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Pierre de L'Estoile (1546-1611) kept an extraordinary diary and collection in Paris during the Wars of Religion, recording everything from high-political scandals to low-life criminality during this crucial turning point in early modern history. The first extensive study of L'Estoile in any language, this thesis demonstrates how he negotiated and commemorated the conflicts that divided France as he engaged creatively with the rumours, ephemeral prints, poems, pictures, and books that he assembled in his diary and cabinet. It argues that the story of his life and times is the history of the civil wars in the making. While historians and literary scholars depend on L'Estoile’s diaries as an essential source of information, citing him as a mere passive observer, this thesis instead explores his subjectivity and interprets a wide range of hitherto unseen or neglected manuscript evidence that situates him in the Parisian society of royal office holders and demonstrates his significance in the republic of letters. It follows a microhistorical approach to L'Estoile and his world in order to challenge established interpretations of his sources as evidence of a widespread mentality of eschatological anxiety in sixteenth-century France, instead focusing on L'Estoile’s personal responses to pieces in his collection. In this way, it critiques a common trend in cultural history to roam freely among ‘collective representations’ and argues for the importance of a precise analysis of social context, materiality, and individual subjectivity in reception studies.
Second Abstract

Pierre de L'Estoile (1546-1611) was an extraordinary diarist and collector. This thesis explores his world in Paris during the Wars of Religion. It focuses on the circulation and reception of books, pictures, and news in his milieu, and provides the first extensive study of the unique records he kept throughout his life. Historians depend on L'Estoile’s diaries as an essential source of information about Parisian life and the civil wars, but this thesis considers all of his known manuscripts and makes many new discoveries that situate him in the Parisian society of royal office-holders and demonstrates his significance in the republic of letters. In the study and cabinet of his home in the Left Bank parish of Saint André des Arts, L'Estoile amassed manuscripts, books, printed ephemera, pictures, and art objects concerning the history of his life and times; a store of cultural capital that attracted visits from friends and family, as well as collectors from across Europe. Because his beliefs positioned him in the religious middle ground – explaining that ‘even if the Catholic Church is a whore (as the Protestants have it) nevertheless she is my mother’ – he claimed a critical understanding of the extremes of both confessions. And because of his contacts in the Parisian print trade and the high court of the Parlement of Paris, he had unparalleled access to information about current events. The story of his life and collecting is the history of the civil wars in the making.

The method of this thesis is to approach L'Estoile as a microhistorian’s ‘normal exception’, a rare case that reveals aspects of common practice in a culture that are otherwise hidden from the historian’s view. It explores L'Estoile’s responses to his social, cultural, political, and intellectual contexts, since an individual does not live in these fields as separate categories, and his minutely recorded subjective experience can give insight into them all. By focusing on the problem of reception in L'Estoile’s manuscripts and cabinet, this thesis seeks
to make an innovative contribution to social and cultural history. It challenges established interpretations of these sources as evidence of ‘collective representations’, or the shared symbols that hold a culture together. It emphasises instead L'Estoile's personal responses to pieces in his collection, asserting the combined importance of social context, materiality, and individual subjectivity in reception studies.

This argument builds throughout the six chapters of this thesis, divided into two parts. Part One addresses key themes that set L'Estoile in context. Chapter One situates his collection in the material culture of his home, comparing his after-death household inventory with a sample of thirty-nine inventories of his colleagues among the office-holders in the Parlement of Paris and the college of Royal Secretaries, in order to determine how exceptional he was in his milieu, and what choices he made in accumulating pieces in his home and cabinet. It explores how L'Estoile and his family engaged with and appeared to contemporaries and how they inhabited their world. L'Estoile’s home stands out in this context for the religious pictures on display, as he shunned the devotional images of his colleagues, while his wardrobe was the barest and shabbiest in the entire sample, indicating L'Estoile’s somewhat lowly status among the Royal Secretaries. Instead, L'Estoile expressed his subjectivity by dressing his cabinet and collection. Finally, this chapter situates L'Estoile in early modern European cultures of collecting, demonstrating that the civil wars might be a stimulus as much as a disruption to collecting in sixteenth-century France.

Chapters Two and Three focus on L'Estoile’s office in the Palais de Justice as it relates to reports in his diaries. He acquired his office as Hearer and Royal Secretary in the Chancery attached to the Parlement of Paris in 1566 and sold it for a profit in 1601. No previous study has explored his duties and the links between his office-holding and reporting. These chapters consider the Palais de Justice as a site of information exchange, where L'Estoile gathered the sources that he deployed in his reports and the publications he amassed
in his library. Among his duties in the Chancery, L'Estoile signed printers’ privileges, outlined in Chapter Two and Appendix III, which allowed him to build up contacts with significant printers and authors. This context is crucial for explaining L'Estoile’s book collecting throughout his life as well as his censorious reporting of contemporary publications. Chapter Three considers L'Estoile’s reports of crimes and situates the sources and the arguments of his reports in the Palais de Justice. Drawing on all of his resources in the Palais, L'Estoile’s reports of crimes and criminal justice relied on official documents in the Parlement, interviews with prisoners, and gossip with colleagues, and not published crime pamphlets. He wrote about crimes with a curiosity for rare and extraordinary details relating to specific cases, treated as evidence of the malice of the times that needed policing through the good justice of the Parlement. His office governed the sources of his reports and the way he thought about and represented his world.

Part Two follows L'Estoile’s life and collecting throughout the Wars of Religion. Chapter Four tackles the problem of genre and shows how L'Estoile composed fragmented histories of the early and middle phases of the civil wars. His family diary ignores the troubles, his miscellaneous compilations of polemical poetry foreground events such as the Saint Bartholomew’s day massacre but obscure his personal experience, while his diary for the reign of Henri III veers between these two extremes, depending on both intertextual links with his manuscript miscellanies and eyewitness evidence. Contemporary historians whom L'Estoile admired, above all Henri Lancelot-Voisin, sieur de La Popelinière and Jacques-Auguste de Thou, balanced confessional interests in their narratives of primarily political affairs by reducing politics to calculations of interest, carried out behind the cloak of religion. L'Estoile tried to do something similar in his most formal histories of the civil wars, setting Protestant claims alongside Catholic claims and leaving his readers to find the truth therein,
then relying on divine providence and corrupt contemporary morality as catch-all explanations for the events he described.

The crucial turning point in L'Estoile’s life and collecting came with the troubles of the Catholic League and their aftermath, the subject of Chapter Five. Leaguers raided his study and briefly arrested him along with other accused ‘Politiques’ in July 1589. Many of his colleagues fled the capital to join the royalist Parlement of Tours, but L'Estoile remained with his family in Paris and thereby effectively collaborated with the Parlement of the League. His actions present something of a paradox, yet he was uniquely placed to compile the history of his political enemies and shame them for posterity. Most significantly, he amassed the *Drolleries of the League*, an iconoclastic, scrapbook history of the League compiled from the material evidence of its own publications, containing the only surviving copies of much of the ephemeral print circulated by the Leaguers to justify their cause. After an evaluation of L'Estoile’s decision to remain in Paris under the League and his manner of writing its history, this chapter analyses his engagement with the *Drolleries* as a study in the circulation and reception of polemical print in the post-Reformation period.

Chapter Six considers L'Estoile’s collection at the end of the civil wars. It demonstrates how he managed, read, and passed on books in the ‘interpretative community’ of the Palais de Justice, as a detailed study in the history of reading and book collecting at a time of significant growth in the number of publications available in Paris. L'Estoile expanded his diaries considerably from July 1606, just before he turned sixty, as he explained that such a record serves ‘to support one’s unstable memory, especially as one comes to advanced age, like me’. Increasingly, he recorded his book-buying and reading as a method of managing and interpreting texts. This chapter moves from the problem of coping with an abundant and growing book collection towards an interpretation of reading as a means of working through religious controversies at the end of the civil wars. It sets out how L'Estoile
managed his library, how he read books with erudite, Gallican friends, and then how he
inherited and passed them on within his family.

While the first half of this thesis is organised thematically and the second half is
organised chronologically, as a whole it is intended to give a microhistorical approach to
L'Estoile’s world in the Wars of Religion that comes close to a biography, but which offers
both more and less than a traditional product of that genre. It offers more than a biography,
because each chapter engages with a distinct historiographical problem that it approaches
from a microhistorical perspective. And it is also offers less than a biography, because it
makes no claim to complete coverage of every period of L'Estoile’s life, focusing on his later
years according to the available sources, and selecting crucial passages within his expansive
diaries that give greatest insight into the problem of reception in his world.¹

By offering wide-ranging conclusions regarding cultural reception, based on in-depth
research focused on an individual case, this thesis follows the microhistorical method of
‘changing the scale’, zooming out to ask what are the broader implications of a closely
observed study. Focusing on the problem of cultural reception, this thesis changes the scale in
two distinct ways. First, it argues that in his writing and collecting, L'Estoile took up
positions in the debates carried out within the Parlement of Paris. He did not speak for this
society or directly reflect its concerns, and he is not a typical or representative figure. Instead,
the structures of this society instinctively shaped his dispositions, perceptions, and practices,
or what might be termed, following Pierre Bourdieu, his habitus. L'Estoile’s case gives
insight into that structuring process on an individual scale, demonstrating through his
practices of reading, writing, and collecting how he ‘put his world in order’. His uniquely
well-documented case matters because the choices available to him within that structuring
process, and the issues he engaged with, were common throughout his milieu.

Second, this micro-analysis of L'Estoile’s life and collecting reassesses the value of his evidence for the history of the Wars of Religion as well as early modern social and cultural history. An in-depth study of all of his known manuscripts in their broad context has implications for how scholars might use his sources in the future in considering the multitude of topics for which his evidence is significant. Beyond the history and historiography of the civil wars, this study of L'Estoile and his world takes a distinctive approach to the early modern histories of material culture and collecting (especially Chapters One, Five, and Six), information and communication (especially Chapters Two, Three, and Five), and reader reception in both manuscript and print (especially Chapters Two, Four, Five, and Six). The detail and range of L'Estoile’s evidence is such that he gives unique insight not only into the Wars of Religion, but into society and culture in the early modern world.
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Abbreviations and Conventions

AN  Archives nationales, Paris
APP  Archives de la Préfecture de Police, Paris
BnF  Bibliothèque nationale de France, Paris

*Drolleries*  BnF, Réserve des livres rares, RES GR FOL-LA25-6, Pierre de L’Estoile, ‘Les belles Figures et Drolleries de la Ligue’


MC  Minutier central
Soman Collection  Soman Collection, Jacob Burns Law Library, George Washington University
All mentions of *livres* refer to *livres tournois*, unless otherwise specified. Figures given in *écus* follow references in the sources and discrepancies from the standard conversion rate of three *livres* to one *écus* are clarified where necessary.

Foreign language quotations are translated in the text and, following the History Faculty Guidelines, the original text is provided in the footnotes either when giving special emphasis on particular phrases or passages or when relying extensively on manuscript sources. Quotations from verse are left in the original language.

Citations from L'Estoile’s diaries depend in the first instance on the Brunet edition, supplemented with the Lazard-Schrenck edition. For reasons explained in the Introduction, the Brunet edition remains the most reliable complete edition of L'Estoile’s diaries. Digital versions are available via [www.archive.org](http://www.archive.org), accessed 11 September 2014, containing some errors and blurry pages, and via [http://solo.bodleian.ox.ac.uk](http://solo.bodleian.ox.ac.uk), accessed 11 September 2014, the online catalogue of the Bodleian Library, which contains an accurate scan of the copy held in the Taylor Institution Library, Oxford.
Introduction

Throughout his life, Pierre de L'Estoile collected materials for the history of the Wars of Religion, kept in defiance of the edicts of pacification which demanded that all memory of the troubles be forgotten.¹ Historians have relied on his sources ever since. While modern historians followed his commonplace judgement of the civil wars as politics under the cloak of religion, social and cultural historians from the 1970s turned to his diaries and miscellanies as they began ‘putting the religion back into the Wars of Religion’. Drawing on the approaches of cultural anthropology, their research has integrated new histories of religious mentalities and identities with established histories of political and social change at court as well as in the cities and regions.² Their interpretations tend to situate themselves on the level of ‘collective representations’, or the shared symbols that hold a culture together. In this way, their approach simplifies the responses of individuals, ignores the conditions that shaped the contemporary impact of their sources, and passes over the question of how early modern record keeping has shaped modern historians’ accounts.

Tacking these problems of reception, this thesis uses L'Estoile’s extraordinary records to explore his world in the Wars of Religion. In the study and cabinet of his home in the Left Bank parish of Saint André des Arts, he amassed manuscripts, books, printed ephemera, pictures, and art objects concerning the history of his life and times; a store of cultural capital that attracted visits from friends and family as well as collectors from across Europe. While other contemporary Parisians kept diaries that have survived, most of them clerics and royal

office-holders, none of their manuscripts match L'Estoile’s in their extent and ambition. If many of L'Estoile’s contemporaries accumulated collections of art and curiosities, none of them held the same significance as the pieces he assembled. Because his beliefs positioned him in the religious middle ground – he confessed that ‘even if the Catholic Church is a whore (as the Huguenots have it) nevertheless she is my mother’ – he claimed a critical understanding of the extremes of both confessions. And because of his contacts in the milieu of the Parlement of Paris and the Parisian print trade, he had privileged access to information about current events. Together, L'Estoile’s sources give unique insight into his world in the Wars of Religion. The story of his life and collecting is the history of the civil wars in the making.

Historians depend on L'Estoile’s diaries as an essential source of information about Parisian life and the civil wars, but this thesis is the first study of L'Estoile and his collection to consider all of his known manuscripts, making many new discoveries. It approaches L'Estoile as a microhistorian’s ‘normal exception’, a rare case that reveals aspects of normal practice in a culture that are otherwise hidden from the historian’s view, setting him in a rich context of printed and archival sources. By focusing on L'Estoile’s reception of news, texts, and images in his manuscripts and cabinet, this thesis seeks to make an innovative contribution to social and cultural history. It challenges established interpretations of these


sources as evidence of ‘collective representations’, demonstrating instead L'Estoile’s personal responses to pieces in his collection, asserting the combined importance of social context, materiality, and individual subjectivity in reception studies. Part One of this Introduction situates this study with a brief account of L'Estoile’s position in Parisian society; Part Two introduces his sources and their reception by generations of editors, historians, and literary scholars; and Part Three defines the approach of this thesis before suggesting some of the broader implications of its findings.

I. Pierre de L'Estoile’s Paris

L'Estoile’s social world comprised royal office-holders in the Parlement of Paris and the residents of the Left Bank parish of Saint André des Arts. The reports in his diaries depended on information he acquired from them. Nicolay’s 1609 map of the capital (Figure 1), published by L'Estoile’s friend Jean Le Clerc in order to celebrate the impact of Henri IV’s recent architectural improvements, also emphasises the grandeur and significance of L'Estoile’s parish church of Saint André des Arts. The map demonstrates the parish’s proximity to the Palais de Justice on the Ile de la Cité, where the Parlement of Paris sat, a short walk across either the Pont Saint Michel or the Pont Neuf that opened to the public in 1604. Office-holders in the Palais dominated the parish, which was among the wealthiest in the capital. Turning away from the Palais, crossing the Pont Saint Michel and following the rue Saint André des Arts to the west, L'Estoile would have passed the parish church on the left and approached as the third turning on the right his own rue des Grands Augustins, alternatively known as the rue de l’Hôtel Saint Denis. The road took its name from either the

---

convent at its northern end as it met the river Seine, or the student hostel at its southern end, the site of the giant Pantagruel’s lodgings in Rabelais’ novel. L’Estoile and his family moved to a house on this road after he signed a contract on 17 July 1573 agreeing to pay 300 livres in annual rent. On Nicolay’s map, theirs is the third house from the end of the rue des Grands Augustins as it meets the rue Saint André, on the left-hand side, facing the viewer (Detail of Figure 1).

Aged twenty-seven when they moved, L’Estoile was already settled in his office in the Palais as a Hearer (grand audiencier) and Royal Secretary in the Chancery attached to the Parlement (la petite chancellerie). Moving with him to the rue des Grands Augustins were Anne de Baillon, his wife since their marriage on 25 February 1569, and their one-year-old son Louis. Anne was around seven months pregnant at the time L’Estoile signed the rental contract. They left a house on the rue Thibautaudé in the Right Bank parish of Saint Germain de l’Auxerrois, in the vicinity of the royal palace of the Louvre and across the road from a household of Anne’s mother’s family, the Hacqueville. Saint Germain de l’Auxerrois had seen some of the worst violence during the recent Saint Bartholomew’s day massacre, beginning on 24 August 1572. They might have moved with some trepidation, not least because the opportunity arose when the house on the rue des Grands Augustins was vacated by the heirs of Anne du Moulin, after it had been ransacked and the pregnant Anne du Moulin murdered there, along with her two children, wet-nurse, and servant in January

---

10 AN MC VIII 103, 17 July 1573; Greffe-Lothe, pp. 105-106, 1056.
11 Identified by Greffe-Lothe, p. 112.
12 Family diary, p. 37.
1572, with no culprit brought to justice in a widely reported and controversial criminal case heard in the Parlement.15

Yet they also moved with great assurance. On the rue des Grands Augustins, L'Estoile arrived surrounded by his extended family. He moved closer to his mother, Marguerite de Montholon, who lived on the corner of the parallel rue Pavée where it met the rue Saint André des Arts, along with her third husband Gérard Cotton and their children and step-children.16 Along the rue Pavée lived another household of the Montholon family as well as a branch of the Hennequin family, among whom L'Estoile named his childhood companion Pierre Hennequin as ‘the greatest of all of my friends’.17 The Séguier family lived on the nearby rue Gillecoer and later moved to the rue Pavée. Among them was Louise Boudet, L'Estoile’s great aunt and godmother, the wife of Pierre I Séguier, président in the Parlement.18 The Montholon, Hennequin, and Séguier families all produced generations of influential royal counsellors and office-holders in the Parlement.19 On the opposite side of the rue Pavée was the Morel household, headed by the royal printer Fédéric de Morel the elder,

15 In this case, Barnabé Brisson pleaded for the prosecution, Simon Bobé, avocat in the Parlement and Anne du Moulin’s widower, alleging that Anne’s ghost revealed the culprit to his client in a dream – Recueil de plaidoyez notables de plusieurs anciens et fameux advocats de la cour de Parlement faicts en causes celebres (Paris, 1612), pp. 246-264 – while Etienne Pasquier pleaded for the defendant Jacques Brosset, Sire d’Arconville, Anne’s cousin, who was acquitted – Etienne Pasquier, Les oeuvres (Amsterdam, 1723), ii, 311-326. Discussed by La Fosse, Mémoires, p. 107; Pierre Le Loyer, Discours et histoires des spectres (Paris, 1655), pp. 676-678; Caroline Callard, “Horrible massacre”, haine fratricide et fantôme accusateur: L’affaire Anne du Moulin (1572)”, unpublished paper presented to the seminar of M. Denis Crouzet at the Centre Roland Mousnier, l’Université Paris-Sorbonne Paris IV, 15 April 2013 which first made me aware of the affair.
16 Greffe-Lothe, p. 101 n.162; AN MC XXIV 91, 18 September 1600 records the sale of this house by her successors, ‘contenant plusieurs corps d’hôtel, court et jardin’. Marguerite de Montholon signed a marriage contract with François Tronson, at the time avocat in the Parlement, on 17 March 1560, witnessed on her side by Louise Boudet, Marie de Montholon, François de Montholon, and Nicolle de Montholon: AN Y 107, fol. 213v. Following her second husband’s death, she signed a marriage contract with Gerard Cotton on 28 January 1568. The surviving copy registered at the Châtelet does not list the witnesses: AN Y 113, fol. 378r. For their names on the tax roll of the rue Pavée see BnF ms. fr. 11692, fol. 282r.
18 Family Diary, p. 35; Brunet, iv, 222. The Séguier family are listed in BnF ms. fr. 11692, fol. 282r on rue Gillecoeur, parallel to the rue Pavée and nearer the Place Saint Michel. In the after-death inventory of Pierre II Séguier his address is given as Quai des Augustins, at the end of the rue Pavée: AN MC LXXVIII 164, 2 May 1602. The rue Pavée is now known as the rue Séguier.
one of L’Estoile’s childhood tutors, as well as Morel’s daughter the poet Camille Morel, whom L’Estoile described as ‘a friend of mine and a pearl among the young women of our times’.\textsuperscript{20} In the nearby Cloître Saint Marcel, soon to move to the rue Saint André des Arts, lived L’Estoile’s godfather and uncle Mathieu Chartier, conseiller and later président in the Parlement.\textsuperscript{21} Soon settled, L’Estoile purchased the house on 8 June 1575 for the relatively modest sum of 5,600 livres, much of which he raised by constituting a rente or annual debt payment of 266 livres to Francois Sevyn, conseiller in the Cour des aides, in exchange for the loan of 3,200 livres paid directly to the inheritors of Anne du Moulin.\textsuperscript{22}

Marguerite de Montholon, Pierre de L’Estoile’s mother, was a central figure in his life, living close on the rue Pavée by until her death on 21 June 1596. Thereafter L’Estoile, along with his siblings, managed the sale of her home as well as the settling of her debts.\textsuperscript{23} Marguerite passed onto her son both her social connections with major families of office-holders in the parish and her religious position in the middle ground between the extremes of Catholicism and Protestantism. She shared these connections and this religious position with her first husband and Pierre’s father, Louis de L’Estoile, whose death on 24 August 1558 was a distant memory for Pierre that he recalled in September 1610. In this late passage of his diaries, Pierre de L’Estoile justified his religious position with regard to his father’s dying wish that his Protestant tutor Mathieu Béroalde might teach him to understand critically the superstitions of the Catholic Church but never leave it.\textsuperscript{24} While L’Estoile evoked his father’s memory in this instance, it was his mother who maintained contact with Béroalde and served

\textsuperscript{20} BNFr ms. fr. 11692, fol. 282r; Joseph Dumoulin, \textit{Vie et œuvres de Fédéric Morel, imprimeur à Paris depuis 1557 jusqu’à 1583} (Paris, 1901), pp. 17-18; Brunet, ix, 199.
\textsuperscript{21} BNFr ms. fr. 11692, fol. 281r; ANMC LXXIII 221, 14, 20 April 1594; Brunet, vii, 108.
\textsuperscript{22} ANMC XXXIX 8, 8 June 1575; Greffe-Lothe, pp. 21-22, 105-106, 1056; \textit{Family diary}, p. 37. On L’Estoile’s rentes see pp. 130-131, 208 n.11 and Appendix II. Following L’Estoile’s death the house was worth 24,000 livres – Greffe-Lothe, p. 107 – suggesting that Anne du Moulin’s murder reduced the price he paid in 1575.
\textsuperscript{23} Brunet, vii, 64; ANMC XXIV 91, 18 September 1600; ANMC CXXII 1543, 27 September 1600; ANMC CXX 356, 10 February 1601; ANMC XIX 298, 30 July 1610; Greffe-Lothe, pp. 1063-1064; Appendix II.
\textsuperscript{24} Brunet, xi, 15, discussed below pp. 240-242. Pierre de L’Estoile recorded the date of Louis de L’Estoile’s death in his family diary BNFr NAF 12871, fol. 4r, transcribed incorrectly as 1555 in the published version \textit{Family Diary}, p. 35.
as godmother to his daughter on 26 February 1560, giving the child her name. She had significant links to the Protestant movement during the early civil wars. L'Estoile recalled how at that time she took him to hide ‘for the sake of the Reformed Religion’ with other Huguenots at the chateau of Blandy, 31 miles outside of Paris in the direction of Melun. It is possible that she was the unnamed host who gave shelter to Béroalde, along with his family and students, at one of the L'Estoile family properties in Coudret near Orléans in 1562, as they fled from persecution in Paris for their Reformed Religion. These connections, and a marked sympathy for aspects of Protestantism, remained with L'Estoile throughout his life.

II. Pierre de L'Estoile’s Manuscripts and Collection

The circumstances, content, and range of L'Estoile’s collection are extraordinary, but the manuscripts at its core belong to a variety of overlapping genres that were common across early modern Europe. His earliest manuscript is perhaps the most common, best described as his ‘family diary’ rather than a ‘livre de raison’, an anachronistic term used to identify it by its editor in 1945, that nevertheless links the manuscript with a tradition of mercantile and bourgeois record keeping that emerged in the late middle ages, especially in southern Europe. It does not record financial accounts like a classic livre de raison but instead narrates the births and deaths of his children and relatives, and the role of God’s providence in his life, serving as a store of family memory to be passed down through generations.

25 BnF ms. Dupuy, 630, fol. 177r.
26 L’Estoile recalled this moment as he reported the death of André de Villeboisin on 30 August 1609, ‘que j’avois veu et congneu à Blandi, lorsque feu ma mère y estoit refugiée pour la Religion, aux premiers troubles de 1562 (qui est du plus loing que me souvienne, car il y a quarante sept ans à ceste heure)’. Brunet, ix, 387. Blandy was owned by François Orléans-Longueville and Jacqueline de Rohan, Marquis and Marquise de Rothelin. Jacqueline de Rohan had converted to Protestantism before 1559. Their daughter married Louis de Bourbon, Prince de Condé. A.H. Taillandier, Histoire du château et du bourg de Blandy en Brie (Paris, 1854), pp. 82-99.
L'Estoile continued the manuscript from his father’s family diary, beginning his own record with his marriage to Anne de Baillon in 1569 and adding to it until 1595. This family diary concerns events in the civil wars only as they directly affect his family during the troubles of the Catholic League (1589-1594), when its narrative overlaps with L'Estoile’s other manuscripts. Published in 1945, it has never been discussed in any detail.²⁹

From childhood, L'Estoile collected documents of contemporary history, that he later compiled into at least five surviving manuscript miscellanies.³⁰ These miscellanies contain poems, libels, letters, and edicts, as well as prodigious histories, comic and learned poetry, erudite correspondence and treatises, and documents relating to his life.³¹ L'Estoile highlighted their historical significance, describing them variously as ‘miscellanies’ that include material ‘of our times’, ‘of ancient and modern times’, and ‘a mixture of good and bad, according to our times’.³² Contemporary collectors in Paris, above all the Gallican scholar Pierre Dupuy, assembled several of the same pieces.³³ The earliest dated piece in one of L'Estoile’s miscellanies is a prodigious story told to him in 1558 by his childhood tutor Mathieu Béroalde, recounting the supernatural and mysterious death of a learned man lodging in Paris, ‘addicted to Magic and the invocation of malign Spirits’. Béroalde heard the tale from the learned man’s host, his own godson, and so assured the twelve-year-old L'Estoile that the story was true. Perhaps it served as a lesson for L'Estoile against indulging in curiosity about magic and the supernatural. It marks the beginning of L'Estoile’s lifelong...

²⁹ _Family diary_. Lazard-Schrenck, i, 42 cite it in their bibliography and rarely in their footnotes, eg. Lazard-Schrenck, iii, 130 n.81. Greffe-Lothé does not mention it at all.

³⁰ See p. 156 n.105 for another possible attribution of a miscellany to L'Estoile’s collection.

³¹ BnF ms. fr. 10303, 10304, 25560; _Drolleries_; Armitage.


³³ For his links with L'Estoile see below pp. 186-187, 216-227.
interest in collecting prodigious histories in his manuscripts. L'Esteole’s miscellanies are diverse, compiled histories that have strong intertextual links with his diaries, but they have been largely ignored by historians.

As distinct from the ‘family diary’ introduced above, I use the terms ‘diary’ and ‘diaries’ to refer to L'Esteole’s manuscripts that give a narrative history of his life and times in the Wars of Religion, referred to collectively by modern historians as the Mémoires-Journaux. The diaries begin with the death of Charles IX and the start of the reign of Henri III in May 1574, continuing until September 1611, a few weeks before L'Esteole’s death, divided between eleven manuscripts. These continuous manuscripts stray between the genres of personal memoir, formal history, and compiled miscellany, to name but a few categories that might be applied to different passages that might appear side-by-side even on the same page. Chapters in Part Two of this thesis explore the distinctions between the genres and narrative strategies of these manuscripts in detail. L'Esteole composed the diaries over an indeterminate period of time, most likely with significant hindsight. He subjected the manuscripts of his earliest ‘registre-journal’ of events occurring during the reign of Henri III and ‘mémoires’ of the troubles of the League to many subsequent additions and revisions. His later consecutive ‘mémoires-journaux’, ‘mémoires’, ‘journaux’, and ‘tablettes’ bear the marks of more contemporary composition, particularly after they expand in July 1606, immediately before his sixtieth birthday. However, his claim in July 1606 to write daily must be treated with scepticism, since this manuscript overlapped with another manuscript ‘Journal’ in his

---

34 This story is copied into Armitage, p. 116, ‘Extr. de mes mem.’, now held at the Kenneth Spencer Research Library of the University of Kansas, Ms C72. I have not been able to consult this autograph manuscript, which is described in detail in Armitage’s edition. See Timothy Chesters, Ghost Stories in Late Renaissance France: Walking By Night (Oxford, 2011), pp. 168-172.

35 Lazard-Schreneck cite in their footnotes correspondences between pieces in L’Esteole’s diaries for the reign of Henri III and his manuscript miscellanies. Brunet published two of L’Esteole’s miscellanies in vols. iv and xii. Armitage’s edition has never been discussed alongside L’Esteole’s other manuscripts.
collection between 2 July 1606 and 18 March 1607, and includes later additions, most often as he noted the return of books he had lent out.\textsuperscript{36}

L'Estoile’s diaries have long been interpreted as a canonical documentary source for the history of his times. Subsequent editions have obscured the differences between his manuscripts by titling them collectively as \textit{Mémoires} or \textit{Mémoires-Journaux} for the reigns of Henri III, Henri IV, and the beginning of the reign of Louis XIII. Pierre Dupuy, with whom L'Estoile frequently exchanged documents between 1607 and 1611, including some of the manuscripts of the diaries, published the first edition of a part of L'Estoile’s diaries in 1621. His edition reproduced fragments of L'Estoile’s diary for the reign of Henri III that appeared anonymously as a \textit{Journal des choses mémorables advenües durant tout le regne de Henry III}. These fragments from L'Estoile’s narrative provide a moral portrait of the king and his court, as Dupuy assembled them alongside texts that exposed the intrigues of the Catholic League and the papacy, and detached them from passages that criticised royal dignity too strongly.\textsuperscript{37} This text was frequently republished in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, typically in collections of historical memoirs.\textsuperscript{38} Further publications depended on the availability of L'Estoile’s manuscripts, almost all of which were kept at the library of the Abbey of Saint Acheul in Amiens, where they had been deposited by L'Estoile’s great-great-grandson Pierre Poussemothe de L’Estoile on his death in 1718. The first publication to expand beyond the reign of Henri III and to identify L'Estoile’s authorship appeared in a 1719 volume edited in Cologne by the Protestant exile Jacob Le Duchat and the scholar and director in the Lille Chambre de comptes, Jean Godefroy, announcing L'Estoile’s office as a

\textsuperscript{36} Brunet, vols. viii-ix point out minor discrepancies in their footnotes. Médiathèque du Grand Troyes, ms 1117, ‘Journal de Pierre de L’Estoile depuis le 17 janvier 1605 jusques au 18 mars 1607’; BnF ms. fr. 10300, ‘Registre journal (2 July 1606 - 25 February 1609)’.


\textsuperscript{38} Marin, ‘Fortune éditoriale’, pp. 93-95; Marie Madeleine Fragonard, ‘Une mémoire individualisée: Éditions et rééditions des acteurs et témoins des guerres’ in Jacques Berchtold and Marie Madeleine Fragonard eds., \textit{La mémoire des guerres de religion: La concurrence des genres historiques (XVI\textsuperscript{e}-XVII\textsuperscript{e} siècles)} (Geneva, 2007), pp. 33-34, 36-37, 61-63, 67-85.
‘Grand Audiencier en la Chancellerie de Paris’.

This edition continued to emphasise the national, political aspects of the diaries by publishing them as *Mémoires pour servir à l’histoire de France*. It reproduced fragments of two of L'Estoile’s miscellanies, rearranged in chronological order and presented uncritically so as to serve as a prelude to L'Estoile’s own narrative. These editors’ successor volume in 1720 corrected certain supposed errors in the diary for the reign of Henri III by comparison with other sources published in the same volume. Subsequent eighteenth-century editions added fictional passages at crucial points in the narrative that later editions highlighted and finally dropped.

After the Revolution, national institutions claimed L'Estoile’s manuscripts. Most were removed from Amiens to the Bibliothèque royale in 1824, while the Bibliothèque municipale in Troyes acquired the manuscripts of certain of his later diaries in 1804 from the private collection of the successors of Jean Bouhier (1673-1746), président in the Parlement of Dijon. Claude-Bernard Petitot published in 1825 the text of the eighteenth-century editions of L'Estoile’s diaries for the reigns of Henri III and Henri IV as part of his grand series of French historical memoirs, superseded in 1837 by the series published by Joseph-François Michaud and Jean-Joseph-François Poujoulat, which included a substantial introduction to L'Estoile’s manuscripts held in the Bibliothèque royale, composed by their editors Jacques-
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39 *Mémoires pour servir à l’histoire de France, contenant ce qui s’est passé de plus remarquable dans ce royaume, depuis 1515 jusqu’en 1611*, eds. Jacob Le Duchat and Jean Godefroy (Cologne, 1719), attributed to Pierre de L'Estoile on fols. 2r-3r; Marin, ‘Fortune éditoriale’, pp. 95-97.
40 *Mémoires*, eds. Le Duchat and Godefroy, pp. 1-30, drawing on ms. fr. 10303 and especially ms. fr. 10304, these extracts are reproduced in the later editions cited below by the Champollion Figeac (as a preface) and Lefèvre (as an appendix).
Joseph and Aimé-Louis Champollion Figeac. The manuscripts of L'Estoile’s diaries for the years 1594-1606, which had circulated among private collectors and did not form part of the corpus of L'Estoile manuscripts in Amiens, were still missing from these major editions.

Eugène Halphern began to fill the gap with his edition of the manuscript for the years 1598-1602, which had been held by the Jacobins on rue Saint Honoré before he found it in the Bibliothèque impériale and published it in 1862.

Enthusiasm for L'Estoile rose among Parisian scholars of the Old Regime in the first decades of the Third Republic, setting the trajectory for subsequent research. City councillors decided to display L'Estoile’s statue alongside other eminent Parisians on the façade of the new Hôtel de Ville, completed in 1882, after a debate in the council chamber which decided that L'Estoile should be included on the façade in place of the eighteenth-century civil engineer and administrator Daniel-Charles Trudaine, following the urging of a liberal, anticlerical city counsellor, the painter and art critic Jules-Antoine Castagnary. Since there has never been any suggestion that a portrait of L'Estoile exists, the sculptor Adolphe Martial Tabard depicted him as a typical representative of the sixteenth-century urban elite, bearded and wearing an elegant jacket with doublet and hose, his robe slipping nonchalantly from his shoulders, quite a contrast to the ragged wardrobe listed in his 1611 after-death inventory.

He carries a manuscript of his diaries under his arm, ready to be filled with eyewitness observations about the Parisian society he surveys beneath him (Figure 24). As the new Hôtel de Ville was being built, the first, and still the most reliable, complete edition of L'Estoile’s diaries was underway, edited by a team directed by the bibliophile Pierre Gustave Brunet and

47 See below pp. 41-47.
published between 1878 and 1896. Its thorough index is particularly valuable. It is being gradually replaced by the most detailed edition to date, published in Geneva by Droz. This edition continues that of the diaries for the reign of Henri III edited by Madeleine Lazard and Gilbert Schrenck, that for the first time reconciled the texts of L’Estoile’s two extant manuscripts covering these years, labelling them the A and B manuscripts in the manner of the Villey edition of Montaigne’s *Essais*. Now many of L’Estoile’s manuscripts are available online via the Gallica website of the Bibliothèque nationale de France.

Modern historians have treated L’Estoile’s diaries as a canonical documentary source which they typically refer to as a mine of factual detail for narrative accounts of the civil wars. A few have gone further and discussed aspects of L’Estoile in some detail. Religious historians have analysed L’Estoile’s doctrinal statements in order to define him as a typical representative of the confessional middle ground, focusing on particularly revealing passages of the diaries, especially his remarkable confession of faith in September 1610. Intellectual historians have highlighted certain of L’Estoile’s contacts with Parisian scholars towards the

---

48 Brunet, xii, iii-xxxviii for their biography of L'Estoile and description of his manuscripts and the various editions, followed by the index.

49 The most widely available and regularly cited is the Lefèvre edition, which adds nothing to the Brunet edition, continues its mistakes (see eg. below p. 245 n. 160) and is more misleading since it integrates the additional eighteenth-century passages into the narrative. It also lacks a critical explanation of L'Estoile's manuscripts of the sort provided by the Champollion Figeac and Brunet.


end of his life. The effect of their interpretations has been somewhat to marginalise L'Estoile and characterise him as a second rate intellectual figure, an interpretation that closes off more avenues of research than it opens. This thesis challenges such interpretations and uses new evidence to assert L'Estoile’s significance in Parisian intellectual circles.

Literary scholars have produced a range of short studies of aspects of L'Estoile’s diaries, treating him as an established French Renaissance author. Important breakthroughs were made by those scholars who addressed L'Estoile’s conception of history and his method of composing narratives of contemporary political events in his diaries, drawing on classical models such as Tacitus but also appropriating contemporary texts that he wove into his account. Several studies have focused on the formal aspects of the political libels that L’Estoile collected in his diaries for the reign of Henri III, especially their representations of courtiers. Passages that have recently attracted attention are those in which L'Estoile describes modes of political communication in the civil wars, including oral news,


manuscript, printed publications, and images.\textsuperscript{58} In these ways, scholars have moved away from understanding L’Estoile’s writing as everyday diary-keeping – introducing him as the archetypal ‘Parisian Pepys’ – and treated him more like a serious historian of the civil wars, nevertheless remaining distinct from the higher register and more formally structured histories of the contemporaries he admired, especially Henri Lancelot-Voisin, sieur de La Popelinière and Jacques Auguste de Thou.\textsuperscript{59} This thesis considerably develops these lines of enquiry by interpreting L’Estoile’s critical reception of different media and his examining his historical writing throughout his life.

Nevertheless, literary scholars have persisted in publishing short studies of L'Estoile’s life-writing.\textsuperscript{60} A frequent point of comparison in this sense has been with the \textit{Essais} of Michel de Montaigne, that L’Estoile named towards the end of his life as his ‘vade mecum’. L’Estoile shared with Montaigne certain social prejudices, religious tendencies, and methods of


\textsuperscript{59} Andrew Pettegree, \textit{The Book in the Renaissance} (New Haven, 2010), pp. 348-351, uses the term ‘Parisian Pepys’ illustratively – and it is interesting how the term resonates – in a short discussion of L’Estoile’s responses to print, especially in the League years, as a fitting conclusion to the transformation of print in the sixteenth century.

However, scholars have exaggerated the similarities between these two complex and subtle writers. Their claims perhaps depend more on these humanists’ similar experience in the society of royal-office holders in the *parlements* as well as superficial resemblances of genre between two rare authors of autobiographical works in sixteenth-century France who both revised their texts retrospectively. Comparisons with Montaigne depend on eleven citations of the *Essais* by L’Estoile after 1606, among thousands of diverse citations throughout his manuscripts. L’Estoile’s most significant citation of Montaigne comes in his 2 July 1606 preface to a new manuscript of his diaries where he justified his record keeping, borrowing Montaigne’s claim that he kept a diary because his father did so, and professing to write so that ‘I am seen (as the sieur de Montaigne says in his *Essais*, speaking of himself) naked and such as I am’, enfranchised by Montaigne’s liberty in the *Essais* to pursue his own curiosity and compose his self-portrait. This significant justification, made at a point when Montaigne’s renown was rising among Parisian office-holders thanks to the publication of Abel L’Angelier’s 1595 edition of the *Essais* and the praise of leading scholars, clarifies some of the differences between L’Estoile’s later diaries and his earlier manuscripts, as he increasingly turned to everyday diary keeping and more personal reflection on his reading and piety after July 1606. However, it cannot serve as a sufficient explanation for L’Estoile’s life of record keeping. Moreover, L’Estoile did not name Montaigne’s *Essais* as his only ‘vade mecum’. He described in the same terms an unidentified devotional text that he read for comfort during his illness in June 1609.

64 Boutcher, *School of Montaigne*.
65 Brunet, ix, 274-275.
A reinterpretation of the significance of L’Estoile’s diaries is particularly timely following the discovery and cataloguing in the Archives nationales of notarial acts concerning L’Estoile, as well as his after-death inventory, published by Florence Greffe and José Lothe in 2002. Their edition presents the text of his inventory, a summary biography, the contents of his library, and an index of relevant notarial documents. They conclude that L’Estoile’s library shows him to be a typically ‘accomplished humanist’, but otherwise they fit their findings into the established interpretation of L’Estoile’s religious and intellectual life. The interpretative passages of their volume make little or no mention of L’Estoile’s diaries, let alone his family diary and miscellanies.\textsuperscript{66} Their volume is a transformational research tool that I use heavily throughout this thesis. I have checked its references to notarial documents concerning L’Estoile and pursued this line of enquiry further by locating additional notarial documents concerning L’Estoile and his family, friends, and colleagues in the parish of Saint André des Arts and the community of royal office-holders. Combining the information that Greffe and Lothe provide with contextual research and an interpretation of the whole corpus of L’Estoile’s manuscripts, it is possible to see his world differently.

III. A Microhistorical Approach to Cultural Reception

As opposed to these approaches to L’Estoile by modern editors, historians, and literary scholars, this thesis offers the first interpretation of L’Estoile and his collection as a whole. Its method is to approach L’Estoile as a microhistorian’s ‘normal exception’, a rare case that reveals aspects of normal practice in a culture that are otherwise hidden from the historian’s view. In exploring aspects of L’Estoile’s world, the conceptual vocabulary of this thesis is informed by Pierre Bourdieu’s theory of practice, material culture studies, and reader-

\textsuperscript{66} Greffe-Lothe, pp. 144-158, 303-305, argues that ‘La lecture de ses Journaux le prouve abondamment, Pierre de L’Estoile fut un esprit lettré et curieux’, and for this reason he is a typical ‘humaniste accompli’. For problems with their approach to his library see in particular below p. 56 n.108 and p. 206 n. 6.
reception theory, so as to critique a prominent trend in cultural history concerned with ‘collective representations’ and instead emphasise the combined importance of social context, materiality, and individual subjectivity in reception studies.

Edouardo Grendi first encouraged historians to look for ‘exceptionally normal’ cases of social interaction in a 1977 article, using the term as something of a throwaway remark and an illustrative oxymoron.\(^{67}\) Identifying the ‘normal exception’ has since become a defining approach for microhistorians. As Carlo Ginzburg and Carlo Poni argued in a programmatic article published in 1993, ‘if the sources are silent about or systematically distort the social reality of the lower classes, then a truly exceptional (and thus statistically infrequent) document can be much more revealing than a thousand stereotypical documents’.\(^{68}\) Subsequently, this insight has been applied to exceptional sources from all levels of society and not just marginal figures. Significant recent studies of early modern individuals who kept diaries of different kinds use their exceptional subjects to construct innovative interpretations of global connectedness, family memory, dressing up, religious choice, and female agency.\(^{69}\)

These studies combine social and literary approaches to contextualise their subjects’ modes of writing about their sense of self, challenging established interpretations of the Renaissance invention of individualism, and instead revealing the contingent variety of meanings attached to this concept.\(^{70}\) Moreover, their findings demonstrate that individuals’ behaviour cannot be

---


satisfactorily explained in terms of prevailing social and cultural norms. While their subjects were exceptional in their time, microhistorians’ interpretations of their lives suggest that, so long as sufficient sources might be available, all individuals can be seen as exceptional in some way as they negotiate the dominant structures of their societies. The Italian microhistorians of the 1970s and 80s made this case as they reacted against what they saw as the impersonal determinism of Annales ‘total history’, as well as approaches informed by cultural anthropology that assumed a common meaning of particular symbolic forms throughout a culture, neither of which left sufficient space for individual negotiation and expression.

This thesis draws on these arguments in a critique of Denis Crouzet’s powerful interpretation that a common ‘imaginary’ of eschatological anxiety characterised the mental world of sixteenth-century France, driving the violence of the civil wars on both sides of the confessional divide. It does so in order to make a wider point about the importance of reception studies in social and cultural history as opposed to the history of collective representations. The ‘imaginary’, l’imaginaire, is a common term in contemporary French cultural history but almost entirely absent in English historical writing. Its closest companion terms – used by Crouzet somewhat interchangeably – are ‘discourse’ and ‘collective representations’, the language that structures the limits of individual and collective thought, and the shared symbols that hold a culture together. The imaginary is also distinct from these terms as it works simultaneously at the level of individual and collective psychology. It is a

---

74 Crouzet, Les guerriers de Dieu.
‘magma’ of words and signs flowing through a culture, structuring how individuals perceive and respond to the world, and it is in this way both instituted and instituting, an imposition of culture on the individual and a force that drives an individual’s actions. Crouzet’s ‘a-biographical biographies’ continue this interpretation by focusing on themes in their subjects’ imaginary that make them representative of collective concerns. He aims in this way to complete the Annales historians’ mission to establish a ‘new history’ by discarding ‘event history’ altogether.

Crouzet’s interpretation does not engage with the problem of reception since his concept of the imaginary justifies him bringing together the great mass of polemical literature and memoirs of the civil wars with a consistent interpretation about the shared ideas that made up their authors’ mental world. A polemical libel has as much significance as a learned treatise when ‘one unique impression suffices for a pamphlet to be taken up into collective consciousness’. He cites L'Estoile’s activities in reporting, circulating, and collecting published texts in Paris as evidence of this process. However, seen from different perspectives, this claim also reveals the weaknesses of Crouzet’s interpretation, some of which historians have already discussed. His interpretation works at such a level of abstraction that it ignores differences in format and genre between these texts, as well as evidence that conflicts with the central thesis of eschatological anxiety. And it reacts so strongly against social determinism that his interpretation of the mental world of the

---


78 ‘il suffit d’une unique impression pour que le pamphlet soit aussitôt l’objet d’une prise de connaissance collective’. Crouzet, *Guerrriers*, ii, 187-188.


22
imaginary deliberately ignores the social context in which these texts were produced and received. A similar degree of eschatological rhetoric might be found in sermons and polemical literature in post-Reformation England, but not the same extent of religious violence. Despite Crouzet’s Francophone use of the term ‘imaginary’, these criticisms of his interpretation might also be applied to strands of Anglophone ‘new cultural history’, whose historians have tended to invoke the collective meaning of particular discourses while failing to establish how widespread or significant they might have been in the periods they study.

To understand the impact of these representations, this thesis argues that it is necessary to evaluate an individual reader’s responses to the texts that Crouzet, like many cultural historians, presents as an indistinguishable whole, interpreted for their discursive content alone. In this way its approach is informed by aspects of reader-reception theory that give agency to the individual reader in engaging with the discourses presented in a text, and which emphasise the significance of the text’s material form as well as the social situation that shapes a reader’s preconceived ideas as they approach that text. The six chapters of this thesis tackle the problem of cultural reception in L’Estoile’s case, demonstrating how his reading and collecting was shaped by his position in the society of the royal office-holders and the parish of Saint André des Arts, the constraints and possibilities of the materials he engaged with, as well as the peculiar passions and prejudices that he developed throughout his life in the civil wars. Moreover, since this thesis argues that it is necessary to interpret the particular circumstances of the production, circulation, and reception of texts, it also applies

81 Denis Crouzet, Le haut cœur de Catherine de Médicis: Une raison politique au temps de la Saint-Barthélemy (Paris, 2005), pp. 575-580, responds to these criticisms.
these approaches in its analysis of the interrelation of L'Estoile’s life and work, giving close attention to the varieties of materials and genres among his manuscripts, as well as their own reception in the society of Parisian office-holders. These two approaches depend on one another, so that throughout this thesis L'Estoile’s engaged reading and collecting appears as a driving force for his record keeping.

By offering wide-ranging conclusions about cultural reception, based on in-depth research focused on an individual case, this thesis follows microhistorians’ method of ‘changing the scale’, zooming out to ask what are the broader implications of a closely observed study.85 It changes the scale in two distinct ways. First, it argues that in his writing and collecting, L'Estoile took up positions in the debates carried out within the Parlement. He did not speak for this society or directly reflect its concerns, and he is not a typical or representative figure. Instead, the structures of this society instinctively shaped his dispositions, perceptions, and practices, or what might be termed, following Pierre Bourdieu, his habitus.86 L'Estoile's case gives insight into that structuring process on an individual scale, demonstrating through his practices of reading, writing, and collecting how he ‘put his world in order’.87 His uniquely well-documented case matters because the choices available to him within that structuring process, and the issues he engaged with, were common throughout his milieu.

Second, this micro-analysis of L'Estoile’s life and collecting reassesses the value of his evidence for the history of the Wars of Religion as well as early modern social and cultural history. An in-depth study of all of his known manuscripts in their broad context has implications for how he is used in the future by scholars concerned with the multitude of

87 The phrase is borrowed from Robert Darnton, ‘A Bourgeois Puts His World in Order: The City as Text’ in The Great Cat Massacre and Other Episodes in French Cultural History (New York, 1984), pp. 107-143.
topics in which his evidence is significant. Part One of this thesis situates L'Estoile in his milieu while exploring the potential of his sources as a contribution to themes in early modern social and cultural history. Chapter One explores the material world of L'Estoile’s household, offering an in-depth case study of the material culture of everyday life in early modern Paris, demonstrating how L'Estoile and his family appropriated elements of this material culture with mixed success, and how the pieces in his collection made sense in their material context. Although L'Estoile’s home was crowded and his wardrobe was particularly shabby, nevertheless the collection he stored in his study and cabinet made him stand out in his milieu. It deserves a place in the early modern history of collecting, as his example demonstrates that the civil wars might be a stimulus as much as a disruption to collecting in sixteenth-century France. Chapters Two and Three demonstrate the importance of the Parlement’s situation in the Palais de Justice for the circulation and reception of information in the civil wars. L'Estoile’s reports are particularly significant concerning the licensing and sale of printed books, about which he possessed professional expertise and recorded acute insights unparalleled in other contemporary sources. His accounts discuss the public presence of print and the limits contemporaries imposed on its sale and circulation. Moreover, L'Estoile pursued and discussed news of crime and criminal justice with a voracious appetite for precise details of cases and procedure, revealing how news and official documents circulated in his milieu. He reported crime in his diaries as a way of writing about the wider social world that his fellow office-holders in the Parlement encountered.

Part Two of this thesis follows L'Estoile’s life and collecting throughout the civil wars. From a biographical perspective, it offers as an example of what it was like for a well-connected, particularly observant Parisian to live through the troubles. Each chapter addresses a period of his life and historical writing so as to reveal his process of reception and reader response. Chapter Four analyses the fragmentation of L'Estoile’s record keeping in the
decades following his first marriage. It considers his response to the problem of genre, as he split his history of these years across the distinct genres of the family diary, miscellany, and narrative history, each of which were common throughout early modern Europe, but whose combination is exceptional. Chapter Five focuses on the crucial turning point in L'Estoile’s life and the civil wars, the period of the Catholic League and its aftermath, from 1589-1598. It evaluates the impact of uncertain information at a moment of crisis, providing a close study in an individual’s reception of ephemeral, polemical print at the end of the Wars of Religion, focusing on L'Estoile’s scrapbook compilation of the Drolleries of the League. Finally, Chapter Six continues this analysis of L'Estoile’s reception as it explores the intellectual world of the Parlement of Paris at the end of the civil wars through the reading and book collecting of L'Estoile and his family. L'Estoile’s techniques for managing his collection were common in his time, but his record of this process is uncommonly rich. The broad range of his contacts includes all the crucial figures in contemporary Parisian intellectual life, many of them brokered by the young scholar Pierre Dupuy. In these ways, this study of L'Estoile and his world takes a distinctive approaches to the problem of reception, exploring the histories of material culture and collecting, information and communication, and reader response in both manuscript and print. The detail and range of L'Estoile’s evidence is such that he gives unique insight not only into the Wars of Religion, but into society and culture in the early modern world.
Part I. Pierre de L’Estoile and his World
The Material World of a Household and Collection

Pierre de L'Estoile died aged sixty-five in his home on the rue des Grands Augustins and was buried at the parish church of Saint André des Arts on 8 October 1611. He left behind a large family and a unique collection amassed throughout his life. Based primarily on his after-death inventory, this chapter introduces L'Estoile and his world through the material culture of his household and collection. It demonstrates the choices he made in the acquisition and display of pictures, clothes, and art objects in comparison with a sample of thirty-nine inventories of similar and higher ranked royal office-holders in Paris, namely avocats, conseillers, and présidents in the Parlement, and his fellow Royal Secretaries. L'Estoile was at once typical and extraordinary in this milieu. Throughout the reception rooms of his house, his choice of furniture and display of objects fits well among this class of office-holders, and his exceptionally well-documented case gives insight into domestic life in their society. Then in his study and cabinet on the second floor, he assembled an antiquarian collection unparalleled among his contemporaries, an extension of the world he recorded in his diaries and miscellanies, and a museum of the history of the Wars of Religion.

Exploring the material world of L'Estoile’s household is crucial to understanding his social position and subjectivity. It demonstrates how he and his family engaged with and appeared to their contemporaries, how they valued their things, and how they inhabited and imagined their world. The types of objects arranged and displayed in a home indicate a level
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1 Brunet, xii, xvi.
2 See Daniel Miller, Stuff (Cambridge, 2010), pp. 4-5, 109. By contrast, in their edition of L'Estoile’s inventory Greffe and Lothe produced a quantitative study of his fortune and an outline of his library. As far as this chapter is concerned, I aim to move beyond their claims that ‘l’inventaire après décès ne permet pas de reconstituer sa disposition intérieure’, and that the furniture ‘révélaient un intérieur simple’: Greffe-Lothe, pp. 107, 114.
of purchasing power and cultural discernment relative to one’s position in the social
hierarchy. Part One of this chapter compares the situation of L’Estoile’s home with his
fellow royal office-holders, while Parts Two and Three focus on the contexts for his choices
in pictures and dress, both of which are quantifiable visual materials, rich in symbolic
meaning. The arrangement of objects in a home also provides a stage for a family’s self-
presentation, on which social interactions can be understood. Throughout, this chapter
considers how the provision of chairs, tables, beds, and pictures set the family’s social space,
making gendered divisions between ‘front stage’ public rooms for sociability and ‘back
stage’ rooms for individual privacy where the performance ceased. The example of the
L’Estoile family demonstrates how early modern bourgeois homes were not isolated and
progressively ‘private’ but instead made careful provision for sociability.

By recreating the space a family inhabited, and by evaluating the objects they used
there, it is possible to understand something of their practices in everyday life and their
sensory experiences. As a family inhabits a home and determines its arrangement, objects
come to signify and fix meanings for them with a degree of permanence. This is especially
the case for those objects set aside as a collection of special significance compared with the
rest of the household’s items. As Part Four particularly shows with the objects L’Estoile

3 Pierre Bourdieu, Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste, trans. Richard Nice (Cambridge,
4 George Wildenstein, Le goût pour la peinture dans la bourgeoisie Parisienne, 1550-1610, d’après les
inventaires après décès conservés au Minutier central des Archives Nationales (Paris, 1962); Ulinka Rublack,
5 Erving Goffman, The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life (London, 1990, first edition 1959); Miller, Stuff,
pp. 91-99.
6 See Marta Ajmar-Wollheim and Flora Dennis eds., At Home in Renaissance Italy (London, 2006); Patricia
new perspectives on sociability and domestic life in early modern Italy have challenged some French historians’
teleological focus on the emergence of a closeted ‘private life’ as a crucial condition of modernity: Roger
7 Ulinka Rublack, ‘Matter in the Material Renaissance’, Past & Present, 219 (2013), pp. 41-47; Renata Ago,
Paula Findlen (Chicago, 2013, first Italian edition 2006); Michel de Certeau, The Practice of Everyday Life,
assembled in his study and cabinet, collections constitute a treasury of meaning, put together and stored by their owner.\textsuperscript{8} Subsequent chapters develop these lines of analysis by examining the composition and use of L'Estoile’s collection throughout his life.

I. Assessing the Household

As a representation of the material world of a household, inventories do not represent true-to-life images of an interior, but contested records at a fixed moment in time.\textsuperscript{9} In this instance, the time is about two o’clock in the afternoon on Tuesday 25 October 1611.\textsuperscript{10} Colombe de Marteau, L'Estoile’s second wife and now widow, requested the inventory both as her husband’s heir and as the guardian of their children, under pressure from L'Estoile’s sons-in-law and his surviving daughters with Anne, who had not been provided for in L'Estoile’s will.\textsuperscript{11} His will has not been found, but a settlement between his heirs signed on 4 July 1612 ordered the sale of the house and the division of the proceeds between the households signing the inventory.\textsuperscript{12} A common problem with early modern inventories as sources is that crucial items one might expect to find are often missing. Assessors only record what they deemed of value to those for whom the inventory was carried out. This problem is particularly acute in L'Estoile’s inventory, where the greatest absence is his diaries and miscellanies, and it recurs throughout this chapter.

\textsuperscript{10} For the full of text L'Estoile’s inventory: Greffe-Lothe, pp. 17-79; AN MC XXIX 678, 25 October 1611.
\textsuperscript{11} Greffe-Lothe, pp. 86-88.
\textsuperscript{12} The children of L'Estoile’s first marriage received 6,000 \textit{lire\`es} from the sale: Anne and Jean de Poussemothe received 2,400 \textit{lire\`es}, Marguerite and Adrien Le Pelletier, sieur de Granville received 1,800 \textit{lire\`es}, Guillaume Duranti also received 1,800 \textit{lire\`es}. Colombe received the rest of the proceeds. L'Estoile’s son-in-law Guillaume Duranti bought the house for 24,000 \textit{lire\`es} and Colombe stayed on as a lodger: AN MC CXXII 1557, 4 July 1612; Greffé-Lothe, pp. 1071-1072.
L'Estoile’s three-storey home contained a typical if relatively humble array of reception rooms and chambers, before separating off into his exceptional study and cabinet on the second floor (see the map, photograph, and floor plan in Figures 1, 4, 5). Royal Secretaries in sixteenth-century Paris usually occupied homes of at least two principal buildings, separated by a garden or courtyard, with an average of fourteen or fifteen rooms.\footnote{Sylvie Charton-Le Clech, 	extit{Chancellerie et culture au XVI\textsuperscript{e} siècle: Les notaires et secrétaires du roi, 1515-1547} (Toulouse, 1993), pp. 129. For a range of contemporary arrangements see Madeleine Jurgens and Pierre Couperie, ‘Le logement à Paris au XVI\textsuperscript{e} et XVII\textsuperscript{e} siècles’, 	extit{Annales. Économies, sociétés, civilisations}, 17 (1962), pp. 488-500.}

Set between the rue des Grands Augustins and the courtyard that connected it to the homes of his family and friends on the rue Pavée, L’Estoile’s home of one building containing ten rooms was inferior to those of his peers. As Chapter Two demonstrates, L'Estoile ranked fairly low down in the hierarchy of Royal Secretaries, having acquired his office as their numbers considerably expanded in the mid-sixteenth century.\footnote{Hélène Michaud, 	extit{La grande chancellerie et les écritures royales au seizième siècle (1515-1589)} (Paris, 1967), pp. 100-107.} He could not match the fortunes of some of his wealthier colleagues who worked in the Great Chancery attached to the royal court and who might hold another superior royal-office.\footnote{Michaud, 	extit{La grande chancellerie}, pp. 118-126, 187-203.}

Nevertheless, the L'Estoile family’s reception rooms set a fitting stage for social interactions, presenting them as sufficiently hospitable among their class of office-holders. All manner of guests first entered the hall, accessible from the courtyard and common to all the family. No tapestry is listed here, but one kept in the loft on the day of the assessment is identified with this room and perhaps often hung there, a rather old-fashioned tapestry in ‘verdure’ that had the ‘colouring of the hall, very old and antique’, worth eighty \textit{livres}.\footnote{On Parisian Royal Secretaries’ courtly tapestries see Charton-Le Clech, 	extit{Chancellerie et culture}, pp. 149-155. Tapestry seemed out-dated in the seventeenth-century Netherlands: John Loughman and John Michael Montias, 	extit{Public and Private Spaces: Works of Art in Seventeenth-Century Dutch Houses} (Zwolle, 2000), p. 36. It is not clear whether the term ‘fort vieille et antique’ signifies ‘in the antique style’ or ‘outdated’. On Parisian tapestry production in this period see Thomas P. Campbell, 	extit{Tapestry in the Renaissance: Art and Magnificence} (London, 2002), pp. 462-465.} The hall was otherwise furnished sparsely with a large walnut table ‘done in a classical style, sat
on its trestle with turned pillars’, as well as a walnut buffet, an oak wardrobe, an oak children’s high-chair, and two small walnut chairs covered with coloured wool. Perhaps other stools had been sold or passed on, or did not merit a valuation in the inventory. Four chairs and two benches that might have served the hall were stored upstairs in a loft room. Colombe, protesting to the assessors as they left that room, declared that those chairs now belonged to her as part of her inheritance from her brother Claude, who died in 1595. A landscape painting decorated the hall, three feet long and in a gold-painted frame, worth thirty *livres* and the most valuable painting in the house. An open fireplace warmed the room from near the entrance. The hall presented a typical Parisian bourgeois reception room, with valuable tapestry and sturdy furniture, even if on the day of the assessment it lacked sufficient chairs to seat a large number of guests.

