Giovanni Battista Castelli, refers to Gondi as "zeo verso il servitio di Dio". Gondi's reforming tendencies are not surprising since he came from a family of reformers. Gondi's aunt was Antoinette de Gondi, daughter of Léonor de Longueville, the reformer of Fontevrault and founder of the Benedictines of Calvaire. His nephews included Henri de Gondi (1572-1622), and his brother Jean-François de Gondi, both future bishops of Paris, and Emmanuel de Gondi, the first protector of the spiritual reformer, Vincent de Paul. He entered the Oratory in 1622. See Plongeron, Paris, 265.
conflict, although disorder within the house threatened to involve other Parisian religious organizations. He dodged requests from both the preacher Jacques Berson (to support the house against the minister general) and the papacy (to defend the general). In the end, Catherine de Médicis resolved the disorder by sending a few members of her Swiss Guard along with the minister general when he returned to the friary.  

Although episcopal authority over the friars was heavily circumscribed (by the choice of the bishop as much as by canonical authority), two arenas of official influence remained integral to the relationship between bishop and friar: the procession and preaching.

**The procession**

The richness and complexity of early modern processions has been closely studied in recent years by Denis Richet and Denis Crouzet among others, and Barbara Diefendorf's work *Beneath the Cross* is particularly evocative of the importance of this institution.  

---

**Footnotes:**


often participated in the numerous small-scale and ad hoc processions organized at the parish level, he was not usually involved in their organization. Rather, the bishop presided over the processions organized for the great religious feast days that routinely brought together the larger religious houses as well as the secular clergy under the aegis of the bishop to process, chant and hear mass as one body. The most important feast day was that of Corpus Christi (Fête-Dieu), but of course there were numerous other important days on the liturgical calendar such as Ascension Day and Palm Sunday.\(^1\) The celebration of Corpus Christi witnessed the organization of parochial processions which then converged on the cathedral to celebrate mass.\(^2\) The four orders of mendicants, a symbolic blend of the active and contemplative spiritual life, were usually at the front of the procession followed by the secular clergy arranged according to rank. The bishop presided over the public devotions and consequently marched at the centre of the procession. Following the members of the Church were the various orders of lay society similarly arranged according

---


\(^2\) Diefendorf, 39-40.
to rank and status.\textsuperscript{16} This symbolic union of different spiritual expressions celebrated the richness and diversity of catholic spiritual life. It also underlined the role of the bishop as mediator between the different religious institutions, an image which well suited an individual who was both a patron and governor of numerous clerical organizations.

**Preaching**

Preaching was one of the most important functions of the mendicant orders, but control of the pulpits within a diocese remained the domain of the bishop throughout the medieval and early modern periods. Papal legislation and the statutes of their order required friars to seek episcopal license before preaching in a diocese. Episcopal, and papal, desire to control preaching was understandable, since it was one of the most direct means for reaching a wide audience. Access to the pulpit therefore brought with it tremendous responsibility, and bishops and other ecclesiastics were very aware of the potential power of this agency for spreading dangerous or unwholesome political and spiritual

ideas. 17

The archives of the Paris Cordeliers meticulously record the battles waged between friars and French bishops during this period. A petition to the Parlement of Paris from the Cordeliers of Beauvais dated May 4 1559, for example, took issue with the resistance of a local vicar and the bishop of Beauvais to the preaching of the Cordelier guardian in a local church. 18 Similarly, the former Parisian Cordelier Christophe Blaiseau, then guardian of the convent of Troyes, was successful in his bid to preach in the diocese, following the intervention of the minister general in 1588. Blaiseau was given permission to preach "selon les saints decret et doctrine apostolique et romaine comme auparavant." 19

Surprisingly, we have little evidence of such conflict between the bishop of Paris and the Cordeliers during the late sixteenth century, at least with respect to preaching. This might suggest that neither Du Bellay nor Gondi


18 The dispute continued for over two years. Parlement took the side of the vicar, however, stating that the friars were to present a list of the preachers to the vicar or bishop and have it signed. AN LL1524, f. 84r. This judgement was passed on June 19, 1561.

19 The complainant was Jean le Coq, "promoteur et lofficial" of the bishop of Troyes. Blaiseau received the judgement on July 30, 1588. AN LL1524, f. 86r.
perceived a need to control more closely the Paris friars, or at the very least that the Cordeliers were saying little that was displeasing to the bishop. This would be going too far, however, since vicars and their wardens were allowed to nominate preachers and therefore exercised a fair degree of control over their own pulpits.\textsuperscript{20} Episcopal influence therefore could be frustrated at the parochial level. During the time of the Holy League, for example, the royalist Gondi was unable to control the pulpits within his diocese since the majority were controlled by League supporters.\textsuperscript{21}

Along with other mendicants, the Franciscans were routinely selected to preach in the great church of Notre-

\textsuperscript{20} AN LL1524, f. 84r. " Arrests de Parlement contre quelques evesques pour prescher dans leurs dioceses." The decree outlines the jurisdictions within the diocese involving the selection of preachers. Preachers were chosen with the permission of the bishop but "quart a la nomination des predicateurs es Eglises parrochiales de ladite ville et faubourgs de Paris le cure et marguillier adviseront par ensemble du personnage qui devra prescher ...." This practise, however, does not seem to have been fully accepted by the bishop of Paris. An extract from Parlement registers from March 1588 contends that it is "grandemen estrange que les Marguilliers des paroisses de ceste ville et faubourgs nomment et choississent les predicateurs pour prescher, veu que estoit loffice et charge de levesque". BNF MS Coll. Dupuy 677, no. 17.

\textsuperscript{21} Charles Labitte, \textit{De la démocratie chez les prédicateurs de la ligue} (Paris: Joubert, 1841): 136-7. Gondi was a royalist and therefore not sympathetic to the League. In fact he was forced to leave Paris in 1591 because he refused to sign the University of Paris decree condemning Henry of Navarre. His revenues were consequently seized. Pierre de L'Estoile also discusses the reasons for his departure from Paris in an entry dated October 2 1591:"... la véritable motif est qu'il craint l'intrigue des Seize, qui ne le consultent en rien, qui ont découvert que ledit prélat travaille sourdement avec quelques curés, en faveur de roi de Navarre, et a refusé de signer le nouveau serment de l'Union." L'Estoile, \textit{Journal de l'Estoile pour la règne de Henri IV} 2 (Paris: Gallimard, 1958): 126.
Dame, particularly at Lent and Easter. Among those chosen by the bishop and his council during the period of this study were the friars Jacques Hugonis (1561), Louis Hébert (1578), François Feuardent (1584, 1585), Jean Benedict (1585), and Maurice Hylaret (1587).

The parish clergy

In addition to preaching in the Cathedral, the Franciscans and other mendicants were also invited into many of the parish churches, especially during the latter part of the religious wars. Already mentioned in a previous chapter were specific foundations established by lay patrons for the holding of annual sermons in certain Paris parochial churches like that of Saint-Nicholas-des-Champs. Stimulated by the emergence of the Holy League, there was a heightened demand for mendicant preachers in the Parisian pulpits after 1585. During the high holy season, Cordeliers preached in the parishes of Saint-André-des-Arts and Saint-Jacques-de-la-Boucherie among others. Both of these parishes were controlled by Leaguer vicars as were all but three of the

22 The choice of preachers for the cathedral rested with the bishop and his council although the Faculty of Theology's approval was required. AN LL1524, fol 76. "Arrestes de Parlement contre quelque evesques pour prescher dans leurs dioceses ...." Names were submitted to the University of Paris six weeks before Lent and Easter.

23 AN L533. This document contains excerpts from the episcopal council minutes, listing preachers chosen to preach at the cathedral during the latter half of the sixteenth century.
parish pulpits in Paris. François Feuardent, Robert Chessé and Maurice Hylaret were two of the better known Cordeliers directly associated with the League, and were frequently mentioned in chronicles and memoires of the period as preaching in the city of Paris as well as travelling and preaching in other cities throughout France. François Feuardent preached at Saint-Jean among other churches. Hylaret became a subject of discontent for royalists because of his success preaching in the city of Orléans. Friars from other parts of Europe were also attracted to France. Two of the better known Franciscans to preach in Paris were the Savoyard Jean Garin (Guarinus) and the celebrated Italian orator Panigarolle, "dont les gestes libres et élégants, la parole insinuante et spirituelle,

24 Charles Labitte, De la démocratie, 76. The vicar of Saint-André-des-Arts was Christophe Aubry, and Julien Pelletier was at Saint-Jacques-de-la-Boucherie.

25 The minutes may be referring to the parochial church Saint-Jean-en-Grève. Plongeron, Paris, 119.

26 Far too often memorialists mention friars preaching without specifying the location. Pierre de l'Estoile provides more detail than most. L'Estoile has Feuardent preaching at Saint-Jean (most likely the parochial church Saint-Jean-en-Grève) in July 1592. Journal de L'Estoile 1, 219. However, he is mentioned on several occasions preaching in the city with no more specific information given. Another Franciscan often mentioned is Robert Chessé (or Jessé), described by L'Estoile as "un seditieux cordelier ... qui animait le peuple au sang et à la rebellion" Journal 1, 30. See also Labitte, Démocratie, 82. Chessé is further discussed in chapter 4.

séduisaient les plus modérés." Jean Garin's popularity is evident in the repeated mentions of his sermons by memorialists. L'Estoile finds him preaching at the churches of Saint-Merry, Sainte-Geneviève-des-Ardents, and most frequently at Saint-Jacques-de-la-Boucherie after 1591.

The willingness of vicars to bring friars into their parish church, especially during the holy season, suggests that the secular clergy acknowledged Franciscan oratorical skill and were willing to cooperate with them during a particularly tumultuous time. The same willingness to cooperate accounts for the periodic participation of the mendicant orders in parochial processions, such as the one attended by the Cordeliers in the parish of Saint-Barthélemy in 1562. Although it is difficult to be sure exactly how far the secular and regular clergy supported the Holy League, they did share a common enemy, Protestantism, and

26 Labitte, 76. Panigarolle studied at the Paris Faculty in the 1570's, and returned later to Paris during the time of the League. Both Garin and Panigarolle were supporters of the Holy League.

29 L'Estoile provides more specific information on the preaching of Garin than that of other friars. He is found at Saint-Mérri on two occasions, in January 1593 (1, 210) and 28 July 1593 (1, 300), at Saint-Etienne-des-Près (1, 318), and at Sainte-Geneviève-des-Ardents in May 1593 (1, 261). He preached at Saint-Jacques-de-la-Boucherie on at least six occasions from 1592 to 1594 (1, 224, 237, 331, 334, 345). Garin's frequent mentioning in association with Saint-Jacques-de-la-Boucherie is suggestive of an official relationship, if not between the friary and the church, at least between Garin and the church. L'Estoile, Journal de L'Estoile.

feared the imminent demise of Catholicism if greater vigilance by its ministers was not exercised.

A shared ideology was at least partly responsible for the formation of alliances among different religious organizations during times of crisis like that of the religious wars. We see the same process at work with respect to Gallicanism. Not all clergy were Gallicanists, but a substantial segment of the secular clergy in particular were suspicious of Roman authority, a fact suggested by the readiness of some Paris vicars to offer Jacques Berson their pulpits during the dispute of 1581/82. By granting Berson a pulpit, these secular clergy were aligning themselves with the rebellious friars.

However, we should not overstate the degree of this cooperation. The history of secular and regular relations was characterised by periods of peaceful coexistence alternating with periods of conflict. Cooperation and conflict were important facets of their relationship, and should be seen not as antithetical, but rather as essential elements in the continual redefinition of their relationship. Such constant redefinition was essential because the spiritual, economic and political authority of the clergy overlapped, and lines of jurisdiction between the different groups were therefore not clear. Relations between the secular and regular clergy at the University of Paris were discussed in chapter 3. Here we will concentrate on relations within the diocese.
Cure of souls

As discussed in an earlier chapter, the friars enjoyed many of the same privileges as the secular clergy, though none was so important as the cure of souls. The cure of souls was the foundation of the authority of the clergy since by means of the power to administer the sacraments the cleric governed the spiritual life of his flock. Unlike the parish clergy, however, the mendicant orders were not bound to a particular parish but claimed the right to support anyone desiring their services. As a result, the spiritual jurisdiction of the friars and other mendicants transcended the existing geographic structure of the secular church, and brought them into contact with many parish churches on a regular basis.

This state of affairs was never really resolved to the satisfaction of either the mendicants or the secular clergy. The same issue which had infuriated the seculars in the thirteenth century still infuriated them in the sixteenth century -- namely, the perceived Franciscan usurpation of

secular prerogatives. There are six recorded examples of legal conflicts involving the Paris Cordeliers between the years 1530 and 1588, concerning right of confession, right of burial and ownership of processional accoutrements. Two of these cases each concerned the churches of Saint-Séverin, and Saint-Etienne-du-Mont, and one each involved Saint-André-des-Arts and the royal parochial church of Saint-Germain-l'Auxerrois.

A notarial document dated August 7, 1588 responds to a complaint made by Louis Du Bellay, archdeacon of Paris and vicar and archpriest of the church of Saint-Séverin. Du Bellay protested the "unauthorized" confession of one of his parishioners, Pierre De Gargis, to a Cordelier. De Gargis also received other sacraments from the same Cordelier. The friar was therefore charged with "novelty," the priest attesting that the friar required his permission to hear the confession of a parishioner, and demanding reimbursement from the friary.

