HENRY IV
AND THE TOWNS

The Pursuit of Legitimacy in French
Urban Society, 1589–1610

S. Annette Finley-Croswhite

This page intentionally left blank

Henry IV and the Towns

The Pursuit of Legitimacy in French Urban Society, 1589–1610

This book is the first serious study of Henry IV's relationship with the towns of France, and offers an in-depth analysis of a crucial aspect of his craft of kingship. Set in the context of the later Wars of Religion, it examines Henry's achievement in reforging an alliance with the towns by comparing his relationship with Catholic League, royalist and Protestant towns.

Annette Finley-Croswhite focuses on the symbiosis of three key issues: legitimacy, clientage, and absolutism. Henry's pursuit of political legitimacy and his success at winning the support of his urban subjects is traced over the course of his reign. Clientage is examined to show how Henry used patron–client relations to win over the towns and promote acceptance of his rule. By restoring legitimacy to the monarchy, Henry not only ended the religious wars but also strengthened the authority of the crown and laid the foundations of absolutism.

S. ANNETTE FINLEY-CROSWHITE is Associate Professor of History, Old Dominion University, Norfolk, Virginia

CAMBRIDGE STUDIES IN EARLY MODERN HISTORY

Edited by Professor Sir John Elliott, University of Oxford
Professor Olwen Hufton, University of Oxford
Professor H. G. Koenigsberger, University of London
Dr H. M. Scott, University of St Andrews

The idea of an 'early modern' period of European history from the fifteenth to the late eighteenth century is now widely accepted among historians. The purpose of Cambridge Studies in Early Modern History is to publish monographs and studies which illuminate the character of the period as a whole, and in particular focus attention on a dominant theme within it, the interplay of continuity and change as they are presented by the continuity of medieval ideas, political and social organization, and by the impact of new ideas, new methods and new demands on the traditional structure.

For a list of titles published in the series, please see end of book

Henry IV and the Towns

The Pursuit of Legitimacy in
French Urban Society, 1589–1610

S. ANNETTE FINLEY-CROSWHITE

First published in printed format 1999

For John R. Rilling and
in memory of
J. Russell Major

Primi studiorum duces et primae faces

Contents

ix

Illustrations

Tables

Acknowledgements

Rien n'est simple, Emmanuel Le Roy Ladurie once commented in reference to Henry IV's reign, and I borrow the phrase to emphasize that neither is the writing of a book about his municipal politics. In the course of its long years of production, beginning as a doctoral dissertation at Emory University and ending many years later in 1998, I have incurred enormous debts to scholars, institutions, friends, and family, in both the United States and France. The generosity of the many has been truly humbling.

I owe my conceptualization of *Henry IV and the Towns* to the works of and conversations with Mack Holt, Bill Beik, Gayle Brunelle, Sharon Kettering, Barbara Diefendorf, Philip Benedict, Stuart Carroll, Mark Greengrass, Richard Bonney, Orest Ranum, J. H. M. Salmon, Jim Collins, Chris Stocker, Rondo Cameron, Penny Roberts, Mark Konnart, Ron Love, Kevin Robbins, Michael Wolfe, Julie Hardwick, Brad Smith, and Kathy Pearson. Jeff Hamilton helped with the Latin translations in chapter three, Philip Benedict graciously read chapter five, Steve Finley gave advice on an early version of chapter seven, and Maura Hametz edited chapter eight. In France Jean-Pierre Babelon, Janine Garrisson, Bernard Barbiche, Pierre Tucoo-Chala, Marcel Lachiver and, the late, Roland Mousnier opened many doors for me. I would particularly like to thank Jacques Perot, director of the Musée de l'Armée in Paris, who took an interest in me as a young graduate student. Thanks to him I was invited to an international conference on Henry IV in 1989 where I met a multitude of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century historians, most notably Robert Descimon and Denis Crouzet.