On the first floor, the main bed-chamber set an apparently more accommodating stage for familiar sociability. Perhaps another tapestry hung here, also stored in the loft at the time of the assessment. One worth 70 *livres* the assessors described as a ‘tapestry from Auvergne depicting certain characters, made up of eight pieces’, also ‘very old and antique’. The five chairs set around this chamber were of different styles and had leather or woven coverings. By the fire sat ‘a little brass tub holding two buckets, on an oak stand’ for washing. A throw ‘of diverse colours’ covered the table and another ‘of silk set above wool’ lay on the walnut buffet. The assessors found notarial contracts in a lockable safe. Precious items might also be locked in another coffer and the oak wardrobe. A painting of the ‘History of Lot’ hung in a gold painted frame, worth seven *livres*. It is not clear which moment in the story this picture represented. Many contemporary paintings of the history of Lot were lascivious, exploring
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17 On the mid-sixteenth-century popularity among Royal Secretaries of classical style furniture see Charton-Le Clech, *Chancellerie et culture*, p. 145.
18 Perhaps it hung against the chimney. L’Estoile’s painting of a ‘table de Moïse’ in the study directly above is listed ‘devant la cheminée’. This was a common place to display paintings, especially those prominent in a room.
19 Brunet, v, 195. Shown on the much later cadastral plan: AN F31 28, piece 250.
20 Perhaps also against the chimney: see above n.18.
questions of sexual morality and power relations between older men and younger women. Dominating this chamber stood two ‘little beds’ and one ‘large walnut bed’ worth fifty livres, surrounded by four posters, ‘with a high back and turned, inlaid pillars, done in the classical style’. With its yellow camlet curtains closed around, this master bed provided a sanctuary and a fortress against the cold. It also offered a comfortable place to receive guests. The hosts lay against a yellow silk back-rest, embroidered with crimson-red velour and trimmed with multi-coloured wool and silks. A yellow serge quilt spread on top of white woollen sheets and pillows. Beneath these materials sat a mattress and a feather quilt that rested on a canvas and straw base. These warm colours, the comfortable and occasionally luxury fabrics, and the range of beds and chairs, invite sociability at the heart of the home.

A small cabinet leading off from this first-floor main bed-chamber enabled L’Estoile to retreat ‘backstage’ from the social performance space of these reception rooms. This room seems to have been his private domain and he made no provision here for sociability. It contained ‘a walnut desk, covered with a green throw, holding two rolling drawers and two ‘compartments’, as well as a ‘cabinet in the German style’, and a small coffer ‘covered with green velour’. The room seems focused around ‘a small painting done in oil on wood, depicting the Tree of Life, embellished with its gold-painted frame’, worth 30 sous. L’Estoile might have used this room for prayer and meditation, or writing during the long periods he spent towards the end of his life confined to his chamber because of illness.

Retreat into the cabinet offered one solution to the bustle of a house crowded with children and servants. L’Estoile’s daughters from his first marriage with Anne de Baillon

22 Pardailhé-Galabrun, *Birth of Intimacy*, pp. 73-83.
24 The function of the furniture in this room corresponds more closely with the account presented in *A History of Private Life*, pp. 228-229 and Pardailhé-Galabrun, *Birth of Intimacy*, pp. 63-64.
25 Eg. Brunet, ix, 220.
moved out to live with their grandmother on the rue Pavée after Anne died in 1580. These daughters all married by 1601. His eldest son Louis lived at home until 1589 when he fled to join the army of the Catholic League. Of Colombe de Marteau’s eleven children, four seem to have died in infancy. That left seven children all young and unmarried when L'Estoile died in 1611. Three servants witnessed the inventory and were all described as ‘living in this house’. Others had earlier been sent away after misbehaving. Bedrooms in the front of the house made space for the children and perhaps the servants too, although the latter might instead have inhabited the otherwise empty basement. In addition to the three beds in the main bed-chamber, two other small bed-chambers on the first floor each contained two beds while one of the loft rooms contained another bed.

Throughout his diaries, L'Estoile recorded divine interventions in the domestic life of his family and especially his children. He lived in his home with a keen sense of God’s presence, mentioning the reception rooms in his diary as a site for providential escape from harm. On 9 December 1592, he wrote that ‘After I finished my dinner, as I was warming myself by the fire, I narrowly escaped being killed by plaster that fell from the bed-chamber above, passing down through the chimney, from beneath which my children, as God willed, had just left.’ The next day, when he was examining an ancient medal in his bed-chamber, the floorboard gave way beneath him and he fell through the same hole in the plaster, finding himself stuck up to his waist, and he never recovered the medal. These incidents demonstrated for L'Estoile the certainty of his salvation and God’s continued protection over his life. Incidents also served to chastise his paternal laxity. A terrible accident struck

\[27\] See below pp. 172, 175. *Family Diary*, pp. 41-42.
\[28\] Greffe-Lothe, pp. 88-91.
\[29\] Brunet, ix, 281, x, 75-76.
\[30\] Together, the small bed-chambers contained one *couché* and three *couchettes*. The loft room contained one *couchette*.
\[31\] Brunet, v, 195.
\[32\] Brunet, v, 195-196.
L'Estoile’s thirteen-year-old son Claude in his father’s wardrobe on 28 December 1610, which is listed in the inventory in the first of the second-floor loft rooms at the front of the house. As Claude peered into a coffer in the wardrobe, he found himself trapped. His candle caught his ruff and set it on fire, causing him severe burns to his neck and face. Because of his scars he could not enter the service of Madamoiselle de Montpensier, as L'Estoile had planned for the son he called ‘the best of my children and the most nimble’.

In this busy household, watched over by God, the principal reception rooms set a humble but sufficiently welcoming stage for sociability in the society of Parisian office-holders, from which L'Estoile’s cabinet offered private retreat. To situate more firmly the material world of L'Estoile’s home among his contemporaries, Parts Two and Three pause in the assessment of its rooms to compare his pictures and wardrobe with his peers, before Part Four resumes the assessment in the second-floor study and cabinet.

II. Pictures in Parisian Homes

Early modern historians have used inventories to quantify household possessions, to evaluate the scope of ownership of objects among social groups, and to consider the social context of individual tastes. This section takes a microhistorical approach to these topics, comparing the exceptional pictures displayed in L'Estoile’s home with the pictures displayed by his peers. Among the sample of thirty-nine Parisian Royal Secretaries and office-holders in the Parlement, thirty-five owned pictures. Quantification from inventories is problematic, and especially so in the case of pictures, since the format and material of these images is difficult

33 Brunet, xi, 42-43.
34 A sophisticated example of this approach is Ago, Gusto for Things.
35 Table 1.1 and Appendix I.
to determine from the often vague language of inventories. L'Estoile’s inventory, like many others, often refers to ‘a painting’, but it also mentions ‘a portrait’, ‘a head’, ‘a sheet of paper’, ‘a little roll of portraits’, and images printed in ‘taille douce’. Paintings hung in L'Estoile’s reception rooms had frames ‘trimmed with a gold border’ or ‘embellished with its gold-gilt chassis’, in contrast to the devotional paintings sometimes displayed in tabernacles or behind curtains in his contemporaries’ homes. Pictures’ values are mentioned here for comparison within L'Estoile’s inventory, but are not compared systematically across the sample, because of the problems posed by inflation and subjective evaluations conducted by individual assessors. L'Estoile’s least valuable pictures were worth around ten *sous* for a print or eighteen *sous* for a painting, up to three *livres* for his more valuable paintings, or as high as eighteen *livres* for ‘The Garden of Gethsemane’ (‘Le Jardin d’Oliviers’) in the study and thirty *livres* for the landscape in the hall. Counting types of pictures nevertheless offers a general impression of the context in which L'Estoile made decisions about which images to display in his home. L'Estoile’s choices were peculiar, even extraordinary. The pictures he displayed in reception rooms are linked by an aesthetic of a pious flight from the world, and seem distinctive among the overwhelming number of devotional pictures elsewhere in the sample of inventories. Part Four continues this analysis by focusing on the pictures L'Estoile collected in his study.
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37 ‘garny de sa bordure gauderonnée dorée’, ‘garny de son chassis doré’. Contrasting with, eg., ‘ung tableau lequel est figuré une notre dame de pitié garny de son tabernacle peint et dore a fleur de lys ’ in Marguerite Bureau (d.1582); ‘ung image notre dame garny a son tabernacle’ in Nicolas Carat (*avocat*, d.1577).
Table 1.1. Subjects of pictures in L’Estoile’s inventory compared with the inventories of thirty-five royal office-holders in Paris (d.1574-1609) and the collector François Rasse des Noeux (d.1587). Percentages given in brackets. Sources: Appendix I.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Office-holders</th>
<th>Des Noeux</th>
<th>L’Estoile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Virgin Mary</td>
<td>29 (14.5)</td>
<td>1 (1.0)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virgin and Child</td>
<td>3 (1.5)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annunciation</td>
<td>7 (2.5)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charity of the Virgin</td>
<td>5 (2.5)</td>
<td>1 (1.0)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male saints</td>
<td>14 (8.5)</td>
<td>2 (2.0)</td>
<td>1 (1.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female saints</td>
<td>2 (1.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Magdalen</td>
<td>4 (2.0)</td>
<td>1 (1.0)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nativity</td>
<td>7 (3.5)</td>
<td>1 (1.0)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christ and scenes from his life</td>
<td>11 (5.5)</td>
<td>1 (1.0)</td>
<td>2 (3.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crucifixion</td>
<td>13 (6.5)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wise and foolish virgins</td>
<td>1 (0.5)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam and Eve</td>
<td>4 (2.0)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abraham</td>
<td>5 (2.5)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isiah</td>
<td>1 (1.0)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob</td>
<td>4 (2.0)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot</td>
<td>2 (1.0)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (1.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moses</td>
<td>3 (1.5)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (1.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susannah and the Elders</td>
<td>3 (1.5)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten Commandments</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (1.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree of Life</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (1.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descent into Hell</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (1.0)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total religious</strong></td>
<td><strong>118 (59.0)</strong></td>
<td><strong>8 (8.0)</strong></td>
<td><strong>7 (10.8)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family members</td>
<td>4 (2.0)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (1.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royalty</td>
<td>2 (1.0)</td>
<td>10 (10.0)</td>
<td>16 (24.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other noteworthy figures</td>
<td>2 (1.0)</td>
<td>11 (11.0)</td>
<td>7 (10.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unidentified people</td>
<td>19 (9.5)</td>
<td>8 (8.0)</td>
<td>6 (9.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total portraits</strong></td>
<td><strong>27 (13.5)</strong></td>
<td><strong>29 (29.0)</strong></td>
<td><strong>30 (46.2)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gods and goddesses</td>
<td>5 (2.5)</td>
<td>3 (3.0)</td>
<td>1 (1.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancient history</td>
<td>11 (5.5)</td>
<td>1 (1.0)</td>
<td>2 (3.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary history</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8 (8.0)</td>
<td>3 (4.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total historical/mythological</strong></td>
<td><strong>16 (8.0)</strong></td>
<td><strong>12 (12.0)</strong></td>
<td><strong>6 (9.2)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanitas</td>
<td>1 (0.5)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8 (12.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lascivious</td>
<td>2 (1.0)</td>
<td>5 (5.0)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5 (2.5)</td>
<td>7 (5.0)</td>
<td>5 (7.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total genre</strong></td>
<td><strong>8 (4.0)</strong></td>
<td><strong>12 (12.0)</strong></td>
<td><strong>13 (20.0)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>14 (7.0)</td>
<td>3 (3.0)</td>
<td>1 (1.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>3 (1.5)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 (3.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total landscape</strong></td>
<td><strong>17 (8.5)</strong></td>
<td><strong>3 (3.0)</strong></td>
<td><strong>3 (4.6)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maps</td>
<td>4 (2.0)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6 (9.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known subject</td>
<td>190 (95.0)</td>
<td>64 (64.0)</td>
<td>65 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown subject</td>
<td>10 (5.0)</td>
<td>36 (36.0)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>200 (100.0)</strong></td>
<td><strong>100 (100.0)</strong></td>
<td><strong>65 (100.0)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1.2. Rooms in which paintings were stored and displayed by thirty-five office-holders in Paris (d.1574-1609) compared with L’Estoile’s reception rooms. Sources: Appendix I. Other = ‘garde-robe’ (1), ‘pavillion’ (1), ‘cuisine servant de salle’ (2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room</th>
<th>Office-holders (35)</th>
<th>L’Estoile’s reception rooms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main room (‘salle’)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedrooms (‘chambres’)</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study (‘estude’)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabinet (‘cabinet’)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallery (‘gallerie’)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total with room identified</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total with room unknown</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

L’Estoile’s landscape in the hall, worth thirty livres, transported his gaze away from the troubles in Paris and matches fourteen other landscapes in the sample of 190 titled pictures. Some office-holders had a taste for landscapes, but the lacunary descriptions in inventories rarely give insight into their appearances. An exception is the small collection of three landscapes owned by François Courtin (avocat, d.1609). He owned one ‘painting done in oil on wood, trimmed with a gold-gilt frame, representing a landscape’, one ‘painting in oil on canvas’ that depicted the city of Modena and other landscapes, and one ‘sheet of paper painted with several landscapes’. The first two hung in the main chamber and the latter hung in the study. A landscape displayed by Claude Dupuy (conseiller, d.1595) in the hall is the only painting given an artist’s name in the sample, ‘Noé Hueir’, which seems Germanic or Netherlandish and so hints at some stylistic context. Some historians have associated late sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century landscape paintings with ideas of leisure and country retreat, while others have emphasised their religious significance to both Protestants

---


A ‘painting done in oil on wood, depicting the History of Lot, surrounded by its gold-gilt frame’ hung in L’Estoile’s main chamber, worth seven \textit{livres}. Lot figures in two other inventories in the sample, but not in prestigious locations. Adrian du Drac (Royal Secretary and \textit{conseiller}, d.1577) displayed his Lot in a ‘small chamber overlooking the road’ while Guillaume Martin (\textit{avocat}, d.1591) showed Lot in the unenviable ‘kitchen serving as a hall’. More common Old Testament scenes in the sample are Abraham (5), Adam and Eve (4), Jacob (4), Moses (3), and Suzannah and the Elders (3).\footnote{Wildenstein, \textit{Goût pour la peinture}, p. 26, found that the History of Lot was one of the most popular Old Testament scenes depicted in pictures listed in Parisian inventories of this period. Perhaps my sample of royal office-holders is exceptional in this case.} No other inventory in the sample lists a Tree of Life.\footnote{On this theme: Simon Schama, \textit{Landscape and Memory} (London, 1996), pp. 220-226.} Throughout the sample, these few Old Testament scenes contrast with the large number of Virgins (29), saints (14 male, 6 female), scenes of Christ’s life and crucifixion (24), and the Nativity (7). L’Estoile made his measured disdain of the cult of the Virgin clear: he explained after purchasing a pamphlet in April 1610 that ‘the perfections of the Virgin, for my part, I find in the charity and humility of this sacred Lady, which made her worthy to carry the true fruit of life, our Lord Jesus Christ, and earned for her the glorious
and goodly name of the Mother of God … I want to be a religious man, but not a
superstitious one’.44 None of her superstitious images would hang in his home, and
L'Estoile’s decision to display prominently the History of Lot went against norms of the
display of pictures in his milieu.

The discrepancies between those office-holders like L'Estoile who displayed Old
Testament or secular images, and the majority who displayed devotional images of Virgins
and saints, suggest differences in private piety among these Catholic office-holders.45 On the
more obviously devotional side in the sample, Adrien du Drac (Royal Secretary and
conseiller, d.1577) hung his twenty-four paintings across two properties, mostly in individual
chambers, including ten Virgins, three images of Christ, and three saints, alongside Adam
and Eve, Lot, Lucretia, and four unidentified subjects. Louis Desportes (Royal Secretary and
avocat, d.1581) made the strongest confessional statement. He displayed paintings of Saint
Peter, Saint Suzanne, and a landscape in the hall, then ‘a small painting on taffetas of pope
Gregory, embellished with its frame’ in his study.46 The three widows in the sample owned
only religious pictures. Denis Rebuffe (avocat d.1584) displayed one Virgin in the hall, but
when his widow Esperence de Sainct-Mesmyn died in 1591 she had added a Jacob and Isaac,
a Saint Francis, and a Sacrifice of Abraham. However, even determined opponents of
Catholicism might own devotional pictures. The inventory of the Protestant surgeon and
collector François Rasse des Noeux (d.1587) listed one hundred pictures, including
devotional pictures of the Virgin, saints, and the nativity.47 More familiar to L’Estoile were
the paintings of his acquaintance Claude Dupuy, who owned one landscape and eight
unspecified ‘histories’, all shown in his hall, or those of Denis Duboys (avocat, d.1589) who

44 Brunet, x, 199.
46 ‘ung petit tableau de taffetas auquel est peint le pape gregoire garny de son chassis’.
47 On François Rasse des Noeux see below p. 49 n. 75.
showed a Jupiter and two landscapes in different chambers. But these homes lacking in devotional images are the exceptions. For the most part the individuals in the sample are distinguished by the degree of exclusivity with which they displayed religious images.

L'Estoile avoided devotional images in his home and a sense of pious flight from the world links his landscape to the History of Lot on display in the hall and main chamber, as well as the Tree of Life in the first-floor cabinet. Subsequent chapters continue to explore L'Estoile’s position in the religious middle ground, but for the moment it is remarkable that his attitude to the visual conforms more closely with Protestant norms, in cautious opposition to his overtly Catholic peers. However, he compares directly with the office-holders in the sample in the number and types of pictures displayed in his reception rooms (Table 1.2). These rooms therefore are distinctive but not out of place in the society of royal office-holders in Paris.

III. Wardrobes and Self-Presentation in Everyday Life

The assessors of L'Estoile’s inventory found clothes in ‘a large pair of oak wardrobes with six doors, of which two are lockable, measuring eight-feet high and seven-feet long, or thereabouts’, worth ten livres and kept in a second-floor loft room at the front of the house. The contents of L'Estoile’s and Colombe’s wardrobe permit an evaluation of the couple’s self-presentation in everyday life through their choices of clothes. Like many of his colleagues in the Parlement, L'Estoile seems to have been concerned with upholding morality and the social hierarchy through dress. He denounced excesses in costume at Henri III’s court that he felt undermined traditional customs. Nevertheless, he was not the raving critic

48 The consequences of this attitude are explored in Chapter Five.
49 Rublack, Dressing Up, pp. 21-26.
50 For his satisfaction at an example of the enforcement of sumptuary laws see Lazard-Schrenck, iv, 104.
that some historians have suggested as they exaggerated the importance of these passages.

His reproaches were usually targeted not at everyday court apparel but costumes at particular court festivities, that he reported inaccurately.\textsuperscript{51} Comparing L'Estoile’s and Colombe’s wardrobes with a sample of their peers, friends, and relatives, it seems clear that Royal Secretaries and their wives dressed according to rank. However, they were not simply dour figures in the ‘old regime of dress’; they found all manner of ways to assert their individual tastes with modesty.\textsuperscript{52}

Table 1.3. Men’s wardrobes: Pierre de L'Estoile, his friends, and relations.\textsuperscript{53}
Sources: Appendix I. François Tronson, conseiller (1591); Claude Dupuy, conseiller (1595); Pierre II Seguier, président (1602); Pierre de L'Estoile, secrétaire du roi (1611).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Garment</th>
<th>François Tronson</th>
<th>Claude Dupuy</th>
<th>Pierre II Séguier</th>
<th>Pierre de L’Estoile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coats and cloaks</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robes and soutanes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassocks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doublets</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breeches</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hats and hoods</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.4. Women’s wardrobes: widows of Pierre de L'Estoile, his friends, and relations. Sources: Appendix I. Anne Bedeau, widow of Tronson; Claude Sanguyn, widow of Dupuy; Marie du Thillet, widow of Seguier; Colombe de Marteau, widow of L'Estoile.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Garment</th>
<th>Anne Bedeau</th>
<th>Claude Sanguyn</th>
<th>Marie du Thillet</th>
<th>Colombe de Marteau</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coats and cloaks</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petticoats</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoods</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{51} Jacqueline Boucher, \textit{La cour de Henri III} (Rennes, 1986), pp. 25-26, 121-123.


Table 1.5. Wardrobes of nine Royal Secretaries, 1574-1604. Sources: Appendix I.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Garment</th>
<th>Mean number owned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coats and cloaks</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robes and soutanes</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassocks</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doublets</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breeches</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hats and hoods</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.6. Wardrobes of the widows of eight Royal Secretaries, 1574-1604. Sources: Appendix I.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Garment</th>
<th>Mean number owned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coats and cloaks</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robes</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petticoats</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoods</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A striking anomaly appears from this comparison: L'Estoile and Colombe had the barest wardrobes in the sample of office-holders’ inventories. As explained above, inventories give a partial, momentary, and contested record of a household’s possessions. Perhaps Colombe or other relatives had sold or given away clothes before the inventory was taken, and it is likely that the assessors missed out totally worthless pieces, for example very damaged items or pieces that could not be resold. Children’s clothes are also missing from the inventory. The same problems might affect any inventory in the sample, although L'Estoile perhaps had more reason to dispose of any fine clothes because of financial difficulties and health problems towards the end of his long life.

What options were open to royal office-holders in their choice of dress? A significant distinction among the wardrobes in the sample would have seemed obvious to any sixteenth-

54 Adrian du Drac’s inventory does not list any clothes and François de La Pesloe’s inventory does not list any men’s clothes.
55 The inventories of Jean Fortin, Jean Wallet do not list any women’s clothes.
56 Their wardrobes in Greffe-Lothe, pp. 35-36.
57 Roche, Culture of Clothing, pp. 87-90.
58 Discussed in Chapter Six.
century Parisian. According to sumptuary law and contemporary conduct literature, while all royal office-holders should dress with gravity in long black robes over their shirts, doublets, and breeches, only conseillers and présidents in the Parlement might wear distinctive black and red robes on ceremonial occasions.59 When processing with his colleagues from the Great Chamber, the conseiller Claude Dupuy strode majestically in his ‘great robe with scarlet red, seemingly made of black velour, adorned with its fur hood’, worth ninety livres.60 These magisterial outfits constrained the wearer to slow, measured movements, demonstrating equally his superior capacity for emotional self-restraint. Frans Pourbus the Younger’s near-contemporary portrait of the conseiller Guillaume du Vair displays the solemnity of this magisterial attire (Figure 23). The broad, puffed shoulders of Du Vair’s black coat make the regal, scarlet-red velour trim stand out as it tucks under his haughty, pointed collar. Only his long, sagacious beard contravened contemporary recommendations for magistrates.61 Despite their lack of such ceremonial costume, Royal Secretaries owned more clothes than the conseillers among L’Estoile’s friends and family, possessing on average more coats, cloaks, and robes.

Yet even among comparable office-holders, personal differences can be seen in the number, quality, and style of items of clothing. L’Estoile owned just one black coat, with ‘twisted threads’, whereas Royal Secretaries owned on average 7.4 coats, and his friends and relatives owned three or four.62 Some colleagues owned raincoats and coats designated for the Palais.63 Displaying subtle discernment concerning fabrics and cuts, L’Estoile’s half-brother, the conseiller François Tronson, had four fine coats, one in dark crimson bordered with silk, another in black serge doubled with velour, a third in black taffetas also bordered

---

60 ‘grande robbre de scarlette rouge aparament de velours noir garnye de son chaperon fourré’.
62 ‘de fils retors’.
63 Eg. Estienne Guybert, Jacques Perdrier, Pierre II Séguier.
with silk, and a fourth that came in a set with a ‘jacket in fustian, cord, and black felt, bordered and laced with silk, and doubled with black velour by the collar’. 64 L'Estoile’s two soutanes and one robe seem mean when compared to the average of seven among the Royal Secretaries, and miserly when compared to the président Pierre II Séguier’s sumptuous fifteen, in varied materials and all black if the colour was mentioned. Séguier also had chamber robes coloured black and violet, made with camlet, satin, serge, taffetas, and velour, some bordered with fur, all either with long or short sleeves. Perhaps these diverse chamber robes afforded greater personal expression at home, away from the stark conformity of the Palais. By contrast, both of L'Estoile’s soutanes were damaged, one ‘entirely in pieces’ and the other ‘also torn’. His robe was short sleeved and without doubling, the only item of any value in his wardrobe, worth eight livres. Of his two sets of doublets and breeches one was ‘of little value’ and the other at least ‘fashioned’ with velour. Old clothes did not have to be dull clothes, as L'Estoile’s old friend François Béroalde de Verville demonstrated with his ‘violet serge chamber robe, almost worn out’ and ‘three old hats and one other that is valuable’, along with his standard black robes and coats.65 Wearing his worn-out clothes, L'Estoile conformed only to the bare essentials of a Royal Secretary’s wardrobe. Several of his peers went considerably further, expressing personal tastes for particular cuts, colours, and materials in their wardrobes. Their examples demonstrate the pressure of rank in structuring choices of dress, but also the potential for individual variety within even the most conformist social hierarchy.

In contrast to the royal court, women in the society of Royal Secretaries and office-holders in the Parlement generally owned fewer but more colourful outfits. Although they did not own property and negotiated a strictly patriarchal society, these women used clothes to

64 ‘ung manteau a menche et une juppe en fussin et capon de caban noir bordée et passementée de soye alentour et doublée de vellours noir par le collet’.
demonstrate their potential to mix with court and urban elites, and to cultivate a personal look with relatively greater options than their husbands.\(^{66}\) Colombe had fewer clothes to choose from than her peers. Her ‘autumn-leaf damask petticoat doubled with bocasin of the same colour’ was distinctive, but otherwise her one torn robe and two petticoats comprise a rather empty wardrobe in comparison with the other Royal Secretaries’ widows, as well as the wives of L’Estoile’s friends and relatives, Anne Bedeau, Claude Sanguyn, and Marie du Thillet. The wardrobe of Anne Bedeau, L’Estoile’s sister-in-law and widow of François Tronson, is the most elegant of this group. She owned ten coats in satin and velours; most of them doubled, trimmed, or layered with silk and bocasin; some brightly coloured and others printed or striped; and one ‘cut across with jewellery’.\(^{67}\) Alongside such outfits, stashes of material constituted a domestic collection, a treasury of set-aside fabrics. Like many other women in the sample, Marie du Thillet, widow of Pierre II Séguier, had sleeves and a bag, as well as pieces of leather, velour, and fur with which to adapt her clothes. Sleeves needed attaching, belts needed threading through, and entire outfits might be planned. Colombe kept her collection in a personalised ‘night chest covered with violet velour and gold and silk embroidery, with a lock, embellished with a large mirror trimmed with the same velour; and a bag for night clothes also in violet velour, embellished with a silk and gold surround, doubled with violet Bruges satin’, all worth twenty livres. No male wardrobe in the sample displayed such an array of colour and fabrics, or such intricately personalised items.

Colombe’s wardrobe, worth thirty-eight livres and sixty sols, far surpassed that of her husband, worth sixteen livres ten sols, but neither of their wardrobes compared favourably with their contemporaries in terms of the number and value of items. Overall, L’Estoile’s apparently shabby look indicates his old age and lowly status among the Royal Secretaries. It suggests that he preferred to express his subjectivity not through his wardrobe, but instead by


\(^{67}\) ‘descoupé de joyaulx’.
dressing his cabinet and collection. At the end of his life, wearing these threadbare robes, L'Estoile displayed a disregard for worldly appearances that contrasted with the wonders of his collection.

IV. A Collector’s World

When the assessors opened the door to L'Estoile’s study and cabinet on the second floor at the back of the house, they stepped out of a typical Parisian bourgeois home and entered into a collector’s world. There they found sixty-two more pictures alongside art objects and heaps of books (the latter I set aside in this chapter, and discuss in Part Two of the thesis). L'Estoile described his manuscripts as ‘the Storehouse of my Curiosities’ – ‘le Magazin de mes Curiosités’ – a humble, mnemonic metaphor that suggests the rag-bag accumulation of rare and fragmentary pieces. In his study and cabinet L'Estoile assembled the material extension of his diaries and miscellanies. Here he kept apart from rest of the house an array of pictures, art objects, medals, and manuscripts, giving them a clearly defined subject and meaning, as fragments of their troubled times that made up a museum of the history of the Wars of Religion. This section argues that L'Estoile merits a place in early modern European cultures of collecting, suggesting how the civil wars might be a stimulus as much as a disruption to collecting in sixteenth-century France.

A characteristic feature of L'Estoile’s collection is that it was stored entirely in his study. This does not mean that this room was a private space, but that it set a different stage for sociability to the other reception rooms in the house. Early modern humanists assembled objects in their studies to demonstrate to their peers their claims to civility and prestige. As Chapter Six shows in detail, L'Estoile similarly used the study as a place to impress and welcome learned friends who shared his enthusiasms. Containing the collection demanded its practical organisation in the study across eight bookshelves, eight cupboards, three coffers, ‘several large shelves’, one main desk and two further desks for amanuenses. It is difficult to determine from the inventory how his pictures were arranged. They seem to have been crammed into every available space. L'Estoile paid coverers to fix a leak in the attic roof, but having spent 60 livres on these ‘real thieves’, rainwater on 16 April 1610 damaged his ‘craïon’ portrait of Jean de Poltrot, sieur de Meré, the assassin of François de Guise in 1563, as well as a painting of a vanitas skull. The leak was devastating since the two pictures were among ‘my rarest pictures and the ones I like the most’. L'Estoile claimed that he acquired the portrait of Poltrot from the cabinet of the Marie de Clèves, princesse de Condé, who died in 1574. It accompanied a series of epitaph poems both for and against Poltrot’s actions in one of L'Estoile’s manuscript miscellanies. In the next-door cabinet, inviting discussion and devoid of the clutter of the study, the assessors noted a desk covered with a green throw, a table ‘for putting books on’, and five conversation chairs, with a chandelier and a lamp serving to illuminate objects and their discussion. Between these two rooms L'Estoile

71 MacGregor, Curiosity and Enlightenment, p. 66-69 and Dora Thornton, The Scholar in his Study: Ownership and Experience in Renaissance Italy (New Haven, 1997), pp. 99-125, balance the individual and social functions of the study, as opposed to the stress on the individual privacy of the study in A History of Private Life, pp. 225-227.
72 Brunet, ix, 84, 129-130, x, 198-199.
balanced his needs of storage, display, and close examination of the objects in his collection with friends and acquaintances.

L'Estoile separated his collection from his family. Although his sons sometimes worked in his study as amanuenses, he otherwise did not report that his family had access to his second-floor study and cabinet. At best he brought them down gifts, as on New Year’s day 1609 when he gave to Colombe a purse and a pair of gloves, and to his daughters Louise and Marie a ring each, from a collection of twenty he kept in his cabinet ‘out of curiosity’. Alongside these rings in the collection of precious metals in his cabinet he kept Colombe’s chafing dish, salt cellar, dish, and ten spoons. She insisted that the inventory assessors note that the spoons now belonged to her, following her brother’s inheritance. By contrast, the Parisian collector and Protestant surgeon François Rasse des Noeux displayed his one hundred paintings throughout the house, with twenty-two in the hall, sixty-eight in the main chamber, and ten in the study, which also contained weapons and a ‘droguerie’ for his natural specimens. L'Estoile’s study and cabinet appears as a crowded, uniquely male space for learned sociability.

Expert assessors valued the ‘paintings, portraits, and figures’ in L'Estoile’s study: Gabriel Tavernier, ‘portrait seller’ on the Pont Marchant, and Jehan Pitain ‘master painter’ from the nearby suburb of Saint-Germain. L'Estoile reported acquiring engravings from Tavernier, who sourced pictures from the Netherlands and Rome. On 18 August 1608 Tavernier gave him ‘four new engravings in taille-douce, made in Flanders against the Pope,

74 Brunet, ix, 192.
but just as weighed-down and coarse as those spirits in the country from which they came’.  
77 He also acquired engravings from Jean Le Clerc, who traded with Spanish and Roman contacts from his publishing house just off the rue Saint Jacques. Only rarely did L’Estoile mention acquiring paintings rather than engravings for his collection, perhaps because he acquired them before he expanded his diaries in 1606 and began to meticulously document his collecting habits. If paintings were exchanged as gifts, L’Estoile did not record receiving any in return. He gave to Jean de L’Espine ‘the portrait made by the painter Titian of Cardinal Cajetan, exquisitely done and elaborated’, esteemed even if it was most likely a copy.  
79 In the absence of major commercial art dealers in Paris, painters sold their productions from their studios, or portrait sellers sold their wares in the Palais de Justice. Most artists in early seventeenth-century Paris were Flemish, but L’Estoile mentions dealing with at least one Italian, when he sold ‘old portraits’ worth forty francs to ‘an Italian painter named Gabriel de Serniole’.  
81 Finer royal portraits often appeared in the Parisian art market following sales from dynastic collections, such as that of the Queen Mother, Catherine de Médicis whose paintings in her Parisian Hôtel de Soissons were gradually dispersed after her death in 1589.  
82 Among the pictures in his study and cabinet, L’Estoile owned an unusually large number of portraits, including leading figures who governed the world of his manuscripts. He owned pictures of the kings whose reigns structured his diaries: a probably engraved ‘portrait’ of Henri III was worth thirty sous, while a painting of Henri IV ‘on canvas’ was

---

77 Brunet, ix, 117.
79 Brunet, ix, 40; Greffe-Lothe, p. 119.
81 Brunet, ix, 283; Schnapper, *Curieux du Grand Siècle*, p. 86.
83 Several Parisian bourgeois owned a royal portrait, but none of them matched the scale of L’Estoile’s collection: Wildenstein, *Gout pour la peinture*, pp. 44-45.
worth three *livres*, and an image of the Bourbon king ‘on copper enriched with marble and embellished with its wooden border’ was worth six *livres*. L'Estoile’s comments on printed portraits marked his interest in the quality of likenesses. His judgement in the margins of a 1596 engraved portrait by Philippe Thomassin of Henri IV, triumphant on the battlefield, was that ‘Everything is good about this portrait, apart from the face, which does not resemble the King at all’ (Figure 20).  

Elsewhere in the study, his uneven array of portraits – some painted ‘on canvas’ or ‘on wood’, others printed ‘on paper’ and ‘in *taille douce*’ – also depicted some of the emperors and princes who ruled throughout Europe, many of whom feature throughout the diaries in reports of international politics. Alongside these rulers, L'Estoile owned portraits of figures from the highest ranks of the aristocracy and royal office-holders in France. Matching his portrait worth three *livres*, he wrote a critical obituary for the poet and *avocat général* in the Parlement of Paris, Guy du Faur, sieur de Pibrac, notorious for publishing a justification of the Saint Bartholomew’s day massacre: ‘one of the rarest and most diminished spirits of this century, since ambition cut his throat, as it normally does to men of too much discourse and spirit’. L'Estoile’s evaluations of these figures resemble at first glance the elegies that the Italian humanist and historian Paolo Giovio composed as inscriptions to match the portraits of the illustrious men who filled his museum. 

Yet L'Estoile’s terse moral assessments, and his amateur collector’s eye for accurate depiction, suggest instead that his portraits had a critical documentary purpose, as an extension of his

---

84 Brunet, iv, 331-332; *Drolleries*, fol. 38r. See also Brunet, iv, 351-381; *Drolleries*, 42r, where L’Estoile commented that a portrait of Mathieu Chartier ‘ne lui ressemble point’ and that a still widely-reproduced portrait of François Rabelais ‘ne lui retrait aucunement’. 
85 Lazard-Schrenck, iv, 139. 
diaries and records of the men who shaped, or misshaped, the French kingdom during the
Wars of Religion.  

A distinctive theme common to L'Estoile’s pictures and art objects is the brevity of life and the proximity of death, the vanity of all things. He copied a Senecan commonplace onto the frontispiece of one of his miscellanies, ‘Just as we are born unequal, we die as equals’. Displaying this theme, vanitas painting developed as an independent genre in the early seventeenth century, depicting skulls to present an allegory of the brevity of life, now dominating pictures rather than appearing as a support to an iconographical scheme as they typically did in the sixteenth century. L'Estoile’s collection seems to respond to this emerging trend since he owned four paintings of skulls, variously described. The only comparable picture elsewhere in the sample is a ‘painting in oil on wood’ that depicted ‘a little child with his food on a skull’, displayed by the Royal Secretary Jerome Grenier (d.1602) in a second bed-chamber along with a landscape and three devotional paintings. Vanitas themes can be seen in several other paintings L'Estoile owned: ‘an old Man’s head’, ‘the portrait of male and female Bubble-Blowers’, ‘a little Laughing figure’ and ‘a Laughing Figure’, perhaps directing its scorn at the next picture on the list, ‘a portrait of the Spanish Inquisition’. Objects in L'Estoile’s collection also carried these themes. One of his most valuable figurines, worth, twelve livres, was ‘a pleasant earthenware figure that holds in its hand a vase with a skull at its heart’. He also owned ‘a skull that is in a gold-gilt container with a velours screen’ that juxtaposed transient wealth and imminent death. Vanitas themes

---

might also be seen reflected in a mirror, a lantern, and several glass balls, two ‘pleasant on
the eye’, one coloured, and another fatally broken.

The *vanitas* theme connects fragments of L'Estoile’s diaries and collection. As Chapters Two and Three demonstrate, L'Estoile reported all manner of sudden, unexpected, and prodigious deaths in Paris, as well as curious or rare occurrences that concerned people of all social groups, from royal office-holders to base criminals. Providing visual companions to these reports, L'Estoile owned genre pictures in much greater numbers than his contemporaries in the sample, especially representations of social types. Although these pictures are generally of little value, they are described as being painted ‘on canvas’, ‘on wood’, or as a ‘tableau’, with none described as being printed. L'Estoile owned pictures of ‘a little Peasant’, ‘a Cavalier’, ‘a sewing woman’, ‘a Wet-nurse’, and ‘a woman from Bruges’. The proximity of death touched these folk as much as the elites whose portraits they accompanied in L'Estoile’s study.

These pieces demonstrate common interests between L'Estoile’s diaries and collection, but it is often difficult to determine how they were displayed and handled.

Crowning one shelf positioned above the door sat a prized antique marble bust, the most valuable art object in his study. On Tuesday 19 January 1593, when ‘arranging things in my study, mounted at the top of my ladder’, this bust became detached from its stand and almost threw him to the floor, but ‘as God miraculously and above my usual strength supported me’, he held himself steady and climbed back up the ladder by leaning on some books. The English sculptor Epiphanius Evesham assessed L'Estoile’s sculptures, valuing this bust at fifty livres. Objects could be taken down from shelves and out of cupboards to be discussed

---

91 For some of the subjects of genre paintings found in sixteenth-century Parisian inventories see Wildenstein, *Gout pour la peinture*, pp. 47-51.
92 Brunet, v, 213.
with friends around the green table in the cabinet, under the light of the chandelier and lamp. Rulers’ busts, earthenware figurines of social types, and models of skulls hold the same themes as L'Estoile’s picture collection. Each piece might carry a memory of its acquisition.94 One object missing from the inventory deserves pride of place among these items: as a dying gift in November 1590, the Huguenot potter and artisan natural philosopher Bernard Palissy asked his aunt to give L'Estoile his ‘Philosopher’s Stone’ in the form of a ‘skull that the passing of time had turned to stone, with another that he used when working on his creations: these two stones are in my cabinet, and I guard them with care in memory of this good old man’.95 Palissy’s fossilised skull recalled the potter’s death to L'Estoile, but also carried within it the reassuring knowledge of the resurrection, that new life can be forged in the outline of death.96

Medals occupied a prominent place in L'Estoile’s collection.97 They were among the most sought-after and characteristic pieces in an early modern cabinet of antiquarian rarities.98 L'Estoile began to acquire them towards the end of the 1580s, and for years he kept his distinguished array of medals indiscriminately in ‘a green velour purse … having always kept them close there’, ready to be tipped onto the green table in the cabinet for examination. In June 1608 he had this collection of 145 ancient and modern medals catalogued by the collector and conseiller Jean Courtin, who categorised them by ‘the emblems and the years’, and was rewarded with the two doubles he identified.99 L'Estoile bought, sold, and swapped these medals with leading collectors in Paris and beyond, including Claude Menestrier, ‘one

95 Brunet, v, 67.
99 Brunet, ix, 87, 89-90.
of the greatest antiquaries and medallists of our times’, and their mutual friend Nicole Claude Fabri de Peiresc, the erudite Provençal collector and distinguished numismatist, whose collection of up to 25,000 medals focused on late antique and medieval coins. L’Estoile demonstrated his expertise with his collection of medals of contemporary history, although the precise balance of ancient and modern medals in his collection is unclear. He felt ‘great curiosity’ handling a medal ‘forged by the Huguenots at Orléans during the first troubles’, explaining that to forge medals with such fine silver ‘they used the utensils and relics of the churches, that the Huguenots melted down in that town’. They marked the pieces with a little ‘o’ to record their provenance, and ‘not many people know about that’. These pieces he regarded as serving ‘as a memorial and mark of our civil wars’, a phrase that summarises much of L’Estoile’s collecting throughout his cabinet.

As L’Estoile accumulated pieces for his cabinet over time, he generally avoided the naturalia that many other early modern European collectors of curiosities pursued, and his study and cabinet are empty of objects representing the natural world and lands beyond Europe. So are the other inventories in the sample. These office-holders’ legal and historical training did not encourage in them a curiosity for the natural world. When L’Estoile remarked on the few extra-European natural specimens in other Parisian collectors’ cabinets he did so with wonder but little discernment. His cabinet contained a lone natural specimen, ‘a morsel of coral’, and a single object he supposed was from Asia, ‘a little book of Chinese paper, covered with very nice marbled paper, that I have kept for a long time in my

---

101 Ancient medals proved more popular than modern ones among L’Estoile’s contemporary collectors: Schnapper, Les cabinets de curiosités, pp. 294-295.
102 Brunet, ix, 249.
103 ‘pour mémorial et marque de nos fureurs civiles’. Brunet, ix, 106.
104 Schnapper, Les cabinets de curiosités, however, gives many, later examples of erudite collectors in seventeenth-century France who collected both antiquities and natural specimens, above all Peiresc.
The general absence of natural or exotic objects in his collection follows his lack of interest in his diaries for news from beyond Europe.\(^{107}\) Equally, his over-stocked library lacks books on Asia and the New World, apart from a set containing ‘Nine volumes, 8\(^{o}\), of the history of the Indies, and other newly discovered lands, by diverse authors’.\(^{108}\) With its lack of *naturalia*, L'Estoile’s collection does not fit completely with one model of the early modern European cabinet of curiosities as a representation in miniature of the great macrocosm of God’s creation. Instead his pictures and art objects form an antiquarian array of recent social and political, not natural history.\(^{109}\)

Among contemporary discourses on collecting, the closest model to L'Estoile’s study and cabinet is the advice Gabriel Kaltermarkt offered in 1587 to Christian I of Saxony on the formation of an art collection.

In addition to such libraries and book collections, illustrious potentates also established picture galleries or art collections (whatever one wants to call them) in order to encounter the events of history and those who through their deeds created them not only in books but also, through drawings and paintings, as a delight to the eye and a strengthening of memory, as a living incitement to do good and avoid evil, and also as a source of study of art-loving youth.\(^{110}\)

Some of the pieces in L'Estoile’s collection were a ‘delight to the eye’, such as his unique assembly of *vanitas* images, or his rare pots and plates cast in imitation of nature. His medals, art objects, and pictures served for the ‘strengthening of memory’, since they enabled

\(^{106}\) Brunet, ix, 179, he gave one of these books to Pierre Dupuy and kept another for himself.

\(^{107}\) A rare exception is Lazard-Schrenck, v, 198-199.

\(^{108}\) ‘Neuf volumes, 8\(^{o}\), des histoires des Indes, et autres pais nouvellement descouverts, de divers auteurs’. Greffe and Lothe speculate as to which octavo volumes on the New World might have appeared in L'Estoile’s library, with no explanation or justification for their plausible but arbitrary choice of texts from the great mass of publications they might have selected: Greffe-Lothe, items in the library # 7, 509, 1089, 1278, 1585, 1587, 1668, 1729, 1772.


\(^{110}\) Gutfleisch and Menzhausen, ‘How a kunstkammer Should Be Formed’, p. 8.
him to ‘encounter the events of history’ by handling and looking at them. Yet L'Estoile’s cabinet cannot be subsumed into this dominant discourse on early modern cultures of antiquarian collecting. Instead of taking the position of an ‘illustrious potentate’ basking in the glory of his collection, L'Estoile observed with critical detachment the characters who filled his study and diaries, who deserved a place in his museum of the history of their times because they were sufficiently influential if not illustrious, or because they were typical of the groups that made up his society. Forming an idiosyncratic museum of the history of the Wars of Religion, L'Estoile’s example demonstrates that the civil wars could be a stimulus to collecting as well as a disrupting force that supposedly set French collectors behind their European contemporaries.

This approach to L'Estoile and his collection situates him as a ‘normal exception’ among the Royal Secretaries and office-holders in the Parlement of Paris. On the ground and first floors of his home, L'Estoile interacted with family and friends in the habitual manner for Parisian royal office-holders, although wearing a rather shabby robe, and with a pious disregard for the devotional images that most of his peers displayed in their homes. Distinctions of social rank and religious disposition informed his choices, which were structured by the norms of display in his milieu, and which can be studied thanks to the exceptional combination of surviving sources. Part One of this thesis continues the discussion of L'Estoile’s place Parisian society by exploring his professional life in the Palais de Justice, while discussions of his religious position and the problems it caused recur throughout subsequent chapters. It is L'Estoile’s extraordinary collection that marks his distinction among his contemporaries. Part Two of this thesis follows its formation, use, and significance for his contemporaries. Most visitors to his home probably did not visit his second-floor study and cabinet, which was set apart from the rest of the house as a site for learned, male sociability. In this room,
L'Estoile and his fellow collectors interacted in another space entirely, what he called ‘the Storehouse of my Curiosities’, and the world of his historical imagination.
Office and Duties in the Palais de Justice

A short walk across the Pont Saint Michel from Pierre de L'Estoile’s home on the rue des Grands Augustins, the Palais de Justice dominated the western end of the Île de la Cité, the seat of the Parlement of Paris in the heart of the capital (Figures 1-3). For L’Estoile, the Parlement was a ‘great Company, the first and the most renowned in all of Europe’.¹ He worked in the Chancery attached to the Parlement, holding an office as a Hearer (audiencier) and Royal Secretary, passing his entire career in the Palais.² In its courtyard, halls, galleries, and chambers, he sourced much of the information for the reports in his diaries. Here office-holders, suitors, and people of all ranks; from across the vast jurisdiction of the Parlement and beyond; came together to gather news, do business, and pursue justice.³ Through years of professional service and inherited family experience, L’Estoile instinctively understood the hierarchies, duties, and politics of the Palais. As an audiencier, he did not have the public voice of his friends and relations who held offices as présidents or conseillers and participated in debates in the Great Chamber of the Parlement, or as avocats at its bar, nor their capacity to administer or give judgements in civil and criminal cases.⁴ Instead of making public speeches before his more distinguished colleagues, L’Estoile shared information with them that he transformed into reports in his diaries. His office governed the sources of his reports and the way he thought about and represented his world.

¹ Brunet, xi, 90.
² Lazard-Schrenck, i, 9, 17 and Greffe-Lothe, pp. 95-99 state basic details about L'Estoile’s office but they make no attempt to relate his office-holding to the broader context of the social hierarchy in the Parlement and the practice of the venality of offices, nor link his office to the reports in his diaries.
Demonstrating the connections between L'Estoile’s office-holding and reporting, as well as the significance of the Palais de Justice as a site of information and communication in Paris, Part One of this chapter places L'Estoile in the social hierarchy of the Palais, analysing his duties in its Chancery and his involvement in the sale of offices. Part Two then outlines his role in signing printers’ privileges, a duty that gave him direct access to Parisian publishers who sold their wares in the Palais and beyond. This activity cultivated in him a sense of oversight and censorship of their activities which is crucial to understanding his book collecting and reports of the Parisian print trade throughout his life. Chapter Three continues this analysis, focusing on L'Estoile’s accounts of crimes and criminal justice in the Parlement, before reaching a general conclusion on the relationship between his office and the reports of his diaries.

I. Office as Hearer and Royal Secretary

L'Estoile declared his official title as ‘conseiller notaire et secretaire du roy et audiencier en la chancellery de Paris’. Randle Cotgrave concisely interpreted the role for Anglophone audiences in his *Dictionarie of the French and English Tongues* (London, 1611):

Audiencier: m. *A hearer, or giver of audience; also, an Officer in the Chancery, that examines, or heares read, all letters patents, &c, before they passe the seale, and delivers them out, being sealed; he also receives the fees of the seale, and thereout payes all wages, and stipends assigned unto the offices, and defrayes all the ordinarie charges, of that court ...*

---

5 His declaration varied slightly in notarial documents, especially in the manner in which the Chancery was described. This is how his title was given in the contract finalising the purchase of his house: AN MC XXXIX 8, 8 June 1575. See Robert Descimon, ‘Un langage de la dignité: La qualification des personnes dans la société parisienne à l’époque moderne’ in Fanny Cosandey ed., *Dire et vivre l’ordre social: En France sous l’Ancien Régime* (Paris, 2005), pp. 80, 89.
Le grand audiencier de France. The chiefe Audiencier of France, and chiefe paymaster of all Chancerie Officers; for unto him the inferior Audiencier (in each Parliamentall Chancerie one) payes over, everie halfe yeare, that which he hath received.

On 29 June 1566, straight out of university and a month short of his twentieth birthday, L'Estoile took up his office as audiencier, a dignified position in Parisian society entailing duties in the royal administration. A transcription of the rolls presented to the royal seal records this event. François Tronson, L'Estoile’s father-in-law, resigned his office in L'Estoile’s favour before he died on 6 September that year. Behind this official recognition of L'Estoile’s assumption of office surely lies the phenomenon known as ‘venality’ or the sale of offices. Among papers kept in the coffer of L'Estoile’s bed-chamber, the notaries who compiled L'Estoile’s inventory found a record of a payment to the guardian of Tronson’s children that followed the cession of Tronson’s office. On 15 February 1569, L'Estoile paid the Tronson wards six thousand livres, and on 15 January 1582 he paid them another thousand livres for no apparent benefit, a plausible sum for the value of his office.

Office-holding in the Parlement ran in the L'Estoile family, but Pierre de L’Estoile’s career in the Palais de Justice did not match those of his illustrious predecessors. Pierre Taisan de L’Estoile (c.1480-1537), Pierre de L’Estoile’s grandfather, served as Regent and taught as a Professor of Law at the University of Orléans, with Jean Calvin among his pupils.

---


9 Greffe-Lothe, pp. 32, 95 n.122.
before acquiring the office of conseiller in the Parlement in 1531 and then président des enquêtes in 1535. At Orléans he was known as a determined opponent of the emerging mos gallicus tradition of historicist legal humanism and emphasised the importance of logical reasoning rather than philological erudition in determining points of law. ¹⁰ Louis de L'Estoile (d.1555), Pierre de L'Estoile’s father, rose even higher through the ranks of the royal administration. He followed his father by acquiring an office of conseiller in the Parlement in 1538 (at the cost of a loan of 6,000 livres to the crown), entered the Great Chamber of the Parlement and acquired the office of grand rapporteur in its Chancery in 1543, became président in the Cour des aides in 1552, and finally he took up the office of président des enquêtes in the Parlement in 1554.¹¹ Louis de L'Estoile married Marguerite de Montholon, who came from a family of distinguished magistrates, including her father François de Montholon, avocat général in the Parlement and garde des sceaux in 1542, and her brothers, Hierosme de Montholon, conseiller in the Parlement, and François II de Montholon, who became garde des sceaux in 1588.¹² Although Pierre de L'Estoile did not attain the high offices of these relations, their pedigree gave him a certain prestige in Parisian society.

The early acquisition of his office cut short L'Estoile’s university education, limiting his capacity to rise up the ranks of office-holders in the Parlement since he did not possess a degree.¹³ In his youth, he studied in Paris with the Protestant Hebraic scholar Mathieu


¹¹ Greffe-Lothe, p. 82; Maugis, Histoire du Parlement, iii, 178. His loan to the crown is recorded in Paul Marichal, Catalogue des actes de François Ier (Paris, 1889), iii, 492 and the system explained in Philippe Hamon, L’argent du roi: Les finances sous François Ier (Paris, 1994), pp. 181-184, with thanks to Sam Pollack for suggesting these references.

¹² Greffe-Lothe, p. 83; Maugis, Histoire du Parlement, iii, 235; Brunet, iv, 332-333; Drolleries, fol. 38v.

Béroalde, whom he referred to at the end of his life as ‘mon maitre’, nominated by his father for his education and upbringing.\(^{14}\) L’Estoile also studied with the Greek scholar and royal printer Fédéric Morel, another close friend of his father.\(^{15}\) It is not clear precisely for how long L’Estoile studied with these eminent humanists, or what curriculum he followed, but he later displayed an ease with Latin grammar, logic, and rhetoric, and a sophisticated knowledge of Greek.\(^{16}\) For a few months in 1566, L’Estoile studied civil law at the University of Bourges, one of the leading law faculties in sixteenth-century Europe, where pioneers in the mos gallicus tradition of legal humanism taught at various times, including Andrea Alciato, François Le Douaren, François Bauduin, Jacques Cujas, and François Hotman.\(^{17}\) L’Estoile later owned and admired the works of Hotman in particular, a jurist with a reputation for fierce Protestant polemic.\(^{18}\) At Bourges, L’Estoile studied under the Scottish jurist and poet Alexander Arbuthnot, a student of Cujas who soon returned to Scotland to be ordained as a Reformed minister, and who then became the first principal of the newly Reformed University of Aberdeen.\(^{19}\) After he left Bourges, L’Estoile visited his grandfather’s distant successor as Rector at the University of Orléans and Professor of Law, the Protestant

\(^{14}\) Brunet, xi, 15. After taking private pupils from 1556-1562, Béroalde taught in the University of Orléans, the college of Montargis, the Academy at Sancerre, and finally in the Genevan Academy before his death in 1576. BnF ms. Dupuy, 630, fol. 171r lists Petrus Stella among his pupils in the year 1556, alongside his great friend Petrus Hennequinus, with the number 65 nearby, which perhaps signals the year 1565 as an end date to their study. Eugène and Emile Haag, ‘Mathieu Béroalde’ in La France protestante (Paris, 1879), ii, 394-406; Registres de la compagnie des pasteurs de Genève, eds. Olivier Fatio and Olivier Labarthe (Geneva, 1969, 1974), iii, 152-153, 299, 302, iv, 17, 40, 61. L’Estoile later acquired a manuscript copied in July 1571 of Béroalde’s lectures on Aristotle’s logic and metaphysics: Bibliothèque municipale d’Amiens, ms. 506, fols. 123-186v, Cursus philosophiae’, noting in his hand on the first page ‘Dono d[atum] D[omino] Beroaldo Praeceptore meo Auctore’. On Béroalde see above pp. 8-9 and below p. 240.

\(^{15}\) For L’Estoile, reporting his tutor’s death, Morel was an ‘homme de singulière probité et érudition’: Brunet, ii, 35-36. Joseph Dumoulin, Vie et œuvres de Fédéric Morel, imprimeur à Paris depuis 1557 jusqu’à 1583 (Paris, 1901), p. 13, mentions Morel’s dedicatory letter to Louis de L’Estoile in one of the first publications he was involved with as a printer, Morel’s ‘Lexicon graecolatinum’ (Paris, 1552), in which he thanks Louis de L’Estoile for giving him the privilege of teaching his son: ‘In memoria enim habeo quam benignè tuas omnesopes mihi fruendas semper obtuleris, eamque opinionem morum atque eruditionis meae habueris, et unicum filiolum tuum mihi in disciplina tradere, magno etiam (qua naturae es benignitate) proposito praemio, volueris.’

\(^{16}\) For example, it is assumed in his correspondence with Fédéric Morel and Isaac Casaubon: BnF ms. fr. 10303, fols. 283, 403-405.

\(^{17}\) Marie-Claude Tucker, Maîtres et étudiants écossais à la Faculté de droit de l’Université de Bourges (1480-1703), (Paris, 2001), pp. 165-193.


\(^{19}\) Tucker, Maîtres et étudiants écossais, pp. 224-225, 343-345.
Guillaume Fournier, who wrote to L'Estoile on 3 August 1567 to thank him for the visit. In this erudite Latin letter, scattered with Greek commonplaces, that L'Estoile ordered copied into a miscellany forty years later, Fournier recalled to L'Estoile his recent visit and reported how his young son Radolphus was grateful for the gifts L'Estoile brought, pestering him to ask when L'Estoile might come again. Fornerius then expressed his desire to abandon the academic life that wearied him, and instead pursue a career ‘in lights of the forum’. Leaving Bourges for the Palais de Justice, L'Estoile had already made his decision.

Throughout his career and into his retirement, L'Estoile critically engaged himself in the complex and developing administration of the early modern French state. Like most royal office-holders, L'Estoile openly criticised the sale of offices while tacitly practicing it. He denounced ‘the villainous trade and infamous prostitution that takes place among the principal estates in France in exchange for money, especially in the judicature’. It was the
systemic inertia of venality that so exasperated L’Estoile, ‘against all law and reason’. His was but one voice among a chorus denouncing venality and calling for the reform of the laws governing the system, as well as the morality of the office-holders who sustained it. The sale of offices never frustrated L’Estoile more than when he engaged in it himself. Aged fifty-four, he sold his office as Royal Secretary and audiencier in the Chancery attached to the Parlement on 7 March 1601 to Nicolas Martin, a receiver general of the rentes assigned on the clergy of France. They agreed to the significant price of 7,700 écus, or 23,100 livres. Their contract also stated that the annual wages linked to the office amounted to 550 livres. The market for offices posed many dangers, however, and Martin pursued a civil suit with L’Estoile immediately after he purchased his office, although the nature of his accusation is unknown. Notaries briskly recorded the papers regarding their settlement in L’Estoile’s inventory, dated 7 May 1601, with financial agreements dated 24 July 1602 and 30 April 1603. Regardless of this dispute, L’Estoile soon invested the money he had acquired by embarking on his most sustained period of money-lending, purchasing several substantial constitutions de rente between April and December 1601. Yet at the time L’Estoile neglected to report the sale of his office in his diaries. The subject only arose when L’Estoile reported Martin’s death in May 1610, when he denounced his successor as the man he liked least in the world and the greatest thief in Paris, who not only cost him almost eight hundred francs in legal fees, but also ruined his health.

22 Lazard-Schrenck, ii, 182.
24 AN MC XVIII 131, 7 March 1601; Greffe-Lothe, p. 1064.
25 Greffe-Lothe, p. 30. I have not been able to find papers relating to their settlement in the MC.
26 See Appendix II.
27 Brunet, x, 216.
Because of their hereditary nobility, fiscal privileges, and a flexible workload in the chanceries, offices of Royal Secretary fetched a high price on the market for offices. Offices of Royal Secretary associated with the Chancery attached to the itinerant royal court (la grande chancellerie) were sold for 9,000 livres in 1594 and 13,300 livres in 1611 – the latter following the inflationary take-off prompted by the institution of the droit annuel in 1604 – worth a similar amount to the prestigious office of conseiller in the Parlement.\(^{28}\) These figures suggest that the price Martin paid for L’Estoile’s office of audiencier and Royal Secretary in the Chancery attached to the Parlement (la petite chancellerie) was particularly high for the market. Since the grande chancellerie held far more prestige than L’Estoile’s petite chancellerie, it seems that L’Estoile struck gold when he sold his position, although he regularly worried about the management of his finances in retirement.\(^{29}\) The inflated price that L’Estoile attained for his office appears more clearly when following another measure governing the transmission of offices instituted in 1578, the tariff known as the marc d’or, paid as a ‘gift’ to the crown by the office-holder upon taking-up his office. On this measure, the tariff due from an audiencier in petite chancellerie was significantly inferior to that of an audiencier in the grande chancellerie. According to the 1583 tariff, all audiencers in the grande chancellerie paid 1.5 marcs d’or, or 324 livres, the same amount as conseillers in the Parlement, and half the amount asked of a président in the Parlement, while audiencers in the petite chancellerie paid six onces d’or or 162 livres, and audiencers attached to chanceries in provincial parlements paid four onces d’or or 108 livres.\(^{30}\) The price that L’Estoile attained on the market for offices surpassed what it might have be expected to fetch.

---


\(^{29}\) See below p. 208 n.11 and Appendix II.

Yet there is no objective measure of prestige in early modern France, since the price of offices fluctuated and office-holders constantly negotiated and contested their position in the social hierarchy. Confusion and instability characterised the internal hierarchy of the college of Royal Secretaries. Audienciers automatically held the additional title of Royal Secretary, a particularly coveted position that gave L'Estoile and his family hereditary noble status and added to his prestige as well as to his potential workload. While most Royal Secretaries held that office alone and were associated with the grande chancellerie, others held additional offices in other government departments. Audienciers also holding the title of Royal Secretary and those office-holders holding the sole title of Royal Secretary jostled for precedence. In December 1583, the royal council issued a decree to permit the Chancellor to determine precise degrees of distinction between the two groups during processions so as to avoid disputes. These disputes ran counter to the harmonious image that the Royal Secretaries projected, as they took their place in a college of peers that usually met either in the Palais de Justice or the chapel of the Order of the Celestins in Paris and together defended their fiscal privileges. Those Royal Secretaries whose offices were later creations towards the end of the sixteenth century could not join this college and instead belonged to their own subordinate colleges. Royal Secretaries might also pursue cultural distinction, but although many Royal Secretaries in sixteenth-century France made distinguished contributions to learning and the royal administration – above all the renowned humanist Guillaume Budé, working with the patronage of François I" – as a group they did not share the reputation for erudition or magisterial responsibility of their colleagues in the Great Chamber of the

33 Michaud, Grande chancellerie, pp. 121-126.
34 AN V2 7, 4 December 1583; Tessereau, Chancellerie, i, 221-222.
35 AN V2 57, fol. ir lists a meeting at each location. Bernard de La Roche Flavin, Treze livres des parlemens de France (Bordeaux, 1617), p. 914.
36 Nagle, Marc d’or, pp. 28-29.
The precise place of the Royal Secretaries in the hierarchy of early modern French society, and of particular office-holders within their college, is difficult to characterise with precision, but L'Estoile’s position as audiencier in the petite chancellerie was clearly inferior to his more distinguished colleagues in the grande chancellerie and in the Great Chamber of the Parlement, despite the high price he attained for it on the market for offices in 1601.