The friars denied the charge of novelty, citing the rules of the council of Vienne\textsuperscript{32} which gave them permission to hear confessions and administer other sacraments with or

\textsuperscript{32} This Council was held between 1311 and 1312 in the French city of Vienne. Mendicant right to the cure of souls was first granted to them in the bull of Boniface VIII known as Super Cathedram (1300). This council curtailed mendicant independence with respect to the cure of souls, but it nevertheless confirmed their right to this spiritual authority. Karl-Josef Hefele, \textit{Histoire des conciles} 6 (Paris: Librairie Letouzey et Ané, 1915): 673-678, and N. Tanner ed., \textit{Decrees of Ecumenical Councils} (Washington: Sheed & Ward and Georgetown University Press, 1990): 31-37.
without the bishop's permission in any diocese. The friars "peuvent tels presentes apres lacception ou reffus de l'Evesque ou prelat ouir lesdicts confessions et administrer poenitance salutaire au consitens sans le congé et license des curez ....". The friars pointed out that De Gargis had sought papal permission to seek their services and had such permission in the written form of bulls and letters.

This incident reveals the ongoing tension between secular and regular clergy over what constituted their respective spiritual and temporal domains. The secular cleric interpreted Franciscan involvement as a source of disruption in his relationship with a parishioner and a violation of his prerogatives over the spiritual life of his flock. By taking De Gargis out of the confessional fold of Saint-Séverin, the Franciscans were disturbing the unity of the parish and thus threatening the parish priest's authority.

Although the parish priest was worried about losing his spiritual authority to the Franciscans, another issue for him was purely financial. The various sacraments were accompanied by financial payments. The parishoner paid for baptisms, for confession and for burial in addition to the usual tithes. The Franciscans were biting into Du Bellay's livelihood and therefore could hardly have been regarded favourably. Conflict over burial particularly reveals the financial as well as political threat posed by the regular

33 AN LL1524, ff. 87-92. This document is dated August 7, 1588.
orders to the secular clergy. The intestate death in 1533 of the book merchant Jean Freslon caused some controversy over his burial. Freslon had indicated to witnesses his desire to be buried at the Cordeliers near the sepulchres of his wife and daughter. However, when the Cordeliers arrived at Saint-Etienne-du-Mont they were unable to collect the body, having been told that the vicar was not there. How this dispute was resolved is unclear, although probably the parish won since Freslon was subsequently buried in the Church of Saint-Etienne-du-Mont.  

A more hotly contested burial involving the church of Saint-Séverin was that of the son of François Rousseau in 1554. Rousseau's son had similarly indicated a desire to be buried at the Cordeliers, but the priest, Anthoine Le Febvre, would not cooperate. The parents tried to recompense Le Febvre, though apparently to no avail, since Rousseau is not among the burials listed at the Cordelier Church. Another burial foiled by an obdurate parish priest was that of the wife of Laurent Sicardy (Sicardi) in 1561. The vicar of the parish of Saint-André-des-Arts, François Le Court, resisted Sicardy's request, complaining about the number of parishioners who sought burial elsewhere.  

34 AN LL1524, fol 93r.  

35 "... combien que ses parroisiens ordonnent estre inhumez et enterrez en autre lieu que en ladicte eglise que neantmoins il a toujours veu que lon les arreste en jcelle eglise au preallable que de les porter aux lieux ou ils doivent estre inhumez ...." The Cordeliers were involved in another burial dispute in 1581, though this time involving another community of friars from the town of Agen. The inner council minutes of July 19, 1581 say that the body of
Although most cases of burial were not contested, a few factors played a central role in the cases which were disputed. The most vulnerable burials were those of people who lacked a will, or lacked official ecclesiastical permission to be buried with the friars, even when it was so stated in their wills. Freslon had papal permission and was the only one of the three to succeed in being buried there. Success may also have been partly dependent on speed. The ability of one organization to gain control of the body quickly for burial clearly made it more difficult for its opponents to contest its claim.

Right of burial was disputed, but so was ownership of the accoutrements required for the burial procession. Funeral processions often brought together both secular and regular clergy. The wills of the deceased listed which priests were expected to attend and how much they should be paid for their presence. It also paid for the items used, the most common being candles. Candles were often placed at the door of the church, and were carried by processioners in the more elaborate processions. Candles were expensive and so their ownership subsequent to the burial ceremony was hotly contested at times. One case before the Parlement in 1533 saw the Cordeliers accusing the vicar of Saint-Etienne-
du-Mont of taking three or four candles from the church door for which they claimed reimbursement. A legal process initiated later on by the priests of Saint-Germain-l'Auxerrois against the friars claimed ownership of candles whenever a procession led from their doors -- even when the body was to be buried elsewhere. All these cases reveal that the secular and regular clergy coexisted but that the peace could be easily violated. The friars and vicars were brought into regular contact as a result of sharing spiritual jurisdiction over parishioners. However, the mendicant orders were outside the existing secular structure and therefore represented an uneasy and unpredictable force -- a constant threat to the livelihood and authority of the parish priest.

THE REGULAR ORDERS

The same uneasy cooperation that marked relations between the secular and regular clergy defined relations between the regular orders as well. For the most part, the orders coexisted peacefully, largely because proximity, societal pressure and the demands of their own spirituality forced them to interact on a regular basis. Many regular clergy studied together at the University as well as worked

36 "Ledict maistre Jacques Bardelin a esté faict responce que ... estoit en bonne possession et a tousjours joui de tout le luminaire qui est alumé et porté au convoy de ses parroisienz quelque part quils soient interrez et que dudict luminaire les executeurs du testament dudict deffunct luy ont baillé pleige pour le valeur de la totalite djdceluy arrest ...." See AN LL1524, f. 105v.
with each other among the sick and the poor. They processed and prayed together on high holidays and special occasions. They were also neighbours. The Franciscans would have come into daily contact with the Benedictine monks from the abbey of Saint-Germain-des-Prés, the rigorous order of Carthusians or the "chartreux,"\textsuperscript{37} or the mendicant order of the Augustinians.\textsuperscript{38} All of these houses were established within the modern day quarter known as the sixth arrondissement. Another cluster of religious communities was located just east of the modern boulevard Saint-Michel. These included the Mathurins,\textsuperscript{39} the priories of Cluny Saint-Bernard and Saint-Edmond, and the other great mendicant order of preachers, the Dominicans (Jacobins). The Carmelites, the last of the four mendicant houses,\textsuperscript{40} were situated on the

\textsuperscript{37} The Paris Carthusian house was established during the latter part of the thirteenth century. The Carthusians of course were one of the most rigorous ascetic cloistered orders. See Paul and Mary Biver, \textit{Abbayes, monastères et couvents de Paris} (Paris: Éditions d'Histoire et D'Art, 1970): 105-106.

\textsuperscript{38} The order of Hermits, the Augustinian friars, also known as the "grands Augustins" to distinguish them from later Paris houses, were one of the four great mendicant orders in Paris along with the Cordeliers, the Dominicans and the Carmelites. They were established by papal bull in 1240 when Innocent IV forced all hermits to unite and share the rule of Saint Augustine. The order was first established in Paris during the reign of Saint Louis. Its refectory was enormous and became a meeting place for civic and other official gatherings throughout the early modern period. See Biver and Biver, \textit{Abbayes}, 175-177.

\textsuperscript{39} The Mathurins were in fact a branch of the Trinitarian order who earned their sobriquet from their patron saint, Mathurin. Their convent was constructed early on in the thirteenth century. Biver, 231.

\textsuperscript{40} The order of Mount Carmel officially began as an order of hermits during the twelfth century, though their
eastern edge of what became the fifth arrondissement near the Place Maubert, not far south of the other great Parisian abbey, Sainte-Geneviève-du-Mont."

Although proximity did force religious communities generally to coexist, it could not prevent the quarrels that frequently arose between them. In fact, at times geographic proximity was one of the underlying causes, since remarkably different spiritual organizations were forced to interact and to rely upon one another from time to time. Respect could and did exist between clerics of different orders but so also did feelings of suspicion, fear and disdain.

During the late sixteenth century, as in previous ones, we find the Paris Franciscans periodically in conflict with several religious houses, though their greatest hostility seems to have been reserved for other mendicants. Their long-standing rivals were the Dominicans, and their history of conflict with this order is a matter of record. During origins can be traced back much earlier. They arrived in Paris during the thirteenth century. Biver, 383-391.

" See Biver and Biver, Abbayes, monastères, couvents de femmes à Paris (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1963). Surprisingly, the Bivers do not find any female religious communities in the fifth and sixth arrondissements prior to the early part of the seventeenth century. The female monastery with which the friars seem the most in contact as a result of patrons, and because they provided them with priests, were the Clarisses of the Ave Maria, who were located near the Hôtel de Sens in the twelfth arrondissement. See P. Gratien, "La fondation des Clarisses de l'Ave-Maria" in Études franciscaines 27 (1912): 605-621, 272-290, and 504-516.

" One of the most important historic conflicts between the two orders centred over the medieval debate concerning the Immaculate Conception of Mary. Franciscan insistence on the veracity of this doctrine was countered by Dominican
the late sixteenth century, however, two new orders were attacked by the Cordeliers. The hostile reaction of the Franciscans to the arrival of the Jesuit and Capuchin communities in Paris shows the extent to which the religious orders viewed one another as competitors in a fixed marketplace. However, the threat posed by these two new orders was also psychological in nature, and consequently revealing of early modern conceptions of the "foreign" in society.

**Economic and political rivalries**

The Jesuits first arrived in Paris in 1540. Although the order quickly found generous and influential patrons such as Guillaume du Prat, they also faced serious opposition not only from the bishop of Paris and the secular clergy but also from the University of Paris, the Parlement of Paris and the mendicant houses. In 1550, the Parlement refused to register patent letters granting the order rejection of it. See John Henderson's work *Piety and Charity in Late Medieval Florence* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994): 31-33.

Guillaume du Prat, bishop of Clermont and a known reformer, was instrumental in the establishment of a Jesuit community in Paris. In addition to aiding them in their struggle for recognition by the University and the bishop of Paris, Du Prat gave the Paris community land and money for the building of a college upon his death in October 1560. See César-Égasse Du Boulay, *Historia Universitatis Parisiensis* 6 (Paris: Petrus de Bresche, 1665-1673; Reprinted Frankfurt am Main: Minerva, 1966): 574.
permission to own property in France." The Gallican bishop of Paris, Eustache Du Bellay, refused to ordain any new Jesuits and forbade them to hear confession, to preach, or to exercise the cure of souls. 

Gallican sentiment can certainly explain some of the antipathy of the Parlement, University and the other clerical institutions towards the new community, since the incorporation of new clerical institutions inevitably involved a jostling of jurisdictions and privileges among existing ones. A decree of canonical extermination published by the University of Paris on December 1, 1554 reveals this very concern. The Jesuits, it states, had been given so many papal privileges with respect to teaching and the cure of souls that to recognize them would be "to the prejudice of bishops, of other religious orders, and even of princes and temporal authorities as well as to the detriment of universities," and went on to warn that they would be the


Du Bellay was obstinate in his refusal to recognize the order. Responding to efforts by the King to enforce his lettres patentes supporting papal recognition, Du Bellay argued in 1554 that "lesdites Bulles contiennent plusieurs choses qui semblent, sous correction, estranges & alienes de raison, & qui ne doivent estre tolerées ne recueues en la Religion Chrestienne". Like the Parlement and the University, Du Bellay was suspicious of the order's innovative organizational structure. Moreover, he clearly disliked their intrusion in his diocese. As he demands at the end of the discourse, why should an order designed to convert the Turks and other "infidelles" establish a house in Paris rather than "és lieux prochains desdits Infidelles, ainsi qu'anciennement a esté fait des Chevaliers de Rhodes ...." Du Boulay, Historia 6, 572.
cause of "innumerable complaints, quarrels, contentions, hatreds, rebellions, and schisms among people." Quite simply, they were disrupting the existing structure of the Gallican Church.

Gallicanism was evidently a factor in anti-Jesuit sentiment but to say that it dominated such sentiment would be to undervalue the complexity of the ecclesiastic world of France. The regular orders, with few exceptions, showed little Gallicanist sympathy during the sixteenth century, and the Franciscans were no exception. Much more of an issue for the regular communities, and for the mendicant ones above all, was the economic and political threat posed by the appearance of a new order. Although not a mendicant order strictly speaking, the Jesuits were impinging on mendicant jurisdiction by collecting alms, performing the

---

4 I am using Broderick's translation. The Progress of the Jesuits: 45. The original states: The Jesuits "... tam multis tamque variis privilegiis, Indultis & Libertatibus donata, praesertim in administratione Sacramenti Poenitentiae & Eucharistiae, idque sine discrimine locorum aut personarum, in officio etiam praedicandi, legendi & docendi in praedictum Ordinariorum & Hierarchici ordinis, in praedictum quoque aliarum Religionum, imò etiam Principum & dominorum temporalium, contra privilegia Universitatum, denique in magnum populi gravamen, Religionis Monasticæ honestatem violare videtur ...." Furthermore, the order would "dominos tam temporales quam Ecclesiasticos sui iuribus in iuste privat, perturbationem in utraque politia, multas in populo querelas, multas lites, dissidia, contentiones, aemulationes, rebelliones, variæque Schismata inducit. Du Boulay, 6, 573.

