Francia – Forschungen zur westeuropäischen Geschichte

Bd. 34/2

2007

DOI: 10.11588/fr.2007.2.45065

Mark Greengrass

THE CALVINIST AND THE CHANCELLOR: THE MENTAL WORLD OF LOUIS TURQUET DE MAYERNE

Heinz Schilling has taught us to think about Calvinist »civic republicanism«[1]. In his notable work on Emden in the later reformation, the Emden of Althusius, he found a »städtischen Republikanismus«[2]. It was not, perhaps, the conscious republicanism of Venice or the Renaissance Florentine republic, the kind that would be later refashioned into a building-block for states where limited government and civic freedom were important nostrums. But it could draw on that respectable tradition and fashion it into a more homely pride in local self-government and respect for politically active and responsible citizens, and it became an important constituent element in the Emden alliance of its Reformed church, ministers and elders in their opposition to princely rule. Yet there was nothing automatic or intrinsic in this connection between Calvinism and civic republicanism. There was no immanent Troeltschian »ethos of liberty« within Calvinism as a whole. The coalescence was rather the consequence of an accidental political constellation, the result of a particular place, faced with the need to justify a particular resistance[3]. Calvinist political thought, like its religious thought, was as haunted by notions of obedience as it was inflected with a respect for the human conscience and its awakening to the hearing and doing of God's word.

In this paper, I want to explore this question in the same time-period, but via a separate route and in a very different political context. The route is the political tradition of »monarchical republicanism«. That may strike us as a strange and incompatible oxymoron; such is the impact of absolutist political thinking upon our own way of thinking about the nature of political rule in western Europe in the age of the Reformation. Yet, as the distinguished British historian of the later reformation, Patrick Collinson, has reminded us, it was how many individuals wanted to conceive of godly rule[4]. Even as Queen Elizabeth I struggled to articulate her absolute authority, members of her privy council were urging that she was obliged to rule in

1 This article was conceived as a contribution to Professor Heinz Schilling's 65th Birthday Festschrift volume but the research for it was completed too late for it to be included. It is, however, dedicated to him, a small tribute to his immense scholarly contribution to early-modern European history. I am grateful to Philip Benedict, Joe Bergin, Patrick Collinson, Robert Descimon, Simon Hodson, Marco Penzi, Penny Roberts and John Young for their comments on an earlier draft.

2 Heinz Schilling, Civic Calvinism in Northwestern Germany and the Netherlands: Sixteenth to Nineteenth Centuries. Sixteenth Century Essays and Studies, vol. 16, Kirksville 1991.

3 Ibid. p. 30.

4 Patrick Collinson, The Monarchical Republic of Queen Elizabeth I, in: Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester 69 (1987), p. 394–424.

the interests of the *res publica*, and that she therefore necessarily needed advice and »counsel«[5]. The »regiment« of England was not »a mere monarchy, as some for lack of consideration think, nor a mere oligarchy, nor democracy, but rule mixed of all these«[6]. John Aylmer, who wrote this, will stand here as a reminder that there were impeccable Aristotelian roots to mixed monarchy. He wrote that text in exile from England, perhaps in Zürich, and in the shadow of the persecution of Mary Tudor. But it did not need that acculturating experience to make monarchical republicanism appear to be the functioning reality. Among the middling sort in the shire villages and market towns of England, the Puritan equivalents of the Emden notables readily conceived of themselves as busily constructing their own local godly rule, enforcing moral discipline in their communities and actively participating in the wider polity. If the political circumstances had been different, »monarchical republicanism« could have turned out to justify resistance to Tudor rule as it would do later to the Stuart monarchy.

*

»Monarchical republicanism« was also not an unknown quantity in France, despite the deeper traditions of its absolute monarchy[7]. Louis Turquet de Mayerne is the exemplar upon which we shall focus. The centrepiece of his writings is a large treatise, appropriately called »La Monarchie Aristodémocratique«, published in Paris in 1611[8]. This work by Louis Turquet is quite well-known, but it has become marginalised. That is partly because it did not have much contemporary impact. Its publication was seized upon the orders of the French Chancellor and the Council of State – an event to which we shall return later. His views were unfashionable in Richelieu's France, where the intellectual agenda was increasingly dominated by reason of state and questions about how the intellectual should behave in a political world that laid ambitious claims to absolute authority. But it is also because the best-known and most distinguished modern analyst of them, Roland Mousnier, sought to place them in a teleology which maximised Turquet's prefiguring of the Enlightenment and minimised his sixteenth-century and protestant roots[9]. Turquet de Mayerne was a

5 Anne McLaren, Delineating the Elizabethan Body Politics: Knox, Aylmer and the definition of counsel, 1558–1588, in: History of Political Thought 17.2 (1996), p. 224–252.

6 John Aylmer, An harborowe for faithful and trewe subiectes, »Strasbourg« [London] 1559.

7 For an entirely orthodox statement of how the French monarchy included traces of democracy, aristocracy and monarchy in it from the early sixteenth century, see Claude de Seyssel's introduction (»Prohème«) to his translation of Appian's history, reproduced in J. Poujol (ed.), Claude de Seyssel: La Monarchie de France, Paris 1961, p. 80.

8 Louis Turquet de Mayerne, La Monarchie Aristodemocratique, ou Le Gouvernement Composé et Meslé des Trois Formes de legitimes Republiques. Aux Estats Generaux des Provinces Confederees des Pays-bas, Paris 1611 (henceforth referred to as »MA«).

9 Roland Mousnier, L'opposition politique bourgeoise à la fin du XVI^e siècle et au début du XVII^e siècle. L'œuvre de Louis Turquet de Mayerne, in: Id. (ed.), La plume, la faucille et le marteau: institution et société en France du Moyen Age à la Révolution, Paris 1970, p. 57–75. More recently, Luigi Gambino, Un progetto di stato perfetto: La monarchie aristodemocratique di Turquet de Mayerne, Turin 2000, provides an analysis of Turquet's work which is more rooted in sixteenth-century intellectual thought, criticizing the »reductionism« in Mousnier's analysis.

problem for Mousnier since he clearly did not subscribe to the »society of orders« which Mousnier had reconstructed as the dominant social reality for seventeenth-century France. Part of the purpose of this paper is to recover those roots and, through them, the »mental world« that gave coherence and force to his picture of a thoroughly reformed »machine of state« and »well-policed« society.

The experience of the French civil wars dominated Louis Turquet's adult life. Of that life, we are now much better informed, thanks to the recently published and rich study of Louis' son, Théodore Turquet de Mayerne by the late Lord Dacre (Hugh Trevor-Roper). Louis was born in Lyon in 1533 or 1534[10]. His family was from Chiéri in Piedmont, where a hotel still had the family coat of arms on a house as late as 1580[11]. His father, Etienne Turquet, was drawn to Lyon, along with many other banking and mercantile families from northern Italy. There he dealt in imported cloth, especially silk, and salted fish, which he supplied to the royal galleys. Etienne owned two houses adjoining one another, one on the rue de Sâonerie and the other on the rue de la Chevrerie, and married into the commercial elite of Lyon. His business associate was another Piedmontese merchant, Barthélemy Naris, and together they persuaded King François I, as he passed through the city in 1536, to grant them concessions for the native production of silk in the city, using imported Piedmontese skills. The letters-patent were duly granted in October 1536 and the result became a model for how to grow successfully a native industry[12]. Etienne Turquet, who died in 1560, deserved the cul-de-sac that still carries his name in Lyon.

Louis Turquet's marriage to Louise Le Maçon, the daughter of Antoine, *trésorier des guerres*, secured that much-sought-after link between mercantile and office-holding notability for the family.[13] We do not know exactly how he and his wife became protestants. Louis' sisters – Philippe and Françoise – were both brought up, and remained, catholics. His mother too, stayed with the old faith and, in her will, dated September 1575, she apparently left the residue of her estate to Louis Turquet's children, but on condition that they be brought up as catholics. If they, or any one of them, turned protestant, the revenues of the estate after Louis' death were to be donated to the *Hôpital général* and the *Pont du Rhône* hospital in Lyon[14]. Louis and Louise lived their lives under the shadow of a family divided on religious lines. Jacques Turquet, probably Louis' blood relative, a merchant-jeweller in Paris, was

10 Not c.1550, as in E. Haag, and E. Haag (ed), La France Protestante. 10 vols., Paris 1846–1858, vol. 7. p. 349–50 and Mousnier (as in note 9), p. 59. In his interrogation of 20 June 1611, he declares himself 78 years of age (Bibliothèque nationale de France [henceforth: BN] MS Dupuy 558, fol. 40); cf. Hugh Trevor-Roper, Europe's Physician. The Life of Sir Theodore de Mayerne, 1573–1635, New Haven and London 2006, p. 16. I am grateful to Blaire Worden, who oversaw this posthumous work through to publication for his kindness in letting me see it at page-proof stage.