Royal offices conferred dignity on their holders but they often also demanded significant duties of them. As an audiencier, L'Estoile headed a small team of office-holders in the petite chancellerie. This Chancery was housed in a two-storey wooden building that stood at the opposite end of the Galerie des Merciers from the Great Hall of the Parlement, between the tower at the southern end of that gallery and the three-storey stone building that housed the archives of the royal Chancery in the Trésor des chartes, connected to the Sainte Chapelle (see Figures 1-3). From around 1285, this two-storey building served as the site of the royal Chancery while the king resided principally at this Palais on the Île de la Cité. It consisted of a parchment-making room and an audience room, that L'Estoile and his


Michaud, Grande chancellerie, pp. 62-72; La Roche Flavin, Treze livres, pp. 910-913; Pierre de Miraumont, Traicté de la chancellerie (Paris, 1610), fols. 20r-21v.


Guerout, ‘Palais’, i, 179.
predecessors in the emergent Chancery of the Parlement inherited and occupied as their duties and staff expanded over the centuries and gradually became distinct from the increasingly itinerant royal Chancery.\textsuperscript{41} Royal documents first mention the existence of an independent Chancery attached to the Parlement in the Palais in 1482.\textsuperscript{42}

With the January 1551 Edict of Blois, Henri II created six offices of audienciers and contrôleurs, one each for the grande chancellerie and the petites chancelleries attached to the five parlements of the kingdom. Publicly, the monarchy intended this move to support the activities of the grande chancellerie. But as all office-holders knew, the creation of offices also raised significant revenue for the king, in this instance as he re-commenced the Italian Wars. According to this Edict, the audienciers should be paid 200 livres annually in wages from their chancery, as well as 40 sols per document they registered. To collect their wages they had to reside in the city of their Chancery.\textsuperscript{43} Listed in later, fragmentary copies of Chancery accounts, L’Estoile received 80 livres in wages and 39 livres from the king’s grande bourse for the six final months of 1570.\textsuperscript{44} The 1579 Ordinance of Blois revealed an illicit source of potential revenue when it insisted that audienciers and other Chancery officials must not accept money from parties in exchange for sealing their letters, on pain of exemplary punishment.\textsuperscript{45}

The number of L’Estoile’s colleagues grew as the monarchy created and sold new offices in the chanceries, giving rise to both problems and opportunities for him. As part of his duties as an audiencier, L’Estoile oversaw the roll of offices of Royal Secretaries and managed their wages, so was particularly aware of changes in their ranks.\textsuperscript{46} He reported in his

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{41} Guerout, ‘Palais’, ii, 184-187.
  \item \textsuperscript{43} Greffe-Lothe, p. 96; Tessereau, Chancellerie, i, 113-116.
  \item \textsuperscript{44} Greffe-Lothe, p. 96, citing BnF ms. fr. 18264, fols. 560v, 561r.
  \item \textsuperscript{45} Barnabé Brisson, Le Code du roy Henry III: Augmenté des Édicts du Roy Henri IV (Paris, 1609), iv, 573.
  \item \textsuperscript{46} Tessereau, Chancellerie, i, 115.
\end{itemize}
diaries no opposition to the royal edicts in March 1572 and August 1576 that announced the sale initially of a second office as grand audiencier in each petite chancellerie, and then of two more of those offices, so that for most of his career L'Estoile shared the role with three other office-holders, alternating in each quarter of the year.\(^{47}\) Perhaps these edicts frustrated him more than he conveyed in his diaries. On 21 December 1581, he signed a letter of complaint along with his three of his colleagues in the Chancery, protesting to the magistrates of the Great Chamber of the Parlement about the proposed creation of twenty-six new offices of Royal Secretaries, bringing the college up to two hundred, which the audienciers claimed would adversely affect the wages and privileges of existing office-holders.\(^{48}\) The Parlement eventually registered this act in September 1587.\(^{49}\) In the Chancery of the Parlement of Bordeaux, such office-sharing caused friction, as those who were supposed to work in one quarter interfered during another quarter.\(^{50}\) However, L'Estoile recorded no examples of conflicts with his immediate colleagues. He reported the death of the audiencier M. de Grosbois as ‘one of my friends and my companion in office’, although he cast an envious eye over his valuable collection of medals and antiques.\(^{51}\) François Olier, another fellow audiencier, stood as godparent and gave his name to L'Estoile’s son baptised on 31 March

\(^{47}\) Greffe-Lothe, p. 97. Louis de L'Estoile experienced the same problem and protested to the Conseil privé when the king doubled his office in 1552: Michaud, Grande chancellerie, pp. 78-79.

\(^{48}\) AN V2 7, 21 December 1581. ‘Suppliant humblement les audienciers et controlleurs de la chancellerie de Paris qu’il vous plaise les recevoir opposans a la publication de l’edict du roy contenant creation nouvelle de vingt six secretaire pour l’interest qu’ils y ont a cause de leur gages et droits qui sont assignez en partie sur la revenu de l’augmentation du sceau et pour autres causes et raisons qu’ils desdurent quant par la Cour sera ordonne requerance a ceste finannonciation dudit et[it] edit par votre souverain bien. [Signed:] Delestoille, Olier, Prieur, Dumolinet, Le Comte, Deneufville.’ The edict is transcribed in AN V2 7, December 1581. For the opposition of the college of Royal Secretaries to this edict around this time see AN V2 57, fols. iii v – v r, 4 November 1581. Following, AN V2 8, 23 May 1582, the Parlement seems to have heeded their petition as it published an arrêt to reject the initial Edict. On the number of Royal Secretaries see Michaud, Grande chancellerie, pp. 100-106.

\(^{49}\) AN V2 8, 22 September 1587; Tessereau, i, 232-233.

\(^{50}\) AN V2 7, 8 March 1579. ‘Les feux audienciers et controlleurs encores qu’ils soient hors de quartier ne laissent pour cela d’assister au sceau le long de l’année et par chacun jour et quartier de chancellroye de sorte qu’ils sont toujours deux audienciers et deux controlleurs. Vous pouvez conjecturer pourquoi c’est tels farce et incommodité que messieurs les secretaire en general et particulier peuvent par la recevoir non seulement a l’occassion de l’occupation de ichez estant contrainctz d’estre si pressez et scorez qu’il fault qu’ils aillent prendre place ailleurs’.

\(^{51}\) Brunet, viii, 101.
Throughout his career, L'Estoile keenly observed and depended on the reputations of his Chancery colleagues.

L'Estoile also relied on his assistants, or commis, who held offices as chauffe-cires in the Chancery attached to the Parlement, championing their good reputation in Parisian society. The first named was Guillaume Chesneau, ‘one of my good friends’ who died at Melun in November 1590. In 1571 Chesneau settled a constitution de rente for L'Estoile in his master’s absence, and in the same year temporarily absented himself from his office on account of his Protestant faith. Succeeding Chesneau was Savinian de Bellemanière, who signed on 9 November 1594 a contract with L'Estoile to serve as his assistant. Bellemanière lived on the Quay des Augustins, at the end of L'Estoile’s rue des Augustins. The 1594 contract perhaps formalised an earlier agreement, since Bellemanière and his family assisted L'Estoile during the troubles of the League. Bellemanière died on 15 July 1596, ‘before his time, leaving behind his wife, aged eighty, to her great regret’. Not all Chancery office-holders carried such fine reputations in L'Estoile’s reports. He described many of the Royal Secretaries whose deaths he reported as being among his friends, or, what was better, god-
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52 Family Diary, pp. 43-44. Olier bought on 17 November 1588 a rente that L'Estoile had constituted with Anne Hennequin, and renewed it on 9 March 1592. AN MC VII 44, 17 November 1588; Greffe-Lothe, pp. 24-25, 1060-1061. François Olier père resigned his office as grand audiencier to François Olier fils on 22 May 1586: Greffe-Lothe, p. 97.

53 Michaud, Grande chancellerie, pp. 82-89.

54 Brunet, v, 61.

55 AN MC XXIV, 23 September 1569; Greffe-Lothe, p. 1055; Michaud, Grande chancellerie, pp. 84-87. Chesneau re-purchased this rente in L'Estoile’s name on 22 November 1571.

56 AN MC LXXIII 222, 9 November 1594. Bellemanière had previously held the office of Royal Secretary, which he resigned in April 1584 in favour of Pierre du Vair, brother of the conseiller Guillaume du Vair: Tessereau, Chancellerie, i, 222, cited in Robert Descimon, ‘Guillaume du Vair (7 mars 1556 – 3 août 1621): Les enseignements d’une biographie sociale’ in Petey-Girard and Tarrête eds., Guillaume du Vair, p. 26.

57 Brunet, v, 41, 182-183. Bellemanière also witnessed alongside L'Estoile assignations in October and December 1595 confirming the tutorship of Mary Blanche, daughter of their widower colleague in the Parlement the avocat Louis Blanche and his recently deceased wife Charlotte Morin: AN MC LXXIII 227, 13 October and 11 December 1595.

58 Brunet, vii, 66.

59 Eg. Brunet, vi, 111-112.
fearing *hommes de bien*. But he had nothing but bitter disdain for those who failed in their duties or who engaged in corrupt practices, such as falsifying documents. L’Estoile’s reports of the deaths of his close colleagues are a mark of the great esteem in which he held them, as he relied on them both inside and outside the Chancery.

Bringing these colleagues together, the principal duty of an audiencier was to oversee the ceremony of the *audience*, the presentation of documents from his Chancery to the royal seal held by a maître des requêtes, a higher judicial officer based in the Parlement, acting on behalf of the Chancellor. This *audience* took place in the *salle de l’audience* in the Chancery building in the Palais de Justice, following a similar format to the equivalent ceremony performed in the *grande chancellerie*, which was overseen not by a maître des requêtes but by the Chancellor himself. During the *audience*, before the maître des requêtes stood the officers of the Chancery of the Parlement: the audiencier, the contrôleur, and the chauffe-cire. A huissier guarded access to the ceremony. The contrôleur maintained a list of letters to be sealed and the related fees. He handed documents from the coffer to the chauffe-cire. The audiencier announced the letters to be presented to the maître des requêtes, who either refused them or declared them acceptable to be admitted to the seal. The chauffe-cire prepared the wax, deposited some onto the approved documents, and then, on the order of the maître des requêtes, impressed the seal. Finally, the contrôleur placed the sealed documents in the coffer, into which the seal was returned at the end of the *audience*. Thereafter, these sealed documents might be sent to the neighbouring Trésor des chartes or chambers in the Parlement, or else to private individuals so as to fulfil their functions. Beyond this core

---

60 Reports of the deaths of friends among the Royal Secretaries and their wives include Brunet, v, 192, vii, 29, 72, ix, 227, 251, 341. God-fearing Royal Secretaries include Brunet, vii, 188, 214, viii, 125-126. For ‘un bon corrompu et vieil peccheur’ of a Royal Secretary, M. Nicolas, see Brunet, viii, 120.

61 Eg. Brunet, viii, 116.


activity of sealing letters, the audience also provided an occasion for the announcement of any new royal legislation concerning the Chanceries and Royal Secretaries. As he carried out these duties, L'Estoile oversaw the approval of documents in the name of the king, and here was the source of the prestige of his office.

The two roles of audiencier and Royal Secretary were closely related and mutually beneficial to L'Estoile. When he was not active in his capacity as audiencier, he might have signed all manner of documents in the Chancery attached to the Parlement in his capacity as Royal Secretary. This Chancery dealt principally with letters requiring only the petit sceau, typically private lettres clos concerning decisions in particular cases and not open lettres patentes conveying royal decisions and requiring the grand sceau.\footnote{Michaud, \textit{Grande chancellerie}, pp. 207-392.} The main types of letters L'Estoile might have signed included civil requests of ennoblement or legitimisation, letters granting remission in criminal judgements, and printers’ privileges.\footnote{See Papon, \textit{Secrets du troisieme et dernier notaire} for a range of formulae for letters requiring the petit sceau.} Since the archives of the Chancery attached to the Parlement are lost, and only occasional traces of its documents appear in the archives of the Great Chancery and the college of Royal Secretaries, in most cases it is impossible to determine what L'Estoile signed on a regular basis. The next section considers the exceptional evidence of his activity in signing printers’ privileges.

\section*{II. Book Licensing}

L'Estoile oversaw the Parisian print trade both in his diaries and from the Chancery. His reports offer an unparalleled source for understanding the circulation and reception of print in the Wars of Religion and their aftermath. He filled his diaries with reports of his book-collecting; increasingly so after he sold his office in 1601. This activity was not a simple collector’s mania, but was shaped by his duties in the Chancery, where he signed at least
thirty-eight printers’ privileges for forty-two published books between 1571 and 1599, administering book licensing in the name of the king (Appendix III). L'Estoile signed one or more privileges in most of the years in which he held his office. During his most prolific year in 1579, he signed eight privileges in total, four of which he signed on 31 January for books translated from Italian by Gabriel Chappuys and printed in Lyon by Jean Béraud. Yet he mentioned this activity only once in his diaries, when on 10 February 1591 he acquired a copy of a letter from a member of the Faculty of Theology with whom he had business concerning a privilege. His activity in signing printers’ privileges is significant for two reasons. First, it gives the most detailed insight available into an aspect of L'Estoile’s duties in his capacity as a Royal Secretary in the Chancery. Because printers reproduced privileges in their publications, proclaiming the terms of the sealed letters held privately by the parties concerned, they have survived archival losses. Second, this activity reveals the position from which L'Estoile acquired printed publications and discussed them in his diaries. He read as a royal counsellor who judged publications in the king’s name, with the scrutiny of a censor, and he reserved his praise for only the most superior publications.

Printers published their privileges in accordance with the 1566 Edict du Moulins, that demanded in its seventy-eighth article that no printed publications be sold without royal permission or letters of privilege confirmed with the great seal. According to this article, printers must display the date of publication, the author’s name, and their trademark either at the beginning or end of a book. Small books (under forty pages) were exempt. Privileges served as a publisher’s guarantee of copyright over a text for a given period of time, and they soon became confused with royal permission to print, which instead had to be granted by the University of Paris for theological books or by a maître des requêtes for books of law and

---

66 Brunet, v, 147-148.
history. This Edict trumped competing levels of regulation overseen by the University of Paris and the printers elected as the twenty-four libraires-jurés of the craft.67

How did L'Estoile respond to the books for which he signed a privilege? None of them appear in the inventory of his library taken after his death in 1611, although some might have been overlooked by the assessors if they were bound in packets. However, among the reading materials he took to his country estates in Gland in the late summer of 1606, ‘to pass the time there’, he packed Philippe du Plessis Mornay’s Excellent discours de la vie et de la mort, for which he signed a privilege on 27 January 1580.68 A book for which L'Estoile signed a privilege on 18 March 1579, the Institution des chevaliers de l’ordre et milice du saint Esprit, served as a significant, unacknowledged source from which he copied a passage into his diary reporting the inaugural meeting of their order at the convent of the Augustins at the end of his road.69 On 4 March 1609, L’Estoile praised the inventive translations of certain of Giovanni Marinello’s medical texts by the Parisian doctor Jean Liébault, whose privileges he signed on 23 August 1581, having lent his copies of the original Italian editions to the printer Bérion.70 Among the books for which L’Estoile signed privileges are notable works by Bodin, La Popelinière, Passerat, and Tacitus that reached a wide audience among learned readers in Paris, who might have recognised L’Estoile’s distinctive name on the privilege.71

While the particular editions by these authors for which he signed a privilege are absent from

68 Philippe du Plessis Mornay, Excellent discours de la vie et de la mort (Paris, 1583); Brunet, viii, 241-2.
69 Lazard-Schreck, iii, 11, 75 n.1; Institution des chevaliers de l’ordre et milice du saint Esprit (Paris, 1579).
70 Brunet, vii, 65, ix, 227.
71 Half a century later, Valentin Conrart, Royal Secretary and secretary of the Academie française, used printers’ privileges creatively, signing for significant works so as to establish himself in literary circles and gain prestige and influence among writers and publishers: Nicolas Schapira, Un professionnel des lettres au XVIIe siècle. Valentin Conrart: Une histoire sociale (Paris, 2003), pp. 87, 116.
L’Estoile’s library, nevertheless he owned and admired other works and cited them favourably in his diaries.\footnote{On Bodin see above p. 64 n.21 and below pp. 107-108, on La Popelinière see below p. 125 n.2, on Tacitus see below p. 151 n.85, and on Passerat see Brunet, viii, 42.}

Significant personal connections could be made and proclaimed by signing privileges. L’Estoile signed the privilege in July 1580 for Martin Le Jeune to print the *Discours admirables* composed by the Huguenot potter Bernard Palissy, whom L’Estoile later supported during his imprisonment in the Bastille.\footnote{On L’Estoile and Palissy see above p. 54 and below pp. 113-115.} L’Estoile also signed the privilege on 4 December 1593 for Abel L’Angelier to publish *De l’eloquence française* by Guillaume Du Vair, *conseiller* in the Parlement, whom L’Estoile named as one of his friends among the group opposed to the Catholic League and whom he appraised as the ‘*Politiques* (in common speech), which is to say one of the *gens de bien*’.\footnote{Brunet, v, 170, 205. On the significance of Du Vair’s treatise see Fumaroli, *L’age de l’éloquence*, pp. 498-519; Guillaume du Vair, *De l’éloquence française: Edition critique précédée d’une étude sur le Traité de Du Vair*, ed. René Radouant (Paris, 1907); Anne Sancier, ‘Modernité du Guillaume du Vair dans son traité *De l’éloquence française*’ in Petey-Girard and Tarrête eds., *Guillaume du Vair*, pp. 163-173.}

Ordered before Henri IV entered Paris and re-established the authority of the Parlement of Paris, L’Estoile signed this letter ‘By grace & privilege’, and *not* in the name of the king.\footnote{Guillaume du Vair, *De l’eloquence francaise* (Paris, 1694 [sic 1594]).} L’Estoile further publicised his opposition to the League by signing a privilege on 18 November 1594 for the Toulouse magistrate Pierre de Belloy’s *De l’autorité du roy et crimes de leze majesté*, first published anonymously in 1587 to support the cause of Henri de Navarre against the League, and reprinted with royal permission by Jamet Mettayer and Pierre L’Huillier after the League’s defeat.\footnote{Summarised in Tatiana Debbagi Baranova, *A coup des libelles: Une culture politique au temps des guerres de religion* (Geneva, 2012), pp. 304-305. L’Estoile reported texts printed by L’Huillier and Mettayer but not any contact with them: Brunet, ii, 157, vii, 133-134, 320, 322, viii, 118, ix, 35-36, 112, 141, x, 141, xi, 105.}

L’Estoile reported in his diary how Du Belloy had been arrested in June 1587 for publishing libels in defence of Henri de Navarre.\footnote{Brunet, iii, 48.} In an interrogation on 26 November that year, he was accused of involvement in a plot to escape from the Conciergerie prisons.\footnote{AN X2B 1176, 26 November 1587, Soman Collection.} On 9 July 1588, L’Estoile
next reported that a number of Leaguers stormed into the Great Chamber of the Parlement to demand Du Belloy’s execution. Then on 12 August 1590, Du Belloy was transferred to the Bastille, from which he escaped on 18 May 1591. L'Estoile learned from Du Belloy himself that his only means of escape was ‘a special grace of God’. By contrast, when the power of the League was on the rise in Paris and L'Estoile collaborated in its administration of the Parlement, he signed the privilege for a 1588 tract, verified by Doctors of the Theology Faculty, that called for the registration of the edicts of the Council of Trent in France, a policy for which he later declared abhorrence. Considering the full range of books for which L'Estoile signed privileges, it seems that most often Royal Secretaries had little choice over which case they administered. Official duties trumped personal affection when L'Estoile signed the privilege for Bonaventure Grangier’s tract affirming the utility of unicorn horns in medical practice, responding to the critique of this practice by the surgeon Ambroise Paré, L'Estoile’s neighbour and the doctor who delivered his third child Marie. By signing privileges for books written by Palissy, Du Vair, and Du Belloy, L'Estoile publicly associated his and the king’s name with writers who opposed the League. Yet the process of arranging and signing privileges was sufficiently haphazard to qualify any such association, since it granted a printing monopoly and not strictly royal approval.

What is of greater significance, then, is that L'Estoile built up professional relationships with printers by signing privileges for them. These contacts are difficult to evaluate during much of his career. Between 1578 and 1587 he signed five privileges for books published by the Parisian printer Jacques du Puys, but did not mention this relationship

79 Brunet, iii, 168.
80 APP AB 10, fol. 75r, Soman Collection; Brunet, v, 97-98.
81 See below pp. 229-231 for his view on the Council of Trent.
82 On L’Estoile and Paré see below p. 133.
in his diaries. Authors might put him in touch with particular printers, as did Léon Trippault, who obtained a privilege from L'Estoile on 11 May 1577 for his *Dictionnaire françois-grec* that he then passed on to the Protestant printer Eloi Gibier in Orléans. L'Estoile later directly signed a privilege with Gibier for Trippault’s *Celt-hellenisme, ou etymologie des mots francois tirez du graec*. It is only in his later diaries, particularly after 1606, that L'Estoile reported in detail his contacts with Parisian printers who kept him up to date with their latest publications through gifts and sales of books. Some of those contacts he seems to have inherited from earlier professional ties. L'Estoile signed five privileges (1580-1586) for the Protestant printer Thomas Périer, whose brother Charles most likely died during the Saint Bartholomew’s day massacre, while his father, also named Charles, narrowly escaped the same fate. The family owned a shop on the rue Saint Jacques and kept a stall in the Great Hall of the Palais de Justice. L'Estoile later maintained close contact with Thomas’ Protestant sons Adrien and Jeremie Périer. He often reported visits to their shop. Jéremie took L'Estoile to meet the author of a new tract titled *L'excellence de la Viellesse* and to give his opinion on the text, but L'Estoile decided that their encounter was just as worthless as the book, and that Jéremie should not waste his money printing it. Towards the end of his career, on 24 February, L’Estoile signed one privilege for the scholarly printer Mamert Patisson, an edition of Jean Passerat’s *Premier livre des poèmes* (1597) that he published with the prestigious Estienne publishing house. When Patisson was found dead, drowned on a journey back to Paris in January 1602, L'Estoile reported that he was ‘my good friend … who

---

87 Significant passages include Brunet, viii, 236, 239, 296, ix, 141, 209, 267, 311-312, x, 30-3, 107, 138, xi, 87-88.
88 Brunet, x, 57-58.
printed nothing, however secret, about which he did not inform me’. 89 L'Estoile’s official duties signing privileges made contacts that he maintained throughout his life, establishing him as a well-informed and respected figure among Parisian printers, whose products he judged in the king’s name and with a censorious eye.

L'Estoile encountered this world of print not only from his desk in the Chancery but as soon as he arrived at the Palais de Justice. Passing into its courtyard, through the large gates on the road that led across the Ile de la Cité between the Pont au Change and Pont aux Marchans, he encountered posters displayed there. One advertised the services of a woman from the Vendôme who claimed to understand and teach all the languages in the world, whom L'Estoile traced to her home near the church of the Madeleine nearby on the Ile de la Cité. He admired her apparent talents, but deferred judgement on them to others more capable than himself, and left with a copy of her poster, which he found ‘pleasant and charlatan’. 90

Empty in contemporary representations (Figures 1-2), the Palais courtyard was in reality filled with pedlars and temporary stalls selling prints that L'Estoile reported on and purchased, including two prints depicting monsters that he came across by chance on Tuesday 6 January 1609. 91 Activities in the courtyard were closely regulated. According to a sentence confirmed on 22 September 1578 by the bailli of the Palais de Justice and an arrêt issued by the Parlement on 30 April 1579, ten pedlars were permitted in the courtyard to sell small printed books such as almanacs, edicts, ordinances, and sentences. They stood at one of two positions, either by the side of the Great Hall and the tree known as the May du Palais, or by the side of the Sainte Chappelle and the Chancery, lining up in order of nomination and

90 Brunet, ix, 208.
91 Brunet, ix, 193-195; Greffe-Lothe, p. 132.
alternating sides each week.\textsuperscript{92} Pedlars also illicitly hawked their wares beyond the Palais in disregard of these rules, including those arrested in August 1587 after they were caught at the end of the Pont Saint Michel, selling unlicensed copies of libels defending the cause of Henri de Navarre.\textsuperscript{93}

Beyond the courtyard, crowds gathered in the Great Hall of the Palais under a tall, vaulted roof, supported by pillars that displayed statues of the kings of France, primarily to hear news of judgements announced there and to solicit for their cases, but here they also shopped for luxury goods.\textsuperscript{94} The Great Hall hosted the stalls of twenty-four of the most significant booksellers in the capital, who advertised their presence on the frontispieces of their editions.\textsuperscript{95} Most renowned among the Palais booksellers at this time was Abel L’Angelier, for whom L’Estoile signed two privileges for books both published in 1594.\textsuperscript{96} L’Angelier sold his wares at the first pillar in the Grande Salle from 1572 until 1610, and was well-known for his editions of legal texts and literary works, especially his 1588 and 1595 editions of Montaigne’s \textit{Essais}.\textsuperscript{97} Other booksellers had stalls in the galleries leading to the Chancery (Galerie des Merciers) and to the Conciergerie (Galerie des Prisonniers). In his editions, the publisher Jean Houzé advertised his boutiques ‘At the Palais in the gallery near the Conciergerie’ and ‘in the Galerie des Prisonniers and near the Chancery’.\textsuperscript{98} L’Estoile signed a privilege for Houzé in 1599, accumulated debts with him for book purchases, and was a sufficiently loyal customer that on 28 July 1609 Houzé brought a book to L’Estoile at

\textsuperscript{92} These sentences overturned a previous judgement of the Parlement, issued in 1551 and repeated in 1560, that had banned pedlars’ activity anywhere in Paris or its suburbs. BnF ms. fr. 22115, fols. 1r-6r; Pallier, \textit{L’imprimerie à Paris}, p. 38; Martin, \textit{Livre}, i, 357.

\textsuperscript{93} AN X2B 1176, August 1587.


\textsuperscript{95} Balsamo and Simonin, \textit{Abel L’Angelier}, p. 33.

\textsuperscript{96} Brunet, x, 119.


home. At the end of the period of the League, L'Estoile reported disputes in the gallery leading to the Chancery involving a female seller named ‘la Gourdeille’ (or ‘Goreil’) with those who objected to her selling prints depicting Henri IV. In the complex of the Palais and throughout the pages of his diaries, L'Estoile observed, regulated, and indulged his curiosity for the print market.

These printers traded far beyond the confines of the Palais de Justice. L'Estoile took advantage of their connections to gain insights into the European print market that he related in his diaries. Many of his contacts among Parisian printers traded at the Frankfurt book fair. Following a period of scant Parisian representation in Frankfurt in the 1590s, as the troubles of the League disrupted domestic trade, Parisian representation in Frankfurt rose significantly in the 1600s (Figure 2.1). It peaked in 1609 when the Frankfurt catalogue advertised eighty-two books from Parisian publishers. Parisians selling editions at Frankfurt in these years included contacts L'Estoile mentioned in his diaries – especially Adrien Beys (twenty-seven editions in 1604-1611), Jean Le Preux (nine editions in 1596-1608), and Adrien Périer (twenty-eight editions in 1601-1611) – as well as other printers for whom he signed privileges – Jamet Mettayer (five editions in 1596) and Marc Orry (twenty-six editions 1589-1608). L'Estoile collected all the Frankfurt catalogues from 1600 until at least 1608, and probably continued until 1611. His contacts who sold books at Frankfurt also gave him these catalogues back in Paris and took his orders. In autumn 1608, L'Estoile bought books advertised at the fair from both Adrien Beys and Jeremie Périer. The catalogues gave L'Estoile a chance to oversee learned books produced by the great European publishing
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99 Brunet, viii, 303, ix, 309.
100 Brunet, vi, 100-101, 222.
102 Brunet, viii, 307, ix, 70, xi, 116.
103 Brunet, viii, 251, ix, 70-71, 146, 147, 148, 152.
houses, which he often treated with the same disdain as cheap print purchased in the Palais de Justice. He bought eight more books sold at the autumn 1608 fair from Périer and concluded that the catalogue was ‘abundant in twaddle, invectives, and slanders more than ever before, so that one can say, as with everything else, that things go from bad to worse’. Beyond the Frankfurt fair, some of L’Estoile’s contacts among the Parisian printers had regular contact with European publishers, especially the Plantin press. Gilles Beys, uncle of Adrien, married Plantin’s third daughter Madeleine and ran the Parisian branch of the Plantin press until his death in 1595, before Madeleine married Adrien Périerer, who then took over that role. L’Estoile also claimed an old acquaintance with the Leyden bookseller and Plantin agent Louis Elzevier. Through his contacts among these printers, L’Estoile maintained critical oversight in the European print market and continued to stock his library.

L’Estoile also reported his expertise in searching for publications in the University quarter on the Left Bank, where many printers and publishers had their principal shops, and here in particular he extended his observations into book censorship. He reported on 28 January 1602 how he asked for news there of a ‘wicked’ book denouncing the ‘incestuous’ marriage of Henri IV and Marie de Médicis, that had greatly offended the king, and that he tracked down being sold on the rue Saint Jacques by a bookseller from Rouen who imported copies from Flanders. L’Estoile credited Henri IV with the suppression of this book and another pro-League pamphlet circulating at the same time, ‘by silence rather than by research … which (in France and especially in Paris) is often the reason for printing it sooner’. This tacit, dismissive response by the king to seditious books suited L’Estoile’s instincts about the limits of censorship. Modern historians have drawn similar conclusions, demonstrating that
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104 Brunet, ix, 148-149.
105 Renouard, Répertoire, pp. 31-32, 337-338; Martin, Livre, i, 332-333 n.5.
107 Renouard, Répertoire, pp. 383-420; Martin, Livre, i, 394-397.
efforts at systematic book censorship were in vain. Instances of repression of unlicensed printing in L'Estoile’s Paris appear in the criminal archives at crucial moments, particularly in the years preceding the 1572 Saint Bartholomew’s day massacre, and in the middle years of the 1580s before the later victories of the League. Repression of unlicensed printing functioned ‘ad hoc and ad hominem’. L'Estoile knew this well, and repeated in several of his manuscripts a commonplace adapted from a 1565 pamphlet: ‘It is barely in the capacity of any earthly powers to guard against French liberty in speech, just as it is to bury the sun in the earth, or to shut it up in a trunk.’

The only case of book censorship that led to a capital sentence in the criminal chamber of the Parlement during L'Estoile’s career prompted detailed analysis in his diaries, informed by professional expertise. François Le Breton, an avocat in the Parlement, composed his Remonstrances aux trois estats de la France, printed in 1586, and he was hanged in the courtyard of the Palais de Justice on 22 November in that year for lèse majesté, found guilty of ‘disturbing the public peace’. Le Breton’s scandalous pamphlet recounted his trials with the judicial system as he defended the estate of an orphaned child in a civil suit that stretched over several years. Seeing the orphan’s case overturned in the Parlement, then ignored by the king and grandees, he raged against the corruption of the judicature and the hypocrisy of the king. Le Breton persisted in denying his guilt as he was led to the scaffold in the courtyard of the Palais de Justice, the site chosen in order to prevent a crowd gathering. There he was refused a dying speech, leaving him no chance of a public confession. The

109 Diefendorf, Beneath the Cross, pp. 130-136; Pallier, L’imprimerie à Paris, pp. 63-64; Baranova, Libelles, pp. 50-57.
111 ‘Il est aussi peu en la puissance de toute la faculté terrienne d’engarder la liberté françoise de parler, comme d’enfourir le soleil en terre, ou l’enfermer dans un trou.’ Brunet, i, 1. ‘n’estant non plus possible de garder la liberté françoise de parler que d’enfourir le soleil en terre ou l’enfermer dans un trou’. Brunet, vii, 25-26. The passage is adapted from a passage in Faits et dicts memorables de plusieurs grans personnages et seigneurs français, & de choses rares & secrettes aduenues en France (1565), p. 7, identified in Baranova, Libelles, p. 470.
112 François Le Breton, Remonstrances aux trois estats de la France, & a tous les peuples Chrestiens pour la delivrance du Pauure & des Orpelles ([Paris], 1586); Frederic J. Baumgartner, Radical Reactionaries: The Political Thought of the French Catholic League (Geneva, 1976), pp. 76-79.
pamphlet’s printer Jehan du Carroy and compositor Gilles Martin were whipped at the foot of
the gallows and banished from the kingdom for nine years. When Le Breton’s body was
taken to the gibbet at Montfaucon, on the outskirts of the city, members of the crowd took
relics from his remains and soon League preachers pronounced him as a martyr for their
cause. On 2 December, the Parlement paid two clerks of the Châtelet 40 écus to cover their
expenses in conducting further interrogations and seizing copies of Le Breton’s pamphlet
from the shops of printers and binders around the rue Saint Jacques and the University.
L’Estoile regretted that Le Breton acted foolishly both in publishing his pamphlet and in
refusing to retreat from his position during his interrogations in the Bastille, where, with tact,
he could have avoided a death sentence. In these terms, the Parlement was not applying
universal principles of censorship in this case, but punishing a particularly intransigent rebel
against the king’s justice over many years. L’Estoile’s report of Le Breton’s execution in
places echoes quite precisely the wording of the sentence of the Parlement, and he might have
had access to information from his uncle and godfather, Mathieu Chartier, the conseiller
serving as rapporteur in this case.113 In his report, L’Estoile discussed and preserved for
posterity the court’s judgement, with well-informed insight into the working of criminal
justice of the Parlement. He continued these insights across a range of crime reports, and this
is the subject of the next chapter, which extends the analysis of this chapter in a case study of
the relationship between L’Estoile’s office and the reports in his diaries.

In the Chancery on the south side of the Palais courtyard, L’Estoile worked away from the
Great Chamber where superior office-holders held their debates, as well as the civil chambers

113 Brunet, ii, 358-359; APP AB 10 fol. 2v; AN X2B 148, 23 October, 15, 17 19, 22 November, 2 December
1586; ‘séditieux et pertubateur de l’estat et repos public’, BnF ms. Dupuy 137, fols. 107r-110r; Jehan de La
Fosse, Les “Mémoires” d’un curé de Paris (1557-1590) au temps des guerres de Religion, ed. Marc Venard
(Geneva, 2004), p. 153; De Thou, ix, 613-615; Michel Simonin, ‘L’affaire Le Breton (1586) ou comment de
Thou écrivait ses Histoires’ in Jean Lecointe ed., Devis d’amitié: Mélanges en l’honneur de Nicole Cazauran
(Paris, 2002), pp. 762-802; Pierre Fayet, Journal historique sur les troubles de la Ligue (Tours, 1852), pp. 33-
34.
of enquêtes and requêtes, and the criminal chamber of the Tournelle, where conseillers and présidents tried cases. His reports of sessions of the Great Chamber critically appraised their political significance, but have been found wanting for their grasp of detail. Yet despite his relative distance from the centres of power in the Parlement, L'Estoile’s significant position in the Chancery gave him distinct advantages in his pursuit of information in the Palais, as he assumed a position of oversight particularly with regard to the college of Royal Secretaries and the Parisian world of print, and dealt with papers concerning many aspects of royal government. At no point in his diaries did he express a desire or capacity to exchange his respectable if relatively lowly office in the Chancery for the superior office of conseiller in the Parlement held by both his father and grandfather. Family and neighbourhood connections with conseillers and other leading office-holders in the Parlement ensured that L'Estoile’s reports in his diaries did not want for information that was otherwise closed to him. Overall, it is L'Estoile’s masterful and richly detailed account of the hierarchies, duties, and politics of the Palais that makes his reports so valuable in this milieu. His is a subjective viewpoint from a position within its field of social relations. If his reports do not speak for this society or directly reflect its concerns, they are shaped by its structures. As L'Estoile reported on his world in the Wars of Religion, he did so with a wealth of information and circumscribed powers within the society of the Palais de Justice.

Reports of Crime and Criminal Justice in the Parlement of Paris

Pierre de L'Estoile’s frequent reports of crimes give an ‘inside story’ of criminal justice in the Parlement of Paris, drawing on information circulating in the Palais de Justice and the shared assumptions of its office-holders regarding criminality at the time of the Wars of Religion. This chapter juxtaposes L'Estoile’s reports with crime pamphlets and documents from the criminal archives of the Parlement, in order to demonstrate what information was available to him, how he went about gathering it, and how he appropriated it for reports of crimes in his diaries. It provides a detailed study in the relationship between L'Estoile’s office and reporting, exploring his attitude towards the world beyond the society of Parisian office-holders, and evaluating the prominent place of condemned criminals and their victims in his diaries.

While L'Estoile’s role in the administration of criminal justice was marginal, he was sufficiently well-informed and curious to compose insightful reports of cases that arrived on appeal from across the Parlement’s jurisdiction that covered two-thirds of the French kingdom. Among his varied duties as a Royal Secretary and audiencier in the Chancery attached to the Parlement, L'Estoile would have administered letters of remission, requests addressed to the king for a reduction or overturning of a judgement, sent by someone who had committed a crime in pardonable circumstances, composed for a fee in collaboration with a Royal Secretary. These letters required registration by his colleagues, the conseillers and présidents sitting in the criminal chamber of the Tournelle, or by the Chancellor holding the

---

Great Seal at the Chancery attached to the royal court. Officially, L'Estoile did not have access to the archives of the criminal chamber of the Parlement, whose authority rivalled that of the Chancellor in giving definitive judgements in criminal cases. Unofficially, he might gain access to its archives, or at least detailed information concerning cases, from his many contacts throughout the Palais. Modern historians have neglected the criminal archives of the Parlement, deterred by their organisation and handwriting. Yet the interrogations conducted by the magistrates before reaching a final judgement – known as *plumitifs* of interrogations *sur la sellette* – contain information concerning the magistrates’ responses to the vast majority of cases passing through its chambers. They provide a comparative basis for establishing that L'Estoile’s reports give an accurate representation and thorough consideration of the criminal justice practiced by the Parlement of Paris, shaped by the generic conventions of its judgements.

In these reports, L'Estoile conveyed his own conception of how criminal justice in the Parlement should proceed. While he usually supported its judgements and shared common assumptions with his colleagues, he also criticised his colleagues’ decisions and argued for a more punitive approach. After reporting the execution on 11 October 1610 of ‘one of these twilight pickpockets, a poor boy who had nothing but his arse and his teeth’, he complained that the Parlement condemns only ‘worthless companions, brigands, and cloak-twitchers … and never punishes the seditious ones who should share the gallows with the ravens. I say this...

---


is to do justice like spiders: to kill lots of flies, but never the big bees.\(^5\) He overstated his point here, and discussed several cases concerning ‘big bees’ elsewhere. Nevertheless, in many of his reports of crimes L'Estoile set out real disagreements with his colleagues. Discussing judgements with them, he might have hoped to shape their opinions in future cases.\(^6\) He reported his frustrations most openly after he retired from his office, as he frequently returned to the Palais de Justice, often discussing crimes committed in Paris and the jurisdiction of its Parlement. He felt torn between his loyalty to the institution and outrage at certain of its judgements, writing that crimes were evidence of the ‘malice of this century’, and that they were ‘so frequent in Paris, at the Court and everywhere, that one hears talk of nothing else, even in the Palais, where the injustice that rules obscures the beauty and lustre of this ancient and august Senate’.\(^7\) L'Estoile’s reports of crimes made informed contributions to debates within the Parlement about criminal justice.

Demonstrating this argument, Part One of this chapter evaluates how representative L'Estoile’s reports of crime are in comparison with the activity of the criminal chamber of the Parlement, and Part Two determines the genre of his reports, before subsequent sections engage in detailed case studies of his reports of violent crimes in the civil wars, witchcraft and scepticism, heresy, and public executions.

\(^5\) ‘Le lundi 11\(^e\) de ce mois [d’Octobre 1610], fust pendu, au bout du Pont Neuf, à Paris, un de ces tiremanteaux sur la brune, pauvre garson qui n’avoir que le cul et les dents. Je ne dis pas que ce ne soit bien de purger la ville de tels mateins, brigandieux et tirelaines, de peur d’y ouvrir la porte au meurtre et au brigandage; mais de laisser aller impunis les gros larrons, espargner les assassins, comme on fait tous les jours, et ne point punir les séditieux qui doivent avoir pour partage le corbeau et la fourche; je dis que c’est faire la justice en guise d’araignées: tuer beaucoup de mouches, mais non pas les gros bourdons; car, quand nos juges font justice aujourd’hui, ils ne la font guères que d’hommes bas et vils.’ Brunet, xi, 17-18; discussed in Diane Roussell, *Violences et passions dans le Paris de la Renaissance* (Paris, 2012), pp. 77-80. Roussell (pp. 51-81, 359) analyses L'Estoile’s reports as those of an ‘alarmist’ bourgeois, revealing his anxieties rather than the realities of contemporary criminality, evidence of a mounting concern about crime in sixteenth-century Paris that was a crucial agent in the civilising process described by Norbert Elias and Robert Muchembled. She contrasts L'Estoile’s reports with the petty criminality she encountered in her important research in the archives of the subordinate court of Saint Germain des Prés. The present chapter demonstrates that this archival comparison is misplaced.


\(^7\) Brunet, viii, 264.
I. Reporting Curious Crimes

L'Estoile overwhelmingly reported crimes following public executions. The manner of a criminal’s death revealed the character of their life: ‘telle vie, telle fin’. He reported 228 executions concerning at least 311 condemned, usually ordered by the criminal chamber of the Parlement of Paris and very occasionally by other jurisdictions. His reports of the number of condemned in each instance are often vague and so any overall count must remain imprecise. He rarely explained his selection of cases or the sources of his information. The only common characteristic among his reports of crimes is that he found something about a cases ‘curious’ or ‘remarkable’. It might be ‘rare’ or sometimes typical, and so deserved a place in ‘the storehouse of my curiosities’. Together, his reports explore the problem of policing moral norms and deviant behaviour in his world.

Each year, L'Estoile reported only a fragment of the executions ordered by the Parlement, usually between five and ten. The Parlement might order up to eighty-two in one year during the period 1572-1611 (Table 3.1). This balance changed during the troubles of the League in 1588-1594, which disrupted criminal justice across the jurisdiction of the Parlement as Henri III established a rival royalist Parlement at Tours. In these years, both

---

8 Lazard-Schrenck, i, 150; Brunet, viii, 194.
9 I say ‘at least’ 311 condemned since L'Estoile often reports imprecisely a group of condemned, in which case I have counted two, whereas the number could be greater. Claudine Dagnet, ‘Pierre de L’Estoile témoin de la justice criminelle, 1574-1611’, Mémoire de maitrise, L’Université Paris-Sorbonne Paris IV Centre Roland Mousnier, (1977), p. 106, counts 218 ‘affairs’ tried in the Parlement of Paris and our proportions of types of crimes reported are closely comparable. Diane Roussell counted 370 ‘cases’ reported by L’Estoile but her definition of a ‘case’ is unclear and presumably includes reports of crimes that did not lead to executions: Roussell, Violence, p. 67. Marie Houllemare counted 143 reports of public executions between 1574-1598: Marie Houllemare ‘Ecrire la justice hors la greffe: La mémoire judiciaire dans la ville à Paris au XVIe siècle’ in Olivier Poncet and Isabelle Storez-Broncourt eds., Une histoire de la mémoire judiciaire de l’antiquité à nos jours (Paris, 2009), p. 325.
the number of appeals to the Parlement in criminal cases carrying death sentences and the
number of death sentences confirmed in the Parlement fell dramatically, as did the number of
appeals from outside Paris. Historians have identified the rule of the League in Paris with
summary public executions, above all that of the premier président of the Parlement, Barnabé
Brisson along with the conseiller in the Parlement Claude Larcher and the conseiller in the
Châtelet Jean Tardif on 15 November 1591. In the extraordinary circumstances of that year,
L'Estoile recorded more executions than were confirmed by the Parlement. Activity in the
court recovered quickly on all counts following Henri IV’s political successes, first with his
abjuration on 25 July 1593 and the three-month truce announced in Paris on 1 August 1593,
then more permanently after the king entered Paris on 22 March 1594 and re-established the
sovereignty of the Parlement of Paris five days later.

Demonstrating the representativeness of L'Estoile’s sample, Table 3.2 sets out the
number and types of crimes he reported in comparison with the number and types of crimes
receiving death sentences in the Parlement. L'Estoile reported executions for most types of
crimes in a similar proportion to the death sentences ordered by the Parlement, the significant
over-representation of lèse majesté and the under-reporting of infanticide excepted. His
criterion of ‘curiosity’ then did not depend on any category of crime and presented a
representative sample of the criminal justice of the Parlement. This statistical analysis reveals
that his choice of crimes to report did not depend on conventional categories, but on a
random multiplier, acertain rare or notable element that piqued his curiosity and became the
subject of discussionin the Palais de Justice.

conciliatio’, Thèse pour le diplôme d’archiviste paléographe de L’Ecole nationale des chartes, (2008); Michel
12 Elie Barnavi and Robert Descimon, La sainte ligue: Le juge et la potence (Paris, 1985), pp. 189-192; Robert
pp. 125-126.
13 Tom Hamilton, ‘Contesting Public Executions in Paris Towards the End of the Wars of Religion’ in Stephen
Cummins and Laura Kounine eds., Cultures of Conflict Resolution in Early Modern Europe (Farnham,
forthcoming 2014).
Table 3.1. Appeals to and death sentences confirmed by the Parlement of Paris in criminal cases, 1572-1610.\textsuperscript{14}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total appeals</th>
<th>% of appeals within Paris\textsuperscript{15}</th>
<th>Appeals carrying death sentences</th>
<th>Death sentences ordered</th>
<th>L’Estoile’s reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 months 1572-1573</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1588</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1589</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1590</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1591</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1592</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1593</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 months 1609-1610</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.2. Types of crime receiving death sentences in the Parlement of Paris, 1572-1611.\textsuperscript{16}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime</th>
<th>1572-1573 (12 months) N=64</th>
<th>1588-1594 (84 months) N= 222</th>
<th>1609-1610 (12 months) N=82</th>
<th>L’Estoile’s reports, 1574-1611 N=311</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lèse-majesté</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homicide</td>
<td>59.4%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infanticide</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homicide and another crime</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excès</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape and abduction</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arson</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falsehoods</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual crimes\textsuperscript{17}</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witchcraft</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heresy</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blasphemy</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not named</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


\textsuperscript{15} Following Soman and Bercé, ‘Les archives du Parlement’, pp. 267-270, the old department of Seine-et-Oise.


\textsuperscript{17} Adultery, bestiality, bigamy, incest, sodomy.
Social prejudices explain the unrepresentative cases that L’Estoile reported. Lèse majesté is a case apart, as these rare executions so preoccupied L’Estoile that he integrated them closely into the political narrative of his diaries, especially as they concerned plots and defamatory libels against Henri III’s rule, conspiracies against the rule of the League in Paris, and physical or verbal threats against Henri IV’s life. Infanticide in L’Estoile’s reports is a pitifully regular crime. Alfred Soman has demonstrated that there was an ‘infanticide craze’ in early modern France, with a particularly high rate of prosecution of this crime in the Parlement that lasted for over a century following Henri II’s edict of February 1557. This edict made concealment of a pregnancy conclusive proof of guilt of infanticide, punishable by death. In his reports of infanticide cases, L’Estoile did not name the condemned – always reporting ‘a girl’, ‘a woman’, ‘a wench’ – and in his brief commentary following the judgement he barely regretted the crime: ‘Saturday the 14th [December 1596] a wench was hanged, at the place Maubert, who had thrown her child in the privy, quite a common thing in Paris.’ He might equally issue a moral condemnation, as he did concerning one woman ‘who said she was of the [Reformed] Religion, but she was a whore’. Such terse reports ignore the pressures that drove the accused to conceal their pregnancies and the magistrates pursued these subjects in their interrogations. Ysabeau de Mandousse, aged twenty-two – for L’Estoile merely ‘a gentlewoman who killed her child’ – responded under interrogation that she was married but raped by an unnamed ‘wicked man’. She lived in the household of

18 See, for example, the cases of Claude Barie, François de La Ramée, François Le Breton, and Jean Trimel discussed throughout this chapter and in Chapter Two above pp. 84-85, as well as the cases of Pierre Desguet, Jean Chastel, and Jean Guignard discussed in Hamilton, ‘Contesting Public Executions’; and the case of Barnabé Brisson discussed in Barnavi and Descimon, Le juge et la potence.
21 Brunet, vii, 77.
22 Brunet, vii, 125.
23 In Soman’s sample of fourteen years between 1569 and 1608, 63% of the accused were unmarried, mostly domestic servants, 13% were married women with absent husbands, 18% were young widows. In nine trials out of ten the mother was the sole defendant: Soman, ‘Anatomy of an Infanticide Trial’, pp. 249, 251. See also Muchembled, ‘Fils de Cain, enfants de Médée’, pp. 1065-1083; Robert Muchembled, Passions de femmes au temps de la Reine Margot, 1553-1615 (Paris, 2003), pp. 199-204.
the sieur de Clemenceau and, perhaps to retain her place there, she concealed her pregnancy from him and his daughter, to whom she gave instruction. Three women assisted at her birth and she denied any violence towards the child. In infanticide cases, the magistrates showed greater curiosity than L'Estoile to establish the extent of the culpability of the accused, and he seems to have been content to leave them to apply to their punitive legislation.

Beyond these unrepresentative cases, L'Estoile’s choice of crimes to report might at first sight seem baffling. On 24 November 1598, he noted briskly, ‘hanged at the Place de Grève, a young man who, being at the tavern, had killed a man in a dispute over an egg that the other wanted to have’. This is almost certainly the case of Nicolas Frenelet from Amiens, a mercer and alleged cutpurse, the young man condemned to hang at the Place de Grève on that day for the homicide. L'Estoile might have heard that Frenelet was hanged for killing the squire Nicolas Le Foyet, following a fight in the tavern ‘La Cavée’ that involved his companion Louis Riquier. Frenelet denied having drunk any wine, while Riquier accepted they had been drinking and that he had thrown a plate at Le Foyet. None of the legal documents relating to their case mentions a dispute over an egg, but neither is there any mention in their interrogations as to how Riquier came to beat Le Foyet to the ground and hold a baton to his throat. If L'Estoile was going to report the crime at all, why do so in such a brief and imprecise account? One plausible interpretation is that his report is presented as a typical record of yet another homicide committed by criminal low-lives that resulted in a public execution in Paris. The detail of the egg demonstrates the social distinction between criminals who fight to the death in petty disputes and their supposedly peaceable judges and superiors. L'Estoile made no attempt to explain why he chose this case and not others, nor the significance he intended by the report. It is a curious fragment of contemporary criminality

24 Brunet, vii, 182; APP AB 13, fol. 185v; AN X2A 960, 24 March 1599.
25 Brunet, vii, 150.
26 On Frenelet’s case: APP AB 13, fol. 151r; AN X2A 960, 21 November, 1598; AN X2B 186, 24 November, 1598; AN X2B 1330, 24 November.
in microcosm, at once uniquely insightful and representative of the cases encountered across the jurisdiction of the Parlement, humble and everyday yet deserving of a place in his ‘storehouse of curiosities’.

L’Estoile might have gathered information for his reports of crimes during the public announcements of judgements at sites of execution and in the Great Hall of the Palais, or relied on chains of rumour and exchanged documents in its halls, corridors, and chambers. Many of his close friends and relatives held offices as conseillers in the Parlement and served terms in the criminal chamber of the Tournelle. During the period in which L'Estoile composed his diaries he might have heard news from conseillers such as his uncles Mathieu Chartier, ‘one of the best men and the most wholesome and incorruptible judges in the Palais’, and Hierosme de Montholon, ‘regretted at the Palais and elsewhere for his great gentlemanliness and integrity’, as well as his cousins Jacques Le Coigneux, Edouard and Mathieu Molé, Guillaume de Montholon, Pierre III Séguyer, and his friend Jean Courtin. These conseillers sat in judgement on many of the criminal cases that L'Estoile reported. Sometimes relations and other unnamed contacts in the Parlement gave L'Estoile information about cases. Le Coigneux acted as the rapporteur in the case of Jean Roullet, the supposed werewolf, and told L'Estoile how Roullet confessed more than he was asked in his earlier interrogations. On other occasions, L'Estoile acquired documents that confirmed his reports. On 5 October 1591 Jean Trimel, a solicitor in the Palais and a fellow Royal Secretary was hanged for conspiracy against the Catholic League in Paris. The next weekend L'Estoile was shown ‘by one of my friends … in the Palais this letter from Trimel that had caused him to

27 Brunet, vii, 108.
28 Brunet, ix, 50.
29 All of these men are mentioned in several diary entries. See the index in Brunet, xii.
30 Names of serving présidents and conseillers are listed on the opening page of every book of plumitifs, recording the terms served in the Tournelle, as well as at the beginning of each day’s sessions.
31 Brunet, vii, 150-151, and discussed below pp. 109-110.
hang, and I copied it at that very moment on one of the desks in the Chancery’. He also acquired ‘with trouble’ the judgement upon Claude de Culan, condemned for ‘abominable luxuriousness and brutality’, accused of ‘giving filthy caresses’ to her dog at St Lubin. A friend who was a scribe in the Chambre des vacations (the criminal chamber sitting outside of regular terms) procured this document for him on 15 October 1601. Courtin, Molé, and Montholon were all present at her interrogation, which was led by the président Jacques-Auguste de Thou. If they were reluctant to show L'Estoile a copy of the judgement, they might have discussed the case with him informally. L'Estoile often reported precisely the names of the condemned so perhaps used documentary sources more regularly than he made clear. In one instance his report follows closely the criminal scribe’s transcription of an interrogation.

L'Estoile also carried out his own interrogations with prisoners in the Palais. In la Chapelle – presumably the chapel of the prisons of the Conciergerie – he encountered the condemned François de La Ramée, executed for lèse majesté on 8 March 1596, who believed he was the son of Charles IX after experiencing divine inspiration. L'Estoile thought he saw ‘something of majesty written in the face’ of La Ramée and learned a great deal about his case not reported in the pluminetif in the Tournelle. L'Estoile reproached La Ramée for the accusation of rebellion that he carried, but regretted that the court sentenced him to death, when exile to a monastery seemed more fitting for him. Certain prisoners were particularly familiar with L'Estoile. On 15 April 1609 he met with the prévôt of Brétigny, one of the

---

32 Brunet, v, 114–115. The letter was printed, with differences in spelling from the version L'Estoile copied, as Coppie de la lettre escripte à l'encontre de nostre bonne ville de Paris (Paris, 1591). For Trimel’s case see APP AB 11, fol. 58r; AN X2A 956, 5 October 1591; AN X2B 165, 5 October 1591; Journal historique de Pierre Fayet sur les troubles de la Ligue, ed. Victor Luzarche (Tours, 1852), p. 107; Denis Pallier, Recherches sur l'imprimerie à Paris pendant la Ligue, 1585-1594 (Geneva, 1976), p. 90.

33 Brunet, vii, 316-317; APP AB 15, fol. 123; AN X2A 963, 13, 15 October 1601, Soman Collection.


35 Brunet, vii, 54. In his interrogation La Ramée explained his family history, visions, and how he had performed the royal touch in the prisons: AN X2B 174, 7 March 1596; AN X2A 958 1, 8 March 1596.
longest serving prisoners of the Conciergerie, and discussed with him justice in their time, including the case of a poor woman who had pursued justice for twelve years after the alleged rape and murder of her five-year old daughter. The prévôt gave L'Estoile a copy of the surgeon’s report of the child’s autopsy, which he kept, with irony, ‘in memory of the good justice of this century’. These examples demonstrate the types of crimes L'Estoile discussed and the sources he might have used for his reports of crime and criminal justice. The next section turns to his modes of writing about it.

II. Tragicall Histories?

Crime-writing in early modern France often appeared in publications titled ‘histoires tragiques’, or ‘tragicall histories’ when printed on English presses. L'Estoile was familiar with these publications and his accounts of crimes have been interpreted as belonging to the genre in its nascent stage. Retrospectively adding titles to entries in his diaries for the reign of Henri III, L'Estoile aligned one of his reports of crimes to this genre. He reported a ‘tragicall history of one who had a child with the daughter of President Bailli’, a domestic servant named Claude Touart, who was charged by his master, président in the Chambre des comptes, with the abduction of the his daughter, Artemis. She pleaded with her father that she initiated their affair and that she and Touart had contracted a ‘true and legitimate marriage between them’. Their story was tragicall perhaps because it was a crime of passion, with no victim beyond the father’s sense of rank.

36 Brunet, ix, 247-248.
38 Schrenck-Lazard, iv, 38-40. His execution discussed below pp. 120-121.
However, reports so clearly identified as tragical histories are rare in L'Estoile’s diaries. Overall, his form of crime-writing cannot be fitted neatly into this genre, which is exemplified by François de Belleforest’s frequently expanded *Histoires tragiques* (first edition Paris, 1559). Following Thierry Pech, the genre might be defined in the following way: 1. tragicall histories report contemporary and extraordinary news, 2. their denouement evokes pity, 3. their tone is grave rather than realistic, 4. their structure is regular and consists of a suspenseful introduction, a narrative, and a moral conclusion, 5. their thematic range is more limited than typical novellas and focuses on the miseries of the human condition, 6. they are often presented in compilations of other tales sharing these features. In these terms, L'Estoile’s reports of crimes cannot be classified strictly as tragicall histories since they are too fragmented in both their internal structure and narrative position among the great variety of reports in his diaries; they are too varied in their tone, length, and subject matter to be categorised in this way; and they are too light on exegesis, characterised instead by terse prose highlighting crucial and curious rather than gratuitous details. L'Estoile’s reports compare more closely to the genre of comments on *arrêts*, or judgements, of the Parlement, as he typically provided details of the name of the condemned, along with the date, place, and method of execution. Magistrates commonly compiled collections of *arrêts* in personal miscellanies, and from the mid sixteenth century such collections were frequently published and re-edited, forming a crucial part of legal training. L'Estoile developed his reports of crimes out of this standard judicial form as he saw fit, incorporating elements of tragicall histories and other genres depending on the sources available to him and his interpretation of the case.

Only in a few rare cases can L'Esteole’s reports be matched with a relevant crime pamphlet. These pamphlets were never his only sources; more typically he seems to have not seen the pamphlet at all before composing his report.\textsuperscript{42} When he did mention crime pamphlets it was to denounce them as rehashed old stories with little regard for accurate reporting.\textsuperscript{43} The cases of the Tourlavilles (incest and adultery) and Louise Jacquinot (parricide) lent themselves to reports in the genre of tragicall histories and provided material for pamphlets that L'Esteole seems to have ignored in his reports. Both crimes had a sexual motivation, \textit{paillardise} – ‘lecherie’ or ‘wickedness’ – being one of the main causes of crime according to the jurist Claude Le Brun de la Rochette.\textsuperscript{44} Yet L'Esteole did not dwell on voyeuristic details and instead recorded these crimes in order to demonstrate the justice of the Parlement’s verdict.

The Tourlavilles’ execution for adultery and incest inspired a near-contemporary pamphlet and a widely-circulated tale in François Rosset’s \textit{Histoires tragiques} (first edition Paris, 1617). Typically, God’s justice structures the pamphlet, demonstrating that He would not leave hidden and unpunished such detestable evil. In the same framework of divine justice, but with greater gusto, Rosset described in horror the siblings’ initial sexual encounters and Marguerite’s adulterous flight from her husband, the siblings’ arrest and interrogations, and ultimately their pleasingly contrite execution ordered by the Parlement at the Place de Grève in Paris before the Hôtel de Ville. These printed accounts concluded with a phrase from Marguerite’s dying speech as the criminal scribe reported it in their interrogation before execution: ‘My brother, take courage, console yourself in God. We have

\textsuperscript{42} Crime pamphlets that L’Esteole purchased or that relate to crimes he reported are listed among the bibliography presented in Jean-Pierre Seguin, \textit{L’information en France avant le périodique: 517 canards imprimés entre 1529 et 1631} (Paris, 1964), pp. 71-75. There is no space here to set out the differences of detail, form, and style between L’Esteole’s reports and the pamphlets related to the cases of the sieur de Chantepie (Brunet, iii, 64-65) and the sieur de Montestruc (Brunet, ix, 32-34) that can be compared in Lever, \textit{Canards sanglants}, pp. 97-102, 133-140.

\textsuperscript{43} Brunet, x, 158, cited in Silvia Liebel, \textit{Les Médées modernes: La cruauté féminine d’après les canards imprimés (1574-1651)} (Paris, 2013), pp. 31-33.

