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INTRODUCTION

In 1912 the distinguished French historian Henri Hauser wrote, "The studies, sometimes distinguished, that have been consecrated to d'Aubigné envisage the man, the soldier, the writer, but very rarely the historian." In 1926 H. Courteault pointed out that no careful historiographical study had been made of d'Aubigné's Histoire universelle as had been made of Blaise de Monluc's Commentaires. Two years later A. Garnier admitted in his exhaustive and remarkable biography of the Huguenot historian that he felt a historiographical study was "too important to be treated superficially here." And in 1930 S. Rocheblave published an interesting work on d'Aubigné in which he asserted that the Histoire universelle "has never yet been judged on its merits."


2H. Courteault, "Rapport de M. Henri Courteault," Annuaire-Bulletin de la société de l'histoire de France, LXIII (1926), p. 120.

3A. Garnier, Agrippa d'Aubigné et le parti protestant (Paris, 1928), II, p. 178.

This situation still prevails in the late 1950's. In addition to Garnier and Rocheblave, J. Plattard has published a fine general study of d'Aubigné's career. Recently two admirable books concerning d'Aubigné's epic poem, the Tragiques, have come from the pen of American literary critics. However, there has been a surprising void, except for rare periodical articles or short chapters in general works, of studies devoted to Agrippa d'Aubigné's historical labors. It was the Histoire universelle which he considered to be the most significant of his literary efforts. The increasing interest today in historiography, particularly sixteenth-century historiography, makes this lacuna even more astounding.

The present study was initiated because of this deficiency and also because of an interest in the history of history. Only the Histoire universelle, including the unfinished fourth tome, has been considered as proper material for the evaluation of d'Aubigné's

5J. Plattard, Une Figure de premier plan dans nos lettres de la renaissance: Agrippa d'Aubigné (Paris, 1931).


7A. Garnier, op. cit., III, p. 79, writes, "The Histoire universelle was his grand oeuvre—he placed it considerably above the Tragiques—the Histoire was a work slowly erected and proudly dedicated to Posterity." Cf. also Garnier, op. cit., III, p. 150.

historical work. Moreover, only four typical sections of the
Histoire have been given detailed study for sources and accuracy.
For, as Rocheblave has written, "the proof and verification of this
enormous subject would require a lifetime."

Since the two seventeenth-century editions (1618-20 and
1626) of the Histoire universelle are virtually inaccessible to
American scholars, the nineteenth-century edition edited by Baron
Alphonse de Ruble has been utilized. Unfortunately, this ten-
volume de Ruble edition tends to obscure the major divisions of the
Histoire universelle, which originally was separated into three
tomes. The first tome, an "abrégé," narrates events for the years
from 1553 to 1570, the second, the years from 1570 to 1585, and the
third and most detailed, the years from 1585 to 1602.

---

9S. Rocheblave, loc. cit.


11The de Ruble edition's defects are referred to by H. Hauser,
Les Sources de l'histoire de France, III, pp. 26, 27, and by
G. Ellerbroek, Observations sur la langue de l'Histoire universelle
(Amsterdam, 1925), p. 17.
Théodore Agrippa d'Aubigné was a person of considerable importance in France during the Reformation era. He was a military and political figure whose significance for French Protestantism, though inferior to that of an Admiral Coligny or a Henry of Navarre (later Henry IV of France), was virtually equal to that of a Philippe du Plessis-Mornay or a François de la Noue. However, d'Aubigné advances from the second to the first rank in the realm of literature. He was "une figure de premier plan dans les lettres de la Renaissance."1 Today he is recognized as one of France's greatest poets, and his satirical works have earned him great esteem also.2 Although not the greatest French historian of his era--this title must be reserved for Jacques-Auguste de Thou—he was one of the foremost.

Agrippa d'Aubigné was born in 1552 in Saintonge and died in 1630 at Geneva; his life spanned eight decades of European religious strife.3 The year of his birth was marked by the Peace of Passau, which for a half-century ended the religious wars of Germany.

1J. Plattard, Une Figure de premier plan dans nos lettres de la Renaissance: Agrippa d'Aubigné.
2Ibid., Chapters III and IV.
3A. Garnier, op. cit., I, p. 1. Garnier clarifies the various misunderstandings which have surrounded the date of d'Aubigné's birth.
Simultaneously, French Protestantism was expanding and preparing to end its period of helpless martyrdom. D'Aubigné's death occurred in the midst of the Thirty Years War, which had begun partially as a religious war. Also, his demise followed a few months after the fall of La Rochelle to Cardinal Richelieu's army and the latter's extinction of the military and political privileges of the Huguenots—their "state within a state."

During his early and middle years d'Aubigné witnessed and actively participated in the ferocious "wars of religion," which raged in France from 1562 until the 1590's. However, civil and religious strife was not confined to France during this part of d'Aubigné's life. He was very much aware of the disturbances in the Spanish Netherlands, which commenced in the 1560's and finally resulted in the independence of the Calvinist northern provinces, and of the battles of Elizabethan England against the Catholics. Of course the "diabolic" director of the attempt to suppress the Dutch heresy and revolt as well as the self-appointed champion of the counter-Reformation was Philip II of Spain. It was he who urged the extirpation of Protestantism upon the French ruler and sought to overwhelm Elizabeth I of England because she discreetly but obstinately supported the Gueux of the Netherlands and the Huguenots of France.

As a patriotic Frenchman and ardent Protestant, d'Aubigné was most concerned with the civil strife within France. These
struggles were not continuous but intermittent ones, interrupted by periods of uneasy and insincere peace, which were more like periods of truce than peace. These conflicts were not solely religious wars, though the religious fanaticism of the Parisian populace in 1572 or 1588 and that of the Rochelinois in 1573 or later, as well as the religious sentiments of innumerable other participants, should not be underestimated. Certainly political and social factors played an important role. In 1559 the cessation for a generation of the Hapsburg-Valois military rivalry released many hundreds of French veterans—nobles and commoners, officers and enlisted men—from their military duties. These men, who were either unable or unwilling to find peace-time employ, readily flocked to the banners of national or provincial leaders during the civil strife. Furthermore, French Protestantism was transformed in the 1550’s from a body of meek martyrs into a party with the power and the will to defend itself from the inquisitioner’s stake, the hangman’s noose, or the executioner’s axe. The Huguenots of state, mostly gentlemen who had abandoned Roman Catholicism for political reasons, came to predominate over the Huguenots of faith. In the 1540’s the French Protestants had been incapable, even if they had so desired, of defending themselves by rebellion against the crown, but by the 1560’s such was not the situation. The continued expansion of their

---

movement, which may have attained the level of ten per cent of the French populace, but especially the influx of many French nobles, gave the Huguenots the strength to resist.  

Coupled with the growing power and desire of the Huguenots to resist persecution was the weakness of the French monarchy. Incompetent royal leadership from 1559 to 1589 temporarily undermined the previous efforts of Louis XI, Louis XII, and Francis I to erect a centralized, absolute monarchy. The lance head which shattered the life of Henry II, an avowed enemy of the Protestant "heresy," during the festivities marking the settlement with Philip II at Cateau-Cambrésis, seemed to shatter the French throne. This death, which the Huguenots interpreted as an act of God, left Henry's widow Catherine de Medici and four young and sickly sons as custodians of French royal power.  

Francis II's reign lasted until December, 1560, a mere eighteen months, and witnessed the exacerbation of the Catholic-Protestant division and antagonism. This period should actually be termed the reign of the Guises, for the Duke of Guise and his brother, the Cardinal of Lorraine, dominated the fifteen-year old monarch. They were the uncles of his captivating wife, Mary Stuart, and thus succeeded in supplanting the Queen Mother Catherine as the effective authority. Their exercise of power and their attempts to balance French finances and suppress la religion prétendue réformée irritated

———  

many French nobles. The outcome was the conspiracy or disturbance of Amboise in March, 1560. This abortive design to unseat the Guises and to relieve the persecuted Huguenots frightened Francis II, although not aimed at him. It embittered the duke and the cardinal. The Guises struck back by executing scores of captives and by initiating a campaign to destroy the Bourbon princes of the royal blood, who were suspected of complicity. Hence the appearance of the Bourbons, Antoine King of Navarre and Louis Prince of Condé, at the royal court in October, 1560, was the signal for the imprisonment of the latter and virtual arrest of the former.

However, the Guises relaxed the severity of Francis II's reign towards the Huguenots by accepting the tolerant Michel de l'Hôpital as chancellor and by issuing the Edict of Romorantin, which relaxed religious persecution. Furthermore, at the Assembly of Notables, held in August, 1560, at Fontainebleau, they were forced to listen to a plea for religious toleration and to strictures upon their regime by Admiral Coligny, the most forthright and unimpeachable Huguenot leader. At the behest of a majority of the notables, the Guises agreed to convolve the Estates General shortly thereafter.6

Thus the Estates were in session at Orléans when the Prince of Condé was arrested and clapped into an elaborately guarded prison there. Without a doubt the prince would soon have been beheaded,

if the reign of the Guises had not been unexpectedly ended by the death of the pitiful Francis II on December 5, 1560.

The new sovereign was a mere boy of eleven years whose name is indelibly associated with the tragic and criminal massacre of St. Bartholomew's Day. Of course, he could not yet rule in his own name, although French kings attained their majority when fourteen years of age, and Catherine cleverly eliminated the other claimants to the regency. She and l'Hôpital sought to pacify the disturbed kingdom by substituting moderate toleration of the Huguenots for the Guises' policy of extirpation. As les réformés of France, nobles and commoners alike made a bolder display of their cult, and as their faith seemed to expand irresistibly, the Roman Catholics took action without the approval of the crown. Three leading Catholic nobles, the Duke of Guise, the Constable of Montmorency, and the Marshall of Saint-André, formed an anti-Huguenot party called the triumvirate.

Nevertheless, a royal edict of July, 1561, and especially the famous Edict of January, 1562, further improved the position of the Protestants. This latter edict, of which the enforcement or the reestablishment was continually demanded by the Huguenots, granted full freedom of conscience and the right to conduct worship publicly outside the walls of cities or privately within a city's confines.7

Catherine evidently sought to reconcile and reunite the two faiths in order to maintain law and order. A celebrated but

7 Ibid., p. 53.
unsuccessful "colloquy" was held between leading Roman Catholic and Protestant divines at Poissy in August, 1561. The impossibility of reunion was proven during this period by intemperate demonstrations and outbreaks among the "little people" of both faiths. Also at Poissy the uncompromising attitudes of Théodore de Bèze, Calvin's chief lieutenant, and the Cardinals of Tournon and Lorraine over the issue of transubstantiation indicated the impossibility of reconciliation. The admission of the militant new Roman Catholic order, the Company of Jesus, into France and the failure of the colloquy of Poissy testified to the growing intransigence of both sides during the waning months of 1561.8

This dangerously combustible situation was ignited by the massacre of Vassy in March, 1562. In this Burgundian town the men of the Duke of Guise brutally attacked a Huguenot service which was being conducted, contrary to the Edict of January within the city's walls. Some thirty worshippers were killed and about one-hundred and thirty wounded. Guise rapidly became the hero of the Roman Catholic populace whose military men flocked to him at Paris. Condé, the highest born noble among the Huguenots after his brother defected to the Roman Catholics, and his entourage were forced to withdraw from the hostile capital city. Soon the forces of the réformés were gathering at Orleans, and the first religious war broke out.9

---

8Ibid., pp. 47-50.
9Ibid., pp. 55-63.
Between 1562 and 1570 three such conflicts were fought, interrupted only by short-lived periods of peace. These resulted in the exaltation of religious fanaticism and the sheer love of violence and destruction. Cities were sacked and men, women, and children massacred. As was only just, the leaders, many fighting for less than noble ideals, did not escape the holocaust. In 1563 the Duke of Guise was assassinated by a Protestant fanatic. During the second war the aged Constable of Montmorency was slain at St. Denis; in the course of the third war it was the turn of Louis of Condé. When peace was made at St. Germain in 1570, all the principals in these first conflicts had disappeared except Admiral Gaspard de Coligny.

Shortly after the conclusion of the first war in 1563 Catherine had the majority of Charles IX declared by the Parliament of Rouen. Then the court spent the time from early 1564 to mid-1566 making a great tour of France. The queen mother desired that the sight of the young king and his entourage should instill respect for the central authority and assist in the pacification of the kingdom. She was disappointed in her hopes. One aspect of the grand tour frightened the Huguenots and helped precipitate the second outburst of strife. In June, 1565, the French court met with the infamous—to the Protestants—Duke of Alva and with Queen Elizabeth of Spain, the representatives of Philip II, at Bayonne. The famous conference of Bayonne was a failure from both the Spanish and French points of view, for Philip II wanted the French monarchy to stamp out the fire of "heresy," whereas Catherine hoped to achieve profitable matrimonial
alliances for her children. However, the Protestants of France and Europe were ignorant of these facts and they feared that a destructive plot to eliminate Protestantism had been hatched. Especially after 1572 did the Bayonne meeting acquire a sinister character.10

In 1571 and 1572 Admiral Coligny was welcomed to the French court where he exercised a dominant influence upon the young Charles IX to the detriment of the power of Catherine de Medici. This growing authority, coupled with the admiral's audacious and patriotic plan for a foreign war in the Netherlands against Spain, led to the holocaust of August 24, 1572. In brief, Catherine resented Coligny's position and feared that his foreign policy would have disastrous consequences. Probably she and the Guises, who considered, but unjustly, Coligny to be the instigator of the assassination of Duke Francois of Guise, plotted the fateful attack of August 22 on the Huguenot leader. Its failure irretrievably led the plotters, who now involved the young and perhaps half-demented sovereign in the plot, to the atrocious crime of unleashing a massacre by their followers and the fanatical Parisian populace. The Huguenot residents of the city and the Protestant gentlemen, who had assembled in the capital for the marriage of young Henry, King of Navarre, with Marguerite of Valois, Charles IX's sister, first fell to irrational religious passion and the lust for violence. The massacre of St. Bartholomew's Day spread

10 Ibid., pp. 85-93.
to the provinces during the ensuing week and probably ten to twenty thousand Huguenots lost their lives.\textsuperscript{11}

The "bloodstained anarchy" of Charles IX's reign did not cease with this unhappy and troubled king's death in 1574.\textsuperscript{12} His brother, who ruled as Henry III, was to be the last and the most abhorred of the Valois rulers. This debauched and perverted ruler seemed to be more interested in his pleasures, his unbalanced devotion, or even his scholarly studies than in statecraft. Thus the Roman Catholics, still enamoured of the house of Guise, began to organize religious leagues for the purpose of uprooting "heresy." These commenced after the much too generous Peace of Monsieur, ending the sixth civil war, was granted to the Huguenots in 1576. The new Catholic League, although influential during the Estates General held at Blois in 1576-1577, languished until the death in 1584 of the Duke of Anjou, brother of the childless king and heir to the throne. Quite naturally Henry Duke of Guise was the leader of the revived Catholic League or Sainte-Union.

After the demise of the Duke of Anjou, the heir to the throne, if the Salic law was to be observed, was the youthful and vigorous King Henry of Navarre, whose nuptials had been celebrated


\textsuperscript{12}L. Batiffol, \textit{The Century of the Renaissance in France} (New York, 1916), Chapter VI.
with Huguenot blood. The Protestants had not been crushed by the
St. Bartholomew tragedy, despite the loss of many leaders, especially
the irreplaceable Coligny. Their military power gradually revived in
the 1570's, but their polemical vigor had never waned. The French
Calvinists had always proclaimed their loyalty to the monarchy before
1572, and Coligny was merely attempting to capture it for Protestantism
with his anti-Spanish policy. After the massacre the right of rebel-
lion and even republican sentiments as well as repudiation of the
treachery sovereign were trumpeted in Huguenot pamphlets. The most
famous of these pamphlets was the *Vindicia contra tyrannos*.13
Following his escape from the royal court, where he was a virtual
prisoner from August, 1572, until February, 1576, Henry of Navarre
became the "Protector" of the Protestants. His religious motives,
ever too profound, were adulterated by political designs once he was
the heir to the French throne. However, he remained true to the
Huguenots, certainly his most dependable followers, and repulsed the
invitations from Henry III that he abjure Protestantism.

The unhappy French king was forced into an acceptance of
the League and its stringent demand that the Huguenot faith be pro-
scribed. He issued the Edict of July (1585) which revoked all pre-
vious edicts, prohibited Protestant worship, banished all pastors,
and gave the Huguenot laity six months to accept Roman Catholicism or

The victory by Henry of Navarre over the royalist forces at Coutras in 1587 plus two military successes by the Duke of Guise over a German army coming to the aid of the Huguenots intensified the unequalled popularity of Guise and the growing hatred of Henry III among the French Roman Catholics. The king was suspected of favoring the "heretic" Henry of Navarre versus Henry of Guise, the Roman Catholic paladin; to some extent this was true during the campaigns of 1587.15

The following year witnessed no noteworthy military actions, and political developments far outshone them.16 In May occurred the day of the barricades in Paris, after which Guise was king of Paris and Henry III, a fugitive from his capital, was merely king of Chartres or Tours. Following a superficial reconciliation between Henry III and the Leaguers, the Estates General met at Blois in the autumn with the Leaguers and especially Guise in command. The king, fearing the ambitions of Guise, effected his revenge with the aid of a carefully chosen group from his faithful quarante-oinq. Guise was assassinated in the royal apartments of the chateau of Blois on December 23, and the king exaltingly told the aged and dying Catherine, "Now, I am king."17

The Catholic nation, however, rejected its hereditary sovereign with a revolutionary passion born of religious zeal and

---

17 J. H. Mariéjol, La Réforme et la Ligue, pp. 292, 293.
the machinations of the Leaguers. In Paris a revolutionary government of the Seize was established, and the Duke of Mayenne, brother of Guise, was elected "Lieutenant General of the State and Crown of France." The provinces followed suit, and soon Henry III controlled only part of the Loire valley. Inevitably he was forced to unite with Henry of Navarre in the spring of 1589. Then the combined forces—the royalists and the Huguenots—prepared to attack Paris. As the siege commenced the dagger of a Dominican monk, who was fanatically exalted by the orations in praise of tyrannicide preached by the Leaguer clergy, ended the perverted life of Henry III on August 2, 1589.18

Now Henry of Navarre was Henry IV, King of France, but the League controlled the capital and chief cities of the kingdom as well as several provinces. First he attempted to conquer his kingdom with the aid of the Huguenots, the politiques, who esteemed political peace and unity above religious unity, and the disgruntled royalists who supported the king but demanded his conversion. Despite Henry's victories over Mayenne at Arques in late 1589 and his smashing success at Ivry in March, 1590, the failure of his attempts to conquer Paris by siege operations in 1590 and 1591 and the military stalemate of 1592 hastened his conversion to Roman Catholicism. This "saut perilleux" began to appear inevitable because of the convocation of the Estates General at Paris in January, 1593, which set itself the task

18Tbid., pp. 292-301.
of selecting a king, and the diplomacy and intrigues of the Spaniards. 19

The dramatic ceremony of Henry's conversion, enacted outside Paris at St. Denis, chagrined many of his ardent Huguenot followers, but it reconciled him to the great mass of Catholic Frenchmen. Thereafter the dissolution of the League was ineluctable, especially once he had been anointed with sacred oil and crowned at Chartres in 1594. Leaguer governors of provinces and cities had begun capitulating immediately after his abjuration of Protestantism in July, 1593. The capital, which had been rent by divisions between the aristocratic supporters of Mayenne and the democratic and zealously religious organization of the Seize, witnessed the entrance of le roi très chrétien in March, 1594, much to the satisfaction of the growing number of royalists in Paris. The clemency of Henry IV and his willingness to buy back his kingdom with monetary grants won to his ranks the Duke of Guise in 1594, Mayenne the following year, and numerous others. However, the final capitulation did not occur until the Duke of Nevers in Brittany made his peace five years after the abjuration. 20

War with Spain from 1595 to 1598 facilitated the pacification of France, but the Huguenots, who had been disturbed, suspicious, and uncooperative in the war with Philip II, merited and required a settlement with their former Protector. Thus the "perpetual and

19 Ibid., pp. 364-382.
irrevocable" Edict of Nantes was issued by Henry IV after lengthy and difficult negotiations with his former co-religionists. Hereafter, they were a privileged group, an arrangement much more customary in the sixteenth century than today, and equivalent to the existence of a state within a state. Complete freedom of conscience, a limited right of religious worship, and political and military guarantees were granted them. 21

Economic reconstruction was next attended to by Henry IV and indicated his true greatness as king. Assisted by the Duke of Sully and others, agricultural, industrial, and commercial rehabilitation for the nation plus fiscal and administrative reconstruction for the state were realized by Henry IV. A new era had commenced in economic, political, and religious life. Persuasion, though sometimes with bribes, had replaced coercion as a means of securing converts from Protestantism to Catholicism. Then the fateful assassination of the king by the fanatical Ravaillac seemed to place the settlement in jeopardy in 1610. 22

The early years of Louis XIII's reign were marked by revolts of the nobility against the regent Marie de Medici and then by Marie against her son. These sometimes ensnared the Huguenots in rebellion. Cardinal Richelieu, a devotee of royal absolutism, became


the principal minister of Louis XIII in the early 1620's and determined to break the power of the nobility and eliminate the military privileges of the Huguenots. The siege of La Rochelle and its capitulation in 1628, coupled with the Peace of Alais the following year, attained the latter goal. Thus the reopening of the religious conflicts in the 1620's was disastrous for Huguenot military pretensions. Furthermore, they resulted in the banishment of their most ardent leader, the Duke of Rohan, who was a friend of d'Aubigné and an indomitable opponent of the crown's policy.23

Obviously Agrippa d'Aubigné's life spanned an extremely important period, years of great significance for Western Civilization, for European Protestantism, and for French Calvinism. The inability of the latter to conquer the French monarchy and nation was undeniable, but likewise the failure of the fanatical Roman Catholics to reconver the "heretics" was apparent. Virtually from the day of his birth d'Aubigné had been not only an interested spectator but also a passionate participant in the struggles of French Protestantism. His father, Jean d'Aubigné, had selected devout as well as industrious tutors for this son, whose mother had died at his birth. When d'Aubigné was eight, he and his father passed through Amboise. This was shortly after the Amboise conspiracy against the Guises had failed, and Jean enjoined Agrippa to help avenge the "martyrs," whose

bodies were yet displayed there, or suffer a father's curse upon his head. The lad never forgot this stirring incident and surely fulfilled his father's charge.24

Since the lad was an extremely able student and with some assistance had translated Plato's Crito at seven years of age, his father sent him to Paris in 1562 for further education. Unfortunately, the outbreak of the first war forced Agrippa, several fellow scholars, and their master to flee to Orleans.25 Agrippa was left an orphan in 1563 after his father died of wounds received while fighting for the Protestant cause. Two years later the boy was sent to Geneva to continue his studies in the Calvinist capital; however, he was unhappy with pedagogical methods there and soon returned to France. As the third religious war broke out d'Aubigné, despite the precautions of his guardian who had his clothing hidden during the night, slipped away and joined a troop of Protestant cavalry. At the age of sixteen his formal schooling was concluded and his military combats for Protestantism commenced. During this war he participated, always with a reckless bravery, in numerous battles, the most important of which was fought at Jarnac in 1569.26

This noted Huguenot poet and historian might never have accomplished his literary feats if a fortunate accident, a fracas

24 A. Garnier, op. cit., I, p. 34.
with the municipal guard, had not forced him to flee Paris on August 21, 1572, the eve of the abortive assassination of Admiral Coligny. Hence d'Aubigné escaped the bloody end meted out to so many of his coreligionists during the St. Bartholomew massacre.\(^{27}\) He and other fugitives fled down the Loire valley, hoping to attain safety at La Rochelle, but d'Aubigné's flight was curtailed at the chateau of Talcy by "love and poverty."\(^{28}\)

D'Aubigné had lived from 1570 to 1572 on a modest estate, inherited from his mother, close to Talcy. During these months he had become acquainted with the Lord of Talcy, Jean de Salviati, and his beautiful daughter Diane. The young Huguenot was smitten with love for Diane and composed themost of the poems which later comprised the collection called Printemps.\(^{29}\) After his escape from Paris he sojourned at Talcy and described his plight to Jean de Salviati. He happened to mention that he possessed papers which incriminated l'Hôpital in the conspiracy of Amboise, and Salviati suggested that the former chancellor might be blackmailed. Immediately the young soldier and poet flung the documents into the fire and cried, "I have burned them so that they won't burn me."

The Lord of Talcy was so moved by this action that he offered his daughter to Agrippa in marriage. However, the event never transpired,

\(^{27}\)Ibid., p. 116. \(^{28}\)Ibid., p. 129. \(^{29}\)Ibid., p. 92.
probably because d'Aubigné's love was not returned by Diane or possibly because of his Huguenot faith, which was the ostensible reason. As a result their relationship was ended in 1573.  

His unrequited love for Diane caused Agrippa heart-rending grief, but adventures and escapades at the royal court from 1573 to 1576 as the squire of King Henry of Navarre relieved his troubled soul. The young Huguenot evidently enjoyed the revelry of the court and even participated in some military actions against Protestant forces in 1574 and 1576; the latter time he served under and became well acquainted with Duke Henry of Guise. Nevertheless, his Huguenot conscience was not entirely asleep, and in February, 1576, he assisted in the evasion of Henry III from the royal court, an escape for which d'Aubigné considered himself, somewhat incorrectly, most responsible.  

Henry of Navarre, thereafter the Huguenot leader and protector, was served in numerous military campaigns and various missions by his loyal squire. As a result of injuries received in the late 1570's d'Aubigné retired to his estate near Taloy and began the composition of his poetic masterpiece, the Tragiques. Shortly thereafter a dispute with Henry of Navarre occasioned d'Aubigne to withdraw from his service temporarily and consider a journey to Germany.  

---

30Ibid., pp. 129-136. 31Ibid., pp. 184-188. 32Ibid., p. 213.
However, this scheme was swiftly terminated when he met and became enamoured of the lovely Suzanne de Lezay as he passed through Poitou. His courtship of Suzanne was hindered by her family who considered d'Aubigné's social station too inferior to that of the wealthy heiress. Finally in 1583 the personal intervention of Henry of Navarre, but especially d'Aubigné's timely discovery of his titles of nobility, overcame the obstacles, and the marriage was consummated.

The marriage was a very happy one and blessed with five children of which two sons died at an early age. The other son, Constant, was a grievous burden to d'Aubigné in his later years since the boy was a profligate, rake, criminal, and apostate to Roman Catholicism. Constant's daughter by a second wife—he killed his first spouse—was the famous Madame de Maintenon. The two daughters were beloved by their father, and they and their families relieved the chagrin and pain he suffered from Constant's debaucheries and betrayals. Unfortunately, the pleasant family group, which lived most of the time at Murzay in Poitou, was disrupted by the early death of Suzanne after only eleven or twelve years of marriage. The bereaved husband grieved deeply and described his loss in poignant lines, but he did not fail his paternal duties and increased his supervision of the children. He especially interested himself in

33 Ibid., pp. 3-5, 291-293.
their education and generously provided for it despite the modest expenditures on other aspects of the d'Aubigné foyer at Murzay.34

D'Aubigné's personal life has been erroneously referred to as debauched, especially during his youth. These allegations have been thoroughly disproven by careful research, and he has been described as having distinguished himself not by debaucheries, which were common in a corrupt age, but by the "severity of his principles, the force, the seriousness, the faithfulness of his passions."35

The ardor and fanaticism in d'Aubigné's character coupled with his genius and manifold interests truly made him an outstanding representative of the main currents of the Renaissance and the Reformation. His was a deeply religious life; "Dieu est sans cesse présent à sa pensée," asserts one student of his career.36 This "servant of God," however, was interested in antiquity, knew its languages and literature, and can be considered a humanist. Not merely was he a great writer and lover of literature, but also a

34S. Rocheblave, Agrippa d'Aubigné (1930), pp. 123-142.

35H. Monod, "La Jeunesse d'Agrippa d'Aubigné a-t-elle été débauchée," Bulletin de la société de l'histoire du protestantisme français, XLI (1892), pp. 495, 496.

lover of music and perhaps a musician. These talents and interests plus his passionate and somewhat violent, fanatical nature have led several writers, in imitation of Sainte-Beuve, to characterize d'Aubigné as the most perfect personification of his era.

During the years immediately preceding his marriage and those after it, d'Aubigné was still the loyal supporter of the Huguenot cause and its champion Henry of Navarre. He participated in numerous engagements and was promoted to the rank of maréchal de camp or colonel in 1586. He fought for Henry IV at Coutras, at various sieges in 1588, and at the siege of Paris by the combined forces of Navarre and Henry III in 1589. When the King of Navarre advanced to the throne of France, d'Aubigné fought with the royal troops at Ivry and at the sieges of Paris and Rouen from 1590 to 1592. Then occurred Henry's resatation of Protestantism, a "sin" d'Aubigné found virtually unpardonable, and a great abyss opened between them.

After the abjuration relations cooled between d'Aubigné and the king. The Huguenot historian became a leading "malcontent" among his coreligionists. However, the ardent Calvinist assisted the

---


king at the siege of La Fère in 1595-1596 and during it was consulted by Henry IV concerning the sinfulness of the abjuration. He was an important participant in the negotiations between the Huguenot and royal representatives which preceded the issuance of the Edict of Nantes. Probably in his memoirs d'Aubigné aggrandized his role, but he met several times with the royalists and was usually recalcitrant. The Huguenot moderates, more willing to accept the king's offers, branded d'Aubigné the "Bouc du désert." Therefore, the tireless partisan retired to his fortress of Maillezais, of which he had been made governor in 1589, out of favor with both the royalists and the moderate Huguenots, or prudents, as d'Aubigné branded them.

His visits to the royal court and Paris were infrequent thereafter. He continued his battles for Protestantism but with the pen or in debate rather than with the sword. In 1600 he participated in a theological disputation with the noted Roman Catholic cleric du Perron in order to avenge his faith and fellow Huguenot du Plessis-Mornay, who had been unfairly worsted by the Catholic shortly before. The following year d'Aubigné carried on a correspondence with Catherine of Bourbon whose brother, Henry IV, and her husband, the Duke de Bar, desired her conversion. Again d'Aubigné


142Ibid., pp. 117-149; d'Aubigné, Mémoires de la vie de Théodore-Agrippa d'Aubigné (Paris, 1854), pp. 96-98. Hereafter this work is cited as d'Aubigné, Mémoires.
defended Protestantism successfully and angered the king.\footnote{A. Garnier, \textit{op. cit.}, II, pp. 277-301.}

D'Aubigné might have lived the remainder of his existence as a peaceful and loyal but somewhat discontented subject of Henry IV. However, Ravillac's blow ended both the life of Henry IV and the religious stability which had resulted from the Edict of Nantes. D'Aubigné was involved in some of the Huguenot demands and conspiracies of the nobility during the following decade, especially that of the Catholic Prince of Condé against the Queen Mother Marie de Medici in 1615.\footnote{J. Plattard, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 44.} Despite these political disturbances, his literary efforts of the past two decades reached fruition. In 1617 the first edition of the \textit{Tragiques} was published under the nom de plume of \textit{Le Bouc Du Désert}, and from 1618 to 1620 the first edition of the \textit{Histoire universelle} was printed secretly without permission.\footnote{A. Garnier, \textit{op. cit.}, III, pp. 71-85.}

The publication of these works and especially the rebellion of d'Aubigné's close friend, the Duke of Rohan, against the crown in 1620 resulted in a royal proscription of the Huguenot soldier and writer.\footnote{Ibid., pp. 85-88.} He then fled to Geneva where he spent the last decade of his life in relative peace. There he was generously and respectfully welcomed, which he repaid by assisting in the improvement of
Geneva's fortifications as well as those of Berne and Basel. About ten miles outside the city he purchased land and built the chateau of Crest, which except for an eighteenth-century addition retains today its original aspect. It has been called an excellent example of a small sixteenth-century castle. 47

In 1623 the aged but yet vigorous Huguenot warrior married the widow, Renée Burlamachi, who was a member of one of the Italian Protestant families which had sought refuge in and enriched Geneva. 48 At last considerable quiet descended upon his belligerent soul, but still there were altercations with his renegade son Constant, or with the Geneva governing council, because of his dabbling in international politics or his satirical writings. For example, in 1630 he published a risqué supplement to his polemic Baron de Fænestra. 49 This action resulted in an admonition and a fine of one hundred écus only four weeks before his death. His principal occupation during these years was that of re-editing, polishing, and supplementing his previous publications and producing new ones from his prolific pen. Thus the Tragiques were republished probably in 1625, and three years later a corrected edition of the Histoire universelle came from the press of


49 Ibid., pp. 271-280.
a Genevan printer but bore Amsterdam as the city of publication. The last months of his life were saddened and disturbed by the news from France and a final betrayal by his son Constant. Nevertheless, the faithful and talented Huguenot courageously faced death, which came on May 9, 1630. Two days before he had intoned joyfully Psalm 118, which the Huguenot army had repeated on the morning of its great victory at Coutras. The words of his widow to his son concerning her anguish at the loss of "such a dear and beloved husband" testify to the rectitude and generosity of Agrippa d'Aubigné.

D'Aubigné's character and life are well described by his admiring yet critical biographer, Armand Garnier, when he writes, "His death was his last act of faith. And so he went to sleep with the memory of continual battles for the good Cause and with the hope of the recompense that awaited him in the bosom of God."

---

50 A. Garnier, op. cit., III, pp. 155-161.
51 Ibid., pp. 176-180.
CHAPTER II

POSSIBLE SOURCES FOR THE HISTOIRE UNIVERSELLE

Before entering a detailed study of the printed sources actually used by d'Aubigné, it should be helpful to consider ensemble the books and pamphlets from which the Histoire universelle might have been written and which have been perused for the present study. Two criteria have been utilized in making this selection. Any historical work published before 1620, the latest possible date for the printing of d'Aubigné's first edition, or 1626, the date of the second edition, if a passage was changed, has been considered as a possible source. Secondly, no work has been described in the present chapter if it could not have served as a source for the reign of Francis II, the St. Bartholomew massacre, the events of 1576-1577, or those of 1588-1589. For example, the Discours politiques et militaires of La Noue undoubtedly supplied d'Aubigné with numerous facts for the first three religious wars from 1562-1570. However, La Noue's memoirs do not pertain to any of the above-mentioned periods and have been omitted.

There are several general histories of late sixteenth-century France, in which two or more of these periods are described.

---

and which d'Aubigné might have used. The most famous, and justifiably so, is Jacques Auguste de Thou's *Histoire universelle* or *Historiarum sui temporis*. This is a mammoth and surprisingly impartial work written originally in Latin by an outstanding politique.² Of course, d'Aubigné could have utilized it only for the first half of his history, since de Thou's work, although finished in 1609, was published in two parts. The first, which comprised the years from 1544 to 1584, or books one to eighty, appeared from 1604 to 1609, but the second half, comprising the events from 1584 to 1607, was not printed until 1620 and thus could have served d'Aubigné only for his second edition.³ D'Aubigné drew very heavily upon de Thou's first eighty books, which was wise since the latter's history was carefully compiled and written. He reserved, in the preface to his history, the highest praise for de Thou. D'Aubigné advanced some trivial objections to the *Historiarum sui temporis* but then wrote that "France n'a jamais produit un esprit puissant" like de Thou who was worthy of "tant d'amour et d'honneur." Elsewhere the Huguenot described de Thou and La Popelinière as virtually the only writers who merited the name of

²De Thou was one of the decreasing number of historians who wrote in Latin rather than the vulgar tongue, but in the mid-eighteenth century his fine work was translated into French. J. A. de Thou, *Histoire universelle de Jacques Auguste de Thou, depuis 1543 jusqu'en 1607* (London, 1734), 16 volumes. The French translation has been used for the present study.

³A. Garnier, *op. cit.*, II, p. 179.
historian in the latter half of the sixteenth century.  

La Popelinière's *L'Histoire de France ...* is another vast and universal history which was available to d'Aubigné.  

Lancelot Voisin de La Popelinière was a Huguenot military man and writer, as was d'Aubigné, but he was somewhat more impartial in his historical judgments. In fact, La Popelinière was censured by a Protestant synod for his moderation and even plagiarized by a Roman Catholic historian. La Popelinière himself was an extreme plagiarist, and Hauser justly asserts, "Il a inséré dans son texte sans les nommer, les histoires presque entières de Pierre de La Place et de Bignon de La Planche."  

Moreover, the present writer has discovered that virtually all of Jean Bodin's journal of the first Estates General of Blois was copied by La Popelinière. *L'Histoire de France ...* was considerably utilized by d'Aubigné and even plagiarized by him at least with respect to documents. Again this printed source could have been used for only about the first half of d'Aubigné's *Histoire universelle* since it was published in 1581 and never extended beyond that date.  

---


5. La Popelinière, *L'Histoire de France enrichie des plus notables Occurrences survenues en provinces de l'Europe et pays voisins depuis l'An 1550 jusques à ces tems, 3 vols.* (La Rochelle, 1681).  

D'Aubigné mentioned La Popelinière's military exploits several times, but he also twice refers at some length to the latter's historical work. In the preface of his history d'Aubigné praised him for his "labeur sans pareil, son langage bien françois, qui sent ensemble l'homme de lettre et l'homme de guerre." Especially did he respect La Popelinière for having borne the burden of vast research and historical composition "sans avoir devant les yeux un corps d'histoire que le relevast aux defauts." However, d'Aubigné accused his coreligionist of minor historical sins of omission and twice of the major one of selling his pen to the Roman Catholics. Modern historians give little credence to d'Aubigné's charge, attributing it to his fervent Protestantism and La Popelinière's "dispassionate and impartial history."

There are several shorter narratives of the entire period with which d'Aubigné was undoubtedly familiar. One of these was the famous Recueil des choses mémorables avenues en France . . ., which was also called the Histoire des cinq rois. This distinctly Huguenot work covers the era from the reign of Henry II to the 1590's

---

7D'Aubigné, I, p. 4.
8Ibid., I, p. 3, and III, p. 23.
and thus merits its sobriquet. It is an anonymous account and has been attributed to various Protestant writers, but Hauser avers that it is a collection made by Simon Goulart with very generous borrowings from the writings of Jean de Serres.\textsuperscript{11} The present writer has discovered that the \textit{Recueil} was based upon La Popelinière's history for the St. Bartholomew massacre and either upon the latter's history for the reign of Francis II or directly upon Regnier de La Flanche's narrative, which was plagiarized by La Popelinière.

Jean de Serres' name is properly attached to another general narrative of this period which was utilized more as a source by d'Aubigné than the preceding work. The \textit{Inventaire général de l'histoire de France} \ldots was begun by de Serres but finished only to the reign of Louis XI. It was extended to the year 1598 by a son of the Protestant pastor Jean de Montlyard from de Serres' notes and other data.\textsuperscript{12} D'Aubigné paid his respects to de Serres' \textit{Inventaire général} in the preface of the \textit{Histoire universelle} where he described it as "docte et eloquente" but as inferior to the historiographical pearls of the age such as the histories of de Thou and La Popelinière. In several places throughout the \textit{Histoire universelle} d'Aubigné criticized de Serres for being too conciliatory and mercenary towards the

\textsuperscript{11}H. Hauser, \textit{Les Sources de l'histoire de France}, II, p. 70.

\textsuperscript{12}L'\textit{Inventaire général de l'histoire de France} depuis Pharamond jusques à Présent \ldots (Paris, 1603), 2 vols. For its authorship of H. Hauser, \textit{Les Sources} \ldots, II, pp. 69, 70.
Catholics and especially berated him for his part in Henry IV's abjuration of Protestantism in 1593. De Serres did work and write tirelessly in the 1590's in order to reconcile Catholics and Huguenots, but he did not once consider abandoning his Calvinist convictions. Moreover, a modern historian defends him against d'Aubigné's bitterest accusation. "Aucune preuve n'existe qu'il ait conseillé au roi de faire le 'saut périlleux' (From Protestantism to Romanism)."

Another anonymous work, the Commentariorum de statu religionis et reipublicae in regna galliae, was indubitably written by de Serres in a fervently pro-Huguenot vein. The last editions of 1580 and 1590 carried the narrative from 1557 to May, 1576. Thus it could have aided greatly d'Aubigné's historiographical labors.

Bernard de Girard Du Haillan, perhaps a moderate Calvinist, who returned to Catholicism, was named royal historian in the 1570's and composed several works on French institutions and royalty. D'Aubigné in the preface to the Histoire universelle mentioned him as one of the most learned historians, but the present research indicates little specific use of his writings by d'Aubigné. His Quatre livres

---

13D'Aubigné, I, pp. 7, 8; VI, pp. 23, 24; VIII, p. 335; IX, pp. 78, 282.


15H. Hauser, Les Sources . . ., III, pp. 68, 69; Hauser wrote, "D'Aubigné a ignoré ou feint d'ignorer les Commentaires."

16Ibid., pp. 52, 53. 17D'Aubigné, I, p. 4.
de l'estat . . . de France is a topical study of the history of French institutions, but his Histoire générale des rois de France has the customary chronological arrangement. Du Haillan concluded the latter work with Louis XI, but unknown hands extended it to the late sixteenth century. The latter "author" very wisely remained anonymous since he plagiarized large segments if not all of the text of the Inventaire général. Near the conclusion of his history d'Aubigné mentioned Du Haillan and referred the reader to his Histoire générale if a lengthier description of the negotiations between France and Savoy in 1600 was desired. He noted that this would be found in "l'histoire, qui est adjoustée à celle de du Haillan" but was silent about the plagiarism. Either he was ignorant of it, which is surprising, or considered the fact inconsequential.

There are histories of special subjects covering the latter-half of the sixteenth century, on which d'Aubigné might have relied. Jean Crespin's Histoire des martyrs . . . is one of the most celebrated of such works. Crespin died at Geneva in 1572, but after

---

18Quatre livres de l'estat et succes des affaires de France contenant sommairement l'histoire des rois (Paris, editions from 1576-1609); Histoire générale des rois de France (Paris, 1576).

19D'Aubigné, IX, p. 320.

20The martyrology is most accessible in a modern printing of the 1619 edition entitled Histoire des martyrs percutez et mis a mort pour la verité de l'Evangile depuis le temps des Apostres jusques à present (1619), 3 vols. (Toulouse, 1885-89).
his death other writers continued his martyrology. Therefore, there are editions of Crespin's work with somewhat varying titles from 1554 to 1619. Hauser asserts that impartiality cannot be expected of Crespin, who was narrating the persecution of his coreligionists. Nonetheless, he truthfully and powerfully depicted the tribulations of the Huguenots. D'Aubigné appears to have placed some reliance upon Crespin's martyrology, but in the parts of the Histoire universelle given detailed study there is little indication that he "a beaucoup utilisé Crespin" as Hauser asserts about the earlier books of d'Aubigné's history. Jean Taffin's L'Estat de l'église ..., a continuation from the 1550's of Jean de Haynault's work with the same title, is a similar book upon which d'Aubigné might have drawn. However, Taffin's chronicle has little detail and no indebtedness to it by d'Aubigné has been observed.

For his second edition d'Aubigné possibly could have consulted the posthumous memoirs of Philippe du Plessis-Mornay which covered the years from 1572 to 1599 and were published in 1624 and 1625. Likewise the Journal of Pierre de l'Estoile for the reign of

---

22 Ibid., III, p. 75.
23 L'Estat de l'église avec le discours des temps depuis les Apôtres jusques au présent (Bergues-sur-le-Zoom, 1605).
Henry III appeared in 1621. Nonetheless, no direct relationship between these two works and the parts of the Histoire universelle given detailed study has been uncovered. This is especially obvious since d'Aubigné made few changes in these four portions of the text in the second edition.

There are several accounts, specifically of the reign of Francis II or somewhat later, that d'Aubigné might have followed as sources, but little direct and clear-cut indebtedness has been found. The Commentaires de l'estat de la religion et republique soubs les rois Henry et Francois seconds et Charles neuviemes, published anonymously in 1565, are considered yet today one of the best sources for the years from 1556 to 1561. A second edition of this appeared a year later and was entitled Histoire de nostre temps, contenant les commentaires . . . . It is universally accepted today that the Commentaires were written by Pierre de La Place, a distinguished parlementarian and faithful Huguenot, who was murdered during the St. Bartholomew holocaust.

The Histoire de l'estat de France tant de la republique que de la religion sous le regne de Francois II (1576) is another

---

24 Mémoires de Messire Philippe de Mornay . . ., 2 vols. (1624-25). This same material with many additions can be found in Mornay's Mémoires et correspondance, 12 vols. (Paris, 1824-25); Pierre de L'Estoile, Journal des choses mémorables advenues durant tout le regne de Henry III (1621).

anonymous but excellent source for this period. The author, a passionate and puritanical Protestant, has been identified customarily with Regnier de La Planche, but this attribution is a dubious one. This unknown historian describes La Planche in a curious fashion if he and La Planche were one and the same person. For example, La Planche is called "un certain Louis Regnier" and his analyses of the religious situation in 1560 as well as of the motives of La Renaudie during the conspiracy of Amboise are criticized by the author. Nevertheless, the Histoire de l'estat de France will hereafter be cited as La Planche's composition for ease of reference and because his authorship is widely accepted.

The renowned Histoire ecclésiastique . . ., which is erroneously attributed to Théodore de Bèze, appeared in 1580 and could have supplied d'Aubigné with information on Huguenot origins from 1521 to 1563. Probably Simon Goulart, also at Geneva, compiled this composite work rather than de Bèze. Much of the introduction,
comprising about one-third of the history, is formed of plagiarisms from the Histoire des martyrs and the narratives of La Planche and La Place. Hauser asserts that d'Aubigné utilized the Histoire ecolésiastique very little; one of its editors finds only one unquestionable debt of d'Aubigné to the work. There seems to be no direct connection between the two histories during the four eras studied.

An excellent source for the fate of the Parisian Protestants is the Histoire des persécutions et martyrs de l'église de Paris ... by Antoine de Chandieu. He was pastor of the Parisian congregation in the mid-1550's and active in nation-wide affairs of the Huguenots afterwards; thus, he was an eyewitness of many events which he narrated. Hauser proves that Jean Crespin drew heavily upon Chandieu's work. Contradictions between the texts of d'Aubigné and Chandieu plus no direct or even indirect filiation between them indicate that the Histoire des persécutions ... was not a source for the Histoire universelle.

The Petit traité des guerres civiles ... is an anonymous source for the years from 1559 to 1564 and has been called the first

30Histoire des persécutions et martyrs de l'église de Paris depuis l'An 1557 jusques au temps du Roy Charles neuvième (Lyon, 1585).
historiographical work of the Huguenot party. It is a brief but interesting résumé, which evidently was not consulted and probably was not available to d'Aubigné.

A work containing documents from 1560 to 1567 which d'Aubigné undoubtedly knew and probably consulted for the reign of Francis II was a collection entitled the Histoire de nostre temps which was published first in 1566-67 and again in 1568 at Antwerp with the title Recueil de toutes les choses mémorables; both editions had three volumes. This work was a valuable collection of pamphlets and chronicles. Today it is best known under its eighteenth-century title of the Mémoires de Condé. Not only was the name changed but also the work was expanded to include additional documents which would not have been available to d'Aubigné in the editions of the 1560's.

The Légende de domp Claude de Guyse (1581) is a fantastic anti-Guise chronicle which was included in the eighteenth-century publication of the Mémoires de Condé but not in the sixteenth-century version. Nevertheless, d'Aubigné had access to it and utilized it for part of his description of the preliminaries to St. Bartholomew's Day as well as events of the 1560's.

---

32 Ibid., III, pp. 64, 65. Petit traité des guerres civiles advenues en France sous les roys François II et Charles IX (1567).

33 Mémoires de Condé, servant d'éclaircissement et de preuves à l'histoire de M. de Thou, 6 vols. (London, 1748).

34 H. Hauser, Les Sources . . ., III, pp. 103-105.
The work devoted especially to the early 1570’s which d’Aubigné most frequently and unquestionably consulted is entitled Mémoires de l’estat de France sous Charles neufiesme ...

This is a collection of sources, letters, chronicles, etc., similar to the Mémoires de Condé, and was compiled by the same Simon Goulart who was probably most responsible for the publication of the Histoire ecclésiastique. Goulart was a passionate Huguenot who said that he wanted to prepare some materials for a future historian and to inspire upright men of both the Protestant and Roman Catholic parties with horror concerning heinous crimes such as that of St. Bartholomew’s Day. Of course, this is a tendentious collection, but as Hauser writes, “C’est un instrument de travail indispensable, une vraie bibliothèque portative, pour les années 1571-1574.”

Undoubtedly d’Aubigné referred to this “portable library” several times when writing his account of the tragic events of St. Bartholomew’s Day.

D’Aubigné, like most Protestant and politque writers of his era, accepted unquestioningly the theory that the St. Bartholomew massacre had been premeditated for many months. He may have acquired this theory and some data about the treacherous event from numerous Protestant pamphlets such as the De Furoribus Gallicos ... or the

[35] Mémoires de l’estat de France sous Charles neufiesme ...
depuis ... 1570 jusqu’au règne de Henri troisieme ..., 3 vols. (Middelbourg, 1578).

Réveille-matin. The former work has been described as "une sorte de récit officiel huguenot." It is a rather violent account in which Catherine de Medici was held primarily responsible for the crime.

The work carried the name of Ernestus Varamundus as author, but the Huguenot polemicist Francis Hotman is often considered as the writer. The Réveille-matin des François et de leurs voisins . . . (Edinburgh, 1574) is a passionate Huguenot attack, probably written by the physician Nicholas Barnaud, upon the persons responsible for the massacre. He purportedly wished to inform the German princes, the Queen of England, and the Swiss of the truth about St. Bartholomew's Day.

Much of this pamphlet was incorporated unchanged into the Mémoires de l'estat de France sous Charles neufiesme . . . The Réveille-matin and Le Toosain contre les massacreurs et auteurs des confusions en France . . . (Rheims, 1579) plus several other contemporary polemics concerned with the massacre can be conveniently found in the Archives curieuses.

---

37 De Furoribus Gallicis, horrenda et indigna Admiralli Castilliani . . . vera et simplex narratio (Edinburgh, 1573). The present writer consulted this work in the English translation, A True and Plain Report of the Furious Outrages of France, and the . . . Slaughter of Chastillon . . . (Striveling, 1573). The De Furoribus Gallicis exists only in the sixteenth-century editions and is rather rare.


39 Ibid., pp. 249-251.

40 H. L. Cimber and F. Danjou, (eds.), Archives curieuses, First Series (Paris, 1835-36), VII.
The Catholic historian François de Belleforest penned two partisan works which d'Aubigné might have utilized but very probably did not. His *Histoire des neuf roys Charles de France* (Paris, 1568) is a superficial panegyric; his *Les Grands Annales et histoire générale de France . . . jusques au regne du Roy tres-chrestien Henry III . . .* (Paris, 1579) is ardently anti-Huguenot.\(^{41}\)

For the Estates General of 1576 d'Aubigné could have availed himself of the excellent journal of Jean Bodin, in which the political theorist narrated the debates and other activities of the third estate.\(^{42}\) However, it appears that d'Aubigné never saw Bodin's journal; certainly he failed to use it.

Pierre Matthieu was one of the few Roman Catholic historians to whom d'Aubigné was obligated for information. Matthieu's *Histoire des derniers troubles de France sous les règnes des roys . . . Henry III et Henry IV . . .* (1600) was a fusion of two earlier works by Matthieu. Evidently it was very helpful to d'Aubigné, especially for affairs at the French court. Matthieu had been a partisan of the Guises, but he rallied to Henry IV in 1594 and was named royal historian the following year. His *Histoire des derniers troubles* is largely a résumé and compilation of other sources (for example the works of


\(^{42}\)J. Bodin, *Recueil de tout ce qui s'est negocié en la compagnie du tiers Estat de France . . .* en la ville de Bloys au XV Novembre 1576 (1577). This is most easily consulted in Lalourcé and Duval, *Recueil des pièces originales et authentiques concernant la tenue des États-Generaux* (Paris, 1789), VI.
La Popelinière and La Noue), but it is an intelligent one. 43

Matthieu's history was of little value to d'Aubigné for the period before the late 1580's. This is true also of the excellent Mémoires de la Ligue, another compilation by Simon Goulart. This collection of documents was published as individual volumes from 1587 to 1599 and then all six volumes were republished as a complete set in 1602. An eighteenth-century edition (1758) of this was printed with corrections and a few additions after the great success of the republication of the Mémoires de Condé. 44 Despite Goulart's passions and prejudices, his collection, for which he obtained documents everywhere, has an inestimable value. "C'est une véritable bibliothèque," asserts Hauser. 45 Unquestionably, d'Aubigné frequently consulted the Mémoires de la Ligue and utilized it for documents, but he named it only once in his Histoire universelle. He sent interested readers to Tome VI where a pamphlet was reprinted containing Huguenot complaints concerning the preparatory negotiations for the issuance of the Edict of Nantes. 46


44 Mémoires de la Ligue . . . depuis 1576 jusqu'à la paix . . . en 1598, 6 vols. (Amsterdam, 1758).


46 D'Aubigné, IX, p. 295.
An undistinguished history written by Gabriel Chappuys for the reigns of Henry III and Henry IV might have served d'Aubigné. However, there is apparently no connection between d'Aubigné and Chappuys. Two relatively unknown histories of "Henry le Grand" or Henry IV by Baptiste Legrain and Julien Peleus were published before the Histoire universelle, but no use of them by d'Aubigné has been uncovered in the four portions of his history given detailed study for sources. However, d'Aubigné quoted with gusto from Legrain's history when he narrated the arrangements for the Edict of Nantes. Legrain had defended religious toleration for the Huguenots since even the Jews in Rome were tolerated by the papacy. The two works appeared almost simultaneously and are extremely uncritical panegyrics of Henry IV; both Legrain and Peleus were close to the court and undoubtedly hoped for royal favors.

In conclusion, one of the most famous histories devoted primarily to the reign of Henry IV must be mentioned. The Chronologie novenaire, which recounts events from 1589 to 1598, plus an introduction devoted to the 1570's and 1580's, was published in 1608 by

---

47 G. Chappuys, Histoire de nostre temps sous ... Henri III ... et Henri IV ... (Paris, 1600).


49 D'Aubigné, IX, pp. 289-292.
Pierre-Victor Cayet, often called Palma Cayet. This work served as a fairly important source for d'Aubigné. Cayet had been a Huguenot pastor who held several positions, including one as minister to Catherine of Bourbon, but when Henry IV went to the mass Palma Cayet followed him and abjured in 1595. Henry IV recompensed him by making him a royal professor of oriental languages and by giving him the title of chronologue. He became a priest in 1600 and wrote numerous polemical works as well as two important histories—the other a Chronologie septenaire (1598-1605) before his death in 1610 at the age of eighty-five. Cayet defined history as a "recit des choses que l'auteur a vues," and his histories meet this interesting if limited, definition. His works are based on abundant information, much of which was obtained orally.

Palma Cayet has been reproached for his partiality against his former coreligionists. Especially did he distort the former relationships of Henry IV with the Huguenots. Although not such a blatant panegyrist as a Baptiste Legrain, he "presente tous les evenements a l'avantage du roi [Henry IV], sans un mot du blame."

Thus his work is slanted and pedestrian and is essentially a compilation from documents, other histories, and conversations, but it is "assez complète et non sans mérite." 51

D'Aubigné made no references in his history to Cayet's works, but he did, when recapitulating the acceptance of the mass by Henry IV, speak disparagingly of the turncoat. He recorded that Cayet had been accused of stating that the sixth commandment condemned neither fornication nor adultery but only the "pêché d'Onan" (Genesis 38: 6-11) and that it was necessary to establish brothels. In addition, d'Aubigné accepted the charge that Cayet was guilty of "travaillant à la magie." 52 De Ruble asserts that these accusations were unfounded, but Hauser leaves the question unanswered and states that Henry IV "scorned him." 53

Political polemics multiplied in France as the sixteenth century drew to its end. Especially were they numerous for outstanding events such as the St. Bartholomew massacre, the day of the barricades in 1588, or the assassinations of the Guises and of Henry III. Therefore, numerous pamphlets have been consulted for this study but little indebtedness to them by d'Aubigné has been

52 D'Aubigné, IX, p. 79.
53 Ibid.; Cf. note 2 for de Ruble's comment; H. Hauser, Les Sources . . ., IV, pp. 46, 47.
found. The Huguenot writer had a healthy skepticism toward and even contempt for such products of political or religious passion.\textsuperscript{54}

The pertinent historical works in d'Aubigné's personal library at the time of his demise in 1630 should form an appropriate conclusion to this chapter. His library contained literary works like the customary classics of antiquity, but the major part, as might be expected, was composed of numerous historical and polemic works. Of the books mentioned in this chapter de Thou's great universal history was included as was the first edition of Du Halilain's Quatre Livres de l'estat et success des affaires de France. There may also have been copies of Simon Goulart's Recueil des choses mémorables and his Mémories de l'estat de France sous Charles neufiesme.\textsuperscript{55}

\textsuperscript{54} Probably d'Aubigné was thinking of such polemics when he condemned "les livres monstrueux qui courent, sales de flatteries impudentes... La recherche des actions particulières, indignes de lumière publique" in the preface of his Histoire universelle, I, p. 2. J. Plattard writes that it is improbable that d'Aubigné consulted the "littérature de propagande... abondante" of the early 1620's when he began to compose the fourth tome of his history (Supplément de l'Histoire universelle, xi and xii). The names of these innumerable polemics are omitted here, but several are included in the bibliography of this study. A thorough list can be found in Henri Hauser's Les Sources de l'histoire de France, III and IV.

\textsuperscript{55} E. Droz, "L'Inventaire après décès des biens d'Agrippa d'Aubigné," Bibliothèque d'humanisme et renaissance, XI (1949), pp. 99-104. It cannot be asserted positively that the two works, probably published by Goulart, were also in d'Aubigné's library, since Droz when describing the books merely lists a "Recueil des choses... (1575-1576)" and the "Mémories d'Etat."
CHAPTER III

D'AUBIGNÉ'S SOURCES FOR HIS ACCOUNT OF THE REIGN OF FRANCIS II

Agrippa d'Aubigné had available several sources of information when he began to write the history of Francis II's reign. Since he was only seven and eight years of age in 1559 and 1560, his personal recollections must have been few and dubious in value. Of course his father and other older relatives and friends undoubtedly supplied him with information about such events as the Amboise conspiracy, the assembly of Fountainebleau and others. D'Aubigné cited his father as a source for some material in his Histoire universelle, and in his memoirs he mentioned the oath of vengeance.

1The material from the Histoire universelle, which has been studied for this chapter, is found in chaps. xiv-xxiii, bk. ii, Vol. I in both the 1626 edition and the nineteenth-century edition of Baron de Ruble. In de Ruble's edition this comprises pp. 239-300 of Vol. I. In order to scrutinize d'Aubigné's accuracy in historical research, recent historical studies devoted to the French "wars of religion" have been collated with his narrative and the results placed in the footnotes of this and the three subsequent chapters. It would have been impractical to authenticate every statement made by d'Aubigné in the four portions of the Histoire universelle subjected to minute examination for their sources. Moreover, it is unnecessary, since this would have meant verifying the accuracy of the histories of de Thou, La Popelinière and the other historians from whom he borrowed. Therefore, only when no source could be found for d'Aubigné's narrative was it checked against the best modern research. The result is that the latter chapters, concerned with much more original portions of the Histoire universelle, are considerably longer and have more and lengthier footnotes.
for the Amboise deaths which his father required of him.  

Nevertheless, the value to the young lad of his father's descriptions is questionable unless they were written. D'Aubigné had to be a mere boy when these stories and declarations were recounted since his father died in March, 1563, when Agrippa was barely eleven years old. Moreover, the child passed virtually all these years, but not unhappily, outside his father's house, since his mother died at his birth and his stepmother had little love for him.

Unquestionably another source for this portion of d'Aubigné's history was manuscripts of letters and memoirs supplied to him by friends and coreligionists. Finally, his most important source of information came from printed narratives, as the information in this chapter proves.