11 M. A. Desplanque, Mézières en Brenne et la famille Turquet de Mayerne, notice historique extraict du compte-rendu des travaux de la société du Berry, Paris 1863–1864, p. 28.

12 Vital de Valous, Etienne Turquet et les origins de la fabrique lyonnaise, Lyon 1868, esp. p. 60.

13 For transactions involving Louis and Louise's inheritance from her father, see A[rchives] N[ationales] Minutier Central, Etude XIX, 255 (19 November 1573; 26 November 1573). I am grateful to Robert Descimon for this reference.

14 Trevor-Roper, Europe's Physician (as in n. 10), p. 17.

an active League supporter and colonel for his *quartier*[15]. Louis was not the only immigrant, however, to be attracted to the new faith[16]. And nor was he alone in being the double target (immigrant and protestant) of sectarian hatreds. In the Lyon massacre of St Bartholomew, Huguenots were arrested and slaughtered *en masse*, with the tacit compliance of the city government, the Consulate. Turquet's two houses were ransacked and he and his wife narrowly escaped the city with their lives. It was perhaps personal experience as well as the common currency among contemporary Lyonnais notability that is reflected in his dyspeptic comments on the evils of a popular *ochlocratie*[17]. Louis and Louise took up refuge in Geneva, where he was received as an inhabitant on 16 March 1573. Théodore, their first son, the great Huguenot court physician, was born later that same year on 28 September and baptised in the cathedral church with Théodore de Bèze preaching the sermon and presenting the child, his namesake, at the font[18].

Thereafter, Louis Turquet's mental world was that of an exile: in between one society and another, but belonging to neither. France he refers to repeatedly in his writings *auec respect & affection filiale*, the country *de laquelle je suis nay humble et dévot subject*[19]. But, for almost 30 years, he did not feel safe there, returning to Lyon occasionally to administer the family property and deal with his printers, but never staying long. Geneva remained, however, a temporary home. He never sought its citizenship or to remake his life there as a Genevan notable. In his enforced idleness (as he explicitly termed it) he turned to reading, thinking and writing. The latter were mainly translations, probably to keep the wolf from the door (his later remarks about poverty being a curse may have been rooted in his personal experience). His French versions of Antonio Guevara's »Menosprecio de corte y alabanza de aldea«, published in 1574, and Cornelius Agrippa's »De Incertitudine et Vanitate Scientiarum«, published in 1582, enjoyed a modest, but enduring success[20]. There were others too, which were never published and are now lost to us, including a French vernacular translation of Ammianus Marcellinus, the Roman historian who chronicled the decline of the Roman empire in terms of moral decay and social and economic disruption. Turquet's »General History of Spain«, on the other hand, published in 1587, was the first work under his name that he had authored himself. It was a substantial protestant attempt to understand where the roots of that country's strength lay, a large compilation from Spanish, Italian and Latin writers, and composed (the preface tells us) *dans les montagnes savoyardes* – perhaps back in Chiéri, where his cousins still lived. It had an undeniable influence in France and (translated

15 Robert Descimon, Qui étaient les Seize? Mythes et réalités de la Ligue parisienne (1585–1594), Paris 1983, p. 226.

16 Natalie Zemon Davis, The Sacred and the Body Social in Lyon, in: Past and Present, 90 (1981), p. 40–70, esp. p. 44–48.

17 E.g. the views of Claude de Rubys, Histoire veritable de la ville de Lyon, Lyon 1604 on the *menue populace de Lyon*, *ceste beste a plusieurs testes de populace*, etc (p. 332), in: Arlette Jouanna, L'idée de race en France au XVI^e^ siècle et au début du XVII^e^ siècle, 3 vols., Lille 1976, p. 1025–6; MA, p. 8; 165; 214 etc, for the people – *turbulent, aveugle, ignorant & conducteur des ignorant*s.

18 Trevor-Roper (as in note 10), p. 17; Haag (as in note 10).

19 Louis Turquet de Mayerne, Histoire générale d'Espagne, Lyon 1587, dedication; MA, preface (both unpaginated).

20 Henri Baudrier (ed.), Bibliographie lyonnaise. 12 vols., Mayenne 1965, vol. 3, p. 231.

in 1612) in England too. Turquet's mental world had been conditioned in certain ways, and it showed in the »General History«. The »sufferings« of the Christians of the Hispanic peninsula under Muslim rule were generally given short shrift. They were not the martyrdoms of a persecuted minority, but a legitimate ruler's handling of insolence and rebellion[21]. The history of the Spanish peninsula provided ample proof for how tyranny worked. With more than a nod towards Machiavelli, Turquet accepted that tyrants liked to be feared. They used religion as a cloak for their abusive rule and harboured their grudges. But God would punish them in his own time, and popular rebellion against them was displeasing in His eyes[22]. In more recent times, Habsburg Hispanic rule might, at first sight, look like a mighty empire. But, underneath the surface, it had feet of clay; an unmixed monarchy in institutions and social orders, reliant on an inquisition, established by the monarchy, and whose practices he deplored[23]. Its only intermixture was in race, and Turquet was ambiguous towards it. Explaining the conversion of Jews to Catholicism after 1492, he declared that it had progressively led the noble families of Spain to become contaminated, *polluées de sang, et de créances*[24].

The reading and reflection that weighed on him most, however, during these years, concerned how the kingdom of France might be reformed. The notion that French society needed to be transformed into a society of justice was a dominant issue among France's notables and elite groups in the years after 1572 – »un des grands mythes« of these years[25]. It reflected their fundamental disquiets in coming to terms with the impact of the civil wars. To explain why the latter had occurred in France rather than elsewhere required an explanation in terms of a deeper malaise in French society and government – a deficit in virtue at all levels, but particularly among themselves, the governing elites. The more elusive civil peace became in the wake of St Bartholomew, the more urgent seemed to be the need for reform. It became, albeit briefly, a major political endeavour for the last Valois king, Henri III, in the years from 1576 to 1585[26]. But, since the aim was a moral reform, the more it was talked about and pursued, the larger the task became, and the more elusive the objective. For Genevan protestants of French origin like Turquet de Mayerne, their objective was to hold a mirror up to France's governing groups and show them the true face of the moral failings that had caused their sufferings. A remarkable »family« of reformist writings emerging from Geneva in 1582, works that Turquet evidently knew well, advocated a profound change in the way France's governing institutions behaved, its financial courts, office-holding structures, church, hospitals, educational institutions and poor-law provisions[27]. Although explicitly not anti-monar-

21 Louis Turquet de Mayerne, The Generall Historie of Spaine, London 1612, p. 187.
22 Ibid. p. 7, 187, 195, 202, 504, 692.
23 Ibid. p. 1119–1121.
24 Turquet de Mayerne, Histoire générale (as in note 19), p. 1298; cited Guillaume Aubert, »The Blood of France«. Race and Purity of Blood in the French Atlantic World, in: William and Mary Quarterly 61 (2004), note 50. Turquet's visceral anti-Semitism also appears in MA, p. 290.
25 Denis Crouzet, La nuit de la Saint-Barthélemy: un rêve perdu de la renaissance, Paris 1994, p. 224.
26 This is the subject of my forthcoming book: Mark Greengrass, Governing Passions. Peace and Reformation in the French Kingdom, 1576–1585, Oxford 2007.
27 N. F. [Froumenteau, pseud.], Le secret des finances de France, descouvert et départi en trois livres [...], 1581; N. Froumenteau [pseud.], Le Cabinet du roy de France, dans lequel il y a trois perles

chical, they propounded a reformation of the French royal court and a mixed monarchy, in which there was a mutual responsibility between ruler and ruled. In the wake of the failure of the estates general of 15767, which they criticized as a half-baked sham, pressurized from below and manipulated from above, they advocated an emphatic return to the constitutionality of a properly-constituted and regularly summoned estates general and a resurrection in local accountability[28]. One of those works, »Le Secret des Finances« was published by the Genevan printers Jean du Bois and Jean Berjon. Thirty years later, it would be another member of the Berjon Genevan printing dynasty, Jean's nephew, Jean II Berjon, whom Mayerne would naturally approach in Paris to publish the »Monarchie Aristodémocratique«.