\textsuperscript{44} Claude Le Brun de La Rochette, \textit{Les procès civil et criminel} (Lyon, 1622, first edition Lyon, 1609), \textit{Le procès criminel}, i, 8; Cotgrave, \textit{Dictionarie}, ‘Paillardise’.
well merited death.” However, the pamphlets did not take seriously Marguerite’s protest in earlier interrogations in the criminal chamber of the Parlement at the dreadful treatment she received from her husband, leading her brother to take her away; nor her claim that the father of her child was not her brother but a tailor who worked for their father, who denied the charge when confronted with her. Rosset said that she contradicted herself in the interrogations, which is clearly not the case. Marguerite and Julien maintained their position and confessed at their execution only in general terms, always evading the specific charge of incest, and they did so following an assurance that they would be withheld from further punishment if they confessed. L’Estoile ignored these details, and was not privy to the negotiations in the interrogation before execution. In a sole phrase hinting at the adulterous desire of the condemned he commented that Julien was handsome and rich while Marguerite was ‘fort belle’. He suggested perhaps that their beauty was a cause of their moral corruption and sexual temptation. His brief report gave the details of the judgement against the Tourlavilles and its execution, then focused on their father’s failed attempt to gain them pardon, as he ‘threw himself on his knees before the king’. Henri IV replied, following L’Estoile’s gloss, that if Marguerite was not married, he would have willingly given his grace, while the Queen showed that she was strongly against the appeal. L’Estoile in this case

---

47 A pamphlet concerning another case that L’Estoile reported, Les pitoyables et funestes regrets de Marguerite d’Auge (no place, 1600), p. 3, opens with the laments of Marguerite, guilty of complicity in the murder of her husband by her lover, ‘Miserable beauté! miserable jeunesse! Que ma servi ce corps moulé de la divinité, s’il s’est laissé conduire à ses sales plaisirs.’ Brunet, vii, 179-180; AN X2A 960, 9, 10 March 1599; Claude La Charité, ‘L’éthos pathétique de Marguerite d’Auge dans Les pitoyables et funestes regrets (1600)’, Tangence, 77 (2005), pp. 82-83, on this passage in the pamphlet.
composed a politically sensitive report of the effective workings of the Parlement’s criminal justice, and no tragicall history.\textsuperscript{48}

In the case of Louise Jacquinot, L’Estoile’s report at first compares more closely with the pamphlet reporting her ‘Prodigious history’. He related how this young girl, aged seventeen (the pamphlet reported ‘thirteen or fourteen’) had her father killed in order to run away with a young priest named Gloria. Her sister Geneviève escaped prison and justice. She had plotted the murder of her father and had her husband killed to pursue her own romance with another young priest. Louise Jacquinot, in her interrogation in the Tournelle, denied all knowledge of her father’s death and claimed the priests alone had killed him. She presented herself as an innocent victim of their schemes and, more often than not, resisted Gloria’s attempts to have sex with her. Any confessions she had made in previous interrogations she renounced as forced from her by the magistrates. Finally, the magistrates judged her sufficiently convicted and convinced of the accusation of parricide, and they also ordered her sister hanged in effigy.\textsuperscript{49} L’Estoile reported only Louise Jacquinot’s contrite execution as an example of God’s justice being done. Contrasting with L’Estoile’s moralistic summary, the pamphlet casts the crime as a piteous tragedy directed by the lustful priests, dwelling on Gloria’s attempts to seduce Louise, and imputing her sister’s role to the temptations of the Devil. In its terse presentation, L’Estoile’s report predominantly follows the structure of a

\textsuperscript{48} Brunet, viii, 108.
\textsuperscript{49} AN X2A 959, 9 September 1598; AN X2B 185, 9 September.
- Est de Suresne.
- Est innocente, a esté condamné a mort ne scait pourquoi elle est condamnée.
- Pourquoi l’ont interrogée, Dit qu’ils luy ont faicte dire tout ce qu’ils ont voulu …
- Remonstrée que se veyt clairement qu’il est mort et que le traistre meschant et malheureux le tué, assisté de deux autres meschans.
- Dit qu’elle en est innocente et ne sayt que luy est tué que jusques a que la justice luy a dict.
- Remonstrée que le presbtre luy a sceu la demandait a esté grosse de son faict.
- Dit qu’elle n’en a jamais de luy fait a ceste visite.
- Remonstrée qu’elle confessa que le presbtre l’entretenoit.
- Dit qu’il la prise une fois parfois …
- Remonstrée qu’elle a confessa que le presbtre coucha avec elle lors qu’elle aouvoit tué son pere.
- Dit que les meubles furent print au college St Barbe ou elle estoit chacuns son lict.
- Dit qu’elle s’en rapporta a tous si elle scait que c’est de cela estre au college de St Barbe chercha meistre Godard servant et est innocente de la mort de son pere.
criminal judgement, presenting the date and place of execution, the name of the accused, and then recounting the crime to demonstrate that the Parlement had performed good justice. L'Estoile rarely, if ever, used pamphlets as the source of his reports, scorning their fabrications and relying instead on oral and manuscript communication in the Palais de Justice. His reports were no tragical histories, and because of their proximity to the style and interpretation of the criminal judgements of the Parlement, L'Estoile’s reports make an excellent point from which to analyse its magistrates’ discussions of criminality.

III. Violent Crimes in the Civil Wars

L'Estoile saw violence and rebellion as characteristic of his fallen society and ‘the malice of this century’, inextricably bound with the social pressures of life in the capital and the impact of the civil wars. He selected serious cases of ‘big bees’ whose crimes threatened the social order, as well as ‘small flies’ whose misdemeanours in some way were typical or representative of wider patterns of criminality. Occasionally he reached for providential explanations, which might serve either to reinforce or to critique the Parlement’s justice, such as the case of Jehan Reveillon, whose appeal on a death sentence from the Châtelet for theft the Parlement overturned, but who then hanged himself in the prisons, implying to L'Estoile that his stern, initial judgement was just. Above all, L'Estoile intended to demonstrate how deserving of punishment these villains were. Some of his reports deploy commonplaces – criminals might flee to Paris to conceal themselves in ‘the most beautiful forest in the

50 Brunet, vii, 135-136; Histoire prodigieuse, avec la justice qui en a esté faicte le 12 septembre 1598 (no place or date), pp. 5, 6, 10, 11 for the relevant passages.
51 Brunet, v, 82-83; APP AB 11, fol. 44.
world”\textsuperscript{52} – but others were precise and compare directly with interrogations in the criminal chamber of the Parlement, discussing critically their judgements.

Among the cases that L'Estoile reported as being most worthy of condemnation, Joseph Chasteau and his masters René and Charles Bianque were broken on the wheel on 29 and 30 January 1584 for committing robbery and homicide in the house of Madame de La Tour in the Left Bank suburb of Saint Germain des Près. L'Estoile linked their death to that of their detested father René, ‘who killed and robbed on Saint Bartholomew’s night’ and himself died ‘consumed by lice and vermin’, as well as that of his wife ‘who was a whore who died in a beggar’s corner’. All of the family’s deaths were ‘a considerable judgement of God’.\textsuperscript{53} In drawing these links L'Estoile went far beyond the magistrates leading the interrogation in the Tournelle, who focused on the manner in which the brothers cruelly manipulated Chasteau, calling him names – ‘Pierre Hillot’, the name that L'Estoile reported, was one of his nicknames, taken after their dog – and the question of whether Chasteau had been forewarned of and rewarded for his involvement in the plot. Nevertheless, the details of the court’s judgement correspond with those in L'Estoile’s report. In the house of Monsieur du Bois, the trio killed Madame de La Tour, her servant Michelle Tessonne, and Nicolas Refue aged six to ten years (L'Estoile said ten, and that he was the grandson of Madame de la Tour). Their case attained a certain degree of notoriety. Claude Dupuy, conseiller in the Parlement, copied their arrêts into a compilation of notable judgements, making the same link between the crimes of the sons and the ‘vice and wickedness’ of the father.\textsuperscript{54} God’s punishment of the Bianque

\textsuperscript{52} Brunet, vii, 132. This commonplace of Paris as ‘la plus belle forest du monde’ is analysed in Roussel, \textit{Violences}, p. 44.
\textsuperscript{53} On René the elder’s role in the massacre of Saint Bartholomew, see L'Estoile’s BnF ms. fr. 10304, fols. 232-233.
\textsuperscript{54} Brunet, ii, 322-323; AN X2A 954, 29, 30 January 1586; AN X2B 144, 29, 30 January 1586; BnF ms. Dupuy 137, fols. 78-80.
family stood for all those who committed crimes in the Saint Bartholomew’s day massacre and who would not escape a final judgement.  

L’Estoile highlighted the violence of members of the Paris Sixteen, the group he excoriated in his memoirs of the League: ‘It is the ordinary exercise of a Leaguer, and the infallible mark of a zealous Catholic, always to have the mass and religion on their lips, atheism and brigandage at heart, and murder and blood on their hands’.  

He witnessed the execution of the Leaguer François Perrichon for homicide on 9 August 1589 and described Perrichon as ‘one of the most evil seditious and en-leagued thieves of Paris’, prominently involved in the uprising of the Day of the Barricades that chased Henri III out of Paris. Perrichon had killed a fellow Leaguer, Nicolas Muteau, whose allies among ‘the principal Leaguers of Paris’ pursued the case up to its rapporteur in the Parlement, Hierosme Anroux. These details about the negotiations surrounding the trial in L’Estoile’s account took the place of a report of the homicide itself. Reading from the case files in the criminal chamber, the magistrates put it to Perrichon that he had begun a dispute with Muteau over the ownership of a horse and a foal, with the result that Perrichon and Mutueau confronted one-another before the house of the Prévôt des Marchands of Paris, with Muteau supported by nine men. Next, Perrichon was accused of dragging Muteau by the arm to the rue des Boucherons where he gave him a final blow, before a group of soldiers who cried ‘kill kill’. He responded to this allegation by protesting that Muteau’s widow had put the witnesses up to saying this. For L’Estoile, Perrichon exemplified the wickedness of the Leaguers, a rowdy rabble of thieves and brawlers. Pierre Laisne, the conseiller overseeing the interrogation before execution,

---

55 For other divine judgements on those involved in the massacre see below p. 141 n.54.
56 Schrenck-Lazard, vi, 171-172.
appeared a little more lenient and promised to pursue with his colleagues Perrichon’s dying wish to be buried in consecrated ground.\textsuperscript{57}

Immediate threats to his person and property concerned L'Estoile and he feared for his safety at home. He reported in 1582 three murders of masters by their servants in fewer than six weeks, ‘a rare and notable thing’ and ‘a good example for masters to never trust servants they have known to be thieves’.\textsuperscript{58} On one occasion, his son Matthew was beaten by one of his lackeys named Loys, and the next day he took the lackey to be imprisoned. The event ‘troubled my repose and spirit’.\textsuperscript{59} Domestic thefts also troubled him. On 19 July 1608 an unnamed friend, ‘a man otherwise of honour and quality’, stole medals from his study, causing him to lament ‘O my friends! There are no friends!’\textsuperscript{60} Most distressing for L'Estoile, the beloved aunt of his second wife Colombe, Antoinette Guibert, Madame de Fontenay had her house broken into by one of her grandsons while she was at another son’s wedding party, that L'Estoile and Colombe were attending. Accompanied by a soldier, the young Fontenay threatened his grandmother’s maid with a sword and took rings worth 250 \textit{écus}. Colombe stayed with her aunt that night and L'Estoile felt ‘a strange and extraordinary disquiet’ and ‘was no less afflicted by this accident than if it had happened to myself’.\textsuperscript{61} Nor was his property secure in the Palais de Justice, whose busy chambers, corridors, and halls offered a place of opportunity for thieves. On 23 March 1588 a nineteen-year-old Norman – Jehan Gohin, his entry in the prison book of the Conciergerie described him as a ‘self-proclaimed writer’ – stole a watch from around the neck of a gentleman in the packed Grande Salle de Plaidoyers of the Palais and was hanged ‘on the spot’ in its courtyard in an act of ‘Good and


\textsuperscript{58} Brunet, ii, 69.

\textsuperscript{59} Brunet, x, 75-76.

\textsuperscript{60} Brunet, ix, 107.

\textsuperscript{61} Brunet, ix, 252-253.
swift justice. Seen in this context, L'Estoile’s reports of violent crimes in Paris were shaped by the interests of someone all too aware of the material and spiritual threats that his city posed.

L'Estoile’s reports of violent crimes were sensitive to the variety of cases passing through the Parlement and the circumstances particular to each case. He reported more ‘flies’ than ‘big bees’, but villains like the Bianque and Perrichon were among the most notorious executed in Paris in this period. Among the ‘flies’, he overlooked the diversity of motives in different examples of violent criminal activity, attributing it to wickedness and malice, plainly deserving of divine and secular punishment, and in infanticide cases, he felt competent to pronounce his condemnations despite possessing very little information about the women involved. Violent crime then was at once in close proximity to his household and banished to the further reaches of the jurisdiction of the Parlement. He was determined to see it prosecuted.

IV. Witchcraft and Scepticism

The period that L'Estoile covered in his diaries coincides with the peak as well as the decline of executions for witchcraft in the Parlement of Paris. His colleagues divided on the issue, with many sceptical about the possibility of proving the reality of witchcraft and intent on decriminalising it. L'Estoile’s reports mark him out as a proponent of witchcraft prosecution across the jurisdiction in the Parlement. His interest in the subject is attested in one of the

---

62 Brunet, iii, 129; APP AB 10, fol. 152v. L’Estoile reported that the theft occurred in the Salle de l’Audience. The entry in the prison book of the Conciergerie names the condemned as Jehan Gohin and describes him as a ‘soy disant escripvain natif de Mortain en Normandy dem[eurant] partout’, and noted that the crime took place in the the Grande Salle de Plaidoyers. L'Estoile reported several other cutpurses and thieves in the meeting spaces of the Palais and overlooked more still recorded in the criminal archives: Brunet, vii, 205, viii, 56; APP AB 10, fol. 160r; APP AB 11, fol. 82r. On cases of thefts in the Palais see La Roche Flavin, Treze livres, p. 857.
earliest pieces in his collection, a report of the killing of a witch in Normandy dated 1564.⁶³ Later in his diaries, with accurate and zealously argued reports, L'Estoile sought to convince his friends and colleagues of the crime’s significance and the need to prosecute it.

In a report dated 26 February 1587, L'Estoile discussed the case of Dominique Miraille and his mother-in-law Marguerite Garnier, executed that day before the cathedral of Notre Dame. That year saw eight witches executed by the Parlement of Paris, the largest number in any year.⁶⁴ Accusations against Miraille and Garnier began with Miraille’s alleged discovery of a magic book in the house of the sieur de La Rochesurion where he was a concierge, and his attempts to use this book, along with information garnered from a shepherd, to talk to the sibyls. L'Estoile did not mention these details and instead summarised their reason for using magic, that Garnier had encouraged Miraille in order to become rich.

L'Estoile was most interested in using Miraille and Garnier’s case to complain against the Parlement’s reluctance to prosecute witches across its jurisdiction – ‘one finds this execution a great novelty in Paris, since this vermin always remained free and not tracked down, especially at the Court’ – citing the figure of 30,000 witches that allegedly plagued the kingdom in 1572, according to ‘their leader’. Here L'Estoile marks himself out as a committed proponent of witch-hunting, citing Exodus 22.18 ‘Thou shalt not suffer a witch to live’.⁶⁵ In this passage, L'Estoile borrowed from Jean Bodin’s Demonomanie des sorciers, listed in his after-death inventory in its 1587 enlarged second edition, as he adapted Bodin in coupling the passage from Exodus with the statement made by the pardoned magician Trois-Eschelles before Charles IX in 1571. L'Estoile simply reduced the number of witches from Bodin’s figure of ‘more than a hundred thousand in this realm’ and ignored the qualification that this

---

⁶³ Armitage, p. 117.
⁶⁴ Soman, Sorcellerie, I, 808.
⁶⁵ Brunet, iii, 10-11; AN X2A 955, 19 February 1587; AN X2B 149, 19, 27, 28 February 1587, Soman Collection; BnF ms. Dupuy 137, fols. 75-77.
claim might be fictitious, concocted by Trois-Eschelles as he had been pardoned on the condition that he name his accomplices.66

Bodin published the *Demonomanie* so as to exhort the Parlement and other criminal courts to loosen witchcraft from what he saw as their overly rigorous procedure, since the Parlement overturned the majority of cases of witchcraft that came to it on appeal.67 In siding with Bodin in this passage, L'Estoile differed from many of his colleagues in the Parlement. As Alfred Soman demonstrated, in 1587 and 1588 a large number of scandalous and abusive witchcraft cases came to the attention of the Parlement, causing its magistrates to react decisively and to begin to decriminalise witchcraft in their jurisdiction. In two judgements of 1588 the Parlement called for an end to the water test, an order they repeated in 1601.68

Again in judgements from 1588, the Parlement requested the automatic appeal of witchcraft cases from lesser jurisdictions. The magistrates declared these reforms again in 1604 and passed them in a general judgement of the court in 1624.69 The combination of the ban on the water test and the call for automatic appeals made the years 1600-1604 the crucial moment in the decline in witchcraft prosecutions in the Parlement.70 L'Estoile reported neither of these developments. He continued to report executions for witchcraft after Henri IV’s victory over the League and did so without doubt, mentioning the cases of two female accused witches in dismissive anonymity, and reporting several male witches involved in a rare conspiracy against the king’s life.71 Support for witchcraft persecution in the Parlement has been

---

71 Jehanne Davesne’s case revolved around typical accusations of *maleficium*: Brunet, vi, 156; AN X2A 957, 9 February 1594; AN X2A 149, 16 February 1594; Soman Collection. Jeanne Patarde’s case was concerned visits to the sabbat and *maleficium*, and was uncommon for the number of times she appeared before the Tournelle: Brunet viii, 163; AN X2A 961, 30 August 1603, 3 September 1603, 16 December 1603; AN X2A 158 16 December 1603, Soman Collection; AN X2A 160, 13 August 1604; AN X2B 1330, 13 August 1604; Soman
associated with the Leaguers, whose control of the court between 1588 and 1594 delayed the automatic appeal of witchcraft cases, but L'Estoile’s example demonstrates how witchcraft belief and support for its prosecution could cross political divides within the Parlement, and how divisions of opinion could continue in the court behind the unanimity of its judgements. 72

On certain questions, even committed believers in the reality of witchcraft exercised a strong degree of scepticism, and among these questions was that of the metamorphosis of humans into animals. 73 In 1598 L'Estoile reported the case of the ‘so-called werewolf’ Jean Roullet, a ‘poor wretch’ from Anjou, whose death sentence for ‘having killed and eaten the body of Michel Comier, then injured and outraged several other children in the guise of a wolf’ was overturned by the Parlement. L'Estoile was curious to witness Roullet shaved in the Conciergerie of his ‘hair hanging down to his heels, his beard the same, and his nails as long as his hands’, perhaps seeing the illusion of his transformation shorn off in the process. Citing the doctrines of Saint Augustine, the Sorbonne, and the ‘principle doctors’, L'Estoile denied the possibility of bodily transformations such as lycanthropy as ‘false and imaginary’. 74 He saw Roullet ‘alienated from his spirit’. L'Estoile’s cousin the conseiller Le Coigneux told him that Roullet had confessed more than he was asked, presumably in his earlier interrogation in Angers. Before the magistrates in the Parlement, on 23 and 26 November 1598, Roullet’s story unravelled. This time he denied eating the children and

---

72 Pearl, Crime of Crimes, pp. 77-100; Soman, Sorcellerie, II, 39, XII, 187.
transforming into a wolf. He said he wanted to cease becoming a wolf and asked pardon of God. He had never heard of the sabbath. The magistrates thought his replies sufficient to overturn his judgement and L'Estoile concluded his account of Roullet’s ‘extravagant suppositions’ with the fact that the court sent him to confinement in the hospital of Saint Germain des Près. Accusations of lycanthropy and eating children are rare in the criminal archives of the Parlement. In two such cases linked to witchcraft accusations heard during the period of L'Estoile’s diaries the Parlement overturned earlier death sentences. L'Estoile shared his colleagues’ scepticism concerning lycanthropy without it affecting his belief in the reality of witchcraft.

The most striking witchcraft case that L'Estoile reported began with a group arrest in September 1608. For L'Estoile, their practices ‘seemed to me like the stories that mad dotard old women tell’ even if the ‘iniquity of these times, the freezing-up of charity everywhere, and the disregard for the fear of God give weight and credence to the common rumours of these abominations’. These arrests led to the execution on 4 June 1609 of André Gauvin, known as La Croix, a priest and conjurer from Lower Normandy, ‘accused and convicted of a thousand abominations’. Among those arrested with La Croix was a doctor, ‘a man of lively and subtle understanding’ whom L'Estoile knew ‘quite privately (but not in this capacity)’, named Charles Poictevan, known as Saint Maurice, as well as Jean Fuzil, a companion-printer ‘from whom were discovered magical characters that he had printed’, and Pierre Rigault, a mason. While L'Estoile did not name crucial members of their party, Jehan de

---

75 Brunet, vii, 150-151; AB 13, fol. 152; AN X2A 960, 23, 26 November 1598; AN X2B 186, 27 November 1599; Soman Collection; Sieur de Beauvoys de Chauvincourt, Discours de la lycanthropie de la transmutation des hommes en loups (no place, 1599); Pierre de Lancre, L'incredulite et mescreance du sortilège plaineamment convaincue (Paris, 1622), pp. 785-790.
76 Jean Marot was incidentally accused of lycanthropy among other claims of maleficium: AN X2A 964, 25 September 1602; AN X2B 1330, 27 September 1602; Soman Collection. The case of the accused werewolf Jean Bouteroux was brought before the Parlement by his widow Jeanne Guillerier who prosecuted his interrogator the lieutenant general at Gien, Pierre d’Anjou, who had tortured Bouteroux so severely that he died in prison: AN X2B 198, 29 December 1600; AN X2A 152, fols. 126-128, 8 January 1601; Soman Collection. Oates, ‘Trials of Werewolves’, p. 14.
77 Brunet, ix, 134-135.
Chastelet known as Cesar, and Denis Martin, sieur de Bellecour, he was correct on all the
details he reported of the case. La Croix and his companions were accused of consecrating a
toad and sacrificing a fox in a parody of the mass, and assembling at the gallows at
Montfaucon, all in the hope of finding buried treasure at Merly and in the basement of a
house in the Beaubourg quarter of Paris. La Croix copied out invocations for locating treasure
to accompany these rites, but protested he did so only from ‘curiosity’. Such practices were
known in witchcraft trials across early modern Europe.78

L'Estoile soon reported a further development in their case, an event that occurred in
the prisons, told to him by the avocat du roi Cardin Le Bret. In the darkened cell of the
Conciergerie, La Croix told his companions that – if they so desired – a black man, the figure
of the devil, would come to them and release them, and that they should agree to go with him
by giving their blood, to seal their pact. Since they risked death by breaking on the wheel, the
companions agreed. But when the magistrates found the companions in the cell later,
distraught by the experience, they pardoned them all but La Croix, who received a death
sentence on 4 June 1609, while his companions were banished by a judgement of 1 July
1609. Perhaps L'Estoile implied that La Croix employed a devilish ruse so powerful as to
evoke the pity of the magistrates for its victims. Should they have hanged alongside him? As
he and his companions presented the case in their interrogations, La Croix was the clear co-
ordinator of the treasure-seeking. This extraordinary case proved for L'Estoile, and he hoped
for his readers, that witchcraft was a reality that subverted Christian rituals, and a crime that
the Parlement should continue to punish rigorously.79 While L'Estoile might share the
Parlement’s scepticism concerning Roullet’s lycanthropy, he was consistently zealous in

78 Cases involving treasure-hunters mentioned in eg. Robert Mandrou, Magistrats et sorciers en France au XVIIe
siècle: Une analyse de psychologie historique (Paris, 1968), pp. 228 n.68, 258, 515, 517, 520; Ruth Martin,
Witchcraft and the Inquisition in Venice, 1550-1650 (Oxford, 1989), pp. 87-96; Robin Briggs, The Witches of
79 Brunet, ix, 134-135, 270; X2A 971, 26, 29 May, 22 June 1609; X2B 173, 4 June 1609; X2B 174, 1, 2 July
1609; Soman Collection.
exhorting his colleagues to confirm death sentences in cases of witchcraft, just when the court was moving to its decriminalisation. He highlighted scandalous cases that supported his appeal to execute strict justice in the prosecution of witchcraft in the Parlement.

V. Heresy Trials in ‘the Autumn of the Church’

Une rose d’automne est plus qu’une autre exquise:  
Vous avez esjouï l’automne de l’Eglise.80

L’Estoile reported the prosecution of heresy in only a handful of cases, since the crime was rarely tried by the Parlement during the period of his diaries. With the May 1560 Edict of Romorantin, the monarchy made a legal distinction between heresy and sedition, decreeing that from that point on the Church and not the parlements should deal with the problem of heresy. As a result, the Parlement of Paris only tried heretics in specific periods of unrest in the late 1560s and late 1580s.81 L’Estoile reported the most notable of those cases tried before the Parlement in the second of those periods. His judgements put him in direct opposition to the criminal justice of the Parlement under the League. Against these prosecutions, L’Estoile’s reports might be aligned with those of the Protestant soldier and humanist Agrippa d’Aubigné, a fellow student of Mathieu Béralde at the beginning of the civil wars.

D’Aubigné recounted these cases in his epic poem Les tragiques, describing them as the blessed martyrdoms of a few late roses who enjoyed ‘the autumn of the Church’. While the passages of Les tragiques concerning these cases are well-known, the relevant plumitifs have

been ignored by historians, and their content qualifies and clarifies the laudatory, confessional accounts composed by both L'Estoile and d'Aubigné.

Under pressure from the newly formed second Catholic League, in signing the July 1585 Edict of Nemours Henri III revoked religious toleration and ordered Protestants to leave the kingdom within six months.\(^8^2\) L'Estoile reported how, following the Edict, certain Protestants abjured their faith while others ‘held firm’ and left, including the royal architect André du Cerceau, who had long enjoyed the king’s protection.\(^8^3\) L'Estoile’s friend the Huguenot potter Bernard Palissy dared to return to Paris. Palissy was twice brought before the Parlement, first on 30 December 1586 then again on 4 July 1588. His death in the prison of the Bastille in 1590 forms a set-piece in L'Estoile’s diaries as he died ‘aged eighty’, held along with three women ‘for the cause of the Religion’, suffering from ‘misery, necessity, and poor treatment’.\(^8^4\) L'Estoile did not report Palissy’s first appearance before the Parlement, but its circumstances clarify his sympathetic report of Palissy’s second arrest and death in prison.

This discovery of Palissy’s first interrogation in the Parlement is significant as it records and interprets his justification for coming to Paris despite of the Edict of Nemours. Along with Loys Besnard, domestic servant of Jehan Robineau, sieur de Croissy, and Pierre Restou, tailor, Palissy was brought to the Parlement on 30 December 1586, appealing for a reduction in his penalty following the sentence of an amende honorable and perpetual banishment ordered by the subordinate court of Saint Germain des Près, which found the trio guilty of the crime of heresy.\(^8^5\) After a short stay in the prison of the Parlement, on 10 January 1587 Palissy appeared in its criminal chamber of the Tournelle. The scribe recorded how Palissy claimed that he fled from Paris to Sedan after the Edict of Nemours, but was

---


\(^8^3\) Brunet, ii, 220.

\(^8^4\) Brunet, v, 67. On L’Estoile and Palissy see above pp. 54, 76.

driven back to the capital because otherwise ‘he waited to die of hunger, unable to exercise his art. Seeing that he was in debt to several who were feeding him, he returned to finish a villa he was making for the Queen Mother … seeing that the king was tolerating artisans in his household he returned and hoped the Queen Mother would come’. He tried to evoke pity by pleading necessity, and to invoke a higher authority by mentioning the patronage of Catherine de Médicis. Perhaps he had in mind the protection Henri III gave to his Protestant architect Du Cerceau. Palissy and his companions were unsuccessful in their appeal and their sentence was upheld.

The details of this interrogation clarify aspects of the accounts composed by Agrippa d'Aubigné and L'Estoile of Palissy’s second interrogation in the Parlement, appealing this time against a death sentence. Palissy did not obey the earlier judgement of the Parlement and was taken to the prisons of the Conciergerie again on 4 July 1588 – less than a month after the Catholic League took power in Paris – alongside Marguerite Mesline, widow and inhabitant of Saint Germain des Près. Later he was transferred to the prison of the Bastille on account of his age. Perhaps the plumitif in this case does not survive because the interrogation

86 AN X2A 955, 10 January 1587. Du Samedy x° Janvier mv° iii°vii Messieurs Potier, De Thou, President Messieurs Perrot, Angenoust, De Here, Michon, Sanguin, De Noucy, De la Vau, Charreton, Baron Bernard Palissy
- Est né d’Agenais que la Reine la amené en ceste ville a la cour et sa maison jusques a la S’ Bartelemey.
- Il doit fuir ses batis sacagez es Tuilleries, que la Roine luy a appellé qu’elle eust rangé de luy faire de bien.
- Est architete en l’art de terre, est prisonnier pour que apres l’Edict du Roy il s’en alla a Sedan ou il s’attendait mourir de fain ne pouvant exercer son art. Voyant qu’il estoit en faulte a plusieurs qui le nourrissoient, et s’en revient pour achever ung villa qu’il fait pour la Roine.
- Est de la Religion reformée.

87 Palissy’s entry into the prison book and his judgement, first published by N. Weiss, are reproduced in the most up-to-date biography of Palissy: Amico, Bernard Palissy, pp. 236-237.
took place in the Bastille rather than the Tournelle, and apparently included questioning by
Henri III in politically charged circumstances.\(^88\)

Recounting this second arrest, both d’Aubigné and L’Estoile proposed Palissy as a
potential martyr in ‘the autumn of the Church’, if only he had died in the bonfires lit by the
League rather than in his cell in the Bastille. According to d’Aubigné’s *Histoire universelle*,
the potter’s response to the king’s questioning left him torn between his earthly and heavenly
obligations: ‘Sire, I was ready to give my life for the glory of God’.\(^89\) L’Estoile reported
Palissy’s similar response to the taunts of Bussy Le Clere, the League’s captain of the
Bastille: ‘let me only pray to my God, and then do with my body what you will.’\(^90\) Contrary
to this heroic image, a different Palissy appeared in his January 1587 interrogation. That year,
Palissy presented himself as a cowed and defensive appellant hoping for pity and the reversal
of his sentence of banishment and an *amende honorable*. On his return to the Parlement in
1589, according to d’Aubigné and L’Estoile, Palissy appeared instead a resilient and constant
Protestant facing a death sentence. Inspired by their accounts, his heroism under interrogation
has been celebrated ever since.

L’Estoile, d’Aubigné, and the criminal scribe recorded more combative resistance in
the interrogations of the Protestant sisters Radegonde and Claude Foucaulde, executed for
heresy at the Place de Grève on 28 June 1588.\(^91\) L’Estoile reported the interrogation by Henri
III and theologians of these ‘two poor girls of the [Reformed] Religion’, as they pressured the
sisters to abjure their faith, while d’Aubigné celebrated their ‘immortal triumph’ and ‘angelic

\(^88\) Palissy’s interrogation is not recorded in the relevant register of the *plumitifs* of the Tournelle AN X2A 956.
tragiques*, p. 146 vv. 1241-1256; Gilbert Schrenck, ‘Bernard Palissy dans l’œuvre d’Agrippa d’Aubigné’, in
\(^91\) AN X2A 956, 28 June 1588; AN X2B 157, 28 June 1588; Brunet, iii, 120-121, 166; Fayet, *Journal
historique*, p. 44; Simon Goulart’s addition to Jean Crespin, *Histoire des martyrs persecutez mis a mort pour la
verité de l’Evangile, depuis le temps des Apostres jusques l’an 1597* (Geneva, 1597), fols. 756v-757r.
beauty’. L'Estoile reported that they remained ‘strong and firm’ in subsequent interrogations by doctors of the Church, and responded to their questions ‘resolutely and pertinently on the principal points of their Religion’. They continued in this stance during their later interrogation by the magistrates of the Tournelle. Radegonde, an upholsterer of bed canopies in Paris, explained that she was held in the city because of ‘the Religion and several rents that are due’. She recounted how her father, the procureur in the Parlement Jacques Foucauld, as well as ministers, had taught her the doctrines of the Reformed faith. She had not been to mass in twenty years and reposted that she ‘knows well that the mass has not been taught by Jesus Christ but by popes’. Claude described the same education and related how she had always lived in Paris but had been forced ‘because of the troubles to change quarter so as not to be recognised’. When told that ‘outside the apostolic and Roman Church lies the way to perdition’, ‘she said that she is not outside of the Church and that she is in the light and that is the way to election’. Both sisters affirmed the Reformed position on the Eucharist and refused to speak to a confessor, denying that they were ‘obstinate and opinionated’. Marie Vuade, in L'Estoile’s brief report a ‘Woman burned at Paris, for the Religion’ on 6 May 1589, who ‘died firm and constant in her religion’, batted back a similar volley of questions, and insisted at the end of her interrogation that she ‘will remain on the side of Jesus Christ’, and that ‘the doctors know that she speaks the truth’.

In the next stage of their martyrdom, L'Estoile reported that the Foucauldes ‘endured their execution with great constancy’, a crucial characteristic of earlier martyrs in the

---

92 D'Aubigné, Les tragiques, pp. 146-147 vv. 1259-1278
93 ‘Dict qu'elle est de ceste ville faict du ciel de tapisserie a dicte de moyen de spetiallement a cause des troubles se sera contreinctes en ceste ville a cause de la religion et par l'eritier de quelques deniers qui sont acquises des rendiers.’ According to Simon Goulart’s reported speech she was owed money in Pierrefitte and was burdened by three children so could not leave Paris: Goulart’s addition to Jean Crespin, Histoire des martyrs, fol. 757r.
94 ‘Elle a este instuicte apres par les ministre et scayt bien que la messe n’a esté instuicte de Jesus Christ mais par les papés’.
95 ‘A dict que c’est en ceste ville … a cause des troubles de <se> changeoit de quartier pour n’estre recognue.’
96 ‘A dict qu’elle n’est hors l’eglise et que es lumieres et est en voye eslue.’
97 Brunet, iii, 286; APP AB 10 fol. 247r; AN X2A 956, 6 May 1589. ‘Dict quelle demeurera en Jesus Christ … Dict que les docteurs scaven bien qu’elle dict vray.’
‘springtime’ of their Church. 98 Edmund Stafford, the English ambassador, reported that because of their ‘chearfull countenance and constancie’ on the route between the Palais de Justice and the Châtelet, a procureur ‘putt gags into their mouthes, and tydd downe their chinnes thatt theire devotion in lettinge upp theire eyes wought nott be seene’. 99 These procedures recall the executions of those condemned for heresy earlier in the French Reformation, who had disturbed execution proceedings instead by singing psalms, marking the constancy of their faith. 100 At the scaffold the crowd rushed ‘in animated fury’ to cut the cord hanging one of Foucaulde sisters so that she would not die quietly but fall into the flames below and burn alive. 101 Their case then seems to have more in common with contested executions of heretics in the years before the outbreak of the civil wars, and repeats an earlier pattern of ritual violence. 102 These rare heresy trials, appearing decades after the first Edict of Pacification that supposedly put an end to heresy proceedings in the parlements, seemed significant enough for L’Estoile and d’Aubigné to place their histories in the context of the long-term fate of the French Reformation, using the tone and vocabulary of martyrologists. After decades of civil war, before their deaths these last few flourishing roses enjoyed the ‘autumn of the Church’.

101 Brunet, iii, 166; Simon Goulart’s addition to Jean Crespin, Histoire des martyrs, fol. 757r, reports that the executioner cut the cord early at the instigation of the crowd.
VI. Contesting Public Executions

Places of execution all served as points of communication between the government and the people. Royal edicts were announced at the same sites.\textsuperscript{103} Most executions took place at the Place de Grève, but other large public spaces across the city were also used, notably the Place Maubert, the square at the end of the bridge of Saint Michel, the market of Les Halles, the square before Notre Dame, the courtyard before the Palais de Justice, and the city gates. At the scaffold, the executioner called for silence and the scribe proclaimed a summary of the judgement.\textsuperscript{104} Perhaps L’Estoile relied on these announcements as sources of information more often than he acknowledged.\textsuperscript{105}

Before execution, in the procedure known as the question préalable, the condemned might be submitted by the criminal scribe and the confessor to redoubled physical and moral pressure to confess. They usually denied their sentence to the last. Their protests reveal that the penitent last dying speech was not a submissive response to the authority of the criminal justice system, but the forced outcome of conflicting responses to the court’s judgements.\textsuperscript{106} A particularly extreme case is that of Claude Barie, who persisted in his denials up to the scaffold and challenged the foundations of the process. He was arrested for what L’Estoile called ‘undignified words’ upon leaving midnight mass drunk on Christmas Eve 1596, threatening to kill the king.\textsuperscript{107} His words were foolish; wine had overtaken him, and the devil had whispered in his ear. When Barie was told to confess his crimes in the hope of salvation, the criminal scribe recorded his insistence that ‘the damnation of his soul is not up to the king...’

\textsuperscript{104} The procedure described in Jean Imbert, \textit{La pratique judiciaire, tant civile que criminelle, receue et observe par tout le Royaume de France} (Villefranche, 1615), pp. 744-748.
\textsuperscript{105} He mentioned his presence at an execution rarely, eg. Brunet, v, 11-12, but often gave vivid reports of proceedings.
\textsuperscript{106} Hamilton, ‘Contesting Public Executions’.
\textsuperscript{107} Brunet, vii, 79.
nor any other person’, and he eventually asked for pardon in only the most general terms. Barie would wait for God’s judgement and could not be guilty as he did not have the will to say those words against the king. His excuse of drunkenness was fairly common, but he went further than his fellow condemned in denying outright the legitimacy of the Parlement’s procedure.

Typically, L’Estoile did not report dying speeches, implying that executions mostly proceeded in the ‘customary manner’, as the criminal scribe put it. But he could not disregard the protests of Laurent Gervasion, named ‘La Fortune’, condemned for theft and homicide, since he ‘never wanted to recognise his impending death, speaking ill of Justice, and not wanting to confess anything’. Gervaison was tortured on the scaffold by breaking on the wheel – where he cried vengeance against the executioner and his accusers – until he made a partial confession. L’Estoile insisted that his crimes were ‘execrable’ and that he was a ‘poor wretch’, surely damned. His response indicates how office-holders in the Parlement might try to explain away denials on the scaffold, which were ‘not worthy of a Christian about to die’, as further proof of the tainted soul of the condemned.

L’Estoile’s reports and those of his contemporaries referring simply to the presence of *le peuple* leave the size and composition of scaffold crowds impossible to determine, but the sites of execution had great capacity. He sometimes treated these crowds as a passive audience that should be deterred from crime by the terrors of exemplary justice – in one instance he wrote that the crowd would ‘ordinarily’ judge criminals ‘by the length of their noses’ – but his reports also demonstrate that their responses to executions were considered

---

108 ‘Au Roy ny a aucune personne soit la damnation de son ame.’ AN X2B 1330, 4 January 1597; AN X2A 959, 4 January 1597.
110 Brunet, viii, 288-289.
111 Brunet, viii, 32.
and could be unpredictable, and above all they demanded to see justice done. Such variety in their responses left him room for interpretation. On one occasion, L'Estoile related how the crowd took pity on two murderers who seemed too young, suggesting they deserved pardon for this reason. At the execution of Bartholomæo Bourguesso, accused of claiming to be the son of the pope – although ‘he denied it until the end’ and was ‘strongly resilient and constant’ – the crowd muttered that if the court hanged all the sons of priests then all the scaffolds in Paris would not contain them. Most damning of all, he reported how the crowd responded to the Leaguers’ summary execution of Brisson, Larcher, and Tardif with scathing silence, and this misstep by the Paris Sixteen revealed that they could no longer rely on the support of Parisians in their struggle against the ‘polite’ supporters of Henri IV. In all of these cases, L'Estoile’s occasional reports of the responses of the crowd served to bolster his judgements by invoking his interpretation of ‘public opinion’.

Historians of early modern public executions have debated the ‘carnivalesque’ nature of scaffold crowds and their propensity for unruly behaviour, even overturning courts’ judgements. L’Estoile mentions just one occasion when certain among the crowd rose up to overturn the decision of the Parlement, the execution of Claude Touart for abduction (‘rapt’) in 1582. In this tragicall history he thought that ‘the judgement was iniquitous’ – weeks earlier a notorious, corrupt conseiller in the Parlement, Jean Poisile, had been pardoned

112 Brunet, ix, 166.
113 Brunet, viii, 317.
114 Brunet, ix, 166-167.
115 Descimon and Barnavi, Le juge et la potence, p. 25.
117 See above p. 97.
for astonishing crimes of falsehoods\(^\text{118}\) – and perhaps both L'Estoile and the crowd felt Touart merited a last-minute pardon. Two sergeants of the Parlement were killed and several wounded in the tumult. The next month, the Parlement hanged as an exemplar Robert Duval ‘for causing a popular uprising, sedition, rebellions, insolences and violence, rescue and abduction committed at the execution of Claude Tonnard [sic]’. L'Estoile reported that this man had a doubtful link to the affair. To avoid a repeat performance on the day of Duval’s execution at the Place de Grève, the Parlement ordered the *commissaires* of the Châtelet to search the houses close to the site and warn the inhabitants not to receive anyone carrying arms.\(^\text{119}\) As this singular disturbance shows, the magistrates of the Parlement had reason to regard the crowd with unease, but they maintained public order at the scaffold more often than not. L'Estoile was sufficiently considerate of the criminal justice of the court that he might report such disorder as proof of its flawed judgement, and yet insist in general on the necessity of good order among the scaffold crowd.

Reports of the behaviour of the crowd might also reinforce the impact of the Parlement’s good justice. Responses to the extraordinarily brutal execution of François Ravaillac demonstrate that the crowd not only wanted to see justice done to Henri IV’s assassin, but also sought to participate themselves. According to L'Estoile, when Ravaillac left the Conciergerie there was a ‘great concourse and swelling of people, cruelly animated and bloodthirsty’, and ‘everyone wanted to get their hands on him; men, women, and even little children’. Courtiers stood in the Hotel de Ville to watch the execution in the Place de Grève from a distance. The English diplomat William Becher matches L'Estoile’s report that ‘the people did exceedingly applaude his torments, and there was much adoe through theyre

---

\(^{118}\) On Poisile see Barnavi and Descimon, *Le juge et la potence*, pp. 166-172.

rage to bring him alive to the execution, and after his death they did in part satisfy theyre rage on his members, dragging them in great fury about the towne'.

Distancing himself from the passionate crowd, L’Estoile did not indulge in re-enactments of the torments inflicted on Ravaillac, leaving this to contemporary publications. Prints supportive of the Parlement’s judgement widely celebrated the report of the crowd’s vengeful violence, and I suspect it was tacitly permitted by the magistrates and sergeants. L’Estoile reported the printing of Ravaillac’s judgement and suggested his torments were intended to stop people physically enacting vengeance against the condemned, so that witnessing the spectacle of violence might compensate for missing out on the act. Jean Ziarnko’s gruesome image (Figure 6) is itself pulled apart and its action quartered into scenes situated around Ravaillac’s limbs, repeating his punishments with every viewing. Beyond his tortured scream, Ravaillac’s facial features are barely discernible, and his body is a site of escalating stages of punishment. This is the extraordinary image of ancien régime criminal justice that the Parlement repeated in the execution of the attempted-regicide Robert-François Damiens on 28 March 1757, which in Michel Foucault’s stunning reconstruction ‘define[s] a certain penal style’. Aware of the exceptional nature of this punishment, L’Estoile recounted the scene of Ravaillac’s death with magisterial distance, composing an anatomy of the crowd that legitimated the Parlement’s judgement and its apparently successful defence of royal authority.

120 William Becher to Robert Cecil, 20 May 1610, TNA SP 78/56, fol. 136r-v.
121 Arrêt de la Cour de Parlement, contre le tresmeschant parricide François Ravaillac (Lyon, 1610), pp. 4-6; Sapplice, mort, et fin ignominieuse du parricide inhumain, & desnaturé François Ravaillac (Lyon, 1610), pp. 6-7; Discours véritable sur la mort de François Ravaillac, executé à Paris le 27 May, pour le cruel & detestable parricide par lui commis en la personne de Henry IIII Roy de France et Navarre (Lyon, 1610), pp. 8-11.
122 Ravaillac’s procès verbal d’exécution is printed in Mémoires de Condé (La Haye, 1743), vi, 236-238.
123 Brunet, x, 262.
125 Foucault, Discipline and Punish, p. 7.
L’Estoile’s reports of crimes read like judgements of the Parlement overrunning at the margins, as different modes of crime writing follow on from the essential details of a case. In turn, L'Estoile’s reports resemble a chronicler’s curious fragment, a pamphleteer’s tragicall history, a preacher’s providential intervention, a Protestant’s martyrology, or a magistrate’s judgement of events on the scaffold. Regarding the majority of violent crimes that the Parlement tried, L'Estoile was fully supportive of its justice, pushing his colleagues among the magistrates to execute more big bees as they continued to swat small flies among the criminal classes of the jurisdiction of the court. Where L'Estoile disagreed with his colleagues, especially in cases of witchcraft, and heresy during the troubles of the League, his accounts of crimes read like minority reports of the criminal justice of the Parlement. Moreover, L'Estoile’s accounts of crimes give a detailed example of his creative reception of information circulating in Paris as he transformed it into a history of his times, demonstrating the significance of the Palais de Justice as a centre of information and communication for the entire jurisdiction of the Parlement. From this perspective, L'Estoile does not appear simply as a typical spokesman for his milieu, as historians tend to characterise him, but rather as a humble figure in the Palais de Justice, whose reports drew precisely on the information circulating in his workplace, and whose interpretations engaged closely with the prejudices of his colleagues. Through the passages of his diaries concerning life in and around the Palais, L'Estoile related what he found rare, curious, or contemptible, rejecting the voyeurism of printed crime pamphlets. Condemned criminals in the Parlement had a place in the storehouse of L'Estoile’s curiosities alongside the grandees and zealots who tore his world apart in the Wars of Religion. How L'Estoile put together a history of the troubles is the subject of Part Two.
Part II. Life and Collecting in the Wars of Religion
Fragmented Histories of Family Life and the Civil Wars  
1569-1589

There is no more truth, there is no more pity, and there is no longer any knowledge of God on this earth. Cursing, lying, killing, thieving, lechery, these things abound, and one family-line fights another: this is the true representation of these times.

With this lament, Pierre de L’Estoile concluded a report and a sequence of sonnets denouncing the fractured state of the French kingdom in the reign of Henri III.¹ This chapter evaluates L’Estoile’s concern with truth not as another example of a chronicler’s pessimism, but as a crucial problematic in record keeping, as he struggled to write objective histories of his family life and the civil wars that were untainted by confessional passions, at a time when the Reformation had shattered any sense of a single doctrinal truth in Christendom.

Contemporary historians whom L’Estoile admired, above all Henri Lancelot-Voisin, sieur de La Popelinière and Jacques-Auguste de Thou, balanced confessional passions in their narratives by reducing politics to calculations of interest, carried out under the cloak of religion. Held up by twentieth-century scholars as founders of modern historical scholarship, they scandalised confessional hard-liners on both sides of the divide.² L’Estoile similarly set

Protestant claims alongside Catholic claims, leaving his readers to find the truth therein and exhorting them to ‘take the good, leave the bad’, as he relied on the mysteries of divine providence and corrupt contemporary morality as catch-all explanations for the events he described.\(^3\) Fragmentation, then, characterises not only L'Estoile’s understanding of his troubled times but also his way of recording their history. It helps to explain how historians have interpreted his diary for the reign of Henri III in particular as being an essential and unbiased source for the period, as they have too often taken L'Estoile’s claims to objectivity at face value. Instead this chapter examines the process by which L'Estoile laboriously composed a fragmented, therefore ‘true representation of these times’.

This fragmentation is exacerbated by a tension between L'Estoile’s choice of genres, a tension which structures this chapter. However private and disinterested L'Estoile tried to appear in his most autobiographical writing – his family diary, considered in Part One – he relied on his established technique of compiling passages of the narrative from pieces in his miscellanies. And however confessionally objective L'Estoile tried to be in his most formal histories – the compilation on the massacre of Saint Bartholomew and the diary for the reign of Henri III, considered in Parts Two and Three respectively – his life-writing and personal prejudices continued to appear in his narrative and selection of sources. This is particularly the case in the diary for the reign of Henri III, which prominently relied on information sourced by his brother-in-law from his second marriage, Claude de Marteau. Precisely because L'Estoile’s historical writing in this period is so fragmented, depending on texts he assembled from diverse sources, it offers invaluable evidence of his reader reception of the

---

\(^3\) Eg. Lazard-Schrenck, v, 53-152. For a contrasting contemporary example see Mark Greengrass, “‘J’ay finalement essayé de réduire toutes ces pieces en un corps”’. Historical Coherence and the Histoire Ecclesiastique des Eglises’ in Benedict, Daussy, and Léchot eds., L’identité huguenote, pp. 67-86.
polemical literature of the civil wars and its circulation in his milieu. This theme is particularly pursued in Parts Two and Three.

I. Family Diary

L'Estoile’s earliest surviving manuscript is his family diary, the ‘Paper of the deceased Louis Delestoille, my father, continued by me Pierre Delestoille, his son’. This section considers how the genre of the manuscript that L'Estoile inherited shaped how he wrote the history of his family life during the civil wars, in a way that was entirely cut off from the troubles, which he ignored in this manuscript entirely in the two decades before 1589. In considering the practices of elaboration and textual appropriation that L'Estoile engaged in when composing his family’s history, it juxtaposes the family diary with a variety of biographical sources concerning L'Estoile’s family life, particularly focusing on his marriage with Anne de Baillon, from 1569-1580.

Family diaries like L'Estoile’s were common across early modern Europe. In France, they were especially kept by members of the urban, mercantile, and office-holding bourgeoisie, as well as the nobility. Like so many of his male, literate contemporaries, Louis de L'Estoile recorded in their family diary the births and deaths of his children and relatives, following his marriage to Marguerite de Montholon in 1544. The final entry in Louis’ hand is dated 1554, continued by Pierre who then reported his father’s death on 24 August 1558. Pierre de L'Estoile began his section of the family diary after his first marriage in 1569 and concluded it in 1595. During the troubles of the League, from 1589-1595, L'Estoile recorded family history both in the family diary and the manuscript he referred to as his ‘memoirs’ of

---


5 Mouysset, Papiers de famille, pp. 106-113.
the League, discussed in the following chapter. He kept the family diary as a store of family memory in the bottom drawer of his desk, alongside his epitaph, astrological chart, and the Psalms, mentioning its location in his diary near the end of his life perhaps so as to pass it on to his own sons.6 Clarifying this astrological chart, Louis de L'Estoile’s section of the family diary records Pierre de L'Estoile’s birth in Paris at 5pm on 31 July 1546, and situates the event under God’s protection and in the society of elite Parisian office-holders. It also records Pierre de L'Estoile’s baptism at the Left Bank convent church of the Mathurins, with the conseiller in the Parlement Mathieu Chartier and Louise Boudet, wife of the président in the Parlement Pierre I Séguier among his godparents.7

Louis de L'Estoile presented his family diary as a model of simple piety for his eldest son to follow, and perhaps Pierre similarly hoped that his family diary might serve as useful and edifying knowledge for his own children, who most likely inherited the manuscript.8 Their life-writing over two generations served to strengthen family bonds. A brief family genealogy opens the manuscript, reaching back only to Louis de L'Estoile’s grandfather Sébastien de L'Estoile, and refusing to enquire further into the family’s less distinguished past among the Orléans urban elite.9 Next, Louis copied verses from the Book of Proverbs that command obedience within the family: ‘He that gathereth in summer is a wise son: but he that sleepeth in harvest is a son that causeth shame.’10 Reinforcing this message, Pierre copied onto the preceding page a ‘Christian sonnet’.11 It is not clear whether this sonnet is of Pierre’s composition or whether he copied it from an unidentified piece in his collection, as

---

6 Brunet, ix, 141.
7 Family Diary, p. 35.
8 Family Diary, pp. 33-34 does not mention the provenance of the manuscript before the editor acquired it for the BnF, but it seems likely that L'Estoile’s children inherited it along with the manuscripts of his other diaries.
9 Brunet, xii, iii-iv.
10 ‘L’enfant sage réjouist son père, mais le fou est à tristesse à sa mere … L’enfant sage garde la Loy et assemble en l’esté, mais le fou est la misère du père et honte et confusion, qui dort en la moisson’. Family Diary, p. 34. Proverbs 10.1, 10.5.
11 Family Diary, p. 33 describes the manuscript: BnF ms. NAF 12871.
he did so often in his other manuscripts. This opening sonnet expresses hope for salvation through God’s grace and urges a duty of care on the head of the family.

Porte aux grands honneur, aux vieux, et supporter
Les foibles et petits, avoir famille et femme
Aimans le Tout-puissant.\(^{12}\)

By copying this poem, Pierre de L’Estoile confirmed that he continued this family diary in God’s name and under His oversight, doing so simply and with no evidence of confessional division. In this way he followed his father’s moral guide for family life and record keeping.\(^{13}\)

Anne de Baillon, L’Estoile’s first wife, is a crucial figure in the family diary, appearing in her husband’s words as pious and caring but also physically vulnerable. By writing about Anne and her troubles, L’Estoile attempted to discern God’s message for their family and to confess his simple faith.\(^{14}\) Their wedding on 25 February 1569, at the Right Bank parish church of Saint Paul, opens the family diary as ‘the day that I consider to be the happiest I have had and ever will have in my life’. L’Estoile thanked God for having chosen for him a woman of singular virtue who would care for him in his illness.\(^{15}\) As he married

---

\(^{12}\) *Family Diary*, p. 34.

\(^{13}\) Brunet, viii, 225; Mouysset, *Papiers de famille*, pp. 113-120.


\(^{15}\) ‘lequel jour je tiens pour le plus heureux que j’aie jamais eu et scaurois avoir en ma vie’. *Family Diary*, p. 36; BnF ms NAF 12871, fol. 5r. The conditional tense – ‘scaurois avoir’ – might suggest a retrospective composition, and the entry in the manuscript is a neat one, but throughout the manuscript of the family diary L’Estoile’s entries are discontinuous, as his hand evolves from an earlier, rounded hand to his characteristic sharp, italic hand from 1589 (beginning fol. 13v), with occasional additions to earlier passages. Perhaps this passage was not written too long after the event, surely no later than Anne’s death in 1580. The reference to illness suggests a link to L’Estoile’s illness later that year, or perhaps in September 1575 when he reported Anne’s ‘bon soin et traictement’ of him: *Family Diary*, p. 37. No researcher has located the marriage contract between L’Estoile and Anne: Greffe-Lothe, p. 102. Her cousin also named Anne de Baillon married on 10 June 1566 Jean Janpitue, ‘receveur des payeurs’ at the Parlement of Bordeaux, in the ‘Chapelle de l’hostel Saint Denis’, an event recorded in the parish registers of Saint André des Arts: BnF ms. Clairambault 987, fol. 185; AN MC XIX 235, 3 April 1566.
Anne, L’Estoile entered into the family of her mother Marie de Hacqueville, widow of the recently deceased Jean de Baillon, sieur de Marivaux and Janvry, a Royal Secretary and Treasurer managing the royal domain.\textsuperscript{16} L’Estoile appeared as a dedicatee of a poem along with Anne’s sister Marie and her husband René Crespin, Sire du Gast, councilor in the conseil privé of Henri III, in the encyclopaedic collection of Les apprehensions spirituelles composed by the ribald François Béroalde de Verville, son of L’Estoile’s childhood tutor Mathieu Béroalde, recently arrived in the capital having been denounced only two years earlier as a ‘vainglorious fool’ by the Genevan consistory court for slanders.\textsuperscript{17} Béroalde de Verville’s dedication to L’Estoile, thanking him for an unexplained act of generosity, is the only evidence of their direct connection. L’Estoile praised Du Gast in the diary for the reign of Henri III as judicious and incorruptible, and a portrait of Du Gast painted on canvas, worth 3 livres, is the only image of a family member that L’Estoile kept in the study at his death in October 1611.\textsuperscript{18} Marrying into the Baillon family, L’Estoile made serious connections in the royal administration and Parisian intellectual life, but writing about his marriage he simply thanked God for his good fortune.

Soon after the wedding, L’Estoile and Anne established their household on what they hoped would be a solid financial basis. L’Estoile recorded in the family diary how, aged twenty-three, and already settled in his office in the Chancery attached to the Parlement, on 1 May 1569 he came into his father’s inheritance, a share of the family property near Orléans, including the properties of Soullas and Lorris in the parish of Sandillon in Sologne.\textsuperscript{19} He did not mention that the Baillon family principally held land in Janvris in the Marcoussis, twenty-three miles south of Paris, and that his and Anne’s share of her father’s property was the farm

\textsuperscript{16} ‘conseiller, notaire et secrétaire du roy, trésorier de son épargne’.
\textsuperscript{18} Brunet, i, 141, ii, 183; Greffe-Lothe, p. 37.
\textsuperscript{19} Family Diary, p. 36; Greffe-Lothe, pp. 99-100.
at Frécul and the Seigneuie of Cour du Bois in the parish of Saint Péray. Nor did he record in any of his manuscripts just how often from that point on he used this land in the Orléanais to guarantee his sales of *constitutions de rente* (see Appendix II), an increasingly common instrument of credit in mid-sixteenth-century France, used particularly by landowning royal office-holders. In these rather convoluted transactions, the vendor sold a promise to make an annual and perpetual payment of *rente* to the purchaser, receiving in exchange a lump sum from the purchaser guaranteed against the vendor’s property. This lump sum was effectively loaned to the vendor by the purchaser, since the vendor might return it in order to settle the *constitution de rente* and cease the annual payment. Crucially, the purchaser could not demand its return at any point. The annual payment of *rente* serviced the loan but it cost dear, typically one twelfth of the total sum, following the limit set by royal legislation. L’Estoile complained at financial difficulties in his old age, perhaps overwhelmed by the number of his *rente* payments, since in total he sold far more *constitutions de rente* than he purchased. While he settled many of these contracts quickly, he also left some unresolved over decades, an increasingly common situation in the market for *constitutions de rente* in the 1570s and 1580s. These complex financial transactions, which left him progressively indebted, had no place in his family diary that recorded the life of his simple, pious household.  

Joy at his wedding soon turned to sorrow and a different relationship with God’s providence in the family diary, as L’Estoile fell ill from late September 1569 until the end of the year. At this time, he composed a prayer ‘particularly for me’, that he later copied as a

---

20 J.P. Dagnot, ‘Chronique du Vieux Marcoussy et des lieux circumvoisins’: ‘La succession de Jehan de Baillon à Janvry’ and ‘Les enfants de Jehan I de Baillon’, accessed 11 September 2014, http://julienchristian.perso.sfr.fr/Chroniques/janvry3.htm; http://julienchristian.perso.sfr.fr/Chroniques/janvry4.htm. I thank the author for permission to cite from this website of local history. These articles do not cite their sources according to conventional academic standards, but the author has sent me a list of his sources in the AN MC. On 20 January 1574, L’Estoile and Anne leased the farm at Cour de Bois for six years to Jacques Foujeau, a labourer of the farm of Frecul, for the sum of 400 *livres* and six *muids* of wheat: AN MC VIII 103, 20 January 1574.

fragment in one of his miscellanies, hitherto unnoticed by historians, revealing just how carefully composed certain passages in the family diary might be. In the prayer and the corresponding passage in the family diary, L’Estoile explained his illness as a chastisement from God, ‘taking on the duty of a Father towards me’, that served to ‘pull me away from much of the youthfulness and vice to which I was subject’.\(^22\) L’Estoile’s prayer repeatedly refers to God as his father, superior to earthly fathers who draw their goodness from Him, suggesting something of the gulf in L’Estoile’s life left by the death of his father when he was aged nine.\(^23\) But since this illness appears in the sentence immediately following his inheritance, finishing ‘of my late father’, L’Estoile’s report of his recovery from this illness also suggests that he felt he was now embarking on a new stage in his life, having overcome these difficulties and set himself up at the head of the household. L’Estoile interpreted this illness as an example of God anger at his youthful vice, and the punishment as a sign that he ‘would never return there’.\(^24\)

Events in the family diary during L’Estoile’s marriage to Anne ignore the troubles of the civil wars and primarily concern their children, ‘issued by the grace of God’. He recorded their children’s’ baptisms alongside the names of their godparents, demonstrating the strength of L’Estoile’s and Anne’s connections among a wide network of uncles, aunts, cousins, and neighbours. Most of the godparents recognisably connected to the L’Estoile’s family were office-holders or the wives of office-holders in the Parlement, while those connected to Anne’s family were office-holders and the wives of office-holders in the Trésor du roi or Chambre des comptes. They typically acted in groups of three godparents, always with one

\(^{22}\) ‘faisant office de Père envers moi … me retira de beaucoup de junesses et vices auxquels j’estois subject … affin de n’y retourner plus’. *Family Diary*, p. 36. He uses an almost identical phrase in the miscellany BnF ms. fr. 10304, fol. 171, identifying the prayer as his own composition. L’Estoile continued in his old age to chide himself for the unnamed sins of his youth: Brunet, x, 361.

\(^{23}\) ‘Toutesfois, comme l’enfant, encor qu’il ait offensé le père, ne laisse d’avoir recours à luy, pource qu’il scait que c’est son père, et qu’il demande plus sa vie que sa mort, tellement que s’humiliant devant luy, et demandant pardon, il s’asseure de <’l’avoir> l’obtenir. Ainsy mon Dieu, toi qui es beaucoup meilleur que les pères terreins, (car s’ils ont quelque chose de bon, ils l’ont puisé de toy qui en es la source), je viens me prosterner aux pieds de ta majesté tant tremblant, et te demande pardon comme ton enfant’. BnF ms. fr. 10304, fols. 171-173.

\(^{24}\) *Family Diary*, p. 36.
godparent from either the L'Estoile or Baillon extended family and circle of friends. Acting as a godparent was a significant mark of honour. On May 1609, L'Estoile lamented that he was not of a sufficient rank so that he might stand a chance of serving as godfather for his nephews. Baptisms gave L'Estoile and Anne the opportunity to confirm in their parishes significant social ties between their families, recorded in the family diary as evidence of social success.

These baptisms typically followed reports of problematic births that threatened Anne’s life, and were themselves often succeeded by the tragic early deaths of their children. L'Estoile interpreted these events as acts of God’s providence, but also as moments of acute worldly sorrow that required precise, natural explanation. L'Estoile and Anne employed expert care. Their daughter Marie died on 1 October 1573 in the arms of their neighbour, the surgeon to the king Ambroise Paré, her death allegedly caused by syphilis that she contracted when her wet-nurse lent her to be fed by one of her neighbours, which was perhaps a diagnosis suggested by Paré, who wrote about such cases in his treatise *On Syphilis*. L'Estoile felt particularly attached to his offspring when on Easter Sunday, 30 March 1578, Anne delivered a stillborn child. He claimed that the foetus ‘looked just like me in his facial features’. As on previous occasions, after this stillbirth L'Estoile felt that Anne was in great danger of losing her life because of a haemorrhage. He explained these tragedies as evidence of God’s anger on his household, which was doubled when on 8 July 1579 Anne suffered a miscarriage, this time of a boy whom L'Estoile considered had never absorbed

---

25 The first three baptisms of L'Estoile’s and Anne’s children took place in Right Bank parishes, closer to Anne’s relations and their home on the rue Thibautaudé, namely Saint Germain de l’Auxerrois and Saint Eustache. Following their move in summer 1573, baptisms all take place in the parish of Saint André des Arts. *Family Diary*, pp. 36-38.
26 Brunet, ix, 263.
nourishment in the womb, as if he had only grown for six weeks. Decades later, L'Estoile continued to report difficult births among his acquaintances. He desired to understand them better when he purchased the *Observations diverses* (Paris, 1609) on the subject of Louise Bourgeois, Marie de Médici’s midwife, hoping to learn from her ‘many little secrets of nature’. L'Estoile was deeply concerned in his family diary with the welfare of his wife and children, which he attempted to explain within the consistent providential framework of his family diary, but in his attempt to comprehend his loss he also recorded natural descriptions of his infants’ premature deaths.