5 The regular orders supported many of the papal measures which annoyed supporters of Gallican privileges during this period, the introduction of the Tridentine decrees being one striking example. See Victor Martin, La Gallicanisme et la réforme catholique (Paris: librairie Alphonse Picard et fils, 1919): 130-131.
cure of souls and by trying to gain access to the University in order to produce preachers.

The hostile reception of the originally Italian order of Capuchins in 1568 was fuelled by similar concerns. Even more than the Jesuits, this reformed order of Franciscans threatened the economic security of the Paris Cordeliers. The Capuchin order emphasized the strictures of charity, poverty and humility as first ordered by Saint Francis and, therefore, took issue with the large houses and evident wealth of the Conventual and Observant branches of the order. From their arrival in Picpus near Paris in 1568, and their subsequent relocation to Paris in 1574, the Capuchins worked hard to prove that they were the true descendants of Saint Francis. Their chronicler Philippe de Paris joyously recounts the diligence of the early members

---

46 Constant self-questioning about the nature of true Franciscanism and its consequent propensity to subdivide as members pursued individual conceptions of the ideal was a feature of the Franciscan order from the early days of its existence, as we have seen in chapter 1. Antagonism between these two branches of the order was of such a magnitude that the Capuchins were placed under the jurisdiction of the Conventual branch. See Father Cuthbert, The Capuchins: a Contribution to the History of the Counter Reformation (London: Sheed & Paul, 1928): 52.

49 Founded in Italy in 1529, the Capuchin order attempted to revive the religious life envisioned by Francis of Assisi, which its members characterized as rigorously ascetic and informed by an emotional, mystical form of piety. Father Cuthbert's history of the order, The Capuchins remains a good, basic introduction to the emergence of the Capuchin movement. For the history of the Capuchins in France, see Godefroy de Paris, Les Frères-mineurs capucins en France (Paris: Bibliothèque Franciscaine Provinciale des F.F. Min. Cap. de Paris, 1937).
who worked with victims of the plague in Paris in 1580. Given that preaching was another important Franciscan function, the Capuchins took every opportunity to speak. Patrons such as the Cardinal of Lorraine and Aymar de Rochouart, Bishop of Sistéron, ensured that the Capuchins found receptive pulpits, and consequently we have accounts of these friars preaching at the church of Saint-Germain-l'Auxerrois among others.

Although Philippe assures us that the pious efforts of the Capuchins quickly won them favour in Paris, he concedes that acceptance was by no means immediate, nor was it universal. From their arrival, members of the small Capuchin community were routinely abused by lay as well as ecclesiastic sectors of Parisian society. As in the case of the Jesuits, mendicant and secular priests preached against them from the pulpits. The bishop of Paris, Pierre de Gondi, was overtly hostile and refused to recognize them during their early years. Philippe de Paris also mentions crowds

---

56 BNF fr. 25044. Philippe de Paris, "Chronologie historique de ce qui s'est passé de plus considérable dans la province de Paris depuis lan 1574 jusques a l'anée commancement de la reforme des peres capucins en France" (1634): 7.

51 We know that Paciphique de Saint-Gervais, the first commissioner general of the French Capuchins, preached at the University of Paris. Maurice d'Epernay, "Eloges des ministres capucins de la province de Paris" (1709): 73. This manuscript is found at the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris, f.fr. 25046.

52 Gondi was forced by the combined efforts of the King and the Pope to recognize the order in 1576, though we find him blessing the newly constructed Capuchin church as early as 1575. Epernay, "Eloges," 5.
of people jeering at the monks, throwing rocks, and shoving them as they processed through the streets.\textsuperscript{53}

The Cordeliers were among the most outspoken opponents of the Capuchins, for obvious reasons. By claiming to represent true Franciscan spirituality, the Capuchins were repudiating the spiritual life of their Paris brothers and, in consequence, threatening their livelihood. Cordelier fear seems to have been justified. Daniel Vidal's list of Capuchin patrons from the turn of the seventeenth century includes many of the same families as the Cordeliers.\textsuperscript{54} In fact, one of their most prominent patrons became a Capuchin himself. Henri de Joyeuse, comte du Bouchage and brother to the King's favourite Anne, buried his wife Anne in the Cordelier house in 1587 and entered the Capuchin order a few months later.\textsuperscript{55} One can only imagine how bitterly the Cordeliers must have resented the sudden popularity of their rival brothers, or how angry they were to discover that one of the founding members of the new order in Paris was Pierre

\textsuperscript{53} BNF fr. 25044, "Chronologie," 7.


\textsuperscript{55} Joyeuse's entry into the Capuchin order astonished Jehan de la Fosse, who remarks in his journal: "Je crois que ledict seigneur estoit touché [par] la main de Dieu, voyant les moyens qu'il avoit et ayant l'oreille du roy Henry, autant et plus qu'homme du royaulme." \textit{Journal}, 207. Joyeuse entered the order on September 4, 1587. The Capuchins also enjoyed substantial royal favour, both from the Queen Mother and from Henry III. Catherine de Médicis donated to the community some land on the rue Saint-Honoré in Paris. Her son, a frequent visitor to the convent, established there his noble confraternity known as the Disciples de Saint-François. Godefroy of Paris, \textit{Les Frères-mineurs capucins}, 41.
Deschamps, an apostate of their own community.\textsuperscript{56}

Mendicant distrust of the new communities is particularly understandable given contemporary conceptions of the sixteenth-century marketplace as a finite financial pool. Du Bellay says in 1554 that there were already too many religious communities and charitable organizations in Paris dependent on alms, and the pool was not large enough to support another, especially considering "la malice du temps, auquel la charité est bien fort refroidie ...."\textsuperscript{57} Lynn Martin records the friars of Pamiers in 1560, and of Rouen a decade later, expressing a more pointed concern about the threat posed by the new Jesuit houses, saying that they "would take bread from the friars' mouths by ruining their earnings from burials, masses and confessions."\textsuperscript{55} A

\textsuperscript{56} Pierre Deschamps' career was anything but peaceful. After leaving the Paris Cordeliers in 1565, Deschamps went to Rome in order to enter a stricter spiritual community. After receiving papal dispensation to do so, Deschamps entered the Capuchin order and was sent back to France to help found the first French community in Paris in 1573/1574. He was made guardian of the community in 1579. However, his penchant for running into conflict with authority brought him into the history books once again, when in 1590 he set up a rival provincial chapter. See Maurice d'Epernay, "Abrége historique des illustres religieux capucins de la province de Paris," BNF fr. 25048, f. 30, and Godefroy de Paris, 32, 114-116.

\textsuperscript{57} Du Boulay, 6, 571. The full quotation is the following:" ... considéré la malice du temps, auquelle la charité est bien fort refroidie, dautant qu'il y a beaucoup de monasteres & maisons ja receü es & approuvées qui vivent & s'entretiennent desdites Aumosnes, partant les faudroit oüir avant ladite publication, comme y ayant interest, c'est à savoir les 4 mendians, les Quinze-Vingts & les Repenties."

new mendicant order, therefore, meant the potential reduction of the intake of each order. Not surprisingly, therefore, religious communities were territorial about their right to collect alms, and were reluctant even to let members of their own order from outside the city participate. We find this reluctance expressed in the Cordeliers from other houses were allowed to collect alms in Paris.\textsuperscript{59}

**Resistance to foreigners**

Combined with this concern about the juggling of jurisdictions and economic competition was native suspicion of a foreign organization insinuating itself in the Gallican Church. Pasquier emphasized the threat posed by the foreign character of the Jesuit order during his defence of the University before the Parlement in 1565. The Jesuit community was a house of "estranagers," he argued, and their establishment would lead to "la ruine & subversion de l'Estat Hierarchique ...."\textsuperscript{60} The Jesuits took a special

\textsuperscript{59} AN LL1515 (29 August 1566), f. 2v. "Non admittantur ... qui veniunt vel elesmosnas procurant in hac civitate pro suis conventibus cum hoc maxime rogat in detrimentum huius conventus". The unwillingness of the friars and the other mendicants to share their privileges with the new order was reinforced by Jesuit outspokenness on the subject of clerical abuses, since as Lynn Martin suggests, they seemed to imply that they were the only untarnished order. See also Lynn Martin, *The Jesuit Mind*, 208.

\textsuperscript{60} Pasquier was defending the University against the establishment of the Jesuit college in 1565. Du Boulay, *Historia* 6, 644.
fourth vow of loyalty to the pope, and, therefore, were unlikely to earn easy acceptance from the Parlement and the other Gallicanist institutions. It did not help the Jesuit cause that many of their members in France came from other countries or that the form and nature of their order defied easy categorization. By their own admission they were neither secular nor regular clergy, but an altogether new kind of organization and, therefore, alien. They were not cloistered, nor did they wear a distinctive clerical garb. By calling themselves the Society of Jesus, furthermore, the Jesuits found themselves labelled "insolent" and "arrogant" by the Faculty of Theology among others.

The Capuchins made contemporaries nervous for similar reasons. The French were already uneasy about the growing Italian community in Paris, many members of which seemed to

---

61 Although there were Frenchmen among the early Jesuits, Emond Auger the King's confessor, being a particularly prominent one, the majority of the earliest Jesuits in Paris were from other countries, notably Spain and Italy. Among the Jesuits first sent to Paris to study in 1540 were men like Francesco Estrada, Andreas de Oviedo, Paolo d'Achille and Everard Mercurian. See John O'Malley, S.J., The First Jesuits (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1993), 288.

62 The Faculty of Theology's disdain for the novelty of the new order is evident in its condemnation of the order in its conclusions from December 1 1554: "Haec nova Societas insolitam nominis Jesu appellationem peculiariter sibi vendicans, tam licenter & sine delectu quaslibet personas ... nulim à secularibus habens differentiam in habitu exterio re, in tonsurâ, in horis Canonicis privatim dicendis, aut publicâ in templo decantandis, in claustris & silentio, in delectu ciborum & dierum, in ieiunijis & alis variis legibus ...." Du Boulay, Historia 6, 572. For a discussion of the ambiguous nature of the Jesuit order within the context of the Church, see chapter 2 in O'Malley, The First Jesuits. In particular, see 67-69.
occupy the most important secular and ecclesiastic posts in the country. The arrival of a small band of Italian clerics was not viewed favourably, especially given their close association with the most famous Italian expatriate, Catherine de Médicis.

As in the case of the Jesuits, this anti-foreign sentiment was clearly informed by Gallicanism. The Capuchin order was governed by non-French individuals, the first French provincial minister not being appointed until 1597. After the appointment of Pierre Deschamps as guardian of the Paris house in 1579, no other French guardian was appointed until 1591. Furthermore, even though French membership was increasing rapidly during the first decade of the community's establishment, Italian Capuchins continued to come to France. In fact Gallicanism can explain the hostility of two particularly bitter opponents of the Capuchins: Simon Vigor, the vicar of Saint-Paul, and Pierre de Gondi, the Bishop of Paris. Neither Gondi nor Vigor welcomed into their respective jurisdictions an organization over which they had little power. Gallicanism may also have accounted for a later schism of the Capuchin order itself.

---

62 The Gondi and Gonzaga families are two of the better known Italian families. Interestingly, both families were also affiliated with the Paris Cordeliers. See ch. 4. pp. 222-223.

64 BNF Ms. 6451.

65 An astonishing fourteen French novices joined the first community at Picpus in 1569. See BNF Ms. 6541, and Bibl. Maz Ms. 2418, Annales des Reverends Peres de la Province de Paris.
In 1590 friar Pierre Deschamps and a few associates went to Orléans and there held their own chapter. The "campistes", as they were known, demanded above all the establishment of an all-French executive and limited intervention from the minister general.\(^6\)

The foreign origins of the early Capuchins raised some concerns but perhaps not as many as the novel form of religiosity they represented. Capuchin processions featured chanting and crying as well as bodily mortification. According to Philippe de Paris, their austerity shocked many people as well: "leurs habits faisoient horraire a voir leur nudite, leur pauvrete faisoit que plusieurs se retiroient....."\(^6\) The enthusiastic nature of Capuchin spirituality would have been at home in a country like Italy and other countries to the south, but for those living in Northern

\(^6\) Godefroy of Paris, 123-124. The three major demands from the chapter were: the recall of French subjects to their province, especially the young expatriate French Capuchins who would have been affected by their Italian superiors; the Italians to leave France and have no future role in the province of France; the limitation of the authority of the Minister General within the province of France. This chapter was never recognized by the order, though the Italians did leave France for a few years because of the violence of the religious wars.

\(^6\) Maurice Epernay, Elloges, 177. The memorialist Pierre de L'Estoile describes the reaction of a crowd to a pilgrimage of the Parisian capuchins to Chartres in May 1588, following the Day of Barricades. According to L'Estoile, the crowd was divided in its reaction to the procession, some amazed by the nature of Capuchin devotion, some finding it amusing or offensive: "les uns trouvans beaux ces nouveaux mistères, les autres s'en rians et s'en moquans, et beaucoup s'en offensans, comme si on eust voulu se servir des céremoines de la religion Catholique, Apostoliques et Romaine, pour masque et risée". Mémoires-journalx 3, 152.
France, accustomed as they were to much more solemn and emotionally-controlled processions, the Capuchin displays were disconcerting, terrifying and even ridiculous.