Turquet's own political reformist treatises were composed in the shadow of the reformist literature of the 1580s. They led him to play the role of a »projector« for practical change on a wider scale. Seizing what he regarded as the best chance there would ever be for reforming French government and society, he set out from Geneva in the Spring of 1590 to present his plan – neatly copied out in three volumes *(assez amples)* in his own hand – to the new protestant French king, Henri IV[29]. Many had written *des Estats & Polices, & de leurs gouuernemens, à la commune utilité*, but they had not had the benefit of a true »Reformator«. With the advent of Henri IV, *tous les bons François* had great hopes *de vostre magnanimité en la reformation de la France*[30]. The king must be *le grand et plus affectionné reformateur qui uiue entre les François*[31]. That way, he would deserve the French throne, for *Les Iustes prendront le Royaume d'honneur*[32]. *Il faut, dy-ie, Sire tout reformer, & croire que ce n'est rien faict de reprimer les petites fautes, si la correction ne parviennent iusques aux grande*[33]. He went, acting also as an agent of the *Petit Conseil* in Geneva, one of the French king's financial backers, and called in on Henri de la Tour d'Auvergne vicomte de Turenne, one of the lynchpins of the new régime and a future patron for his son, the physician Théodore, at Sedan *en route* – no doubt to garner support for his scheme. At Tours, he had an audience with Henri IV in October 1591. The king received him graciously and, equally delicately, set the proposal to one side. It was no time to give a reforming hostage to fortune to his enemies in the Catholic League. Turquet readily admitted the dilemma. His proposals contained *conseils divers de la commune opinion & pratique, & partant tres-difficiles (selon qu'il pourra sembler à aucuns) à executer*. His friend, Joseph Scaliger, whom he visited in Poitou in March 1592 after his audience with the king, urged him to publish the whole work[34]. But, although he circulated his plans in manuscript, where they were *veu & loué par plusieurs*, Turquet knew the dangers of

précieuses d'inestimable valeur, par le moyen desquelles Sa Majesté s'en va le premier monarque du monde et ses sujets du tout soulagez, 1581; N. Barnaud [pseud.], Le miroir des François, dialogues, par Nicolas de Montand, 1582.

28 See Greengrass (as in note 26), ch. 7.

29 Louis Turquet de Mayerne, Epistre au roy. Presentee à sa Majesté au mois d'Octobre 1591, Tours 1592, p.3.

30 Ibid. p. 1.

31 Ibid. p. 6.

32 The verse at the head of the »Epistre«.

33 Ibid. p. 36.

34 J. Rèves (ed.), Epistres françoises des personnages illustres et doctes à Mons[ieu]r J. J. de la Scala, Hardewyck 1624, p. 516.

making them all public[35]. His advocacy of a stronger role for the estates general would be seized upon immediately by the most thoughtful and provocative of the Catholic League's propagandists, Louis Dorléans. His reform ideas would be turned against the Bourbon cause[36]. The risk of faction within the Bourbon cause at this moment was itself so great, too, that his reform proposals might easily become a cause for internal divisions as well as external criticism. So it was that he simply published a prospectus for his great reform of the kingdom; an elaborate sketch *(en abbregé)* of what he proposed *suiuant Dieu & Nature, que doit estre construicte la machine d'un grand Estat, & les lois appliquées qui le reserrent & maintiennent*[37]. Incidentally, he had probably picked up this machine-state analogy (which reappears often in his works) from the collection of political writings of the Italian Scipio di Castro, published in Paris a couple of years previously[38]. Turquet evidently read a good deal of these early »reason of state« writings, and had persuaded himself that there was a »science of politics« which could be reduced to a series of »Axiomes et Maximes« which could serve as a handbook to understanding the relationships between the various pieces of the machine of state, in particular between the state and the society to which it relates[39]. Luigi Gambino also plausibly surmises some neo-Pythagorian mathematical influences in Turquet's thought[40].

Turquet's reform scheme remained a mental construct, a vision of a political new world, rather than a practical programme. During the League his papers were scattered – *emportee en Languedoc, partie a Paris, & autres laissees ailleurs, esgares*[41]. But he did not abandon them altogether. Through Henri IV's reign, he lived, first in Geneva and Lyon and then, from at least 1603, he settled in Paris in a fashionable *quartier* at the rue Sainte Croix de la Bretonnerie, drawn there perhaps by the growing success of his elder son's medical practice. With the assassination of Henri IV in 1610, and the advent of the Regency of Marie de Médicis, Turquet was by then in his later 70s. Only the reform that he had dreamt of, and the mixed monarchy at its core, could save France from the (as he saw it) combined destructive forces of a minority, a female regency, factional court politics based around a coterie of Hispanophile favourites, and the disregard for the »natural« organisms of state which protected a polity in those circumstances. By 1611, he had little or nothing to lose by publishing his great political reform scheme. He later claimed that he had made it more generalized, and cut down the detailed references to the French monarchy, but everything

35 Louis Turquet de Mayerne, Traicté des negoces et traffiqves, ou contracts qvi se font en choses meubles. Reiglement, & Administration du Bureau ou Chambre politique des Marchans, Paris 1599, p. 2.

36 For the political thought of Louis Dorléans, see Francis J. Baumgartner, Radical Reactionaries: the political thought of the French catholic League, Geneva, 1976.

37 Turquet de Mayerne, Epistre au roy (as in note 29), p. 5.

38 [Scipio di Castro], Thesoro Politico civè Relationi Instrvttioni Trattati, discorsi varii […], [Paris?] 1589; cf. MA, pp. 3; 6; 10, etc. For the later history and significance of this metaphor, see Barbara Stollberg-Rilinger, Der Staat als Maschine: zur politischen Metaphorik des absoluten Fürstenstaats, Berlin, 1986, esp. ch. 2 (»Die Vorgeschichte der Metapher«). I am grateful to Bettina Dietz for alerting me to this important text.

39 Ibid. preface; p. 1, etc.

40 Gambino, Un progetto (as in note 9), p. 19.

41 Turquet de Mayerne, Traicté (as in note 35), p. 2.

in the preliminary sketch of 1591 appears in the later, larger publication of 1611[42]. Whether he actually went to the Netherlands some time after May 1610 to gain the permission of the States General in order to dedicate the work to them, as Trevor-Roper suggests, is doubtful[43]. It would surely have been picked up in his interrogation of 20 June 1611, where the *lieutenant civil* would have been interested in dealings with a foreign power. As it is, he was careful to assure his interrogator that the Low Countries was a place *dont Il na point de Congnoissance*[44]. The permission was more likely to have been arranged through the baron de Langerac, the Dutch ambassador in Paris at the time, who was Turquet's distant kinsman[45]. And it was in Paris that it was published the following year, a privilege having been obtained from the Chancellor, Brulart de Sillery. Mayerne's *la Monarchie aristodémocratique* proved to be political dynamite and Brulart's permission turned out, for reasons to which we shall return, to be worth less than the paper it was written on.

*

Almost everything about the »Monarchie aristodemocratique« made it calculatedly controversial. He promises his readers a series of »paradoxes«, *reigles vrayement estranges de l'opinion & vsage commun de ce temps, mais veritables*[46]. It offered a reform of France from top to bottom, of its institutions and its society. The nature of its monarchy was to be profoundly changed, the royal court partially dismantled. Central institutions would be weakened; local ones strengthened. »Police« would become a major preoccupation of a state that sought to discipline and reform its citizens. The fabric of French society, in particular the prevalent legal division into »orders« and the established role of the catholic church and its clergy would be profoundly modified with the creation of five separate and secular »classes«. Nobility would become less a matter of inherited privilege. Female rule, as exemplified by the Regent Marie de Médicis, was subjected to withering criticism as against the laws of nature. Although he makes little of it explicitly, Turquet's world has a patena of protestantism at every turn. It is a lay Calvinist vision of a reformed mixed monarchy and a picture of the kind of society that would sustain it. And it was published just as the political assembly of protestants convened at Saumur in May, the first major political challenge to the new Regency government[47].

From the outset, wholesale reform is Turquet's agenda: *car ceux qui pensent procurer le bien public, ou estiment s'en bien acquitter, y apportant simplement des remedes particuliers, ne font plus que les Medecins ignorants ou negligents, courans seulement aux accidents qui se monstrent au dehors*[48]. The trouble is that reform on

42 Louis Turquet de Mayerne, Apologie contre les detracteurs des livres de la Monarchie Aristodemocratique, 1616.
43 Trevor-Roper, Europe's Physician (as in note 10), p. 143.
44 BN MS Dupuy, fol. 48.
45 Trevor-Roper, Europe's Physician (as in note 10), p. 143; Mousnier (as in note 9), p. 60.
46 MA, p. 8.
47 The privilege of the work is dated 14 May 1611.
48 Ibid p. 6. The medical analogy came readily to Turquet – both his brother Jean and his son Théodore were physicians.

such a scale disrupted vested interests, angering *esprits indociles & desdaigneux*. Yet the task was urgent because the French state was once more in profound crisis, and its difficulties *menassent de ruine par tout*[49]. The changes attempted so far had been too timid, conceding too much to the world of self-interested courtiers; *Il faut tout reformer*[50]. On what basis? Turquet had absorbed from the reason of state theorists the significance of basing the science of politics upon the *enseignements de Nature*. The idea was hardly new (it had impeccable Aristotelian foundations) but he presents it as though he had discovered it for the first time. Turquet refers back to the three underlying principles of nature which dominate his work[51]. The first is that of diversity. God has disposed the natural world to be a cornucopia of variety and growth. It is replicated in human society and lies at the basis of our mutual interdependence and the importance of communication and exchange. The second is the principle of inutility. Nothing in nature is there for nothing. Everything has a particular vocation which corresponds to God's providential disposition, and within that vocation there is always an element of both obedience and command. The third is a destiny principle, in which all the elements of nature strive towards the perfection of their vocation, sometimes needing »reform« to achieve it. Throughout his work, Turquet refers to the state as a garden. France is one of the *grands et plantureux Royaumes*. Knowing how to look after it, with *leger artifice et convenable culture* was the essence of political science. Sadly, the gardeners currently in charge had not the least idea how to set about it. Their *desraisonnables projets* resulted in rank weeds and undesirable growths – fraud, superstition, secrecy and perversion. The former League propagandist, Louis Dorléans seized the opportunity to reply. In *La Plante humaine* (1612), he expanded on Turquet's home-spun analogies of the French kingdom as a »garden«, its schools as »nurseries«, its social groups as »parterres« with the nobility as its »fruit«. Like human beings, plants live and die, and have emotions, ones which they display when they are transplanted (delicate references, here, to his own emotions when he was »transplanted« into exile in the Spanish Netherlands after the League)[52]. But then he turned on Turquet as one of *ces esprits fretillants & petillants* that want to change *nostre pure Monarchie en vn gouuernement estranger*[53].