The moment of L'Estoile’s greatest anxiety in the family diary occurred during and after Anne’s final pregnancy and the birth of their daughter Elizabeth in August 1580. These passages are the most carefully composed in the manuscript. That summer saw a terrible plague in Paris, causing over 30,000 deaths according to L'Estoile’s report. All those who could flee the capital did so. L'Estoile and his family were among those who escaped, after he contracted measles and Anne and their children also fell ill. They rented from the contrôleur at Bourges a house at Lagny sur Marne, sixteen miles east of Paris, upstream from the capital. Anne gave birth on 7 August, following a period of labour that lasted two days and two nights, and they baptised the child Elizabeth the next day at the church of Saint Foisil in Lagny, with their host the contrôleur, Anne’s sister Geneviève de Baillon, and L'Estoile’s sister Marguerite all acting as godparents. Five days after giving birth, Anne caught a fever, which lasted for almost four weeks and finally caused her death on 4 September 1580.

Fédéric de Morel, L'Estoile’s childhood tutor, royal printer and a neighbour in Saint André des Arts, wrote a densely erudite letter to L'Estoile dated 28 August 1580, in ignorance of developments in L'Estoile’s household. He signed it from ‘Corylaeus’, suggesting that he

---

29 *Family Diary*, p. 38.
30 Brunet, viii, 8-9, ix, 196; Greffe-Lothe, p. 435.
31 Lazard-Schrenck, iii, 105-106.
too was in flight from the plague in Paris. Morel was responding to an apparently equally learned letter sent to him by L'Estoile, urging and challenging him to respond, so as to give him intellectual stimulation in his isolation outside of Paris. The letter is riddled with Greek and Latin commonplaces, an intellectual exercise that demonstrates how this period of flight from Paris was also a moment of literary productivity for both L'Estoile and Morel. It is preserved not in any of L'Estoile’s diaries but in a miscellany that he had copied towards the end of his life, hitherto unnoticed by historians, assembled alongside the correspondence of leading figures in the republic of letters.  

Morel also discussed the education of L'Estoile’s son Louis in the traditional ‘regimen of the arts’, perhaps because L'Estoile sought out his former tutor to teach his own son. Having heard about the birth but not the tragedy that followed, the letter concludes with a poem, seemingly of Morel’s devising, congratulating L’Estoile on his new-born child by addressing her as a fourth addition to the three Graces, identifying her three sisters as the other Graces, as ‘Four and equally with Louis they bind together in a union’. The tone of Morel’s upbeat, learned letter contrasts markedly with L’Estoile’s report of events in the family diary.

---

33 See below pp. 220-221.
34 ‘Omnino seria hà ad te literas misi, quam putaram. Et enim aeris ἀκρασία adversia valetudinis cause, et filii tui reuocatio, omne mihi argumentum eripuerat rescribendi epistola tua plena consilii et doctrina, et summa cum benevolentia, tum etiam prudentia... Tu quidem, patrone optime, in ista solitudine et reces su, quae provincia tua est, perbeatus mihi videris: ἀγαθὸς γὰρ ὅν ut de Cyro minore Lysander olim dicebat εὐδαιμονοί, istic enim affluenter omnes illas hauris πηγάς καλῶν, et cum Charitibus domo deducis vertice musas. Quare tota tua est Euripide silla ἡδοστία — σοφία πρεσβίων te, quam Archilocha ἄρκος και Μοισσόν nae tu velle parī προσδοκίαν iocaris, nostram qui te expetere dicis συνουσίαν: quasi te solitudo ista, quam frequentiam potius ἔσθλα λέγειν ἀεὶ πάντας. Sed tuum etiam est, ἑσθλὰ λέγειν αἰεί πάντας. Mihi quidem gratum hoc est, ὧζῆν μετ᾽ ἀμουσίας... Illa autem de Ludouici ἀγωγικὴ και παιδεία, et perquam meditate teneo, et menti penitus infixaque habeo: sed πάντα καιρῷ καλὰ. Illum ego filium tuum si ante dilexi, nunc tamen amo vehementius. Est enim mihi iam indeoles eius apertior, atque ἥθος διδαξη ὑλιτῶν. Quod si est ὑμηρὸς τὴν ψυχὴν arte regendus erit, remoque utendum et aura. In quo quidem poterit omnia πατρὸς ὀρθολογία. Reliquum est uti summas tibi grates agam, partim de honore literarum ad me tuarum ιδίᾳ χειρὶ καὶ χαρακτήρι scripturam (hoc enim mihi palmarium, hoc ὑφήμημεν esse duco:) partim de tua illa vere Socratica πρὸς ἀρετὴν καὶ φιλολογίαν cohaesionone, quam omnibus Crassi diuitios libens anteponerem. Tua vero nos παράκλησίς bis ad Latinas epistolās conscribendas, duos ἀθλητής solicītāt-[damage to the ms.] αἴδισθαι μὲν ἀναίνεισθαι, δὲσαιν δ’ ἢποδέχθαι... En tibi quarta Charis nunc edita, maxime Stella, / A genitor suo stellans Asteria dicta, / A genitrice sua, qua non praestantior iyps /Eurynome Charitum mater, Isabella vocatur. / Illa suas placido retinēbit amore sorores. / Quattuor at pariter Lodovicus foedere iungent. BnF ms. fr. 10303, fols. 403-404.
Following Anne’s death, L’Estoile and the other family members present took her body to be buried at her cousin’s house at Pomponne, one-and-a-half miles away from Lagny. If L’Estoile despaired at losing his wife, then the report in the family diary did not show it, and instead he composed this passage as the moment of greatest spiritual assurance in the manuscript. This passage is directly related to three anonymous sonnets composed on the occasion of Anne’s death, copied by L’Estoile as pieces in one of his miscellanies, revealing how his account of this event was carefully prepared, whether the reports or the sonnets came first. L’Estoile might have composed these sonnets himself after Anne’s death, or perhaps a friend sent them to him as consolation. He took up the same theme in his family diary.\textsuperscript{35} L’Estoile wrote in the family diary that Anne’s death was a ‘happy end’, because of ‘the certainty that she had of her salvation, until her last breath, by the sole merit of the son of God, from whom she asked for judgement’.\textsuperscript{36} Echoing this passage, the second sonnet transcribed into his miscellany spoke from Anne’s position and assured the reader that on earth ‘La Grace, la Beauté, la Vertu, et l’Honneur / ... m’ont tenu Compagnie’, but now in Heaven she lies in ‘heureux Repos’. That Anne died confirmed in her salvation, L’Estoile recorded in his family diary, ‘everyday serves as consolation to me, softening the sorrow that I have after having lost such a good and faithful companion’.\textsuperscript{37} Consolation is the intended outcome of the third sonnet, in which Anne addresses a lone reader, perhaps L'Estoile himself, ‘qui d’un Oeil piteux, souspirés pour ma Mort’. She compels the reader, ‘ne regrettés ma Vie’, nor ‘l’irrevocable Sort’, and instead ‘Benissés la Fortune’ that has delivered her from the ‘la misère commue’ of life on earth. At her death, L’Estoile sensed that he was

\textsuperscript{35} L’Estoile copied the sonnets in his neat hand into the section at the end of a miscellany in which he added epitaphs in his own hand to the preceding poems copied by a scribe. ‘Sur le trespas de sage et vertueuse danoiselle, Anne de Baillon, sonnets, 1580. Elle mourust heureuseusement en nostre Seigneur le Dimanche IIIe Septembre 1580, entre Midi et une heure en l’aage de XXXe ans au logis du controller de Bourges à Lagni. Son corps repose à Pomponne.’ BnF ms. fr. 10304, fols. 405-406, published in Lazard-Schrenck, iii, 130-131 and attributed there to L’Estoile.

\textsuperscript{36} ‘L’heureuse fin qu’elle a faite et l’assurance qu’elle a eu de son salut jusques au dernier souspir, par le seul mérite du Filz de Dieu, lequel elle ne demandoit qu’à aller voir’.

\textsuperscript{37} ‘me sert journellement de consolation, pour adoucir la douleur que j’ai d’avoir perdu une si bonne et fidèle compagne’.
‘touched by the hand of God, that I felt wondrously weighing on me, and justly, because of my sins’. More than ever before in his family diary, he felt ‘this affliction lifted and relieved by His misericord’ in ‘such a significant act of grace’. It was in this despondency that L’Estoile wrote that he found God most clearly.

L’Estoile returned home to Paris, ‘even though the plague continues to be severe, mortality being almost universal, my affliction causing me to neglect the danger’. This explanation reveals the special effort of composition that L’Estoile put into the preceding report of his apparent joy at Anne’s salvation, as he journeyed home despite the plague that drove him out of Paris in the first instance. Not only had he lost his beloved wife; L’Estoile also recorded in the family diary how he had her complicated inheritance to manage. Perhaps to relieve him of part of the burden, his mother took charge of his four daughters, leaving him with the care of his eldest son Louis. In February the next year he wrote that he had rid himself of the tutelage of the Baillon heirs, Anne’s nephews, and then in March 1582 following his second marriage he signed a notarial act to confirm his abandonment of the tutelage of the Baillon heirs and to pass on to his children with Anne his significant 800 écus share of the inheritance of Jean de Baillon. Nevertheless, complications with the Baillon inheritance, above all the arrears arising from a rence that L’Estoile inherited from his

38 ‘touché de la main de Dieu, laquelle j’ai sentie merveilleusement apesante sur moi et justement à cause de mes pechés’.
39 ‘ceste affliction relevé et soulagé par sa miséricorde’ in a ‘si grande grâce’.
40 Family Diary, p. 39.
41 Family Diary, p. 40, their daughter Elizabeth died in Marguerite de Montholon’s home on 11 June, soon after L’Estoile had sent his elder daughter Marguerite to Rouen to stay with his aunt Marie du Thil, ‘qu’elle nourrisst et entretient comme la sienne propre’.
42 Greffe-Lothe, p. 102. L’Estoile’s renunciation of the inheritance of Jean de Baillon: AN MC XXIII 201, 22 March 1582; Greffe-Lothe, p. 1059. L’Estoile’s quittance of a rence with Anne’s nephews by her brother Guillaume de Baillon: AN MC VIII 393, 14 January 1584; Greffe-Lothe, p. 1060. L’Estoile’s renewed renunciation of the inheritance of Michel de Baillon for his children with Anne de Baillon: AN MC LXXIII 224, 28 February 1595; Greffe-Lothe, pp. 1061-1062.
brother-in-law Du Gast, continued to provoke disagreements and civil suits until the end of his life with Anne’s brothers and then their sons.\textsuperscript{43}

At the turn of the new year 1582, L'Estoile married the eighteen-year-old Colombe de Marteau, daughter of Colombe Guibert and Adrien Marteau, \textit{avocat du roi} at Château-Thierry in Picardy.\textsuperscript{44} Under a new title in the family diary, L'Estoile reported the marriage pragmatically and with a terse entry, while subsequent entries report the healthy births of their children. Prior to their marriage, Colombe had lodged in Paris with her aunt Anthoinette Guibert, to whom L'Estoile reluctantly paid the cost of Colombe’s maintenance over the previous four years, an undisclosed sum that Guibert then passed on to her own children.\textsuperscript{45} Perhaps these concerns were among those reported by L'Estoile in the only surviving letter of his composition, sent soon after his second wedding to an unspecified recipient, an old friend, explaining how he was distracted by business, enclosing a token of the marriage to affirm their old friendship despite his new nuptials, and asking him to visit soon.\textsuperscript{46} With this second marriage, L'Estoile confirmed another group of social ties in Paris, above all with his close friend and Colombe’s brother Claude de Marteau, \textit{avocat} in the Parlement, whose role in the composition of the diary for the reign of Henri III is considered in Part Three of this chapter.

Until 1589 and the troubles of the League, L'Estoile’s family diary records his attempt to continue his father’s record and discern God’s will for himself and his relations, ignoring the divisions of the civil wars entirely. For all its apparent immediacy, intertextual links

\textsuperscript{43} Brunet, x, 115-116, 360-362, xi, 6. An \textit{arrêt} in one of the civil chambers Parlement on 29 March 1611 in favour of L'Estoile against Marie de Baillon and the inheritors of René Du Gast is reported in summary form in L'Estoile’s inventory: Greffe-Lothe, p. 29.

\textsuperscript{44} \textit{Family Diary}, p. 39; AN MC XXIII 201, 1 January 1582; Greffe-Lothe, p. 1059. Colombe Guibert and Adrien Marteau appear in the parish registers of Saint André des Arts on 2 December 1548 as godparents for Simon, the son of Claudé André, \textit{procureur} in the Parlement, and Marguerite Marteau: BnF ms. Clairambault 987, fol. 128.

\textsuperscript{45} AN Y 124, fols. 22r-23r, 13 March and 23 June 1582.

\textsuperscript{46} ‘Ut ego maturius ad te scriberem, novus rerum meacum status non permisit. Scis enim quam multis occupationibus detinentur, qui uxorem ducere suscipiant. Interea tamen ne me immemorem existimes, mitto ad te hoc nuptiarum symboolum, ut etiam intellegas, in medis noue coniugi amplexibus, nos de amicis veteribus cogitare. Cupio quam primum videre te, et si per oitum licuerit, ut cras mane huc venias, pergratum feceris. multa enim habeo tibi enarranda, in quibus opem tuam, et consilium desidero. Vale 1582. Tuus ex asse. P. Stella’. BnF ms. fr. 10303 fol. 409.
between the family diary and pieces in the miscellanies demonstrate how L'Estoile carefully composed passages to establish a compelling, non-confessional account of his relationship with God and the members of his close-knit family.

II. Compilation on the Saint Bartholomew’s Day Massacre

By ignoring the troubles in his family diary, and by writing his first formal history as a diary of the reign of Henri III, L'Estoile passed over with dynastic continuity the Saint Bartholomew’s day massacre, 24 August 1572, perhaps the crucial and most controversial turning point in the Wars of Religion, a crisis of royal authority that also marked the defeat of the Huguenot party as a national political force. Instead of writing a narrative history that tackled contested topics of the motivations, course, and impact of the massacre, L'Estoile collected poems and documents circulating after the event among Catholics as well as Protestants, in order to record and denounce the extremes of confessional polemic on both sides. This section considers how L'Estoile’s collection shaped a history of the massacre that sought critical distance from its confessional passions. At the same time, it uses his evidence to evaluate the reception of polemical texts relating to the massacre in his milieu.

Where was L'Estoile during the massacre? If he remained at home in Paris on the rue Thibautaudé then he was close to the events, as contemporary sources claim that when

---


Gaspard de Coligny was killed on Saint Bartholomew’s day, the tocsin of the parish church of Saint Germain de l’Auxerrois rang out to announce the massacre, a few streets away from L'Estoile’s residence.49 Flight to the family properties near Orléans would have proved more perilous than remaining in Paris, as that Protestant stronghold saw some of the worst violence in the weeks following the massacre in the capital.50 L'Estoile was at least in Paris to sign two printers’ privileges on 24 October 1572, and to constitute and then collect the repayment of a share of a rente on 29 June and 16 December 1572 with André de Hacqueville, maître de requêtes and a relative of his mother-in-law, also living on the rue Thibautaudé.51

In his only mention of his action during the massacre in his diaries, L'Estoile explained how he feared that his collection of polemical literature might mark him as a Protestant. He recalled this fear on 27 June 1607, when he bought Antoine du Pinet’s Taxes des parties casuelles de la boutique du Pape (Lyon, 1564), a tract denouncing the avarice of the papal chancery and the impious canon law that justified its trade in special dispensations. He recorded that he had often looked for a copy of this tract to replace the one that he burned on Saint Bartholomew’s day, as he put it, ‘for fear that it would have me burned’.52 Although he avoided narrating the history of the massacre directly in his diaries, he did not neglect its memory in later decades, as he discussed fears of its repeat and denounced its perpetrators. League preachers threatened a ‘Saint Bartholomew’s of the most renowned Politiques’ following the siege of Paris in 1590 and a ‘Saint Bartholomew’s of the Huguenots’ after the signing of the Edict of Nantes.53 L'Estoile also reported the gruesome deaths of many of the

52 ‘Il y avoit long temps que j’en cherchois un, pour remettre en la place de celui que je bruslay à la S.-Berthelemi, craignant qu’il me brulast.’ Brunet, viii, 310.
53 Brunet, v, 71, 90, vii, 156, 171.
‘killers on Saint Bartholomew’s night’ as evidence of God’s revenge for their sins. The massacre had a prominent place in L'Estoile’s memory of his life in the civil wars, but its confessional passions posed significant problems for him as a historian of his times.

L'Estoile collected at least 120 poems and stories concerning the massacre, that he had copied into a miscellany he titled ‘A diverse compilation on the miseries of this century’ (BnF ms. fr. 10304). Pieces concerning the massacre occupy the central portion of the miscellany, which includes in total at least 385 poems, stories, and documents concerning political and religious subjects between the death of Henri II to the reign of Henri III. The miscellany is written in three hands: two scribal hands and L'Estoile’s own hand. The pieces concerning the Saint Bartholomew’s day massacre are entirely copied in the second scribal hand. The series of pieces copied entirely in L'Estoile’s hand concerns the years 1574-1584, and so perhaps the two earlier sections had been copied by scribes by that point. L'Estoile’s hand also appears in the earlier sections as he added particular pieces and annotations in the margins and covered the frontispiece with commonplaces that elaborate his central theme of ‘the miseries of this century’. All of the pieces concerning the massacre that I have been able to trace were near contemporaneous, and some of them circulated in Paris in the days after the massacre.

A section within this miscellany is entitled ‘A collection of diverse writings, in prose and Poetry, published and circulated both for and against the Saint Bartholomew’s day

54 Brunet, ii, 322-3, vii, 77, viii, 158-159.
55 ‘Recueils divers de ce temps, latins et français, principalement de tombeaux, curieusement recherchés avec autres vers satiriques, traités et discours funèbres sur la misère du siècle’. BnF ms. fr. 10304, fols. 229-356. The beginning and end of particular pieces within the miscellany is occasionally ambiguous and so a precise count is impossible. Many pieces in this miscellany are trabscribed in Tatiana Debbagi Baranova, ‘Ecrits diffamatoires et troubles civils: Une culture politique dans la France des guerres de religion’, Thèse de doctorat, L’Université Paris-Sorbonne Paris IV Centre Roland Mousnier (2006), iii, Appendix 7.
56 The diary for the reign of Henri III contains titled collection of pieces at the end of the year 1585, Lazard-Schrenck, v, 53-152, as L'Estoile transferred his copying activities from the ‘Recueil divers de ce temps’ to the diary from this point.
57 See above p. 52 n.88.
massacre, as well as its authors and those who were complicit in it.⁵⁸ Containing arguments both ‘for and against’ the massacre, in French and Latin,⁵⁹ many pieces attack the Huguenot rebels and defend the royal position; others commemorate Coligny’s martyrdom, denounce the complicity of Catherine de Médicis and Charles IX, and pity the fate of the Huguenots. L’Estoile’s collection exhibited the competing voices on all sides of the debate but concealed his own. Instead, he defined the massacre as an act of God’s providence, denying all worldly explanation. The collection opens with an epigraph drawn from Jeremiah 30.14 which makes this position clear: ‘For I have wounded thee with the wound of an enemy, with the chastisement of a cruel one, for the multitude of thine iniquity’.⁶⁰

Since the collection is copied entirely in a scribal hand, with only occasional annotations in L'Estoile’s hand, it is impossible to determine definitively how the pieces were put together and who was responsible for their arrangement. It seems plausible to attribute its composition to L'Estoile, since the manuscript belongs to his collection, prominently features his handwriting, and he typically arranged pieces in miscellanies in this way, giving occasional introductions and glosses to pieces. It includes ‘curious remarks’ on events surrounding the massacre, including one concerning the fate of René Bianqué, the father of the villains Charles and René Bianqué, whose execution L’Estoile reported in 1584 as just retribution for their own and their father’s crimes.⁶¹ The problem of L'Estoile’s role in the miscellany is particularly meaningful in the case of a sonnet introduced as being ‘by a learned French gentleman, whose life I saved, with God’s grace, on 24 August 1572’. Who is the poet and who is the recipient in this case? It is possible that L'Estoile received this poem after

---

⁵⁸ ‘Ramas de divers escrits, tant en prose qu’en Poesie, publiez et semez, pour et contre la Journée de St Barthélemy & aucteurs et complices d’Icelle.’
⁵⁹ Forty-six pieces in French, including several long prose pieces, and seventy-seven in Latin, typically short poems. A preponderance of Latin pieces is particularly due to the many short pieces copied from the *Illustrium Aliquot Germanorum Carminum Liber* (Basel, 1573). See below pp. 148-149.
⁶¹ See above pp. 103-104.
giving his learned friend shelter from the violence – a friend of L'Estoile’s, knowing that he liked poetry, similarly repaid him for the gift of food supplies during the 1590 siege of Paris by composing sonnets on the subject of starvation⁶² – but equally the sonnet might be addressed to another and L'Estoile’s scribe might have simply copied the extant title. Within the collection, this sonnet demonstrates the importance of poetry as a means of expressing a personal response to the massacre, since the verses allow the reader to see into the poet’s soul as he bares his ‘heart’, ‘will’, and ‘force’.

… tu pourras voir mon cœur,
Et qu’elle fut, et qu’elle est mon envie.
A ta bonté ma force est asservie.

The poet is left with little, but with his pen, his sword, and his life he binds himself to the dedicatee in God’s name until his death, casting the dedicatee as an instrument of providence who is ‘the retreat’, ‘the sun’, and ‘the will’, whose whims he swears to follow.

Tu es l’eschieu, où mon bien fait ses tours
Et le soleil qui mesure mes jours,
Ta volonté de la mienne est suivie.
Par le haut Dieu, ainsi je le promet
Que pour toi seul, et les tiens à jamais
J’ay une plume, une espée, une vie.⁶³

Individual pieces in L'Estoile’s collection give contrasting accounts of the massacre and present the positions of those on both sides of the debate over its memory. L'Estoile’s appropriation of these pieces is itself an act of reader-reception, demonstrating his evaluation of the significant texts he deemed worth preserving. In the collection, L'Estoile presented these pieces without commentary and let the powerful polemics of these texts speak for, and incriminate, themselves. Contrasting Catholic and Huguenot examples demonstrate this point.

⁶² Brunet, v, 48.
⁶³ ‘Sonnet, d’un docte gentil-homme françois, auquel apres Dieu, je sauwy la vie, le 24 aoust 1572’. BnF ms. fr. 10304, fol. 234.
Some of the most vehement Catholic attacks that L’Estoile presented in the collection appear in three sonnets ‘pasted up at several sites in Paris, on Thursday 28 August, IIII days after the massacre’, identified with the minor Pléiade poet and religious controversialist Estienne Jodelle. These sonnets continue to inflict the violence of the massacre immediately after the event and for posterity. Their own ‘rites of violence’ manifest themselves as devastating rhetorical tropes. Catholics claimed that the Huguenots provoked the massacre with their plot against the king, in Jodelle’s terms, ‘Vouloir pipper un Roy par ruse et par cautelle, / Braver sa majesté’. He denounced the Huguenots at the start of successive lines in sharp tri-syllabic blows as

Ennemis de repos, de Dieu et de nos princes,
Ennemis parjurés du peuple et des provinces,
Immortels ennemis de l’homme …

Jodelle denounced a key phrase in Huguenot discourse when he claimed that with ‘de feu d’ambition’ they pursued their revolutionary aims, ‘faire un monde nouveau’. They pursue this goal ‘dessous un masque fin tromper les plus habiles’ and in the name of ‘vengeance’. Finally, Jodelle mercilessly observed the ‘charognes puantes’ of Huguenots that ‘Roulent dessus les eaux, & ne servent errantes / Que d’amorse aux poisons et de gorge aux corbeaux’, polluted bodies ritually diverted downstream. L’Estoile shaped Jodelle’s subsequent reputation in his autograph section of his miscellany ‘A diverse compilation on the miseries of this century’ and in his diary for the reign of Henri III, as he castigated the poet’s death as ‘most miserable and appalling, for he died without giving any sign of


65 See Crouzet, Guerriers, i, 683-689.

recognising God, despising his creator with blasphemies and appalling curses’. He also remarked that Jodelle deemed the Huguenots ‘rebel Heretics’, appropriating the central theme of the three sonnets in the collection. However, by choosing not to include this information damning Jodelle in the collection, L’Estoile refrained from condemning the sonnets’ violent rhetoric in this manuscript, leaving their interpretation to the reader’s discretion.

Instead, L’Estoile juxtaposed in the collection Catholic verses like Jodelle’s sonnets with Huguenot pieces that responded to the violent rhetoric of their Catholic persecutors, thereby positioning himself as a silent mediator, selecting the most significant pieces on both sides. Many Huguenot pieces concern the martyrdom of Coligny, the hero whose death formed the centrepiece of much of the Protestant polemic in the aftermath of the massacre. Establishing a position for the Huguenot party as a whole, a ‘Cantique’ on the massacre by Estienne Maisonfleur, ‘French gentleman, Huguenot’, appears early in the collection after an initial run of Catholic poems, and is dated 26 August 1572, which perhaps indicates the moment of its manuscript publication in Paris. The ‘Cantique’ opens with repeated, drawn out open ‘o’ syllables in ‘tous’, ‘toutes’, and ‘nos’, that sing a plaintive lament for the defeat of the Huguenots, since everything materially and spiritually in their possession has been destroyed.

Toutes nos maisons volées,
Toutes nos loix violées,
Tous nos hostes abbatus,
Tous nos livres mis en cendre,
Tous nos cœurs prêts à se rendre,
Tous nos esprits combattus.

Like many Protestant writers in the aftermath of the massacre, Maisonfleur struggled to give a providential explanation to events that affirmed the righteousness of his confessional cause. He marked his confusion on this point by the caesura of ‘Las!’ followed by a lengthy demand for answers from his Creator.

… Seigneur
Las! Voudrois tu bien permettre
Tant de meurtres se commettre
Aux despens de tout honneur?

And similarly to Jodelle, but from the victims’ perspective, Maisonfleur deployed the rhetorical tropes of religious violence, above all the Catholic attempts to purge the kingdom of the Protestants by casting them into rivers, but instead he appropriated these tropes to identify the Catholics’ blades as polluted instruments – ‘leurs tranchans pollus’ – and the bodies of their victims as belonging to God’s elect.

Leurs cruautez excessives
Ont bordé toutes les rives
Des corps morts de tes esleuz

The ‘Cantique’ served as a song of war as much as a song of lament, and so these examples of the suffering of the elect serve to build a cause of just retribution, with the same force as the Catholic violence that they endured. ‘Pour venger sur eux ta gloire, / Donne leur du sang à boire’. L’Estoile gave no indication of precedence in the collection to Maisonfleur’s ‘Cantique’ by comparison with Jodelle’s vehement Catholic polemic. Thanks to the generic form of the miscellaneous collection, L’Estoile had no need to decide as to the true history the Saint Bartholomew’s day massacre, presenting it in fragments and as a

70 Published in Le chansonnier Huguenot du XVIe siècle (Paris, 1870), pp. 288-294; Pineaux, La poésie des protestants, pp. 210-211, 218.
Providential blow, that his contemporaries competed to comprehend for their own polemical purposes.

L'Estoile took a more explicitly neutral position in evaluating contemporary printed sources for the history of the massacre in his diary for the reign of Henri III. Through a critique of polemical publications denouncing the massacre, he evaluated their significance while establishing his detachment from rival confessional positions. He identified one of the most dangerous of these publications, *Le reveille-matin des francois, et de leurs voisins* (1574), as a significant and vengeful Protestant compilation. It circulated widely in France and across Europe in French, Latin, and German editions. L'Estoile dealt most forcefully with the *Reveille-matin* in passages in his diary dated to the year of its publication, relating that the book was published ‘to show the whole world the innocence of the victims and the cruelty and the perfidy of the killers’, insisting that its ‘slanders and jests’ should be ‘entirely rejected’, as they are compiled by ‘men without hope’.  

As L'Estoile copied into his collection on the massacre five fragments from the *Reveille-matin*, he picked apart its composition, and in so doing he sharpened his critique of its confessional agenda. Glossing the ‘Verses taken from Ronsard’s *Franciade*’, he explained that they were ‘most adeptly’ manipulated by the Huguenot compilers of the *Reveille-matin* in order to twist the original sense of the poem so that passages attacked the monarchy for its responsibility in the massacre. He gave exact page references to these adapted passages of Ronsard’s *Franciade* in the 1574 ‘Edinburgh’ edition of the *Reveille-matin*, most likely printed by Bernard Jobin of Strasbourg along with his brother-in-law Johann Fischart. Four further pieces shared with the *Reveille-matin* in L'Estoile’s collection he had copied from texts that first circulated separately before they were reworked in the 1574 printed publication

---

71 Lazard-Schrenck, i, 88-89, 109-112.
in subtle ways, so as to strengthen the force of their confessional polemic. L’Estoile treated these pieces with disdain, one of them a ‘mutinous discourse’, another a ‘bizarre discourse’. However, he expressed some sympathy with the critique of court morality in the ‘Copy of an intercepted letter, written in Paris by a courtesan in September 1573’, that he received from a friend on the eve of the feast of Saint Martin that year. The same friend gave him a sonnet of his own composition on the subject of the ‘duty that Kings have towards their subjects, and that subjects have towards their King’, which damned the latter for rejecting this duty.

L’Estoile disagreed with the argument of his friend’s sonnet, quoting Proverbs 28.16, because ‘The prince that wanteth understanding is also a great oppressor’. Nevertheless, he insisted that ‘this is not to excuse those who allow themselves to slander their princes because they are debauched’. For L’Estoile, the Reveille-matin was a dangerously bold critique of the massacre that deserved a place in his collection and a rebuttal in his diaries. He would not fall for its confessional claims.

In the same passage of his diaries that denounced the Reveille-matin, L’Estoile praised a more learned, but equally polemical, major published source for pieces in his collection on the massacre, the Illustrium Aliquot Germanorum Carminum Liber (Basel, 1573), containing Latin and Greek poems commemorating the deaths of Gaspard de Coligny and others among its victims, intended for a scholarly European Protestant audience. L’Estoile appreciated the

---

74 The ‘Dialogue sur l’effigie de la paix’ (Reveille-matin, unpaginated fols. 15r-17r; BnF ms. fr. 10304, fols. 245-250); ‘Extrait d’un discours mutin ... attribué à un Huguenot’ (Reveille-matin, Dialogue II, pp. 97-100; BnF ms. fr. 10304, fols. 274-277, diverging from the printed version fols. 276-277); ‘Discours bizarre d’un gentilhomme tenu pour Huguenot’ (Reveille-matin, Dialogue I, pp. 93-107; BnF ms. fr. 10304, fols. 277-290, significant differences explained in Baranova, Libelles, pp. 191-195).
76 Baranova, Libelles, pp. 276-279, introduces the text, identifies Beza as an author, and suggests (p. 279 n.95) that L’Estoile copied his pieces from another edition due to discrepancies in his cross-references. Pieces taken from the Carminum Liber are identified in Baranova, ‘Ecrits diffamatoires’, iii, Appendix 7 concentrated in BnF ms. fr. 10304, fols. 267, 269-271, 295-314, 338. This publication circulated alongside the Epicedia illustri heroi.
learned Carminum Liber for its rarity, boasting that it was ‘seen by few people’, while he had received it from an unnamed friend from Germany, crediting it since ‘there are many pieces within it that are curiously assembled and which well merit copying’. In this way, L’Estoile perhaps highlighted crucial criteria towards the end of his life for pieces that were worth collecting, their rarity and curiosity. These factors counted equally for pieces in his miscellanies as for pieces in his cabinet.

Many of the pieces published in the Carminum Liber also appeared in Simon Goulart’s Mémoires de l’estat de France sous Charles neufiesme, first published in Geneva in 1576 and then revised for a second edition in 1578. Yet where L’Estoile admired the Carminum Liber, he railed against Goulart’s allegedly sloppy Mémoires as ‘a rhapsody of confusion’, filling three volumes with copies of a vast range of libels, treatises, poems, letters, and documents that recounted aspects of the massacre in detail, presenting its events in a European context and advancing radical ideas about the foundations of royal government. L’Estoile claimed it was ‘rushed onto the press in too much of a hurry to contain the Truth’, discussing it in a passage that he dated to October 1574, but which was certainly composed at least two years later, following the book’s publication. Goulart had tried to pre-empt such a charge as he justified the provenance of his sources and their veracity in his paratextual apparatus. Some pieces in the collection were valuable to L’Estoile, however, since they were otherwise unavailable in print, notably Etienne de La Boétie’s

---

Lazard-Schrenck, i, 88-89, 109-112.


‘Discours de la servitude volontaire’. While L'Estoile’s miscellany relied much more heavily on the *Carminum Liber* and the *Reveille-matin*, the notable presence of Goulart’s *Mémoires* alongside these texts in L'Estoile’s diary suggests the dominant influence of all three in shaping memories of the massacre in the following decades. By compiling and commentating on these infamous publications concerning the Saint Bartholomew’s day massacre, alongside texts like Jodelle’s sonnets and Maisonfleur’s ‘Cantique’ that did not make it into print, L'Estoile shaped their critical reception in posterity. At the same time, he established a history of the massacre in fragments, refusing to engage in confessional interpretations and instead explaining the event as a providential blow, beyond human understanding.

### III. Diary for the Reign of Henri III

This section defines the hybrid genre of L’Estoile’s diary for the reign of Henri III, perhaps his best known manuscript, cited by historians above all as an indispensable documentary source for the political history of the period. Its full title is *Registre journal* by a curious observer, concerning several memorable things, published freely in French during the reign of Henri III, king of France and Poland. The term ‘Registre journal’ is distinctive, although L'Estoile did not explicitly justify his choice. As a ‘journal’, the manuscript gives an account of contemporary history divided systematically into a chronological framework, by years, months, and days, imposing the continuity of the king’s reign over the rupture of the civil

---

81 Lazard-Schrenck, i, 112.
83 ‘Registre journal d’un curieux de plusieurs choses mémorables et publiées librement à la francoise pendant et durant le règne de Henri III roi de France et de Pologne’.
wars. Although the manuscript gives a rather formal history in this sense, nevertheless events from L'Estoile’s life and milieu appear in the narrative, particularly concerning his brother-in-law by his second marriage, Claude de Marteau, whose relationship with L'Estoile is examined in detail in the second half of this section. As a ‘Registre’, this manuscript provides a compilation in the form of a fairly neat copy, perhaps relying on earlier drafts, compiled from diverse sources and assembled in one place in chronological order. Assembled throughout the diary are collections of pieces ‘published freely in French’, like the one L'Estoile assembled on the Saint Bartholomew’s day massacre and had copied into a miscellany, so that this manuscript too speaks with many voices and avoids reaching definitive conclusions. The diary for the reign of Henri III is therefore a hybrid genre that combines features of his family diary and miscellanies with those of more formal contemporary histories. In this sense, there is a defining tension running through this manuscript, between its tight chronological structure and the dynamics of the pieces used to assemble it, always threatening fragmentation.

In the dominant narrative passages of the diary, L'Estoile wrote in the third person with a terse, moralising authorial voice, with clear debts to classical historians he admired such as Tacitus. However, he went much further than such ancient models. He strove for a confessionally-neutral tone that balanced attention between the different parties of the civil wars. The Huguenots appear in the diary as a political and military force, as prone to threaten civilians as were Catholic troops. Individual Protestants and Catholics receive praise or blame depending on their virtue and not their confession, although L'Estoile especially castigated those Catholics linked to the League, whom he accused of excessive and false
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84 On the definition of a ‘registre’ in the archives of the Parlement, as a manuscript of neat copies in chronological order drawn from ‘minutes’ or rough drafts, see A. Grün, ‘Notice sur les archives du Parlement de Paris’ in Actes du Parlement de Paris ed. E. Boutaric (Paris, 1863), i, p. xii. On L'Estoile’s method of copying passages directly from printed sources see Roger Trinquet, ‘La méthode de travail de Pierre de L’Estoile’, Bibliothèque d’Humanisme et Renaissance, 17 (1955), pp. 286-291; Lazard-Schrenck, i, 25, iii, 75 n.1.

85 Greffe-Lothe, pp. 147, 980-981.

piety. And as Part One of this thesis showed, L'Estoile included in his diary reports of publications, crimes, and social life in Paris alongside political events. These reports rarely last for more than a paragraph. They are presented as fragments of his troubled times that fit somewhere between a chronicle and the equally wide-ranging but more systematic works of contemporary history that he admired.

Since L'Estoile compiled the diary from a range of fragmentary sources, and heavily re-worked certain passages over time, it is impossible to date precisely its composition. His hand in the surviving autograph manuscript of this diary matches his mature italic hand which appears in the family diary only from 1589, suggesting that he substantially composed this manuscript of his diary for the reign of Henri III following the king’s death, relying on previous drafts that are now lost. Many passages were composed with a significant degree of hindsight, particularly with reference to the subsequent events of the League, such as an account of Henri III’s dream dated to 21 January 1581, in which the king claimed he was devoured by lions, bears, bulls, and other animals, that in L'Estoile’s report served as a ‘warning of what was coming’. In the autograph manuscript, this passage has undergone no revisions and is composed in the same hand as the surrounding passages for that year.

While the para-textual information of years, months, and folio numbers remain consistent throughout the manuscript, the size of L'Estoile’s hand and the ink that he used vary somewhat. Carefully composed passages, such as his renowned account of the chaotic Day of the Barricades on 12 May 1588, when the League took power in Paris, are written in a dense

---

87 See above pp. 71-72 and Chapter Three.
90 See above p. 129 n.15.
91 Lazard-Schrenck, iv, 67 and BnF ms. fr. 6678, fol. 201v. See also Lazard-Schrenck, iv, 142 and BnF ms. fr. fol. 204; Lazard-Schrenck, iv, 160-161, BnF ms. fr. 6678, fols. 228v-229r, discussed in Baranova, *Libelles*, pp. 25-28.
hand with few corrections, presumably copied from a prior draft, whereas additional passages are often written in a large and relatively messy hand so as to fill up remaining blank pages.\textsuperscript{92} L'Estoile later added sub-titles and annotations concerning individual passages in the margins with a lighter coloured ink. Cross-referencing between numbered folios, L'Estoile crammed-in additional passages by marking the manuscript with stars, crosses, or letters to indicate references to passages included at the end of a particular year, where he regularly left pages blank in order to accommodate additions.\textsuperscript{93} His modern editors do the page-work for the reader by silently bringing these additional passages back in line with the initial, marked entry.\textsuperscript{94} These means of cross-referencing also could be used to indicate similar subjects across different passages, such as the sermons preached in Paris by Jean Linceste in December 1588 and continued in January 1589, which are broken up in the autograph manuscript by additional pieces included at the end of 1588.\textsuperscript{95} Such paratextual strategies serve to bind together diverse passages, composed over time, that always threaten fragmentation.

L'Estoile’s means of guiding his readers through these passages reinforces the integrity of the diary against its potential fragmentation, while contradicting his claim to write only for himself. He lent the autograph manuscript to his friend M. Despinelle on 14 December 1606, noting that he made a copy of it in ‘a separate book containing the best of it, which is for me alone’. This is perhaps the manuscript that he lent to his regular contact Pierre Dupuy on 19 October 1607, a manuscript that ‘has never left my study’.\textsuperscript{96} Both the autograph manuscript and a later scribal copy survive, named the A and B manuscripts.


\textsuperscript{93} Significant blanks, with some passages filled in, at the end of 1583: BnF ms. fr. 6678, fols. 214v-217v.

\textsuperscript{94} Eg. BnF ms. fr. 6678, fols. 236v, 289r and Lazard-Schrenck, v, 14; BnF ms. fr. 6678, fols. 246v, 287r, and Lazard-Schrenck, v, 41; BnF ms. fr. 6678, fols. 388, 398v and Lazard-Schrenck, vi, 90-91.

\textsuperscript{95} BnF ms. fr. 6678, fols. 388v and 403 and Lazard-Schrenck, vi, 92, 129.

\textsuperscript{96} Brunet, viii, 260, 353
respectively by their most recent editors. L’Estoile crossed out with thin lines in the A manuscript many poems and pieces that are absent from the B manuscript, suggesting that he guided the scribe to omit these passages so as to give the second manuscript a clearer narrative structure. But he also added a significant number of fragments to the B manuscript that supplement his narrative, in a continuation of his extensions to the A manuscript. Pierre Dupuy published an even more condensed version of the diary in 1621, focusing on political events, and his selections have directed historians’ use of the diary ever since, as they typically cite L’Estoile for well-informed statements of events at court and in the capital.

Throughout the diary for the reign of Henri III, L'Estoile claimed, ‘the good and the bad, the veritable and the slanderous, are mixed up together’, using a common naturalistic metaphor in contemporary historical and poetic writing of the intermingling and vicissitude of all things in the world. Introductory reports to fragments in the diary determine how readers should engage with these pieces, such as the report that prefaced the epitaph poems on the death in 1577 of the président in the Parlement Pierre Hennequin, which figure among the thirty-nine pieces shared between L’Estoile’s miscellany the ‘Diverse compilation on the miseries of this century’ (BnF ms. fr. 10304) and his diary for the reign of Henri III during the years 1574-1584. Belonging to a different strand of the Hennequin family to L’Estoile’s childhood friend, L'Estoile declared the président to have been exceptionally ambitious and avaricious, a member of the first Catholic League in 1576 and a creature of the Guise who

97 Lazard-Schrenck, i, 33-37. BnF ms. NAF, 6888 is composed in a scribal hand, with occasional additions from L'Estoile.
98 Particularly vehement crossing-out and a notable addition on BnF ms. fr. 6678, fols. 239v-240v; Lazard-Schrenck, v, 22-25.
99 See above p. 12.
101 This miscellany is BnF ms. fr. 10304. Correspondences noted in Lazard-Schrenck, i, 128 n.64, 148 n.139, 149 n.142, 240 n.56, ii, 165 n.77, 166 n.90-101, 247 n.63 n.64, 248 n.66-72, 250 n.91, 251 n.92-93, 253 n.108 n.110, iii, 83 n.58, 84 n.64-65, iv, 61 n.98-99, 168 n.28, 170 n.42 n.44.
only attained his position by loaning Charles IX 60,000 francs. L’Estoile confirmed his own judgement of Hennequin’s character with a description of the death of the président, following a drawn-out illness that troubled his spirit. With such an introduction, L’Estoile prepared his readers to respond sympathetically to the libellous epitaphs composed by the Huguenots, whose language informs L’Estoile’s gloss, with Hennequin first represented by an ‘esprit malin, des plus meschans le pire’, who announces to the Passant

Hennequin, Hennequin effronté,
Qui, par Brigues et Arts, par Argent et Menées,
President au Palais fut dix ou douze années,
Où il n’a fait que du mal: dont estoit redouté.

Once the Esprits have convinced the Passant of Hennequin’s maleficence, they then denounce his role in the Parlement, situating this poem in a wider current of satirical literature, much of it copied by L’Estoile, that targeted the corruption of particular office-holders in the Palais de Justice who perverted royal justice, arguing that the pursuit of worldly fame is of no use in eternity.102

Obscene verses also took part in the cacophony of competing voices in L’Estoile’s diary for the reign of Henri III. He controlled their reception with introductory reports that highlighted the corrupt morality and formal decline of poetry that he witnessed in sixteenth-century France.103 Modern critics’ attention has particularly focused on the discourse analysis of poems concerning the sexuality of Henri III’s courtiers, especially his group of favourites known as the Mignons.104 Their approach obscures L’Estoile’s work as a collector and

---

compiler of poetry. Among the most obscene sexual poems of the diary are some of the forty-two pieces shared with the hitherto unidentified miscellany ‘A compilation of lascivious pranks and slanders’ (BnF Cinq Cents Colbert 488), that I suggest derives from another lost manuscript that once belonged to L’Estoile’s collection.105 Passages introducing and pre-determining the reception of poems in this miscellany are reproduced in very similar terms in L’Estoile’s diary for the reign of Henri III, such as the introduction to and text of Remi

105 This note presents a case for the miscellany BnF Cinq Cents Colbert 488, fols. 306v-554r, ‘Bigarrures folastres et mesdisantes’, being derived from L’Estoile’s collection. The miscellany is copied in a mid-seventeenth-century scribal hand as part of a miscellany in the Cinq Cents Colbert Collection in the BnF, alongside pieces concerning the genealogy of the counts of Burgundy, personalities of the civil wars, monetary reform, and Parisian and European politics between 1618 and 1620, which perhaps mark an end date for the compilation. For an overview of Colbert’s library see Denise Bloch, ‘La bibliothèque de Colbert’ in Claude Jolly ed., Histoire des bibliothèques françaises, II: Les bibliothèques sous l’Ancien Régime, 1530-1789 (Paris, 1988), pp. 157-179.

Forty-two pieces are shared between L’Estoile’s diary and this miscellany, which Lazard-Schrenck attributed to the collection of Henri de Mesmes with no apparent justification: Lazard-Schrenck, v, 248 n.15. The shared pieces, with occasional variations in orthography, are noted in Lazard-Schrenck, i, 126-127 n.62, 129 n.67, 237 n.38, ii, 158 n.11, 158 n.17, 159 n.18, 159 n.19, 159 n.20, 159 n.21, 159 n.23, 167 n.103, 167 n.105, 167 n.107, 167 n.108, 167 n.110, 167 n.113-114, 168 n.120, 169 n.134, 169 n.135, 169 n.138, 170 n.140, 242 n.12, 242 n.14, 245 n.38, 245 n.39, 245 n.40, 246 n.43, 247 n.55, 247 n.58, 252 n.103, iii, 84 n.73, 85 n.74, 85 n.75, 85 n.76, 85 n.77, 128 n.64, 129 n.74, 133 n.90, 134 n.92, iv, 53 n.31, v, 248 n.15.

A Latin epigram in the ‘Bigarrures folastres et mesdisantes’, concerning the entrance of the sieur de Grandru into the Parlement, is introduced ‘Monsieur Marteau, mon beau frere, fist sur ce subject, l’épigrame latin suivant’, referring to L’Estoile’s brother-in-law, Claude de Marteau: BnF Cinq Cents Colbert 488, fol. 383r; Lazard-Schrenck, iv, 173.

The frontispiece of the ‘Bigarrures folastres et mesdisantes’ reproduces a distinctive commonplace found in several of L’Estoile’s manuscripts: ‘Qui veult faire cesser les écrits, et biaisons, qu’il s’adonne a bien faire, car il est aussy peu en la puissance de toute la faculté terienne d’engarder la liberté francoise de parler comme d’enfouir le soleil en terre, ou l’ennemer dedans un trou.’ See above p. 84 n.111.

The ‘Bigarrures folastres et mesdisantes’ is perfectly complementary with L’Estoile’s poetry miscellany ‘Receuil diverses de ce temps’ (BnF ms. fr. 10304) as they each cover similar topics in a comparable timespan (c.1530s to 1585/6) but with no overlapping pieces. They also follow a very similar presentation on the page. Both miscellanies set their pieces in a broadly chronological order, with occasional marginal glosses and introductions. Their paratextual apparatus are also similar, as the scribe for the ‘Bigarrures folastres et mesdisantes’ also used stars, underlined titles, and three bars for emphasis that are typical features of L’Estoile’s introductions. Their paratextual apparatus are also similar, as the scribe for the ‘Bigarrures folastres et mesdisantes’ also used stars, underlined titles, and three bars for emphasis that are typical features of L’Estoile’s introductions. For an overview of Colbert’s library see Denise Bloch, ‘La bibliothèque de Colbert’ in Claude Jolly ed., Histoire des bibliothèques françaises, II: Les bibliothèques sous l’Ancien Régime, 1530-1789 (Paris, 1988), pp. 157-179.

The topics covered by the ‘Bigarrures folastres et mesdisantes’ are entirely in accord with L’Estoile’s collecting habits. It contains 413 distinct pieces, a mix of French and Latin, and a preponderance of verse over prose. A list of titles of many of the pieces is given in Charles de La Roncière, Catalogue des manuscrits de la collection des Cinq Cents de Colbert (Paris, 1908), pp. 290-295. As well as pieces on sexual morality, many pieces concern the politics of the civil wars. They prominently feature Protestant arguments and critiques of leading Catholic figures, such as the Cardinal de Lorraine, as well as office-holders in the Parlement of Paris. In its title as well as its generic range the ‘Bigarrures folastres et mesdisantes’ particularly resemble the first half of L’Estoile’s miscellany ‘Receuil divers, bigarrés, du grave et du facétieux, du bon et du mauvais, selon le temps’, BnF ms. fr. 25560, published in Brunet, xi, 143-409.

If these points are plausible if not entirely sufficient to establish without doubt that this miscellany once belonged to L’Estoile’s collection, nevertheless they demonstrate the close links between this miscellany and L’Estoile’s diary for the reign of Henri III.
Belleau’s poem ‘Jean qui ne peult’, whose protagonist longs to spend the night with his mistress, but instead can only imagine their intercourse in verse, since ‘Mon Vit reste poltron, Mollasse en same sorte / Qu’un boiau replié de quelque Beste morte’. The miscellany introduces Belleau as a learned gentleman, criticised because the lascivious villainies of his verses sullied his reputation, while the near identical passage in L'Estoile’s diary gently qualifies this same statement by claiming that the attribution to Belleau is not certain, and that the poem also ‘rings badly in Christian ears’. L'Estoile drew on miscellanies like this one in compiling his fragmented histories, but in the diary of the reign of Henri III he made sure to introduce pieces he selected in such a way so as to reinforce his guiding interpretation of social fracture and moral decline in the civil wars.

Beyond the compiled miscellanies and fragmentary reports in L'Estoile’s diaries extends a network of informants and sources. Claude de Marteau, L'Estoile’s brother-in-law by his second marriage to Colombe, is the most prominent named source in the diary for the reign of Henri III. L'Estoile described Claude as ‘one of the most excellent minds of this century and among its most learned’. Claude apparently never married and lodged in Paris with the avocat Rochefort and his family. Claude’s presence in the diary demonstrates L'Estoile’s dependence on family connections in composing the manuscript, a dependence that broke through its fragmented and seemingly objective formal presentation. L'Estoile invoked Claude’s direct eyewitness is in a report dated 17 May 1587, relating how Claude saw a soldier hanged at Livry, who survived being cut loose a few minutes after the execution. Although the hanged man fell on his head, soon after he began to speak, and when

106 ‘Le suivant poeme, vilain et lascif, et mal sonnant aux aureilles chrestiennes, intitulé Jan qui ne peult, fut divulgué, en ce temps, à Paris et partout, dont on tenoit pour aucteur Remi Belleau, un des doctres et gentils poetes de nostre temps, mais qui, en ce siecle corrompu, n’eust esté tenu pour bon poete et parfait, si, à l’exemple de ses compagnons, il n’eust souillé sa muse de telles semblables villanies’, Lazard-Schrenck, ii, 141, 167 n.144; ‘Poeme vilain et lascif composé par Remi Belleau, un des doctes et gentils poetes de nostre temps, comme ses oeuvres en tesmoignent, mais qui en ce siecle miserable et corrompu, n’eust esté tenu pour vray Poete et parfait, si comme ses compagnons il n’eust souillé sa Muse de lascivetés et vilanies’, BnF Cinq Cents Colbert 488, fol. 550r.

Claude returned to visit him later he found that the soldier had escaped.\textsuperscript{108} As with his more abundantly referenced reports during the League years, which frequently rely on Claude’s evidence in this way, L'Estoile invoked the name of an authoritative eye-witness to confirm events at a distance.\textsuperscript{109} The singularity of this report in the diary for the reign of Henri III suggests Claude’s exceptional credit as a witness.

Claude’s correspondence, hitherto unknown to historians, reveals how he was a continual source of information and intellectual stimulation for L'Estoile, who had three of Claude’s letters copied into a miscellany, arranging them as worthy companions to the correspondence of Claude’s favourite historian, Joseph Scaliger.\textsuperscript{110} In one letter, Claude asked L'Estoile to send ‘that book about which you rave so much’, a fragment suggesting perhaps that more of the manuscript and printed sources of L'Estoile’s diaries and miscellanies came from exchanges with Claude.\textsuperscript{111} Even when he had no news to relate, Claude cultivated his reputation for curiosity and good story telling, comparing himself to the Lamiae, mythological, demonic figures with removable eyes, who in folk tales devoured misbehaving young boys and roamed about with an insatiable desire to understand what was happening in the world.\textsuperscript{112}

Claude perhaps pursued esteem as a poet rather than a gossip, and this is how he most regularly appears in the diary for the reign of Henri III, either as he passes on pieces or

\textsuperscript{108} Brunet, iii, 45-46.

\textsuperscript{109} Claude’s eye-witness cited in Brunet, v, 7, 37, 46, 47, 49, 52, 53, 56, 82, 83, 147, 166, vi, 42.

\textsuperscript{110} See below pp. 220-221.

\textsuperscript{111} ‘mihi gratissimum feceris, si opusculum illud quod tanti furis ad me miseris.’ BnF ms. fr. 10303, fol. 408.

\textsuperscript{112} ‘Lamiis similimus sum, quas anus senectute tremula narrant puellulis pra metu totis artibus contremiscentibus, maxime cum ad focum delerant vagientes glubere pueros. Historia sit nerone, plane ignoro. Nihil enim habeo praeter auditum: sed has ferunt habere oculos quos eximunt cum volunt. Cum igitur domo pedem effecunt, statim oculos inse- runt cavis subter cilia et palpebras, et acutum tuentes vagantur per domus, per fora, conciliabula, theatra, circulos garrientium, coronas nugantium, videntque qua fiunt, dicuntur, geruntur. mox ubi fessa domum se recepere, exerunt oculos, et in thera recondunt, suntque semper domi cara, semper foris oculata. Ita quid ab aliis fiat ad unguem tenent, quid domi ignorant. Sic ego aliena negotio curo, meaurum rerum negliegens sum’. BnF ms. fr. 10303, fol. 406. The entire passage on the Lamiae is closely related to Angelo Poliziano, \textit{Angelo Poliziano's Lamia: Text, Translation, and Introductory Studies}, ed. Christopher S. Celenza (Leiden, 2010), pp. 20-21, 194-197, so much so that Claude’s claim to ignorance of its source seems to be a feint.
penned them himself, his authorship typically noted with his initials C.M. or M.C. In an assembly of poems criticising the sale of offices, Claude’s sonnets are introduced by L’Estoile as being composed by ‘one of my Friends’, given to him on 14 April 1578, which were widely collected and praised as being ‘well written’. Contrary to the fragmented voices of many of L’Estoile’s miscellaneous collections, these sonnets demonstrate the unity of Claude’s and L’Estoile’s world view, as Claude’s sonnets lament the state of disorder in France.

La Noblesse commet de merveilleus degasts;
La Justice n’a plus son egale balance;
Au Peuple, n’i a plus de Foy, d’obeissance
A son Superieur: le Clergé ne fait cas
Du service de Dieu; la plus par des Soldas
Ravit, rançonne, vole avec toute license.

Each estate abuses its position and insults God, provoking His vengeance in the tercets.

Donc, ne faut s’esbahir si nous sentons sur nous
Du Ciel, incessamment, le tres juste courroux.
Et qui fait provoquer sa divine vengeance?
C’est que plus il nous bat et menace aujourd’hui,
Tant plus, nous, obstinés, roidissons contre lui,
Et, redoublant nos maux, redoublons nostre offense.

The second sonnet opens with a reflection on the great inconstance of all things, ‘Rien n’est, en ces bas lieux, constant ni perdurable: / Tout s’y change soudain’, and all civilisations who once had glory – the Babylonians, Medes, Greeks, and Romans – have since fallen. L’Estoile in his conclusion to these sonnets, cited at the very beginning of this chapter, echoes the terms of Claude’s conclusion to the second sonnet. Again, L’Estoile appropriated the language of the pieces he copied out, demonstrating here their shared view of

---

113 Both sets of initials are identified as marks of Claude de Marteau’s authorship by Lazard-Schrenck in the notes to their edition. Lazard-Schrenck, i, 70, 207-208, ii, 186-187, 196-197, 207, 246, 248, iii, 18-19, iv, 138, v, 173, 325; BnF ms. fr. 10304, fols. 398, 407; BnF ms. fr. 1662, fol. 24r.
114 Schrenck-Lazard, ii, 186-187.
contemporary history, concerning the immorality of their times and the vicissitude of all things. However, in the B manuscript to his diary, L'Estoile replaced Claude’s sonnets and his own conclusion with a series of obscene poems by Ronsard that also appear in the miscellany of the ‘Compilation of lascivious pranks and slanders’ (BnF Cinq Cents Colbert 488).

Ronsard’s poems criticised sexual perversion at court in appropriately base language, demonstrating L'Estoile’s critique as it denounced the base morality of his times.\(^{115}\)

The examples that Claude used in his second sonnet suggest his classically humanist propensity for using historical examples to critique contemporary morality, which he exercised in far greater detail through a virtuoso Latin letter sent to L'Estoile on 1 January 1588. This letter compared the civil wars in their time with the civil wars fought between the sons of Louis the Pious in 841-844, relying on a text he sent as an accompaniment, which he called the ‘Commentaries of Charles the Bald’, referring to Nithart’s contemporary

*History*.\(^{116}\) The comparison came loaded with significance, as Lothar, the eldest son of Louis the Pious, gave his name to the territory of Lorraine, and it was his Carolingian ancestry that allowed the Guise to lay their claim to the French throne. Claude took this civil war as an explanatory model for the contemporary troubles, particularly the civil war between Henri III, Henri de Navarre, and Henri de Guise that began in 1584 following the death of the king’s brother François de Valois, leaving the Protestant Henri de Navarre as the heir to the throne.


according to Salic Law. Claude argued that both of these civil wars were driven by the ambition of great men, but also hoped that the new year of 1588 would mark the end of their present troubles, so that they would last no longer than the three years of civil war fought between the sons of Louis the Pious.\footnote{In eo enim se quis Lotharii erga patrem fratresque animum penitius paulo scrutetur, primorumque (ut Authoris verbis utar) caecam cupiditatem attentius consideret, nil nisi quod a 27 annis ipse vidimus, sensimus, se legere testabitur ... At istud summopere à deo opt. max. supplex optarim, ut, quemadmodum tertio anno evoluto, post tot tantasque clades praefecta confecta, pax inter Reges fratres populi totius sensim, etiam horre anno, qui quartus (in deus omen avertat) recentorum Gallicarum aerumnarum imminet, bellorum finis indicatur: concordiaque inter nostrates, illorum exemplo, deique supremi beneficio, talis renascatur, ut in aeternum unanimes omnes efficiantur.’ BnF ms. fr. 10303, fols. 415-416.} While Claude had tracked down, transcribed, and critiqued the manuscript of Nithard’s history in a copy belonging to the collection of Jean de Saint André, canon of the Parisian abbey of Saint Magloire on the rue Saint Denis, he was not always so successful in locating rare manuscripts. When L’Estoile borrowed from Pierre Dupuy on 7 July 1607 a Parisian chronicle of the civil wars between the Burgundians and the Armagnacs, covering the period 1409-1449, he recorded his regret that Claude could not live to read it, as he had long desired to possess a copy of the manuscript.\footnote{Brunet, viii, 318, see Table 6.1.} These shared interests between L’Estoile and Claude demonstrate how, beneath the fragments of contemporary history in the diary for the reign of Henri III, L’Estoile was also interested in the underlying patterns of French political history.

Claude signed his letters to L’Estoile ‘your brother and best friend’. Their correspondence reveals an intellectual companionship beyond the concerns of their manuscript collections. Claude wrote in September 1584 from the family estate at Gland, near Château-Thierry, which he inherited from his mother.\footnote{His succession, titles, and duties regarding his properties listed in his feudal payment AN MC LXXIII 222, 4 August 1594 and the contract whereby Pierre de L’Estoile and Hierosme de Benevant inherit the repayments owed on his \textit{rentes} in AN MC LXXIII 227, 19 October 1595, including additional lands at Gercourt near Verdun and Trilport near Meaux. Colombe Guibert and Adrian de Marteau appear in the parish registers of Saint André des Arts on 2 December 1548 as godparents for Simon, the son of Claudé André, procureur in the Parlement, and Marguerite Marteau: BnF ms. Clairambault 987, fol. 128.} In his letters, Claude portrays Gland as a place of leisurely retreat from affairs in Paris, where he could enjoy losing himself in astrology and ecclesiastical history – ‘I know better what is happening in the skies, and in
the Abyssinian, Ethiopian, Coptic Church, than what is happening in my own home’ – as well as profit from the abundant grape harvest. He found time for business too, as he sold his wine stock to L'Estoile’s mother, and also thanked L'Estoile for investing his money well, urging him to invest another fifty gold coins, ‘for gold is less valuable than seaweed unless it is put to use’.

Following Claude’s death in 1595, L'Estoile and Colombe inherited Gland, which L'Estoile then treated as his own site of leisurely retreat from the capital. When L'Estoile and Colombe travelled there with their children in September 1606, L'Estoile packed a trunk full of edifying reading, first a Bible, ‘the book of books’, then classical and devotional literature, but he also included Charles Estienne’s *Maison rustique* ‘a fitting book to take into the fields’.

He rented out land on his estates at Gland to tenants and used the property to guarantee *constitutions de rente*, co-signing these contracts with Colombe since it formed part of her inheritance.