Eventually both the Capuchins and Jesuits were able to establish themselves securely in the French capital, but not before the combined forces of Pope, monarchy and other powerful individuals were brought to work on their behalf. A desire to effect a reformation of a spiritually-torn France brought these orders to Paris, but distrust of new religious forms and fear of disrupting the economic and political structure of the existing French church were major obstacles in the path of their establishment. Hostility towards the two communities continued to grow in the years following their respective establishments in the city. The windows of the Jesuit college were smashed with stones, and the walls were smeared with filth when the community pushed to become incorporated into the University in 1565. 66 Fifteen years later, the Jesuits faced more opposition when the building of a new house by the order on the rue Saint-Antoine united clerics and bishop once again in protest. 67 Cordeliers' hostility in particular emerges from a letter sent in 1585 to their minister general, in which they attribute politically disruptive behaviour in Paris to the Jesuits and

66 Broderick, 64-65.
67 Fosse, 184.
the Capuchins. 70

The Cordeliers and the other mendicant orders alone could not prevent new orders from arriving in Paris. However, they could make the lives of the new religious difficult by uniting among themselves, by appealing to other jurisdictions, secular as well as ecclesiastic, and by resorting to physical and verbal harassment. Furthermore, the government and the papacy were virtually powerless to protect the new orders once the religious wars began, their authority undermined by the virtual collapse of French society. The ineffectiveness of royal authority in the last decades of the sixteenth century is apparent in the series of six royal patent letters published in recognition of the Capuchin order beginning in 1573. These decrees, which recognized the Capuchin establishment and forbade harassment of its members, spanned less than a decade and each succeeding decree was as ineffective as the previous one. 71

The pope was a little more successful. Efforts by the papal nuncio, Salviati, to influence Gondi in favour of the Capuchins in 1573 had little effect at first, and the bishop resisted recognizing the order officially for another two years. 72 The Jesuits similarly found that the series of papal bulls and royal patent letters they received during

70 AN LL1511 (May 21, 1585), f. 31r.

71 AN S3705, nos. 1-6.

72 Gondi officially recognized the order in 1576, though he reportedly dedicated the Capuchin Church on December 28, 1575. See Philippe de Paris, Chronicle, 22.
their early years carried no guarantee of a warm reception.

The ability of the Jesuits and Capuchins to secure places for themselves in Paris testifies not only to their ability to find powerful lay and clerical supporters but also to their willingness to adapt to the ecclesiastic environment of Paris. The Jesuits countered criticisms of their papal connections by presenting testimonials to their good faith and qualifications from important French individuals. Furthermore, in order to be accepted legally as a religious community, the order accepted a compromise designation from the Colloquy of Poissy in 1562 in addition to other restrictions. The Society of Jesus was recognized henceforth as a corporation and college but not as a religious order per se. The new name of the order was the Clercs of Clermont rather than the less popular and more provocative title, Society of Jesus.72

The Capuchins in contrast emphasized their non-foreign membership and community-centred form of spirituality in order to win acceptance. They were visibly active in Paris, appearing in civic and ecclesiastic processions, working among the sick, and preaching. They also used the procession and other public occasions to highlight new French membership within the Capuchin community. There are a few examples of this publicizing of recent recruits, though perhaps the most sensational one was the featuring of their

72 Broderick, 60-61. The order was legally recognized on February 13, 1562.
newest and most prominent recruit, Henri de Joyeuse, as Jesus in a passion pilgrimage to Blois in 1588."

To some extent, then, conflict with the other ecclesiastic bodies such as the Cordeliers forced these orders to justify their existence in Paris by showing that they were not a threat either to existing orders or the Gallican church, and equally importantly, that they made a unique and useful contribution to the spiritual life of the community of Paris. The history of the Jesuit order, however, shows that the Capuchins proved to be more successful at assuaging the fears of contemporaries than were the Jesuits. By accepting the terms of the existing clerical establishment in France, the Jesuits won a measure of acceptance. This acceptance remained conditional, however, and their rapid rise in influence among the French elite and their political activity garnered them as much suspicion as approbation in their adopted country. Their consequent expulsions, first in 1594 and more permanently in the late seventeenth century, show that the Jesuits, unlike the Capuchins, were never able to overcome their taint of being an alien organization.

The Franciscan Order: the Observants

The division within the Franciscan order between Observant and Conventual friars created a complicated web of overlapping jurisdictions in France, just as it did

---

74 Fosse, 207. Joyeuse entered the order on September 4, 1587.
throughout Europe. Conventual and Observant houses co-existed in the same region but were governed by altogether separate hierarchies. We will concentrate on the Observant branch of the order since it was by far the largest segment, and it is to this branch that the Paris friary belonged.

As of 1558, the Observant branch in France comprised eleven provinces. The three largest and most important were those of France, Touronne and Bonaventure. The province of Bonaventure was concentrated for the most part in the region of modern-day Burgundy. Touronne included the Observant houses located in the centre and west of France. The Paris friary was located in the province of France, a territory which included the immediate area around Paris and certain regions to the north and east. By 1586 there were 332 convents in all of France according to Francesco-Scipio Gonzaga, fifty-five from the Conventual provinces and 277 from the Observant ones. Gonzaga also noted that although the number of friars was falling during the second half of the sixteenth century, there were approximately 7,000 friars

75 These three provinces were also the first ones to be reformed. The other provinces were Touraine-Poitou, France-Parisienne, Aquitaine primitive and Aquitaine observante, Bourgogne primitive, Flanders, Saint-André and Brittany. Flanders separated in 1523 from France-Parisienne which was itself an earlier splinter from the province of France. The province of Saint-André separated in 1558 at the insistence of the King of Spain. See Antoine Sérent, Les Frères mineurs français en face du Protestantisme, extract from Études franciscaines (Paris: Société et Librairie St-François d'Assise, 1930): 7-8.
in France by 1580, 2,000 of whom were preachers.\textsuperscript{76}

Governance of the Franciscan order was similar to that of the Dominican order after which it was modelled. Each province was divided into smaller administrative units known as custodies which were supervised by a "custos."\textsuperscript{77} The provincial minister was appointed by the minister general to oversee the provinces. His responsibilities involved the visitation of houses to ensure discipline, the interrogation of candidates for the convent theology schools, and the mediation of disputes between houses. At the apex of the political structure was the minister general who, with the aid of elected officials known as the diffinitors, ran the entire order from his base in Rome. By the late sixteenth century, general chapters of the order were held every eight years, at which time the minister general and the diffinitors were elected.

Like the Spanish sector of the order, the French provinces enjoyed a somewhat special constitutional relationship with the Rome-based order, exercising by force of custom certain privileges which were uniquely theirs. These privileges were in part a response to the distinct path of reform taken by French and Spanish Franciscans beginning in the late fourteenth century and continuing into

\textsuperscript{76} Francesco-Scipio Gonzaga, \textit{De origine seraphicae religionis franciscanae...} (Rome, 1587), ff. 551-579. See also Sérent, \textit{Les Frères mineurs}, 8-9. Sérent says that there were approximately 10,000 friars in France by 1517.

\textsuperscript{77} The emergence of the custody and the office of custos is discussed by Moorman, \textit{A History of the Franciscan Order}, 62.
the fifteenth. The French Franciscan movement was very much influenced in particular by the Colettan reform movement which began at the friary of Mirabeau in the province of Touronne.\textsuperscript{76} The appearance of distinct, moderate forms of observant Franciscan spirituality was accompanied by the development of certain regulations to preserve these forms. The general chapter sessions routinely specify certain regulations for the French provinces, and even for the Paris house in particular.\textsuperscript{77} Following a dispute with certain houses in the province of Touronne-Poitou in 1574, for example, the minister general was forced to concede at the general chapter of 1579 that commissioners could only visit French provinces if requested, and only with the approval of

\textsuperscript{76} The Council of Constance in 1415 granted the French friars the right to follow a more strict observance of the Rule. Moorman argues that this episode signalled the division of the order into numerous different reform movements. However the bull \textit{Ite et Vos} in 1517 forced the Colettans to join the Observant branch. John Moorman, \textit{A History of the Franciscan Order}: 380-383. See also Duncan Nimmo, \textit{Reform and Division in the Franciscan Order 1226-1538} (Rome: Capuchin Historical Institute, 1987): 459-495. The Spanish reform movement similarly emphasized a stricter observance. See Nimmo: 435-6, 495-497.

\textsuperscript{77} These reform movements were the Recollets in Spain, known in France as the Colettes, the Colletan reform and the Mirabeau group. The Recollets followed a more strict version of the Rule but were still an accommodation between regular (moderate) and Observant Franciscanism. They obtained their own statutes in 1523 in Spain. These were extended to the Italian houses in 1526. This independence was short-lived, however, since they were forced to join the Capuchins in 1528 by the Minister General. The Spanish branch of the order, the Recollets, also eventually established houses in France, though not until the end of the sixteenth century. See Duncan Nimmo, \textit{Reform and Division in the Franciscan Order 1226-1538} (Rome: Capuchin Historical Institute, 1987), 642-643.
the majority of houses in the province. Nevertheless, the provinces were bound by the general regulations of the order, and the minister general retained substantial authority over the houses throughout the period in question.

Mendicant houses, in general, were smaller in size than other regular communities, containing on average between twenty and fifty members. The Paris friary was by far the biggest Franciscan house in France and one of the biggest in the order, oscillating between four and five hundred members during the sixteenth century. The second biggest friary in France was the grand convent of Toulouse, which housed upwards of 200 students, and which like the Paris house operated an important theology school.

Because of its function as an intellectual centre and as the producer of the functionaries of the order, the Paris

---

This may refer to a particularly contentious issue brought before the minister general and the pope, concerning the sending of commissioners into the province known as Touronne-Poitou. Jean Porthaise led a revolt against this practise. Arch. Vat. N.F. 7 ff. 584-600. See also Lynn Martin, ed., Correspondance du nonce en France. Fabio Mirto Frangipani: 1568-1572 et 1586-1587. Rome: École française de Rome and Université Pontificale Grégorienne, 1984): 13, 126, 3f. The same statute was repeated in the general chapter of 1587, though with the added remark that the commissioner could be sent if there were legitimate causes: "Non mittantur commissarii in provincias, nisi a ministro, vel patribus petantur; vel minister generalis ex legitima causa mittendos iudicaverit". Lucas Wadding, Annales minorum 22, 167.


See Introduction, p. 28, nt. 54.
house was in regular contact with other houses, particularly those from the three great provinces, because these supplied most of the students. Students at the theology school presented letters from their guardians and provincial minister upon arrival at the convent, and their conduct was recorded and periodically conveyed to the mother house during their stay. Other business matters pertaining to the theology school would have also been handled, such as fees or, as was the case during the religious wars, the closing of certain sectors of the school. The appointing of members to the internal council was also an ever-present concern for provinces since they exercised the right to appoint a member on a rotating basis (see chapter 3).

However, the theology school was merely one point of contact. The mobile nature of the Franciscan life ensured that friars were always visiting other houses, either on official visitations (e.g. the provincial ministers and commissioners), to preach, or to take up office. Students were also sent to their home during the seasons that the theology school was closed. As a result, the mendicant orders were well-informed about the affairs of their order both at the regional and at the international level perhaps more so than the cloistered orders. Such close communication meant that collective action was possible at times. We see examples of such collective action periodically during the religious wars. Anger about the intrusive presence of the commissioners forged an alliance among convents in the province of Touronne in 1574, as mentioned above. Similarly,
a letter-writing campaign aimed at the Duke of Nevers in 1592, urging that indecisive nobleman to join the League openly, involved several Cordelier houses and suggests a degree of coordination and cooperation.\textsuperscript{63}

Because of its special exempt status from the jurisdiction of the provincial minister of France, the Paris house was most regularly in contact with the head of their order, the minister general. This contact took three forms: letters to and from the minister general, visits from his commissioner, and visits from the general himself. During most of the sixteenth century, visits by commissioners were relatively infrequent, usually confined to periods governing the election of the guardian. Visits by the minister general were even more uncommon. Contact with the minister general, therefore, consisted largely of correspondence by letter and, despite the difficulties of postal systems at the time, such exchange was remarkably frequent. The inner council minutes of the Cordelier friary show that letters from Rome

\textsuperscript{63} BNF fr. 3633. Letters included in this collection of documents include one from the Cordeliers of Pontoise on behalf of the Cordeliers of the province of France, and one from the third order of Saint Francis. Both were dated 1592. Letters were also gathered from other regular houses in different orders. Nevers was one of the wealthiest and most powerful nobles in France. Early on he was supportive of the League but by the end of the wars he was acting as liaison between Henry of Navarre and the Pope. Another cited example of Cordeliers gathering is mentioned by Pierre L'Estoile, who says that over 200 Cordeliers were rumoured to have arrived in Paris in 1593 bearing arms for the Catholic Union. It is an interesting rumour, but I have yet to find any other evidence of this particular collective behaviour. L'Estoile, \textit{Mémoires-journaux}, 6, 55. The date of this entry is July 11, 1593. L'Estoile says that the Cordeliers came in defiance of the Duke of Mayenne.
were received as often as every two to three weeks, and more frequently during disputes. Although the correspondence has long since disappeared, the minutes reveal two particular preoccupations of the minister general: the University and internal discipline.