Dorléans had old scores to settle. Back in the League, he had expressed harsh words for the *politiques*, those self-serving royalists who put political expediency above their loyalty to the catholic faith, and supported Henri de Bourbon. *Politique* was still a term of opprobrium in France two decades later. So Turquet was being consciously provocative in referring to a *politique* as an *homme d'Estat* who understands *les raisons d'Estat*, and *police* as the science of politics[54]. *Police* is a protean

49 Ibid. p. 7.
50 Ibid. p. 34.
51 Ibid. p. 73 et seq.
52 Louis Dorléans, La plante hvmaine, svr le trespas du roy Henry le Grand. Où il se traicte du rapport des hommes avec les plantes qui viuent et meurent de mesme façon: Et où se refute ce qu'a escrit Turquet contre la Regence de la Royne et le Parlement, en son liure de la Monarchie Aristo-Democratique, Paris 1612, fols. 41 et seq.
53 Ibid. fols. 363–4.
54 MA, pp. 71–4; 162.

word in Turquet's lexicon – and for many of his contemporaries too. It is a synonym for the state, a French translation of the Greek »polis«. But it is also, more specifically, the way in which a state is managed, the dynamics of its rule. So *police*, far from being the suspect doctrines of *politiques*, is the essence of discipline in the republic, *ce don admirable & diuin que nous appellons Police (c'est la vie sociale & ciuile) sans lequel tant s'en faut qu'il puisse commodement vivre*[55]. A well-established *police* would maintain civility by controlling the *affection que nous pouuons appeler necessitez occultes: lesquelles seruent comme de renes ou d'anses aux Roys & Magistrats* […] *pour renger doucement ce frenetique & empescher qu'il be se jette à travers champs*. The distinctiveness of Mayerne's mental world is the dominance of this concept of »police«, and how a truly reformed France will be *bien policée*. By it, he intended a humanist sense of a self-governing political entity, imbued with civil virtue: [*l*]*a vertu de quoy nous parlons est une sagesse religieuse, ou une religion instruicte et sçavante en ce que Dieu veut et commande* […][56]. Turquet envisaged a »self-policed state« rather than the more modern sense of *police* as an agency of social control which would gradually emerge in the course of the early-modern period[57].

Why was *police* necessary? Human society, like nature, is *une diversité délectable*[58]. This diversity had, in its earliest incarnations, encouraged our mutual communication, *nous rendans industrieux & propres à infinies operations, nous invitant à nous associer & entrechercher les vns les autres, pour estre mutuellement secourus & soulages és necessitez de ceste vie*[59]. The regulation of this human communicative energy is what *proprement nous appellons Police*. In one of the reform treatises that he had circulated in the early 1590s, and which he managed to publish in 1599, Turquet concentrated on the »police« of merchants. As in all his writings, he emphasized his respect for merchants and commercial life – and thereby honoured his own family background too. *Il n'y a rien si naturel & ordinaire aux homes, que de contracter, marchander & traffiquer les vns auec les autres. Et n'est possible de voir trois personnes conuerser deux heures ensemble, qu'elles ne tombent en propos de vente, trocque, prest, ou aultre espèce de contract*. Even children are habituated to it from their earliest years: *Sont ils a l'Echole ils ne font autre mestier que de changer, rechanger, & marchander entre eux, de ce qu'ils apportent de leurs maisons*[60]. The whole world is a market: *Le Prince auec ses suiects, le Maistre auec ses vallets, l'amy auec son amy, le Capitaine auec ses Soldats, l'espoux auec son Espouse, les femmes entre elles: en vn mot, tout le monde court & forsenne apres les marchez*. All intellectual, social and political life represents for Turquet this reality of perpetual, affective exchange: *En somme tout ce que l'homme faict de la main, & discourt en son esprit, n'est aultre chose que marchandise, & vn essay de praticquer les contracts que les*

55 Ibid. p. 71.
56 MA, p. 166.
57 For the evolution in French ideas of »police« see Andrea Iseli, »Bonne Police«. Frühneuzeitliches Verständnis von der guten Ordnung eines Staates in Frankreich, Epfendorf/Neckar 2003, p. 23–46.
58 MA, p. 4.
59 Ibid.
60 Turquet de Mayerne, Traicté (as in note 35), p. 8.

legistes n'ont sceu nommer aultres sinon que Ie te donne, à fin que tu me donnes. Et ie fay à fin que tu faces. Lesquels de faict comprennent tous negoces & trafficques, & ne sont aultre chose que marchandises. The sentiments are identical to those of Althusius in the first paragraphs of the »Politica« (1603), where he wrote of the *communicatio mutua rerum, operarum, et juris* as the basis of civil and political life, *communicatio* being one rendering of the Greek *koinonia* (*communio* being another, altogether more high-octane translation used by Althusius). For Turquet too, the centrality of the discipline of *police* was an ineluctable consequence of this lateral, communicative world, dominated by »arithmetical« proportion in which there is the *mesme ordre, mesme soing, mesmes desires, mesmes liberté, mesme autorité chez les marchans, les artisans, & les paysans, que chez les Gentilshommes*[61].

But it is an unequal diversity, mutually compatible through that inequality, itself the result of our different natural inclinations or »vocations«[62]. Nature is an *ouvriere tres-industrieuse … qui incline chacun à quelque vacation & industrie en sa vie priuee, & par là remplit les Republiques de diuerses professions, vtiles au general*[63]. These »vocations« are essential to the way that society is constituted, reflected in the multiplicity of »classes« in society that reflect differences of vocation. Turquet envisaged five basic »classes«, or vocational groupings, *colloqués* into those with capacities for making money, for studying, for trading, using their craft skills, and for deploying their manual labour[64]. Each vocation represented a social utility, and lack of such a vocation was a social crime: *Car a quelque chose que l'homme s'arreste pour son particulier, doit estre conioincte quelque vtilité reuenante à la commune société des hommes, autrement il ya un mal qui requirt reformation*[65]. In Turquet's polity, every individual reaching adulthood (25 years of age) was required to declare their vocation before the *bureaux de police*. Idleness was a social curse (and especially amongst the nobility), to be »reformed« by the *bureaux de police*, precisely because it denied social utility[66]. Social climbing, moving from one class to another, was to be discouraged by the superintendants of the *bureaux de police*: it was a recipe for rewarding ambition and creating social chaos. But vocations did not pass naturally from father to son, and it would be a false reformation to try to make it so. Social change, therefore, naturally occurred over time, from one generation to another: *Il faudroit que ce fust de generation en generation*[67]. Those who refused to declare their vocations were the equivalent of non-citizens. They had no *adresse*. For Turquet an *adresse* was not a geographical location but a social reality: a vocation in which God had »planted« each individual (*dresser* meaning, in sixteenth-century French, to »plant«). It was a terminology with an auspicious future ahead of it in the *bureaux d'adresses* reformist schemes of Théophraste Renaudot and, in an English context, Samuel Hartlib[68].