In the course of researching this book I travelled from one end of France to the other. I thank all the directors and staff of the many libraries and archives where I worked. I would especially like to thank the personnel at the *Archives Départementales de la Somme* and the *Archives Municipales* in Amiens, Dijon, and Lyons for their courteous service and helpful advice.

and to a very generous colleague, Carl Boyd, who allowed me to tap into some surplus research monies which helped with my revisions. Debbie Miller in the Graphics Department was wonderfully helpful in devising the graphics in chapter two. Three students, Scott Becker, Brian Crim, and Jan Rives challenged me in the classroom to rethink many of my ideas, and another student, Catherine Cardon, helped with some of the French translations. Finally, many years ago Ted Llewellen tried to impart to me the thinking of an anthropologist. Those lessons have served me well ever since.

I additionally wish to thank Richard Fisher for opening the door for me at Cambridge University Press, William Davies, my editor, for offering encouragement and advice, and Rachel Coldicutt, my copy-editor, for making many helpful suggestions in improving the text.

I also have incurred debts of a very personal nature. In Atlanta, Georgia Jonathan Prude and Rosemary Eberel, Rick and Shana Elliott, and Dick and Barbara Baker all gave me free lodging and friendship during the writing of the dissertation. The support of Laura Mackail and Jody Aud has been unending. In France, Marika Neoschil, Hélène Bourdon, Anne-Marie Chevais, Dennis and Janey Barton, and Bernard and Christel Teisseire all took me into their homes and provided me with family. The Teisseires in particular showered me with southern French hospitality and charm and made me an honorary *citoyenne* of Foix.

I extend special thanks to Sharon Kettering. She poured over the manuscript for many long hours and tirelessly read and reread chapters and offered advice. Her generosity and friendship are extraordinary, and her insight improved the book immeasurably. My debt to her is great.

Three friends also stand out above the rest and deserve special mention. Mack P. Holt has acted for me like a sixteenth-century patron. He has written numerous letters of recommendation, commented on the book, and extended never-ending encouragement. Gayle Brunelle made the whole process enjoyable. The best parts of this book stem from the many conversations we had during our summer research trips to France. Finally, Philippe Andrau offered boundless enthusiasm for the project and made many a relevant comment along the way.

The thanks I extend to my family seems hardly adequate. My husband, Chip Croswhite, never went on a research trip or took any notes for me and had to make do with postcards during my many long absences. Yet he bore up amazingly well competing for my attention with a king who has been dead for nearly four hundred years. He is a walking lexicon and has saved me from many embarrassing mistakes. My parents, Clyde and Eula Finley, have deep pockets and big hearts. They helped to support my research as a graduate student in 1987 and again as a new professor in 1993. But their agape love is what sustained me.

Finally, I wish to thank my two mentors, John R. Rilling and J. Russell Major. Rilling was my undergraduate academic advisor at the University of Richmond. To him above all others I owe my life as a scholar – such is the life-changing power of

Introduction

The aim of this book is to examine the relationship that Henry IV cultivated with urban France in order to explore how he acquired power and strengthened the French state. The work continues the general effort made by revisionary historians to explain what the term 'absolute' meant in practice to rulers and subjects as opposed to what it meant in theory to jurists and dogmatists.[1] This book is not a biographical assessment of Henry IV, but rather a case study of his interactions with selected towns. It attempts to discover how the balance between royal authority and urban autonomy was negotiated in the late sixteenth century. Henry IV mastered urban France with a policy of lenient pacification that emphasized his clemency. By easing internal strife after the religious wars, he re-opened lines of communication between the Crown and the towns. The re-establishment of communication strengthened the state by promoting cooperation between the king and his urban subjects and encouraging their compliance.