A study of d'Aubigné's chapters on the reign of Francis II and of his possible sources indicates that d'Aubigné probably wrote this material with de Thou's Histoire universelle open before him. Obviously, the great politique and historian was his chief guide through the maze of historical data. This does not mean that d'Aubigné copied from de Thou's volumes or used them as the only source, but the Huguenot wrote much of his history by summarizing

2D'Aubigné, Mémoires, p. 5; in his Histoire, I, p. 271, he wrote, "Ainsi ai-je ouy mon père en rendre compte à ses amis," when describing the Amboise fiasco.

3A. Garnier, op. cit., I, pp. 62, 63.

4Ibid., I, p. 51.
de Thou's work and rather slavishly following the organization of the latter. The topical chart, given in the appendix to this chapter, proves that d'Aubigné's arrangement of facts for Francis II's reign was borrowed from de Thou's history. Also there is irrefutable evidence that d'Aubigné used the material of several other historians. The Histoire de l'estat de France . . ., attributed to Regnier de La Planche, was a very important source for d'Aubigné but not his principal source as Alphonse de Rube mistakenly asserted. The history written by Pierre de La Place was another important mine from which d'Aubigné secured information. Undoubtedly he also used Jean Crespin's Histoire des martyrs and the Mémoires de Condé. Very probably La Popelinière's history and the Inventaire général were likewise read and utilized for the years 1559 and 1560.5

D'Aubigné's Debt to de Thou

Not only does the topical chart in Appendix I show d'Aubigné's continuous and profound reliance upon the Histoire universelle of de Thou, but a study of their descriptions of various

5Hereafter in this study the following editions and methods of citation shall be used for the histories of d'Aubigné, de Thou, La Popelinière, La Planche, and La Place: A. d'Aubigné, Histoire universelle, 10 vols. (Paris, 1886-1909) cited as d'Aubigné; J. A. de Thou, Histoire universelle, 16 vols. (London, 1734) cited as de Thou; La Popelinière, L'Histoire de France enrichie . . ., 3 vols. (La Rochelle, 1581) cited as La Popelinière; L. R. de La Planche, Histoire de l'estat de France . . . (Paris, 1836) cited as La Planche; and P. de La Place, Commentaires de l'estat de la religion et republique . . . (Paris, 1856) cited as La Place.
events likewise proves it. The topical chart indicates only three differences (the assassination of Minard, the origin of the name Huguenot, and the deaths of Francois II and the Vidame of Chartres) in their respective outlines. Likewise the chart shows only two events mentioned by d'Aubigné that are omitted by de Thou. Of these two, one is erroneous and the other is considered to be incredible by many historians.

There are numerous facts or descriptions of events which are found in the histories of both d'Aubigné and de Thou but are not found in any of the other descriptions of Francois II's reign which were consulted. Undoubtedly d'Aubigné drew this information from de Thou's Histoire universelle; the Huguenot owed no similar debt to any other source for this period. He was not guilty of plagiarism at this point in his use of de Thou's or any other history, but there are sections in his history with phraseology extremely akin to parts of the moderate Catholic's opus.

In discussing the accession of Francois II, d'Aubigné wrote that the Constable Anne de Montmorency called on Catherine de Medicis and, while giving advice, said, "que les François ont à coeur l'obéissance de leurs princes naturels, et à contrecœur celle des princes étrangers." In his description de Thou had the Constable say, "qu'elle [Catherine] allait commander à une nation qui obéit volontiers à ses Rois & à ses Princes, & qui souffre impatiemment la domination des étrangers." Both d'Aubigné and de Thou immediately follow their accounts of this conversation with similar descriptions.
of the vacillation of Antoine of Navarre, who had been urged by the Constable to hurry to court and secure political power. However, the King of Navarre failed to rush; in fact he dawdled. D'Aubigné said that Navarre "vint à petites journées à Véndosme."\(^6\)

De Ruble asserts that the above material is found in both d'Aubigné and La Planohe, and he implies that d'Aubigné had utilized La Planohe. In a footnote on the preceding page de Ruble had erroneously stated that "Le récit du règne de François II, dans l'Histoire universelle est principalement tiré de l'Histoire de l'estat de France de Regnier de La Planohe, auteur protestant."\(^7\) De Ruble's generalization is faulty, since this narrative appears only in part and then in a different form in La Planohe's history. The latter reported no statements by Montmorency to the queen mother like the one given above. No one did but de Thou. Also, La Planohe merely said that Navarre "ne se hâta aucunement";\(^8\) he omitted the picturesque phrase "à petites journées" found in de Thou's and d'Aubigné's accounts.

De Ruble again incorrectly implies that La Planohe was the source for d'Aubigné's description of the callous and tactless dispersal of petitioners from the court by the Guises shortly after Henry II's death. The incident was mentioned by neither La Planohe

---

\(^6\) D'Aubigné, I, p. 240; de Thou, III, p. 372.

\(^7\) D'Aubigné, I, p. 240, note 1.

\(^8\) La Planohe, p. 212.
nor La Place but is related in similar fashion by de Thou. In another footnote de Ruble contends that d'Aubigné's description of the cold reception accorded to Navarre, when he finally arrived at court, was drawn from La Planche. However, de Ruble failed to note that de Thou related the story in a similar way. Probably d'Aubigné was here following de Thou rather than La Planche, since the latter inserted the incident in a different part of his text, but de Thou and d'Aubigné have the same arrangement.

De Ruble, who seems to have had great reverence for de Thou as a historian, must have read carelessly the latter's pages devoted to the reign of François II. When d'Aubigné described the death of Charles de Castelnau, he quoted a speech, critical of the Guises, which the nobleman made before his execution. De Ruble comments that this discourse appears to have been composed by d'Aubigné. The speech may be fictional; if so, it was written by another historian. De Thou, La Planche, La Place, and the Mémoires de Condé all cite similar remarks by Castelnau, but probably d'Aubigné was again following de Thou. La Place, La Planche, and the author of the account

9 D'Aubigné, I, p. 251, note 1; de Thou, III, pp. 397, 398.


11 D'Aubigné, I, p. 270 and note 1; de Thou, III, pp. 493, 494; La Planche, p. 266; La Place, pp. 34, 35; and "L'Histoire du tumulte d'Amboise," Mémoires de Condé, I, p. 327. It was printed in both the sixteenth- and eighteenth-century editions.
printed in the Mémoires de Condé gave only résumés. However, de Thou and d'Aubigné put the words in quotation marks, and only they had Castelnau end his speech by referring to death and then a better life as his lot.

The following examples are the most obvious passages which d'Aubigné borrowed from de Thou. When discussing the rather harsh treatment meted out by the Guises to Diane de Poitiers, mistress of the deceased Henry II, d'Aubigné wrote, "Telle est la différence entre les sectateurs de la faveur et les amis." Only de Thou philosophized in precisely the same vein, when he wrote, "On vit alors plus que jamais, combien on doit peu compter sur la fidélité à sur la re-

connaissance des Courtisans."12

The Huguenot certainly followed the moderate Catholic in his description of the removal of the princes of the blood-royal, Roche-sur-Yon and Condé, from the court shortly after Francis II's accession. D'Aubigné wrote,

Tout d'un même coup, on despeche en Espagne les Princes de Condé et de la Roche-sur-Yon, l'un pour recevoir le serment de la paix [of Cateau-Cambrésis], l'autre pour porter l'ordre [of Saint Michel], commissions qui n'estoyent pas incompatible. Le cardinal de Lorraine, sur-intendant des finances, ordonna mille beaux sous au prince de Condé pour son voyage, qui ne fut pas une des moindres offenses. A ce prince pauvre et courageux,13


13D'Aubigné, I, p. 245. All the recent historians agree that both Condé and Roche-sur-Yon were sent to Flanders and not to Spain, J. W. Thompson, The Wars of Religion in France (Chicago, 1909), p. 7, and J. H. Mariéjol, La Réforme et la Ligue (Paris, 1904),
De Ruble justly remarks in a footnote to this passage that d'Aubigné erred for Condé was sent to Ghent and not to Spain. If d'Aubigné had been utilizing La Planche or the Recueil des choses mémorables or the Inventaire général, he would not have made this mistake, since all three explicitly say that Condé and Roche-sur-Yon were sent to Flanders. The author of "La Legende du Cardinal de Lorraine" asserted that one of the "Princes du Sang" was sent "porter l'ordre en Espagne," but he added that another was sent to Flanders for the

L. Homier in La Conjuration d'Amboise (Paris, 1923), pp. 15 and 16, contradicts this interpretation with the following thesis. "Les apologistes de la maison de Bourbon, assez embarrassés pour expliquer cette mission honorifique confiée spontanément par les Guises à leur adversaire, accuseront les ministres de François II d'avoir voulu le prince en l'obligeant à 'entrer en nouvelle despense sans être aidé du Roy.' . . . Or le prince ne passa que deux jours à Gand. Si l'entretien de ses cent cinquante cavaliers lui coûtait cher, il ne pouvait s'en prendre qu'à sa vanité." H. Naef, La Conjuration d'Amboise et Genève (Genève, 1922), p. 20, is inclined to agree with Homier's position. Naef said that Condé's mission was an important one, and he added, "Il est peut-être injuste de ne voir dans le choix du prince qu'un subterfuge des Lorrains, ainsi qu'on l'a répété d'après l'Histoire de l'estat de France."

14 La Planche, pp. 207, 208; Recueil ..., p. 68; Inventaire général, p. 605.
confirmation of the peace. Thus "La Legende" is not a probable source. De Thou, whose narrative is vague on this point does not explicitly state that Condé and Roche-sur-Yon were sent to Spain, but a hasty perusal, which was not uncommon for d'Aubigné, of de Thou's text would have led to such an assumption. The latter wrote,

On trouva aussi un prétexte honorable pour éloigner pour un temps les princes de Condé & de la Roche-sur-Yon, en les envoyant auprès du roi d'Espagne; le premier pour jurer au nom du jeune Roi la paix conclue par Henri; and le second pour porter à Philippe le Collier de l'Ordre de Saint Michel. Le prince de Condé n'eut pour son voyage que mille écus d'or, que le cardinal de Lorraine surintendant des finances lui accorda dedaigneusement.36

D'Aubigné related another incident, which is found only in de Thou, as a conclusion to the description of the king's poor health and of the fantastic rumor that the royal physicians had prescribed infants' blood as a healing bath solution for Francis II. After casting doubt on the alleged origins of the rumor, d'Aubigné wrote, "Cette-oi est vraye que la Roine avoit eu ses menstrueuses si tard, que son fils estoit de ceux qu'on appelle mal-nex . . . ." De Thou similarly asserted, "Il est certain que le Roi des son enfance avoit une sante extrêmente foible; ce qu'on attribuoit à la constitution de Catherine de Medicis qui, n'avoit été sujette que très-tard aux incommoditez de femmes."17

16De Thou, III, p. 380. Philip II was in Flanders at this time. Had d'Aubigné remembered this he would not have made such a mistake.
17D'Aubigné, I, p. 252; de Thou, III, p. 399.
When describing the selection of a leader for the conspiracy of Amboise, d'Aubigné was again obviously following de Thou. Both the Huguenot and the Catholic agreed that Antoine of Navarre was not a satisfactory chief because of his timidity, but that Condé with his "courage and poverty" was a natural choice. It is true that La Planoche did mention Condé as the _chef muet_, for whom La Renaudie was the "front man," of the enterprise. However, La Planoche nowhere noted Navarre's inadequacy and the reasons why he was not selected as leader.\(^{18}\)

After narrating the failure of the Amboise fiasco, d'Aubigné undoubtedly was referring to de Thou, if to no other Catholic, when he wrote, "Les catholiques qui en [The interrogation of the captive Castelnau in which Chancellor Olivier participated and was forced into embarrassed silence by Castelnau] ont écrit en donnant la raison; c'est que Olivier estoit de même créance." De Thou described these occurrences and concluded them by stating, "Olivier qui favorisait en secret ceux qui demandaient une réforme dans l'Eglise ... gardoit un profond silence."\(^{19}\)

D'Aubigné continued the above quotation with a tale which very probably was borrowed from de Thou and carelessly distorted by the Huguenot. The latter wrote, "Toute la cour s'employa pour sauver

\(^{18}\)D'Aubigné, I, p. 268; de Thou, III, pp. 468, 469; La Planoche, p. 238.

\(^{19}\)D'Aubigné, I, p. 269; de Thou, III, p. 492.
la vie à Castelau, mesesmement la Roine, se souvenant qu'il l'avait sauvée, et son fils le duc d'Orléans à Amboise, un jour qu'estant desguisé, une multitude l'assommoit." None of the other historians of the reign of François II except de Thou mentioned this service by Charles de Castelau. He asserted that Charles, the Duke of Orléans, was saved from angry and inebriated townsman at Amboise by the two Castelau brothers. One had been killed and the other, the participant in the Amboise disturbance, had been severely wounded in the defense of the prince. However, de Thou said nothing about Catherine's life being saved.\(^{20}\) Brantôme, who also related this incident, omitted the Queen and Charles de Castelau, the accused. He mentioned only Castelau's brother as a participant in the valiant defense of the prince.\(^{21}\)

In his description of the last days of François II's reign, d'Aubigné obviously borrowed from de Thou, when he cited the advice which Chancellor L'Hôpital gave to the queen mother an an antidote to the insidious counsels of the Guises. The two historians agreed that the Guises, as François II lay dying, urged Catherine to have Antoine of Navarre killed. Then they similarly quoted the remarks

\(^{20}\) D'Aubigné, I, p. 269; de Thou, p. 499.

\(^{21}\) Brantôme is cited by de Ruble in d'Aubigné, I, p. 269, note 3. De Ruble accepted the interpretation of this incident as given by Brantôme. Thus he disagreed with both d'Aubigné and de Thou. Likewise, L. Romier, La Conjonction d'Amboise, p. 49, wrote, "Castelau connaît toute la cour, sa famille est alliée à la haute noblesse, son frère a sauvé la vie jadis au duc d'Orléans troisième fils de François Ier . . . ."
which L'Hôpital made to the queen. This latter conversation has been found in no other contemporary narrative, and the former one is found only in La Planche's history and is quite differently narrated.  

There are several less important and shorter examples of dependence by the Huguenot historian upon de Thou's Histoire universelle. When describing the debasement of the Ordre de Saint Michel by the creation of eighteen new chevaliers, d'Aubigné was following de Thou. As de Ruble pointed out, d'Aubigné confused the promotion of 1560 with that of 1559, but La Planche and de Thou made the same mistake. Unquestionably, d'Aubigné's error resulted from his faithful borrowing from the Catholic parliamentarian. The remark by d'Aubigné and de Thou that, after the mass promotion, la Roche du Maine stigmatized the collar of the order as a "collier à toutes bêtes" proves that de Thou and not La Planche was the source, since La Planche did not identify the man who hurled this criticism at the order. 

On the following page d'Aubigné continued, though carelessly, to utilize de Thou. In describing the testimony of two witnesses of alleged Protestant debauches, d'Aubigné agreed with de Thou in stating that a lawyer of the Place Maubert, at whose home

22 d'Aubigné, I, pp. 297, 298; de Thou, III, p. 574; La Planche, p. 415.

the supposed immoralities occurred, had only one daughter rather than two. La Planche, La Popelinière, and the author of the *Recueil des choses mémorables* stated that the advocate had two daughters. 24

D'Aubigné and de Thou described almost identically the relative success of the Amboise conspirators in maintaining the secrecy of their plot. In narrating the clandestine planning meeting at Nantes, d'Aubigné spoke of this secrecy as a "chose émerveillable," and de Thou called it "surprenant." La Planche, La Place, and the writers in the *Mémoires de Condé* said nothing similar. 25

The final example of d'Aubigné's utilization of de Thou's history is one of the most striking and one which best shows how d'Aubigné relied upon and summarized his work. Both writers, at identical places in their narratives, presented a brief description of the temper of the French people at the time of François II's accession to the throne; such a characterization has been found in no other chronicle of this period. D'Aubigné declared,

La noblesse, lasse des guerres, ne se voulait point mesler des dissensions de la cour. Le peuple ne sentoit que les tailles; l'écclesiastique la passion contre le schisme, et à cause d'elle espousa la maison de Guise.

De Thou wrote,

La Noblesse, dont le pouvoir est fort grand dans le temps des troubles domestiques, ennuyée des guerres passées,

---

24 D'Aubigné, I, p. 248; de Thou, III, p. 386; La Planche, p. 235; La Popelinière, I, f. 149r; *Recueil ...*, p. 74.

vivait chez elle dans le repos à la tranquillité, sans se soucier des affaires de l'Etat. Le peuple se contentait de demander la diminution des subsides, qu'on avait imposé à l'occasion des guerres du règne précédent. Du reste il lui importait peu qui domineroit à la Cour. Il ne manquoit plus à la puissance du duc de Guise, que de mettre dans ses intérêts le Clergé ce premier corps du Royaume, si considérable par sa prééminence, & par ses grands biens. Il avait trouvè moyen de se l'attacher étroitement, en se montrant zélé défenseur de la Religion ancienne, & en faisant paroître une haine implacable contre les sectaires."26

Obviously the Huguenot merely summarized and sharpened the generalizations of the Catholic. Certainly, this passage typifies d'Aubigné's heavy reliance upon de Thou and consequent lack of originality, in data and arrangement, for this section of his history.

D'Aubigné's Use of the Histories of La Planche and La Place

Without a doubt the Histoire de l'état . . . of Regnier de La Planche and Pierre de La Place's Commentaires de l'état de la religion et republique were well known to d'Aubigné and often used by him when he wrote this part of his history. Several incidents and facts in the Histoire universelle must have been taken from the works of these two Protestants. However, the topical chart in Appendix I demonstrates that neither history, and especially not that of La Place, formed the basis for d'Aubigné's outline as did the magnum opus of de Thou. Of course when La Planche described the conspiracy

of Amboise or the imprisonment of Condé, his arrangement of materials was virtually the same as that of d'Aubigné. This similarity was a result primarily of the dependence in these areas of de Thou upon the Histoire de l'estat. In copying de Thou’s outline d'Aubigné automatically transferred part of La Planche’s arrangement into his work.

D'Aubigné may have been referring to both La Planche and de Thou or perhaps to de Thou only when he related the rumors about the king's need for infants' blood. For he wrote,

Les uns disaient que les ennemies des Lorrains faisoient courir ce bruit pour les rendre exécrables, les autres qu’eux mesmes en estoient auteurs, ayans dès lors envie de rendre odieuse la race royalle.

La Planche asserted that the Guises spread these rumors, but de Thou wrote, "on ne sait si ce furent les ennemis des Guises, ou les Guises mêmes, qui autoriseront cette fable . . . ."27

In discussing the disclosure of the Amboise plot to the Court, d'Aubigné probably again took information from La Planche’s narrative but also from de Thou’s. La Planche attributed Pierre des Avenelle’s betrayal of the plot to his fear and his cupidity. In the Mémoires de Condé, the Recueil des choses mémorables, and the Inventaire général, the authors specified avariciousness and ambition as the reasons for des Avenelle’s actions. However, de Thou wrote that he revealed the plot "plutôt par des motifs de conscience, que dans la vue d’un vil intérêt." The latter’s phrasing and La Planche’s

analysis are most similar to d'Aubigné's explanation that des Avenelles "plutost meu de peur que d'ambition et d'avarice coupa la gorge à plusiers hommes de marque et de soldats /i.e. those inculpated in the conspiracy/.28 In completing this story d'Aubigné undoubtedly drew data from La Planche. The former wrote, "Avenelles dono descouvrit l'affaire au sieur de Marmagne, maistre des requests, créature du cardinal . . . ." De Thou related that he told the plot to "Lalamant Vouzay Maître des Requêtes, un des confidens du cardinal de Lorraine." Thus the great Catholic historian failed to mention any "Marmagne" as also did other contemporary historians. Only La Planche wrote that des Avenelles went to see a Master of Requests "nommé l'Allament, seigneur de Vouzé, autrement dit Marmagne . . . ." 29 La Planche's Histoire d'estat was undoubtedly d'Aubigné's source for some of his material about the battles in Provence and Dauphiny in 1560. When describing the violation of a truce in

28 D'Aubigné, I, p. 262; de Thou, III, p. 481; La Planche, p. 246; Mémoires de Condé, I, p. 329; Reueil . . . ., p. 81; Inventaire général, II, p. 610.

29 D'Aubigné, I, p. 262; de Thou, III, p. 481; La Planche, p. 246. D'Aubigné, I, pp. 262, 263, committed an error when discussing the fright of the court after they heard rumors of the Amboise plot. He wrote, "The Guises avoyent deja fait retirer le Roi, /to/ Amboise sur les premiers avis d'Italie." J. H. Mariéjol, La Réforme et la Ligue, p. 15, and L. Homier, La Conjuration d'Amboise, pp. 90-95, disagreed somewhat on other details, but they agreed that the court did not move to Amboise until February 22. Warnings had arrived before this date but had not occasioned immediate protective measures by the Guises and the king or a flight to Amboise.
Dauphiny, d'Aubigné related that the Huguenot leader Monbrun re-gathered his troops and captured Orpierre where the troops were spared but the priests and others who had broken their faith were killed. La Planche wrote that the priests (prêtres) had to pay the piper (payer l'escoot) because they had stirred up new troubles after an agreement had been sworn. La Place omitted all this material and de Thou asserted that the charge against the priests was merely a pretext for mistreating them.30

The history of Pierre de La Place was the third most important source used by d'Aubigné for the reign of Francois II. Its influence is seen in a few of d'Aubigné's narratives which either are not reported or are reported differently by de Thou and La Planche.

When discussing the arrest of Jerome Groslot and the interrogation of Condé, d'Aubigné very likely relied essentially on La Place's narrative. He stated, "Le même jour de la prise du prince [Condé], la bailli d'Orléans, Groslot, fut arresté." Shortly after d'Aubigné also listed the men selected to question Condé, and he included Gilles Bourdin the public prosecutor. De Thou and La Planche both discussed these events, but neither agreed with d'Aubigné about the date of Groslot's arrest. La Place asserted

30 D'Aubigné, I, pp. 286, 287; de Thou, III, p. 552; La Planche, p. 343.
that Groslot was arrested "en même temps," but it is not clear whether he meant at the same time as the arrest of Condé or as the arrest of Condé's mother-in-law who was imprisoned thirty-six hours after Condé. Very probably d'Aubigné hastily assumed the first. Also, de Thou omitted Bourdin as one of Condé's inquisitors, a fact included by both La Planche and La Place, but La Planche omitted several other pertinent details, such as who secured Condé's lawyers, found in both d'Aubigné's and La Place's narratives.  

Other Sources for D'Aubigné's Account

There is undeniable proof that d'Aubigné utilized Jean Crespin's Histoire des martyrs in writing about the reign of Francis II just as he undoubtedly drew information from it for earlier parts of the Histoire universelle. When describing the trials and vacillations of Anne du Bourg during his imprisonment, d'Aubigné attributed du Bourg's final steadfastness in the faith to the influence of an heroic Huguenot martyr "la dame de la Caille." In the Histoire des martyrs is found a very similar and the only other printed reference to Marguerite le Riche called "la dame de la Caille." De Thou, but not d'Aubigné mentioned an anonymous minister who strengthened du Bourg's

---

31 D'Aubigné, I, pp. 294, 295; de Thou, III, pp. 568, 569; La Planche, pp. 382, 400; La Place, p. 74. The Duke d'Aumale, op. cit., I, p. 89, stated that Groslot was arrested on the same day as Condé when steps were also taken to arrest his mother-in-law.
faith and helped end his equivocal actions. The other chroniclers of du Bourg’s imprisonment and execution failed to note any specific individuals who maintained the Parliamentarian in his Protestant faith.

Certainly d'Aubigné was familiar with several accounts of the sufferings and death of du Bourg, and he referred to one in the text. He wrote, "Les reproches qu'il fit à ses juges, ... et les autres discours se peuvent lire au livre exprès pour ces choses."

De Ruble is probably correct when he asserts that the Huguenot historian was referring to the Vraye histoire contenant l'inique jugement et fausse procédure faite contre le fidele serviteur de Dieu Anne du Bourg ..., which was published in 1561. However, this polemic was fifty years old when d'Aubigné was writing and probably rare. Possibly d'Aubigné was thinking of Crespin's martyrology rather than the Vraye histoire ..., but his use of the phrase "au livre exprès pour ces choses" indicates the latter work.

---

32 D'Aubigné, I, pp. 252, 253; de Thou, III, p. 400; J. Crespin, Histoire des martyrs (1885-89), II, pp. 668, 669; L. R. Lefèvre, Le Tumulte d'Amboise (Paris, 1949), p. 200, criticizes "ce ministre resté anonyme" and other Huguenots not in prison for urging du Bourg to be adamant, as if their cause required a famous martyr. M. Lefèvre states that he secured information about unimportant Protestant martyrs, "ces croquants," from the Histoire des martyrs. Had M. Lefèvre read the Histoire des martyrs, II, p. 698, more carefully, he would have found that the minister, unnamed by de Thou, was called Augustin Marlorat.

35 D'Aubigné, I, p. 253 and note 1. This same pamphlet with a slightly different title, "La Vraye histoire de la fausse procédure contre Anne du Bourg," was included in the eighteenth-century edition of the Mémoires de Condé, I, pp. 217-305, but not included in the sixteenth-century edition.
D'Aubigné, when analyzing the reasons for the reluctance of Antoine of Navarre to oppose the Guises at the commencement of François II's reign, very probably acquired his details from a pamphlet entitled *La Légende du Cardinal de Lorraine*, which was available to d'Aubigné and was referred to by him elsewhere in his history. The Huguenot writer asserted that Navarre's principal favorites, "le sieur des Cars et Bouchard, chancelier," were friendly to and even "gagnés" by the Guises. Neither La Planohe nor de Thou attributed his vacillation to his councillors, but La Planche had considerable detail about their influence upon Antoine and their relations with the Guises. However, the latter named d'Escars, chamberlain and favorite of the king, and Jarnac, the Bishop of Mende, as the enervating influences upon Navarre. Thus, d'Aubigné, unless he confused the facts—not an extremely uncommon blunder for him—given by La Planche, must have utilized *La Légende* as his source. The anonymous author of this narrative wrote that the Guises utilized Navarre's councillors, "assavoir Dascars son chamberlan, Bouchart, son chancelier & autres / who were unnamed."

Naturally d'Aubigné's account of several incidents is a composite one drawn from two or more sources rather than only one. Probably d'Aubigné's description of the assembly of Fountainbleau,

---

35 *D'Aubigné, I, p. 244; de Thou, III, p. 378; La Planche, pp. 212, 213.*

36 *Mémoires de Condé, VI, p. 47.*
much briefer than the ones given by de Thou, La Place, or La Planche, is a composite product based upon all three accounts. His narrative is quite different from de Thou's and La Place's but very close to La Planche's, when he described the presentation by Admiral Coligny of a Huguenot petition concerning free practice of their faith.

D'Aubigné and La Planche stated that Coligny presented "une requête" immediately after the assembly was convened and before any speeches had been made. La Place and de Thou differed by writing that he presented two requests, which was done only after the welcoming speeches were completed and the second day's session had begun. It is true that d'Aubigné might have taken his information from the Inventaire général or the Recueil des choses mémorables, especially from the Recueil . . . which in this passage is nothing but a précis of the material in La Planche's history.

D'Aubigné concluded his account of this assembly by writing that the government agreed to convocate the Estates General at Meaux and also call a national church council. Then he stated, "Cependant les prisonniers pour la religion soient eslargis, sauf ceux qui avoyent esté trouvé en armes." Most chroniclers agreed about the convocation of the Estates and a council, but only de Thou and

---

37 This is the correct number, for two petitions are printed in the Mémoires de Condé, II, p. 645.

38 D'Aubigné, I, p. 278; de Thou, III, p. 526; La Planche, p. 351; La Place, p. 55; Inventaire général, II, p. 617; Recueil . . ., pp. 104, 105.
La Place asserted that the persecution of the Huguenots lessened. The former wrote, "Qu'on suspendoit quant-a-present la punition des Sectaires . . . ." The latter stated, "Et sans qu'on procedast plus par voye d'aucunes punitions de justice contre aucuns [Huguenots], sinon contre ceux qui s'esleveroyent avec armes et feroyent les seditieux . . . ." 39

D'Aubigné's material on the capture and confession, incriminating the Bourbons, of Jacques de la Sague, the chagrin and death of the Archbishop of Vienne, and the imprisonment of Condé and other suspects could very easily have been taken from La Place's pages. However, de Thou, who paraphrased and summarized these pages from the history of La Place as well as that of La Planche has virtually everything that is found in the Commentaires de l'estat de la religion et republique. Therefore, it is impossible to determine whether d'Aubigné relied primarily on La Place, La Planche, or de Thou for this information in Chapter XXI of Book II. Probably he wrote these pages with an eye, at least his mind's eye, on all three histories. 40

The discussion of Francis II's death and related events given by d'Aubigné includes data which he took from several sources. The works of de Thou, La Planche, and especially La Place and

39 D'Aubigné, I, p. 279; de Thou, III, p. 535; La Place, p. 65.
40 D'Aubigné, I, pp. 289-296; La Place, pp. 71-75.
La Popelinière seem to have served as sources for this section of the Histoire universelle. La Popelinière's account was largely copied from La Place's and La Planche's works, but he alone, in agreement with d'Aubigné, described the Constable's removal of the royal guards at Orléans and mentioned a ten-day interval between Francis II's death and Condé's release from prison at Orléans. La Place described, similarly but not identically with d'Aubigné, the lightness of Condé's imprisonment after the king's death.41

In citing dates for these momentous events d'Aubigné must have borrowed, and borrowed heedlessly, from his sources. He agreed with de Thou and La Place that the king died on December 5, 1560. La Popelinière and La Planche both asserted that Francis II succumbed on December 14. However, d'Aubigné must have followed La Popelinière's statement, but not the implied date of December 16, for the Vidame de Chartres' death. La Popelinière wrote, "Le Vidame of Chartres/ deçuda incontinent, deux jours après le deces du Roy." D'Aubigné's confused statement about both deaths surely means that the Vidame died "quasi au meme temps" as the king.42 This could not have been based on de Thou who dated the Vidame's death on December 15 or La Place who placed it about December 23 or 24. La Planche failed to specify the date of the Vidame's death. He merely said that the authorities sensed the approach of the king's death so the Vidame was moved from

41 D'Aubigné, I, pp. 298-300; La Popelinière, I, ff. 220, 222v; La Place, p. 76.

42 D'Aubigné, I, pp. 298, 299; de Thou, III, p. 575; La Place, p. 76; La Popelinière, I, ff. 208v, 220; La Planche, p. 418.
the Bastille to his home where he died immediately. Of course La Planohe narrated these details four pages before he described the death of François II.  

When relating the possible origins of the name Huguenot, d'Aubigné referred to two somewhat different theories associated with the city of Tours, which he may have taken from several writers. The Huguenot historian wrote,

Le Roi voulut faire son entrée à Tours, suspects pour le nombre des réformés, et où, comme quelques uns ont voulu, les Huguenots avoyent pris leur nom à cause de la Tour Hugon, où ils s'assemblaient, ou d'un lutin de même nom, duquel on menace les enfants en cette ville-là.

The theory of a playful ghost was given by de Thou as well as by La Planohe and the author of the Histoiere ecclésiastique. However, only de Thou spelled his name Hugon; the other two historians wrote Huguet. In the works of La Place and La Popelinière d'Aubigné could have found the story about a tower named Hugon.

43 De Thou, III, p. 580; La Place, p. 78; La Planohe, p. 414. All recent writers agree that François II died on December 5, 1560. De Ruble (d'Aubigné, I, p. 298, note 3) says that the Vidame of Chartres died between December 23 and 28, 1560. J. H. Mariéjol, Catherine de Médicis, p. 208, asserts that he died on December 22.

44 D'Aubigné, I, p. 275; de Thou, III, p. 485; La Planohe, p. 262; Histoiere ecclésiastique, I, p. 308; La Place, p. 34; La Popelinière, I, f. 162. H. Naef, "Huguenot ou le procès d'un mot," Bibliothèque d'humanisme et renaissance, XII (1950), pp. 208-227, has given the latest exposition of the origin of the word Huguenot. Naef asserts that it is derived from the German word eigenot, meaning confederate. It had been applied to the Genevan "confederates" who had expelled their bishop and the Duke of Savoy and had established an urban republic. After the conspiracy of Amboise it was widely applied to the French Protestants as a term of opprobrium. However, the Protestant historians cited above connected the name with Hugon or Huguet. Naef insists that Crespin,
Material for which No Sources Were Found

Naturally there are several incidents as well as individual facts in the part of d'Aubigné's historical opus, devoted to the reign of Francis II, for which no source could be found. Such incidents do not occur frequently enough to invalidate the thesis that d'Aubigné summarized de Thou's history; nevertheless, they must be acknowledged. Part of this information may have been acquired from friends, relatives, and his childhood memories. Another part may have been obtained from letters and memoirs sent to him by friends and fellow Huguenots who wished to aid his research. Other passages may have resulted from his careless and erroneous use of the sources.

A few of these instances, for which no sources have been found, are implausible or incredible and probably stem from faulty sources or faulty use of the sources. The latter seems to be true in d'Aubigné's characterization of François Olivier as a "créature du cardinal de Lorraine." The opinion of de Thou, who called Olivier a "personnage illustré par son intégrité," was also expressed by La Planche and the authors of the Recueil des choses mémorables and the Inventaire général. Perhaps d'Aubigné was following the latter work and arrived at his statement by jumbling the following sentence:

de Bâze, and perhaps other Protestant writers knew the correct origin but gave the erroneous explanation in order to prevent the French Protestants from being branded as rebels, i.e. confederates, versus their king through association with the Genevan émigrés.
of the Inventaire. "Ils [the Guises] ostent les sceaux au Cardinal Bertrand creature de ladite Duchesse de Valentois; & pour avoir un Chancelier à dévotion, retablissent Olivier."45

The ordeal of Anne du Bourg and the other Parlementarians imprisoned by Henry II shortly before his death occasioned some contradiction between d'Aubigné's account and those of the other historians. D'Aubigné, when recounting the assassination of President Antoine Minard of the Parlement of Paris wrote, "Quelques uns ont pensé que la mort du President Minard . . . avoir appris aux juges les plus rigoureux à mettre de l'eau dans leur vin." Whom d'Aubigné designated by the words "quelques uns" is a mystery. Writers either failed to mention any result of the assassination, as did the author of the "La Vraye histoire . . .," or like La Planche and La Place asserted that persecution of the Huguenots was intensified. De Thou declared, "Cet attentât hâta la perte de du Bourg . . . ." Thus no other source substantiates d'Aubigné's account.46

The Huguenot poet-historian was guilty of very inaccurate

45D'Aubigné, I, p. 242; de Thou, III, p. 374; La Planche, p. 204; Recueil . . ., p. 67; Inventaire général, II, p. 605. Some modern historians agree with d'Aubigné and probably accept his assertion at face value. J. W. Thompson, op. cit., p. 43, describes Olivier as "an instrument of the Guises." L. R. Lefèvre, Le Tumulte d'Amboise, p. 175, calls Olivier a "créature du cardinal de Lorraine."

L. Romier, op. cit., p. 180, accepts de Thou's characterization and writes that François Olivier "était un vieux robin, plein de 'pesanteur et gravité,' tatillon à merveille, qui devait sa fortune aux Guises, mais qui les ennuyait par sa manie de vouloir toujours peser et dégérer les choses premier que les dépoucher."

46D'Aubigné, I, p. 254; "La Vraye histoire . . .," Mémoires de Condé, I, pp. 246, 247; La Planche, p. 254; La Place, p. 27;
historiography when he described the fate of du Bourg's fellow prisoners and colleagues.

In this passage d'Aubigné contradicted not only his fellow historians but himself. He had already written that five Parliamentarians including du Bourg, were arrested by Henry II, but Arnauld du Ferrier and two associates escaped arrest. All the other chroniclers agreed among themselves about the fate of the five men who were arrested, and they agreed with d'Aubigné except for the inclusion of Ferrier. Probably de Thou was the source for this passage, and d'Aubigné inadvertently included the name of Ferrier and accorded to him the statement that de Thou made about de Foix. The great Catholic historian

---

J. W. Thompson, The Wars of Religion in France, pp. 15, 16, describes the murder of Minard and a messenger of the Parliament and writes, "These two crimes undoubtedly hardened the government and hastened the prosecution of du Bourg . . . ." L. R. Lefèvre, op. cit., pp. 200, 201, asserts that the death of Minard frightened the authorities and du Bourg was the first victim of this fright. He implies of course that there were other victims.

Lefèvre, op. cit., pp. 200 and 201, asserts that the Parisian Protestants very probably wanted an important martyr and did everything possible to ensure du Bourg's execution. This is a dubious assertion, and the Protestant attempts to secure his release disprove it. If d'Aubigné's statement about the death of Minard is correct, it completely contradicts Lefèvre.

wrote, "Paul de Foix fut honoré dans la suite de plusiers ambassades

In most of his description of the tumult of Amboise
d'Aubigné seems to have followed de Thou and La Planche as was said
above, but d'Aubigné disagreed with them and the other chroniclers
about the dates for the granting of the lieutenant generalship to
the Duke of Guise and the death of La Renaudie. d'Aubigné related
that these events occurred on the same day, but de Thou and La Planche
asserted that these events occurred on consecutive days. Of course,
La Planche dated them as March 17 and 18, whereas de Thou assigned
them to March 18 and 19. Perhaps this discrepancy in their dates led
to d'Aubigné's conflict with them.49

D'Aubigné wrote that the King of Navarre pursued and dis-
banded two thousand Protestants about the time of the Amboise dis-
turbance. This event was omitted by La Planche but de Thou and
La Place both included it. The former wrote that some scattered and
undisciplined troops were defeated by Navarre, but he did not specify
their number. La Place referred to the same anti-Huguenot action by

48D'Aubigné, I, pp. 233-235; de Thou, III, pp. 402-405. The
quotation from de Thou is found on p. 404.

49D'Aubigné, I, pp. 267, 268; de Thou, III, p. 488; La Planche,
pp. 252, 253. Both the sixteenth- and eighteenth-century editions of
the Mémoires de Condé, I, p. 340 (in the later edition), include the
royal edict, dated March 17, 1559, by which Guise received the lieu-
tenant generalship. J. W. Thompson, The Wars of Religion in France,
pp. 36 and 38, and J. H. Mariéjol, La Réforme et la Ligue, p. 17,
agree that the Duke of Guise was made lieutenant général on March 17,
1560, and that Renaudie was killed on March 19. L. Romier, La
Conjuration d'Amboise, pp. 113, 115, dates these events on March 17
and 18, 1560, as did La Planche.
Antoine, but he asserted that three or four thousand men were thus dispersed. In this instance d'Aubigné was probably following La Place but was careless, as he often was, with numbers. 50

D'Aubigné's statistics disagree once again with the other sources in his discussion of Maligny's unsuccessful attempt to seize Lyons in the summer of 1560. He wrote that before Maligny and his men were forced to flee from the city they killed one hundred or one hundred and twenty men from the city garrison. Both de Thou and La Planche gave detailed accounts of the unsuccessful coup, and d'Aubigné seems to have drawn his brief recital from de Thou's longer one. However, La Planche mentions only slight casualties, no more than three, on the side of the garrison. De Thou spoke of no deaths on either side, but he did refer to the large number of wounded that the garrison suffered at one stage of the conflict. 51

D'Aubigné made another statement, when describing Huguenot audacity in the summer of 1560, which is completely uncorroborated by any other writer. He wrote, "On commença à prêcher publiquement en

50 D'Aubigné, I, p. 271; de Thou, III, p. 502; La Place, p. 36.

51 D'Aubigné, I, p. 281; La Planche, p. 367; de Thou, III, p. 359. L. Romier, La Conjuration d'Amboise, p. 229, devotes one entire page to Maligny's fiasco at Lyons. He mentions that there was hot fighting, but he says nothing about the number of casualties. He asserts that Maligny allowed himself to be repulsed and his forces dispersed or captured, and he adds that the incompetence of the chiefs and the weakness of the soldiers recalls the lamentable occurrence of Amboise.

Romier's statements can hardly be reconciled with d'Aubigné's figures of one hundred or one hundred and twenty casualties among the royalist defenders.
either La Planche or de Thou, if not both, was d'Aubigné's source for this section. His narrative, although briefer, is precisely like theirs except that he mentions public preaching in Brittany, a fact which was unknown to his fellow historians. Was this another slip of the pen by d'Aubigné? 52

One of the most debatable assertions made by d'Aubigné, for which no contemporary source or corroboration has been found, relates to l'Hôpital and the conspiracy of Amboise. The Huguenot boldly declared,

[L'Hôpital] eust esté des conjurés pour le fait d'Amboise. Ce que je maintiens contre tout ce qui en a esté escript, pource que l'original de l'entreprise fut consigné entre les mains de mon père, où estoit son seing tout du long entre celui d'Andelot et d'un Spifame chose que j'ai fait voir à plusieurs personnes de marque. 53

Seemingly d'Aubigné's source is unimpeachable; moreover, he returned to this accusation, when recapitulating the Huguenot past near the conclusion of his Histoire universelle. There he even included the King of Navarre as one of "les principaux en intérêts et autorité" in the affair. 54

52D'Aubigné, I, p. 289; La Planche, pp. 294-296; de Thou, III, pp. 558, 559.


54D'Aubigné, IX, p. 286. Several historians have challenged d'Aubigné's assertion of l'Hôpital's complicity. De Ruble (d'Aubigné, I, p. 273, note 2) states that it appears unreasonable and is mentioned by no contemporary historian. Jean Héritier in his Michel de l'Hôpital (Paris, 1943), pp. 116, 117, stingingly rebukes d'Aubigné. He wrote, "Sur ce point l'Hôpital's connection with the plot rien n'est à retêmer des ridicules calomnies qui coururent, par la suite, et lorsqu'il était chancelier, sur les rapports de l'Hôpital et des conjurés. Agrippa d'Aubigné, aussi romanesque en ses mémoires
When discussing contemporary pamphleteering, d'Aubigné was guilty of a serious chronological inaccuracy which seemingly had no justification in the sixteenth-century sources. He asserted that one of the polemios of 1560, which provoked the Amboise troubles, was the Defenses contre les tyrans. This pamphlet, which is usually known by que vêhément en ses satires, a contribué avec Tavannes, a répondre ces imaginations, dénouées de tout fondament, et par lesquelles, Catherine de Médicis et son chancelier ont été, représentées comme favorisant, par un machiavélisme puéril, l'affaire d'Amboise . . .

To accuse l'Hôpital comme fait d'Aubigné, dans sa vantardise et sa légèreté contumelières, d'avoir signé une convention avec Andelot et Spifame, ne mérite pas d'être réfuté."

However, other modern historians are more cautious with their strictures and are more willing to accept the charge. A. Garnier, op. cit., I, p. 130, defends d'Aubigné and states, "Mais d'Aubigné l'affirme dans son Histoire où il n'a pas l'habitude de faire du roman. F. Leger, La Fin de la Ligue (Paris, 1944), p. 80 praises d'Aubigné as an historian and writes, "Ne lui faisons pas imprudemment la leçon. Ne prétendons pas mieux savoir son temps que lui. Si quelques dizaines d'années ont pu obscurcir ses souvenirs, quelques siècles ont pu amoindrir nos connaissances."

Moreover, the character of l'Hôpital does not make it completely incredible. Mariéjol, Catherine de Médicis (Paris, 1920), p. 141, describes him as humane and having a religion of love and charity. L'Hôpital became more sympathetic towards the Huguenots by the late 1560's especially after his wife and daughter had abandoned Roman Catholicism. A. C. Keller in "Michel de l'Hôpital . . .," Bibliothèque d'humanisme et renaissance, XIV (1952), p. 308, asserts that l'Hôpital displayed no reverence for the papacy and frequently attacked the Roman clergy. Keller considers l'Hôpital to have been a politique rather than a crypto-Huguenot. However, both Keller, pp. 300, 309, and Mariéjol, loc. cit., declare that in the early 1560's l'Hôpital insisted upon acceptance of only the Roman faith in France and obedience to the laws by the Protestants.

With respect to the complicity of Andelot in the plot, L. Romier, op. cit., pp. 45-56, and A. Whitehead, Gaspard de Coligny (London, 1904), p. 81, failed to incriminate him. However, Henri Nasç, op. cit., p. 30, placed some faith in d'Aubigné's statement and said that Andelot should not be too hastily absolved of guilt.
its Latin title, *Vindiciae Contra Tyrannos*, was analyzed rather accurately by him and attributed to Hubert Languet rather than to François Hotman or an unnamed gentleman whom he also mentioned. This pamphlet actually appeared in 1579 rather than 1560. It was a sharp Protestant criticism of the monarchy after the massacre of St. Bartholomew's Day and not a spur to the uprising at Amboise. Evidently d'Aubigné trusted his memory for this assertion and was grievously deceived.

Certain information in d'Aubigné's narrative of François II's reign is fully credible and probably accurate, though no printed source for this data has been found. D'Aubigné mentioned the Vidame of Chartres and Jacques de Boucarm as present at Vendôme for a Huguenot consultation with Antoine of Navarre shortly after the accession of Francis II. No other chronicler specified their names. In discussing the preparations made for the conspiracy of Amboise d'Aubigné described the planning meeting at Nantes and then gave a list of the men selected to recruit support for the conspiracy. His list is not

---

55D'Aubigné, I, pp. 256, 257.

56Pierre Mesnard, *L'Essor de la philosophie politique au XVIᵉ siècle* (Paris, 1951), pp. 337 ff., has an excellent summary of the authorship, raison d'être, and content of the *Vindiciae*. Mesnard states that Hubert Languet wrote the preface and third part but Philippe du Plessis-Mornay wrote the major part of it. De Ruble (d'Aubigné, I, p. 257, note 2) asserts that the anonymous gentleman referred to by d'Aubigné was du Plessis-Mornay.

57D'Aubigné, I, p. 243.
only more detailed than, but also somewhat different from, those
given by La Planche and de Thou. D'Aubigné's list should be the
most reliable because he wrote that Saint-Cyr and his lieutenant,
d'Aubigné, were assigned to Poitou. The latter individual was, of
course, Jean d'Aubigné, father of Agrippa.

When he described the last-minute assignments before the
execution of the Amboise plot, d'Aubigné said, "Le lieutenant de
S. Cire, avec trente autres, devoit couler le premier dans le
chateau . . . ." La Planche merely said it was decided that "un
autre" should lodge thirty men in the chateau. De Thou confessed
ignorance and wrote, "Un autre chef, dont on n'a pas sou le nom,
s'était charger d'amener encore trente officiers, & de les placer
dans la citadelle." D'Aubigné concluded his discussion of the
Amboise disturbance with another reference to these thirty men under
his father's leadership and here he expressly named his father as the
source for this information. D'Aubigné wrote,

Les trente, qui devoyent donner les premiers dans le chateau,
et autres, que r'allia celui qui les devoit mener, desja coulez
dans la rue basse d'entre la rivière et le chateau, se sauve-
rent, faisant les eschaufiez parmi ceux qui alloient attaquer
l'embuscade du paro. Ainsi ai-je ouy mon père en rendre compte
des amis.60

58 D'Aubigné, I, pp. 259, 260; La Planche, p. 239; de Thou, III,
p. 480.

59 D'Aubigné, I, p. 265; La Planche, p. 249; de Thou, III, p. 483.

60 D'Aubigné, I, pp. 270, 271.
It is evident that d'Aubigné's father was the source for his unique material about the Amboise conspiracy. Also Jean d'Aubigné very probably informed him that Jacques de Boucart and the Vidame of Chartres were present with other Huguenot nobles at Vendôme to confer with Navarre. d'Aubigné's père very likely attended the conference himself.

There is no reason for questioning the historicity of the information in the two preceding paragraphs that is supplied solely by d'Aubigné. However, the paucity of credible, original data in d'Aubigné's account lends weight to the thesis that his narrative is essentially a summarization of de Thou's history with some material inserted from the accounts of La Planche, La Place, and other writers.
CHAPTER IV

D'AUBIGNÉ'S SOURCES FROM 1670 THROUGH THE ST. BARTHOLOMEW MASSACRE AT PARIS

The events from the Peace of St. Germain in August, 1570, through the St. Bartholomew massacre form a naturally unified and dramatic section in the Histoire universelle. Personal observations, experiences, and conversations could have supplied d'Aubigné with considerable information for this portion of his history.

Temporarily his military adventures had ceased with the conclusion of hostilities, but a tempestuous love affair began. Since d'Aubigné was eighteen years of age in 1570, his guardian presented to him his inheritance, whereupon the young soldier retired to his small estate of Landes-Guinemer in the Loire valley to the west of Orléans. Nearby was the impressive chateau of Taloy where d'Aubigné became enamoured of the lord's daughter, Diane de Salviati. For about two years this "roman d'amour" was carried on until d'Aubigné traveled to Paris for the wedding of Marguerite of Valois and Henry of Navarre. He was evidently present in the capitol from about mid-July, 1572, until August 21, 1572, when a conflict with the Parisian guard forced him to flee. D'Aubigné and a troop of soldiers, which he had raised

---

1The material studied for this present chapter comprises chaps. i-iv, bk. vi, Vol. III, pp. 273-343, of de Rubé's edition of the Histoire universelle.
for Admiral Coligny's campaign against the Spanish in Flanders, re­
turned to the Loire region and thus escaped the St. Bartholomew
holocaust. During the several months following this tragedy d'Aubigné
resided either at Taloy or Landes-Guinemer.  

In addition to his recollections of the events from 1570
to 1572, d'Aubigné could have utilized numerous printed narratives as
sources for his Histoire. There were the general histories such as
those of de Thou and La Popelinière or the Recueil des choses
mémorables and the Inventaire général. Also specialized works like
the Mémoires de l'estat de France sous Charles neuvième ... or
pamphlets such as the De Furoribus Gallicis, Le Réveille-matin des
Français et de leurs voisins," and various others were available to
the Huguenot historian.3 Nevertheless, d'Aubigné again, as for his
narrative of the reign of François II, borrowed extensively from de Thou's
Histoire universelle. However, he considerably supplemented de Thou's
fine work with the Mémoires ... sous Charles IX.

D'Aubigné's Use of de Thou's Histoire Universelle

Near the end of his chapter on the St. Bartholomew massacre at
Paris, d'Aubigné gave a general description of the horrors accomplished

2A. Garnier, op. cit., I, pp. 91-93, 103, 104, 110, 113, 114, 116,
127-130.

3In addition to the footnote abbreviations listed at the beginning
of chap. iii, hereafter the Mémoires de l'estat de France sous Charles
neuvième ... (Mèdelbourg, 1578) shall be referred to in the text
and cited in the Footnotes as Mémoires ... sous Charles IX and "Le
Réveille-matin des Français et de leurs voisins," Archives curieuses,
First Series, VII, pp. 167-207, as "Réveille-matin."
there. Then he concluded this description by writing, "Je n'ai voulu en ces dernières lignes faire office que de traduoteur." At first glance this statement is rather confusing, and one might conclude that he sought only to explain faithfully these events. However, d'Aubigné stated earlier in this paragraph,

Tous ceux qui ont descrit cette journée, et par dessus tous ce grand senateur de Thou, n'ont point de honte de dire de leur ville mesme que les capitaines et dixaniers exctoyent leurs bourgeois à une triste et horrible face partout . . . .

A comparison of de Thou's text with d'Aubigné proves that the Huguenot literally meant that he was perforating the role of a language translator when he used the word traduoteur. De Thou's history existed only in a Latin edition in the seventeenth century, and d'Aubigné merely gave a free translation or paraphrase of de Thou's generalizations about the horrors. D'Aubigné's passage has about 135 words and de Thou's text in French about 140 words; moreover, the context is identical. There are minor variations in terminology, but they might have resulted from the translation into French by different men.4

Of course, d'Aubigné did not slavishly copy or plagiarize -- if this is plagiarism -- de Thou's history elsewhere. However, the Huguenot historian followed the latter's chef d'oeuvre very closely. There are numerous factual differences resulting primarily from omissions or additions by d'Aubigné and occasionally from varying

4D'Aubigné, III, pp. 328, 329; De Thou, VI, p. 408.
descriptions of the same events, but d'Aubigné undoubtedly wrote
his narrative of St. Bartholomew's day, just as he did that for the
reign of Francis II, with de Thou's text well in mind and probably
open before him. The topical chart in Appendix II illustrates
d'Aubigné's reliance on de Thou. From page 273 to page 335
d'Aubigné's outline, except for three insignificant differences, is
exactly the same as de Thou's. From page 335 to page 342 d'Aubigné's
Histoire is very similar to de Thou's, and the chart reveals only
four events that are found in the former's but not in the latter's
account.

Not only does the similarity in organization and narrative
reveal d'Aubigné's debt to de Thou, but also the numerous events
which are described only in their two histories prove that d'Aubigné
again took the substance of his narrative from de Thou's Histoire
universelle. From no other narrative did d'Aubigné borrow so much
material when writing his account of the St. Bartholomew massacre.

On pages 286 and 287 of Volume III appears an example of
d'Aubigné's debt to de Thou. It is true that d'Aubigné somewhat
changed de Thou's account, but the debt is clear nonetheless. This
material is found in none of the other chronicles. D'Aubigné de-
scribed the Guises' irritation and departure from the court because
of Coligny's warm reception by the king. They were followed by
Catherine and the Duke of Anjou, and a conference was held to plan
the destruction of the Huguenots in the "festive and mock" storming
of a "fort à plaisir." In addition, d'Aubigné asserted that the
conspirators met in the room where Henry III later died. De Thou gave this same material, but he described first the plans for a "fort à plaisir" which he said were discussed by the same conspirators in two fateful rooms, subsequently to become the death chambers of Henry of Guise and Henry of Valois. Then de Thou related the irritation and departure of the Guises after a three-paragraph interjection about the assassination of Lignerolles and the flight of Charlotte of Bourbon.\(^5\)

D'Aubigné's discussion of the fears of the inhabitants of La Rochelle and their warning to Coligny with his response was undoubtedly taken from de Thou's history also, since their narratives are almost identical.\(^6\) The Mémoires . . . sous Charles IX have considerable detail about this incident, but they omit certain data, for example the names of Lansao and Landreau, found in de Thou and d'Aubigné.\(^7\)

De Thou's history was probably not the most important source for d'Aubigné's account of the death of the Queen of Navarre, but his celebrated eulogy of her is virtually a paraphrase of de Thou's.

\(^5\)De Thou, VI, pp. 327, 328, 330. Very probably d'Aubigné secured most of his information for this discussion from de Thou. However, d'Aubigné was also an eyewitness to part of it, and he wrote, "Mais l'affaire de [the "fort à plaisir"] sembla grosse /to the Court/, et nous ne vismo qu'une fois ce fort, pour que'il fut aussi tout ruiné."

\(^6\)D'Aubigné, III, pp. 289, 290; de Thou, VI, p. 339.

\(^7\)Mémoires . . . sous Charles IX, I, ff. 251v-253r.
All the Protestant historians praised her, but none, even the author of the Mémoires . . . sous Charles IX, extolled her virtues so similarly to d'Aubigné as did de Thou. De Thou wrote,

"On remarque toujours dans cette Princesse beaucoup d'esprit & de courage. Très-attachée à sa religion, elle n'épargna ni travaux, ni dépenses pour la defendre; elle avoit une intrepidity audessus de son sexe; il n'eut point de péril, qu'elle ne méprisât, pour rendre service à la cause qu'elle avoit embrassée."

Evidently d'Aubigné was thinking of this statement by de Thou when he penned the often-quoted sentence which follows:

"Ainsi mourut cette princesse n'ayant de feurme que le sexe l'âme entière de choses viriles, l'esprit puissant aux grands affaires, le coeur invincible à adversitez."

The accounts by de Thou and d'Aubigné of the counsel which Coligny and Jean Morvilliers gave to Charles IX about war in Flanders are remarkably similar. No other historian's narrative of this subject approximates theirs except for the recital given by La Popelinière, and the latter omitted many facts found in the accounts of de Thou and d'Aubigné. Charles II had asked Coligny and

---


9D'Aubigné, of course, based his characterization of Jeanne d'Albret on more than de Thou's history. Nabonne, Jeanne d'Albret: Reine des Huguenots (Paris, 1945), p. 9, quotes d'Aubigné's words of praise and says that d'Aubigné knew the Queen of Navarre. Nabonne corroborates and enlarges upon the statements of both de Thou and d'Aubigné.

10The occasion for the memoranda about the Spanish war had been the capture of Mons from the Spanish. Concerning this latter
Morvilliers respectively for pro and con discussions of the projected Flemish campaign against Spain. De Thou quoted in full their memoranda and d'Aubigné summarized them, undoubtedly from de Thou's pages.11 The Huguenot's debt to the Catholic is strikingly emphasized in their unique descriptions of the advice that Coligny whispered into the ear of the king rather than entrust it to writing.

The admiral warned Charles IX, asserted both historians, of the danger that the English might interfere in the Low Countries if the French abstained there. Also, d'Aubigné surely borrowed his characterization of Morvilliers from de Thou. The latter wrote,

\begin{quote}
Morvilliers passoit pour un homme de probité, à qui l'expérience avait donné de grandes lumières . . . .
\end{quote}

His spirit panchoit toujours pour le côté le plus sûr. La crainte d'un péril present, quelque léger qu'il fût, le rendoit incapable de donner un conseil mâle & vigoureux pour prévenir un péril beaucoup plus grand, & plus difficile à parer.


As has been said, d'Aubigné unquestionably was following de Thou for this material, and no other possible source for d'Aubigné has been found which attributes this capture to Prince William of Orange. However, the Huguenot borrowed from the Catholic historian carelessly, for de Thou very plainly wrote, VI, p. 342, "Pendant que l'affaire de la guerre de Flandre se négocioit avec chaleur, on reçut la nouvelle que Louis de Nassau avoit surpris Mons en Hainaut."

11 d'Aubigné, III, pp. 293-295; de Thou, VI, pp. 343-370; La Popelinière, II, ff. 44r-47r.
D'Aubigné succinctly and forcefully paraphrased de Thou's description
and appraised Morvilliers as a "vieil conseiller d'État, docte et
experimenté, ennemi de toute nouveauté et qui faisait prudence de
 crainte."

Immediately after de Thou's and d'Aubigné's accounts of
the pro-and anti-war counsels, they both included two paragraphs
which are virtually identical. Once again the Huguenot paraphrased
the text of the Catholic. De Thou wrote,

Pendant que le Roi cherche à gagner du temps par ces disputes,
& que Feligny Briquevaut à Chavagnes vont sans cesse con-
ferer avec Coligny qui était à Chatillon-sur-Loing, on reçut
la nouvelle que les troupes de Genlis avoient été taillées
en pièces par le duc d'Albe. Le Roi fit semblant d'y être
très-sensibles; & il écrivit à Mondouet son agent auprès
du duc d'Albe, de faire tout ce qu'il pourroit pour engager
ce Général à mettre en liberté les Gentilshommes Français,
qu'il avoit fait prisonniers; & Coligny toujours plein de
confiance, étant venu à la Cour contre l'avis de ses amis
le Roi lui permit de lever sur la frontière autant de
troupes qu'il le jugerait nécessaire.

D'Aubigné also described the Protestant setback in the Lowlands and
the departure of Coligny for Paris, but he stated more concisely,

Durant ces disputes, la nouvelle vint de la défaite de
Genlis. Le roi écrivit de belles lettres à l'ambassadeur
Mondouet, résident près le duc d'Albe, en faveur des
gentilshommes prisonniers, et l'amiral, contre le conseil
de ses amis, va à Paris impétrer tant de commissions qu'il
voulut pour lever des forces à la frontière.