He sent his sons there, perhaps to manage his affairs, among them his son-in-law Guillaume Duranti who returned by coach on 10 November 1608, narrowly escaping collisions on the pont Notre Dame during what L'Estoile remarked as being the worst fog that he could remember in his life.

Gland was key to Claude’s legacy to L'Estoile and his successors. Beyond his financial inheritance, Claude’s intellectual activity there and in Paris was a great stimulus to L'Estoile as he compiled his diaries. Not only did Claude offer L'Estoile information in letters, poems, and gossip, but he also contributed some of the moral force for the diary, which enabled L'Estoile to bring these pieces together around his central theme of fragmentation and decline. Their collaboration shaped L'Estoile’s diary for Henri III, a defining history of their times.

---

120 *aurum enim nisi utare vilius alga est.* BnF ms. fr. 10303, fols. 406-407.
121 Brunet, viii, 242; Greffe-Lothe, p. 626.
122 He leased a building and plot of land on the estate to Jean Lorain, vigneron: AN MC CXXII 1556, 29 December 1605; Greffe-Lothe, p. 1066. See Appendix II for *constitutions de rente*.
123 Brunet, ix, 160-161.
L'Estoile and Claude agreed that in their times ‘there is no more truth, there is no more pity, and there is no longer any knowledge of God on this earth’. L'Estoile illustrated this theme in his collection on the Saint Bartholomew’s day massacre as well as his diary for the reign of Henri III, setting fragments of contemporary polemic against one another, yet refusing to take a position on either side. As he did so, he cut an idiosyncratic path through sources that new cultural historians might interpret as ‘collective representations’, by appropriating and evaluating contemporary manuscript and printed literature that made crucial interventions in the debates concerning the civil wars. All of the manuscripts analysed in this chapter reveal how L'Estoile’s active process of reading supported his attempt to take a neutral position in their confessional conflicts. Just as L'Estoile took up an absent or detached authorial position in the collection on the Saint Bartholomew’s day massacre and the diary for the reign of Henri III, so he avoided mentioning the troubles in his family diary in this period. Instead, he used the family diary as an exemplary record of his family’s constant, simple piety and strong moral purpose, both of which he learned from his father and hoped his own sons would share. In these ways, L'Estoile’s family diary, miscellanies, and diary for the reign of Henri III allowed him both to record and negotiate his fractured times, conveying for posterity an account of contemporary history while scrupulously avoiding any confessional judgement on it. His strategy was successful in his young adulthood and early career until 1589, but from that point on the victories of the League profoundly affected his way of inhabiting and representing his world.
Drolleries of the League
1589-1598

‘Les belles Figures et Drolleries de la Ligue’ form Pierre de L'Estoile’s most extraordinary manuscript, an iconoclastic, scrapbook history of the Catholic League assembled from the material evidence of its own publications. L'Estoile defaced these ephemeral prints and mocked them as trifles that deserved to be destroyed, preserving exemplary copies that slandered the League for posterity and documented this moment of crisis at the end of the Wars of Religion. Alongside the Drolleries, L'Estoile’s diaries of the League years relate his informed, eyewitness account of the rise and fall of the League in the capital, concluding with its humiliating defeat and Henri IV’s entry into Paris on 22 March 1594. He referred to these diaries as his ‘memoirs’, making a clear break with the impersonal, fragmented style of his diaries for the reign of Henri III, as their narrative overlaps with that of his family diary.

The troubles of the League mark a turning point in L'Estoile’s life and gave focus to his collecting. Historians of the League in Paris depend heavily on L'Estoile’s evidence, citing him with critical approval while identifying him as a representative of the so-called ‘Politique’ opposition to the League among the office-holders in the Parlement.¹ To evaluate their claims, it is important to establish an outline of L'Estoile’s life in Paris and determine

why he remained in the capital despite frequent intimidation from the Leaguers and threats to his life. Part One of this chapter takes a biographical approach, analysing L'Estoile’s memoirs and miscellanies of the League alongside his family diary and notarial documents, as it considers his decision to remain in Paris and collaborate in the administration of the Parlement of the League rather than leave the capital to join the royalist Parlement at Tours. Part Two continues to discuss L'Estoile’s narrative strategies in his memoirs of the League years and argues that he addressed an audience among his colleagues in the Parlement.

L'Estoile’s life in Paris under the League shaped the way he put together its history. Parts Two and Three of this chapter examine L'Estoile’s memoirs and Drolleries of the League respectively, contributing to a wider debate in early modern history about the reception of printed publications and other forms of communication. As Chapter Four showed, and as this chapter demonstrates in a different context, because L'Estoile made criticism of his sources a subject of his historical writing, in assembling his histories he evaluated his own subjective reception of information, providing a close study in audience response. This approach to L'Estoile’s collection critiques historians’ typically anecdotal use of his evidence in accounts that depict the League as waging a terrifying multi-media propaganda campaign, flooding Paris with print, preaching, and processions, especially as it established its authority in the capital in 1588-1591. Detesting the Leaguers and exaggerating their populism, L'Estoile responded to their tactics of persuasion in creative and resourceful ways. Chapter Two outlined his professional connections and position of oversight in the Parisian print trade, as well as his place in the society of office holders in the Parlement and the college of royal secretaries. During the period of the League he exploited

---

2 L'Estoile’s editors observed his stance but did not interrogate it. Brunet, xii, viii-xi; Roelker, pp. 17-18; Lazard-Schrenck, i, 11-15; Greffe-Lothe, p. 92.

these connections to great effect as he sourced information that he compiled to create a
unique history of his times. He condemned the Leaguers with his direct testimony, first by his
eyewitness accounts and second with the materiality of the texts he collected.

I. Life in Paris under the League

L'Estoile lived with his family in Paris throughout its domination by the Catholic League,
making only a few short trips out to manage his affairs between 1591 and 1593, and only
sending his relatives away to take refuge at the peak of the siege of Paris in August 1590. An
apparently committed supporter of Henri de Navarre with Protestant sympathies, he
nevertheless refused to leave the capital to join the royalist Parlement at Tours. His actions
present something of a paradox: by continuing to exercise his office in Paris he collaborated
in the administration of the Parlement of the League, balancing the possibility of losing his
office in the event of a royal victory with the threat of persecution from the Leaguers in Paris
because of his political and religious sympathies. This section takes a chronological and
biographical approach to trace L'Estoile’s steps throughout the crisis of the League,
demonstrating how his experience informed the way he compiled its history.

Hostility to the League shaped L'Estoile’s account of the years of its rise, as he
included in his retrospectively composed diary for the reign of Henri III evidence of his
activism on behalf of Henri de Navarre, justifying his royalist credentials. In his first
acknowledged act of anti-League activism, L'Estoile claimed to have composed a libel on
Navarre’s behalf that attacked Pope Sixtus V’s 9 September 1585 bull of excommunication
against Navarre, barring him from the succession to the French throne. This short response to
the bull returned the accusation of heresy back at the ‘so-called pope’, defying Sixtus to hold
a Council of the Church if he wished to declare Navarre a heretic, and announcing that if he
refused to do so then he was the true Antichrist and Heretic. In this way, the libel takes an orthodox Protestant position against the pope and sits alongside contemporary libels coordinated by the Huguenots in defence of Navarre. L’Estoile included the text of the short response to the bull in his diary and remarked that it was ‘done by the <writer of the present book> the Author of the present memoirs’, adjusting the passage in his manuscript in a way that identifies it with his manner of writing the ‘memoirs’ of the League, and perhaps suggests a degree of special pleading for his authorship. There is no further evidence as to whether L’Estoile composed this libel. In an eighteenth-century edition of Simon Goulart’s *Mémoires de la Ligue*, that re-published the libel, it is attributed to the French ambassador to the Holy Roman Empire, the Protestant Jacques Bongars. Whether L’Estoile did compose this response, or at least copied it for circulation, his explanation of his actions identifies him clearly in Navarre’s party. As soon as the League was formed, L’Estoile wanted his readers to identify him at the vanguard of royalist resistance to their actions.

In March 1589, L’Estoile claimed to have continued his anti-League activism by circulating eighteen sonnets dedicated to Henri de Navarre, composed by the lieutenant criminel in Paris, Nicolas Rapin. He explained that the first copies of these sonnets were circulated by office-holders in the Parlement held in the Bastille before spreading further out across Paris. L’Estoile positioned himself as a subversive and risk-taking royalist as he reported that ‘I copied them myself, in the evening, in my study, on the day of the
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5 ‘fait par <l’escrivain du present livre> l’Aucteur des presens memoires’.

6 Lazard-Schrenck, v, 41-43, 162-163 n.79. L’Estoile observed that the short response was pasted publicly in Rome and appeared in the ‘Recueils de ce temps’ published in La Rochelle. That publication is Simon Goulart ed., *Premier volume du receuil, contenant les choses memorables advenues sous la Ligue* (La Rochelle, 1587), pp. 463-465. L’Estoile’s text and the published version are almost identical, with only minor differences in orthography. The Amsterdam edition of *Mémoires de la Ligue, contenant les evenemens les plus remarquables depuis 1576, jusqu’a la Paix accordée entre le Roi de France & le Roi d’Espagne, en 1598*, ed. Simon Goulart (Amsterdam, 1758), i, 243-244 makes the attribution to Bongars. De Thou, ix, 376-378, gives greater detail concerning the bull, its reception, and Gallican responses.

7 La Pommereux, Navarre’s treasurer and the uncle of Colombe, served as godfather for their daughter Marie, baptised in the church of Saint André des Arts on 13 November 1587. *Family diary*, p. 40; Brunet, vii, 160.
Annunciation, 25 March, and I made them fall (more boldly than prudently) into many good pairs of hands.’ The sonnets concluded with a call to take up arms and defend the kingdom against the League in the name of Henri de Navarre.  

L'Estoile proudly recorded his response to this call to arms as he took up his pen for Navarre’s cause.  

Reports in L'Estoile’s family diary and memoirs of the League highlight his conflicts with the Leaguers as they established their control in the capital. On 8 January 1589, in the wake of Henri III’s assassination of the duke and cardinal of Guise, the Leaguer scribe Pierre Senault raided L'Estoile’s house, claiming to look for concealed money. After that raid, L'Estoile burned a great number of censured books and papers. ‘Without some of my friends, who held me back and saved much against my will, I would have lost everything’. Then at four o’clock on the morning of 31 July 1589, agents of the Catholic League entered L'Estoile’s house once again. Pierre de La Rue arrested him and took him to the prison of the Conciergerie. Detained alongside him were several office-holders in the chambers of the Palais de Justice, many of them his friends, but few of them men of renown. Thomas Sebillet, the aged poet and avocat in the Parlement, was the only friend arrested with him that he mentioned elsewhere in his diaries. L'Estoile and his friends were held under suspicion as supporters of Henri III. He claimed that they had been arrested to enable the assassination of the king by the Dominican friar Jacques Clement on 2 August, serving as hostages in case Clement was held prisoner, perhaps exaggerating the prisoners’ significance. They were released on 7 August. Two days after their release from the Conciergerie, L'Estoile and Sebillet passed by the Châtelet where they witnessed the execution at one of the city gates of
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11 APP AB 10, 31 July 1589, fols. 261v-262r.  
13 Brunet, v, 6; *Family diary*, p. 41.
François Perrichon, condemned for the homicide of a fellow Leaguer, Nicolas Muteau. L’Estoile recalled that upon their release from the Conciergerie crowds cried ‘At the Politiques!’ and said that they should all hang.¹⁴

At the same time as L’Estoile and his friends were released from the Conciergerie, so were a great number of the office-holders in the Great Chamber of the Parlement released from imprisonment in the Bastille and the Louvre, where they had been held since 16 January 1589.¹⁵ Rapin’s poems for Henri de Navarre first circulated among these imprisoned office-holders. Upon their release, key figures from the Parlement such as the premier président Achille de Harlay fled Paris to join the royalist Parlement at Tours, there acknowledging Henri de Navarre as the rightful successor to Henri III.¹⁶ Certain leading office-holders in the Parlement who eventually supported Navarre remained in Paris, including Guillaume du Vair, who claimed that he initially supported the League to avenge his father’s financial ruin, which he blamed on Henri III.¹⁷ In 1589 the dividing line in the politics of the parlements was set, with the Parlement of the League in Paris and the Parlement of the king in Tours.¹⁸ L’Estoile made his decision to remain in Paris.

Throughout the troubles of the League, L’Estoile continued to exercise his functions in the Chancery, effectively collaborating with the administration of the League, while in his memoirs he was determined to emphasise his royalist resistance. On 24 March 1589, L’Estoile reported the registration of the edict of translation to establish the Parlement at Tours and not at Paris, but did not mention that by remaining in Paris and declining to follow

---

his colleagues to Tours he now worked for the king’s enemies in the Parlement of the League.\textsuperscript{19} L’Estoile seems to have deliberately laid low in exercising his office in the Paris Chancery in these years. On 23 February 1591, an unexplained ‘letter of justice’ arrived there concerning the Leaguer and commissaire in the Châtelet Jean Louchart, but neither L’Estoile nor any of his colleagues were bold enough to seal or deliver it.\textsuperscript{20} L’Estoile’s one observable official activity, the signing of printers’ privileges, ceased between 12 August 1588 and 4 December 1593, although in December 1591 he reported discussing a privilege with a member of the Faculty of Theology.\textsuperscript{21}

Working for the Parlement of the League came at a cost. Henri III created a rival office as royalist audiencier at the Parlement of Tours on 23 June 1589, purchased by the Royal Secretary Nicolas Goguier. After Henri IV entered Paris in March 1594, L'Estoile had to buy-out his rival and re-purchase his office. The royal council officially readmitted the Parisian audienciers to their offices in May 1594 and the act was registered on 17 October that year.\textsuperscript{22} On the day of their readmission, L'Estoile and a Parisian colleague as audiencier, François de la Haye, both agreed a payment of 1,200 écus to Goguier to reimburse him for the sum he had paid to purchase the office of royalist audiencier in Tours, and 23 écus 30 sols to reimburse him for the payment of the marc d’or he made upon taking up his office.\textsuperscript{23} None of this information on the repurchase of his office appears in L'Estoile’s memoirs of the League and his only mention of Goguier in his diaries appears following his rival’s death in October 1609.\textsuperscript{24}

\textsuperscript{19} Daubresse, ‘De Paris à Tours’, pp. 309-311.
\textsuperscript{21} Brunet, v, 148.
\textsuperscript{22} Gérard Jubert, \textit{Ordonnances enregistrées au Parlement de Paris sous le règne de Henri IV. Inventaire analytique des registres X1A 8640 à 8646} (Paris, 1993), p. 44.
\textsuperscript{23} AN MC LIX 39, 28 June 1594; Greffe-Lothe, p. 1061. To make this payment, L'Estoile constituted an annual rente of 33 écus 20 sols against the sum of 1,200 écus that he owed Goguier. On 27 June 1595 and 16 June 1598 L'Estoile paid off his debt to Goguier.
\textsuperscript{24} Brunet, x, 58.
As L’Estoile lived through the years of League rule in Paris, he justified his actions in both his family diary and memoirs by interpreting his fate as well as that of Henri de Navarre as determined by God’s providence. Navarre laid siege to Paris and blocked off its food supply after his victory at the battle of Ivry on 14 March 1590, ‘God giving him the sign of his favour’, according to L’Estoile’s report. These were years of hunger, necessity, and a surcharged divine presence in L’Estoile’s world. In Reformed Protestant terms, he argued that the struggle against an impious enemy confirmed his sense of his salvation. He compared the Sixteen to the ‘satraps’ who sacked Jerusalem in the siege of AD 70, writing about these years as one long test that God set for him. At certain moments, L’Estoile sensed that God was protecting him from the troubles and acted through him to perform acts of charity. His family survived the 1590 siege of Paris ‘without ever lacking bread, by the grace of my God’. And when he encountered at his doorstep, on 15 August 1590, ‘a poor man dying of hunger, with a child in his arms about five years old, whom I saw die in his father’s arms’, L’Estoile gave the father some bread and money, concluding that ‘God made use of me to save, or at least prolong, his life’. At home L’Estoile again felt God’s presence, as he narrowly escaped from two potentially fatal accidents. Significant acts of charity stand out among smaller acts of kindness, as he made loans of four, ten, and one hundredécus in 1589 and 1590. These loans are peculiar among L’Estoile’s notarial contracts, as he typically constituted rentes in order to trade in debts. I have found no record of these debts being repaid. During these years of crisis, L’Estoile felt that God worked through him as he survived with his family in relative prosperity.

28 Family diary, p. 42.
29 Roelker, p. 192; Brunet, v, 47.
30 Brunet, v, 195-196, 213. See above pp. 34-35.
31 Summarised in L’Estoile’s inventory: Greffe-Lothe, pp. 31-32.
32 On L’Estoile’s rentes see pp. 130-131, 208 n.11, and Appendix II.
L'Estoile also felt that God tested and punished him in these years. Personal suffering came through the fate of his family members as ‘God visited me first in my wife.’ L'Estoile’s patriarchal form of life-writing in his family diary left him reflecting on his personal salvation whenever he recorded the misfortunes of those close to him. He sent on 14 August 1590 his pregnant wife Colombe, his son Mathieu, the wet-nurse, his sister Anne, and his mother to take refuge in Corbeil, eighteen miles south of Paris. Henri de Navarre had secured the town on 1 April 1590, but on 16 October Spanish troops re-captured it after a month-long siege. L'Estoile heard news on 18 October that the Spanish held Colombe captive there, demanding a ransom of seventy-five écus. But on 31 October she returned to Paris following the intervention of Nicolas de Neufville, sieur de Villeroy – secretary of state and a Leaguer – as well as L'Estoile’s uncle the conseiller Mathieu Chartier, who lent him 100 écus to pay her ransom. L'Estoile equally felt that God tested him through the actions of his eldest son, Louis. At Pentecost 1589, Louis stole from his father’s study several Greek and Latin books that he then sold. This ‘prodigal son’ then left home to join the army of the League on 25 November 1589. L'Estoile excused his acceptance by ‘the malady of this century’, that meant that ‘a good man cannot live here in surety if he does not shut his eyes to the violence and rebellions that occur against the King’. L’Estoile claimed that he did his best to endure the troubles in Paris, justifying his decision to remain in the capital with special pleading, arguing that he had no choice but to stay since he abandoned himself to the will of God.

A turning point in the politics of the League in Paris came when the extreme faction among the Sixteen organised the summary execution on 15 November 1591 of the premier président in the Parlement Barnabé Brisson, the conseiller in the Parlement Claude Larcher,
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33 ‘Dieu me visita premièremenent en ma femme’. Family diary, p. 42.
34 Brunet, v, 22.
36 Family diary, pp. 41-42; Brunet, v, 10.
and the conseiller in the Châtelet Jean Tardif. L’Estoile had earlier criticised Brisson’s ambition, but reported his calm anticipation of death and his eventual execution as a ‘worthy judgement of God’ that made him a martyr for the resistance in the Parlement to the League. The week after these executions, in a final attempt to assert their authority, members of the Sixteen attempted to purge Paris of any opposition to their Holy Union. They drew up a list of ‘Polитiques’ in every quarter that they named the ‘red paper’. The commissaire in the Châtelet Jacques Bazin and the scribe Pierre Senault composed the list for L’Estoile’s quarter. They marked names on the list with three categories, distinguished by the letters P, D, and C for pendu, dagué, chassé: hanged, knifed, exiled. L’Estoile was shown the list – he did not reveal his source – and saw his name marked D, while his father-in-law Gerard Cotton was marked P, concluding that ‘on this list they put all those (however devout Catholics they are) who, as true Frenchmen, refuse to submit to Spanish domination’. His influential cousin Edouard Molé, conseiller and since January 1589 reluctant procureur général in the Parlement, was also marked P. The Sixteen failed in this coup since their Spanish and Neapolitan soldiers refused to carry out the orders. This moment marks the apogee of the League threat against L’Estoile’s life and he later reported it with an assurance of his protection.

Certain influential office-holders in L’Estoile’s family and kin network did not appear on the red paper. On his mother’s street – the rue Pavée parallel to his rue des Grands Augustins – he revealed that only her Montholon family were missing from the list. Bazin and Senault perhaps recognised in this way the reputation of Hierosme de Montholon,
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37 Barnavi and Descimon, Le juge et la potence.
38 Brunet, v, 119-125; Roelker, p. 208. The assessors of L’Estoile’s inventory found a portrait of Brisson in his study: Greffe-Lothe, p. 37.
41 Brunet, v, 131-134; Roelker, pp. 210-211.
42 Roelker, p. 211.
L'Estoile’s uncle and a conseiller in the Parlement who remained in Paris under the League.\footnote{Brunet, ix, 50. On his actions in the Parlement under the League see Daubresse, \textit{Ligue}, pp. 84, 103-104, 122, 161, 192, 335-336, 341.} Mathieu Chartier also escaped the red paper. He was L'Estoile’s uncle and godfather, a conseiller in the Parlement living on the rue Saint André des Arts. Chartier ran a greater risk than Hierosme de Montholon because the Leaguers suspected him of being a heretic, but at Molé’s instigation his name had been removed from the roll of proscribed Politiques in April 1591.\footnote{Brunet, v, 81.} On 17 May 1591, the Parlement turned to Chartier as its oldest member to take-up the office of président.\footnote{Edouard Maugis, \textit{Histoire du Parlement de Paris de l’avènement des rois Valois à la mort d’Henri IV} (Paris, 1913-1916), ii, 68.} Following the execution of Brisson in November that year, Chartier excused himself from rising to the highest office of premier président on account of his age, and thereafter he rarely returned to the Palais. As the Leaguers in Saint André des Arts threatened them persistently, L'Estoile expressed his solidarity with these neighbours, relations, and significant office-holders.

When L'Estoile tried to leave Paris in these years it was on short trips to manage his affairs, particularly the income from his estates in the Orléanais, and never to depart for good to join his royalist colleagues in Tours. He recorded his dream of leaving the capital on 30 November 1591, the day that the military leader of the League, the duc de Mayenne, promised to chastise those radical members of the Paris Sixteen who had conspired to execute Brisson and draw up the red paper. In the dream, L'Estoile left Paris but was driven back by dogs who surrounded him, barking on all sides. Five weeks later his dream had the significance he feared. He described in his family diary how on 28 December 1591 he left the capital for Saint Denis to put his affairs in order, but he was forced to return on 14 January 1592 since he had not made sufficient preparations.\footnote{Brunet, v, 138; \textit{Family diary}, p. 43.} This was not the first time he had been frustrated in his attempts to leave the capital. On 29 August 1590, along with his step-father
Gerard Cotton and his brother-in-law Alexis Le Bon, he obtained passports to leave since
their supplies of bread had run out, and he even paid fifty écus for an armed guard, but their
trip was halted as the siege was lifted the next day. Following his unproductive trip to Saint
Denis in January 1592, on 23 October that year he returned there with his sister Marguerite,
and with far more success. Monsieur du Four, Governor of Gergeau, helped L’Estoile to
overcome obstacles set up by ‘those who treat me as a Leaguer there [in Saint Denis] – as I
am treated as a “Politique” [in Paris]’. Exploiting his power in the Chancery to smooth his
passage, he used the name of his assistant Bellemanière as a pseudonym. Then in
September and October 1593 he visited Orléans, where he sold his land and farm at Jarceaux
to prop up his ailing resources. These short trips outside of Paris are evidence of L’Estoile’s
commitment to remain in the capital and support his family. He expressed no wish to
abandon his property and his wider family network in Saint André des Arts.

After the defeat of the League, L’Estoile experienced something of a spiritual crisis.
His memoirs of the League ended in triumph soon after Henri IV’s entry into Paris on 22
March 1594. Yet he reflected in his family diary on ‘so many changes wrought by the hand of
God on me and on my family in this year 1595, in which I remark no more signs of his love
towards me, rather his anger’. L’Estoile’s sense of election had perhaps depended on his
struggle against the League and his providential survival under its rule in Paris. Losses in the
family quickly followed the defeat of the League. His son Louis returned home on 25
October 1594, having earlier been captured and then released at Caen, when L’Estoile’s aunt
Marie du Thil and her family paid the ransom of 200 écus. L’Estoile had preferred to let
Louis find his own path to redemption, but was ultimately grateful for his aunt’s intervention.

47 Brunet, v, 49b (NB error in pagination).
48 Brunet, v, 182-183; Roelker, p. 220.
49 Family diary, p. 44; Brunet, vi, 93; Greffe-Lothe, p. 29.
50 Family diary, p. 46.
51 Du Thil also made L’Estoile the gift of four hundred and fifty écus to settle an ‘obligation’ that Louis accrued: Brunet, viii, 282.
When Louis returned – he had not seen his family since November 1589 – L'Estoile forgave him so long as he promised to be a ‘good man, that is to say, in the hand of God’. Not long after this reunion, Louis died on 28 July 1595 as he fought in the royal army at Doullens in Picardy, which was taken by Spanish troops on 21 July before they massacred the garrison there. L'Estoile cried ‘the tears of a father’ and surprised himself with the intensity of his grieving. Two months later, on 27 September, L'Estoile’s great friend and brother-in-law Claude de Marteau died suddenly from an illness that L'Estoile thanked God for preventing from spreading to the rest of his family. What is more, L'Estoile’s financial anxieties accumulated during the League years, compounded by the need to repurchase his office.

Marriages for two of his daughters at this time only temporarily lightened his mood as they strengthened family ties in the parish, in the Palais de Justice, and with his relatives in Normandy. Marguerite (b. 1575) married Adrien Le Pelletier, sieur de Grainville at Rouen in late 1594. After this marriage, L'Estoile signed a procuration to announce to his other daughters with his first wife Anne de Baillon that he could not give them a dowry as favourable as Marguerite had received, since this was a particularly profitable match. His daughter Anne (b.1573) married on 8 October 1595 the avocat in the Parlement Jean de Poussemothe, a neighbour on the rue des Grands Augustins and a friend to L'Estoile during

52 Family diary, p. 45.
54 Family diary, pp. 45-46.
55 Family diary, p. 46.
56 Family diary, p. 45. Nevertheless, on 21 July 1595 he was able to lend Claude Anjorrat, sieur de Cloye, 2,400 livres by purchasing from him a constitution de rente worth 100 livres annually, recorded on its ultimate settlement: AN MC CXXII 1596, 24 June 1618; Greffe-Lothe, p. 1073.
57 Family diary, p. 45. Marguerite lodged with L'Estoile’s aunt Nicole du Thil (née Montholon) who married Jacques Jubert, Sire du Thil of the Parlement of Rouen in 1587. Nicole du Thil granted Marguerite 1,000 écus for her dowry at the end of 1587: Family diary, p. 40. L'Estoile’s mother and Nicole’s sister, Marguerite de Montholon, contributed 333 écus to Marguerite’s dowry immediately before the wedding: AN MC LXXIII 223, 10 November 1594 and L'Estoile transported the revenues of three of the constitutions de rentes from his mother’s succession to his daughter Marguerite and her husband on 27 September 1600 and at the same time sold a constitution de rente to them of fifty livres so as to borrow 500 livres, which he returned on 9 April 1601, immediately after the sale of his office: AN MC CXXII 1543, 27 September 1600; AN MC CXXII 357, 9 April 1601.
58 AN MC LXXIII 223, 10 November 1594; Greffe-Lothe, p. 87.
the troubles of the League. She required no dowry beyond her wedding dress and a grant to be free of the debts carried in her mother’s inheritance. L’Estoile welcomed their marriage for the reputation of her husband and the little he demanded of them in return, ‘fearing to refuse a gift that God presented to me as I was sleeping’. Their marriage was witnessed on L’Estoile’s side by his mother and step-father along with the conseiller in the Parlement Hiérosme de Montholon, the avocat in the Parlement Jacques de Montholon, the conseiller Edouard Molé, and the président Mathieu Chartier. All these witnesses were office HOLDERS in the Parlement who remained in Paris under the League. It is likely that their decisions to remain in Paris shaped L’Estoile’s own decision to stay with their protection.

L’Estoile’s family diary ends in 1595 in misery rather than triumph. He had remained in Paris under the League with his family and kin, safeguarding his office and property, and justifying his actions by reporting a strong sense of God’s protection. The defeat of the League removed the spiritual enemy that had confirmed his sense of election, and significant deaths in the family made him fear that God’s grace had left him. He copied a closing ‘Christian sonnet’ into the final page of his family diary that responds to the troubles of the League and the sufferings of his family, with a rare reference to the devil’s influence in his diaries, as he reflected on ‘Tant d’accidens de ceste pauvre vie / Mille malheurs par Satan excite’. But the sonnet does not let anxiety give way to doubt or weakness, concluding with a plea for God’s mercy, and for Him to ‘ren mes épaules fortes’. L’Estoile drew on the strength of his faith to compose his history of the League in Paris.

59 Family diary, p. 46. AN MC LXXIII 227, 8 October 1595; Greffe-Lothe, pp. 86-87. Poussemothe might have been L’Estoile’s source for his report of Brisson’s last days: Brunet, v, 120. AN MC LXXIII 227, 8 October 1595; Greffe-Lothe, pp. 86-87.
60 Family Diary, p. 47.
II. Memoirs of the League

L'Estoile related the troubles of the League in what he called his ‘Memoirs’ for these years, giving an accurate account of ‘the most memorable things that occurred following the death of the previous king [Henri III] until the reduction of Paris ... that is to say, the things that I have seen and whose occurrence I have remarked on out of curiosity’. 61 His positive use of the term ‘curiosity’ in this passage positions the fragments of narrative in the memoirs alongside their companion pieces in his antiquarian collector’s cabinet as a store of useful information. 62 This section analyses L'Estoile’s reception of news under the League and his strategies of verifying and narrating it in his memoirs. First, he relied on his eyewitness testimony, or otherwise the testimony of ‘trustworthy men’ and sometimes trustworthy women. 63 The genre of personal ‘memoirs’ of public affairs, as opposed to his earlier, relatively impersonal ‘registre-journal’ or his relatively private family diary, served his needs as he cultivated a prominent authorial voice, justifying his position among the elite gens de bien in the Parlement against the base rumour-mongers of the League. 64 Second, he depended on authentic textual sources that he compiled in his study and referred to throughout his memoirs of the League. These strategies ensured the manuscript’s successful reception among Parisian office-holders, brokered by the young avocat Pierre Dupuy.

It is impossible to determine precisely when L'Estoile composed his memoirs of the League, but it is likely that he substantially revised them in retrospect. 65 Many pages he left
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61 ‘ce qui s’est passé de plus memorable depuis la mort du feu Roy jusques à la reduction de Paris ... c’est à dire de ce que j’ya ay veu et remarqué curieusement estre advenu’. Brunet, ix, 22.
63 Brunet, ix, 22.
blank for later additions and it is clear that he composed his reports over some time, making more revisions to this manuscript than perhaps to any other in his cabinet. To protect his office and reputation, it was essential for him to present these memoirs in a way that confirmed his resistance to the League. He described its pages as being ‘rather scribbled over’ with some passages difficult to understand without his assistance. As with the manuscripts of his other diaries, he claimed that these memoirs were initially composed ‘only for me’, but later undermined his claim as he willingly lent them to Pierre Dupuy on 10 November 1607, along with a great many documents from his miscellanies of the League. He recorded that he added certain passages significantly after the event and still more phrases reveal a strong degree of hindsight. A report dated 28 June 1593, with no revision to this particular passage in the manuscript, recorded the verification in the Parlement of the crucial judgement that confirmed the application of Salic Law in determining the primacy of heredity by the male line in the royal succession, thus ensuring the accession of Henri de Navarre as Henri IV. L’Estoile added that ‘even today’ it is known as ‘the arrêt of président Le Maistre’ after the celebrated royalist who proposed it to the Great Chamber. When Pierre Dupuy borrowed L’Estoile’s manuscript of his memoirs of the League in 1607 he also asked to see this judgement. Over a decade after the events he described, L’Estoile’s knowledge of the events of the League remained urgent.

L’Estoile’s memoirs of the League depend on his eyewitness evidence because available information was particularly uncertain in these years of devastating civil war. They contain a greater number of what he declared to be rumours than any other years in his diaries. Early modern diarists might use the term ‘rumour’ and its cognates to mark a degree of distance from the stories they reported, as it stood for an absent source and declared that a
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66 Brunet, ix, 22.
67 Brunet, x, 171-187.
68 BnF ms. fr. 10299, fol. 976; Brunet, vi, 41, Brunet, ix, 23.
story could not be verified on the terms presented. They might elide rumour and ‘opinion’ in the negative sense, as the folly of uninformed popular speech. L'Estoile invoked the concept of rumour most frequently to deny reports of imminent war and peace. He scorned a ‘bruit of peace’ on 17 August 1590 by determining that it was ‘founded on a common desire’. Typically, rumours about peace spread when certain influential figures were spotted leaving Paris to meet with Henri de Navarre. Sometimes uncertain information that circulated and later turned out to be true was worth reporting in its own right, such as when contradictory rumours circulated in Paris about the length of the renewed truce between the armies of Henri de Navarre and the League on 22 July 1593, among which L'Estoile singled out the correct version. Rumours also concerned significant figures in the civil wars. L'Estoile scorned false information concerning the alleged deaths of Theodore Beza, Philip II of Spain, the duc d’Epernon, the duc de Montpensier, and James VI of Scotland. The most common subjects of this sort of rumour were the life, death, and confessional choice of Henri de Navarre. In all these cases, L'Estoile’s use of the term rumour creates elisions between a piece of unverified information and a piece of information that he knew to be false.

L'Estoile reported his personal investigation to disprove a false report on 29 April 1592, when he pursued one rumour that ‘was spreading everywhere’. Crosses had allegedly appeared on altar vestments at several churches, including the church of Saint Barthélemy on
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71 At least twenty-two instances reported in Brunet vols. v, vi using terms associated with ‘rumour’.
72 Brunet, v, 48.
73 Brunet, v, 48, 162, 178
74 Brunet, vi, 61.
75 Brunet, v, 57, 95, 98, 175, vi, 56, 90-91.
76 Brunet, v, 179, 181, vi, 4, 61, 86.
77 On the flexibility of the term ‘rumour’ and its cognates see Philip Hardie, Rumour and Renown: Representations of Fama in Western Literature (Cambridge, 2012), pp. 3-11.
the Ile de la Cité, which L'Estoile also visited, following his curiosity. He saw there a cloth displayed by the curate to be kissed, but soon retired from the crowd ‘softly’, ‘tout doucement’, having seen nothing on the cloth that was not on his own handkerchief. He noticed several ‘Politiques’ among the spectators, eager to mock a new miracle. Similar crosses were seen on altar cloths at Bourges in 1591, reported in a contemporary print published by Gilles Bichon in Paris. L'Estoile’s calm, critical reporting – repeating that he acted ‘tut doucement’ – contrasted with the ‘press’ of the ‘multitude of people’ at the church. While he reported the rumour of the supposedly miraculous crosses with wry humour, he was damning when he claimed to have tracked down the source of a false rumour. The most pernicious culprit he identified was an unnamed League notary, a ‘poor ignoramus’, who spread four false rumours on 17 March 1593 and forged a marriage contract for the duc de Guise and the Infanta of Spain, supposed to resolve the crisis of the succession in the League’s favour. Rumour was a regrettable, destabilising presence in society and posed a problem for L'Estoile as he planned to compose his memoirs based on reliable information. He took up his pen both to report and denounce the rumours circulating in Paris under the League.

Some of the most pernicious false rumours that L'Estoile denounced in Paris in these years came from the pulpits. Sermons were a critical mode of political communication in the Wars of Religion. Popular preachers encouraged the violence of the early civil wars. Many Parisian curates joined the League and preached its cause, and so L'Estoile associated them

---

78 Brunet, v, 93.
79 Des croix miraculeuses apparues en la ville de Bourges (Paris, 1591).
80 Brunet, v, 227-228.
with false information and the manipulation of the people.\textsuperscript{82} Preserving their slanders for posterity, he sometimes took notes on particularly virulent sermons when he left a mass and reported them in his memoirs of the League.\textsuperscript{83} On 24 March 1591, the advertisements circulated by preachers ahead of their sermons claimed that Navarre had made a false conversion. They proceeded to preach what L'Estoile called ‘a magazine of insults that they spewed against the King’. L'Estoile reported gross insults from Christophe Aubry (Saint André des Arts), Jean Boucher (Saint Benoît), Jacques de Cueilly (Saint Germain de l’Auxerrois), Guillaume Rose (bishop of Senlis), Guillaume Lucain (Doctor of Theology), and Jacques Commolet (a Jesuit), concluding ‘voila, a sample of the sermons that were delivered on this day in Paris’.\textsuperscript{84} This report is typical of the tone of L’Estoile’s notes on sermons under the League, as he focused on the polemical claims made by the most committed League preachers, to the exclusion of the doctrine explained in the rest of the sermon.\textsuperscript{85} Published sermons by preachers typically directed their coherent argument at a learned audience, in contrast to their typically emotive performance from the pulpit intended for saving souls.\textsuperscript{86} However, Jean Boucher’s sermons on Navarre’s conversion also read like a League libel and systematically set out the same position that L'Estoile recorded in fragments of reports of his sermons.\textsuperscript{87} While it is implausible that L’Estoile attended quite so many sermons on one Sunday as he reported on 24 March 1591, he regularly reported sermons grouped together in this way, perhaps visiting several in one day and relying on

\textsuperscript{83} Brunet, vi, 11, 161.
\textsuperscript{84} Brunet, v, 76-78. On these preachers: Anglo, Curés, pp. 629, 651-652, 676-677; Thierry Amalou, Le lys et la mitre: Loyalisme monarchique et pouvoir épiscopal pendant les guerres de religion, 1580-1610 (Paris, 2007), pp. 91-161.
\textsuperscript{86} Hunt, Art of Hearing, pp. 117-186.
\textsuperscript{87} Jean Boucher, Sermons de la simulée conversion et nullité de la pretendu absolution de Henry de Bourbon, prince de Bearn à S. Denys en France, le dimenche 25.7.1593 (Paris, 1594); Brunet, vi, 26, 30-32, 36, 54, 76, 79; Labitte, Prédicateurs, pp. 266-278.
others’ reports to supplement his notes. In denouncing the false rumours of Leaguer sermons, L’Estoile trusted that his respectable readers would rely on these fragmentary, polemical reports.

Attending one’s parish church sustained a fragile sense of neighbourhood solidarity through the troubles of the League, fragile because so-called ‘Politiques’ were often denounced from the pulpit. On 1 May 1592 Christophe Aubry, the campaigning Leaguer curate of Saint André des Arts, ‘said that whoever was to open the belly of many in this parish would find there a fat Béarnois [Henri de Navarre]’. The participation of ‘Politiques’ at masses perhaps settled suspicious neighbours into accepting their continued presence in the parish. L’Estoile joined his parish in a procession to Saint-Jacques de la Boucherie, with the declared intention of praying to Saint Jacques ‘to ask him to use his staff to strike the head off that devil of a Béarnois and to crush him in front of everyone’. Not all of the parishioners placidly accepted their curate’s attitude. L’Estoile’s great aunt Louise Boudet, Madame de Séguier, accused the curate of hypocrisy after the assassination in May 1588 of an accused Huguenot, the teacher Mercier, just days after the curate had given Mercier communion in the parish. Aubry threatened to throw her into the Seine for her insolence. Subsequently, Aubry denounced Boudet from the pulpit for performing acts of charity and feigning to be a good Catholic while her sons served Navarre in Tours. By attending these sermons, L’Estoile helped ensure his safety in Paris under the League, and by recording them he denounced their false information and sharpened the polemic of his memoirs.

A common means of responding to the problem of uncertain information in early modern Europe was to gather direct visual and oral evidence that could be verified by reliable
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89 Brunet, v, 168.
90 Brunet, v, 87.
91 Brunet, iii, 156-157.
individuals. L'Estoile relied in this way on a close group of friends and informants among his family and at the Palais de Justice. A Royal Secretary among his friends reported to him a conversation he had on 3 November 1592 with Anne d’Este, duchesse de Nemours, widow of the duc de Guise, as she pressed him for news from Paris. Incidents beyond L'Estoile’s immediate society in the parish of Saint André des Arts and the Ile de la Cité particularly demanded verification. On 11 August 1590, L'Estoile was walking with his brother Du Couldrai and his brother-in-law Claude de Marteau by the Croix Saint Eustache when they saw a poor woman who was eating the skin of a dog. Claude told L'Estoile that he would write it in his own register, so their reports might reinforce one-another. Information sometimes moved too fast to be verified. On 1 August 1590 L'Estoile saw on the gates of Saint-Innocent, at the entrance to the market of Les Halles on the Right Bank, ‘a pleasant drollery’ that represented the League chief, the duc de Mayenne with a great pair of scissors above his head, known as his ‘forces’, with the description inscribed ‘I CANNOT HAVE MY FORCES’, mocking Mayenne’s incapacity to raise troops. But when he returned at midday with his brother-in-law Alexis Le Bon and his nephew Tronson it had already been cleaned off. Lacking direct testimony, L'Estoile at least reported his efforts as he aimed to capture trustworthy evidence of public criticism of the League. While L'Estoile might wander far outside of his familiar world of the Left Bank and the Palais de Justice to gather reports for his memoirs of the League, when he did so he relied on relations, friends, and colleagues to verify and respond to the information he gathered.

L'Estoile also used textual sources to verify rumours and establish accounts of events, copying these documents into his memoirs or referring his readers back to his large collection

94 Brunet, v, 187-189.
95 Brunet, v, 46.
96 ‘JE NE PUIS AVOIR MES FORCES’, Brunet, v, 39; El Kenz, ‘La propagande’.
of miscellanies for this period that he stored in his cabinet. Manuscript letters circulated fast in Paris concerning news the wars of the League, with terrible repercussions when sensitive information fell into the wrong hands. The Parlement condemned to death in separate cases of conspiracy against the League the royal secretary Jean Trimel on 5 October 1591 and the court astrologer François Liberati on 17 December 1591, after they each sent letters out of the capital to Navarre or his party that gave details of the whereabouts of significant Leaguers. L’Estoile read and copied Trimel’s letter on his desk in the Chancery, then transcribed it into his memoirs, but he was not permitted access to the details of Liberati’s conspiracy, so he had to make do with copying the libel that Liberati composed against the duc de Guise.97 Offering his readers a reference guide to pieces in his cabinet, L’Estoile mentioned in his memoirs letters or papers that he had copied to increase his collection. He kept among his papers one letter from Henri de Navarre addressed to Gabrielle d’Estrées about his abjuration, but L’Estoile did not add this piece to his memoirs simply because he did not take the time to copy it out, adding that he should copy it out again later.98 The most reliable pieces he came across were documents in the king’s hand.99 L’Estoile might record with precision the sources for pieces he collected, as when Mademoiselle Caminat, his mother’s neighbour, gave his mother a letter written from the royalist prisons in Tours by Edmé Bourgoing, prior of the Jacobins in Paris and an ardent Leaguer inculcated in Jacques Clement’s tyrannicide. Bourgoing cast himself as a martyr for the League, ‘already half in Paradise’. L’Estoile copied and circulated this letter, then inserted it into one of his miscellanies of the League, ‘bound in parchment, in the form of music’, which recalls the volume also ‘bound in

97 Trimel: see above pp. 95-96. Liberati: Brunet, v, 147; APP AB 11, fol. 61r; AN X2A 957, 11, 14, 16, 17, 20 December 1591, 17, 23 January 1592, Soman Collection; AN X2B 165, 17 December 1591.
98 Brunet, vi, 64.
99 Brunet, v, 49b-50b (NB error in pagination).
parchment, in-8°, in the form of music, inscribed: *Drolleries de la Ligue*, that he lent to Pierre Dupuy on 8 July 1607.¹⁰⁰

By recording the provenance and location in his cabinet of documents that he copied into his memoirs of the League, L'Estoile made them a store of useful information. On 10 November 1607 he lent Pierre Dupuy the manuscript of his memoirs for the League years, since he could not refuse it to a friend who had given him so much ‘curious and secret’ information for his collection.¹⁰¹ In the following months he continued to lend Dupuy a whole sequence of now lost miscellanies of the League that he had copied and compiled, marked in his own hand.¹⁰² Once Dupuy gave L’Estoile in return a piece on the League that he had not been able to locate.¹⁰³ A copy in L'Estoile’s hand of a poem by Florent Chrestien criticising royal clemency after the defeat of the League survives in the Dupuy collection.¹⁰⁴ Chapter Six discusses the exchanges between these men in much greater detail, but here it is important to note that Dupuy came to visit L'Estoile particularly to see pieces related to the history of the League. These exchanges encouraged Dupuy as he developed his vocation as an ardent defender of the liberties of the Gallican Church.¹⁰⁵

L'Estoile in his memoirs of the League tackled the problem of uncertain information in these years by investigating and denouncing rumours, gathering eye-witness testimonies, and collecting authentic textual sources. Associating the problem of uncertain information with the League was one strategy that L'Estoile deployed in denouncing to his readers its pernicious rule in Paris. In the case of sermons, the polemical tone of his reports outweighed the need to present full and accurate information. The reports in L'Estoile’s memoirs, and the
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¹⁰⁰ *qui est relié en parchemin en forme de musique*; ‘relié en parchemin, in-8°, en forme de musique, inscrit: *Drolleries de la Ligue*, dans lequel il y a force pasquils et folies, que j’ay toutes receuillies ailleurs manuscrites’. Brunet, v, 10-11, viii, 319. The letter is also copied with further information in Armitage, pp. 104-105, a miscellany which does not fit this description.
¹⁰¹ Brunet, ix, 22.
¹⁰² Brunet, ix, 196, 202, 203-204, 206, 212.
¹⁰³ Brunet, x, 202.
¹⁰⁴ BnF ms. Dupuy 843, fols. 199r-201v.
compelling testimony he deployed to back them up, have helped to define the reputation of the League ever since.

III. Drolleries of the League

Ephemeral prints, amassed in a bulging scrapbook miscellany, served L'Estoile as compelling proof of the illegitimacy and populism of the League as it tried to persuade the people of Paris of the truth of its cause. He put together ‘a great folio of pictures and placards … which I should have thrown in the fire, as they deserved, except that they may serve in some way to show and expose the abuses, impostures, vanities, and furies of this great monster of the League’. This great folio formed ‘Les belles Figures et Drolleries de la Ligue’. ‘Drolleries’ is a word L'Estoile used to refer dismissively to the cheap print that he acquired. The term also described jocular genre pictures in contemporary household inventories, including ‘a village drollery, 40 sols’ and a ‘a painted silk where there is a drollery from Flanders, 40 sols’. Most suggestively, L'Estoile’s use of the term also recalls Jean Calvin’s mockery of Catholic relics as ‘baggage and trifles’, marking his miscellaneous assembly and defacement of these prints as an act of iconoclasm. The term’s range of associations suggests that this collection of printed ephemera possessed both mundane and extraordinary spiritual significance. As L'Estoile manipulated its pages, he engaged in the final conflict of the Wars of Religion and shaped its memory for future generations.

106 Roelker, p. 177; Lazard-Schrenck, vi, 174-175.
107 Eg. Brunet, ix, 103.
L'Estoile’s manuscript of *Drolleries* is a unique survival that gives unparalleled insight into the Parisian world of print and the circulation and reception of information under the League. Yet historians have not systematically exploited this potential and instead cited L'Estoile and his *Drolleries* anecdotally in order to bolster their own claims. Denis Pallier argued that the enormous published output of the League, especially in 1588-1589 (Figure 5.1), constituted an organised propaganda campaign.\(^{110}\) While Pallier’s account is authoritative and deeply researched, its use of the term propaganda lacks subtlety, and it is least convincing on the issue of reception, relying on isolated passages from L'Estoile and a small number of contemporary memoirs.\(^{111}\) Revisionist historians of early modern print culture have eschewed the term ‘propaganda’, defined in this period by a concern with the propagation and dissemination of the Catholic faith in missionary work, since it represents a top-down view of political communication, obscuring the diverse responses of individuals who took part in political debates, or who remained beyond the control of dominant institutions.\(^{112}\) They have explored the complex rhetorical strategies of polemical literature, but their studies typically do not address satisfactorily the evidence for the effective reception of print, tending to focus on the representation of ideal readers within texts and the appropriation of passages between them.\(^{113}\) A large body of scholarship continues these lines of enquiry beyond pamphlet literature to explore the genres and rhetorical strategies of different forms of polemic in early modern Europe, especially images, songs, and sermons,
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\(^{110}\) Importantly, he also pointed out when differences of opinion within the League were reflected in its publications as the movement evolved. Pallier, *L'imprimerie à Paris*, pp. 55-145, especially 80-83, 103-109; Alexander Wilkinson, *Mary Queen of Scots and French Public Opinion* (Basingstoke, 2004), p. 126.


\(^{113}\) A significant study of this type is Baranova, *Libelles*, pp. 189-206, 413-464. Major exceptions to this tendency, providing detailed evidence of the reception of print, are Jason Peacey, *Print and Public Politics in the English Revolution* (Cambridge, 2013) and De Vivo, *Information and Communication in Venice*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Pallier: League Publications</th>
<th>Wilkinson: Catholic Polemical Output</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1585</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1586</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1587</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1588</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1589</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>1038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1590</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1591</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1592</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1593</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
leading to an emerging consensus about the elements of a post-Reformation ‘culture of persuasion’.\footnote{Andrew Pettegree, \textit{Reformation and the Culture of Persuasion} (Cambridge, 2005), gives an important synthesis.}

To move beyond anecdotal claims about the impact of Leaguer print it is necessary to interrogate L'Estoile’s responses in detail, not just in isolated passages in his diaries but by setting these reports against the texts that he preserved, to evaluate how he engaged with them directly. Pallier and other historians of the League assume that its print and other means of persuasion were effective because that is what L'Estoile reported.\footnote{See p. 164 n.1.} To an extent, they have been seduced by his apparently reliable, eyewitness account. The only way in which much of the so-called popular print of the League survived is by its place in L'Estoile’s elite collection. An edict published on 2 April 1594, following Henri IV’s victorious entry into Paris, banned the sale and display of these publications and ordered them seized by the 
\textit{lieutenant civil}, L'Estoile’s cousin Jean Séguier, Sire d’Autruy, and his \textit{commissaires}, so that they might be brought to the sites of public executions to be burned.\footnote{AN Y 19, 2 April 1594. On its application see Brunet, vi, 201. Further printed images from the League years are collected in BnF Cabinet des Estampes, Qb1 1558-1589, 1589-1610, and BnF Collection Hennin, catalogued in \textit{Inventaire de la collection d'estampes relatives à l'histoire de France léguée en 1863 à la Bibliothèque nationale par M. Michel Hennin}, ed. Georges Duplessis (Paris, 1877), i, 93-134.} By going to extreme lengths in order to preserve for posterity prints that deserved to be destroyed, L'Estoile engaged in a comparable practice to the \textit{conseillers} in the Parlement, Pierre Pithou and Guillaume du Vair, who, when charged by Henri IV with purging the archives of the Parlement of Paris under the League, copied and assembled in a miscellany many of the most significant pieces.\footnote{Daubresse, \textit{Ligue}.}

The \textit{Drolleries} bridge several genres. They form a visual history of the troubles of the League.\footnote{Comparable with Philip Benedict, \textit{Graphic History: The Wars, Massacres and Troubles of Tortorel and Perrisin} (Geneva, 2007).} L'Estoile selected for his compilation pieces that supported his chronological approach to document the movement’s rise and fall. They also act as a miscellaneous anti-
League libel.\textsuperscript{119} L'Estoile denounced the League through the evidence of its own publications, appropriating pieces that supported his argument. Further, L'Estoile compiled the \textit{Drolleries} in an act of iconoclasm, identifying these objects of false piety with scornful laughter, and then defacing them in his miscellany, preserving the remnants of material that deserved destruction.\textsuperscript{120} L'Estoile’s approach to this miscellany follows his use of eyewitness reports and textual evidence in his ‘memoirs’ of the League, since he compiled the \textit{Drolleries} so as to use the materiality of the texts as evidence of his direct engagement with them. It also follows the way he wrote about his life in Paris under the League with God’s grace. By assembling and defacing the \textit{Drolleries} of the League, L'Estoile cut through the movement’s printed polemic, exposing its false devotion, populism, and rebellion against the king.\textsuperscript{121}

The manuscript of the \textit{Drolleries} is a compiled scrapbook, its forty-six folio pages measuring 54cm in height x 36cm in width. It is impossible to establish precisely how and when these collection pages were put together. Throughout the manuscript are pasted loose sheets of prints and manuscripts, sometimes heavily clipped, many of them annotated in L'Estoile’s hand. Some pieces are pasted onto the pages of the manuscript, others are pasted together to form entirely new pages. L'Estoile did not report that he circulated this folio volume of the \textit{Drolleries}. It passed into the library of the Abbey of Saint Acheul in Amiens with many of his other manuscripts, inherited by his great-great-grandson Pierre Poussemouth de L’Esteile, and has been rebound at least three times since the seventeenth century.\textsuperscript{122} The reception history of the \textit{Drolleries} warns that generations of restorers, family inheritors, and perhaps even L'Estoile’s amanuenses may well have had a hand in the

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{119 Comparable with Cécile Huchard, \textit{D’encre et de sang: Simon Goulart et la Saint-Barthélemy} (Paris, 2007).}
\footnote{122 Notes bound in with the manuscript of the \textit{Drolleries}.}
\end{footnotes}
composition of this manuscript. However, the thematic coherence of the collection, and L'Estoile’s numerous annotations to the pieces, suggest that L'Estoile himself predominantly guided the structure and arrangement of pieces in the collection.

Pieces compiled in the *Drolleries* mark stages in a narrative of the rise and fall of the League. The first new folio pages after the frontispiece open the collection with sympathetic depictions of ‘the cruelties endured by Catholics in England for the faith’, a series of five engravings with accompanying text (Figure 7). They depict the arrests, interrogations, imprisonment, condemnation, and execution of English Catholics. The images’ power came from French Catholics’ fear that Henri de Navarre would emulate the religious policy of Elizabeth I in England, summarised with all manner of gruesome executions outside London in the fifth engraving of the series. L'Estoile discussed in a marginal annotation to these pieces, a passage he repeated in his diary, how in July 1587 Madame de Montpensier and the curate of Saint Severin displayed companion paintings to these engravings in the cemetery of that parish. L'Estoile observed how crowds of people went to see these paintings, crying that the ‘Politiques’ and Huguenots should be exterminated. Edmund Stafford, the English ambassador, complained to the king about this display, and relayed to Francis Walsingham that ‘I thinke nott so few as five thousand people a daye come to see ytt, and some Inglyshe knave priests thatt be there, theie pointe with a rodde and shewe everythinge, affirme ytt to be true and aggravate ytt’. At Stafford’s request, Henri III ordered the Parlement to remove the paintings without trouble. L'Estoile reported that they reappeared in the cathedral of Notre Dame before being finally removed, again at the request of the English

123 Perhaps they are are the only surviving examples of a series of engravings by Richard Verstegen that were seized from him by the English Ambassador to France, Edmund Stafford: Stuart Carroll, ‘The Revolt of Paris, 1588: Aristocratic Insurgency and the Mobilization of Popular Support 1588’, *French Historical Studies*, 23 (2000), p. 319 n.75; Katy Gibbons, *English Catholic Exiles in Late Sixteenth-Century Paris* (Woodbridge, 2011), pp. 90-91; TNA SP 78/11, fol. 7r. The images in L'Estoile’s report are often described as being those in Richard Verstegen’s *Theatre of Cruelties*. The scenes in these prints are similar but not identical to those in Verstegen’s editions. Compare Richard Verstegen, *Theatrum crudelitatum haereticorum nostri temporis* (Antwerp, 1587), pp. 69-85; Richard Verstegen, *Theatrum crudelitatum hereticiorum nostri temporis* (Antwerp, 1588), pp. 69-86; *Drolleries*, fols. 2r-3r, 4v, esp. Verstegan, *Theatrum*, p. 73 and *Drolleries*, fol. 3r.
ambassador, after Henri IV’s entry into Paris in March 1594. Responses to these images depended on one’s point of view. For L'Estoile and Stafford, the crowds in Saint Severin were aroused by the fearful persecution on display and compelled to call for action against their enemies. The engravings survive in L'Estoile’s collection as historical specimens of the populist beginning to the rise of the League that threatened a return to the violence of the early civil wars.\textsuperscript{124}

The fifth folio of the \textit{Drolleries} depicts an assembled collection of pieces that L'Estoile labelled as ‘the penitents of Henri III that will not better those of the League’. This page positions the king’s penitential processions of the 1580s as rivals to the charismatic white penitent processions that spread across northern France in 1583, and were characteristic of the piety that L'Estoile abhorred in the League in 1589.\textsuperscript{125} L'Estoile pasted together four separate prints of white penitents and one sheet of blue penitents, subsequently rearranged by librarians so that three of the sheets of white penitents formed a complete set, surrounded by their border (Figures 8, 9).\textsuperscript{126} He added the phrase, ‘to remove the bees from the nest, one needs the habit of a penitent’, taken from a satirical poem copied into his compilation of poems for the end of the year 1585. Its significance depends on a libel mocking Henri III’s penitence, now lost, that depicted the king cowering under his habit to avoid being stung by bees, in which the bees represent the Leaguers, stinging Henri III for trying to grab at their

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{124} Brunet, iv, 13-25, v, 189; Lazard-Schrenck, v, 305-307; TNA SP 78/17, fol. 191r; Crouzet, \textit{Guerriers}, ii, 205, 229 n.81; Carroll, ‘The Revolt of Paris, 1588’, pp. 318-320; Wilkinson, \textit{Opinion}, pp. 103-109; Gibbons, \textit{English Catholic Exiles}, pp. 84-86. It is not clear whom L'Estoile referred to as the English Ambassador in March 1594 and I have found no mention of this event in TNA SP. Sir Robert Sidney acted as Special Ambassador at that time, before being recalled in early April 1594: Gary M. Bell, \textit{A Handlist of British Diplomatic Representatives, 1509-1688} (London, 1990), p. 99.
\item \textsuperscript{126} On Henri III and the blue penitents: Yates, \textit{Astraea}, pp. 176, 201. The rearrangement described in the notes included in the \textit{Drolleries}. 
\end{itemize}
honey, or the pious practices that they made their own. In the intertextual web of
L'Estoile’s diaries and miscellanies, these collectible prints scorn Henri III’s failed project of
penitential and political reform as it clashed with the impious agenda of the nascent League.

A major sequence of publications in the Drolleries denounces Henri III and the
assassination he ordered of the duke and cardinal de Guise on 23 December 1588 at Blois.
Historians have extensively analysed their iconography and rhetorical strategies. Their
arrangement by L'Estoile piles up and denounces evidence of the efforts made by League
publishers to demonise their allegedly traitorous royal opponent, as they hailed the Guise as
martyrs for their cause. A coloured broadsheet woodcut depicting the effigies of the Guise
brothers (Figure 10) stands out among these images as L'Estoile used it to demonstrate how
the people of Paris responded to the death of the Guise brothers by rallying to the cause of the
League. At the centre of the image is Christ on the cross, rising above the effigies of the
Guise brothers lying in state, surrounded by candles and set against a curtain of silver tears
that suspends their coat of arms and instruments of the passion. Verses relate how the
brothers were massacred in the name of Christ and demand vengeance. L'Estoile’s annotation
explains that the effigy was ‘Carried in processions at Paris and elsewhere, in January and
February 1589, where boys and girls, men and women all mixed together, most of them
barefoot and wearing nothing but a shirt, although it was bitterly cold … which I would not
have believed, if I had not seen it myself’. He reported several similar processions in his

127 Lazard-Schrenck, v, 98-108, 103; Baranova, Libelles, pp. 182-183, citing Palma Cayet, Chronologie
novenaire in Joseph-François Michaud and Jean-Joseph-François Poujoulat eds., Nouvelle collection des
mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de France (Paris, 1838), xii, 31-32.
128 Keith Cameron, A Maligned or Malignant King? Aspects of the Satirical Iconography of Henri de Valois
(Exeter, 1978); David A. Bell, ‘Unmasking a King: The Political Uses of Popular Literature under the French
127-130; Alexander Wilkinson, ‘Homicides Royaux: The Assassination of the duc and cardinal de Guise and
174-188, 316-326.
129 Brunet, iv, 46-47; Drolleries, fol. 10r.
diaries for these months that he scorned as evidence of the ‘foolish devotion of the people’. This print that was incorporated into the Parisians’ procession stands in the *Drolleries* as a surrogate and direct material evidence of their false piety. L'Estoile’s collecting is an act of iconoclastic de-sacralisation, stripping the image of the power attributed to it by the League, and deriding the wider process by which the broadsheet became a relic of the martyrdom of the Guise brothers.

L'Estoile’s annotations to pieces in the *Drolleries* also parodied the libels contained in the collection, appropriating their tactics to mock the prints he displayed and to constitute his own libel against the League. He compiled on fol. 16r (Figure 11) three depictions of Jacques Clement, the Dominican friar who assassinated Henri III on 2 August 1589, before he was killed on the spot by the king’s guards, straightaway heralded by the Leaguers as a saint and martyr for their cause. L'Estoile annotated one piece to claim that the League’s tactics of persuasion brainwashed its audiences: ‘Honoured publicly in Paris with the name of Martyr, even by Preachers, so much has the Devil cast a spell over the spirits of men’. Exempting himself from this category of reader, L'Estoile appropriated on this page the hagiographical portraits of Clement produced by the League, pasting them together to form a new page in the miscellany, not on a background but glued together and overlapping one-another. Demanding attention near the centre of the page, L'Estoile defaced an engraved portrait by adding an anagram of ‘F. Jacques Clement’: ‘C’est l’enfer qui m’a crée’, or ‘I was born in hell’, revealing the truth hidden behind the name. This page demonstrates L'Estoile’s work of defacement and desacralisation in the *Drolleries*, carried out against the diabolic print and false piety proffered by the League.