In the pages that follow two key concepts appear many times, legitimacy and clientage. In fact, the two terms are linked in explaining how Henry secured his realm and restored peace to France. The idea of a 'legitimate' king is one that appears often in the literature on early modern kingship, but legitimacy is a concept seldom defined by historians.[2] This book relies on Orlando Patterson's definition of legitimacy as a process that incorporates power relations into a moral order ultimately defining right and wrong.[3] Legitimation, the action of establishing

---

[1] For the historiography of absolutism see William Beik, *Absolutism and Society in Seventeenth-Century France, State Power and Provincial Aristocracy in Languedoc* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 3–33; Richard Bonney, 'Absolutism: What's in a Name?', *French History*, 1 (1987), 93–117; Nicholas Henshall, *The Myth of Absolutism: Change and Continuity in Early Modern European History* (London: Longman, 1992).

[2] For an exception see, Reinhard Bendix, *Kings or People: Power and the Mandate to Rule* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978), 8–9.

[3] Orlando Patterson, *Slavery and Social Death: A Comparative Study* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1982). Patterson does not address 'legitimacy' as a separate topic, but he does discuss it in relation to authority. His conceptualization is close to Jean-Jacques Rousseau's belief that legitimacy is grounded in human agency expressed through conventions or customs that validate it. Jean-Jacques Rousseau, *The Social Contract*, ed. Charles Frankel (New York: Hafner Publishing Company, 1947), 8; William Connolly, 'Introduction: Legitimacy and Modernity', in *Legitimacy and the State*, ed. William Connolly (New York: New York University Press, 1984), 4–7; Ronald Cohen, 'Introduction', in *State Formation and Political Legitimacy 6: Political Anthropology*, eds. Ronald Cohen and Judith Toland (New Brunswick, New Jersey: Transaction Books, 1988), 3.

legitimacy, is an important part of all political processes and can be conceptualized in the early modern period as a dialogue between rulers and subjects. In the premodern context legitimacy was circumscribed by Christianity so that rulers were divinely sanctioned. As Johann Huizinga put it, monarchies were thought to be ordained by God as good and perverted by humans as bad, but people never contemplated 'reforming' what was divinely inspired.[4] The Wars of Religion complicated this view of kingship when France first faced a series of weak kings and then an unacceptable Protestant one. The effects caused political thinkers to question divine right rule and introduce the idea of natural law; some even advocated the overthrow of tyrants and heretics.[5] Legitimation was thus a key issue confronted by the last Valois and the first Bourbon.

Henry IV's position in 1589 was uncertain. Under normal circumstances a king acquired his right to rule at the death of his predecessor.[6] When Henry III lay dying, however, his last thoughts were on the unsure succession. He mumbled over and over to the circle of nobles around him to accept his cousin, Henry of Navarre, as the legitimate king of France. Legitimacy under the Salic law meant tracing a blood alliance through the male line back to the thirteenth century. Twenty-two degrees of cousinage separated Henry III and Henry IV. Yet this distant familial link would not have been an issue if Henry of Navarre had been Catholic. But Navarre claimed the throne as a Protestant and delegitimized himself to most of France. He faced not only a kingdom torn apart by religious warfare, but also one in which the majority of cities and towns refused to recognize his kingship.[7] The pivotal moment of Henry IV's reign was his abjuration on 25 July 1593 when he formally took on his role as France's 'most Christian [Catholic] king'.[8] Certainly this 'perilous leap' made Henry *legitimus* to many, but it also alienated him from his former Protestant allies and never really convinced his most zealous Catholic subjects of his sincerity.

The subtitle of this book, *The Pursuit of Legitimacy*, best describes the trajectory of Henry's reign. The central point hinges on the distinction between Henry's clear *de jure* legitimacy based on Salic law and his lifelong pursuit of political legitimation. Legitimation, Reinhard Bendix has explained, realizes what power alone

---

[4] Johann Huizinga, *The Waning of the Middle Ages* (New York: Double Day Anchor Books, 1954) 38; Connolly, 'Introduction', 3.