Very probably d'Aubigné borrowed and virtually plagiarized

---

12 D'Aubigné, III, p. 295; de Thou, VI, p. 358.
13 D'Aubigné, III, p. 296; de Thou, VI, p. 370.
another statement found in both his and de Thou's history. Coligny had received various warnings about the danger of royal treachery since his arrival at Paris. De Thou and d'Aubigné gave them, but in somewhat different order and form. Then they attributed to Coligny a very striking statement which indicated his sincere aversion to further civil strife. Only de Thou, of the possible printed sources for d'Aubigné asserted that the admiral said, "qu'il aimoit mieux être traîné par les rues de Paris, que se ranger dans une guerre civile." D'Aubigné put precisely the same words in the mouth of Coligny; he described how the admiral replied to these admonitions by saying that "il aimoit mieux se laisser traîner par les bouées de Paris qu'à la guerre civile."

D'Aubigné's description of the warnings given to Coligny and to the Bourbon princes is followed by a paragraph about the marriage of Condé and the arrival of Navarre and Condé at Paris. D'Aubigné wrote, "Tout cela [the warnings from the pessimistic Huguenots] bien rabroué, les noces du prince de Condé etant achevées à Blandi, les princes vindrent à Paris . . . ." De Ruble justly remarked that d'Aubigné committed an error, since the princes entered Paris on July 8, 1572, one month before the wedding of Condé.

However, d'Aubigné's chronological mistake proves that his narrative, which is identical with de Thou's, was borrowed from the Catholic

---

14D'Aubigné, III, p. 300; de Thou, VI, p. 372.
historian. The latter said that Navarre attended the marriage of Condé to Marie of Cleves at Blandy. De Thou continued his account and wrote,

La cérémonie du mariage étant faite, les deux Princes suivis d'un grand nombre de Protestans, se rendirent à Paris malgré les remonstrances de leurs amis; c'étoit au commencement du mois d'Août.15

De Thou's Histoire and the Mémoires ... sous Charles IX have detailed treatments of the final preparations for the massacre, but very probably d'Aubigné followed de Thou's narrative when he composed his description of these events. There are similarities in all three accounts, but d'Aubigné's relation is identical with de Thou's whereas it differs with that of the Mémoires ... sous Charles IX in three notable instances. D'Aubigné's quotation of the Duke of Guise's last-minute instructions is more like that given by de Thou than by the writer of the Mémoires. Moreover, the first two writers used quotation marks around Guise's words, whereas the author of the Mémoires did not.16

Also, de Thou and d'Aubigné agreed about the parts played by Jean Charron and Claude Marcel, the new and the former holders of the office of Prévot des Marchands at Paris, in these preparations.


16 D'Aubigné, III, pp. 315, 314; de Thou, VI, pp. 395, 396; Mémoires ... sous Charles IX, 1, ff. 284, 285.
They both declared that Charron gathered the Parisian officials before the Hôtel de Ville where at midnight Maroel explained to them the plans for the massacre. However, the author of the Mémoires reversed the roles played by Maroel and Charron.

Finally, d'Aubigné used the same phrase as de Thou when relating the midnight instructions that were given to the Parisian officials. In d'Aubigné's Histoire one reads, "que toutes les villes de France faisoient comme eux" and in de Thou's work "que toutes les villes du Royaume suivissent l'exemple de la Capitale." However, the author of the Mémoires had written, "qu'on leur [the Huguenots] feroit pareil traitement en chasque province . . . ." Undoubtedly, d'Aubigné was quite familiar with the Mémoires . . . sous Charles IX, but here he again was indebted primarily to de Thou.

D'Aubigné's description of the murder of Coligny and the abuse wreaked upon his corpse was written from material garnered in numerous places, some impossible to discover. However, part of the account was certainly taken from de Thou's history since the information is not found elsewhere. De Ribble was justified when he asserted that d'Aubigné's jejuine remark that Coligny's enemies in putting his body in mud, water, fire, and air employed "à leur vengeance tous les éléments" was taken from de Thou. Also, the latter supplied the source for d'Aubigné's observation that "ils le [Coligny] traînent par les rues, selon ce qu'il avoit prédit sans y penser . . . ."

17D'Aubigné, III, p. 318; de Thou, VI, p. 400. De Ribble's comment is found in d'Aubigné, III, p. 318, note 5.
On pages 322 to 324 of Volume III d'Aubigné described the deaths of numerous Huguenot nobles such as Soubize and Laverdin. Except for four trivial points, all of d'Aubigné's material can be found in de Thou's Histoire universelle and arranged very similarly. Of course, the Mémoires . . . sous Charles IX parallel, with some omissions and a few valuable additions, de Thou's material and were very probably also used by d'Aubigné. The latter's observations about the remarkable salvation and subsequent life of Jacques Nompar de Caumont, Duke de la Force, must have been borrowed from de Thou. Their accounts are identical, and d'Aubigné's remark that he was saved by Biron "de la fille duquel il a aujourd'hui une excellente lignée" is much too similar to the following statement by de Thou to have been mere coincidence. The latter wrote,

Il semble que Dieu l'ait voulu arracher à la mort pour relever cette maison qui estoit prête à tomber, & qui est aujourd'hui très-florissante par le grand nombre d'ênfans qu'il a eus de Charlotte de Gontault fille de Biron.

The only other account of this incident which has been found is a brief one in the "Réveille-matin," lacking many details which are included in both d'Aubigné's and de Thou's recitals.18

D'Aubigné was undoubtedly merely paraphrasing de Thou when he described the murderous orgies of a certain Croiset, or Crucé, who killed four hundred men and then became a hermit with vampire desires, and when he related the means by which the Montmorencys

---

escaped destruction. In the Mémoires . . . sous Charles IX are found some references to this material, but they are considerably different and less detailed. 19

The death of the distinguished Huguenot historian and parliamentarian, Pierre de la Place, is described by d'Aubigné in precisely the same manner as by de Thou. There is also a pious and lengthy account of this murder in the Mémoires . . . sous Charles IX, but this has several variations when compared with d'Aubigné's account. 20 Again de Thou's history must be assessed as d'Aubigné's chief source.

Finally, the Huguenot historian is indubitably indebted to de Thou for his description of the salvation of Resniers, or Regniers, by his bitter but honorable enemy Vesins. D'Aubigné's recital has a few details, for example the valuation of the horse given to Resniers by Vesins at 500 éous or the astonishment of Resnier's wife when he returned safely from Paris, which are not found in de Thou's account. Nevertheless, de Thou was surely a source for d'Aubigné's narrative since the two are so very similar and no other record of this event has been found. Very probably d'Aubigné's additional information was supplied to him orally, possibly from the mouth of Resniers. 21

19d'Aubigné, III, pp. 330, 331; de Thou, VI, pp. 410, 411; Mémoires . . . sous Charles IX, I, ff. 314v, 315r.

20d'Aubigné, III, p. 344; de Thou, VI, p. 415; Mémoires . . . sous Charles IX, I, ff. 300-303.

21d'Aubigné, III, pp. 338, 339; de Thou, VI, pp. 412, 413. It
The final part of d'Aubigné's chapter devoted to the Paris slaughter is based solely upon the history of de Thou. In these paragraphs he described the lit de justice, which Charles IX held with the Parlement of Paris, the Jubilee issued by the clergy, and the royal edict by which Coligny and the other victims were accused of weaving a conspiracy against the king.

Except for two minor points every fact found in d'Aubigné's narrative can be discovered in de Thou's. One of these points is d'Aubigné's statement about Christophe de Thou, first president of the Parlement and publicly a supporter of the massacre. D'Aubigné wrote that de Thou "pleuroit et soupirait à la maison et détestoit le règne présent." Understandably no such statement is made about Christophe de Thou in his son's Histoire universelle; however, the latter did write that his father made a speech "accommodé au temps." De Thou fils and d'Aubigné also disagreed about the dates of the Jubilee and the royal edict. The former stated that both occurred on Thursday, August 28. D'Aubigné gave no specific date and merely said that the edict was issued the day after the celebration of the Jubilee was remarked by De Ruble that d'Aubigné borrowed his information from de Thou, but he failed to note that the Huguenot historian had details in his account not found in the Catholic's.

22 D'Aubigné, III, pp. 341, 342; de Thou, VI, pp. 417-421.

Jubilee. This disagreement does not invalidate the contention that de Thou was d'Aubigné's only source; no other source agrees with d'Aubigné's date and several agree with de Thou. Evidently d'Aubigné once more carelessly utilized the history of the great Catholic writer.

De Buble asserted that d'Aubigné had borrowed all these details from the Mémoires ... sous Charles IX.24 M. de Buble again denied just credit to de Thou; for the narrative in the Mémoires ... sous Charles IX lacks several facts, found in both de Thou and d'Aubigné, about the lit de justice. Moreover, the greater part of the narrative in the Mémoires ... sous Charles IX was plagiarized from the "Réveille-matin."25

Surely the information given above and the page numbers in the topical chart in Appendix II illustrate conclusively that de Thou's Histoire universelle was the most important source of information for this portion of d'Aubigné's history.

D'Aubigné's Debt to the Mémoires ... sous Charles IX

Nevertheless, the Mémoires ... sous Charles IX were also an important source although definitely secondary to de Thou's narrative. The topical chart shows that of the seventy-eight topics

listed only fifteen were omitted from the account in the Mémoires . . . sous Charles IX. Moreover, the accounts in the Mémoires are virtually always more detailed than those in de Thou's and d'Aubigné's histories. The arrangement of materials in the Mémoires . . . sous Charles IX is similar to that found in d'Aubigné, but there is not the similitude between the outlines of the Mémoires . . . sous Charles IX and d'Aubigné's history as between d'Aubigné's outline and de Thou's.

There are at least four if not five events for which d'Aubigné drew information primarily from the Mémoires . . . sous Charles IX. In discussing the massacre of some Protestants at Orange in February, 1571, d'Aubigné has some details which are found in the relation of these events given in the Mémoires but not in de Thou's account. For example, d'Aubigné wrote that "quelques jeunes hommes de bonne famille [were] tirez entre les mains des mères." The only possible source for this remark was the following statement in the Mémoires . . . sous Charles IX.

Entre autres un jeune gentilhomme nommé Chabert aîné de seize a dixsept ans, nouvellement revenu de Paris où il avait étudié, fut cruellement meurtry entre les bras de sa mere . . . . Plusiers maris furent massacrez entre les bras de leurs femmes.

---

26D'Aubigné, III, pp. 276, 277; de Thou, VI, p. 267; Mémoires sous Charles IX, I, ff. 40v-47r.

27I, f. 43v.
Likewise, d'Aubigné and the author of the Mémoires agreed that Marshall Danville or his assistant in Orange had been guilty of laxity in repressing the slaughter of the Huguenots, whereas de Thou stated that prompt and strict measures had been taken against the "seditious" Catholics. However, d'Aubigné, who declared that the disturbances lasted three days, agreed with de Thou on this rather than with the author of the chronicle in the Mémoires sous Charles IX, who asserted that the "massacres et ravages... continué depuis le 2 Fevrier jusques au 17..."  

D'Aubigné was undoubtedly drawing much of his material uniquely from the Mémoires sous Charles IX when he related the apparent rupture between the Duke of Guise and the king after the wounding of Coligny. In the Mémoires is found a lengthy description of Guise's irritation and request to leave the Court occasioned by the arrest of one of his followers and the coldness of Charles IX toward him. D'Aubigné's account of the same events is considerably briefer but is much more similar to that of the Mémoires than to any other.  

De Ruble asserted that d'Aubigné had copied the Latin epitaph, which follows the description of Coligny's death in the

---

28 D'Aubigné, III, p. 277; Mémoires... sous Charles IX, I, ff. 45v, 46v; de Thou, VI, p. 287.

29 D'Aubigné, III, p. 312; Mémoires... sous Charles IX, I, f. 280.
This he might very easily have done, but very possibly he copied the epitaph directly from the admiral's grave at Châtillon. D'Aubigné asserted that Coligny's bones had been interred at Châtillon in 1608; then he wrote, "Maintenant il ya une lame d'airin dessus, avec l'épitaphe qui s'ensuit, composé par Scaliger."  

The Mémoires . . . sous Charles IX must have been d'Aubigné's source for two descriptions of the slaughter of infants during the horrors. D'Aubigné wrote,  

Un petit enfant au maillot fut traîné par les rues avec un ceinture au col par d'autres enfants de dix ans; d'autres qui jouoyent à la barbe de ceux qui les emportoyent tuer, et ce jeu payé d'un coup de dague à travers le corps.  

These facts are found only in the Mémoires . . . sous Charles IX; moreover, the text is so similar that d'Aubigné probably merely paraphrased it. The author of the chronicle in the Mémoires . . . Charles IX wrote,  

Un petit enfant au maillot fut traîné par les rues avec un ceinture au col par des garçons sages de neuf à dix ans. Un autre petit enfant emporté par un massacreur se jouoit à la barbe d'iœluy et ce sourioit. Mais au lieu de l'esmonvoir à compassion, ce barbare endiablé luy donna un coup de dague, puis le jetta en l'eau . . . .  

---

30 The epitaph is found in Tome I, f. 563 of the Mémoires . . . sous Charles IX and de Rubly's assertion in d'Aubigné, III, p. 319, note 4.
31 D'Aubigné, III, p. 318.
32 D'Aubigné, III, p. 336; Mémoires . . . sous Charles IX, I, f. 315.
D'Aubigné continued the passage quoted above with a recital of the brutal treatment meted out to two sets of sisters, but the source of these remarks has not been found in either the Mémoires ... sous Charles IX or elsewhere.

Very probably d'Aubigné relied upon the Mémoires ... sous Charles IX as one source for his account of a Huguenot lawyer's, a certain Taverny's, or Teverni's, valiant but unsuccessful defense of his home against the assassins. However, d'Aubigné's narrative has several details that are not found in the Mémoires. Perhaps a letter, memoir, or even oral information served as his additional source.

D'Aubigné's Debt to and Fusion of Various Sources

Actually one might say that hardly any accounts other than de Thou's Histoire universelle and the Mémoires ... sous Charles IX served as unique sources for the different incidents related by

35 d'Aubigné, III, p. 340; Mémoires ... sous Charles IX, I, ff. 305, 306. In "Le Tocassin contre les massacreurs," Archives curieuses, First Series, VII, p. 61, Teverni's valiant but hopeless struggle is recorded in identical fashion with that of the Mémoires ... sous Charles IX. However, the omission of Teverni's name in "Le Tocassin"'s account indicates that d'Aubigné followed the Mémoires and not "Le Tocassin." It is difficult to say whether the author of "Le Tocassin" plagiarized the Mémoires or vice versa. Known publication dates indicate the former, since the second edition of the Mémoires appeared in 1578 and "Le Tocassin" was printed in 1579. However, M. Henri Hauser, Les Sources de l'histoire de France, III, p. 253, asks, "Est-ce la première édition?" Moreover, the method by which the Mémoires were composed—plagiarism of various earlier accounts which were pieced together—indicates that the version in "Le Tocassin" may be the original.
d'Aubigné in this section. Certainly no other books were such con­stant aids in d'Aubigné's historiographical labors on the St.
Bartholomew massacre. Possibly La Popelinière's history along with
d'Aubigné's own observations supplied the material for the latter's
rather partisan remarks about the state of France and the attitudes
of the Catholics and Protestants in 1570. D'Aubigné began his
Book I of Tome II as follows:

Du long et violent travail des troisièmes guerres, tous
les particuliers d'un parti, aussi bien que leurs grands,
n'affectoyent qu'un repos de meme mesure; autres estoient
les pensées des suprêmes dominateurs et de la lies du peuple
de l'autre parti.

Very possibly d'Aubigné was remembering or looking at, as he penned
the above sentences, the generalizations given by La Popelinière at
the beginning of Tome II of his history. In a somewhat more re­strained vein the latter had written,

En general tous les bons Catholiques & Confederez /Huguenots/
... dressaient leurs prières au Ciel pour les bien heurer
à l'avenir d'une assurée bonasse, d'un temps clair & serain,
leguel changeant les ennemis passés avec un plaisir present;
leur fist voir le reste de leurs jours accompagné du repos
tant désiré.54

54 D'Aubigné, III, p. 273; La Popelinière, II, f. lv.
La Popelinière's description may be more restrained and seemingly
impartial than d'Aubigné's, but very probably the latter was more
accurate. Jean Héritier, certainly no friend of the Huguenots, in
his Catherine de Médicis (Paris, 1940), p. 454, wrote,

"La paix de Saint-Germain, si elle avait indigné les
xéles du catholicisme, ne rencontrait que défiance chez les
Huguenots, mécontents des restrictions, imposées au gouvernemen­t
par l'esprit public, dans l'application des clauses qui leur étaient
le plus favorables."
Unquestionably the "Réveille-matin" served as d'Aubigné's sole source for a tale of heartless avarice and cool-headed perception during the massacre. After the younger La Force boy had been safely escorted to Marshall de Biron, the boy's sister and heiress unsuccessfully tried to secure control of his person. Biron realized that she intended to murder the boy and refused to put him in her custody. Of d'Aubigné's known sources only the author of the "Réveille-matin" recounts this incident.55

The details which d'Aubigné included in his account of the death of the Queen of Navarre undoubtedly came from only one source, from the lengthy "Legende de Domp Claude de Guyse" found in the Mémoires de Condé. Probably only in this lurid narrative could d'Aubigné have found a printed source which mentioned, as did he, a certain "Saint-Barthélemi, grand empoisonneur, et accusé d'avoir fait mourir plusieurs princes," and servant of Claude of Guise, who was Abbot of Cluny and an alleged bastard of Duke Claude of Guise.36 Moreover, there is no question in either the "Legend of Domp Claude" or the Histoire universelle about the truth of the story that Jeanne d'Albret, Queen of Navarre, was poisoned, whereas virtually all the sixteenth-century historians cast doubt upon this allegation.37

37The author of the Mémoires . . . sous Charles IX, I, ff. 221v, 222r, recounted the poisoning story without questioning it. However,
Several incidents in d'Aubigné's narrative were very probably based upon material drawn jointly from de Thou's history and the Mémoires . . . sous Charles IX. This is true of his description of the conferences between the royal envoys, the Marshall de Cossé and La Proutièrê, and the Huguenot leaders at La Rochelle in December, 1570.\(^\text{38}\) Except for one minor point


---

Bernard Nabonne in his recent biography, Jeanne d'Albret, Reine des Huguenots, pp. 266-277, affirms that she died a natural death from a lung ailment. Moreover, he shows that she was ill before coming to the court and that she wrote a letter from Blois on March 11, 1572, in which she said (p. 271), "Je vous dirais encore que s'il me fallait être encore un mois comme je suis, je serais malade . . . ." However, Nabonne believes that Catherine, recognizing the weakened condition of Jeanne d'Albret, did everything legally possible to bring about her death.
de Thou's account has everything and more than d'Aubigné's. De Thou did not mention that Admiral Coligny was the protagonist in presenting the Huguenot complaints and justifications. However, the statement that Cossé talked very privately with the Queen of Navarre and especially with Coligny is found in the Mémoires . . . sous Charles IX and may be the source of d'Aubigné's assertion.\(^59\) One of the Protestant complaints was that Chancellor l'Hôpital had been removed as Keeper of the Seals because of his lack of Catholic fanaticism. His dismissal was mentioned by d'Aubigné but not by the author of the Mémoires . . . sous Charles IX. However, de Thou supplied this information for the Huguenot historian.\(^40\) D'Aubigné's description of these conferences is essentially a paraphrase and fusion of the Mémoires and de Thou's narrative.

The Huguenot warrior-historian included a brief paragraph about massacres of Protestants at Rouen and Dieppe. These two attacks are recounted with much greater detail in both the history of de Thou and the Mémoires . . . sous Charles IX.\(^41\) D'Aubigné might have been following either of these two accounts, but probably he used both. D'Aubigné included no information alien to these two sources except for a trivial point which probably was a result of carelessness. He stated that three hundred persons were condemned to death but only

\(^59\)I, f. 33r.  \(^40\)VI, p. 263.

\(^41\)D'Aubigné, III, p. 276; de Thou, VI, pp. 265, 266; Mémoires . . . sous Charles IX, I, ff. 58-66.
two men were actually hanged. De Thou and the author of the Mémoires agreed that three hundred were condemned, but the former said that "quelques uns des coupables, gens sans noms," were hanged and the latter that a few "belistres" were hanged in person.

The following statement by d'Aubigné is surely based upon material in de Thou's history, or the Mémoires, or both. D'Aubigné wrote,

\[\text{De ce temps le roi fait une grande et longue harangue dans son parlement, où, après avoir touché les manquements qui paraissent en toutes les charges, il y joignit les remonstrances et exhortations de faire mieux, et puis n'oublia rien pour se montrer passionné à l'entretien de la paix.}\]

De Thou and the author of the Mémoires . . . sous Charles IX purported to give the entire speech of the king to the Parisian Parlement.42 The content and organization of the speech as given by them is the same, but they varied slightly in terminology. D'Aubigné's analysis of the speech is arranged differently from the full speech as given by de Thou and the author of the Mémoires. D'Aubigné reported that the king criticized the laxity of the officials, urged them to do better, and especially stressed the need for peace; whereas the "harangue" in d'Aubigné's two sources was begun with a plea for peace and then the failures of the officialdom and encouragement to improve followed. This transposition of ideas was

42 D'Aubigné, III, p. 277; de Thou, VI, pp. 269-271; Mémoires . . . sous Charles IX, I, ff. 55-57r.
undoubtedly a result of carelessness and was not taken from another source.

The Mémoires . . . sous Charles IX and de Thou's Histoire . . . must have been the sources for d'Aubigné's account of the Duke of Montmorency's retirement from Paris to Chantilly shortly after the marriage of Henry of Navarre and Marguerite of France.43

De Thou's narrative was more important to d'Aubigné since they both referred to Montmorency's poor health or his anticipation of the massacre as possible reasons for his departure. The health issue is not mentioned in the Mémoires . . ., but a hunting trip is referred to as the pretext for his journey to Chantilly.

Coligny's actions during the painful treatment of his harquebuse wounds is a noble scene in d'Aubigné's history which he likewise drew from de Thou's work and the Mémoires . . . sous Charles IX.44 Again more of the Huguenot historian's information came from de Thou's account than from that of the Mémoires. De Thou and d'Aubigné mentioned two ministers (Merlin and More, said de Thou; Merlin and another, said d'Aubigné) as present at the surgery performed by Ambroise Paré, but in the Mémoires only one minister, Merlin, is referred to. Moreover, d'Aubigné introduced this scene with a

43D'Aubigné, III, p. 304; de Thou, VI, pp. 379, 380; Mémoires . . . sous Charles IX, I, f. 270v.

description of the reactions of the king, Guise, and others to the news of Coligny's wound which agrees completely with de Thou's account. D'Aubigné reported that the king, when he heard of the attempted assassination, blurted out, "N'aurai-je jamais de patience?"

In the Mémoires. . . sous Charles IX the king's remark at hearing the news and the reactions of certain other persons were omitted.

In addition, d'Aubigné recounted that the admiral requested that one hundred sous be given to Merlin and then distributed to the poor.

The author of the Mémoires . . . failed to mention this fact, but de Thou reported it and said that Ambroise Paré himself had supplied it to him. Thus d'Aubigné must have drawn it from the Catholic historian. D'Aubigné's arrangement of this material and surrounding information is precisely the same as de Thou's but at variance with the organization of the Mémoires. In the latter work the outline is:

1) treatment of Coligny, 2) visit of Cossé and Damville, 3) complaints of Bourbon princes to the king, 4) investigation of the attack.

De Thou's and d'Aubigné's outline is 1) treatment of Coligny, 2) complaints of Bourbon princes to the king, 3) investigation of the attack, 4) visit of Cossé and Damville to the admiral.

Nevertheless, d'Aubigné's use of the Mémoires for these events is proven by the quotation which d'Aubigné attributed to Coligny during the operation, "Ces playes me sont douces, comme pour le nom de Dieu, priez-le avec moi qu'il me fortifie." This statement was obviously formed from two quotations in the Mémoires.
rather than from the two given in de Thou's history. According to the former record Coligny said,

Mes amis... pourquoi pleurez-vous? je m'estime bien heureux d'avoir été ainsi blessé pour le nom de Dieu... Vois... des bénéfices de Dieu mes amis, je suis voirement bien blessé, mais je cognois que c'est par la volonté du Seigneur nostre Dieu, et remercie sa Majesté de ce qu'il me daigne tant honorer que je souffre quelque chose pour son saint nom; prions-le afin qu'il m'octroie le don de persévérance.

De Thou related the same material as follows:

[7] vois que Dieu m'aime, puisque'il a permis que je reoues ces blessures pour sou saint nom; puisse-t'il me faire la grace de n'oublier jamais la miséricorde qu'il exercise sur moi... Mon Dieu, ne m'abandonnez pas dans l'état où je suis, & continuez à me faire sentir les effets de notre miséricorde accoutumée. 45

Thus the above examples indicate not only that d'Aubigné sometimes combined details from de Thou's Histoire universelle and from the Mémoires... sous Charles IX, but also that even in this combination de Thou's work was the more important source.

D'Aubigné's descriptions of several incidents during the massacre and the preceding period were each drawn from a number of sources. The Huguenot historian obviously borrowed material not only from de Thou's history or the Mémoires... sous Charles IX but also from La Popelinière's history, the Histoire des martyrs, the "Réveille-matin," and possibly the Recueil des choses mémorables... D'Aubigné's recital of the erection and

45D'Aubigné, III, p. 307; de Thou, VI, p. 288; Mémoires... sous Charles IX, I, f. 272.
removal of the Gastines' cross was partially based on the narrations, in his perennial sources for these events, de Thou's Histoire universelle and the Mémoires ... sous Charles IX. He very possibly consulted La Popelinière's chronicle of these troubles, and unquestionably the Histoire des martyrs served as an important source.46

De Thou mentioned no cross, as did d'Aubigné, in his account and merely said that a pyramid was erected on the site of the razed Gastines' house. Moreover, de Thou said that the Gastines who had been executed for their religion were Philippe Gastines, "Richard, son frere \textit{and} Nicolas Croquet son beau-frere," but d'Aubigné described them as "Nicolas Croquet, Phillipes de Gastine et Richard son fils." The author of the Mémoires ... sous Charles IX failed to record the relationship among the condemned men, but he did relate that a pyramid of stone crowned with a crucifix was erected in place of the Gastines' house. However, the Histoire des martyrs supplied the different facts given by d'Aubigné; in the latter work was printed the sentence by which the three were condemned. It stated,

\begin{quote}
On fait assavoir Que Nicholas Croquet, Philippe à Richard de Gastines, pore à fils ... shall be punished. In describing the expiatory monument the sentence continued that\footnote{D'Aubigné, III, pp. 277-279; de Thou, VI, pp. 272, 273; Mémoires ... sous Charles IX, I, ff. 85v-88r; Histoire des martyrs, III, p. 656; La Popelinière, II, f. 10v; Recueil des choses mémorables, p. 412.} une croix de pierre de taille, au dessus de laquelle croix sera mis un tableau de cuivre \footnote{D'Aubigné, III, pp. 277-279; de Thou, VI, pp. 272, 273; Mémoires ... sous Charles IX, I, ff. 85v-88r; Histoire des martyrs, III, p. 656; La Popelinière, II, f. 10v; Recueil des choses mémorables, p. 412.} would be built on the site of the demolished house.\footnote{D'Aubigné, III, pp. 277-279; de Thou, VI, pp. 272, 273; Mémoires ... sous Charles IX, I, ff. 85v-88r; Histoire des martyrs, III, p. 656; La Popelinière, II, f. 10v; Recueil des choses mémorables, p. 412.}
\end{quote}
The condemnatory decree gave the particle de to the Gastines as likewise did d'Aubigné but not de Thou or the author of the Mémoires.47

The influence of La Popelinière's history upon the Histoire universelle can probably be seen blended in with several other sources. It may have been one of d'Aubigné's sources for the preceding example, but it seems more obvious in his descriptions of the payment of the German cavalry, the completion of the English alliance, and the betrothal of Henry of Navarre and Marguerite of France. The German reitses, or cavaliers, who had aided the Huguenots in the third religious war, had not been completely paid during the conflict, and the Huguenots were now required to liquidate the debt. D'Aubigné wrote that "une commission de contrainte sur leurs Églises" was granted by the king in order to secure the funds owed to the Germans. De Thou made no reference to this, but the authors of the Recueil des choses mémorables . . . and the Mémoires . . . sous Charles IX and La Popelinière agreed that the Huguenots had "À payer le quint de leur revenus." La Popelinière gave the most

47Pierre Champion, Paris au temps des guerres de religion (Paris, 1938), pp. 159, 160, agrees with d'Aubigné and the Histoire des martyrs about the relationship between the Gastines, the particle in their name, and the erection of a stone cross at the site of the demolished house. Hector de La Ferrière, Lettres de Catherine de Médicis (Paris, 1891-95), IV, xxvii, speaks of the Gastines as brothers, but much of the narrative in his introductions to the Lettres de Catherine de Médicis is drawn from de Thou's history.
D'Aubigné followed very closely de Thou's account of the signing of the defensive alliance with England in April, 1572, but the Huguenot writer asserted that Charles IX solemnly swore to observe the alliance in the presence of his council and of Admiral Clinton and Francis Walsingham "presents pour l'étranger / i.e. England/". De Thou and the author of the Mémoires . . . sous Charles IX mentioned only Admiral Edward Clinton as present for the English. However, La Popelinière stated that Clinton was in Paris for the completion of the treaty and that Walsingham had helped draft it at Blois, although he was not specifically mentioned as being in Paris for the signing. These assertions by La Popelinière may have been the source for d'Aubigné's erroneous comment that both Clinton and Walsingham represented England.49

48 D'Aubigné, III, p. 278; de Thou, VI, pp. 267, 268; Recueil des choses mémorables . . ., p. 412; Mémoires . . . sous Charles IX, I, f. 51r; La Popelinière, II, f. 8.

49 D'Aubigné, pp. 288, 289; La Popelinière, II, f. 40v; Mémoires . . . sous Charles IX, I, f. 221r; de Thou, VI, pp. 531-354. Pierre Champion, Charles IX, la France et le contrôle de l'Espagne, II, pp. 29, 40, says that the treaty was signed at Blois with Francis Walsingham present for England, but Champion mentions only Admiral Edward Clinton as present in Paris when Charles IX swore to observe the treaty.
D'Aubigné's relation of the completion of the engagement ceremony was probably taken from the histories of de Thou and La Popelinière and from the "Réveille-matin" and the Mémoires sous Charles IX. The Cardinal of Bourbon's qualms about his right to perform the marriage had necessitated another request for a papal dispensation and further delay, both of which angered Charles IX and caused him to say, according to d'Aubigné, "Ce vieux bigot avec ses cafarderies fait perdre un bon temps ma grosse soeur Margot." De Thou attributed a similar but much less racy statement to Charles IX. The "Réveille-matin" and the Mémoires sous Charles IX, the author of which plagiarized this from the "Réveille-matin," have more striking quotations which may have inspired d'Aubigné's. According to de Thou the king said, "Il [Bourbon] faisait en cela grand tort à sa Marguerite . . . à qu'elle ne trouvait pas bon qu'on différer si longtemps ce qui lui faisoit tant de plaisir." According to the "Réveille-matin" Charles IX stated that if the Cardinal of Bourbon would not marry them he would lead Marguerite and Henry to a Huguenot minister to be married, "et que par la mort Dieu il ne vouloit pas que sa Margot . . . fussent plus long-temps en ceste languer."

D'Aubigné's reliance upon La Popelinière's history seems to be proven by the following statement from the former's Histoire universelle: "Enfin le bref du pape venu, les fiançailles se font à la mi-aoust au Louvre, où tout le soir le roi tint propos à l'amiral . . . qu'il estoit engagé à la guerre d'Espagne . . . ."
La Popelinière is the only other informant found who did not mention, explicitly or implicitly, that the letter of dispensation was a forgery. He then added that the wedding was held on August 18, but he failed to record when or where the engagement ceremony was held and to mention any conversations about "la guerre d'Espagne." The author of the Mémoires ... sous Charles IX described the engagement proceedings as occurring in the Louvre on August 18, but he asserted that Catherine de Medici forged the alleged letters of dispensation. He also omitted any reference to conversations between the king and Coligny concerning war.

Possibly d'Aubigné followed de Thou's history, although erroneously, as his sole source for the sentence quoted above.

De Thou wrote,

\[\text{On\ convince de faire paraître une lettre de l'ambassadeur du Roi à Rome par laquelle il informoit S. M. que le Pape avait enfin accordé une dispense . . . & qu'il partirait bientôt de Rome . . . . Ainsi les fiançailles se firent au Louvre le dixseptième d'Août . . . .}\]

Of course de Thou implied that the letter from Rome was false, and he explicitly stated that it came not "du Pape" but from the French ambassador. The conversation between Charles IX and Coligny about war with Spain presents another problem. De Thou reported it rather differently from d'Aubigné. Also, he placed it in his narrative ahead of the report about the letter from Rome and the engagement ceremony and merely said it occurred "pendant ce temps-là."50

50 D'Aubigné, III, pp. 301, 302; de Thou, VI, pp. 376, 377; La Popelinière, II, f. 63; Mémoires ... sous Charles IX, I,
There are several other instances in which d'Aubigné combined the narratives from three or four or more sources in order to compose accounts in the *Histoire universelle*. His relation of the wounding of the admiral is probably based upon the material in the histories of de Thou and La Popelinière, the *Mémoires... sous Charles IX*, and the "Réveille-matin."\(^{51}\)

D'Aubigné's description of the request by the Bourbon princes to Charles IX that they be permitted, as a result of the attack on Coligny, to leave court is taken essentially from de Thou's history, but undoubtedly either or both the "Réveille-matin" and the *Mémoires... sous Charles IX* served as a source also. D'Aubigné reported Catherine de Médici's feigned horror at the attack and her statement that next the king would be attacked in his bed. De Thou

According to S. England, *op. cit.*, p. 56, the king and Catherine told the Cardinal de Bourbon on August 16 that a letter, which he never asked to see, had just arrived from Rome "announcing that the dispensation had been granted and was being dispatched immediately. This false statement they could make with safety, as they knew that no courier bearing a contradictory letter would be allowed to pass beyond Lyons." Thus her narrative follows de Thou's but disagrees with d'Aubigné's account.

\(^{51}\) D'Aubigné, III, pp. 305, 306; de Thou, VI, pp. 383, 384; La Popelinière, II, f. 64r; *Mémoires... sous Charles IX*, I, f. 272; "Réveille-matin," Archives curieuses, VII, pp. 174, 175. De Ruble (d'Aubigné, III, p. 206, note 4) correctly asserts that d'Aubigné utilized the "Réveille-matin."
omitted any mention of the royal bed, but a similar statement is found in the Mémoires... and the "Rêveille-matin." 52

De Thou's history and probably the Mémoires... sous Charles IX were sources for d’Aubigné's description of the visit of Charles IX to Coligny after the attempted assassination. Possibly the "Rêveille-matin" supplied d’Aubigné with his statement about Coligny's desire for a private conference with the king; in no other source is there even a hint of a secret conference between them. 53

The murder of the admiral was reported in considerable detail in all the narratives of this period. Certainly de Thou's account and that in the Mémoires... sous Charles IX were consulted by d’Aubigné. The latter's remarks about Yolet, Certon, and Merlin strongly indicate that the Recueil des choses mémorables... was one of his sources. Probably he consulted the De Furoribus

52 d’Aubigné, III, p. 308; de Thou, VI, p. 386; "Rêveille-matin," Archives curieuses, VII, p. 177; Mémoires... sous Charles IX, I, ff. 274v, 275r; the account in the Mémoires was completely plagiarized from the "Rêveille-matin."

53 d’Aubigné, III, pp. 309-311; de Thou, VI, pp. 387-390; Mémoires... sous Charles IX, I, ff. 276-279; "Rêveille-matin," Archives curieuses, VII, pp. 178, 179. De Ruble (d’Aubigné, III, p. 309, note 1) wrote, "Le récit de la visite du roi à Coligny est tiré du Rêveille-matin des François..." This assertion is demonstrably erroneous for the "Rêveille-matin" lacks many details, e.g. Coligny's advice to the king that he purge his council of spies and maintain his edicts, the high praise rendered the admiral by Charles IX, and the proposal—veted by the Protestants—to move Coligny to the Louvre, that are found in d’Aubigné's much longer account.
Galliois and the "Réveille-matin," although no obvious debts to them have been found. The Mémoires ... sous Charles IX was d'Aubigné's most important source when he described the death of Coligny. 

D'Aubigné's description of the abuse of and disposition of Coligny's corpse was probably based upon the sources mentioned in the preceding paragraph. However, he also seems to have utilized "Le Stratagème de Charles IX contre les Huguenots" and the Inventaire général. The authors of the latter two works were the only writers who mentioned that Coligny grasped at something as his battered body was thrown down into the courtyard by the murderers. Their works must have been the basis for d'Aubigné's statement that, as he was thrown through the window, "l'amiral, non encore mort, se prit des mains à un morceau de gervis [a piece of the balustrade], qu'il emporta." 

---

54 The English translation of the De Furoribus Gallicis, A True and Plaine Report of the Furious Outrages of France, has been consulted. Coligny's death is found on pp. 55-57 of A True and Plaine Report. . . .


56 D'Aubigné, III, pp. 317, 381; "Le Stratagème . . .," Archives curieuses, First Series, VII, pp. 434, 435, and the Inventaire général, II, p. 761, say that Coligny grabbed a part of the window. De Ruble (d'Aubigné, III, p. 318, note 1) asserted incorrectly that all the historians said Coligny clutched the balustrade of the steps as he fell. No basis for de Ruble's statement has been found. D'Aubigné continued the above quotation by saying that the Dukes of Guise and Aumale and Henry of Angoulême wiped the admiral's face in order to identify him, "aussi que le
The Mémoires . . . sous Charles IX and de Thou's history supplied most of the material for d'Aubigné's narrative of the deaths of various persons such as Chappes, Lomenie, and Lambin. However, d'Aubigné's account of the murder of "la demoiselle d'Yverni," is more detailed than their descriptions. D'Aubigné wrote,

She sauvait en religieuse; mais, cognue par ses mulles de velours orange, la vie lui estant promise, si elle voulait renoncer sa religion, à son refus fut poignardée et jetée en l'eau; et comme la rivière la soulevait, on courit de tous costez l'assomer à coups de baston et de pierres.

The most probable source for this information was the Protestant pamphlet "Le Tocsain contre les massacreurs . . . ". In it is found

... undoubtedly Guise lui donna du pied sur le ventre . . . ."

Many of d'Aubigné's contemporaries agreed that after the admiral's face was wiped and his body identified his corpse was kicked. However, they disagreed on who kicked it. The De Furoribus Gallicis and the "Réveille-matin" omit it entirely, whereas de Thou said that Angoulême kicked the remains. In the Recueil des choses mémorables . . . the Mémoires . . . sous Charles IX, and the Inventaire général the Duke of Guise was accused of kicking Coligny, but only d'Aubigné stated that Guise kicked the admiral in the stomach.

Among recent historians, S. England, op. cit., p. 107; A. W. Whitehead, op. cit., p. 267; and J. Viénot, op. cit., p. 408, agree that the dying admiral clutched at the window as he was thrown down into the courtyard. None of the three accuses Guise of having kicked the corpse; S. England and J. Viénot attribute this action to the bâtard d'Angoulême. Van Dyke, Catherine de Medici (New York, 1923), II, p. 91, says that there is absolutely no reason to believe that Guise kicked Coligny in the stomach or anywhere. Van Dyke asserts that the story first appeared in an account of the massacre which was circulated in the Netherlands by the Duke of Alva. Apparently Alva wanted to increase the shame heaped upon Coligny. Only P. F. Willert, Henry of Navarre (New York, 1893), p. 80, among recent writers consulted, charges both Guise and Angoulême with kicking the murdered Coligny.
the following quotation:

*The* demoiselle d'Yverny . . . laquelle aiant esté trouvée par les rues, desguisée, pour se cuider sauver avec ses filles, et remarqué par un cotillon de couleur qui apparut ses habits; aiant donc esté outragée grandement en ses biens et en sa personne, et ne voulant consentir d'Aller à l'idolatrie, fut menée sur le Pont-aux-Musniers et précipitée en l'eau, après qu'elle eust demandé temps d'invoquer Dieu, aignant mieux sceller la vérité par sa mort que, pour vivre plus longuement, renoncer sa religion.*

De Thou's history, the *Mémoires . . . sous Charles IX*; and the "Réveille-matin" supplied the data for d'Aubigné's account of the attempt by Charles IX to throw the blame for the massacre on the Guises. Royal letters, which attributed the massacre to the hatred of the Guises for Coligny, were sent to the provinces and foreign lands. The account in the *Mémoires . . . sous Charles IX* is the most detailed; it and the one given by de Thou agree generally with d'Aubigné's. Nevertheless, these two narratives and that in the "Réveille-matin" disagree with d'Aubigné's about the date of emission of the royal letters. The authors of all three works stated that they were sent on Sunday, but d'Aubigné asserted "le soir de le seconde journée" (Monday) the letters were dispatched.

---


58D'Aubigné, III, pp. 332, 333; de Thou, VI, p. 414; "Réveille-matin," p. 189; *Mémoires . . . sous Charles IX*, I, ff. 297, 298. Hector de La Ferrière, op. cit., IV, xci, and S. England, op. cit., p. 140, also disagree with d'Aubigné about the date of emission of these letters blaming the Guises for the massacre. Along with de Thou et al. S. England asserts that they were sent on August 24,
A final narrative which d'Aubigné may have taken from the Mémoires ... sous Charles IX, the "Réveille-matin," and de Thou's Histoire universelle is the story about the extraordinary flowering of a dried-up hawthorn in the cemetery of the Holy i.e. on Sunday, Saint Bartholomew's Day.

D'Aubigné ended this paragraph about these letters by writing, "Ces lettres envoyées non seulement dans le royaume, mais en Angleterre, en Allemagne et aux cantons des Suisses, signées de la même main de laquelle ce prince giboïoit de la fenestre du Louvre aux corps passans." With these words d'Aubigné makes his accusation against the king that he fired at his subjects. His version, which S. England calls a legend, is different from the more common one given by the author of the "Réveille-matin," pp. 186, 187, which was plagiarized by the compiler of the Mémoires ... sous Charles IX, I, f. 294. According to these works the king was standing at a window of the Louvre and saw Montgomery, the Vidame de Chartres, and other Huguenots crossing the Seine from the faubourg Saint-Germain. "Encore, dit-on, que le Roy prenant une harquebuse de chasse entre ses mains, en despitant Dieu, dit: Tirons, mort Dieu, ils s'en fuyent."

Today historians are much less willing to accept this Protestant charge made against Charles IX than they were in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. H. Bordier, op. cit., pp. 42-52, has a lengthy discussion in which he upholds the charge. Likewise, J. Viénot, op. cit., pp. 414, 415, finds it no more difficult to believe than the well-substantiated story that the royal family went "pour voir les corps morts les uns après autres, et ... accordé au cadavre du Soubise une scandaleuse attention." Rather surprisingly, J. Heritier, Catherine de Médicis, p. 487, accepts the accusation. He wrote, "Charles IX se livrait à tous les excès sanguinaires d'une fou." Then he added in a footnote that it is impossible to say from what window in the Louvre he fired. "Mais ou sait qu'il a tiré. Le goût du sang, chez ce malheureux prince, est hélas! prouvé par de nombreuses pièces d'archives . . . ."

A. Garnier, op. cit., I, pp. 118, 119, refuses to accept or reject the story and adopts an agnostic attitude. He writes, "En resumé le geste monstrueux attribué à Charles IX donne lieu à un problème historique qui n'est pas encore élucidé."

However, the weight of scholarly opinion has turned against
Innocents, for the tale is recounted in similar fashion in all three sources. D'Aubigné mentioned that fraternities went there with beating drums crying that the church would flower again because of the murder of so many heretics. This latter information is found

belief in the tale. The very erudite P. Champion, Charles IX ..., II, p. 109, scoffs at the story and states that "il faut scarter la légende ..., d'Agrippa d'Aubigné montrant Charles IX tirant de L'arquebuse sur les passants durant le massacre ..." The impartial English historian, S. England, op. cit., pp. 122, 123, thinks that Charles IX may have appeared at a window waving an arquebuse and shouting as Montgomery's group tried to cross the Seine. However, she completely refutes the claims that he did fire and impugns the validity of d'Aubigné's account since he was not in Paris.

Jules Loiseleur, "Les Nouvelles Controveres ...," Revue historique, XV (1881), pp. 91-107, has discussed very thoroughly this question and states that Charles IX's direct participation in the massacre during a frenzied fit is not contrary to probability, but there is no proof of it. Then Loiseleur demolishes both the stories found in the "Rêveille-matin" and d'Aubigné's Histoire universelle. He declares (p. 107), "La version de d'Aubigné telle qu'on la lit dans les Tragiques et the Histoire universelle est incontestablement une fiction ..."

Certainly the contemporary evidence for the charge is not very credible. The author of the "Rêveille-matin" merely said "on m'a dit," which the compiler of the Mémoires ..., sous Charles IX modestly changed to "on a dit," statements which give an aura of hearsay or gossip to the entire affair. Moreover, the author of the inflammatory Protestant pamphlet, "Le Tossain contre les massacreurs" of 1579 charged the king with insatiable cruelty and methodical murders, but he stated, "non pas qu'il y mit les mains." Cf. Archives curieuses, First Series, VII, pp. 62, 63. Coming from a fervent Protestant, this should dear Charles IX of any role in the actual killing. Moreover, a letter written by the Huguenot Geoffrey de Caumont, who had lodged with Montgomery in the faubourg Saint-Germain and accompanied him, to Catherine de Medici on September 13, 1572, gives a lengthy description of his actions and flight but makes no mention of Charles IX firing on him. Cf. Hector de La Ferrière, op. cit., IV, lxxxviii-xl. Of course this is the argument from silence, and it is based on a letter written to the mother of Charles IX.

D'Aubigné, III, pp. 334, 335; de Thou, VI, p. 416; Mémoires ..., sous Charles IX, I, f. 318; "Rêveille-matin," pp. 195, 194. The
only in de Thou's account; so probably his history was the Huguenot's most important source for this narrative. Undoubtedly, d'Aubigné was familiar with all three of these accounts and others as well, for they were numerous. However, d'Aubigné's narrative differs from the preceding three in one important respect. He asserted that this "miracle" occurred on Sunday, but in the other accounts it is said to have happened on Monday. A short deposition about the massacre by an eyewitness, an anonymous citizen of Strasbourg, is the only other narrative found which also dated this incident on Sunday. However, d'Aubigné probably did not have access to this deposition, and this recital differs in that the Strasbourg witness asserted that the hawthorn sweat blood. Moreover, there are no other significant similarities between his general account of the massacre and d'Aubigné's. D'Aubigné's different date may stem from an unknown source of information or from another mistake when borrowing data.

**Accounts for Which No Sources Were Found**

There are numerous narratives or portions of narratives in d'Aubigné's *Histoire universelle* for which no sources could be found.

---


61 Recent writers have disagreed with d'Aubigné and the bourgeois of Strasbourg and say that the hawthorn flowered on Monday. De Ruble (d'Aubigné, III, p. 354, note 6), and S. England, op. cit., p. 150, who often uses the accounts of both d'Aubigné and the bourgeois of Strasbourg as sources, believe it occurred on Monday.
This material varies in length from two or three words to two or three paragraphs. Only the more important incidents without known sources have been included in the following pages. When describing the second marriage of Coligny in March, 1571, d'Aubigné drew most of his information from de Thou's history. According to d'Aubigné there were obstacles in the path of the marriage, but the admiral's prospective wife traveled to La Rochelle "pour avoir nom avant que mourir, ainsi qu'elle disoit, la Martia de Cato." Neither de Thou nor any other of d'Aubigné's sources reported this alleged statement by the bride-to-be.62

The first arrival of Coligny at court is related by d'Aubigné after the account given by de Thou. However, the following quotation is not found in de Thou's history; d'Aubigné wrote,

Je saisi bien, dit-il /Charles IX/, que vous aimez le jardinage. Quelques-uns ont voulu, depuis que ce mot fust en souvenance, que le jour avant que prendre les armes /by Coligny/, quelqu'un envoyé pour l'espier, en le visitant, le trouva essigolant ses antes /cutting trees/, et un serpe dans la main, de façon qu'il avoit élongné beaucoup de mesfiances par ce rapport.

In addition to de Thou no other known source of d'Aubigné's Histoire universelle supplies this information. Perhaps d'Aubigné's statement

62De Thou, VI, p. 275; d'Aubigné, III, p. 281. Of recent accounts only Delaborde, op. cit., III, p. 292, mentions this unique phrase. He placed no great credence in it and merely inserted it in a footnote as a remark made by d'Aubigné.
"Quelques-uns ont voulu" applies to information he obtained orally rather than from written accounts. 63

In describing the salvation from execution of a certain Vilandri, or Villandry, d'Aubigné narrated an incident which has been found in none of his sources. The Huguenot historian was explaining the great influence of Coligny over the king in 1572, and he related how only Coligny was able to save Vilandri from the royal wrath. No other favorites or advisors, including Catherine, could secure his release. D'Aubigné's source for this story must have been his personal observations of events at court, for he wrote, "Nous [d'Aubigné] visimes entr'autres l'expérience de cela à Vilandri ... ." 64

D'Aubigné's narration of festivities for the marriage of Marguerite and Henry was based largely upon de Thou and the Mémoires sous Charles IX. Nevertheless, the actions of "Langoiran, depuis Montferrand," who departed from Paris and said to the admiral, "Je m'en vais pour la bonne chère qu'on vous fait, aimant mieux estre au rang des fous que des sots, pourqu'on guérit du premier et de l'autre jamais," have not been found recorded in any of d'Aubigné's sources. Very probably d'Aubigné was a witness of Langoiran's speech to Coligny or it was related to him by Langoiran. The


64D'Aubigné, III, pp. 284, 285. Despite the lack of corroboration this story should be fully reliable.
historian followed the above quotation with the statement, "Cestui-là [l'angoiran] me trouva en peine pour un coup d'espée, dont me print bien de le [l'angoiran] suivre et ne mépriser son conseil."®®

When discussing the victims of the massacre d'Aubigné related the heartless actions of a young woman, "nommée Boyan," who discovered the hiding place of a former lover and a relative, both Huguenots. She then led the killers to them and boasted of this "feat" to the queen. Probably only d'Aubigné reported this incident, since no source for it was found.®® Possibly his material was based upon oral information.

Likewise, no written source for the following tale has been found, but it was undoubtedly based upon the spoken rather than the written word. D'Aubigné related that behind a door in "la valé de Misère," which de Ruble states was the name of a Paris street in 1572, many of the principal killers stationed themselves and threw their wretched victims into the Seine. D'Aubigné indicated a commendable skepticism as well as the source of this information when he wrote, "Voici encore un acte qui ne peut estre

®®D'Aubigné, III, pp. 303, 304. A. Garnier, op. cit., I, pp. 115, 116, asserts that Montferrand made his rather biting statement to Coligny on August 21, and that d'Aubigné, when saying Montferrand found him in trouble, was referring to a coup d'espée that he had given to a sergeant of the guard. The sergeant had tried to arrest a friend for whom d'Aubigné was serving as a second in a duel. Garnier adds, "II [d'Aubigné] sortit donc de Paris le 21 aoüt; il ne vit ni l'attentat contre Coligny, . . . ni enfin la tragédie de la Saint-Barthélemy."

®®D'Aubigné, III, p. 332.
Another incident in d'Aubigné's magnum opus for which no source has been discovered concerns the warnings given to Coligny by pessimistic Huguenots shortly after his return to Paris in early June, 1572. In the "Réveille-matin," the Mémoires . . . sous Charles IX, and de Thou's history are found references to these voices of doom, but in all three accounts the entire latter part of d'Aubigné's narrative is omitted. Precisely where d'Aubigné obtained his material at the bottom of page 298 and the top of page 299 of Volume III is a mystery.

D'Aubigné's recounting of the wedding of Marguerite of France and Henry of Navarre is very similar to that given by de Thou and may well be based primarily on the latter's narrative. However, there are some striking differences between the two accounts which cannot be ascribed to other written sources. Very possibly some of d'Aubigné's information for the nuptials was derived orally from Huguenots who attended them, but his own observations were undoubtedly more important. D'Aubigné witnessed the marriage of Henry of Navarre and Marguerite of France if not the massacre.

D'Aubigné disagreed

67 Ibid., pp. 336, 337.
with de Thou's *Histoire*, and other sources as well, when he said that
the wedding occurred two days after the betrothal. De Thou and the
author of the *Mémoires . . . sous Charles IX* said that the engage­
ment ceremony occurred on August 17 and the wedding on August 18.
All three disagreed about what the Huguenot leaders, including
Henry, did while Marguerite attended mass in Notre Dame. D'Aubigné
wrote that they walked in the cloister and the nave, de Thou that
they went to the episcopal palace, and the author of the *Mémoires
. . . sous Charles IX* that they retired to a court close to the
church.

De Thou and d'Aubigné also related differently the story
about the Protestant battle flags, lost at the battle of Moncontour,
which the Huguenot nobles saw hanging in Notre Dame and commented
upon. D'Aubigné asserted that this discussion occurred during the
mass and that Marshall Damville pointed out the standards to Coligny.
De Thou wrote that it occurred after the mass and that Coligny showed
them to Damville. They agreed that Coligny declared they must be
torn down and more appropriate flags displayed there. The author
of the *Mémoires . . . sous Charles IX* and other possible sources
failed to discuss the incident of the battle flags.70

70D'Aubigné, III, pp. 302, 303; de Thou, VI, pp. 377,378;
*Mémoires . . . sous Charles IX*, I, ff. 262v, 263. Recent historians
have virtually all followed de Thou's account of these events.
IX . . .*, II, pp. 73, 74, and S. England, op. cit., pp. 56, 57,
declare that the betrothal and wedding occurred on consecutive days,
i.e. August 17 and August 18. De Ruble (d'Aubigné, III, p. 301,
The last-minute consultations for the massacre and the sounding of the tocsin to signal the beginning of the horrors are incidents about which d'Aubigné disagreed with his probable sources. D'Aubigné stated that the Duke of Guise was present in the king's chamber when Catherine arrived at midnight. According to the sources Guise arrived after the queen; in fact he was late for the conference. D'Aubigné also differed with his sources in describing the remarks made by the queen at this final, secret conference. He reported that she stiffened the king's will by quoting an Italian admonition from the sermons of the Bishop of Bitonte: "Che pista lor ser crudele? che crudelta lor ser pietoso."\(^7\) In the other note 4, and p. 302, note 1) disagrees with them and persuasively insists that the betrothal occurred on August 16 and the marriage on the 18th. According to de Ruble, d'Aubigné, though he gave no dates, was chronologically more correct than de Thou and the author of the Mémories ... sous Charles IX.


Hector de la Ferrière, op. cit., IV, lxxiv, to whose account F. C. Palm was indebted, agrees partly with de Thou and partly with d'Aubigné. He wrote, "Pendant que s'accomplit ce simulacre de mariage, l'amiral est resté dans l'église; et là ... pointed out au maréchal Damville les drapeaux de Jarnac et de Moncontour ... ."\(^7\)

\(^7\) "Mildness is sometimes cruelty, and cruelty mildness."
chronicles are found no quotations by Catherine in Italian. The sources say that the tocsin was sounded by the great bell of the church Saint-Germain de l'Auxerrois; d'Aubigné insisted that the bell of the palace, that is the Palace of Justice, sounded one and one-half hours before that of Saint-Germain de l'Auxerrois.  

D'Aubigné also was at odds with his possible sources about how many victims met death as a result of the massacre. Of course this is not surprising since there are virtually as many estimates of the number dead as there were chroniclers of the massacre. About three thousand dead on the first day is the estimate given by d'Aubigné. De Thou thought about two thousand died on Saint Bartholomew's Day. The authors of the Mémoires . . . sous Charles IX and the Inventaire général agreed on more than ten thousand as Sunday's toll of massacred. The fanatical Catholic author of "Le Stratégème de Charles IX . . ." gave the figure of twenty-five thousand as the total number of victims for the entire massacre over several days and in all the kingdom. The author of the

---

72D'Aubigné, III, pp. 314, 315; de Thou, VI, pp. 396, 397; Mémoires . . . sous Charles IX, I, ff. 285, 286; La Popelinière, II, p. 68; "Réveille-matin," p. 181. S. England's recent and detailed account of the massacre at Paris is different from d'Aubigné's on these points. She, op. cit., p. 93, states that Catherine went to the room of Charles IX before Gondi, Tavannes, Nevers, and Guise arrived. Also, she asserts, pp. 101-103, that before 3:00 A.M. the bell of Saint-Germain de l'Auxerrois, "within the precincts of the Louvre itself," clanged out. Hector de la Ferrière, op. cit., IV, lxxxiv, who often uses de Thou's history, here agrees with de Thou's and S. England's narratives.
De Furoribus Gallicis declared that about one-hundred thousand well-born babies, children, and wives were left destitute as a result of the loss of fathers, husbands, mothers, or other relatives. This might mean that thirty thousand people lost their lives in the entire massacre.  

D'Aubigné thought that it was unnecessary for him to attempt to list the names of all the victims of the massacre. He wrote, "Il y a des livres publiés qui ont pris un tel soin et ausquels je vous renvoie [For such detailed information]." Surely the words *livres publiés* refer to books which were important sources.

---

73 D'Aubigné, III, pp. 335, 336; de Thou, VI, pp. 413, 414; Mémoires ... sous Charles IX, I, f. 295r; Inventaire général, II, p. 762; "Le Stratège..." Archives curieuses, First Series, VII, p. 440; and De Furoribus Gallicis or the Furious Outrages ..., p. 86. Modern estimates of the number of victims in Paris vary considerably, but they tend to substantiate d'Aubigné's moderate figure of 3000 dead on the first day. Van Dyke, op. cit., II, p. 97, in his very restrained and impartial account of the massacre thinks that probably between three and four thousand persons perished at Paris. S. England, op. cit., pp. 151, 152, in her excellent book states that Brantôme's estimate of 4000 dead for Paris is closest to the truth but Claude Haton's figure of 7000 should also be kept in mind. P. Champion, Paris au temps ..., p. 217, wrote, "On pense que plus de 4000 personnes disparurent à Paris/" J. Viénot, op. cit., pp. 416, 417, gives one of the highest recent estimates for the dead at Paris when he borrows Crespin's figure of 10,468.

No recent exposition of the massacre which has been examined gave a figure as low as did the Abbé Caveiras in the eighteenth century. In his "Dissertation sur la journée de la Saint-Étañlemi," Archives curieuses, First Series, VII, p. 526, he wrote, "Ainsi, c'est grâce faisant que je supposerai mille personnes massacrées dans Paris, conformément à ce que la Popelinière a écrit."
for d'Aubigné's narrative of these events, but it is difficult to say precisely to what books he was referring. Perhaps he meant the Mémoires . . . sous Charles IX or the Histoire des martyrs.  

D'Aubigné related another tale, for which little source material has been found, when he described the near-miraculous escape of Merlin and Certon after they had fled from Coligny's house. Merlin fell into a granary because of his bad eyesight where he was saved from starvation by a chicken which laid three eggs in his hand. Certon fell into the same granary where he slept and was finally saved. The only other references to the escape of Merlin and another Huguenot are found in the Recueil des choses mémorables.

---

74 Actually d'Aubigné had only one source at his command if he used these two books. The late-nineteenth century editors of the Histoire des martyrs said that the account of the massacre at Paris in Crespin's martyrology, III, pp. 663-681, was borrowed, with some abridgements, from the Mémoires . . . sous Charles IX. De Ruble (d'Aubigné, III, p. 355, note 7) and Félix Hoquain, La France et Rome pendant les guerres de religion (Paris, 1924), p. 132, refer to a mysterious Martyrologe des Calvinistes printed in 1582 which gave the names of 786 victims for the massacre in all of France. This mysterious Martyrologe seemed like a probable source for d'Aubigné's narrative and possibly one of the livres publiés to which he referred. However, librarians at the Bibliothèque Nationale and the Bibliothèque de Protestantism Français in Paris had never heard of it. Henri Hauser did not include any work by this title in his Les Sources de l'histoire de France.