Surviving documentation of the Paris house reveals a close working relationship with its minister general, especially after being placed under his direct supervision in 1500. ⁶⁴ The minister general was routinely informed about house matters including episodes of individual misbehaviour, scholarly endeavours and office-holding. The minister general also scrupulously exercised his right to nominate individuals for study at the Paris house in preparation for their nomination to the Faculty of Theology. Nevertheless, relations with the minister general were not always harmonious. In 1502, the Observant order was introduced into the Paris house but only after a great deal of conflict between the house and the minister general and the outbreak of violence within the friary. The minister general similarly enforced reform on the house in 1543 against the will of the house.⁶⁵

Conflict was clearly one component in the relationship between the Paris house and its superior during the

⁶⁴ The Alexandrine statutes placed the Grand Couvent of Paris directly under the authority of the Minister General. Celestino di Piana, "Gli statuti", 50.

sixteenth century, and if anything the conflict only increased in intensity during the last decades. The reasons for this are varied though the Tridentine decrees, Gallicanism, and the ongoing turmoil of the religious wars were each among contributing factors. The explosive combination of these forces, when combined with the distinct personality and character of the Paris house, resulted in a gradual build-up of resentment within the Paris friary and its ultimate eruption into violence in 1581. During the latter part of the sixteenth century, the question of discipline increasingly posed problems between the Paris house and its superior.

First let us examine the roots of this conflict. For many religious orders, the closing of the Council of Trent in 1565 signalled another wave of internal reform. Under the guidance of two successive reforming ministers general, Christophe Cheffontaine (1571-1579) and Francesco-Scipio Gonzaga (1579-1587), the order implemented many of the Tridentine decrees. Doctrine sanctioned by the council was recognized and a determination to maintain a stricter discipline within the different Franciscan communities was endorsed. Needless to say, the French provinces were an area of particular concern for the minister general because of the continuing religious conflict in the country. The Paris house, the largest and most important friary, therefore quickly became a target of reform.

As mentioned in an earlier chapter, the minister general retained full authority over the Paris house and in
recognition of this power was allowed to have a permanent representative in the form of a commissioner. In practice, the commissioner was not usually present and for many years appeared only to preside over the election of new guardians, which took place every third year. Furthermore, succeeding generations of Ministers General had routinely chosen former members, and sometimes even present members, of the community to preside over the forthcoming election. The result of this practice was that for most of the sixteenth century, the Paris Cordeliers were a largely self-regulating body, albeit one in regular communication with Rome. The degree to which the house considered itself a self-regulating institution is apparent in a minute entry from 1569, when the minister general was told that he would be welcome as long as he came specifically for the election period. The inner council argued that the visit would as a result not seem like a calculated intrusion.

The decision of Cheffontaine to take a more active role in the Paris community was hardly surprising, not only because of the prominence of the community within the order,

56 See ch. 2, pp. 74.

57 Rarely do we find commissioners appointed who had not spent some time studying in Paris. The Italian Angelus Justianus, commissioner in 1566, was an unusual choice. Products of the Paris community, Antoine Léger (1576), Jean Benedict (1577, 1579), Jean Bourgogne (1581) and Pierre Morselin (1569) were more typical choices as commissioner. In fact, it was not uncommon to appoint the former guardian as commissioner over subsequent elections. Morselin was appointed guardian in 1572 and therefore reversed the usual process.

58 AN LL1515 (April 15, 1569), f. 36r.
but also because of his general interest, as a Frenchman, in promoting religious reform in France. During his term of office and later as bishop of Caesarea, Cheffontaine initiated a number of policies intended to promote a rejuvenation of Catholicism in his native land. In 1575, Cheffontaine won papal approval for the extension of the Italian-based confraternity of the Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist into France. He was also responsible for the establishment of a confraternity in Lyon in 1581.

Cheffontaine also insisted on holding the general chapter in Paris in 1579, rather than in an Italian city as was customary. This event was an extraordinary publicity manoeuvre. The Assembly attracted over 1200 friars to Paris to elect their new general. These general assemblies were important public spectacles, involving public debates and sermons, processions and, at the end of it all a sumptuous banquet. According to the memoires of Claude Haton, the event attracted enormous crowds, since its scale was

---

57 Christophe Cheffontaine was born in Brittany, the product of the marriage of two ancient noble families from the region: the Esmerus and the Emegues. His rapid rise through the order saw him become custos and then provincial minister of the province of Brittany before acceding to the highest office, that of Minister General, in 1571 at the age of 39. See Othon de Pavie, L'Aquitaine séraphique 1 (Auch: 1905): 299-300.

90 The bishopric of Caesarea was one of the numerous dioceses granted to clerics in areas controlled by non-Christian powers -- "in partibus infidelium." This type of bishopric is discussed in chapter 4.

91 Othon de Pavie, L'Aquitaine séraphique, 313. Cheffontaine won permission from the Pope in 1575 to direct the confraternity of the Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist in any French church.
unprecedented. People filled the roads to Paris, "parce qu'il n'était mémoire par les plus anciens ni par les cronicques que jamais telle assemblée eut esté faicte à Paris ni en France." To help defray the costs, Charles IX granted the friary 10,000 livres and his brother Henry, the duke of Anjou, gave 4,000 livres. Other religious communities, churches, the colleges of the University and lay patrons also made contributions. Cheffontaine's intention was two-fold. On the one hand, he wished to prove to the rest of the Christian world that beleaguered France was still Catholic. On the other hand, the gathering of so many friars and prelates from all over Europe and the consequent spiritual celebrations accompanying the event were intended to stimulate French devotional enthusiasm. The popular preacher René Benoist wrote about the spiritual utility of the gathering, comparing the effect of the chapter to "plusieurs fontaines spirituelles" which would water the "champ de l'Eglise, des eau vives, tant de la saincte doctrine, que d'une vie louable & conversation edificative." Like Cheffontaine, Benoist saw the event as

--

93 Pierre de L'Estoile, Journal de L'Estoile 1, 315. See also Sérent, Protestantisme, 42.
94 René Benoist, Exhortation aux francois et principalement Parisiens de recevoir humainement & Christiennement les religieux de l'ordre de S. Francois dits les Freres mineurs, en la celebration de leur chapitre general... (Paris: Nicolas Chesneau, 1579): 3-4. He continues on to compare the general chapter to a trumpet "qui excite & encourage les capitaines & soldats au combat...."
an opportunity for France, and especially Paris, to
demonstrate that it had not yet been deformed by the
Protestant Reformation. France "n'est si gastee, difforme, &
souillee, soit en la foy, ou ès moeurs, comme quelques uns
en ont faulsemcnt & calumnieusement semé & faict courir le
bruit ...."35

Another facet of Cheffontaine's reform policy was, of
course, reform of the Paris house. Successful implementation
of reform in the order required the cooperation of an
institution which not only produced superb preachers and
theologians but also provided administrators for many French
convents. Gonzaga shared Cheffontaine's viewpoint. His
awareness of the importance of the Paris community was
evident in a letter to the house in August 1581 in which he
stated that he rejoiced that the house was filled with so
many men known for their sound doctrine and wisdom.36 Like
Cheffontaine, Gonzaga was eager to implement a reform
throughout the order. A circular sent to superiors of the
order in 1579 signalled this very intention, for it held
them responsible for a relaxation in discipline.37 Control

55 Benoist, Exhortation, 17.
56 The letter is reprinted in Wadding, Annales minorum
21, 313.
57 A subsequent circular called for a stricter
enforcement of the vow of poverty. Pastor, History of the
Popes 19, 112. Pastor says that Gonzaga himself undertook
numerous visitations during his tenure in power, visiting
northern and central Italy and the Iberian peninsula in
addition to certain French convents.
of the Paris friary was clearly a crucial part of his reform programme.

This explains why the house was so frequently visited after 1574. Acting strictly within the guidelines of his office, Cheffontaine regularly began to send in commissioners to visit the house, and his successor Gonzaga did much the same. Between 1574 and 1581, the Paris house was visited on five different occasions, including visitations by Cheffontaine and Gonzaga themselves. Not only were visitations more frequent; they also lasted longer. Cheffontaine spent several weeks in the house in 1574 and stayed again for a long visit in 1578. Gonzaga similarly spent a number of weeks in the house in 1579. Jean Benedict, commissioner to the house in 1577, stayed well over four months.

The length of the visitations was irritating for the friars, because they were responsible for financially supporting the commissioner and his party during their stay. However, they were equally displeased that the visits were increasingly accompanied by the development and implementation of new statutes. These statutes, the majority

---

56 AN LL1515 and AN LL1511. Cheffontaine was living in the house from September to November 1574, and resurfaced again on May 5, 1578 (f. 90r). He was still in the convent as of October the same year (f. 94r). His commissioner, Antoine Léger was at the house as of July 1576 (f. 75r) and again in October (f. 77r). Jean Benedict was received as commissioner on January 15, 1577 and was consistently signing the minutes through till May 3, 1577 (fol.85r). Gonzaga spent several weeks in Paris in 1579 and reappeared in 1582 to resolve the turmoil. Arriving in March 1582, Gonzaga is still mentioned in the council minutes as late as September 1582 (f. 6r).
of which were promulgated between 1575 and 1581, concerned virtually every facet of mendicant life: clothing and food, divine office, collection of alms, deportment, and even office-holding. Although the Paris friars played a role in formulating the new regulations, the development of the majority of these statutes during the visitations of the commissioners suggests that Rome was exerting its control over the friary's reform.

The first grumblings against the actions of the minister general came from outside the Paris community. In 1574 a group of Franciscan communities protested to the papacy about the burdensome nature of the visitations. Jean Porthaise, then provincial of Touronne-Poitou, appealed Cheffontaine's actions to the Pope, claiming financial strain as well as general irritation about the inappropriate behaviour of the commissioners. The Pope supported Porthaise's claim, especially since it was accompanied by the testimonials of Henry III, Catherine de Médicis and other high-ranking individuals.

The Paris community, because of its special relationship with the minister general, was not in a

99 AN LL1515. For the reforming efforts of Cheffontaine see ff. 66r-69r. For those of Gonzaga, see in particular ff. 97r-99v.

100 Arch. Vat. N.F. 7, ff. 584-600. Jean Porthaise was a known reformer himself, but he clearly took issue with the heavy-handed nature of reform proposed by the Minister General as did the French houses he represented. In this large dossier of letters, Porthaise complains about the abuses of the commissioners which ranged from the expenses of their upkeep to their inappropriate behaviour.
position to protest formally. Nevertheless, murmurings of discontent appear in the minutes in 1577. Clearly exasperated by the lengthy stay of Jean Benedict, the minutes of the discretoire record the sending of a letter to Cheffontaine which protested the future sending of such burdensome visitations.\textsuperscript{101} There is also evidence of numerous clashes between Benedict and many of the friars, among them Jacques Berson and another friar named Capard. Although the details governing these clashes remain hazy, Benedict's repeated insistence that his authority be recognized suggests that the friars felt he was heavy-handed in his application of the authority.\textsuperscript{102}

Even though the visitations continued, we do not hear from the friars again until the election of a new guardian in 1581. Contrary to normal practise, the election was held without the presence of the commissioner. Adding insult to injury, a commissioner sent a few weeks later to investigate was rejected by the inner council. Somewhat ironically, Cheffontaine chose as commissioner the man who had challenged his own authority to send visitors a few years previously -- Jean Porthaise. Porthaise' rebellious reputation notwithstanding, the inner council argued that he

\textsuperscript{101} LL1515 (May 1, 1577), ff. 82r-83v. Several entries discuss Benedict.

\textsuperscript{102} At least one of the friars, Capard, was imprisoned for running to the secular authorities. Again, no specific information was given but it is suggestive of an attempt to use secular authority to counteract that of the commissioner. See AN LL1515 (May 3, 1577), f. 85r.
was not from one of the three great French provinces\textsuperscript{103} and therefore had no right to preside over the Paris election. This thinly-disguised excuse only angered Gonzaga. In the same letter to the house dated August 1581, Gonzaga called the friars rebellious, saying that rather than presiding over Franciscans he instead found himself nurturing dogs and vipers.\textsuperscript{104} He went on to deny their claims of wrongdoing and instead asserted his right to choose any commissioner he wished.\textsuperscript{105}

The inner council's bold move against the minister general's authority is indicative of the rising level of frustration concerning his intrusions upon the community's authority and, more specifically, the authority of the inner council. For decades the inner council had governed the affairs of the house including the enforcement of discipline. That such autonomy was an issue for the friars is suggested by a reference in the minutes from June 2, 1581 to the rediscovery of an old statute which empowered the

\textsuperscript{103} Porthaise was from the small province known as Turonne-Poitou, and not from the three major provinces of France, Saint Bonaventure and Turonne. The French provinces are discussed in the same chapter, nt. 75.

\textsuperscript{104} "Vestram def leo miseriam fratres, ac meum infortunium deploro, quod fratribus, et franciscanis religiosis putans me praesidere, canes ac viperas in matrem insurgentes videar sustinere, ac regere". Wadding, \textit{Annales minorum}, 21, 314.