[5] See for example Kathleen Parrow, *From Defense to Resistance: Justification of Violence during the French Wars of Religion* (Philadelphia: The American Philosophical Society, 1993) Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, vol. 83, part 6 ; Frederic J. Baumgartner, *Radical Reactionaries: the Political Thought of the French Catholic League* (Geneva: Droz, 1976); J. H. M. Salmon, *Renaissance and Revolt, Essays in the Intellectual and Social History of Early Modern France* (New York: St Martin's Press, 1987).

[6] Frederic J. Baumgartner, *France in the Sixteenth Century* (New York: St Martin's Press, 1995), 235–6.

[7] Jean–Pierre Babelon, *Henri IV* (Paris: Fayard, 1982), 317–21. Henry III was descended from Saint Louis's oldest son, Philip the Hardy, while Henry IV was descended from Louis's youngest son, Robert of Clermont.

[8] Michael Wolfe, *The Conversion of Henri IV: Politics, Power and Religious Belief in Early Modern France* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1993).

cannot because it promotes acceptance in the rightness of rule.[9] My concept of legitimacy is based on Jean-Jacques Rousseau's notion of a social contract in which people give their consent to be governed, an idea that Henry never would have recognized, although the belief that legitimacy was tied to popular support became increasingly prevalent during the sixteenth century.[10] Henry secured his throne through battle, bribery, diplomacy, and negotiation. Eventually he won his people's consent, although his assassination in 1610 proves his legitimacy as king was never universally accepted.[11]

Ronald Cohen has argued that acquiring legitimacy involves 'changing capabilities (i.e. power) into culturally sanctioned rights.'[12] In this context legitimacy and clientage can be linked. Clientage humanizes power by involving human agents in the struggle for consent.[13] Clientage also provides the historical context in which to consider legitimacy. Clients sanction power by giving their consent to be ruled, thereby recognizing a ruler as legitimate. More importantly, clients often open the dialogue that brings together rulers and ruled.

Sharon Kettering has studied the complex realities of the patron–client system in early modern France and defined key words like patron, client, broker, clientelism, and fidelity.[14] I use her definition of clientage as 'a voluntary relationship based on a reciprocal exchange between participants who are unequal in status' and accept her scepticism of Roland Mousnier's argument defining patron–client relations as *maître-fidèle* relationships denoted by absolute loyalty in the man-to-man tie.[15] Like Stuart Carroll, I believe such a model exaggerates the strength of vertical links uniting nobles and their clienteles.[16] Like Robert Harding I see many different kinds of clientage relationships, some motivated by self-interest, most more fragile than ties of complete devotion, and more easily severed.[17] Finally, I agree with

---

[9] Bendix, *Kings or People* 17.

[10] Ibid., 8–9.

[11] For a good summary of the history of the idea of legitimacy, see Tilo Schabert, 'Power Legitimacy and Truth: Reflections on the Impossibility to Legitimise Legitimations of Political Order': *Legitimacy / Légitimitié Proceedings of the Conference held in Florence June 3 and 4, 1982* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1985), 96–104; Connolly, 'Introduction', 1–19.

[12] Cohen, 'Introduction', 3.

[13] On 'consent' see Schabert, 'Power, Legitimacy and Truth'.

[14] For example, Sharon Kettering, *Patrons, Brokers and Clients in Seventeenth-Century France* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986); 'Clientage during the French Wars of Religion' *Sixteenth Century Journal*, 20 (1989), 68–87; 'Friendship and Clientage in Early Modern France', *French History*, 6 (1992), 139–58; 'The Historical Development of Political Clientelism', *Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, 18 (1988), 419–47; 'Patronage in Early Modern Europe', *French Historical Studies*, 17 (1992), 839–62; 'Political Parties at Aix-en-Provence in 1589', *European History Quarterly*, 24 (1994), 181–211. Kettering also surveys the literature on clientage. See in particular 'Patronage in Early Modern Europe'.

[15] Kettering, *Patrons, Brokers, and Clients*, 33.