However, the Abbé de Caveirac mentioned a "Martyrologe des Calvinistes, imprimé en 1582," which listed 786 victims in his "Dissertation sur la Journée de la Saint-Barthélemy," Archives curieuses, First Series, VII, pp. 525, 526. Although Caveirac did not mention Crespin's name or in any way connect him with the Martyrologe des Calvinistes, this title must designate Crespin's record of martyrs since one of many editions of it appeared in 1582. Cf. H. Hauser, Les Sources . . ., II, p. 39. Undoubtedly de Ruble and Hoquain have taken their information from Caveirac's "Dissertation . . .," and they did not realize that the Abbé was referring to Crespin's work.
... and the Histoire des martyrs. The authors of these two works briefly related that most of the men in Coligny's chamber were killed shortly after they fled, but a few escaped, "notamment, Cornaton & Merlin." D'Aubigné mentioned that both a man named Certon and one named Cornaton, who was not mentioned again, fled from Coligny's house as the assassins entered it; this seems to eliminate an orthographical mistake as the cause of the discrepancy between the accounts of d'Aubigné and these two sources.

---


76 D'Aubigné, III, pp. 315, 316. There may have been two men with the similar names of Certon and Cornaton, but an error in spelling and the creation of two men from one man's name by d'Aubigné would not be an incredible blunder by the Huguenot. He made other errors which are just as serious.

No mention of this Certon has been found in any of the secondary sources on the massacre that have been consulted. Even S. England, op. cit., p. 105, in her detailed account of Coligny's last minutes and the flight of his companions, mentions Cornaton but not Certon.
CHAPTER V

D'AUBIGNE'S SOURCES FOR THE YEARS 1576 AND 1577

During the years 1576 and 1577 the Catholic League was born and the Estates General held its first sixteenth-century assembly at Blois. Agrippa d'Aubigné had attained the age of twenty-four years at the time of these events. Therefore, personal observations might have played a role virtually as important as printed and manuscript materials when d'Aubigné composed this part of his Histoire universelle. His presence at the court of Henry of Navarre, his participation in Huguenot attacks upon Niort, Marmande, and Saint-Macaire and other towns, and especially his clandestine visit to Blois during the Estates General supplied d'Aubigné with personal knowledge of many important events. Nevertheless, the major part of d'Aubigné's account was based upon one printed source. He had undoubtedly read the pages in G. Chappuy's Histoire de nostre temps, P. Matthieu's L'Histoire des derniers troubles, and those in the Recueil des choses mémorables as well as the Inventaire général, in which the Catholic League and the first Estates General of Blois are described. However, none of these works has a detailed account

1The material studied for the present chapter comprises chaps. i-vii and part of chap. viii, bk. viii, Vol. I, pp. 80-190 in de Ruble's edition of the Histoire universelle.
of these events, and there is no evidence that d'Aubigné utilized them. Even the lengthier descriptions in de Thou's *Histoire* were little drawn upon; similarly, Jean Bodin's *Journal* or *Recueil* ... du tiers Estat ... as the sixteenth-century edition was called, was not an important printed source.

La Popelinière's *Histoire de France* served as the major crutch for d'Aubigné's narration of these events in 1576 and 1577 as de Thou's *Histoire universelle* had served as his historical guide for the reign of Francis II and the massacre of Saint Bartholomew's Day. D'Aubigné, as the present chapter will indicate, included much more material derived from memoirs or his personal experiences than in earlier pages of his history, but the outline of his account and most of his information for the period from the summer of 1576 to the late winter of 1577 were derived from La Popelinière's ponderous and pedestrian tomes.²

²It is true that de Thou's narration of the same period was also based primarily upon the history of La Popelinière and the journal of Bodin. De Ruble (d'Aubigné, V, p. 134, note 3) declares that La Popelinière and "après lui d'Aubigné" knew only the *Journal* de Bodin, certain collections of documents, the minutes of the Estates General, and current pamphlets as historical sources for their narrations of the Estates General. D'Aubigné may have been acquainted with Bodin's journal, but he seldom utilized it, as the present chapter will indicate.
Agrippa d'Aubigné was indebted to La Popelinière's history for about two-thirds of the material in this section of his history. Many examples of this indebtedness could be cited, but only the most striking will be used. In several places d'Aubigné merely paraphrased or even plagiarized his fellow Huguenot's account. Moreover, virtually every document or speech quoted by d'Aubigné was taken from La Popelinière's history.

D'Aubigné's description of the generous treatment accorded to Henry III's brother, the Duke of Anjou, and the failure to fulfill the obligations to the Prince of Condé, who "fut traité à la fourche," after the Peace of Monsier was surely drawn from La Popelinière's account. There is an interesting verbal similarity in their descriptions of the nominal but not actual confirmation of Picardy upon the Prince of Condé. La Popelinière wrote that Condé was provided with Picardy "par le feu roy Charles après le deces du feu Duc de Longueville . . .; Et en iceluy confirmé par le benefice de la Paix." D'Aubigné followed his Huguenot colleague closely and repeated that Picardy was "à lui

---

This is a rough estimate based upon the number of pages in d'Aubigné's Histoire universelle, where La Popelinière's influence as a source seems undeniable.

The complaint of the Parisians to the king (D'Aubigné, III, pp. 81-83) about a subsidy requested in May, 1576, is probably the only one not borrowed from La Popelinière.
When discussing the origins of the Catholic or Holy League, d'Aubigné gave the texts of the manifesto and oath of the League. These documents were unquestionably taken by d'Aubigné from La Popelinière's history and no other source. The text is

5D'Aubigné, V, pp. 84, 85; La Popelinière, III, p. 309v.

6D'Aubigné, V, pp. 96-108; La Popelinière, III, ff. 319-321. D'Aubigné, V, pp. 96, 97, 109, described the origins of the Sainte-Union or League most unsatisfactorily. He attributed its inception and growth solely to the activities of the Jesuits and their helpers and to the discontent of the principal personages of Péronne, who should have accepted the Prince of Condé as governor of their city according to the terms of the Peace of Monsieur. He completely omitted the Catholics' nation-wide irritation with the Peace of Monsieur, which was too favorable to the Huguenots, the existence of earlier Catholic leagues, and the support which the house of Guise and especially the Duke of Guise, who aspired to its headship, gave to the League. H. Baird, The Huguenots and Henry of Navarre (New York, 1896), I, pp. 104-108, J. H. Mariâtre, La Réforme et la Ligue, pp. 174, 175, and M. Wilkinson, A History of the League or Sainte Union, 1576-1595 (Glasgow, 1929), pp. 1-5, have, particularly the latter two, good discussions of the birth and early growth of the League. Two sentences from Wilkinson's study summarize well this question. He wrote (pp. 1 and 5),

The immediate cause of the League was the explosion of anger on the part of the Catholics at the terms of the Peace of Beaulieu or of Monsieur.

The conclusion of the whole matter is this; the League of Picardy was in its inspiration Lorrainer; d'Humière's annoyance over Péronne was only the cause of its publication.

Nevertheless, d'Aubigné's explanation of the "Naissance de la Ligue" is superior to de Thou's, VII, pp. 423-426. The latter
identical in both histories except for minor variations in spelling (d'Aubigné used prendre and La Popelinière prandre), punctuation, and paragraphing. Also, d'Aubigné inserted "Nous jurons" into the manifesto, but these words do not appear in La Popelinière's text. However, de Rable states in a footnote that this did not appear in the first edition of the Histoire universelle. The irrefutable proof of d'Aubigné's reliance upon his Huguenot colleague's history is found in d'Aubigné's careless use of it. The latter was copying the manifesto and some explanatory sentences which La Popelinière interjected before giving another manifesto and the oath of the League. D'Aubigné negligently passed from the conclusion of the manifesto, which explains the governmental organization of the League, asserted that it began in Paris ("Paris, comme la capitale, voulut donner l'exemple à tout le reste des royaumes.") rather than Péronne, and he emphasized a personal grievance of d'Humières more than the heresy of Condé as the cause of Péronne's rebellion against its lawful governor. La Popelinière, of these three historians, gave the fullest and best account of the League's appearance and rise in his Tome III, f. 319r. Paul Robiquet, Paris et la Ligue sous le Règne de Henri III (Paris, 1886), pp. 55-57, disagrees with the preceding discussion and argues that the League developed first in Paris and then spread to the provinces ("Les historiens les plus dignes de foi constatent qu'il [the League] a d'abord éclaté à Paris.") rather than vice versa. The propagators of the League, when they encountered stout opposition in Paris, especially from the father of the historian de Thou, then decided to publish it in the provinces in order to secure recruits. Robiquet's thesis, based solely upon de Thou's history rather than that of "les historiens les plus dignes," has little support among other writers.

to the following explanation by La Popelinière of the propagation of the League before ending his quotation.® La Popelinière added and d'Aubigné copied the following:

Puis ils envoyèrent par toutes les provinces, bailliages, et sénéchausées, pour animer à l'effet que dessus toute la noblesse et les plus apparents des catholiques, suivant la créance qu'ils auront particulière du général et des chefs particuliers de la province.

The injustices suffered by the Protestants after the Peace of Monsieur were described carelessly and inaccurately by d'Aubigné in two separate parts of his text; however, he very probably drew virtually his entire list of wrongs from La Popelinière's Histoire. The latter described the mission of a certain Wier, envoy of John Casimir of Bavaria, a leader of mercenary, German-Protestant troops, to the court of Henry III. Wier, according to La Popelinière's lengthy narrative, protested against the "seditious" Catholic preachers, who were violently anti-Protestant, against the failure to establish Protestant-Catholic chambers in the Parlement, against the large number of Catholic troops stationed in Protestant areas, and against the "inconsiderate" treatment of the Prince of Condé in Picardy.® D'Aubigné repeated much of this information with only one or two additions, but he utilized it in different portions of his

®D'Aubigné, V, p. 105; La Popelinière, III, f. 320v.
®La Popelinière, III, f. 318.
narrative, part of it when describing Wier's embassy. Then he again followed it when depicting the troubles which agitated France as a result of the birth of the League and the inexecution of the peace treaty.

There is one extreme similarity in wording between the two accounts. La Popelinière had Wier complain, "Que plusieurs Gentilshommes Catholiques & autres disent que la moisson prochaine faite; estant Monseigneur le Duc de Cazimir sorti de France; l'on recommencera la Guerre de plus belle." D'Aubigné included a

10 D'Aubigné, V, pp. 93, 94.

11 D'Aubigné, V, pp. 109-111. D'Aubigné on page 109 described how the Jesuit preachers with help from other orders excited the populace after the Peace of Monsieur, and on page 97 he previously had explicitly asserted that the Jesuits recruited support in Péronne for the nascent League. H. Baird, The Huguebots and Henry of Navarre, I, p. 114, accepts d'Aubigné's statements and merely paraphrases them. A. Garnier, op. cit., I, p. 185, adopts, with a slight change, d'Aubigné's position and wrote that the League developed "sous l'impulsion des Jésuites et des Cordeliers." Moreover, Charles Labitte in De la démocratie chez les prédicateurs de la Ligue (Paris, 1868), pp. 95, 97, states that the Company of Jesus had entered the League and as it grew "les jésuites se haterent de propager" it.

Nonetheless, the specific facts given in Labitte's study contradict his generalizations as well as the similar ones of Baird, Garnier, and d'Aubigné. Labitte (pp. 95-97), when describing the League in the 1570's, identifies only one of the early clerical supporters of and preachers for the League as a Jesuit. Even when listing and characterizing the prédicateurs de la Ligue in the 1580's and the 1590's, Labitte (pp. 135-152) mentions only one other. Thus only two League preachers, among several score, are named as members of the Company of Jesus. The Franciscans, parish priests, and even bishops outnumbered the Jesuits, according to the details of Labitte's book, as expounders of the gospel of the League from the pulpit.
virtually identical phrase when describing the failure to establish
genuine peace in 1576; he wrote, "Les courtisans, sur les discours
de ces choses [the troubled state of the realm and the wrongs suf­
fered by the Huguenots], disoyent que la moisson estoit preste et
qu'il en faloit voir la fin." 12

12 La Popelinière, III, f. 318v; d'Aubigné, V, p. 111. D'Aubigné
again followed La Popelinière's account very closely when the latter
reported that Wier also criticized the action by the Cardinal of
Bourbon in dissolving a Huguenot assembly in Normandy. La Popelinière,
III, f. 318r, wrote,

"À Rouen Monseigneur le Cardinal de Bourbon non avec son
train seulement, mais suivi de plusieurs Conseillers de la Court de
Parlement de Rouen, des Capitaines de la ville de l'Evêque Devreux
& de son Cordellier, estant assis dans la Châize d'un Ministre,
sollicita le 15 jour de ce mois [August] ceux de la Religion de se
departir de leur Religion & le reconôitste pour pasteur; les
menaçant qu'il ne voulait que l'exercice se fit cependant qu'il
seroit dans la ville."

D'Aubigné, V, p. 110, narrated this incident in very
similar fashion;

"Le cardinal de Bourbon, voulant tenir sa partie à un
bon œuvre [dissolution of Huguenot assemblies], s'en alla dans
l'assemblée, se mit dans la châize du ministre qu'on attendoit,
et commençant par Ego sum Pastor bonus, changea bientost son
sermon en menaces . . . ."

De Rubé committed an error in dating this dissolution of
the Huguenot assembly at Rouen by the Cardinal of Bourbon. De Rubé
gave the two dates of July 23, 1576, and November 15, 1576, for this
single event (D'Aubigné, V, p. 94, note 1 and p. 110, note 1), and
both of them may be incorrect. According to La Popelinière's quo­
tation above, this incident occurred on August 15, 1576, since he
had already recorded that the outrages reported by Wier occurred
three months after the edict of peace (May 6, 1576). However, the
cardinal preached to the Huguenots, according to E. Sauliner, Le
Rôle politique du cardinal de Bourbon (Paris, 1912), pp. 76, 77,
sometime shortly after the middle of July. Also, H. Baird, The
Huguenots and Henry of Navarre, I, p. 110, dates this occurrence
about mid-July.
D'Aubigné followed the preceding statement with a brief account of complaints made to Henry III by a certain Manducage, envoy of Condé, and a description of the king's conciliatory response. Everything found in d'Aubigné's recital is also included in La Popelinière's much longer description, which was most probably the basis for that of d'Aubigné.13

Plagiarism, although a common historiographical sin in the sixteenth century, especially for La Popelinière, very rarely tempted d'Aubigné. Nonetheless, the latter was guilty of it when utilizing La Popelinière's account of Protestant and Catholic polemics concerning the miseries of France and the failure of the 1576 edict of peace.14 D'Aubigné plagiarized two and one-half pages of material and paraphrased La Popelinière's narrative for virtually all the remainder of his account.15 The major portion of the plagiarized material is a citation of arguments from the polemics, but d'Aubigné also copied La Popelinière's explanatory sentences about the use of the polemics. Nevertheless, d'Aubigné did include material which was not taken from La Popelinière. The latter reported that the

13La Popelinière, III, f. 321; d'Aubigné, V, p. 111. Of course the former's account of this matter is separated from Wier's embassy by several other events, among them the origin of the League. This difference in organization undoubtedly resulted from d'Aubigné's clumsiness and inaccurate treatment of Wier's protests.

14D'Aubigné, V, pp. 120-123; La Popelinière, III, ff. 331r-333v.

15All of pp. 120 and 121 except the first four lines of the former and the last four lines of the latter and parts of p. 122.
Huguenots questioned the validity of the recently elected Estates General. D'Aubigné borrowed this assertion but corroborated it by adding information about Huguenot members of the Estates who had been disqualified on religious grounds. He also inserted another Huguenot argument for the immutability of the Peace of Monsieur.\textsuperscript{16}

Immediately following his description of the polemical strife d'Aubigné quoted a declaration by the Prince of Condé concerning his reasons for taking up arms again. This declaration was undoubtedly copied, despite minor differences in punctuation, from La Popelinière's *Histoire* where it also immediately came after the polemics.\textsuperscript{17}

D'Aubigné again partially plagiarized and partially paraphrased La Popelinière's account of several Huguenot protests, especially that of the King of Navarre, to the court about the invalidity of the Estates General. Everything in d'Aubigné's description of the incident was taken from his colleague's history. D'Aubigné devoted most of his attention to the complaint from the King of Navarre. Indeed, one entire page of his narrative is identical, except for slight variations in spelling and punctuation with La Popelinière's material about Navarre's protest.\textsuperscript{18}

\textsuperscript{16}D'Aubigné, V, p. 122, ll. 17-23, and p. 123, last five lines.

\textsuperscript{17}D'Aubigné, V, pp. 124-126; La Popelinière, III, ff. 333v, 334r.

\textsuperscript{18}D'Aubigné, V, pp. 132-134; La Popelinière, III, ff. 356r-359v. D'Aubigné's material on the latter half of p. 132 and the first half of p. 133 was plagiarized from La Popelinière's recital on f. 356v. The latter gave a much longer description of the Huguenot petitions.
Another example of plagiarism and summarization by d'Aubigné from his fellow Huguenot's history is found shortly after the preceding instance. He was totally indebted to La Popelinière for his account of the opening ceremonies of the Estates General at Blois in December, 1576. In addition, he plagiarized more than one page for his description of the seating of the court and the arrangement of the three Estates for the opening session.¹⁹

Jean Bodin narrated the inauguration of the assembly in very similar fashion to La Popelinière and d'Aubigné.²⁰ However, the latter was clearly copying La Popelinière's rather than Bodin's text. De Rible has pointed out, but somewhat incorrectly, the only difference between d'Aubigné's and La Popelinière's recital of this occasion. The former asserted that the Dukes of Guise and Nevers attended the festivities and were seated below and to the right of the king. Actually Guise was absent and possibly Nevers was not

in addition to the King of Navarre's, but d'Aubigné summarized this very briefly on p. 154.

¹⁹d'Aubigné, pp. 135-137; La Popelinière, III, f. 341. Part of d'Aubigné's p. 136 and all of his p. 137 except the last sentence were copied from La Popelinière's narrative on f. 341. Of course there were the customary minor variations in spelling and punctuation. In addition, d'Aubigné substituted chaire once and derrière twice for La Popelinière's use of chaise and pierre, but this does not invalidate the indictment of plagiarism.

present, but d'Aubigné undoubtedly inserted erroneously and inadvertently this information.  

At this opening session Henry III, as soon as the company was seated, made an excellent speech of welcome in which he explained his and his mother's attempts to establish peace and the obstacles this policy had encountered. D'Aubigné quoted this address in full because he did not dare "toucher à celle d'un roi bien disant."

Unquestionably, he drew the text of the speech from La Popelinière's history, where it is found in precisely the same form except for a difference of one word. Jean Bodin's journal could not have been used as a source by either of the two Huguenot historians since the

---

21 D'Aubigné, V, p. 136. De Ruble states (D'Aubigné, V, p. 136, note 5) that both de Thou and La Popelinière reported that Nevers and Guise were absent. De Thou, VII, p. 448, explicitly states that Guise was absent but neglects to mention Nevers. La Popelinière, III, f. 341v, as well as Bodin, Journal, p. 290, fail to mention either of the two dukes, but their silence naturally implies the absence of Guise and Nevers.

G. Picot, Histoire des états généraux (Paris, 1872), II, pp. 309-312, omits any lengthy description of the formalities at the séance royale d'ouverture and does not mention what dignitaries were present. P. Abbiquet, op. cit., p. 77, states that Guise was present for the séance royale of January 17, 1577, but absent for the opening one. He completely omits Nevers. H. de la Ferrière in his "Introduction" to the Lettres de Catherine de Médicis, V, lxxi, describes this ceremonial and the famous personages present among whom he includes the Duke of Nevers and omits Guise. P. LaFue, Henri III et son secret (Paris, 1949), p. 161, also states that Nevers attended but he fails to mention Guise. Thus, no recent writer agrees with d'Aubigné that Guise attended this session.

22 D'Aubigné, V, p. 144.

23 D'Aubigné, V, pp. 138-144; La Popelinière, III, ff. 341v, 342. The former (p. 138) gave "les tours et changements qui se voyent par tout . . . ." but the latter recorded only "l'estrange changement qui se voit par tout . . . ."
famous political theorist did not summarize or quote the king's address and merely noted that Henry III spoke "d'une grace et action très-belle." 24

For further information about the Estates General d'Aubigné continued to follow La Popelinière's history and drew from it his account of the king's request for funds. Similarities in terminology and arrangement prove that the Histoire de France enrichie ... was d'Aubigné's source. The latter stated that the king desired a subvention because he "voulait acquitter la foi de ses devanciers ...," and La Popelinière wrote that Henry III told the assembly that they had been convoked primarily "pour acquitter la foî de ses Devanciers ...." Also, d'Aubigné closely followed La Popelinière in chronicling the reaction of the Estates to a royal financial report. The former stated that "le président [of the chambres des comptes] leur en bâilla des abrèges, dequels ils ne se contentèrent pas." The former wrote that the members of the Estates were discontented "attendu qu'il [the president] ne bâllait rien qu'en abrèges." 25

In his next passage d'Aubigné continued to use La Popelinière's history as his source. They both have the same dates


25 D'Aubigné, V, pp. 145, 146; La Popelinière, III, f. 543r. La Popelinière plagiarized with a few omissions the narrative given in Bodin's Journal, p. 298. Therefore, d'Aubigné may have been following the latter, but it is unlikely that he suddenly jumped from La Popelinière's to Bodin's work as his crutch in the composition of the Histoire universelle.
and the same lists of names in their descriptions of the missions sent to Condé, Navarre, and Montmorency-Damville. Moreover, the two accounts suffer from the same confusions and obscurities. La Popelinière depicted the instructions given to the envoys no more clearly than did d'Aubigné in the following quotation. A proposal was made to send "trois députes des trois estats avec instructions, desquelles aucun ne prendroit copie, ni en papier ne en tablettes; le tout communiqué au tiers Estat." Of course, Bodin referred to these missions in his Journal, but there is not as close a correlation between his account and d'Aubigné's as between the latter's and La Popelinière's narrative. Moreover, Bodin mentioned that he was requested to serve as an envoy but refused. This incident was reported by de Thou, who was following Bodin; however, it is not found in the histories of d'Aubigné and La Popelinière.26

D'Aubigné was still following his fellow Huguenot historian when he described how the king promoted the spread of the League. However, the former's statement that the king supported the League "pour plaie à l'eclesiastic" was not corroborated by La Popelinière, Bodin, or de Thou.27

Undoubtedly d'Aubigné, who next described provincial disorders as did La Popelinière, continued to utilize the latter's

---


27D'Aubigné, V, p. 147; La Popelinière, III, f. 343r; de Thou, VII, pp. 458, 459; Bodin, Journal, pp. 303-306. Neither sixteenth-
account as his source. A rather serious disagreement in the two narratives is surely a result of hasty and careless summarization by d'Aubigné. La Popelinière asserted that royal troops were dispatched to suspected towns in Guyenne and shortly afterwards disturbances were reported in Dauphiny, but he said nothing of troops being sent there. D'Aubigné omitted the dispatching of troops to Guyenne and mentioned merely that troubles occurred in Dauphiny and that troops were sent. Bodin agreed with La Popelinière and not d'Aubigné. Moreover, the Journal was obviously not d'Aubigné's source since Bodin interspersed fifteen pages of his century nor modern historians accept d'Aubigné's explanation of the reason for Henry III's support for and headship of the League in 1576 and 1577. Various interpretations are now given, but no writer contends that Henry merely wanted to please the clergy. Van Dyke, op. cit., II, pp. 211, 212, cites Marguerite of Navarre who reported that Henry III feared the League as a dangerous force. Therefore, to render it innocuous he made himself chief of the menacing organization. P. Robiquet, op. cit., p. 61, and G. Pictot, op. cit., II, pp. 307, 341, 342, attribute Henry's actions also to his fear of the rising power of the new association and to the influence of Catherine de Medicis.

M. Wilkinson, op. cit., presents a more convincing explanation in attributing Henry's actions to his personal beliefs and desire to crush the Huguenot military power. Wilkinson wrote (p. 8) that Henry III "never liked heretics and the sight of the German reiters fighting in France was a constant annoyance, whereas with the League views he was somewhat in sympathy." Later this historian of the League declared (p. 18), "Therefore he decided on using the League somewhat for weakening the Huguenots and then if possible to get rid of the League itself ...." J. H. Mariéjol, La Réforme et la Ligue, pp. 177, 178, agrees with Wilkinson's argument that Henry III wanted to use the League vs. the Protestants, but he amplifies it. Mariéjol declares that Henry III wanted to use it "pour la plus grande gloire de la royauté." The king expected marvelous results from the new institution and expected to secure an army of 36,000 infantry and 6,000 cavalry from it.
narrative about the Estates General with these details, which
La Popelinière united in one paragraph whence d'Aubigné erroneously
copied them.28

Immediately after discussing the turmoil in the provinces,
the two Huguenot historians described a change in the attitude of
the Third Estate which charged its orator to emphasize that religious
unity should be sought but only "sans guerre." Again d'Aubigné was
unquestionably plagiarizing and abridging the history of La
Popelinière rather than Bodin's Journal. Bodin used the words
"second point" and "tière point," but La Popelinière and after
him d'Aubigné wrote "deuxième" and "troisième." Furthermore, Bodin
included two lengthy phrases in his Journal which are lacking in
the histories of the two Protestant writers.29

La Popelinière was certainly one of d'Aubigné's sources,
if not his only one, for the events at the second plenary session

28D'Aubigné, V, p. 148; La Popelinière, III, f. 343r; Bodin,
agrees with neither d'Aubigné nor La Popelinière. He states merely
that "vers la fin de décembre, le bruit se répandit que les hosti­
lités avaient repris en Guyenne et en Poitou." The Huguenots had
seized Bazas and la Réole (two towns in Guyenne), adds Picot.

29D'Aubigné, V, p. 148; La Popelinière, III, f. 343; J. Bodin,
Recueil . . . du tiers Estat . . . (1576), pp. 44-46. Approximately
one-half of d'Aubigné's p. 148 was copied directly from the Histoire
de France enrichie . . . Since there are variations at this point
between the text of the 1576 and the 1789 editions of Bodin's
Journal, the sixteenth-century edition, which was available to
d'Aubigné and La Popelinière, is cited.
of the Estates General. Unquestionably, d'Aubigné based his description of the activities of the three Estates' orators upon the Histoire de France which was responsible for his error concerning Versoris' oration for the Third Estate. Bodin clearly stated that Versoris spoke for one hour and one-half and knelt for the first half-hour of his speech. La Popelinière condensed Bodin's description and omitted a verb which rendered his account somewhat obscure. He wrote, "Versoris parla une heure & demie à genoux pres de demie jusque où le Heraut le fit lever par commandement du Roy." D'Aubigné probably read this hurriedly and completely misunderstood it. Therefore, he asserted, "Mais Versoris, pour le tiers Estat, demeura de genoux une heure et demie, autant qu'il harangua, contre ce qui avoit esté practiqué aux Estats d'Orléans, où le tiers Estat parla debout." 30

30Bodin, Journal, p. 313; La Popelinière, III, f. 343v; d'Aubigné, V, p. 148. G. Picot, op. cit., II, p. 338, in describing Versoris' speech omits the orateur's posture during the address. Picot does state that the representatives of the third estate were irritated with the king who forced them to stand with heads uncovered during their speaker's oration.

P. Bobiquet, op. cit., p. 78, relates that the orators for the clergy and the nobility spoke from their knees only an instant until the king asked them to rise, but "Versoris resta à genoux une heure et demie, aussi longtemps que dura sa harangue." Bobiquet's error is quite comprehensible, since he relied very heavily, for his discussion (pp. 76-78) of this séance royale and the attitude of the tiers toward the religious issue in January, 1677, upon d'Aubigné's history.
the three speeches, which indicates that d'Aubigné may have had another source, but it was not Bodin. The latter did not reproduce the speeches, for he said that they were printed. Perhaps the published speeches, which seem to be unavailable today, were d'Aubigné's other source of information. He gave information about the oration for the clergy, which was omitted by La Popelinière, and he implied that the orator for the nobility, Baron de Senecey, made the finest address. However, La Popelinière bluntly asserted that the First Estates' orator took the forensic honors. Both d'Aubigné and La Popelinière quoted only Senecey's speech of those made for the three Estates.  

31d'Aubigné, V, p. 150; La Popelinière, III, f. 343v; Bodin, Journal, p. 314. Except for the "louanges du roi, de la roine et de Monsieur" and three minor verbal differences, d'Aubigné reproduced the text of the baron's speech exactly as did La Popelinière. Two of these differences exist only in d'Aubigné's second but not in his first edition; cf. de Rable's footnotes in d'Aubigné, V, pp. 152, 154. The other difference is the omission of the word sainte in line 12, p. 150 of Volume V.

D'Aubigné may have quoted only Senecey's speech since he found the text for it, but not for the others, in La Popelinière's history. Then he may have wanted to justify this lengthy quotation by describing Senecey's oration as giving pleasure to the assembly and implying that it was superior to the others.

P. Robiquet, op. cit., p. 77, follows d'Aubigné again and disagrees with La Popelinière about the quality of the orations. Robiquet does not explicitly say that Senecey made the best speech, but he describes his as an address "qui fut accueillie par l'assemblée avec une faveur marquée" and omits any praise of the others.
Surely La Popelinière's chronicle was the source for d'Aubigné's description of the king's attempts to secure funds from the Estates. Henry III asked the deputies not to leave early, and his ministers haggled with them about a money grant. This data in Bodin's Journal was plagiarized by La Popelinière, but d'Aubigné used the latter's history rather than the former's journal as his mine of information. This material was intermingled with other data and spread over eleven pages of Bodin's work, but La Popelinière, like d'Aubigné, united these scattered references into one passage.32

D'Aubigné must have plagiarized in part La Popelinière's description of the rebuttal of Missery, a deputy from Auxois, to the eloquent pleadings by the Lord of Mirambeau that the Edict of Beaulieu should be maintained and that Protestantism should not be outlawed. Most of d'Aubigné's narration of Missery's demand for only one religion in France is identical with La Popelinière's material.33

Similarly d'Aubigné probably copied from La Popelinière's history the remonstrance about the difficulty of establishing one religion in France, which the Parisian deputies presented to Henry III. Of course, d'Aubigné wrote a brief introduction and

---

33 D'Aubigné, V, p. 160; La Popelinière, III, f. 345.
summary of the remonstrance which are lacking in La Popelinière's
work, but the text is the same in both histories except for the
customary variations in spelling, punctuation, and capitalization
and one place where La Popelinière recorded "je vous supplie con-
sidérez, Sire," and d'Aubigné gave "nous vous supplions, Sire."34

The account given by d'Aubigné of the return and report
of the Bishop of Autun and the other envoys sent to the Prince of
Condé was most certainly taken from La Popelinière's account. It
is true that the latter's narrative is a verbatim plagiarism from
Bodin's Journal but, other than the fact that d'Aubigné consistently
followed La Popelinière's work, there is evidence to prove that the
latter was not d'Aubigné's source. Jean Bodin, like de Thou who
frequently utilized Bodin's Journal, asserted that the envoys
arrived at Blois on February 8, 1577, but La Popelinière gave
February 15 as the date of their return. D'Aubigné wrote that
the Bishop of Autun returned and made his report "de même temps"
as the Parisian deputies made their remonstrance to the king.
Since he dated all these events as occurring "vers la fin de
février," he was surely following La Popelinière rather than Bodin.35

34 d'Aubigné, V, pp. 162-167; La Popelinière, III, ff. 346r-347r.

35 d'Aubigné, V, pp. 162 and 167; La Popelinière, III, f. 346r;
de Thou, VII, p. 473; Bodin, Journal, p. 327. Recent writers on
Estates General of 1576 are vague or disagree concerning the date
of the return of the envoys sent to Condé. E. Charleville, Les
États généraux de 1576 (Paris, 1901), p. 147, says that the com-
missioners returned on February 15. G. Picot, op. cit., p. 375,
D'Aubigné copied much of the bishop's report and summarized the rest, with only minor changes, from La Popelinière's narrative. However, there is one interesting and perhaps significant difference between the two accounts. D'Aubigné recorded that Condé told Autun that the King of Navarre and he would both have been present at the Estates General if the assembly had been properly and freely held. But in La Popelinière's report of this statement by Condé the latter fails to mention Navarre. None of the other possible sources mentions Henry of Navarre in this context. 36

Undoubtedly, d'Aubigné when describing the proscription of Protestantism by the Estates, continued to follow La Popelinière's history, since there are only insignificant differences in the two accounts and they are identical for several lines. Of course, La Popelinière plagiarized most of his narrative from Bodin's Journal, but it is very unlikely that d'Aubigné "changed sources in the middle of the stream" of his description about the Estates General.

makes the generalization that the "ambassadeurs /to all three rebellious chiefs/ reviennent à Blois, au milieu de février," but he (p. 359 and note 1) earlier cites the date of February 8 as he discusses the return of the mission to Condé. A. Garnier, op. cit., p. 204, note 1, declares that the three deputations returned from February 15 to 26 and more closely agrees with d'Aubigné.

Moreover, the return of the Bishop of Autun immediately precedes the proscription of Protestantism in both d'Aubigné's and La Popelinière's account, but the former event follows the latter by about thirty pages in Bodin's record. 37

When discussing Navarre's siege of Marande-sur-Garonne or his discussions with the emissaries from the assembly at Blois, d'Aubigné ceased utilizing the history of La Popelinière as his source. 38 As soon as the scene shifted to the Estates General and the return of the envoys sent to Montmorency-Damville, d'Aubigné returned to his fellow Huguenot's history as his guide. La Popelinière had continued to plagiarize much of his material from Bodin's account, but the different organization of Bodin's Journal indicates that it was not d'Aubigné's source. Again d'Aubigné was guilty of plagiarism from La Popelinière. He placed parts of Damville's declaration to the Estates in quotation marks but other passages, with no quotation marks and which appear to be summaries by d'Aubigné were copied from La Popelinière's book. He was also guilty of carelessness because in the quotations which he indicated he omitted words and even misplaced a lengthy clause. 39


38 D'Aubigné, V, pp. 170-176.

The disagreement over the maintenance of peace which occurred between the two privileged Estates and the Third Estate, when they met together during late February in the church of the Holy Savior in Blois, is another event for which La Popelinière plagiarized Bodin's account, and d'Aubigné very probably summarized and paraphrased La Popelinière's history. There is one discrepancy between the narratives of the two Huguenots, and hence between those of d'Aubigné and Bodin, which surely resulted from d'Aubigné's heedless use of his source. La Popelinière asserted that "quelques Deputes du tiers Estat" assembled with the first two Estates and asked for peace, but d'Aubigné's narrative implies that all the deputies of the Third Estate were present for he wrote, "Ce rapport /by the envoys to Damville/ fait, les Estats s'assemblérent en l'église Saint-Saveur pour délibérer dessus .... Là, le tiers estat convint pour solliciter le roi de redresser la paix." The argument from silence can be used at this point to prove further d'Aubigné's reliance upon La Popelinière rather than Bodin. The latter described how he had successfully opposed a demand in the Third Estate for religious conformity at any price, but La Popelinière and therefore d'Aubigné omitted this completely.40

---

40 D'Aubigné, V, pp. 179, 180; La Popelinière, III, f. 360; Bodin, Journal, pp. 359-361. D'Aubigné not only disagreed with La Popelinière but also with historical truth when he described the session in the "église Saint-Saveur." According to d'Aubigné's account a plenary session of the Estates General, at which the three orders met together, was held there in late February, 1577. However, E. Charleville, op. cit., pp. 107, 143, asserts bluntly
La Popelinière's descriptions of the arrival of the Duke of Montpensier, who urged moderation, and of the action of the Third Estate in heeding his advice were unquestionably paraphrased and copied by d'Aubigné. Of course the former copied verbatim his account of these events from Bodin's Journal. Moreover, all three writers gave identical reports, except for the usual differences in punctuation or spelling, of the request of the Third Estate to Henry III that religious unity should be achieved only "par les plus doux et gracieux moyens ... en paix et sans guerre." However, the histories of d'Aubigné and La Popelinière, but not the Journal of Bodin, connected the above request to a quotation describing its passage with "puis le registre portoit ces mots." Thus d'Aubigné's slavish plagiarism of La Popelinière's history indicates again his utilization of it rather than Bodin's Journal.

D'Aubigné, consistent with his practice throughout his discussion of the first Estates General of Blois, utilized La Popelinière's discussion of the final activities of the assembly. These concerned such things as a Protestant petition and the king's reply and Henry III's desperate but unsuccessful attempts to secure

and persuasively that the first Estates General of Blois held only two plenary sessions, one on December 6, 1576, and the other on January 17, 1577. The first was the séance royale d'ouverture, the official commencement of the Estates, and at the second occurred the "présentation solennelle des remonstrances et doléances" by the three orders.

funds through either a new tax or the sale of portions of the royal
domain. D'Aubigné must have summarized most of La Popelinière's
account and copied his version of the response of Henry III to the
Protestant petitioners. There are no significant discrepancies
between their accounts and the organization is identical. Furthermore,
much of this information is found in neither Bodin's *Journal* or
de Thou's history.42

**Narratives for which No Sources Were Found**

As has been stated above, most of the material in this
section of the *Histoire universelle* was drawn from La Popelinière's
*Histoire de France*. To no other writer, not even de Thou, was
d'Aubigné indebted for any lengthy passages. Perhaps he drew an
occasional fact from other historians, but no noteworthy borrowing
occurred. However, about one-third to two-fifths of this portion
of his history has no traceable printed sources which d'Aubigné
utilized. The major part of this material concerns military
adventures or events at the court of Henry of Navarre for which
d'Aubigné was an eyewitness. In a very few instances no source
could be found for an occurrence at the court of Henry III or at
the Estates General of Blois, for which the Huguenot historian
could not have had first-hand information. Probably, conversations,

42 D'Aubigné, V, pp. 188-190; La Popelinière, III, ff. 351v-
letters, or memoirs, now lost, served here as the basis for
d'Aubigné's information.

Early in this portion of his history the Huguenot writer
devoted several pages to the activities of Henry of Navarre. He
described the reunion of Navarre with his sister, Catherine of
Bourbon, after she left the court of Henry III, and how she abandoned
Roman Catholicism and returned to the Huguenot fold during the journey.
He even stated, "Elle ouit le presche à Chasteaudun." La Popelinière
and de Thou, who was utilizing the former's history as his guide,
briefly mentioned the union of the two, but they said nothing about
Catherine's departure from the Roman fold. Similarly, de Thou and
La Popelinière, again the former's source, noted the entry of Navarre
and his retinue into La Rochelle, but their accounts are less de-
tailed than d'Aubigné's. The latter refers to Catholics "qui avoyent
joué du cousteau à la saïnt Barthélemy" among Navarre's court.

D'Aubigné also added that the Lord of Fervaques had prevented the
King of Navarre from returning to Protestantism after his flight
from the French court and thus Henry lived for three months "sans
religion." Only d'Aubigné asserted that Henry of Navarre and
Catherine of Bourbon while at La Rochelle made public repentance.

43. d'Aubigné, V, pp. 85, 86; La Popelinière, III, f. 309v;
de Thou, VII, p. 429.
for having accepted Roman Catholicism at the time of the Saint Bartholomew massacre.44

The travels of Navarre throughout his province of Guyenne were described by La Popelinière and after him by de Thou, but d'Aubigné included more and different details about these events. For example, only the latter recounted how quantities of unknown birds and a spectacular mock naval battle marked the celebration of his arrival at Brouage, which was governed by the Lord of Mirambeau. Moreover, d'Aubigné and La Popelinière, hence de Thou also, differed about Navarre's itinerary. The latter two asserted that after two days at Brouage he went to Saintes and then to Périgueux, but the former stated that Henry of Navarre journeyed to Périgueux via Montguyon rather than Saintes.45

---

44d'Aubigné, V, pp. 86, 87; La Popelinière, III, ff. 309r, 310r; de Thou, VII, pp. 429, 430. Both H. Baird, The Huguenots and Henry of Navarre, I, pp. 108, 109, and P. Willert, Henry of Navarre, p. 117, accept and résumé d'Aubigné's narration of the concessions, such as the public confession of his and his sisters' remorse and the removal of certain Catholics from his suite, which Henry of Navarre made to the inhabitants of La Rochelle.

45d'Aubigné, V, pp. 87, 88. La Popelinière, III, f. 310r; de Thou, VII, p. 430. In this instance d'Aubigné was correct, for the letters of Henry of Navarre indicate that he went to Montguyon and then Périgueux; cf. de Rubé's footnote 4 in d'Aubigné, V, p. 87. Certainly d'Aubigné should have known the itinerary. In the Histoire universelle he stated that Navarre, as they entered Périgueux asked him (un escuyer), the meaning of a Latin inscription on a welcoming arch. However, P. de Vaissière agrees with de Thou and writes (Henri IV, p. 140) that Navarre traveled from La Rochelle to Brouage, Saintes, Saint-Jean-d'Angély, Cognac, and then to Périgueux.
Several activities of the Navarrese court were not mentioned by La Popelinière or de Thou. Thus, they omit any reference to the establishment of Navarre's troops in Agen and Villeneuve-d'Agen, which was noted by d'Aubigné. Only d'Aubigné, who perennially sensed conspiracies, accused Fervaques and the Viscount of Duras, his successor as the chief favorite of Henry of Navarre, of allegiance to Catherine de Medici and of working to create divisions and discontent at the court of the King of Navarre.

About midway of this section in the Histoire universelle d'Aubigné penned a chapter entitled "L'Ouverture de la guerre par entreprises." This chapter commences with rather detailed descriptions of the unsuccessful Huguenot attempt on the town of Niort in January, 1877, and the happier attacks upon la Bâcle and Civray. La Popelinière also discussed these occurrences, but d'Aubigné has considerably more information about the Niort failure as well as different details about the others. For example, the former omitted

46 D'Aubigné, V, pp. 90, 91.

47 D'Aubigné, V, p. 93. De Thou entirely omitted this question and La Popelinière, III, f. 316r, merely asserted that Duras supplanted Fervaques.

D'Aubigné evidently allowed his personal and religious feelings to obscure his comprehension of these difficulties at the court of Henry of Navarre. Undoubtedly, rivalry for the favor of Navarre created difficulties, but especially the existence of Huguenot and Catholic nobles, since Henry was trying to maintain the alliance between the Huguenots and the politiques, caused animosity among his followers. To these factors rather than to treachery and the influence of Catherine should be attributed the divisions and difficulties. Cf. A. Garnier, op. cit., I, pp. 197, 198 and H. Hauser, François de la Noue (Paris, 1892), p. 87.
the name of Saint-Gelais as the leader of the attack upon Niort or any reference to the gate by the same name there and the heroic role played by the Abbot of Châteliers among the defenders. Moreover, La Popelinière and d'Aubigné disagreed about the name of the conqueror of Civray; the former said that Saint-Gelais captured the town but the latter that la Boulaye, a Protestant captain, seized it. In addition, only d'Aubigné attributed the fall of Civray to the inhabitants' failure to post a sentry.48

Agrippa d'Aubigné, near the conclusion of his discussion about the first Estates General of Blois, narrated several military campaigns of the King of Navarre and his captains. These are either described with fewer details or completely omitted in the other printed histories. Of course, d'Aubigné participated personally in these exploits as he had in the attack upon Niort.49

The Huguenot historian gave a lengthy, four-page description of the Protestant attack upon and short siege of Marmande-sur-Garonne. His lengthy description certainly was not written to celebrate the defeat suffered by Navarre and his chief aid La Noue, but probably d'Aubigné composed such a detailed account because of his first-hand knowledge and certainly to commemorate "la plus desraisonnable

48 D'Aubigné, V, pp. 129, 130; La Popelinière, III, ff. 334r and 336r.

49 D'Aubigné, Mémoires, pp. 42, 43.
Probably an even more foolhardy and certainly a more disastrous attack was narrated by d'Aubigné about ten pages later. This was an attack upon Saint-Macaire which was such a fiasco that when the Marshall of Biron came in early March to discuss a possible peace with Henry, "Il trouva la cour de Navarre triste pour l'accident de Saint-Macaire." D'Aubigné played a valiant part in the attack and was fortunate to escape alive and free. Only twelve men of an original 260 escaped "qui ne fussent morts, blesses ou prisonniers." D'Aubigné gave a spirited and detailed account of this adventure describing how he was toppled from a scaling ladder, how Guerci was killed by a barrel which a woman threw down from the battlements, and how Navarre's guards saved their lives by surrendering and proclaiming themselves to be Catholics.51

50 D'Aubigné, V, pp. 171-174. La Popelinière, III, f. 347v, made only a passing allusion to this siege. The great French historian H. Hauser in his François de la Noue, p. 87, accepts fully d'Aubigné's statement about La Noue and quotes it approvingly.

51 D'Aubigné, V, pp. 184-187. None of the other historians described this attack. A. Garnier, op. cit., I, p. 202, accepts and utilizes without hesitation d'Aubigné's description of "la surprise manquée de Saint-Macaire" except for d'Aubigné's explanation of its failure. The warrior historian, V, p. 187, ascribed the Huguenots' defeat to treachery on the part of René de Lansac, who was a member of Navarre's council and a brother of the governor of Saint-Macaire. Garnier thinks that treachery may have occurred, but he writes, "D'Aubigné n'admet pas que la Fortune ne sourie pas toujours aux audacieux."
Both d'Aubigné and La Popelinière recounted the Protestant seizure of the city of Concarneau, which was one of the strongest places in Brittany. However, their narratives not only have different details but also different emphases. La Popelinière stressed the inadequacy in men and supplies of the Huguenot force, which was overthrown by the hostile populace when no help arrived. D'Aubigné indicated that the delay of the Rochellos in sending reinforcements was a factor, but he, as usual, ascribed the loss primarily to the treachery of one of the leaders, a certain Caillebotte, or Calebote. The latter suspected another leader, the Lord of Kermassonnet, of improper relations with his wife; so Caillebotte killed Kermassonnet and gave the fortress keys to the Catholics. D'Aubigné gave an interesting and concise narration of these events, but his source is unknown.52

D'Aubigné has some très vivant descriptions of the military, political, and courtly situation at Blois when the Estates General convened. For these no sources can be or need be found since d'Aubigné wrote them from his personal observations of Blois which he obtained as he passed through there in early December, 1576, on a mission for the King of Navarre.53 His description of Huguenot

52 D'Aubigné, V, pp. 187, 188; La Popelinière, III, ff. 560v, 561r.

53A. Garnier, op. cit., I, pp. 198-200; d'Aubigné, Mémoires, pp. 41, 42.
military preparations in Picardy and Artois stemmed from the same journey. He asserted that Blois was overwhelmed by royal troops, contrary to promise, and that some gentlemen were stabbed in their lodgings at the command of Catherine de Medici after the court arrived. D'Aubigné in disguise visited the court where he talked with the Marshall de Cossé and even attended a ball at which he would have been arrested if he had not been warned by one of Catherine's maids of honor. After leaving Blois he contacted La Noue, "ne respirant que la bonté de Monsieur [Duke of Anjou]," and finally persuaded him to prepare for hostilities against the Catholics.

Thirty pages later d'Aubigné recounted the proscription of Protestantism and the demand for une foi by the three Estates. He followed this event with a reproduction of the Lord of Mirambeau's, the only Huguenot deputy at Blois, oration protesting the revocation of toleration for the Huguenots. La Popelinière also reproduced Mirambeau's speech, but his account is much more pedestrian than d'Aubigné's. Unquestionably, the latter's version is more nearly correct, since d'Aubigné asserted in his Mémoires that he had written the speech as he journeyed through Blois. However,

54 D'Aubigné, V, p. 118.
55 D'Aubigné, V, pp. 126-128.
56 Ibid., pp. 158, 159.
57 A. Garnier, op. cit., I, pp. 198-200; d'Aubigné, Mémoires, p. 42.
d'Aubigné made a serious and rather incomprehensible error when he
dated these occurrences. He recorded that the proscription of
Protestantism was voted on February 19, 1577, and that Mirambeau
delivered his protest on February 20. 58

D'Aubigné described the activities of the royal court in

58 d'Aubigné, V, p. 158. De Ruble (d'Aubigné, V, p. 158, note 3
and p. 159, note 2) asserts that the Third Estate outlawed
Protestantism on December 26, 1576, and that Mirambeau had delivered
his protest on December 21. Mariéjol, La Réforme et la Ligue,
p. 181, states that the action by the Third Estate was an event of
December 21. Garnier, op. cit., I, pp. 199, 200, writes that the
nobility voted to outlaw Protestantism on December 19, the clergy
on December 22, and the commoners on December 26. Garnier, in
agreement with de Ruble and his own date of December 19 for the
decision of the Second Estate, dates Mirambeau's address on
December 21. H. de la Ferrére, op. cit., V, lxxiv, writes in
harmony with Garnier that on December 19 the nobility and on
December 22 the clergy voted for religious uniformity. However,
both P. Robiquet, op. cit., p. 74, and G. Picot, op. cit., II,
p. 322, assert that the First and Second Estates voted to revoke
all religious privileges of the Huguenots on December 22 and were
followed by the Third Estate, swept along by the current of in­
tolerance, on December 26. Piot, Robiquet, and E. Charleville,
who have devoted considerable study to the Estates of 1576, omit
any mention of Mirambeau's valiant and dramatic protest against
this display of religious bigotry.

Garnier, op. cit., p. 200, note 2, remarks that d'Aubigné's
discussion of the Estates General of Blois is disorganized and con­
fused; however, Garnier thinks that it is superior to the account
given by de Thou, since the latter is more vague and fails to dif­
ferentiate between the periods of the Estates. There indubitably
was a surprising volte-face made by the deputies at Blois during
the winter of 1576-1577; so at least two periods in the history of
the Estates General there can be noted. In December a strong current
of religious fanaticism caused all three orders to vote for the
attainment of religious uniformity by any means. Then the tiers
realized by January 9 and 10 that the king merely wanted to obtain
as large a subsidy as possible and that the nobility and the clergy
expected the commoners to "foot the bill" for the war which this
intolerant goal made inevitable and which had already broken out.
On January 15 the Third Estate instructed its orator, Versoris, to
a few passages which could not have been based on his personal ex-
periences and which are not recounted by earlier historians or
memorialists such as La Popelinière, de Thou, Goulart, and others.
For example, he recorded some unique information about Henry III's
demand religious unity sans guerre when he spoke at the séance
royale of January 17, but Versoris betrayed his colleagues and
"rendit le tiers Estat . . . instigateur et solliciteur de la
guerre." As the king pressed for a money grant, the tiers
became more pacific in late January and early February. Finally,
the return of envoys sent to Navarre, Condé, and Damville and
especially the return of the Duke of Montpensier resulted in a
defiant stand by the Third Estate for peace. On February 28 the
tiers, influenced by the fear of new taxes and the reports by the
envoys that the country wanted peace, decided by a large majority
to demand that the extirpation of Protestantism should be achieved
without war and annulled its bellicose resolution of December.
Cf. E. Charleville, op. cit., p. 149; G. Picot, op. cit., II,
pp. 326-375; P. Robiquet, op. cit., pp. 74-77; and O. Ulph "Jean
Bodin and the Estates General of 1576," Journal of Modern History,
XIX (1947), pp. 289ff., who give good summaries of the First
Estates of Blois.

The present writer believes that M. Garnier incorrectly
characterizes d'Aubigné's account (V, pp. 154-170) of the Estates
as better than that of de Thou (III, pp. 452-457 and 459-483).
Certainly de Thou failed to note clearly the change in the tiers'
sentiment during January. Only when he described Montpensier's
return and his influence in late February did de Thou note the
"nouvelle décision des Etats au sujet de la Religion," but he in-
cluded with this the remark that the tiers joined to their request
for peace an extract of the "arrêté qu'ils avaient fait le 15 de
Janvier au sujet de la Religion." D'Aubigné, who was following
carefully La Popelinière at this point, had the merit of noting
this latter action and Versoris' betrayal in the proper chronological
place (p. 148). However, d'Aubigné's narrative is hopelessly con-
fused and confusing about other chronological details. Ten pages
after his account of the pacific instructions given Versoris
d'Aubigné asserted that on February 19 it "fut arrêté qu'il ne
seroit toléré qu'une religion en France." Somewhat later (p. 170)
court after the Duke of Anjou abandoned the Huguenots and the politiques and returned there. La Popelinière briefly referred to this, but he gave none of the statements which d'Aubigné put in the mouth of Anjou or a certain Warty. The Duke of Anjou stated that he knew only one honest Huguenot, La Noue, and "que pour hayr

he reiterated, without dating the event, that the assemblée decided for the revocation of the Edict of Beaulieu and the prohibition of all public or private religious observances by the Huguenots. D'Aubigné failed to designate which Estate or whether all three took these intolerant actions, but his text clearly indicates that he was referring to the Third Estate in both instances. In addition, he completely omitted any reference to the similar actions taken by the nobility and clergy; of course, de Thou was guilty of the same omission. Then d'Aubigné (p. 168) cited Mirambeau's courageous protest to the prohibition of Protestantism and dated this action on February 20. The Huguenot historian not only forgot the date of this brilliant address which he himself had written but also implied that it was a reaction to a vote of the Third Estate. Actually, the speech preceded the tiers' intolerant action and was, naturally, the Baron of Mirambeau's answer to the decision taken by the nobility against Protestantism. D'Aubigné recorded the decision for peace by the Third Estate as occurring on February 26 rather than February 28, the correct date. Cf. A. Garnier, op. cit., I, p. 24.

Thus d'Aubigné described an incredible volte-face by the tiers which was much more sudden than the actual one, since he pictured the Third Estate as favoring peace on January 15, religious unity at any price on February 19 and peace again on February 26. Moreover, d'Aubigné gave inadequate attention to the financial questions which agitated the Estates. De Thou's account is fuller and clearer in these matters. However, both historians failed to elucidate the connection between the financial issue and the growing demand for peace among the commoners. Finally, d'Aubigné's account, as always, lacks the balance of de Thou's. The Huguenot devoted nineteen pages of a twenty-two page chapter, concerned entirely with the Estates General, to the two séances royales of December 6 and January 17 and thus omitted many important details.
les huguenots il les fallait cognoistre." Moreover, Warty further
incensed Anjou towards the Huguenots by saying that they, including
Henry of Navarre, called his academy of Bourges "l'Académie des
bougres" (perverts) and that the prince of Condé ridiculed and
imitated him when tilting at the ring. 59

59 D'Aubigné, V, pp. 116, 117. In introducing this passage
d'Aubigné was guilty of an anachronism when he referred to the
passage of John of Austria and the "cardinal Aldobrandin" through
France. De Ruble (d'Aubigné, V, p. 116, note 1) states that
Cinzio-Passero Aldobrandini was not made a cardinal until 1593.

The statements by Anjou about hating the Huguenots and
La Noue being the only honest one, though found only in d'Aubigné's
history, have been accepted and incorporated in H. Baird's The
Huguenots and Henry of Navarre, I, p. 100 and P. Willert's Henry
of Navarre, p. 117. The malicious gossip which d'Aubigné attributes
to Warty is corroborated by no sixteenth-century or modern historian.
CHAPTER VI

D'AUBIGNE'S SOURCES FOR THE YEARS 1588 AND 1589

The printed sources available to d'Aubigné for the composition of an account of the meeting of the Estates General in 1588 and the assassinations of the Guises and Henry III were numerous. Of course there were the general narratives on the later sixteenth century which have been mentioned above in Chapter II.

For the years 1588 and 1589 several biographies or histories concerned especially with the activities of Henry IV were available, such as Palma Cayet's *Chronologie novenaire* (1608), Baptiste Legrain's *Décade contenant la vie . . . de Henry le Grand . . .* (1614), Julien Peleus' *L'Histoire . . . de Henry le Grand* (1613-1616), Gabriel Chappuy's *Histoire de nostre temps . . . sous Henry III . . . et Henry IV . . .* (1600), and especially Pierre Matthieu's *Histoire des derniers troubles de France sous les regnes des roys . . . Henry III . . . et Henry IV . . .* (1600). D'Aubigné also could have used Simon Goulart's extremely valuable compilation of documents called the *Mémoires de la Ligue . . . depuis 1576 jusqu'à . . . 1598* (1599 and 1602). Moreover, there were myriads of political

---

*In the de Rube edition of the Histoire universelle the material investigated included chaps. xxii, xxiii, portions of xxiv and xxix in bk. ii and chaps. i, iii, iv, v, vii, viii, xii, xiii, xiv, xxii, xxiii, xxiv and portions of ii and iv in bk. iii. These are found in Vols. VII and VIII.*
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pamphlets published about the assemblies, sieges, assassinations, and other events of these years which might have been utilized by d'Aubigné. The *Déploration de la mort du roy, Henry III . . .* (1589), a long anti-league polemic, and *Le Martyre de frere Jacques Clement . . .* (1589), a sixty-two page pamphlet, are only two examples of the scores of polemics available to an historian of d'Aubigné's time and even yet today.\(^2\)

In addition to the preceding printed sources d'Aubigné had the customary data received either orally or in written memoranda and reports from his informants. Very possibly such information was more abundant for this period than for the three earlier ones investigated. Certainly the percentage of d'Aubigné's material derived from his personal experiences was greater for these events of 1588 and 1589 than for the others. The numerous lacunae for which no printed sources could be found and the fact that d'Aubigné was often in the "thick of things" testify to the importance of his personal observations.

Throughout most of the year 1588 d'Aubigné accompanied the forces of Henry of Navarre. He probably aided Navarre's forces

\(^2\)Several of the pamphlets perused for this study are found in the "Bibliography." Hereafter the historical works of P. Matthieu, S. Goulart, and Palma Cayet are cited in the following editions and fashion. P. Matthieu's *Histoire des derniers troubles de France . . .* (Paris, 1601), is cited as Matthieu; P. Cayet's *Chronologie novenaire . . . 1589-1598* (Paris, 1854), is cited as Palma Cayet; and S. Goulart's *Mémoires de la Ligue . . . depuis 1576 jusqu'à . . . 1598*, 6 vols. (Amsterdam, 1758), is cited as *Mémoires de la Ligue*. 
in the furious skirmish before Nérac in February, 1588. In March d'Aubigné stated that he was present at the reconnaissance of Marans, and surely he participated in Navarre's recapture of that town in June.3 August found d'Aubigné assisting Navarre in his attempt to protect the town of Montaigu. The lengthy Huguenot siege of Beauvoir, throughout most of October, saw d'Aubigné again with Navarre's forces. However, d'Aubigné was extremely irritated that this long siege and Navarre's strategy had prevented the execution of the former's "grand design" to seize the mouth of the Loire River. Nevertheless, d'Aubigné was approached for advice by Navarre on November 10 when the latter was considering marrying the Countess of Guiche. 4 D'Aubigné's negative answer probably angered the king.5

The Huguenot assembly at La Rochelle, the Protestant counterpoise to the pro-Holy League Estates General at Blois, met during late November and early December. The King of Navarre was naturally present and so was d'Aubigné. However, the Huguenot warrior historian was unable to attend the sessions since he was not an elected representative or a delegate of Navarre. The assembly ended on December 17 with Navarre and his Huguenot followers on good terms, but d'Aubigné had already departed with aid for Garnache which was besieged by the Catholics. D'Aubigné had rejoined Navarre's

---

3 Garnier, op. cit., I, pp. 387-389. Garnier states that he would be most surprised if d'Aubigné did not share in the recapture of Marans.
4 Ibid., pp. 396-400.
forces for an attack upon Niort before the news of the assassinations at Blois of the Duke and Cardinal of Guise was brought to the Huguenot camp.\(^5\)

From mid-January of 1689 until the end of the winter d'Aubigné was occupied with the fortress of Maillezais, which he had captured about the first of the year and of which he was made governor by Henry of Navarre. Thus he was not present for Navarre's victorious march from La Rochelle to Tours and his agreement with the friendless and desperate Henry III. Probably d'Aubigné rejoined Navarre's forces in mid-April when Henry occupied Saumur according to the agreement with the King of France.\(^6\)

D'Aubigné formed a part of Navarre's suite during the approach to Paris and then during the abortive siege of the capital in late July and early August. D'Aubigné displayed his customary audacity and zest for combat which resulted in a victorious duel for him outside the walls of Paris at the Pré aux Clercs. He did not accompany Navarre on his first visit to the chamber of the mortally—though it was not then so believed—wounded Henry III, but d'Aubigné was informed of these events by the King of Navarre on his return.\(^7\) Navarre, when he returned to see Henry III, was

---

\(^5\)Ibid., pp. 403-405, 408, 409.