The visual effect of the pages of the miscellany that are compiled from pasted-together publications of the League is to highlight their ephemerality and illegitimacy. These
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130 Lazard-Schrenck, vi, 145.
pieces only survive because they have been collected and preserved, and they have only been preserved because they carry the trace of their seditious design. The sheer weight of the evidence of this ephemeral print that L’Estoile assembled is damning, suggesting a density both of printed output and public exposure. An arrangement of loose-leaf song-sheets pasted together to form a new page is exemplary in this sense. Fol. 25r (Figure 12) presents a cacophony of the League, a complete assault on the senses. L’Estoile described these songs as ‘found in the great bird cage, in Paris’, the deafening cries of the ‘little birdies of the League’, replete with ‘mad buffooneries, dirty and odorous slander’ against Henri de Navarre. The page displays four song-sheets and another on its reverse, concerning the assassination of Henri III, the defence of Pontoise, and attacks on Henri de Navarre.

Reinforcing L’Estoile’s claim about their popularity, two of the songs, as well as another song-sheet pasted earlier in the Drolleries praising Jacques Clement, were selected for a songbook edited in 1590 by the League printer Nicolas Bonfons, which bears no dedication and is addressed ‘to the French people’. Certain passages envisaged ideal readers among the devout laity: ‘Qu’on puisse voir en boutique, / Le pauvre artisan chanter / Quelque victoire ou cantique / Pour son esprit contenter’. Historians have argued that, because of their oral transmission and mnemonic verse, songs were the most accessible form of poetic libels. They also contained sophisticated political and theological arguments. The noise of these popular and impious publications served L’Estoile as evidence for his claims about the corrupting power of Leaguer print, although he did not report specific occasions of these songs being sung in Paris. The Drolleries celebrate the silencing of the Leaguers’ cries.

131 Other song-sheets in the Drolleries are fols. 12r, 18r, 27v. On song-sheets printed by the League see Pallier, L’imprimerie à Paris, pp. 164-165.
132 Brunet, iv, 218.
Ephemeral prints pasted into the *Drolleries* testified to their circulation. L'Estoile found slipped under his door on 30 April 1590 the copy of a pseudo-truce signed between the League and Henri de Navarre during the siege of Paris, with the annotation scrawled alongside its heading ‘This is all false’. The printed broadsheet (Figure 13), warned of the terrible consequences of a victory for Henri de Navarre, including the banishment of all those who held offices in the institutions governed by the League, a pressing threat for someone in L'Estoile’s position. He later added to his annotation that he never knew who slipped him this threatening sheet with its reassuring note.\(^\text{135}\) Another annotation to an ephemeral print in the *Drolleries* reveals L'Estoile’s source. A loose-leaf quarto edict demanding a payment to support the League, dated 22 June 1589, is signed Senault – the Leaguer who raided L'Estoile’s study in January 1589 – and addressed in the same hand to L'Estoile’s colleague in the Chancery, ‘Chesneau Chauffecire’ (Figure 14). With this edict, Senault ordered Chesneau to pay a staggering four hundred *écus* to the cause of the League.\(^\text{136}\) It is one of six that L'Estoile pasted together to form a new page in the *Drolleries*, a plastered site displaying the League’s exactions, demonstrating how these edicts affected the lives of his closest friends and colleagues.\(^\text{137}\) This page of edicts appears like the song sheets, arranged and pasted together to form a new page in the miscellany that demonstrates the cacophony of official League pronouncements intended to manipulate the people of Paris.

Pasting together ephemeral print to form new pages allowed L'Estoile space to make condemning intertextual links and punning contrasts between pieces. On the reverse of the page of assembled edicts that included Chesneau’s bill (Figure 15), he formed a complex anthropomorphic satire to slander the legates representing the pope in Paris under the League. These motifs have intertextual links with the most successful royalist satire of the League, the

\(^{\text{135}}\) Brunet, iv, 152-157.
\(^{\text{136}}\) Brunet, iv, 208-210.
\(^{\text{137}}\) Brunet, iv, 202-212.
Satyre menippée de la vertu du catholicon d’Espagne et de la tenue des estats de Paris (1593), compiled from pieces composed by many of L’Estoile’s colleagues in the Parlement and his literary contacts in Paris. After a comic introduction to the power of the drug Catholicon, imported by the Spanish to corrupt en-Leagued Catholics and snatch the French throne for the Infanta of Spain, the Satyre menippée consists of mock speeches by Leaguers at the 1593 Estates of the League, ridiculing their interests and arguments.\textsuperscript{138} L’Estoile’s page has a similarly miscellaneous form. In the upper-right corner of the page, the placard addressed ‘To the People of Paris’, which L’Estoile dated 28 October 1593, sets the scene at the end of the Estates General of the League, after the duc de Guise had been elected there as the Leaguers’ candidate for the throne.\textsuperscript{139} The pen and ink sketch in the bottom-right corner of the page (Figure 15 detail) attacks two of the most influential figures at the Estates. It depicts Lorenzo Suarez de Figueroa, duc de Feria, the Spanish ambassador, and Philippe Séga, cardinal de Plaisance, the papal legate, as a hen and a cockerel respectively. They colluded in supporting the candidacy of the Spanish Infanta for the French crown at the Estates. The animal transformation in this sketch targets its subjects’ vanity, as Feria preens in his pointed hat that matches the legate’s hood in cardinal red.\textsuperscript{140} The legate leans on a walking stick and has a foot stuck in a pot. Both figures have pierced fish on their sharp poles, perhaps a reference to the Lenten piety of the League.\textsuperscript{141} The link between this page and the Satyre menippée is most direct with the print pasted in its lower-left corner, depicting ‘The ass of the good party, in August 1590’. The ass stands for the people of Paris, who suffered for the League, but were led by blind and ignorant rulers, specifically the Legate,

\textsuperscript{138} Satyre menippée de la vertu du catholicon d’Espagne et de la tenue des estats de Paris ed. Martian Martin (Paris, 2007), pp. xlvii-li. L’Estoile knew its authors the conseillers Pierre Pithou, Jacques Gillot, the poet Florent Chrestien, and the lieutenant criminal Nicolas Rapin, and collected many poems by Jean Passerat.

\textsuperscript{139} Brunet, iv, 212-216.

\textsuperscript{140} Satyre menippée, p. 17, ridiculed the legate as the ‘vray image de parfaicte beauté’, although he had the opposite reputation.

\textsuperscript{141} As in Peter Brueghel the Elder’s The Fight between Carnival and Lent (1559), Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna.
who understood nothing of war. The same ass appears in a short poem included in the *Satyre menippée*, in which the Legate sold the ass for thirty *écus* to be slaughtered and its flesh sold as veal or mutton, just as he left the people of Paris to die during the siege while taking their money to fill the coffers of the League.\(^{142}\) A graffito that L'Estoile describes in the upper-left corner of the page, displayed in August 1590, at the end of the siege of Paris, attacks the legate with a similar satirical metamorphosis. It depicted Séga’s predecessor as legate, Cardinal Cajetan, as a mule, attempting to mount a woman exposing her private parts, identified as Madame de Montpensier, sister to the murdered Guise brothers. It mocks the sexual voraciousness of these figures, whose public piety was but a front for their corrupt desires. These pieces build a composite libel, relying on anthropomorphic transformations and subtle intertextual links, to slander the League and the papal legates from every corner of the page.

The clergy appear in the *Drolleries* not only in satires but also in the edicts they published in Paris to organise devotions in the name of the League, which L'Estoile presented as an insidious introduction of false piety, linked to the worst excesses of the Roman Church. These pieces demonstrate his iconoclastic engagement with Leaguer polemic. He included on fol. 22 (Figure 16) an order of 20 December 1592 issued by Philippe Séga, the papal legate, for Forty-Hour prayers to be held in parish churches across the capital during the period after Christmas, paired with a printed sheet listing the pardons granted by the legate for those devotions.\(^{143}\) L'Estoile annotated the latter to give a character sketch of the legate, condemning him as the ignorant son of a sausage-seller, with more zeal than judgement.\(^{144}\) To unmask the true intent of these Christmas devotions, L'Estoile paired the prints with a printed sheet from the start of the civil wars, masquerading as *La Criée et Proclamation du*

---

\(^{142}\) *Satyre menippée*, pp. 155, 436-437 n. 1118.
\(^{144}\) Brunet, iv, 165-171.
Pape contre les Luthériens, les Huguenotz, et autres tenant le party de l’Evangile, nos ennemis capitaux (1561). It announced the persecution of the Lutherans and Huguenots in the name of pope Pius IV and his conclave, but revealed its polemical position in favour of the Reformed movement by acknowledging that the pope’s power derived from Satan and that the conclave was made up of ‘true Hypocrites, Seducers, Abusers, and Atheists’.

L’Estoile linked the false devotions of the League with the Catholics’ persecutions of the Huguenots at the start of the civil wars, and made his interpretation clear with the annotation and juxtaposition of pieces on this page.

A break in the visual narrative of the Drolleries arrives with the victory of Henri IV over the League. Celebratory portraits and documents demonstrate his legitimate rule and triumph over the disorder of the civil wars. The portrait on fol. 33r (Figure 18) characterises this change, a fine courtly sketch to move beyond the printed libels of the League years, positioned above the triptych of a thickly coloured medallion flanked by Swiss guards. Documentary proof served to justify Henri IV’s legitimacy as a Catholic monarch.

L’Estoile included on fol. 37r a manuscript in a scribal hand recounting the ceremony of his absolution in Rome in September 1595. Henri IV’s military victories also feature prominently (Figure 20). Two news-sheets represent his army’s triumph over the Spanish army at Amiens in 1597 (fols. 40r, 41r), followed by printed and manuscript verse that sings their praise (fol. 41v). L’Estoile did not include a reference to the Edict of Nantes among these pages, a subject of immense contemporary controversy that he reported in detail in his

---

145 The date 1561 is given by the BnF catalogue but I cannot find confirmation on this point. The ‘Pope Pius’ mentioned in the piece could plausibly be Pius V, but the BnF attribution seems most likely.
146 Brunet, iv, 171-174. The piece is dated 1561 by the BnF.
148 Brunet, iv, 328-331.
149 Brunet, iv, 331-332, discussed above p. 51.
150 Brunet, iv, 334-350.
diaries, as the office-holders of the Parlement feared it threatened their jurisdictional authority.151 Outside of the Drolleries, L'Esteirole collected portraits of Henri IV in his study and observed popular responses to them in the Palais de Justice. Just as L'Esteirole reported that God’s providence guided the king to military victories, so did it protect his image. In a report dated 23 June 1593, L'Esteirole noted the League’s attempt in the courtyard outside the Palais to burn portraits of Henri IV and Elizabeth I, labelled ‘LE BEARNOIS’ and ‘JEZABEL’. Gusts of wind blew the incombustible pictures from the pyre, a ‘beautiful mystery’ that gave lustre to the victorious portraits of Henri IV that L'Esteirole assembled in the Drolleries.152

While these glorious, providential images of Henri IV seem to sit above the affray of the polemical libels of the civil wars, other royalist prints that L'Esteirole collected continue the battle, denouncing the League by appropriating the forms of its own libels. Several of these prints were published by L'Esteirole’s print-seller Jean Le Clerc.153 In Le Clerc’s broadsheet La pauvreté et lamentation de la Ligue (Figure 17), the monstrous League takes the form of an old crone, pulling at the French crown with the rope of ambition while the devil calls her back to Hell, just as the League’s libels once claimed that Henri III acted on behalf of the devil.154 A partner broadsheet, published by Le Clerc with the same setting on the page, represents Les entre-paroles du Manant de-ligüé, & du Maheutre (Figure 19). This broadsheet is a visual response to a League satire, the Dialogue d’entre le maheustre et le manant, first published in December 1593. Its modern editor affirms L'Esteirole’s attribution of the first edition to François Morin, sieur de Cromé, a zealous Leaguer who wrote to denounce the moderate course along which the duc de Mayenne steered the movement after the Sixteen’s execution of premier président Brisson in November 1591. L'Esteirole mocked in his memoirs of the League Mayenne’s failed attempt to censor the publication on 13 December

151 Brunet, vii, 164-168, 178.
152 Brunet, vi, 38.
153 Drolleries, fols. 30r, 31r, 33v, 34v-36r, 39r, 40r, 41r, 42r, 42v, 43r, 44r, 44v. On L'Esteirole and Le Clerc see above p. 50.
1593 by shutting the printers’ shops in Paris. He then reported a fantastical chain of reception to illustrate how wildly different parties pursued the text. This satire was subtly transformed and re-published in 1594 by royalists, with crucial passages edited to put forward the king’s cause. Le Clerc’s broadsheet makes clear the print’s now distinctly royalist allegiance as it shows the humble Manant backed by an old crone as the unmasked League, followed out of Paris by hungry dogs and with a butcher’s knife hanging from her belt, while the dashing Maheustre arrives to liberate the capital in the king’s name, accompanied by a miraculously bountiful rain-shower of corn, falling on *fleurs-de-lys* that spring into life.\(^{155}\) Le Clerc’s royalist broadsheets followed a similar polemical tactic to L’Estoile’s *Drolleries*, by appropriating aspects of the League’s libels in order to denounce the movement in its own terms.

Prints of monsters discovered across Europe bring the *Drolleries* to an ambiguous close (Figure 21). In his diaries and miscellanies, L’Estoile did not express a fixed view on monsters as prodigies. Sometimes he wrote about monsters with curiosity for these wonders of nature, while in his response to particular pamphlets he expressed rational doubts as to the claims made for their significance.\(^{156}\) When he lent to a friend Jean Crespin’s 1557 edition of Philip Melanchthon’s and Martin Luther’s prodigious Papal Ass and Monk Calf print, that heralded the pope as the Anti-Christ in 1523, he described it as a ‘pleasant drollery’.\(^{157}\) Nevertheless, he collected stories and prints concerning monsters and prodigies that captured his curiosity throughout his life, sometimes reporting them as simple ‘prodigies’ whose significance he dared not divine, on other occasions dismissing them as the inventions of

---

superstitious folk.\textsuperscript{158} He was not alone in amassing monster prints. A contemporary collector, the Protestant pastor in Zurich Johann Jakob Wick, acquired a print recounting the same red herrings discovered in Denmark in 1587, that L'Estoile’s Danish friend Pierre Paisen sent him with a letter dated 1 February 1588.\textsuperscript{159} Perhaps the monsters of the \textit{Drolleries} conclude the line of polemic followed in pieces that L'Estoile assembled depicting the League as a monster, an aberration in God’s creation.\textsuperscript{160} Or perhaps they appear like the ambiguous ‘prodigious histories’ that L'Estoile copied into his diaries and miscellanies, that set earthly events under the signs of providence, but whose significance he refused to interpret. These monstrous prints bring an end to the \textit{Drolleries} that lies outside of the realm of human understanding, abandoned to God’s will.

L'Estoile reported that the Leaguers suspected him as being ‘one of the most notorious “Politiques” and Heretics in Paris’ and he somewhat embraced their claims.\textsuperscript{161} He lived in Paris under the League with his extended family, collaborated in the administration of the Parlement, and justified his actions by claiming to feel a strong sense of God’s presence in his life. Throughout his family diary and memoirs for these years, L'Estoile emphasised his role as a so-called ‘Politique’ supporter for Henri de Navarre’s claim to the throne, while his life-long and apparently ‘heretical’ sympathy for aspects of Protestantism, and abhorrence for zealous Roman Catholicism, informed his critical responses to the League. Thereafter, these years dominated L'Estoile’s historical imagination, such that he continued to edit, annotate,

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{158} ‘Prodigious histories’ in his miscellanies, dated between 1558 and 1601: Armitage, pp. 113-117; BnF ms. fr. 10303, fols. 348-351. ‘Prodigies’ whose significance he dared not divine in his diaries: Lazard-Schrenck, i, 88; Brunet, vii, 215, 256-257, viii, 24-25, ix, 392-393. Alleged prodigies whose reality he denied: Brunet, viii, 18-19, 55-56.

\textsuperscript{159} Brunet, iv, 407. Presumably the same Danish friend who sent him news of a prodigious death in April 1606: Brunet, viii, 217-218.

\textsuperscript{160} \textit{Drolleries}, fol. 31r; Wes Williams, \textit{Monsters and their Meanings in Early Modern Culture: Mighty Magic} (Oxford, 2011), p. 80.

\textsuperscript{161} Brunet, v, 51a (NB error in pagination).
\end{footnotesize}
and extend his memoirs and *Drolleries* long after the Henri IV’s entry into Paris, just as he composed his account of the reign of Henri III so as to foreshadow the period of the League.

Since so many of his colleagues in the Parlement fled to Tours in these years, L’Estoile was in a unique position to shape the history of the League in Paris. He attempted to compose a trustworthy account of these years that justified his own actions and denounced those of the League, making great efforts to determine whether information circulating in these years was true or false. He used similar strategies in evaluating the truth-claims of oral, visual, and textual evidence, relying on authoritative individuals and the documents they lent him to supplement his eyewitness testimony. After he recorded that information it became a reference point for historians interested in the League, first among them Pierre Dupuy.

Never did L’Estoile feel more invigorated to disprove the false claims of the Leaguers than when assembling the *Drolleries*. Their peculiar composition cautions against an uncritical acceptance of his polemical argument that a co-ordinated League propaganda campaign radicalised and dominated ‘public opinion’. In this miscellany, L’Estoile compiled an iconoclastic, visual history of the League that denounced its populism and false piety with the material evidence of its own publications. He was an elite, ferocious consumer of so-called popular print that only survives because of his polemical record keeping. The years of the League marked a turning point in L’Estoile’s life and the civil wars. In response, he compiled his most extraordinary histories.
Previous chapters have traced Pierre de L'Estoile’s collection as it was assembled at different stages of the civil wars, often mediated by his reflections towards the end of his life. He expanded his diaries considerably from July 1606, just before he turned sixty, as he used the example of Michel de Montaigne to justify a more inward, self-reflexive form of writing, and explained that such a record serves ‘to support one’s unstable memory, especially as one comes to advanced age, like me’. Following the defeat of the League, and especially after he expanded his diaries in July 1606, it is possible to trace in greater detail than before how L’Estoile and those who came to visit him responded to his collection. Above all, they were overwhelmed by his large collection of books. L'Estoile saved letters he received praising his ‘most numerous’ and ‘most instructive’ library. Jacques Esprinchard, sieur de Plomb, a Protestant legal scholar and travel-writer from La Rochelle, even tried to persuade L'Estoile to bequeath his books to a public library that he and others established there in 1606.

This chapter demonstrates how L'Estoile’s reader reception was characterised by social exchanges and shaped by his ‘interpretative community’ in the Palais de Justice, made up of its printers, binders, scribes, office-holders, and the erudite humanists whose legal
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1 ‘Les Registres-Journaux sont d’usage ancien, et servent souvent à nous oster de peine et à soulager nostre mémoire labile, principalement quand nous venons sur l’age, comme moy.’ Brunet, viii, 225. See above pp. 17-18 for L'Estoile’s use of Michel de Montaigne in this passage.
training drew them into its orbit. Their loans, gifts, and recommendations of books shaped his responses to those texts and forged relationships of reciprocal exchange. Demonstrating this argument, sections of this chapter move from the problem of coping with an abundant and growing book collection towards an interpretation of reading as a means of working through religious controversies at the end of the civil wars. They set out how L'Estoile managed his library (Part One), how he read books with erudite, Gallican friends (Parts Two and Three), and then how he inherited and passed them on within his family (Part Four).

By making his collection available in this milieu, L'Estoile gained influence and prestige as he became known as a generous and learned collector. Florence Greffe and José Lothe, in their edition of his inventory, demonstrated that L'Estoile’s library was one of the largest in his milieu of royal office-holders in Paris, containing at the end of his life 822 books as well as at least 834 pamphlets that he had bound into 103 ‘packets’, miscellaneous volumes of ephemeral print typically bound with parchment, velum, or leather, a common means for contemporary readers to organise their collections. L'Estoile’s library was well-stocked in every field of humanist learning and arranged across the eight bookshelves and several large shelves in his study. This chapter explores how L'Estoile and others used the

---

4 Stanley Fish, *Is There a Text in This Class? The Authority of Interpretative Communities* (Cambridge, MA, 1982), pp. 303-321.
library, providing a microhistorical perspective on the circulation and reception of books in Paris at the end of the civil wars.

I. Managing the Library

As L'Estoile recorded his acquisition of great quantities of books and pamphlets towards the end of his life, he faced a problem common to early modern book-collectors struggling with large collections: how to deal with too much information? At points he despaired of the task. On 7 October 1608, searching through his study, he came across and transcribed a passage which reinforced his despair since he could neither remember the source from which he had extracted it nor its author: ‘People who ostentatiously strive after piles of books, who turn the gifts of the Muses into superfluous, gutter-bound stuff, those people are truly ridiculous.’ This passage justified his resolve on that day to sell a large part of his library to the perfumer M. Devaux.8

L'Estoile did not sell his library to the perfumer in October 1608, nor on other occasions when he made contact with interested potential buyers.9 Despite his large profit from the sale of his office, he regularly complained of financial trouble in retirement and took steps to keep control of his accounts, noting the cost of his frequent, incidental purchases of pamphlets, and selling small quantities of books and medals, but he continued to add to his

---

7 Ann M. Blair, Too Much to Know: Managing Scholarly Information before the Modern Age (London, 2010) defines the problem while focusing on note taking and reference books.
8 ‘Qui, ostentationis gratia, librorum strues affectant, nae illi ridiculi sunt, qui Musarum delicias supervacaneam suppellectilem faciunt.’ Brunet, ix, 140.
9 Brunet, x, 91 reports the interest of the Archbishop of Bologna, Alfonso Paleotti, brokered by the brother of L'Estoile’s son-in-law Guillaume Duranti. Twice he had his son François copy a catalogue of his library for interested buyers: Brunet, ix, 325-326, x, 91.
collection. As Chapter Four and Appendix II demonstrate, since L'Estoile purchased far more constitutions de rente than he sold, acting overall as a debtor, he may have been overwhelmed at times by a net out-flow of payments. To overcome the vanity and uselessness of great libraries, he relied on strategies of information management common in his milieu: employing amanuenses, deciding on clear categories for his books, and using memory aids. L'Estoile’s strategies for managing his library matter because the details of his reports enable an interpretation of an early modern reader in action, revealing the full range of his engagement with books – his sourcing, reading (or not), copying, and storing of them – beyond the examples of marginalia that have hitherto captured historians’ attention.

The working relationship between L'Estoile and his book-binder, ‘master Abraham’, demonstrates how the organisation and re-organisation of L'Estoile’s reading material depended on this learned craftsman who could clarify the collection and present it for him, and how the collection evolved over time. The 1611 inventory is but one stage in a complex evolution of L'Estoile’s library. Rather than sell his library in October 1608, L'Estoile employed Abraham to organise and bind his pamphlets into packets that they together labelled alphabetically and generally arranged chronologically. Abraham worked as L'Estoile’s regular binder from at least February 1607. He lived on the rue d’Ecosse in the

---


11 Problems surrounding the sale of his house in Orléans: Brunet, ix, 25, x, 76, xi, 30; AN MC CXXII 1559, 10 February 1607; AN MC CXXII 1564, 14 May 1608; Greffe-Lothe, pp. 1066-1067. Difficulties regarding his clients’ payments of rentes: Brunet, ix, 230-231; AN MC CXXII 1567, 15 January 1609; Greffe-Lothe, p. 1067. Brunet, x, 89-90, 146-147; AN MC CXXII 387, 18 February 1610; Greffe-Lothe, p. 1067.


13 By contrast, Greffe-Lothe, pp. 159-163 uses these passages to estimate a static figure of the total number of pieces that ever passed through L'Estoile’s library.

14 Brunet, viii, 277.
University quarter on the Left Bank. Abraham assisted L'Estoile in two large scale re-organisations of his library. They spent three days together in the study until 1 October 1607 as L'Estoile changed the organisation of his pamphlets to put them in better order ‘for use and for memory’, resulting in forty-three bound packets. Soon L'Estoile had altered them and brought his total up to sixty-nine bound packets, or three entire alphabets of 1,213 pamphlets. On 17 May 1608 L'Estoile and Abraham added forty-four further packets of 2,079 pamphlets that did not have codes, which they placed on the high shelves of L'Estoile’s study, alongside 120 other books that still required binding. Thereafter, L'Estoile employed Abraham to make up packets of pamphlets at regular intervals, continuing to bind his new acquisitions on 15 November 1609 (DDDD, forty-one packets since 10 October), 5 January 1609 (EEEE, unknown number), 6 July 1609 (HHHH and KKKK, each with eighty pamphlets since 5 January). Following the aborted sale of his library in October 1608, Abraham bound for L'Estoile a packet of fifty pamphlets acquired since the start of the year, marked CCCC, and sorted through his other books, papers, and portraits. That day L'Estoile paid Abraham fifteen sous and bought a fox-tail brush to clean his books. On many other occasions Abraham rebound individual books for L'Estoile and supplied him with paper, pens, and ink. Typically, L'Estoile paid him in cash – one écu for the three days’ work in September-October 1607 – but after his binding work on 15 November 1608 L'Estoile instead gave Abraham erudite manuscripts. It is in large part thanks to M. Abraham that L'Estoile kept in control of his library in 1607-1609.

\[15\] Brunet, viii, 156, if Abraham is ‘mon relieur’ mentioned in this passage.
\[16\] Brunet, viii, 347-348.
\[17\] Brunet, ix, 75.
\[18\] Brunet, ix, 162, 193, 283
\[19\] Brunet, ix, 140-141.
\[20\] Brunet, viii, 277, 307, ix, 28, 62, 160.
\[21\] Brunet, ix, 162.
L'Estoile hired amanuenses like Abraham whom he could trust; especially god-fearing Protestants. His most regular copyist was M. Chausson from Geneva. Between 6 August 1607 and 7 April 1608 Chausson copied 730 folios from L'Estoile’s manuscripts and from pieces he had received from friends. L'Estoile justified entrusting this task to Chausson because, even though the scribe’s handwriting was poor, he worked fast and diligently, and because L'Estoile recognised Chausson ‘as being most secret, peaceable, faithful and god-fearing’. On 24 November 1608, he again resolved to sell books and hired M. Culerier, ‘a child of Geneva’, to transcribe an inventory of those for sale. At this time of stark confessional division, employing even the most apparently trustworthy servant carried the risk of betrayal. Wracked with guilt, another of L'Estoile’s amanuenses, named Saüle, committed suicide by hanging himself at the Protestant parish of Charenton in January 1610, where he lodged with L'Estoile’s friend Du Clos, the schoolteacher to the congregation and the source for this story. L'Estoile could hardly believe Saüle capable of this act. Over a period of three months, he had trusted Saüle with the secrets of his cabinet because he recognised the scribe as a ‘mortal enemy’ of the Jesuits. But it was the Jesuits who had persuaded him to convert to Catholicism and to inform on the Protestants at Charenton. Saüle repented and planned to return to Charenton to ask for pardon from the congregation, but in despair he hanged himself from the balcony of Du Clos’ house during the Sunday service, days before his planned pardon plea. The returning congregation found his body outside the house, symbolically caught between the rival confessions with the Psalms in one pocket of his hose and a rosary in the other.

These amanuenses had close relationships with L'Estoile and knew his study intimately. Their activities have a wider importance because the techniques they used to order
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22 On amanuenses: Blair, Too Much to Know, pp. 102-112.
23 Brunet, ix, 65.
24 Brunet, ix, 169, 177. For more of his copy-work: Brunet, ix, 197, 204-205.
25 Brunet, x, 110-113.
his collection were common in their time, developed in response to the particular material form of late-sixteenth and early seventeenth-century publications, in which bound books circulated alongside unbound pamphlets that required binding into packets. Such bound packets of pamphlets, marked alphabetically, were typical of the libraries of L'Estoile’s contemporaries and are listed in twenty-three of the thirty-nine inventories in the sample.26 These packets have not captured the attention of book historians who have focused instead on classifying the subjects of identifiable books in library lists.27 L'Estoile’s inventory does not list the materials he and Abraham used to bind these packets together. The packets in his inventory typically contain between five and fifteen volumes, but the packets he mentioned in his diaries were considerably larger. Packets in the library of Claude de Tudeau (conseiller, d.1599) were bound in paper, parchment, velum, and red and black leather, with paper and parchment often but not exclusively used for larger packets (up to thirty volumes), and leather never used for packets of more than eight volumes. The library of Claude Dupuy (conseiller, d.1595) includes packets of manuscript as well as printed books.28 L'Estoile’s library is an exceptional case because he records the process of packaging pamphlets over time. Among the libraries in the sample, L'Estoile’s library as recorded in his 1611 inventory has the second largest number of bound packets of pamphlets, behind the libraries of the premier président Barnabé Brisson (d.1591) and the conseiller Claude Dupuy (d.1595).29 The 3,292 pamphlets bound into 113 packets that L'Estoile reported in his study on 17 May 1608 exceed their collections, and were perhaps whittled down by unrecorded sales and bequests. Every library in the sample containing packets of pamphlets used the same alphabetical classification scheme as L'Estoile’s library, with the exception of Claude Tudeau (conseiller, d.1599) whose thirty-one packets (‘liasses’, rather than the standard ‘paquets’) of 241

26 Appendix I.
27 Delatour, Bibliothèque, p. 231, identified ‘around ten’ books with Claude Dupuy’s annotations that might have been bound into packets.
29 See above p. 206 n.6 and Appendix I.
volumes were numbered. Binding pamphlets into packets was a pragmatic solution to keep them together in an accessible order. Abraham and Chausson both drew up inventories for L'Estoile of the books he had in packets.

Well-organised packets of pamphlets helped inventory assessors give a comprehensive list of a library’s holdings. Packets in the inventory of Guillaume Martin (avocat, d.1591) are neatly divided by languages and listed with the titles of many of the books they contained. On the other hand, loose books posed problems to inventory assessors. The inventory of Jacques Malingre (avocat, d.1591) contains twenty-six books as well as sixty-nine ‘books of little value’ in twenty-one ‘piles’ that the assessors valued at ten sols each without going into any further detail. Malingre also held onto twenty-two other books concerning theology that belonged to Denys de La Barre, a doctor of theology, that Malingre kept in order to settle outstanding rente payments owed to him, although it is not clear if the settlement was sufficient or permanent.³⁰

Packets were not always organised chronologically in the way that Abraham and L'Estoile decided in 1608-1609.³¹ Like most libraries in the sample, the packets in L'Estoile’s inventory sometimes had titles as well as codes. In his diaries, he mentioned that he gave titles to packets that contradicted those given to other packets in his library. Some of his packets have titles common elsewhere in the sample, while others are peculiar to his interests. His inventory lists packets labelled ‘A, Funeral discourses’, ‘B, French poetry’, ‘C, Latin poetry’, ‘D, Italian and Spanish books’, ‘I, On the reunion of the Churches’, ‘K, On

³⁰ A rente worth 9 livres 43 sols and 2 deniers constituted on 28 August 1588 is recorded among the papers and titles at the end of the inventory.
³¹ Greffe-Lothe, pp. 159-163, speculate that L'Estoile’s packets were consistently chronological and suggest he began to form them in July 1593. Before L'Estoile’s reports of employing M. Abraham it is impossible to determine how his packets were organised.
³² Jacques Perdrier (Royal Secretary, d.1578) had a packet marked ‘C, Œuvres de Joachim du Bellay relié en velin’.
³³ Inventories commonly distinguished between French and Latin packets, eg. Guillaume Martin (avocat, d.1591).

Elsewhere in his diaries, beyond those packets already mentioned, he described packets labelled DD, ‘Bulls, indulgences, pardons, confraternities’, as well as unlabelled packets on ‘Superstitions of these times’, ‘Monsters’, ‘defamatory Political libels’, ‘Jesuitical Drolleries’ (‘because I like the Jesuits’), and ‘The Eucharist’. Perhaps the apparent overlaps between labelled packets in L’Estoile’s library are due to unreported re-organisations, or because he did not mention these thematic packets in the major re-organisations with Abraham that he recorded in his diaries.

Yet even this system did not always help L’Estoile to locate pieces. On 15 March 1610, although he was sure he had a copy bound somewhere else in his library, he bought a pamphlet describing the coronation of Elisabeth of Austria, the Queen of Charles IX, published on 25 March 1571, and much sought after because of the upcoming coronation of Marie de Médicis. Again recalling the events and publications of the early civil wars, a month after the assassination of Henri IV he bought a copy of the Order of Ceremonies of the interment of Henri II in 1559, but then when he returned home he found a copy of the same pamphlet in his packet marked ‘numero Ie’, which does not appear elsewhere in his diaries or inventory. L’Estoile’s generally alphabetical manner of organising his packets of pamphlets

34 Spanish and especially Italian packets were also found in the libraries of Ernard de Bavres (Royal Secretary, d.1574); Jacques Perdrier (Royal Secretary, d.1578); Claude Dupuy (conseiller, d.1595); Delatour. Bibliothèque, 217, 228-229; Jehan Wallet (Royal Secretary, d.1600); François Courtin (avocat, d.1609).
35 ‘I, De disseditis Ecclesiae componendis’.
36 ‘K, De poteste summi pontificis diversor’.
37 Denis Duboys (avocat, d.1589) had ‘FFFF, Plusieurs romans’.
38 Guillaume Martin (avocat, d.1591) had ‘12 liasses d’edits’.
39 Brunet, x, 195.
40 Brunet, ix, 193, x, 144-145.
41 Brunet, ix, 195.
42 Brunet, x, 1.
43 Brunet, viii, 355, x, 1, 326, xi, 88.
44 Brunet, x, 148.
45 Brunet, x, 169.
46 Brunet, x, 279.
was typical of his milieu and carefully managed, but not infallible, and it struggled to contain competing topical and chronological modes of categorisation.

Classification systems need guides to access them. Other than the 1611 inventory, the lists of books in L'Estoile’s library drawn up by amanuenses do not survive, but his diary after July 1606 served the same function. Often when he bought a book he noted carefully the binding, publisher, date of publication, and author, so that his diaries served as a store of bibliographic information. He carefully recorded when he lent out books and then added in the margin when they were returned. Typically, books came back within a few weeks, but some borrowers kept them for much longer periods. On 23 June 1608, his neighbour Marcelin de Guillon returned his copy of Blaise de Monluc’s *Commentaires*, that he had borrowed on 28 March 1607. L'Estoile wrote that he would not have remembered that fifteen-month-old loan if he had not written it in his diary. Notes in his diaries occasionally referred back to his marginal annotations in books, as he said that he ‘always scrawls’ in them, although very few of his books survive to test his claim. He wrote inside the cover of his regally bound copy of François Grudé’s *Bibliotheque*, that he bought the book from a Leaguer who had purchased it in a book-sale outside the Hôtel de Ville following Henri III’s assassination, and that it was originally the king’s presentation copy. On the cover of his copy of the *Cymbalum mundi* by Bonadventure des Périers, L'Estoile castigated the author as ‘a nasty man and an atheist, as revealed in this detestable book’. A trail of notes connected L'Estoile’s library to others across Paris.

47 Brunet, ix, 91.
50 ‘homme meschant et athée comme il appert par ce detestable livre’. Bonadventure des Périers, *Cymbalum mundi en francoys* (Lyon, 1538), frontispiece, BnF Z 2442. Greffe-Lothe, pp. 170, 548 located this annotated copy but incorrectly attributed the annotations to Louis de L'Estoile. The manuscript of the *Family Diary*, which Greffe-Lothe does not cite, includes the hands of both father and son, confirming that the annotations to this book are in Pierre de L'Estoile’s hand.
Copying out passages from books in his diary, organised chronologically at the point of reading, produced a guide to a book’s contents and a means of retaining significant passages. In this way, the early modern culture of copying excerpts into commonplace books for memory and literary invention joined with the need to manage an overwhelming mass of texts in the library. The Sermones of Saint Zeno, the fourth-century bishop of Verona and martyr, had sat in his study for a long time, and L'Estoile confessed that he only knew the book by its cover. But after several unnamed, learned men made a case for the book, he read it twice from cover to cover, made short extracts from certain sermons, and copied the entire sermon on Psalm 79. He read it for a third time on 25 November 1609 and copied out further extracts. L'Estoile’s pious copying allowed him to single-out parts of a book that he found ‘so pure and so beautiful’, especially after he lent the book to his cousin, the young office-holder and future premier président Mathieu Molé on 12 April 1611, with no record of its return.

These strategies of employing amanuenses, establishing categories, and using finding aids enabled L'Estoile and his contemporaries to maintain some grasp over their book collections. Because of his expert knowledge of the Parisian book trade, outlined in Chapter Two, L'Estoile was well connected with its professionals and able to provide accurate documentation, and because of his life-long enterprise of record keeping in miscellanies and diaries he was in the habit of writing down this sort of information and incorporating it with other interests in his manuscripts. Above all, because of his large library, L'Estoile had a greater need of these strategies than many of his contemporaries. Yet L'Estoile did not always acquire books to read them straightaway. Once he had acquired and bound these books, it

52 ‘dès longtemps, et que je ne connois que par la couverture (comme beaucoup d’autre qui y sont).
53 Brunet, x, 63-69, 79-83; Greffe-Lothe, pp. 1033-1034.
54 Brunet, xi, 100.
often took individual recommendations to nudge L'Estoile to engage closely with them, and this is the subject of the following sections.

II. Bundles of Erudition

L'Estoile found a place in his collection for leading figures in Europe’s republic of letters, situating himself in close proximity to them. Towards the end of his life, Parisian friends lent him letters by Isaac Casaubon, Jacques-Auguste de Thou, Justus Lipsius, and Joseph Scaliger, introducing him to their intellectual world. L'Estoile’s most significant contact in these circles was Pierre Dupuy, the young avocat in the Parlement and his most regularly recorded visitor in retirement. This section takes their relationship as a case study in L'Estoile’s engagement with erudite humanism. They belonged to different generations and had different approaches to reading. Dupuy inherited from his father an interest and connections in the world of legal humanism, following the mos gallicus tradition of Jacques Cujas and his pupils. He gave L'Estoile access to the collection and contacts of his father, the conseiller Claude Dupuy, and pursued philological research to establish the origins of the liberties of the Gallican Church. In exchange, Dupuy confirmed the value of L'Estoile’s collection as he borrowed pieces concerning the history of the civil wars, treating L'Estoile as an eminent historian of his times.

The terms of their relationship were set on L'Estoile’s first recorded visit to the Dupuy cabinet, on 22 June 1607. The Dupuy brothers, Pierre and Jacques, lived in the house that they inherited from their father on the rue des Poitevins in the parish of Saint André des Arts, about five minutes’ walk from L'Estoile’s home heading in the direction of the rue Saint

---

56 Delatour.
57 See above p. 186.
Jacques. L’Estoile recorded his wonder at their ancient and curious collection, especially their old manuscripts and their Greek and Latin books. At this first meeting, Pierre Dupuy gave L’Estoile the collection of funeral poems he had commissioned for his father. Lending books and manuscripts from his family collection, Dupuy tried to impress L’Estoile and cultivate through him the reputations of his father and his erudite friends, above all Joseph Scaliger, demonstrating how scholarly reputations might be made in the republic of letters. He somewhat overwhelmed his older friend with material, and L’Estoile was ill-prepared to digest it all critically. However, L’Estoile delighted in accumulating and selectively sampling these texts in his diaries and miscellanies. He allowed his reading materials, if not his reading practices, to be shaped by his contacts with Dupuy.

In the week following L’Estoile’s first visit to the Dupuy library, the two men carried bundles of erudite texts between one another’s studies on a great range of subjects. Their friendship was strengthened through these intense exchanges. Their most significant exchange of that week happened on Thursday 30 June, when L’Estoile proudly lent Pierre Dupuy a ‘Remonstrance faite au Roi l’an 1592 … a piece seen by very few people, but one of the best of the time, one of the hardiest and best done’. In return, Dupuy lent him ‘a weighty manuscript’ once belonging to Adrien de Thou, a mixture of prose and poetry in Italian, Latin, and French, although L’Estoile already had copies of most of these pieces. Since this first loan was not the success he had planned, Dupuy came back with at least twenty-seven manuscript treatises as well as a list of these items. L’Estoile carefully copied this list into his diary and marked items with an ‘R’ when he had returned a piece and a ‘B’ if it was ‘bon’ and so worth copying. Eight merited a ‘B’ and eventually he returned each piece, having

---

58 Delatour, *Une bibliothèque*; Delatour, pp. 375-393.
59 Brunet, viii, 307.
60 Chopard, ‘Erudition’, pp. 205-235, traces Dupuy’s loans to L’Estoile in the BnF Dupuy collection and lists the pieces exchanged between the two.
commissioned copies of many of them. Over the next two weeks, Dupuy lent L'Estoile a manuscript of poems by Scaliger (most likely Dupuy’s correspondent and his father’s close friend Joseph Scaliger), a fifteenth-century chronicle known as the ‘Journal d’un Bourgeois de Paris’, as well as a bundle of miscellaneous papers, including pieces in Greek, Latin, Italian, and French, and Latin letters by Joseph Scaliger, Dominicus Baudius, Justus Lipsius, Michel de L’Hospital, Jacques Auguste de Thou and others. In thanks, on 2 July L'Estoile gave Dupuy one of his manuscripts in-folio, including thirty-nine treatises copied in his hand, as well as his octavo Drolleries of the League. Over the next four years, L'Estoile and Dupuy continued to exchange pieces from their collections until the final weeks of L'Estoile’s life, but this initial flurry of activity was their most intense period of contact.

These bundles of erudition posed the familiar problem to L'Estoile of how to cope with an abundance of scholarly information. In order to manage these texts he decided to have them copied into a new manuscript miscellany. After he received from Dupuy on 13 July 1607 the fifteenth-century ‘Journal d’un Bourgeois de Paris’, he commissioned the scribe and scholar Etienne Guichard to transcribe it in a great book of paper that I gave him, bound in paperboard in-folio, where I desire that Guichard continues to write (if God permits it) many good and curious things that people give me, having good assurance of his fidelity, sufficiency, and integrity (he is poor, in truth, but God-fearing: which is what I esteem above all).

In commissioning this manuscript, L’Estoile continued his strategy of hiring amanuenses to manage the pieces in his cabinet. This Parisian journal is the first piece in L'Estoile’s extant manuscript miscellany entitled ‘A compilation of notable and curious memoirs, letters, and

---

61 Brunet, viii, 311-314.
62 Brunet, viii, 316-319, described above pp. 185-186.
63 ‘J’ay mis, ce jour, entre les mains de M. Estienne Guischard, le vieil Journal de ce prestre, que M. Du Pui m’a presté pour le transcrire en un grand livre de papier, relié en carton in-folio, que je lui ai baillé, où je désire faire continuer et escrire par ledit Guischard (si Dieu le permect) beaucoup de belles choses et curieuses qu’on m’a prestées, aint bonne asseurance de la fidélité, sufficance et prêudhommie de cest homme (pauvre, à la vérité, mais craignant Dieu: qui est ce que j’estime et honore par-dessus tout). Brunet, viii, 318, 321-322.
discourses, both ancient and modern’ (BnF ms. fr. 10303), and in that manuscript it is followed by a great number of pieces given to L’Estoile by Dupuy, particularly those lent on 30 June. It is plausible then to identify this manuscript as the one L’Estoile commissioned from Guichard. The manuscript is composed in the same hand throughout, by a scribe competent in Greek and Hebrew letters.  

Table 6.1 Manuscripts given to Pierre de L’Estoile by Pierre Dupuy on 30 June 1607 and copied into BnF ms. fr. 10303.

| Title in BnF ms. fr. 10303 | BnF ms. fr. 10303, fols. | Dupuy Collection  

| Proces verbal de tout ce qui s’est passé sur l’envoy du Concordat à la Cour de Parlement de Paris en l’année 1517 | 75-90 | ms. Dupuy 117, fol. 158 |
| Mémoire d’un différend meu à Moulins 1566 entre le Cardinal de Lorraine et le Chancelier de l’Hospital, sur l’interpretation de l’Edict de Pacification | 94-97 | - |
| Harangue de Monsieur de Pibrac au Roy, pour le Roy de Navarre 1583 | 100-109 | - |
| Adviz trouvé en l’année 1588 entre les papiers d’un grand après sa mort au Chasteau de Blois | 112-118 | ms. Dupuy 203, fol. 102 |
| Relatio dictorum a Clemente Papa VIII die 20 Decembris 1592 in Consistorio | 122-126 | ms. Dupuy 119 fols. 54, 56; ms. Dupuy 744, 127 |
| Pour l’Absolution du Roy, par Monsieur l’Evesque du Mans | 134-139 | ms. Dupuy 119, fol. 2 |
| Remonstrance faicte par Monsieur Du Plessis Mornay, apres la Conversion du Roy | 140-147 | - |
| Conseil faict à Rome sur la dissolution du Mariage du Roy Henry 4me avec Marguerite de Valois, par Monsieur le Cardinal d’Ossat | 148-155 | ms. Dupuy 347, fol. 51 |
| Coppie de la Bulle du Pape Clement VIII sur la dissolution du Mariage du Roy Henry IIII Roy de France | 156-158 | ms. Dupuy 347, fol. 51 |
| Vita Illustissimi Cardinalis Arnaldi Ossati | 164-173 | - |
| Du Pape Clement 8 | 174-175 | - |
| La Response qui fut faite, en Latin par Elizabeth Roine d’Angleterre (et de sa propre bouche) à la | 191-200 | ms. Dupuy 33, fol. 90 |

64 Guichard published L’harmonie étymologique des langues hébraique, chaldaique, syriaque, grecque, latine, française, italienne, espagnole, allemande, flamande, angloise &c (Paris, 1631) and clearly forms Greek and Hebrew characters in BnF ms. fr. 10303, eg. fols. 518-521.
65 Relying on Chopard, ‘Erudition’, pp. 224-235, giving the first folio of each piece.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Page Range</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harangue d’un ambassadeur de Pologne, qui l’avoir mise en colere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oratio Episcopi Moguntinensis ad Pipinum</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>ms. Dupuy 1, fol. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quae desiderantur ad finem epistolae ultimae</td>
<td>234-240</td>
<td>ms. Dupuy 449, fols. 164, 166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicolas P.R. Ex tomo tertio Epistolarum Pontif. pag 235 ex mscr. D. Fabri</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardinalis Bellai Epistola ad Sleidanum 1545</td>
<td>241-243</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pipini Epistola ad Mizaldum, de igne Johannes Pipinus Ant. Mizala suo SPD</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>ms. Dupuy 488, fol. 108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epistola viri Fabri Pibracis ad Carolum Lotharingum Cardinalem 1559</td>
<td>244-252</td>
<td>ms. Dupuy 86, fol. 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epistola Sixti Papa</td>
<td>263</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lettre de Monsieur le Cardinal de Joyeuse au Roy sur la jonction des deux mers 1598</td>
<td>341-345</td>
<td>ms. Dupuy 88, fol. 338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extract des Registres de la Chambre de l’Édit de Castres 1602 pour Mon9 de Bouillon</td>
<td>351-354</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extract de la lettre de la Royne d’Angleterre a son Ambassadeur en France sur le fait de mons’ Bouillon 1603</td>
<td>354-359</td>
<td>ms. Dupuy 89, fol. 87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lettre de Mons9 le Fevre au S9 Du Puy estant à Rome, pour la lecture de l’Histoire Ecclesiastique. De l’an 1603 et 4</td>
<td>364-365</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epitaphium Voladislas Regis Polonia</td>
<td>388-389</td>
<td>ms. Dupuy 1, fol. 189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescrit du Pape Clement VII</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>ms. Dupuy 1, fol. 189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitia et vertutes omnium nationum ex veteri libro manuscripto Cl. Falecheti</td>
<td>390</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tumuli aliquot clarorum virorum Patavii in aede D. Francisci Christoph Longolio</td>
<td>397-398</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decretum Capituli Parisiensis 1602</td>
<td>399</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Censure des Plaidoiers de Monsieur l’Advocat du Roy Servin par la Sorbonne 1604</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>ms. Dupuy 594, fol. 224</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dupuy did not provide all of the content of this miscellany. Among other pieces, it contains nine letters of L’Estoile’s Latin correspondence, hitherto unnoticed by historians and discussed throughout this thesis, revealing his select erudite exchanges with Guillaume Fournier, Fédéric Morel, Claude Marteau, and Isaac Casaubon, which he deemed worthy of a place alongside the letters of Dupuy’s leading lights of the republic of letters.

67 Dated 1602 in the Dupuy Collection.
Table 6.2. Pierre de L'Estoile’s Latin Correspondence in BnF ms. fr. 10303.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ms. fr. 10303 fols.</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Sender</th>
<th>Recipient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>402-403</td>
<td>1567 08 03</td>
<td>Guillaume Fournier</td>
<td>Pierre de L'Estoile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>403-405</td>
<td>1580 08 28</td>
<td>Féderic de Morel</td>
<td>Pierre de L'Estoile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>409</td>
<td>1582 – –</td>
<td>Pierre de L'Estoile</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>407-408</td>
<td>1584 09 16</td>
<td>Claude de Marteau</td>
<td>Pierre de L'Estoile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>406-407</td>
<td>1584 09 27</td>
<td>Claude de Marteau</td>
<td>Pierre de L'Estoile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>415-416</td>
<td>1588 01 01</td>
<td>Claude de Marteau</td>
<td>Pierre de L'Estoile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283</td>
<td>1603 04 09</td>
<td>Isaac Casaubon</td>
<td>Pierre de L'Estoile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>413-415</td>
<td>– 09 05</td>
<td>J. Vincent</td>
<td>Pierre de L'Estoile</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Once the miscellany was compiled and the originals returned to Dupuy, L'Estoile could begin to use these texts. He only occasionally annotated this miscellany and referred to few of these pieces in his diaries. He made most use of the Scaliger letters, occasionally citing passages from them in his diaries in the form of commonplaces. His copies of Scaliger letters have hitherto been passed over by historians and deserve close attention. Thanks to the recent publication of Scaliger’s correspondence it is possible to evaluate the significance of L'Estoile’s bundles. L'Estoile had his scribe copy eighty-seven letters composed by Scaliger into this miscellany. He also cited seven letters by Scaliger in the diaries that do not appear in the miscellany. These ninety-four letters are Pierre Dupuy’s selections from his family’s papers and demonstrate his attempt to shape the scholarly reputations of his father and his father’s friends. L'Estoile possessed copies of letters from Scaliger to twenty different recipients, the most represented being Claude Dupuy (25 from 1577-1594), Charles and Pierre de Labbé (18 to the brothers, 13 to Charles alone from 1601-1607), Gilbert Seguin (5 from c.1590-c.1593), Dominicus Baudius (5 from 1592-1595), Augustin and Christophe Dupuy (4 from 1600-1602), Pierre Dupuy (2 from 1605 and 1607), Richard Thompson (2

---

68 L'Estoile’s brief annotations to BnF ms. fr. 10303 include fols. 75, 100, 203, 244, 279, 401, 518.
69 Passages in which L'Estoile described receiving Scaliger letters from Dupuy are Brunet, viii, 318, 325, 337, ix, 17, 34, 41, 70. I am grateful to Paul Botley and Dirk van Miert, editors of Scaliger’s correspondence, for their help in evaluating the significance of L'Estoile’s copies, which do not appear in their edition.
from 1594 and 1595), and Jacques-Auguste De Thou (2 from 1587 and 1591). Further letters cited in the diaries were addressed to Charles de Labbé (5 from 1606-1608), Claude Dupuy, and Jacques Gillot. Loans of Scaliger letters from Pierre Dupuy to L'Estoile then represented the Dupuy family’s contacts first, above all relations and their close friends the Labbé brothers, and then a scattering of Scaliger’s intellectual network second.\footnote{Scaliger, i, xi-xiii and viii, 41-164.}

L'Estoile’s miscellany is the only surviving manuscript source for twenty-six of these letters (Table 6.3). Presumably they have since gone missing from the Dupuy collection.\footnote{On Scaliger’s letters in the Dupuy collection see Scaliger, i, xviii-xxii. Chopard, ‘Erudition’, pp. 224-235, notes pieces exchanged between L'Estoile and Dupuy now missing from the Dupuy collection.} Daniel Heinsius published in Leiden in 1627 and 1628 the most complete early modern edition of Scaliger’s correspondence, having corresponded with Pierre Dupuy in 1620 about the latter’s later-aborted plans to publish an edition of the letters of great men, notably the correspondence between Scaliger and Casaubon. Heinsius acquired from Dupuy at least some of the letters he published in 1627.\footnote{Scaliger, i, xli-xlvi.} In his edition, Heinsius amended Scaliger’s prose, typically moving Scaliger’s verbs to the end of clauses and sentences. L'Estoile’s manuscript copies provide Scaliger’s original word ordering in comparison and further demonstrate the extent of Heinsius’ revisions. Other than these syntactical changes, there are only two differences in content between L'Estoile’s manuscript copies and Heinsius’ edition of the letters. In one letter to Charles Labbé, L'Estoile’s copy gives the date ‘XV Kalend Mai Juliani 1604’ (27 April 1604) whereas the printed edition gave the date ‘IV Kalend Maii Juliani’ (8 May 1604).\footnote{Following Botley and Van Miert, I give the modern date according to the Gregorian Calendar. BnF ms. fr. 10303, fols. 460-461; Scaliger, v, 307-308, 1604 05 08, Scaliger to Carolus Labbaeus.} Heinsius also edited sections of Scaliger’s letters to save his correspondents from embarrassment.\footnote{Scaliger, i, xlv.} In L'Estoile’s manuscript a postscript remains that was omitted from Heinsius’ edition, concerning Henry Wotton’s use of Isaac Casaubon’s credit in Geneva in
Table 6.3. Scaliger letters lent by Pierre Dupuy to Pierre de L’Estoile of which L’Estoile’s copy in BnF ms. fr. 10303 is the only surviving manuscript source.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ms. fr. 10303 fols.</th>
<th>Recipients</th>
<th>Scaliger</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>294-295</td>
<td>Charles et Pierre de Labbé</td>
<td>iv, 349, 1602 08 06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298</td>
<td>Charles et Pierre de Labbé</td>
<td>iv, 612, 1603 03 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299</td>
<td>Charles de Labbé</td>
<td>v, 554, 1605 02 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>Charles de Labbé</td>
<td>v, 592, 1605 04 06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>Charles de Labbé</td>
<td>v, 499, 1605 01 07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309</td>
<td>Charles de Labbé</td>
<td>vi, 614, 1606 11 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310-312</td>
<td>Charles de Labbé</td>
<td>vi, 618, 1606 11 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313-314</td>
<td>Charles de Labbé</td>
<td>vi, 630, 1606 11 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315</td>
<td>Charles de Labbé</td>
<td>vi, 645, 1606 12 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>316-317</td>
<td>Charles de Labbé</td>
<td>vii, 55, 1607 02 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>317-319</td>
<td>Charles de Labbé</td>
<td>vii, 82, 1607 03 08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>451</td>
<td>Richard Thomson</td>
<td>ii, 473, 1594 12 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>452</td>
<td>Richard Thomson</td>
<td>ii, 522, 1595 06 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>452-453</td>
<td>Grissaeus</td>
<td>i, 505, [1586] 04 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>457-458</td>
<td>Charles et Pierre de Labbé</td>
<td>iv, 159, 1601 12 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>458</td>
<td>Charles et Pierre de Labbé</td>
<td>iv, 557, 1603 01 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>459-460</td>
<td>Charles et Pierre de Labbé</td>
<td>v, 200, 1603 12 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>460-461</td>
<td>Charles de Labbé</td>
<td>v, 307, 1604 05 08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>461-462</td>
<td>Charles de Labbé</td>
<td>v, 315, 1604 05 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>463-465</td>
<td>Charles de Labbé</td>
<td>v, 423, 1604 10 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>465-466</td>
<td>Charles de Labbé</td>
<td>vi, 36-37, 1605 05 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>470-472</td>
<td>Charles de Labbé</td>
<td>vi, 165, 1605 09 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>472-473</td>
<td>Charles de Labbé</td>
<td>vi, 184, 1605 09 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>509-512</td>
<td>Vazet</td>
<td>ii, 252, 1592 06 04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>513</td>
<td>François Vertunien</td>
<td>ii, 256, 1592 07 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>518-521</td>
<td>Jacques-Auguste de Thou</td>
<td>ii, 9, 1587 03 23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1594, which forced Casaubon to think about selling books to raise the required amount.76

Scaliger’s letters deserved careful collecting. On Scaliger’s death, L’Estoile named him a ‘great and rare personality, the light of our century, the honour of good spirits and the first and last (as I believe) of the learned men in Europe’.77 Pierre Dupuy had succeeded in convincing his friend to proclaim the scholar’s reputation in his manuscripts. L’Estoile particularly admired the letters for Scaliger’s ‘judgements contained therein, that he makes summarily about several illustrious men of this century’.78 He also admired Scaliger’s emendations and glosses of Biblical passages, notably in one letter to De Thou concerning his paraphrase of the Book of Job, that L’Estoile titled in an annotation to his miscellany.79 In his diaries, L’Estoile sometimes copied out entire passages of Scaliger’s letters, deciding not to send them to a scribe and incorporating them instead into his register, often to cite Scaliger’s authoritative response to recent publications or political events.80 These letters attracted the attention of L’Estoile’s friend the Royal Secretary Christophe Justel, who borrowed two individual letters and soon the entire miscellany, returning them five days later.81 These copies of Scaliger’s letters were prized pieces in L’Estoile’s library, that he used in his historical writing, devout reading, and literary exchanges.

Dupuy encouraged L’Estoile to regard with similar reverence the illustrious humanists Justus Lipsius, Jacques-Auguste de Thou, and Isaac Casaubon. L’Estoile treated them as a group and collected sketches of Julius Caesar Scaliger and Lipsius done by Dupuy’s lackey, which he compared favourably to the portraits of De Thou and Casaubon done in ‘Craion’ by

76 My thanks to Paul Botley for this interpretation of the passage. BnF ms. fr. 10303, fol. 452, ‘De Wultone quaeso memineris. Audio Casauboni Bibliothecam eo nomine dissoluendo in auctione venisse.’ Postscript to the letter in Scaliger, ii, 522, 1595 06 14, Scaliger to Richard Thompson. 77 Brunet, ix, 266. 78 Brunet, viii, 325. Eg. Schrenck-Lazard, v, 29-30, citing Scaliger, i, 471-472, [1585] 07 23, Scaliger to Claude Dupuy. 79 Brunet, viii, 337. For this letter see ms. fr. 10303, fols. 518-521, with L’Estoile’s marginal annotation ‘Sur le Jobus de Mr le President de Thou, correct. de Mr de Lescalle”; Scaliger, ii, 9, 1587 03 23, to De Thou. On this poem see De Smet, Thuanus, pp. 66-73. 80 Eg. Brunet, viii, 84-85, 265, ix, 17. 81 Brunet, ix, 182, 195.
the collector Du Monstier, which he found ‘very bad’. Dupuy’s bundles of erudite letters included some from Lipsius, and L'Estoile also bought the printed edition to set alongside his copies of Lipsius’ treatises and editions. He cited Lipsius in his diaries even more frequently than Scaliger and found in his works moral consolation for the misfortunes of the world. De Thou was a neighbour in the parish of Saint André des Arts and a président in the Parlement, and yet considering the evidence of his reports, L'Estoile seems to have hardly known him personally. He wrote about De Thou from the near distance as a superior man of his times, citing his authoritative opinions of publications and diligently reading his histories, sometimes at the instigation of Dupuy. Only on one occasion did L'Estoile report a meeting between them, after which De Thou introduced L'Estoile to an English Catholic priest, with whom he discussed the pamphlets concerning James VI and I’s dispute with the papacy.

Dupuy also lent L'Estoile letters sent and received by Isaac Casaubon, but L'Estoile seems to have known and admired him already. Hearing of Casaubon’s arrival to Paris in September 1600, L'Estoile praised him as a ‘man singular in doctrine and the understanding of languages, especially Greek’. Both men often made the long journey to hear Protestant services outside Paris at Ablon and Charenton. L'Estoile drew on Casaubon’s theological knowledge on 8 April 1603, following a dispute he had with Jacopo Suarez, a Portuguese Franciscan who had preached a sermon on the subject of whether Scripture proves the existence of purgatory, which Suarez affirmed and L'Estoile denied on the basis of a passage
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82 The lackey delivered Julius Caesar Scaliger’s portrait, Brunet, viii, 349; M. de Gérocourt gave L’Estoile the Lipsius portrait, Brunet, ix, 104, ‘oeuvre rare de laquais’; and L’Estoile visited Du Monstier’s cabinet with Tourval, Brunet, ix, 337. On this group, focusing on De Thou’s relations among them, see De Smet, Thuanus, pp. 75-105.
83 Greffe-Lothe, pp. 780-784, 980-981.
84 Eg. Brunet, xi, 24-25.
85 For the passages in which L’Estoile describes reading de Thou’s histories see Greffe-Lothe, pp. 989-992. For L’Estoile citing at second-hand De Thou’s opinions on publications see eg. Brunet, ix, 158.
86 Their sole recorded meeting in Brunet, x, 129.
87 Pierre Dupuy giving L’Estoile Casaubon letters in Brunet, ix, 206, 263, 266; xi, 40, 141.
that Suarez cited from Martin Luther’s Leipzig dispute with Johann Eck. L’Estoile sought the opinion of Casaubon, who sent him on 9 April two Greek passages from Gregory of Nazianzus, that L’Estoile checked in his library and declared to be in favour of his position and not that of Suarez. Casaubon copied these passages for L’Estoile in a hitherto unnoticed letter that addressed him as ‘most excellent Stella’ and claimed that their case against the Cordeliers was incontrovertible. No charlatan might respond, Casaubon claimed, and the Cordeliers’ position was pure insanity. In exchange for this knowledge, L’Estoile could offer Casaubon his expertise in the Parisian book trade. On 16 January 1604 he agreed to search for a book that Casaubon had spotted in De Thou’s library, Alexander Carrerius’ *De potestate Romani Pontificis adversus impios politicos* (1599). It took him three or four days of research in the University before he found it. Since Carrerius seemed to equate the power of the pope with that of God, L’Estoile quipped that he preferred the title *Liber Blasphemiarum Carrerii*. L’Estoile deferred to Casaubon’s judgements, as he deferred to his renowned peers in the republic of letters, but L’Estoile’s closer relationship with Casaubon and shared abhorrence for aspects of the Roman Church placed him in this case in sympathetic contact, and not simply on the margins of great erudition.