[16] Stuart Carroll, 'The Guise Affinity and Popular Protest During the Wars of Religion', *French History*, 9 (1995), 126.

[17] Robert Harding, *Anatomy of a Power Elite: The Provincial Governors of Early Modern France* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1978), 36–7.

Sharon Kettering that the word 'affinity', preferred by Mark Greengrass and Stuart Carroll in describing client networks, is too ambiguous.[18] 'Affinity' perhaps better denotes the wide range of personal relationships that included clienteles. Client, clientage, and clientelism give a more precise indication of the patron–client system to the English speaker.[19]

An objective of this study is to explore the ways in which the patron–client system operated in an urban setting. The extent to which vertical ties reaching down from the Crown penetrated into French cities and towns is unknown because no serious study of Crown–town patronage has been made.[20] Accumulating the documentation to pursue such research has been an obstacle for historians because no tidy set of documents exists in one location, and constant travel between national and local archives is necessary. Municipal magistrates, unlike robe and sword nobles, rarely left memoirs, and almost none of their personal correspondence has survived. The historian, therefore, must painstakingly sift through state papers, municipal documents, deputy-to-court letters, wills, marriage registers, godparentage records, property transfers, notarial acts, inventories after death, appointments to offices, and the occasional rare memoir in a frustrating and often abortive attempt to reconstruct kinship networks and clienteles. Not surprisingly, there is very little literature on Henry IV and the towns, and when the issue is addressed the same examples are used over and over.

One essential argument of this book asserts that Henry IV's pursuit of legitimacy among his urban subjects involved the effective use of the patron–client system. In short, clientage was one means Henry employed to increase his legitimacy as king of France. In dealing with the towns, Henry sought their loyalty and secured peace by placing his clients in municipal office. Royal clients were rewarded with favour, gifts, and increased status, and their reciprocal duty was to provide the king with peaceful, cooperative, and well-administered towns. Kettering believes that patrons disseminated their ideas to their clients. 'A patron's personal and political goals become the collective goals of his clientele.'[21] Since municipal elites were patrons who had their own clientele networks, Henry's use of patronage helped to ensure the acceptance of his legitimacy among nameless subjects he never saw. His employment of the patron–client system refutes Robert Harding's belief that there was a failure of patronage during the religious wars. In fact, Henry's pursuit of legitimacy made the patron–client system all the more relevant.[22]

---

[18] Mark Greengrass, 'Noble Affinities in Early Modern France: The Case of Henri I de Montmorency, Constable of France', *European History Quarterly*, 16 (1986), 275–311; Carroll, 'The Guise Affinity'.

[19] See Kettering's excellent discussion of the terminology of clientelism in 'Patronage in Early Modern France', 839–71, see especially, 850–1.

[20] Kettering points out the problem of the scarcity of evidence in 'Patronage in Early Modern Europe', 842.   [21] Kettering, *Patrons, Brokers, and Clients*, 69.

[22] See Kettering's criticism of Robert Harding who argued in favour of a failure of clientage during the French Wars of Religion. Kettering, 'Clientage During the French Wars of Religion'; Harding, *Anatomy of a Power Elite*, 68–87.

Introduction

It is in relation to power that the symbiosis of legitimacy, clientage, and absolutism was achieved during Henry's reign. Power is embedded within society. A community of people achieves power by acting in concert; their power reflects a coalescence of opinions and beliefs. Power has no independent justification. It takes its justification from the community, and it is the community that endows rulers and institutions with political legitimacy.[23] Rulers possess legitimacy when they adopt and promote the common beliefs of the group. The success of rulers in projecting acceptance of shared beliefs reinforces their legitimacy.[24] Belief in their legitimacy also enhances their authority while the possession of authority, legitimizes their power.[25] The distribution of power also involves the circulation of knowledge. Henry used clientage to promote his legitimacy and urge townspeople to accept his rule. It was Henry's clients in the towns who spoke out for his clemency and re-incorporated him into the spiritual and moral order of the day by voicing their consent to his authority through the cry, *Vive le Roi!* If power in its most rudimentary form incorporates the ability of someone to get someone else to do what he or she wants, the king's clients were crucial in re-establishing stability in France.[26] The process was not simple because clienteles were not easily controlled. Power was fragmented among competing clienteles, and loyalties changed over time. Even so, clients aided the king by serving as avenues of human access to the towns.[27] Legitimacy is a quality of power, and clientage served Henry to buttress his legitimacy.