61 MA, p. 81.
62 There is *diversité, mais contrarieté, non* – Ibid. p. 80.
63 Ibid. p. 75.
64 Ibid. p. 99–100.
65 Ibid. p. 22.
66 Ibid. p. 92.
67 Ibid. p. 87.
68 Howard M. Solomon, Public Welfare, Science, and Propaganda in Seventeenth-Century France. The Innovations of Theophraste Renaudot, Princeton 1972; Mark Greengrass, Samuel Hartlib

»Nobility« was not one of the classes of Turquet's imagined reformed society. It was not a natural, domestic vocation but a civil and public reward for those whose »virtue« is outstanding. »Virtue«, in this instance, however, lay in those *qui ont les affections principalement dressees par certaine education à l'honneur et utilité publique*[69]. Turquet recognised that his vision of nobility would be regarded by French contemporaries as among his most »paradoxical« notions, *estrange aux hommes* and *chose difficile*[70]. Roland Mousnier rightly interpreted them as running clean contrary to any sense of the nobility as a hereditary military order[71]. One whole book (Book 5) of his treatise was dedicated to defining the »virtues« of a nobility and delineating how they should properly be formulated in his reformed state. Nobility was not something created within nature. Nor was it inevitably or naturally an inherited quality: *[l]es races ne sont ny sources ny fondement de la Noblesse*[72]. To imagine that nobility was something that could be *automatically* inherited was *vne vaine imagination, confirmee par indulgence, & vne excuse legerement receue sous la faveur de ce faux lustre*[73]. Nobility could not be acquired by marriage or by inheriting a particular piece of property. It could not be bought, sold, or usurped[74]. It was certainly not the preserve of those who fought. Military force had (he readily admitted) been one of the qualities that had historically been one of the distinguishing features of the nobility but only when conjoined with other virtuous qualities as well – fortitude, prudence and patience in adversity are those he emphasises. That is because the *vraie noblesse* was one that is respected by others, rather than feared. So nobility was consonant with many vocations, rather than just one. Indeed, it was better to have nobles who are rich, lettered and skilled. Penurious nobles, by contrast, were dangerous to the state since their poverty bred resentment and disdain[75]. There was a long tradition of nobles being lettered and skilled, which more recent prejudices about the *dérogéance* associated with mercantile or intellectual activity had only served to obscure[76]. Only those whose vocation lay in their manual labour were excluded from being considered for elevation to the nobility, since it did not enable them to demonstrate the virtues required of nobles. Turquet's conclusion, therefore, was that, in his reformed polity, nobility was a virtuous patriciate of all the talents, a notability of diverse vocations[77]. It was for the sovereign to encourage these virtues by educational establishments and apprenticeships, to »recognise« and confirm the nobility of individuals in whom they were preeminent, it being then for the »censors« in the state, and ultimately the estates general, to ensure that those individuals retained their virtue and did not become corrupt over

and the commonwealth of learning, in: John Barnard and Donald Francis McKenzie (ed.), The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain, Cambridge 2002, p. 304–22.

69 MA, p. 291.
70 Ibid. p. 96.
71 Mousnier (as in note 9), p. 62–3; cf. Jouanna, L'idée de race (as in note 17), p. 1026–1043.
72 MA, p. 256.
73 Ibid. p. 96.
74 Ibid. p. 261–3.
75 Ibid. p. 140–2.
76 Ibid. p. 134–5.
77 Ibid. p. 259.

time. This sovereign power was essential to Turquet's mixed monarchy since it was one of the means by which the state could retain a *proportion géometrique* between nobles and non-nobles, a »temperature« between the nobility and the various vocational groups in society.

Redefining the nobility as a civil patriciate created by the sovereign enabled Turquet to envisage a very different kind of monarchy for France. Just as nobility is based upon the respect of others, just so monarchy is based on the »modest censure« of those whom it rules. This is the *paradoxe merveilleux* at the centre of *vne Monarchie bien proportionnee & ordonnee selon Nature*, a *Royauté Aristodemocratique & equitable*[78]. Throughout the »Monarchie Aristodemocratique« there is the dark shadow, always implicit, of Bodin's »Six Livres de la République«. Bodin had vested indivisible power – sovereignty – in the absolute ruler. For Turquet (and he was not alone) this was really quite incomprehensible. There were no indivisible absolutes in this world, and certainly not in the endlessly variable Nature. Indivisible absolutes belonged to God, and even He was divisible into a Trinity. Turquet was much more inclined to see sovereignty as *vn rayon […] en chasque corps de people qui s'associe*[79]. So God's providence works by planting in the souls of *ceste machine mondaine* a governing principle which is part and parcel of our vocations, a faculty of sovereign majesty (*Ie dy faculté Souueraine & non pas absolue*) which is then vested in a monarch. To envisage indivisible sovereignty vested in one individual was a means of creating and legitimizing slavery and tyranny (one of the two long historical excursions in his book is on what could be learnt from the history of Roman tyrants)[80]. Monarchs derive their sovereignty *du corps universel de leurs Estats, qui le leur donne souueraine, mais non infinie*; and, in a passage that has to be read as a direct commentary on Book 1, ch. 10 of Bodin's »République«, Turquet drew on the classic resistance writings of sixteenth-century French Calvinists in order to demonstrate that royal oaths of consecration reflect his view that sovereignty is mediated from God *par le Corps universel de son people, pour l'exercer à certaines conditions, restrainctes dans les terms de ses Lois eternelles qui reluisent en Nature*[81]. A true sovereign, in short, is one who rules in tandem with the patriciate and in harmony with the estates-general, *le siege di-je de l'intelligence, lesquels estant viuifié de son Prince, luy suggere reciproquement vn droict sentiment & vn mouuement reiglé en ses actions*[82].

This *mutuel devoir* and reciprocal censorship is fundamental to Turquet's vision of the government of a reformed state. It was a constituent element of the reformed princely »Grand Council« (*un ample college ordinaire & permanent* composed of 2000 councillors chosen by geometric proportion from the various classes in society), whose tasks were to counsel the prince on all aspects of state. Good counsel was *la loy immuable* of monarchy[83]. It ensured that ordinary procedures were not overturned under the pressure of extraordinary events. It assisted in the recommen-

78 Ibid. p. 8; 30.
79 Ibid. p. 39.
80 Ibid. p. 41 et seq.
81 Ibid. p. 47.
82 Ibid. p. 67.
83 Ibid. p. 190.

dation of those with the requisite virtuous qualities to be noble. It anchored the science of politics – the balance between »persuasion« and »force« and the associated applications of prudence. Equally vital was the regular convening of a true estates general, *primitifs et naturels conseruateurs [of the king] comme les Roys aussi reciproquement sont protecteurs de la dignite & autorité des Estats*[84]. They are the subject of a whole book [Book 6] and the climax of his political analysis. Although there are distant echoes of »Francogallia« in this chapter, Turquet mustered arguments for the centrality of the estates general in the government of a mixed monarchy that were largely non-historical. The fact was that the estates were essential to the well-being of the state. Their task was to validate fundamental laws, conserve the sovereign powers of the ruler by their modest censure, and to instigate reform where it was needed[85]. If the recent experience of the holding of estates general in France had been less than auspicious (the estates of Blois in 1577 and then again in 1589 had been political failures) that was because they had been corrupted by those who sought to use them for their own ends. True estates general, frequently summoned, cemented sovereignty in a state, providing an instrument for its reform and a safety valve for the expression of grievances: *vn souverain preseruatif contre toutes maladies populaires & destruisantes*[86]. They served as the *frein des Roys & des peuples*, encouraging modesty in rulers and docility in the ruled. They were the *naturels & seuls conseruateurs des fondemens des polices* and *l'instrument des instruments à cest effect*[87]. For they were the apex of a series of regional and local assemblies, who elected the deputies to the estates general, and who were embodiments of the regionalized and decentralized »self-policed state« that Turquet envisaged.

At every turn of this »self-policed state« lay instruments of »censorship«. French lawyers and political theorists from the sixteenth century had been interested in the Ancient idea of a »censor« in the state, an embodiment of the idea of mutual discipline[88]. Turquet took it several stages further, instigating »censors« at every conceivable opportunity. The estates general were expected to dispatch colleges of *commissaires reformateurs & censeurs* to visit each locality on a regular basis with wide executive powers of enquiry. Part of their responsibility was to construct registers of those »virtuous« individuals in each vocation who would, in due course, be recommended by the estates general for elevation to the nobility[89]. Of the four great departments of state that he envisages (»Police«, »Military Affairs«, »the Judiciary« and »Domain and Finance«, the first and most important was that of »Police« with, at its head, a *conseruateur & general reformateur de la Police*. Working in tandem with local *Bureaux de Police* and their *conseruateurs*, the responsibilities of these *bureaux* were awesome, *instruments du tout propres pour la reformation*[90]. In addition to keeping the registers of vocations and contributing to the recommendations

84 Ibid. p. 15.
85 Ibid. p. 323–8.
86 Ibid. p. 338.
87 Ibid. p. 330.
88 J. Parsons, The Roman Censors in the Renaissance Political Imagination, in: History of Political Thought 22 (2001), p. 565–86.
89 Ibid. p. 388–393.
90 Ibid. p. 27.

for ennoblement, they were also responsible for social discipline of all kinds, the control of *tous insolents & mal complexionnez*, the regulation of dress, *pompes, jeux, banquets, convoys funebres, ou autres vanitez* and *la police des marriages*. Other local *bureaux* had responsibilities for hospitals and the poor law, the control of trade and commerce, and the oversight of tax collection. Each of these *bureaux* had a censoring role and together, their control over the lives and activities of individuals was far-reaching: *estend ses branches par tous estats & conditions de personnes, leurs actions & occupations, charges & administration quelconques, & par maniere de dire en la circonference d'icelle s'enferment & contournent*[91]. And the authority of the censors was as much about the oversight of the state itself as of the ruled. The newly-reformed royal court would itself have a new office of *intendant du cabinet, censures en l'hostel royal*[92]. *Police* was more important than the other instruments of state because it was the means to keep the lesser magistrates *(officiers subalternes)* from corruption. And, in common with reformist discourse everywhere in the early-modern period, Turquet was aware that the major weakness of the state lay in the inadequacies of its own servants. However lesser officials were appointed (and he favoured selection over election, but it depended on the nature of the state in question), the authority of the censor was vital to provide a continual bridle upon their behaviour *pour avoir soin continuel de conseruer cest ordre en son entier*[93]. If our reading of mixed monarchy as interpreted in the early-modern period should incline us to believe that it was a vehicle for a limited state, Turquet's treatise should make us think again. As an elaboration of the application of sixteenth-century notions of »police« to a large kingdom like France, Turquet's views are hard to match for their uncompromising vision of the powers of an all-embracing state.