\textsuperscript{105} Wadding, \textit{Annales minorum} 22: 313. "Non enim latere debeat tantae reipublicae patres, in nostris capitulis generalibus statutum, ad omnes ordinis partes, ac provincias generalem ministrum posse commissarios destinare. Insuper et eosdem ab omnibus ordinis partibus fore recipiundos, sub poenis quae a S.S.D.N. Papa in constitutione edita anno MDLXXV continentur."
house to hold an election without a commissioner present.\textsuperscript{106}

The dispute did not end here but rather grew in intensity over the succeeding months. Gonzaga's appointment of Porthaise to investigate the matter may have sparked this increased intensity, because it signalled yet another, perhaps greater, attempt to reorder the affairs of the house. Porthaise was a known French reformer and Gonzaga was open about his desire to effect still greater change. What may have been equally worrisome for the friars was the fact that since Porthaise did not come from one of the three great provinces of France he did not have close ties to the Paris community. He was an outsider and therefore unlikely to be an ally.

Gonzaga's reproaches to the house had little effect, and enlisting the support of the papal nuncio and other notables only encouraged the rebellious friars to approach the Parlement of Paris, known for its Gallican sympathies.

\textsuperscript{106} AN LL1511 (August 2, 1581), f. 3r. The entry in the minutes is rather cryptic. It alludes to the statute but does not state precisely what it says. However, prior to the reform of 1502, the house was accustomed to electing its own guardian, according to Celestino di Piana. The statutes of 1502 ensured that the guardian was chosen only from one of the three reformed provinces, but more important for the discussion at hand, they reiterated the right of the minister general and the diffinitors in the general chaper to ratify the election, a practise first enunciated in the \textit{Ordinationes Benedictinae} of 1336. Piana argues that this practise had fallen out of fashion and was not even recognized at the previous chapters of 1485 and 1500, therefore its adoption in 1502 was surprising. Piana, \textit{Statuti}, 51. It should be noted that although a number of the friars protested the validity of this document, those who were supporting it were members of the inner council and therefore those whose power was most directly affected by the intrusions of the Minister General.
Gonzaga was forced to come to Paris himself in March 1582 and reestablish order, although a procès-verbal from August 1582 reveals that, months after it began, the dispute remained far from settled. In fact Gonzaga's high-handed measures had served only to encourage the factionalism within the house. Members of the friary interviewed by the Parlement investigative commission mention physical clashes between Gonzaga's followers and various friars, and one account has Gonzaga personally striking the sacristan for withholding the keys to the sacristy. Just as irritating to the office-holders of the friary was the minister general's refusal to consult or inform the brothers about house matters. Interviewed by the Parlementary commission a month earlier on July 6 regarding the tumult, the vicar of priests, states that

... depuis le temps qu'il [le general de l'ordre] estoit arrivé au couvent n'avoit ouy personne, combien que ce soit la coustume d'assembler en general tous les religieux, & s'enquerir de l'estat & ordre & du desordre.

Gonzaga has also imprisoned a number of friars without explanation, and these poor brothers could do nothing but

\textsuperscript{107} The commission was organized August 3, 1582 after the Parlement of Paris had received petitions both from the preacher Jacques Berson and the minister general. The commission included Christophe de Thou and four other councillors: Brisson, Boutin, Violle and Jacques de la Faye. The lieutenant criminel of the Châtelet also accompanied the councillors to the conven. See Michel Félibien, \textit{Histoire de la ville de Paris} 5 (Paris: chez Guillaume Desprez, 1725): 15. The procès-verbal from this commission is found in AN X2B 1175.

\textsuperscript{106} Félibien, \textit{Histoire}, 5, 14.
wait for "une sentence cruelle," according to the same friar.109

Yet despite the intensity of the dispute of 1581/82, the Paris Cordeliers and their minister general soon returned to a more amicable relationship. In fact one could be excused for thinking that the status quo had been reestablished. Duret was removed from office and two new vicars were chosen during an election in September 1582.110 We find no more mention by the friars of the election statute. However, we also do not find the commissioners visiting with the same regularity as they did between 1575 and 1581.111 Furthermore, the minister general had gone back to the practise of appointing the exiting guardian to preside as commissioner over the subsequent election in virtually all elections after 1582.112

109 Félibien, Histoire 5, 14. The friar interviewed was Christophe Robert, one of the most intransigent opponents of the Minister General. Robert angered the Minister General enough that he was forced out of the theology curriculum at the University. This is discussed further at the end of this section.

110 Peter Bourgogne was appointed to preside over the convent until a new guardian was chosen. Bourgogne was the second commissioner sent to the friary, similarly sent away by the discretoire in September 1582. AN LL1511 (September 5, 1581), f. 3v.

111 In 1586 the house requested that no commissioner be sent that year, and their request seems to have been granted. AN LL1511 (Jan 9, 1586), f. 41r. The next minister general to visit the house was Bonaventure of Calathagory who appeared in 1599.

112 Bourgogne presided in 1587, Surreau in 1590, Feuardent in 1593, and Le Heurt, who was presiding in the absence of the exiled Jean David, presided over the election of 1596. The minister general presided, not surprisingly, during his visit in 1599.
Gonzaga's restraint with respect to the rebellious friars also indicates a conciliatory attitude. Jacques Berson left the house for a few years along with a few compatriots, among them Christophe Robert, the vicar of priests, and Poudreully. However, no one was either excommunicated or banished from the order, and Christophe Robert was later reestablished in the theology cursum after acknowledging his disobedience before the general chapter in 1583.

Neither the friars nor the minister general could be declared the victors in the conflict. Rather, their interaction resulted in a degree of mutual accommodation and cooperation. The authority of the general was recognized, and the privileges and self-regulation of the friary were acknowledged. This accommodation continued throughout the last two decades of the sixteenth century, as we can see in the statutes of the general chapter of 1587. The minister general asserted his right to send individuals bearing his letters of obedience to the Paris convent.

In fact, the Parlement was largely responsible for developing a plan to resolve the dispute. Evidently tired of the turmoil, and mollified by Gonzaga's protestations of recognition of the Gallican Church, the Parlement ordered a few of the more recalcitrant brothers -- Chessé, Berson, and Pastier -- to leave. They were told to leave "porter honneur & reverence à la justice, & se comporter humilité & modesté selon le devoir de leur profession ...." Félibien, 5, 14-15.

AN LL1511, ff. 13v-16r. Poudreully was also reinstated in the theology cursum according to the minutes from June 26, 1584, which say that Poudreully required new letters of obedience to be readmitted. See f. 24r.

Statute 59: "Discreti conventus Parisiensis admittant obedientias omnes ministri generalis; alias
time, however, he confirmed that commissioners could only be sent to France if invited by the province -- unless there was a legitimate reason for doing otherwise.\textsuperscript{116} The accommodation evident in the statutes was mirrored in the daily relationship of the house and the General, and from all appearances their relationship resumed its usual contours. In 1585 the General did express concern about the increasing turmoil in Paris associated with the emergence of the Holy League, and the house hastened to assure him that they were not involved.\textsuperscript{117} Beyond such admonitions, however, the minister general seems to have accepted the determinations of the house with respect to its own administration, and it is not until 1622 that we see another attempt substantially to reform the community.\textsuperscript{118}

\textbf{THE PAPACY}

As patriarch of the Catholic Church, the pope was always a distant but nevertheless powerful presence in the life of the Parisian friars. The establishment of the Paris friary and its subsequent prominence as an important

\vspace{10pt}

\textsuperscript{116} Statute 56, general chapter 1587: "Non mittantur commissarii in provincias, nisi a ministro, vel patribus petantur; vel minister generalis ex legitima causa mittendos iudicaverit". Wadding, \textit{Annales minorum} 22, 167.

\textsuperscript{117} AN LL1511 (May 21, 1585), fol 31r. The Cordeliers pointedly state that the Capuchins and the Jesuits are the ones causing the turmoil. This letter is also discussed in chapter 2.

\textsuperscript{118} For the reform of 1622, see Beaumont-Maillet, \textit{Le Grand Couvent}, 140-145.
theological centre within the Church owed a great deal to early papal support. In 1219 the Cordeliers were granted permission to establish themselves in Paris, and over the next few decades the house accumulated numerous other papal privileges. In 1227 the Pope ordered the bishop of Paris to let them celebrate mass. A bull of foundation from 1240 let the Cordeliers possess a clock tower and fixed altars.

In subsequent centuries the pope reappeared periodically to chastise the house when it erred and to prevent its privileges from threatening other clerical and secular institutions. This was true of the late sixteenth century as well, though the papal presence was perhaps more marked at this time than in previous years. This active presence can be attributed to a reinvigorated notion of papal authority as defined by a succession of strong, reform-minded popes, in particular Pius V (1565-1572), Gregory XIII (1572-1585) and the Franciscan Sixtus V (1585-1590).

The broad contours of papal history from this period are already well known, and therefore what will concern us here are papal policies which directly influenced the Paris Cordeliers. Responding to the spread of Protestantism, the late sixteenth-century popes were convinced that a more powerful papacy was an essential component of a revitalized Church and Catholic spirituality. The increasing political

---

119 Gonzaga, De origine seraphicae, 115-116.
120 AN L767, no. 2.
and spiritual turmoil in France was particularly distressing to these patriarchs given France's stature as one of the largest and most powerful countries in Europe. The papacy was well aware that a weakened French Church would weaken the Church in general; therefore, papal policy with respect to France concentrated on halting the spread of Protestantism by reforming the existing ecclesiastical structure and by stimulating lay and clerical piety. Papal encouragement of the spread of new religious communities into France, and the subsequent effect of their arrival on the ecclesiastic landscape of France, has been touched on briefly in an earlier section of this chapter.  

Another facet of their policy was the molding of the mendicant orders into leaders of reform. The various popes inundated the orders with privileges. Schools within the regular orders were granted the status of seminary by Pius V.  

Gregory XIII removed mendicant churches from episcopal surveillance.  

Sixtus V, a Franciscan himself, was particularly affectionate towards the various branches of

---

121 Gregory XIII in particular was extremely supportive of the Jesuits and Capuchins, and in 1574 revoked a decree of Paul III which had forbidden the Capuchins to establish outside of Italy. Pastor, History of the Popes, 61-65. Other communities sponsored by the popes included the austere Theatines, the Order of St Bernard known as the Feuillants in France, and the Ursulines. Gregory XIII and Sixtus V were strong advocates of these latter communities. For Sixtus V see Pastor, 21, 138-142.

122 Pius V argued that these schools were the nurseries of preachers and confessors. Nicole Lemaitre, Saint Pie V, 166.

123 Lemaitre, Saint Pie V, 163.
his own order. During his administration, a number of Franciscan friars were promoted to bishoprics and other important posts.\textsuperscript{124} Also important for the mission of the Paris Franciscans was the permission granted to mendicant theologians to read heretical material, in order better to counter Protestant arguments in print and from the pulpit. Noel Taillepied and François Feuardent were two of the more prominent Franciscan polemicists who took advantage of this opportunity.\textsuperscript{125}

The granting of new privileges to the mendicant orders enhanced their role as reformers, but it was accompanied by an emphasis on internal discipline which placed a great deal of pressure upon the well-established French mendicant houses to conform to a post-Tridentine interpretation of ecclesiastical relations -- an interpretation which posited at base a more closely-monitored existence for these orders. Numerous bulls were promulgated regarding the maintenance of the various rules of the regular orders, the mendicant ones

\textsuperscript{124} Pastor, History, 21, 138.

\textsuperscript{125} Among the surviving works produced by these friars are tracts demonstrating a close reading of the same texts as Protestant authors. An obvious one by Feuardent is his Brief examen des confessions, prières, sacrements et catechisme des calvinistes (1599, Paris). As discussed in chapter 3, he also produced a number of exegetical works between 1582 and 1600 including a number of commentaries on the epistles of Saint Paul, on Ruth, Jonas and Esther. Taillepied wrote Histoire des vies, moeurs, actes, doctrine et mort des trois principaux herétiques de nostre temps. a scavoir Martin Luther, Jean Calvin, et Theodore de Beze... (Douai, 1616). The Latin version was first published in 1572.
Further signalling papal intention to play a more active role in the various religious communities was the reinterpretation of the role of the nuncio. Rather than relying strictly on bishops and the administrators of the religious orders to ensure the implementation of reform, the papacy transformed its political liaison, the nuncio, into another spiritual watchdog. During the pontificates of Pius V and especially Gregory XIII, the once-informal political liaison position of nuncio was transformed into a regulated diplomatic office. Only a bishop could now hold this position, and the term of office was limited to a period of two years. Gregory XIII also increased the number of nuncios, establishing nine permanent nunciatures including one in France. More importantly with respect to the French

---

126 Nicole Lemaitre points out that twenty-five bulls concerning the mendicant orders were promulgated during the pontificate of Pius V alone. Nicole Lemaitre, Pie V, 163-164.