While Pierre Dupuy shaped L’Estoile’s engagement with erudite humanists, he did not reform the scholarly habits of this aged collector, since L’Estoile was more interested in pursuing his own peculiar curiosity than philology. L’Estoile would not change his ways after Dupuy lent him a Scaliger letter that denounced the anachronistic use of accents in Latin,
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91 Brunet, viii, 117-118.
boasting that ‘I am one of those fools to which he refers, and I will not correct myself’. 92 When Dupuy showed L'Estoile on 23 February 1608 an edition of John Barclay’s Neo-Latin work of prose fiction, *Euphormio’s Satyricon*, sought-after by the papal nuncio since it slandered the pope, and presented him with the key to distinguish between the allegorical characters, he warned L'Estoile that there was nothing worth copying out in the book, parroting Scaliger’s opinion on the text. 93 L'Estoile disagreed and copied out passages concerning the pope, European monarchs and princes, and the duc de Sully, then returned the book to Dupuy on 27 February. 94 Christophe Justel, Royal Secretary, lent him the second part of *Euphormio’s Satyricon* in August 1609, when L'Estoile extracted a great many passages. Upon finishing, L'Estoile wrote that ‘I took so much pleasure in copying these passages that I could not take my hand from the paper, and I could have happily transcribed the whole book.’ 95 Satirical novels and accents on Latin words suited L'Estoile’s humour – ‘sots’, ‘plaisans’, ‘gentils’ – but did not amuse Dupuy.

L'Estoile’s exchanges with Dupuy demonstrate how scholarly reputations in the republic of letters might be cultivated both at close proximity and at a distance. L'Estoile often deferred to celebrated scholars’ opinions, and assiduously collected their writings in a newly commissioned manuscript miscellany, in these ways signalling their renown. At the same time, L'Estoile established himself as a worthy recipient of these pieces and compiled his own correspondence alongside that of scholars he admired. However, while Dupuy was L'Estoile’s most regularly reported visitor in retirement, their exchanges are a-typical of L'Estoile’s reading and collecting practices, since above all he was interested in religious controversy. This interest is the subject of the next sections.
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92 Brunet, ix, 70; Scaliger, vii, 447, 1608 03 14.
94 Brunet, ix, 46-49.
95 Brunet, ix, 323-324, 348-383, 383 for the quotation.
III. Gallican Readings

Recording in his diaries his responses to theologico-political controversies at the end of the civil wars, L'Estoile denounced the pope’s claims to temporal authority and affirmed the liberties of the Gallican Church. Contacts in the Palais de Justice and beyond shaped the emphasis of L'Estoile’s reading on those topics, especially those individuals involved directly in the polemical campaigns, but his long experience of religious controversy and unbending hostility to the papacy meant that his position on these debates was already fixed.

L'Estoile asserted his position in the debate over papal authority most instinctively when on 31 January 1610 his second cousin Pierre de Bérulle visited him in his study. At that moment Bérulle was already a distinguished theologian, planning his imminent foundation of the congregation of the Oratory to further the post-Tridentine reform of the secular clergy. Bérulle had heard about L'Estoile’s library and came to examine his collection. He had also heard of L'Estoile’s beliefs and came to convince his older cousin of a fundamental point of doctrine, that ‘the Church cannot err’. L'Estoile could never accept this doctrine. Advancing apparently subtle arguments, Bérulle left L'Estoile frustrated and unable to respond on the spot. When he later continued the argument in his diaries, L'Estoile exclaimed that Bérulle’s doctrine was vulgar sophistry, and the opposite of the truth. He felt that it was his natural tendency to respond this way, caused by his zeal for the reformation of abuses in the Church. In an irenic spirit, they parted as friends and promised to see one another again to discuss the point further. Bérulle borrowed books by the Protestant educational reformer Petrus Ramus and the Portuguese Dominican theologian Bartholomew

98 ‘l’Église ne peut errer’.
of Braga. Apart from the return of the Bartholomew of Braga (and not the Ramus) on 23 August 1610, L’Estoile did not report a further meeting between them. Reflecting on this disagreement, L’Estoile felt that he was armed with truth, which was stronger than Bérulle’s theology.

Major theologico-political debates in late sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century France revolved around the temporal authority of the papacy and the publication of the decrees of the Council of Trent. L’Estoile engaged with these issues in his reading, and got to the heart of the issue on 7 August 1609 in his reading of the Révision du Concile de Trente (1600), a critique of Tridentine doctrine that was banned by Henri IV and the Parlement of Toulouse in 1601. It had been published anonymously by Guillaume Ranchin, a Protestant and Professor of Law in Montpellier with connections in Parisian Gallican circles, and a former a student of Jacques Cujas. Ranchin’s preface to his text set out the main Gallican criticism of the Council, that sensible reforms proposed to the Council had been frustrated by the intrigues of the bishops and the papal curia. L’Estoile copied out in his diary a passage on the crucial subject of papal authority. In a discussion of the Jesuits’ ‘blind obedience’, Ranchin cited from Cardinal Robert Bellarmine’s Controversiae (1581-1593) the argument

99 Greffe-Lothe, p. 377, 912 identifies these books as Bartholomeus de Martyribus [Bartholomew of Braga], Compendium spiritualis doctrinae ex variis sanctorum patrum sententiis magna ex parte collectum (Paris, 1601) – although the USTC lists other possible editions published in Madrid: Luis Sánchez, 1598 and Lisbon: Antônio Ribeiro, 1582; and Petrus Ramus, De unica religione (Frankfurt, 1566) – although L’Estoile’s reference is incomplete and this specific title does not appear in the USTC.
100 ‘la promptitude de mon naturel’, ‘je me trouve armé de la vérité, qui est plus forte que toute sa théologie’. Brunet, x, 131-133.
that since no pope has ever fallen into heresy, it is probable and can be believed as a matter of faith that no pope can ever fall into heresy in the future.\textsuperscript{104} L’Estoile likewise found this passage absurd and heretical. To confirm its authorship, he cited the passage from his copy of Bellarmine’s \textit{Controversiae}, Book IV Chapter VI, in the treatise ‘De Romano Pontifice’.

L'Estoile denied outright Bellarmine’s reasoning and did not offer counter-arguments here. Next, he highlighted a second passage from Ranchin concerning Jesuit obedience, as to whether they must always follow the pope on points of doctrine, but this time he did not have the source, ‘\textit{In Censura Coloniensi}’, and he hoped to borrow or buy it soon.\textsuperscript{105} Instead, L'Estoile turned once again to his transcription of Barclay’s \textit{Euphormio’s Satyricon}, which allegorised the blind devotion of the Jesuits to the popes. By locating the correct citations and reflecting on these passages, reporting his findings in his diary, L'Estoile disputed papal claims to temporal authority.

L'Estoile’s reports of the Parisian impact of publications concerning the Council of Trent demonstrate that these theologico-political debates were still alive, and that if resistance in the Parlement slipped, and the king gave way to the wishes of the pope and his nuncios, then the Tridentine decrees might be implemented at any moment. Engaging with this issue, L'Estoile bought both editions of Jacques Gillot’s \textit{Actes du Concile de Trente} in July 1607 and March 1608. The title page claimed that these acts were ‘Taken from the originals’, but Gillot did not publish the official proceedings of the Council, and instead set out the correspondence between Charles IX and his ambassadors to Trent, demonstrating the frustrations they felt throughout the Council’s debates and behind-the-scenes negotiations. In


\textsuperscript{105} Brunet, ix, 327-328. Ranchin’s passage that L’Estoile copied: ‘Si aucun examine la doctrine du Pape à la reigle de la parole de Dieu, et voiant qu’elle est différente, il vient à lui contredire, qu’il soit exterminê à fer et à feu’.
this way, Gillot hoped to prove to his readers that the Council of Trent was illegitimate. ¹⁰⁶

L’Estoile’s report of this publication delighted in the failed efforts to censor it by the nuncio, Cardinal Maffeo Barberini, after book-sellers had been forewarned of his opposition, which gave the text a certain notoriety. L’Estoile’s conclusion to the report celebrated the book’s impact in Paris, since ‘by this means, the book spread everywhere, and is read with benefit and enjoyment by many’. ¹⁰⁷ This publication announced a victory for the Gallican cause.

Confirming its impact, L’Estoile later acquired Gillot’s edition, prepared with Jacques Leschassier, of texts demonstrating the Privileges de l’Église gallicane (Paris, 1609). He patriotically concluded that ‘these liberties have served for all time as a bridle and a caution on the ambition of the popes in Rome’. ¹⁰⁸

The debate over the extent of the pope’s temporal authority broke out into pamphlet warfare in two significant controversies in these years. The first is the dispute over the Venetian Interdict of 17 April 1606, by which pope Paul V declared the Republic excommunicated in response to a succession of jurisdictional disputes, especially over the clergy. And the second is the dispute concerning James VI and I’s 22 June 1606 Oath of Allegiance, that demanded loyalty to the king and denied that the pope had any power to depose him. These controversies resonated in France as they had direct implications for the liberties of the Gallican Church when faced with an assertive papacy, and involved two of Henri IV’s closest diplomatic allies. ¹⁰⁹ L’Estoile followed both controversies in detail but his

¹⁰⁶ Scaliger, vii, 150. 1607 05 05, Jacques Gillot to Scaliger.
¹⁰⁸ Brunet, ix, 245, xi, 37-38.
responses to each differed, primarily because of his particular relations with those in Paris closely involved in the pamphlet debates.

L’Estoile hunted down publications on the Venetian Interdict controversy, ‘which I amass furiously wherever I can recover them’. After peace had been made between Venice and the papacy in April, following significant French intervention, he counted up his collection and recorded that he had assembled fifty-three treatises on the controversy, including nineteen reproduced in one Italian compilation that he bought on 25 June 1607. He spent 10 sols to have Abraham bind the treatises together. Previously, he had included pieces on the Interdict in a packet of twenty-six pamphlets amassed between 1 October and 31 December 1606, marked HHH. Fifty-three treatises, in at most thirty-four distinct editions, is a considerable collection of the one hundred and forty or so distinct editions of works published across Europe and relating to the controversy, of which eighty-one were published outside of Italy, and thirty in France. Since he owned so many of these texts, he had less need to engage in a close copying and reading of them in his diaries.

L’Estoile’s reports of the libels concerning the Interdict focused on the political impact of their publication rather than the content of their arguments. Paolo Sarpi’s anonymous edition of two short works by the late medieval French conciliarist Jean Gerson launched the libel campaign over the Interdict in a way that identified the Venetian cause with the Gallican struggle against papal claims to temporal authority. L’Estoile reported on 4 July 1606 that De Thou spread the news of the nuncio’s effective censorship of this
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Brunet, viii, 295.

Brunet, viii, 302, 310.

Brunet, viii, 268.


publication in Paris. L'Estoile’s colleagues and contacts became directly involved in the campaign, especially the avocat Jacques Leschassier, the avocat du roi Louis Servin, and Isaac Casaubon, who were each employed in May 1606 by the Venetian ambassador to France, Piero Priuli to compose a libel in defence of the Republic, even before Priuli had official authorisation to do so. L'Estoile’s report of these publications consisted of a superficial weighing of Servin and Leschassier’s texts, in which he declared Servin more worthy of the gold chain offered by the Venetian Senate, and Leschassier’s text more derivative from previous sources.

Leschassier and Casaubon, among other Gallicans and Protestants in Paris, had connections in the Republic, most significantly with Sarpi, the leading Venetian polemicist. Following their lead, L'Estoile regarded Sarpi as the hero of the controversy, reading his Considerationi sopra le censure, translated as L’Examen, because his colleagues recommended it – ‘strongly praised by all honest and learned men’ – and he felt their opinions worth transmitting. He acquired two copies of L’Examen, one for himself and another to lend to friends and family, despite the nuncio’s success in having the libel seized from the printers. He bought several of Sarpi’s subsequent publications and continued to remark on news of Sarpi from the letters, tracts, and epigrams he came across in his regular
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115 Brunet, viii, 229.
exchanges of material.\textsuperscript{120} L'Estoile read the pamphlets in defence of the Roman cause with less attention, picking up Baronius' texts and simply glossing Bellarmine's response to Sarpi with the phrase 'subtlety passes over truth'.\textsuperscript{121} The men who published alongside Sarpi and attacked the temporal power of the papacy defined L'Estoile's interpretative community and shaped his responses to the Interdict. In his reports of the publications concerning the Interdict controversy, L'Estoile emphasised a simple message that needed little textual support: beware the temporal ambitions of the Papacy.

The controversy over James VI and I’s Oath of Allegiance proved this lesson abundantly. L'Estoile’s first encounter with the affair came on 28 April 1608 when he bought James’ \textit{Triplex nodo triplex Cuneus}, his apology for the Oath of Allegiance against the denunciations of Pope Paul V and Cardinal Bellarmine. L'Estoile’s report of this purchase resembles those of publications concerning the Venetian Interdict, noting the price, the printer (his good friend Adrien Périer), and the fact that the papal nuncio had ordered it banned, which of course led to it selling out quickly.\textsuperscript{122} As the controversy developed, L'Estoile followed its publications in greater detail and was encouraged to read more expansively by his contacts at the English embassy in Paris.

Jean de Tourval, the English ambassador’s secretary and the translator of James VI and I’s libels, brought L'Estoile directly into the pamphlet war.\textsuperscript{123} On 7 August 1609, L'Estoile visited Tourval to distract him from his work translating the king’s Apology into French, and found that it was already in print. Tourval showed L'Estoile his letter of commission from the king, but L'Estoile feared that it would not save him from the

\textsuperscript{120}Brunet, viii, 279, 280, ix, 18, 21, 23, 88, 113, 217, 234, 305-306; Greffe-Lothe, pp. 952-954.
\textsuperscript{122}Brunet, ix, 69-70; De Franceschi, \textit{Crise}, pp. 134-135; Patterson, \textit{James VI and I}, pp. 84-86.
repercussions of censorship.\textsuperscript{124} On 18 August, Tourval gave L'Estoile the \textit{Tortura Torti} – Lancelot Andrews’ reply to Bellarmine’s attack on the king’s \textit{Apology} – from which L'Estoile copied out extracts since it had been widely praised.\textsuperscript{125} Writing on 27 August 1609 to the Secretary of State, Robert Cecil, Tourval regretted that he had to remain in Paris to add a preface to the king’s \textit{Apology}, facing the continual investigations of the ‘Jesuits and ministers of the Pope’. He said that he had ‘spread the rumour’ that he had travelled to England, but instead he remained hidden in Paris.\textsuperscript{126} By 12 September, Tourval’s translation of the \textit{Apology} was selling outside Charenton, where booksellers sold political libels to the Protestant congregation ‘from under their coats’, despite the restrictions of the Edict of Nantes and repeated bans imposed by the Elders.\textsuperscript{127} In these tense months, Tourval’s behaviour seemed increasingly bizarre and childish to L'Estoile, as Tourval lent him an English breviary and then soon demanded it back.\textsuperscript{128} After their final recorded meeting L'Estoile had forgiven him, having held back from criticising his ‘rather bad’ French prose in his translation of Joseph Hall’s \textit{Characters of Virtues and Vice}, so as not to anger him, and because he respected his piety and fear of God.\textsuperscript{129} L'Estoile’s friendship with Tourval was forged over their shared desire for the reunion and reformation of the Church. Their contact encouraged L'Estoile to read the pamphlets concerning James VI and I’s conflict with the Papacy over his Oath of Allegiance a little more closely than he read the pamphlets of the Venetian Interdict controversy.

\textsuperscript{124} Brunet, ix, 326-327.
\textsuperscript{125} Brunet, ix, 338-339, 387, x, 39; Greffe-Lothe, pp. 323-324, 960; De Franceschi, \textit{Crise}, pp. 221-222, 229.
\textsuperscript{126} ‘mais depuis etant icy m'a fait comandes par my Lord of Bathes d’y adjouter sa Preface, ce qu'ayant finlement mis a execution, apres y avoir eté afligé et traversé des Jesuïtes & ministres du Pape tout ce qui se peut dire, qui en ont fait tout coup sur coup faire recherches sur recherches, et envoyé querir devant les Juges tous ceux quiz doutoyent qui le pussent faire, tandis que j’etoy cache en cette grand foret de Paris ayant fait courir le bruyt d’estre passé en Ang[leteerre]’’. TNA SP 78/55, fol. 164r-v.
\textsuperscript{128} Brunet, x, 36, 92.
\textsuperscript{129} Brunet, x, 168-169; Greffe-Lothe, p. 692.
While L'Estoile followed closely the theologico-political controversies of his time, he hoped that his contemporaries might one day move beyond them. In addition to Tourval, his interest in the reunion and reformation of the Church endeared him to the English embassy in the suburb of Saint Germain des Près, just beyond the city walls along the rue Saint André des Arts. The ambassador, George Carew, perhaps recognised him as a well-connected figure in the Palais de Justice, sympathetic to their cause. L'Estoile’s first recorded contact at the embassy came on 3 August 1608 when he met with Carew and stayed to hear an Anglican service. Although he relied on a translator, he admired the service for being neither plain nor superstitious, and preferred it to the Protestant services at Charenton for its passages of call and response in the Psalms, and the greater time given to sing a Psalm in its entirety.  

On 15 September, Carew reciprocated by visiting L'Estoile’s cabin, praising his portraits of Henry VIII and Poltrot de Meré.  

The next summer, Tourval, along with Nathaniel Taylor, the embassy’s minister, visited L'Estoile’s study on 17 August 1609. After their meeting, Taylor wrote to L'Estoile on 22 August to thank him for his hospitality and to send him a copy of a book on Church reform, newly printed in London, a letter which L'Estoile appreciated enough to copy into his diary, although he owned an earlier copy of the book.  

On 7 October Taylor stopped to say a fond goodbye before returning to London. They recognised in one another a zeal for reunion and reformation of the Church.  

L'Estoile also met with Parisian intellectuals who published to advance the reformation and reunion of the Churches. In a visit to L'Estoile’s study and cabinet on 24 September 1607, the former avocat and now European diplomat Jean de Villiers Hotman gave L'Estoile books that he hoped would serve the  irenic cause, including copies of his recent re-editions of *De Pace Ecclesiae* by Philip Melanchthon and other reformers, as well
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130 Brunet, ix, 111-112.
131 Brunet, ix, 129-130.
132 Brunet, ix, 337.
133 Brunet, ix, 344-345; Greffe-Lothe, pp. 497-498.
134 Brunet, x, 38-39.
as George Cassander’s *De officio pii viri*, that pleaded for a return to the ways of the primitive Church and in Hotman’s edition included his syllabus of irenic literature.¹³⁵ L'Estoile reported his great interest in Hotman’s books but scepticism of his diplomatic efforts, since he understood well Henri IV’s reluctance to take action in religious matters, and took a dim view on the confessional zeal of those on both sides of the divide. Hotman took his chance during a moment of optimism for a reunion of the churches in 1606-1607, as the Venetian Interdict controversy seemed to bring together France, England, and Venice in opposition to the temporal ambitions of the papacy. But L'Estoile was under no illusion as to its chance of success. Louis Turquet, Sieur de Mayerne, whom L'Estoile introduced as ‘a good and learned man, and very zealous for the reform and reunion of the Church’, visited him on 3 October 1608 and gave him a copy of his short tract on Henri IV’s plan for a national synod. Although L'Estoile admired Turquet’s irenic intentions, he feared that the book would be rejected by both confessions.¹³⁶ L'Estoile’s experience of religious conflict left him sceptical as to the chance of religious concord. It was through sharing books among his family members that L'Estoile found a personal way to overcome the confessional divide.


IV. Reading within the Family

L'Estoile treasured his father’s books as his legacy, inscribing the frontispieces of editions of the works of Ovid and Ausonius to mark that he inherited them from his father’s library. He identified further pieces of his father’s collection in his diaries. In particular, Louis’ religious books situated the L'Estoile family’s reading beyond the rival confessions of the post-Reformation era and instead represented efforts at bringing about religious concord, based on a return to the simple doctrine of the early Church. Of particularly value among them, L'Estoile lent to Christophe Justel his father’s Greek manuscript of the acts of the Council of Chalcedon, which Justel used in preparing his Codex Canonum Ecclesiae Universae (Paris, 1608), a compilation of acts of the early Church until the age of Justinian. L'Estoile found Justel’s text useful since it contained nothing but authentic documents that cast the light of Roman antiquity onto the shadows of the present. Justel included L'Estoile’s father’s Greek manuscript at the top of his list of index of sources.

L'Estoile proudly described in his diaries significant books that were composed, edited, and annotated by individuals closely connected to his father, all students of the Reformer and Hebraic scholar François de Vatable. This group was associated with the religious middle ground and those denounced by Jean Calvin as ‘moyenneurs’ and ‘Nicodemites’. L'Estoile’s inventory listed four Bibles and one Psalter all edited by
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138 Brunet, x, 240; Christophe Justel, Codex Canonum ECClesiae universae, a Justinano imperatore confirmatus (Paris, 1608), p. 241.

139 On Béroalde see the prologue.

140 On the ‘moyenneurs’ and ‘Nicodemites’ see Turchetti, Concordia o tolleranza?, pp. 332-342; Mario Turchetti, ‘Middle Parties in France during the Wars of Religion’ in Philip Benedict, Guido Marnet, Henk van
Vatable and printed by Robert Estienne. One copy of the Vatable Bible he prized particularly highly since it contained the annotations of his father’s friend and Vatable’s student Jean de Salignac, successor to his master as royal reader in Hebrew and an outspoken doctor of theology in Paris. Salignac took part in the 1544-1545 Assembly of Melun to prepare the French delegation attending the first session of the Council of Trent, as well as the 1561 Colloquy of Poissy that tried to resolve religious differences at the start of the civil wars. At the Colloquy, he called for the distribution of communion in two kinds and affirmed transubstantiation, approved the use of the vernacular at points in the mass, and demanded a suppression of the religious orders and the abolition of devotional images. When the Parisian curate Jean de La Fosse recorded Salignac’s death in 1567 he referred to him as a Huguenot, although Calvin and Beza had tried unsuccessfully to convert him to their cause.

Relying on his familiarity with the handwriting of his father’s friends, L’Estoile insisted to Justel that a five-page manuscript ‘Treatise on Predestination’, in a minute and compact hand, was not by Pierre Picherel, a good friend both to L’Estoile and his father, whom L’Estoile referred to as ‘a learned man and a great theologian and Hebraicist’. Picherel studied under Vatable and took part in the Colloquy of Poissy alongside Salignac. He too stood in the middle of the confessional divide. In the early civil wars, the Provins chronicler and curate Claude Haton recorded Picherel’s activities as a canon at the priory of La Fontaine.
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Greffe-Lothe, p. 173, attributes these Bibles to Louis de L’Estoile’s library. This attribution is possible, and the biographical connections between Louis de L’Estoile and the Vatable circle are strong, but it is not certain. Pierre de L’Estoile admired copies of the Vatable Bible in the collection of the former prior of the Abbey of Saint Germain des Près, Jacques du Breuil: Brunet, ix, 304-305; Antoine Le Roux De Lincy and Alexandre Bruel, ‘Notice historique et critique sur dom Jacques du Breul, prieur de Saint-Germain-des-Prés’, *Bibliothèque de l’École des chartes*, 29 (1868), pp. 56-72, 479-512.

aux Bois in the Ile de France. Haton declared Picherel to be a Huguenot and a ‘false Christian’, but neither a Lutheran nor a Calvinist, holding his own private opinions that were rejected by both Catholics and Protestants. According to Haton, Picherel said only one mass a week, on a Sunday, using the vestments of the Roman mass but omitting references to the cult of the Virgin and saints from the *Confiteor*, and rushing the consecration of the Eucharist, that he then distributed to the whole congregation in both kinds, using unleavened bread. After these conflicts, Picherel devoted himself to theology. In 1581 he gave L'Estoile his publication that affirmed the real presence in the Eucharist, printed by Mamert Patisson in a few copies for Pischerel to distribute among friends.\textsuperscript{143} L'Estoile inherited both from his father and his father’s friends books that affirmed a position in the religious middle ground.

L'Estoile’s confession of faith on 14 September 1610, the most extensive doctrinal discussion in the diaries, situates his religious position across three generations, invoking his father’s stance to justify his own doctrine and in this way explaining this position to his son. He claimed to have followed his father’s dying wish, expressed to his childhood tutor, the Protestant Mathieu Béroalde, another of his father’s friends who studied under Vatable: ‘I ask you above all to instruct him in piety and the fear of God; and regarding the Reformed Religion (knowing M' Matthieu well), I do not want you to take him away from this [Catholic] Church: I forbid it. But, also, I forbid you to nourish in him its abuses and superstitions.’\textsuperscript{144} With this recollection, L’Estoile argued that he had always held a religious position in the middle ground throughout his life in the civil wars, and had consistently


\textsuperscript{144} ‘Maistre Mathieu, mon ami, je vous recommande mon fils que voilà; je le depose en vos mains, comme un des plus précieux gages que Dieu m’a donnés. Je vous prie surtout de l'instruire en la piété et crainte de Dieu; et pour le regard de la Religion (connaissant bien ledit M’ Matthieu), je ne veux pas que vous me l’ostiez de ceste Eglise: je vous le défends. Mais, aussi, ne veux-je pas (lui dit-il) que vous me le nourrissiez aux abus et superstitions d’icelle.’ Brunet, xi, 15.
followed his father’s dying wish. Addressing one of his sons, he implied that he expected him and his siblings to follow their father’s example.

The occasion for this confession came when L’Estoile feared that he might die following a painful combination of fever, flux, and haemorrhoids that began two weeks earlier, as ‘God redoubled his anger on my house’. He took communion with the curate of Saint André des Arts and then made his confession on 13 September with a Dominican friar, Noël Deslandes. He confessed his belief in the real presence in the Eucharist and craved it in his illness, copying a passage from the Council of Nicea that described how it should be brought to those ill and facing death. But when Deslandes asked him to proclaim ‘the Faith of the Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman Church’, including the doctrine that the Church cannot err, L’Estoile refused, protesting that the Roman Church had declined since antiquity and introduced many false doctrines, including the cult of saints. Deslandes then accused L’Estoile of holding erroneous and heretical opinions, blaming these on the books he read. The friar pointed out these errors to L’Estoile’s son who was present, but L’Estoile insisted that he preferred the Church Fathers and Scripture to any modern theologians.

Responding to these accusations, L’Estoile affirmed his position in the middle ground between the rival confessions and expressed his desire for concord among them. He insisted that ‘I shall always embrace with all my heart reformation, but never dissipation; and even if
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146 L’Estoile denounced Calvin’s ‘erreur’ on the Eucharist and predestination: Brunet, ix, 325. He copied passages on the debate over the Eucharist, especially at the Colloquy of Poissy, in BnF ms. fr. 10303 fols. 224-227, so as to ‘conjoindre toutes bonnes doctrines ensemble, pour l’esclaircissement d’icelle’, before giving his conclusion ‘de s’arrester a la propriete des paroles de Jesuschrist, si claires et si manifestes, qu’elles n’admettent point en ceste Sainte matiere, un Quomodo. Il faut captiver ses sens a ces haultes mysteres, et faire cest honueur a Dieu, de dire qu’il est veritable et puissant, pour accomplir ce qu’il promet. Car de dire qu’a ceste Sainte Table de Jesuschrist nous n’y mangions que par Foy, ce seroit manger a vide, et ressembler les Tables charmées des Sorciers, qui font grande chere par fantaisie.’

147 The son is perhaps Matthieu, mentioned elsewhere in connection with the passage of Luther’s commentary on Galatians 1 that L’Estoile goes on to cite: Brunet, x, 371.
the Catholic Church is a whore (as the Huguenots have it) nevertheless she is my mother … I will hold onto this old trunk of the Papacy therefore, even though it is mutilated’.\(^\text{148}\)

Affirming that it is possible to find salvation in the Roman Church, he copied a passage of Luther’s commentary on the first chapter of St Paul’s letters to the Galatians, arguing that the Roman Church was found wherever there was true faith, concluding that ‘Voilà, by the witness of the Lutherans and by the Calvinists, one may find salvation in the Roman Church, corrupt as she is’.\(^\text{149}\) It was crucial for L’Estoile to find a point of contact between all the confessions, that brought him back to the pure doctrine of the early Church.

Just as L’Estoile inherited pieces from his father’s library and claimed to follow his father’s doctrinal position, so he passed on his own books within his family to shape his relatives’ education and doctrine, regularly recording these activities in his later diaries. Most often, he reported lending books to his son-in-law, the *avocat* Guillaume Duranti, typically on topics he was eager to discuss, and especially contemporary religious controversies.\(^\text{150}\)

Fulfilling his reciprocal duty, Duranti lent his father-in-law books and money, and offered him gossip and household advice.\(^\text{151}\) L’Estoile’s sons borrowed books less frequently, but he made careful selections for them, lending volumes by classical authors with good commentaries by learned authors, regardless of their religious position.\(^\text{152}\) Pierre, who became an *avocat*, winning his first case before *président* Edouard Molé and pleasing his father, received Suetonius’s works with a commentary by Philippe Béroalde, Aristotle’s *Rhetoric* with commentary by Johannes Sturm, Cicero’s works edited by Denis Lambin, and
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\(^\text{148}\) ‘J’en embrasserai toujours de bon Coeur la reformation; mais je n’en consentirai jamais la dissipation; et quand mesmes elle [l’Eglise] seroit putain (comme les Huguenos veulent), encore seroit-ça ma mère … Je me tiendrai donc à ce vieux tronc (bien que pourri) de la Papauté, en laquelle on trouve l’Eglise, bien qu’icelle ne soit pas l’Eglise.’

\(^\text{149}\) ‘Voilà comme, par le tesmoignage des Luthériens emmel et des Calvinistes, on peut demeurer en l’Eglise Rommaine, quelque corrompu qu’elle soit, et y faire son salut.’

\(^\text{150}\) Brunet, viii, 235, 256, 281-282, 342, x, 22.

\(^\text{151}\) Brunet, vii, 270, ix, 130, 161, x, 91, 146, 148-149, xi, 55; AN MC CXXII 390, 3 September 1611; Greffe-Lothe, p. 1069.

\(^\text{152}\) On L’Estoile’s classical books: Greffe-Lothe, pp. 267-272.
Giovanni Pontano’s commentary on Virgil. Mathieu, who studied theology and assisted at a synod of curates at Notre Dame on 19 April 1610, although his father regretted his career choice, received Horace’s *Odes* with commentary by Figulus (Hermann Ulner).

L’Estoile gave acceptable Catholic devotional books to his daughters. He seems to have neglected to provide them with the Latin education he recommended to his sons, but encouraged their pious reading in the vernacular within established limits. Marie received ‘*l’Exercise du Chrestien*’ and the ‘*Méditations de M. Dorrion, sur la Passion de Jésus-Christ*’, while Louise received Daniel Toussaint’s *Exercise de l’Amé fidelle*. With similar intent, L’Estoile’s sister Marguerite des Forneaux received the ‘*Oeuvres spirituelles de Granate* [Luis de Granada]’, originally a gift from his daughter Marie. Marie and Marguerite (at least) could write well and signed notarial documents in clear hands. In lending books to his aunt Fontenay, L’Estoile indulged her Protestant interests. He lent her meditations on the Psalms, a new printing of Jean Crespin’s *Histoire des martyrs*, and what he declared to be the best edition of Jean Calvin’s *Institutes*, the 1566 Perrin impression in French. When he recorded the loan of the *Institutes* he added that, although it contained many good points, Calvin was in error on the Eucharist and Predestination. But he did not fear for his aunt’s reading, as he wrote that he expected her to understand no more than women usually do from Latin books of hours, a phrase he repeated to describe his own comprehension of an English breviary. Lending books within his family, L’Estoile seemed most in control of his library, as he established clear distinctions between his expectations of subjects proper for male and female reading. In so doing, he escaped from the troubles of religious controversy and managing an abundance of books.

153 Brunet, viii, 235, 293, 331, ix, 192; Greffe-Lothe, pp. 333, 482, 895, 975.
154 Brunet, viii, 270, x, 201; Greffe-Lothe, p. 1004.
155 Brunet, viii, 233, 235; Greffe-Lothe, pp. 583, 634, 997.
156 Brunet, viii, 243, 333; Greffe-Lothe, p. 788. L’Estoile later passed this book on to a local convent.
157 Eg. AN MC CCXXII 356, 10 February 1601.
This chapter has argued that L'Estoile’s book collecting and reading at the end of the civil wars was typically social, engaging with issues that affected his contemporaries in a way that was shaped by and helped to shape their reading habits and assumptions. His methods of managing his library were typical in his milieu, and determined by the materiality of its texts, but his diary is a unique surviving record of how such a system worked in practice. His erudite and Gallican readings depended on an expansive group of printers, readers, and writers in the intellectual world of the Palais de Justice, who lent him books and recommended others. If his prejudices in engaging with these books were fixed by a lifetime’s experience of religious conflict, the subjects and emphasis of his reading depended on this group. L'Estoile was no passive observer of Parisian intellectual life at the end of the civil wars, but a key figure who made his library accessible to those he knew or who arrived with a recommendation.

L'Estoile continued to record his book collecting and reading until the end of September 1611, a few weeks before his death. His record keeping served particular functions in managing his library, cultivating relationships with readers, collectors, and relations, and working through his reading of contemporary controversies. But it was also a life-long habit that he could not give up. After one bout of illness in February 1609, he expressed his desire to abandon this vain pursuit, but confessed that he wrote ‘to overcome my pain and melancholy’. In the final month of his life, he recorded attending several funerals in nearby parishes, especially of Protestants. He also received visits from Pierre Dupuy and Jérémie Pérrier. At the end of June 1611, L'Estoile reduced the size of his handwriting, leaving his words stunted when compared with his usual bold italic hand, perhaps since he was unwilling to finish this manuscript and start another at his advanced age. He wrote until he could add no more, continuing to record publications and minor local
events, before aborting a final diary entry to follow Wednesday 27 September (Figure 22).

His final words then crawl into the bottom corner of the page:

‘These Frenchmen are all drunk.
Jesus Christ is the saviour of my life.
The Sire D’Ancre loses 1,000 pistoles.

Everything is melancholy, as if blackened with ink.’

Conclusion

Throughout his life, Pierre de L'Estoile collected materials for the history of the Wars of Religion. His final year was no different, as he assembled his last miscellaneous collection concerning the assassination of Henri IV by François Ravaillac in Paris on 14 May 1610. This prodigious event seems to have given L'Estoile a new burst of energy as a historian of his times. He marked his lengthy passage on the regicide with an especially bold title in his manuscript – ‘The day of the king's death and other particular remarks on this sad day’ – and proceeded to narrate the assassination and its consequences in vivid detail that has since proved an essential source for historians’ accounts of the event.\(^1\) Giving a providential explanation for this contemporary tragedy, he marked his account for the close attention of readers since ‘this is a work of God that is great, magnificent, and worthy of being celebrated, published, and registered solemnly everywhere’.\(^2\) Urging his colleagues in the Parlement to search out Ravaillac’s accomplices and restore peace in the capital, he feared that disorder in the weeks following the regicide threatened a return to the violence of the civil wars.\(^3\)

Over the following months, L'Estoile pursued his own investigation and continued to collect pieces to add to his collection on the regicide, mixing oral news with manuscript sources and carefully researched printed publications, just as he had done during the decades of the civil wars and their aftermath. On 28 July, he waited all morning in the convent of the Augustins at the bottom of his road, missing his lunch so as to procure from a monk there a
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\(^{2}\) Brunet, x, 227.

letter received on 15 October 1607 that warned of a future attempt on the king’s life.\(^4\) His collection on the regicide included many published sermons on the king’s funeral, among which he admired sufficiently the sermon at Saint Merry of the Dominican friar, Noël Deslandes, that he invited the friar to hear what he thought would be his own death-bed confession in September 1610.\(^5\) The regicide occurred just over a year before L’Estoile’s own death. It marked the end of the penultimate manuscript of his diaries. Although he had promised to end his record with this manuscript, he explained that so many ‘new and curious occurrences’ compelled him to begin one more. Events took hold of him, as he confessed to having suffered a month of sleepless nights for the loss of his king and fear for the providential significance of this event.\(^6\)

It is remarkable that L’Estoile seems to have persisted in the same form of record keeping over decades, although in the summer of 1610 he wrote with even more verve and richer detail, combining his capacity for terse, formal historical writing with his later tendency to reflect on the sources of his reports and willingness to discuss topics at great length. To an extent, this continuity is an illusion of L’Estoile’s carefully composed narrative. As the chapters in Part Two of this thesis demonstrated, the surviving manuscripts of L’Estoile’s diaries date from the 1580s at the earliest, although they might be based on earlier sources, and it is likely that his subsequent revisions to the manuscripts transformed them so as to give them an appearance of unity. While L’Estoile documented his antiquarian activities in close detail in his final decades, including certain revisions to earlier manuscripts, he neglected to mention significant pieces such as his collection on the Saint Bartholomew’s day massacre. Even if L’Estoile was hard at work revising his manuscripts in his final years, there are simply too many manuscripts in the collection, incorporating such a diverse scattering of

\(^4\) Brunet, x, 351-353.
\(^6\) Brunet, x, 231-232.
rare pieces that circulated at particular moments throughout the civil wars, for him to have not embarked on a serious commitment to collecting pieces of contemporary history much earlier in his life.

Claims to continuity appear most strongly in L'Estoïle’s statements of his religious position. L'Estoïle presented himself as remaining constant in his simple piety, by contrast with the vicissitudes of confessional disputes in the civil wars. In his recollections of childhood and accounts of family history, especially in his September 1610 confession, L'Estoïle repeatedly pointed out that he had followed his parents’ position in the religious middle ground, that he should understand the corruption of the Catholic Church but never leave it. Above all, he affirmed this position so as to exhort his children, who inherited his manuscripts, to do the same. This thesis has agreed with the broadly accepted interpretation that in taking this position L'Estoïle was a ‘Gallican Catholic’, but it has also discussed moments of rupture that qualify L'Estoïle’s conviction and demonstrate contradictory tendencies. While he compiled and wrote explicitly non-confessional histories throughout his life, he came close to acknowledging a Reformed Protestant allegiance in his references to his childhood experiences with his mother and tutor Mathieu Béroalde, in his martyrological account of the executions of Huguenots in Paris under the League, and in his exclusive employment of Protestant amanuenses. His discussion of the role of providence in his life and belief in his salvation through Christ alone took on particularly Protestant expression at moments of great strife, notably after the death of his first wife Anne de Baillon and in his account of life in Paris under the League. While these accounts suggest similarity with the waves of spiritual anguish in sixteenth-century France identified by Denis Crouzet, albeit following events in family life as much as national politics, in practice they were also carefully composed and self-serving, intended to convey simple theological ideas to his children, to ensure that Anne’s death was remembered for her guaranteed salvation, or to
justify his decision to remain in Paris under the League as an act of heroic resistance rather than reluctant collaboration.

Particular doctrinal points clarify L'Estoile’s religious position. His iconoclastic attitude towards images throughout his home and manuscripts aligns him with a Reformed Protestant position, but he remained devoted to the Eucharist in a traditional, Roman Catholic manner, affirming the real presence. This combination of beliefs recalls that of his father’s friends among the ‘moyenneurs’ in the early years of the civil wars, especially Jean de Salignac and Pierre Pischerel, whose works L'Estoile valued at the end of his life. Nonetheless, as far as it is possible to evaluate L'Estoile’s religious position throughout his life, it seems that he did follow his parents’ position in outline at least, and continued to exercise a rather reclusive, simple piety that accorded with aspects of Protestantism but never came close to conversion. By taking this position he put himself at risk at moments of high tension – the Saint Bartholomew’s day massacre and the troubles of the League – but for the most part he guaranteed his and his family’s safety in Paris during the civil wars.

This thesis has approached L'Estoile as a microhistorian’s ‘normal exception’. In this sense, it has reinterpreted L'Estoile both as a source concerning Parisian society as well as a crucial figure within it. While intellectual historians have interpreted L'Estoile as being situated ‘on the margins of great erudition’, instead he instinctively understood the structures of intellectual life in and around the Palais de Justice and was close to its centre, above all through his friendship and exchanges with the young Pierre Dupuy, as well as his correspondents Guillaume Fournier, Fédéric Morel, Claude de Marteau, and Isaac Casaubon. A re-evaluation of L'Estoile’s reputation in Parisian scholarly circles can only go so far: he cannot compare with Jacques Auguste de Thou, for example, and seems hardly to have known the président and erudite historian whose works he so admired. Nevertheless, it is
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7 See p. 241 n.147.
clear that L'Estoile was an esteemed collector and an expert contemporary historian. From his base in Paris, he collected evidence from his youth in 1558 – the year before the accidental death of Henri II – until a few weeks before his death in October 1611. The history of L'Estoile’s life and times is the history of the civil wars in the making.

The horizons of L'Estoile’s world also stretched beyond these political upheavals to encompass society and culture at large. Like many wealthy civic elites, L'Estoile left the capital on occasion to manage his estates, but the centre of his world was Paris, the parish of Saint André des Arts, and the Palais de Justice. Investigating L'Estoile's office and duties, this thesis has focused in particular on his reports of printed publications as well as crime and criminal justice. From his study and cabinet, and in the halls and corridors of the Palais, L'Estoile cultivated something of a magisterial view of society, railing against immoral publications and base criminality, and relying on his professional connections and experience to gather information for his reports. Yet he never attained such a distinguished rank in the society of office-holders as his father and grandfather, nor at the end of his life did he even own a smart coat or robe to stand proudly beside his more eminent colleagues. L'Estoile was not typical or representative of Parisian office-holding society, but he is an indispensable guide through it.

Rather than treating pieces in L'Estoile’s collection as aspects of ‘collective representations’ or a shared imaginary throughout sixteenth-century France, this thesis has focused on his direct engagement with the materials he assembled, tracing their sources and circulation among his contemporaries in Paris, and critically evaluating his process of reception. It has emphasised the importance of the Palais de Justice as a site of information and communication, demonstrating how its ‘interpretative community’ structured L'Estoile’s responses. Moreover, it has explored how the types of materials that L'Estoile engaged with shaped his reception, from ephemeral prints and fleeting rumours that he captured and
censoriously confined to his manuscripts, to prestigious pictures and art objects that he prominently displayed in his cabinet. All of these fragments that he amassed belong together in what he called ‘the storehouse of my curiosities’, an idiosyncratic and copious collection that continues to serve as a microcosm of early modern society and culture. It has great potential for further exploration by scholars of this period with interests as wide-ranging as L'Estoile’s own. By approaching L'Estoile’s life and collecting in this way, it is possible to gain fresh insight into his world in the Wars of Religion.
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## Appendix I. Sample of the Post-Mortem Inventories of Forty Royal Office-Holders in Paris (d.1574-1611).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Pictures</th>
<th>Packets of books</th>
<th>Inventory (AN MC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emard de Vabres</td>
<td>Secrétaire du Roy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>42+ packets, 489+ volumes</td>
<td>LIV 222, 3 September 1574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacques Le Chandellier</td>
<td>Secrétaire du Roy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>IX 155, 3 September 1574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>François de Pesloe</td>
<td>Secrétaire du Roy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>LIV 86, 2 January 1576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicolas Carat</td>
<td>Avocat</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>IX 158, 2 January 1577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adrian du Drac</td>
<td>Conseiller and Secrétaire du Roy</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2 packets of ‘old books’</td>
<td>XIX 284, 29 August 1577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacques Perdrier</td>
<td>Secrétaire du Roy</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22 packets, 41+ volumes</td>
<td>LXXXVI 154, 29 July 1578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean Mosnier</td>
<td>Avocat</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>XXIII 132, 11 March 1581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis Desportes</td>
<td>Avocat and Secrétaire du Roy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>III 188, 3 March 1581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean de Therouenne</td>
<td>Conseiller</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>XI 71, 26 April 1581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marguerite Bureau, widow of Pierre Forget</td>
<td>Secrétaire du Roy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>III 440, 20 January 1582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denis Rebuffe</td>
<td>Avocat</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>XXIII 132, 21 March 1584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicolas Mauduy</td>
<td>Avocat</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30 packets, 208+ volumes</td>
<td>XXIV 261, 14 Dec 1584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francois de Corbie</td>
<td>Avocat</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>LXXXVI 160, 4 February 1586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacques Challopin</td>
<td>Avocat</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24 packets, 179 volumes</td>
<td>XVIII 202, 2 April 1586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claude de Foucroy</td>
<td>Avocat</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14 packets, 129+ volumes</td>
<td>XXIII 133, 7 October 1587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean Fortin</td>
<td>Secrétaire du Roy</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>XLII 42, 14 December 1587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olivier de Fontenaye</td>
<td>Conseiller</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>I 51, 6 September 1587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacques Forme</td>
<td>Avocat</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>XVIII 203, 4 May 1588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etienne Guybert</td>
<td>Secrétaire du Roy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13 packets, 177 volumes</td>
<td>LIV 126, 8 September 1589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denis Duboys</td>
<td>Avocat</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75 packets, 867+ volumes</td>
<td>XXIII 134, 29 December 1589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierre Charpentier</td>
<td>Avocat</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13 packets, 93+ volumes</td>
<td>LXXXVIII 123, 24 September 1590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francois Tronson</td>
<td>Avocat</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18 packets, 129 volumes</td>
<td>XXIV 263, 4 January 1591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacques Malingre</td>
<td>Avocat</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21 piles, 69 volumes</td>
<td>XXIII 135, 27 February 1591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guillaume Martin</td>
<td>Avocat</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>41 packets, 305+ volumes</td>
<td>XXIII 135, 10 June 1591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Volumes</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnabé Brisson</td>
<td>Premier Président</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>135 packets, 1734 volumes</td>
<td>LXXVIII 155, 7 December 1591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esperence de Sainct-Mesmyn, widow of Denis Rebuffe</td>
<td>Avocat</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>XXIII 135, 26 May 1592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claude Dupuy</td>
<td>Conseiller</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>81 packets, 1,123+ volumes</td>
<td>XLIX 220, 20 January 1595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicolas Patin</td>
<td>Avocat</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>XI 113, 10 June 1596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean Houdron</td>
<td>Conseiller</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22 packets, 231 volumes</td>
<td>XI 113, 23 June 1598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierre Legendre</td>
<td>Avocat</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3 packets, 30 volumes</td>
<td>LXXXVIII 123, 6 July 1598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claude de Tudeau</td>
<td>Conseiller</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31 packets, 241 volumes</td>
<td>XLV 161, 9 December 1599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jehan Wallet</td>
<td>Secrétaire du Roy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3 packets, 3+ volumes</td>
<td>XLV,162, 6 November 1600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean Lemaitre</td>
<td>Président</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11 packets, 94 volumes</td>
<td>LXXXIII 298, 27 March 1601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierre II Seguier</td>
<td>Président</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3 packets, 23 volumes</td>
<td>LXXVIII 164, 2 May 1602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerome Grenier</td>
<td>Secrétaire du Roy</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3 packets, 3+ volumes</td>
<td>XLIX 182, 5 October 1602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Choquart</td>
<td>Avocat</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>XXXV 44, 17 June 1603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierre Breart</td>
<td>Contrôleur des finances and Secrétaire du Roy</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1 packet, 34 volumes</td>
<td>III 473, 9 March 1604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francois Courtin</td>
<td>Avocat</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>47 packets, 458+ volumes</td>
<td>III 487, 2 September 1609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte Veron, widow of Jehan Amaritou</td>
<td>Avocat</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>XI 115, 21 May 1609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierre de L’Estoile</td>
<td>Grand Audiencier and Secrétaire du Roy</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>103 packets, 834+ volumes</td>
<td>XXIX 678, 25 October 1611</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix II Pierre de L’Estoile’s rentes

This appendix provides evidence for discussions of L’Estoile’s dealings in constitutions de rente throughout this thesis.¹ Figure II.1 illustrates how overall L’Estoile acted as a debtor by raising money in the form of loans generated through sales of constitutions de rente, especially in the years following his marriages in 1569 and 1580. He settled many of these contracts quickly, but the annuities required by the remaining contracts built up over decades.² This evidence also demonstrates how L’Estoile used the money he gained from the sale of his office in 1601 to settle many constitutions de rente in that year as well as acting as a creditor by purchasing constitutions de rente and lending money himself. He also lent a significant amount of money by purchasing constitutions de rente following the defeat of the League. As Figure II.2 shows, by buying, settling, and selling constitutions de rente, L’Estoile situated himself firmly in the milieu of royal office-holders in Paris.

These Figures analyse forty-seven constitutions de rente, focusing on the value of L’Estoile’s loans and not the cost of their annuities, since it is rarely clear how frequently the rente was paid and the extent of any arrears. A fraction of the papers survive for one of L’Estoile’s regular notaries, Nicolas Le Camus, who was also L’Estoile’s father’s notary.³ In six cases, the only record of a constitution de rente appears in the summary given in L’Estoile’s after-death inventory or in the contracts signed by his clients’ notaries. Three of these summaries do not include the total amount loaned and are therefore excluded from Figure II.1. L’Estoile used the notary Mathieu Bontemps between 1594 and 1600, and the notary Claude de Troyes from 1600 onwards. Their papers survive in complete series.

1 Sources: Greffe-Lothe, pp. 21-32, 1054-1069, with these document summaries checked and details added from AN MC VII 44, VIII 384, 421, XVI 196, XXIII 209, 210, XXIV 23, XXXVI 46, XXXIX 8, XLI 17, XLIX 150, LIV 72, 75, LVI 3, LXIV 4, LXXIII 85, 87, 163, 225-226, XCVI 69, CXXII 40, 116, 357, 387-389, 1174, 1209, 1546-1548, 1562, 1566, 1572, 1596.

2 The significant price inflation that occurred during this period perhaps alleviated some of their cumulative cost: Bernard Schnapper, Les rentes au XVIe siècle: Histoire d’un instrument de crédit (Paris, 1957), pp. 141, 292-293.

3 Brunet, ix, 251.
Figure II.1 Annual values of L’Estoile’s dealings in *constitutions de rente* (1569-1611).

\[ x = \text{date of sale, settlement of sale, or purchase}; \ y = \text{value in livres tournois} \]

Figure II.2 Rank of L’Estoile’s clients in dealings concerning *constitutions de rente* (1569-1611).

Other = one labourer, one *rente* on the Hôtel de Ville de Paris, one widow with husband’s rank unknown, one unknown.
### Appendix III Editions Displaying Pierre de L'Estoile’s Signature on Printers’ Privileges

This information is taken from the database of the Universal Short Title Catalogue and I thank Sandy Wilkinson for making it available to me.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Duration (years)</th>
<th>Principal Author</th>
<th>Short Title</th>
<th>Place – Printer – Dates of editions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11/05/1571</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Giovanni Boccaccio</td>
<td>La laberinthe d'amour</td>
<td>Paris, Jean Ruelle, 1571, 1571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/05/1571</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Lodovico Guicciardini</td>
<td>Les heures de recreation et apres-disnees</td>
<td>Paris, Jean Ruelle, 1571, 1573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/10/1572</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Pierre de Gondi</td>
<td>Sommaire de la religion chrestienne</td>
<td>Paris, Nicolas Roffet, 1572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/10/1572</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Louis Charondas</td>
<td>Response du droit observe en la France</td>
<td>Paris, Vincent Normant, 1572, 1576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/12/1576</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Juan Luis Vives</td>
<td>Les trois livres pour l'instruxion de la femme chretienne</td>
<td>Paris, Guillaume Linocier, 1587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/12/1577</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Jean Bodin</td>
<td>Discours sur le rehaussement et diminution des monnoyes</td>
<td>Paris, Jacques du Puys, 1578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/12/1577</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>François Garrault</td>
<td>Recueil des principaux avis donnez es assemblees faites par commandement du roy en l'abbaye sainct Germain des Prez</td>
<td>Paris, Jacques du Puys, 1578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/05/1577</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Léon Trippault</td>
<td>Dictionnaire francais-grec</td>
<td>Orléans, Eloi Gibier, 1577, 1579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/1579</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Nicolo Franco, trans. Gabriel Chappuys</td>
<td>Dix plaisans dialogues</td>
<td>Lyon, Jean Béraud, 1579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/1579</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Amadis de Gaule, trans. Gabriel Chappuys</td>
<td>Le dixneufiesme livre d'Amadis de Gaule</td>
<td>Lyon, Jean Béraud, 1582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/1579</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Stefano Guazzo, trans. Gabriel Chappuys</td>
<td>La civile conversation</td>
<td>Lyon, Jean Béraud, 1579, 1579, 1580, 1582 (with Basile Bouquet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/01/1579</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Primaléon, trans. Gabriel Chappuys</td>
<td>Le troisiesme livre de Primaleon de Grece</td>
<td>Lyon, Jean Béraud, sold atParis, by Emanuel Richard, 1579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/02/1579</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Jean d'Ongoys</td>
<td>Le promptuaire</td>
<td>Paris, Jean de Bordeaux, 1579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/03/1579</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Louis Le Caron Charondas</td>
<td>Questions diverses et discours</td>
<td>Paris, Vincent Normant, 1579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/03/1579</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Institution des chevaliers de l'ordre et milice du saint Esprit</td>
<td>Paris, Jean d'Ongois, 1579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Volume</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Publisher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/11/1579</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Charles de Figon</td>
<td><em>Discours des estats et offices tant du gouvernement que de la justice et des finances de France</em></td>
<td>Paris, Guillaume Auvray, 1579, 1580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/01/1580</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Philippe du Plessis</td>
<td>Mornay</td>
<td>Excellent discours de la vie et de la mort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/02/1580</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Michel de La Serre</td>
<td><em>Coppie du discours fait a Paris a monseigneur le duc</em></td>
<td>Paris, Jean d'Ongois, 1580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/05/1580</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Léon Trippault</td>
<td><em>Celt-hellenisme, ou etymologie des mots francais tirez du graec</em></td>
<td>Orléans, Eloi Gibier, 1580, 1581, 1583, 1586, 1587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/07/1580</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Bernard Palissy</td>
<td><em>Discours admirables de la nature des eaux et fonteines</em></td>
<td>Paris, Martin Le Jeune, 1580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23/08/1581</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>trans. Jean Liébault</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23/08/1581</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>trans. Jean Liébault</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23/08/1581</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Giovanni Marinello,</td>
<td><em>Trois livres de la sante, foecundite et maladies des femmes</em></td>
<td>Paris, Jacques du Puys, 1582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23/08/1581</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>trans. Jean Liébault</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/08/1581</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Bartolomé de las Casas</td>
<td><em>Tyrannies et cruaitez des espagnols perpetrees es Indes occidentales</em></td>
<td>Paris, Guillaume Julian, 1582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/01/1583</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Bonaventure Grangier</td>
<td><em>Response au discours d'Ambroise Paré, touchant l'usage de la licorne</em></td>
<td>Paris, for Abraham Dauvel, 1583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/02/1583</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Pierre de Cornu</td>
<td><em>Les oeuvres poetiques</em></td>
<td>Lyon, Thibaud Ancelin for Jean Huguetan, 1583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/08/1584</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Henri Lancelot-Voisin</td>
<td>de La Popelinière</td>
<td><em>L'amiral de France</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/10/1585</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>René de Lucinge</td>
<td><em>Le premier loysir</em></td>
<td>Paris, Thomas Périer, 1585, 1586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/01/1586</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>René Laudonnière</td>
<td><em>L'histoire notable de la Floride</em></td>
<td>Paris, Guillaume Auvray, 1586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/09/1586</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Pierre Courtin</td>
<td><em>Souverain remede contre temerite et avarice</em></td>
<td>Paris, Gilles Beys, 1586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/08/1587</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Louis Lasserre</td>
<td><em>La vie de monseigneur sainct Hierosme</em></td>
<td>Paris, Sébastien Molin, 1588, Etienne Vallet, 1588, Guillaume Linocier, 1588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Publisher and Printers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/08/1587</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Francisco Miranda Villagane</td>
<td><em>Dialogues de la philosophie phantastique</em></td>
<td>Paris, Sébastien Molin, 1587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/08/1588</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td><em>Remonstrance ou oraison en forme deliberative prononcee en l'assemblée des estats d'un bailliage, par le lieutenant general d'iceluy, contenant la defense et illustration de la religion catholique</em></td>
<td>Paris, Pierre L'Huillier, 1588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/12/1593</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Guillaume du Vair</td>
<td><em>De l'éloquence française</em></td>
<td>Paris, Abel L'Angelier, 1684 (=1594)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/11/1594</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pierre de Belloy</td>
<td><em>De l'autorité du roy et crimes de leze majesté qui se commettent par ligues</em></td>
<td>Paris, Jamet Mettayer et Pierre L'Huillier, 1594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-/-1594</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Jean Errard</td>
<td><em>La geometrie et praticque generalle d'icelle</em></td>
<td>Paris, David Le Clerc, 1594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/05/1596</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Alexandre de Pontaymer</td>
<td><em>Le livre de la parfaicte vaillance</em></td>
<td>Paris, for Lucas Breyer, [1596], Pierre Mettayer, 1596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-/03/1596</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Georges Babou de la Bourdaisière</td>
<td><em>Meditations sur le cinquantiesme psalme de David</em></td>
<td>Paris, Lucas Breyer, 1596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/01/1597</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Jean Passerat</td>
<td><em>Le premier livre des poemes</em></td>
<td>Paris, Mamert Patisson chez Robert Estienne, 1597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/01/1599</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Publius Cornelius Tacitus</td>
<td><em>Les oeuvres</em></td>
<td>Paris, Marc Orry, 1599, Jean Houzé, 1599</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure III.2 Chronology of L'Estoile’s signatures on printers’ privileges (1571-1599).
Figure III.3 Examples of L’Estoile’s Signature on Printers’ Privileges

EXTRAICT DU PRIVILEGE
DU ROY.

Par privilege du Roy, donné à Paris le 15 jour de Janvier 1599, il est permis à Jean Houze et Marc Orry, Libraires à Paris, d'imprimer ou faire imprimer outre les précédentes imprimés, les œuvres de Cornelius Tacitus en Frans ou en cette dernière imprimée, illustrée de Sommaires des Chapitres & amples annotations aux lieux necessaires, par P.D.B. Et sont faites deffences à tous autres marchands Libraires, Imprimeurs ou autres de quelque qualité ou céditon qu'ils fissent d'imprimer ou faire imprimer, védre ny distribuer, autres que ceux que les suddits auront fait imprimer, taches au temps & terme de dix ans, à commencer du jour & date que la presente impression sera parachevée d'imprimer à peine de cent ecus d'amende, la moité auxdits expoans, l'autre applicable aux pauvres, & confiscation des exemplaires qui seront trouvés être faits par autres, & sans le consentement desdits expoans ou de ceux qui d'eux auront la permission. Doné à Paris le jour & an que desus, & de nostre regne le dixiesme.

Signé
Par le Conseil.
DE L'ESTOILE.
Appendix IV. Genealogical Tables. Source: Greffe-Lothe, pp. 1180-1181.

I. The L'Estoile Family
II. The Montholon Family

* Marie Boudet is the sister of Louise Boudet, who married Pierre I Ségui-er.

* Marie Boudet is the sister of Louise Boudet, who married Pierre I Ségui-er.
Figures

1. Detail of Vassalieu dit Nicolay, Plan de Paris (Paris: Jean Le Clerc, 1609). Wikimedia Commons. This projection follows an a-typical orientation, showing south at the top of the map.
Detail of Figure 1. L'Estoile’s home on the rue des Grands Augustins in the parish of Saint André des Arts.
Detail of Figure 1. The Palais de Justice Nicolay inaccurately depicts the Galerie des Merciers as being parallel to the Sainte Chapelle and Grande Salle on either side, when instead it was perpendicular and ran between them, leading to the Chancery (see Figure 2).
2. Detail of the Palais de Justice in Matthäus Merian, Plan de Paris (Paris, 1615). Wikimedia Commons. The two-storey wooden building that housed the Chancery is not visible in this map, situated between the Gallerie des Merciers and the Trésor des chartes that extends out from the side of the Sainte Chapelle.

*Image removed for copyright reasons.*
4. L’Estoile’s home, now 23 rue des Grands Augustins, Paris, 75006. Author’s photograph, May 2013.¹

¹ Greffe-Lothe, p. 112 identify L'Estoile’s house as number 23.
5. A hypothetical recreation of the floor plan of L'Estoile’s home. Based on the inventory, passages in L'Estoile’s diaries, a site visit, and an early nineteenth-century cadastral map of the building: AN F31 28, piece 250, 1822 Paris Cadastre, no. 23 rue des Grands Augustins.

Second floor:

```
| Cabinet | Study | Loft | Loft |
```

First floor:

```
| Cabinet | First Bedroom | Bedroom | Bedroom |
```

Ground floor:

```
| Hall | Larder | Kitchen |
```

← Further into the courtyard

To the road →
6. Detail of *Figure représentant le supplice & exécution de l’arrest de mort donné contre le très-meschant, très-abominable & très détestable parricide Ravaillac le 27 May 1610* engraving by Jan Ziarnko (Paris: Jean Le Clerc, 1610). Bibliothèque nationale de France.

*Image removed for copyright reasons.*

---

2 Full image available via Gallica, accessed 11 September 2014, [http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b8401557w](http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b8401557w).
7. Drolleries, fol. 4v Advertissement aux Catholiques Anglois: Les jugemens et condemnations; La cruauté en faisant mourir les catholiques.

8. *Drolleries*, fols. 5r, 6r, 4r, Penitential procession.


Figure 11 detail.

12. *Drolleries*, fol. 25r. *Chanson pleine de résjouissance, avec action de graces sur la mort aduenue à Henry de Valloys* (top left); *Chanson nouvelle ou est descrite la vertu et valeur des Lyonnois en la deffence de Pontoise* (top right); *Chanson nouvelle du Biernois* (bottom right); *Chanson nouvelles des farrignez* (bottom left).
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22. Médiathèque du Grand Troyes, ms. 1117, ‘Continuation de mes memoires journaus, et curiosités tant publiques que particulières … depuis le 15 Mars 1610 jusques ou il plaira à Dieu’, fol. 113v.
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Image removed for copyright reasons.
23. Frans Pourbus the Younger, Portrait of Guillaume du Vair, before 1622. Wikimedia Commons.
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