*

At first sight, this analysis of Turquet de Mayerne's »Monarchie aristodémocratique« lends strong support to the American sociologist Philip Gorski's proposition of a »disciplinary revolution« linking the ethos of Calvinism with the rise of the state in early-modern Europe[94]. Imaginatively linking two independent strands of historical sociology – those of Weber and Foucault – he argues that a Calvinist ethos for »discipline« lay at the heart of a »disciplinary revolution«, which explains the hitherto unexplained inner strength of the Dutch Republic and Prussian state. The disciplinary revolution was based on particular and more intensively applied notions of social and moral discipline which were distinctive to the processes of confessionalisation in its Calvinist incarnation. He draws, of course, upon the fundamental work of Heinz Schilling and the links that he has drawn between confessional conflict and state-building[95]. Heinz Schilling, however, has always been careful to allow that

91 Ibid. p. 19.
92 Ibid. p. 454.
93 Ibid. p. 155.
94 P. S. Gorski, The Disciplinary Revolution. Calvinism and the Rise of the State in Early Modern Europe, Chicago, London 2003.
95 Heinz Schilling, Konfessionskonflikt und Staatsbildung, Gütersloh 1981; and many subsequent works.

some essential features of the »disciplinary revolution« can readily be shown to have been shared across the confessional boundaries created as the reformation's impact was felt in Europe. Gorski's contention is more confessionally specific. It went »further and faster in the Calvinist polities«, and they tended to rely there on intensive combinations of the individual and social, normative and coercive modes of discipline, whose ideal types he sketches out[96].

Louis Turquet's vision of a reformed France was undoubtedly inspired by his understanding of a Calvinist polity. Genevan Calvinist views of the need for a profound reformation in the world around him – socially as well as ecclesiastically – dominated it. Calvinist ecclesiology inflected his political and social language (*classe/classis*; *adresse/église dressée*, *vocation*, etc). The *mutua obligatio* between ruler and ruled, the political doctrine of choice among the professors of the French protestant academies at Saumur, Montauban and Sedan in the 1600s, is evident at every turn in the way that he conceived of a French mixed monarchy. It is not difficult to read Turquet's obsession with »police« and »censorship« as a political application of the Genevan consistorial discipline to the wider stage of the French realm. For what was a Genevan-style ecclesiastical structure if not a »self-policed« polity, imbued with mutual censorship and disciplinary structures at every level in combinations of all four ideal-types outlined by Gorski? And the French Huguenot political and ecclesiastical organization was just such an application, and one that Turquet de Mayerne knew well, having attended the national synods at Saumur in 1596 and Jargeau in 1601[97]. Turquet de Mayerne's treatise demonstrates, one might say, a vision of how the »disciplinary revolution« might have been applied in France.

At this point, however, we should register caveats. Firstly, Turquet warned his readers against making too close a comparison between ecclesiastical and state structures: *Dieu est pareillement auteur & des Eglises & des Polices; mais quant aux formes de [les] representer en ce monde, & d'y administrer ou l'Eglise ou la Police elles sont du tout diuerses; ne sont les instruments desquels Dieu se sert à conduire l'vne &l'autre aucunement semblables*[98]. The visible church was part of an invisible *saincte communion générale* and it was a house of many mansions. Church and state were separate domains he argued – uncomfortably so for his Gallican and Ultramontane critics. For the claims of the clerical order to be a constituent part of the estates general were absurd, a *fraude manifeste*[99]. So, although he regarded clerics as the ecclesiastical equivalent of lesser magistrates, who *peuuent estre dicts officiers de police*, and that there was *vne disposition reciproque d'entre l'Eglise & la Police, que l'vne doit regarder & veiller sur l'autre*, his polity was a confessionally neutral one[100]. Indeed, on the great question of the day in the wake of the edict of Nantes – religious pluralism – Turquet was in the forefront of those in the Calvinist leadership who thought an irenicist reconciliation of religious differences was possible through a national council. Ten days after he returned from the synod of Jargeau in 1601, he brought his friend

96 Gorski (as in note 94), p. xvii; 32–4.
97 Haag (as in note 10), p. 349.
98 MA, p. 300.
99 Ibid. p. 306.
100 Ibid. p. 303.

Pierre de l'Estoile in Paris a lengthy paper he had written on the question[101]. We should expect his views of French reform, and the social discipline that they contain, like his religious convictions, to be open to cross-confessional allegiance and echo.

Of course they were. It is an illusion, born of selective reading of the evidence, to imagine that only protestant voices called for a disciplinary reformation in French society. Scarcely a month before the publication of Turquet's book, the *premier president* of the Parlement of Paris, Achille de Harlay had opened the legal sessions of the Parlement of Paris with his accustomed *mercuriale*. In it, as Estoile recounted, he *triumpha de discourir sur la nécessité de la reformation en tous estats, et principalement sur les grands abus et corruption de la justice et police de Paris, auxquels il estoit nécessaire de donner ordre et y mettre la main*[102]. Four days later, one of Estoile's friends recorded that he had just visited Harlay and found him *merveilleusement bien disposé et porté du tout au bien publiq et à la réformation des abus du Palais et corruptions de la Justice, en tout ce qui despendroit de sa charge, sans faveur ni acception de personne*[103]. Achille de Harlay's *mercuriale* was the address of a Cato in the French state, a censor of its judicial affairs, the deliberations of the court in a *mercuriale* being none other than a session of mutual discipline and self-police. Turquet's vision of a well-policed state was one which was widely shared and cross-confessional in early seventeenth-century France.

But it was just a vision: a utopian picture of an ideal reformed society. And, as Bettina Dietz has reminded us, there is no more »disciplined« and »policed« landscape in early-modern Europe than in its utopias[104]. The further away from reality the utopia was, the more attractive it became – the more alluring and striking the alternative vision that it represented, and the more elaborate its forms of self-discipline. If we want a catholic counterpart to Turquet's utopian vision of a disciplined and self-policed France, we have only to turn to the works of Jean Talpin, canon and *théologal* from Périgueux, writing in the midst of the civil wars[105]. *Voyant en tant de pais, & en tant de bonnes & celebres villes* [he mentioned Paris, Périgueux and Bordeaux] *ou I'ay demeure depuis ma jeunesse estre aduenues plusieurs calamités* he sought to derive the principles of a *police chrestienne* for France directly from Scrip-

101 G. Brunet, A. Champollion, and E. Halphen (ed.), Pierre de l'Estoile: Mémoires-journaux, Paris, 1875–1896, vol. 9, p. 138.

102 Ibid. 11, p. 100. In the manuscript collection of Harlay's speeches, that for the *Mercuriale* of April 1611 is, if l'Estoile's summary is to be believed, an inadequate reflection of what he actually said (BN MS Fr 4397 fols. 292–3; 18418 fols. 250v–251). His text emphasizes, however, the importance of reformation. In the *maison de Themis* (i.e. in the world of ordered nature), the state must itself be *un livre de preceptes, exercice de Prudence, escolle de Justice, et continuelle meditation d'honneur. Par raisons et discours*, the judges were a fundamental part of that reformation.

103 Ibid. p. 103.

104 Bettina Dietz, Utopie und Policey. Frühneuzeitliche Konzeptionen eines idealen Ordnungsstaates, in: Zeitschrift für Historische Forschung 30 (2003), p. 591–617.

105 J. Talpin, La police chrestienne […] Livre tresutile & salutaire à tous Gouverneurs de Republiques, pour heureusement les regir & gouverner selon Dieu: & autant necessaire à toutes manières de gens, de quelque estat ou vacation qu'ils soyent, à cause qu'il contient la doctrine non seulement generale, mais aussi speciale, pour l'instruction de toute particuliere & Chrestienne profession. De la doctrine duquel aussi les curez & predicateurs se pourront servir quand ils voudront advertir chacun estat de son particulier deuoir, Paris 1568.

ture. The result was an earthly parallel to the celestial hierarchy, maintained by a mixture of disciplinary measures, coercive and persuasive, individual and collective, that are more hierarchical and centralized than Turquet's perhaps, but no less strong in their disciplinary emphasis. Talpin's *police chrestienne* was, however, no more capable, or likely, of being realized in early-modern France than Turquet's.