\(^6\)Garnier, op. cit., II, pp. 2-5, 9.

\(^7\)Ibid., pp. 21, 22, 25.
accompanied by eight loyal followers, one of whom was d'Aubigné and another Sully. Thus the Huguenot historian was present in Henry III's chamber shortly after his demise, and he witnessed the sullenness and rebelliousness of the Catholic nobles towards the new Huguenot sovereign. In fact, d'Aubigné gave valuable counsel and support to Henry of Navarre, now Henry IV, in this difficulty.  

As was stated above, d'Aubigné relied much less upon printed sources for his account of this period than for the earlier ones that have been studied. This part of the Histoire universelle is much more original, much more d'Aubigné's own, than his account of the reign of Francis II and the tragedy of St. Bartholomew for which he leaned heavily on de Thou's history or than his description of the years 1576 and 1577, much of which was drawn from La Popelinière's Histoire de France enrichie . . . D'Aubigné's narration of the tragic and dramatic occurrences of 1588 and 1589 has an original outline rather than one borrowed from another historian, and he was here not guilty of plagiarism or even of lengthy paraphrases from his sources.  

Matthieu's Histoire des derniers troubles de France . . . was the narrative most consistently and frequently utilized by the warrior historian. Nonetheless, the latter never slavishly followed  

---

8Ibid., pp. 27, 28, 30-35. Histoire universelle, VIII, pp. 81-83.  

9Cf. chaps. iii, iv, v above.
Matthieu's history for specific data, for the narration of a group of events, or for general arrangement. Of virtually equal importance as a source was Simon Goulart's Mémoires de la Ligue... This collection was generally employed by d'Aubigné to supply his Histoire universelle with the text of a speech, letter, or agreement, such as Henry III's edict of July, 1588. D'Aubigné drew some facts from Palma Cayet's Chronologie novenaire and possibly others from the Inventaire général, but they were less significant than the two preceding sources.¹⁰ The numerous political polemics of 1588 and 1589 do not seem to have served d'Aubigné as important sources of information. Probably he mistrusted them; moreover, d'Aubigné probably possessed few of them when he composed the Histoire universelle.

D'Aubigné's Debt to Pierre Matthieu

Undoubtedly d'Aubigné read, studied, and drew information from Matthieu's Histoire des derniers troubles..., but d'Aubigné's debt to him is considerably more difficult to prove than his earlier debt to La Popelinière or de Thou. The Histoire des derniers troubles... was not an important source for all facets of d'Aubigné's

¹⁰De Ruble's note 1 in d'Aubigné, VII, p. 388, is incorrect; he states that d'Aubigné "a... beaucoup emprunté" from the Inventaire général. The present research does not substantiate this statement. Moreover, the material in the Inventaire général for the reigns of Henry III and Henry IV often seems to be merely a condensation of Matthieu's history, especially the description of the assassination of the Duke and Cardinal of Guise.
narrative during this period. The warrior historian utilized it primarily for material about events at the court of Henry III, the proceedings at the Estates General of Blois, and especially the assassination of the Guises. The connection between the two histories is frequently rather obscure and occasionally tenuous, but it does exist. However, Palma Cayet's *Chronologie novenaire* contains much the same material. Both Cayet and Matthieu omitted one or two details, such as the promise of benefices worth 100,000 livres for the Cardinal of Guise, but included virtually everything else found in the *Histoire universelle*.

Moreover, all three historians interpreted identically but incorrectly the dismissal of the royal councillors Cheverny, Villeroy, and Bellièvre by Henry III. They asserted that this was an act of appeasement toward the Leaguers by the king, which it certainly was not. The identical arrangement of this narrative in the *Histoire*

---

11 These events are found between pp. 300 and 400 of Vol. VII of d'Aubigné's history.

12 D'Aubigné, VII, pp. 302-305; Matthieu, bk. iv, ff. 103v-106; Palma Cayet, pp. 61, 67. Twentieth-century writers are virtually unanimous in interpreting the dismissal of his councillors by Henry III as an act by which he hoped to emancipate himself from the control of the Leaguers and his mother who had been too pro-Guise earlier in 1588. Cf. J. Héritier, *Catherine de Médicis*, pp. 664-666; J. Vivent, *La Tragédie de Blois* (Paris, 1948), pp. 242-245; Van Dyke, op. cit., II, pp. 380, 381; and J. H. Mariéjol, *Catherine de Médicis*, p. 400. However, G. Pirot, op. cit., III, p. 91 erroneously agrees with d'Aubigné and writes, "Henri III cédant à l'insistance du duc de Guise, qui demandait le renvoi de ses conseillers, les royal conseillers avait congédiés . . . ."
universelle and the Derniers troubles—Palma Cayet's outline was considerably different—indicates d'Aubigné's reliance upon Matthieu's history rather than the Chronologie novenaire. The two latter writers penned a continuous description of Henry III's appeasement of the Holy League chiefs, but Palma Cayet interrupted his narrative for several pages with an account of the defeat of the Spanish Armada and a summary of anti-League polemics.

Rumors of violence against the Guises during the Estates General at Blois led the king to smother them with kindness and displays of friendship. This passage of the Histoire universelle was surely taken from Matthieu's history for no other source for this material has been found. Their accounts are virtually identical with merely slight variations in the statement attributed to the king.¹³

D'Aubigné's greatest reliance upon Matthieu's history has been found in his description of the assassination of the Guises. He utilized other sources of information, but the Histoire des derniers troubles was his most important guide. The author of the latter work gave numerous reasons why Henry III should have liquidated the Duke of Guise, and these probably were utilized by the Huguenot historian.¹⁴ The latter's description of warnings received

¹³D'Aubigné, VII, p. 327; Matthieu, bk. iv, f. 129.

¹⁴D'Aubigné, VII, pp. 331, 382; Matthieu, bk. iv, ff. 142v-144r.
by the Duke of Guise, of his actions on the eve and the morning of his murder, and finally of the actual assassination of the duke undoubtedly were drawn from Matthieu's history and formed the basic narrative to which d'Aubigné added about three details.

In the Derniers troubles, but not elsewhere, can be found all d'Aubigné's material except the name of Larchant, captain of the Scotch guard, the obstruction of a portal which Guise tried to enter as he was attacked, and the figure of eight assassins besides Laugnac, who murdered the duke. Matthieu and most historians of d'Aubigné's era asserted that there were only seven assassins in addition to Laugnac, their captain. An untitled account of Guise's death, in which it was stated that there were seven or eight murderers besides the captain, was included in the Mémoires de la Ligue. This narrative has other data found in d'Aubigné's description, but there are too many gaps in information for it to have served d'Aubigné in place of the Histoire des derniers troubles. It can be assumed that d'Aubigné knew this account.

---

D'Aubigné, VII, pp. 386-390; Matthieu, bk iv, ff. 146v-148r. Mémoires de la Ligue, III, pp. 145-148. De Rubeo makes an astounding blunder (d'Aubigné, VII, p. 387, note 5) when he writes that all the historians of c. 1600 agreed that there were eight assassins "sans compter Laugnac." In addition to the above writers the author of the Inventaire général . . ., II, p. 916, and Julien Peleus, Histoire de Henry . . . le Grand . . ., III, p. 428, both assert that there were seven men and Laugnac. Undoubtedly the figure of eight murderers besides Laugnac is correct. Pierre de Vaissière in his very excellent De Quelques assassins (Paris, 1912), pp. 268-271, thoroughly corroborates this figure, but he also inexplicably relates that "les récits s'accordent donc à en fixer le nombre à huit."

D'Aubigné erroneously asserted that Guise was attacked as
To the description of the duke's murder de Rubé appends a note in which he declares that d'Aubigné had read the Inventaire général and borrowed considerable parts of it for the Histoire universelle. As already stated this is not true in general, and it is not true for this passage in particular. The author of the Inventaire général omitted several details, for example the disposal of the keys to the chateau, the water in Guise's scar and his request for a lemon, the description of the duke's death and his inability to draw his sword, found in both the Histoire universelle and the Histoire des derniers troubles.16

D'Aubigné's account of the events immediately following the death of the duke such as the imprisonment of the Cardinal of Guise, the Archbishop of Lyons, and numerous other "Guisards," Henry III's haste to inform his mother of the act, the success of the Leaguers in holding Orléans and Lyons, and the murder of the Cardinal of Guise was indubitably drawn from Matthieu's work. In one sentence d'Aubigné was evidently greatly influenced by Matthieu's

he raised the tapestry of "la porte condamnée" (the entrance which was blocked). The duke was beset by the assassins as he entered a short passage which led from the chambre du Roi to the king's cabinetieux, but the entrance had not been obstructed. Two doors, one which led from the salle du conseil to the cabinet vieux and another from the salle du conseil to the cabinet neuf, had been blocked, but the doomed man tried to utilize neither of these. Vaissière has made an exhaustive study of all these details (pp. 256, 284, 285).

16 D'Aubigné, VII, p. 388, note 1; Inventaire général, II, pp. 916, 917.
The latter stated that after the Duke of Guise had been killed "la première chose que le Roy fist ce jour au sortir de son cabinet, fut de porter lui--mesme les nouvelles à la Royne sa Mere... " D'Aubigné was virtually guilty of plagiarism from the Histoire des derniers troubles when he wrote, "La première sortie du roi pour aller porter lui--mesme ces nouvelles à la roine sa mère... "

17 D'Aubigné, VII, pp. 390-396; Matthieu, bk iv, ff. 148-150. The two quotations are found on d'Aubigné's, VII, p. 395 and Matthieu's Book 4, f. 149r. According to Vaissière, De Quelques assassins, pp. 294, 300-302, d'Aubigné and Matthieu mistakenly stated that Henry III had other Guisards arrested and then immediately went to inform his mother of his coup. Vaissière writes that the king had undoubtedly already prepared for the arrests and that he busied himself with his council and other activities before visiting Catherine. D'Aubigné and his guide also incorrectly described Catherine as going directly from her shocking conversation with her son to see the Cardinal of Bourbon who had been imprisoned. Actually, Guise was killed on December 23, but the Queen Mother did not make her unpleasant visit to see the cardinal until January 1 or 2. Cf. Van Dyke, op. cit., II, p. 396; J. Héritier, Catherine de Médicis, p. 675; and J. H. Mariéjol, Catherine de Médicis, p. 405.

For d'Aubigné's explanation of the death of Catherine, which occurred on January 5, 1589, Matthieu's history was not the source and none has been found. Perhaps it was a figment of d'Aubigné's fervent imagination or a groundless Huguenot rumor. Catherine's best recent biographers do not accept d'Aubigné's explanation that her illness grew worse solely as a result of the crudeness with which Henry III informed her of the assassination or as a result of the bitter reproaches which the Cardinal of Bourbon hurled at her. Especially fictitious is d'Aubigné's implication that Catherine leaned toward Protestantism on her death bed and preferred a Huguenot "femme de chambre" to her Roman Catholic attendants. Certainly the unjust accusations of the cardinal did weaken Catherine's spirit, but also she foolishly exposed herself to further infection when she visited Bourbon on a cold, wintry day. Cf. Van Dyke, II, pp. 396, 397; Mariéjol, p. 405; Héritier, pp. 675, 676. Concerning her orthodoxy Héritier, p. 680,
No other account, such as those of the *Inventaire général* or Cayet's *Chronologie novenaire*, displays such a striking similarity with the *Histoire universelle*, and very little information given by d'Aubigné is not found in the *Histoire des derniers troubles*. However, the latter work lacks d'Aubigné's statement that the Archbishop of Lyons heard the Duke of Guise utter "Traistre roy" immediately before expiring. Matthieu also failed to mention the name of de Gast, who chose the assassins of the cardinal, and that of the "capitaine Châlons" as one of them; the statement made to the cardinal by his executioners and the four-foot high wall built near the cell are not found in Matthieu's work. These facts are not found in the histories that were available to d'Aubigné, and many of the contemporary pamphlets omitted them too.

Two of these details are mentioned in a series of depositions which were made by informed persons at the request of the Duchess of Guise after the murders. Esme of Hautefort declared that the "capitaine du Guast" supplied Henry III with three soldiers, la Fleur, Violet, and Châlons, who disposed of the Cardinal of Guise. The Archbishop of Lyons asserted, in his deposition, that he had heard the Duke of Guise say "Ha, messieurs," several times, then

writes, "Madame Catherine a toujours été croyante, sans que rien l'ait troublé sur l'essentiel du catholicisme . . . ." Van Dyke, p. 397, quotes, for her last hours, her physician who wrote that "she confessed, took the communion and received extreme unction so contritely and devoutly . . . ," all of which was omitted by d'Aubigné.
"O quelle trahison!" and finally "Mon Dieu, miséricorde," before dying.\(^\text{18}\) However, it is very dubious that d'Aubigné saw these depositions, which were received by two councillors of the Parlement of Paris.

Part of the remainder of d'Aubigné's chapter about the "Mort des deux frères Guisars et ce que avint du reste" was probably taken from Matthieu's history. They agree closely on La Chastre's actions, the conversation of Henry III and the papal legate, and the conclusion of the Estates General.\(^\text{19}\)

The Discours de ce qui est arrivé à Blois jusques à la mort du Duc & du Cardinal de Guise (1588) is a contemporary polemic which d'Aubigné might have used as a source for these events; however, there is little obvious proof of it. It has several details

\(^{18}\)These depositions are found in the Archives curieuses, First Series, XII, pp. 203, 204 and 218. P. de Vaissière, De Quelques assassins, pp. 287-290, attributes several statements to Guise as he was attacked and dying, but none are the same as d'Aubigné's "Traistre roy." According to Vaissière Guise first, calling for assistance, cried, "Hé! mes amis!" and then several times said, "Ah! Messieurs Ah! Messieurs!" and afterwards "Ohe quelle trahison! quelle trahison!" and finally murmured, "Ce sont mes offenses! Mon Héau miséricordé!"

D'Aubigné was correct in saying that "de Gast" chose and accompanied the slayers of the Cardinal of Guise, but he selected six soldiers, one of them named Châlons, rather than four to perpetrate the bloody act. Moreover, d'Aubigné abandoned his sources and incorrectly said that two days elapsed between the deaths of the two brothers whereas in fact the duke was slain on December 23 and the cardinal the following day. Cf. Vaissière, op. cit., pp. 318-320. Vaissière also makes no mention of the "muraille de quatre pieds de haut" which d'Aubigné said was built near the cardinal's cell.

\(^{19}\)D'Aubigné, VII, pp. 399-401; Matthieu, bk. iv, ff. 149, 161-162.
which agree with those of the *Histoire universelle*, but they are also found in similar form in Matthieu's history. All three narratives agree in describing the warning to beware of Guise which Henry III allegedly received from Guise's brother, the Duke of Mayenne, the warning which Guise received under his napkin on the eve of his death, the method by which La Chastre saved himself, the king's relation of the first murder to Catherine, and the dissimulation of the papal legate during his conversation with Henry III. The *Discours ...* differs from the *Histoire universelle* and Matthieu's account occasionally; for example, according to the former work it was the Cardinal of Guise who heard the duke's dying words rather than the Archbishop of Lyons, as the authors of the two other works asserted.\(^{20}\)

D'Aubigné's description of the death of Henry III is probably not indebted to any printed source. He did at this juncture pen a criticism which was possibly intended for Matthieu's history but more probably for the *Inventaire général* alone or for both it and the *Histoire des derniers troubles*. The warrior historian asserted that Henry III did not make a lengthy and continuous speech during these last moments of his life but that he spoke sporadically, however well, about the sins of his life, vengeance for his death,

\(^{20}\) The *Discours ... jusques à la mort du Duc & du Cardinal de Guise* is easily obtained today in the *Archives curieuses*, First Series, XII, pp. 141-155
and commanded the union of his followers with Henry of Navarre whom he declared to be his successor. In both Matthieu's history and the *Inventaire général* a 350 word speech, identical in both books except that the *Inventaire* omits the first and last sentences, is attributed to the dying king.\(^{21}\)

---

\(^{21}\)D'Aubigné, VIII, p. 78; *Inventaire général*, II, pp. 942, 943; Matthieu, bk. v, f. 7. Both de Rible (d'Aubigné, loc. cit., note 1) and Garnier, *op. cit.*, II, p. 29, think that d'Aubigné was referring to the very artificial discourse which de Thou, X, pp. 671-673, put in the mouth of the dying king. Since this part of de Thou's history was not published until 1620, d'Aubigné could not have used it for his first edition and the second edition of 1626 was here identical with the first. De Rible fails to recognize this difficulty, but Garnier does and assumes that communications between the two historians made possible d'Aubigné's allusion.

Palma Cayet, pp. 149, 150, also attributed a rather lengthy discourse to Henry III when he was visited by the King of Navarre. Since Cayet asserted that Henry was already in agony, his description is also improbable. D'Aubigné, when he criticized such "une harangue continue," probably was not considering this passage in Cayet's *Chronologie*, for in the following sentence he related the tale about the place of the king's death, which Cayet demolished so well.

Undoubtedly d'Aubigné was correct when he stated that the dying king's last words (derniers propos) were not in the form of a lengthy speech but were "entrecoupez de gemissements et de sanglots." Vaissièbre, *De Quelques assassins*, pp. 470-476, adopts the narrative of Charles of Valois, nephew of the king and a witness to his death, and describes Henry III as speaking at some length with Henry of Navarre and his nobility about noon of August 1. Of course this was some fifteen hours before his death and these were not his final words. After Navarre left the dying man slept, but his conversation when he awoke was fitful and devoted almost solely to religion and the state of his soul. LaPue, *op. cit.*, pp. 291, 292, narrates these events very similarly to Vaissièbre but without documentation.
Moreover, the author of the *Inventaire* declared that Henry died in the same room in which he had helped plot the massacre of St. Bartholomew's Day. This dubious coincidence was omitted by Matthieu, which strengthens the belief that d'Aubigné was here thinking of and utilizing the *Inventaire général*.\(^{22}\) d'Aubigné either had never read, had forgotten, or discounted Palma Cayet's thorough demolition of the tale about this allegedly doubly-tragic chamber. Cayet also described the final remarks and actions of Henry III in a more credible fashion than Matthieu or the author of the *Inventaire général*.\(^{23}\)

One other passage in the *Histoire universelle* may have been drawn from the *Inventaire général* but also possibly from the *Histoire des derniers troubles*. D'Aubigné, when describing the tumult of May 12, 1588, or the day of the barricades, asserted that the Duke of Guise refused to heed Catherine's request to quiet the people. Then the embittered Henry III fled Paris upon the advice of Catherine and other councillors. The *Inventaire* has virtually everything that is found in the *Histoire universelle* and the *Histoire des derniers troubles* is only slightly different for these events.

\(^{22}\) D'Aubigné, VIII, pp. 78, 79; Matthieu, bk. v, f. 7; *Inventaire général*, II, pp. 942, 943.

\(^{23}\) Palma Cayet, pp. 149-151. Pierre de Vaissièrè in his *De Quelques assassins*, p. 328, disposes of this fiction about Henry III's death chamber very effectively.
No other printed sources are so similar to d'Aubigné's account.24

D'Aubigné's Use of the Mémoires de la Ligue

Agrippa d'Aubigné utilized Simon Goulart's Mémoires de la Ligue virtually as much as any other source. As with Matthieu's Histoire... most of the borrowings are not easily proven, but

24 D'Aubigné, VII, pp. 214, 215; Matthieu, bk. iv, f. 51; Inventaire général, II, pp. 881, 882. De Ruble (d'Aubigné, VII, p. 214, notes 1, 2, and 7) asserts that d'Aubigné was mistaken in stating that Catherine visited Guise twice on May 12, that the Louvre was invested, and that she herself journeyed to the Louvre and personally warned her son to flee Paris. Certainly de Ruble's last two criticisms are justified. On the afternoon of May 13 the Louvre was not yet completely surrounded and one city gate, the porte Saint-Honoré, and perhaps two were not in the hands of the rebellious Leaguers, also Catherine did not personally warn her son to flee Paris but sent her secretary, Pinart. Cf. P. Robiquet, op. cit., pp. 345, 346, 351; B. Zeller, "Le Mouvement guisard en 1588," Revue historique, XLI (1889), pp. 275, 276; and J. H. Mariejol, Catherine de Médicis, p. 397.

However, de Ruble's first criticism very possibly has no basis. D'Aubigné did not state that Catherine had visited the Duke of Guise twice on May 12. He wrote that she made her trips through the barrièdes "durant ces exercices," by which he meant the defeat, surrender, and withdrawal of the royalist troops on May 12 and 13. There is a disagreement among historians as to whether Catherine went to see Guise once or twice. Several modern writers assert that she made the journey once on May 12 and again the next day. Cf. Robiquet, op. cit., p. 351, note 1; B. Zeller, loc. cit., p. 275; and Van Dyke, op. cit., pp. 365, 367. The author of a contemporary pamphlet, "Amplification des Particularités qui se passerent à Paris...," Archives curieuses, First Series, XI, pp. 357-359, stated that Catherine made two trips on May 13, but this is surely incorrect.
some passages of the *Histoire universelle* were without question taken only from Goulart's collection. The recital of the siege of Jametz by the Duke of Lorraine in the first half of 1588 is a narrative which d'Aubigné took almost entirely from the *Mémoires de la Ligue*. His seven-page Chapter XI of Book XII is nothing but a summary of a very lengthy description of these events in the latter work. In Goulart's book the preliminaries of the siege and the investment itself form a whole, but in the *Histoire universelle* d'Aubigné divided it into three sections. His earlier material about the death of the Duke of Bouillon, the inheritance of Jametz and Sedan by his sister, La Noue's defense of her rights, and the first weeks of the siege was undoubtedly, in part, based upon the material in the *Mémoires de la Ligue*. However, d'Aubigné's

---


26 D'Aubigné's discussion (VII, pp. 204, 205) of the action of La Noue, who came to the aid of Bouillon's heiress, La Noue's ward, is faulty in several respects. Evidently d'Aubigné did not study La Noue's *Déclaration...*, to which he already had referred and which is printed in the *Mémoires de la Ligue*, II, pp. 290ff., very assiduously and also was badly informed about Henry III's actions.

D'Aubigné incorrectly asserted that La Noue had sworn that he would not take up arms against the King of Spain unless that contravened his obedience and fidelity to the crown of France. However, H. Hauser in his *François de la Noue*, pp. 221, 222, asserts that La Noue gave an unlimited oath never to fight against the King of Spain in any of his lands. Hauser, incidentally, states that La Noue never violated this pledge.

Also, d'Aubigné erroneously declared that La Noue "fut sommé par son roi d'entreprendre la défense de la pupille." This is
narrative differs from the latter one where he wrote that forty-five of the besiegers, fortified in a windmill, were killed in a clever booby-trap which one of the defenders arranged. According to the account in the Mémoires . . . about forty men were in the windmill and virtually all were killed.27 Again d'Aubigné asserted that the king dispatched des Réaux to protect royal interests and those of the heiress, but the writer in the Mémoires . . . stated that Henry III sent the sieur de Rieux to Sedan.28 Nevertheless d'Aubigné's debt to the Mémoires de la Ligue is most cogently shown in these

completely incorrect. Hauser in François de la Noue, p. 234, explains that, far from La Noue being summoned to defend his ward, he was told by Henry III "qu'il luy sembloit n'estre de besoing que . . ." La Noue should participate.

27 D'Aubigné, VII, p. 196; Mémoires de la Ligue, III, pp. 610, 611.

28 D'Aubigné, VII, p. 196; Mémoires de la Ligue, III, p. 605. De Thou, X, p. 222, committed the same error as d'Aubigné, but the former magnified it by asserting that "des Réaux" was sent to Sedan by the King of Navarre rather than by Henry III. De Ruble (d'Aubigné, VII, p. 196, notes 4 and 5) has ascertained that des Réaux was a negotiator and councillor of Henry of Navarre, but des Réaux was occupied in Geneva in early 1588. Hauser, François de la Noue, p. 228, agrees with de Ruble that Henry III's envoy was the sieur de Rieux.
passages. The chart in footnote 29 below should fully corroborate the preceding asseveration. In addition, the Huguenot described an important skirmish, resulting from a wood-cutting expedition by the beleaguered, and dated it erroneously on March 22 as did the author of the chronicle in the Mémoires de la Ligue. De Ruble contends, after de Thou, that the date of the engagement was March 18; thus d'Aubigné very probably secured this information from the Mémoires.

D'Aubigné's description of the death of the Prince of Condé on March 5, 1588, surely is partially based upon the Mémoires de la Ligue, where an "Avertissement sur la mort de Mgr le Prince de Condé" was printed. The "Avertissement" has all the information given by d'Aubigné about the "poisoning" of Condé and the execution

---

29 The following chart should prove that d'Aubigné's chap. xi of bk. vii, Vol. VII, pp. 362-368, contains nothing not found in the Mémoires de la Ligue, III, pp. 611-665, and is a summary of the latter account.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pages of the Histoire universelle</th>
<th>Pages of the Mémoires de la Ligue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>362, 363</td>
<td>611-613, 615, 617-619, 621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>364</td>
<td>627, 628, 632, 635-637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>365</td>
<td>639-641, 646, 647, 653, 654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>366</td>
<td>655, 659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>357</td>
<td>660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>358</td>
<td>662-664</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30 De Ruble's comments are found in d'Aubigné, VII, p. 362, note 2.
of the guilty party, but it lacks any information about the suspected
guilt, imprisonment, and release of the Princess of Condé.\textsuperscript{31}

After the day of the barricades and the flight of Henry III from Paris to Chartres, the Duke of Guise wrote from Paris several
letters to his friends and supporters. His "lettre à Bassompierre"

\textsuperscript{31}D'Aubigné, VII, pp. 205-207; Mémoires de la Ligue, II,
pp. 304ff. As de Ruble asserts (d'Aubigné, VII, p. 206, note 5),
"La mort du prince de Condé reste un des plus profonds secrets
de l'histoire du XVI\textsuperscript{e} siècle." P. de Vaissière, Henri IV, pp. 311-
313, refuses to commit himself as does A. Garnier, op. cit., I,
p. 388. The historian of the house of Condé, the Duke d'Aumale,
op. cit., II, p. 182, also considers Condé's death an unsolved
mystery. He refuses to assert whether or not Condé died of poison
and whether or not the princess was guilty. However, he does cast
doubt upon the validity of the evidence incriminating her, and he
reiterates that Condé had been manifestly ill for several months
before March, 1588. However, other historians are more dogmatic
about the event. M. Wilkinson in his A History of the League . . . ,
p. 64, dismisses casually the charges that Condé was poisoned by
his wife with the assertion that "without any doubt the suspicion
seems absurd." B. Zeller, loc. cit., pp. 258, 259, equally em-
phatically declares that Condé was "sans doute empoisonné par sa
femme Charlotte de la Trémouille . . . ." Two learned, late-nineteenth century French monographs
appeared on the subject of the prince's death about which the
authors took almost diametrically opposed views. Ed. de Barthélemy
in his "Charlotte de la Trémouille . . .," Revue des questions
historiques, XLII (July, 1887), pp. 129-159, insists that the
Princess of Condé was completely innocent and the charges had no
basis since certain modern medical authorities declare that Condé
died a natural death from a wound sustained at the battle of
Coutras in October, 1587. However, Jules Loiseleur in his "La
Mort du second Prince de Condé," Revue Historique, I (1876),
pp. 410-437, asserts that Condé's death from poisoning is indubitable.
Loiseleur is less certain of the guilt of the princess and the story
that the posthumous heir of Condé II was actually conceived by a
page, but he implies rather strongly that both are true.

It is interesting to note that d'Aubigné, who accepted as
true Condé's death by poison, did not flatly state that the princess
is quoted fully in d'Aubigné's Chapter XXIV, Book XI. The Huguenot historian unquestionably drew this text from the Mémoires de la Ligue where several of Guise's letters of May, 1588, are printed. There are merely three insignificant differences between the letter as it is given by d'Aubigné and Simon Goulart.32

Another document which d'Aubigné undoubtedly copied from the Mémoires de la Ligue is the Edict of July (1588) or the Edict of Union. By this decree Henry III surrendered to the demands of the Holy League; he declared for a united effort by all French Catholics against the Huguenots and commanded that a "heretic" should never be accepted as King of France. D'Aubigné's text of the edict is identical with that in the Mémoires . . . except for two unimportant verbal differences and d'Aubigné's omission of Roman numeral topic headings. He might have taken the text from Antoine Fontanan's compilation of ancient laws which was first

was guilty and was silent about the possible illegitimacy of Condé III. Of course d'Aubigné did imply the guilt of the princess when he wrote that she was finally released either for lack of evidence or "par discretion d'Estat." D'Aubigné erred grievously about the date of the new infant's birth. According to the Histoire universelle it seems to have occurred even before Condé died or certainly before the accused widow was imprisoned. Actually Condé died on March 5, 1588, the princess was imprisoned shortly thereafter, and her son was born on September 1 during her imprisonment.

published in 1585 and again in 1611, but surely he continued to use the *Mémoires de la Ligue.*33 Aside from Fontanon's collection, d'Aubigné could not readily have found the text since historians like Matthieu and Palma Cayet merely published résumés of the edict.34

In the *Mémoires de la Ligue* was included a narrative of the Duke of Epernon's removal from the royal court and the dangers he suffered from a Guise-inspired rebellion by the populace in his town of Angoulême. D'Aubigné followed this narrative, though less slavishly, for eight or nine pages of the *Histoire universelle* just as he utilized the *Mémoires* account of the siege of Jametz. The two descriptions of Epernon's perils are not identical, since d'Aubigné has omitted portions of his source and added some details to it. For example, d'Aubigné asserted that de Meré, Monélière, Mazerolle and Des Bouchaux, followers of the Duke of Guise, were the ringleaders in the plot against Epernon and that the conspirators had circulated rumors of an agreement between Epernon and Henry of Navarre. Also he described in more detail the seizure of the Duchess of Epernon by the rebels. Moreover, the Huguenot historian disagreed with the writer of the chronicle in the *Mémoires de la Ligue*

34 D'Aubigné, VII, pp. 279-298; *Mémoires de la Ligue,* II, pp. 368-373; Matthieu, bk. iv, ff. 100v, 101r; Palma Cayet, pp. 58, 59.
concerning the names of the leaders of Guisard reinforcements for the rebels. The former said that they were Trouverao and Coutures; whereas the latter recorded Tonnerao and Caze. Also Epernon went forty hours without eating and drinking according to the Histoire universelle but only thirty-six hours after the Mémoires de la Ligue.

---

35 d'Aubigné, VII, pp. 306-314; Mémoires de la Ligue, II, pp. 512-525. Léo Mouton in his Un Demi-Roi: le duc d'Epernon (Paris, 1922), a recent study of Epernon's life to 1589, describes in detail the "entreprise d'Angoulême" vs. the duke. Mouton occasionally accepts or corroborates some of d'Aubigné's assertions which contradict the account found in the Mémoires de la Ligue, but more frequently he disagrees with d'Aubigné where the latter departed from the narrative in the Mémoires. E.g., Mouton, pp. 229 and 237, speaks of Messers Merai, Messelière, Mazerolle, and Des Boucheaux as important accomplices in the conspiracy as did d'Aubigné, VII, p. 307. Also Mouton, p. 226, agrees with d'Aubigné, VII, p. 308, that Epernon and a few friends protected themselves vs. the conspirators by bracing a door with a chest, a fact omitted in the Mémoires. However, Mouton, p. 229, declares that de Meré (or Méri), de Mazerolles, and Des Boucheaux ran through the streets of Angoulême during the attack on Epernon, crying that the duke had been conspiring to deliver the city to the Huguenots; whereas d'Aubigné, VII, p. 309, attributed a similar calumny to Souchet, the brother of the mayor of Angoulême, and rather illogically said that the story about Epernon and the Huguenots was spread on the day preceding the attack. D'Aubigné, VII, p. 311, recorded that the mayor, who had secured entrance to Epernon's chateau, was subsequently forced to take refuge in a tower with only two comrades, but Mouton, pp. 231, 232, relates that he was supported by eight fellow plotters of whom three were seriously wounded. Again Mouton, p. 242, states and agrees with de Thou, X, p. 365, that the spirits of the pro-League conspirators were momentarily raised by the arrival of Trouverao and Lacase accompanied by a few men, but d'Aubigné, VII, p. 313, declared that Trouverao and Coutures brought small reinforcements and renewed hope for the Leaguers. D'Aubigné, ibid., then wrote that for two hours the affair was in suspense until Tagent arrived in the suburbs of Angoulême with considerable aid for Epernon. Mouton, pp. 243, 244, agrees that the arrival of Tagent's troops helped quell the
Despite the differences, the many similarities and especially the identical arrangement of the two accounts, plus the absence of other similar narratives which d'Aubigné might have used, demand agreement with de Ruble's assertion that "le recit ... de d'Aubigné est presque entièrement composé d'après une relation qui a été réimprimée dans les Mémoires de la Ligue ...".

When describing Henry of Navarre's campaigns in the summer of 1588 d'Aubigné seems to have supplemented his personal knowledge of these exploits with material from the Mémoires de la Ligue. D'Aubigné was accompanying Navarre's forces and was informed of rebellion, but he does not specify, as did not the Mémoires, the amount of time that elapsed while affairs were in suspense. Moreover, the arrival of Huguenot troops sent by Henry of Navarre, who wanted the support of Epernon, is cited by Mouton, ibid., as partially responsible for the capitulation of the Leaguers. Inexplicably, d'Aubigné completely omitted the role of Navarre's forces in the surrender. Finally, d'Aubigné, VII, p. 314, stated that the Duke of Epernon had gone for forty hours without eating or drinking during the attack, but Mouton, p. 245, and the Mémoires de la Ligue, II, p. 625, assert that he suffered these privations for thirty-six hours.

36 De Ruble's comment is found in d'Aubigné, VII, p. 314, note 1. Both Matthieu, bk. iv, ff. 106v-108r, and Palma Cayet, p. 64, have only brief discussions of these events. Of course they were surely read by d'Aubigné, and Palma Cayet's chronology may have been the source for the names of the four Guisard instigators of the outbreak as well as the rumor about cooperation between Navarre and Epernon. In the year 1588 a pamphlet entitled Discours Veritable de Ce Qui s'est Passe dans la Ville d'Angoulême entre les Habitans & le Duc d'Eperon was published at Paris, but it is considerably different from d'Aubigné's recital and contained none of the details in which the latter differs from the Mémoires de la Ligue.
their activities, but he utilized the latter account in order to
describe the activities of the Catholic troops during the military
sparring between the Duke of Mercœur and the King of Navarre near
the town of Montaigu.37 Thus his description of the movements of
Mercœur's forces is nothing but a summary of the information in
the Mémoires de la Ligue.38 However, d'Aubigné evidently relied
on personal observations for his narrative of the conflict between
Navarre's troops and Mercœur's rear guard led by Gerzai. His
account of the defeat of Gerzai is considerably more detailed than
the corresponding data in the Mémoires . . . . In general the two
descriptions of Gerzai's defeat are harmonious, but there are a few
differences in detail. According to the Histoire universelle the
Huguenots captured eight flags and four hundred prisoners, but in
the Mémoires de la Ligue the capture of ten flags and four hundred
men is recorded.39

37Cf. the opening pages of this chapter.
38D'Aubigné, VII, p. 331; Mémoires de la Ligue, III, pp. 510,
511.
39D'Aubigné, VII, pp. 332, 333; Mémoires de la Ligue, III,
pp. 510, 511. P. de Vaissière, Henry IV, p. 314, agrees with the
account in the Mémoires de la Ligue about the number of flags that
Gerzai lost, but he disagrees with both concerning the number of
his men who were captured. Vaissière asserts that Mercœur's cam-
paign was an inglorious one since he was forced to raise the siege
of Montaigu and his lieutenant, "René Bourré, agr de Gerazi, est
battu, le 12 août . . . par le Béarnais qui lui tue 50 hommes, lui
fait 450 prisonniers, et lui prend huit drapeaux."
D'Aubigné's Fusion of Various Sources in the Histoire universelle

Several passages from the Histoire universelle were evidently based upon printed sources, but d'Aubigné so intermingled and fused the accounts, or the narratives in the sources are so similar, that it is impossible to detect his indebtedness to the individual histories. When describing the arrival in Paris of the Duke of Guise on May 9, 1588, shortly before the day of the barricades, d'Aubigné very probably utilized the narratives found in the Mémoires de la Ligue, the Inventaire général, and the Histoire des derniers troubles. Perhaps he was most indebted to Matthieu's work, the account most like d'Aubigné's.40

However, d'Aubigné related certain details which are found in none of the preceding sources or in other printed accounts. Several writers said that among the plaudits which Guise received from the welcoming crowd was "Bon prince, puisque tu es ici, nous sommes tous sauvez." Only d'Aubigné attributed this statement to a certain "Vitry," who was probably Louise de l'Hospital-Vitry, a maid of honor of Catherine. Moreover, d'Aubigné alone gave another statement of adulation made to Guise, "Ne mourrai-je point après t'avoir vu roi." It is very possible though certainly not

40D'Aubigné, VII, pp. 210-212; Matthieu, bk iv, ff. 49v, 50r; Mémoires de la Ligue, II, pp. 316, 317.
indisputable that d'Aubigné received these two facts directly from Vitry either orally or in a letter. She and d'Aubigné were seemingly good friends since she had helped him escape from the chateau of Blois when he made his dangerous visit there in December, 1576, during the first Estates General of Blois.\textsuperscript{41}

The Huguenot historian narrated the attempts of the Parisians, after the day of the barricades and the royal flight from Paris, to secure a reconciliation with Henry III, and he related the consequent deputations and negotiations. The Inventaire

\textsuperscript{41}D'Aubigné, VII, p. 211 and note 1; cf. with d'Aubigné, V, pp. 127, 128. H. Baird, The Huguenots and Henry of Navarre, II, pp. 35, 36 follows the Histoire universelle when describing the joyous reception which the Parisians gave Guise. However, Baird attributes both statements of praise for Guise, which are given above, to Vitry; whereas d'Aubigné's text is obscure concerning who uttered the second. Moreover, Baird translates the second utterance in a dubious way. He interprets it as saying: "Shall I not die after having seen the king?" Baird's translation is literally correct, but what does the English mean? Perhaps d'Aubigné intended to write, "Will I die before I have seen you king?"

Nevertheless, two authoritative French writers disagree with these details in the narrative of d'Aubigné. P. Robiquet, op. cit., p. 315 omits, as did d'Aubigné's sources, this second statement of praise for Guise, and he asserts that the first was cried by a female shopkeeper (une boutiquière) rather than by Vitry. J. H. Mariéjol, La Réforme et la Ligue, p. 269, agrees with Robiquet on these two points.

Pierre de Vaissière, De Quelques assassins, p. 305, casts some light on this question. He follows L'Estoile for the first quotation and ascribes it to une demoiselle standing in front of a boutique. He draws upon the correspondence of Etienne Pasquier for a statement very similar to the second and attributes it to a fine old woman (bonne vieille). The vieille said that she was no longer afraid to die (elle ne se souciet plus de mourir), since God had blessed her with a sight of the duke.
The description of the opening ceremonies and sessions of the second Estates General of Blois was narrated at considerable length by d'Aubigné in Chapter V, Book XII, of the Histoire universelle. It was based upon a veritable mélange of sources which d'Aubigné fused into a unit difficult to unravel. He relied heavily upon the histories of Matthieu and Palma Cayet but also somewhat upon the Mémoires de la Ligue and Les Oeuvres diverses of du Perron. A Sommaire de toutes les harangues, edits et ordonnances of the assembly was published in 1588, which might have been utilized as a source by d'Aubigné, but no obvious proof of such a debt has been discovered.

His relation of the preliminary festivities and activities before the opening royal session might have been taken from either

---

42 d'Aubigné, VII, pp. 219-228; Matthieu, bk iv, ff. 84v-90; Inventaire général, II, pp. 887, 888; Palma Cayet, pp. 54-57.
Matthieu’s or Palma Cayet’s account or from both. D’Aubigné’s only information not found in their histories is the discussion of the efforts by Guise and his supporters to secure control of the assembly. The description of the “séance royale d’ouverture” in the Histoire universelle is a mixture of the Histoire des derniers troubles and the Chronologie novenaires with more of the narrative possibly taken from the former work. D’Aubigné and Matthieu agreed that the royal throne was placed on a dais on which also sat the chair of the Duke of Guise, but Palma Cayet placed the king’s seat on a “grand marchepied” rather than a dais and above the seat of Guise. Also, Palma Cayet failed to mention the absence of the Duke of Mayenne which was included by Matthieu and d’Aubigné. However, the latter and Palma Cayet both asserted that Guise with a company of two-hundred gentlemen escorted Henry III to the throne, whereas Matthieu stated that there were only one-hundred gentlemen in the duke’s retinue.43

Henry III’s address to the assembly was summarized by d’Aubigné, and the précis might have been taken from Matthieu’s history, the Mémoires de la Ligue, or the Sommaire de toutes les harangues . . . since all have identical texts for it. Very probably the Sommaire . . . was not used because d’Aubigné erroneously characterized the royal address as the longest made at the Estates General. In the Sommaire . . . one speech of the Archbishop of Bourges equals

43D’Aubigné, VII, pp. 315-318; Matthieu, bk. iv, ff. 113v-115r; Palma Cayet, pp. 69, 70.
the royal address in length and the speech of François de Mentholon, keeper of the seals, is almost twice as long. D'Aubigné may have acquired this mistaken idea from the Mémoires de la Ligue or the Derniers troubles in which only the speech of Henry III is fully quoted and the others are summarized. D'Aubigné quoted three fragments of the royal harangue, but only one portion agreed with the text as given in the Sommaire ..., Mémoires ..., or Derniers troubles. The Huguenot historian refers the reader to the Œuvres diverses of du Perron, the author of the king's address, if he wants the entire speech. However, two of d'Aubigné's quotations are also different from du Perron's unique version. The one portion of the royal address, which is quoted in the Histoire universelle identically with the four sources of the speech mentioned above, is introduced by the statement that "il Henry III conclut en ces mots." Only in du Perron's text is this the concluding paragraph; it is the penultimate paragraph in the three other narratives.44

44 D'Aubigné's analysis of Henry III's speech is found in Vol. VII, pp. 319, 321. The complete text is found in Mémoires de la Ligue, II, pp. 481 ff., Matthieu, bk iv, ff. 119-124; Sommaire ..., (1688), First Speech (In the Sommaire ..., the individual speeches are numbered separately.); J. D. du Perron, Les Œuvres diverses (1622), pp. 713-721.

The considerable variation between the versions of the king's oration found in du Perron's works and the identical texts in the Sommaire ..., Derniers troubles ..., and Mémoires ..., plus d'Aubigné's dissimilar summary is rather astonishing. Perhaps these differences are partially explained by the textual changes which the Guises, irritated by some of Henry's remarks, secured after only a few correct copies of the speech had been printed and
D'Aubigné was primarily following Matthieu's *Derniers troubles* for his analysis of the other speeches and activities at the opening session. Matthieu gave lengthy summaries of the addresses and events which agree with the narrative of d'Aubigné. The *Sommaire* . . . surely was not closely, if at all, followed by d'Aubigné since the conclusions recorded in it of the speeches made by the Archbishop of Bourges, orator for the clergy, and by the orator for the commoners are quite different from those in the *Histoire universelle*. Likewise, d'Aubigné evidently did not carefully follow the *Mémoires de la Ligue* for these subsequent speeches and activities of the first session.

Both d'Aubigné and Matthieu assert that the orator of the Third Estate knelt while speaking, and they conclude their summaries of his speech and that of the Archbishop of Bourges virtually identically. The author of the *resumé* in the *Mémoires* . . . omitted any mention of the speaker for the commoners being "de genoux" and ended differently the archbishop's address.45

distributed. Cf. Palma Cayet, p. 72; Van Dyke, *op. cit.* , II, p. 383; Pictet, *op. cit.*, III, p. 105. Of course in the sixteenth century, speakers and writers were much less concerned about literal accuracy than today. The famous orator of the Parlement of Paris, Guillaume du Vair, changed the text of his speeches before they were published. He may even have fused two speeches which he gave during the summer of 1588 into one when they were printed (Cf. René Radouant's *Guillaume du Vair* (Paris), p. 161).

The description of the second royal session of the Estates General in the *Histoire universelle* is composed of a confusing mixture of the above-mentioned printed sources plus a few statements for which no printed sources can be found. Palma Cayet's chronicle was probably d'Aubigné's most valuable and continuous guide whereas only one or two statements were taken from the *Histoire des derniers troubles* and *Mémoires de la Ligue*. An error in Palma Cayet's history was undoubtedly responsible for d'Aubigné's incorrect assertion that "le second [session] commence le jour suivant [Monday, October 17]." In the *Chronologie novenaire* Palma Cayet wrote, "Ceste seconde séance fut tenue le dix-septiesme octobre . . . ." Nevertheless, d'Aubigné's paragraph about rumors of "murders and treasons" at Blois and the king's "invention" of quieting them with another solemn oath has no basis in Palma Cayet's history. Also, only a portion of this ominous material could have been found in Matthieu's work and there the "Leaguers" are made responsible for the oath.

The account in the *Histoire universelle* of the oath-taking ceremony by the king and the Estates was very probably also based

---


47 D'Aubigné, VII, p. 323; Matthieu, bk. iv, f. 127.
upon the Chronologie novenaire. Some of the preliminary remarks of Henry III and the exhortation by the Archbishop of Bourges about the solemnity of the occasion seem to be summaries of Palma Cayet's description. However, the intervening activities such as secretary Beaulieu's declamation and the king's short speech have no basis in Palma Cayet's or other histories. Unquestionably d'Aubigné's text of the archbishop's oration and very probably Henry III's concluding exhortation were taken from the Chronologie novenaire. The texts for the ecclesiastic's speech are identical only in it, the Histoire universelle, and the Sommaire ..., but it is extremely unlikely, considering the above evidence, that d'Aubigné utilized the latter work. The sovereign's final speech is identical in the Mémoires de la Ligue, the Sommaire ..., and the Chronologie novenaire with that of the Histoire universelle. Again Palma Cayet probably supplied historical guidance to d'Aubigné.48

The warrior historian's description of the closing activities of the session, such as the exultation of the assemblage, the Te Deum at the church of the Holy Saviour, and the amiable conversation between Henry III and the pro-League chief magistrate

48 D'Aubigné, VII, pp. 323-326; Mémoires de la Ligue, II, pp. 499-508; Palma Cayet, pp. 72, 73; Sommaire ..., Harangues by Henry III and the Archbishop of Bourges at second session. D'Aubigné, VII, pp. 323, 324, was heedless in his use of quotation marks at this point. At least twice he evidently was too generous with them. When quoting remarks made by the king he included explanatory material within the quotes as if it were part of the text of the speech. Also he summarized part of the archbishop's speech, but it is found in quotes.
(prevost des marchans) of Paris, may have been derived from the history of Matthieu and especially that of Palma Cayet. However, d'Aubigné's quotation of the king's remarks to the Parisian executive differs from both accounts.49

A final passage from d'Aubigné's Histoire universelle which might have been based upon Cayet's or Matthieu's work concerns the seizure of the marquisate of Saluzzo from France by the Duke of Savoy. The latter two writers described this event and the consternation which it caused Guise and his party during the Estates General, in very similar fashion, and both supplied almost all the data found in d'Aubigné's narrative.50

Accounts for which No Sources Were Found

Absolutely no printed sources could be found for virtually half d'Aubigné's narrative of the events during 1588 and 1589. This is readily explicable for military activities such as those at Beauvoir or Marans, the assembly of La Rochelle, or the death of Henry III, all of which d'Aubigné witnessed. However, his seemingly original material on the day of the barricades or the assassination of the Guises could not have stemmed from personal observation and

49 D'Aubigné, VII, p. 326; Matthieu, bk. iv, f. 129; Palma Cayet, p. 73.

50 D'Aubigné, VII, pp. 379, 380; Matthieu, bk. iv, ff. 135-137; Palma Cayet, p. 77.
must have resulted from oral and manuscript information or from a misuse of the printed sources.

D'Aubigné in addition to the details about the enthusiastic reception given the Duke of Guise, which was mentioned above, recounted other facts about the day of the barricades and related occurrences in Paris for which no sources have been discovered. His accounts of the events preceding the duke's arrival such as the machinations of Guise and other Leaguers, of the consequent fears of Henry III and his attempts to strengthen himself, and finally of the factors which influenced Guise to disobey the king and come to Paris have no specific basis in the printed sources. Of course

51 D'Aubigné, VII, pp. 207-209. The Huguenot historian analyzed rather well the factors which caused Guise to enter Paris, contrary to the king's wishes, and thus become involved in the day of the barricades. D'Aubigné mentioned Guise's ambition, his fear of being discovered, his hatred of Epernon, the influence of the church and Spain in fanaticizing the Parisians as important reasons why "Guise crossed the Rubicon and entered Rome."

P. Robiquet in his excellent Paris et la Ligue sous le règne de Henri III, pp. 294-312, accepts the factors already mentioned, but he contradicts others proposed by D'Aubigné such as "les sollicitations des Jésuites et de Romme" or the promotion of Epernon to be Admiral of France. Certainly the honors showered upon Epernon angered Guise, but the former was made Admiral in early November of 1587 which was rather remote from Guise's Paris entry in May, 1588. Cf. L. Mouton, Un Demi-Roi: le duc d'Epernon, pp. 180-182. Robiquet, p. 301, stresses that there was "presque unanimité du clergé" in opposition to Henry III, and he does not single out the Jesuits as special enemies of the king; moreover, Robiquet, pp. 357, 358, quotes Sixtus V as having criticized Henry III for allowing Guise to insult him so and then escape as he did in May, 1588.

D'Aubigné's gravest error was his failure to discern that Guise was the idol of the Parisian Leaguers but also their servant. As
d'Aubigné was generalizing somewhat, and he may have fused his general knowledge of the spring of 1588 with details from the Histoire des derniers troubles, the Chronologie novenaire, the Mémoires de la Ligue, and other works.

D'Aubigné's description of the day of the barricades, that is the actual stationing of the royal troops, the erection of barricades by the populace, and the defeat and retreat of the troops,

Robiquet, p. 299, writes, "Il fallait pour Guise obéir aux sommations des Parisiens et venir se mettre à leur tête pour donner au Valois le suprême assaut, ou bien perdre à jamais sa popularité." The Parisians wanted to undertake a "coup de main" vs. Henry III and Guise was forced to support them. After several plots had failed in late April and early May, the Leaguers, fearful of punishment by the king, demanded that Guise come to Paris and overtly affront the royal authority. Robiquet, p. 310, asserts that their messenger

"déclara au duc que, s'il temporisait davantage, tous ses serviteurs l'abandonneraient et ne manqueraient pas de révéler au roi les projets de la Ligue. Le duc de Guise eut un moment de perplexité terrible. D'une part, ses partisans le menaçaient de l'abandonner et même de le trahir, s'il tardait à donner le signal de l'insurrection, et d'autre part, le roi lui avait fait transmettre à trois reprises différentes la défense formelle de venir à Paris."

D'Aubigné also omits the information that Catherine secretly advised Guise to enter the capital, which some sixteenth-century writers related and several modern historians accept, e.g. P. Robiquet, op. cit., pp. 311, 312; B. Zeller, loc. cit., p. 265; M. Wilkinson, op. cit., pp. 15, 34; J. Héritier, Catherine de Médicis, pp. 664-667; and J. Vivent, La Tragédie de Blois (Paris, 1946), pp. 203, 204. In fact, d'Aubigné, VII, p. 310, interpreted the duke's arrival as a complete surprise to Catherine and described her as "toute effrayée" when she escorted Guise to the Louvre. Some of d'Aubigné's contemporaries as well as recent biographers of Catherine, e.g. Van Dyke, op. cit., II, p. 362, and J. H. Mariéjol, Catherine de Médicis, p. 395, agree with his explanation that Catherine did not clandestinely work to bring Guise to Paris.
is no longer than that in the *Inventaire général* or in the *Histoire des derniers troubles*. However, the Huguenot writer has details which are unique and different from those in printed sources. He alone specified the number—two thousand—of French infantry that accompanied the four thousand Swiss "occupation" troops. He disagreed with the other sources about what captains occupied certain points of the city. Of course, d'Aubigné and Matthieu both stated that Captain Crillon stationed his men at the "pont St. Michel" and that Marshall d'Aumont fortified the "pont Nôtre Dame." Nonetheless, only d'Aubigné asserted that the Place Maubert was occupied by the royal troops.\textsuperscript{52} All other chroniclers of this revolutionary day

\textsuperscript{52}D'Aubigné, VII, p. 212; Matthieu, bk. iv, f. 50r. P. Robiquet, op. cit., does not specify the size of the reinforcements which the king ordered into Paris. B. Zeller, loc. cit., p. 271, mentions a regiment of French guards and 4000 Swiss, as did several of the sources. However, M. Wilkinson, op. cit., p. 55, and LaFue, op. cit., p. 230, adopt d'Aubigné's figures for the number of troops. The former writes that some 6000 Swiss and French troops were brought into Paris, and the latter asserts, exactly as d'Aubigné, that Biron led "4000 Suisses and 2000 gardes françaises" into the capital.

Not only did d'Aubigné's account of the stationing of the Swiss troops and the French guards differ from the narratives of his contemporaries, but also it is at variance with the most complete modern account of the day of the barricades, Robiquet's *Paris et la Ligue . . .*, pp. 326, 327. For example, Robiquet authoritatively asserts that Marivaux rather than Crillon seized the pont Saint-Michel; he states that Crillon was assigned the duty of seizing the Place Maubert but failed, after which students from Mont Saint-Geneviève occupied the Place Maubert and built barricades there. Also Robiquet attributes the occupation of the Hôtel de Ville and the Place de Grève to François d'O, but d'Aubigné mistakenly assigned this task to Marshall d'Aumont. Modern historians such as B. Zeller, loc. cit., p. 272, and P. Robiquet, pp. 330, 331, disagree with the contention of the sixteenth-century writers who
declared that the Place Maubert was not seized by the king's men; and some writers, such as de Thou, considered this to be a serious royalist blunder.

As the populace rebelled against the soldiers, d'Aubigné also uniquely stated that the Swiss of the Place Maubert, since they had no defenses, were the first to throw themselves into the narrow streets where they were decimated.53

No printed source described the activities of the Count of Brissac, who had been called a failure on land and sea by the king, with such detail. Only d'Aubigné attributed to him leadership in the erection of the first barricades, a feat of the university students, and the statement, "At least I will show the king that I have found my element and that I am good on the pavement." D'Aubigné alone described the defeated Swiss as baring their heads and clasping their hands as they asked for mercy. However, a contemporary pamphlet also narrated that they knelt and praised the Duke of Guise.54

---

53 De Thou, X, pp. 256, 257; d'Aubigné, VII, p. 213.
After the king fled to Chartres the Leaguers sought to appease his anger. D'Aubigné has some original details about these advances, especially that of the Capuchin monks who reenacted Christ's climb to Calvary and asked for mercy from Henry III. D'Aubigné was alone in stating that a "frère Ange," who portrayed Jesus, had formerly been a member of the king's secret group and had left it because of the shameful things that he had seen and had endured. Also the reactions of the court and especially of the Duke of Montpensier, who cried and made a striking exclamation about the Capuchin's performance, are found only in the Histoire universelle.  

D'Aubigné's descriptions of military actions form some of the most original material in this portion of his history. However, this assertion is not as valid for his account of the recapture of Marans by Henry of Navarre as for other sieges or encounters. There is a narrative of this Huguenot victory in the Mémoires de la Ligue, which in general is not contradictory to d'Aubigné's material, but

with the Huguenot historian in attributing to Brissac ardent efforts among the university students who raised the first barricades. In addition, Robiquet cites from the Histoire universelle Brissac's statement about his military prowess "on the pavement."

55 D'Aubigné, VII, pp. 218, 219. D'Aubigné quoted Montpensier as exclaiming, "Tout irait encore bien, n'estoit que la musique est un peu aigre et que l'on fait semblant de fouetter." P. Robiquet, op. cit., pp. 384, 385, has the most detailed modern account of this narrative that has been found, but even he makes no reference to the secret sins of frère Ange or the reaction of Montpensier.
there are details in each account which are not found in or are
different from those of the other. Du Plessis-Mornay, author of the
relation in the Mémoires . . . , stated that the chateau of Marans
fell three days after the fortress of Clousi, but d'Aubigné implied
that the chateau was captured the following day. Mornay related
that ten companies surrendered to Navarre but he captured only eight
ensigns since two companies had no flags; however, d'Aubigné flatly
stated that the Huguenots captured ten flags. Finally, the latter
mentioned that the Huguenots used only two artillery pieces during
the siege, but du Plessis-Mornay spoke of four.56 Perhaps these
disagreements stem from d'Aubigné's careless utilization of the nar­
rative in the Mémoires de la Ligue, but they may result from his
superior information or neglect of Mornay's account. There is no
definite proof of d'Aubigné's absence or presence at this operation;
however, it would be surprising, as M. Garnier remarks, that he
should have missed the siege of Marans after having participated
in reconnoitering it.57

56 D'Aubigné, VII, pp. 298-300; Mémoires de la Ligue, II,
pp. 378-383.

57 A. Garnier, op. cit., I, p. 389. M. Garnier also justly
points out that d'Aubigné's narrative is considerably more concise
and hence more confusing than du Plessis-Mornay's. Assuming that
d'Aubigné was present, Garnier asserts, "Son obscurité relative
viendroit-elle de ce que voyant en imagination sur le terrain ce
qui se passa, il ne se rend pas compte que son lecteur auroit besoin
pour le suivre de plus de précisions sur la disposition des lieux
et des forts."

This criticism about d'Aubigné's concision and his failure
to give necessary geographic or other explanatory details can be
applied to numerous other passages in the Histoire universelle.
There is an eight-page section (Chapter VII of Book XII) in the *Histoire universelle* devoted to d'Aubigné's plan, which Henry of Navarre adopted of seizing the mouth of the Loire River, for military and fiscal reasons, and to Navarre's siege of Beauvoir-sur-Mer. Naturally d'Aubigné's information about the genesis and development of the design on the mouth of the Loire is original material; also his details about the king's preparations are original since Navarre related them to him. However, his subsequent narrative about the sieges of Clisson and Beauvoir-sur-Mer is also found in the *Mémoires de la Ligue*. Undoubtedly, d'Aubigné was familiar with this account in the *Mémoires* ..., as he must have been with their narrative about Marans; nevertheless, he utilized it very little. His description of operations at Clisson and Beauvoir-sur-Mer was based upon his knowledge from participation in these events.

---

58 One might assume, since there are errors in the account and since the "grand design" did not reach fruition, that d'Aubigné's "grand design" was as imaginary as that granted to Henry IV by Sully. Nevertheless, Garnier, *op. cit.*, I, pp. 395, 396, has no doubts about its existence especially since d'Aubigné is not alone in mentioning it. A. Garnier writes that "De Thou X, p. 365, sans lui en attribuer la paternité, en connaît l'existence." Mme. de Mornay in her *Mémoires* (Paris, 1868), I, p. 168, also mentioned a plan "pour maîtriser la rivière de Loire" at its mouth by Navarre's forces after the capture of Beauvoir-sur-Mer. However, she did not mention d'Aubigné and seemed to attribute its inception to her husband, du Plessis-Mornay.