In the context of legitimacy my statement on absolutism is a simple one. Henry pursued legitimacy and in the process strengthened Bourbon rule, although he never envisioned becoming an 'absolute' king. Looking at the way he acquired legitimacy and hence power allows us to reassess the political achievements of his reign. Frederic Baumgartner states, 'His contribution to absolutism was restoring the efficiency of the government so that it was again responsive to the king's will.'[28] He also restored legitimacy to the monarchy as a force able to exert its will and bring about the desired response. Consent is seldom universal in any political setting, and in Henry's case it was never complete, but he won the active support of his people so that his government proved effective. Re-establishing the alliance and dialogue between the Crown and the towns enjoyed by earlier kings was one of Henry's successes.

[23] Richard Flathman, *The Practice of Political Authority, Authority and the Authoritative* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980), 152–3; Hannah Arendt, *On Violence* (London: Allen Lane, Penguin Books, 1970), 46; Barry Barnes, *The Nature of Power* (Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1988), 61.

[24] R. B. Friedman, 'On the Concept of Authority in Political Philosophy', *Authority*, ed. Joseph Raz (New York: New York University Press, 1990), 58; Emile Durkheim, *The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life*, trans. Joseph Swain (New York: Free Press, 1965), 236–45; Barnes, *The Nature of Power*, 58–63.

[25] Carl J. Friedrich, *Tradition and Authority* (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1972), 94.

[26] Kenneth E. Boulding, *Three Faces of Power* (Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications, 1989), 15.

[27] Carroll, 'The Guise Affinity', 150.   [28] Baumgartner, *France*, 234.

Henry IV has attracted many biographers and historians. Scholars before the 1970s who studied his reign interpreted his actions using a top-down model in which the king forced his will on the towns and imposed royal directives from above. Henry's intervention in municipal politics caused many historians to decide that he had intended to destroy municipal privileges. Jean Mariéjol and Gabriel Hanotaux, for example, argued in the early twentieth century that Henry perceived town privileges as threats to his authority and wanted to discontinue their use.[29] Mariéjol called Henry an 'enemy of the franchises of the towns'.[30] Paul Robiquet likewise argued that when the king re-established order after the religious wars, he destroyed municipal privileges to punish the Catholic League.[31] Georges Pagès, however, disagreed with his contemporaries. Rather than threatening urban autonomy, Pagès believed Henry IV simply accommodated himself to existing municipal institutions.[32]

In the late 1940s scholars began incorporating Henry IV into the growing literature on absolutism. Gaston Zeller and Roger Doucet, for example, saw Henry as a founder of absolutism. Zeller placed Henry at the head of municipal reform and contended that no other king intervened more often in municipal affairs. Doucet saw Henry as an innovator and wrote that 'the absolutist reaction [that had] begun with the reign of Henry IV' contributed to 'the ruin of the [municipal] institutions'.[33] For some historians, the real issue was the growing trend toward centralization of government. Robert Trullinger investigated Henry's attempts to oversee financial matters in the towns of Brittany. He concluded that Henry succeeded in extending Crown control over matters formally handled by municipalities. 'By the end of the reign', he states, 'the king and his government had established an organized and centralized structure for the control of the financial administration of the towns.'[34] Henry's determination to weaken the towns and end municipal independence was also the interpretation emphasized by two biographers of the king, Jean-Pierre Babelon and Janine Garrisson, who published works in the early 1980s.[35] Babelon went so far as to subtitle his discussion of Henry's municipal policy, 'La mainmise sur les villes'.[36]

[29] Jean Mariéjol, *Histoire de France 6: Henri IV and Louis XIII*, ed. Ernest Lavisse (Paris: Hachette, 1911), 33–5; Gabriel Hanotaux, *Sur les Chemins de l'histoire* (Paris: Edouard Champion, 1924), 44–5.