127 Prior to the middle of the sixteenth century, the position of nuncio was an informal patronage appointment and its duration depended on the wishes of the pope. There were different kinds of nuncios, furthermore, and the types of business with which each was occupied varied dramatically. Lynn Martin discusses the papal nuncio in some detail in his introduction to Correspondance du nonce en France Fabio Mirto Frangipani (Rome: École Française de Rome and Université Pontificale Grégorienne, 1984), volume 16 in the series Acta nuntiaturae gallicae. An excellent, detailed examination of legations to France is the article by Bernard Barbiche and Ségolène de Dainville-Barbiche entitled "Les légats à latere en France et leurs facultés aux XVIe et XVIIe siècles," in Archivum historiae pontificae, 23 (1985): 93-165. See also Garrett Mattingly's definitive study Renaissance Diplomacy (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1955; Reprinted, New York: Dover Publications, 1988): 25-27.
Church, the nuncio was transformed into an agent of ecclesiastic reform and was charged with ensuring the publication of papal bulls in each state as well as the visitation of dioceses.

By means of this office, the papacy sought to supply itself with a direct line of communication on the state of the Church in other countries as well as a means for extending its direct authority over these ecclesiastic institutions. However in so doing, the papacy was setting itself up for conflict with the French Church as well as with the Parlement of Paris and other lay institutions. Since French Gallicans had always considered the nuncio an unwelcome and intrusive presence in the French Church, they were unlikely to find the new breed of papal official any more congenial -- especially since one of the mandates given by Pius V, Gregory XIII and Sixtus V to their respective nuncios was the implementation of the controversial Tridentine statutes in France.\textsuperscript{128}

The dispute of 1581/1582

One of the better known conflicts resulting from the convergence of papal reform endeavours and Gallicanism was the Cordelier dispute of 1581/82. This dispute has already been discussed with respect to the preservation of order

\textsuperscript{128} The new breed of nuncio made its appearance in Frangipani, who in 1570 called a meeting of French prelates and preachers in Paris to discuss pastoral reform. Victor Martin, \textit{Le Gallicanisme}, 76.
within a religious community and also with respect to relations between the friary and the minister general. The role of the papacy also requires some attention, since it was the intervention of the nuncio which transformed a localized dispute into an international one.

The Cordelier dispute occurred during a particularly sensitive period of papal-French relations. Although the final session of the Council of Trent had finished fifteen years earlier, France was still refusing to publish the Tridentine decrees as late as 1580. Its refusal to do so stemmed not from a desire to prevent ecclesiastic reform but from a distrust of the enhanced papal authority resulting from the Council. Repeated papal claim of sovereignty over the universal church understandably irritated the Gallicanists, who viewed the French church as a distinct, unique body within the context of the greater Church.

Distrust led the French contingent to withdraw from the 1559 session of the Council of Trent in disgust when measures concerning lay control of ecclesiastic issues

\[\text{129}\] At the Trent session held at Câteau-Cambrésis in 1559, the French contingent was among the most forceful in pressing for measures concerned primarily with pastoral care. Disillusionment with the Council ultimately led Catherine de Médicis to initiate a specifically French reform by organizing the Colloquy of Poissy in 1561. The failure of the Colloquy did not derail attempts at reform. Catherine attempted to enforce decrees developed by the council concerning episcopal residence and visitations. In 1580 the Ordinances of Blois introduced further measures similarly aimed at ensuring greater vigilance by the episcopacy and improved pastoral care. Victor Martin, *Le Gallicanisme*, 148.
quickly gained its attention,\(^{130}\) and over the subsequent decades suspicion of the papacy continued to place obstacles in the path of papal implementation of the Tridentine decrees.\(^{131}\) The result of this rising hostility was that Tridentine reforms in the secular church could only be introduced covertly and relied heavily on the agency of motivated bishops. It also meant, of course, that resistance to the decrees within French ecclesiastic institutions was easier because lay support (ie. royal) for the measures did not exist.

The Cordelier dispute of 1581/82 illustrates this last

\(^{130}\) Martin, *Le Gallicanisme*, 14-16. Martin points out that thirteen of the measures proposed in this session concerned the reduction of lay power within the ecclesiastic structure. One of the measures particularly galling to Catherine de Médicis and the Gallicanists was the proposed suppression of the "appels comme d'abus" and the obligation of the lay ruler to publish apostolic letters. The "appel comme d'abus" was a statute allowing cases involving jurisdictional disputes to be transferred from lower courts to the courts of Parlement. This statute was old, possibly going back to fourteenth-century Provence. Initially it was applied to disputes between secular jurisdictions, but by the end of the fifteenth century it was also being applied to ecclesiastical ones as well. See Louis de Héricourt, *Les lois ecclésiastiques de France dans leur ordre naturel, et une analyse des livres du droit canonique conférés avec les usages de l'Eglise gallicane...* (Paris: G. Le Mercier, 1756): 170. A recent thesis by Jotham Parsons, *Church and Magistrate in Early Modern France: Parlementaire Gallicanism, 1560-1615* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University, Fall 1997) is also illuminating about usage of this statute. During the sixteenth century, many religious institutions were invoking this statute in their disputes with other religious institutions.

\(^{131}\) Martin, *Le Gallicanisme*, 26, 30. That the French saw the council as a threat to Gallican liberties is clear. Martin records that Charles IX, writing to his agent du Ferrier, remarks: "L'on trouva que la Cour de Rome a toujours augmenté et confirmé son autorité, à nostre désavantage."
point. News about the turmoil at the Cordeliers reached Pope Gregory XIII in August 1581. His initial reaction was to refuse to intervene directly, and he encouraged his nuncio, Salviati, to act as mediator. Gregory's reaction was understandable. The Franciscan conflict erupted during a particularly sensitive time in Franco-papal relations when the papacy was once again trying to encourage France to officially recognize the Tridentine decrees. Despite the hostility of the Parlement, papal efforts seemed to be paying off by 1579 when the ecclesiastical Assembly of Melun recommended endorsing the decrees.\textsuperscript{132} This state of uneasy accord quickly unravelled over the following two years, however, when Henry III refused to recognize the recommendations of Melun concerning the Tridentine decrees. The illegal publishing of the bull \textit{In Coena Domini} in Paris around the same time also heightened tension because it infuriated Henry III, who believed that this bull, which listed excommunicated Kings, was intended as a warning. The Parlement felt much the same way and officially condemned the bull.\textsuperscript{133}

The dispute which broke out in the friary during this time initially remained localized, an event of some interest to contemporaries like Pierre de l'Estoile, but still a

\textsuperscript{132} The assembly at Melun (1579/1580) was one of the Assemblées générales du clergé de France which met every ten years.

\textsuperscript{133} The bull was published in 1580 through the agency of the papal nuncio, Dandino, the nuncio who preceded Castelli, and a Jesuit. Pastor, 19, 555-556.
matter that most felt would be settled within the Franciscan family. The papal nuncio, Giovanni Battista Castelli, however, was less sanguine about the affair, especially when certain friars like Jacques Berson began cultivating supporters at the Parlement of Paris. Writing to the papal secretary on August 21 1581, Castelli tells Cardinal Côme that the friars were throwing stones at one another and that an office-holder, the president of the convent, had been threatened with imprisonment by one of the "seditious brothers." He continues on to bemoan his lack of authority to manage both the friars and their supporters, the magistrates of the Parlement of Paris. Over the following weeks Castelli's correspondance becomes more angry in tone, and his frustration over his lack of authority to resolve the situation is more apparent. He refers to the "manifesta disobbedienza" of the friars in a letter from September 1 1581 and a month later on October 2 suggests that the pope should investigate so that "justice" would be served. What is particularly bothersome to Castelli is the community's willful disobedience to its minister general, and its evident willingness to turn to a secular power to regulate its affairs. An ultramontanist at heart, Castelli urged the Pope to return the friary to "la buona via" whether by

---

134 Correspondance du nonce 7, 173. "Questi frati Cordiglieri sono in tanto fracasso ... si sono buttate delle pietre l'un l'altro, et hieri il Presidente di quel convento fu minaciato d'essero posto prigione da alcuni frati seditiosi". This episode is briefly mentioned in chapter 2.

135 Correspondance du nonce 7, 173.
gentle reminders or threats if necessary.\textsuperscript{126}

Castelli got what he wanted in the end. Over the subsequent months, increasing violence and disorder in the friary paralleled deteriorating relations between France and the Papacy. Once it became clear that the Tridentine decrees would not be implemented in the immediate future, Gregory XIII turned his attention to his disorderly house in Paris. Salviati's repeated demands for greater powers such as that of excommunication were finally granted by the pope in February 1582. Armed with this authority, Castelli excommunicated the more recalcitrant friars along with those magistrates who supported them.

Ironically, Castelli's direct intervention in the affair had the opposite effect from that which he intended. Rather than subduing the situation and restoring the friars to their obedience, Castelli faced a Gallican-fuelled explosion from the magistrates. Led by Christophe de Thou, the Parlement levelled a series of "appels comme d'abus" against the papal representative on behalf of the friars and the magistrates. It must have seemed to be a bad joke to Castelli that he, someone who did not recognize secular jurisdiction in clerical matters, should find himself before a secular court charged with abuse of clerical jurisdiction.

The friars were no more receptive to Castelli's reform measures. Although a few friars approached Castelli for

\textsuperscript{126} \textit{Ibid.}
absolution following the condemnation, others became even more intransigent and outspoken in their opposition. Castelli quickly discovered that the recognized leader of the rebel faction, Jacques Berson, evidently buoyed by Parlement sanction, was preaching against the minister general, the papacy and the nuncio himself from Parisian pulpits.

The League

The incident of 1581/1582 is the most dramatic altercation we find between the pope and the Paris community during the second half of the sixteenth century, although it was certainly not the last time that friars publicly differed from papal policy. Berson was once again in trouble for his preaching against the papacy in 1585, this time for criticizing Sixtus V's willingness to allow the alienation of Church property to the French Crown. Eight years later, the Paris friars were among the most intransigent opponents of Henry of Navarre's accession to the throne, outlasting papal resistance to the point that their activities became

---

137 The method of absolving friars "ad cautelam" (touching the shoulder with a stick to signify castigation) was regarded as a violation of Gallican liberties and only infuriated Parlement further. The result was another appel comme d'abus charge on March 29, 1582. See BNF Ms. Colbert 153, f. 175r. "Arrêt de la Cour de Parlement, contre le Nonce du Pape, pour avoir excommunié les Cordeliers de Paris, & iceux absous à la baguette."

136 Berson was later forced to recant publicly. See Victor Martin, *Le Gallicanisme*, 226.
an embarassment to the pontiff.139 Prior to this time, the pope had refused to recognize Navarre's accession because of his Protestantism, and had formally excommunicated him in 1589. By 1593, however, with Henry IV's demonstrated willingness to convert, rumours were circulating wildly in Paris about papal negotiations with him.

At first the more hardened League supporters refused to ascribe any legitimacy to these rumours, and it was only as reports came back to Paris confirming that the pope was receiving the embassies of Navarre that they started to take the rumours more seriously. The about-face of the pontiff at this juncture is not hard to understand. Sixtus V and his successors felt that the civil wars had done more to frustrate the work of reform in France than serve it. Equally, Sixtus V was distrustful of the League because of its willingness to question royal authority, despite its evident zeal to rid France of Protestantism. As a monarch himself, and a supporter of established authority, the pope would not look kindly on challengers of this authority.140

Following the coronation of Henry IV at Chartres on

139 L'Estoile, Journal 1, 185. By 1593, Henry of Navarre's demonstrated willingness to convert removed the last barrier to his rule among a population exhausted by thirty years of war. Negotiations for papal recognition of Henry had been under way since October 1592, when Pierre de Gondi was first sent to Rome.

140 Bor Hübner says that Sixtus V was much more sympathetic to Henry IV's conversion after 1589, especially once many nobles began to ally with him. Hübner, The Life and Times of Sixtus the Fifth (London: Longmans Green & Co., 1872): 153, 252. Pastor provides a similar portrait of Sixtus V, and discusses his anger over the Day of the Barricades. See History of the Popes, 21, 300-301.
March 1, 1594, we find the preachers in Paris responding to fears that papal recognition could come at any time. Feuardent and Garin were among the most vituperative, according to L'Estoile, and they were not beyond criticizing the Pope himself. Garin, for one, preached on March 8, 1594 that he would never accept the "Béarnais," even if the pope did: "... mais quand le Pape voudrait absoudre le Béarnais, il ne pourrait, d'autant qu'il se déclarait hérétique lui-même."¹⁴¹ For Garin and the other friars, Henry of Navarre was a heretic, and no conversion could turn him into a legitimate monarch. This was a powerful motivating force among many of the more devoted League supporters, since they believed that Navarre's accession to the throne would be a victory for the Devil. This fear is explicit in Garin's comment following Henry IV's consecration that the Devil was now King of France.¹⁴²

Even after papal recognition came in 1594,¹⁴³ Garin and the other Cordeliers remained obdurate in their resistance. Only the arrival of Henry of Navarre in Paris and the evident support of the Paris municipal government for his rule convinced the community that they could resist no more. The guardian of the friary, Jean David, was forced to flee,

¹⁴¹ L'Estoile, _Journal de L'Estoile_, 1, 377.
¹⁴² March 1, 1594. L'Estoile, _Journal_ 1, 374.
¹⁴³ Pastor, _History_, 23, 124. Henry IV was recognized in the General Congregation on August 2, 1594. The presiding pope was Clement VIII.
as was Garin himself.\textsuperscript{144}

CONCLUSION

Though the issues which brought the Paris friars into conflict with the papacy in 1582 and 1594 were markedly different, the two occasions do reveal a unifying theme: the willingness of the friars to oppose superior authority when it ran counter to the conception of their role in society as reformers. Given that theirs was one of the most prestigious houses in the order and one used to managing its own affairs, many of the Paris friars were understandably unreceptive to the increasing intervention by Rome. They were supportive of the Tridentine efforts at pastoral and doctrinal reform but remained unconvinced that Trent's insistence on greater centralization of authority was essential to achieve the desired rejuvenation of French spirituality. After all, who was better suited to lead a reformation of France than French friars trained at the most prestigious theological centre in Europe? Their resistance in 1594 similarly stemmed from a strong belief that their mission was being undermined by the leaders of the Church. The friars could not accept papal recognition of a relapsed

\begin{footnote}{144}The house minutes from 1595 refer to David's continuing exile (exilium suum) from the house. AN LL1511 (April 15, 1595) f. 82v. Garin left Paris on March 31, 1594 according to L'Estoile, who says that he was found hiding in a grain shelter disguised as a Spaniard. The owner, Monsieur Targier, freed him after he promised not to preach again against the King. \textit{Journal de L'Estoile} 1, 407.\end{footnote}
heretic as King of France since to do so would jeopardize the spiritual security of their nation.