59 Both A. Garnier, *op. cit.*, I, p. 396, and de Ruble (d'Aubigné, VII, p. 338, note 1) assert that d'Aubigné utilized the narrative in the *Mémoires de la Ligue*, but this is a half-truth as the present analysis indicates. D'Aubigné's presence at these operation is attested to by his statements in the *Histoire universelle*, VII, pp. 339-342. Also cf. Garnier, *op. cit.*, I, pp. 392-399.
more detail concerning the actual combats and some difference in interpretation and particulars. From the Mémoires de la Ligue it seems that Navarre was relatively uninterested in the conquest of Clisson. Yet d'Aubigné asserted that the king intended to capture Clisson in order better to protect other Huguenot towns but planned only to feign a siege of Beauvoir-sur-Mer. Moreover, d'Aubigné's details about the fortifications of the latter town, the heroism of a squire /d'Aubigné/ and other followers who saved the King of Navarre when attacked from ambush, and the engineering activities of himself and even Navarre in building siege trenches around Beauvoir are peculiar to the Histoire universelle and not found in the Mémoires de la Ligue.\textsuperscript{60}

\textsuperscript{60}D'Aubigné, VII, pp. 335-342; Mémoires de la Ligue, II, pp. 526-529. Despite the originality of d'Aubigné's eyewitness account it contains two serious defects, which Garnier has signaled. The latter, op. cit., I, p. 396, justly asserts that part of d'Aubigné's material on pp. 336-337 about the "grand design" must refer to the year 1586, when d'Aubigné had just been released from prison, rather than 1588. Also, Garnier, op. cit., I, p. 397, questions d'Aubigné's strategical judgments. The Huguenot historian, piqued by Navarre's failure to carry out the "grand design," attributes it, VII, pp. 338 and 342, to Henry's having "assujetti les progres de la mer à ceux de la terre." Garnier discerningly states that d'Aubigné's account itself proves (D'Aubigné wrote on p. 338 that when Navarre besieged Beauvoir-sur-Mer he thought "que ses navires seroyent plus avancés qu'ils n'estoyent . . . ") that in reality the sea campaign hampered the one on land rather than the reverse. Henry of Navarre, as quoted by P. de Vaissièrè, Henri IV, p. 315, supported this interpretation when he described this siege and wrote, "Si nostre canon /which was aboard ship/ fut arrivé plus tost qu'il ne fit, je n'eusse esté si longtemps devant /Beauvoir/; mais c'est chose facheuse d'avoir affaire à la mer et aux vents . . . ."

The attempt from ambush to kill Navarre, which permitted
D'Aubigné's Chapter XII of Book XII concerns the conquests in Poitou of the Catholic army under the Duke of Nevers during November and December of 1588. As for the activity at Marans and Beauvoir-sur-Mer, narrations of Nevers' operations against Mauléon, Montaigu, and Garnache are also found in the Mémoires de la Ligue. Undoubtedly, d'Aubigné was familiar with these accounts and used them occasionally, especially since he was present only at the siege of Garnache, but the Histoire universelle contains numerous details which are not found in the Mémoires de la Ligue. More than half of d'Aubigné's account of the capture of Mauléon, particularly the preliminary operations and skirmishes, is not found in the Mémoires. 

Certainly de Ruble's comment on the passages about the capture of Montaigu in the Histoire universelle is absurdly false. He wrote, "Les Mémoires de la Ligue contiennent une relation du siège de Montaigu dont d'Aubigné a presque copié le texte." The Huguenot historian did utilize the Mémoires . . ., but virtually one-half of his narrative is foreign to the latter work. D'Aubigné's descriptions of the fortifications and of the Huguenot defenders at Montaigu, of the preliminary skirmishes before investment, of the discontent among the Leaguers in the Catholic army at the release of

d'Aubigné and these other gentlemen to display their heroism, is fully accepted and quoted by P. de Vaissière in his Henri IV, p. 314. However, he does state that d'Aubigné, in his customary manner, made it into a colorful tale (un récit coloré à l'habitude).

Huguenot garrisons in captured towns, and of the catastrophic heed­lessness of the released defenders of Montaigu are unique to the Histoire universelle.62

The account of the siege of Garnache in the latter work is brief and is based upon the longer chronicle in the Mémoires de la Ligue and d'Aubigné's personal information. Again de Ruble is mistaken in saying that d'Aubigné shortened but "here followed almost literally" the recital in the Mémoires . . . . Details about the reconnaissance made by Nevers, the size of the garrison, the reasons for the fatal recklessness of Rusigni, and others are peculiar to d'Aubigné's narrative.63 Palma Cayet and Matthieu recounted these sieges very briefly, the former after the Mémoires de la Ligue, but neither served as a source for d'Aubigné.64

In November and December of 1588 the Huguenots held an extremely important assembly at La Rochelle; because of its importance and his presence in La Rochelle during most of the meeting, d'Aubigné might be expected to have given a thorough and lengthy discussion of it. Unfortunately the Huguenot historian merely presented a brief


64Matthieu, bk. iv, ff. 133, 155; Palma Cayet, pp. 75, 76.
(three and one-half page) and distorted account. He limited his narrative to the opening address of Henry of Navarre, to the complaints, which d'Aubigné implies were public ones, about Navarre's private and public life, to the machinations by which Henry attempted to reconcile recalcitrant Huguenots, and to Navarre's futile memoir, aimed at preventing his removal as heir to the French throne, to the Estates General of Blois.

In the Mémoires de la Ligue was printed a narration of the activities of this assembly, which might have been utilized by d'Aubigné as a supplement to his personal notes and recollections. However, his brief account needed no supplement, and he used none. De Ruble, who asserts that d'Aubigné utilized the narrative in the Mémoires de la Ligue for his account of the La Rochelle assembly, must not have read it carefully. There is no similarity between the depiction of these events in the Histoire universelle and the Mémoires de la Ligue. They disagree on the opening date, and they report Navarre's introductory speech quite differently. The anonymous author in the Mémoires ... omitted the lengthy criticisms of Henry of Navarre's action, Henry's notification of the Estates General of his willingness to receive religious instruction, and the concluding Holy Communion service at which, according to d'Aubigné, Navarre won general approval.65

65 D'Aubigné, VII, pp. 342-346; Mémoires de la Ligue, II, pp. 529-532. D'Aubigné was guilty of errors in details as well as
Later d'Aubigné again discussed the memoir which Henry of Navarre sent to the Estates General. Very possibly d'Aubigné based his analysis of it upon a copy or upon the original document itself, for d'Aubigné described the memoir as something "que nous avons touchée." This may mean that he actually saw and handled in generalities in his account of the "Assemblée de la Rochelle." He even gave an erroneous date for the opening of the assembly which he said occurred on November 16, when Navarre made his welcoming address. Henry's speech was made on December 16, but the first sessions occurred on November 14. Cf. H. Baird, The Huguenots and Henry of Navarre, II, pp. 69, 70, and A. Garnier, op. cit., I, p. 405. Moreover, d'Aubigné implied, very probably erroneously, that the King of Navarre had to bear several public criticisms of his actions, e.g. of his over-indulgence of Catholic supporters and stinginess toward Huguenot ones or his "slavish" devotion to the Countess of Guiche, the belle Corisande, which resulted in a frittering away of the fruits of the victory of Coutras. M. Garnier, I, pp. 404-406, very persuasively argues that the criticisms of Navarre listed by d'Aubigné were undoubtedly private, muted attacks rather than public ones in the assembly "À haute voix." Garnier also asserts that some of these criticisms of Henry are d'Aubigné's personal complaints and that the Huguenot historian probably confused, when he drafted this passage several years later, his private grievances with general ones from the assembly.

The most serious weakness of this chapter of the Histoire universelle is that d'Aubigné, perhaps unwittingly, falsified history by omitting the remarkably fruitful work of the La Rochelle assembly which fashioned and perfected the Huguenots' political, military, financial, and judicial organization. Cf. L. Anquez, op. cit., pp. 40-50. As Garnier so moderately writes, op. cit., I, p. 407,

"Tout n'est pas faux dans le récit que fait d'Aubigné de l'Assemblée de la Rochelle, mais ce n'est pas moins en fauser la physionomie que d'y voir seulement des marques d'hostilité contre le Roi de Navarre, en négligeant tout le labeur fécond."

Nevertheless, Baird and Anquez both relied heavily upon the account of this assembly given in the Histoire universelle and cite it often; therefore, it must be partially accurate. H. Baird,
it, or it might be translated as referring to his earlier comments in Chapter VIII about the mémoire. Nevertheless, there are several discrepancies between his summary of the document and the version of it which was composed by du Plessis-Mornay and printed in the latter's Mémoires et Correspondances. Both versions agree on Navarre's interest in the throne and that he asked for religious instruction. However, d'Aubigné's reference to Navarre's attempted justification of his former religious gyrations and his plea that a king should be granted the same religious rights as a commoner are not found in du Plessis-Mornay's text.  

As was stated above, d'Aubigné's account of the assassination of the Guises was taken primarily from Matthieu's Derniers troubles; nevertheless, there are some important details in the Histoire universelle for which no printed source can be found. The

The Huguenots and Henry of Navarre, II, pp. 74, 76, 77, accepts d'Aubigné's assertions about Navarre's requests for religious instruction from a church council, the closing communion service, and Navarre's pains to secure the friendship of his harshest critics. P. de Vaissièrè, Navarre's best biographer, in his Henri IV, pp. 315-317, also accepts unquestioningly d'Aubigné's account of these latter two incidents. In addition, d'Aubigné's allusion to Henry's favoritism towards his Catholic followers is frequently affirmed by modern historians. Cf. M. Wilkinson, op. cit., pp. 147 and 167. Léo Mouton, Le Duc et le roi (Paris, 1924), p. 64, writes "Henri IV était bien capable aussi de trancher de parti pris en faveur d'un serviteur douteux... contre un serviteur foncièrement fidèle... ."

warrior historian described, with considerable and original detail, the secret council (le roi en conseil avec peu), at which the death of the Duke of Guise was decided. He asserted that the Marshall d'Aumont urged the king to have Guise killed. Others suggested diverse plans and problems, but finally all, except one, were persuaded to adopt d'Aumont's proposal. The single objector was the only person to mention the royal oath by which Henry III had guaranteed safety to the Estates General. This councillor, when told that a prince could not be required to give an oath to his people, replied that a prince who took an oath before his people either was not a prince or rendered his subjects capable of receiving it. This courageous utterance did not change the resolution of the council and subsequently proved to be ruinous to its author. D'Aubigné informed the reader that he had obtained these facts, which are unique in the Histoire universelle, from the unnamed but honorable opponent of the decision to have Guise murdered.  

67D'Aubigné, VII, pp. 383-385. The true composition and actions of the council, which decided that the Duke of Guise must die, are difficult to unravel. There are several differences among sixteenth-century as well as among modern accounts. P. de Vaissière, De Quelques assassins, pp. 238-242, and J. Vivent, op. cit., pp. 269-271, give the most detailed recent narratives of these events, but they are also somewhat at variance. Evidently a small group met with Henry III on December 18 and decided upon the assassination. Possibly another and slightly larger group met on December 20 and planned the details of the murder. The exact composition of the councils is debatable but certainly the Marshall d'Aumont played an important role.

However, no modern or sixteenth-century narrative has been found which substantiates, even partially, d'Aubigné's description
After the Duke and Cardinal of Guise had been killed, their bodies, according to d'Aubigné, were burned and the ashes thrown in the Loire. He added that some apologists justified this disposal of the corpses as a means of preventing their bodies from becoming "furiously" revered relics by the superstitious Catholic populace, especially should the Pope canonize them. Other historians like Matthieu, Palma Cayet, de Thou, and the authors of the narratives in the Mémoires de la Ligue and the Inventaire général omitted this detail. D'Aubigné might have received the information orally or by letter, but rather similar information is found in a pamphlet of the year 1588. The author wrote that the corpses were "consumés et réduits en cendres par feu avec chaux vifve et souffre meslé, et les cendres jetées par les fenestres." Also the Parisian Provost of the Merchants declared, in a deposition prepared for the duke's widow, that during his arrest at the time of the murders he had been conducted to a putrid-smelling chamber in which he was told the corpses of the two Guises had been burned. Of course, this latter source lacks d'Aubigné's details and it may not have been available to him.  

of the courageous role which an anonymous councillor played. Vaissière after exhaustive research admits that it is difficult to clarify some details of this plotting, but his failure to mention even in passing the courageous councillor or ever to cite the Histoire universelle is a persuasive reason for thinking that d'Aubigné's account may be erroneous.

68 D'Aubigné, VII, p. 398. The pamphlet is entitled "Advis de Ceux qui ont esté a Blois . . .," Archives curieuses, First Series,
The Histoire universelle has a more complete and first-hand description of how the Huguenot military forces reacted to the slaughter of the Duke of Guise than the other printed accounts. Matthieu stated that the Huguenots in their published writings attributed the deed to the vengeance of God. D'Aubigné, who was present with the army when the tidings arrived, asserted that the humble Huguenots (le peuple simple) praised God and interpreted it as his vengeance, but the cavaliers and gentlemen castigated the assassination as cowardly and perfidious and praised the virtues of the deceased duke. In fact, the King of Navarre had difficulty in quieting the comments of the latter group, for he and his most interested councillors accepted the deed, because of its utility, as an honorable one.  

XII, p. 147, footnote. The deposition of Chapelle-Marteau, the Parisian Provost of the Merchants, is printed in ibid., p. 213. P. de Vaissière, De Quelques assassins, pp. 320-322, declares that most of the narratives—undoubtedly he refers to accounts devoted solely to this event—of the murder of the Guises agree with d'Aubigné that the corpses were burned and the ashes thrown in the Loire. However, Vaissière is skeptical of this tale and thinks that it is merely a legend which reflects the terror and the anguish which such an unheard of and heinous crime (forfait) created among the populace. P. Robiquet, op. cit., p. 477, is more credulous than Vaissière and accepts the story of the cremation of their bodies.  

69D'Aubigné, VII, pp. 398, 399; Matthieu, bk. iv, ff. 154, 155r. Garnier, op. cit., I, pp. 408, 409, asserts that d'Aubigné was the first member of the Huguenot army to be informed of the Blois murder. However, Garnier, pp. 409-411, rejects d'Aubigné's strictures upon the Huguenots who rejoiced at the news, and he thinks that the warrior historian was probably influenced by his former flattering camaraderie with Guise during the campaign of Dormans in 1575 before Navarre and d'Aubigné fled the royal
D'Aubigné's account of the wounding and death of Henry III and his narration of the accession of Henry of Navarre to the "trembling" throne of France comprise some of the most original material included in the Histoire universelle for the years 1588 and 1589. This dramatic section of d'Aubigné's history should also contain some of the most reliable information for these events, since the warrior historian participated in or observed personally many of the occurrences and was informed of others by the King of Navarre.70

D'Aubigné's criticisms and chivalry are rather incongruous with respect to this assassination. Recent writers like Van Dyke, op. cit., II, pp. 393, 394, J. Vivent, op. cit., pp. 281, 283, and M. Wilkinson, op. cit., p. 71, have somewhat excused and justified the bloody elimination of the duke. The latter writes that "perhaps in the case of a rebel [Guise] so undoubtedly and so powerful his assassination may be regarded as a justifiable execution." Moreover, the virtually unanimous condemnation of the act by the Huguenot nobles and their near insubordination, which d'Aubigné reports, may well be exaggerated. Pierre de Vaissière, Henri IV, p. 317, writes that Navarre and his army "encouraged by this new news [of the assassination], he responds to the advance of Nevers [a Roman Catholic general] by the taking of Niort, Saint-Maixent and Le Maillezais." Raoul Patry in his Philippe du Plessis-Mornay (Paris, 1933), p. 149, notes that Mornay praised God because such a fearful enemy had been removed without the Huguenots soiling their hands. "Ce sentiment domine tous les autres [Huguenots] . . .," writes Patry. Moreover, Mornay, who was then Navarre's representative at La Rochelle, cannot be accused of unseemly exaltation over Guise's death. He declared, "L'Eglise reconnaissait c'est œuvre de Dieu publiquement; mais avec la modération requise, plus tost pour s'humilier que pour se resjouir."

70Cf. above pp. 170, 171.
When describing the investment of Paris by the army of the two kings (Henry III and Henry of Navarre) d'Aubigné related several facts unavailable in his printed sources. For example, his narration of the council of war which decided for the siege of Paris contains the unique details of how the optimism of Givry and Navarre defeated the advice of pessimistic older heads. There are also no printed sources for d'Aubigné's description of the exultation of the Huguenots as they entrenched themselves at the village of Vaugirard, and naturally the account of his noteworthy and victorious duel with Sagonne, a defender of Paris, on the Pré aux Cleres was original.  

---

D'Aubigné, VIII, pp. 70-73. P. de Vaissière in his Henri IV, p. 324, has merely summarized and quoted from d'Aubigné's account of the council of war at which the siege of Paris was decided. A. Garnier, op. cit., II, pp. 19 and 20, displays more skepticism. He thinks that d'Aubigné's narrative is basically correct, but he doubts that Navarre's comments are literally accurate. To Garnier they seem artificial and composed by d'Aubigné after the event; nevertheless, he admits that a racy metaphor attributed to Henry was characteristic of the vert-galant.

Garnier, op. cit., II, pp. 20 and 21, likewise criticizes d'Aubigné's description of the opening skirmishes between the Parisian forces and the royalist army. He merely stated that on August 1 the King of Navarre placed eight hundred of his men close to the city's fortifications "pour taster le poux de l'armée assiégée." D'Aubigné failed to mention, and thus distorted the narrative, that this action by the Huguenots was only part of a plan, conceived by Henry III, to draw the besieged into an ambush where they would be decimated by the royalist artillery.

P. Robiquet, op. cit., pp. 567, 568, accepts fully d'Aubigné's description of these events. In fact, the former's narrative at this point is composed primarily of quotations from the Histoire universelle. Robiquet was wise, because d'Aubigné's account, if corrected according to Garnier's suggestions of the preceding paragraph, is very probably the best source for these details.
Possibly d'Aubigné utilized a few printed sources to supplement his recital of the assassination of Henry III. His material about the cloistral crimes of Jacques Clément, the king's monkish assassin, and the means by which his superiors motivated him to kill the monarch were probably drawn from several printed sources such as the history by Gabriel Chappuys and other histories and contemporary pamphlets. In fact, d'Aubigné referred to some who "say" (disent) that Clément was given a formula and powder to render him invisible and others who "write" (esrivent) that it was the assassin of William the Silent who was supplied with such magic instead of Clément. These sources have not been discovered, and no published account of the king's death which has been examined referred to Clément's "invisibility."
D'Aubigné's assertions that after Clément had stabbed Henry III he leaned against a wall and extended his arms in imitation of a crucifix and that La Guesle, the royal attorney general, killed the fanatical monk with one blow of his sword were not taken from any known printed source. Also d'Aubigné alone stated that the

to attack Henry III by the papal monitory threatening the king with excommunication.

P. de Vaissière, *Ibid.*, pp. 336-346, explains well the character of the fanatical monk and refutes foolish motives such as those advanced by d'Aubigné. Clément was probably about twenty-seven and an intelligent and upright, but highly emotional, student who suffered from hallucinations and other mental illness. Thus he was not merely twenty-two, as d'Aubigné wrote, and not guilty of "quelques crimes enormes auxquels les cloistres sont sujets." Vaissière cogently criticizes the assertions, made by d'Aubigné and others, that Clément's crime was approved by his prior and other superiors in the Dominican order or that the monk was promised a bishopric. He disdains to mention d'Aubigné's fantastic reference to a "chambre de meditations" or that Clément would be canonized if he died in his attempt. Vaissière is less sure that the Parisian Leaguers and the Guises can be exculpated of directly encouraging Clément to regicide as d'Aubigné and others implied. Most certainly d'Aubigné erroneously described the imprisonment of nearly two hundred royalist notables by the Parisian authorities as hostages for the release of Clément after he had committed the act. The arrests did occur but for an entirely different reason as Robiquet says, *op. cit.*, p. 567,

"Pour prévenir un mouvement possible des royalistes restés à Paris, le conseil général fit emprisonner, à la fin de juillet, trois cents notables bourgeois, sous le simple soupçon 'de favoriser le parti du roi en leur coeur.'"

Cf. also R. Radouant's *Guillaume du Vair*, p. 207, for a similar interpretation. A. Garnier, *op. cit.*, II, p. 24, mistakenly accepts d'Aubigné's story about the hostages and tends to believe the latter's statement that Clément's prior and the chief Leaguers supported his action. P. Robiquet, *op. cit.*, p. 571, also accepts many of d'Aubigné's details and generally agrees with his account; however, Robiquet's presentation is much less convincing and authoritative.
king, seemingly not fatally wounded, chatted with the King of Navarre, who thus first visited Henry III in the late morning of August 1, 1589, and even requested that the victor (d'Aubigné) of the duel on the Pré aux Cleres be sent to him. There was, of course, no printed source for d'Aubigné's description of the return of Navarre with eight of his "serviteurs plus confidents," one of which was the historian, to the sovereign's quarters. A visit which was made too late for Henry III had died immediately before their arrival.73

than Vaissière's.

One false piece of slander which d'Aubigné omitted was the tale that Mme. de Montpensier, sister of the late Duke of Guise, granted adulterous pleasures to the monk in order to inspire him to the assassination. Cf. Vaissière, p. 346, and C. Labitte, op. cit., p. 134.

73D'Aubigné, VIII, pp. 75-77. One might expect the anonymous author of the contemporary polemic Le Martyre de Frere Jaques Clement ... (Paris, 1588) to have mentioned that Clément formed a crucifix after the assassination, but he did not as did no other pamphleteer or historian whose account has been found in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris. Nevertheless, two modern historians attribute this action to Clément as he was slain. P. LaFue, op. cit., p. 287, writes that the monk was "frappé dans l'attitude du crucifié," but he gives no authority for the detail. Also P. de Vaissière, De Quelques assassins, p. 363, states that Clément died with "les bras en croix" and cites as his source the "Discours aux François avec l'Histoire Véritable ... de la Mort de Henry de Valois," Archives curieuses, First Series, XII, p. 365. However, this incident is not referred to in the "Discours aux François ... ."

Recent historians contradict d'Aubigné's statement that La Guesle ran his sword through the body of the assassin and slew him "de ce coup seul." There is some disagreement about who actually dispatched Clément, but LaFue, loc. cit., Robiquet, op. cit., p. 573, Vaissière, loc. cit., et.al. agree that La Guesle attempted to spare Clément's life at this time in order to interrogate him.

D'Aubigné recounted the morning visit of Navarre to Henry III
D'Aubigné's striking account of the royal death chamber and of the reception accorded Henry of Navarre, the new King of France, stemmed from no second-or third-hand account but from his own sensitive observations. He described the respects paid the corpse and especially the anger of the Catholic nobles, some of whom said that they would "plutost mourir de mille morts" than accept a "heretic" king. The rebellious nobles selected a spokesman for their religious demands, and the Marshall of Biron used this occasion to exact concessions from Henry IV. The latter was troubled by this demonstration of recalcitrance and closeted himself with the Huguenot Duke de la Force and "another of his gentlemen" (d'Aubigné). When the king asked for advice, La Force excused himself but d'Aubigné made a beautiful and rather lengthy advisory oration, which he:

as a rather gay and pleasant affair, but J. H. Mariéjol, La Réforme et la Ligue, p. 300, mentions only one visit by Navarre on August 1 and writes that when he arrived in the evening Henry III's "état était désespéré." Evidently Mariéjol is wrong and d'Aubigné, who had first-hand information, described events correctly. LaFue, p. 289, Vaissière, p. 370, and Poirson, op. cit., I, p. 20, assert that the King of Navarre hurried to see the wounded sovereign shortly before noon and Navarre returned to his troops since Henry III's condition seemed to be good. Vaissière ends his narrative here, but Poirson, p. 22, and LaFue, p. 292, contradict d'Aubigné and state that Henry of Navarre did not return to the quarters of Henry III, who had expired at 3:00 A.M., until 10:00 A.M. on August 2. Moreover, Poirson nowhere mentions in his detailed account that Henry of Navarre took council with or called upon the services of d'Aubigné. However, Garnier, op. cit., II, pp. 24-28, accepts and substantiates from the correspondence of Henry IV the narration found in the Histoire universelle, and he justly writes, p. 28, note 2, that d'Aubigné "doit avoir raison . . . puisqu'il rapporte des souvenirs personnels."
printed in the Histoire universelle. Henry IV approved most of it, d'Aubigné asserted, and called upon Biron to secure the allegiance of the several thousand Swiss infantry in the army and Givry that of many of the nobles. 74

Since the grumbling of the Catholic nobles had increased, François d'O, a former mignon of Henry III, presented their demands to Henry IV in a long speech. They requested especially that he accept the mass and return to Roman Catholicism. The king "paled, either from anger or fear," but collected his spirits and made, asserted d'Aubigné, a Ciceronian oration in reply. Henry IV in his rebuttal asked the Catholic nobles if they wished a godless king by stripping him of his heart and soul at his accession to the throne. The new king appealed from their present ideas to their spirits after more serious deliberation, but he gave leave to those who would not remain with a Huguenot king to "aller chercher leur salaire sous des

74 d'Aubigné, VIII, pp. 79-83. D'Aubigné's description of the "death chamber" and the attitude of the Catholic nobles is accepted and utilized by most modern historians, e.g. P. de Vaissière; Henri IV, p. 327; J. H. Mariéjol, La Réforme et la Ligue, pp. 303, 304; Léo Mouton, Le Roi et le duc, pp. 2, 3; and A. Garnier, op. cit., II, p. 30. Greater skepticism has been evinced towards the prominent part which d'Aubigné granted to himself in advising Henry IV and towards the lengthy advisory speech which he made to the king when he closeted himself with La Force and d'Aubigné. Vaissière, Henri IV, and A. Poirson, op. cit., I, do not refer to d'Aubigné's role or his oratory. Likewise, de Thou, XI, pp. 1-10, omitted any mention of his fellow historian. A. Garnier, op. cit., II, also discounts this section of the Histoire universelle and declares that d'Aubigné "écrivait longtemps après les événements ... grandit de très bonne foi la part qu'il y prit, par une illusion d'optique et d'amour-propre assez naturelle."
maistres insolens /the Leaguers/." De Thou in his history and Simon Goulart in the Mémoires de la Ligue both recorded a similar heroic address by Henry but at a later time. Of course, only Goulart's could have served d'Aubigné as a source, but the two speeches are different from the text given in the Histoire universelle. D'Aubigné concluded his unique account by describing the return of Givry with the allegiance of the "flower of the nobility," as Henry IV ended his speech, and by noting the arrival

75 D'Aubigné, VIII, pp. 83-86; de Thou, XI, pp. 12, 13; Mémoires de la Ligue, IV, pp. 34-37. P. de Vaissière, Henri IV, pp. 328, 329, and A. S. Poirson, op. cit., I, p. 23, utilized d'Aubigné's description of the demands made by François d'O for the Catholic nobles upon Henry IV, but A. Garnier, II, pp. 33, 34, argues that very possibly d'Aubigné has considerably changed d'O's discourse. As for the proud response which d'Aubigné attributes to Henry IV, Vaissière, Henri IV, p. 329, thinks the king may have made such statements, but he introduces his narrative with the word "if." However, Garnier, op. cit., II, pp. 34, 35, explicitly declares that it is "assez invraisemblable que le Roi ait pu faire à d'O la réponse hauteïne que d'Aubigné rapporte." He cogently asserts that Henry IV was already preparing to accept important compromises which he made public in his "Déclaration" of August 4. Thus Garnier thinks that d'Aubigné sharpened the tone of the king's assertions so that they would harmonize with the alleged advice given by d'Aubigné. He writes, "Il faut croire que l'influence de d'Aubigné n'y fut pas aussi grande qu'il s'en imagine, et que le discours du Roi à la délégation Catholique ne fut pas un simple écho de celui que lui-même avait soufflé aux oreilles royales." The fact that d'Aubigné, VIII, pp. 89, 90, gave only contemptuous and inadequate notice to the "Déclaration" of August 4, by which Henry IV compromised with the nobles' demands that he submit to religious instruction and guarantee the preservation of Roman Catholicism, substantiates Garnier's argument. D'Aubigné merely described it as a declaration whereby the nobles recognized Henry as their king; the Huguenot omitted the concessions made by the king. In addition, he asserts that it was "mal signée," but A. S. Poirson, op. cit., I, pp. 28, 29, 42, 43, and Léo Mouton, Le Duc et le roi, p. 8, strongly disagree with d'Aubigné about this.
of the news that Biron had won the support of the Swiss. This allowed the king to end the difficult situation and retire to don mourning attire. Then arrived La Noue, Châtillon, Guitry, and other Huguenot chieftains. 76

D'Aubigné's depiction of the joy of the Parisians, of whom the principal personages wore green sashes ("escharpes vertes"), contrasting markedly with the despair of the royalist camp, was probably based upon the Recueil des choses mémorables . . . , the

76 D'Aubigné, VIII, p. 87. De Thou, XI, pp. 5-7, recounted quite differently the adherence which the Swiss gave to Henry. He wrote that the Swiss had already been won for the Huguenot monarch before he arrived at the quarters of Henry III in St. Cloud. However, de Thou especially asserted that the Lord of Sancy, who had brought the Swiss troops into France, was solely responsible for securing their support of Henry IV. De Thou omitted any mention of Biron but described at length the harangues and cajolery employed by Sancy. Modern historians tend to agree with de Thou rather than d'Aubigné about the role of Sancy. A. Poirson, op. cit., I, p. 24, stresses the importance of Sancy and omits Biron. Of course, Vaissière, Henri IV, p. 329, gives a weak conditional approval to d'Aubigné's narrative, but J. H. Mariéjol, La Réforme et la Ligue, p. 304, attributes the deed to Sancy. D'Aubigné's biographer, A. Garnier, op. cit., II, p. 33, emphatically accepts de Thou's and criticizes d'Aubigné's version. Garnier expostulates that d'Aubigné could not have been ignorant of Sancy's meritorious action and that he, because of his notorious hatred of Sancy, consciously omitted it and distorted historical facts. "La pamphlète a domino l'historien." Garnier here refers to d'Aubigné as a pamphleteer because he penned the famous La Confession Catholique du Sieur de Sancy, published posthumously, in which he satirized Sancy for his conversion to Catholicism following the example of Henry IV.
Mémoires de la Ligue, the Inventaire général, Cayet's Chronologie novenaire, or Matthieu's Derniers troubles. However, only d'Aubigné recounted the never-fulfilled request of Henry III for ten Huguenot guards to supplement the regular royal guards whom he suspected of infidelity. The Huguenot historian uniquely recorded, as indications of the royalists' demoralization, that certain nobles, whose names he withheld through historiographical modesty, knelt and asked pardon for their actions as mignons of the late monarch; furthermore, d'Aubigné related that their petitions expressed shame, horror, and effeminacy, but a duke rebuked them.

77 D'Aubigné, VII, p. 89; Recueil des choses mémorables . . . , pp. 704, 705; Mémoires de la Ligue, IV, p. 3; Inventaire général, II, pp. 945-952; Palma Cayet, pp. 170, 171; Matthieu, bk. v, ff. 8, 9. The author of the narrative in the Mémoires de la Ligue, which was followed by most of the other historians, remarked that the Parisians abandoned black sashes worn since the "execution" of Blois and adopted green ones as a sign of rejoicing and hope.

78 D'Aubigné, VII, pp. 88, 89; J. H. Mariéjol, La Réforme et la Ligue, pp. 300, 301, asserts that he is quoting from and following the Histoire universelle in his description of the shameful penitence of the mignons. D'Aubigné refused to identify those seeking pardon and the duke, but Mariéjol asserts that Bellegarde was a penitent petitioner and d'Épernon the duke.
CHAPTER VII

A STUDY OF D'AUBIGNE'S HISTORICAL CHARACTERIZATION

A brief study of d'Aubigné's accuracy and impartiality in the characterization of the chief personages—Huguenot, Politique, and Leaguer—of the late sixteenth-century France will be valuable in assessing his significance as a historian. The purpose of this chapter is to compare d'Aubigné's historical judgments with those of the best recent historians of the period and thus verify his accuracy.

A Depiction of Four Protestant Leaders

The most famous, and justly so, of the Huguenot leaders was Admiral Gaspard de Coligny. If the generalization by an English historian that "the whole period [late-sixteenth century] was magnificently false, feminine, and feline" is applicable to Henry III, Catherine de Medici, Elizabeth I, or Mary Stuart, it is completely invalid for the person of Coligny.\footnote{M. Wilkinson, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 28.} The admiral was the very incarnation of sincerity, honesty, and integrity. His upright personality captivated Charles IX in 1571, and Coligny became more influential than the queen mother.\footnote{L. Batiffol, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 224.} The genuiness of his conversion has never been questioned as have those of certain "Huguenots of

---

\footnote{M. Wilkinson, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 28.}
\footnote{L. Batiffol, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 224.}
State, or political Huguenots. His religious zeal and sincerity were admitted even by such bitter enemies of the Protestants as a papal nuncio and a Venetian ambassador. His integrity coupled with great courage and ability made him a born leader. His followers were passionately attached to him because of these traits and unwillingly abandoned him during the St. Bartholomew massacre. His power to lead and command is attested to by Van Dyke, who writes that his death in the St. Bartholomew holocaust was the one irreparable loss to the Huguenots. "There never was another leader who could do what Coligny had done in keeping the party united, in making the two horses of the Huguenot team, the nobles and the churches, pull together."

Unfortunately even such a staunch and fine character was contaminated by the hatred and violence of his era. He was responsible for at least one slaughter of his enemies. In 1568 Coligny had the Catholic garrison of the chateau of Mirebeau put to the sword, and a few other times he displayed cruelty toward his foes. However, such actions usually had compassionate ends, and "no one was more humane," writes Whitehead, "where mercy was possible." He did not commission the assassination of Francis of Guise in 1563, but he openly rejoiced

5Van Dyke, op. cit., II, p. 120.
in his enemy's death and stated that he would not have obstructed it had this been possible.\(^7\)

Coligny's greatest quality was probably his devotion to country and to church. One biographer has heralded the admiral as the founder of religious liberty in France.\(^8\) This compliment is too generous. He did work and fight unswervingly for his faith, but he undoubtedly hoped to convert all Frenchmen to Protestantism. Being a French patriot as well as a Huguenot cavalier, he hoped to unite the crown and Calvinism.\(^9\) He had reluctantly gone to war against his sovereign in 1562, and he always hoped to win over the royal family to his faith. Not only did he want interior peace but also international strength and victory over Philip II of Spain for his king. Henri Hauser has approvingly quoted Montesquieu's judgment of Coligny: "Il mourut n'ayant au cœur que le bien de l'Etat."\(^10\)

D'Aubigné, like all his coreligionists, had great admiration for Coligny and displayed it in the *Histoire universelle*. The admiral is described as the greatest military leader of the Reformation era.

---

\(^7\) E. Maroks, "Gaspard de Coligny," *Florida State University Studies*, XIV, p. 6.

\(^8\) Delaborde, *op. cit.*, III, p. 477.


"Le plus grand capitaine de son siécle" and the man who in military matters "exécutait son siécle" are statements that d'Aubigné penned about him. Such statements are erroneous if only Coligny's generalship is considered, especially when it is compared with that of Henry IV, the Duke of Parma, or even with Francis of Guise. Despite d'Aubigné's high esteem for Coligny's role in the battle of Dreux (1562), the Huguenot historian himself depicted Coligny as failing to foresee the battle. He arrived tardily at Louis of Condé's headquarters and several of his men had to fight in their doublets without armor. However, such praise is more valid if Coligny is thought of as the most excellent leader of his century in political, religious, and social, as well as military, troubles. D'Aubigné described as "marvelous" the manner in which he organized and supplied a demoralized army after the defeat at St. Denis in 1567.

---

11 D'Aubigné, III, pp. 270 and 320.


13 D'Aubigné, II, pp. 280, 281. E. Marcks, loc. cit., p. 18, wrote that in defense of French Protestantism Coligny "became outstanding among the statesmen and military men of his day, great among the men of all times." Moreover, H. Hauser, La Prépondérance espagnole, p. 8, praised Coligny, after his defeat at Moncontour, in the following manner: "Il se montre dans ces circonstances en apparence désespérées, un grand capitaine."
D'Aubigné nowhere presented a rounded and lengthy portrayal of the admiral's character. Nevertheless, numerous short statements indicate that he had perseverance and courage, bulwarked by a profound Christian faith. The attempted assassination of Coligny in August, 1572, resulted in a painful wound for him. The surgeon, Ambroise Paré, was forced to hack on a mutilated finger three times before amputating it. Two ministers were consoling Coligny, but d'Aubigné quoted him as saying, "Ces playes sont douce, comme pour le nom de Dieu, priez-le avec moi qu'il me fortifie." Shortly afterwards the admiral was visited by two marshals and some principal courtiers. They were consoled by the wounded rather than giving him sympathy and aid. As the St. Bartholomew massacre commenced, he displayed again this courage and piety when he bade his servants to flee and stated that he would "willingly receive death from the hand of God." D'Aubigné depicted Coligny as the aristocratic leader to the end. When he was struck the first blow, he cried, "At least let me die from the hand of a cavalier and not from that of this valet (goujat)."

The Huguenot historian omitted any mention of the vengeance and cruelty which Coligny wreaked upon his foes, information which he should have possessed. However, he penned an equivocal statement about the admiral's role in the assassination of Francois of Guise.

D'Aubigné stated that he was writing frankly and had accurate information about an interview between the admiral and Guise's assassin which preceded the attack. "J'estime que les langages qu'on lui tenoit sentoyent le refus et donnoyent le courage."16

One anecdote related by d'Aubigné depicts the famous Huguenot as pious and persevering in defense of Protestantism but also very human in his momentary despair, following the defeat of his army at the battle of Moncontour. He was being criticized for all their difficulties. The army had not been paid and lacked supplies. The Huguenot fortified cities were weak; whereas their Catholic enemies were powerful and pitiless. Coligny was suffering from a painful wound and had to be carried on a litter as the army moved. Then an old companion and councillor, also wounded and on a litter, was carried abreast of the chieftain. The friend stared at him and repeated, as they both wiped tears from their eyes, the Biblical phrase: "Si que Dieu est très doux." Afterward Coligny confessed to his intimates that these "words from a friend had encouraged him and reestablished him on the road of good thoughts and firm resolutions for the future."17

Another grand Huguenot leader, less renowned than Coligny

---

16 Ibd., II, p. 131. P. de Vaissière, De Quelques assassins, p. 81, primarily utilizing this sentence, charges Coligny with being a tacit accomplice in Guise's death.

17 D'Aubigné, III, pp. 130, 131.
but cast in the same mold, was Frangois de La Noue. His biographer
Henri Hauser asserts that he "deserves a brilliant place beside his
master, the admiral, not only as a glory of French Protestantism but
among . . . /French/ national heroes." All recent writers are
agreed that La Noue was "one of the bravest and the wisest," as
states Van Dyke, "of the Huguenot captains," or "the bravest among
the brave and the most loyal of all," as writes Mariéjol. Hauser,
of course, stresses his prudence, wisdom, and courage as a captain,
but notes that he was too heedless of his personal safety in combat.
However, he was erudite, puritanical, and tolerant, and combined the
faith of Calvin with the toleration of Montaigne. He was a Calvinistic
moralist who never indulged in the debaucheries of some Huguenot
leaders such as Louis of Condé. Though a military captain, he was
a "guerrier pacifique" who loved peace and exhorted Frenchmen to
spare one another. He was a "philosopher on horseback" whose toler-
ation was based upon religious fervor and respect for all things
divine and not upon the skepticism of a Voltaire or Montaigne. "He
knew the price of human life . . . because he considered man the
most beautiful creature of God and because he had seen men live,
act, and die."21

---

18H. Hauser, Frangois de la Noue, p. 289.
19Van Dyke, op. cit., I, p. 366; J. H. Mariéjol, La Réforme et
la Ligue, p. 136.
21Ibid., pp. 87, 143-159, 290. J. H. M. Salmon in his "Catherine
His faults were few, but among them were naiveté, a superficial attitude towards human wickedness and prejudice, plus a careless ness about making promises which might prove contradictory. 22 Hauser concludes his excellent biography of La Noue with the following words:

Modestie, bonhomie, bon sens ferme et droit, indulgence, vaillance et douceur, patriotisme ardent, ferveur tolérante, résignation active, une bonté un peu faible et un peu chimerique: il semble que voilà tout la Noue. Ces qualités, il les a mises au service d'une noble cause, qu'il a loyalement servie jusqu'à son dernier soupir . . . 23

Certainly La Noue was pictured as valiant and courageous by d'Aubigné, who characterized him as "le plus hasardeux capitaine de son siècle." His courage which bordered on foolhardiness, led to his capture by the forces of Philip II in 1580, for "il aima mieux estre prisonnier que fuyard." 24 Frequently in the Histoire universelle, his military exploits were recounted. In may, 1588, he led a spirited cavalry charge, which was largely responsible for a royalist victory over the League's forces. 25 His combativeness plus his devotion to the Huguenot cause almost led to an unseemly and disrespectful duel between Laverdin and him in the presence of dei Medici," History Today, VI (1956), p. 305, describes La Noue as a "Huguenot-Politique." Such a term has its justification, but it may be misleading since the term politique usually connotes a person like Henry IV, Elizabeth I, or even Catherine de Medici.

22 H. Hauser, François de la Noue, pp. 280-284.
23 Ibid., p. 289. 24 D'Aubigné, V, p. 75; VI, p. 363.
25 Ibid., VIII, pp. 48, 49.
the King of Navarre. He had reproached the Catholic Laverdin for his failure to defend a town valuable to the Huguenot forces and questioned his honor. Laverdin made a biting and scathing reply, which caused La Noue to grasp the hilt of his sword, and the two men almost came to blows.26

His integrity cannot be questioned, according to d'Aubigné.

In 1588 Henry of Navarre, perhaps jealous, refused to charge him with the "grand design" of capturing control of the mouth of the Loire because of his "trop estimé probité."27 During the siege of La Rochelle in 1572 and 1573 La Noue was placed in a very compromising position by the king, whose prisoner he had been and who allowed him to enter the city and become its governor. He was beset by mental turmoil, reported d'Aubigné, since death was more preferable to him than infidelity to either Charles IX or the Rochellois. However, as long as he was in the city, "il n'estoit blasmable que de chercher trop les périls." Afterwards the king was pleased with his activities for peace which d'Aubigné considered a "chose très rare et hors du commun."28 His obligations to his ward, the heiress of the Duke of Bouillon, involved him in questionable actions towards the King of Spain in 1588. After five years of imprisonment

26Ibid., V, pp. 236, 237.
27Ibid., VII, pp. 335, 336.
La Noue had been released by Philip II in 1585, at which time he took an absolute oath never to wage war against the Spanish king in any of his lands. The Leaguers in several polemics berated La Noue for infidelity to his oath. D'Aubigné defended him and wrote, "Il n'y eut pas faute de blâme contre l'action de ce prud'homme." This assertion overlooks the fact that La Noue was guilty of a certain ingenuousness, but he never, as Hauser states, violated his pledge to Philip II.

Several times d'Aubigné noted the humanity and generosity of La Noue. In 1589, during the siege of the pro-League city of Senlis, La Noue mortgaged all his property, including his chateau of Le Plessis des Tournelles, in order to buy ammunition. Then the historian remarked that the chateau "pour cette dette et autres de même nature, appartient aujourd'hui [circa 1620] à des financiers. His humaneness and liberality are reported by d'Aubigné during the siege and surrender of Sainte-Gemme in 1570. He prevented any slaughter of the defeated garrison, a rather uncommon practice during these wars, and then paid four hundred écus from his own pocket for some baggage which his men had taken. D'Aubigné illustrated La Noue's humanity and lack of haughtiness in an anecdote

29H. Hauser, François de la Noue, pp. 221, 222.
30Ibid., pp. 280-284, 221, 222; VII, pp. 204, 205.
31D'Aubigné, IX, p. 48; III, p. 195.
about his leadership during the La Rochelle siege. A hot-headed pastor, infuriated by La Noue's efforts for peace, slapped him one day after a meeting of the city council. La Noue refused to allow his gentlemen to punish the old man; instead, he was arrested and taken to his wife who was charged with caring for him.  

Naturally, d'Aubigné, ardent Huguenot, had no difficulty in depicting the virtues of two such remarkable and upright men as Coligny and La Noue. However, the characterization of two less praiseworthy Protestant chieftains such as Louis and Henry of Bourbon, father and son and Princes of Condé, was a sterner test. Louis of Condé was a bold and reckless captain; his death, it is asserted, was regretted by all who knew him except personal enemies and fanatics. He was generous and brilliant, witty and vivacious. His biographer, the Duke d'Aumale, also praises his constancy in difficulties, his fidelity toward his friends who mistrusted him, and his love and reverence for France. These latter qualities, however, are disputable. Among his faults were his erotic adventures, his lack of genuine Protestant convictions, and his inferior military abilities. As Whitehead remarks, he "never represented the more sober elements among his followers." D'Aumale admits that he was "dissolu et scandaleux dans ses moeurs," that he was partially driven by spite and ambition to adopt Protestantism, and that he never had firm

---

religious convictions. Likewise, he was not a great general and
often was confused and uncertain in his military projects. C. Oman
describes him as "a most genial and inspiring leader, but a very bad
general," and Van Dyke asserts, "The death of Condé did not weaken
the Huguenot party very much."33

As he had done for Coligny and La Noue, d'Aubigné presented
no single, well-rounded, literary portrait of Louis of Condé, although
he was naturally referred to many times in the *Histoire universelle.*
The warrior historian portrayed the prince as a valiant warrior and
"grand capitaine." In his eyewitness description of the battle of
Jarnac (1569), d'Aubigné described Condé's bravery but also, probably
inadvertently, his poor generalship. The prince, after his leg was
broken so that the bone protruded from the boot, cried to his men
that the fray had begun and must be finished. The prince continued,
"Et vous souvenez en quel estat Louis de Bourbon entre au combat pour
Christ et sa patrie." Then his men charged, outnumbered, into the
enemy. Condé was surrounded, his horse was killed under him, and his
companions carried away. Only in these circumstances did he surrender.
But shortly thereafter he was fatally shot in the back.34

33 For Condé's character, cf. Duke d'Aumale, op. cit., I,
pp. 78-81; Van Dyke, op. cit., II, pp. 16, 82; A. Whitehead, op. cit.,
p. 89. Cf. C. Oman, op. cit., pp. 418, 426, 429 and especially
p. 438 for Condé's military ability or rather incapability.

34 D'Aubigné, III, pp. 270 and 51, 52. J. Plattard, op. cit.,
p. 14, justly criticizes d'Aubigné's description of Condé's condition
at the battle of Jarnac, by asking how Condé could stand, which was
necessary after his horse was killed, with his leg bone penetrating
his boot.
D'Aubigné did not fail to note the less pleasant aspects of Condé's character. He indicated a certain heedlessness and flightiness when narrating Louis' offer to exile himself from the kingdom if this would prevent its ruin. Catherine immediately accepted it (empoigna la parole au bond), but the prince after second thoughts and consultations "ne fut pas marri d'estre ainsi dédit par ses compagnons" and withdrew the promise. D'Aubigné recorded how Condé's love for the frivolity, gaiety, and ladies of the court caused him to betray his wife and his fellow Huguenots. After the peace of 1568 the flattery of the queen mother and the caresses of a courtesan were much more pleasant than complaints of persecuted Huguenots, the remonstrances of the pastors, or even the tears of the princess, his wife. All these were received in "mauvaise grace," and several months later his wife died, "éthique, accablée (comme quelques-uns ont voulu) de déplaisir." Again the historian depicted the prince as much more eager than Coligny to negotiate peace in 1568 with the royalists, since he desired life at the court where he had left the seeds of some flirtations. He advanced numerous reasons for peace such as the desertion of their troops, the miseries of an unpaid army, and the danger of rebellion, and he even stooped to intrigue with those most weary of the conflict in order to secure his goal.

35 D'Aubigné, II, p. 38. 36 Ibid., II, p. 196. 37 Ibid., II, p. 238. The prince had married again in 1565 but was no more faithful to his second spouse.
Modern historians assess Prince Henry of Condé differently from his father, Louis. Henry is judged to have been not only generous, gracious, and exceedingly brave, but also thoroughly sincere in his Huguenot convictions and exemplary in his private life. D'Aumale asserts, "Il était austère dans ses moeurs, ferme dans ses principes . . . ." He was more popular with the Protestants than had been his father. Baird styles him "the very heart of the party." Both writers believe that he never would have followed Henry IV to the mass in the 1590's; Baird remarks that he was inflexible, whereas d'Aumale says he was stubborn.38

The strength of Henry of Condé's religious convictions is several times stressed by d'Aubigné. Twice he described graphically scenes in which King Charles IX, during and after the tragedy of St. Bartholomew, threatened the prince with death if he did not abjure his faith. Both times Condé courageously replied, "Dieu ne permette point, mon roi et mon seigneur, que je choisisse [the mass] . . . ." Henry of Navarre was more suppliant and humble when menaced.39 D'Aubigné also emphasized the prince's liberality and noted the affection he inspired in his followers. During Condé's imprisonment following the massacre, one of his former gentlemen stole into his chamber, where he found "un coeur que la prison n'avait


39 D'Aubigné, III, pp. 326, 359.
attéédé. As the gentlemen left, the prince, although deprived of possessions, forced upon him, despite protestations, a string of emeralds which Condé had worn at the time of his marriage.  

After describing the prince's death in 1588, d'Aubigné penned the following estimate of his career and character:

Longtemps après le parti des refformez sentit cette perte comme d'un prince pieux, de bon naturel, liberal, d'un courage eslevé, imployable partisan et que eust esté excellant capitaine, pour les armées reiglées et florissantes; car ce qui lui manquoit aux guerres civiles estoit qu'estimant les probitez de ses gens à la sienne, il pensoit les choses faites quand elles estoient commandées et n'avait pas cette rare partie, principale au roi de Navarre, d'estre present a tout."  

Thus in this final eulogy, d'Aubigné praised his piety, liberality, and unbending courage, but he pointed up his weaknesses as well. He was incapable of leading voluntary, unpaid troops and lacked discernment, foresight, and an understanding of his men's weaknesses.

A Portrayal of Francois and Henry of Guise

A more rigorous test of d'Aubigné's historical judgment and impartiality was his portrayal of the leaders of the Roman Catholic, especially the League, forces. The renowned, powerful, and talented family of Guise supplied a father-son combination which was a Roman Catholic counterpoise to the Protestant Prince

---

40 Ibid., IV, pp. 235, 236.

41 Ibid., VII, pp. 206, 207. Both Baird and d'Aumale were greatly indebted to this passage.
of Condé. Francis, Duke of Guise, became a popular national hero because of his leadership against the Huguenots in the early 1560's. His brilliant generalship was and is widely recognized. P. de Vaissière terms him "le plus grand homme de guerre de son époque, et le dieu de tous ceux qui portaient les armes . . . ." Numerous historians have admitted his military excellence, which rested upon his perspicacity, his ability to make rapid decisions, which rarely were wrong, his courage, his tenacity, his energy, and his great popularity with the soldiery. These qualities made him, according to L. Batiffol, "one of the most remarkable generals that France has ever had." C. Oman is less generous to Guise than recent French historians, but he does respect highly his military leadership.

The humanity of Francis of Guise as well as his religious convictions should also be stressed. Vaissière asserts that his popularity with the troops sprang not only from his courage but also from his interest in them and their welfare, his familiarity with and courtesy toward them, and his concern never to claim for himself the heroism of a valiant man. A. Whitehead, the biographer of Coligny, declares that the duke's humane interests, so rare in the sixteenth century, should not be forgotten.
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profundity of his religious beliefs seem unquestionable. Van Dyke quotes one of the duke's enemies who admitted the sincerity of his zeal. To Vaissière Francis of Guise personified and defended Roman Catholicism in the same manner as Gaspard de Coligny did Calvinism.  

D'Aubigné recognized that Guise was a "grand capitaine, en toutes ses parties excellent" and that he was especially gifted in the reconnaissance of fortified places. He stressed his contribution to the royalist victory at Dreux, but he never evaluated him as "le plus grand capitaine de son siécle" as he had Coligny. Surely here the Huguenot historian was mistaken. He stressed the humanity of the duke in several passages, such as in the description of the surrender of Rouen to Guise's army. The latter halted his troops as they entered the city and saved the lives of most of the Protestant garrison.

D'Aubigné also noted that several Huguenots were slaughtered, drowned, and shot after their defeat at Dreux. This had been attributed to the Duke of Guise, "but such inhumanity," wrote the Huguenot, "cannot be reconciled with the other fine qualities (courtoisies) of this prince."  

However, d'Aubigné, not untruthfully, characterized the duke's actions during the reign of Francis II as harsh and vindictive.

---

47 Ibid., II, pp. 84, 117.
During the Amboise disturbance, captives who had been promised their libes and liberty were executed in violation of this pledge with the duke’s knowledge. The Guises "tore Castelnau from the hands of the king" and had him executed during the conspiracy. Duke Francois replaced the governor of Dauphiny because he was "too mild and patient" towards the Huguenots. Nevertheless, d'Aubigné in his final estimate of Duke Francois, after describing his assassination and last words, declared that his "character would have carried him to the aggrandizement of France rather than her ruin in a different epoch and under a different brother [The avaricious Cardinal of Lorraine]."

There is more disagreement among modern historians about the character of Duke Henry of Guise than about that of his father, Francis of Guise. Unquestionably, this stems from the greater complexity of Henry’s nature but also from the intricacies of French politics during the reign of Henry III. P. de Vaissière portrays Henry of Guise in what seems to be the most favorable light possible. Guise had a well-deserved military reputation, writes Vaissière. He was a favorite of his troops and noted for his generosity and clemency. He was not the vassal of Spain, asserts Vaissière, but a Catholic Coligny who perhaps had no other aim than war against

48 Ibid., II, pp. 267, 269, 284. J. H. Mariéjol, La Régence et la Ligue, pp. 1-29, agrees with d'Aubigné's evaluation of his severity during the reign of Francois II.

49 D'Aubigné, II, p. 144.
England and the complete destruction of Protestantism in Europe. The triumph of orthodoxy was definitely one of his guiding principles and must be considered, along with his personal ambition, as a prime motive in his actions. Moreover, Vaissière declares that there is no proof of Guise's alleged plan to supplant the degenerate Henry III. If he had wished to replace Henry III, asks Vaissière, why did he fail to do so on May 12, 1588, the day of the barricades in Paris.  

Nevertheless, Vaissière is forced to admit that Henry of Guise, although of a regal bearing which made "other princes appear like commoners," had eyes more shifty (mobile) and perhaps less frank than those of his father." In addition, his fine mind was probably more like that of his clever uncle, the Cardinal of Lorraine, than that of his parent. Even the "cruel" characterization by de Thou, who called Guise a "maître dans l'art de tromper et de dissimuler" as well as a plotter and liar, has some truth, confesses Vaissière.  

Other writers have been much less kind in their treatment of Henry of Guise. Van Dyke doubts that he was a distinguished military leader and speaks of "his almost servile dependence" upon

\[50\] P. de Vaissière, De Quelques assassins, pp. 207-218.  
\[51\] Ibid., pp. 189-203. H. Sedgwick in his The House of Guise (New York, 1938), p. 180, presents almost as favorable a picture: "He was intelligent high-minded, generous and early mature, of clear judgment, very clever in understanding people, with a great gift for business, and a power of rapid determination and action . . . ." But Sedgwick adds, "He was also very ambitious for power and glory. He courted popularity and won it."
Spain as an "ignoble trait." There is agreement that his character was inferior to that of his father's. R. Badouant refers to his "cynicism and duplicity which served an unlimited (démesurée) ambition." One of the harshest judgments is that of Maurice Wilkinson, historian of the Catholic League, who asserts that "Guise had a wholly undeserved reputation for frankness" and hunted women persistently. He also accuses the leader and darling of the League of being devoid of Christian piety. "Amongst the many motives which swayed the Guise brothers, the Duke and Cardinal of Guise in the 1580's, religion was entirely absent." Van Dyke, nevertheless, thinks that people have perhaps unjustly suspected his extremely zealous support of the church.52

In certain respects d'Aubigné's characterizations—of Henry of Guise are surprising. He did not praise the duke as one of the great captains of his time, and he several times noted his cunning and duplicity. He remarked that as early as the 1570's the "Guisarts" through intrigues and with money from the King of Spain were advancing the popularity of the duke. He stressed the discernment and opportunism (profondeur et souplesse) of Guise's nature and asserted that this reputation was correct and not mere "popular error."53 Following

---

the day of the barricades, Henry of Guise was depicted by d'Aubigné as playing a Janus-faced role before his partisans and Henry III. He wrote letters in two styles (de deux mains) to them. Of the king he asked mercy and attributed the uprising to a misunderstanding; to his followers he wrote triumphantly and modestly disclosed the glory of his actions.54

Nevertheless, d'Aubigné recorded that Guise's honesty helped restore the reputation of the Catholic gentleman, Fervaques, who had been accused of cowardice at the battle of Dormans. D'Aubigné related that Guise "had acquired enough honor without taking that of another."55

Especially did the Huguenot historian emphasize the humanity of the duke. "It is certain that those of Guise . . .," wrote d'Aubigné, "saved several Huguenots during the St. Bartholomew massacre." Before the battle of Jarnac (1569) the duke is recorded as having described certain Huguenots as "all good gentlemen." In 1577 La Charité surrendered to a royal army led by the Duke of Anjou with Guise as his lieutenant, and the Huguenot garrison were promised their lives, arms, and baggage. This pledge would have been violated because of the vindictiveness of some Italian troops and the acquiescence of Anjou, but the "duc de Guise, conservateur de la foi et

54 Ibid., VII, pp. 217, 218.
55 Ibid., IV, p. 389.
du droit des gens," prevented it. This same army then captured Issoire where the garrison were butchered and women and children killed. Most reprehensible was the continuation of the killing in the town and even in the surrounding rural area. However, d'Aubigné held the Duke of Anjou responsible for these atrocities and implied that they would have been avoided had Guise still accompanied the forces.56

Most surprising is d'Aubigné's treatment of the assassination of Henry of Guise. The blow is described as cowardly, traitorous, and perfidious, and the virtues and fine qualities ("les vertus . . . et les courtoisies") of the duke are emphasized.57

A Portrayal of Charles IX, Catherine de Medici, and Henry III

Perhaps the most rigorous test of d'Aubigné's historical accuracy was his treatment of the "last of the Valois." Could he, a passionate partisan, depict objectively the character and actions of

56 Ibid., III, p. 332, p. 47; V, pp. 231, 233. D'Aubigné's impartiality is indicated by a comment he made about the initial slaughters in Issoire. "Plusieurs en ont écrit avec grandes injures," he wrote, "mais on peut dire que c'est une cruauté que le droit de la guerre permet."

57 Ibid., VII, p. 399. The familiarity and kindness of Henry of Guise to d'Aubigné--once he may have saved him from the Bastille--when he was Navarre's squire at the royal court from 1573 to 1576 probably help explain d'Aubigné's rather generous remarks about the duke. Cf. L. Mouton, Le Duc et le roi, p. 9, and A. Garnier, op. cit., I, pp. 181, 182; d'Aubigné, Mémoires, p. 30.
the unhappy Charles IX, who must bear the stigma of acquiescing in
the St. Bartholomew massacre, of the wily Catherine de Medici, more
responsible than her son for this bloody tragedy, or of the effem­
inate, dissolute, and treacherous Henry III?

The personality of Charles IX was extremely ambivalent,
composed of striking contrasts of love and tenderness one moment
and suddenly hatred and violence the next.®® Dodu thinks that he
was almost insane, or not far removed from becoming so, especially
since he was insensitive to the maladies of those nearest him and
suffered from hallucinations.®® Indisputably, the king had a
sadistic thirst for blood. He enjoyed the sight of his lions tearing
apart a mule, he released his ferocious hunting dogs to devour a cow,
he gloried in slitting the throats of hogs and slaughtering them as
ably as a charcutier.®® Pierre Champion, who asserts that Charles
cannot be described as cruel, attempts to mitigate these facts by
attributing them to his thorough education as a huntsman, which was
desired for the son of any sixteenth-century, French gentleman.
Moreover, Champion says that the king lived in an imaginary world.