[30] Mariéjol, *Histoire de France*, 34.

[31] Paul Robiquet, *Histoire municipale de Paris* (Paris: Hachette, 1904), vol. 3, 196–9. For more arguments along these lines see, August Poirson, *Histoire du Règne de Henri IV* (Paris: Didier, 1862), vol. 3, 29–30; François Bourçier, 'Le Régime Municipal à Dijon sous Henry IV', *Revue d'Histoire Moderne*, 4 (1935), 118.

[32] Georges Pagès, *La Monarchie d'Ancien Régime en France de Henri IV à Louis XVI* (Paris: Armand Colin, 1928), 58–9.

[33] Roger Doucet, *Les Institutions de la France au XVI Siècle 1: Les Cadres géographiques, les institutions centrales et locales* (Paris: A. and J. Picard, 1948), 393. See also, Gaston Zeller, *Les Institutions de la France au XVI siècle* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1949), 38.

[34] Robert Trullinger, 'The Royal Administration of Bretagne Under Henri IV (1589–1610)', (Ph. D. thesis, Vanderbilt University, 1972), 317.

[35] Babelon, *Henri IV*, 792–6; Janine Garrisson, *Henri IV* (Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1984), 260–2.

By the 1980s, however, several historians began to advise caution in judging Henry's relationship with the towns. J. Russell Major saw Henry as a founder of absolutism but recognized that it was easy to exaggerate his ability to control the towns. He wrote, 'As a whole they [the towns] remained quite capable of thwarting the royal will by their delaying tactics and in some instances of putting up stout defenses against the royal army, as the following reign was to prove.'[37] This sentiment was echoed by David Buisseret who felt Henry's intervention in the towns was sporadic. He emphasized that the king interfered in town politics only when the requirements of military necessity, civil order, and fiscal needs forced his hand. 'Outside these limits', Buisseret observed, 'his intervention was rare.'[38]

Finally, Robert Descimon in 1988 published an intensive study of Henry's interference in Parisian elections. He argued that the king and the municipal magistrates reached a compromise designed to maintain the appearance of free elections while ensuring the king's participation in the events. Henry frequently nominated the city's *prévôt des marchands*, but Descimon found that he rarely interfered in the election of *échevins*. When the king did recommend a royal candidate for senior office, he generally confirmed a choice the electors had already made. Henry thus rubber-stamped the popular voice as kings had often done before him and sealed the collusion between the state and the municipal oligarchy. Descimon asserted, 'To sum up, the attitude of Henry IV referred to the most archaic possible political framework, far from all centralizing, modernizing, or absolutist will.'[39]

William Beik has made scholars aware in recent years of the shortcomings of traditional political history by uncovering an alliance in seventeenth-century Languedoc between provincial elites and the Crown that was profitable to both.[40] Micro-histories of towns, published with increasing frequency since the 1960s, have also underscored the complexities of urban life and revealed the wide diversity of the urban experience in early modern France.[41] Recent monographs on towns during the Wars of Religion, for instance, those by Philip Benedict, Robert Descimon, and Penny Roberts, have exposed the complex rivalries that existed

---

[36] Babelon, *Henri IV*, 792.

[37] J. Russell Major, *Representative Government in Early Modern France* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1980), 380.

[38] David Buisseret, *Henry IV* (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1984), 169.