If the willingness of the Paris friars to oppose superior authority is revealing of their self-consciousness as a community of reformers, the reactions of the ecclesiastical hierarchy are revealing about early modern conceptions of disobedience and authority. Contemporaries clearly viewed signs of disobedience and disagreement as a serious threat to the stability of the entire structure. The papal legate and the minister general were both quick in 1582 to label the actions of the Cordeliers as rebellious and schismatic,\textsuperscript{145} and the use of similar language in the inner council minutes to chastise difficult brothers shows that these attitudes filtered down through the levels of clerical authority (see chapter 2). These attitudes persisted, even though conflict was a common enough element of church relations. The organic development of the Church over time precluded a neat, direct chain of power. Instead, an elaborate weave of overlapping, interlocking jurisdictions and privileges ensured that religious institutions were frequently both in contact and in conflict with one another.

\textsuperscript{145} A letter from Gonzaga to the Cardinal d'Este, for example, refers to the "seditiose rebellioni" of the friars. "Una lettera e una Relazione autografe del Ven. Fr. Francesco Gonzaga Min. G. dei Min. Oss. all riforma del gran Convento di Parigi, 1582" in Archivum franciscanum historicum 2 (1909): 669-672. Ed. by F. C. Carreri. Castelli frequently uses the term seditious, and in a letter dated September 1, 1581 refers to the "manifesta disobbedienza" of the Cordeliers. Correspondance du nonce 7, 181.
Fear of disobedience points to some weaknesses in the Church as an institution: weaknesses which became all the more apparent during the religious wars, when royal authority was weak and papal-French relations were at best guarded. The papacy claimed universal authority, but in reality it was dependent on secular support to enforce order within its own structure. This was especially the case in France because the French Church enjoyed the privileges of a quasi-independent ecclesiastic organization. Neither the papacy, the minister general, nor other clerical officials could force the friars to cooperate without secular assistance, and as often as not during the religious wars, this assistance was unavailable. The Jesuits and Capuchins established themselves in Paris only with great difficulty, and the conflict in the Cordelier house in 1581/1582 was only finally resolved through sending in the Swiss Guards.\footnote{Henry III delegated resolution of the friary's dispute to his mother, Catherine de Médicis. In the end, she sent a few of her Swiss guards along with Gonzaga to ensure him access to the convent. This incident is mentioned also in chapter 2.}

For the Church to maintain its authority, therefore, it had to rely on cultivating consensus among its various constituents. The pope and the minister general could formulate policy, but, for it to be successfully implemented, the bodies which they governed had to decide to cooperate. Conflict resulted when policies were not accepted. Conflict, however, was not necessarily as great a threat to the security of the Church as contemporary
rhetoric would suggest. Underneath the rhetoric of rebellion and schism was another reality, one better characterized as negotiation and mutual accommodation. We see this process occurring during the Cordeliers dispute of 1582 and the friary's conflicts with the Jesuits and the Capuchins a littler earlier. Neither the Cordeliers nor their opponents could be declared victors, but by contesting the authority of other clerics, the Cordeliers managed to exact a compromise.

The struggles of the Cordeliers to protect their community during the religious wars suggest another possible function of clerical conflict. The uneasy alliance of religious institutions resulting from the balance of cooperation and conflict ensured the survival and evolution of particularist religious groups within the structure of the Church, and hence preservation of the Church's ability to reinvent itself continually to meet the needs of society. We have seen that new groups appearing in Paris during the religious wars were forced to some degree to accommodate themselves to the existing ecclesiastic and secular community in order to win acceptance. They had to define closely the nature of their community and prove that they had a unique contribution to make, but at the same time they would not threaten the privileges and jurisdictions of the other religious communities. In the process, they even at times outwardly changed the form of their own religious life.

However the process of accommodation worked both ways.
The Cordeliers and other communities could not help but be affected by the new groups, even as they could not help but be affected by papally-engineered reforms. In order to continue to survive, the existing religious communities were also forced to justify their own existence and, in consequence, to articulate a sense of their own role within the Church. This process of redefinition was continual throughout Church history since waves of reform swept over the structure at regular intervals. The Franciscans in particular were subject to these frequent reexaminations because of the difficulties in trying to follow the life prescribed by Saint Francis. The Paris house had been subject to no less than three reformation during the sixteenth century, and another one was soon to come in 1622. At the very least then, if we can use late sixteenth-century Paris as an example, the continuing development of new forms of spirituality and/or the reinvigoration of old forms helped to revitalize existing ecclesiastic institutions by preserving and even consecrating the differences among them.
CONCLUSION:
THE FRANCISCAN MISSION IN SIXTEENTH-CENTURY FRANCE

During the Wars of Religion, the Paris Franciscan community was galvanized into action against the most dangerous threat then facing the Church: Protestantism. We catch glimpses of these men in the memoirs of the period, processing through the streets, working among the less fortunate members of society, and preaching -- all in the name of spiritual rejuvenation. This active ministry of the Franciscans, modelled as it was on the life of Christ, explains the continuing effectiveness of this missionary order over the centuries. Equally appealing for those living through the religious wars, however, was the enhanced role Franciscan doctrine assigned to lay piety in the pursuit of communal salvation. Confronted as they were by the confessional and political strife of their epoch, many French individuals were eager to participate in ending the discord in their country.

The appeal of Franciscan doctrine was matched by the order's remarkable ability to adapt its missionary strategies to the complex and ever-changing character of European society. To reach broad sectors of French society, the Paris friars called upon every weapon in their missionary arsenal. They modelled the ideal Christian life to set an example for all Christians to follow, and used their colourful, emotional oratorical abilities to stimulate popular spirituality. Responding to the particular cultural,
intellectual and spiritual climate of sixteenth-century France, the friars also wrote polemics, sermons and treatises both in the vernacular as well as in Latin, frequently using literary allusions and stylistic techniques popularized by humanism. Equally important, many of the Paris friars applied the knowledge and skills which they acquired at the University, in particular textual and linguistic skills associated with humanist scholarship, to undermine the theological basis of Protestant thought.

Though the Paris friars were diligent in pursuit of a general reformation, their missionary endeavours were nevertheless jeopardized at times by outside forces. Disputes with the secular-dominated Faculty of Theology at the University of Paris complicated the friary's efforts to train its members for the battle against heresy, as did the episodic violence and disorder of the wars. The emergence of a revitalized Catholic Church, in the form of enhanced papal authority and new religious communities, also frequently frustrated the pastoral and intellectual activities of the Paris Franciscans. However, the greatest threat to the mission of the Paris friars came from within. The age-old contention within the order over the true nature of Franciscanism periodically sparked conflict not only within the Paris community (the dispute of 1581/1582), but also between the friary and the political hierarchy of the order, and even with other Franciscan communities such as the Capuchins.

The constant self-examination of the Franciscans was
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clearly disruptive -- even destructive at times -- but it was also one of the reasons for the order's remarkable vitality over the centuries. Continual questioning kept the Franciscan ideal perpetually before the eyes of its followers, thereby making it a constant, vibrant presence in the life of Franciscan communities. The continuing vitality of the Franciscan ideal for its followers goes far in explaining the actions of the Paris community during the Wars of Religion. As a learned Franciscan community, the Paris friars considered themselves natural leaders of a spiritual reformation and, buoyed by this certain knowledge, they willingly challenged ecclesiastical authority, whether in the form of their own guardian, the minister general or even the pope, whenever it seemed to threaten their mission. They did so on the basis of Franciscan doctrine which, although it emphasized conformity within the order, nevertheless gave primacy to individual conscience in the pursuit of salvation.

As we can see from the period of the Catholic League in Paris, Franciscan willingness to resist authority could encompass secular authorities as well. However, it should be recognized that the political activism of the Paris friars after 1589 was unusual to say the least. Forming militias, conspiring against municipal governments and preaching against royal tyranny were not typical Franciscan spiritual activities. From their perspective, however, the desperate nature of the times seemed to call for desperate measures. Henry III's assassination of the Guise brothers in 1588 and
his ongoing negotiations with the Protestant leaders convinced the Franciscans that their desired spiritual reformation could not take place until the political structure was itself reformed.

Following the arrival of Henry IV in Paris in 1594, the Paris friars largely disappear from the political discourses of the memoirs and chronicles of the period. Exhaustion and fear may both have played a role, since the friary was drained of its most outspoken preachers and Henry IV made efforts to stamp out any signs of Leaguer activity. However, it is also possible that they found a return to the political status quo appealing. As Frenchmen as well as clerics, the Paris friars believed that the natural order required a divinely-ordained King, one who was born to hold the title. Outside the period of the Catholic League, furthermore, the Franciscans were generally supportive of monarchical rule. De Thou refers to friar Robert Chessé, for example, as "a famous preacher" and "one who once supported the King but who unfortunately changed sides ....": For the friars, the King, as God's designated representative on earth, was the natural partner of the cleric in the spiritual reformation of society. The priest and the King were farmers, according to Berson, who "doivent garder la vigne par vive voix & la glaive trenchant: Car autraement à

1 " ... le pere Robert Chessé, Prédicateur celebre parmi le peuple, & qui etoit au commencement dans les intérêts du Roi; mais qui peu de temps après changea malheureusement de parti ... ." Histoire universelle de Jacques-Auguste de Thou depuis 543 jusqu'en 1607 1 (London: 1734): 144.
leur grande ruine, Seront punis, & la vigne en un champ."

Although they were initially reluctant to accept it, the conversion of Henry IV in 1593 removed the threat to the stability of society which, for the friars, a Protestant succession had posed.

Franciscan willingness to challenge secular authority during times of crisis has a number of ramifications for the history of the civil wars. In particular, it shows the need to broaden the scope of present studies of resistance theory to encompass a greater variety of schools of thought. Like the monarchomach authors and the League activist Jean Boucher, the Franciscans were convinced that the existing political structure required reform. Like these authors furthermore, they believed that this reform could be effected by members of society outside the existing power structures.\(^3\)

Nevertheless, the Paris friars found their


\(^3\) Julian H. Franklin, *Constitutionalism and Resistance in the Sixteenth Century* (New York: Pegasus, 1969), and Frederick Baumgartner, *Radical Reactionaries: the Political Thought of the French Catholic League* (Geneva: Librairie Droz, 1975). For the monarchomachs, the right to resistance lay in the historic, consensus-based nature of political society. The office of King, they argued, was elective rather than divine-right in origin. Catholic resistance theory, Baumgartner suggests, was motivated in particular by a medieval conception of a community's right to set aside a ruler who was jeopardizing the political and spiritual stability of society. Franciscan resistance, however, pivoted around the issue of individual conscience in matters of faith and their own role, as designated spiritual leaders, to lead resistance.
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justification for resistance to secular as well as ecclesiastical authority within their own ideological system, and the same can no doubt be said for the various other religious communities associated with the Catholic League after 1589. The willingness of friars like Jean Garin and François Feuardent to question the authority of the League by 1593 shows that they were independent members of this association who were following their own conception of reform. When examining support for the League, therefore, we have to acknowledge the different ideological impulses driving members of the organization into union with one another to challenge royal authority. Only then will we fully appreciate the complexity of this period in French history and, equally importantly, the complexity of French spirituality during the early modern period.

---

4 Both Jean Garin and François Feuardent criticized aspects of League policy during the dying days of the organization. A letter from Estienne Pasquier to his son Theodore, dated March 1594, discusses Feuardent's criticism of Mayenne's treatment of his brother, the duke of Nemours. Pasquier, Lettres historiques pour les années 1556-1594 (Geneva: Librairie Droz, 1966): 470. Edited by D. Thickett. Mayenne gave the governorship of Lyon to the Archbishop rather than to his brother, the duke of Nemours, in 1594. Mayenne was worried about Nemours' ambitions. Feuardent, however attacked Mayenne from the pulpit. A few months earlier, in December 1593, Garin preached that Mayenne was too much under the influence of politique individuals. Pierre de L'Estoile, Journal de L'Estoile pour la règne de Henri IV (Paris: Gallimard, 1958) 1: 331.
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