58J. Loiseleur, "Les Nouvelles controverses sur la Saint-
Barthélémy," p. 91; Van Dyke, op. cit., II, p. 64; L. Romier, Le
Royaume de Catherine de Médicis (Paris, 1925), I, p. 50.
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His passion for the hunt resulted from his attempt to escape his regal responsibilities and difficulties.61

The king, physically weak, was protected and dominated by his mother. In fact, her control of Charles IX was a salient feature of his reign. One ambassador reported that she was the actual sovereign, a fact which she desired to make more apparent by having herself called queen, mother of the king, rather than queen mother.62

In addition to being a loyal and obedient son, he was a devoted husband. His marriage with Elizabeth of Austria was serene, and she brought to him, as to an infant, great consolation in his troubled days and nights after the massacre. The erotic escapades of a Francis I or Henry IV were foreign to him. "Quant à l'amour," to quote Romier, "il y demeurait insensible 'comme une pierre.'" Since mistresses were fashionable at the court, he took one, but more for appearances than lasciviousness.63

The frequent use of profanity was a crude habit which most historians attribute to Charles. Dodu says that his occasional rages accompanied by vile oaths became almost daily occurrences after St. Bartholomew's Day. This great tragedy transformed his life and caused him continual mental anguish. Thereafter he was morose, cruel, and

---

aged rapidly, so that he appeared to be an old man by his twenty-
fourth birthday.64

The king, who possessed a good mind and memory, disliked
statecraft but enjoyed painting, sculpture, poetry, and music, which
helped soothe his tormented soul. During his reign he founded a
literary academy and is assumed to have written a book on hunting.
Had he ruled a generation earlier, he might have been a renowned
and much eulogized Renaissance prince like Francis I or Henry VIII.65

Certainly A. Chaussade is just when he says,

Charles IX, en effet, vaut peut-être mieux que sa renommée.
En dépit de ses tares héréditaires, en dépit de l'éducation
qu'il a reçue de sa mère, il possède d'excellentes qualités
naturelles. On ne saurait oublier qu'il fut le jout de
fatalités plus forte que lui, qu'il fut le digne élève
d'Amyot, admira Ronsard, écoute l'Hospital et fit son ami
du bonhomme Paré.66

D'Aubigné's characterization of Charles IX, with few
exceptions, is quite similar to that given above. He pictured
Charles as addicted to hunting rather than politics, for he wrote
that the king "fuyoit les affaires et cherchoit ses plaisirs dans
les forêts."67 In the Histoire universelle he took note of Charles' penchant for swearing and his irrational rages, especially after the

64G. Dodu, op. cit., pp. 370-372.
65Ibid., pp. 373, 374; A. Chaussade, loc. cit., p. 301.
66Loc. cit., p. 309.
67D'Aubigné, IV, p. 183.
St. Bartholomew massacre. When Henry of Condé replied audaciously to the royal request that he abandon Protestantism, the king was greatly angered and swore at the prince. The Huguenot historian also described the king's disturbed nights when his sleep was interrupted by "starts and moans" which were concluded with oaths against God (reniements) and declarations of despair.

D'Aubigné's assertion that the king was extremely addicted to amorous adventures is unquestionably erroneous, although the fault seems to be one of information rather than interpretation. Further, his charge that Charles IX forced Henry of Navarre to participate with him in some horrid debauchery hardly seems plausible. The gravest accusation which d'Aubigné leveled at Charles IX is that the king fired upon his subjects during the St. Bartholomew massacre. This charge is very probably false, because sixteenth-century corroboration is flimsy and the tale is weakened by internal difficulties.

Charles IX was justly portrayed by d'Aubigné as having been endowed with an able mind which was perverted by a bad rearing. His

---

68 Ibid., III, p. 326. 69 Ibid., IV, p. 256. 70 Ibid.
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interest in music, of which he was very fond, as well as in poetry of which he composed creditable examples, was also noted. In concluding a brief characterization, the Huguenot historian declared, undoubtedly with satisfaction, that the king during his few years of life after the massacre frequently condemned the tragedy of August 24, 1572.

Catherine de Médici has been one of the most maligned individuals of the Reformation era. Her role as wife, mother, and regent have all been critically judged. For example, she has been charged with driving her husband, who feared her syphilitic condition, into the arms of a mistress and with purposely perverting and enervating her children so that she might exercise absolute power. As regent for and advisor to her sons, she has been held responsible for innumerable diabolical crimes of which the most heinous was the "carefully and distantly" prepared St. Bartholomew massacre.

Actually, she was obedient to and passionately devoted to her husband. There was nothing feigned about her love for Henry II to whom she gave all her heart but from whom she received only a small part of his. The tale of her venereal infection is sheer poppycock; she was always pure and faithful to him during his life and after his death. "She was," writes Van Dyke, "a most careful

---
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and loving mother." Some biographers have accentuated that l'amour maternel was the guiding and dominant principle of her life, which sometimes blinded her to political realities. Very possibly the desire to protect her children and their royal inheritance inspired her interest in politics.76

However, the will to power has also been noted as a potent, if not dominant, trait of her personality. This love of power may have overruled all other desires and considerably antedated the demise of Henry II and the accession of her fledgling sons to the kingship.77

In the exercise of royal power she might be considered an "assez belle figure," asserts Mariéjol, if she had not been responsible for the bloody events of August, 1572. She had generous intentions and noble desires during the thirty years that she tried to protect the state and the dynasty against the prevalent anarchism.78 However, her fatal folly of unleashing the great massacre was inevitably responsible for subsequent tragedies; thus, she cannot be considered


77 Van Dyke, op. cit., I, pp. 27, 180; L. Romier, loc. cit..

78 J. H. Mariéjol, Catherine de Médicis, pp. 415, 420, 429.
"une grande femme d'Etat" as was Elizabeth I. Catherine's political activity was always concerned with mediating disputes, pouring oil on troubled waters. She was the "great compromiser" of sixteenth-century France but was even less successful than Henry Clay in the American pre-Civil War period. Of course her policy of a balance of power between the Huguenot party and the ardent Catholic party was predicated upon compromise and upon the weakness of both sides.

Catherine's superficial religiousness was responsible for her incomprehension of the great abyss between Huguenots and ardent Catholics. This shortsightedness misled her into trying to heal the grave schisms of France with only her cordiality and the wiles of the bewitching ladies, of dubious virtue, who composed her "flying squadron." She failed to recognize the significance of ideological factors in these French "wars of religion" and thought that if the material and sensual desires of the leaders were satiated they would and could pacify their followers. Her religious faith was based upon habit and the acceptance of traditional practices and never penetrated into the innermost part of her being. In her conception of the relationship between herself and her Creator she always remained pagan. She was skeptical about certain theological subtleties.

---
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yet superstitious enough to be addicted to the prophecies of such popular sixteenth-century astrologers as Nostradamus and Regnier Ruggiero. She was not hostile to the doctrinal novelties of Protestantism and opposed the Huguenots only when they became a dangerous force in the state. However, she was never tempted to abandon the Roman faith and supported the authority of the papacy versus its enemies. A favorite phrase which she taught her children was: "Born Catholic, I wish to live and to die in the same faith." 32

Accompanying her shallow religiousness was a complacent amorality. She had no qualms about poisoning her enemies such as Coligny, whom she also considered to be a criminal. She had no "definite sense of wrongdoing," writes Van Dyke, and never "felt any remorse or regret for St. Bartholomew." She was completely unscrupulous and assumed that her contemporaries were equally unprincipled. 33 The verdict of J. H. M. Salmon seems justified: "She had learned to regard religion as an empty formality, and politics as an art to which ethical considerations were completely irrelevant." 34

---


33Van Dyke, II, p. 108; J. H. Mariéjol, Catherine de Médicis, pp. 175, 419.

Her responsibility for the great massacre coupled with her amorality have caused her to be considered, though falsely, as a born criminal and irrevocably evil. She could be kind and loving; she disliked religious persecution. She was not an inhuman monster but a woman beset with many problems and fears. She was not "cold and passionless" but fearful, capricious, and impulsive. H. Hauser stresses that fear was one of her habitual reflexes and largely responsible for the attack on Coligny and the subsequent massacre of St. Bartholomew. Rashness, especially in defense of her personal designs or interests, is noted by Romier as an important characteristic. He also attributes much of her power to her unceasing energy and vitality.

D'Aubigné underlined in the Histoire universelle her policy of maintaining an equilibrium between the two parties, and he especially stressed her desire for power. After the death of Francois II in 1560 she balanced the Bourbons and Guises against one another as they threatened "la maison de France et en cette maison son autorité." He related that she seemingly sought to ruin the
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Protestants in 1562, but actually wanted peace because she was jealous of the glory which the Duke of Guise had acquired at the battle of Dreux. In 1574 she was able to maintain Henry of Navarre and Monsieur, the future Henry III, as virtual prisoners because she was so experienced in the game of dividing and conquering enemies which she should have feared. Elsewhere the Huguenot historian noted that Catherine intrigued and maneuvered upon the accession of Henry III to the throne and his return from Poland, because she "ne voulut pas que l'arrivée de son fils fust marque de son (her) impuissance ou de sa (his) mauvaise volonté." 89

Catherine's use of deceit and intrigue is alluded to in the above passages from the *Histoire universelle* as well as elsewhere. In his description of the unsuccessful peace negotiations at Nérac in late 1578 between Catherine and Henry of Navarre, d'Aubigné bluntly accused the queen mother of "la fraude perpetuelle." Instead of genuinely seeking peace, Catherine schemed to weaken the Huguenots by attracting the King of Navarre or his principal followers to the French court and by sowing divisions. 90 Shortly afterward the "mother of the king" attempted to use her charm and cajolery on some provincial Huguenot leaders. D'Aubigné depicted her as mastering certain


Huguenot locutions, such as "Dieu soit juge entre vous et nous,"
which the courtesans called the "langage de Canaan." He noted the
insincerity and hypocrisy of Catherine in the whole affair since the
lessons were conducted by the court fool to the accompaniment of
considerable merriment. Furthermore, the queen broke off this con­
ference with the Protestants, among whom was d'Aubigné, when her
tears and "consistorial terminology" were brusquely rebuffed. 91

Catherine's lavish interment of the body of Charles IX
and her carefully arranged (composez) tears and lamentations for her
dead son are cited by d'Aubigné as means by which she hoped to remove
the suspicion that she was responsible for Charles' demise. This
charge, completely unfounded, was tacitly, at least, accepted by
d'Aubigné. 92 He was on firmer ground when he pointed out that among
her children she displayed favoritism for Henry III and was grieved
when he had to leave France to become King of Poland. 93

D'Aubigné noted with admiration Catherine's remarkable
vitality and unfailing energy in dealing with the continual crises
which confronted her. He described her bravery and activity during
the day of the barricades in 1588, and he especially remarked upon

91 Ibid., V, pp. 365-366.
92 Ibid., IV, p. 262. G. Dodu, op. cit., p. 411, remarks that
Catherine de Medici was "an unnatural enough mother to discount
the deaths of two of her children for the profit of a third."
93 Ibid., IV, pp. 183, 188, 262.
her "merveilleuse diligence" during the summer of 1578 in Languedoc, whence she hastened to Provence and then "flew" to the court.\textsuperscript{94} He praised her "high courage" during her difficulties and her "discretion" by refraining from inconsiderately heaping French offices and honors upon her relatives and supporters. Perhaps d'Aubigné is here somewhat too kind to the Medici queen. Her biographer, Mariéjol, admits that she recompensed her compatriots and relatives generously, but he asserts that she displayed more restraint than later did Cardinal Richelieu.\textsuperscript{95}

Catherine's dignity and lack of pettiness or meanness were recorded by the Huguenot. He narrated an anecdote about two churls (goujats) who were overheard by Catherine and Antoine of Navarre debating a crude and vulgar tale concerning the Cardinal of Lorraine and Catherine. Navarre immediately wanted to hang them, but the queen mother mildly reprimanded the men and then laughingly said to Antoine that their anger should not descend to such "game." About this d'Aubigné remarked, "Soit dit sur ce qu'elle n'avait rien de bas."\textsuperscript{96}

D'Aubigné was surely mistaken when he implied that Catherine had a penchant for Protestantism and seemed to deny her Roman Catholic

\textsuperscript{94}Ibid., V, p. 366.
\textsuperscript{95}Ibid., VI, pp. 284, 285; J. H. Mariéjol, Catherine de Médicis, p. 256.
\textsuperscript{96}D'Aubigné, II, p. 40.
faith at the time of her death. Moreover, he was guilty of an even
greater error when he charged her with having planned the St.
Bartholomew massacre as early as the conference of Bayonne, where she
and the Duke of Alva conferred in 1565. However, such an accusation
was accepted as an indubitable fact not only by passionate Huguenot
historians and by those who were politiques but even by some fanatical
Roman Catholics during the later Reformation era.

King Henry III was probably damned more in his day than any
other leader, and today the harsh criticism of this abnormal man and
ruler continues. To several historians it has appeared impossible
to rehabilitate his blackened reputation. "Henri III n'est pas,"

97 d'Aubigné, VII, p. 397. Cf. above chap. vi, p. 177, fn. 17,
for a more complete criticism of d'Aubigné's narration of Catherine's
death.

98 d'Aubigné, II, p. 220, and IV, p. 89. The premeditation of the
St. Bartholomew massacre since Bayonne, widely accepted formerly, has
been universally rejected today. One of the last defenders of an
attenuated form of this thesis is H. Bordier in his La Saint-
Barthélémy et la critique moderne (1879). Encouragement for such a
coup was frequently received at the French court from Spain and Rome.
Moreover, Catherine had undoubtedly toyed with the idea of elim-
inating Coligny. However, the massacre resulted from the hatred of
the Guises for the Châtillons, Catherine's fear of war with Spain
in the Low Countries, and her resentment at Coligny's ascendance
over Charles IX. These factors explain the abortive assassination
of Coligny on August 22, 1572. Its failure led inexorably to the
horrible massacre. There are innumerable accounts of these momentous
decisions and events, but of especially: S. England, op. cit.,
pp. 37, 39, 69, 70, 246, 254-257; L. Romier, "La Saint-Barthélemy
. . . ," pp. 529-560; J. Héritier, Catherine de Médicis, pp. 466-480;
J. H. Mariéjol, Catherine de Médicis, pp. 154, 189, 190; Van Dyke,
op. cit., II, pp. 61-87; J. Loiseleur, "Les Nouvelles controverses sur
la Saint-Barthélémy," p. 109; P. de Vaissière, De Quelques assassins,
pp. 114-119, 141, 142, 158, 159; H. Bordier, op. cit., pp. 76, 77,
95-99; and J. Viénot, op. cit., pp. 297-428.
writes G. Dodu, "près de descendre du pilori où la postérité l'a
cloué."99

Nevertheless, Henry III possessed several remarkable traits.
There is general agreement that he was very bright, quick and per-
ceptive, the most intelligent of all Catherine's sons. Jacques Amyot,
the translator of Plutarch and Henry's teacher, admired his gifts
which were coupled with genuine scholarly interests. Also he was
affable and had a noble and graceful bearing. He could be, as says
Batiffol, "every inch a King." His oratorical ability, which was
useful at the two assemblages of the Estates General during his
reign, was of a high order, and perhaps he even surpassed "les
meilleurs orateurs de son temps," as Pierre LaFue, a very friendly
biographer, remarks.100

Unfortunately, numerous defects of character were coupled
with these good traits. The amorality of his mother, not sur-
prisingly, was in part acquired by Henry, her most cherished and
spoiled child. LaFue admits that he was ashamed of his participation
in the St. Bartholomew massacre. However, "ce n'est pas tant d'avoir
participé au massacre d'hommes et de femmes sans defense que d'avoir
accompli une fausse manoeuvre."101 Another characteristic, derived

99G. Dodu, op. cit., p. 415; H. Sée, A. Rebillon, E. Précolin,

100L. Batiffol, op. cit., p. 243; G. Dodu, op. cit., pp. 392,
393; LaFue, op. cit., p. 146; Mariéjol, Catherine de Médicis, p. 259.

101LaFue, op. cit., p. 65.
from the gay and luxurious surroundings in which he was reared, was his uninhibited and even irrational hedonism. He has been described as "essentially a man of pleasure" or as a person dominated by "an unexampled frivolity." 102

Unquestionably Henry was mentally unbalanced and abnormal. Numerous writers have remarked about the extreme paradoxes and contradictions in his personality and his extremely "unhealthy and sickly mentality." 103 Gaston Dodu describes very graphically the striking contrasts in Henry's character. "The figure, the man, the instincts, the tastes, the means--everything about him is capricious, fantastic, bizarre and incoherent," writes Dodu. "This husband, who confronts his wife with worse rivals than mistresses, is so attentive that one is reminded of a honeymoon . . . . This servant of God, whose devotions cause his mother to despair and astound the ambassadors . . . . seasons his piety with sacrifice." 104 LaFue has attempted to explain the unregulated piety and pursuit of pleasure during his later years as the result of a subtle Machiavellian ruse by which he protected his scepter against powerful enemies. However, Dodu more persuasively attributes the king's faults to his ancestry, his corrupt environment, 

102 L. Batiffol, loc. cit.; J. Héritier, Catherine de Médicis, p. 516.

103 J. Héritier, Catherine de Médicis, pp. 516, 517; L. Mouton, Le Duc et le roi, pp. 60-62. Héritier remarks that the surest way of misunderstanding Henry III is to oversimplify his complex character.

104 G. Dodu, op. cit., pp. 403, 404.
the temptations of his royal position, and his sexual perversion. Even LaFue recognizes that this allegedly "calculated and affected" hedonism eventually conquered Henry. 105

The most damaging accusation which has been hurled at Henry III and one which has been much debated by modern historians is that of his homosexuality. Virtually all historians are agreed that he was excessively effeminate, but they disagree as to the extent of this peculiarity. He reveled in dressing himself and his comrades as women for parties, dinners, or balls. He adorned himself with bracelets, necklaces, fragrant perfumes and cosmetics, and gowns with plunging necklines. Moreover, he displayed a great infatuation for masculine favorites, the infamous _mignons_, rather than for courtesans. Despite these universally accepted facts, L. Batiffol categorically declares, "But there is not the slightest evidence of a taste which would brand him as a man of perverted instincts." 106 The notorious _mignons_ according to both P. Champion and LaFue were merely political councillors and trustworthy supporters to Henry III, a person of extreme, rather than abnormal, tastes and practices. Champion asserts that they were quite different from their legend and that _mignon_ meant merely supporter or _homme de cour_. These young men were valiant loyal followers, many of whom later fought for and

---

105LaFue, _op. cit._, pp. 150-153, p. 189; G. Dodu, _op. cit._, pp. 384, 392-399.

106L. Batiffol, _op. cit._, pp. 244, 245.
Other writers take a more equivocal position towards Henry's relationship with these brash and handsome young men, and neither definitely absolve nor indict them. However, both J. H. Mariéjol and Van Dyke describe the mignons as "compagnons du plaisir," as well as political and military supporters of the king.108

Nevertheless, Gaston Dodu's exhaustive researches upon the character of the last Valois have led him to affirm convincingly that, despite the absence of irrefutable evidence, there are "toutes sortes de raisons" for believing in the king's sexual abnormality. Moreover, he asserts that the continuing predominance of Epernon and Joyeuse among the mignons resulted from the fact that they were "les plus actifs ministres des voluptés du roi, les archmignons . . . ." Léon Mouton, the biographer of Epernon, relates that the intimacy of the king with his mignons "exceeded all the limits" and that he was inaccessible to others when closeted with them. He admits that the situation was a very suspicious one and is inclined to doubt the innocence of Henry III. Mouton and Dodu are agreed that the king's perversion resulted from the corrupt environment and era rather than the converse being true.109

---


Valois ruler point out that he lavished huge sums of money and valuable offices upon the mignons, especially when they were married or interred.\textsuperscript{110}

The religious life of this abnormal king was also unbalanced. He often displayed an excessive and intense piety as pilgrim, mendicant, or flagellant, but a voluptuous debauch might soon follow. Such fanatical observances by the king were viewed by many Frenchmen with mortification and cynicism. However, LaFue insists, seemingly with justice, upon the sincerity of his faith and even believes that Henry III in certain religious experiences approached the exaltation and fervor of the mystic.\textsuperscript{111} Probably the most valid argument in defense of Henry III is that he was dearly loved by the two women, his mother and his wife, who might have detested him most. Especially does his relationship with Louise de Vaudemont, his pure and lovely wife, testify in his favor. Theirs was a marriage for love, rare among sixteenth-century princes, and they remained devoted to each other until Henry's tragic death. Thus the last Valois was surely not totally depraved.\textsuperscript{112}

The literary portrait of Henry III painted by d'Aubigné is

\textsuperscript{110}Van Dyke, \textit{op. cit.}, II, pp. 277, 278; LaFue, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 170.

\textsuperscript{111}LaFue, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 158, 160; Van Dyke, \textit{op. cit.}, II, pp. 274, 275.

\textsuperscript{112}G. Dodu, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 402, 412, 413; LaFue, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 187.
by no means all black; however, it does lack the nuances and paradoxes which Jean Héritier feels are essential to an understanding of this ruler. The Huguenot historian cited the great deterioration in Henry's character as occurring about 1576 or 1577. The king was "courageux en jeunesse," wrote d'Aubigné, "et lors désiré de tous; en vieillesse aimé de peu." This unhappy transformation occurred before the Peace of Bergerac in September, 1577, and was an important factor in its realization, asserted d'Aubigné. "Suddenly (tout à coup) the king was stripped of martial ambition and plunged into une vie tranquille. Some attributed this to his voluptuous desires and others to his excessive (religious) devotions."

Thereafter Henry III pursued a life of pleasure and softness and displayed an extreme financial prodigality in expenditures on luxuries and frivolities as well as in excessive gifts to his favorites. D'Aubigné related how several of Henry IV's nobles grumbled at his large requests and relatively small bequests. They had been accustomed to pleasure and splendor under Henry III, who, when granting fifty thousand écus to a sturdy supporter, belittled the gift and exalted the services and character of the recipient. Such lavishness

---

113 D'Aubigné, VIII, p. 78.

114 Ibid., V, pp. 340, 341. G. Dodu, op. cit., pp. 394, 395, takes issue with this date, for the obvious deformation of Henry III's character certainly dated from his accession to the throne in 1574 and resulted partially from what Dodu terms "la césarité," i.e. the exercise of great political power.
emptied the royal treasury and even hampered military operations in 1580. Almost unlimited (desmesures) grants were made; a portion went to maintain the royal captains against the intrigues of the Guises, but much more was spent on the splendor of the mignons, whose smallest pleasures became great necessities.115 D'Aubigné stressed the frivolous and extravagant royal disbursements of one-hundred thousand sous annually for the court at a time when bankruptcy threatened the treasury. The king's "excessive taste for amassing and nourishing" little dogs, of which there were at least one thousand with a nursemaid and pack horse for each group of eight dogs, was critically recorded. D'Aubigné likewise noted the king's expensive interest in illuminated books and reported that he had his book of hours illuminated with saint-like portraits of those persons at the court "whom he loved violently." Thus d'Aubigné had seen illuminations with the "most excellent young captains" of that age painted as a Saint Jerome or Franciscan monks.116 Even Henry III's oratorical ability somewhat declined according to the Huguenot historian. He highly praised the king's first speech at the Estates General of 1576-1577 as that of a "roi bien disant." However, he was rather critical of the royal oratory at the Blois assembly of 1588. D'Aubigné conceded that the

115D'Aubigné, VIII, p. 332; VI, pp. 52, 53.

116Ibid., VII, pp. 102, 103. De Thou, IX, p. 599, confirmed this story and was possibly the source for much of d'Aubigné's account. Cf. also Van Dyke, op. cit., II, p. 332, who accepts the story about the king's mania for dogs.
address was delivered well, but he disapproved of the content. 117

The religious observances and aberrations of the king led
d'Aubigné to brand him, with perhaps pardonable exaggeration, as
"the most bigoted prince that has lived in three hundred years."
Again Henry III was described as having been "inimitable aux
devotions." His several religious foundations, such as monasteries
and an order of penitents, as well as his semiweekly practice of
donning the penitent's garb with a whip at the belt, joining re-
ligious processions in Paris or other cities, and then chanting con-
tinuously, were emphasized. 118 Obviously, d'Aubigné considered
Henry's religious exercises not only bigoted but also superficial,
if not insincere. He related how the king utilized a religious pro-
cession as a means of seducing the wife of a citizen of Lyons. Henry
and the husband participated together in the procession, but the king
slipped away for his tryst with the unfaithful wife. Henry was almost
discovered by the suspicious husband and escaped recognition only by
putting on a monastic habit. "Thus he employed," wrote d'Aubigné,
"his devotion as a means of retreat as well as combat."119

The Huguenot historian unequivocally described Henry III as
a homosexual. Numerous times d'Aubigné referred to the perverse

117 d'Aubigné, V, p. 144; VII, p. 320.
118 d'Aubigné, V, pp. 343, 344. D'Aubigné, VIII, p. 75, again
referred to the king as a "bigoted spirit" when he described his
assassination by Jacques Clément.
relationship between the king and his mignons. As early as the battle of Dormans in October, 1575, the word mignon acquired a vulgar connotation, asserted d'Aubigné. Again he wrote that several ladies of the court during the first months of 1576 began to hate the king "pour quelques amours étranges, desquelles elles l'accusèrent." D'Aubigné noted that the removal of certain royal advisors in the following years had been attributed to their knowledge of the king's abnormal practices and that Marguerite of Navarre, during her tempestuous residence at the French court, had imputed certain "very filthy debauches" to the mignons. When Henry III was threatened by the machinations of the Leaguers in 1585, the Huguenot historian described him as unable to shake off his lethargic ways, because "le feu estoit mort au foyer de son cœur." Certain people said boldly (tout haut) that since the king had prostituted himself to "l'amour contre nature" his youthful courage had visibly disappeared.

Twice d'Aubigné described how the Count du Bouchage abandoned the "secret cabinet" of the king, "because of the things that he had seen and endured there," for the monastery. He also

---

120 Ibid., IV, p. 380; V, p. 6.
121 Ibid., V, p. 346; VI, pp. 169, 170.
122 Ibid., VI, pp. 239, 240.
123 Ibid., VII, p. 218; IX, p. 103. D'Aubigné did prefix his first remark about Bouchage with an "it is said" (on disoit) but not the second one.
related that the audacious remarks and actions of Henry, Duke of Guise, forced Henry III in 1587 to leave "his secret and strange pleasures" for the military profession which he detested.\footnote{Ibid., VII, p. 169.} Even d'Aubigné's narration of events following Henry III's death has allusions to the king's perversion. When describing the grief of Henry III's followers, d'Aubigné made the rather shocking statement that "the companions of the king's couch exploded their lamentations." Again the mignons are pictured as kneeling before the new king, Henry IV, and asking pardon in terms that expressed "shame, horror, and effeminacy."\footnote{Ibid., VIII, pp. 80, 88.}

LaFue takes d'Aubigné to task for his anecdote about one of the mignons, Saint-Luc, who was disgusted with his and the king's shameful ways and sought to reform Henry. Saint-Luc ran a hidden tube into the king's bed and then, imitating an angel, menaced this "spirit, weakened by bigotry," with divine punishment. When Henry was informed of the deception, his love for Saint-Luc turned into mortal hate, and the mignon was forced to flee for his life. This tale may be incorrect, though Saint-Luc did flee the court, but LaFue is certainly unjustified in describing d'Aubigné's version as scandalous or the historian as specializing in "licentious stories."\footnote{Ibid., VI, pp. 72-74; LaFue, op. cit., p. 181.}

D'Aubigné wrote that he omitted the most shameful words from this
account just as he refused to mention for "la modestie de l'histoire" the names of the kneeling mignons who begged forgiveness of Henry IV. D'Aubigné's frequent references to Henry III's sexual abnormality did not stem from pornographic roots but from his desire to recount history accurately. In this judgment upon the king he was probably correct.

D'Aubigné's characterization of Henry III in his later years, when his personality was deformed, is unquestionably a harsh one. After narrating the assassination of the Duke of Guise, d'Aubigné asserted that Henry III was notorious for his "cowardice, treachery, and perfidy." The king was portrayed by him in a brief literary sketch as having been a youth who was "agreeable in conversation, a lover of letters, and more generous than other kings," but afterwards the king was "loved by few," and would have been "worthy of the kingdom if he had not reigned."127 D'Aubigné's depiction of Henry III is not that of an "avowed enemy," as LaFue, Henry's apologist, pretends. He never wrote as did one contemporary, perhaps with justice, that it would have been better if Henry III had never been born. He saw the king with the eyes of a conscientious Huguenot historian and truthfully and accurately wrote of him "only that which any good Frenchman can say."128

127 D'Aubigné, VII, pp. 78, 79.
128 Ibid., VII, p. 79; LaFue, loc. cit.; G. Dodu, op. cit., p. 415, appraises d'Aubigné's judgment of the last Valois as "exempt of passion."
A Portrayal of Henry IV

The most prominent figure in the Histoire universelle and in France about 1600 was the great sovereign Henry IV. He justly deserved the title of "Henry le Grand," which contemporary writers gave him. An English historian calls him the greatest king of modern France except for Louis XIV, and a fellow countryman describes him as "the most intelligent of all French kings." However, A. Poirson, his fervent admirer, is doubtless too eulogistic when he writes that the principles of everything which constituted the excellence of the late-nineteenth century dated from Henry's reign.\(^{129}\) He has been called a providential leader since his character included the best points of the old and new eras, and his sensible policies ended the religious and feudal strife of the preceding generation. In his personality the various differences which had divided France were submerged, and he became the "national rallying point" for a newly united country.\(^{130}\)

Henry was well endowed intellectually and physically. His body was strong and sturdy as a result of an outdoor life during his childhood and during most of his time as King of Navarre and leader of the Huguenots. He was a vigorous and courageous military man, a


"roi et la française, un roi à cheval, soldat et capitaine," the French historians enjoy saying. As a military leader Henry IV ranked with the ablest generals of his day, although not an extremely brilliant strategist. He was outclassed during his campaigns of the early 1590's by Philip II's general, the Duke of Parma; of course, the latter has been termed the "greatest soldier of the sixteenth century." 131

Coupled with this king's healthy body was a healthy mind. Certainly his sobriquet of the "Vert Galant" is apropos, since numerous amorous affairs and mistresses dotted his career. However, as writes Mariéjol, "After the reign of the mignons, the reappearance of mistresses indicated progress in the royal morality." He was a strong man with a "weak heart," and the most satisfactory comment on this facet of his career is that his galantries seem neither to have interfered with his royal duties nor to have damaged French finances and policy. 132

Henry's engaging personality won the affection and loyalty

131 J. H. Mariéjol, La Réforme et la Ligue, p. 307; M. Wilkinson, op. cit., p. 125; F. Leger, La Fin de la Ligue, p. 133. His biographer P. de Vaissièze (Henri IV, p. 384) writes, "If Henry IV was a brilliant tactician he was only a mediocre strategist." C. Oman, op. cit., pp. 467-469, 511, 512, completely agrees with Vaissièze.

132 F. Leger, op. cit., p. 141; J. H. Mariéjol, loc. cit.; A. Poirson, op. cit., I, x, xi. Vaissièze, Henri IV, p. 237, writes, "No more at this period [the early 1580's] of his existence, ... than at any other, did the game of love cause this prince to lose sight of the game of politics."
of men as well as women. His kindness, energy, wittiness, and simple yet regal manner secured the support of partisans, even during the dark days following his predecessor's assassination, when he could repay them with little but compliments and additional duties. His experiences at the French court plus his continual shortage of human and financial resources as the Huguenot chieftain had created considerable cynicism, pessimism, and opportunism in his character. Nevertheless, he had an interest in and affection for his subjects, though he may have felt a certain amused contempt for the motives of both the great and the small. These traits surely served him well as he dealt with Leaguers, Huguenots, and Spaniards in his work of internal and external pacification. His strength of will, his experience, and his sense of political realities were essential to the renovation of the French absolute monarchy and French economic rehabilitation.\(^{133}\)

Henry IV's religious sentiments have been a subject of much dispute. Certainly he was not irreligious and was faithful in either his Calvinist or Roman Catholic observances; however, he was never a zealot or bigot and was uninterested in theological disputes. A modern toleration and comprehensiveness characterized

his religious views. He may have preferred Protestantism, though this has frequently been disputed, but he came to believe that a man could attain salvation in either the Huguenot or Roman Catholic fold. Thus his faith, adulterated by opportunism, presented no great obstacle when dynastic and patriotic factors virtually required his abjuration of Protestantism in 1593.134

One last aspect of the king's personality which must be stressed is his relative ingratitude and inconstancy. "As fickle in his friendships as in his romantic liaisons," writes Mariéjol, "he forgot services as well as injuries." He was by nature somewhat avaricious and greedy for favors from his supporters, but in return he was niggardly with rewards although extravagant with compliments and promises.135 Veteran followers, whose loyalty seemed unquestioned, were often forgotten whereas recent and doubtful ones were handsomely rewarded. His Huguenot gentlemen were often overlooked when Henry IV lavished offices and gifts upon former Leaguers as a means of eliminating united opposition in the 1590's.136 Moreover, he seemed capable, occasionally, of mocking and railing at a faithful supporter


135Mariéjol, La Réforme et la Ligue, p. 307; P. de Vaissière, Henri IV, p. 385; L. Batiffol, op. cit., pp. 316, 322. Batiffol records that during his reign Henry was most frequently accused of the faults of "avarice and . . . forgetfulness of services rendered him."

whose advice he disapproved. Such was his treatment of the brave and aged La Noue, whom he ridiculed rather harshly, during the siege of Paris in 1590. Under Henry's apparent friendliness and good-heartedness there was a certain lack of frankness; he had something of the courtier's desire to please rather than a genuine interest in and attachment to those around him. In private he might unjustly disparage those he had publicly praised, because "jealousy of the exploits and of the reputation of those who served him" was one of his unpleasant traits.

It might be assumed that d'Aubigné's portrayal of his master Henry IV in the Histoire universelle is nothing but a continuous panegyric, especially since the history, although universal, began "à la naissance de Henri quatre-vingt, justement surnommé le Grand." Certainly, the Huguenot historian had the highest regard for Henry's efforts as sovereign of France. In the projected fourth tome of the work, he described the first Bourbon ruler with considerable justification as "le plus grand roy qui ait manié le sceptre de France."

---

137 H. Hauser, François de la Noue, pp. 263, 264. P. de Vaissière, Henri IV, pp. 383, 384, attempts to minimize these biting remarks made to La Noue as gaugeries or plaisanteries at which La Noue should have laughed rather than taken offense. Henry IV displayed a similar cruelty towards du Plessis-Mornay in 1600 after the Huguenot had been "defeated" in a theological dispute with du Perron, the Bishop of Evreux. Cf. Garnier, op. cit., II, p. 279, and R. Patry, op. cit., pp. 389-393.

138 P. de Vaissière, loc. cit.

139 D'Aubigné, I, p. 8.
Elsewhere Henry IV is called a "king without peer"; again his son, Louis XIII, is described as stemming from "the most splendid lineage of Europe" and the "highest family of the world." Nevertheless, d'Aubigné wanted to characterize this "prince sans pareil" with impartiality and accuracy. He truthfully wrote that "in the painting of this handsome visage I have not forgotten the flaws and the follies."  

Such an exuberant eulogist of Henry IV as A. Poirson should not cavil at d'Aubigné's elucidation of Henry's political achievements. The Huguenot historian stressed that once more the monarchy was strengthened and exalted. The king's followers requested rather than demanded recompense, and when services were performed the executor said that he had "performed his duty" instead of stating that he had "obliged the king," as was formerly the practice. The great nobles, even the highest, no longer threatened to usurp the royal power. The most surprising and unheard of reform was that the past poverty of the monarchy had been superseded by a surplus in the royal treasury. Furthermore, the Duke of Sully had cannons, weapons for forty thousand men, and quantities of powder and bullets in the royal arsenal.  

---

140 D'Aubigné, Supplément à l'histoire universelle d'Agrippa d'Aubigné (Paris, 1926), p. 7; d'Aubigné, IX, p. 475; VII, p. 5.  
141 D'Aubigné, V, p. 15. P. de Vaissière, Henri IV, p. 383, agrees that in the "beau portrait . . . du roi de Navarre, il y a bien quelques ombres et quelques taches."  
142 Ibid., IX, pp. 457, 458.
d'Aubigné's opinion the one grave error which Henry IV made was to readmit to France "ces pestes" the Jesuits. Aside from this fault, which d'Aubigné asserts cost him his life, "Henry le Grand" restored peace and prosperity to France and power and prestige to the monarchy.

Although he had great respect for the military prowess of his master, d'Aubigné never bestowed upon him the superlative praise that he did upon Coligny, or even upon François of Guise. Certainly he praised Henry's courage and his ability to inspire his men. He wrote that Navarre's warlike ability was displayed as early as 1580 when his troops captured Cahors. His men, motivated primarily by the desire for plunder, might have failed against the defenders of the city if they had been led by a captain inferior to Henry of Navarre. The prince was "présent à tout" and inspired his men to victory by "speaking to them and calling each by name." 144

Numerous times the historian noted Henry's bravery. During a combat in 1585 Henry of Navarre, by then heir to the throne, rallied his men and charged so audaciously into the enemy that part of his spur and the sole of his boot were carried away by a bullet; d'Aubigné remarked that he "là oublia l'héritier de la couronne pour faire le soldat." After he had become king, Henry IV displayed remarkable

---

143 Ibid., IX, p. 459.
144 Ibid., VI, pp. 11-15.
valor when he was forced to besiege the pro-League city of Rouen in 1591. A sortie by the defenders threatened some of his men as the king, d'Aubigné, and a certain Roger Williams watched from a hill. On horseback Henry dashed down the slope, a difficult descent for a man on foot, and crossed a river. D'Aubigné confessed that neither he nor Williams dared follow the king, and he added, "Ioi, je me nomme, pour donner gloire à mon maistre aux despens d'un des plus vaillans hommes du monde [Williams] et aux miens." 145

Likewise, he depicted Henry IV as an inspiring and valiant commander at the battle of Ivry, where the royalists defeated the Leaguers led by the Duke of Mayenne. As the king laughingly donned his helmet, he said to his troops, "My companions, God is with us. Here are his enemies and ours; here is your king. Against them. If you lose sight of your standards, rally to my white plume; you will find it on the road of victory and honor." 146 With advancing age and greater experience Henry IV abandoned some of the recklessness of his earlier career and utilized more care and planning in his generalship. In 1597 he besieged the Spanish-held city of Amiens and was not only the general on horseback (le cul sur la selle) but also the able organizer of a lengthy siege. 147

145 Ibid., VI, p. 278; VIII, pp. 254, 255.
146 Ibid., VIII, p. 189. The historicity of this famous passage is substantiated by P. de Vaissière in his Henri IV, p. 357.
147 D'Aubigné, IX, p. 153.
D'Aubigné gave an interesting military comparison of Henry IV and Mayenne, the king's primary enemy during the campaigns against the League in the early 1590's. He explained that Henry's distinctive characteristics were as follows: He had perseverance and optimism concerning the future coupled with a "miraculous vivacity"; these traits and especially his gayété or enthusiasm were communicated to his troops. In addition, his powers of sight and hearing, so valuable to a general, were astounding. His excellent vision allowed him to discern at a distance not only the quantity but the quality of the enemy forces and whether they advanced with bold or faltering spirits; thus he could make the appropriate decisions. Finally, a maxim which had continually guided his military exploits was his belief that the enemy always made mistakes; these he sought to discover and then to exploit. It is noteworthy that nowhere in this analysis did d'Aubigné, although praising Henry's military ability and implying that he, as well as Mayenne, was a "capitaine excellent," describe the king's generalship as unequalled. His brilliant opponent, the Duke of Parma, was extolled as "le plus accompli de son temps en toutes les vertus de capitaine général."

The amorous adventures of Henry IV throughout his life are a fertile field for anyone who wishes to dwell upon erotic exploits.

148 Ibid., VIII, pp. 322-324.
149 D'Aubigné, VIII, p. 404. Elsewhere d'Aubigné, VIII, p. 302, declared that Parma habitually defeated his opponents despite their larger forces, and he continued, "À la vérité il n'avait pour lors capitaine en l'Europe qui sçait prendre ses mesures comme cettui-là /Parma/."
Had d'Aubigné been writing "recits licencieux" as Pierre LaFue charges, he would have found suitable material in Henry's private life. However, he usually recorded these experiences, as he had the perverse morals of Henry III, only when he thought, correctly or incorrectly, that they were germane to military, political, and religious developments. D'Aubigné noted with mild criticism Henry's visit to la belle Corisande in March of 1586 but related it to his fortuitous opportunity to prevent a rebellion in the town of Eauze.

Henry, returning from the rendezvous with Corisande, passed through the rebellious town and averted its loss, which served as a "favorable excuse à son escapade." After describing Navarre's victory at Coutras in 1587, d'Aubigné recorded a flying trip by Henry through Gascony in order to carry the captured battle standards to this enchanting mistress. In the Histoire universelle Henry was soundly, but unjustly, accused of throwing the martial advice of his captains "au vent et sa victoire à l'amour."

---

150 Ibid., VII, p. 47.

151 D'Aubigné, VII, p. 161. This contention, though formerly widely accepted, has been virtually undermined today. Modern historians discount d'Aubigné's strictures of the King of Navarre and interpret differently his defensive military actions after Coutras. P. de Vaissière, Henri IV, pp. 305-309, thinks that, in part, Navarre feared to confront the strong, fresh Catholic army with his reduced forces after the battle but primarily he wished to abstain from weakening or ruining the French royal power which he hoped to inherit. Levis-Mirepoix, Les Guerres de Religion (Paris, 1950), p. 269, agrees with the latter view and writes, "Le Béarnais n'a qu'une pensée après Coutras se rapprocher de Henri III, l'assurer que, s'il a battu la Ligue, il a servi son roi." Garnier, op. cit., I, pp. 381-384, asserts that neither passion for the belle Corisande nor respect for
D'Aubigné did not fail to narrate the unsavory moral life at Henry's court when he was King of Navarre in the 1570's and 1580's. He would have preferred to conceal these "imperfections de la maison," but he had taken an oath to be truthful and considered them significant. Henry's queen, the notorious Marguerite of Valois, taught him that a cavalier without love had no soul; thus Henry publicly maintained his mistress, "Foeuse," hoping that overt adultery "expressed some virtue and concealed adultery was a mark of vice." Then d'Aubigné explained, but erroneously, that Marguerite, who hated her brother the King of France, employed her hold over "Foeuse" and the mistresses of Navarre's chief followers to instigate "la guerre qu'on appella des amoureux." D'Aubigné's emphasis upon the significance of amorous affairs in the policies of the "Vert Galant" was probably more accurate for the explanation of his abjuration of Protestantism in 1593. He attributed a major part to Henry's beloved mistress of the 1590's, Gabrielle d'Estrees, who was lured by Henry III explains Navarre's action. His army simply could not fight; the cavalry, composed of gentlemen, had disbanded, and the underpaid infantry were burdened with booty. "Sa troupe refusa donc le suivre. N'est-ce pas la meilleure justification du Roi de Navarre, qui avait estimé impossible de se remettre en route immédiatement." The explanation that Navarre's army was exhausted and disintegrating is also advanced by G. B. de Puchesse in his "Henri IV avant son avenement," Revue Henri IV, III (1909), p. 17. C. Oman, op. cit., pp. 468, 469, defends, but erroneously it seems, d'Aubigné's interpretation.  

152 D'Aubigné, V, pp. 382-386. Pierre de Vaissière in his Henri IV, pp. 199, 200, has thoroughly demolished this explanation for the outbreak of war in the winter of 1579-1580.
the prospects of becoming Queen of France. She was the "dernier instrument qui fit plus que tout." The role of Gabrielle, later the Duchess of Beaufort, was overemphasized by d'Aubigné, but her influence was not negligible.\textsuperscript{153}

Henry IV was a person of honor and considerable integrity, according to d'Aubigné. In 1576 the Estates General sought to woo the King of Navarre away from his Huguenot followers, but their envoys were unable to discover in his character the penchant for deserting his friends.\textsuperscript{154} Navarre's honor was defended by d'Aubigné himself before Henry III in 1583; the historian told the French monarch that his master would submit his life, his property, and his men to the king but he would never enslave his honor to any living prince. Again in early 1587 the future Henry IV refused to besmirch his reputation by seizing Catherine de Medici and her court, which would have been possible in d'Aubigné's opinion. The queen and her court could have been held for an enormous ransom. Henry was restrained by his honor, a restraint which he later regretted, wrote d'Aubigné.\textsuperscript{155}

The Huguenot historian depicted little of the cynicism in Henry's character which modern historians stress, but his renowned opportunism was not missing from d'Aubigné's literary portrait. In


\textsuperscript{154}D'Aubigné, V, p. 116.

\textsuperscript{155}Ibid., VI, p. 172; VII, pp. 62, 63.
the mid 1580's Henry of Navarre was accused of having made a treaty with Philip II prejudicial to France. D'Aubigné described the negotiations and the proposed treaty, but stated that it was never signed because Henry at that time became heir to the throne after the death of Monsieur. D'Aubigné refused to pass judgment upon these actions, but he quoted the following statement made by the King of Navarre to Catherine concerning the affair: "I would arm Hell, where you [Catherine] have so much credit, against you, should you make me feel it is necessary."156 The famous conversion of 1593 is interpreted by d'Aubigné as primarily an act of political opportunism, although he recognizes amorous and feeble religious motives as well. As his military and political fortunes improved, the king had less need of his loyal Huguenot warriors. Furthermore, many supporters among the politiques were unruly and the Leaguers were preparing to elect a king in their pseudo-Estates General of 1593. These factors forced Henry IV to take the saut perilleux into the Roman Catholic church, but he told the Huguenots that he was persuaded by no other theology than "nécessité de l'Estat."157

156Ibid., VI, pp. 286-288.

157Ibid., VIII, pp. 331-342; Cf. especially pp. 331, 336, 342. Probably the weakest part of d'Aubigné's characterization of Henry IV is the discussion of his abjuration and its ramifications. Several recent writers have commented that d'Aubigné's comprehension of this question was partially obscured by his religious ardor. F. Leger speaks of an "incompréhension ... presque pathologique;" A. Garnier is less severe and asserts that du Plessis-Mornay displayed the same lack of discernment. Cf. F. Leger, op. cit., pp. 91-93; A. Garnier, op. cit., II, pp. 85, 86, 91; and E. Réaume, "Notice biographique et littéraire," pp. 83-86.
Inconstancy, envy, ingratitude, and parsimony were four defects in the character of Henry IV which d'Aubigné mentioned several times. Particularly did he stress that Henry was guilty of favoring his more recent Roman Catholic supporters—the politiques—over his loyal Protestant veterans. This injustice may have been inevitable, but an ardent Huguenot could never recognize its necessity. Unquestionably, some personal resentment at his own treatment influenced d'Aubigné's interpretation of this matter. For example, he recorded that in 1577 the King of Navarre claimed to be more indebted to the politiques than to the Huguenots. Then he refused to support several Calvinists, "and among them was the author of his liberty [d'Aubigné]".158

Divisions between Henry and his cousin the Prince of Condé occurred in the 1580's over the question of pre-eminence in the Huguenot party. D'Aubigné recorded how this quarrel and jealousy of Condé caused the court of Navarre to mock the difficulties of the prince and jeer at a military reverse he suffered in Anjou. Again envy prevented Henry from commissioning La Noue to lead an attack on the mouth of the Loire because of his "trop estimé probité" among the party. Navarre wanted a less popular man and found him in du Plessis-Mornay.159

158 D'Aubigné, V, pp. 237, 238.
159 Ibid., VI, p. 275; VII, p. 335.
Several times Henry IV's miserliness is stressed in the *Histoire universelle*, especially towards veteran followers. The king promised financial assistance to d'Aubigné for the writing of his history, but the promises were always deferred and finally voided by his death. In 1588 his supporters (*domestiques*) suffered from "intolerable poverties," but Navarre refused to allow certain of them to participate in the Huguenot assembly at La Rochelle where he had to endure numerous criticisms. When listing the military virtues of Mayenne and Henry IV, d'Aubigné granted all of Mayenne's good points to Henry except generosity. "Le roi avoit toutes ces choses, hormis la libéralité." In the 1590's he was described as sharing penuriousness with the Marquis de Rosny, and the king was said to be "stingy" toward everyone but the Duchess of Beaufort. The most egregious example of his ingratitude and miserliness was his unkind treatment of Odet de la Noue, son of the famous François de la Noue. The son was participating in Henry's siege of Paris immediately before it submitted in March, 1594. There his belongings were sequestered because of an unpaid debt which his father had incurred in 1590 for the cause of Henry IV. When Odet asked Henry IV

---


to prevent the seizure, the king brutally replied, "La Noue, when I have to pay my debts I will not come complaining to you."

D'Aubigné interpreted Henry's action as motivated by his desire to see Paris pacified and in submission. 163

D'Aubigné portrayed Henry's religious feelings as genuine; however, they were not strong enough to resist the demands of raison d'état or raison de vie. During the massacre of St. Bartholomew, Henry of Navarre, according to D'Aubigné and other contemporaries, was much more submissive to King Charles IX than was his cousin, the Prince of Condé. The former asked that their consciences be left in peace but added that he was willing to obey the king; whereas Condé boldly retorted that the king could dispose of his wealth and property as he pleased but he was resolved not to renounce "la vérité." 164

Five years later, after returning to Protestantism, Henry was depicted as taking a somewhat equivocal religious position during the first Estates General of Blois. In a statement to the Estates he had inserted a clause about the recognition of religious errors, which the Huguenot pastors expunged but he reinserted. Of course his 1595 acceptance of the mass occurred largely because of political factors,

163 Ibid., IX, pp. 18, 19.

164 Ibid., III, p. 326. D'Aubigné may have "whitewashed" Navarre's actions somewhat for one writer described him as "doux comme un agneau." Nevertheless, D'Aubigné's description may be more accurate for Condé abjured Protestantism on September 12, 1572, but Navarre not until September 26. Cf. Vaissière's Henri IV, pp. 115, 116.
as is stated above, and the religious motive was of slight significance.

D'Aubigné described the issuance of the Edict of Nantes as being pervaded with political opportunism. Shortly after his abjuration Henry IV, yet seated on an unsteady throne, secretly made fine promises to the Huguenots and spoke of "NOS EGLISES," but as his power grew he cooled towards his former coreligionists. Nonetheless, he was pleased to see Mayenne championing an edict for the Protestants, but it was postponed until all the Leaguers were pacified. Moreover, he employed various intrigues and bribes in order to secure its acceptance by influential Huguenots.

The threats to his life by assassins gradually dulled Henry IV's religious sensitivity; at least this is the regression indicated by scattered comments in the last tome of the Histoire universelle. In the mid-1590's the king, deathly ill, called d'Aubigné to him and "after several tears and long prayers" asked if his abjuration was an unforgivable sin against the Holy Ghost. The historian parried the question because of its difficulty, but he had shortly before replied quite boldly to the king after he had been wounded in the lip by the would-be assassin Jean Châtel. Then d'Aubigné had said, "Sire, God, whom you have thus far only abandoned

165D'Aubigné, V, pp. 175, 176; Ibid., VIII, pp. 333-335, 340.
166Ibid., IX, pp. 275-277, 281, 282, 292.
and offended with your lips, is content to pierce them, but when your heart renounces him he will pierce your heart." D'Aubigné recorded that Henry IV by 1601 no longer declared to the Huguenots that he had subjected himself to God's anathema--as a result of his recantation--for their good. The king had become insensible to this wrong, declared the historian, but this stemmed from his fear of assassination. However, d'Aubigné indicated a subsequent and further fall from grace by Henry IV, because he had "lost the fear of all things [human and divine?] except the dagger of the Jesuits." Thus the Jesuit order was allowed to return to France and was well treated by the king.  

Nevertheless, it would be quite incorrect to assert that d'Aubigné, a sincere and ardent Christian himself, actually believed that Henry IV had become a godless cynic and opportunist. He loved and respected too much this "prince sans pareil" whose life formed the heart of the Histoire universelle. In fact, he concluded his great work by stating that he would have preferred a comic rather than a tragic end to it, and he poignantly wrote, "I have no more breath with which to pursue any detail of the success of this assassination; the pen falls from my hand."

167Ibid., IX, pp. 104.  
168Ibid., IX, pp. 359, 360, 452, 460.  
169Ibid., V, p. 15.  
170Ibid., IX, pp. 472, 475.
Summary of D'Aubigné's Historical Characterization

It can be concluded from the above analysis that d'Aubigné was amazingly impartial in characterizing his prominent French contemporaries. He candidly reported that Coligny failed to discourage the assassin of Francis of Guise. He pointed out the shortcomings of Princes Louis and Henry of Condé. The character blemishes of his hero, Henry IV, were not glossed over; perhaps d'Aubigné's beliefs and prejudices led him occasionally to emphasize them unduly. The Huguenot historian was surprisingly generous in his praise of Francis and Henry of Guise, possibly too generous towards the latter. He asserted that Catherine de Medici was not petty or spiteful ("Elle n'avait rien de bas.") and the unhappy Charles IX was portrayed sympathetically. His characterization of the wretched Henry III is judicious and truly that of a "good Frenchman."

In addition, d'Aubigné depicted accurately their personalities. His portrayals of Henry III, Francis of Guise, and Henry of Condé are excellent and thoroughly valid today. He, perhaps, erred slightly by omitting from La Noue's characterization a touch of naïveté and by overstressing Henry of Guise's "vertus et .. courtsies." The virtues and vices of Prince Louis of Condé were described with precision, but d'Aubigné neglected to analyze the prince's incompetent generalship, although he narrated Condé's military blunders.
Virtually all d'Aubigné's remarks about Charles IX are indisputably true except for a dubious reference to his sexual license and the accusation that he fired upon his subjects. Without question, d'Aubigné's religious and personal interests slightly impaired his evaluation of Catherine de Medici and Henry IV. He was blind to the queen mother's fears and panic which were largely responsible for the St. Bartholomew tragedy. Instead he attributed the massacre to a conspiracy allegedly hatched at Bayonne in 1565. Furthermore, the conversion of Henry IV and his treatment of the Huguenots were partially incomprehensible to d'Aubigné. Nevertheless, the historian characterized admirably the most famous queen and the greatest king of sixteenth-century France.

171 The following quotation from B. Bates' Literary Portraiture in the Historical Narrative of the French Renaissance, p. 30, is completely correct if the two adverbs, "seemingly" and "overtly," are omitted:

"D'Aubigné created literary portraiture that was evocative in its chastened lines. In concise and seemingly impersonal phrases the acute eyes of the warrior thoughtfully cast judgments without overtly impairing the objectivity of the historian."
CHAPTER VIII

D'AUBIGNE'S HISTORICAL METHOD

D'Aubigné's goals in the writing of the Histoire universelle were several, and it is somewhat difficult to say which was most important. From the preface of Tome I and the appendix of Tome III it appears that his purpose was primarily that of edification. He wrote in order to raise men's hearts to "le Saint des Saints" and to display the glory of God and his judgment upon human folly and weakness. Moreover, the historian, like the theologian, should instruct men "à bien faire et non à bien causer." This educational aspect of historiography extended especially to the proper rearing of princes, and he wrote for that purpose. In a letter to Louis XIII he recommended to the king the numerous valuable "fruits" which might be picked in the Histoire universelle. The narration of his father's assassination indicated not only the danger of a king's position but also the means by which God "harvests the spirits of those who abandon him."

Unquestionably, his desire to record the glorious deeds of Henry IV, to write a biography of the king, was an important factor.

---

1 D'Aubigné, IX, p. 455; I, p. 10.
2 Ibid., I, p. 2; IX, p. 455.
3 D'Aubigné, Oeuvres complètes, I, pp. 505, 510. E. Gout, Agrippa d'Aubigné théologien (Montauban, 1883), p. 20 asserts that d'Aubigné was such a profound Christian that all his writings are filled with a religious spirit.
since Henry had urged him several times to undertake such a task.
"Je commence mon ouvre à la naissance de Henri quatrième . . . ," wrote d'Aubigné in his preface to Tome I. Again he mentioned the king and said, "C'est le coeur de mon histoire . . . ."4 Much of the first preface is devoted to an eulogy or apotheosis, as says Garnier, of Henry IV. Several times in the Histoire d'Aubigné asserted that Henry IV had commanded him to write his history. In the "Preface" d'Aubigné described himself as divinely chosen to liberate Henry from the prison of the French court in 1576, and he seems virtually to imply that he was divinely chosen to write his history.5 In d'Aubigné's correspondence are also found several references to this commission from "Henry le Grand."6

However, in one letter he mentioned that not only had Henry charged him with historical labor but so also had the Huguenot assembly which met at Gap in 1603. When writing to Simon Goulart at Geneva, d'Aubigné also asserted that this synod had changed his pleasant literary efforts into the weighty ones of history, although he would have preferred that someone with stronger shoulders had taken up the burden.7 The Histoire universelle was thus written for con-

4D'Aubigné, I, p. 8; V, p. 15.

5Ibid., I, pp. 10, 12, 18.


7D'Aubigné, Pages inédites, p. 59; d'Aubigné, Oeuvres complètes, I, p. 474.
fessional purposes; it was a glorious defense of Protestantism as well as a "biography" of Henry IV. In the same letter to Goulart he cited the need for posterity, to whom the Histoire was dedicated, to know "nos nouvelles par nous mesmes," and referred to himself as an "eye-witness of all the most notable things" who would record the Protestant epic for the future. Several students of d'Aubigné's life consider this apologia for Protestantism as the chief goal of the Histoire universelle; in fact, E. Réaume praises it as "une des plus belles apologies du Protestantisme au XVIe siècle." 8

The importance of military matters in the Histoire and especially the frequent "lessons" which d'Aubigné inserted for "captains" indicate that one of the historian's chief goals was the composition of a military manual, as well as a history which was generally educative. He made no reference to this aim in his prefaces, but as he concluded Tome II he promised the reader "plus argumens pour l'escole de la guerre et des affaires, que les grosses multitudes n'en ont donné." 9 E. Réaume declares that d'Aubigné

8E. Réaume, "Notice biographique et littéraire," p. 86; E. Gout, op. cit., p. 20; J. Plattard, op. cit., p. 37; A. Garnier, op. cit., II, p. 81. Garnier asserts that the defense of Protestantism was not contradictory to the glorification of Henry IV. This is a dubious assertion for after 1593 Henry was no staunch supporter of the Protestants. They were given the Edict of Nantes rather grudgingly. After 1598 the king especially encouraged defections from Protestantism and in 1603 readmitted the Jesuits, bitter foes of the Huguenots. A less ardent Huguenot than d'Aubigné would have trouble, as the latter did, in uniting these two goals in his narrative after Henry's abjuration.

9D'Aubigné, III, p. 270.
desired his book, like Monluc's Commentaires, to be "la bible du soldat."