[39] Robert Descimon, 'L'Echevinage Parisien sous Henri IV (1594–1609). Autonomie urbaine, conflits politiques et exclusives sociales', *La Ville la bourgeoisie et al Genèse de L'Etat* (Paris: Editions du CNRS, 1988), 150. For more background see, Sharon Kettering, 'State Control and Municipal Authority in France', in *Edo and Paris: Urban Life and the State in the Early Modern Era*, eds. James McClain, John Merriman, and Ugawa Kaoru (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1994), 86–101.

[40] Beik, *Absolutism and Society*.

[41] For example, Pierre Goubert, *Beauvais et les Beauvaisis de 1600 à 1730* (Paris: SEVPEN, 1960); Pierre Deyon, *Amiens, capitale provinciale, étude sur la société urbaine au 17e siècle* (Paris: Mouton, 1967); Richard Gascon, *Grand commerce et vie urbaine au XVIe siècle: Lyon et ses marchands (environs de 1520–environs de 1580* (Paris: SEVPEN, 1971); Robert Schneider, *Public Life in Toulouse, 1463–1789: From Municipal Republic to Cosmopolitan City* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1989).

inside urban power structures.[42] The following pages examine the interplay between urban elites and the Crown, and several chapters use a micro-history approach by focusing on a few urban examples. Substantial case studies are made of Amiens, Abbeville, Limoges, and Lyons. Other chapters, specifically four and five, consider Henry's interaction with the towns more broadly. By using these two approaches, both in-depth and comparative analyses and top-down and bottom-up models are developed of Henry IV's relationship with his towns. Finally, while this book makes no attempt to engage in the current debate among scholars about the place of religion in the Wars of Religion, the importance of religion in the lives of sixteenth-century people is endorsed completely as part of the backdrop to Henry's reign.[43]

To eliminate confusion in the text, the reader should note that municipal governments came in all shapes and sizes in the sixteenth century. The *corps de ville* numbered four at Blois, five at Paris, six at Narbonne, eight at Toulouse, twenty at Dijon, and twenty-four at Poitiers. A varying degree of advisory bodies could boost the number of municipal councillors in any given town to over one hundred, as in the case of La Rochelle, although this was rare. Terminology was not uniform either. Mayors headed most municipal governments in northern and central France, but this position equalled that of *vîcomte-mayeur* in Dijon, *prévôt des marchands* in Paris and Lyons, and *lieutenant du capitaine* in Reims. Aiding these important officials were burghers for the most part known as *échevins*. Governing councils in the south of France were known as consulates. Consuls shared equal power and prestige whereas mayors outranked *échevins*, although sometimes a *premier consul* was named. A few towns acquired unique titles for their municipal officers. There were *gouverneurs* at Senlis, *jurats* at Bordeaux, and *capitouls* at Toulouse.[44]

After a short introduction that places French early modern towns in historical context, chapter two on patronage and clientage in Amiens demonstrates how Henry used his clients to broker his clemency for capitulation and to secure the town from within as the Catholic League fell apart in Picardy. Chapter three looks at ceremonial entries and the imaginative way Henry turned former Catholic League towns into institutional clients. Chapters four and five explore Henry's relationship with former Catholic League, royalist, and Protestant towns and underscore his use of clientage to negotiate with the towns. Chapter six discusses

---

[42] Philip Benedict, *Rouen During the Wars of Religion* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981); Robert Descimon, *Qui Etaient Les Seize? Mythes et réalités de la Ligue parisienne (1585–1594)* (Paris: Klincksieck, 1983); Penny Roberts, *A city in conflict: Troyes during the French Wars of Religion* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1996).

[43] Mack P. Holt, 'Putting Religion Back in the Wars of Religion', *French Historical Studies*, 18 (1993), 524–51.

[44] Doucet, *Les institutions de la France*, vol. 1, 370; Albert Babeau, *La Ville sous l'Ancien Régime* (Paris: Didier, 1880), 75–6. For more on municipal magistrates and their duties see, William Beik, *Urban Protest in Seventeenth-Century France, The Culture of Retribution* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 73–94.