Gorski's »Disciplinary Revolution« has reinforced Heinz Schilling's essential invitation to early-modern historians to make sense of the fundamental religious and structural impulses that link the later reformation, the processes of confessionalisation and the longer-term development of the state, and to do so in a comparative context. Turquet's treatise is a reminder that we need to understand not only these impulses (where and when they occurred) – the ideological and structural forces for *change*, but also (equally importantly), the powerful, inherited forces for conservative *reaction* to them. We need, in short, to understand that what was possible in the *newly constructed* states of the Netherlands or Prussia was equally impossible in well-established states like France, with inherited legal, political and social arrangements upheld by strong institutions, social groups and interests. Here, the fate of Turquet's treatise is as important as its contents. Although he had no doubt hoped that it would gain a hearing at the political assembly of French protestants at Saumur, there is no sign that they took any interest in it whatsoever[106]. The meeting became the battleground for the competing influence of the protestant *grands nobles.* One loosely-conceived *bloc* rallied around the duc de Bouillon and sought support from eastern and southern France through Lesdiguières and Châtillon. Another brought together the newly-disgraced Sully and his son-in-law, the duc de Rohan with his brother the comte de Soubise, drawing their influence from western France. Issues of reform disappeared into insignificance before the struggle for the presidency of the assembly and the dominance of its affairs. Worse still, as news of the content of Turquet's work spread through the French court, the Chancellor Brulart de Sillery felt compromised by the publication privilege he had accorded it. Upon his recommendation and at the order of the Council of State, copies of the book were seized on 29 May from the shops of Iean Berjon on the rue St-Jean de Beauvais and on the Prisoners' Gallery of the Parlement, as well as from the shop of his co-publisher Iean Le Bouc, about two weeks after its publication[107]. By the end of July, the book could only be bought on the black market for up to six times its advertised sale-price[108]. Having extolled the virtues of a self-policed state in the abstract, Turquet now came into close contact with its more uncomfortable, and potentially oppressive reality. For, however badly it was enforced, the French monarchy laid large claims to policing what was published within the realm: *Quiconque sera conuaincu d'auoir escript, composé & semé libels & placetz diffamatoires* […] *contre l'honneur du Roy ou pour exciter et esmouuoir le people à sedition*

106 For an analysis of the Saumur political assembly, see A. L. Herman, The Saumur Assembly of 1611: Huguenot Political Belief and Action in the Age of Marie de Medici. Unpublished PhD Thesis, Johns Hopkins University 1984.

107 L'Estoile (as in note 101), p. 126.

108 Ibid. p. 133 – *Tout avoit esté saisi, et le reste se vendent à discretion, quatre francs, cent sols, et deux escus*.

et rebellion was guilty of *lèse-majesté.* Such seditious libel was punishable by death and the seizure of the assets of the individuals concerned[109]. Pierre de l'Estoile was perhaps right to have advised *que l'aucteur devoit faire imprimer en une cite libre, et non à Paris*[110]. Louis Turquet himself was arrested and interrogated a fortnight later by a councilor of state, the *lieutenant-civil de la prevôté de Paris*, Nicolas Le Jay, sieur de la Maison Rouge, on 20 June. The Calvinist came face to face with the Chancellor.

*

We do not need to imagine how that interrogation went. We have a signed copy of it, preserved for us in the papers of the Dupuy brothers, and tucked away in a miscellaneous bundle on the nature and prerogatives of the French crown. Mousnier is alone in mentioning its existence (in a footnote), but it seems clear that he never consulted it in detail. Yet it is a fascinating document. Here is that rare commodity in early-modern Europe, a political theorist (albeit an autodidact such as Turquet) having to defend extempore his opinions before the authorities. Le Jay, acting for the Chancellor, had clearly read the book with some care, and picked out 16 specific passages that he regarded as prima facie cases of seditious libel. He began with its title. These words »monarchy«, »aristocracy« and »democracy« were *tous motz grecs, que toutesfois ont leurs significations differentes & diuerses*[111]. By bundling them together Turquet *semble faire confusion, en ce quil mect Monarchie Aristo Democraticque semble diminuer la Monarchie*. Turquet was not disposed, however, to apologise. Le Jay had not appreciated the *social* implications of his work:

Il intitule sondit liure Monarchie Aristo democraticque, par ce quil n'entend ny a entendu que la porte soit fermée a aucun noble ou non noble aux charges & offices publicques, et que l'exercice dIcelles soubz l'auctorité du Prince est le vray chemin selon les Grands Politicques, a ceulx qui ne sont pas nobles de paruenir a l'estat de Noblesse qu'il maintient & soustient estre le chef d'œuvre du Prince, assauoir de faire d'un plebeyen ung homme noble, et que requerant l'honneur en la Profession de Noble, de viure noblement. Il estime que vivre noblement c'est s'employer aux charges & offices publicques principalles Continuellement, soit des Armes, de La Justice, des finances, de la Police en general, que c'est l'ordre de la Cité & fondement de tout Estat, et en ce faisant a l'interpreté tout le tiltre[112].

It was an able reply. Social speculation was not seditious libel. So Le Jay tried another tack. Why had Turquet dedicated the work to a foreign power, to the Estates-General of the Netherlands? Turquet's response emphasized how he saw the

109 This was the formula adopted by the *premier président* of the Parlement of Paris, Barnabé Brisson when he presented a list of treasonable offences to the Assembly of Notables at St Germain-en-Laye in December 1583.

110 Ibid. p. 131.

111 BN MS Dupuy 558 fol. 43r.

112 Ibid. fol. 41v.

Netherlands as essentially a new state in the making, and (in case Le Jay was inclined to press him further about why he was giving out advice) he was merely speculating aloud about what (in an ideal world) that new state-to-be might look like:

Il a entendu leur proposer une forme ou ydée d'estat en Perfection, par ce qu'ils n'ont point encores de forme bien accordee en leur estat, Qui ne consiste a presente proprement ny en monarchie, aristocratie ny democratie, affin que la Reigle contenue dans son liure leur puisse seruir de Patron pour s'en approcher ou y paruenir entierement sil est possible. Confesse bien qu'il n'y a Aucune forme d'estat qu'il cognoisse au monde, qui soit reiglé selon telle perfection, Mais qu'il peult aduenir qu'aux estatz qui en sont esloignez, Ils puissent prendre volonte aux Roys & souuerains Magistrats d'amender les deffaults qui se trouueroient selon les opportunitez que dieu leur en presentoit[113].

Le Jay was not deceived. Under cover of an advice manual for the Dutch Republic, Turquet was in fact talking about France and the French monarchy. Had he not written (Book I, fol. 13) that, throughout his book *ie pren icy la France pour champ*? Turquet was in greater difficulty here. There was really no doubt that his book had, and in terms, addressed itself to France under the guide of a dedication to the Estates General. He was forced to concede that he had done so *pour ce qu'estant françoys, Il luy a esté plus aise de tracer ses desseings sur un pays qu'il congnoist* although he had never intended *a donner Conseil ny aduis a la France, ny a son gouuernement pour y rien changer, ny remuer, Mais quil y a trassé ses desseings comme sur une Carte blanche*.

It was to the nature of Turquet's »advice« that Le Jay turned next. His strategy was to tease out those passages of the book that were *prima facie* capable of being construed as seditious libel. He began with the preface, where Turquet had written unambiguously that rulers could and should be censured by their subjects. Princes and potentates should not be offended *si on leur dit hardiment qu'eux & leurs oeuvres sont subiectes à la Censure du peuple*[114]. He singled out the passage, too, where Turquet said that, even in tyrannies, historical experience demonstrated that the people retain their power of censure through their »langues« and »plumes«[115]. Had Turquet not stated (Book I, fol. 13) that *la dignite Royale* was *assez peu cogneuë, & par consequent asse mal recogneuë en ce siecle pour la pluspart*? Le Jay had accurately picked up the drift of Turquet's argument about the »mutuality« of relationship between governor and governed and the author was obliged to stand by it, whilst stoutly defending himself from any charge of encouraging sedition thereby. Kings

ne Regnent point Paisiblement que moyennant une reputation ou Persuasion que le Peuple se forme de leur bonté, Iustice & vertu, de laquelle Reputation leurs actions sont Certaines Indices et quils ne peuuent euiter que le people, qui est compose de Creatures douées de Raison, qui n'est aultre chose que de faire discretion entre la vertu et le vice, n'en face Iugement en soy mesme des qualitez de son Prince, qui peu-

113 Ibid. fol. 43r.
114 Ibid. fol. 44r; MA preface, [unpag] e ii.
115 Ibid. fol. 45r; idem.

uent Causer Amitié & obeissance volontaire, ou desdain & hayne, qui sont aduertissements aux Princes, sains & salutaires a eulx & a leur estat, pour les maux que tous aages & siecles ont experimenté, la ou Ils les ont desdaignez, et se sont gouuernez trop absolument […][116].