As is mentioned above, d'Aubigné reluctantly assumed his historical labor for he recognized the gravity and the difficulty of the historian's task. "Ayant assez long temps appréhendé la pesanteur de l'histoire et redouté ce labeur pour les rigourenses loix ... od il [the historian] a pour spectateur l'univers ..." were the serious words with which he began his magnum opus. Frequently he referred to the "pesant chariot" or the "char triomphant" of history in his writings. In his "Preface" to Tome I he indirectly elucidated some of the laws which the historian should follow: He should proportion his history well and give events their proper weight; he should avoid errors, as much as possible, and not narrate the death of one prince in two different places and in contradictory ways. Most important, he must be truthful and never sell his pen to anyone or any cause. The historian should not inflate his narrative with lengthy and artificial orations; in other words, he should add nothing to the narrative and merely record history wie ist eigentlich gewesen. "Nous n'oserions affirmer," proclaimed d'Aubigné, "qu'il n'y ait rien du nostre [in the Histoire universelle]." Furthermore, the true historian will not judge events

---

10 Notice biographique et littéraire," p. 138. Réaume (p. 137) states that d'Aubigné set for himself the triple goal of writing a defense of Protestantism, the military history of Henry IV, and instructions for future captains in the Histoire universelle. This is certainly correct, but to these three should be added his goal of religious instruction.
or people; d'Aubigné asserted frequently that he only narrated facts without judging them as if he were expounding the premises of an argument and left to the reader the task of reaching a "judicious conclusion." 11

Like any conscientious historian d'Aubigné recognized the need for ample and reliable sources from which to construct his narrative. As has been pointed out in earlier chapters, he had four general classes of sources available to him: printed histories and documents, unprinted memoirs and narratives, information received orally from informants, and data based upon his own experiences. The second type he considered, justifiably, to be highly important for his history of the latter-half of the sixteenth century and displayed great interest in the acquisition of it. His correspondence is filled with numerous requests for memoirs about certain events. In 1616 or 1617 he wrote to the two great Huguenot nobles Lesdigniéres and Monbrun and requested memoirs about their campaigns. He implied that they would receive good treatment in his Histoire in return. Two high royal civil servants, Messrs de Lomenie and de Seaux, were asked to send him material about Middle Eastern affairs during the period from 1575 to 1590. He was dissatisfied with this portion of his narrative and had delayed the printing of it. 12 He wrote to

11 D'Aubigné, I, pp. 3, 6, 10.

12 D'Aubigné, Oeuvres complètes, I, pp. 344, 345, 467, 470, 471.
an unknown correspondent, perhaps the Duke of Savoy, and asked for information about Franco-Savoyard relations. This material he especially desired since he had received memoirs only from those who had made war on his correspondent. 13

In the mid 1620's d'Aubigné began writing at his chateau of Crest near Geneva in order to add a fourth tome to his Histoire. This is the part now printed as the Supplément, which if completed would have extended his universal history from 1610 to the 1620's. To a correspondent he wrote in 1624 that he had received "de très expres & grands memoires" from all parts of France, from both confessions, and especially from the principal "captains" of the royal armies during the war of 1621 and 1622. When writing this fourth tome he also requested some documents on the Netherlands. 14

Evidently these correspondents replied to him generously. D'Aubigné wrote, probably in the late 1620's, that he had "un gros amas de memoires reçus depuis dix ans bien souvent par les Mareschaux du Camp des deux partis." Such solicitations were nevertheless not always fruitful, as a letter written to the seigneurie of Geneva in 1619 testifies. He desired information about Genevan public events from 1685 to 1600 for his third tome, since his private

13 D'Aubigné, Pages inédites, pp. 65, 66.
friends had failed to supply him. From d'Aubigné's correspondence we can appreciate his eagerness to improve the factual content of his narrative and present an unbiased account, through the acquisition of more data where his sources were skimpy. The Huguenot historian was aided in his search for sources by the previously mentioned Synod of Gap in 1603. It passed a decision inviting the Huguenot churches "to seek the most memorable acts and memoirs of the past fifty years, and caused them to be sent to M. d'Aubigny in Poitou, who writes the history of our time."  

This quest for additional documents was even carried over into the Histoire universelle. As he concluded the last tome, he defended himself against those who might complain that he had forgotten many things and asserted that their criticisms were unjust.

15Ibid., pp. 520, 369, 553, 554. The correspondence of 1619 with the Genevans was successful; they replied graciously to d'Aubigné and stated that they were sending the documents which he had requested. Also they included "le Discours imprimé de l'Escalade" of 1602, which he could use for his general information or in his writings. According to de Ruble (d'Aubigné, IX, p. 381, fn. 2) this Discours was utilized as the primary source for the account in the Histoire universelle (IX, pp. 374-382) of the surprise attack on Geneva.

Surely d'Aubigné's reputation alone would have sufficed in this matter, but his friend de Hautefontaine, who was well known in Geneva, also wrote to them. Cf. T. Heyer, "Théodore-Agrippa d'Aubigné à Genève," Société d'histoire et d'archéologie de Genève, XVII (1872), pp. 164-172, for this correspondence.

The complainants themselves were to blame for failing to send him memoirs during the past sixteen years, but he hoped their unjust anger would cause them to remedy the lacunae by dispatching documents. A similar statement was included in the preface to this tome.\textsuperscript{17}

Scattered throughout the \textit{Histoire} were similar criticisms (by the historian) of those who neglected to supply him with data and created gaps in the narrative or made it impossible for him to identify individuals whose names should have been known by posterity. For example, he castigated those whose "stupidity and scorn of renown" prevented him from obtaining the names of certain heroes in a naval battle. Likewise, he was ignorant of the names of some of Lesdignières' valiant soldiers and reprimanded the \textit{Dauphinois} for this defect.\textsuperscript{18}

Several times he mentioned that he hoped to receive additional information and improve his history in later editions. He hoped for more details about the Spanish campaigns in northern France during 1595 or about events in Africa during the 1590's, of which he wrote virtually nothing.\textsuperscript{19}

Therefore no doubt can exist that d'Aubigné appreciated the importance of satisfactory documents for his history. It nevertheless should be noted that he did not resort to extensive and expensive

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{17}D'Aubigné, IX, p. 476; VII, pp. 1, 2.  \\
\textsuperscript{18}Ibid., IX, pp. 148, 163.  \\
\textsuperscript{19}Ibid., pp. 62, 231, 232. D'Aubigné solicited documents in various other passages of his history. Cf. VIII, p. 311; VI, p. 182; IX, p. 112.
\end{flushright}
personal travel in order to obtain documents or copies of them. Of course the dispatching of couriers was costly, but not so expensive and burdensome as La Popelinière's search for documents which consumed all his considerable fortune. Moreover, d'Aubigné solicited memoirs only for his third tome, which began with 1585, and his projected fourth tome. Perhaps he believed documents for the anterior period would be too difficult to obtain. More probably he felt no need of them since his first two tomes were based primarily upon printed sources. The studies made above prove that the Histoire universelle lacks originality in both outline and details for the events of Francis II's reign, the St. Bartholomew massacre, and the years 1576 and 1577, but is largely d'Aubigné's own for the years 1588 and 1589. The first two sections were almost completely drawn from de Thou's history and the third was based, somewhat less slavishly, upon La Popelinière's work. Significantly, only de Thou and La Popelinière are praised by d'Aubigné among the several contemporary historians whom he describes in the "Preface" to Tome I. D'Aubigné acknowledged his debt to La Popelinière, and in his first preface declared that he is "celui à la diligence et labeur duquel nous devons tous." In the letter to Simon Goulart, previously cited, d'Aubigné praised de Thou as "cet auteur excellent" and admitted that from him "j'ay tiré

20 Ibid., I, p. 4.
beaucoup de choses. 21

An exposition of d'Aubigné's criticism of the sources is virtually impossible for he was typical of sixteenth-century historians in that he had little knowledge of scientific historical methodology. He sought the truth and criticized the sources after a fashion, but he had little interest in an attempt to compose an accurate account from several contradictory narratives. "Ce n'est pas son gibier," writes E. Réaume, who also contends that d'Aubigné seems "denuded" of any critical sense in the Histoire. 22 D'Aubigné occasionally criticized the information in his sources from his own experience. For example, he rejected the account of a Spanish historian who had written that the King of Portugal was killed when the Moors cut the leather thongs of his helmet and struck him twice on the head at the battle of Alcazar in 1578. This was almost impossible if a man was well mounted, expostulated d'Aubigné. 23 At other times d'Aubigné wrote that a story was too uncertain to include in his history or that he would not vouch for the truth of one he did include. 24 Concerning an attempted assassination of James VI of

21D'Aubigné, I, p. 3; d'Aubigné, Oeuvres complètes, I, p. 474. P. Courteault, Blaise de Monluc historien (Paris, 1908), p. 11, corroborates this assertion about d'Aubigné's slavish following of de Thou's history. The data in the Histoire universelle from Monluc's Commentaires, states Courteault, came most frequently by way of de Thou, "qu'il d'Aubigné pille sans scrupule."


23D'Aubigné, VI, pp. 119, 120. 24Ibid., V, p. 58; IX, p. 282.
Scotland, d'Aubigné wrote, "Je ne suis pas attaché à ceste histoire pour les contrariétés des rapports," and he failed to unravel the contradictory reports. The divergent interpretations given to the appearance of a pretender to the Portuguese throne in the 1590's led d'Aubigné again to take the same position. "Not being a judge of these contrary opinions," he asserted, "I will be content with relating historically and briefly what several have written about them."

Thereupon he reported the Spanish contentions that the man was an imposter and the Portuguese assertion that he was actually their King Dom Sebastian. If the historian cannot evaluate his sources, one might ask d'Aubigné, who will criticize them?

The historian after amassing his sources and data must organize them, according to some conscious or unconscious principle, and then compose a narrative. D'Aubigné's goals of defending Protestantism, of recounting the experiences of Henry IV, and of writing a "soldier's bible" were principles which unified his narrative, at least until 1593 and Henry's abjuration. Particularly was he guided by his desire to write an apologia of the Huguenots insofar as he composed an original outline for the Histoire universelle.

At the commencement and the conclusion of his history d'Aubigné recognized the problems of historical organisation. In

---

25Ibid., IX, pp. 404-412.

the appendix to Tome III d'Aubigné defended his work, whose errors would be pointed out, by referring to "la difficulté de mettre en ordre des choses [of history] tant désordonnées . . . ." He praised La Popelinière in his preface because he had carried the burden of composing his history "sans avoir devant les yeux un corps d'histoire qui le relevast aux défauts." As was proven above, d'Aubigné copied both details and outlines from La Popelinière and de Thou in three of those parts of the Histoire universelle which were given detailed study. Very probably this was his practice for his entire first two tomes. However, Tome III seems to have been much more original; possibly it was the only original part of the first three tomes of the Histoire. Jean Plattard asserts that, although d'Aubigné borrowed much information from certain sources for his fourth tome, "he distributed it according to a personal plan."28

Above his borrowed or personal outlines, all of which were chronological ones, d'Aubigné attempted to superimpose a completely artificial arrangement. Each of his three tomes which covered the

27 D'Aubigné, IX, p. 476; I, p. 4. E. Réaume, "Notice biographique et littéraire," p. 157, certainly underestates d'Aubigné's indebtedness to La Popelinière when he writes that undoubtedly "l'esprit de notre d'Aubigné n'ait été quelquefois hanté par d'inévitables réminiscences" of La Popelinière's history. The latter work haunted d'Aubigné's spirit from his writing desk where he unquestionably kept the Histoire de France . . . while writing large portions of the Histoire universelle.

28 D'Aubigné, Supplément, xix. In "L'Imprimeur au Lecteur" at the beginning of Tome I (d'Aubigné, I, p. 17), d'Aubigné asserted that he spoke with greater knowledge and authority in Tome III.
period from Henry IV's birth until 1602 in detail is divided into five books, and each book ends with an "edict of peace or an equivalent thing." Moreover, the last five chapters of each book are devoted to foreign affairs and the major portion of each book to French history. The sections on foreign affairs are symmetrically arranged into an introductory chapter "tiding the affairs of France with her four neighbors," whereas in the four other chapters are described events of the East, South, West, and North. This extremely unhistorical arrangement has been frequently criticized—but de Thou used one also. S. Rocheblave remarks that the historian and maréchal de camp has arranged historical facts for a detailed military inspection and review. E. Réaume refers to the plan as that of a carefully arranged chest with each historical article put in place. He justly asserts that d'Aubigné failed to comprehend that such an arrangement is perhaps appropriate to the natural sciences but not to historical exposition.29

Not only did d'Aubigné fail to see its unsuitability, but he took pride in this plan. The reader might peruse chapters on the East or the North if he chose. Moreover, he boasted that it brought order to historical facts which were "bien désordonnées" and made possible the elimination of an index for "discerning spirits."30


30D'Aubigné, I, pp. 17, 18.
It should be noted that the title *Histoire universelle* did not refer to a universal narrative which covered all history from the creation up to the seventeenth century. Instead d'Aubigné intended to write a comprehensive narrative for the events of the latter-half of the sixteenth century as did de Thou in his great work. Even this goal, however, was not attained by d'Aubigné and his "universal history" is essentially an account of the religious and civil wars in France.  

This highly symmetrical and a priori arrangement of historical data broke down when d'Aubigné attempted to apply it. For in addition to the aforementioned artificial devices, he also often attempted to describe all the important events in a certain province such as Languedoc or Poitou and halt his narrative at the end of the year. Thus, he "cleared the year" of 1569 for all important events in Languedoc, or he broke off his narrative of military campaigns in the same province because he had reached the end of 1572. Furthermore, he, without apparent good reason, ceased describing military events in Morocco during 1574 because events had reached the end of the year.  

This same unhistorical affectation led d'Aubigné to divide the siege of Janetz into three segments, because he considered the fighting as  

---

31 D'Aubigné, I, pp. 14, 15, justifies his pretentions to write a universal history on the grounds that such a great prince as Henry IV affected and shook his entire world. Actually d'Aubigné was probably influenced by the examples of La Popelinière's and de Thou's works.  

32 Ibid., III, pp. 152, 392; V, p. 55.
having begun in 1587 and having continued until 1589.33 Despite the fact that he drew much of his information about it from a unified narrative in the Mémoires de la Ligue, this is true.34

Therefore he violated this arbitrary arrangement occasionally. He extended his account of events in Languedoc and Huguenot negotiations in Germany outside these limits in order to carry them to a more natural conclusion. In the Netherlands he pushed forward his narrative so that it might include the Treaty of Ghent of November, 1576, which was a natural terminus. He did the same with the siege of Montaigu by the Huguenots in 1579 and 1580.35 He, however, sometimes distorted historical truth in order to force the events into his symmetrical mold. He considered the April, 1589, truce between Henry III's forces and those of Henry of Navarre as the equivalent of a peace treaty which permitted him to end his Book II of Tome III. However, the inevitable conclusion for a narrative of French history in 1589 is the assassination of Henry III on August 2, 1589. D'Aubigné continued Book II to this point on the pretense that the truce did not become effective until then.36 The abjuration of Henry IV in 1593 or his entrance into Paris the following

34 Mémoires de la Ligue, III, pp. 600-665.
35 D'Aubigné, IV, pp. 370, 371; V, p. 74; VI, p. 3. Cf. also IX, p. 227.
36 Ibid., VIII, pp. 41, 42, 90.
year are obvious dates for periodization. D'Aubigné, shackled by his plan, had to end Book III with the surrender of the first of the Leaguer governors to Henry IV. Finally, he was forced to utilize the Edict of Nantes as the peace treaty which concludes his last book in Tome III, despite the fact that it was issued four years before certain events he was narrating. 37

Thus the artificial but rigorous arrangement of facts utilized by d'Aubigné resulted not in a history that was better organized but one that was more disorganized and occasionally erroneous. Moreover, important events such as the Edict of Nantes or Henry IV's recantation were often treated inadequately, whereas a moderately important battle such as that of Roche-Abeille in 1569 or d'Aubigné's negotiations with Montmorency-Dumville in 1577 were given a disproportionate amount of space. 38

The reader has a clear, overall grasp neither of the principal developments in France from 1550 to 1600 nor of the troop movements in many of the battles and skirmishes which d'Aubigné gloried in and frequently described. 39 Of course, the very confusion

37Ibid., VIII, pp. 356, 408; IX, pp. 344, 345, 450-454.

38Ibid., III, pp. 70-75; V, 195-208. D'Aubigné ended what he called his abrégé of history with the combat at Roche-Abeille in which he participated.

in the author's narrative may give the reader a more accurate picture of a sixteenth-century battle, which was composed of several separate episodes, and of the French "wars of religion." The latter were not continuous wars and were never unified but often fought independently of the central Huguenot or Catholic leaders by local chieftains in the provinces. Also his emphasis upon siege operations is typical of the era's art of war.\(^{40}\)

The confusion in many of d'Aubigné's battle narratives is surprising since he aspired to be another Montluc and devoted the major portion of his space in the \textit{Histoire universelle} to military matters.\(^{41}\) There are innumerable military lessons included in the \textit{Histoire}, especially for \textit{jeunes capitaines}. They concern such matters as discipline, military organization, ruses used at Jametz and elsewhere, new engines of war, fortifications, and so forth.\(^{42}\) D'Aubigné mentioned at great length his own hairbreadth escapes at Limoges during 1578 in order to alert his readers to possible dangers when trying to secure the rendition of a fortified town or chateau by

\(^{40}\)J. Plattard, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 117, 118.

\(^{41}\)J. Plattard, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 110-117, attributes this confusion to d'Aubigné's omission of important topographical details and the strategy of commanders. However, he was writing for \textit{gens de guerre} of his epoch who often did not need such assistance and who understood the difficult military jargon which he purposely employed in order to give an "\textit{air de guerre}" to his narrative. Moreover, he enjoyed a high reputation with contemporary captains.

intelligence with conspirators inside. He advised besieged captains not to waste men's lives on vainglorious sorties but only on useful ones which might result in the destruction of the besiegers' artillery or trenches. In the projected fourth tome the septuagenarian veteran also described the three chefs-d'oeuvre of a captain as follows: a successful retreat in the face of powerful and valiant enemies, the throwing of relief forces into a beleaguered city, and the construction of defenses within view of a powerful enemy.

D'Aubigné's preference for military history over diplomatic or domestic political narration is obvious not only from the allotment of space in the Histoire universelle but also from frequent assertions that certain conferences were nothing but "vaines paroles." This tendency was especially true in the fourth tome but is also apparent in the earlier parts of the history. There he even spoke of the writing of military narratives as more honorable than diplomatic accounts. Thus he shared the contempt for negotiations so common to many military men; this is rather surprising considering the fact that the Huguenots always won more at the conference table than they did on the battlefield in the 1560's and 1570's.

43Ibid., V, pp. 371-380.
44D'Aubigné, Supplément, pp. 139, 140, 194.
Military engagements were also much more agreeable to d'Aubigné's pen than were ceremonials, festive entries into cities by princes, nuptials, and pomp and circumstance of any kind. In 1582 the Duke of Anjou, opponent of Philip II in the Netherlands, was greeted with great ceremony in several cities there. D'Aubigné left these details to the local historians and preferred to describe the exploits of the "gens de guerre durant ces pourménades." Likewise, he narrated a military coup by the Duke of Turenne on his wedding night to the Duchess of Bouillon rather than the marriage festivities. 46

D'Aubigné, moreover, appears to have believed that there was little or no history if peace reigned and no warlike adventures occurred. In the early 1580's he had virtually nothing to recount about Italy because the peninsula was peaceful. The same was true of Africa in the early 1590's; so the narrative about it was very brief. He refused to narrate the capitulation of a town to the royalist forces during the Huguenot rebellion of 1621 and 1622 since the town surrendered without conflict. 47

The frequent and zealous descriptions of brave actions of men and women, exalted and humble, Huguenot and Catholic, by d'Aubigné

1622 by describing military exploits, especially of humble folk, with "juvenile enthusiasm" in the supplement to the Histoire. Courteault is correct, but he ignores this emphasis throughout the work.

46 Ibid., VI, pp. 334-338; VIII, p. 346.

47 Ibid., VI, p. 300; VIII, p. 337; d'Aubigné, Supplément, pp. 71, 72.
were a corollary to his interest in military affairs. Repeatedly d'Aubigné noted a brave deed, a heroic death, or the end of a valiant career in the *Histoire universelle*. Several times he regretted that he did not know the name of a valiant soldier. Interestingly, the warrior historian differentiated between true valor and foolhardiness. He banished duels from his history because he wanted to praise only the genuinely brave men who fought for their parties or countries rather than vain individuals who fought for personal glory. During the siege of Saint Antonin by Louis XIII in 1622 six young men of the court attempted to tear down the flag of the besieged. Since they failed and received only a few blows, d'Aubigné considered this an empty feat and refused to record their names.

The obverse of d'Aubigné's praise of valor was his scorn of cowardice or treachery. However, he considered it improper for history to record many shameful acts and either omitted them or the names of the guilty persons. A gentleman who lost his courage in battle in 1574 was left anonymous especially since he fought bravely afterward. Several followers of Henry IV who fled his side during a combat against the Spanish in 1595 were graciously unnamed. Elsewhere

---

48 *D'Aubigné, III*, pp. 127, 199; *IV*, pp. 62, 73; *D'Aubigné, Supplément*, p. 275.


he was not grieved to have forgotten the name of the governor of a chateau who was corrupted by the Duke of Mercoeur in 1588.51

His sense of historical propriety also prevented d'Aubigné from printing or describing in detail the "putrid" satires disseminated by the League in 1588 or from "sullying the lips of history" with the foul lampoons which Henry III and the Archbishop of Lyons hurled at each other in the same year.52 In the preceding chapter on d'Aubigné's characterization his restraint in describing the private lives of the great is indicated.

Despite his proclivity for military history, d'Aubigné was no hardened and heartless creature whose courageous and bloody deeds had blinded him to the genuine horror of war. Occasionally in the Histoire the warrior historian displayed humanitarian sentiments especially with respect to the sufferings of the common people. He recounted how three "demoiselles" were saved from execution by his Huguenot scouts; a few days later the soldiers received from the rescued ladies some scarfs and handkerchiefs. Then he wrote, "C'est pour n'emplir pas toujours mon livre de choses horribles et dénaturées." Again he related the story of some shipwrecked sailors whose lifeboat would hold only part of the crew. Lots were drawn and one unlucky man destined to drown was saved by a brother who was

51 D'Aubigné, IV, p. 325; IX, p. 59; VII, p. 347.
52 Ibid., VII, pp. 306, 383.
thrown into the sea in his place. This brother swam six hours and was finally taken into the boat and saved. D'Aubigné accused anyone who criticized him for including this story of being bereft of humanitarian sentiment. He praised his own brother at some length when recounting his death in 1580; instead of defending this family allusion, he simply and humanly wrote, "Mais c'est un frère."53

The impartiality and veracity of d'Aubigné in the Histoire universelle have been much debated since the work first appeared. However, the historian unequivocally stated several times in his history itself and in his letters that he had attempted to be impartial and completely truthful in the Histoire. He wrote in the "Preface" to Tome I that he put nothing of his own in the work and in the conclusion he asserted, "Il m'est peu advaired d'avoir dit messonge, mais non pas d'avoir menti." Most graphically of all he wrote in the preface to his fourth tome, "When truth puts her dagger to one's throat, it is necessary to kiss her white hand even though it is stained with our Huguenots' blood."54

He asserted that he was such a lover of truth that he had refused the use of Villeroy's memoirs, for their usage entailed censorship of his work. Thus he preferred "to be deficient in some points rather than enslaved for all." Again he had refused corrections

53Ibid., V, pp. 252, 253; VII, pp. 239, 240; VI, pp. 81, 82.
54Ibid., I, p. 6; IX, p. 477; d'Aubigné, Supplément, p. 8.
from Guillaume du Vair because they threatened his literary liberty; he preferred to throw himself into the fire rather than his history. In letters to important royal officials he protested that he left all conclusions to his readers, because "The historian loses his name if he wishes to anticipate the reader's judgment." He proclaimed that he had bridled the passion formerly displayed in his highly partisan poetic works like the Tragiques. He even boasted that the word cruelty had not "escaped" from his pen when he narrated the "strange things of St. Bartholomew's Day." 56

Such extravagant claims by the fervent Huguenot are not unfounded. E. Réaume does not exaggerate in stating that no historian of the sixteenth century had a greater desire for impartiality than did d'Aubigné. 57 In the preceding chapter d'Aubigné's equitable and just characterizations have been indicated. Perhaps he was somewhat too kind to Coligny and too harsh to Henry IV, but he wrote, in general, quite justly. Other evidence from the Histoire universelle corroborates his impartiality. Early in the work he proclaimed that

55 D'Aubigné, VI, pp. 373, 374; d'Aubigné, Oeuvres complètes, I, p. 475.

56 D'Aubigné, Oeuvres complètes, I, pp. 467, 468, 471. Sylvia Shgland in her excellent The Massacre of St. Bartholomew, p. 241, writes, "D'Aubigné . . . made a great achievement in his restrained account of the massacre on which he does not even pass judgment."

he would not use derogatory names such as Papist or Huguenot but would grant to each party "un titre honorable." He wrote frankly about Coligny's role in Guise's assassination; he also noted that the admiral's troops mistreated some priests. The Huguenots as well as the Roman Catholics violated the Edict of January, granting religious toleration in 1562, and soldiers of both confessions were guilty of violence and injustices in 1577.58

D'Aubigné was partisan neither with his praise nor with his criticisms. He praised the courage of Monluc's Catholic troops. His literary and military rival, La Popelinière, was noted by d'Aubigné for his valor. He commended the honor and fidelity of the Roman Catholic troops who occupied Nérac in 1621.59 He noted that the Duke of Joyeuse was guilty of cruelty but not of perfidy at the town of Saint-Eloi in 1587. Moreover, the Huguenot victory at Coutras was not so miraculous since the forces were not extremely unequal. The Huguenots had virtually as many infantry as the Catholics but only half as many cavalry troops.60

Of course, no one can attain complete objectivity. Despite his frequent claims of not judging men and events, d'Aubigné consciously or unconsciously did. Certainly he ostentatiously refused

58D'Aubigné, I, pp. 131, 132; II, pp. 131, 140, 3; III, p. 222; IV, p. 355; V, p. 228.

59Ibid., III, p. 99; IV, p. 355; d'Aubigné, Supplément, pp. 70, 71.

60D'Aubigné, VII, pp. 121, 158.
to pass judgment upon certain negotiations between Henry of Navarre and Philip II in the early 1580's and upon a speech which Henry III made to the second Estates General of Blois. However, his choice of words and data in both instances indicated a rather unfavorable assessment of the two actions. He employed innuendo and insinuation in order to color an event, though he claimed not to interpret it, especially when he narrated both sides of a question without overtly aligning himself with either group. Thus in the dispute between the Spanish and the Portuguese concerning the throne of Portugal his sentiments seemed to be with the Portuguese. When he refused to describe the cruelties which the Spaniards inflicted upon the Mexicans, he claimed to be observing his profession of avoiding partisanship and passion, but his remarks definitely cause the reader to assess the Spaniards as bestially cruel.

Nevertheless, Baguenault de Puchesse unjustly accuses d'Aubigné of lacking both "la mesure et la vérité," although this critic grants that the Huguenot historian had the intention of being impartial. Likewise, H. Hauser deplores d'Aubigné's fearful lack of

---

61 Ibid., VI, p. 288, VII, p. 320.

62 Ibid., IX, 404-412; I, p. 115. E. Réaume, "Notice biographique et littéraire," p. 177, states with justice that d'Aubigné like Tacitus excelled in reporting rumors and opinions and insinuating his own judgments among them.

D'Aubigné admired Tacitus and even referred to him as "mon maistre Tacite." Cf. d'Aubigné, VII, pp. 4, 40; IX, p. 133.
veracity, but he earlier had praised d'Aubigné's impartiality.  

Both critics have overlooked d'Aubigné's statement that he might have lied, that is erred, in his history, but he was not a liar, and they have not distinguished between accuracy and truthfulness. A truthful man may be in error as d'Aubigné was numerous times.

No doubt can be cast upon d'Aubigné's zeal to be accurate as well as unbiased and truthful. His accuracy, however, was much inferior to his impartiality. Certainly he corrected mistakes made by other historians and rectified his own. In the Histoire universelle are passages where d'Aubigné recorded the correct names of a town in Languedoc that armed in late 1572, of a chateau that was captured in the same year, of the author of some "bien chantez et mal composez" poetry, which entertained the French court in 1573. In certain of these corrections he sought to right an injustice done by other historians. In 1569 the town of Coué was burned accidentally and not from vengeance during a siege. The execution of the Count of Montgomery, who had been responsible for Henry II's death, after his capture at Domfront in 1574, was not treachery regardless of what others had written. "There are too many perfidious actions in France," wrote d'Aubigné, "without inventing them."

---


64d'Aubigné, III, p. 389; IV, pp. 52, 178.

65Ibid., III, p. 101; IV, p. 247.
Several of his criticisms and corrections of his historiographical predecessor were based upon personal observations. The above reference to the name of the court poet was one, or his criticism of the historians who portrayed Henry IV as orating at great length before the battle of Ivry was another. The succinct and vigorous words, which d'Aubigné attributed to Henry IV, are those recorded by a participant in the Ivry encounter. Likewise, he corrected, from first-hand information, those who attributed a lengthy speech to Henry III during his dying hours.66

He corrected the errors in earlier books of his history as he proceeded to the conclusion, and naturally he utilized the second edition of the Histoire universelle for this purpose.67 He told a correspondent in 1626 that he was augmenting and correcting his history for the second edition, which he hoped would be better than the edition which was printed in the "Desert."68 In this latter edition he rectified, "after much trouble and research," errors which both he and other historians had made concerning Protestant troop movements after their defeat at Moncontour.69 Undoubtedly many of d'Aubigné's details as well as his succinct and sparkling generalizations are

66Ibid., VIII, pp. 189, 78.  67Ibid., VIII, p. 311.
accurate. The value of his concise characterizations was indicated in the previous chapter. There are many graphic and valid phrases such as this about the Peace of Monsieur (1576), which he called "la paix la plus spécieuse et la moins utile aux réformés." 70

Nevertheless, d'Aubigné's lack of historical accuracy is deplorable. The Histoire universelle is replete with confused chronology, erroneous nomenclature, and superficial analyses. To corroborate the valid portions and uncover the mistakes would be the work of a lifetime, but in the footnotes to Chapters III through VI above various errors are pointed out. D'Aubigné's chronology is frequently unreliable. For example, during the reign of François II he recorded incorrectly the dates for the movement of the royal court to Amboise during the conspiracy, for the death of the Vidame de Chartres, for the promotion of François, Duke of Guise, to the lieutenant generalship of the kingdom, and for the publication of the Vindiciae contra tyrannos. 71 He recorded the wrong day for the dispatching of letters to the provinces during the St. Bartholomew massacre. 72 In describing the events of 1588 he erroneously specified the death of the Cardinal

70Ibid., V, p. 26. Cf. this description with the similar one in J. H. Marijol's La Réforme et la Ligue, p. 175.

71Cf. chap. iii above, p. 62, fn. 29; p. 70, fn. 43; p. 74, fn. 49; p. 78, fn. 56. D'Aubigné, V, p. 190, referred to the Vindiciae again but dated it as appearing in 1573 rather than 1579 and gave it an incorrect title.

72Cf. chap. iv above, p. 117, fn. 58.
of Guise as two days rather than one day after the assassination of
the Duke of Guise. He even confused the date for the origin of a
Huguenot plan to seize the mouth of the Loire in which he played a
prominent role.73 Numerous errors in details can be culled from the
Histoire universelle. During his account of 1572 he attributed the
death of the Queen of Navarre, Henry's mother, to poison, which few
contemporary and no modern historians do. His descriptions of the
mid-night conference and the sounding of the tocsin in preparation for
the St. Bartholomew tragedy were partially erroneous.74 Several
events are incorrect in his accounts for the years 1588 and 1589 of
the rebellion against the Duke of Epernon in Angoulême, the day of
the barricades in Paris, the assassination of the Duke of Guise, and
the death of Jacques Clément, the assassin of Henry III.75

Unfortunately, d'Aubigné's historical blunders extended
also to the analysis of causes and effects. The origin and growth
of the Catholic League in 1576 is interpreted in a superficial
fashion. He overlooked the more basic reasons for Henry III's reluc­
tant promotion of the League and attributed it merely to the king's
desire to please the Catholic clergy. D'Aubigné confused greatly his

73 Cf. chap. vi above, p. 179, fn. 18; p. 207, fn. 57.
75 Cf. chap. vi above, p. 190, fn. 35; p. 204, fn. 52; p. 175,
fn. 15; p. 222, fn. 73.
account of the sessions of the first Estates General of Blois and why their bellicosity was transformed into more pacific sentiments.\(^7\)\(^6\)

Likewise, his interpretations for the years 1588 and 1689 are often superficial, silly, or incorrect. He completely misunderstood why Henry III dismissed his old and seasoned ministers after the day of the barricades, and he failed to understand that the Duke of Guise was the servant as well as the master of the Paris mob.\(^7\)\(^7\)

He inadequately described the Huguenot assembly at La Rochelle and its constructive results. Surprisingly, he misinterpreted the strategic reasons for the failure of the Huguenots' "grand design" to conquer control of the mouth of the Loire. His analysis of the motives for Jacques Clément's deed was not only puerile and ridiculous, but he overlooked the principal factor, which was the religious exaltation and fanaticism of the Parisian populace after the murder of the Duke of Guise.\(^7\)\(^8\)

D'Aubigné, moreover, often could not plagiarise or summarize other histories accurately. He, like most of his contemporary historians, was guilty of plagiarism, but he occasionally copied incorrectly and included irrelevant material or excluded an important passage.\(^7\)\(^9\)

\(^7\)\(^6\)Cf. chap. v above, p. 134, fn. 6; p. 137, fn. 11; p. 144, fn. 27; p. 163, fn. 58.

\(^7\)\(^7\)Cf. chap. vi above, p. 173, fn. 12; p. 202, fn. 51.

\(^7\)\(^8\)Cf. chap. vi above, p. 209, fn. 60; p. 212, fn. 65; p. 220, fn. 72.

\(^7\)\(^9\)Cf. chap. v above, pp. 139-142, 146, 152; chap. vi above, p. 200, fn. 48.
If the text which he was summarizing was somewhat obscure, d'Aubigné occasionally misunderstood it and narrated events incorrectly. For example, he confused, although copying de Thou, the missions of the princes of the royal blood who were dispatched to the Netherlands at the beginning of François II's reign. When following La Popelinière, he distorted the oratorical efforts of Versoris before the Estates General in 1576.  

Therefore the harsh criticisms of the *Histoire universelle* by Henri Hauser seem to be, in large part, justified. Hauser asserts that d'Aubigné painted grand tableaux rather than analyzing history and that this led him to falsify developments. The above analysis corroborates Hauser's statement about the early chapters of the *Histoire* and d'Aubigné's use of Jean Crespin's *Histoire des martyrs.* "D'Aubigné worked very rapidly," writes Hauser; "he was content to throw the mantle of his style over notes taken carelessly (à le diable)."  

The literary brilliance of the *Histoire universelle*, considered by some critics to be its only merit, must be mentioned.

---

80 Cf. chap. iii above, p. 53, fn. 13; chap. v above, p. 147. A Garnier, in his exhaustive biography, *Agrippa d'Aubigné*, was led inevitably to criticize the reliability of many portions of the *Histoire universelle*. Hence, he often has pointed out d'Aubigné's historiographical faults. Cf. Garnier, *op. cit.*., I, pp. 127, 158, 165, 322, etc.

81 *Les Sources de l'histoire de France*, III, pp. 75, 76. P. Courteault, *Blaise de Monlu; historien*, p. 61, asserts that d'Aubigné utilized Monlu's *Commentaires*, when he did not obtain their data from de Thou's history, in the same hasty, heedless fashion.
D'Aubigné did have great ability to portray a situation, a scene, or an individual with a few striking, evocative words. Rocheblave has described him as "un écrivain-né." However, the literary quality of the Histoire varies, and it is not all of high merit. Some passages, like the assessment of the Peace of Monsieur quoted above, are unforgettable for their imagery, their trenchant phrases, or their lucid, concise descriptions. A truce was "bien faite, bien signée et mal gardée," or a king, attacked by his enemies, was "misérable entre les mains du peuple sans force et de grands sans coeur et sans foi."

Elsewhere d'Aubigné summed up the "tragedy of Blois" when he wrote, "Le duc de Guise, absous des offenses passées, fut condamnée à mort pour les crimes à venir."82 D'Aubigné especially wanted to write prose with the "air de soldat" for this history of the French "wars of religion," so he compressed his language and wrote as concisely and succinctly as possible. However, this extreme concision sometimes resulted in incomprehensible passages such as his description, which is cited above, of Versoris' speech to the Estates General of 1576.83


83 Also cf. d'Aubigné, III, p. 150; VIII, p. 80. Excellent evaluations of d'Aubigné's historical prose can be found in the works of J. Plattard, op. cit., pp. 107, 108; S. Rocheblave, Agrippa d'Aubigné (Paris, 1910), pp. 195-201; B. Bates, Literary Portraiture in the Historical Narrative of the French Renaissance (New York, 1946), pp. 26-30. G. Elferbroek in his Observations sur la langue de l'Histoire universelle . . . , p. 18, indicates the orthographical vagaries (of which there are many) in the Histoire and asserts that it is impossible to ascertain whether the author or printer was responsible for them.
In conclusion d'Aubigné's predilection for witchcraft, prognostication of the future, and supernatural prodigies of various sorts, as well as his philosophy of history, must be alluded to since they inevitably intruded into his history. He continually declared that supernatural events (bigottries) should be excluded from serious historical works, and with the next pen-stroke he described some supernatural event.84 His correspondence with Louis XIII's "first physician" undeniably proves that d'Aubigné believed in witchcraft and the possibility of some persons foretelling the future but that he rejected magic.85 In the Histoire universelle, despite his contention that history is denuded of its veracity if filled with miracles, he reported as an incident "non pareil" that the Loire River was reduced in depth for the duration of a four-hour crossing by some Huguenot troops in 1568. For the edification of physicians he recorded how the plague in the form of a red hat-shaped cloud hovered over a disease-stricken town, and he testified that he received three severe blows as a supernatural warning of his absent brother's death.86 Occasionally he criticized a prodigy in a somewhat naturalistic manner, but if the evidence was convincing enough it was included

84 For such instances cf. d'Aubigné, V, p. 244; VII, pp. 124, 125.
86 D'Aubigné, II, p. 177; III, p. 21; VII, pp. 20, 21; VI, pp. 78, 79.
in the Histoire. D'Aubigné had little of our modern world's rationalism.  

D'Aubigné's philosophy or theology of history has been described as that of a Protestant Bossuet. His work was merely a part of the stream of Christian-inspired historiography which ran from Augustine through Joachim of Floris to the Reformation era and finally culminated in the historical works of Louis XIV's preacher. D'Aubigné's belief in the providential direction of history is apparent from his correspondence, his shorter writings, and the Histoire universelle. He believed that only divine protection and guidance prevented the destruction of Protestantism. Nevertheless, his ardent and confident trust in God's assistance rarely intruded blatantly into the text of the Histoire. In his prefaces and appendices, which he considered to be free from the "laws" of impartiality and non-judgment, he proclaimed God's aid of the Huguenots and Henry of Navarre or asserted that "les batailles soient les arrests du ciel, qui changent l'estre des grands affaires . . . ." Statements that heaven had ordained the fate of the Bourbons in 1560, that God


89 D'Aubigné, Oeuvres complètes, II, pp. 4-7; d'Aubigné, I, p. 12; III, p. 271.

90 Cf. d'Aubigné, VI, pp. 368, 369, for his opinion of the freedom he enjoyed there, and d'Aubigné, I, p. 3, for the quotation.
had punished d'Aubigné for his folly or had assisted Henry of Navarre, that the scourges which befell western France in 1585 were divine acts, or that God had punished some sodomists with death are extremely infrequent in d'Aubigné's narrative. He occasionally remarked that, "Dieu aidant," he hoped to complete his history, but the Histoire universelle is not studded with theological allusions and explanations in spite of d'Aubigné's fervent Protestantism.

CONCLUSION: AN EVALUATION OF THE HISTOIRE UNIVERSELE

A historian who was occasionally guilty of plagiarism and frequently of errors in detail and interpretation, who was credulous and superstitious, who believed in the providential direction of history and the moral purpose of historiography, and who was an ardent fighter and apologist for his coreligionists: all these comments are applicable to Agrippa d'Aubigné. However, the status of historiography during the sixteenth century should be remembered when assessing the merits of this Huguenot historian.

Our twentieth-century scorn of the plagiarist was non-existent; plagiarism was a means of securing a more exact narrative. For example, the compiler of the Histoire ecclésiastique plagiarized the histories of La Planche, La Place, and Jean Crespin, to mention only three. Crespin copied part of his Histoire des martyrs from de La Roche Chandieu's records of the persecutions suffered by the Huguenot congregation in Paris.1 La Popelinière copied from La Planche, La Place, Jean Bodin, and surely various others. Etienne Pasquier, the historian of French institutions, borrowed from his predecessors without acknowledgement.2 The renowned compiler of

---


journals and memoirs, Pierre L'Estoile, plagiarized copiously a work by du Plessis-Mornay. Moreover, L'Estoile falsified portions of Mornay's work in order to make the account more anecdotal and piquant.\(^3\) L. Romier asserts that the accounts given by La Planche, La Place, the compiler of the Histoire ecclésiastique, de Thou, and d'Aubigné for the conspiracy of Amboise are so similar that they actually comprise only one source.\(^4\)

Naturalistic accounts of history, aside from those of a Guicciardini or a Machiavelli, hardly existed. In northern Europe the role of providence was important in virtually all historical works.\(^5\) Pasquier's explanation of great historical events was often valueless to the modern reader because he attributed them to "the anger of God or the admirable secrets of his omnipotence."\(^6\)

---


4L. Romier, La Conjuration d'Amboise, p. 49.

5L. Febvre in his Le Problème de l'inocroyance au XVI\(^{\text{e}}\) siècle (Paris, 1947), stresses the providential character of sixteenth-century thought. He writes (p. 500), "De par la volonté de ses meilleurs représentants il fut... un siècle inspiré. Un siècle qui sur toutes choses cherchait, d'abord, un reflet du divin."

6Bouteiller, loc. cit., p. 387.
Huguenot apology like the Petit traité des guerres civiles ... is replete with references to the divine direction of history.

Innumerable references to God's direct manipulation of events are found in the more sophisticated history of La Planche. Even de Thou's magisterial work has been reckoned as inferior to those of Machiavelli and Guicciardini largely because "he defended the providential theory of history."*

The moralistic and apologetic element was prominent in the works of Pasquier, de Thou, de Serres, and their colleagues.® Pierre Droit de Gaillard, who published a treatise on historiography in 1579, considered the inculcation of morality as the chief end of history.® Credulity concerning prodigies and sorcery was widespread and shared by Jean Bodin, who was perhaps the greatest "social scientist" and writer on historical methodology of the age.® Scientific

---


®J. Brown, op. cit., p. 170.

methodology for the composition of historical works had reached only a rudimentary level. Even the famous work of de Thou was merely a pot-pourri of historical accounts of other mixed with documents accessible to him and compiled according to the sentiments of a politique.\textsuperscript{12} Viewed in comparison with the contributions of his contemporaries, d'Aubigné's Histoire universelle, his grand œuvre if not his chef-d'œuvre, can be evaluated more accurately. It also must be judged more leniently than in the past. One severe critic declares that particularly "proportion and truthfulness" are lacking in the Histoire. D'Aubigné, he asserts, must be ranked with the other mediocre historians of the era such as Du Halil, La Popelinière, and Matthieu and cannot be compared with de Thou. Only the "power, the originality, the real beauty of his style" make d'Aubigné's history noteworthy.\textsuperscript{13} A careful student of d'Aubigné's literary and historical works is hardly more generous. To the "gentleman" (honnest homme) of today only d'Aubigné's literary merits, his evocative portrayals of certain men and situations, and his military anecdotes are of interest.\textsuperscript{14} Even an author who writes of d'Aubigné's genius finds

\textsuperscript{12}L. Bomier, Le Royaume de Catherine de Médicis, I, xxxii, xxxiii. Cf. also G. Monod, loc. cit., pp. 10-14, for the inadequacies of sixteenth-century French historiography.

\textsuperscript{13}G. Baguenault de Puchesse, "Preface" to d'Aubigné's Histoire universelle, X, iii, iv.

\textsuperscript{14}J. Plattard, op. cit., pp. 125, 126.
little of value other than its stylistic brilliance and some psychological penetration in the Histoire.\textsuperscript{15}

In rebuttal d'Aubigné's defenders exalt his history, and Rocheblave writes, "But if de Thou is the first historical genius of the century d'Aubigné is assuredly the second."\textsuperscript{16} E. Réaume praises him as, "despite undeniable borrowings, the most original historian of the sixteenth century."\textsuperscript{17} Certainly such eulogies are questionable if all sixteenth-century historical work is considered, but if he is compared with only French historians they are somewhat defensible. D'Aubigné was probably superior to all his French rivals except de Thou on virtually all the points mentioned at the beginning of this "Conclusion," and it may be asserted that his striving for impartiality was unsurpassed. Furthermore, d'Aubigné's originality in Tome III of the Histoire excels that of de Thou when the latter's patchwork method of composition is considered. Most of d'Aubigné's Tomes I and II seem to be mere summaries, often disorganized, of other histories, but the last tome is largely based upon his personal experience. D'Aubigné, as Fuster says of de Thou, made no significant contribution to historiography because his work possesses no philosophical foundation other than the providential interpretation of

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{15}P. Grosclaude, loc. cit., p. 84.
\textsuperscript{16}S. Rocheblave, Agrippa d'Aubigné (1950), pp. 234, 235.
\textsuperscript{17}E. Réaume, "Notice biographique et littéraire," p. 152.
\end{flushright}
history. Moreover, the Huguenot's Histoire lacks unity and a penetrating analysis of events and their relationships.\textsuperscript{18}

A. Garnier's description of the Histoire universelle as "an imposing work and a document of the first order for the history of Protestantism and sometimes for general history" seems most appropriate if qualified to apply to Tome III and part of Tome II.\textsuperscript{19}

D'Aubigné's history is primarily of interest to professional historians today, but even to them almost all of Tome I, large parts of Tome II, and even portions of Tome III are useless. Certainly his chapters on foreign affairs are of no value, and much of his material on French history is of dubious worth. Nevertheless, his characterizations of the great and lesser figures of the era like Henry IV, Catherine de Medici, Henry III, Henry of Guise, François de la Noue, and others whom he knew personally are invaluable. His narration of events at the courts of France and Navarre is unimpeachable and irreplaceable. Finally, his descriptions of military affairs, although often confused and boresome because of their quantity and details, are precious portrayals of certain campaigns, battles, and the military life of the age.

\textsuperscript{18}E. Fueter, loc. cit.; Fueter's criticisms of de Thou are even more applicable to d'Aubigné.

\textsuperscript{19}Letter of A. Garnier to P. Grosclaude cited in P. Grosclaude, loc. cit., p. 70.
APPENDIX I

TOPICAL CHART FOR D'AUBIGNE'S DESCRIPTION

OF THE REIGN OF FRANCIS II*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>d'Aubigné</th>
<th>de Thou</th>
<th>La Planche</th>
<th>La Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salutation of François II as king</td>
<td>239,240</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antoine de Navarre's actions</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine allies herself with Guise</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane de Poitiers humbled</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>373,374</td>
<td>204,205</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olivier called to Chancellorship</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude of nobility and people</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parlement of Paris submits</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacillation of Antoine of Navarre</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>212,213</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constable leaves Court</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removal of Condé and Roche sur Yon</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>207,208</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrival &amp; departure of Antoine of Navarre</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>380,382</td>
<td>214,215</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In this chart events described by d'Aubigné have been listed in the left-hand column. The pages on which they are discussed by him, by de Thou, by La Planche, and by La Place have been given opposite the events. A zero means that incident was not discussed by a historian. The citation of a page from the works of La Planche, La Place, or de Thou does not necessarily mean that these writers gave precisely the same or all the information that can be found in d'Aubigné's work. The citation merely indicates that the event was mentioned by them.
TOPICAL CHART FOR REIGN OF FRANCIS II (contd.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>d'Aubigné</th>
<th>de Thou</th>
<th>La Planche</th>
<th>La Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constable resigns a position</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation of 18 new Chevaliers de l'Ordre</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>217,218</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alleged Huguenot debauches</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>220,224</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawyer and his family arrested</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamphlet controversy</td>
<td>250,251</td>
<td>387-396</td>
<td>229-231</td>
<td>23-32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Edict&quot; to remove soldiers from Court</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>397,398</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine's late menstrual period</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Du Bourg's imprisonment</td>
<td>252,253</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>209,210</td>
<td>20,21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Du Bourg's execution</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fate of Other Parlementarians</td>
<td>253,254</td>
<td>402-404</td>
<td>242-245</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assassination of Minard</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>233,235</td>
<td>23,24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alleged plot to fire Paris</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public shrines as traps for Huguenots</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>405,406</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Vindiciae contra Tyrannos&quot;</td>
<td>256,257</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condé heads conspiracy of Amboise</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>468*</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renaudie's speech at Nantes</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>470-479</td>
<td>238,239</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Between pages 406 and 468 of Volume III, de Thou discussed foreign affairs.
TOPOICAL CHART FOR REIGN OF FRANCIS II (contd.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>d'Aubigné</th>
<th>de Thou</th>
<th>La Planché</th>
<th>La Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assignment of Conspirators</td>
<td>260,261</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revelations by Avensilles</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>480-482</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mild edict to appease tumult</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revelations by de Lignières</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capture of Castelnau</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>486,487</td>
<td>250-252</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guise made Lieutenant General</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>252-253</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death of Renaudie</td>
<td>267,268</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confessions by Bigne, Rauné, and Masères</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>254,255</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrogation of Castelnau</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>263-265</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Execution of Castelnau and Villemongey</td>
<td>269,270</td>
<td>493,494</td>
<td>265,263</td>
<td>34,35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal letters dispatched</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>501-503</td>
<td>271-273</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condé suspected</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>495,496</td>
<td>267-269</td>
<td>35,36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death of Olivier (L'Hôpital made Chano)</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L'Hôpital a conspirator at Amboise</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constable's speech to Parliament of Paris</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>500,501</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coligny sent to Normandy</td>
<td>273,274</td>
<td>503,504</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event</td>
<td>d'Aubigné</td>
<td>de Thou</td>
<td>La Planche</td>
<td>La Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edict of Bomorantin</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>504,505</td>
<td>305,306</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escape of Huguenot Prisoners</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Origin of name &quot;Huguenot&quot;</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal court at Tours</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>507-509</td>
<td>296-298</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine and de La Roche Chandieu</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Théophile</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>510-512</td>
<td>299-302</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Tigre</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>312,313</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flight of Condé</td>
<td>276,277</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>276,314,315</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Planche visits the queen</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>514-518</td>
<td>315-318</td>
<td>41-45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L'Hôpital speaks to Parliament of Paris</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>518-523</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>47-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constable's retinue at Fontainebleau</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coligny's petition</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>526,527</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speeches at Fontainebleau Assembly</td>
<td>278,279</td>
<td>527-534</td>
<td>351-363</td>
<td>53-68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results of Fontainebleau Assembly</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capture of La Sague</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>536,537</td>
<td>345,346</td>
<td>68,69,71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bourbons wooed by Court</td>
<td>281,282</td>
<td>540,541</td>
<td>373-375</td>
<td>69-71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bourbons delay arrival at court</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>541,542</td>
<td>374,375</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event Description</td>
<td>d'Aubigné</td>
<td>de Thou</td>
<td>La Planche</td>
<td>La Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huguenot audacity in Dauphiny</td>
<td>283,284</td>
<td>543-545</td>
<td>284-286</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maugiron captures Valence</td>
<td>284,285</td>
<td>545-546</td>
<td>287-289</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truce between Monbrun and Gondrin</td>
<td>286,287</td>
<td>551-553</td>
<td>342,343</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escape of Monbrun</td>
<td>287,288</td>
<td>553,554</td>
<td>370-372</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouvans in Provence</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>554-558</td>
<td>289-294</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huguenot boldness in Normandy</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>558,559</td>
<td>294-296</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movement of court to Orléans</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>377,378</td>
<td>71,73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death of Archbishop of Vienne</td>
<td>290,291</td>
<td>561-563</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>71,72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparations at Orléans</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>564,565</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>73,74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warnings to Bourbons</td>
<td>291,292</td>
<td>565-567</td>
<td>376,377</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reception of Bourbons at Orléans</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>567,568</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imprisonment and Supervision of Bourbons</td>
<td>293,294</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>380,381</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrest of Groslot</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrogation of Condé</td>
<td>294,295</td>
<td>569,570</td>
<td>400,401</td>
<td>74,75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antoine's danger</td>
<td>295,296</td>
<td>570,571</td>
<td>404-406</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine's fear</td>
<td>296,297</td>
<td>571,572</td>
<td>414,415</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illness of king</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>411,413</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event</td>
<td>d’Aubigné</td>
<td>de Thou</td>
<td>La Planche</td>
<td>La Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guise advises Catherine to kill Antoine</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>573,574</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice from l’Hôpital to Catherine</td>
<td>297,298</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constable’s trip to Orléans</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>575,577</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death of Vidame de Chartres</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death of Francis II</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condé released</td>
<td>299,300</td>
<td>575,577</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event</td>
<td>d'Aubigné</td>
<td>de Thou</td>
<td>Mémoires sous Chas. IX</td>
<td>Popelinière</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditions in France in 1570</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal envoys to La Rochelle</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>33r</td>
<td>5r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant complaints &amp; Cosse's reply</td>
<td>274, 275</td>
<td>261-265</td>
<td>33-40</td>
<td>5v-8v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troubles in Rouen &amp; Dieppe</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>265, 266</td>
<td>60r, 61v</td>
<td>5r, 7v, 8r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troubles at Orange</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>40-45</td>
<td>8r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal speech to Parlement of Paris</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>269-271</td>
<td>55-57r</td>
<td>9v-10v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment of reltres</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>267, 268</td>
<td>61r</td>
<td>8r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gastines' cross</td>
<td>277-279</td>
<td>272, 273</td>
<td>85v-88r</td>
<td>10v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navarre's marriage at La Rochelle</td>
<td>279, 280</td>
<td>274, 275</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other marriages &amp; death of Card. of Châtillon</td>
<td>280, 281</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>49v, 50r</td>
<td>12v, 12r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70v</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assassination of Lignerolles</td>
<td>281, 282</td>
<td>276, 277</td>
<td>47v, 48r</td>
<td>12v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>62, 65r</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrival of Coligny at court</td>
<td>282-284</td>
<td>278-280</td>
<td>72v, 73</td>
<td>20v, 21r</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This chart is precisely like the preceding one in Appendix I. The citations from La Popelinière's history and from the Mémoires sous Charles IX refer to folios rather than pages, and *r* and *v* refer, of course, to recto and verso.
### TOPOICAL CHART FOR ST. BARTHOLOMEW MASSACRE (contd.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>d’Aubigné</th>
<th>de Thou</th>
<th>Mémoires sous Chas. IX</th>
<th>Popelinière</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coligny recalled to court</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>84v,85r</td>
<td>44r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No favor refused Coligny by king</td>
<td>284,285</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>74r</td>
<td>44r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flight of Charlotte of Bourbon</td>
<td>285,286</td>
<td>329,330</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans to kill Protestants</td>
<td>286,287</td>
<td>327,328</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandrini at Court</td>
<td>287,288</td>
<td>331-334</td>
<td>207r,217r</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen of Navarre at Paris</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>108,206v,222v,245v</td>
<td>11v,12r,42v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English alliance</td>
<td>288,289</td>
<td>334-339</td>
<td>108v,221r</td>
<td>40v,41r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Rochelle warns Coligny</td>
<td>289,290</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>251v-253r</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death of Queen of Navarre</td>
<td>290-292</td>
<td>340-342</td>
<td>222r,232v</td>
<td>42v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capture of Mons &amp; results</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>220-240</td>
<td>51r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coligny’s memorandum</td>
<td>292-294</td>
<td>343-357</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44r,47r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characterization of Morvilliers</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morvillier’s report</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>359-370</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defeat of Genlis &amp; Coligny at Paris</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>242v,248v</td>
<td>55v,44r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precautions taken in Paris</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>371,372</td>
<td>244v,245r</td>
<td>44r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warnings to Coligny</td>
<td>297-299</td>
<td>372-374</td>
<td>263v-255</td>
<td>58v-62v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event Description</td>
<td>d'Aubigné</td>
<td>de Thou</td>
<td>Mémoires sous Chas. IX</td>
<td>Popelinière</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reply of Coligny</td>
<td>299,300</td>
<td>374,375</td>
<td>256,257r</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warnings to &amp; replies of Condé &amp; Navarre</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage of Condé &amp; Princes go to Paris</td>
<td>300,301</td>
<td>375,376</td>
<td>245v,242r</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion of betrothal</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>376,377</td>
<td>247v,248r</td>
<td>65r,65v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversation of king &amp; Coligny about war</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wedding of Navarre &amp; Marguerite</td>
<td>502,303</td>
<td>377,378</td>
<td>262,263</td>
<td>65v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Festivities following the wedding</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>378,379</td>
<td>263v,268v</td>
<td>65v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montmorency leaves Paris &amp; results</td>
<td>303,304</td>
<td>379,380</td>
<td>270v</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan to kill Coligny</td>
<td>304,305</td>
<td>381-383</td>
<td>265-268r</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wounding of Coligny</td>
<td>305,306</td>
<td>385,384</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>64r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News brought to king; reaction of Guise</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>272r</td>
<td>64r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment of Coligny</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>272-274r</td>
<td>64r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navarre &amp; Condé ask permission to leave</td>
<td>307,308</td>
<td>385,386</td>
<td>274v,275r</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigation of attack</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>272r,275r</td>
<td>64r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King's visit to Coligny</td>
<td>309-311</td>
<td>387-390</td>
<td>276r</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council of Protestant nobles</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>390,391</td>
<td>279v,280r</td>
<td>64v,65r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event/Comment</td>
<td>d'Aubigné</td>
<td>de Thou</td>
<td>Mémoires sous Chas. IX</td>
<td>Popelinière</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic conference before massacre</td>
<td>311,312</td>
<td>392,393</td>
<td>280v,281r,283v</td>
<td>65r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irritation of Guise</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Téligny stifles Protestants' suspicions</td>
<td>312,313</td>
<td>394,395</td>
<td>283v,284r</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guise directs final preparations</td>
<td>313,314</td>
<td>395,396</td>
<td>284v,285r</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen stiffens king's will</td>
<td>314,315</td>
<td>396,397</td>
<td>285v,286r,399</td>
<td>65r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murder of admiral</td>
<td>315-317</td>
<td>397-399</td>
<td>286v-289r</td>
<td>65r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abuse of Coligny's corpse</td>
<td>317-319</td>
<td>399,400</td>
<td>289v,290r</td>
<td>67r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epitaph &amp; praise of admiral</td>
<td>319-321</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaths of Rochefoucaud &amp; Téligny</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>292v,293r</td>
<td>65v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaths of Protestant nobles</td>
<td>322,323</td>
<td>401-404</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of other murders</td>
<td>324,325</td>
<td>404,405</td>
<td>290v,291r,299v</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King pardons four Huguenots</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>292r</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navarre &amp; Condé required to recant</td>
<td>325,326</td>
<td>405-407</td>
<td>291,292r</td>
<td>67r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestants in suburb saved</td>
<td>327,328</td>
<td>407,408</td>
<td>294,295</td>
<td>66r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fates of Cavagnes &amp; Briquemaut</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General description of horrors</td>
<td>328,329</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>66r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event</td>
<td>d'Aubigné</td>
<td>de Thou</td>
<td>Mémoires sous Chas. IX</td>
<td>Popelinière</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other murders</td>
<td>329,330</td>
<td>409,410</td>
<td>303,310r</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crucé (or Croiset) &amp; his murders</td>
<td>330,331</td>
<td>410,411</td>
<td>315v, 314v</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escapes of Cossé &amp; Biron</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>314v</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biron saves La Force boy</td>
<td>331,332</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More murders; Guises save some</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>411,412</td>
<td>315v</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King blames Guises for massacre</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>296-299</td>
<td>67v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murder of La Place</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>415,416</td>
<td>300-303</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A hawthorn blooms</td>
<td>334,335</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>316v</td>
<td>67v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Châtillon children seized</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>317v</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of dead</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>413,414</td>
<td>395v</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massacre of various children</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>315v</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massacres in Valée de Misère</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escape of Merlin &amp; Certon</td>
<td>337,338</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escape of Resnier</td>
<td>338,339</td>
<td>412,413</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valor of Taverny</td>
<td>339,340</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>306v, 306r</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King publicly assumes responsibility</td>
<td>340,341</td>
<td>417,418</td>
<td>316,317</td>
<td>67v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lit de Justice</td>
<td>341,342</td>
<td>418-420</td>
<td>318,319, 320</td>
<td>67v</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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