It was deeper in the book, however, that Le Jay suspected that he had found the telltale signs of a subverter of France's »pure monarchy«, a closet monarchomach. He picked out ten suspicious passages from Book II (fols. 451). There Turquet had unambiguously asserted that the »corps« of the state *retient toujours le droict de Souueraineté, en proprieté & directe seigneurie*, that nature abhorred *les Monarchies purement seigneuriales, comme barbares, ainsi que de maistres sur leurs serfs* (fol. 40), that kings and sovereign rulers *prennent leurs magistere & puissance d'ailleurs … c'est a sçauoir du corps vniuersel de leurs Estats, qui la leur donne souuveraine, mais non infinie* […] (fol. 41), and that *ce que nos Iurisconsultes appellent la Loy Royale* was a *Loy imaginaire, qui n'est point, & ne fut oncques en nature* (fol. 43). Turquet's response was to refer Le Jay to those other parts of his text where he had emphasized that in *tout Royaume naturel* people are free and subjected only to the laws of nature and God, one of which was to obey legitimate rulers who governed them *comme sur leurs frères*[117]. His rejection of barbarous seigneurial monarchies referred to princes who *pretendent droit d'user & abuser de leur Peuple et de toutes choses, comme s'il est besoing d'exemple, nous pourrions alleguer l'estat de Moscouye et du Turc, Qui dominent sur leurs subiectz comme sur des Esclaues, Ce quil n'a iamais creu estre venu en pensée a noz Roys* […][118]. Although he had indeed written that sovereignty rested with the people, that was *eu Esgard a la Loy de Nature et en cest aage Primitif, ou Premierement ont esté conceue les Polices* (and he regarded the contemporary situation in the Netherlands as something approaching that primitive age when it came to its state-building). In well-established states such sovereignty was *comme dormante & sans aucune action*, a reserve power that only came into play in the extraordinary circumstances of an extreme tyranny. *Car pour lordinaire le Roy en est garde conseruateur & exacteur, et que les estats generaulx luy sont adjoints Regulierement, comme aydes et conseilz libres & fidelles, et pour Reculler au menu Peuple du Manyement et de la Congnoissance des grandes affaires*[119]. The so-called »Royal Law« was, in reality, a Roman invention for pagan emperors, who had used it to justify tyranny. His political principles were constructed around Christian notions of duty and obligation and that he therefore had written *en Chrestien & Theologien*.

Le Jay had one further issue to pursue. It was one where Turquet was at his most vulnerable. In Book II, fol. 59 then again in Book VII, fols. 4935, he had made unambiguous and direct remarks about the rule of women and foreigners, and about the kinds of marriage that French kings should and should not make. Here, Le Jay had found not just a smoking gun but a fully-loaded Kalashnikov, pointing straight at the Regent Marie de Médicis and the negotiations for the Spanish marriage of

116 Ibid. fols. 44v–45.
117 Ibid. fol. 48v.
118 Ibid. fol. 49v.
119 Ibid. fol. 51r.

Louis XIII. His views on a *gynnecocrastie*, or the »unnatural« régime of a female ruler were, of course, not unique to him or to Genevan protestants. They could be found powerfully advocated in Bodin too[120]. And, as Turquet robustly argued in his defence, the Salic Law was a foundation-stone of the French monarchy and *c'est un maxime quil poursuict en plusieurs endroicts de son liure sur ce propos quil ne fault rien alterer ny Innover en ce qui est receu de longue main en ung estat*. So, Le Jay, no seditious libel there. But, as his interrogator countered, the fact was that he had cast doubt on the auspiciousness and legitimacy of foreign and female rule during the Regency of just such a queen mother:

Il semble ses paroles blesser leurs Majestés bien que nous Recongnoissions tous tels gouuernement estre de l'usaige antien de la France et necessaire pour la conseruation de l'estat, et que le travail et Industrie de tous les subiectz doibt tender pendant la minorité du Roy a auctoriser la Regence de la Royne sa mere, sans apporter aucune diminution ny a son sexe ny a sa dignité[121].

Turquet recognised his danger and staged a strategic withdrawal. He had never intended to call into question the rule of Marie de Médicis. If he had used

de quelques termes aspres et quilz puissent estre mal receuz en parlant des femmes qui sont appellez au Regime des peuples, Il l'a faict aussy comme Chrestien, et Theologien, comme Il faict aussy en parlant des hommes, suiuant ce que en est porte en la parolle de dieu […] *non point pour en faire aucun reproche, mais pour leur mectre deuant les yeulx le naturel de l'homme et la femme pervertiz par le peche, qui est le premier degree de Sagesse*.

The queen mother was among *des sages & vertueuses pour l'experience qu'elle en a* and, for the removal of any doubt, he offered *s'explicquer plus amplement en la louange de ladicte dame et de l'estat francoys, et inciter ung chacun de luy obeyr de prier dieu quil luy face la grace sur tout de faire Instruire nostre Roy son fils en la reuerence des loix de dieu & de nature*. His offer of a revised preface, however, fell on deaf ears and Le Jay conspicuously ignored it.

Turquet may have been fortunate that his case was not pursued before the Parlement by the king's law officers. His age probably told in his favour. But so, too, did the politics of the moment. There would be prolonged negotiations with the Huguenot assembly at Saumur, lasting through the summer of 1611. The last thing the regency government wanted was that the protestants would come to treat Turquet de Mayerne or his book as a *cause célèbre*. That, at least, was Richelieu's explanation for why the case against Turquet was left pending[122]. Better to have the book,

120 See Claudia Opitz, Männliche Souveränität, weibliche Subordination? Staatsbildung, Adelsherrschaft und Geschlechterordnung in Jean Bodins »Six Livres de la Republique«, in: Ronald G. Asch and Dagmar Freist (ed), Staatsbildung als kultureller Prozess, Köln,Weimar,Wien 2005, p. 291–319; and, more generally, M. Waele, La Fin des Guerres de Religion et l'exclusion des femmes de la vie politique française, in: French Historical Studies 29 (2006), p. 199–230.

121 BN MS Dupuy 558, fols. 60v–61.

122 Richelieu's »Mémoires«, cited Mousnier (as in note 9), op.cit., p. 58.

rather than the author, buried. There was no question of a reissue, with or without a preface. It was left to Louis Dorléans to settle old scores. He appears to have been the only one of Turquet's critics in print who had actually read the »Monarchie aristodémocratique«[123]. His reply hinted at Turquet's non-French origins (in a play on the »Turc« in his surname) and ridiculed him as one of those *ancien puritains* who *n'ont montre, & ne montrent en leur purete, que de la turbulence*. His mixed monarchy was a Genevan Trojan Horse with which to *changer notre domination, & couper le chef, les bras & les iambes à nostre Françoise Monarchie*[124]. In his League days, Dorléans had been a supporter of (catholic) mixed monarchy so one might say that it took one to know one – a point that Turquet made when, in his reply six years later, he tried to smuggle in as much of the substance of the original argument as he dared[125]. But it fell on deaf ears. A »disciplinary revolution« might have been conceivable in newly-configured state-like structures or states (The Netherlands: Brandenburg-Prussia). But in an old polity like the French kingdom it was different. The French political elite, dominated by its magistrates and jurists had, with the accumulated weight of their bitter experience of a generation of civil war, come to see the state as embodied in a pure and unadulterated monarchy. Another (anonymous and undated) treatise in the Dupuy collection, alongside Turquet's interrogation, encapsulates this conception[126]. Monarchy is where sovereignty is in the hands of one person. That sovereignty has »marks« (the power of Bodin's conception is everywhere to be heard among French jurists in the early seventeenth century). A mixed monarchy is therefore an aberration, one of those *monstres d'estatz*. Such *establissementz libres & meslez soit de democratie ou aristocratie ont esté et seront tousiours la peste & ruine de notre religion catholicque*[127]. »Civic republicanism« and »monarchical republicanism« may have been only contingently associated with Calvinist protestantism in Emden or among the middling sort of England's villages and market towns, but in the minds of French magistrates and jurists they were two faces of the same unacceptable coin.

123 J. d. Baricave, La defence de la monarchie francoise et avtres monarchies. Contre les detestables et execrables Maximes d'Estat d'Estienne Ivnivs Brvtvs & de Lovys de Mayerne Tvrqvet & leurs adhérens, Toulouse 1614 cites him in the title, but it is evident that he does not know the work firsthand. Turquet also mentions two further attacks on the work, one by François Solier and the other by Pelletier, neither of which I have located.

124 Dorléans (as in note 52), fols. 373; 376.

125 Louis Turquet de Mayerne, Apologie contre les detractevrs des liures de la Monarchie Aristodemocratique, 1617.

126 BN MS Dupuy 558 fol. 67 et seq. [»Traicte des droictz et auctoritez du roy«].

127 Ibid. fol. 76r.